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A MESSAGE FROM SAMDECH HUN SEN
Prime Minister of the Royal Government of Cambodia

The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) is committed to the development of community based natural resource management (CBNRM), community forestry, community fisheries, community protected area management, and participatory land use planning in Cambodia. I welcome the establishment of the Community Based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute, which will work to promote CBNRM, good governance and sustainable livelihoods in Cambodia.

In this regard, I would like to congratulate the many professional and experienced authors for their efforts. These authors, academics, facilitators and CBNRM practitioners have successfully used the spirit of teamwork as an approach to compile their academic knowledge, skills and field experiences to write insightful, analytical and interesting articles on CBNRM in Cambodia. The RGC appreciates your initiatives, teamwork spirit and the useful outcome.

This effort highlights the importance of multi-stakeholder involvement in planning and decision-making processes, if Cambodia’s natural resources are to be sustainably managed for both now and the future. The book clearly demonstrates that changes in approach from conventional single sectoral management, towards participatory multi-sectoral management, are a "must strategy" for the RGC to take if the goals of sustainable development, poverty alleviation and environmentally sound economic growth are to be achieved.

Cambodia's commitment to CBNRM and new management approaches can be seen in a number of government initiatives, from policy reforms and integrated strategies, to lending its support and endorsing the many activities at local levels.

Firstly, the RGC has implemented a series of policy reforms that are essential for achieving the goals of sustainable development, poverty alleviation, decentralization, good governance and environmentally sound economic growth.

Secondly, the Rectangular Strategy of the RGC recognizes the need to continue to reform forestry, fisheries and land sectors while diversifying agricultural production as most Cambodians rely heavily on natural resources and rural agriculture for their livelihoods. At the core of Rectangular Strategy is good governance. This strategy incorporates key elements of the Millennium Development Goals, the Cambodia Socio-Economic Development
Programme 2001-2005 (SEDP II), the Cambodia National Poverty Reduction Strategy 2003-2005 (NPRS), and various policies, strategies, plans and other important reform programmes.

Thirdly, the Royal Government of Cambodia supports all initiatives highlighting the importance of multi-stakeholder involvement in planning and decision-making processes. These participatory management approaches enable natural resources to be sustainably managed for the benefit of current and future generations of Cambodians, thus contributing to regional and global well-being.

Fourthly, the Royal Government of Cambodia endorses the dedicated efforts of villagers and facilitators to improve local planning management of natural resources. The generous technical and financial support of international organizations, NGOs, donors and all partner organizations are greatly appreciated.

Fifthly, the Royal Government of Cambodia intends to transform policy reforms into concrete action for the steady enhancement of livelihoods for the people of our nation while conserving our great natural and cultural heritage.

Finally, on behalf of the RGC, I would like to extend our appreciation to the authors and the Board of Directors and team at the CBNRM Learning Institute for their dedication in leading the process of preparing this book. I would also like to thank donors and funding agencies for their generous support. I hope they will continue to endorse the importance of CBNRM LI’s role as the national focus and facilitator for community based natural resource management, and provide the much needed financial resources and technical assistance for CBNRM LI to accomplish its tasks.

Samdech Hun Sen
Prime Minister
Royal Government of Cambodia
CFWORD

This publication represents an important collaboration between partners, bringing together non-governmental organizations, the Royal Government of Cambodia and donors. It similarly brings together the multidimensional nature of natural resource management and livelihoods including dimensions of legislation, policy and implementation across land, fisheries and forestry.

Whilst we may wish to conserve forests and fisheries, we also need to improve our understanding of the complex relationships and dependency of poor people on common property resources. We need to ensure that conservation is carried out equitably as many people depend on these for their very survival. These include some of the poorest people in Cambodia and they derive many unseen and under-reported benefits that enable them to sustain a livelihood. Natural resources contribute to their physical, social, economic, spiritual and cultural aspects of their lives.

The publication focuses on participation and learning. Only through collaboration, sharing of experience and discussion of this nature will we strengthen our understanding and find new approaches to integrate poverty and environmental concerns in support of sustainable and equitable development.

Mogens Laumand Christensen
Minister Counsellor
Head of Development Cooperation Section, Royal Danish Embassy

Chris Price
Rural Livelihoods Advisor
DFID Cambodia
The CBNRM Learning Initiative has highlighted the benefits of building partnerships and learning to work effectively together across sectors and disciplines, ranging from local to regional levels.

Preparing this document has truly been a remarkable group effort and collaboration with over 35 dynamic authors from many partner organizations. WWF has been pleased to facilitate this important team process uniting government, NGOs and academics to synthesize key insights and experiences of CBNRM in Cambodia.

This group of multi-disciplinary individuals has brought different skills and strengths to the work of the team. Similarly, the organizations co-supporting this endeavour have brought various assets to the project. IDRC has helped to guide the research process, particularly by linking lessons learned from participatory action research with policy development. Oxfam America has provided inspiration in the field of social sciences, networking as well as regional experience in fisheries. RECOFTC has brought strengths in training and regional experience in community forestry. DFID has provided frameworks for sustainable livelihoods and good governance.

WWF is pleased to have performed the catalytic and coordination role as well as providing the more traditional background in biodiversity conservation. We strongly believe that people are integrally part of nature. Therefore, we as global citizens must come together to find solutions to environmental problems. CBNRM is an approach with real potential to be part of solutions. It is essential that people are encouraged to find ways to work together as communities.

Together, may we leave our children a "living planet"!

Seng Teak
Country Director
WWF Cambodia
**ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSC</td>
<td>American Friend Service Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIT</td>
<td>Asia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Team</td>
<td>Analysis and Planning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPA</td>
<td>Appreciative Participatory Planning and Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRLP</td>
<td>Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARERE</td>
<td>Cambodian Area Regeneration and Rehabilitation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Cat Action Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBET</td>
<td>Community Based Eco-Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCRM</td>
<td>Community Based Coastal Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community Based Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM LI</td>
<td>Community Based Natural Resource Management Learning Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Commune Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>Commune Council-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCBEN</td>
<td>Cambodia Community Based Eco-tourism Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Commune Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Commune Development Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>Commune Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMP</td>
<td>Cambodian Environmental Management Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERD</td>
<td>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Community Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAC</td>
<td>Community Forestry Alliance for Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFDO</td>
<td>Community Fisheries Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFG</td>
<td>Community Forestry Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Community Forestry International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM</td>
<td>Community Fisheries Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFRP</td>
<td>Community Forestry Research Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFU</td>
<td>Community Forestry Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Consultative Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGFP</td>
<td>Cambodian German Forestry Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDSE</td>
<td>Coopération International pour le Développement et la Solidarité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Commune Investment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Community Organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Community Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRF</td>
<td>Commune Representative Facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIN</td>
<td>Child Rights Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWRP</td>
<td>Community Wildlife Ranger Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZM</td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DED</td>
<td>German Development Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRONYMS</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFT</td>
<td>District Facilitation Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW</td>
<td>Department of Forestry and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLMUPC</td>
<td>Department of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE</td>
<td>Department of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoF</td>
<td>Department of Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLA</td>
<td>Department of Local Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoP</td>
<td>Department of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNCP</td>
<td>Department of Nature Conservation and Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRIVE</td>
<td>Developing Remote Indigenous Village Education Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTRI</td>
<td>Environmental Treaties and Resource Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPDO</td>
<td>Environment Protection and Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Forest Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>Fisheries Action Coalition Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFI</td>
<td>Fauna and Flora International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>German Technical Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>International Convention on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>International Development Research Centre, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES</td>
<td>International Eco-tourism Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/E-PP</td>
<td>Integrated/Extended Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIRR</td>
<td>The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>International Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPP</td>
<td>Integrated Community and Natural Resource-based Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>The World Conservation Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYSD</td>
<td>Khmer Youth and Social Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP</td>
<td>Local Planning Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF</td>
<td>The Lutheran World Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLI</td>
<td>Mekong Learning Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLMUPC</td>
<td>Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSAIC EP</td>
<td>Management Of Strategic Areas for Integrated Conservation- Eastern Plains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoT</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>Mondulkiri Protected Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>Mekong River Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAP</td>
<td>National Environmental Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPRS</td>
<td>National Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACRONYMS

NREM: Natural Resource and Environmental Management
NRM: Natural Resources Management
NTDP: National Tourism Development Plan 2003
NTFP: Non-Timber Forest Product
OA: Oxfam America
OCAA: Oxfam Community Aid Abroad
Oxfam GB: Oxfam Great Britain
PAR: Participatory Action Research
PBA: Participatory Biodiversity Assessments
PDAFF: Provincial Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
PDIME: Provincial Department of Industry, Mines and Energy
PDLMUPC: Provincial Department of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction
PDRD: Provincial Department of Rural Development
PIF: Provincial Investment Funds
PKWS: Peam Krasaop Wildlife Sanctuary
PLG: Partnership for Local Governance
PLUP: Participatory Land Use Planning
PMMR: Participatory Management of Mangrove Resources
PPWS: Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary
PRA: Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRDC: Provincial Rural Development Committee
PRSP: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RECOFT: Regional Community Forestry Training Centre
RGC: Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC)
RUA: Royal University of Agriculture
SEDP II: Second Five Year Socio-Economic Development Plan
SFM: Sustainable Forest Management
SIDA: Swedish International Development Agency
SMRP: Sustainable Management of Resources Project
SSP: Strey Daoembey Santepheap Nung Pakristhan
SL: Sustainable Livelihoods
ToT: Training of Trainers
UDHR: Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
VDC: Village Development Committee
VMC: Village Management Committee
WCS: Wildlife Conservation Society
WWF: World Wide Fund for Nature
Executive Summary

By: Ken Serey Rotha, Toby Carson, Steph Cox and Erika von Kaschke

During the last two decades, policy makers, planners and scholars have needed to revisit and reconsider the important role of relevant stakeholders, particularly marginalized groups in local communities, in natural resource management and conservation.

One new management approach towards sustainable natural resource management is community based natural resource management (CBNRM). This is an umbrella term used for many initiatives including community forestry, community fisheries, participatory land use planning, community protected area and joint forest management.

A National Workshop on CBNRM, which was held in Phnom Penh in November 2002, indicated a strong need to compile the field lessons learned from different projects and organizations. This status report responds directly to that need. It was led by the Community Based Natural Resource Management Learning Initiative (CBNRM LI) with the support of many key partners including the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Oxfam America, and the Regional Community Forestry Research Center (RECOFTC). Additional funding support was provided by DFID and FAO.

The Development of CBNRM in Cambodia is an outcome of many different group and individual consultations, meetings, workshops and peer review consultations over the last two years with local and international practitioners and academics working in this field. This collaborative effort has led to the development of 20 chapters with over 35 authors (refer to author profiles section for more details) who have shared skills and dedicated their time and energy to this process.

This compilation document is divided into five sections and twenty chapters. The first section, Developing CBNRM in Cambodia, provides an overview of the theoretical background and practical situation for CBNRM in Cambodia.

Ken Serey Rotha starts off with chapter one by providing a description of the understanding of key concepts of CBNRM and their understanding in Cambodia.
This chapter discusses the shift from conventional management approaches of natural resources to a more participatory management approach involving stakeholders, including disadvantaged groups. It debates what conditions are needed if CBNRM is to be promoted as sustainable natural resource management, which meets the goals of biodiversity conservation and securing local livelihoods.

Chapter two, by Toby Carson, Hou Kalyan and Srey Marona, summarizes the context and experiences of CBNRM in Cambodia. This chapter synthesizes key information highlighted in other chapters of this publication.

The second section focuses on recent policy changes and legal developments in Cambodia. Robert Oberndorf provides an overview of the overall policy and legal framework related to CBNRM in chapter three. This includes laws, sub-decrees and “Prakas”. The author also identifies key gaps within the legislative framework in Cambodia.

The influence of CBNRM approaches on the government’s decentralization programme, the Seila Programme, comes under scrutiny by Nhem Sovanna in chapter four. This paper documents recent experiences of mainstreaming natural resource and environmental management (NREM) into the commune level planning processes of the Seila Programme.

Thay Somony, Sim Bunthoeun and So Sreymom, authors of chapter five, discuss fisheries policy reforms and the legal framework for community fisheries. This paper provides the historical context of fisheries management, and notes the important contributions that fisheries provide to household nutrition and the national economy.

The third section explores networking, working groups, and institutional developments.

Chapter six, written by Chean Thayuth and Ou Sopheary with contributions from the Network Organizing Committee, explains the evolution of the Community Forestry (CF) and Community Protected Areas (CPA) Network. This network is an important forum for practitioners at all levels to share information and experiences both inside and outside protected areas, through quarterly network meetings and
Executive Summary

newsletters. This chapter provides an overview of the evolution, benefits and problems of the network, and the authors give recommendations for improving the network in the future.

In chapter seven, Thay Somony, Sim Bunthoeun and So Sreymom, with contributions from Ly Vuthy, Ngin Navirak, and other members of the Fisheries Facilitator Working Group, provide an overview of the development of community fisheries concepts and networking in Cambodia.

Ken Sopheap, Rasmey Dara, Amanda Bradley and Yin Soriya, members of the Community Based Eco-tourism Network in Cambodia were the authors of chapter eight. This chapter discusses Community Based Eco-Tourism (CBET) in the Cambodian context where natural resources are considered tourism assets. The related policy framework is analysed, and experiences and case studies are shared to learn lessons and consider recommendations for future development.

Chapter nine, written by Min Bunnara, Harald Kirsch and Ignas Dümmer, presents the Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) approach in Cambodia and its relationship with CBNRM.

The development of Community Protected Areas in Cambodia is under the spotlight in chapter ten. This paper was written by Meas Sothun Vatanak and Socheat Leakhena with important contributions from Ken Serey Rotha, Stefan Janssens and other members of the Community Protected Areas (CPAD) team of the Ministry of Environment.

The next section delves more deeply into lessons learned from field experiences and includes six interesting chapters.

Chapter eleven focusses on lessons learned from case study research and writing. In this chapter, the authors (Srey Marona, Hou Kalyan and Rebecca Kinakin) use examples from case studies facilitated by the CBRNM LI to illustrate these key lessons learned.

Chapter twelve by Sy Ramony, Phan Kamnap and Kim Sarin presents an overview of Participatory Action Research (PAR) in Community Forestry (CF), based on the
Chapter thirteen discusses forest resource and land conflicts in Mondulkiri province, and methods used to resolve these conflicts through the Management Of Strategic Areas For Integrated Conservation (MOSAIC) project. This chapter was written by Cheam Mony, Oul Kim Sear and Andy Maxwell, with contributions from the MOSAIC team.

Ashish John, the author of chapter fourteen, summarizes experiments of fusing CBNRM with Local Planning Processes (LPP) in Ratanakiri, a pilot initiative under the Seila Programme.

Chapter fifteen was written by Kim Nong, Ouk Ly Khim and Khy An. It reflects on experiences with community organizing as a way to work on resource management with Village Management Committees (VMCs). The chapter analyses what activities VMCs are able to carry out at the village level, and the implications of these experiences for CBNRM in Cambodia.

Melissa Marschke uses chapter sixteen to concentrate on the relationship between planning and action and provides an overview of two resource management committees, highlighting how community based management can unfold at a local level and why villagers are participating in such activities.

The final section emphasizes key opportunities and challenges for CBNRM, and includes three concluding chapters that discuss moving towards good governance, securing land and resource tenure rights, and sustainable livelihoods.

Chapter seventeen, written by Doug Henderson, analyses the role of community forestry in improving forest governance in Cambodia. The author argues that forest governance is fundamentally a political process, often involving highly charged and contentious relationships between different stakeholders.

Frank van Acker takes a look at the link between human rights and environmental management in Cambodia. In chapter eighteen he explores the concepts and reflections of the human rights-based approach.
Katrin Seidel provides an insight into issues of recognizing indigenous land rights and the role of CBNRM in chapter nineteen. Assessing the potential and actual performance of CBNRM in the process of formalizing indigenous customary law, the author draws attention to the opportunities, and also to the risks of the CBNRM approach.

In chapter twenty Rebecca Kinakin introduces the sustainable livelihoods (SL) concept, framework, and applications and considers the implications of using the SL approach for CBNRM purposes in Cambodia. The SL framework has been touted as a way to deepen understanding of the challenges to rural livelihood sustainability.

The Development of Community Based Natural Resource Management in Cambodia is the first Cambodian publication in the field of participatory natural resource management where many different experts have worked together to compile their field experiences. The publication has been written in both Khmer and English, covering different sectors ranging from fisheries, forestry and biodiversity (protected areas) to land use planning.

This status report serves as important baseline information for CBNRM as it stands in Cambodia towards the end of 2004. Many of the chapters are still descriptive and not yet very analytical. As CBNRM develops in Cambodia and further lessons are learned, it is hoped that this report will be updated to reflect the change in status. We hope that the authors will continue to collaborate together on a follow-up second volume that can provide further analysis on the development of CBNRM in Cambodia. It is highly recommended that a joint effort to update the information should be approached, if information is to reflect the diversity of initiatives and lessons learned, and to be useful to CBNRM practitioners for generations to come.
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Chapter 1  

Understanding key CBNRM concepts

By: Ken Serey Rotha

INTRODUCTION

This paper provides a brief introductory explanation of the key concepts of community based natural resource management (CBNRM). It discusses the relationship between people and natural resources for both biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods. In addition, it highlights the need for CBNRM and how the term is defined from the different perspectives and experiences of organizations and institutions that have been working in this field for many years.

Natural resources including trees, land, fish and non-timber forest products have always been important to humans. Forests support human life at many levels: at a local level, forests provide food, shelter, warmth, and income. Globally, forests make more subtle and complex contributions, such as acting as carbon sinks to regulate the earth's climate. There is a strong relationship between forests and people, especially the poor, who are often heavily dependent on forest resources. If forests and natural resources are to be managed sustainably for both current and future generations, it is important to understand this relationship, and to involve different groups of people in the management of natural resources.

Experience and lessons from many governments in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world have recognized a failure to manage forests effectively. For most of the 20th century, the management of a great number of forests was focused on industrial timber production by government-operated forest departments. These same government departments now see a need for a change in their management approach if natural resources and forests are to be effectively managed for the future.

---

1 This paper is the result of collective efforts by different meetings, discussions and consultations with many people through the author's network both in Cambodia and overseas. The author would like to express his thanks to everyone for their great contributions and support, which made this paper possible. Special thanks are due to Toby Carson, Marona Srey and Kalyan Hou, who have given continuous support and encouragement from the earliest draft to this final version. Also thanks to IDRC, WWF and Oxfam America for their continuous support to promote community participation in natural resources in Cambodia. However, views in this paper, are the sole responsibility of the author.

2 Rotha has recently been promoted from the head of the Community Forestry and Buffer Zone Management Office to Deputy Director at the Department of Nature Conservation and Protection (DNCP), Ministry of Environment (MoE) and is also an Advisor to the CBNRM Learning Initiative, based at WWF Cambodia.
The last two decades have witnessed the rise of a new movement in the management of natural resources; namely a participatory management approach, also known as decentralized and community based management. This movement has swept across much of the world, including many parts of Asia and Africa as well as industrial nations. In Australia, natural resource management, particularly of forests and protected areas, has changed from a largely centralized planning approach to a bottom up planning process. This new approach in sustainable natural resources management has been adopted by many conservation and international organizations and donor agencies such as the World Bank, International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), FAO, DFID, DANIDA, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the Ford Foundation.

Informal discussion of different natural resources management approaches in Cambodia

Changing the approach to managing natural resources requires a new administrative environment and mandate that modifies the role of the government from being in direct control over forests and natural resources, to one that focuses on facilitating the involvement of all relevant stakeholders with an interest in natural resources and forests in a participatory planning and decision-making process. This new participatory approach has emerged across the world and has often been led by local initiatives in different countries and reflecting their local circumstances, environment, and politics. Although different countries may use different terminology to describe their new approaches, central to all is the participatory management of natural resources, and an ultimate goal of biodiversity conservation and secure local livelihoods.
Some terms have come to have distinct meanings in particular countries, for example approaches termed community forestry in India, Nepal and other countries in Southeast Asia may vary. Likewise the approach of community fisheries in Cambodia may not be the same as other countries. In general, a participatory management approach, whether for protected areas, community forestry or community fisheries, intends to enable key stakeholders to engage in the planning and decision-making process for a specific set of resources. Their involvement ensures their tenure rights over natural resources, securing benefits and sustainable use of natural resources to meet the needs of current and future generations.

WHAT IS CBNRM?

The weak results of natural resources management and conservation over the last two decades have convinced policy makers, planners and scholars to revisit and reconsider the important role of relevant stakeholders, particularly local communities, including groups that are often marginalised in natural resources management and conservation.

Although there may be strong support for participatory natural resource management, there is a great deal of work to do to address the central issue of how to integrate goals of conservation, which focus on protection of threatened wildlife and habitats (such as endangered species, forests, pastures, fisheries and water), with the interests of local communities, which are usually focused on food, fuel, shelter and water.

CBNRM is associated with a variety of related terms such as community resource management, community based coastal resource management, community forestry, and co-management. The various definitions and terms depend on the context and location.

The term 'community based' distinguishes the new emerging approaches from an early concept of community natural resource management, which referred to communities having full, and generally autonomous, responsibility for the protection of natural resources.

---

and use of natural resources. This approach has been derived from indigenous systems of natural resource management, where local knowledge and institutions have evolved together with those ecosystems.

CBNRM is characterized by local communities playing a central, but not the only, role in identifying resources, defining development priorities, adapting technologies and implementing management practices. In addition, CBNRM is a potential development option for many countries, including Cambodia, to help address issues of rural poverty and environmental degradation. A variety of CBRNM approaches have been tried and tested in several countries in the region, and a number of working models have been developed using practical experiences from India, Nepal, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and other countries (Carson, 1999:353-4).

The CBNRM approach is very different to government centred or top down management systems. In the old style of resource management, officials at relevant government agencies took a leading role in developing and formulating policy related to resource management. Senior officials made decisions on resource use and the distribution of benefits from those resources.

