QUESTIONNAIRE FOR POTENTIAL RUPES SITES

Dear Respondent,

Rewarding Upland Poor for Environmental Services They Provide (RUPES) is a program to develop appropriate mechanisms for rewarding the poor upland communities for the environmental services that they provide.

Through partnership with the International Fund for Agriculture and Development (IFAD) as the major donor, the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) is taking an active role in leading a consortium with potential partners to create the knowledge to deploy rewards to upland communities. New methods for transfer payments to upland communities will be tested and monitored through action research. These methods will ensure that the transaction costs for these activities are competitive, and that there is full community involvement in the decision-making process. The program will also explore the most appropriate means of institutionalising a sustainable process of transfer payments.

A key element of the RUPES program is the identification of sites that represent a broad social and ecological range. The information from these sites will be subjected to a cross-site analysis to draw up a typology and classification for environmental services that captures the breadth of scope for these services in Asia. The classification will guide the choice of case study sites for intensive implementation of specific agreements.

This questionnaire seeks to obtain information on sites proposed for the development of mechanisms for rewarding the upland poor for environmental services. The questionnaire is divided into four parts. The replies and descriptions in the first two parts are to gain an overall information on the proposing institution, the site and preliminary data on relevance to RUPES. The third and fourth pertains to more detailed information on the geographical setting, land use practices, the environmental service and how it is monitored, their providers, socio-political-institutional setting, beneficiaries, and potential for development of rewards during the next few years.

It is requested that you complete the PART I and PART II of the questionnaire in order to register your interest in the RUPES program at a site level by DATE . The information from PART III and PART IV will need to be submitted as soon as possible in order to enable a technical committee to process the results and formulate recommendations for discussion by the International Steering Committee within the next two months. The results may also be used as input into the country level discussions on the formulation of RUPES strategy appropriate to the national setting.

If you would like any further information, please don' hesitate to contact the RUPES Program.

F.J.C. Chandler
RUPES Program Manager
C/o The World Agroforestry Centre, Southeast Asia Regional Office
PO Box 161 Bogor, 16001 Indonesia
Tel: +62 251 625415   Fax: +62 251 625416   Email: f.chandler@cgiar.org

Thank you for your participation!

PART I. PROPOSING INSTITUTION

1. Name of main institution:

_____

2. Document prepared by

Full name	: _____
Title	: _____
Address	: _____
Fax.	: _____
E-mail	: _____

3. Persons involved in proposing the site (Full name and title)

1. _____	9. _____
2. _____	10. _____
3. _____	11. _____
4. _____	12. _____
5. _____	12. _____
6. _____	14. _____
7. _____	15. _____
8. _____	16. _____

4. Partners / collaborators (if any)

Name and address of institution	*Contact person(s)*

5. Please specify the following:

a. **nature of your engagement in the site (researcher, donor, development agency, extension worker, etc.)**
_____

b. **how long you have been engaged**
_____

c. **level of funding and relevant period**
_____

d. **successes experienced**
_____

e. **problems to date**
_____

PART II. RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE - BASIC INFORMATION

1. Name of proposed site   :

    Region / province   :

    Country   :

2. **Site general condition:** Key important features /aspects of the site. Please provide estimated when the data are not available

Physical	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data
Total site area (hectare)			
Elevation (m asl)			
Longitude coordinate			
Latitude coordinate			

Landuse	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data
Total forest cover (hectare)			
Total agricultural land (hectare)			
Other types of land use (please specify)			

Demographic – Socioeconomics characteristics	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data
Total population (persons)			
Population density (persons/sq.km)			
Ethnic groups (% of total population)			
Disadvantaged groups (if any) (% of total population)			
Poverty indicators relative to national baseline			

3. Site accessibility – please specify the type of travel (land, water or air), the most common and available means of transportation (example: car/bus/motor bike/boat/air plane) and the length of travelling from the nearest city

Type of travelling	Transportation means	Length of travelling

4. **Existing environmental services – please specify the type environmental service provided at the site. One or more of each environmental service can be represented.**

