



TREES FOR GLOBAL BENEFITS PROGRAM IN UGANDA

A Plan Vivo Project Annual Report

February 2011

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| LIST OF ACRONYMS | 5 |
| 1. KEY EVENTS, DEVELOPMENTS AND CHALLENGES..... | 7 |
| 1.1 Key Developments..... | 7 |
| 1.1.1 Expansion of Project Area..... | 7 |
| 1.2 Key Events | 8 |
| 1.2.1 Plan vivo stakeholder conference 2010: | 8 |
| 1.2.2 Conference on Payments for Ecosystem Services in East and Central Africa Sub-region, | 8 |
| 1.2.3 Capacity-Building for Agricultural Carbon Projects in Africa; Nov. 2010..... | 8 |
| 1.3 Other Developments..... | 9 |
| 1.3.1 REDD + Preparedness Process..... | 9 |
| 1.3.2 Visit by Plan Vivo Foundation staff | 9 |
| 1.3.3 Equator Snow Lodge | 12 |
| 1.3.4 Visits by other Projects | 12 |
| 1.4 Challenges..... | 12 |
| 1.5 Suggestions to address the challenges | 13 |
| 2. ACTIVITIES | 13 |
| 3. SALES..... | 15 |
| 4. ALLOCATION OF SALES TO PRODUCERS | 17 |
| 5. PARTICIPATION AND RECRUITMENT | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| 5.1 Recruitment | 19 |
| 5.2 Farmer Sensitisation and Training | 21 |
| 5.4 Revised Guidelines for seedlings management..... | 22 |
| 6.0 SUMMARY OF MONITORING RESULTS..... | 23 |
| 6.1 Challenges observed during monitoring | 25 |
| 6. PAYMENTS TO PRODUCERS | 25 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 8.1 | FARMER MEETINGS | 27 |
| 8.2 | COMMUNITY – BASED MONITORING | 27 |
| 8.3 | CARBON COMMUNITY FUND | 27 |
| 8.4 | ISSUES ARISING OUT OF THE MEETINGS..... | 28 |
| 8. | BREAKDOWN OF OPERATIONAL COSTS..... | 28 |
| 10.1 | Extension of Project to Mt. Elgon Area..... | 29 |
| 10.2 | Improved Forest Management | 29 |
| 10.3 | Identification of other project activities | 29 |
| 10.4 | Building for Local Stakeholder Involvement..... | 29 |
| 10.5 | Equipment | 29 |
| 10.6 | Farmer Exchange Visits. | 29 |

List of Tables

Table 1: Carbon sales in 2010

Table 2: Summary allocation per site

Table 3: Allocation for 2010 compared with sales for the same year

Table 4: Recruitment

Table 5: Total number of farmers recruited by the project over the years

Table 6: Community training in 2010

Table 7: Monitoring results

Table 8: Monitoring results of continuing farmers who did not meet their targets

Table 9: Amount for Seedlings received by producers

Table 10: Summary of payments to producers

Table 11: Summary of operational costs

List of Plates

Plate 1: Agro forestry system- coffee intercropped with shade trees. On the right is the carbon producer.

Plate 2: Carbon producers, Plan Vivo staff (second from left) and ECOTRUST officials attending a meeting at Bitereko Sub county

Appendices

Appendix 1 List of Producers Allocated to Buyers in 2010 and their monitoring results

Appendix 2: Verification and monitoring results per district/site-showing numbers monitored and targets

List of Acronyms

| | |
|----------|---|
| ASARECA | Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa |
| CARE | Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere |
| CCAFS | Climate Change Agriculture and Food Security |
| CCF | Carbon Community Fund |
| ECOTRUST | Environment Conservation Trust of Uganda |
| ES | Ecosystem Services |
| ICRAF | World Agroforestry Centre |
| PRESA | Pro-poor Rewards for Environmental Services in Africa |
| REPA | Rights Equity and Protected Areas |
| PES | Payment for Ecosystem Services |
| PIN | Project Idea Note |
| PDD | Project Design Document |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organisation |
| TFGB | Trees For Global Benefit |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| STAR | Sustainable Tourism in the Albertine Rift |
| WWF | World Wild Fund |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural Development |
| VIC | Visitor information Centre |
| EU | European Union |
| WFP | World Food Programme |
| FAO | Food & Agricultural Organisation |
| DFID | Department for International Development |
| DANIDA | Danish International Development Agency |

| | |
|-------|---|
| IPA | Innovations for Poverty Actions |
| IIED | International Institute for Environment and Development |
| NEMA | National Environment Management Authority |
| CSWCT | Chimpanzee Sanctuary and Wildlife Conservation Trust |

Key Events, Developments and Challenges

Trees for Global Benefits is a community carbon management scheme linking small – scale landholder farmers to the voluntary carbon market, based on the Plan Vivo system. This report presents the progress of the project activities for the year 2010.

1.1 Key Developments

1.1.1 Expansion of Project Area

During the reporting period, the project has invested in expansion of its area of coverage. The selected areas of expansion included two mountain ecosystems; Rwenzori (Western Uganda) and Elgon in Eastern Uganda. Whereas a new expansion concept will be needed for the Mt. Elgon area, the Kasese area was already included in the original PDD together with Bushenyi District. However, it is only during this reporting period that the project started to actively recruit farmers from Kasese

1.1.1.1 Kasese

With support from various partners: ASARECA, CARE International, ICRAF/ PRESA, the TFGB project has been mobilising carbon producers in Kasese District, specifically in areas surrounding Mountain Rwenzori National Park to participate in Payment for Environmental Services Schemes (PES). CARE International has supported the formation of the participating groups as part of a wider collaborative natural resource management project under their REPA (Rights, Equity & Protected Areas) programme.

Through the ICRAF/PRESA project, the TFGB project was able to conduct the background surveys that established the need for the project in the area as well as the required technical specifications. The PRESA project has also supported the training of two groups that have joined and planted trees during the reporting period. Furthermore, PRESA has supported the building of capacity for the farmers to access markets for the other products e.g. honey. The communities in Kasese are working on an eco-label for their honey.

ASARECA has supported the assessment of other environmental services as well as supporting the building of capacity for local partners to effectively participate in Payment for Environmental Services schemes.

1.1.1.2 Mt Elgon Area

This is an area that lies in Eastern Uganda and has significant and critical biodiversity. The key values of Mt. Elgon region are natural heritage, biodiversity, water catchment, agricultural base and tourism. The area has been proposed for nomination under the World Convention on Heritage Sites¹. With support from ASARECA, ECOTRUST has conducted an assessment of the value of Ecosystem Services (ES) in the Mt. Elgon area. ECOTRUST gone further and carried out socio-economic assessments to establish the potential for a carbon offset scheme. In addition, ECOTRUST has

¹ Lake Victoria Basin Commission 2009

conducted a biomass assessment to establish the sequestration potential of the desired farming systems and data is still being analysed.

1.1.1.2 New Locations in Old Sites

The project has continued to receive applications for extension of the activities in additional sub-counties within the old districts (especially Masindi). Farmers in some of the sub-counties (Miria and Kamengo) neighbouring areas where the project is operating in Masindi District have expressed interest in planting trees. Furthermore, there is expression of interest by farmers and local leaders Biiso Sub-county which currently belongs to a new neighbouring Bullisa district.

1.2 Key Events

Trees for Global Benefits has continued to be consulted to provide a learning experience at a number of international discussions regarding related to financing for agriculture, food security, forestry and climate change. The meetings that the project has participated in include those hosted by IFAD, Bill Gates, Green Belt Movement, Climate Change Agriculture & Food Security (CCAFS).

1.2.1 Plan vivo stakeholder conference 2010:

ECOTRUST participated in the Plan vivo stakeholder conference that was held in Edinburgh in November 2010. The aim of the meeting was to bring stakeholders together to discuss the development of the Plan vivo system and standard as well as continually scale-up of Plan Vivo activities. The participants also discussed topics that included marketing and funding models for community carbon, Plan Vivo and REDD+ etc.

1.2.2 Conference on Payments for Ecosystem Services in East and Central Africa Sub-region,

In collaboration with several partners (ASARECA, NAHI, KARI, Moi University, VIRED), ECOTRUST organized a sub-regional conference on Payment for Environmental Services (PES) in East and Central Africa. This was under the ASERECA funded project entitled Valuation, Attribution and Compensation of Ecosystem Services in Eastern and Central Africa. The conference aimed at bringing together researchers to share results of diverse researches on PES and stimulating discussion on starting PES Projects and participate in climate change negotiations including transboundary resources. This was an opportunity for researchers, policy makers and community leaders to share research finding and experiences in developing PES schemes and agree on initiatives to implement PES at local, national or regional level. A framework for an alliance PES for the entire region with the aim of implementing PES was also developed during the workshop. The conference focused on the various ES mainly watershed management, carbon sequestration as well as the institutional and policy issues necessary for implementing sustainable PES schemes. The discussions involved the current and emerging environmental issues related to the East and Central African landscapes and highlighted opportunities presented by PES schemes for local communities and for environmental conservation. The Keynote address was presented by Elaine Muir from the Plan Vivo Foundation in Edinburgh.