Wide experience of this approach has shown that resource stocks and environmental quality become degraded, due to a centralized management system that involves planning and decision making only at government offices and does not give the opportunity for local communities, who are often the direct resource users, to share their ideas and concerns in the planning and decision making process (Kosal, 1996).

It is almost impossible to define CBNRM in one or two sentences, as it is a combination of different development goals and approaches. Different organizations, institutions and countries have their own ways of interpreting and expressing exactly what CBNRM means. Box 1 presents a range of definitions, which are by no means exhaustive, but give an overview of what CBNRM is to different organizations and institutions.
**BOX 1: DEFINING CBNRM**

'CBNRM is both a conservation and rural development strategy, involving community mobilization and organization, institutional development, comprehensive training, enterprise development, and monitoring of the natural resource base.'

(Botswana CBNRM Support Programme (IUCN))

'community based natural resource management is a bottom up approach to the integration of conservation and development.'

(Cornell International Institute for Food, Agriculture and Development)

CBNRM came about, to a large extent, as the result of two different processes. Firstly, it is a grassroots, bottom up agenda, inspired by the goals of sustainable development and bio-diversity conservation, gradually broadening and transforming itself to also include a social agenda, and becoming a broad social movement of sorts. The second process is a macro-level, top-down effort spearheaded by multilateral funding agencies, bilateral donors, and, above all, international NGOs and organizations devoted to practical work and research. In addition, 'the many actors, that is, stakeholders, and agendas that constitute these two processes are increasingly meeting, somewhere in the middle, aligning their experience, realizing that they have the same goals, and that they stand a greater chance of making a difference by joining hands, as well as their often different means and resources.'

(CBNRM. World Bank)

'CBNRM is the management of natural resources under a detailed plan developed and agreed to by all concerned stakeholders. The approach is community based in that the communities managing the resources have the legal rights, the local institutions, and the economic incentives to take substantial responsibility for sustained use of these resources. Under natural resource management plans, communities become the primary implementers, assisted and monitored by technical services.'

(USAID)

'CBNRM addresses interactions among the factors that influence natural resource access, use and management patterns. The participation and leadership of local people are essential in CBNRM's approach as innovations must be built on voluntary improvements to local knowledge and practice, rather than imposed from outside. It also requires recognition of the heterogeneity and multiple interests of different community members and outside resource users.'

(International Development Research Centre, Canada)

---

Based on IDRC (2002)

1. http://www.cbnrm.bw/pages_sub_dir/Main.htm
3. http://www.cbnrm.net/about/overview/introduction.html
In the context of Cambodia, CBNRM can be defined as:

“A diversity of co-management approaches that strive to empower local communities to actively participate in the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources through different strategies including community forestry, community fisheries, participatory land use planning, and community protected area management”.

(Community Based Natural Resources Management Learning Initiative, Cambodia)

This definition was adopted during a National Workshop on CBNRM, held in November 2002 in Phnom Penh. The workshop was attended by 115 people from government institutions, research institutes, national and international non-governmental organizations, and various projects working on CBNRM.

In addition to the concept of CBNRM a host of other, related terms are often used when referring to participatory resource management. A description of many of these is provided in Box 2.
### BOX 2. COMMON OR RELATED TERMS IN CBNRM

**Collaborative forest management/collaborative natural resource management/co-management:** Refers to a partnership in which various stakeholders agree on sharing the management functions, rights and tenure, returns and responsibilities for an area of forest. The stakeholders usually include the agency, in whose charge the resource is currently vested, and various associations of local residents, local and traditional authorities, industries, businesses, research institutions and others.

**Social forestry:** First used by the Indian government as a land tenure term for forestry on village land (not forest reserve). Now the term means forest management with a social purpose aiming to benefit local people.

**Community forestry:** A broad term that includes indigenous forest management systems as well as programmes initiated by communities or the government. First used in Nepal where forest user groups can apply to manage local forest and to use the products (on a shared arrangement) with the government. Community forestry now is widely used to denote many forms of people based forest management.

**Joint forest management:** Sharing of products and responsibilities between the forest department and user groups. Involves a contract specifying the distribution of authority, responsibility and benefits between villagers and state forest services. Originally involved plantations on state land in India but now the term has wider use.

**Participatory forestry,** also known as participatory forest management: an umbrella term that could include all the above terms and forms.

**Local forest management:** The actions of people living near a forest to maintain or enhance the forest and improve their well being. It assumes that local people help to enhance the sustainability of forest, acquire a share or benefits, maintain control over decisions related to resources, and that competing demands are resolved in ways that reduce conflict, enable synergies etc. This term implies that management can be done mainly by locals, with minimal interference from outside.

**Community based forest management:** Refers to forest management by or with the local community that includes traditional forms of forest management. More recently, the term has come to mean self-mobilized community forestry initiatives, in commune or municipal forests, possibly sharing ownership with the state, and forms of collaborative management between state and community organizations.

**Farm forestry:** Refers to tree planting on private land by farmers, who are often from community groups, with aims such as joint marketing, processing and mutual learning.

**Public participation in forestry:** A very broad term used to include the many ways people can influence forestry, but not necessarily in shared (collaborative) decision-making.

**Community protected area management,** also known as participatory protected area management: A process which aims to achieve a win-win situation, which enables both resources managers (protected area manager) to meet their biodiversity conservation objectives, and resources users (communities) to sustain their livelihoods, and cultural and spiritual values. It involves the participation of all relevant stakeholders in planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating protected area management.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Adapted from Rapid Assessment on CPAD, DNCP/MoE, 2004.
Initiatives working towards participatory NRM need to have a good understanding of the communities who are key to the process. Because a 'community' is frequently defined as a unified, organic group of people, it is important to understand the different views and interests that may be present, and how these differences may affect resource management outcomes, local politics and strategic interactions within communities, as well as the possibility of layered alliances that can span multiple levels of politics. Experiences in CBNRM demonstrate that it is important to understand that a community can range from a small spatial unit, to a homogeneous social structure, and to those with common interests and shared norms.

**When the community is recognized as a small spatial unit** this is in recognition that the resources those people use, manage, and sometimes protect, usually are located near territorially fixed homes and settlements. In this case, if a centralized management approach to natural resources does not work because of the inability of government resource managers to exercise authority at a distance, then transferring authority to the social groups located near the resource may work better.

Decentralization of authority to a strong local community may work well in NRM because members of small groups that share the same geographical space often are more likely to interact with each other. The close interaction between small group members can lower the costs of making collective decisions. These two aspects of community: fewer individuals, and shared small spaces, may contribute to the distinctiveness of the group. Interactions among small group members over time and within a territorial area may contribute to developing specific strategies to manage natural resources near their communities.

**When a community appears as a homogeneous social structure** this may be because they possess common characteristics in relation to ethnicity, religion, caste, or language. Such homogeneity may further cooperative solutions, reduce hierarchical and conflict interactions, and promote better resource management. Households within the community may be endowed similarly in terms of assets and incomes. In rural areas people living within the same location may hold similar occupations and depend on the same natural resources. These similarities may facilitate regular interactions among group members.
Communities that are defined as those with common interests and shared norms are essentially imagined communities, often based on an outsider's perception. The internalized, or informal, norms of members within these communities can guide resource management outcomes in desired directions and the community may formally recognize itself as such after a period of interactions and processes revealing and exploring these common interests.

WHY CBNRM IS NEEDED

CBNRM has developed and emerged as a result of a combination of frustration and optimism. The frustration comes from the efforts to protect and manage vulnerable natural resources that have been limited by ignoring the needs and interests of local communities, and failing to acknowledge their significant role and capability of managing natural resources. At the same time, NRM elsewhere has been encouraged by the successful participation of some communities in planning for sustainable natural resource management.

If natural resources and forests are to be sustainably managed, CBNRM is necessary to meet goals of both biodiversity conservation and securing the livelihoods of stakeholders, including poor and marginalised groups. Although the two goals have often been in opposition in the past, and represented by different interest groups, both are important for three reasons.

Firstly, protecting biodiversity to maintain the integrity and viability of particular ecosystems with their unique combinations of species of flora and fauna, can have development payoffs, possibly more in the long term than the short term. When linked to economic activities, such as eco-tourism, there are more incentives and benefits attached to the conservation of biological resources, including endangered or threatened species.

Secondly, maintaining ecosystems such as watersheds for their multiple services benefits communities, regions, nations and the entire earth. This might include soil conservation and fertility, sustained water accumulation and flow, favourable microclimates, forest growth for both timber and non-timber forest products, fish production, and purification of soil, air and water resources. These benefits have a
definite economic value, though it is not always commensurate with the costs to those persons and communities whose cooperation is needed to preserve those resources.

Lastly, CBNRM is often linked to the cultures and values of those communities, and as such, is more likely to be successful than other resource management approaches because the capacities and incentives for communities to preserve ecosystems and their attendant resources are greater under these conditions.

It is important to keep in mind that communities may have their own reasons for favouring or opposing CBNRM. Possible reasons might include the short term or long term effects on livelihoods, or, positively, the reinforcement of community identity and sustainability. The discussion and comparison of objectives are important to consider as part of the process of establishing community based management. In addition, external and internal aims need to be harmonised with outside actors contributing to the achievement of local aspirations if community actors are expected to help fulfil external objectives.

Experience and lessons learned indicate that CBNRM can play a key role in addressing the link between, and concern about, social justice and environmental degradation. CBNRM also offers a great opportunity to engage a range of relevant stakeholders, particularly marginalised people, in planning and decision-making processes that affect their well being and living environments. If effectively managed, CBNRM creates opportunities and a forum for relevant stakeholders to meet their basic needs without destroying the quality of the environment.

This partnership approach requires building the capacity of key relevant stakeholders, particularly in the community. The past two decades have seen a shift towards a shared responsibility towards natural resources and forest management, calling for relationships amongst stakeholders, the role and responsibilities of stakeholders, and the management approach to be redefined. In shifting, models of natural resource management have moved from simple, centralized planning approach to a complex, decentralized and flexible process. Box 3 summarizes the key differences in these two approaches and the implications for natural resource management.
BOX 3: TWO MODELS OF MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMPLE MODELS</th>
<th>COMPLEX PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>were</td>
<td>are also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centralized</td>
<td>decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top down</td>
<td>bottom up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue</td>
<td>resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plantation</td>
<td>regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use</td>
<td>management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td>sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blueprints</td>
<td>flexible plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures</td>
<td>experimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling</td>
<td>supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decided</td>
<td>agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area</td>
<td>site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low risk</td>
<td>risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opaque</td>
<td>transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick fix</td>
<td>slower process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single and pre-set</td>
<td>multiple and needs-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species</td>
<td>biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timber</td>
<td>products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target</td>
<td>aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>client</td>
<td>stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution</td>
<td>processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Hobley (1996).

CONCLUSION

Community based natural resource management can be an effective way of managing natural resources; when a community moves from a position of only using resources to managing resources in partnership with government resource managers. This decentralized, open and flexible approach is being used successfully as one solution for reversing the degradation of natural resources. Though heralded as a great step towards sustainable natural resource, and forest, management, many government resource managers and decision makers are hesitant to adopt this new management approach. Time, understanding of local settings, acknowledging different stakeholders' interests and a supportive legal framework are essential if CBNRM is to meet the dual goals of biodiversity conservation and securing local livelihoods.
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Chapter 2

Practising CBNRM in Cambodia

By: Toby Carson¹, Hou Kalyan² and Srey Marona³ & ⁴

INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes the context and experiences of community based natural resource management (CBNRM) in Cambodia. It begins with the situation for natural resource management in the country, and then describes the diversity of co-management approaches, outlines the framework for policy, legal and institutional developments and the role of networking and multi-sectoral working groups and institutional development in building linkages among key stakeholders. This chapter also provides an overview of the lessons learned from field experiences of research and learning forums, which are discussed in more detail in each of the following chapters. Finally, the chapter concludes with a brief look at the opportunities and challenges for CBNRM approaches in Cambodia.

The country of Cambodia covers an area of 181,035 km² and features 435 km of coastline and a border length of 2,438 km. Water, fisheries and forests are dominant features of Cambodia. The Mekong River watershed covers up 86% of the country’s landmass and includes the great Tonle Sap Lake one of the largest floodplain lakes and one of the most productive inland fisheries in the world.

---

¹ Toby is an Advisor to the CBNRM Learning Initiative (WWF, IDRC, Oxfam, RECOFTC) which focuses on capacity building, networking, lessons learning and policy support for CBNRM.
² Kalyan is an Advisor to the CBNRM Learning Initiative and a Technical Officer at the Community Protected Areas Office, Department of Nature Conservation and Protection, Ministry of Environment.
³ Morona is a Team Leader for the CBNRM Learning Initiative and National Advisor for Management of Strategy Areas for Integrated Conservation, based at the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). He has recently been promoted to be the Head of the Community Protected Areas Office at the Ministry of Environment.
⁴ Contributions by: CBNRM Learning Initiative Team
Freshwater fisheries are the fourth largest annual catch in the world and estimated to be between 230,000 and 400,000 tonnes per annum, contributing to 75% of protein consumed by Cambodians, which amounts to 67kg per person per year. Estimates are that between one and three million people depend directly on Tonle Sap fisheries for livelihoods. The Tonle Sap Lake increases its size by four times from 250,000ha to 1,000,000ha in the wet season, contributing to the network of wetlands which occupy up to 30% of the country and plays an important role in the economic, social and cultural life of Cambodians. Despite this important role it is estimated that approximately 7 million Cambodians still live without access to safe drinking water.

Cambodia's coastal zone supports diverse habitats including mangrove forests, coral reefs, and sea grass beds and marine habitats are understood to support more than 435 species of fish as well as globally endangered marine mammals such as dugong and marine dolphin.

Between the 1960s and 1992, Cambodia's forest cover is estimated to have been reduced from 13.2 million ha (73%), to 11.2 million ha (62%). Forest cover is still significant, quite diverse, and includes mangrove, flooded, bamboo, coniferous, dry deciduous and moist deciduous, moist evergreen, moist mountain and dwarf evergreen forests. The forests provide a variety of valuable non-timber products such as fuel wood, medicinal plants, wildlife and building materials. Wood is used as the fuel for cooking for 92% of households across the nation.

Cambodia's rich natural resources have been heavily degraded by over twenty years of civil war as well as a rapid adoption of a free-market economy in the 1990s. The main factors affecting resource decline include increasing population, poor resource management and unregulated use of natural resources. Cambodia has a population of 13 million (and rapidly growing) of which 84% live in rural areas, and over 85% of these rural Cambodians depend directly on these declining natural resources (forestry and fisheries) for their livelihood security (McKenney and Tola, 2002).

In response to the problem of depleting resources and dependency on those resources, particularly by Cambodia's poor rural population, there have been efforts to assist with community organizing and community development. These efforts were initially introduced by non-government organizations (NGOs) who are working
with local villagers on issues of the community's livelihood and natural resources management. The RGC, with support from various donors and NGO partners, has also begun to adopt more decentralized policies to management, including increasing support for community based natural resource management (CBNRM) approaches.

WHAT IS CBNRM IN CAMBODIA?
Diversity of Co-Management Approaches

The term 'CBNRM' actually refers to "a diversity of co-management approaches that strive to empower local communities to participate actively in the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources" (Carson, Srey et al, 2002). In Cambodia, there are various CBNRM related strategies such as Community Forestry, Community Co-Management of Fisheries, Participatory Land Use Planning and Participatory Protected Area Management. Due to Cambodia's historical and political situation, most CBNRM initiatives tend to be more on the government controlled side of the co-management spectrum. There are only a very few examples in Cambodia of CBNRM activities on the "community-based" side of the natural resources co-management spectrum.

The goals of CBNRM approaches can be divided into two categories: community empowerment goals and ecosystem conservation goals. In Cambodia, the goals have so far been primarily related to conservation purposes, subsistence living and household consumption. However, there is a growing realization that CBNRM will only be successful if it also helps to reduce poverty, and improve rural livelihoods and other socio-economic community empowerment goals (refer to diagram below).
Adapted from Oxfam America: These goals emphasize building local capacity, defining community development, holistically to include not only economic aspects, but also cultural, political, social aspects with a strong emphasis on sustainability.

In this status report, CBNRM is used as an umbrella term for other local resource management concepts including community forestry, community fisheries, community based eco-tourism, community protected area development and recognizes a variety of methods used in researching and planning for CBNRM such as participatory land use planning and action research.

Community Forestry

In Cambodia, community forestry (CF) is meant to be an alternative management system that enables the effective participation of local people and communities in managing forest resources, focusing on the forest resources on which they depend. CF has been referred to as "sustainable forest management through the participation of local people, by making the objectives of local people central in forest management and ensuring that local people obtain reasonable benefits from forest management" (Patrick Evans, FAO - Siem Reap, 2003). A failure to effectively engage local people in forest management contributes to forest degradation, to the failure of forest management, and to shortcomings in socio-economic development and governance (Henderson, 2004). (See chapters 6, 12 and 17)
Community Fisheries

In Cambodia, community fisheries refers to a “group of people who voluntarily cooperate in order to manage, conserve, develop and use fisheries resources sustainably”. The main intended outcome of fisheries co-management is to produce improved sustainability, efficiency, equity and resilience (Berkes et al., 2001), provided by the provision of neutral facilitation and the promotion of dialogue between stakeholders” (Gum, 2000). Fisheries co-management in Cambodia has not yet reached its full potential to be used as a valuable tool to improve governance and ensure more equitable and sustainable natural resource allocation by involving all stakeholders in decision-making. (See chapters 5 and 7).

Participatory Land Use Planning

Participatory land-use planning (PLUP) is a planning process initiated at the village level in which villagers and other stakeholders jointly plan the use, the protection and the allocation of all land, forest, agricultural and water areas within their village boundaries (Rock, 2004). In the Cambodian context, this process is assisted by facilitators from outside the village that are meant to be neutral, but often come from various government departments. The main strategy of PLUP is to focus on the capacities and needs of local land users. It is carried out in a series of steps and is based on discussing issues and balancing the interests among parties involved. (See chapters 9 and 13).

Community Protected Areas Development

In Cambodia, community protected areas development is a process whereby the government tries to involve local people in the protection of natural resources within a protected area. Under the management of protected areas, the government shares the management responsibility for natural resources with an identified local community who then gain the right to protect and manage the forest resources in a responsible and sustainable manner. In recognizing the important role of local communities in protected areas, the Ministry of Environment issued a proclamation on community development in protected areas on May 30, 2003 signed by H.E Dr. Mok Mareth, Minister for Environment. The proclamation is intended to guide and coordinate provincial environment departments, NGOs, projects and other partners towards effectively managing community based protected areas in Cambodia’s national protected area system. (See chapter 10).
Community Based Eco-Tourism

Eco-tourism is referred to by the International Eco-tourism Society (IES) as "responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people". Community Based Eco-Tourism (CBET) in Cambodia has not yet reached the stage where local people have substantial control and involvement in eco-tourism projects in order that the majority benefits can remain in the community. However, a group of organizations have formed a network working together to improve the understanding and practice of CBET in Cambodia. (See chapter 8).

POLICY CHANGES AND LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS: FORMING THE FRAMEWORK FOR CBNRM

During the past decade, there have been a number of important government policies, plans, programmes, and strategies that have been developed and implemented to varying degrees of importance for CBNRM. This includes policies and programmes for decentralization, the statement on land policy, national environmental action plan, socio-economic development plan, national poverty reduction strategy, fisheries policy reforms, national forest policy, and the rectangular strategy (see text boxes below, and chapter 3 for more details).

**Government Policy of Decentralization**

The Seila government programme was started in 1996, and assists in developing the capacity for decentralized development planning. The intent of this programme is for the majority of decision-making to take place at the commune level, where Commune Development Committees (CDCs) decide on local activities and budget allocations. Piloted in Ratanakiri, the National Seila Task Force has now started a programme to mainstream natural resource management into commune council development plans. (See chapter 4 and 14).


Published in December 2002 by the Council for Social Development, this strategy highlights that one of the priority poverty reduction actions is to strengthen institutions and improve governance, including reform of natural resources management (land, agriculture, forestry and fisheries). Access of poor people to land and resources is also mentioned by the NPRS as one of the main problems to be addressed.
Practising CBNRM in Cambodia

Developed as a guide to the implementation of the UN Convention on Biodiversity ratified by the Kingdom of Cambodia in 1995. The three main objectives are: the conservation of biodiversity; the sustainable use of biological resources; and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits resulting from the use of genetic resources. Strategic Objective 14.1 states the need to develop CBNRM programs for forestry, fisheries, land use, protected areas, species protection, wildlife management and agriculture.

Includes national goals of environmental protection, biodiversity conservation, poverty reduction, economic development and good governance. It recognizes the legal protection of "traditional rights of local communities in use of forest resources..." and endeavours to "increase the benefits of local communities from the use and management of forest resources through community based forest and wildlife conservation". (See chapter 17).

Articulates government policy on land management, administration and distribution. States that "the people who use land are the day-to-day land managers, their participation in land use planning is essential" and that "concepts of community forestry and community fisheries...imply that community land use planning and land management are expected nationwide." (See chapter 19).

Socio-Economic Development Plan - SEDP II (2001- 2005) The Second Five-Year Socio-Economic Development Plan (SEDP II - July 2002) includes promotion of sustainable management and use of natural resources and the environment as one of its four main strategies, and sees the acceleration of growth in the rural economy as having the highest potential for reducing poverty.

Includes the release of 56% of fishing lot areas under commercial operations potentially for areas of community fisheries. This was a government response to rising tensions between fishing lot owners and poor local fishing communities. (See chapter 5).

National Environmental Action Plan (1998 - 2002) The focus of this plan was on six priority areas and recognized four key principles: the link between poverty alleviation and environment; the importance of communities in natural resource management; the need for institutional capacity building; and the importance of an integrated approach to environmental planning (MoE: 1998).
**Millennium Development Goals**

The most relevant goals for CBNRM include eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, and ensuring environmental sustainability. Target 7.1 hopes to maintain forest cover at the 2000 level of 60% of total land area through 2015 while Target 7.7 calls for an increase in the number of community based fisheries sites from 264 in 2000 to 589 in 2015.

