



# ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC.

## **The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance Project Validation / Verification Report**

The International Small Group and Tree Planting (TIST) Program in  
Uganda, CCB-002

12 March 2013

Project No. V012055.00

### **Validation and Verification Conducted by:**

Environmental Services, Inc.  
Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division  
Corporate Offices at:  
7220 Financial Way, Suite 100  
Jacksonville, Florida 32256  
Phone: 904-470-2200; Fax: 904-470-2112



ANSI ACCREDITED PROGRAM  
GREENHOUSE GAS  
VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION  
0800



## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Contact Information .....	4
Validation /Verification Details .....	5
Validation/Verification Standard .....	5
Validation/Verification Criteria .....	5
Level of Assurance .....	5
Validation/Verification Date(s) .....	5
Materiality.....	5
Validation/Verification Team .....	6
Final Documents from Client.....	6
Project Description.....	6
Executive Summary of Validation/Verification Results.....	7
Validation/Verification Findings .....	7
G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area.....	7
G2 Baseline Projections .....	11
G3 Project Design and Goals .....	14
G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices .....	19
G5 Legal Status and Property Rights.....	23
CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts .....	26
CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”).....	28
CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring .....	29
CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts.....	31
CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts .....	32
CM3 Community Impact Monitoring.....	33
B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts.....	34
B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts .....	37
B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring.....	38
Gold Level Section .....	39
GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits .....	39
GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits.....	39



---

GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits .....	43
Public Shareholder Comments.....		43
Public Comment Period .....		43
Public Meeting .....		43
Email Solicitation.....		44
Validation/Verification Conclusion .....		46
Submittal Information.....		46
Appendix A – Documents Reviewed / Received.....		47
Appendix B – Stakeholder Meeting Announcements and Comments.....		49



## The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance TIST Program in Uganda CCB-002 Validation/Verification Report

### Introduction

This report presents the findings of an audit conducted by Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI), to validate and verify the claims made by the TIST program in Uganda, CCB-002 conforms to the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition - December 2008). ESI is accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) under ISO 14065:2007 for greenhouse gas validation and verifications bodies, which approves us to perform validations/verifications for The Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA).

### Contact Information

Client Name Address Phone Website	Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Ave, Suite 310 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136 United States of America (USA) Phone: +1-918-747-8770 www.tist.org
Contact Name Address Phone	Charlie E. Williams, Vice President 7134 South Yale Ave, Suite 310 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136 United States of America (USA) Phone: +1-918-747-8770
3 <sup>rd</sup> Party Auditors	Environmental Services, Inc.
Lead Validator/Verifier Address Phone	Shawn McMahan Environmental Services, Inc. 3800 Clermont Street NW North Lawrence, Ohio 44666 330-833-9941

## Validation /Verification Details

Validation/Verification Standard	Climate, Community and Biodiversity Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008)
Validation/Verification Criteria	<p>The criteria will follow the guidance documents provided by CCBA located at <a href="http://www.climate-standards.org">www.climate-standards.org</a>. These documents include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Project Design Standards (Second Edition, December 2008)</i></li> <li>b) <i>Rules for the use of the Climate, Community &amp; Biodiversity Standards, Version June 21, 2010.</i></li> </ul>
Level of Assurance	The level of assurance was used to determine the depth of detail that the validator/verifier placed in the validation/verification plan to determine if there were any errors, omissions, or misrepresentations (ISO 14064-3:2006). ESI selected samples of data and information to be validated and verified, to provide <i>reasonable assurance</i> .
Validation/Verification Scope	<p>The scope of the validation included the review of all project documentation provided by the project developer and the appropriate level of fact finding by the validator during the on-site visit. The validator used evidence including, but not limited to, interviews with stakeholders and project proponents, review of supporting records and reports.</p> <p>The scope of the verification, included the GHG project and baseline scenarios; physical infrastructure, activities, technologies and processes of the GHG project; GHG sources, sinks and/or reservoirs; types of GHGs; periods covered; and the evaluation of the project's net climate, community, and biodiversity benefits. Period of evaluation: 01 January 2003 to 12 November 2012.</p>
Validation/Verification Date(s)	07 September 2012 – 07 March 2013
Materiality	Materiality is a concept that errors, omissions and misrepresentations could affect the project design assertions and influence the intended users. CCB does not specifically outline a materiality threshold; however, ESI used a 5% threshold for evidence. If a non-conformance was discovered, the project developer was given the opportunity to correct the non-conformance to the project design document within a reasonable timeframe (within 30 days).
Site Visits	13-17 November 2012



Validation/Verification Team	Lead Verifier/Validator: Shawn McMahon Team Members: Caitlin Sellers, Stewart McMorrow, Rich Scharf, Chris DeRolph, and James Moody Trainees: Terese Walters and Jonathan Pomp QA/QC: Janice McMahon
Final Documents from Client	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCBA Project Description for TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-002 – 11 March 2013</li> <li>• CCB Monitoring Report for TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-002 – 11 March 2013</li> </ul> <p>Please see Appendix A for a complete list of documents received/reviewed during this validation/verification.</p>
Public Comment Period on CCBA	27 November 2012 to 27 December 2012 – Project PDD listing on CCB for public comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments</li> </ul>
Number of Comments Received	27 November 2012 to 27 December 2012 – Posting of Project Implementation Report on CCB for public comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments</li> </ul>

## Project Description

The International Small Group and Tree Planting Program (TIST) empowers Small Groups of subsistence farmers in India, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda to combat the devastating effects of deforestation, poverty and drought. Combining sustainable development with carbon sequestration, TIST already supports the reforestation and biodiversity efforts of over 64,000 subsistence farmers. Carbon credit sales generate participant income and provide project funding to address agricultural, HIV/AIDS, nutritional and fuel challenges. As TIST expands to more groups and more areas, it ensures more trees, more biodiversity, more climate change benefit and more income for more people.

Since its inception in 1999, TIST participants organized into over 9,000 TIST Small Groups have planted over 11 million trees on their own and community lands. GHG sequestration is creating a potential long-term income stream and developing sustainable environments and livelihoods. Replication of TIST in Uganda began in 2003, and has grown to over 5,200 TIST participants in over 800 Small Groups.

As a grassroots initiative, Small Groups are provided a structural network of training and communications that allows them to build on their own internal strengths and develop best practices. Small Groups benefit from a new income source; the sale of carbon credits that result from the sequestration of carbon from the atmosphere in the biomass of the trees and soil. These credits are expected to be approved under the Voluntary Carbon Standard and/or CDM and,



because they are tied to tree growth, will be sustainable. The carbon credits create a new ‘virtual’ cash crop for the participants, who gain all the direct benefits of growing trees and also receive quarterly cash stipends based on the GHG benefits created by their efforts. The maturing trees and conservation farming will provide additional sustainable benefits that far exceed the carbon payments. These include improved crop yield, improved environment, and marketable commodities such as fruits, nuts, and honey. TIST utilizes a high-tech approach to quantify the benefits and report the results in a method transparent to the whole world, which includes palm computers, GPS, and a dynamic “real time” Internet based database.

This project description is for a subset of the TIST Uganda program and corresponds to TIST VCS project descriptions VCS-005 and VCS-006. It applies to 341 of the Small Groups, 2,093 members, 973 project areas and 1,005.7 ha.

## Executive Summary of Validation/Verification Results

	Criterion	Required/ Optional	Conformance Y/N N/A
G1	Original Conditions in the Project Area	Required	Y
G2	Baseline Projections	Required	Y
G3	Project Design and Goals	Required	Y
G4	Management Capacity and Best Practices	Required	Y
G5	Legal Status and Property Rights	Required	Y
CL1	Net Positive Climate Impacts	Required	Y
CL2	Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)	Required	Y
CL3	Climate Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
CM1	Net Positive Community Impacts	Required	Y
CM2	Offsite Stakeholder Impacts	Required	Y
CM3	Community Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
B1	Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B2	Offsite Biodiversity Impacts	Required	Y
B3	Biodiversity Impact Monitoring	Required	Y
GL1	Climate Change Adaptation Benefits	Optional	N/A
GL2	Exceptional Community Benefits	Optional	Y
GL3	Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits	Optional	N/A

## Validation/Verification Findings

### G1 Original Conditions in the Project Area

<b>Indicator G1.1</b> – The location of the project and basic physical parameters (e.g. soil, geology, climate).	The PDD and PIR provide an adequate description of the basic location and the following physical parameters of the project area: soils,
--	---



	topography/hydrology and climate. No geologic information is provided, beyond that included in the soils information.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G1.1 of the PD and PIR.
Findings:	The PDD, PIR and site visit confirms compliance with the CCB indicator G1.1; however, the link provided for soils information does not work.
Opportunity for Improvement:	Substitute the following link for soil-related information: <a href="http://eusoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/esdb_archive/EuDASM/Africa/lists/cug.htm">http://eusoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/esdb_archive/EuDASM/Africa/lists/cug.htm</a>
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date	The referenced soil map was downloaded and made an Exhibit. See TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 24 Uganda Soils Map 1967.jpg

<b>Indicator G1.2</b> – The types and condition of vegetation within the project area.	The PDD and PIR indicate that most of the land is cropland and grassland, with a few scattered trees. A baseline tree count is provided, as well as estimates of grassland and cropland groundcover.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.2 of the PDD and PIR, appendix 04 and the site visit.
Findings:	The PDD, PIR and site visit confirms compliance with the CCB indicator G1.2.