1.2.3 Capacity-Building for Agricultural Carbon Projects in Africa; Nov. 2010.

Two staff members from ECOTRUST attended a workshop organised by The *Institutional Analysis and Capacity-Building for Agricultural Carbon Projects in Africa* project, managed by EcoAgriculture Partners and Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) Programme. The initiative supports developers and managers of agricultural carbon projects in Africa to establish projects that

pay farmers for the environmental services they provide, while ensuring that these projects support local sustainable development priorities and are cost-effective. The workshop engaged ECOTRUST and other five agricultural carbon projects in Africa, and aimed at assessing how projects organize themselves in order to best serve the interests of farmers. Knowledge was shared between projects and research methodology for field work developed. After the workshop, a researcher(s) planned to visit ECOTRUST project site to document some of its institutional characteristics and develop a baseline that will allow for comparative analysis across projects.

1.3 Other Developments

1.3.1 REDD + Preparedness Process

The project through the Programme Officer – Gerald Kairu, has participated in the REDD+ preparedness process for Uganda. The process is spearheaded by the National Forestry Authority under Uganda's Ministry of Water and Environment. Furthermore, ECOTRUST has been selected to lead consultations of the communities and other REDD+ stakeholders in Western Uganda as part of the process to develop a REDD+ preparedness proposal.

1.3.2 Visit by Plan Vivo Foundation staff

The Plan Vivo Foundation visited some of the TFGB implementation sites. The field visit conducted by Elaine Muir, a Programme Manager at the Plan Vivo Foundation coincided with an invitation to the International Conference on Payments for Ecosystem Services in East and Central Africa Sub-region, Jinja, Uganda. The Plan Vivo Foundation was invited to deliver the keynote address and to outline their experience of delivering PES in developing countries. After the conference, a trip was arranged for the Plan Vivo Foundation to visit some of the project sites and producers. The aim of the trip was to visit a sample of producers to discuss their experiences with the project, assess how Plan Vivo activities had progressed since the last project visit in 2008 and identify some of the challenges that farmers continue to face.

Visit to the Rural Bank: The Rural Bank explained the process of how payments were transferred to community members. The Bank receives a list from ECOTRUST detailing the farmers who have met their monitoring targets and the amounts that has been transferred to be credited on their various individual accounts in the Rural Bank.

Visit to Producers: Two farmers in the Bushenyi region were visited - Reverend Kato and Bonny Mukiga. It was noted that Rev. Kato's site was an excellent example of a *plan vivo*, with a variety of activities implemented on the same piece of land including mixed native woodlot and agroforestry as shown in the Plate 1.



Photo by Elaine Muir Plate 1: Agro forestry system- coffee intercropped with shade trees. On the right is the carbon producer.

Community meeting: A meeting consisting of producers in Bitereko was organised and attended by the visiting Plan Vivo staff (Plate 2). Producers' expressed their happiness and appreciation to the Plan Vivo for the work being done especially enabling them (producers) to access carbon finance.



Photo by Elaine Muir

Plate 2: Carbon producers, Plan Vivo staff (second from left) and ECOTRUST officials attending a meeting at Bitereko Sub county



Visit to Kasese: Kasese (near the Rwenzori Mountains National Park) is one of the sites that the project is proposing for expansion. At this site, visits were made to a nursery site, and farms where implementation for agroforestry and boundary planting systems are on-going. Plate 3 shows a farm where boundary planting is being practiced.

Plate 3: Boundary planting on farm in Kasese

Meeting with TreeTalk: A meeting was organised for the Plan Vivo foundation to assess the capacity of Tree talk, a local NGO to manage a carbon offset scheme in Northern Uganda in partnership with ECOTRUST. Partnerships with NGOs/CBOs with a strong presence as well agro-forestry expertise is one of the strategies that the project is employing to extend to other parts of the country. Tree Talk the Northern Uganda project partner is an environmental programme and is part of a larger organisation – Straight Talk Foundation – which is involved with the communication of health and development issues. Although the Straight Talk Foundation was established in 1993, the Tree Talk programme started in

2002 with funding from DFID, WFP, FAO, USAID, EU and DANIDA. The objective of Tree Talk *‘enhance rural livelihoods and support poverty alleviation, to improve awareness on the importance of biodiversity and conservation of Protected Areas and to impart skills and build resilience towards the impending impacts of climate change’* is consistent with that of Tree for Global Benefits.

1.3.3 Equator Snow Lodge

A first class eco-lodge Eco-lodge ‘Equator Snow Mountain Lodge’ has been constructed to complement the project activities in the Rwenzoris through a partnership between ECOTRUST and Geo-lodges. The lodge, which is expected to be fully operational in 2011 is part of an exciting community-based tourism programme to be implemented together with the Rwenzori Communities, at the Rwenzori Mountains Gateway. This is one of the efforts for ECOTRUST to reach out to the wider community in which the carbon project operates. The Rwenzori Mountains Gateway is a 35ha piece of formerly degraded farmland that was purchased by ECOTRUST with funding from WWF and has now been converted into a private nature reserve through assisted natural regeneration. Although the process of regeneration sequesters carbon, the reserve is not generating any credits. It is rather investing in eco-tourism as means of involving communities in its conservation.

In addition to providing first class accommodation to visitors, the Eco-Lodge will generate income for improved community livelihoods as well as for supporting conservation in the area. Geo-lodges, the private sector partner brings a wealth of experience in the hospitality industry and is committed to training the local communities, building their capacity to provide first class hospitality services- the kind that befits the quality of this lodge. In addition to the lodge, the Gateway will also have a Visitor Information Center (VIC) as well as a Forest Exploration Programme.

1.3.4 Visits by other Projects

The project hosted a US based International NGO called Village in Action in one of the villages in Bwijanga Masindi district, to understand the role played by TFGB in the improvement of livelihoods of the communities. Farmers testified that the carbon finance that farmers get through planting of trees is being used for various purposes - for example, some farmers use this money to take their children to school while others use it to buy agricultural inputs like simple agricultural tools, improved cereals and nuts for planting. Through these, farmers are able to get higher yields.

1.4 Challenges

Fires

There was one fire incidence in Masindi, where a mentally disturbed person set a farm belonging to one of the carbon producers (Mugisa Jackson Matovu) ablaze. Mugisa is one of the newly recruited farmers who had signed his carbon sales contract. Monitoring results showed that although Mugisa has met his target, 75% of the trees he planted were burnt. The project is still discussing with Mugisha to find ways of keeping him motivated to continue with the project.

Delays in submission of supporting documents

The project is experiencing delays from some of the newly recruited farmers in sending the supporting documents; mainly passport photographs and account numbers to the field offices. Facilities such as studios to take pictures are far from some of these project locations. Furthermore, the farmers in Masindi have continued to prefer accounts in big banks, which are located in town as opposed to the

village banks. Some of them only open the accounts for purposes of carbon finance. This in turn causes delays in finalising the agreements and thus dispatching the carbon finance.

Performance attainment & monitoring dates

There have been cases of farmers making very significant improvements immediately after the monitoring exercise and allocation of available sales has been concluded. These farmers expect a contract and payments immediately since sometimes they even achieve more than the target. It is very difficult for these farmers to understand that the difference in timing contributed to who gets allocated and paid first. This has resulted in some disgruntled farmers who instead of accepting responsibility for their not meeting the set target on time simply claim that their payments have been delayed.

Poor Tree Management

There is reluctance by some farmers to delay spot weeding/general weeding/slashing. These delays results in the trees not looking healthy and are etiolated. This in turn, makes the monitoring process difficult and tedious in this bushy environment for the team.

Estimating Land Size

Farmers cannot correctly estimate the size of their land. This is partly because of low literacy rates and lack of appropriate tools to use to measure their land. During sensitisation meetings, attempts have been made to train participants in simple user-friendly ways of measuring land, for example, by using sticks of known length to measure the entire boundary. Secondly, use of pace factor/strides as another local way of measuring. Further trainings will be carried out to the wider community to ensure that they can fairly estimate the size of their land. The challenge of the farmer not being able to correctly estimate his/her land is that it causes an unnecessary argument about the correct size of land etc.

1.5 Suggestions to address the challenges

The project will continue to emphasize the tree management requirements to farmers during the different workshops.

2. Activities

The TFGB Plan Vivo project has continued to implement the activities in compliance with the Plan Vivo Standard. There are also cases where some farmers change the land use plan (*plan vivo*) by planting trees in areas that were not originally on the *plan vivo*. The farmers that have changed land use plans have been requested to re-draw them and they are complying.

The project is in the process of developing specifications for the new sites (Mt. Elgon) as well as for new activities such as improved forest management. With support from ASARECA, the project has carried out biomass and socio economic assessments. The results from these assessments will

provide information on the preferred farming systems as well the data that will be used to develop the respective technical specifications for Mt. Elgon area. This work was funded under the ASERECA project that is developing tools for valuation, attribution and compensation of ecosystem services of east and central Africa.