Type of environmental service	Yes	No
Biodiversity		
Watershed protection		
Carbon sequestration		
Landscape beauty		

5. **Existing reward systems – please specify if there are any types of rewards that are currently or potentially tested in the proposed site**

	Yes, currently	Please specify:
	Yes, potentially	Please specify:
	Not currently planned	
	Not sure	

6. **Effective local institutions (e.g. local non-governmental organisations etc) that are capable of acting as intermediaries in providing effective rewards – please specify**

	Yes	**Please specify:**
	No	

PART III. SPECIFIC PROPOSAL TO RUPES PROGRAM

If this site will indeed participate in the RUPES program (consortium), please describe possible contribution(s) and / or expectation(s) of the proposing institution to the consortium as a whole

Regarding	Contribution(s)	Expectation(s)
a. Analysis of environmental functions		
b. Different types of rewards		
c. Local intermediaries		
d. The policy framework		
e. Sustainability of the RUPES mechanism		
f. Actual impacts on poverty		

2.   List of supporting research report, working document and activity.

Please provide any other information and experiences that you think are important and relevant to RUPES type activities on the proposed site.

SECTION IV. RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE – CHARACTERISTICS

Key important features/aspects of the site. Please provide estimated information when the data are not available

1 Landuse	Unit	Year of collection	Source of data
Forest			
Total forest cover area (hectare)			
Protected forest area			
State managed			
Community managed			
Privately managed			
Productive forest area			
State managed			
Community managed			
Privately managed			
Agricultural land (hectare)			
Total agricultural land			
Paddy rice fields (% of total)			
Other annual crops (% of total)			
Land under perennial crops (% of total)			
Permanent pasture (% of total)			
Land under fallow (% of total)			
Other types of land use (please specify)	**Unit in hectare**	**Year of data collection**	**Source of data**

2.	Are there any land-management practices conducted by the local farmers?

	Yes		
	Integrated Pest Management		Crop Rotation
	Biological/organic fertilizer		Bench terraces
	Strip cropping		Trench
	Alley cropping		Check dam
	Hedgerow intercropping		Others, please specify
	Natural vegetative strips		
	Minimum/zero tillage		
	No		
	Not known		

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

3.	Demographic – Socioeconomics characteristics	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data
	Total population (persons)			
	Population density (persons/sq.km)			
	Number of villages			
	Urban villages (% total villages)			
	Rural villages (% total villages)			
	Proportion of rural population (% total population)			
	Proportion of employment (% total population)			
	Participation of women in labor force (% total labour)			

4.	Ethnic groups (please specify)	% of total population	Year of data collection	Source of data

5.	Disadvantaged groups (if any)	% of total population	Year of data collection	Source of data
	Refugee of political conflicts			
	Resettled from natural disaster			
	Displaced from other area because of infrastructure developments			
	Others (please specify)			

6.	Poverty	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data
	Proportion of population living below official poverty line (%)			
	Life expectancy (age)			
	Literacy rate			
	Proportion of rural population that is landless			

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

7. Are there any existing public facilities (hospital / other health center, school, market, etc.) infrastructure (road, dam, irrigation canal, electricity, etc.) or offices - within the area or nearby that benefiting the community - owned by:

a. Government

	Yes
	No
	Not known

If yes, please specify

Type	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data

b. Private sector

	Yes
	No
	Not known

If yes, please specify

Type	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data

c. Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)

	Yes
	No
	Not known

If yes, please specify

Type	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data

d. Religious based

	Yes
	No
	Not known

If yes, please specify

Type	Unit	Year of data collection	Source of data

8. Other important information on geographical condition, land use and poverty

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

9. **Site accessibility – please specify the most common and available means of transportation and the length of travelling from the nearest city**

Type of travelling	Transportation means	Length of travelling
Land/road	Car/bus	
	Motor bike	
	Others (please specify)	
Water	Boat	
	Motor-boat	
	Others (please specify)	
Air	Airplane	
	Others (please specify)	