**Rectangular Strategy (2004-2008)**

Presented by the Royal Government of Cambodia on 16 July 2004, this strategy aims to enhance growth, employment, equity and efficiency through the implementation of SEDP II and NPRS. At the core of the strategy is good governance, focusing on four areas including anti-corruption, legal and judiciary; public administration and decentralization. Of particular importance for the practice of CBNRM is the strategic growth rectangle focusing on 'agricultural production, diversification and competitiveness'. This strategic area includes emphasis on land reform, fisheries reform, and forestry reform.

*Diagram 1: Rectangular strategy of the Royal Government of Cambodia*
The Royal Government of Cambodia has also recently approved a number of important legal instruments including the Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Law, the Law on Commune Administration, the Land Law, the Forest Law, and the Community Forestry Sub-decree. (See table below and chapter 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Instrument</th>
<th>Date of Enactment</th>
<th>Main Contents and relevance for CBNRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>24 Sept 1993</td>
<td>Supreme law in Cambodia that defines rights, structure of government, etc. all other legislation must be consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Decree on the creation &amp; designation of protected areas</td>
<td>1 November 1993</td>
<td>Designates 23 Protected Areas covering 3,273,200 ha, representing 30 percent of total forest area or 18 percent of the country's total area. The Decree constitutes a renewed commitment to the conservation and sustainable use of Cambodia's biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Natural Resources</td>
<td>24 Dec 1996</td>
<td>Outlines provisions and procedures for creating national and regional action plans based on identified environmental priorities, protection of natural resources and through consultations with other ministries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law on Commune Administration</td>
<td>19 March 2001</td>
<td>Legally enforces the policy of decentralization by the RGC; Elected commune councils constitute the lowest administrative level; commune councils are responsible For NRM and the protection of environment in their area of jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Law</td>
<td>September 2001</td>
<td>Differentiates between private property, state public property and state public property; people occupying land before enactment of the law in 2001 are entitled to full ownership; allows for collective ownership of Indigenous community property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Law</td>
<td>August 2002</td>
<td>Clarifies the tasks and responsibilities of the Forest Administration; sets the framework for forest classification; provides for community forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry Sub-decree</td>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>Provides for the allocation of forest land to organized communities for renewable management periods of 15 years;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Current legal instruments and their relevance for CBNRM in Cambodia.

Furthermore, the decentralization concept in Cambodia has also involved the sharing of power from the central level to local government in order to improve governance structures. These policy and legal instruments, along with the recently presented rectangular strategy, are all helping to build the framework for the application of
CBNRM approaches. The current legal instruments relevant to CBNRM, as well as the gaps in the legal framework are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL INSTRUMENTS</th>
<th>DATE OF ENACTMENT</th>
<th>MAIN CONTENTS AND RELEVANCE FOR CBNRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Law</td>
<td>Draft submitted to Parliament 2004</td>
<td>Provides a legislative framework for the new fisheries management structure as a result of the fisheries policy reforms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Fisheries Sub-Decree</td>
<td>Draft at the Council of Ministers in 2004</td>
<td>This sub-decree is intended to grant fishing areas to local organized communities for management, conservation and derived benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Protected Areas Legislation</td>
<td>Draft at the Council of Ministers</td>
<td>This legislation would provide guidance to manage the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of natural resources within protected areas in Cambodia. It defines four management zones: core, conservation, sustainable use, and community zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Management Law</td>
<td>Drafted March 2002</td>
<td>This draft law has the stated purpose of 'fostering the effective management of the water resources of the Kingdom of Cambodia in order to attain socio-economic development and the welfare of the people'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines (Prakas) for Community Forestry, Fisheries and CPAs</td>
<td>In the drafting process</td>
<td>These Prakas will provide the basis for the implementation of CBNRM, and the details for the enactment of the Community Forestry Sub-decree, relating to agreements, management committee by-laws, regulations, monitoring, and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Land Rights</td>
<td>In the drafting process</td>
<td>These legal instruments will help to implement sections of the Land Law that provide indigenous communal land titling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Gaps in the Legal Framework for CBNRM in Cambodia

INSTITUTIONAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The changing policy and regulatory framework in Cambodia has altered the roles and responsibilities of relevant government agencies, such as the Forestry Administration, Land Management Departments, Environmental Departments, Agricultural Department and Provincial Development Committees. For example, commune councils now have the responsibility to participate in natural resource management and to prepare their own commune development plan by involving local communities.

One of the key issues in Cambodia has been the unclear and overlapping/competing areas of responsibility for natural resource management. The following diagram attempts to summarize the mandate and responsibilities of key institutions and organizations with relevance to CBNRM.
Diagram: Government institutions involved in CBNRM in Cambodia: roles and responsibilities

**Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (MAFF)**
- Responsible for the fishery and forestry domain, including forest reserves, protected forests, forest concessions, development of community fisheries and community forestry

**Community Fisheries Development Office, Department of Fisheries/MAFF**
- Responsible for the development of community fisheries in the fisheries domain, flooded forests and mangroves

**Community Forestry Office, Forest Administration/MAFF**
- Responsible for the development of community forestry in the forest

**Ministry of Environment (MoE)**
- Responsible for 23 protected areas, nature conservation and environmental protection

**Community Protected Area Development Office, DNCP/MoE**
- Responsible for the development of community protected zones in the 23 designated national protected areas

**Participatory Land Use Planning Unit, MLMUPC**
- Secretariat for the PLUP training team

**Partnership for Local Governance and the Seila Task Force**
- Secretariat Decentralization support programme of the Royal Government of Cambodia

**Ministry of Land Management Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC)**
- Responsible for land use planning, land allocation and land management

**Ministry of Interior and the National Council to Support Communes**
- In charge of decentralization and supervising the Commune Councils

**Commune Councils**
- Lowest elected administrative level with authority to plan, manage and use natural resources in a sustainable manner; the exact role with regard to their area of jurisdiction has yet to be fully clarified

**Community Protected Area Development Office, DNCP/MoE**
- Responsible for the development of community protected zones in the 23 designated national protected areas

**Participatory Land Use Planning Unit, MLMUPC**
- Secretariat for the PLUP training team

**Partnership for Local Governance and the Seila Task Force**
- Secretariat Decentralization support programme of the Royal Government of Cambodia

**Ministry Water Resources and Meteorology**
- Responsible for water resource management, including providing for rights and obligations of water users such as farmer user groups

**Diagram: Government institutions involved in CBNRM in Cambodia: roles and responsibilities**
NETWORKS AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUPS

Various networks and working groups have been established in an attempt to build better relationships among stakeholders and improve the information flow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF NETWORK OR WORKING GROUP</th>
<th>PURPOSE AND FUNCTION</th>
<th>MEMBERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry and Community Protected Area Network (see chapter 6 and 10)</td>
<td>National network established in 1995 to provide a forum to share information and experiences about Community Forestry and COPAs in Cambodia; meets quarterly in different provinces</td>
<td>More than 200 active members from COs, Gov and NGOs that is organized by a steering committee (co-chaired by FA and MoE); supported by Concern CBNRM/WWF, Oxfam GB, CFI and GTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia Community-Based Eco-Tourism Network (CCBEN) (see chapter 8)</td>
<td>Increase awareness on the concepts and potential of community based eco-tourism (CBET)</td>
<td>Initiated by a group of 15 NGOs in cooperation with the government and other stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum on Environment</td>
<td>NGO Coordination and networking to analyse and advocate on development issues and to serve as a resource centre</td>
<td>Includes over 100 local and international NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Action Coalition Team (see chapter 5 and 7)</td>
<td>Collects and documents information to advocate on behalf of local communities with regards to local fisheries issues</td>
<td>Group of NGOs and community organizations around the Tonle Sap, Mekong and coastal areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry Working Group</td>
<td>Established in 1998 (not functioning since 2003) to provide a forum for organizations and institutions to jointly work on CF issues and to facilitate institutional strengthening</td>
<td>Included members from FA, DNCP, RUA and NGOs who were actively involved with CF activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Law Extension Team (FLET)</td>
<td>Aims to produce a forestry law guide book and other materials to increase understanding about roles and responsibilities in forest management</td>
<td>Led by the Forest Administration and supported by GTZ, Concern Worldwide, CBNRM/WWF, JICA, Oxfam GB, CFI/CFAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Facilitators Working Group (see chapters 5 and 7)</td>
<td>Supports and facilitates the development of fisheries legal instruments and provides training courses related to community fisheries development</td>
<td>Oxfam America, OGB, CBNRM LI, CFDO/DoF, CEPA, Star Cambodia, NGO forum and other organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) Training Team (see chapter 9)</td>
<td>Facilitates PLUP training courses to build up capacities among government and NGO staff to initiate and support local planning processes at village and commune levels, by working as teams of 3-5 facilitators</td>
<td>Multi-disciplinary team consisting of various government agencies including: MLMUPC (secretariat), FA, MoE, Dept of Fisheries, and various NGOs at national and provincial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM Provincial Networks (in various provinces)</td>
<td>Improve the flow of information and ideas and a forum to discuss and take action on NRM issues relevant to local communities</td>
<td>Various local community organizations, NGOs, PLG/Seila, commune councils and local government departments (depending upon each province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Working Group on NRM</td>
<td>Coordinates donor efforts with the RGC and includes technical working groups on forestry, fisheries, and land issues</td>
<td>Group of donors that includes Danida, DFID, FAO, Sida, JICA, USAID, GTZ, WB, ADB and UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization Forum Working Group</td>
<td>Forum is held twice per year in Phnom Penh, providing opportunities to share information, raise and explore decentralization issues, and promote cooperation and coordination.</td>
<td>Broad range of stakeholders including local and international NGOs, donors, private sector, government and commune councils.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These forums also provide great potential for resolving issues, taking action, and expanding upon successes to other areas (scaling up and scaling out). These networks and working groups still operate in isolation of each other, without good mechanisms for linking across sectors and between local to national levels. The diagram below shows some of the potential linkages. Federations of community organizations have not yet formed in Cambodia, but perhaps this will be the next step in the development of networking in CBNRM.
The diverse set of CBNRM approaches in Cambodia have developed rapidly during the past few years. In the mid 1990s, there were only a few recognized community-based approaches. By 2002, according to research reports provided by the Cambodian Development Resources Institute, there were over 237 community forestry areas and 162 community fishery areas (refer to table below).

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES: LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCES AND DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO MOVE CBNRM FORWARD

Numerous lessons can be learned from local CBNRM experiences in Cambodia. For example, a series of case studies and action research initiatives have highlighted the following key opportunities and challenges for CBNRM:

- policy and legal framework gaps
- good governance and decentralization
- conflict resolution mechanisms
- gender and equity issues
- information flow management (cooperation, networking and knowledge sharing)
- monitoring and evaluation of impacts
- capacity building, training, ongoing learning
- land and resource rights
- sustainable livelihoods

The diverse set of CBNRM approaches in Cambodia have developed rapidly during the past few years. In the mid 1990s, there were only a few recognized community-based approaches. By 2002, according to research reports provided by the Cambodian Development Resources Institute, there were over 237 community forestry areas and 162 community fishery areas (refer to table below).
Despite relative successes, there is still only limited distribution of recognized CBNRM areas across the country, while the number of people involved is still low and specific to certain areas. For example, community forestry is mostly found only in degraded areas and not so much in rich forest areas. There is an increasing government support for the CBNRM concept and approaches as indicated by key policy and legal developments. However, there is still a reluctance to grant real benefits and management control to local communities.

The Cambodia-German Forestry Project (Department of Forestry and Wildlife and GTZ, 2002) conducted an assessment of ongoing community forestry initiatives in Cambodia, using information collected by the Cambodian Development Resources Institute (CDRI), the CBNRM LI and field data. This study found that there were approximately 83,000ha under community forestry management in Cambodia (including mangroves) by 2002, with 404 villages involved. Despite rapid increases in CF sites throughout the country, this total area under community forestry management still only represents 0.7% of Cambodia's total forest area in the country while the total number of villages involved only represents 3.6% (415,000 people) of Cambodia's population benefitting from CF activities.

Community forestry is still relatively small in comparison to commercial forestry or protection forests, but there is tremendous potential for community forestry,
especially with the recent enactment of the Community Forestry Sub-Decree. Considerable attention has been given to CF as a potential alternative to forest concession management in order to reduce poverty of the rural population while preventing further environmental problems (CGFP, Department of Forestry and Wildlife and GTZ, 2002). The assessment report concludes that up to 8.4 million ha of Cambodia's forest land could potentially be suitable for community forestry (CGFP, Department of Forestry and Wildlife and GTZ, 2002).

The community fisheries approach also includes both opportunities and challenges. In 2000, the RGC implemented fisheries policies reforms and released 56% of fishing lot areas under commercial operations in response to rising tensions between fishing lot owners and poor local fishing communities. The results have been mixed. What many may claim to be a boost for community managed areas has in reality become a problem of open access resource depletion (see chapters 5 and 11). In effect, the policy was implemented so quickly that the Fisheries Department and other stakeholders struggled to catch up with the changes. Essentially, it created a management vacuum that is still being filled.

As part of the fisheries policy reforms, a draft Fisheries Law was formulated by the Department of Fisheries within MAFF with a contribution from Oxfam GB, WWF/ CBNRM LI, Oxfam America and other organizations. However, there are many issues and constraints concerning the implementation of this reform. Policy reform is no guarantee of an improvement in the management system without a vast improvement in transparency, freedom of information and effective implementation through a fairly paid and well-trained civil service (Somony, Buntheoun and Mom, 2003). The Sub-decree on Community Fisheries was endorsed at a technical inter-ministries meeting at the Council of Ministers held on March 03, 2004.

In the case of forestry reforms, the old forest law was recognized as inadequate and unclear, and a new Forest Law was approved in August 2002. Although this law enables for community forestry in principle, the new forest law also leaves a variety of important issues to be resolved, such as clarification of the criteria and process for distinguishing 'forest' from non-forest areas.
The Community Forestry Sub-decree was finally approved on 02 December 2003 after many earlier drafts were reviewed through multi-stakeholder dialogues and consultations. The National Community Forestry Programme (NCFP) is being developed to help guide the implementation of the Community Forestry Sub-Decree. Legal mechanisms such as *Prakas* on management planning, inventories, benefit sharing, monitoring and evaluation are now being developed as part of NCFP, as well as identifying the steps and other legal mechanisms needed to move CF forward in Cambodia. Communities are becoming increasingly active in both requests for the delineation of community forests and in complaints over legal violations by concessionaires.

Furthermore, the Independent Forest Sector Review (2004) recommended that the concession system to be closed and that the moratorium on cutting should remain in place. It also stated that it is critical to allow community forestry to become self-financing and self-sustaining, it must be able to establish incentives and secure rights to benefits (Independent Forest Sector Review, 2004).

There is great potential for community forestry, community fisheries, community protected areas, and other CBNRM approaches in Cambodia. The immediate challenges will be to improve governance structures and processes, assist poorer rural populations to secure resources and tenure rights, and help find better livelihoods for local people by balancing poverty alleviation with conservation and other concerns.

The Rectangular Strategy (2004-2008) further commits the RGC towards policies of good governance, decentralization, poverty reduction and locally-based management. For example, this strategy states that fisheries reform should include the expansion of community fisheries areas while forestry reform will have three pillars including: sustainable forest management policy, protected area system and community forestry as a sound, transparent and locally managed programme.

**DELIVERING ON GOVERNANCE AND DECENTRALIZATION**

Much improvement has taken place, with regard to the evolving legislative framework and decentralizing structures in Cambodia. However, the fluid nature of the
governance structure and the uncertainties surrounding the actual implementation of
the new measures make it hard to predict how the reforms will impact on poor
communities. These processes need to be understood and monitored and resource
dependent communities supported in dealing with the changes (see chapters 4 & 14).

Improving governance requires an examination of ways to “transform structures and
processes” that influence local people’s access to forest resources and their
livelihood sources by focusing on the relationships between actors, rather than on the
actors themselves (from Hobley and Shields, 2000; Henderson, 2003 - see
contceptual framework below and chapter 17 for more details).

Figure 2: Governance Framework (Henderson, 2003; Hobley and Shields, 2000)

SECURING TENURE AND RESOURCE RIGHTS/RESPONSIBILITIES

The recent changes in policy and legal framework are a significant step towards
recognizing the rights of rural people to manage local natural resources, but it is
unclear how these policies will be implemented. It is therefore necessary to improve
the understanding on local land use and resource tenure systems. The Statement on
Land Policy (2001) explains that the "preferred method for implementing decentralized
land use planning is referred to as participatory land use planning (PLUP)". This
method still needs to be proven as an effective tool for sustainable resource
management. A number of field experiments have been undertaken at various places,
mostly organized by NGOs and some bilateral projects.
The Royal Government of Cambodia has demonstrated a commitment towards land ownership through recognizing communal land titling for indigenous communities (see chapters 14, 18 and 19). However, PLUP needs to be incorporated into this process to ensure that the rights of communities are guaranteed (PLUP Training Team, 2003). Efforts will be needed to develop extension and training materials and mechanisms to ensure that the rights and responsibilities of local communities are respected and to increase understanding amongst all different stakeholders through information sharing.

**TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS**

The SL framework illustrates the importance of CBNRM for improving livelihoods by highlighting the importance of human, physical, financial, natural (e.g. forests, agricultural land, fisheries), and social assets as key elements on which livelihood strategies are based (see chapter 20). It further emphasizes the structures and processes which mediate poor people's access to such assets (Kinakin, 2003). CBNRM approaches in Cambodia should also strive for the core principles of the livelihoods approach including: being people centred, holistic, dynamic, building on strengths, including macro-micro linkages, and sustainability (environmental, economic, social and institutional).

Most Cambodians living in rural areas depend on natural resources to support their livelihoods. Most subsist farm, and rely on fish and other aquatic resources, and a range of forest products. Cambodia's natural resources provide a foundation for food security, income, and employment for more than 85% of the rural population (McKenney and Prom Tola, 2002). As resources become more scarce, local communities will need to work together to assure that natural resources are being used sustainably. The opportunity for CBNRM approaches will be to adapt to ongoing challenges and to play an important role in shaping the future social, ecological and economic well-being of Cambodians.
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by: Robert B. Oberndorf, J.D

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide the reader with an overview of currently existing policy and legislative documents (laws, sub-decrees and Prakas) that can be linked to CBNRM in Cambodia. In order to assist the reader, an explanation of what is policy (policy as compared to legislation) and an overview of the legislative system in Cambodia is provided. In addition, this chapter will identify existing gaps within the legislative framework in Cambodia.

UNDERSTANDING POLICY

The difference between policy and legislation is often confusing; in many instances commentators will refer to legislation as policy, though they should be separate and distinct instruments in the governance field. Policy documents represent a course of action or vision that a government has adopted, written in a standard report format, while legislation sets out specific mandates, rights, responsibilities and prohibitions on a subject matter within a rigid format of chapters and articles. Policy documents are written and adopted by a government's executive branch. Legislation is enacted by either the legislative or executive branches of government, with laws being enacted by the legislative branch and implementing rules and regulations enacted, implemented and enforced by the executive branch.

Good policy documents should be clearly written providing a government and its administrative agencies with clear directions on a course of action that is adopted. Policy documents are often adopted to direct the drafting, enactment and implementation of legislation. Policy documents can also be written to assist in the interpretation of legislation by those entities that are responsible for implementation and enforcement. Properly written policy documents compliment and link to

---

1 Robert is currently working as the Legal and Policy Advisor for Community Forestry International's Community Forestry Alliance for Cambodia project. He is also contracted as the Technical Legal Expert for the ADB Commune Council Development Project in Cambodia.

2 Adapted from a report written by Community Forestry International / Community Forestry Alliance for Cambodia (2004)

3 See Section 4 of this paper for an in depth explanation of the legislative framework in Cambodia.
Policy documents that have exceeded their intended time frames, such as the Government Action Plan (2001-2004) or the National Environmental Action Plan (1998-2002) are not included in this analysis. These government policies need to be replaced or have been integrated into other policy mechanisms such as the National Poverty Reduction Strategy.

In instances where there is no written policy on a subject matter, then the legislative documents are often referred to as the government's policy; this is considered a very poor form of policy development, and in such instances clear policy should be written and adopted by the government.

For government policy to be truly effective, it should contain clear statements on courses of action to be taken that can be effectively measured and monitored over time. Far too often policy documents only contain broad statements embracing a general concept without spelling out a clear course of action.

POLICY DOCUMENTS

The following is an overview of policy documents that link in some way to CBNRM in Cambodia.

Royal Government of Cambodia's Second Five Year Socio-Economic Development Plan 2001-2005

The Royal Government of Cambodia's (RGC) Second Five Year Socio-Economic Development Plan (SEDP II) is a policy document charting the course for the government focusing on a broad variety of developmental issues with a concentration on actions to be taken to stimulate economic growth and private sector development. Because of the natural links between this policy and the recently adopted National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS), the two will be combined in 2006.

This policy makes a commitment to the sustainable use of natural resources and discusses the areas of agriculture, forestry, fisheries and land management reform, but statements that can be linked directly to CBNRM are quite limited. The document does specifically call for the “optimization of benefits [from forest resources] to rural communities through community based forestry,” “formulation and implementation of a legal and regulatory framework for community fisheries management,” and recognizes as a guiding principal that “structured interventions to provide local

--

4 Policy documents that have exceeded their intended time frames, such as the Government Action Plan (2001-2004) or the National Environmental Action Plan (1998-2002) are not included in this analysis. These government policies need to be replaced or have been integrated into other policy mechanisms such as the National Poverty Reduction Strategy.
communities with the skills to manage the natural resources base on which their livelihoods depend is the most effective way of achieving sustainable management of these resources.”


This policy document elaborates on the 2001 Statement on Land Policy and sets forth the principals and plans which will be utilized to accomplish the RGC’s goals regarding land and plans for assuring that land resources are used effectively to achieve broad national goals. It represents an ongoing process of creating detailed land policies for Cambodia.