<b>Indicator G1.3</b> – The boundaries of the project area and the project zone.	The appendices 01, 02 and 03 provide the locations and boundaries (app 03) of the many individual areas within the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.3 of PDD and PIR, appendices 01, 02 and 03.
Findings:	The PDD, PIR and associated appendices adequately fulfill the requirements of CCB indicator G1.3

<b>Indicator G1.4</b> - Current carbon stocks within the project area(s), using stratification by land-use or vegetation type and methods of carbon calculation (such as biomass plots, formulae, default values) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's 2006 Guidelines for	The project developers estimate baseline carbon stocks using CDM methodology AR AMS0001, v 06: Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities.
--	---





National GHG Inventories for Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Uses (IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU) or a more robust and detailed methodology.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.4 of the PDD and PIR, appendix 04.
Findings:	The PDD adequately fulfill the requirements of indicator G1.4.

<b>Indicator G1.5</b> - A description of communities located in the project zone, including basic socio-economic and cultural information that describes the social, economic and cultural diversity within communities (wealth, gender, age, ethnicity etc.), identifies specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples and describes any community characteristics.	The PDD and PIR provide population information from a 1991 census and marriage statistics from a country-wide 2002 census. Estimated annual income is provided, assumed to be from one of the same censuses.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.5 of the PDD and PIR.
Findings:	The PDD and PIR adequately address indicator G1.5.

<b>Indicator G1.6</b> - A description of current land use and customary and legal property rights including community property in the project zone, identifying any ongoing or unresolved conflicts or disputes and identifying and describing any disputes over land tenure that were resolved during the last ten years (see also G5).	The PDD and PIR describe the pre-project land use as agriculture, and present land use as agriculture and tree planting.  The four types of land tenure used in the Bushenyi District are described.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.6 of the PDD and PIR, exhibit 13.
Findings:	The PDD and PIR adequately fulfill the requirements of G1.6.

<b>Indicator G1.7</b> - A description of current biodiversity within the project zone (diversity of species and	The PDD describes the ecosystems of the project zone, and states the main threat is human encroachment, illegal wood harvesting and bush meat
---	---



ecosystems) and threats to that biodiversity, using appropriate methodologies, substantiated where possible with appropriate reference material.	hunting.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Section G1.7 of the PDD and PIR.
Findings:	The PDD and PIR meet the requirement of indicator G1.7.

<p><b>Indicator G1.8</b> - An evaluation of whether the project zone includes any of the following High Conservation Values (HCVs) and a description of the qualifying attributes.</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.1</b> - Globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>protected areas</li> <li>threatened species</li> <li>endemic species</li> <li>areas that support significant concentrations of a species during any time in their lifecycle (e.g. migrations, feeding grounds, breeding areas).</li> </ol> <p><b>Indicator 8.2</b> - Globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape-level areas where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.3</b> Threatened or rare ecosystems.</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.4</b> - Areas that provide critical ecosystem services (e.g., hydrological services, erosion control, fire control).</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR identify Queen Elizabeth National Forest, Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and the surrounding protected forest as areas with high conservation values that are within the project zone.</p> <p>QENP qualifies as an HCV by indicator G1.8.1. Bwindi by G1.8.1 and G1.8.2</p> <p>A list of rare, endangered and threatened species that were potentially present in the project area was compiled. No observation of these species by government officials, staff or group member.</p> <p>G1.8.3 – G1.8.6 not specifically addressed.</p>
--	---



<p><b>Indicator 8.5</b> - Areas that are fundamental for meeting the basic needs of local communities (e.g., for essential food, fuel, fodder, medicines or building materials without readily available alternatives).</p> <p><b>Indicator 8.6</b> - Areas that are critical for the traditional cultural identity of communities (e.g., areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in collaboration with the communities).</p>	
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G1.8 of the PD and PIR</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. After review of the PIR, verification results were found to be consistent with the validation findings.</p>

## G2 Baseline Projections

<p><b>Indicator G2.1</b> - Describe the most likely land-use scenario in the absence of the project following IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or a more robust and detailed methodology, describing the range of potential land use scenarios and the associated drivers of GHG emissions and justifying why the land-use scenario selected is most likely.</p>	<p>The project developer uses CDM methodology AR-AMS0001 Version 06 to determine the most likely scenario without the project, which is for the project areas to continue in grassland and cropland. The project zone continues to undergo deforestation and loss of habitat.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G2.1 of the PDD and the PIR and site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. In the validation and verification process, the PIR, stakeholder meetings and direct observation supported the findings. Verification results supported validation findings.</p>
<p><b>Indicator G2.2</b> - Document that project benefits would not have</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR state that the project activity would not have occurred without the project due to</p>



<p>occurred in the absence of the project, explaining how existing laws or regulations would likely affect land use and justifying that the benefits being claimed by the project are truly ‘additional’ and would be unlikely to occur without the project.</p>	<p>investment barriers, barriers due to social conditions and lack of organization.</p> <p>Land use regulations have had little effect on the continued loss of Ugandan forest in the project zone.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G2.2 of the PDD and PIR, and site visit.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR adequately address the requirements of indicator G2.2.</p>

<p><b>Indicator G2.3</b> - Calculate the estimated carbon stock changes associated with the ‘without project’ reference scenario described above. This requires estimation of carbon stocks for each of the land-use classes of concern and a definition of the carbon pools included, among the classes defined in the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU. The timeframe for this analysis can be either the project lifetime (see G3) or the project GHG accounting period, whichever is more appropriate. Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO<sub>2</sub> GHG emissions such as CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O in the ‘without project’ scenario. Non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period.</p> <p>Projects whose activities are designed to avoid GHG emissions (such as those reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD), avoiding conversion of non-forest land, or certain improved forest management projects) must include an analysis of the relevant drivers and rates of deforestation and/or</p>	<p>The project proponents use CDM methodology AR-AMS0001 Version 06 to calculate carbon stock changes in the without project scenario, and uses a baseline tree count and the assumption that the trees will continue to grow, without mortality. When calculated for the entire project, the conservative change in carbon stocks without the project is estimated to be 333.7 tonnes (see worksheet "Baseline Growth").</p> <p>No power equipment or chemical fertilizers are used, so no non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are calculated.</p>
--	--



<p>degradation and a description and justification of the approaches, assumptions and data used to perform this analysis. Regional-level estimates can be used at the project’s planning stage as long as there is a commitment to evaluate locally-specific carbon stocks and to develop a project-specific spatial analysis of deforestation and/or degradation using an appropriately robust and detailed carbon accounting methodology before the start of the project.</p>	
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G2.3 of the PDD and the PIR, appendix 04.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>The PDD adequately and conservatively calculates the likely change in carbon stocks in the without project scenario.</p>
<p><b>Indicator G2.4</b> - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect communities in the project zone, including the impact of likely changes in water, soil and other locally important ecosystem services.</p>	<p>The without project scenario is a continuation of deforestation through illegal wood harvesting and soil erosion. Training, tree planting, and stipends to farmers would also not have occurred.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G2.4 of the PDD and PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Indicator G2.4 was adequately addressed by the project proponents.</p>
<p><b>Indicator G2.5</b> - Describe how the ‘without project’ reference scenario would affect biodiversity in the project zone (e.g., habitat availability, landscape connectivity and threatened species).</p>	<p>The without project scenario is for the continued decline of biodiversity, loss of forest and pressure on protected lands.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G2.5 of the PDD and PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.</p>



### G3 Project Design and Goals

<p>Indicator G3.1 - Provide a summary of the project's major climate, community and biodiversity objectives.</p>	<p>As stated in the PDD, the project goals are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase biomass and carbon sequestered in project areas,</li> <li>• provide a sustainable fuel wood supply for the members,</li> <li>• provide a new source of revenue to the members from the sale of carbon credits,</li> <li>• provide training in important social and health related subjects, and</li> <li>• improve the biodiversity of the area by adding canopy and indigenous trees.</li> </ul>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G3.1 of the PDD and PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.</p>

<p><b>Indicator G3.2</b> - Describe each project activity with expected climate, community and biodiversity impacts and its relevance to achieving the project's objectives.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR lists and describes these project activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nursery training and development</li> <li>• Tree planting</li> <li>• Selective use of tree products</li> <li>• Training on health, social and environmental topics.</li> </ul> <p>Tree planting is the main carbon sequestration activity. Nursery training and development is an important supporting activity. Use of tree products improves food security, fuel availability and adds to income. Non-tree related training is for improvement of the social condition of the small holders.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections G3.2 of the PDD and the PIR.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.</p>

<p><b>Indicator G3.3</b> - Provide a map identifying the project location and boundaries of the project area(s),</p>	<p>The PDD provides three appendices depicting the project areas and the project zone, including:</p>
--	---



where the project activities will occur, of the project zone and of additional surrounding locations that are predicted to be impacted by project activities (e.g. through leakage).	<p>Appendix 01: Landsat image depicting locations of each project area.</p> <p>Appendix 02: Another Landsat image depicting locations of each project area.</p> <p>Appendix 03: A Google Earth KML file, depicting the boundaries of each project area.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Appendices 01, 02 and 03 of the PDD.
Findings:	The maps found in the PDD appendices adequately fulfill the requirements of indicator G3.3.