3. Sales

A total of 80,879tCO₂ has been sold to buyers in 2010. In addition, the project will be holding 18,091 Plan Vivo Certificates as unsold credits in its registry account. Below is a list of the sales and distribution of funds.

| Buyer | tCO ₂ | Price/t CO ₂ (\$) | Total Price | Total Sale Price in US\$ | Certificate issuance fee (\$0.30) + Registry fee (\$0.05) | Third Party Verification | ET | Producer | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|----|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | | | | | To the Individual | Contribution to CCF | Total % to community |
| U&W | 28538 | * | | | | | | | | 62% |
| Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.p.A | 1615 | * | | | | | | | | 58% |
| Tetra Pak | 15100 | * | | | | | | | | 62% |
| Uganda Carbon Bureau (UCB) | 199 | * | | | | | | | | 41% |
| International Lifeline Fund (via UCB) | 123 | * | | | | | | | | 41% |
| Straight Plc | 1000 | * | | | | | | | | 58% |
| IIED | 779 | * | | | | | | | | 49% |
| U&W Coop Denmark & other | 3111 | * | | | | | | | | 58% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----|
| Embassy of Denmark Kampala | 414 | * | | | | | | | | 49% |
| Nedbank | 30000 | * | | | | | | | | 62% |
| Unsold stocks | 18,091 | * | | | | | | | | 62% |
| | 98,970 | * | | | | | | | | 62% |

*pricing information has been removed to ensure client confidentiality

Table 1: Carbon sales in 2010

Key

ET = ECOTRUST

CCF = Carbon Community Fund

Third Party Verification: Contribution to all third party verification & validation as and when they take place

4. Allocation of Sales to Producers

In 2010, a total of 323 farmers generating 86,604tCO₂ from Bushenyi, Hoima, Masindi and Kasese have been allocated various buyers. In addition, the project will be holding 18,091 tCO₂ from 72 farmers as unsold certificates in the registry. Table 2 shows the number of farmers allocated to the different buyers in the respective sites. Table 3 shows the balance of allocations.

Table 2: Summary allocation per site

| Buyer | Sale (tCO ₂) | Buyer Price (\$) | Producers Description | | | Price to producer (\$) | Monitored? (Y/N) | Payment due |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | | Location | Number of producers | Area (ha) | | | |
| U&W10 Folksam | 3,002 | | Bitereko | 4 | 6 | 3.74 | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kiyanga | 6 | 8.5 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | | 10 | 14.5 | | | |
| U&W10 Other | 828 | | Budongo | 2 | 2 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Bitereko | 1 | 1 | | Y | |
| | | | Kabwoya | 1 | 1 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | | 4 | 4 | | | |
| U&W-Coop Denmark (other) | 3,111 | | Bitereko | 7 | 7.5 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kiziranfumbi | 2 | 4 | | | |
| | | | Kiyanga | 4 | 4.75 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | | 13 | 16.25 | | | |
| U&W Max | 24,708 | | Bitereko | 34 | 39.5 | Y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Budongo | 2 | 3 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Bwijanga | 1 | 1 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kichwamba | 3 | 3 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kiyanga | 39 | 47.25 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kyangwali | 6 | 10 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Ryeru | 10 | 17.75 | Y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | | 95 | 121.5 | | | |
| Tetrapk10 | 15,100 | | Bitereko | 30 | 30.5 | Y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Bwijanga | 5 | 6 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kabwoya | 3 | 3 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kanyabwanga | 2 | 2 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kiyanga | 8 | 12.5 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kiziranfumbi | 9 | 10 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Kyangwali | 4 | 5.75 | y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | Budongo | 4 | 6 | Y | Apr-11 | |
| | | | | 65 | 75.75 | | | |

| Buyer | Sale (tCO2) | Buyer Price (\$) | Producers Description | | | Price to producer (\$) | Monitored? (Y/N) | Payment due |
|------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| | | | Location | Number of producers | Area (ha) | | | |
| Uganda Carbon Bureau | 199 | | Bitereko | 2 | 1.75 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| International Lifeline | 123 | | | | | | | |
| Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A | 1,615 | | Bitereko | 5 | 7.25 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| Prior Year Adjustments** | 5,725 | | Kiyanga | 4 | 8.25 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kichwamba | 6 | 6.25 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Ryeru | 9 | 14.25 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | | 19 | 28.75 | | | |
| IIED | 779 | | Kichwamba | 3 | 3.75 | | y | Apr-11 |
| Embassy of Denmark | 414 | | Ryeru | 1 | 2.25 | | y | Apr-11 |
| Straight PLC | 1,000 | | Ryeru | 4 | 4.75 | | y | Apr-11 |
| Nedbank | 30,000 | | Ryeru | 31 | 59 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Pakanyi | 4 | 4.25 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Nyangahya | 4 | 4.5 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Muhokya | 1 | 4 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Maliba | 9 | 19.8 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kyangwali | 14 | 14 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kiziranfumbi | 14 | 14.75 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kiyanga | 18 | 17.75 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kigorobya | 3 | 3.25 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Bwijanga | 2 | 3.4 | | Y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Bugoye | 2 | 3.4 | | | |
| | | | | 102 | 148.1 | | | |
| ECOTRUST | 18,091 | | Kichwamba | 28 | 26.875 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Kabwoya | 11 | 11 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Bunyaruguru | 8 | 22.75 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Bugoye | 5 | 5 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Budongo | 1 | 1 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Bitereko | 12 | 13.25 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | Ryeru | 7 | 9.75 | | y | Apr-11 |
| | | | | 72 | 89.625 | | | |
| Total | 104,695*** | | Total | 395 | 518.225 | | | |

***Note: Price per producer includes contribution to CCF as according to producer contract.**

**** Adjustment to account for last year's shortfall (due to mis-calculation of risk buffer level)**

***** Total sales (including the allocation of 5,725 for prior year adjustments)**

Table 3: Allocation for 2010 compared with sales for the same year.

| Buyer | Total tCO2 Allocated | Total tCO2 purchased | Deficit/Over Supply |
|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| U&W10 Folksam | 2949.3 | 3,002 | -53 |
| U&W10 Other | 813.6 | 828 | -14 |
| U&W Max | 24713.1 | 24,708 | 5 |
| U&W-Coop Denmark | 2084.85 | 2,111 | -26 |
| U&W (other) | 813.6 | 1,000 | -186 |
| UCB/Lifeline | 355.95 | 322 | 34 |
| Tetrapk10 | 15102.45 | 15,100 | 2 |
| Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A | 1474.65 | 1,615 | -140 |
| Prior Year Adjustments | 5847.75 | 5,725 | 123 |
| IIED | 762.75 | 779 | -16 |
| Embassy of Denmark | 457.65 | 414 | 44 |
| Straight PLC | 966.15 | 1,000 | -34 |
| Nedbank | 30123.54 | 30,000 | 124 |
| ECOTRUST | 18229.73 | 18,091 | 139 |
| | 104695.065 | 104695.07 | 0 |

5. Participation and recruitment

5.1 Recruitment

The project has invested a lot of effort in the recruitment of new producers as well as in the provision opportunities for producers to actively participate in the project. During this reporting period (2010), the project has processed a total of 695 applications submitted by farmers from the districts of Bushenyi, Hoima, Masindi and Kasese. Out of these 395 farmers have been able to fulfill the requirements of entering into agreements to undertake project activities on 518ha of land and have received or are in the process of receiving payments. The remaining 298 with 379ha of land are at different stages of fulfilling the project requirements.

| District | Sub-county | Total Processed | Total Fulfilling requirements |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Bushenyi | Bitereko | 164 | 95 |
| | Kiyanga | 155 | 79 |
| | Ryeru | 99 | 62 |
| | Kichwamba | 68 | 40 |
| | Bunyaruguru | 4 | 8 |
| | Kanyabwanga | 8 | 2 |

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| | Sub total | 498 | 286 |
| Hoima | Kyangwali | 48 | 24 |
| | Kiziranfumbi | 47 | 25 |
| | Kabwoya | 18 | 15 |
| | Kaseta | 0 | 0 |
| | Sub total | 113 | 64 |
| Masindi | Kigorobyia | 3 | 3 |
| | Bwijanga | 12 | 8 |
| | Budongo | 21 | 9 |
| | Nyangahya | 7 | 4 |
| | Pakanyi | 22 | 4 |
| | Sub total | 65 | 28 |
| Kasese | Bugoye | 9 | 7 |
| | Maliba | 9 | 9 |
| | Muhokya | 1 | 1 |
| | Sub total | 19 | 17 |
| | GRAND TOTAL | 695 | 395 |

Table 4: 2010 Recruitment

| Year of Allocation | Number of farmers allocated to buyer |
|---------------------------|---|
| 2003 | 30 |
| 2004 | 54 |
| 2006 | 18 |
| 2007 | 34 |
| 2008 | 268 |
| 2009 | 110 |
| 2010 | 395 |
| Total | 909 |

Table 5: Total number of farmers recruited by the project from 2003 - 2010

5.2 Farmer Sensitisation and Training

During this reporting period a number of sensitizations (including induction) and trainings have been carried out. The trainings have been focusing on ensuring that the different stages in the Plan Vivo cycle are clearly understood by both the potential and participating producers. Training workshops were conducted in all the project sites. These included both new and already participating farmers. During the meetings, the farmers were able to share and learn how the project operates. This is an opportunity for whoever would like to understand the various aspects/components of the project before they join it. This is critical given the long term nature of the project and also due to the fact that tree planting competes with other land use activities. The workshops also included ideas on the enterprises that farmers can conduct within their woodlots. The groups especially in Bushenyi i.e. Bitereko, Bunyaruguru and Kiyanga received training in project identification, design and management as part of the Community Carbon Fund (CCF) application process. The groups in Hoima also received similar training but it was not as detailed as for Bushenyi, since they are still in their early formative stages and still dealing with some group dynamics. Although trainings are held at different sites, the content is the same and generally covers the topics listed below:

- Importance of tree planting to a farmer and the global community
- Tree planting and climate change
- Carbon and carbon sequestration
- A brief overview of the carbon project (Trees for Global Benefit as a case study), its purpose and area of operation
- Farmer recruitment process / project cycle i.e. sensitisation, application & plan vivo, verification, monitoring and carbon sale)
- Tree planting systems promoted and tree proportions (basing on tree classification) promoted
- Nursery and tree management
- Carbon Community Fund; Accessing it through the available guidelines

The project also held short training sessions targeting 10 to 15 participants at different stages of the project, discussing a variety of topics related to the project. These provide more interaction between the facilitators and participants and are very productive. They mainly target farmers in a specific locality, so producers don't have to travel long distances which is the case for large group training.