10. **Features of existing environmental services**

Biodiversity

Area of natural habitat_____

Presence of endemic species	Yes , please specify
	No
Presence of species in the IUCN red list	Yes , please specify
	No

Hydrological Functions

Source of headwaters	Yes	
	No	
Large water body present?	Yes , please specify	
	No	
Supports significant infrastructure?	Yes	No
Irrigation		
Hydropower		
Aquaculture		
Reservoir for Domestic Water Use		

Landscape Beauty

Destination for Recreation	Yes , please specify
	No

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

11. Relevance to RUPES *(the following explores what is currently known as important aspects for sustainable RUPES mechanisms by our current understanding)*

11a. Are current land use choices by communities/households (from the existing array of options) linked to poverty? Please mark one or more of each box with an **X.**

	Strongly related *(the poorest groups use land differently than the better-off)*
	Intermediately related
	Weakly related
	Not known

11b. Are there clear differences in 'environmental services' that can be linked to different land use options? Please mark one or more of each box with an **X.**

	Yes	**No**	**Not Known**
Biodiversity			
Carbon Sequestration			
Watershed functions			
Landscape beauty			

11c. If the answer to 11b. is Yes, are there identifiable and potential beneficiaries of 'services'?

Please determine the level of engagement as follow:
1 = actively interested; 2 = potentially interested ; 3 = no interest; 4 = not available; 5 = not known

Type of environmental service	Level of engagement	Identity of the beneficiaries
Biodiversity		
Carbon sequestration		
Watershed functions		
Landscape beauty		

11d. Do we understand why (poor) farmers tend to choose the land use options that do (or don't) produce environmental services? Please mark one or more of each box with an **X**

	Understood on basis of financial profitability?
	Understood on basis of access to production resources?
	Understood on basis of risks?
	Understood on basis of other factors
	Not known

 Please specify

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

11e.   Are there any the local institutions (e.g. local non-governmental organizations, etc.) that are capable of acting as intermediaries in providing effective rewards? Please mark with an **X.**

☐ Yes

If yes, please specify

☐ No
☐ Not known

11f.   Are there any types of rewards that are currently or potentially tested for effectiveness in the proposed site? Please mark with an **X.**

☐ Yes, currently
☐ Yes, potentially

If yes, please specify

☐ Not currently planned
☐ Not sure

11g.   Are the local communities coherent enough to provide 'services' at a meaningful scale through new relations with other stakeholders? Please mark with an **X.**

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not known

11h.   Is there a **national** supporting framework (e.g. policies or laws) that promotes, regulates or hinders the development and implementation of RUPES mechanisms? Please mark with an **X.**

☐ Yes
    ☐ Strongly supportive
    ☐ Intermediately supportive
    ☐ Discouraging
    ☐ Not known

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

	Please specify

	No
	Not known

11i.   Is there a local supporting framework (e.g. policies or laws) that promotes, regulates or hinders the development and implementation of RUPES mechanisms? Please mark with an **X.**

	Yes
	Strongly supportive
	Intermediately supportive
	Discouraging
	Not known

	Please specify

	No
	Not known

11j.   Are the local farmers/communities aware that they can provide and potentially sell environmental services? Please mark with an **X.**

	Yes
	No
	Not known

11k.   Are there existing procedures for monitoring the environmental services and evaluate the 'rewards'? Please mark with an **X.**

	Yes
	No
	Not known

11l.   Are there any (local / national level) conflicts that may interfere with the implementation of RUPES mechanisms on the proposed site? Please mark with an **X.**

	Yes
	No

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS

11m.   Status of current initiatives on the proposed site (if any). *Please briefly describe any current RUPES type projects/activities that are on-going in the area, and also include expected results and milestones for new activities on the site*

11n.   Please explain any problems that the on-going project experiences

11o.   Project Management. *Please describe how the proposed RUPES mechanism is/will be managed, its decision-making structure, the role of partners and communication mechanisms among partners*

PART IV – RECOMMENDED CANDIDATE SITE CHARACTERISTICS