There are several promising principals that are adopted that link to CBNRM. The policy states that “the people who use land are the day-to-day land managers, their participation in land use planning is essential.” The policy states that “concepts of community forestry and community fisheries…imply that community land use planning and land management are expected nationwide.”

The policy explains that the “preferred method for implementing decentralized land use planning is referred to as Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP).” This is a method of developing local agreement about current and future land use in harmony with development goals and available natural resources, and is based on the principles of local ownership and control of the planning process. In relation to indigenous land rights, the document states that principals of “local land use planning and expanded partnerships between indigenous communities, NGOs and government in managing areas in and around communal property will guide implementation of communal titling.”

**Royal Government of Cambodia’s National Poverty Reduction Strategy (2003)**

The NPRS, like SEDP II, covers a broad range of issues impacting on poverty reduction within Cambodia. The policy does an excellent job of clearly listing objectives, actionable measures to be taken, measurable indicators and targets set to specific timelines and the agencies responsible for carrying out the actions. As such, this is an example of a well written policy document as described above. This
Policy and SEDP II will be integrated into one broad policy document guiding development and poverty reduction in 2006.

Unfortunately the policy makes very few statements that can be linked to CBNRM type activities. The policy does specifically call for the “establishment of land use planning integrated with natural resources management and decentralized land use planning and management,” which should be incorporated into a Sub-Decree on Land Use Planning as called for under the Land Law. It also calls for establishing and strengthening community forestry through increasing awareness and “assisting forest user groups in implementing community forestry management plans,” and continuing “efforts of sustainable communities-based fisheries management.”

In the area of water resources management, the policy states the government needs to adopt a comprehensive set of guidelines and regulations relating to farmer’s involvement in irrigation development and management through the promulgation of a Water Resources Law and Sub-Decree on Farmer Water User Communities.


This document is not so much a policy document as it is a government statement which states a commitment to broad management principles. A comprehensive forestry policy within Cambodia still needs to be developed, and is required under provisions found in the Forestry Law. With this in mind, there is very little in this statement that links to CBNRM issues.

The document states that the government shall “ensure the maximum involvement of private sectors and local communities in the form of sustainable conservation and management of forest resources…,” recognize and “legally protect the traditional rights of local communities in use of forest resources…,” and “increase the benefits of local communities from the use and management of forest resources through the concepts of community based forest and wildlife conservation.”

---

5 This Sub-Decree has yet to be enacted; see section on Gaps in Legislative Framework.

In January 2004, the RGC adopted the country's first National Water Resources Policy. This broadly worded document recognizes the importance of water resources within Cambodia, and calls for the sustainable development, use and conservation of these resources throughout the country. The major weakness with this policy document is that it does not spell out concrete actions that are to be taken, what timelines are involved or what institutions, agencies or departments are responsible. The only ministry that is mentioned, is the Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology, and only in a very limited sense.

In terms of CBNRM issues, the only language within this policy document that links are those statements relating to improved participation of beneficiaries and farmer user communities in management of the water resources in question.

OVERVIEW OF THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM IN CAMBODIA

The legal system in Cambodia exists within the overall governance structure created under the Constitution, which is the supreme law of the land. The government is made up of a system where the intent is to have a clear separation of powers between the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government.

“The separation of powers ensures that no element or branch of government can assume absolute or dictatorial power, and it is a safeguard for the people against abuses of state power.” (see diagram 1)

Due to weakness and lack of capacity within both the legislative and judicial branches, this system of separation of powers does not work as effectively as it should. The judicial branch is perceived as the weakest of the three, though efforts are being made to rectify this situation, such as the recent adoption of a legal and judicial reform policy as drafted by the Council for Legal and Judicial Reform.

The legislative branch is divided into the National Assembly and the Senate with the authority to approve and amend legislation initiated by them or the Royal Government of Cambodia. The executive branch consists of the Prime Minister, the Council of

---

("Legal and Judicial Reform Policy, Page 8, as adopted by the Council of Ministers (20 June 2003)"
Ministers and the various line ministries. The judicial branch consists of 19 provincial courts, two municipal courts, a military court, and an Appeals and Supreme Court in Phnom Penh. The Ministry of Justice and the Chief Prosecutor implement criminal law, procedure and oversee judicial police in the enforcement of all legislation through the courts.

The laws and regulations of Cambodia are hierarchical, and each of these derives its validity and authority from a rule placed above it in the hierarchical structure of laws. Box 1 provides a general outline of the hierarchy of law within the Kingdom of Cambodia:

![Diagram 1: Separation of powers in Cambodia](image)

Within this hierarchy of law are general observations that can be made on time and scope. The higher the level of the instrument that is being enacted, the greater the amount of time for actual enactment due to the various levels of review it must go through. For example, a law that is drafted at the level of the RGC must go through

---

7 The RGC consists of the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister.
a review process at the Council of Ministers, the National Assembly and finally the Senate, while a *Prakas* is simply reviewed within the ministry that is promulgating it.\(^9\)

Another aspect that should be considered is scope of the legal document. Laws have broad scope and apply to all government entities and geographic locations within the country, unless specifically limited within their text. *Prakas* are only binding within the ministry in which they are promulgated, and *Deika* only apply to the geographical area of the province or commune that enacts them.

**Law:** Laws, or *Chhbab* in Khmer, are the primary source of law in Cambodia. *Chhbab* are laws passed by the National Assembly (lower house) and the Senate (upper house). The *Chhbab* is often confused with *Kram*, which is a form of Royal Decree used for the promulgation of a *Chhbab* by the King or Head of State. As already mentioned, the process of promulgating a law that is proposed by the RGC is rather time consuming, and generally proceeds according the following procedure:\(^{10}\)

---

\(^9\) After promulgation, laws may also be reviewed for constitutionality by the Constitutional Council, but only upon request of the King, President of the Senate or National Assembly, the Prime Minister, ¼ of members of the Senate, 1/10 of the members of the National Assembly or the Courts. The Constitutional Council has no authority to review laws on non-constitutional issues, nor does it have authority to review other legal instruments such as Sub-Decrees or Prakas.

\(^{10}\) This procedure would apply to proposed amendments to laws as well.
1) Preparation of a draft law by a technical line ministry, such as MoI;

2) Discussion of the draft law in inter-ministerial meetings (or, if need be, within the concerned ministry itself). Interested stakeholders (donors, civil society, private sector, etc.) are often consulted as well.

3) Study of the draft law by the Council of Jurists under the Council of Ministers to check conformity with the Constitution, coherence with existing legislation, etc.;

4) Discussion of the draft law at the inter-ministerial level under the Council of Ministers;

5) Examination and adoption of the draft law by the Council of Ministers;

6) Submission of the draft law of the RGC to the National Assembly. Draft laws are submitted in a written format accompanied by a “Statement of Purpose” to the Permanent Committee of the National Assembly for distribution to all deputies. The Permanent Committee forwards the draft law to a specialized commission for review. After such review, the Chairman of the Commission presents the opinions of the Commission to the National Assembly;

7) Examination and debate of the draft law at the plenary session, including modifications by the National Assembly;

8) Vote on the draft law by the National Assembly (simple majority);

9) Submission of the adopted law to the Senate which has to review and provide a recommendation within no more than one month. For urgent matters, the period is reduced to seven days. If the Senate does not provide a recommendation within the time limit stipulated, the law is promulgated. If the Senate calls for changes, the National Assembly shall take them into account immediately. In the second review of the adopted law, the National Assembly must adopt it by an absolute majority;

10) Promulgation of the law by the King or the Head of State (Kram).

Royal Decree: The Constitution states that “upon proposal by the Council of Ministers, the King (or Head of State) shall sign decrees (‘Kret’) appointing, transferring or ending the mission of high civil and military officials…” This provision has been utilized by the RGC to create high level multi-ministerial bodies such as the National Committee to Support the Commune and Supreme Council for State Reform. There are also times when Royal Decrees are used as regulatory instruments, such as the case with the Royal Decree on Watershed Management.

11 Constitution, Article 21
Technically speaking, such decrees are unconstitutional since the King only has authority to reign, not govern.

**Sub-Decree:** Sub-decrees, or *Anu-Kret*, are legislative documents that are generally used to implement and clarify specific provisions within laws, though they are also utilized to outline the roles, duties and responsibilities of government entities, such as a ministry, or for the appointment of high ranking government officials. Sub-decrees tend to be drafted within a ministry or amongst several ministries that have subject matter competence on the area to be legislated. Once drafted, the sub-decree is submitted to the Council of Ministers for examination and adoption. Once adopted by the Council of Ministers, the sub-decree is signed by the Prime Minister and counter signed by the minister or ministers in charge of implementation and enforcement. Authorization for the sub-decree, whether direct or indirect, must come from a higher level legal instrument, such as a law. Since sub-decrees are adopted at the Council of Ministers level, their scope can be quite large.

**Prakas:** *Prakas* are ministerial or inter-ministerial regulations that are used, like sub-decrees, to implement and clarify specific provisions within higher level legislative documents. They are also often used for the creation of guidelines that are necessary for the implementation of laws or sub-decrees. *Prakas* are usually drafted at the technical department level and then signed into effect by the minister (or ministers) in charge of the ministry within which the regulation or guidelines apply. It should be noted that *Prakas* are largely used to implement law in Cambodia, and that lessons learned can be quickly incorporated since the process for enacting a *Prakas* are relatively simple and quick. The drawback to *Prakas* is that their scope is limited to the subject matter jurisdiction of the ministries that enact them, and other line ministries or government entities will not always feel bound to follow them.

**Circulars:** Circulars, or *Sarachor*, are instruments that are issued by the Prime Minister or a minister to explain or clarify certain legal or regulatory measures, or to provide instructions. Like *Prakas*, these are limited in scope, but easily issued.

---

12 The steps taken for passage of a sub-decree essentially mirror steps 1-5 for the passage of a Law.
**Deika:** Deika are orders given by provincial governors or commune councils that have the force of law within the geographical limit of their territorial authority. Deika can not conflict with other rules and regulations at the national level.

**LEGISLATIVE DOCUMENTS**

The following is an overview of primary legislative documents that link in some way to CBNRM in Cambodia.

**Law on Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Management (1996)**

This law includes provisions for the protection of the country’s natural resources and environment that covers protected areas that fall under the management responsibility of the Ministry of Environment, water pollution control activities, creation of national and regional environmental action plans, and conducting environmental impact assessments for development projects or other activities that could have a significant impact on the environment.

One of this law’s stated objectives is to “encourage and provide the possibility of the public to participate in the protection of the environment and the management of natural resources.” While this certainly links to concepts of CBNRM, there are no concrete provisions within the law addressing how this is to be done. The law authorizes the drafting and enactment of a sub-decree on procedures for the participation of the public in the protection of the environment and management of natural resources, but this has not been done.

**Land Law (2001)**

The Land Law outlines concepts of land classification (State Public, State Private and Private) and ownership in Cambodia. It also includes important provisions on communal property ownership rights of minority indigenous groups within the country. The law does not specifically spell out any mechanisms for land use planning and management that would link to CBNRM activities, but it does call for the enactment of a sub-decree on state land management that might cover this through provisions on participatory land use planning. The Land Law does provide some conflict resolution mechanisms that could be used when encountering problems of ownership during CBNRM activities.

---

13 For an overview of how the Land Law and Forestry Law classification systems link, see diagram 2 below.
Overview of the policy and legal framework related to CBNRM

Diagram 2: Property classification system according to the Land Law (2001)

**Law on Administration and Management of the Commune (2001)**

This important piece of legislation grants executive and legislative authority to semi-autonomous democratically elected commune councils at the local level of government in Cambodia. Commune councils have authority to protect the environment and natural resources within their commune boundaries, though they are specifically prohibited from making management decisions on forestry issues unless granted specific authority from the RGC. The commune councils must create commune development plans that can include issues surrounding natural resource management. In addition, the commune councils may create sub-committees to assist in specific management issues, such as those that would link to CBNRM activities\(^\text{14}\). There are no specific provisions within this law or subsidiary legislation that directly links to CBNRM.

**Forestry Law (2002)**

The Forestry Law outlines the general rules and regulations related to administration and management of the Permanent Forest Estate within Cambodia\(^\text{15}\). Though primary jurisdiction is granted within the law to the Forestry Administration (FA) over the Permanent Forest Reserve, the FA also has jurisdictional authority over other areas within the Permanent Forest Estate, such as forestry crimes in MoE protected areas and regulation of timber plantations on private land (private forest). The Forestry Law outlines the basic structures, functions and responsibilities of the FA.

The Forestry Law is one of the most important existing pieces of legislation that links to CBNRM issues. This Law contains important provisions on traditional use and

---

\(^\text{14}\) Natural Resource and Environmental Management (NREM) committees have been established by some commune councils in Cambodia as part of a programme to mainstream NREM into the commune development planning process.

\(^\text{15}\) For an overview of how the Forestry Law classifies different forest types and how that links to the Land Law, see
Forestry Law (2002) continued

access rights to forest resources, though these do not include management rights. More important are the provisions that allow for the creation and management of community forests, whereby communities are granted an area of the Permanent Forest Reserve to manage and derive benefits from. Provisions within the Forestry Law only allow community forestry activities to occur in areas classified as Production Forest, thereby excluding areas of Protection Forest from this management scheme.

Diagram 3: Forest classification system according to the Forestry Law (2002)

Royal Decree on Protected Areas (1993)

This Royal Decree created the system of MoE protected areas, but does very little in regards to the management of these areas. The Royal Decree has been criticized for its judicial legitimacy, though that has been handled through the passage of the Forestry Law; essentially the Forestry Law is the mechanism by which the National Assembly has ratified the Royal Decree and given MoE clear jurisdiction over the management of these areas.
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LEGISLATIVE GAPS

There are many laws, sub-decrees and Prakas with the potential to impact on CBNRM activities in the country that have yet to be enacted. Following is a listing of key legislative documents that have been or are in the process of being drafted. It is uncertain what form these will take when finally enacted.

Protected Areas Legislation

There is a tremendous need for legislation that guides the management of protected areas under the management authority of the Ministry of Environment. There is currently a draft that includes provisions on community use and management zones that would link to CBNRM issues. Though originally drafted as a law, it looks more likely that this legislation will be enacted as a sub-decree.

Fisheries Law

This law is needed for management of the entire fisheries sector in Cambodia, including issues surrounding family fishing activities and community fisheries that will link to CBNRM activities. This law needs to be enacted by the National Assembly prior to enactment of the Community Fisheries Sub-Decree. This law has been in draft form for over two years.

Water Resources Management Law

The draft Water Resources Management Law (most recent draft dated March 2002) has the stated purpose of “fostering the effective management of the water resources of the Kingdom of Cambodia in order to attain socio-economic development and the welfare of the people.” This shall be done through the determination of: the rights
and obligations of water users; the fundamental principals of water resources management; institutions in charge of implementation and enforcement; and the participation of users and their associations in the sustainable development of water resources. With its provisions on rights and obligations of water users, including farmer user groups, this legislation links well with CBNRM issues in Cambodia.

Sub-Decree on Community Fisheries

This sub-decree will create the detailed rules for establishment and management of community fisheries in Cambodia. As such, it naturally links well with CBNRM issues and is similar, in terms of granting an area of resources to a community to manage and derive benefits from, to the Community Forestry Sub-Decree.

Community Forestry Guidelines (Prakas)

These Prakas will provide the details for enactment of the Community Forestry Sub-Decree. It will include annexes that provide the general format and content of the Community Forestry Agreement, Community Forestry Management Committee By-Laws, Community Forestry Regulations and Community Forestry Monitoring and Education. Currently existing community forestry sites, and areas that are being proposed for community forestry type activities in the future, cannot be formally recognized under the law until these guidelines are enacted.

CONCLUSION

There are limited provisions within Cambodian policy and legislative documents that directly support concepts of CBNRM. A promising sign in this regard is current use of participatory land use planning techniques that may be codified into legislation on land management in the future, passage of the Community Forestry Sub-Decree, and currently draft legislative documents that contain provisions relating to farmer water user groups and community fisheries management.

What must be remembered is that policy and legislation can change over time. As lessons are learned and attitudes change, then there can be greater opportunity for adoption of concepts relating to CBNRM in the policies and legislature of Cambodia.
Chapter 4

Mainstreaming natural resource and environmental management: the Seila decentralization programme

By: Nhem Sovanna

This paper discusses how the government has been involved in NREM policy dialogue through a decentralized governance programme, the Seila Programme. This paper documents recent experiences of mainstreaming natural resources and environmental management (NREM) into commune level planning processes. Field experiences from Ratanakiri province, where resource management problems are considered as governance issues, were heavily drawn upon in formulating this natural resources and environmental mainstreaming strategy. In the context of decentralization, the mainstreaming strategy considers NREM as a governance issue, which is why NREM is incorporated into commune level planning.

An analysis of the initial two years of NREM mainstreaming is detailed, although it will take further experimentation to be able to reflect critically upon this approach. It appears, however, that in those communes with several rounds of NREM mainstreaming experience, there is an enhanced awareness and confidence within commune councils to support and negotiate around environmental issues.

Mainstreaming NREM is useful, since this is incorporating natural resource management issues within a decentralization framework supported by donors and the government.

Several key struggles remain: firstly, how to incorporate a 'process-based', longer term planning approach (NREM mainstreaming) within an output oriented process (commune investment plans); and secondly, how to get beyond making plans and to encourage a commitment (from all levels) to following a planned project through.

BACKGROUND

The majority of the population in Cambodia are poor farmers dependant, either completely or mostly, on natural resources for their livelihood. Many government

---

1 Sovanna is an Advisor to the Seila Natural Resource and Environment Management Mainstreaming Project focusing on developing strategies including tools and methods for mainstreaming NREM and gender issues into governance structure and system through the Seila decentralization programme.
officials view natural resources as a way to supplement their low income through logging concessions and agri-business. These resources are being depleted at an alarming rate due to corruption and overexploitation.

With the introduction of donor funds in the 1990s there was increased interest by the NGO community in taking a different approach, and an openness to NREM issues at both the national and sub-national (provincial, district and commune) levels. Many of these initial efforts towards sustainable NREM were focused at the village or commune level, often the easiest place for NGOs to begin. These early efforts paid little attention to the district and provincial levels, which are sometimes more challenging for NGOs to negotiate with. Since these levels of government were not involved in NREM activities, they frequently tried to block these initiatives and were not willing to recognize and support institutions at the community level. Therefore, it became clear that without far greater involvement of the government, sustainable NREM was not possible.

THE DECENTRALIZED GOVERNANCE PROGRAMME: THE SEILA PROGRAMME

The administration system in Cambodia is a four-tiered government structure: At the national level there are different line ministries, followed by twenty provinces and four municipalities, which are divided into 185 local districts and 1621 communes/sangkats at the grass-roots level. Governors, appointed by the Ministry of Interior, administer provinces/municipalities and districts.

Years of conflict and genocide, created a need to build the capacity of the government for integrated area development planning; to mobilize and manage financial resources; and to improve socio-economic well-being of the population. This resulted in a UNDP-supported decentralized governance programme for the Royal Government of Cambodia, the Seila Programme.

In 1996 the first phase of the Seila2 Programme was launched by the Royal Government of Cambodia as an experiment to model strengthening of the local government for integrated area development planning; to mobilize and manage financial resources; and to improve socio-economic well-being of the population. This resulted in a UNDP-supported decentralized governance programme for the Royal Government of Cambodia, the Seila Programme.

2 Seila is a multi-donor support programme of the Royal Government of Cambodia. Funds are channeled through UNDP/UNOPS. CARERE Project was the UNDP support project to the Seila Programme.
The Seila Programme was designed to support decentralization and deconcentration of local development.

Communities are provided with procedures and capacity building to formulate commune development plans (CDP).

At the same time, provincial investment funds (PIF) are allocated to the provinces to provide services, through the line departments, to communities based on their CDP. The provincial rural development committee (PRDC) manages the programme at the provincial level. Commune councils are also provided with funds, commune development funds (CDF), to implement projects based on their CDP.

The Seila Programme supports a multi-sectoral approach to local development with the PRDC acting as the coordinating body, thus is a programme for institutional strengthening of local governance within the context of the decentralization and deconcentration (Seila Task Force, 2000: 9).

Experiences at the provincial and commune levels were fed back to the national level to assist them develop policies on decentralization and deconcentration. The four programme principles of dialogue, clarity, agreement and respect provide a framework for such communication (see chapter 17).

The second phase of the Seila Programme (2001-2005) has identified three cross cutting issues, which required strategic planning. In 2003, Seila commenced implementation of its Natural Resource and Environment Management (NREM) mainstreaming strategy, one of the three priority issues, which aimed to facilitate effective mainstreaming of NREM at national (policy), provincial (programme) and commune (project) levels.

---

1 CARERE- Cambodian Area Regeneration and Rehabilitation Project.
2 After the historic elections of February 2002 elected Commune/Sangkat Councils were established as local governance bodies.
3 Poverty Reduction; Gender; Natural Resource and Environment Management.
The NREM strategy has three components:

- The **concepts** underlying NREM as a governance issue;
- The **structure** which must own the concepts and transform them into plans and programmes; and
- The **system** through which implementation is managed.

To facilitate the implementation of the strategy by the three administrative levels of government, emphasis is being placed on awareness raising, capacity building, feedback, planning, and resource mobilization to mainstream NREM within the Seila programme. At the grass-roots level, the project works specifically with Commune Councils and builds their capacity to consider and include NREM issues into the commune development plan and commune investment plans.

At the national level, the Ratanakiri project, a pioneer project working on community based natural resource management (CBNRM) has worked within the Seila Programme with a focus on NREM and decentralization. Experiences from Ratanakiri have been shared and used as a basis to expand NREM mainstreaming to an additional three provinces in the country. The lessons from these pilots will feed into national policy dialogue on NREM within the Seila Programme.

