

**Table S1.** Three hypothetical schemes presented to respondents in order to gauge their acceptability and to stimulate discussion of the key research themes identified in the paper.

*Scheme 1 – Results-based loan*

The first scheme presented would provide the landowner with free seedlings<sup>[1]</sup> and technical assistance at no charge. In addition, they would receive money up-front to cover the direct costs of planting and maintenance<sup>[2]</sup>, in the form of an interest-free loan, repayable over a period of five years. It was explained that repayments would be cancelled each year if survival were above 80% of the initial planting, but if below this threshold, participants would be required to pay the proportion of the seedlings lost from the total, *e.g.* 65% survival = 35% repayment. Seedling survival would be estimated by a monitoring team using randomly selected plots (*e.g.* Griscom *et al.*, 2005), assessed on a yearly basis during the five-year period. Respondents were assured that repayments would be cancelled if the project collapsed for any reason, thus reducing external risks to participants.

*Scheme 2 – Action-based grant*

Scheme 2 contained the same baseline support as Scheme 1 (*i.e.* free seedlings and technical assistance) along with the same payments to cover planting and maintenance costs<sup>[2]</sup>. However, in this case these were in the form of a grant, conditional only on planting outcomes, but unconditional on seedling survival. Comparison of uptake across Schemes 1 and 2, in addition to discussion with participants, allowed us to assess their perceptions of risk and negative conditionality, without focussing on specific payments levels.

*Scheme 3 – Results-based payments*

The last scheme offered the same free seedlings and technical assistance as Schemes 1 and 2, together with payments to cover direct planting costs<sup>[2]</sup>. In addition, participants would receive annual performance payments at US\$3.00 per seedling conditional on and proportional to survival outcomes (*e.g.* 65% overall survival = 65% payment). Planting and survival would be assessed through annual monitoring (same methods as Scheme 1) over five years. Analogously, if survival were less than 25%, participants would receive no results-based payments.

<sup>[1]</sup> The list was derived from a native tree species database developed through research conducted by the American University of Beirut's Nature Conservation Center (AUB-NCC). The database also includes GPS data and images of species used for monitoring biodiversity and locating specimens for harvesting seeds that are later used in seedling production.

<sup>[2]</sup> These costs are often variable and dependent on the kinds of terrain and how densely parcels would be planted. We relied on our own experiential estimates and those provided by reforestation experts to inform respondents that the cost of planting each seedling is approximately US\$7.00.