<b>Indicator G3.4</b> - Define the project lifetime and GHG accounting period and explain and justify any differences between them. Define an implementation schedule, indicating key dates and milestones in the project's development.	The PDD states the project lifetime and accounting period begin 01 January 2003 and continues 30 years. Implementation and planting schedules are provided.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.4 of the PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G3.5</b> - Identify likely natural and human-induced risks to the expected climate, community and biodiversity benefits during the project lifetime and outline measures adopted to mitigate these risks.	<p>Natural risks to the project benefits include drought, pestilence and fire, which is mitigated by the widely dispersed individual project areas.</p> <p>The principle human-caused risk is the uncertainty of the carbon market. This is mitigated somewhat by the low cost of the TIST program.</p> <p>Another risk identified is farmers dropping out of the program. This is mitigated by its popularity, resulting in constant growth in participants.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.5 of the PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation



	findings.
<b>Indicator G3.6</b> - Demonstrate that the project design includes specific measures to ensure the maintenance or enhancement of the high conservation value attributes identified in G1 consistent with the precautionary principle.	<p>Since the HCV areas in the project zone are not in any of the individual project areas, the maintenance of them is indirect.</p> <p>The indirect effects include reduced fuel wood gathering in protected areas and enhanced biodiversity and possibly range expansion of some species that use the HCV areas, due to the newly planted trees.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.6 of the PDD and PIR.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the revised PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
<b>Indicator G3.7</b> - Describe the measures that will be taken to maintain and enhance the climate, community and biodiversity benefits beyond the project lifetime.	The project developers describe training in several areas that will maintain benefits beyond the project life, including training on benefits of certain trees beyond harvest value, training on maintaining stable woodlots, and training on the benefits of biodiversity.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.7 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
<b>Indicator G3.8</b> - Document and defend how communities and other stakeholders potentially affected by the project activities have been identified and have been involved in project design through effective consultation, particularly with a view to optimizing community and stakeholder benefits, respecting local customs and values and maintaining high conservation values. Project developers must document	<p>The PDD describes a voluntary program sensitive to local customs and needs. Several seminars and meetings are documented, news of which was disseminated in assorted ways.</p> <p>A table of stakeholders and their comments are included.</p>





stakeholder dialogues and indicate if and how the project proposal was revised based on such input. A plan must be developed to continue communication and consultation between project managers and all community groups about the project and its impacts to facilitate adaptive management throughout the life of the project.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.8 of the PDD and PIR, TIST.org website, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G3.9</b> - Describe what specific steps have been taken, and communications methods used, to publicize the CCBA public comment period to communities and other stakeholders and to facilitate their submission of comments to CCBA. Project proponents must play an active role in distributing key project documents to affected communities and stakeholders and hold widely publicized information meetings in relevant local or regional languages.	The intent to apply for CCBA validation and a public meeting was announced in Kampala newspapers. The public meeting was held, and a list of attendees provided.  E-mails were sent to stakeholders. Solicited comments were provided.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.9 of the PDD and PIR, provided file "TIST UB PDD-VCS-Spt 14a Public Comments CCB-001.doc," discussion with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholder meetings.
Findings:	Public comment document appears to be for a different project.
Non-Conformity Reports (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please provide the public comments for this project.
Date issued	11 January 2013
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date	The public comments are available in "TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14b Public Comments CCB-002.doc"



Evidence Used to Close NCR	The document "TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14b Public Comments CCB-002.doc" was provided.
Date closed	27 February 2013

<p><b>Indicator G3.10</b> - Formalize a clear process for handling unresolved conflicts and grievances that arise during project planning and implementation. The project design must include a process for hearing, responding to and resolving community and other stakeholder grievances within a reasonable time period. This grievance process must be publicized to communities and other stakeholders and must be managed by a third party or mediator to prevent any conflict of interest. Project management must attempt to resolve all reasonable grievances raised, and provide a written response to grievances within 30 days. Grievances and project responses must be documented.</p>	<p>The project developers have already developed a process to handle grievances. None were received during the processes of planning and implementation.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.10 of the PDD and PIR, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<p><b>Indicator G3.11</b> - Demonstrate that financial mechanisms adopted, including projected revenues from emissions reductions and other sources, are likely to provide an adequate flow of funds for project implementation and to achieve the anticipated climate, community and biodiversity benefits.</p>	<p>The project was designed to be self-funding through carbon revenues after the first 6 – 10 years. Initial funding is provided by the project developers.</p> <p>The TIST program is in its 12<sup>th</sup> year of operation, demonstrating some degree of success already.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G3.11 of the PDD and PIR, TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex9 Financial Plan.xls, and discussion with project proponent.



Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and financial plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
-----------	---

#### G4 Management Capacity and Best Practices

<b>Indicator G4.1</b> - Identify a single project proponent which is responsible for the project's design and implementation. If multiple organizations or individuals are involved in the project's development and implementation the governance structure, roles and responsibilities of each of the organizations or individuals involved must also be described.	The project developer is identified as Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC). The roles of the other parties involved are also described.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G4.1 of the PDD and PIR, discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G4.2</b> - Document key technical skills that will be required to implement the project successfully, including community engagement, biodiversity assessment and carbon measurement and monitoring skills. Document the management team's expertise and prior experience implementing land management projects at the scale of this project. If relevant experience is lacking, the proponents must either demonstrate how other organizations will be partnered with to support the project or have a recruitment strategy to fill the gaps.	The PD explains that the management team has a long background in natural resources management, and extensive experience in implementing projects very similar to this one. In addition to the TIST project in Uganda, there are TIST projects in three other nations.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G4.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussion w project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information



	provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
--	--

<p><b>Indicator G4.3</b> - Include a plan to provide orientation and training for the project's employees and relevant people from the communities with an objective of building locally useful skills and knowledge to increase local participation in project implementation. These capacity building efforts should target a wide range of people in the communities, including minority and underrepresented groups. Identify how training will be passed on to new workers when there is staff turnover, so that local capacity will not be lost.</p>	<p>Training begins with orientation seminars, discussed under indicator 3.8. Employees are taken from small group members, and are trained in how to quantify tree growth, etc.</p> <p>Training in tree planting, care, different species and their benefits, tree management, nursery operations, health-related issues and other subjects are conducted for small holders.</p> <p>Since local staff comes from the small holder groups, the ability to pass information to new workers is clear.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G4.3 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<p><b>Indicator G4.4</b> - Show that people from the communities will be given an equal opportunity to fill all employment positions (including management) if the job requirements are met. Project proponents must explain how employees will be selected for positions and where relevant, must indicate how local community members, including women and other potentially underrepresented groups, will be given a fair chance to fill positions for which they can be trained.</p>	<p>The PDD and PIR state that their local staff is hired from the farmers that are participants in the project, and are chosen based on achievement, not gender, education or social status.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G4.4 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff, and



	stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR and discussions with TIST staff and membership in the verification process supported validation findings.
<b>Indicator G4.5</b> - Submit a list of all relevant laws and regulations covering worker's rights in the host country. Describe how the project will inform workers about their rights. Provide assurance that the project meets or exceeds all applicable laws and/or regulations covering worker rights and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	<p>There are two relevant laws regarding employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Employment Act, 2006</li> <li>• National Social Security Fund Act, Cap 222.</li> </ul> <p>Employees get an overview of their rights when hired, and are provided the contents of Exhibit 16.</p> <p>Some TIST employees, who were interviewed, revealed that they believe their jobs would be in jeopardy if they requested needed time off for family or other reasons. They also believe they would lose their jobs if they complained to local management. Communication from employees to management is blocked due to employee fears.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 4.5 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Reports from employees indicate that some or all of workers' rights regarding leave are not being honored by TIST Uganda management. Employees believe they would lose their jobs if they request leave. They also believe they would lose their jobs if they expressed any dissatisfaction to management. Some employees claim that they have brought this issue up in regular meetings.
Non-Conformity Reports (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please demonstrate that these issues are being addressed when they are brought to the attention of the local TIST management.
Date issued	11 January 2013
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date	CAAC has made all efforts to ensure that the employee rights have been honored. Regarding the issue of leave, all Uganda employees are due seven days of leave for every 4 weeks of continued service. In 2012, it was learned that the leave was not being taken and as a result, and with the permission of the Quantifiers, we made cash payments in lieu time off. Further, US management has discussed this issue



	<p>with the host country director and made it clear that rights listed in Exhibit 16 are legal obligation of the company and shall not be abridged. We will monitor this in the future.</p> <p>Regarding the fear of losing their jobs if they express any dissatisfaction with management, we are restructuring the management hierarchy in Uganda. Instead of having a single director we are moving to a representative for of management, a Leadership Council (LC). The initial LC met on 12 January, 2013 where a gender balance of representatives from the Quantifiers, trainers and members were elected. We believe that this new management structure will address this fear.</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR	The response and actions of the project proponent should adequately address this issue. Future verifications will assess the effectiveness of the response.
Date closed	27 February 2013

<p><b>Indicator G4.6</b> - Comprehensively assess situations and occupations that pose a substantial risk to worker safety. A plan must be in place to inform workers of risks and to explain how to minimize such risks. Where worker safety cannot be guaranteed, project proponents must show how the risks will be minimized using best work practices.</p>	<p>Project participants do not engage in any activities they do not normally do. No additional risk is incurred by being involved in the project.</p> <p>Project proponent has SOP for quantifiers addressing safety, and will brief quantifiers on the safety policy annually.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 4.6 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff, and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR and discussions with TIST staff and membership in the verification process supported validation findings.