**EXAMPLES FROM WORK IN RATANAKIRI PROVINCE**

In Ratanakiri, concession and private owners who are non-indigenous displaced indigenous communities, whose lives depend on natural resources. Government officials found themselves balancing between personal gains, community needs and national policies and laws, which give government control over resources. Initially, the needs of communities were often not heard or given little consideration. The history of resource conflicts was long. Figure 1 presents some core problems identified by select stakeholders at local, provincial and NGO/IO levels in one workshop.
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- Unsustainable use of forests and land
- Loss of culture and livelihoods
- Conflict of resource users’ rights

Figure 1. Problems regarding resource conflicts

The Seila Programme, supported by CARERE, in Ratanakiri, in cooperation with other stakeholders, formulated a project based on existing natural resource problems in the province. Implementation of the new Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Project was led by the Department of Environment, and funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) through the Seila Programme. Specific objectives of the CBNRM project are provided in Figure 2.
OVERALL OBJECTIVE:
To establish community based natural resource management as the basis of an integrated planning approach to sustainable natural resource development in Ratanakiri province

Objective 1  
Raise awareness of provincial department and authorities

Objective 2  
Raise awareness and empower local communities

Objective 3  
Ensure power dialogue between community members and provincial government

Objective 4  
Gain recognition for traditional natural resource management systems

Objective 5  
Initiate / influence policy making

Strategy 1. Study tours
2. Village to Village exchange unit
3. Workshop
4. Meeting/Discussions with community

Strategy 1. Village meeting
2. Role play and drama
3. Contribution to non-formal education class
4. Study tours
5. Village to village exchange

Strategy 1. Workshop
2. Discussions
3. Meetings
4. Training

Strategy 1. Research traditional land use systems
2. Mapping traditional land use
3. Present traditional land use management to provincial authorities

Strategy 1. Workshop
2. Contribution to land and forest laws
3. Supporting consultation with community policy making to ensure community voice is heard by policy

Figure 2: Overview of the CBNRM Project, Ratanakiri.

During the process of the CBNRM project communities were able to present their customary land use and traditional resource management systems. Participatory land use planning approaches were used to map the community user areas.

In order for communities in the CBNRM project to move towards effectively managing their natural resources, it was important that they had a sense of communal ownership over the resources through a:

- Common understanding of how to use and manage resources, and
- A common understanding of how to use and distribute benefits from resources.
- The security of long term ownership rights.
- The support of national and sub-national authorities for the enforcement of community rules and regulations.
In order for this to happen the project had to influence decision-making at different levels and work with the government. This local approach has strongly influenced the Seila NREM mainstreaming strategies.

RATANAKIRI: A THREE-TIERED GOVERNANCE APPROACH

In order to be able to work successfully on CBNRM, the project in Ratanakiri needed to work at three levels: the national level, without whose approval the province would not be likely to implement activities; the provincial level, to implement the project; and the community level, who were the target group to receive the benefits of the project.

At the national level, two approaches were adopted to build understanding on issues related to NREM. The first approach was to be involved in advocacy by establishing linkages with important government institutions, and committees as well as civil bodies involved in policy dialogue. The second approach was to build the awareness of policy makers by bringing community members to visit them or to bringing policy makers to visit community to discuss issues face to face. Forums where these kinds of discussions could take place were set up by the project in collaboration with other projects.

At the provincial level, the project assisted the province to develop projects with participation from NGOs, IOs and communities and provided resources to conduct research studies. The project worked in partnership with the Provincial Rural Development Committee (PRDC), chaired by the governor and comprising of all department heads. The PRDC is the highest coordinating body in the province, and as an inter-departmental body it acts as a forum where departments can meet and discuss issues in an open and fair manner, and make joint decisions following the Seila principles. The project assisted the province to deal with emerging NREM related problems as well as adopting existing projects to fit with the changing situation and legal framework.

At the community level the project learnt that it was important for communities to be able to present their situation themselves and negotiate for their rights. As a result the project, through provincial partners, has assisted communities to map traditional user areas, and to develop rules to use and manage these areas. Intensive capacity building, technical and other support were provided to enable communities to present this information to the provincial authorities for endorsement and assistance in enforcing rules and regulations. Links between the provincial and community level have also been established.

KEY LESSONS ON GOVERNANCE AND CBNRM FROM RATANAKIRI

In the late 1990s communes and villages experienced two very different planning processes, one with a bias towards infrastructure development, the other focused on longer term issues. The formal planning process, now known as CDP/CIP planning
(discussed below), tended to focus on an investment project that would meet the short or medium term needs of a community. The CBNRM process, which was a more process oriented, longer term visioning approach, tended to enable villagers to get to the root of their issues (i.e. land grabbing, conflicts over resources, livelihood issues). In the CBNRM process people's connection to the land, fish and forest were quite clear; however, in the formal planning process of CDP/CIP such needs were seldom included. As a result, the Seila/Ratanakiri Programme emphasized the need to consider natural resource management as a governance issue, and sought to integrate environmental issues into the CIP/CDP planning process (see chapter 14). Following this decision the team experimented with how to integrate these two planning approaches, and the current NREM mainstreaming approach draws heavily from these lessons on governance.

The Ratanakiri project would not have been able to influence the provincial level if it had not been part of the accepted government structure. Although working with the government can be slow and frustrating, it can produce more sustainable results with impacts over the long term.

WHAT IS NREM MAINSTREAMING?

The initial application of NREM mainstreaming uses a series of tools to provide inputs into existing commune development plans (CDP). It is designed to enable environmental priorities to be part of the CDP if communes are interested in pursuing such issues. The overall development objective of the mainstreaming NREM project is:

Achieving sustainable management of natural resources and the environment, assuring secure and equitable access to land and natural resources, and creating opportunities for natural resource related economic activities, thus contributing to poverty reduction.

Commune councils are responsible for planning within their administrative boundaries: each council prepares a CDP every five years, and an annual commune/sangkat 3-year rolling investment programme (CIP). Procedures for NREM mainstreaming within commune councils are being piloted in 40 communes in
three provinces (Pursat, Siem Reap and Kratie) through the Seila Programme. Since communes have already prepared their CDP, piloting is taking place with 40 commune councils to integrate NREM within their CIP process, thereby enabling potential donors and government agencies to fund natural environmental activities such as tree planting and community fisheries through participation in an annual district integration workshop (DIW) and through the provincial investment funds (PIF).

In order to mainstream NREM a technical facilitation team (TFT), comprised of members from different government departments at the provincial level, works with members from the provincial and district facilitation teams (PFT and DFT respectively), who are responsible for helping the planning and budgeting committee (PBC) of the commune council prepare their annual CIP plan. Sometimes the TFT works directly with PBCs and then works with the PFT to integrate NREM into the CIP process; at other times, both these plans can be done at the same time. Figure 3 illustrates how NREM mainstreaming can take place.

---

Footnote:
6 These two paragraphs are taken from: Marschke 2004.
Communes and villages can work on NREM while fitting into governance structures. A legal support instrument and detailed process explains how to formulate commune NREM and related committees, and how existing NREM related committees (many of which already exist in Cambodia i.e. community fisheries, community forestry etc.) can be adapted into this process. NREM projects or activities identified as a priority in a CDP or CIP through a mainstreaming process, are subsequently implemented by the commune NREM committees using the commune/sangkat NREM additional fund. The district integration workshop provides further support from departments, NGOs/IOs and private sectors.

Ideas are starting to emerge from CC / PBC on how to use these funds (Table 1 shows selected examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NREM $ 1000</th>
<th>Allocation Planned Or Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One commune introduced a credit system for a small number of families to collect rattan vines growing in rice fields, and to make them into mats. Collecting and using the vines is an alternative to burning them and helps to cope with problem of dependent rain fed rice cultivated in the area. The group are currently searching for a market.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing fruit trees, as a means of stopping people from cutting fruit trees in the forest.</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building village-level awareness around NREM issues</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish and strengthen existing community forestry and fishery.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agro-forestry, compost to improve soil fertility for rice cultivation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is encouraging to see communities design and implement their own strategies around NREM activities and awareness raising, and it is critical that facilitators support such a process in a meaningful way. Lessons from Ratanakiri demonstrated that communities themselves needed support to improve their capacity for self-negotiation. The NREM mainstreaming project is working towards providing greater support to communes. However, given the wide scale and coverage, it is not possible to use the same intensive approach used in Ratanakiri. The project is working towards enhancing facilitation support in a sustainable manner.
REFLECTION ON IMPLEMENTING THIS NREM PROCESS

Implementation of the NREM mainstreaming strategy within the Seila Programme has been in effect for almost two years. Mainstreaming NREM needs to have good governance at all levels, and because it is a cross cutting issue it requires multi-sectoral collaboration to ensure implementation by a multi-disciplinary team. During the implementation period a multi-disciplinary approach has been taken and various ministries and departments formed a core team for implementation of the NREM strategy. Nevertheless, key issues emerged, as detailed below:

Capacity building issues around mainstreaming NREM into governance

- Capacity building is difficult with departments with no direct NREM mandate.
- Integrating NREM in planning for all sectors following the standard planning process is difficult.
- Coordinating activities across sectors and promoting horizontal dialogue between sectors is complex. There is a need for intermediary facilitation.
- Government structures are normally top-down and will need time to build their capacity to listen to communities.
- Government procedures normally consist of ticking boxes or filling in data sheets in a mechanical manner, while NREM needs the facilitator to analyse the situation and assist communities come to a 'considered' decision, which needs more effort from the staff.
- Mainstreaming NREM into governance requires policies and laws that consider community needs.

Capacity building with NREM-TFT Team

- Facilitators are not yet comfortable with participatory approaches.
- There is tension within the TFTs between those that want to follow the guidelines exactly (training manuals and CIP process) and those who want to experiment and consider what it makes sense to do.
- The team leaders are not always providing enough 'back-stopping' support for field workers, being more concerned (or overwhelmed) by the paper work involved in such a process.
- It seems to be challenging for facilitators to encourage a diversity of commune projects to be supported. Often, what one commune suggests is replicated in
other communes. Is this because the needs are the same or because the facilitators do not probe enough to get at the 'real' needs of each commune?

3 Linkages to personal benefits. Trainers may be doing the minimum required rather than ensuring that a process is working effectively.

3 Training is not about providing solutions but rather about providing a learning environment, where ideas are discussed. This is a new approach, and takes time for both facilitators and communes to see the value of it.

3 Many of these issues are related to the limitations of the rigid, limited time framework of the CIP process, meaning that facilitators do not feel they have the flexibility to really ensure livelihood discussions take place.

3 The process and teams face a dilemma: if they work within the framework, some of the creativity is lost; if they work outside the framework, there may be conflicts between teams and it is even more challenging to integrate NREM issues into the CIP plans.

Capacity building issues around mainstreaming NREM into community

3 Community representatives need to feel accountable to their constituents.

3 Integrating NREM into all sectors following the standard planning process is difficult.

3 Community members often lack confidence to discuss issues with authorities due to lack of knowledge on legal rights, legal instruments etc. This is especially challenging when partners are illiterate.

3 It is difficult for local communities to understand mainstreaming NREM / legal terms/concepts / because of language. People often want to see an immediate benefit without recognizing that it takes time to implement some of the suggested solutions, especially for NREM. Discussions on theoretical aspects appear to bore communities, but are essential for their understanding.

LESSON LEARNED FROM TWO YEARS OF NREM MAINSTREAMING

As NREM mainstreaming into the Seila Programme has been implemented for only two years it is too early to draw conclusive lessons learned. However, lessons and challenges we have identified particularly pertinent are:
Mainstreaming natural resource and environmental management: the Seila decentralization programme

**Cross-sector support**
Mainstreaming natural resource and environmental management needs to be embedded within all institutions, including institutions without a direct NREM mandate.

**New policies**
Creating national policy that recognizes the legal requirements for local governance is an important step in decentralization and natural resource management.

**A flexible approach**
Integration of NREM/CCB-NREM into government planning processes (i.e. national, provincial and commune development planning and programmes) cannot be implemented mechanically by following set procedures and establishing structures.

**NEW WAYS OF WORKING TAKE TIME**

Shifting attitudes is difficult, especially in the Cambodian cultural context, where questioning superiors is discouraged. Given time, and the right approach, those with 'power' can recognize the benefits of 'power' sharing, but this attitude change is possible only when partners understand and appreciate the approach.

Mainstreaming NREM into local level planning processes (i.e. the CIP/CDP process) is a huge first step. The approach taken is as much a 'sensitizing' approach, in this case surrounding NREM issues, as an approach to ensure that NREM issues are included in local level planning.

Bringing in PRA tools helps the CC to analyse their NRM situation. The current framework limits options as it is inflexible, focuses on infrastructure, has limited time to invest, is output-oriented, and there is little attention to the process. CBNRM, on the other hand, aims to be a process-based approach and it can be a challenge to balance these two approaches. One consideration, for the commune councils, is to think of how they can start to deal with NREM issues on their own, possibly through providing financial incentives. This may enable the community to own the process more, and potentially enables the community-based aspect to emerge. The scale of many CBNRM projects is small, enabling them to focus on process-based
approaches. However, the NREM mainstreaming approach aims at a much larger scale and it is a challenge to facilitate. A key issue is how to integrate NREM at a larger scale whilst enabling a reflective process to take place.

**MANAGING FUNDS**

Many projects stop at the end of a funding cycle; however, the Seila Programme is building awareness of NREM, with the aim that commune councils will take into account environmental considerations in the long term. Whilst infrastructure projects like roads and schools may be prioritized initially, over time NREM projects might also be considered.

There is a risk of misspent money or inappropriately spent money when allocating to the provincial government departments. PIF funds are allocated to the appropriate government department that are usually the service-provider for many commune-level projects. In Ratanakiri, a group of facilitators ensured that this process worked by providing support on how to implement the project, and manage budgets. Departments that support new ideas and projects in principle may have little idea of how to facilitate and implement such a project in reality and may waste valuable funds. A critical question arises: is the PIF allocation an effective way to do NREM mainstreaming if there is inadequate support to follow up on how these funds are being spent?

**PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

Creating commune plans is not enough. Advocacy and conflict-resolution processes need to be incorporated into any governance approach, and are lacking. The process, as currently designed, supports commune level planning and implementation of prioritised needs without providing any mechanisms for conflict resolution. A combination of approaches is most likely required to solve conflicts. Maps are used in Ratanakiri as evidence of land conflict or NREM issues to negotiate with the province, but in order to successfully negotiate there needs to be a lot of networking to bring a village or commune-level case to policy makers. The challenge then becomes how to incorporate an advocacy angle into NREM mainstreaming.
At a practical level, government staff are not necessarily committed to providing the support they are mandated to provide. This requires constant negotiation and facilitation. A challenge for local governance is how to ensure departments actually look after local resources.

In addition, there is a need to enable experimentation to take place, and to avoid being too rigid about what is said or not said in the law. This conflict is played out between the commune policy and the Forest Administration (FA) policy. According to the commune law, the commune council has the right to confiscate logs if they report this immediately to the FA. The FA, however, argues that this is illegal. There needs to be more training, and awareness raising, between government staff that reflects on what the law says and what the rights are of local communities. That is, not all laws are harmonized and it is important for staff to know that communities also have rights. Moreover, the laws need to be compared with what actually happens 'on the ground'.

**LINKAGES BETWEEN NREM MAINSTREAMING AND CBNRM**

NREM mainstreaming is a chance to legitimize CBNRM activities through governance structures. In Cambodia, the support of the commune council and other 'power' figures is essential to implement CBNRM at the field level. Therefore, using the CIP/CDP planning process is a critical, strategic step within any CBNRM process.

While supporting civil society movements is important, local governance structures cannot be ignored. The current approach of working directly with communities, that many NGOs and other projects follow, often bypasses these structures. These projects should also work with these communities to promote an awareness of what they can expect from their commune councillors, for example in the area of NREM, and also support commune councils in learning how to better facilitate and support grass-roots CBNRM processes.
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Chapter 5
Fisheries policy reform and legal framework for community fisheries
By Thay Somony, Sim Bunthoeun and So Srey Mom

INTRODUCTION

Cambodia's fisheries and wetland habitats vitally support millions of people in terms of food, income and livelihoods. Together with rice, fisheries form the backbone of Cambodia's food security, accounting for 75% of animal protein consumption as well as providing invaluable revenue and full or part time employment to around 2 million people, especially rural households that still comprise almost 90% of the country's poor. In fact, the contribution of 'freshwater capture fisheries' to national food security and the Cambodian economy is deemed higher than in any other country in the Southeast Asian region. But, in spite of the rich natural resource in the 1.8 million-hectare freshwater system, composed of rivers and lakes, flooded forests, grasslands, rice fields, and swamps, this region of Cambodia has remained one of the poorest in the country. Around 38% of the population in the Tonle Sap Lake communities live below the poverty line.

However, there is growing pressure on fisheries resources as a result of the increasing number of fishing gears and over-intensive fishing. This has caused overexploitation of the fisheries resources. In addition, the clearance of flooded forests have destroyed or damaged important fish habitats.

This paper will look at various aspects of fisheries management in Cambodia including:

- Important contributions of fisheries resources in Cambodia
- Threats to sustainability of fisheries resources in Cambodia
- Brief historical context of fisheries management in Cambodia and fisheries policy reform in Cambodia

---
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IMPORTANCE OF FISHERY RESOURCES IN CAMBODIA

In many ways, fisheries resources including fish, crab, frog, aquatic vegetables, aquatic animals, flooded forests and so on, are of importance to all socio-economic groups of Cambodian people (in terms of food security, family income and national economy). These resources play an important role in ecological systems and are valued for eco-tourism and culture. The Tonle Sap Great Lake is the largest freshwater lake in Southeast Asia and is connected to the Mekong River via the 120km long Tonle Sap River. At its lowest time the Tonle Sap covers some 250,000 hectares, and at the height of the flooding season this swells to over a million hectares with a depth of 8-9 metres. The 250,000-430,000 tonnes of fish that the lake provides has a landing value of approximately $150-$200 million. The Tonle Sap freshwater fisheries production ranks fourth in the world after India, China, and Bangladesh.

FOOD SECURITY

Second only to rice, fish is a vital and generally affordable food source that accounts for more than 75% of the population’s intake of animal protein: an average of 67 kg. of fish is consumed per person/annum in fish dependent communities (compared to a national average of 151 kg of rice per year). The fresh water capture fisheries’ contribution to national food security and the economy in Cambodia is higher than in any other country in the region. Presently it is difficult to obtain 67 kg of annual animal protein intake. People have to spend more time to catch fish for their daily consumption or they have to...
have money to buy fish for their daily protein intake. Sometimes, and in some cases, people are forced to use different fishing gears and modern fishing methods in order to catch sufficient fish. Many villagers in upland areas have already stopped catching fish due to the decline of the fishery resources in their area and the increase in human population. However, people in rural areas still need fish to eat for their additional protein intake even if the amount is less than usual.

**INCOME/ LIVELIHOOD**

Over 2 million people derive employment from the fisheries sector and related activities. Fishing provides a diversified livelihood base in order to buffer the family economy during times of distress (such as drought, pest outbreaks or flood). The Tonle Sap Lake and flood plain alone are home to an estimated 1.2 million people of whom around 25% live in floating villages or raised houses with little or no access to farmland. Such a heavy reliance upon fisheries reflects the critical need to ensure equitable access to and protection of this resource.

**NATIONAL ECONOMY**

Rich fishing areas (fishing lots), introduced by the French in 1864, are auctioned bi-annually for national income collection. Recent estimates by the MRC Capture Fisheries Project at the Department of Fisheries show that inland fisheries can produce 290,000-430,000 tons of fish each year with an estimated value at landing of US$150-200 million, representing considerable revenue for the Royal Government of Cambodia. A recent estimate by the Ministry of Planning calculated that fisheries contribute up to 16% of Cambodia’s GDP. The government and the whole of
Cambodia should benefit from the potentially vast revenue to be derived from fisheries.

**ECOLOGICAL AND HABITAT CONSERVATION**

The ultimate sources of the enormous fish production in Cambodia are the floodplains, in particular the unique flooded forests, which are vast tracts of forest that are inundated with water in the monsoon season to create forest lakes up to 10m deep. These flooded forests are enormously complex and fertile habitats, rich in food and serve as refuges for fish, birds, turtles and a myriad of other species associated with wetlands. These flooded forests are the focus of migration for large numbers of fish species that come from across the Lower Mekong Basin to spawn, and have adjusted the timing of their spawning to the onset of monsoon, so that fry and juveniles are ready to enter the plains when they are flooded. Crucially, many fishing lots rely on catching these migrants in massive *dais* “bag nets” as they return at the end of the wet season. There are also large numbers of non-migratory fish that have more limited movement patterns, progressing from the flooded forest to the permanent water bodies as the water recedes.

**ECO-TOURISM**

The Tonle Sap Lake, with its flooded forest, spectacular flocks of rare water birds (particularly around Preak Toal), and unique floating villages, along with its proximity to Angkor Wat, provides great potential for tourism and a significant source of foreign currency for the Cambodian economy. This eco-tourism has started an enthusiasm for visitors to discover the richness of Tonle Sap ecosystems and floating communities.

**CULTURE**

Cambodia’s wetlands, lakes, rivers and forests have formed the cornerstone of Khmer civilization for centuries. The Tonle Sap and the vast inland fisheries have helped establish the Cambodian national identity and continue to do so to this day. Such is the importance of fish to Khmer people that it is reflected in the proverb “*mian teuk mian trey*” meaning “where there is water, there is fish”. Fisheries are also significant
to farmers who visit the open access areas from December to March, before the rice is harvested, to fish for household consumption. In general, farmers use small scale or traditional fishing gear and fish are either processed into fish paste, sun-dried fish “Trey Prolak”, and smoked fish “Trey Chha Eur”. Some farmers will trade or exchange fish with local fishers. This traditional behaviour still exists today, and helps to maintain the relationship between people in the upland areas and local fishers. Sometimes, romantic relationships blossom during these fish and rice exchanges and young couples from different backgrounds become married, on approval from their families.