Table 6 shows the sites where sensitizations/training meetings have been done, including the number of trainings per site and number of participants attending the training.

Table 6: Community training in 2010

| Details | | | Percent(%) | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------|--------|
| District | Site | Number of Trainings | Number of participants | Male | Female |
| Bushenyi | Bitereko | 3 | 356 | 72 | 28 |
| | Ryeru/rutoto | 3 | 165 | 88 | 12 |
| | Kichwamba/Katerera | 1 | 47 | 91 | 9 |
| | Kiyanga | 2 | 211 | 85 | 15 |
| Masindi | Bwijanga | 2 | 87 | 62.1 | 37.9 |
| | Ongo | 1 | 28 | 71.4 | 28.6 |
| | Karujubu | 2 | 45 | 64.4 | 35.6 |
| | Pakanyi | 3 | 86 | 73.3 | 26.7 |
| | Nyantanzi | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Nyagahya | 2 | 63 | 60.3 | 39.7 |
| Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 1 | 46 | 85 | 15 |
| | Kyangwali | 2 | 127 | 84 | 16 |
| | Kabwoya | 1 | 30 | 20 | 10 |
| | Kaseeta | 2 | 92 | 92 | 8 |
| Kasese | Ruboni | 1 | 49 | 60 | 40 |
| | Maliba | 1 | 20 | 80 | 20 |
| Totals | | 27 | 1452 | | |

5.4 Revised Guidelines for seedlings management

The project has further refined the guidelines that are being used in the management of seedling distribution to interested farmers. Availability of quality seedlings has been a challenge and yet it is critical to the success of the project. There have been issues on the timing of approvals, making of orders and the planting seasons. Experience has shown that farmers who take advantage of the seedling on credit system, are better at attaining targets compared to those that are not. The guidelines will ensure timely supply of good quality and recommended tree species from approved nursery operators. The guidelines give an opportunity for orders by farmers with approved *plan vivos* to be made in time for the next planting season.

6.0 Summary of Monitoring Results

One of the main developments in the monitoring of carbon producers has been the introduction of peer group monitoring. This has been piloted in the previous years but has been always conducted in collaboration with ECOTRUST staff. We have had experienced farmers pairing up with ECOTRUST staff to monitor farmers from a different group. For this reporting period however, the experienced farmers were sent to the field in groups and conducted the monitoring without the ECOTRUST staff. The results were later verified by ECOTRUST staff. However, this was carried out only in the old sites of Ryeru, Kichwamba, Bitereko & Bunyaruguru and also covering farmers in year 1 and above. The project has not yet developed enough capacity among the farmers at the relatively new sites of Hoima, Masindi and Kasese. The monitoring at these sites continues to be fully conducted by ECOTRUST staff. Fortunately, there are field offices and staff in these districts. Table 7 is a summary of monitoring results. Detailed verification and monitoring results are shown in Appendix 2

Table 7: Monitoring results

| District | Site | Number of producers | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| | | Year 0 | Year 1 | Year 3 | Year 5 | Year 10 |
| Bushenyi | Bitereko | 101 | 39 | 9 | 17 | 0 |
| | Ryeru/rutoto | 81 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kichwamba/Katerera | 52 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kiyanga | 87 | 32 | 3 | 9 | 0 |
| | Kanyabwanga | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Masindi | Bwijanga | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | Ongo | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Karujubu | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | Pakanyi | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Budongo | 10 | 17 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| | Nyagahya | 6 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kigorobyia | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|------------|------------|----|----|---|
| Hoima | Kiziramfumbi | 39 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kyangwali | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kabwoya | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Kaseeta | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| N. Uganda | Kitgum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Adjumani | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kasese | Bugoye | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Maliba | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | | 487 | 130 | 45 | 26 | 0 |

Of the monitored farmers, some did not meet the target as in the carbon sales contract (see Appendix 3). As result they were not paid pending completion of their targets. Table 8 shows results of farmers who did not meet targets at the implementations sites

Table 8: Monitoring results of continuing farmers who did not meet their targets

| District | Site | Number |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Bushenyi | Bitereko | 11 |
| | Ryeru | 0 |
| | Kichwamba | 1 |
| | Kiyanga | 16 |
| Masindi | Bwijanga | 1 |
| | Ongo | 17 |
| | Karujubu | 0 |
| | Pakanyi | 0 |
| | Nyantanzi | 0 |
| | Nyagahya | 5 |
| Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 2 |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|----|
| | Kyangwali | 1 |
| | Kabwoya | 0 |
| Totals | | 42 |

6.1 Challenges observed during monitoring

- Seedling thefts and or uprooting due to boundary conflicts: Some producers planted seedlings but are uprooted and stolen by fellow producers and other people. Some producers plant seedlings close to the boundary and these end up being uprooted by the neighbours.
- Trampling of seedlings by domestic animals
- Prolonged drought
- Governance and leadership weaknesses in some groups in Hoima and Masindi
- There was an unusually high number of farmers not fulfilling their requirements due to drought
- Inaccessibility of some of the farms (in hills and mountains) making monitoring rather difficult. It would be unfair not to allow such farmers to plant in these areas for the reason that the pieces of land available to them is in hills. Although it is a very big challenge as far as monitoring is concerned, these sites provide significant environmental benefits such as watershed protection. However, in future, it will be very important to come up with cost effective means of monitoring such farms.

5. Payments to Producers

As is normally the case, all producers who met the targets as specified in the contracts and technical specifications were paid. Most of the payments were made directly to the producers while some were made directly to the nursery operators on behalf of the producers that acquired seedlings on loan. Table 9 and 10 show the direct payments to farmers and to the nursery operators respectively.

Table 9: Summary of payments to producers

| Date | District | Amount(US\$) |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| 26.05.10 | Hoima & Masindi | 5632.00 |
| 19.07.10 | Bushenyi | 34578.00 |
| 13.10.10 | Bushenyi, Hoima and Masindi | 5828.00 |
| 30.11.10 | Bushenyi | 15019.00 |
| Total | | 61057.00 |

Table 10: Amount for Seedlings received by producers

| Date | District | Amount(US\$) |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 01.03.10 | Bushenyi | 3392.00 |
| 29.06.10 | Bushenyi | 4975.00 |
| 19.07.10 | Bushenyi | 4641.00 |
| 07.09.10 | Hoima and Masindi | 1732.00 |
| 20.12.10 | Hoima, Masindi & Bushenyi | 6423.00 |
| Totals | | 21163.00 |

The overall payments to producers including advance for seedlings is US\$ 82220.00

6. Community Participation in Project Governance

8.1 Farmer Meetings

The farmers at the different sites have continued to hold membership meetings. Some of the key results that came out of the meetings include project ideas to be included for funding under the Community Carbon Fund. Two of the groups (Kiyanga & Bitereko) decided to formalize the registration of the carbon groups as different entities from the broader community development groups that hitherto they have been operating under.

8.2 Community – based monitoring

The project is piloting the involvement of communities in monitoring some of the required aspects like number of trees farmers/area should have as in the carbon sales contract. Community participation in monitoring or Community – Based Monitoring follows the same monitoring procedure and uses tools that have been developed by the TFGB. Draft guidelines have been developed and are being tested to see if quality results can be achieved. The bottom line is that Community based monitoring must achieve the same results as any other external person would meet if he/she monitored the same farmers. This type of monitoring may be advantageous in that members have better information about each other and if well managed can be less expensive than using experts to do it. It also is another way of building capacity of the farmers.

8.3 Carbon Community Fund

Trees for Global Benefits has operationalised the small grants programme under the Carbon Community Fund (where producers agree to deposit a percentage of their payment in a community fund). The programme has started with awarding Four Million Uganda Shillings for projects to be implemented by three groups from Bushenyi. These are Bitereko Carbon Community and Kiyanga Tree Planting Group from Mitooma District and Rubirizi Carbon Farmers Association from Rubirizi District. The funds will be used to set up savings and credit facilities in the three sub-counties. Groups from other districts have not yet submitted proposals for funding but are expected to do so in the coming year. In addition, the CCF has also trained the different groups in project development and management. Furthermore, several meetings will be held with the respective local leadership to identify additional projects that are beneficial to the wider community in which the carbon farmers live.