<p><b>Indicator G4.7</b> - Document the financial health of the implementing organization(s) to demonstrate that financial resources budgeted will be</p>	<p>The project developers have been in business for a number of years and have operated TIST for over 10 years. The project developer is profitable after TIST expenses.</p>
---	--



adequate to implement the project.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G4.7 of the PDD and PIR, TIST UG PDD-VCS-Ex6 Financial Plan.xls, discussion with project proponent and project proponent's track record with similar projects.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and financial plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

### G5 Legal Status and Property Rights

<b>Indicator G5.1</b> - Submit a list of all relevant national and local laws and regulations in the host country and all applicable international treaties and agreements. Provide assurance that the project will comply with these and, where relevant, demonstrate how compliance is achieved.	<p>Few laws are relevant to the project, however several laws were listed with varying degrees of relevance to the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• employment laws listed in G4.5.</li> <li>• Companies Act Cap. 110</li> <li>• Constitution of Uganda, 1995</li> <li>• National Environment Act of 1996</li> <li>• National Forestry and Tree Planting Act, 8/2003</li> </ul> <p>The PDD and PIR explain compliance with these laws and the regulatory authorities.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	<p>Sections G5.1 of the PDD and PIR, the following files downloaded from the TIST website:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 01 Environmental Screening 060803.pdf</li> <li>• TIST UB PD-VCS-Ex 02 NEMA EA Approval 070515.pdf</li> </ul> <p>and discussion with project proponent.</p>
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G5.2</b> - Document that the project has approval from the appropriate authorities, including the established formal and/or traditional authorities customarily required by the communities.	<p>No approvals are needed for a farmer to plant trees on his/her lands. The project proponents sought and received approval, nonetheless, from the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA).</p> <p>In addition, the project proponents received approval from the local District Head of Natural Resources</p>
---	--



	(Cyril Mubyenyi) and from the local Forestry Officer (Perez R. Kakumu).
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G5.2 of the PDD and PIR letter from NEMA (file name: TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 02 NEMA EA Approval 070515.pdf), and discussion with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G5.3</b> - Demonstrate with documented consultations and agreements that the project will not encroach uninvited on private property, community property, or government property and has obtained the free, prior, and informed consent of those whose rights will be affected by the project.	All project activities take place on privately owned preexisting land of the farmers and their families. The small holders sign a contract attesting they have the right to plant on these lands.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 5.3 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G5.4</b> - Demonstrate that the project does not require the involuntary relocation of people or of the activities important for the livelihoods and culture of the communities. If any relocation of habitation or activities is undertaken within the terms of an agreement, the project proponents must demonstrate that the agreement was made with the free, prior, and informed consent of those concerned and includes provisions for just and fair compensation.	The project takes place on existing lands of farmers and their families, and participation is voluntary. TIST nor CAAC own or lease any project lands, and have no authority to relocate members or landowners.
Evidence Used to Assess	Sections G5.4 of the PDD and PIR, field visit,





Conformance:	discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G5.5</b> - Identify any illegal activities that could affect the project's climate, community or biodiversity impacts (e.g., logging) taking place in the project zone and describe how the project will help to reduce these activities so that project benefits are not derived from illegal activities.	<p>Illegal harvesting of trees for fuel use exists in the protected forests of the project zone.</p> <p>The project will reduce the illegal wood harvesting pressure on the protected forests by providing an alternative wood source for some of the population.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G5.5 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator G5.6</b> - Demonstrate that the project proponents have clear, uncontested title to the carbon rights, or provide legal documentation demonstrating that the project is undertaken on behalf of the carbon owners with their full consent. Where local or national conditions preclude clear title to the carbon rights at the time of validation against the Standards, the project proponents must provide evidence that their ownership of carbon rights is likely to be established before they enter into any transactions concerning the project's carbon assets.	<p>Each small holder involved in the project signs a contract with CAAC, transferring rights and title to the carbon.</p> <p>No national law governs carbon. Ownership of trees and tree products can be transferred to others via contract.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections G5.6 of the PDD and PIR, supporting documentation (TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 04 GhG Contract UG 080319.doc and TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex



	03 GhG Contract UG 051014.doc, downloaded from TIST website), field visit, and discussion with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

### CL1 Net Positive Climate Impacts

<b>Indicator CL1.1</b> - Estimate the net change in carbon stocks due to the project activities using the methods of calculation, formulae and default values of the IPCC 2006 GL for AFOLU or using a more robust and detailed methodology. The net change is equal to carbon stock changes <i>with</i> the project minus carbon stock changes <i>without</i> the project (the latter having been estimated in G2). This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter GHG emissions of carbon stocks over the duration of the project or the project GHG accounting period.	<p>The change in carbon stocks due to project activities was based on <i>AR-AMS0001 Version 06: Simplified baseline and monitoring methodologies for small-scale A/R CDM project activities implemented on grasslands or croplands with limited displacement of pre-project activities</i>. The trees were stratified by species and year planted. Different growth factors for each species were used to estimate the accumulated carbon over the years.</p> <p>813,845 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>e are expected to accumulate over the life of the project (27,128 tonnes per year).</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL1.1 of the PDD and PIR, Appendix 04 (file: "TIST UG PD-CCB-002e App04 Data 130304.xlsx" downloaded from website) and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	The VCS Validation and Verification Reports prepared by ESI on 07 March 2013 show conformance with this item.
Date closed	08 March 2013

<b>Indicator CL1.2</b> - Estimate the net change in the emissions of non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHG emissions such as CH <sub>4</sub> and N <sub>2</sub> O in the <i>with</i> and <i>without</i> project scenarios if those gases are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent) of the project's overall	<p>Non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are below 5% of project emissions, and are therefore ignored.</p> <p>The project proponent points out that the only CH<sub>4</sub> emissions would be from burning, which would not be a result of project activity but domestic fuels used in daily life.</p>
---	--



GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	TIST asks farmers not to use chemical fertilizers, and to use available dung and plant materials instead – neither of which were a result of the project, so are not considered.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL1.2 of the PDD and PIR, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CL1.3</b> - Estimate any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities. Emissions sources include, but are not limited to, emissions from biomass burning during site preparation, emissions from fossil fuel combustion, direct emissions from the use of synthetic fertilizers, and emissions from the decomposition of N-fixing species.	No biomass burning, burning for site prep, use of motorized equipment or use of chemical fertilizers will be involved in the project. N-fixing species are not left to degrade. Dead wood will be used by farmers for fuel.  For these reasons, these emissions are assumed to be zero.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL1.3 of the PDD and PIR, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CL1.4</b> - Demonstrate that the net climate impact of the project is positive. The net climate impact of the project is the net change in carbon stocks plus net change in non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHGs where appropriate minus any other GHG emissions resulting from project activities minus any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts (see CL2.3).	The ex-ante estimate is that the project will sequester 813,845 tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> e over 30 years, and therefore have a net positive climate impact.  The trees will benefit the overall ecosystem, and reduce deforestation outside project boundaries by providing a source of dead wood.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL1.4 of the PDD and PIR, and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation



	findings.
<b>Indicator CL1.5</b> - Specify how double counting of GHG emissions reductions or removals will be avoided, particularly for offsets sold on the voluntary market and generated in a country with an emissions cap.	The project proponents are validating and verifying under VCS, who will issue VERs on one registry. Registry rules prevent the VERs from being sold twice.  Uganda has no emissions cap.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL1.5 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

## CL2 Offsite Climate Impacts (“Leakage”)

<b>Indicator CL2.1</b> - Determine the types of leakage that are expected and estimate potential offsite increases in GHGs (increases in emissions or decreases in sequestration) due to project activities. Where relevant, define and justify where leakage is most likely to take place.	The project proponents have determined there is no leakage from the project for the following reasons:  <b>Activity shifting or displacement</b> – When questioned, farmers said the tree planting will not shift other activities. Crops are higher value to the farmers than trees, and participation is voluntary.  <b>Market effect</b> – Trees will be a new source of fuel wood, taking pressure off surrounding forests.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL2.1 of the PDD and PIR, and the basic premise of the project.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CL2.2</b> - Document how any leakage will be mitigated and estimate the extent to which such impacts will be reduced by these mitigation activities.	Since no leakage source was identified, no mitigation is needed.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL2.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information



	provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.
--	--

<b>Indicator CL2.3</b> - Subtract any likely project-related unmitigated negative offsite climate impacts from the climate benefits being claimed by the project and demonstrate that this has been included in the evaluation of net climate impact of the project (as calculated in CL1.4).	Since no leakage source was identified, unmitigated offsite climate impacts are zero.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL2.3 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CL2.4</b> - Non-CO <sub>2</sub> gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than a 5% increase or decrease (in terms of CO <sub>2</sub> -equivalent) of the net change calculations (above) of the project's overall off-site GHG emissions reductions or removals over each monitoring period.	None identified.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL2.4 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