WOMEN AND CHILDREN

Women are 12% more likely than men to be active in subsistence agriculture, fisheries and related occupations. For many families almost all members of the household participate in fishing, fish selling, fish processing and equipment construction and many other activities related to fishing throughout the year. Often women are most active in on-shore activities including repairing fishing gear, such as bamboo frames and nets, and grading fish by size and species. In a number of areas children also assist the family. Some women, especially widows who are the head of the household, work extremely hard. Widows are always assisted by their children in fishing activities, resulting in a negative social impact: these children cannot go to school. In the floating villages, almost 95% of children leave school within grades 3 to 5 of primary school to help their families with household chores, including fishing. Women's roles in fishing activities are declining, as fishery resources are decreasing from day to day.
THREATS TO FISHERY RESOURCES IN CAMBODIA

Cambodia’s fisheries resources have been subjected to overexploitation, intensive fishing, weak institutions, increasing population and more. From 2000-2001, the Tonle Sap Great Lake and freshwater fishery was threatened by illegal fishing methods, which were widespread across all open access and release areas. However, fishers were happy to fish as much as they could since 56% of the total fishing lots were released to be open access fishing areas so fishers had a much larger fishing ground. The management of community fisheries was not clear to people living in floating villages due, in part, to a weak institutional management process.

Threats to fisheries resources in Cambodia are described as follows:

Illegal Fishing Activities

Numerous illegal activities exist ranging from the use of prohibited small scale fishing gear and the use of electricity, poison, explosives and water pumps, to the massive encroachment of fishing lots into public access areas. For small and medium scale fishers the basic requirement of subsistence and income can be the driving force in using illegal methods, whilst large-scale fishing operations may resort to illegal methods because the acquisition of fishing lots and commercial scale equipment are costly and the allocation’s two year time limit is very strict. The military and police are also frequently implicated in illegal fishing.

One of the main reasons attributed to over fishing is population growth. In 1992 the population was approximately 5 million, and estimates today put the national
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population at 13 million. Fishers around the Tonle Sap Great Lake have increased from 0.5 million to 1.2 million. As the population increases, over fishing remains an issue in the Tonle Sap Great Lake, along the Mekong River and in the coastal zone. People strive for better living conditions for their families as part of the modernization and globalisation process, and this is threatening the fisheries resources.

Beside population growth, a number of agricultural farmers have changed their profession to fishing due to harsh weather conditions such as floods and droughts, which have damaged crops for the last three years. Competition for the declining resources has led to people trying to find ways that they can catch more fish than their neighbour. Population increase is twofold: in-country population growth, and former farmers who have become fishers. Local communities' needs are very high and the urban population also need this resource as well.

**BIODIVERSITY AND HABITAT LOST**

Natural habitats, particularly flooded forests, have the highest productivity of all fisheries, and therefore deforestation or conversion to agricultural land has a marked negative effect on fish stocks. The regeneration of both migratory and non-migratory fish stocks and the future of the capture fishery, depend on the flooded plains as spawning grounds, nurseries and feeding grounds. The destruction of the flooded forest will also have a direct impact on the globally threatened storks and ibises that use the tall trees for nesting.

**POLLUTION**

In 2000, around 1.3 million litres (Oxfam America, EJF 2002) of pesticides were used in the Tonle Sap catchment area, many of which were highly hazardous chemicals (including DDT) illegally imported from neighbouring countries. Fish samples taken from the Lower Mekong Basin indicate a considerable concentration of pesticide residues, with the highest concentration found in catfish species, one of the most commercially valuable taxa in the Mekong. The widespread use of fertilizers in the dry season could also affect the ecology of the lake, causing the temporarily deprivation of oxygen for plants and fish, and in some cases, even causing fish to die.
FISHING LOT CONFLICTS

Fisheries conflicts prevail in Cambodia due to competing claims on the fisheries resources arising from commercial interests, a growing subsistence population, illegal fishing and demands for agricultural land, water and fuel wood. Conflict has occurred between fishing lot employees, local authorities, military, police and local communities and has been visible as protests, petitions, “fish-ins”, arrests and detention for forced labour, confiscations of fishing gear and livestock, injuries, serious human rights abuses and reported killings of fishermen and fisheries officers.

In many instances, local people are denied access to areas within lots that have been legally designated for their use and may have been fished for generations. There are also reported incidents of conflict over water and fish in reservoirs. As the water retreats lot owners sometimes illegally pump the remaining recession ponds dry in order to extract the fish. This leaves no water in these ponds for irrigation in the dry season, and local communities suffer as a result.

The lack of clarity over lot boundaries means that fishers are sometimes accused of poaching even when they are in open access areas. Common property areas are seized for private gain, occasionally with the use of intimidation, weapons, and military and police involvement. Rarely do conflicts come to the courts for resolution and evidence is not brought forward for examination.

DAMS AND WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

Dams and waters can have a severe impact on flooding, water quality, navigation and food production in downstream countries, and can affect fisheries above the dam by preventing fish migrations. A decline in the fish productivity of Cambodia's lakes and rivers will have a basin-wide impact since the long distance migrant species move between Cambodia, Vietnam, Lao PDR and even China. It is also apparent that widespread logging, mining and unsustainable agriculture throughout the basin, particularly in upland areas, are degrading the watershed, increasing erosion and modifying hydrological regimes.
HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT

Generally, fisheries resources management has been influenced and determined by the different past and present political and management regimes of Cambodia. Each management system has had both positive and negative impacts on livelihoods and the status of fisheries resources.\(^5\)

Management of fisheries in Cambodia includes formal and informal arrangements governing fishing access, rights and practices. This management system can be traced back to the reign of King Norodom (1859-1897) and his predecessors. Under each of their reigns, revenue from the fishing sector was collected through the selling of user rights to fishing areas. In addition, the King can issue fishing concessions to investors and traders and they can sub-lease their fishing concession to fishers.

The first fishery laws and regulations were written and published in 1908, under the French colonial administration. However, the purpose of this legislation was to generate revenue for the colonial administration, not necessarily to change existing patterns of fisheries exploitation.\(^6\)

During the Democratic Kampuchea regime (1975-1979), fishing activity was very limited. There were only a few designated 'fishing units' that harvested and processed fish to supply the cooperatives (Sahakor) and senior Khmer Rouge cadres in Phnom Penh.\(^7\) Fisheries resources were under pressure in favour of agricultural development that involved widespread clearing of inundated forests.\(^8\)
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\(^7\) Bruce and Prom 2002:54 and FACT 2002:40
\(^8\) FACT 2002:40
After the collapse of the Democratic Kampuchea regime in 1979, collective fishing was encouraged until the late 1980s under both the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK) (1979-89) and State of Cambodia (SOC) (1989-93). During this time Cambodia's fisheries management was managed through a system of solidarity groups called “Krom Samaki”. In the late 1980s, a fishing concession system was reintroduced as a management tool and to raise revenue. This system was similar to the past system that existed for more than a century prior to the rise of the Democratic Kampuchea regime. In 1987 Law No.33 was adopted, which defines a framework for fisheries management.\(^9\)

1993-2000 was a transitional period from war to peace and from a centrally planned economy to an export-driven and free market economy. During this period, the Department of Fisheries (DoF), within the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, was given regulatory authority to manage, protect, conserve and develop fisheries resources. In addition, now DoF is responsible for enforcing regulations, granting concessions and issuing licenses, collecting fees from these activities and controlling fish processing, trade, and export activities.

During 1998-2000, most fishing lot owners, after successful bidding, sub-leased the fishing lots to fishing operators by dividing the fishing areas. Though this was illegal according to the fisheries law, enforcement was not effectively exercised. During the same period research fishing lots were introduced, giving lot owners an excuse for taking a commission. This was one of the main reasons for the fisheries policy reform in October 2000. Conflicts and disputes arose between fishing lot owners and fishermen due to an increased population of fishermen, encroachment of public fishing areas, and indiscriminate seizures by fishing lot owners.

**FISHERIES POLICY REFORMS**

Fisheries management in Cambodia has faced problems for many years with the bias for large-scale commercial exploitation and revenue generation causing resource conflicts in many provinces around the Tonle Sap Great Lake and Mekong River systems. Most management problems are related to issues of governance including corruption among law enforcers and local officials, low financial returns to the

\(^9\) Thay, 2002.
government, as well as inequitable distribution of economic benefits from the resources. While these problems continue to threaten food security in Cambodia, the ecological impacts are becoming more obvious as evident in declines in certain fish populations due to intensive fishing practices.

In October 2001, the Prime Minister made an unexpected decision to release parts, or whole areas, of fishing lots to local communities. This fisheries policy reform can be attributed to growing tension and conflicts between fishing lot owners and local fishermen in the preceding three years and motivation by the government to present itself well for the 2002 commune elections, as well as the National Assembly elections, in July 2003.

Presently, there is a new and challenging task for the Department of Fisheries (DoF), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), government and local fishermen, local authorities and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other stakeholders; to implement the new concept of community fisheries or fisheries co-management. The recent promulgation of the new fisheries law has highlighted efforts of the RGC to move away from current practices and adopt a more community-based resource management approach.\(^\text{10}\)

**ISSUES AND CHALLENGES**

Local communities, donors and other stakeholders regard the fisheries policy reform as a popular and good move. However, many issues and constraints face the effective implementation of the reform. A case study by Thay (2002) and preliminary field research by the Policy Reform Impact Assessment Project (DFID - DoF) revealed that failure to provide support and resources to implement the reforms could undermine whatever benefits have been derived. This is because in the legal, institutional and administrative vacuum that currently exists in Cambodia, the rich, powerful and influential are able to subvert the intent of the reforms.

According to a government policy statement, one of the main objectives of fishery reform is to improve food security and reduce poverty of local, dependent fishers. But
livelihood improvement and poverty reduction through this fisheries reform may not be possible because a poor fisherman does not have sufficient money to purchase modern fishing equipment that can be used to catch more fish. In contrast, the rich fishermen are grabbing the opportunity to intensify exploitation by buying new materials and increasing fishing efforts to harvest ever larger fish catches.

Furthermore, policy reform is no guarantee of an improvement in the management system without a vast improvement in transparency, freedom of information and effective implementation through a fairly paid and well-trained civil service. Around 56% of the commercial lots were permanently released to communities but without legislative structures, funding or training to support the establishment of community fisheries in these areas they effectively became open access areas, leading to confusion over access rights, alleged uncontrolled exploitation and illegal fishing.

Concerns have been raised that there has been undue haste to develop community fisheries in order to fill the vacuum left after the removal of lot ownership. In the absence of immediate action this could lead to problems due to poor understanding of the concepts, a lack of vital information such as maps, fish catch and stock levels, fishers' needs and environmental considerations, together with a failure to develop and implement effective regulations and structures. There is now a clear imperative to enhance self-help capacities such as developing the ability to analyse issues, communicate, organize, negotiate and plan. This challenge falls on the Community Fisheries Development Office, who is responsible for facilitating and coordinating with Provincial Community Fisheries Development Units, NGOs, local authorities and especially with local villagers to implement community fisheries successfully and efficiently.

**CONSULTATION PROCESS**

Following consultations with fishing communities, NGOs and the Royal Government of Cambodia, efforts have begun to make essential policy improvements towards the creation of a clear and robust legal framework that will allow the establishment of community fisheries management in specified areas.
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The Community Fisheries Sub-decree was drafted in the early stages of the fisheries reform to support the establishment of community fisheries and is currently awaiting approval from the Council of Ministers. The same applies for the new draft Fisheries Law. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is providing a major loan to Cambodia for community fisheries development around Tonle Sap areas. Technical assistance will be provided by the ADB for reviewing and carrying out a legal framework and policy for Tonle Sap fisheries management.

Following strong recommendations from the Consultative Group’s bi-annual meeting at the RGC Council of Ministers on 28 January 2003, the Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) is cooperating with Oxfam GB, Oxfam America and WWF to consult with local fishing communities, Provincial Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Departments, local authorities, Fisheries Officers and other relevant stakeholders on the Community Fisheries Sub-decree.

The current draft fishery law is considered adequate and enforceable, and was based on a revision of the former fisheries law implemented by the Department of Fisheries, Oxfam GB and Oxfam America, with the support of a World Bank loan to the Department of Fisheries. This draft fisheries law is now completed and has been handed over to the Department of Fisheries and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

**ENFORCEMENT AND MONITORING**

Enforcement will be attempted differently in different communities and will depend to a large degree on the relationship between the community, the authorities and other stakeholders. Community management does not mean that areas are managed by communities to the exclusion of the government; serious offences will continue to require the involvement of the relevant authorities.

The Community Fisheries Sub-decree calls upon communities to report on and collaborate with fishing and local authorities to crack down and confiscate illegal equipment. This places an onus on the community to enforce fisheries regulations but does not in itself necessarily empower communities to act, especially when confronted with violent illegal fishers or others.
Some communities have stressed the need for greater powers to enforce their regulations, arguing that the length of time it takes for the relevant authorities to be informed and act against violators means that culprits are often not apprehended. There is the potential for violators to be fined, with the proceeds benefiting the larger community.

Engaging communities in enforcement is a clear means of improving governance and ensuring a greater stake in resource protection. However, it must be approached with care in order to ensure the development and implementation of transparent rules that will result in tangible benefits for the wider community.

Parallel to an improved enforcement and monitoring system is the need for the establishment of effective, fair and independent lines of recourse and resolution for all stakeholder grievances at the provincial and/or national levels. Care must be taken to ensure that laws are implemented and enforced uniformly.

**CONCLUSION**

Fisheries, a part of Cambodia's rich natural resources, are of vital importance to millions of Cambodian people, livelihoods, income, ecosystems and biodiversity. However, the list of potential threats to these invaluable fisheries resources is many and includes: an unclear legal framework, weak institutions, increasing population, and unsustainable exploitation of the resources due to poverty. The recent fisheries policy reform, parallel with the government's decentralization process, which released 56% of former fishing lots to local communities to manage, conserve, use and develop in the form of co-management, appears to be an alternative approach for sustainable livelihoods and fisheries resource improvement. But there are many challenges ahead to achieve such a goal. The continued commitment and effort from the Royal Government of Cambodia is essential. Similarly, the donor community, including IOs and NGOs, must continue to provide both financial and technical assistance, in order that the ultimate goal of poverty reduction can be realized.
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Chapter 6  Community Forestry and Community Protected Area Network

By: Chean Thayuth¹ and Ou Sopheary² &³

INTRODUCTION

The Community Forestry (CF) and Community Protected Area (CPA) Network is one of the CBNRM Networks in Cambodia. Through quarterly network meetings and newsletters, the network provides a forum for practitioners at all levels to share information and experiences regarding participatory community-based forest management both inside and outside protected areas. This paper provides an overview of the evolution, benefits and problems of the network, and gives recommendations for improving the network in the future.

WHY IS THERE A CF AND CPA NETWORK?

What is networking?

There are different understandings of the meaning of "network". Starkey (1997), defines a network as any group of individuals or organizations who, on a voluntary basis, exchange information or undertake joint activities and organize themselves whilst maintaining their independence and individual autonomy. Regardless of the “Communication channels, structures and organization of a network, the main thing is that active networking takes place”.

In this paper network refers to a shared link among people who have a common purpose to develop and/or to share information and experiences.

Why has the CF and CPA Network been developed?

Natural resources, particularly forests, are essential to the web of life. They are home to millions of species, protect soil from erosion, produce oxygen and fix carbon dioxide, and help maintain regional and global climates. In Cambodia, forests are also essential to humans, especially to local communities in rural areas, for substances

¹ Thayuth is a technical assistant and project advisor for the CBNRM Learning Initiative. Prior to this, he worked with Concern Worldwide and PRASAC/European Union.
² Sopheary works for Concern Worldwide.
³ Contributions from Vaneska Litz and members of organizing committee for the CF and CPA Network.
such as food, fuel, traditional medicine and construction materials. In Cambodia, threats such as illegal or irresponsible logging and land clearance for agriculture and development are resulting in a decline in natural resources.

In 1991, the Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DFW) (now the Forestry Administration) started to encourage local villagers to participate in forest management. The DFW recognized that to ensure sustainable forest management, those who lived near the forest with livelihoods dependent on forest resources had to be included. Two CF initiatives were established: one in Kompong Tralach district, Kampong Chnang province (with financial support from Concern Worldwide, Cambodia) and the other in Tramkok district, Takeo province (with financial support by the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC)).

At that time, community forestry was a new concept in Cambodia although initiatives were spreading to other provinces including Svay Rieng, Ratanakiri, Battambang, Siem Reap and Pursat. In these early days only a few practitioners had CF expertise after attending training courses in other countries in the region. However, the practitioners lacked field experience and though community forestry was receiving strong support at the local and provincial levels, at the national level questions were still being raised of what community forestry was, and how it was implemented.

To raise awareness of the CF concept at the national level, and to enable CF practitioners to share field experiences, a network was established in 1998.

Voice of communities

At provincial, district and commune levels, networks have been developed to share different experiences among community forestry management committees, and to discuss and solve conflicts that have occurred in the field. The members of the network are primarily local communities, local authorities, NGOs, and relevant government institutions, who meet every two or three months.
Current networks are:

- Provincial Network for Natural Resource Management and Environment, Pursat;
- Provincial Network for Community Forestry, Kg. Chhnang;
- District Community Forestry Network, Dambe district, Kg. Cham;
- Forestry Network, Kratie.

Voice of NGOs

NGOs that are supporting CF and CPA development have started collaborating on activities to avoid duplicating work, they include Concern Worldwide Cambodia, Oxfam GB, WWF/CBNRM Learning Initiative, CFI/CFAC, MRC/GTZ, Mlup Baitong, FAO, NREM/PLG/SEILA, CFRP, JICA, LWF, and FFI.

Voice of donors

DANIDA and donors participate in the network meetings and indirectly provide funding for the network through Concern. DANIDA also co-chairs the Joint Royal Government of Cambodia/Donor Forestry Coordination Committee and so can communicate directly with other donors and high-ranking officials in the Forestry Administration. This is important because the network considers development assistance issues including government reform or policy changes. The Director and Deputy Director represent the FA on the committee and other donors on the committee include JICA, the World Bank and DFID.

Members

Membership of the network is open to CF/CPA practitioners, field facilitators, policy makers, local communities, IOs, NGOs, local authorities, and interested individuals. The expansion of membership was done through a mailing list. Existing members have shared information regarding the network to other interested parties who have since joined the network. Some other members are defined and invited to join as a need arises. For example, land management and military staff have been invited to
join since it is important for these people to share information with participants, and to be aware of the issues, and collaborate in solving or avoiding conflicts. Through the network local authorities have an opportunity to learn how they can implement their CF activities in accordance with the law; policy makers are able to learn about problems at the field level and can then develop legal support to secure the rights of the poor rural communities; NGOs and local authorities learn how they could provide support in response to the needs of the local communities. The network aims to hear the voices from local communities.

EXPERIENCES OF THE CF AND CPA NETWORK

The CF/CPA Network in Cambodia is a multi-institutional group devoted to the development of community based forest management so as to ensure that issues related to community forestry are widely disseminated and discussed. The network is committed to sharing information and experiences. In particular, the network encourages stakeholders to raise relevant issues and provides an open forum for discussion through a free learning environment. On the basis of issues, the network hopes to increase outputs among organizations, communities and individuals during meetings and field visits in order to further develop community forestry models in Cambodia. Issues of particular concern are sustainable livelihoods, forest management, community participation, policy-related activities and other technical subjects.

The network has frequently discussed the issue of how community forests can be managed sustainably and how to stop community members, outsiders, and adjacent villagers from cutting trees within and outside the community forest. Experience from different members contributed to the development of a community forest management plan. Recently, there have been demands from local communities for a national community-based forest management model, which can be standardized and implemented at the local level.

The network is not involved in political issues, and its objectives and goals prohibit involvement in any confrontational advocacy activities. As it is committed to promoting and developing community-based forest management, the network is interested in building linkages between or among communities, practitioners and
donors, as well as policy makers through an information-based approach and consultative manner.

Development of the network

Since the network was established in 1998 it has developed in three stages that are presented in Box 1.

**Box 1 The CF and CPA Network: past and present**

**1997**
The CF Network was initiated by collaboration between the Community Forestry Unit (CFU) of the Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DFW), and the CFU of the Department of Nature Conservation and Protection (DNCP) of the Ministry of Environment (MoE) with financial support from the Cambodian Environmental Management Project (CEMP). The meetings were usually organized at either the DFW or MoE office.

**1998-2001**
When CEMP ceased its operation in Cambodia in July 1997, the network postponed its activities for almost a year. In 1998, Concern Worldwide Cambodia, started implementing a community forestry programme, and expressed an interest in restarting the network. Concern Worldwide Cambodia agreed to provide technical and financial support to CFU/DFW and CFU/MoE to re-implement the network.

**2002-Present**
The idea to establish a permanent organizing committee for the CF Network came from a needs assessment conducted with the network's members in 2000. The proposal was revived by Concern Worldwide and presented to the network meeting in March 2002. The idea was strongly supported by the members.

The present permanent organizing committee is comprised of members from FA/CFO (formerly DFW/CFU), MoE/CPAD (formerly CFU), Concern Worldwide Cambodia, Oxfam GB, WWF/CBNRM Learning Initiative, Mlup Baitong, CFI/CFAC, and MRC/GTZ. The major roles of the committee are to lead the quarterly network meetings; to identify strategies to improve the network; and to produce the quarterly CF/CPA newsletters.

Two government institutions, FA/CFO and MoE/CPAD, have taken ownership over the network. This means that the government will take the lead since they are the responsible institutions and the network is more likely to be sustainable. The chair of the network is rotated every 6 months. Annex 1 gives an overview of the structure of the organizing committee.
The organizing committee regularly develops annual budget proposals, which are submitted to donor organizations. Current donors include Concern Worldwide Cambodia, Oxfam GB, WWF/CBNRM Learning Initiative, CFI/CFAC and MRC/GTZ. Concern also provides administrative support.