8.4 Issues arising out of the meetings

Most of the trainings have focused on how the process operates. However, during the training, producers have continuously requested additional training in sourcing and handling of good planting material, fire management, pest and disease control. This is mainly because pests (especially termites) as well as acquisition of seedlings are the main challenges to many potential and already participating producers. Farmers have also expressed interest in knowing how the project coordinator should handle cases of defaulting due to situations beyond one's control e.g. cutting down or destroying their trees by malicious people. The project will be using some of the funds under CCF to give the farmers specific training on how to handle some of these challenges. In response to the seedling challenge, the project has further refined the process of acquiring seedlings on credit as detailed in the section below:

7. Breakdown of Operational Costs

During the reporting period (2010), a total of US\$286,296 was spent on the project out of which US\$152,796 was spent on developing new sites to join the project. The actual operational costs, without the project development costs, were US\$133,500. The project development costs were provided by ASARECA, IFAD/ICRAF/PRESA, CARE International and Standard Chartered Bank Uganda Limited. The Carbon income provided US\$96,240 towards the operating costs.

| Item | Costs (US\$) | Source | | Comments |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | Carbon income in US\$ | Other (PRESA, ASARECA, CARE, Stanchart Bank) | |
| Verification | 1719 | 0 | 1719 | Cost met by Max Hamburger |
| Staff time | 90000 | 65000 | 25000 | 100% for 3 Project Officers, Prog Officer, Database Man & 40% 2nd Prog Officer Accounts & Executive Director |
| Monitoring | 10437 | 10437 | 0 | |
| Office costs | 12000 | 6000 | 6000 | US\$1000 x 12 months inc rent, tel/fax/email, utilities & supplies |
| Vehicle | 7500 | 3750 | 3750 | annual mileage of 5,000km |
| Project Devt | 155966 | 3170 | 152,796 | farmer support, scoping of new areas, technical specs, project surveys etc. |
| Coordinators | 2674 | 2674 | 0 | |
| Other travel | 6000 | 5209 | 791 | International meetings |
| Total | 286296 | 96240 | 190,056.49 | |

Table 11: Summary of operational costs

8. Improvements and Future Development

10.1 Extension of Project to Mt. Elgon Area

The project is planning to prepare communities in the Mt. Elgon area to begin benefiting from Payment for Environmental Services. The project will produce technical specifications for this area as well as a project development document. The project will discuss with the various stakeholders with guidance from Plan Vivo Foundation on whether this should be registered as a new project area or as an extension of the on-going project.

10.2 Improved Forest Management

The project has continued to receive expression of interest for community participation in improved management of community forests. The project will mobilize resources to enable the expansion into the new activity

10.3 Identification of other project activities

The project will continue identifying opportunities for other activities. For instance, the project would like to invest in clean/renewable energy options.

10.4 Building Local Stakeholder Involvement in Monitoring

Building on the experiences of peer monitoring, the project is going to invest further in building local capacity to monitor the project activities. In addition to the participating farmers, the project is also going to train other stakeholders from the local government as well as the local National Forest Authority staff in the monitoring of the different project activities. This way, the project expects to strengthen its relations with the local forestry authorities. In addition to training workshops, the project will need some guides that can enable to identify tree species such as; lists of local names and their corresponding English and botanical names as well as classification of trees according to the yield classes or as fast, medium and slow growers

10.5 Equipment

Furthermore, the project will need to procure additional Global Positioning System (GPS) machines to ease the capturing of GPS points. The project needs to complete the inclusion of GPS points in the database to be able to Map all TFGB farmers

10.6 Farmer Exchange Visits.

An area that requires more improvement is carrying out cross-exchange visits of farmers from different sites in the district and from one district to the other. This will one way of training through practical observations.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: List of Producers Allocated to Buyers in 2010 and their monitoring results