### CL3 Climate Impact Monitoring

<b>Indicator CL3.1</b> - Develop an initial plan for selecting carbon pools and non-CO <sub>2</sub> GHGs to be monitored, and determine the frequency of monitoring. Potential pools include aboveground biomass, litter, dead wood, belowground biomass, wood	The monitoring plan has been operational since 2003. Due to the scattered and remote nature of the project areas, planting schedules and the trees to plant is decided by the local small groups, and are not universal across the project.  Field personnel collect project information on GPS
--	---



<p>products, soil carbon and peat. Pools to monitor must include any pools expected to decrease as a result of project activities, including those in the region outside the project boundaries resulting from all types of leakage identified in CL2. A plan must be in place to continue leakage monitoring for at least five years after all activity displacement or other leakage causing activity has taken place. Individual GHG sources may be considered ‘insignificant’ and do not have to be accounted for if together such omitted decreases in carbon pools and increases in GHG emissions amount to less than 5% of the total CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent benefits generated by the project. Non-CO<sub>2</sub> gases must be included if they are likely to account for more than 5% (in terms of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent) of the project’s overall GHG impact over each monitoring period. Direct field measurements using scientifically robust sampling must be used to measure more significant elements of the project’s carbon stocks. Other data must be suitable to the project site and specific forest type.</p>	<p>supported hand-held computers. Data is transferred to TIST's main database server.</p> <p>The monitoring plan consists of ten steps, including data collection and calculations. A table summarizing the plan and the input parameters required are provided.</p> <p>No pools are expected to decrease over the life of the project, and no leakage will occur on a project like this. Leakage was monitored within the first five years of the project, in the form of displaced activity. None was found.</p> <p>QA/QC procedures include quantifier training, staff auditing of quantifiers, multiple quantifications meant to catch errors and self-correct, running multiple GPS tracks of project perimeters, counting every tree to reduce sampling error, setting up hand-held computers so that all data must be collected and transparency through posting data online.</p>
<p>Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:</p>	<p>Sections CL3.1 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff. While on site, interviews with project management were performed in order to learn about this aspect.</p>
<p>Findings:</p>	<p>Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and PIR. Results from review of the PDD and PIR in the verification process supported, along with interviews, validation findings.</p>
<p><b>Indicator CL3.2</b> - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of</p>	<p>The monitoring plan described in G3.1 is already in operation. It is fully described in Appendix 06, CCBA Monitoring Plan for TIST Program in Uganda CCB-002.</p>



validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CL3.2 of the PDD and PIR, monitoring plan (file: TIST UG PD-CCB-002g App06 Monitoring Plan 130208.doc), discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

### CM1 Net Positive Community Impacts

<p><b>Indicator CM1.1</b> - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate the impacts on communities, including all constituent socio-economic or cultural groups such as indigenous peoples (defined in G1), resulting from planned project activities. A credible estimate of impacts must include changes in community well-being due to project activities and an evaluation of the impacts by the affected groups. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions about how project activities will alter social and economic well-being, including potential impacts of changes in natural resources and ecosystem services identified as important by the communities (including water and soil resources), over the duration of the project. The 'with project' scenario must then be compared with the 'without project' scenario of social and economic well-being in the absence of the project (completed in</p>	<p>The socio-economic impact is expected to be all positive.</p> <p>For small group members and families:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New job opportunities</li> <li>• New source of income</li> <li>• New source of wood and fruits, nuts</li> <li>• Natural source of medicines, insecticides, etc.</li> <li>• Small group structure and creation of BMPs</li> <li>• Capacity building due to rotating leadership</li> <li>• Small groups organize for other community purposes</li> <li>• Improved beauty of the landscape.</li> </ul> <p>In the "without project" scenario, none of the above applies.</p>
---	---



G2). The difference (i.e., the community benefit) must be positive for all community groups.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM1.1 of the PDD and PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CM1.2</b> - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.4-6 will be negatively affected by the project.	The project does not take place on HCV lands. The planting of trees will likely have the effect of reducing illegal tree harvesting from HCV lands by providing an alternative source of some tree products.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM1.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

## CM2 Offsite Stakeholder Impacts

<b>Indicator CM2.1</b> - Identify any potential negative offsite stakeholder impacts that the project activities are likely to cause.	The only identified negative impact to offsite stakeholders of farmers planting trees on land that they have farmed for many years is that some eucalyptus trees may be planted, and they have been identified as having negative effects on groundwater levels. TIST explains the drawbacks of eucalyptus, and has ongoing training about alternatives to eucalyptus.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM2.1 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CM2.2</b> - Describe how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite social and economic impacts.	In order to reduce the number of eucalyptus trees planted, TIST trains members and trainers on indigenous trees and their benefits, as well as the problems associated with eucalyptus.
Evidence Used to Assess	Sections CM2.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussions





Conformance:	with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CM2.3</b> - Demonstrate that the project is not likely to result in net negative impacts on the well-being of other stakeholder groups.	There are a total of 43.3 ha of eucalyptus in the project areas out of 1,005.7 ha. The entire project area includes thousands of square kilometers. The effect of the eucalyptus is not expected to outweigh the positive effects of the project.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM2.3 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

### CM3 Community Impact Monitoring

<b>Indicator CM3.1</b> - Develop an initial plan for selecting community variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's community development objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	The PDD and PIR list 12 items that will be monitored yearly, including the number of participants, the number adopting new management practices, numbers of various species planted, number of people employed by TIST, and more.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM3.1 of the PDD and PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CM3.2</b> - Develop an initial plan for how they will assess the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to community well-being (G1.8.4-6) present in the project zone.	<p>Since the project does not take place on HCV lands, no direct monitoring of HCV lands will take place.</p> <p>Impacts will be addressed by the number of indigenous trees planted and the number of hectares that contain such trees.</p>
--	--



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM3.2 of the PDD and PIR, monitoring plan, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator CM3.3</b> - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	The full plan has been developed and made part of the PDD, as appendix 06.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections CM3.3 of the PDD and PIR, appendix 06 (file: TIST UG PD-CCB-002g App06 Monitoring Plan 130208.doc, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

## B1 Net Positive Biodiversity Impacts

<b>Indicator B1.1</b> - Use appropriate methodologies to estimate changes in biodiversity as a result of the project in the project zone and in the project lifetime. This estimate must be based on clearly defined and defensible assumptions. The 'with project' scenario should then be compared with the baseline 'without project' biodiversity scenario completed in G2. The difference (i.e., the net biodiversity benefit) must be positive.	<p>Natural wildlife populations were eliminated or driven from the project area lands generations ago, and may be present as transient animals. Studies concluded that little native vegetation exists outside protected areas. Native tree planting may improve wildlife connectivity between protected areas.</p> <p>A list of the native tree species that are being planted and their numbers are provided.</p> <p>Increasing forested area may also improve biodiversity indirectly, by taking some pressure off the natural, protected forests. Promoting conservation farming may also reduce pressure for land clearing.</p>
---	--



	In the without project scenario, no tree planting would occur, and pressure on protected lands would not be relieved.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B1.1 of the PDD and PIR, linked study by Derek Pomeroy, et al, and discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process sufficiently supported validation findings.
Opportunity for Improvement (OFI):	Update link in footnote 53 on page 53 of the PDD to <a href="http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACY477.pdf">http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACY477.pdf</a>
Date issued	11 January 2013
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date	This document has been downloaded and made an exhibit (see: TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 25 Uganda Ecosystem 2002.pdf).
Evidence used to close OFI	Availability of document confirmed.
Date closed	27 February 2013

<b>Indicator B1.2</b> - Demonstrate that no High Conservation Values identified in G1.8.1-3 will be negatively affected by the project.	HCVs discussed in G1.8 have not and will not be negatively affected by the project, because no activity takes place on these lands, and project activities will tend to reduce wood harvesting or clearing for agriculture in the HCVs.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B1.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD and monitoring plan. Results from review of the PIR and monitoring report in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator B1.3</b> - Identify all species to be used by the project and show that no known invasive species will be introduced into any area affected by the project and that the population of any invasive species will not increase as a result of the project.	TIST does not provide seeds or seedlings. Participants collect sees from locally existing trees that have a history of being grown in the country or regionally. A list of species present in the area is provided. Ten of the 29 are indigenous to Uganda.  None of the species listed are considered invasive in Uganda.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B1.3 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	While the PDD and PIR state that the non-native



	species listed on table B1.3 were cross checked with the Global Invasive Species Database, and were found to be non-invasive in Uganda, <i>Acacia mearnsii</i> is listed. Specifically it "...threatens native habitats by competing with indigenous vegetation, replacing grass communities, reducing native biodiversity and increasing water loss from riparian zones."
Non-Conformity Reports (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please address the use of this invasive species in the project.
Date issued	11 January 2013
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date	A letter has been provided from District Forest Officer of Bushenyi stating <i>Acacia mearnsii</i> is considered an agro forestry tree and has not invasive tendencies. See "TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 31 <i>Acacia mearnsii</i> .pdf."
Evidence Used to Close NCR	Above mentioned letter from the District Forest Officer closes this NCR.
Date closed	27 February 2013