A needs assessment, carried out in 2000, suggested that meetings should be held every three months and take place in different provinces so that participants have a chance to visit and learn from other field experiences. Topics discussed focus on social and technical issues, rather than policy aspects, and include new information on CF in Cambodia. Members requested that CF experts present on specific topics at each meeting, and that each meeting should be limited to one or two specific topics or issues.

In early 2003, the name of the network was changed from the "Community Forestry Network in Cambodia" to the "Community Forestry and Community Protected Area Network in Cambodia". Under the Forestry Law of 2002, any participatory community based forest management activities are to be known as "Community Forestry", and under the Draft Law on Protected Areas, community based forest management within protected areas is called "Community Protected Areas". Since the network covers both protected and non-protected areas, the name was changed to reflect this.

**SUCCESSES**

The number of participants in the network has increased from twenty members in 1998 to 150 in 2004. Local communities' representation has increased from 15% of the total number of participants in 1998, to 47% in 2004. In addition, there is an increase in the number of NGOs and projects working in this subject area. Annex 2 summarizes the network’s meetings, including details of locations and types of participants since 1998.

"It is the first time I have participated in the CF network meeting. There are many participants with very different experiences. I think the meeting is very useful for me. I gained experiences and lessons learnt from the field visit, presentations, discussions and recommendations."

Mr. Kroch Sothun, Rolea B'ear District Governor, Kompong Chhnang province.
24 December 2002
In 1998, there were only a handful of NGOs/projects (including Concern Worldwide, LWS, AFSC, MCC, Mlup Baitong, CFRP, and SMRP), whereas now there are many more (including Oxfam GB, WWF/CBNRM Learning Initiative, CFI/CFAC, MRC/GTZ, FAO, NREM/PLG/SEILA, JICA, LWF, FFI, NGO Forum, BPS, SSP, PNKRA, EPDO, BFDK, KAFDOC, CBO, KWRA, Kunathor, and KYS).

The network has gained more attention from not only members but also donor organizations. CFI/CFAC and MRC/GTZ have both joined the organizing committee and also provide financial support to network activities.

The government has the responsibility of organizing the network. Their role is to ensure a participatory and learning approach between people from different levels and different entities regarding community based forest management.

The network is now recognized as a national network and provides support and bridges, local networks. These relationships are built through quarterly network meetings in different provinces.

The network provides a great opportunity for members to share experiences and to collaborate on certain activities. This is likely to lead to less duplication of projects.

Through the network members, especially local communities, build their skills, knowledge, experience, and confidence regarding community based forest management. At the same time, people learn different methods in conflict management and conflict resolution.

The network also allows for information and learning to be exchanged between policy-makers. Networking...

...is a key element in the efforts to promote community based forest management and it plays a central role as the basis for the formulation of necessary forestry policies.

Networking...

...of local initiatives at the provincial and regional levels is as important as their representation at the national level in order to exchange ideas and experiences from the field.

Networking...

...helps to define strategies about how best to promote community based forest management as well as how to safeguard local people's participation in the management of natural resources.

(Fichtenau, 2002)
makers and field implementers resulting in field issues and experiences being brought for discussion on policy reform at the national level. At the same time, updated information on current policy is shared with people in the field so that they can implement the policy and adopt the changes.

PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

Sometimes network meetings can be dominated by a single person or institution. Similarly, a group of people may be more aware and active than other participants. This group may be members in order to share their experience as well as learn. The objective of the network is to provide a forum for all members to share information, experiences and learning. If the network does not provide this forum it is in danger of becoming a training centre where one group comes to teach and the other comes to learn.

Theoretically, the network belongs to all members and each has a chance to contribute ideas on how they can improve the usefulness of the network. However, some members have commented that they feel dependent on the organizing committee and do not consider that the network is theirs. The purpose of the organizing committee is to organize, and ensure the flow and the future of the network is maintained. This does not mean the network only belongs to this group. Once the members do not consider the network theirs, it is hard to get them involved in network activities, such as presenting their learning in network meetings, or writing articles for the network newsletters.

The topics and levels of discussion within the network are only just reaching local communities despite the theory that the network is to focus on practical field experiences. Many of the discussions so far have been about project experiences, research and learning and also senior policy development.

Though the number of participants has increased significantly, the number of women representatives has not. Out of the original 20 participants, 3, or 15%, were women. The current membership of 150 includes 20 women, only 13% of the total participants. Thus, hearing the voice of women in the network is quite difficult as they have fewer representatives in the meetings. At the local level, it is extremely difficult
to involve women, due to culture and safety barriers. The organizing committee, which is made up of eight members, has one woman representative.

CONCLUSION

Since 1998, the CF and CPA Network has been providing a useful forum for information exchange relating to community based forest management in Cambodia. There are increasing linkages amongst government institutions, NGOs, projects and local communities. The network has achieved a great deal through meetings, presentations, discussions and field visits in diverse locations. The benefit and effectiveness of the network has been clearly demonstrated. The continuing success of the network is reliant upon the commitment of the organizing committee, open membership, flexible communication channels and multi-donor support. The number of members in the network has increased tremendously since its inception. New members are from all levels, including the donor community.

However, the network should encourage wider participation and practice of decentralization. The organizing committee should work to promote linkages between network members and develop processes to stimulate active networking with other CBNRM networks. Concrete activities are required to maintain network interest, and a mechanism to ensure the effective flow of information between national and local levels should be agreed upon. The needs assessment conducted in 2000 is an essential tool for improving the effectiveness of the network. Such assessments should be regularly conducted to ensure the progress of the network.

STRATEGIES FOR THE FUTURE

- The role of facilitators, presenters, and participants should be clearly defined and followed.
- Ground rules for the network should be developed.
- Topics for sharing and discussion should be relevant, short, simple, and attract the interest of majority of participants.
- The content of the newsletter should be relevant to its target audience, who are local communities.
The committee should assist presenters to prepare attractive and effective presentations.

Since the number of participants has significantly increased, the organizing committee should review its facilitation techniques to ensure that the flow of meetings is maintained.

Ownership among members should be promoted, and members should be encouraged to be more active.

The network should be linked to other relevant networks at national and regional levels.

Useful documents and information should be collected for, and distributed to, members. These documents should be available in Khmer.

Concise work-plans and strategies should be developed to improve the network and the newsletter.
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*Minutes of CF and CPA network meetings and organizing committee meetings.*
ANNEX 1: STRUCTURE OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

STRUCTURE OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

DONORS
- Concern Worldwide
- Oxfam GB
- WWF/CBNRM LI
- CFI - CFAC
- MRC/GTZ

CHIEF
- MoE: Srey Marona
- FA: Lao Sethaphal

ADVISORS
- WWF/CBNRM LI: Toby Carson
- Concern Worldwide: Vaneska Litz

VICE CHIEF
- MoE: Srey Marona
- FA: Lao Sethaphal

SECRETARY
- Concern Worldwide: Ou Sopheary

MEMBERS
- Concern Worldwide: Ouk Thira
- WWF/CBNRM LI: Hou Kalyan
- Oxfam GB: Hak Sarom
- Mlup Baitong: Hak Sokleap
- CFI - CFAC: Yang Phirom
- MRC/GTZ: Min Bunnara

ASSISTANTS
- CFO/FA: Peak Monau
- CPAD/DNCP/MoE: Ma Sophal

\(^4\) The Chief and the Vice Chief of the Organizing Committee are chaired by the representatives from FA and MoE and rotated every six months.
## ANNEX 2: MEETING PLACE AND DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Network Meetings</th>
<th>NGOs &amp; Projects</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>MoE</th>
<th>Local Community</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women participation</th>
<th>Place of Network Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Apr-98</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Jun-98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Aug-98</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Oct-98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-Dec-98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Feb-99</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Apr-99</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Jun-99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Aug-99</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Oct-99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Dec-99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Mar-00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Jun-00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Sep-00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Dec-00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Aug-01</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Dec-01</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Mar-02</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14-Jun-02</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Kg. Thom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12-Sep-02</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24-Dec-02</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21-Mar-03</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kratie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20-Jun-03</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pursat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08-Oct-03</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Kg. Chhnang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23-Dec-03</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kg. Thom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02-Apr-04</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jun-1 Jul-04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23-Sep-04</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>B.M. Chey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02-Dec-04</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Kg. Som</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7 Community fisheries development and networking

By: Thay Somony¹, Sim Bunthoeun² and So Sreymom³

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the concept of community fisheries, which was introduced in Cambodia in 2000, and is very new to Cambodian people, especially the fishers and farmers who rely on fisheries. The paper provides an overview of the development of community fisheries in Cambodia.

Community fisheries refers to a situation whereby the state agrees to grant rights to a local community living in or near the domain fishery, who traditionally use and whose livelihoods depend upon those fisheries resources. Rights are granted on the condition that the fishing ground is managed and utilized in a sustainable manner. Community fisheries management (CFM) is based on the commitment of the community members, who are responsible for implementation, and the cooperation of stakeholders, fisheries agencies and competent institutions, often with the support of local and international NGOs.

When the community fisheries concept was first introduced, many people confused it with the Sahakor (Cooperative) system, which was in place from 1975 to 1979. After this period a solidarity group called “Krom Samaki” managed the nation’s fisheries from 1982 to 1989. The solidarity group was formed to manage fisheries resources in lakes and was characterised by open access.

---

¹ Somony is currently the Acting Country Director for the International Crane Foundation, and was recently the Acting Chief of Community Fisheries Development (CFDO), Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF).
² Bunthoeun is a Fisheries Advocacy Officer for Oxfam America East Asia Regional Office and is based in Phnom Penh.
³ Srey Mom is a Team Leader of the CBNRM Learning Initiative (WWF, IDRC, Oxfam, RECOFTC), which focuses on capacity building, networking, lesson learning and policy support.
and shared fishing rights. However, the “Krom Samaki” resource management system was not successful due to weak management and lack of commitment from community chairpersons in leading, and being responsible for, the community. The bad experiences during the “Krom Samaki” period have led communities to be reluctant to participate in new community fisheries activities and many people, including stakeholders, local authorities, fisheries staff, and NGOs, do not clearly understand the concept of community fisheries management.

A community fishery was first established in Cambodia in Svay Rieng province in 1994, initiated by the Department of Fisheries (DoF) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) in collaboration with the Asia Institute of Technology (AIT). The project aimed to create a community-managed fishpond. The objective was to encourage farmers to conserve refuge ponds, which serve as areas for brood stock, fish spawning and fish refuge during the dry season. In 1995 a flooded forest protection community fishery was created, supported by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). The following year 110 community fisheries were established in Kratie, Kampong Cham, Koh Kong, Battambang, Stung Treng, Kampong Chhnang, Ratanakiri and Banteay Meanchey provinces, supported by various NGOs.

BACKGROUND

Fisheries management in Cambodia has encountered problems for many years as a bias for large-scale commercial exploitation and revenue generation has caused resource conflicts in many provinces around the Tonle Sap Lake and Mekong River systems. Most management problems are related to issues of governance, including corruption among law enforcers and local officials, low financial returns to the government, as well as inequitable distribution of economic benefits from the resources. While these problems continue to threaten food security in Cambodia, ecological impacts are becoming more obvious as evident in declines in certain fish populations due to intensive fishing practices.
WHY IS THERE COMMUNITY FISHERIES MANAGEMENT IN CAMBODIA?

In November 2000 the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) began to undertake fishery policy reform as part of its poverty reduction strategy. Much of the impetus for the reform came from the increasing number of fishery-related conflicts that pitted poor local fishers against fishing lot concessionaires, often supported by armed authorities. These local fishers had been squeezed from their traditional fishing grounds and forced to fish in unproductive areas, resulting in low catches and decreased livelihoods.

Key elements of the reform included reduction of 53 concession lots, with an area of 536,302 ha, which represented 56.23% of the total area of fishing lots. The areas where the fishing lots were released were then designated for small-scale fishing and the promotion of community fisheries establishment. Furthermore, the license fees for medium scale fishing in inland waters and some selected coastal areas were lifted. The government replaced the director of the DoF with his deputy and commenced a transitional withdrawal of provincial fisheries inspection stations/districts in all fishing lots throughout the country. The fisheries policy reform prompted greater efforts in community based fisheries and fisheries co-management initiatives supported by the RGC and the donor community. Within the Department of Fisheries, the Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO) was established to support the development of community fisheries, direct the initiative and to establish guidelines for the establishment of community fisheries in the released fishing lot areas.

Prior to the fisheries policy reform, community fisheries existed in Cambodia primarily as a mechanism for natural resource management. Whilst the new community fisheries model emphasizes fisheries resource management, it also enables people to understand the concept of reform and how people can share and use resources sustainably and equitably. Community fisheries management attempts to reduce conflicts and improve the livelihoods of local fishers and farmers who access fishery resources. However, this process takes time to increase the awareness of those fishers, and to organize groups of people to manage resources by themselves.
CONCEPT OF CO-MANAGEMENT

There are many different definitions of co-management. Hartmann (2000) defines co-management as a “formalized and replicable process of sharing authority and responsibility by government and organized user groups in decentralized decision making aiming at improved resource management”, whilst Gum (2000) states that it is the “provision of neutral facilitation and the promotion of dialogue between stakeholders.” The main intended outcome of fisheries co-management is to produce improved sustainability, efficiency, equity and resilience (Berkes et al, 2001).

Essentially, fisheries co-management is a partnership arrangement, in which the government, the community of local resource users, external agents (NGOs, academics and research institutions), and other fisheries and resource stakeholders share the responsibility and authority for decision making over the management of fisheries (Pomeroy and Williams, 1994; Pomeroy, 1998; and Berkes et al. 2001). Community fisheries in Cambodia can be defined as in the diagram below:
COMMUNITY FISHERIES ORGANIZATION

Community fisheries are organized by a specific group of people, who wish to organize and structure the management of the resources that they rely on. In early stages of the management process the community usually require both financial and technical support from government technical departments and non-government organizations (NGOs). Since 1995 a number of NGOs have supported CBNRM although initiatives have often been focused on forest resources rather than fisheries. After the fisheries reform in 2001, the number of community fisheries initiatives has increased, and people are beginning to understand how to protect and conserve fisheries resources.

Many community fisheries are formed without a real understanding of the concepts and process of organizing, and the reasons for organizing. The community fisheries concept is very new to Cambodian people, particularly those who live in rural areas where information is not easily accessed or available. 360 community fisheries have been organized, which are discussed in this paper (Figures from CFDO/DoP).

ORGANIZING PEOPLE

People who live in the rural areas are very well organized and have protected and conserved natural resources belonging to their communities. Traditionally, especially before the Khmer Rouge period, rural people prefer to live in groups in order to help each other and share information. Whilst these people were not aware of the theory of 'community', they had followed a community process. In the past, pressures on natural resources were far less than they are today with a smaller population, less consumption of natural resources, and less competition for market access. Communities that managed their resources successfully were able to do so because of commitment from people, allocating sufficient time to the process, working within one culture, having a strong community leader who was often the oldest person in the community, as well as a good understanding of the resources concerned. For years communities managed resources alone, without the support of NGOs and government departments.
Many communities in rural areas believe in spirits. For example: where there is a big tree, people believe that there is a ghost or where there is big fish, there is a spirit in it. People will not kill that big fish because it would be bad luck. Because of these spiritual beliefs, the resources can be sustained and preserved, and these communities can help to protect and control natural resources. However, communities can benefit from technical support in order to better manage the community process, and to work on more complex issues such as the illegal and legal use of resources by people from outside the community.

In Koh Kong province, a CBNRM project was facilitated by PMMR/ MoE. It was originally formed by a group of local people in response to an increase in illegal fishing and logging in that area. In 1995, CF and CBNRM initiatives were organized in coastal zones and in the provinces in the northern part of Cambodia, and reflected an acknowledgement that community organizing is essential to protect natural resources.

During the transitional stage, some opportunistic fishers grabbed the opportunity to fish using illegal and large-scale methods in reserve fishing lots around the Tonle Sap Great Lake. Conflicts arose between those who were capable of buying modern large-scale fishing gear and poor fishers who did not have sufficient financial capital to purchase the more efficient fishing equipment. This led to an inequitable sharing of resources. In response, the Royal Government assigned the Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, Department of Fisheries to cooperate with provincial fishery offices to crack down on illegal fishing and to promote the establishment of community fisheries countrywide.

The government consulted widely with various stakeholders in the country to develop a draft sub-decree on community fisheries management. This draft sub-decree puts the government's policy on sustainable management of fisheries resources into practice and provides a legal framework for establishing community fisheries.

A number of controversial issues emerged from the consultation:

- The requirement of community fishers to use only small-scale fishing gears. (Many community fisheries have little or no sources of capital to support their operation.)
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- The demand by community fisheries to have the right to arrest and fine illegal fishermen or offenders by themselves in the absence of legislation.
- The limitation of the right of non-community fisheries members to fish in community fisheries fishing grounds.

The Department of Fisheries accepted all recommendations and amended the draft sub-decree as necessary for the final national consultation workshop. The consultation took place and involved stakeholders from across the country.

At present, even though there is no official legislation regarding the establishment of community fisheries, the MAFF/Department of Fisheries has sent officials to cooperate with provincial-level Departments of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, local authorities, NGO/IOs and related institutions to facilitate the establishment of community fisheries following guidelines set by the Council of Ministers. As a result, the latest update from CFDO shows that 360 community fisheries have been established in inland and coastal areas.

The process of establishing a community fishery includes:
- Distribution of guidelines for the establishment of community fisheries;
- Election process; and
- Creation of by-laws, regulations, a management plan and map of the community fishery boundary.

This process is being actively carried out in the whole country. The Department of Fisheries is also cooperating with NGO/IOs to organize training courses for fishery officers and community fisheries committees. After organizations and groups are established, monitoring and evaluation is carried out at both provincial and municipal levels to ensure that there is frequent follow-up on this new concept.

Thus far, 360 community fisheries have been established in inland and coastal areas.
According to reports from the monitoring and evaluation, implementation of community fisheries has resulted in the following:

— There seems to be a reduction in illegal fishing and conflicts in the fishing areas of community fisheries;
— Fisher folks understand the concept of participatory fisheries resource management through the implementation of community fisheries. Notably, they are willing to volunteer their effort and cooperate with local authorities to establish and implement community fisheries;
— Local authorities, relevant stakeholders and NGOs are supporting the implementation of community fisheries.

Furthermore, fish productivities are improving in community fisheries where there are fish sanctuaries.

**CONSTRAINTS FOR COMMUNITY FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT**

Although there is a reasonable level of support from the various stakeholders, the implementation of the Fisheries Policy Reform has not taken place as smoothly as desired because experience and capacity for organization and management of community fisheries are limited within the Department of Fisheries as the concept is new to Cambodia.

Constraints for the full implementation of community fisheries in Cambodia include:

- Boundaries between commercial (leased) fishing lots and community fishing areas are not yet completely demarcated.
- Prevention and suppression of illegal fishing gear such as electrocution, fine-mesh mosquito nets, push netting and so on is not yet effective.
- There is no clear legal framework regarding the sub-decree on community fisheries; there are no sample by-laws and other provisions for community fisheries management. As a result, there are some controversial issues to be resolved among stakeholders.
- Understanding of community fisheries by fishing communities, fisheries officers and local authorities is still limited.
- Most community fisheries asked for the right to crack down and fine illegal fishing activities by themselves.
Numerous community fisheries requested the right to carry out commercial fishing in their community fishing areas, which contradicts the content of the sub-decree on the release of fishing lots for small-scale household fishing.

Some local authorities (commune councils and Sangkats) do not yet fully support community fisheries and in some cases have sold the community fishing areas to businessmen using the name of community fisheries.

There are still illegal fishers in the community fisheries fishing areas, which needs to be halted.

Poverty among fisher folks is another obstacle for the organization and management of community fisheries.

Lack of materials, budgets and other means for dissemination and extension, organizing, strengthening, monitoring and evaluating community fisheries.

It seems that most of the community fisheries supported by NGO/IOs in cooperation with the fisheries technical staff, either provincial and/or national departments are functioning well. On the other hand, community fisheries organized by the provincial and national Fisheries Department are not functioning well due to budget constraints and technical limitations.

CHALLENGES FOR COMMUNITY CO-MANAGEMENT OF FISHERIES

After policy reform, one key question remains: how can local communities manage, exploit and conserve fisheries resources sustainably? The concept of community co-management of fisheries has been introduced as one way to achieve this objective.

Successful co-management of community fisheries requires:

1. A suitable policy and legal framework
2. Understanding the concept of community
3. Transparency
4. Cooperation, networking and information sharing
5. Conflict resolution mechanisms
6. Enforcement
7. Monitoring and reflective learning analysis
8. Long term commitment
The Department of Fisheries has taken these issues and constraints seriously and has resorted to various approaches to tackle them. For instance, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and the Royal Government of Cambodia have successfully sought a loan from the ADB for the Tonle Sap Environmental Management Project. One of the main focuses of the project is to support and facilitate the development of community fisheries in the five provinces of the Tonle Sap area. In addition, grants provided by UNDP and ADB within the project framework will be used for the capacity building of staff at DoF and provincial levels and for the development of a legal framework regarding the management of Tonle Sap fisheries. 

Following recommendations made during the recent Consultative Group (CG) meeting on 28 January 2003 at the Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) and the Department of Fisheries requested funds and collaboration from Oxfam GB, Oxfam America and WWF to jointly carry out consultations with local fishing communities and relevant stakeholders from March to April 2003. The Department of Fisheries, with the support from Oxfam GB, Oxfam America and WWF, will organize a reflection workshop on community fisheries to share experiences on implementing the concept.

**KEY FACTORS FOR SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMUNITY FISHERIES**

**Collaboration between NGOs and provincial fisheries offices at the beginning**

NGOs and provincial fisheries offices conducted several meetings to form an agreement between those two parties. Some provincial fisheries offices would like to have more staff involved in the fisheries community programme in order to gain more payment for their staff. However, NGOs are able to accept only one or two fisheries staff to work on projects, who must be able to facilitate and provide technical input to the community fisheries management process.