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. | Bitereko | 300 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Folksam |
| 2. | Bitereko | 270 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Folksam |
| 3. | Bitereko | 630 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Folksam |
| 4. | Bitereko | 354 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Folksam |
| | | | | 6 | 1356 | 1220.4 | |
| 1. | Kiyanga | 408 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Folksam |
| 2. | Kiyanga | 400 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Folksam |
| 3. | Kiyanga | 372 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Folksam |
| 4. | Kiyanga | 682 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Folksam |
| 5. | Kiyanga | 817 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Folksam |
| 6. | Kiyanga | 404 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Folksam |
| | | | | 8.5 | 1921 | 1728.9 | |
| | | | | 14.5 | 3277 | 2949.3 | |
| 1. | Bitereko | 380 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 2. | Bitereko | 350 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 3. | Bitereko | 321 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 4. | Bitereko | 321 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 5. | Bitereko | 310 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 6. | Bitereko | 300 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 7. | Bitereko | 270 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 8. | Bitereko | 270 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 9. | Bitereko | 664 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Maxhamburger |
| 10. | Bitereko | 257 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 11. | Bitereko | 635 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Maxhamburger |
| 12. | Bitereko | 380 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 13. | Bitereko | 250 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 14. | Bitereko | 185 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Maxhamburger |
| 15. | Bitereko | 800 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Maxhamburger |
| 16. | Bitereko | 300 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 17. | Bitereko | 300 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 18. | Bitereko | 273 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 19. | Bitereko | 267 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 20. | Bitereko | 264 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 21. | Bitereko | 251 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 22. | Bitereko | 250 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 23. | Bitereko | 492 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Maxhamburger |
| 24. | Bitereko | 242 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 25. | Bitereko | 240 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 26. | Bitereko | 179 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Maxhamburger |
| 27. | Bitereko | 232 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| 28. | Bitereko | 231 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 29. | Bitereko | 230 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 30. | Bitereko | 229 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 31. | Bitereko | 226 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 32. | Bitereko | 222 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 33. | Bitereko | 220 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 34. | Bitereko | 149 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| | | | | 39.5 | 8927 | 8034.3 | |
| 1. | Budongo | 1000 | 1000 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Maxhamburger |
| 2. | Budongo | 303 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| | | | | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | |
| 1. | Bwijanga | 222 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 2. | Kichwamba | 372 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 3. | Kichwamba | 311 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 4. | Kichwamba | 119 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| | | | | 4 | 904 | 813.6 | |
| 1. | Kiyanga | 313 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 2. | Kiyanga | 256 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 3. | Kiyanga | 382 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 4. | Kiyanga | 245 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 5. | Kiyanga | 317 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 6. | Kiyanga | 238 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Maxhamburger |
| 7. | Kiyanga | 385 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 8. | Kiyanga | 157 | 266 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|--------------|
| 9. | Kiyanga | 220 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Maxhamburger |
| 10. | Kiyanga | 310 | 600 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Maxhamburger |
| 11. | Kiyanga | 195 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 12. | Kiyanga | 357 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Maxhamburger |
| 13. | Kiyanga | 385 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 14. | Kiyanga | 300 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 15. | Kiyanga | 260 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Maxhamburger |
| 16. | Kiyanga | 220 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 17. | Kiyanga | 342 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 18. | Kiyanga | 259 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Maxhamburger |
| 19. | Kiyanga | 170 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 20. | Kiyanga | 218 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 21. | Kiyanga | 217 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 22. | Kiyanga | 345 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Maxhamburger |
| 23. | Kiyanga | 538 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Maxhamburger |
| 24. | Kiyanga | 375 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 25. | Kiyanga | 292 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 26. | Kiyanga | 287 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 27. | Kiyanga | 213 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Maxhamburger |
| 28. | Kiyanga | 425 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 29. | Kiyanga | 272 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 30. | Kiyanga | 268 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 31. | Kiyanga | 259 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 32. | Kiyanga | 259 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 33. | Kiyanga | 640 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Maxhamburger |
| 34. | Kiyanga | 352 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 35. | Kiyanga | 352 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 36. | Kiyanga | 229 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 37. | Kiyanga | 171 | 300 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 38. | Kiyanga | 224 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 39. | Kiyanga | 223 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| | | | | 47.25 | 10678.5 | 9610.65 | |
| 1. | Kyangwali | 180 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 2. | Kyangwali | 2000 | 2000 | 5 | 1130 | 1017 | Maxhamburger |
| 3. | Kyangwali | 245 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 4. | Kyangwali | 188 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other |
| 5. | Kyangwali | 270 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 6. | Kyangwali | 266 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| | | | | 10 | 2260 | 2034 | |
| 1. | Ryeru | 260 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Maxhamburger |
| 2. | Ryeru | 288 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 3. | Ryeru | 196 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Maxhamburger |
| 4. | Ryeru | 360 | 200 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Maxhamburger |
| 5. | Ryeru | 465 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Maxhamburger |
| 6. | Ryeru | 84 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| 7. | Ryeru | 890 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Maxhamburger |
| 8. | Ryeru | 900 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Maxhamburger |
| 9. | Ryeru | 390 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-----------|--------|--------------|------------------------------|
| 10. | Ryeru | 388 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Maxhamburger |
| | | | | 17.75 | 4011.5 | 3610.35 | |
| | | | | 121.5 | 27459 | 24713.1 | |
| 1. | Bitereko | 255 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A |
| 2. | Bitereko | 1000 | 2000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A |
| 3. | Bitereko | 398 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A |
| 4. | Bitereko | 120 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A |
| 5. | Bitereko | 140 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ceramica Sant'Agostino S.P.A |
| | | | | 7.25 | 1638.5 | 1474.65 | |
| 1. | Bitereko | 214 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Bitereko | 160 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Bitereko | 213 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 4. | Bitereko | 213 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 5. | Bitereko | 159 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 6. | Bitereko | 212 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 7. | Bitereko | 210 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 8. | Bitereko | 210 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----------|
| 9. | Bitereko | 210 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 10. | Bitereko | 210 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 11. | Bitereko | 208 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 12. | Bitereko | 208 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 13. | Bitereko | 520 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Tetrapak |
| 14. | Bitereko | 207 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 15. | Bitereko | 310 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Tetrapak |
| 16. | Bitereko | 206 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 17. | Bitereko | 206 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 18. | Bitereko | 203 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 19. | Bitereko | 203 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 20. | Bitereko | 202 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 21. | Bitereko | 202 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 22. | Bitereko | 151 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 23. | Bitereko | 151 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 24. | Bitereko | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 25. | Bitereko | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 26. | Bitereko | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 27. | Bitereko | 150 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 28. | Bitereko | 150 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 29. | Bitereko | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 30. | Bitereko | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 30.5 | 6893 | 6203.7 | |
| 1. | Bwijanga | 553 | 400 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Tetrapak |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----------|
| 2. | Bwijanga | 276 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Bwijanga | 265 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 4. | Bwijanga | 256 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 5. | Bwijanga | 202 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 6 | 1356 | 1220.4 | |
| 1. | Kabwoya | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Kabwoya | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Kabwoya | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | |
| 1. | Kanyabwanga | 214 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Kanyabwanga | 211 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | |
| 1. | Kiyanga | 210 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Kiyanga | 785 | 1500 | 3.75 | 847.5 | 762.75 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Kiyanga | 412 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Tetrapak |
| 4. | Kiyanga | 205 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 5. | Kiyanga | 153 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Tetrapak |
| 6. | Kiyanga | 408 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Tetrapak |
| 7. | Kiyanga | 201 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 8. | Kiyanga | 213 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 12.5 | 2825 | 2542.5 | |
| 1. | Kiziranfumbi | 303 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Kiziranfumbi | 280 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Kiziranfumbi | 246 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 4. | Kiziranfumbi | 484 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Tetrapak |
| 5. | Kiziranfumbi | 242 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 6. | Kiziranfumbi | 208 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 7. | Kiziranfumbi | 115 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 8. | Kiziranfumbi | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 9. | Kiziranfumbi | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 10 | 2260 | 2034 | |
| 1. | Kyangwali | 174 | 200 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Kyangwali | 840 | 1000 | 2.5 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Kyangwali | 193 | 400 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Tetrapak |
| 4. | Kyangwali | 191 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 5.75 | 960.5 | 864.45 | |
| 1. | Budongo | 247 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Tetrapak |
| 2. | Budongo | 100 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 3. | Budongo | 140 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| 4. | Budongo | 206 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Tetrapak |
| | | | | 6 | 1356 | 1220.4 | |
| | | | | 75.75 | 16780.5 | 15102.5 | |
| 1. | Budongo | 319 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other-10 |
| 2. | Budongo | 265 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other-10 |
| 3. | Bitereko | 291 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other-10 |
| 4. | Kabwoya | 400 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other-10 |
| | | | | 4 | 904 | 813.6 | |
| 1. | Kiyanga | 185 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| 2. | Kiyanga | 182 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other |
| | | | | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | |
| 1. | Kiziranfumbi | 186 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other |
| 2. | Kiziranfumbi | 180 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-other |
| | | | | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | |
| | | | | 4 | 904 | 813.6 | |
| 1. | Bitereko | 350 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 2. | Bitereko | 252 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 3. | Bitereko | 330 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 4. | Bitereko | 219 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 5. | Bitereko | 217 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 6. | Bitereko | 217 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 7. | Bitereko | 215 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| | | | | 7.5 | 1695 | 1525.5 | |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. | Kiyanga | 323 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| 2. | Kiyanga | 135 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | U&W-Coop Denmark-10-(other) |
| | | | | 2.75 | 621.5 | 559.35 | |
| | | | | 10.25 | 2316.5 | 2084.85 | |
| 1. | Bitereko | 334 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | UCB/lifeline |
| 2. | Bitereko | 161 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | UCB/lifeline |
| | | | | 1.75 | 395.5 | 355.95 | |
| 1. | Ryeru | 895 | 900 | 2.25 | 508.5 | 457.65 | Embassy of Denmark |
| 1. | Kicwamba | 231 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | IIED |
| 2. | Kichwamba | 500 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | IIED |
| 3. | Bunyaruguru | 600 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | IIED |
| | | | | 3.75 | 847.5 | 762.75 | |
| 1. | Ryeru | 107 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Straight PLC |
| 2. | Ryeru | 310 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Straight PLC |
| 3. | Ryeru | 386 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Straight PLC |
| 4. | Ryeru | 299 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Straight PLC |
| | | | | 4.75 | 1073.5 | 966.15 | |
| 1. | Kiyanga | 580 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Prior year adjustments |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 2. | Kiyanga | 214 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| 3. | Kiyanga | 1000 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Prior year adjustments |
| 4. | Kiyanga | 250 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Prior year adjustments |
| | | | | 8.25 | 1864.5 | 1678.05 | |
| 1. | Kichwamba | 138 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| 2. | Kichwamba | 171 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Prior year adjustments |
| 3. | Kichwamba | 448 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Prior year adjustments |
| 4. | Kichwamba | 195 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Prior year adjustments |
| 5. | Kichwamba | 193 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Prior year adjustments |
| 6. | Kichwamba | 250 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| | | | | 6.25 | 1412.5 | 1271.25 | |
| 1. | Ryeru | 615 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Prior year adjustments |
| 2. | Ryeru | 217 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| 3. | Ryeru | 450 | 600 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Prior year adjustments |
| 4. | Ryeru | 600 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|
| 5. | Ryeru | 272 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| 6. | Ryeru | 194 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Prior year adjustments |
| 7. | Ryeru | 220 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| 8. | Ryeru | 229 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Prior year adjustments |
| 9. | Ryeru | 800 | 1400 | 3.5 | 791 | 711.9 | Prior year adjustments |
| | | | | 14.25 | 3220.5 | 2898.45 | |
| | | | | 28.75 | 6497.5 | 5847.75 | |
| 1. | Ryeru | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Ryeru | 152 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Ryeru | 160 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Ryeru | 523 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Nedbank |
| 5. | Ryeru | 113 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 6. | Ryeru | 900 | 1600 | 4 | 904 | 813.6 | Nedbank |
| 7. | Ryeru | 204 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 8. | Ryeru | 509 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Nedbank |
| 9. | Ryeru | 515 | 900 | 2.25 | 508.5 | 457.65 | Nedbank |
| 10. | Ryeru | 400 | 700 | 1.75 | 395.5 | 355.95 | Nedbank |
| 11. | Ryeru | 500 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Nedbank |
| 12. | Ryeru | 196 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 13. | Ryeru | 225 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|---------|
| 14. | Ryeru | 350 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Nedbank |
| 15. | Ryeru | 1400 | 2400 | 6 | 1356 | 1220.4 | Nedbank |
| 16. | Ryeru | 216 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 17. | Ryeru | 635 | 1200 | 3 | 678 | 610.2 | Nedbank |
| 18. | Ryeru | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 19. | Ryeru | 416 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Nedbank |
| 20. | Ryeru | 1315 | 2600 | 6.5 | 1469 | 1322.1 | Nedbank |
| 21. | Ryeru | 104 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 22. | Ryeru | 155 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Nedbank |
| 23. | Ryeru | 222 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 24. | Ryeru | 853 | 1600 | 4 | 904 | 813.6 | Nedbank |
| 25. | Ryeru | 318 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Nedbank |
| 26. | Ryeru | 112 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 27. | Ryeru | 82 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 28. | Ryeru | 102 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 29. | Ryeru | 217 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 30. | Ryeru | 350 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Nedbank |
| 31. | Ryeru | 630 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 59 | 13334 | 12000.6 | |
| 1. | Pakanyi | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Pakanyi | 400 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Pakanyi | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Pakanyi | 129 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 4.25 | 960.5 | 864.45 | |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------|
| 1. | Nyangahya | 89 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Nyangahya | 500 | 500 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Nyangahya | 115 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Nyangahya | 100 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 4.5 | 1017 | 915.3 | |
| 1. | Muhokya | 1600 | 1600 | 4 | 904 | 813.6 | Nedbank |
| 1. | Maliba | 134 | 400 | 1.6 | 361.6 | 325.44 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Maliba | 313 | 500 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Maliba | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Maliba | 154 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 5. | Maliba | 259 | 400 | 1.2 | 271.2 | 244.08 | Nedbank |
| 6. | Maliba | 195 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 7. | Maliba | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 8. | Maliba | 127 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 9. | Maliba | 113 | 400 | 10 | 2260 | 2034 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 23.8 | 5378.8 | 4840.92 | |
| 1. | Kyangwali | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Kyangwali | 102 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Kyangwali | 112 | 200 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Kyangwali | 105 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 5. | Kyangwali | 142 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 6. | Kyangwali | 207 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 7. | Kyangwali | 112 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 8. | Kyangwali | 108 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------|
| 9. | Kyangwali | 107 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 10. | Kyangwali | 92 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 11. | Kyangwali | 83 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 12. | Kyangwali | 50 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 13. | Kyangwali | 137 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 14. | Kyangwali | 60 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 14 | 3164 | 2847.6 | |
| 1. | Kiziranfumbi | 160 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Kiziranfumbi | 180 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Kiziranfumbi | 96 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Kiziranfumbi | 250 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 5. | Kiziranfumbi | 246 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Nedbank |
| 6. | Kiziranfumbi | 190 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 7. | Kiziranfumbi | 190 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 8. | Kiziranfumbi | 188 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Nedbank |
| 9. | Kiziranfumbi | 84 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 10. | Kiziranfumbi | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 11. | Kiziranfumbi | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 12. | Kiziranfumbi | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 13. | Kiziranfumbi | 149 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 14. | Kiziranfumbi | 256 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 14.75 | 3333.5 | 3000.15 | |
| 1. | Kiyanga | 91 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Kiyanga | 122 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------|
| 3. | Kiyanga | 156 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 4. | Kiyanga | 82 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 5. | Kiyanga | 127 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 6. | Kiyanga | 80 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 7. | Kiyanga | 156 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 8. | Kiyanga | 146 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 9. | Kiyanga | 80 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 10. | Kiyanga | 163 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 11. | Kiyanga | 93 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 12. | Kiyanga | 92 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 13. | Kiyanga | 143 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 14. | Kiyanga | 156 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 15. | Kiyanga | 150 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Nedbank |
| 16. | Kiyanga | 89 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 17. | Kiyanga | 158 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 18. | Kiyanga | 101 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 17.75 | 4011.5 | 3610.35 | |
| 1. | Kigorobyasiiba | 169 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Kigorobyasiiba | 250 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Nedbank |
| 3. | Kigorobyasiiba | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 3.25 | 734.5 | 661.05 | |
| 1. | Bwijanga | 157 | 960 | 2.4 | 542.4 | 488.16 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Bwijanga | 276 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|
| | | | | 3.4 | 768.4 | 691.56 | |
| 1. | Bugoye | 115 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Nedbank |
| 2. | Bugoye | 400 | 600 | 2.4 | 542.4 | 488.16 | Nedbank |
| | | | | 3.4 | 768.4 | 691.56 | |
| | | | | 148.1 | 33470.6 | 30123.54 | |
| 1. | Kichwamba | 214 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 2. | Kichwamba | 234 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 3. | Kichwamba | 231 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 4. | Kichwamba | 235 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 5. | Kichwamba | 200 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 6. | Kichwamba | 478 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Ecotrust |
| 7. | Kichwamba | 100 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 8. | Kichwamba | 92 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 9. | Kichwamba | 219 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 10. | Kichwamba | 103 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 11. | Kichwamba | 243 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 12. | Kichwamba | 205 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 13. | Kichwamba | 90 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 14. | Kichwamba | 100 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 15. | Kichwamba | 220 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 16. | Kichwamba | 221 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 17. | Kichwamba | 208 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 18. | Kichwamba | 116 | 200 | 0.5 | 113 | 101.7 | Ecotrust |
| 19. | kichwamba | 212 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| 20. | Kichwamba | 178 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Ecotrust |
| 21. | Kichwamba | 213 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 22. | Kichwamba | 137 | 250 | 0.625 | 141.25 | 127.125 | Ecotrust |
| 23. | Kichwamba | 220 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 24. | Kichwamba | 120 | 200 | 0.5 | 113 | 101.7 | Ecotrust |
| 25. | | 91 | 400 | | | | |
| | Kichwamba | | | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 26. | Kichwamba | 103 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 27. | Kichwamba | 209 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 28. | kichwamba | 122 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| | | | | 26.875 | 6073.75 | 5466.375 | |
| 1. | Kabwoya | 160 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 2. | Kabwoya | 98 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 3. | Kabwoya | 102 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 4. | Kabwoya | 190 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 5. | Kabwoya | 96 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 6. | Kabwoya | 112 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 7. | Kabwoya | 160 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 8. | Kabwoya | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 9. | Kabwoya | 100 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 10. | Kabwoya | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 11. | Kabwoya | 150 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| | | | | 11 | 2486 | 2237.4 | |
| 1. | Bunyaruguru | 1184 | 2500 | 6.25 | 1412.5 | 1271.25 | Ecotrust |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|----------|
| 2. | Bunyaruguru | 225 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 3. | Bunyaruguru | 319 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Ecotrust |
| 4. | Bunyaruguru | 400 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Ecotrust |
| 5. | Bunyaruguru | 102 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 6. | Bunyaruguru | 1156 | 2000 | 5 | 1130 | 1017 | Ecotrust |
| 7. | Bunyaruguru | 1122 | 2000 | 5 | 1130 | 1017 | Ecotrust |
| 8. | Bunyaruguru | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| | | | | 22.75 | 5141.5 | 4627.35 | |
| 1. | Bugoye | 202 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 2. | Bugoye | 190 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 3. | Bugoye | 215 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 4. | Bugoye | 400 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 5. | Bugoye | 186 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| | | | | 5 | 1130 | 1017 | |
| 1. | Budongo | 89 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 1. | Bitereko | 165 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Ecotrust |
| 2. | Bitereko | 89 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 3. | Bitereko | 149 | 300 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 4. | Bitereko | 300 | 1000 | 2.5 | 565 | 508.5 | Ecotrust |
| 5. | Bitereko | 220 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Ecotrust |
| 6. | Bitereko | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 7. | Bitereko | 86 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Ecotrust |
| 8. | Bitereko | 120 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 9. | Bitereko | 126 | 300 | 0.75 | 169.5 | 152.55 | Ecotrust |