<b>Indicator B1.4</b> - Describe possible adverse effects of non-native species used by the project on the region's environment, including impacts on native species and disease introduction or facilitation. Project proponents must justify any use of non-native species over native species	TIST does not provide seeds or seedlings. They are locally sourced from trees with a history of being grown in the area. Eucalyptus is the only popularly grown local tree that may have negative impacts if not properly managed.  Farmers choose the species of tree they plant based on their needs. The project area has been heavily impacted by agriculture and habitation for many years, so non-native species are not displacing native ones. Some trees have been naturalized to the area and have become important food sources. Others have high growth rates that no native species can match.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B1.4 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Indicator B1.4 requires that the project proponent first address the use of <i>Acacia mearnsii</i> , mentioned in B1.3.
Non-Conformity Reports (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Successfully address indicator B1.3.
Date issued	11 January 2013
Project Proponent Response/Actions and Date	The following sentence was added to the last paragraph of Section B1.4 of the PD and PIR:



	Another, <i>Acacia mearnsii</i> , though listed as invasive some places, is considered an agro-forestry tree by Uganda Forest Service, with “no invasive tendencies.” <sup>1</sup>
Evidence Used to Close NCR	Letter from the District Forest Office used to address indicator B1.3 also satisfies B1.4.
Date closed	27 February 2013

<b>Indicator B1.5</b> - Guarantee that no GMOs will be used to generate GHG emissions reductions or removals.	The PDD and PIR state that no GMOs will be used by the project to generate GHG emissions, reductions or removals.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B1.5 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

## B2 Offsite Biodiversity Impacts

<b>Indicator B2.1</b> - Identify potential negative offsite biodiversity impacts that the project is likely to cause.	None are expected. There will be no displacement of people or activities. Sustainable harvest of wood is allowed, reducing the need for fuel wood from other sources. The project will have a beneficial effect on the rate of deforestation.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B2.1 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator B2.2</b> - Document how the project plans to mitigate these negative offsite biodiversity impacts.	Not applicable, since no offsite impacts are expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B2.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff and the basic premise of the project.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation

<sup>1</sup> See TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 31 *Acacia mearnsii*.pdf  
098-FOR-CCBA Validation/Verification Report Template – final – v2  
Controlled Document 8 March 2013



	findings.
<b>Indicator B2.3</b> - Evaluate likely unmitigated negative offsite biodiversity impacts against the biodiversity benefits of the project within the project boundaries. Justify and demonstrate that the net effect of the project on biodiversity is positive.	No negative offsite biodiversity impacts are expected.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B2.3 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff and the basic premise of the project.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

### B3 Biodiversity Impact Monitoring

<b>Indicator B3.1</b> - Develop an initial plan for selecting biodiversity variables to be monitored and the frequency of monitoring and reporting to ensure that monitoring variables are directly linked to the project's biodiversity objectives and to anticipated impacts (positive and negative).	<p>A monitoring plan, including monitoring of biodiversity, is already developed and in effect.</p> <p>Monitoring is expected to be annual, but will be done every two years at a minimum.</p> <p>Monitoring will include the area planted to trees, the number of trees planted, tree age and circumference.</p> <p>At the landscape level, hectares of land improved with indigenous tree plantings will be monitored.</p> <p>Degree of forest fragmentation and connectivity will be monitored using GPS track data.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B3.1 of the PDD and PIR and discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator B3.2</b> - Develop an initial plan for assessing the effectiveness of measures used to maintain or enhance High Conservation Values related to	According to the PDD, "Because there is no direct interaction with the HCV, the monitoring will be indirect and based on monitoring direct project achievements per B3.1 and B3.3."
---	---



globally, regionally or nationally significant biodiversity (G1.8.1-3) present in the project zone.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections 3.2 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

<b>Indicator B3.3</b> - Commit to developing a full monitoring plan within six months of the project start date or within twelve months of validation against the Standards and to disseminate this plan and the results of monitoring, ensuring that they are made publicly available on the internet and are communicated to the communities and other stakeholders.	The monitoring plan for biodiversity was summarized in the description for B3.1.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections B3.3 of the PDD and PIR, monitoring plan (file: TIST UG PD-CCB-002g App06 Monitoring Plan 130208.doc), discussions with project proponent and field staff.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD. Results from review of the PIR in the verification process supported validation findings.

## Gold Level Section

### GL1 Climate Change Adaptation Benefits

Conformance: N/A

### GL2 Exceptional Community Benefits

Conformance: No

<b>Indicator GL2.1</b> - Demonstrate that the project zone is in a low human development country OR in an administrative area of a medium or high human development country in which at least 50% of the population of that area is below the national poverty line.	Uganda is a low human development country, with Human Development Index of 0.446.
--	---



Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL2.1 of the PDD and PIR, page 129 of the United Nations Development Program, Human Development Report 2011 (provided in file: TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 16 UN Human Dev Rpt 2011.pdf), discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.

<p><b>Indicator GL2.2</b> - Demonstrate that at least 50% of households within the lowest category of well-being (e.g., poorest quartile) of the community are likely to benefit substantially from the project.</p>	<p>There is no cost to enter the TIST program, and no minimum land area required. Even landless individuals can participate and benefit from tree planting.</p> <p>Since the project covers thousands of square kilometers and participation is voluntary, the project developers look at the overall benefits of the program to assess whether 50% of the poorest households will benefit. These benefits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• general GHG reduction climate benefits</li> <li>• slows rate of environmental degradation</li> <li>• improves/conserves soil</li> <li>• improves/conserves water supply</li> <li>• mitigates drought</li> <li>• new supply of wood for fuel</li> <li>• health training</li> </ul> <p>The project developers highlight that the world's most disadvantaged people suffer most from environmental degradation, so they will also benefit most from activities that reduce or reverse environmental degradation.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL2.2 of the PDD and PIR, London School of Economics report, "Poverty and Climate Change: Assessing Impacts in Developing Countries and the Initiatives of the International Community," FAO report, "Land and Environmental Degradation and Desertification in Africa., discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.

<b>Indicator GL2.3</b> - Demonstrate that any barriers or risks that might prevent	Barriers to benefits going to poorer households were identified and removed to the greatest extent
--	--





benefits going to poorer households have been identified and addressed in order to increase the probable flow of benefits to poorer households.	possible. There is no cost to join, and seeds and seedlings are collected and grown by the participants. There is no minimum farm size to participate, and even those without land can participate. Environmental benefits can be enjoyed by all in the area, whether they are participants or not.
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL2.3 of the PDD and PIR, discussions with project proponent.
Findings:	Validation findings supported the information provided in the PDD.

<b>Indicator GL2.4</b> - Demonstrate that measures have been taken to identify any poorer and more vulnerable households and individuals whose well-being or poverty may be negatively affected by the project, and that the project design includes measures to avoid any such impacts. Where negative impacts are unavoidable, demonstrate that they will be effectively mitigated.	<p>According to the PD, No poorer, more vulnerable households and individuals were identified through a project design that was developed for subsistence level farmers with the full input of subsistence level farmers.</p> <p>During interviews, some employees expressed dissatisfaction that less demanding jobs, like cleaning, paid more than TIST jobs, and that employees were expected to pay for travel expenses and lodging when work took them away from home over night.</p>
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL2.4 of the PDD and PIR, field visit, discussions with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	While project goals and design generally avoid negative impacts on the poorer and more vulnerable, some employees indicate that they believe they are not being treated fairly by TIST in regards to employment practices and communication with management is hampered by fear of retribution.
Non-Conformity Reports (NCR) to address non-conformance:	Please demonstrate how typical pay for TIST employees has been determined or is similar to that of others doing similar work. Demonstrate that job-related costs of travel and lodging while working are covered by the project.
Date issued:	11 January 2013
Project proponent response/actions	TIST employee pay: Pay for quantifiers is based on the going rate for similar type jobs in southwest Uganda, 200,000 Ush/month (See “TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 90 Quantifier pay email.pdf”). We offer a base pay of 169,000 Ush/month reflecting the fact



	<p>that the quantifiers work on their own schedule and normally only work about half to ¾ time, taking the rest of the time to work at their farms (see “TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 91 January 2013 Budget.xls, rows 7 to 25”). However, we also pay a productivity bonus. As noted in “TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 92 Quantifier Incentive Nov 2012.docx,” two quantifiers made almost one million Ush in bonuses in November. We believe that the quantifiers receive a fair base pay for the location and time requirements and have the ability to make 4 to 5 times that amount if they put in the time and effort.</p> <p>Travel and lodging: Quantifiers are responsible for their own travel expenses but are paid a monthly expense stipend of 250,000 Ush (see “TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 91 January 2013 Budget.xls, rows 30 to 47”). It is up to them to manage their time, travel and meal expenses. They pocket what they don’t spend in a month and at times have to pay out of their own pocket. They do not pay for extra expenses for special meetings or, for example, the costs associated with validation and verification (see “TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 91 January 2013 Budget.xls, row 55).</p> <p>Attachments were sent by email to Stewart McMorrow on Feb 3, 2013.</p>
Evidence Used to Close NCR	Measures taken in response to indicator G4.5 and exhibits 90, 91 and 92 adequately address this NCR. Future verifiers should assess the effectiveness of these actions.
Date closed	27 February 2013
<p><b>Indicator GL2.5</b> - Demonstrate that community impact monitoring will be able to identify positive and negative impacts on poorer and more vulnerable groups. The social impact monitoring must take a differentiated approach that can identify positive and negative impacts on poorer households and individuals and other disadvantaged groups, including</p>	<p>Positive and negative social impacts on poorer households are measured through a monitoring survey.</p>



women.	
Evidence Used to Assess Conformance:	Sections GL2.5 of the PDD and PIR, TIST participants survey (on TIST website, file: TIST UG PD-Ex 21 GL2 Community Survey Template.doc), discussions with project proponent, field staff and stakeholders.
Findings:	Indicator GL2.5 has been adequately addressed.