| Name ² | Subcounty | Trees at monitoring | Total Target | Area (Ha) | tCO2 | Saleable 90% | Buyer |
|-------------------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| 10. | Bitereko | 95 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 11. | Bitereko | 93 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 12. | Bitereko | 140 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| | | | | 14.25 | 3220.5 | 2898.45 | |
| 1. | Ryeru | 310 | 600 | 1.5 | 339 | 305.1 | Ecotrust |
| 2. | Ryeru | 400 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Ecotrust |
| 3. | Ryeru | 90 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 4. | Ryeru | 203 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| 5. | Ryeru | 322 | 800 | 2 | 452 | 406.8 | Ecotrust |
| 6. | Ryeru | 270 | 500 | 1.25 | 282.5 | 254.25 | Ecotrust |
| 7. | Ryeru | 241 | 400 | 1 | 226 | 203.4 | Ecotrust |
| | | | | 9.75 | 2203.5 | 1983.15 | |
| | | | | 89.625 | 20255.25 | 18229.73 | |

Appendix 2: Verification and monitoring results per district/site-showing numbers monitored and targets

Monitoring Results for Bushenyi, July 2010

| No. | Name of Farmer ³ | Site | Period of Monitoring | Acreage (Ha) | No. of enur |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| 1 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1.5 | |
| 2 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1.5 | |
| 3 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1.5 | |
| 4 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1.25 | |
| 5 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1.5 | |
| 6 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 7 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 8 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 2 | |
| 9 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 2.5 | |
| 10 | | Kiyanga | Year 3 | 1.5 | |
| 11 | | Kiyanga | Year 3 | 1 | |
| 12 | | Kiyanga | Year 3 | 2.5 | |
| 13 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 14 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 2 | |
| 15 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 16 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 3 | |
| 17 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1.5 | |
| 18 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 2.5 | |
| 19 | | Kiyanga | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 20 | | Kiyanga | Year 0 | 1 | |
| 21 | | Kiyanga | Year 0 | 0.8 | |
| 22 | | Kiyanga | Year 0 | 1 | |
| 23 | | Kiyanga | Year 0 | 1 | |
| 24 | | Kiyanga | Year 0 | 1 | |
| 25 | | Kichwamba | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 26 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 27 | | Kichwamba | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 28 | | Kichwamba | Year 1 | 2 | |
| 29 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 2 | |
| 30 | | Kichwamba | Year 3 | 1.5 | |
| 31 | | Kichwamba | Year 3 | 2.5 | |
| 32 | | Kichwamba | Year 3 | 2.5 | |
| 33 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 1 | |
| 34 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 1.25 | |
| 35 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 1.5 | |