**GL3 Exceptional Biodiversity Benefits**

**Conformance: N/A**

**Public Shareholder Comments**

Public comments for CCBA were solicited two ways. First a public hearing was held in Bushenyi, Uganda. Second, a series of emails were sent to stakeholders.

**Public Comment Period**

The project PDD and Project Implementation Report was posted to the CCBB website for the formal 30-day public comment period (27 November 2012 to 27 December 2012). No comments were received.

**Public Meeting**

The Public Meeting was held between 10:00 AM and 11:00 AM on 07 January 2013 at the TIST office in Bushenyi, Uganda. Notice was given in the leading Uganda newspaper as follows:

- New Vision (a daily national paper): notice on 29 December 2012, in English.

**TIST Program to hold Public Meeting**

Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC) announces its intent to validate and verify its second subset of project in the International Small Group and Tree Planting Program (TIST) under the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) standards. To receive the validation and verification, CAAC must demonstrate, among other things, that TIST is beneficial to climate, community and biodiversity. CAAC has submitted a Project Description (PD) and a Project Implementation Report (PIR) to Environmental Services Inc, a CCBA certified auditor. The documents are available on line at (see TIST Program in Uganda CCB-002):

<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

A public stakeholders meeting will be held between 10:00 AM and 11:00 AM on 07 January, 2013 at the TIST Office located at Katungu in Bushenyi, Uganda where



comments will be taken. In addition, comments may be submitted up to 17 January 2013 to CCBA by clicking on "SUBMIT COMMENTS" at:

<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

Attendance is not required at the meeting in order to submit comments to CCBA.

Copies of the notice are attached.

### **Email Solicitation**

The following email was sent to stakeholders in Uganda on 02 January, 2013.

Subject: TIST Uganda seeking CCBA accreditation. Comments Requested.

Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC) announces its intent to validate and verify the International Small Group and Tree Planting Program (TIST) under the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) standards. To receive the validation and verification, CAAC must demonstrate, among other things, that TIST is beneficial to climate, community and biodiversity. CAAC has submitted a Project Description (PD) and a Project Implementation Report (PIR) to Environmental Services Inc, a CCBA certified auditor. The documents are available on line at:

<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

A public stakeholders meeting will be held between 10:00 AM and 11:00 AM on 07 January, 2013 at the TIST Office located at Katungu in Bushenyi, Uganda where comments will be taken. In addition, comments may be submitted up to 17 January 2013 to CCBA by clicking on "SUBMIT COMMENTS" at:

<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

Attendance is not required at the meeting in order to submit comments to CCBA.

The emails were sent to the following organizations and individuals:

- Abel Bishoni. [abelbishoni@yahoo.com](mailto:abelbishoni@yahoo.com)
- Action for Social Economic Development. [asedorg.ug@gmail.com](mailto:asedorg.ug@gmail.com)
- AIDS Healthcare Foundation. [global.info@aidshealth.org](mailto:global.info@aidshealth.org)
- Berkeley Reafforestation Trust, Rodney Portman. [rodneyporrtman@thebrt.org](mailto:rodneyporrtman@thebrt.org)
- Bushenyi District Local Government. Hand delivered.
- Care International, Uganda. Online email form.
- Forestry and Environmental Development Network. [fedn.uganda@yahoo.com](mailto:fedn.uganda@yahoo.com)





- Jane Goodall Institute. [panta@janegoodallug.org](mailto:panta@janegoodallug.org)
- Kanungu District Local Government. Hand delivered.
- Kanungu District NGO/CBO Forum. [kaberukar@yahoo.com](mailto:kaberukar@yahoo.com)
- Kabale District Local Government. Hand delivered.
- Kyabuhangwa Women in Development. [kwid2007@yahoo.com](mailto:kwid2007@yahoo.com)
- Ministry of Water and Environment. [mwe@mwe.go.ug](mailto:mwe@mwe.go.ug)
- National Climate Change Steering Committee (NCCSC), Philip Gwage, [pgwage@googlemail.com](mailto:pgwage@googlemail.com)
- National Environment Management Authority (NEMA). Online email form.
- National Forestry Authority. [info@nfa.org.ug](mailto:info@nfa.org.ug)
- Navigators of Development Association. [navoda89@yahoo.com](mailto:navoda89@yahoo.com)
- Peter Apell. [dr.apell@gmail.com](mailto:dr.apell@gmail.com)
- Sawlog Production Grant Scheme. [edithn@sawlog.ug](mailto:edithn@sawlog.ug)
- Sawlog Production Grant Scheme. [charleso@sawlog.ug](mailto:charleso@sawlog.ug)
- Uganda Conservation (U) Ltd. [phil@ugandacf.org](mailto:phil@ugandacf.org)
- Uganda Wildlife Authority. Online email form.
- USAID/Uganda, David Eckerson, Mission Director. [declerson@usaid.gov](mailto:declerson@usaid.gov)
- World Vision. [info@worldvision.org](mailto:info@worldvision.org)
- World Wildlife Foundation (WWF), Eastern & Southern Africa. [KMugo@wwfesarpo.org](mailto:KMugo@wwfesarpo.org)
- TIST Small Group. [beitwendaandco.advocates@yahoo.com](mailto:beitwendaandco.advocates@yahoo.com)
- TIST Small Group, Green Earth Movement SG. [mbcyril@yahoo.com](mailto:mbcyril@yahoo.com)
- TIST Small Group, Forest Fruit Food SG. [forestfruitfoodsltd@yahoo.com](mailto:forestfruitfoodsltd@yahoo.com)
- TIST Small Group, Green Earth Movement SG. [mujurizi2002@yahoo.com](mailto:mujurizi2002@yahoo.com)
- TIST Staff. [sarahnankunda@tist.org](mailto:sarahnankunda@tist.org)
- TIST Quantifiers, Bushenyi. [ugbushquant@tist.org](mailto:ugbushquant@tist.org)
- TIST Quantifier, Kanungu. [arinitweezra@yahoo.com](mailto:arinitweezra@yahoo.com)
- TIST Quantifier, Kabale. [zabroh2000@yahoo.com](mailto:zabroh2000@yahoo.com)
- ESI. Shawn McMahan, [smcmahon@ESINC.CC](mailto:smcmahon@ESINC.CC)
- ESI. Stewart McMorrow [smcmorrow@ESINC.CC](mailto:smcmorrow@ESINC.CC)



### Validation/Verification Conclusion

ESI confirms all validation and verification activities, including objectives, scope and criteria, level of assurance and the PDD adherence to the CCB Project Design Standards, as documented in this report are complete. ESI concludes without any qualifications or limiting conditions that the CCB Project Design Documentation *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-002* (11 March 2013), CCB Project Implementation Report *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-002* (11 March 2013), CCB Monitoring Plan *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-002* (08 February 2013) and the CCB Monitoring Report *TIST Program in Uganda, CCB-002* (04 March 2013) meets the requirements of the CCB Project Design Standards (Second Edition – December 2008) and Gold Level for Exceptional Community Benefits.

### Submittal Information

Report Submitted to:	<p>Mr. Charlie Williams Clean Air Action Corporation 7134 South Yale Ave., Suite 310 Tulsa, OK 74136</p> <p>The Climate, Community &amp; Biodiversity Alliance</p>
Report Submitted (CCBA-Approved Verifier) by:	<p>Environmental Services, Inc. 7220 Financial Way, Suite 100 Jacksonville, Florida 32256</p>
Lead Validator/Verifier and Regional Technical Manager (QA/QC) Names and Signatures:	 <p>Shawn McMahon – Lead Validator/Verifier</p>  <p>Janice McMahon – Vice President and Regional Technical Manager Forestry, Carbon, and GHG Services Division</p>
Date:	12 March 2013

RS/SM/JPM/RMB VO12059.00 CCB Val/Ver Report \_final.doc  
K:pf 03/12/13f



---

## Appendix A – Documents Reviewed / Received

### Documents received 16 November 2012

- TIST UG PD-CCB-002f App05 Implementation Rpt 121112.pdf
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002a PD Text 121112.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002a PD Text 121112.pdf
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002d App03 PA Plots.kml
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002e App04 Data 121112.xlsx
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002f App05 Implementation Rpt 121112.doc

### Documents received 20 November 2012

- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 22 GL2 Community Survey Result.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 01 Environmental Screening 060803.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 02 NEMA EA Approval 070515.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 03 GhG Contract UG 051014.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 04 GhG Contract UG 080319.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 05 Winrock Report 021215.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 06 KE EIA Report NAREDA 100506.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 07 Mgt Resumes 110215.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 08 Mgt Experience 110215.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 09 Financial Plan.xls
- TIST UG PD-VCS-EX 10 CDM SD Review 060925.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 11 Governance Indices.xls
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 12 Pests and Diseases 2008.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 13 Dist Enviro Profile Bushenyi.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14a Public Comments CCB-001.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 15 Quantifier Safety 110110.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 16 Employee Rights.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 17 UN Human Dev Rpt 2011.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 18 FAO Enviro Degradation.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 19 UNEP Tree Benefits.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 20 Dist Enviro Profile Kabale.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 21 GL2 Community Survey Template.doc