³ Due to data protection rules, the names of participants have been removed from the public version of the

| | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|--------|------|------|
| 36 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 2 | 216 |
| 37 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 3 | 656 |
| 38 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 3.75 | 1020 |
| 39 | | Kichwamba | Year 1 | 2.5 | 879 |
| 40 | | Kichwamba | Year 1 | 2.5 | 551 |
| 41 | | Ryeru | Year 1 | 2.5 | 950 |
| 42 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1.5 | 421 |
| 43 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 361 |
| 44 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 2.5 | 202 |
| 45 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 329 |
| 46 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 560 |
| 47 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 2.5 | 733 |
| 48 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 300 |
| 49 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 2.5 | 932 |
| 50 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 2.5 | 733 |
| 51 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 148 |
| 52 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 223 |
| 53 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 206 |
| 54 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 443 |
| 55 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 257 |
| 56 | | Bitereko | | 1 | 229 |
| 57 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 146 |
| 58 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 318 |
| 59 | | Bitereko | Year 3 | 1 | 155 |
| 60 | | Bitereko | Year 1 | 2 | 338 |
| 61 | | Bitereko | Year 1 | 1 | 210 |

Farmers monitored in Bushenyi November 2010

| No. | Name | Sub county | Trees enumerated | Period/contract | Total trees to be planted | Area |
|-----|------|------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|------|
| 1 | | Bitereko | 398 | 0 | 800 | 2 |
| 2 | | Kiyanga | 323 | 0 | 600 | 1.5 |
| 3 | | Bitereko | 259 | 3 | 400 | 1 |
| 4 | | Bitereko | 660 | 1 | 1000 | 2.5 |
| 5 | | Bitereko | 300 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 6 | | Bitereko | 788 | 1 | 800 | 2 |
| 7 | | Bitereko | 402 | 3 | 400 | 1 |
| 8 | | Bitereko | 89 | 1 | 400 | 1 |
| 9 | | Bitereko | 237 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 10 | | Bitereko | 321 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 11 | | Bitereko | 240 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 12 | | Bitereko | NEWPLOT | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 13 | | Bitereko | 380 | 0 | 600 | 1.5 |
| 14 | | Bitereko | 400 | 3 | 500 | 1.25 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------|-----|---|-----|------|
| 15 | | Kiyanga | 182 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 16 | | Bitereko | 358 | | | |
| 17 | | Bitereko | 302 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 18 | | Bitereko | 316 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 19 | | Bitereko | 232 | 3 | 400 | 1 |
| 20 | | Bitereko | 342 | 3 | 500 | 1.25 |
| 21 | | Kiyanga | 201 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 22 | | Bitereko | 315 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 23 | | Kiyanga | 252 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 24 | | Kanyabwanga | 291 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 25 | | Kiyanga | 200 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 26 | | Bitereko | 340 | 1 | 400 | 1 |
| 27 | | Kanyabwanga | 391 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 28 | | Bitereko | 338 | 3 | 600 | 1.5 |
| 29 | | Bitereko | 150 | 3 | 400 | 1 |
| 30 | | Bitereko | 219 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 31 | | Bitereko | 214 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 32 | | Bitereko | 380 | 0 | 600 | 1.5 |
| 33 | | Bitereko | 350 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 34 | | Bitereko | 350 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 35 | | Bitereko | 217 | 0 | 400 | 1 |
| 36 | | Bitereko | 308 | 3 | 400 | 1 |
| 37 | | Bitereko | 310 | 1 | 400 | 1 |

Farmers monitored in January 2011 in Bushenyi

| No | Name | Subcounty | Trees monitored | Year |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | | Bitereko | 382 | Yr 1 |
| 2 | | Bitereko | 314 | Yr 1 |
| 3 | | Bitereko | 1170 | Yr 1 |
| 4 | | Bitereko | 169 | Yr 1 |
| 5 | | Bitereko | 379 | Yr 1 |
| 6 | | Bitereko | 475 | Yr 1 |
| 7 | | Bitereko | 296 | Yr 1 |
| 8 | | Bitereko | 316 | Yr 1 |
| 9 | | Bitereko | 492 | Yr 1 |
| 10 | | Bitereko | 392 | Yr 1 |
| 11 | | Bitereko | 336 | Yr 1 |
| 12 | | Bitereko | 259 | Yr 1 |
| 13 | | Bitereko | 284 | Yr 1 |
| 14 | | Bitereko | 314 | Yr 1 |
| 15 | | Bitereko | 268 | Yr 1 |
| 16 | | Bitereko | 390 | Yr 1 |
| 17 | | Bitereko | 299 | Yr 1 |
| 18 | | Bitereko | 234 | Yr 1 |
| 19 | | Bitereko | 422 | Yr 1 |
| 20 | | Bitereko | 354 | Yr 1 |
| 21 | | Bitereko | 299 | Yr 1 |
| 22 | | Bitereko | 407 | Yr 1 |
| 23 | | Kiyanga | 501 | Yr 1 |
| 24 | | Kiyanga | 100 | Yr 1 |
| 25 | | Kiyanga | 220 | Yr 1 |
| 26 | | Kiyanga | 400 | Yr 1 |
| 27 | | Kiyanga | 460 | Yr 1 |
| 28 | | Kiyanga | 200 | Yr 1 |
| 29 | | Kiyanga | 157 | Yr 1 |
| 30 | | Kiyanga | 400 | Yr 1 |
| 31 | | Kiyanga | 400 | Yr 1 |
| 32 | | Kiyanga | 354 | Yr 1 |
| 33 | | Kiyanga | 100 | Yr 1 |
| 34 | | Kiyanga | 384 | Yr 1 |
| 35 | | Kiyanga | 440 | Yr 1 |
| 36 | | Kiyanga | 450 | Yr 1 |
| 37 | | Kiyanga | 890 | Yr 1 |
| 38 | | Kiyanga | 278 | Yr 1 |
| 39 | | Kiyanga | 551 | Yr 1 |
| 40 | | Kiyanga | 336 | Yr 1 |
| 41 | | Kiyanga | 138 | Yr 1 |
| 42 | | Kiyanga | 110 | Yr 1 |
| 43 | | Kiyanga | 194 | Yr 1 |
| 44 | | Kanyabwanga | 183 | Yr 1 |
| 45 | | Kanyabwanga | 347 | Yr 1 |
| 46 | | Kanyabwanga | 243 | Yr 1 |
| 47 | | Kanyabwanga | 489 | Yr 1 |
| 48 | | Kanyabwanga | 221 | Yr 1 |

| | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|--------------|------|
| 49 | | Kichwamba | 289 | Yr 1 |
| 50 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 51 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 52 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 53 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 54 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 55 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 56 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 57 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 58 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 59 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 60 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 61 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 62 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 63 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 64 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 65 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 66 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 67 | | Bitereko | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 68 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 69 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 70 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 71 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 72 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 73 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 74 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 75 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |
| 76 | | Kiyanga | Analysis DBH | Yr 5 |

Farmers Monitored in Hoima & Masindi

| Name ⁴ | District | Subcounty | Trees at previous monitoring | Total number to be planted | Trees at 2010 monitoring | Comments |
|-------------------|----------|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 109 | 500 | 693 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 300 | 600 | 132 | Trees dried due to prolonged drought |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 667 | 1200 | 171 | Trees dried due to prolonged drought |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 200 | 400 | 468 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 490 | 600 | 693 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------|--------------|-----|------|-----|--|
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 500 | 500 | 132 | Trees dried due to prolonged drought |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 96 | 400 | 96 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 150 | 500 | 150 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 213 | 600 | 213 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 150 | 500 | 150 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 213 | 600 | 213 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 194 | 400 | 194 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 220 | 500 | 279 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 208 | 400 | 208 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 580 | 1000 | 468 | |
| | Hoima | Kyangwali | 200 | 400 | 408 | |
| | Hoima | Kyangwali | 200 | 400 | 389 | |
| | Hoima | Kyangwali | 400 | 800 | 764 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 237 | 250 | 253 | |
| | Hoima | Kiziranfumbi | 237 | 250 | 253 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 150 | 400 | 206 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 150 | 400 | 120 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 52 | 1200 | 247 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 141 | 400 | 149 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 320 | 400 | 400 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 438 | 400 | 445 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 250 | 500 | 50 | Trees dried due to poor management and drought |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 130 | 600 | 107 | Trees dried due to poor management and drought |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 310 | 400 | 60 | Trees dried due to poor management and drought |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 254 | 400 | 60 | Trees dried due to poor management and drought |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 110 | 400 | 110 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 350 | 520 | 520 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 125 | 400 | 400 | |
| | Masindi | Nyangahya | 20 | 400 | 50 | |
| | Masindi | Budongo | 137 | 240 | 300 | |
| | Masindi | Bwijanga | 80 | 400 | 400 | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|--|
| | Masindi | Bwijanga | 309 | 400 | 400 | |
| | Masindi | Nyangahya | 330 | 400 | 0 | Farmer cut down the trees and converted land into a sugarcane plantation |
| | Masindi | Nyangahya | 374 | 400 | 400 | |
| | Masindi | Nyangahya | 825 | 800 | 800 | |
| | Masindi | Nyangahya | 189 | 300 | 200 | |
| | 400 | Nyangahya | 144 | 400 | 400 | |
| | 400 | Nyangahya | 350 | 400 | 400 | |