### Documents received 19 December 2012

- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 22 GL2 Community Survey Result.doc
- 3449.pdf
- PNAACL744.pdf
- \PNACY477.pdf
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002g App06 Monitoring Plan 130208.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002a PD Text 121112.doc



- \TIST UG PD-CCB-002d App03 PA Plots.kml
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002e App04 Data 121112.xlsx
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002f App05 Implementation Rpt 121112.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 02 NEMA EA Approval 070515.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 04 GhG Contract UG 080319.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 14b Public Comments CCB-002.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 15 Quantifier Safety 110110.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 16 Employee Rights.doc
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 17 UN Human Dev Rpt 2011.pdf

**Documents received 05 February 2013**

- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 92 Quantifier Incentive Nov 2012.docx
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 90 Quantifier pay email.pdf
- TIST UG PD-VCS-Ex 91 January 2013 Budget.xls

**Documents received 08 February 2013**

- TIST UG PD-CCB-002g App06 Monitoring Plan 130208.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002h App07 Monitoring Report 130208.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002 CCB NCR Round 1 130208.docx
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002a PD Text 130208.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002b App01 LSat1990 Map.htm
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002b App01 LSat1990 Map.jpg
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002c App02 LSat2090 Map.htm
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002c App02 LSat2090 Map.jpg
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002d App03 PA Plots.kml
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002e App04 Data 130208.xlsx
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002f App05 Implementation Rpt 130208.doc

**Documents received 05 March 2013**

- TIST UG PD-CCB-002h App07 Monitoring Report 130304.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002a PD Text 130304.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002e App04 Data 130304.xlsx
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002f App05 Implementation Rpt 130304.doc

**Documents received 11 March 2013**


- TIST UG PD-CCB-002f App05 Implementation Rpt 130311.doc
- TIST UG PD-CCB-002a PD Text 130311.doc





## Appendix B – Stakeholder Meeting Announcements and Comments

Public Notice, 29 December 2012, New Vision Newspaper



# Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC)

## TIST Program to hold Public Meeting.

**Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC)** announces its Intent to validate and verify its second subset of project in the International Small Group and Tree planting program (TIST) under the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (**CCBA**) standards. To receive the validation and verification, CAAC must demonstrate, among other things that **TIST** is beneficial to Climate, Community and biodiversity. CAAC has submitted a project Description (PD) and a project Implementation Report (PIR) to Environmental services Inc, a CCBA certified auditor. The Documents are available on line at (see TIST program in Uganda CCB-002):  
<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

A public stakeholders meeting will be held between **10:00AM** and **11:00AM** on **7th January, 2013** at the **TIST Office** located at **KATUNGU** in **Bushenyi**, Uganda where comments will be taken. In addition, comments may be submitted up to **17th January 2013** to CCBA by clicking on **SUBMIT COMMENT**™ at <http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

**CCBA**  
**KATUNGU HILL,**  
**Bushenyi Town,**  
**P.OBOX 232**  
**Bushenyi Uganda**  
**Website: [www.tist.org](http://www.tist.org).**



---

**Email Comment Solicitation, 02 January, 2013**

Date: Wed, 02 Jan 2013 14:49:15 -0600

From: Charlie Williams <CharlieWilliams@CleanAirAction.com>

To: Charlie Williams <CharlieWilliams@CleanAirAction.com>

CC: abelbishoni@yahoo.com, asedorg.ug@gmail.com,  
global.info@aidshealth.org, Rodney Portman <rodneyporrtman@thebrt.org>,  
fedn.uganda@yahoo.com, panta@janegoodallug.org, kaberukar@yahoo.com,  
kwid2007@yahoo.com, mwe@mwe.go.ug, pgwage@googlemail.com,  
"info "@nfa.org.ug, navoda89@yahoo.com, dr.apell@gmail.com,  
edithn@sawlog.ug, charleso@sawlog.ug, phil@ugandacf.org,  
declerson@usaid.gov, info@worldvision.org, KMugo@wwfesarpo.org,  
beitwendaandco.advocates@yahoo.com, mbcyril@yahoo.com,  
forestfruitfoodsltd@yahoo.com, mujurizi2002@yahoo.com,  
sarahnankunda@tist.org, ugbushquant@tist.org, arinitweezra@yahoo.com,  
zabroh2000@yahoo.com, Shawn McMahan <smcmahan@ESINC.CC>,  
Stewart McMorrow <smcmorrow@ESINC.CC>,  
"Baanyanga, Ara" <araban@tist.org>,  
"Bachwa, Hakim" <hakimbachwa@tist.org>,  
"Tumwebaze, Enoch" <enochtumwebaze@tist.org>,  
Christine Yankel <christineyankel@cleanairaction.com>

Subject: TIST Uganda seeking CCBA accreditation. Comments Requested.

\*TIST Uganda seeking CCBA accreditation. Comments Requested.\*

Clean Air Action Corporation (CAAC) announces its intent to validate and verify the International Small Group and Tree Planting Program (TIST) under the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Alliance (CCBA) standards. To receive the validation and verification, CAAC must demonstrate, among other things, that TIST is beneficial to climate, community and biodiversity. CAAC has submitted a Project Description (PD) and a Project Implementation Report (PIR) to Environmental Services Inc, a CCBA certified auditor. The documents are available on line at:

<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

A public stakeholders meeting will be held between 10:00 AM and 11:00 AM on 07 January, 2013 at the TIST Office located at Katungu in Bushenyi, Uganda where comments will be taken. In addition, comments may be submitted up to 17 January 2013 to CCBA by clicking on "SUBMIT COMMENTS" at:

<http://www.climate-standards.org/projects/index.html>.

Attendance is not required at the meeting in order to submit comments to CCBA.



**Comments:**

Via email

Date: Sat, 5 Jan 2013 13:40:40 -0800 (PST)

From: ARINITWE EZRA <arinitweezra@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: TIST Uganda seeking CCBA accreditation. Comments Requested.

To: Charlie Williams <CharlieWilliams@CleanAirAction.com>

FOR TIST UGANDA.

It is good tist came here in uganda and here italk of kanungu my place,we have benefited in many ways;

people have learnt through quantifiers that trees can also be looked after not in bushes which has helped our trees to grow well easily.

In schools, they have planted fruits and other species around the compounds after much sensatisation to teachers in schools and over radios.

fruits people have started harvesting fruits and selling to people getting money for the families and yet trees are for life giving fruits every season,examples are jackfruits(these are liked by many),mangoes,oranges,pawpaws among others.

conditions around the homes because of the trees planted have also changed, here i give examples of the hotels in kihiihi and kanungu towns in uganda, some planted trees because we encouraged them to do so and now they are very happy .

the staaf (all those who work for tist.  
they are happy for they get money from the program.

we pray that TIST continues.

thank you

EZRA ARINEITWE  
QUANTIFIER TIST UGANDA.  
256772668636

**COMMENTS FROM TIST FARMERS HELD IN BUSHENYI**

DATE: 07 January 2013

<b>NAME S OF THE FARMERS</b>	<b>QUESTIONS,COMMENT S AND RESPONSE</b>
Bamwine Seith	<p><b>QN: What is TIST?</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST stands for: The International Small group and tree planting Program.</p> <p><b>QN: What are TIST activities?</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST activities are ,Tree planting, Formation of new groups, Training in Conservation farming(CF),Training on Nutrition and Food security, Health care programs, Rotational leadership.</p>
Joyce Murungi	<p><b>QN: Who is TIST</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST is everyone who is a farmer, who does TIST best practices, who does TIST values.</p>
Perry Karamuzi	<p><b>QN: How long will TIST stay and what is its life span:</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST is a 60 years program and will be in operation as long as farmers are willing and can maintain the agreement with the company, keep TIST values</p>
Harriet Asiimwe	<p><b>QN: Where do we need TIST to operate:</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST is needed to operate in our families and communities to ensure sustainable development</p>
Yassin Biraal	<p><b>Comment:</b> TIST is good because it has assisted the individuals, groups, societies and communities to keep the environment clean. It has also supported land management by teaching and training people in small groups how to conserve land through CF Plots. It has increased income generating activities in small groups and families.  TIST works hand in hand with government programs for development and proper planning</p>
Asiimwe Jeska	<p><b>QN: Is TIST program staying to benefit our societies.</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST Program is there to stay as long as people work together in their small groups, TIST Program is designed to help subsistence farmers by encouraging tree planting as a source of income alongside other agricultural produce and products.</p>
Kojo Javelin	<p><b>What is the status of eucalyptus?</b>  <b>Response:</b> Because of farmers harvesting eucalyptus against the contract signed TIST management is considering the action.</p>
Bagyenda Goerge	<p><b>QN: What are the guidelines and policies about TIST.</b>  <b>Response:</b> TIST Program follows Government policies and guidelines about tree planting. It also follows TIST values.  It recommends farmers to plant tree species that are not hazardous to environment.</p>
Bahemuka James	<p><b>QN: What is the cause for CAAC to delay farmer's incentives?</b></p>



---

	<p><b>Response:</b> Payments for this year were delayed because of preparation for the validation exercise. Soon after farmers in Kabale were paid, Kanungu farmers will be paid this week . Bushenyi vouchers will be generated and SGs be paid later.</p>
--	---