Collaboration between NGOs and provincial fisheries offices (CFDU) was not easy as the provincial fisheries officers debated many requirements and NGOs have their own limitations of commitment and funding. Though the relationship is complex, and often fraught with difficulties, fisheries offices and the NGOs are dependent on each
other for successful community fisheries management as one has the expertise in establishing community projects and the other has the technical expertise in fisheries.

**Local authorities are involved in community fisheries establishment**

Collaboration with local authorities is not easy, as many officials are not aware of the fisheries reform. In some provinces, local authorities have not collaborated with NGOs because they say that they would lose their benefit if there was collaboration, and are concerned about the political affiliation of some NGOs. Some local authorities agree to collaborate with NGOs, but fear the community may turn into a strong people's movement, which would be strong at protecting illegal activities. Since then NGOs have conducted many trainings and workshops on the sub-decree and resource management. Awareness has been raised through meetings and workshops, to enable authorities to understand the role of NGOs, and some local authorities are more willing to collaborate openly on community fisheries.

A number of commune chiefs have participated in community organizing: in Battambang, Banteay Mean Chey, Kampong Thom, Siem Reap, Pursat, Kampong Chhnang, and Stung Treng provinces. In 2003, one commune chief in Battambang province paid little attention to the process of community fisheries organizing, and complained that community fisheries had no right to protect the fisheries resources. The community had no experience or expertise in managing fishery resources. One year later, the same commune chief had considerably changed his attitude: he collaborated with the community fisheries initiative and now spends approximately 30% of his time working for the community. Although this is a model example of good collaboration and support at the local level, other local leaders continue to support illegal fishing, or have relatives fishing illegally in the community fishing grounds.

**Stakeholders are involved in community fisheries establishment process**

Since 2000, the community fisheries concept has been widely implemented in the Tonle Sap region. The Ministry of Environment and NGOs have supported implementation and facilitated the organizing process of community fisheries. In
2000, a community resource management project was established in Koh Kong, supported by the IDRC programme and facilitated by the Participatory in Management Mangrove Resources project whose counterpart was staff from the Ministry of Environment. However, there was less involvement from other sectors such as the Military and Police. Experiences during this research suggested that it is difficult to secure the involvement of stakeholders as community fisheries is 'public work' with no income for members. The many trainings and workshops that have been conducted by NGOs and the Department of Fisheries have provided valuable information and experience but have not secured their commitment. In reality those stakeholders are supporting illegal fishing. There are two reasons why they support illegal fishing. One is to supplement their low government salary, and the other is to make more income for their team to implement activities in the flood plain.

**NGOs facilitate community fisheries establishment**

The NGO process was similar to that of the technical department's process, but there were more people participating than with the technical department. There were many consultative workshops at the provincial level. Most of the workshops were conducted and supported by NGO funds. Technical staff provided the technical assistance and responded to questions from the participants. The Fisheries Action Coalition Team (FACT) led the pre-consultative workshops on sub-decree on community fisheries to improve people's knowledge, particularly those who were invited to the regional and national consultative workshops.

Since NGOs conducted the consultative workshops, stakeholders, fishers and civil society understand more about the draft sub-decree on community fisheries. The local authorities are also aware. Recently, many stakeholders, local fishers, and civil
society participated in consultative workshops in order to comment and make recommendations on the draft community fisheries sub-decree. Furthermore, those participants were able to provide information from their neighbourhood in order to improve the draft sub-decree. Presently, many people understand the draft sub-decree on community fisheries, and as a result community fisheries are operating more effectively.

To implement co-management, there are four main components for successful community fisheries. These include resource management, community and economic development, capacity building and institutional support (Pomeroy, Katon and Harkes, 2001 in Thay 2002: 23-4).

1. **Resource management** is aimed at activities to manage, protect, conserve, rehabilitate, regulate, and enhance the fisheries resources.

2. **Community and economic development** aims to raise income, improve standards of living, and generate employment through alternative and supplemental livelihood development, community social services and infrastructure development, enterprise development, and regional economic development, including industrialization.

3. **Capacity building** is aimed at individuals and groups and involves people empowerment, participation, education, training, leadership, and organization development.

4. **Institutional support** involves conflict management mechanisms, individual and organizational linkages, interactive learning, legal support, policy development, advocacy and networking, forums for sharing experiences, power sharing, decision-making, and institution building. Strengthening gender, cultural and ethnic issues are emphasized throughout the implementation phase.

**CONCLUSION**

Although some forms of fisheries co-management have been active in Svay Rieng, Kratie, Stung Treng and Siem Reap provinces since 1994, the recent fisheries policy reform has given an impetus for community fisheries development throughout Cambodia. The Royal Government of Cambodia and donor communities are carefully considering community fisheries development. Presently there are approximately 360 community fisheries located in the Tonle Sap, Mekong and
coastal areas, which have been organized by the Fisheries Technical Department, Ministry of Environment (in Marine Protected Areas) in collaboration with NGOs and IOs. However, community fisheries organized solely by the Fisheries Technical Department are constrained by budget and technical limitations. In addition, many constraints face the implementation of community fisheries because it is a very new concept in Cambodia. The concept requires time, effort, a clear legal framework and long-term commitment from the government (policy-makers, technical officers, local authorities), IOs and NGOs, and the fishing community itself, before it can be realized and the success of community fisheries development and management in Cambodia can be guaranteed.
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Chapter 8  Community Based Eco-Tourism (CBET) in Cambodia: networking and developing the concept
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns Community Based Eco-Tourism (CBET) in Cambodia. It discusses natural resources as tourism assets, defines CBET in the Cambodian context, analyses the related policy framework, and presents some CBET experiences, lessons learned and recommendations for future development.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND TOURISM ASSETS

Cambodia's tourism development potential is based on both cultural and natural assets. The famous Angkor Wat temple complex is the country's main cultural tourism attraction. In addition to this, the capital, Phnom Penh, has architectural, cultural and scenic assets attractive to tourists. The southern coast near Sihanoukville is a popular recreational tourist destination for domestic, as well as international tourists. The northern and northeastern provinces offer opportunities for nature-based and cultural tourism development which have remained largely untapped until now.

¹ Sopheap is Sustainable Livelihoods Assistant of the CBNRM Learning Initiative, based at WWF.
² Dara is a graduate student at the Norton University of Cambodia.
³ Amanda is a Project Advisor with local Cambodian environmental NGO, Mlup Baitong, as well as a Programme Coordinator for the Community Forestry Alliance for Cambodia (CFAC).
⁴ Soriya is a tourism lecturer at the Royal University of Phnom Penh.
⁵ Contributions from the CCBEN Network Committee
Recent trends indicate a significant increase in interest in Cambodia’s nature. The country has a number of rare species of fauna and flora. While numbers have declined, as in other parts of Asia, mainly due to poaching, the habitat is still largely intact. Cambodia possesses areas of great natural beauty, national parks and marine reserves that if better protected and properly managed, offer significant potential for responsible tourism development.

Ratanakiri province, located in the northeast has high eco-tourism potential, and has been designated as the country’s primary eco-tourism destination. In doing so, the government aims to diversify tourism products and destinations while catering to a highly specialized and growing international market for eco-tourism. It is important that these resources, upon which tourism depends, are carefully managed. If tourism is to be sustainable and enhance livelihoods of Cambodian people in rural areas, the development of destination areas must be planned with a long-term perspective of reducing poverty (Yin, 2003).

GROWTH OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

Due to the rich resources, relative political stability, improved infrastructure and expanding tourist facilities, tourism in Cambodia has grown rapidly in the last few years. While numbers alone are not a good indicator of industry performance, the total number of international visitors increased from 118,183 in 1993 to 701,014 in 2003 with the major markets originating from other Asian countries, France, USA, Australia and the UK (MoT, 2003).

![International Visitor Arrivals in Cambodia 1993-2003](Source: Ministry of Tourism Statistic Annual Report, 2003.)

*The graph shows the rapid growth in tourism except in 1997 and 2003. In 1997 tourist numbers dipped due to factional fighting among political parties in the coalition government and the Asian financial crisis. In 2003 the causes were SARS, war in Iraq and anti-Thai riots. Despite this, the Ministry of Tourism is optimistic that tourism will continue to grow.*
TOURISM'S ROLE IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND POVERTY REDUCTION

Tourism has great potential to assist in reducing poverty due to its high economic returns and employment generation. In Cambodia the sector has created approximately 100,000 jobs for Cambodian people (MoT, 2003). Moreover, it has been estimated that Cambodia’s gross foreign tourism earnings more than tripled from approximately USD$100 million in 1995 to USD$346 million in 2003 (MoT, 2003). Currently tourism revenues represent about 12.5 per cent of the country’s total gross domestic product (GDP).

Not all types of tourism contribute to poverty reduction. For example large-scale resort developments and economic leakages may cause most profits to flow out of the destination area. The National Tourism Development Plan (2003) and Schellhorn & Simmons (2003) highly recommend that domestic tourism and backpacker tourism be promoted to reduce poverty in Cambodia. The authors claim that these forms of tourism tend to use more local resources, which poor communities can provide. Moreover, if poverty is to be reduced, local communities should be given management responsibility- a complete right and power over the allocation of the natural resources and their own future (Yin, 2003).

WHAT IS COMMUNITY BASED ECO-TOURISM?

Eco-tourism is described by the International Eco-tourism Society (IES) as "responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people". In Community Based eco-tourism (CBET) local people have substantial control and involvement in an eco-tourism project and receive a significant proportion of overall benefits. CBET is one type of pro-poor tourism. Characteristics of Community
Based eco-tourism include: providing alternative income and employment for local communities, increasing local and visitor awareness of conservation, providing education and interpretation as part of the tourism product, as well as minimizing negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment. CBET typically supports the protection of natural areas by generating economic benefits for the community, is organized for small groups and, in the case of Cambodia, involves not only nature, but also indigenous cultures. CBET should promote biodiversity conservation (Ngece, 2002).

Community involvement

In CBET, the community plays the important role of owner, manager, decision-maker and caretaker. Successful CBET needs strong involvement from the local community, and also good cooperation with relevant stakeholders such as tour operators and local government. In order to promote effective participation, the local community must participate by developing the eco-tourism strategic plan, and in implementing and evaluating the activities. It is also important to strengthen the legal rights and responsibilities of the community over land, natural resources and local development. Local people can earn supplementary income by participating in CBET activities such as guiding services, craft sales, sale of food, providing accommodation, site maintenance, and offering tour products.

Community involvement not only focuses on the material benefits for local residents, but also should work towards the purpose of biodiversity conservation. The local community must make sure that all stakeholders are encouraged to be involved in CBET activities. Tourist activities must not undervalue or destroy natural resources. Tourist revenues must contribute to sustainable development and the diversification of rural livelihoods, and all stakeholders must actively support the conservation of natural and cultural heritage.

Benefits and challenges of CBET

Community based eco-tourism may provide benefits to the local community in material and non-tangible ways such as: socio-economic benefits, environmental benefits, and cultural benefits.
At the same time many challenges also face the community. A main objective of CBET is to provide income to local people. However, if revenues are not shared equitably within the community, the gap between wealthier and poorer residents may increase with the most vulnerable people receiving few benefits. These people may have no incentive to protect natural resources, therefore environmental resources continue to be degraded, and the objective of securing sustainable livelihoods is limited.

In order to gain long term benefits from CBET, local communities must develop a mechanism that allows for a more equitable spread of benefits. Democratic management structures, guidelines and principles for community implementation must be developed, communicated and enforced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greater employment opportunities</td>
<td>• Degradation of fragile ecosystems and disruption of wildlife habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supplementary income to local community</td>
<td>• Environmental pollution, solid waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved human resources capabilities</td>
<td>• Increase in resource consumption, and conflicts over natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empowerment of local communities</td>
<td>• Impacts on indigenous culture and tradition due to outside influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced awareness of CBET activities, environmental issues and support for nature conservation</td>
<td>• Increase in issues of land pressure and land tenure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Infrastructure development (transportation, lodging, etc.)</td>
<td>• Competition with other sectors (e.g. agriculture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction of negative impacts on the environment and opportunities for long term protection of natural resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved health care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Benefits and challenges of CBET

POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR CBET IN CAMBODIA

Though specific policy on CBET has not yet been established in Cambodia, the Socio-Economic Development Plan 2001 - 2005 (SEDP II) (see chapter 3), the National Tourism Development Plan 2003 (NTDP), National Environmental Action Plan 1998-2002 (NEAP) and Decentralization Plan of Cambodia (DP) have provided policies, which are relevant to CBET. The plans have focused on sustainable tourism
development to reduce poverty among poor communities, and to protect the environment and culture by giving the local community autonomy over their natural resources.

The following are relevant policies:

- Poverty reduction and achieving gender and social equity within a social planning and development context (SEDP II);
- The protection of heritage in all its dimensions (natural and cultural as well as traditions and values of the Cambodian people) (NTDP);
- Revenue capture by the local community (SEDP II);
- Effective monitoring to ensure that community plans as well as national policy objectives are met (NTDP);
- Environmental impact assessments (EIA) must be properly done before any development project can be approved (NEAP);
- Local involvement in both planning and well as economic activities is ensured. capacity building and the creation of mechanisms for the support of small and medium enterprises will be explored whenever appropriate (SEDP II);
- Emphasis on formulating strategies that will create opportunities within the more disadvantaged areas of the country (NTDP);
- Ensure that development policies (including public works and transportation and bus and road networks) are supportive of protecting and promoting the various attractions (NTDP); and
- The need for as many stakeholders to be involved in decision-making and resource allocation (NTDP)

The plans also state that if there is to be sustainable tourism development in Cambodia the stress on numbers and statistics has to be complemented by a corresponding emphasis on understanding the qualitative and economic impacts of tourism and how the poor and other segments of Cambodian society can be seen to profit from increased tourism activity. In addition to this, adopting pro poor tourism policies requires more than simply inserting the word poverty in various government policies and strategies. It requires a fundamental shift in thinking about the forms of tourism development that will benefit the poor.
Given the multi-jurisdictional nature of tourism it is also important that development planners and managers working in a number of sectors be aware of the importance of tourism as a potential source of poverty reduction. A pro poor tourism policy will help to ensure that tourism dimensions are incorporated in general community plans and regional economic development strategies.

CBET EXPERIENCES IN CAMBODIA
General Background

In Cambodia, there are only a handful of CBET sites. The first one, Yeak Laom, was established in 1995 in Ratanakiri province; however, several newer projects are currently being organised. In Chambok commune, Kampong Speu province, villagers established a CBET site in January 2003, facilitated by Mlup Baitong, a local NGO. The Lutheran World Federation (LWF), Osmose, WWF, and other organisations are also supporting CBET initiatives in the provinces of Kompong Speu, Mondulkiri, Siem Reap and Ratanakiri.
YEAK LAOM CASE STUDY

Boeung Yeak Laom is a natural, almost square-shaped lake situated in the middle of a mountain in Banlung district, 5km from Rattanakiri provincial town. The lake is ±800m in diameter with a depth of 48m during the dry season, and was created by volcanic movements centuries ago. Boeung Yeak Laom has picturesque mountainous scenery, a charming bird sanctuary and provides the visitor with an opportunity to experience the daily life of local hill-tribe people.

In 1995, in response to a planned forestry concession covering the whole of Ratanakiri province, and resulting environmental degradation, the provincial governor declared a series of 11 provincial protected areas and Yeak Laom commune was one of them. The objectives of developing Yeak Laom as a protected area was to protect forest, vegetation, wildlife and the watershed, and to develop it for recreation, education and tourism.

In 1996 the IDRC entered into a one-year lease with the Ratanakiri provincial authorities for the use of Yeak Laom Lake and the surrounding environment, and prepared ways for the local community to take over (Barton, 1996). Later in 1998 the community requested the provincial authority to give them special rights to manage the lake. The request was approved, and a 25 year lease was granted. The Yeak Loam Lake Committee, formed from the five villages in the commune, was established to protect a core zone of 362 hectares. The committee was formed with the support of the Seila/PLG project and reported directly to the CDC. For the next two years, the Seila/PLG project concentrated on building the capacity of the YLLC and involved the community in some activities, on a small scale, although recognized that it was important to involve the community more in managing the activities of the committee.

In early 2001, with support from the AusAID-funded Developing Remote Indigenous Village Education Project (DRIVE), the first Indigenous Tourist Guide Programme was started, and the Yeak Loam Community Based Eco-Tourism Project (YLCBET) was established, becoming Cambodia’s first eco-tourism site. Both DRIVE and the Seila/PLG project were trying to develop CBET in Yeak Laom Lake and saw the need to combine activities and work under a common local structure to manage their activities, and keep the community involved, even though they were funded separately. In 2002 the election of commune councils (CC) provided a new structure and activities started involving the CC. The YLCBET has been successful in terms of livelihoods, conservation and community participation. The annual revenue from tourism in Yeak Laom Lake increased from US$610 in 1999 to US$3886 in 2002 due to increase in the number of tourists and doubling the entrance fee from US$0.50 to US$1 for international tourists. This income pays for the management of the lake and staff salaries. The community is reported to be proud of its culture and environment. This resulted in community participation in site management, providing services, performing arts, handicrafts and traditional materials, sales of farm products, and tourism asset protection and maintenance (Yin, 2003).

Despite its success, the YLCBET project is facing some challenges, which are similar to those in other areas of Ratanakiri province. These include lack of tourism understanding within the community, lack of tourism skills, land selling and buying, urbanization spreading from Banlung town, pressures from the market economy, lack of project ownership, and a high level of dependency on outsiders and top-down management from higher authorities. Moreover, the community’s solidarity is being threatened and the scarcity of natural resources is causing conflicts within the community.

These issues could be addressed if the community is guaranteed autonomy over their natural resources and lives under the law, and if they are empowered through capacity building for skills development, assistance in marketing their products, and networking with other CBET sites both in and outside the country.
CHAMBOK CASE STUDY

Chambok, Community Based Eco-Tourism site, is located in Chambok commune on the outskirts of Kirirom National Park in Kampong Speu province, Cambodia.

Mlup Baitong, a local Cambodian environmental NGO, has been working with the communities in this area since 2000, with the goal of supporting conservation of the park’s biodiversity as well as alternative livelihoods for villagers living in the border areas. In Chambok commune practically all villagers depended heavily on forest resources, particularly on charcoal and fuel wood production.

A survey in 2003 showed that some ninety-four percent (94%) of households were engaged in a range of forest extraction activities. Rice and vegetable cultivation resulted in low yields, sometimes less than one ton per hectare due to lack of irrigation and poor soil quality. The livelihood of villagers was affected by decreasing availability of resources, with many in debt and facing food scarcity.

Since the official opening of the Chambok eco-tourism site on 4 January 2003, the nature trails and spectacular waterfalls have drawn approximately 800 visitors per month, generating a monthly revenue of $500-$1000. A portion of this income pays for villagers who work at the site. The profits are deposited in a community fund to be spent on the priorities identified by the committee and approved by villagers at large.

While the project has generally been effective in meeting its objectives, Mlup Baitong has faced a number of challenges in implementing CBET in Chambok. The biggest dilemma has been with regard to decision-making and management of the site. A significant portion of the community resent some of the restrictions of eco-tourism and would prefer mass tourism because they think that profits will increase.

Many Cambodian tourists who are unfamiliar with eco-tourism reinforce the demand for commercial tourism because they complain about having to walk or the lack of rubbish bins, etc. To solve this issue, Mlup Baitong has tried to develop a longer-term vision of the site among the committee members and other key villagers, through workshops. There was also an exposure to Thailand where members could see the contrast between a well-managed CBET site and mass tourism sites, where both local cultures and environment have suffered as a result of tourism impacts.

Equitable sharing of benefits has also been an issue for the project. While the profits enter a community fund and a process of village wide approval is necessary for spending of these funds, in actuality the 12 members of the committee largely control decision-making on salaries and spending. They also control the information which is passed along to other villagers. In order to address some of this problem, Mlup Baitong is encouraging the commune council to play a larger role in monitoring the project.

Despite these challenges, Community Based eco-tourism in Chambok has shown some good results, such as forest regeneration, improved food security, and increased pride and motivation among villagers. The project holds good potential for further developing community solidarity, improving livelihoods, protecting resources, and relieving poverty in an equitable and sustainable way.
Lessons learned from case studies

This section gives an overview of the most important lessons learned from both case studies.

◊ A good partnership with local authorities is essential. Learning from the experience in the Chambok case, the commune council has an important role to play in ensuring site security as well as accountability and transparency in implementation.

◊ Land and resource tenure for the community is crucial for CBET investment. Tourism and the revenues that it draws can increase pressure on land. Outsiders may come to occupy lands for which the community does not have official tenure, or community members may be tempted to sell their land, as in the case of Yeak Laom. It is important that land tenure issues are clear and communities realize the negative consequences of selling their land to ensure successful CBET development.

◊ Good financial management skills and issues of transparency and accountability are key factors in project success. Problems of financial management can play havoc with the trust and solidarity among the community. It is important to establish good financial systems and skills to avoid such problems.

◊ Women have an important role to play in eco-tourism development. Experience in Yeak Laom and Chambok has shown that women have important skills and interests in involvement in eco-tourism. Project design should ensure the active involvement of women.

◊ Solidarity among the community encourages local people's participation in conservation of natural resources and management activities of the eco-tourism project. In the case of more disparate communities, significant effort should be made to build trust and solidarity.

◊ Properly managed CBET can have positive impacts on natural resource Management, rural livelihoods, and food security.
CAMBODIA COMMUNITY BASED ECO-TOURISM NETWORK (CCBEN)

Background and aim

The Cambodia Community Based Eco-Tourism Network (CCBEN) was established in September 2002. It is a network of organizations, projects, educational institutions and communities in Cambodia who are involved in community based eco-tourism. It aims to be a partner with the government in trying to support pro-poor community based eco-tourism in Cambodia, as a way of alleviating poverty and protecting environmental, cultural and social resources (see box 1).

Box 1: CCBEN objectives

1. The level of knowledge and skills of network members related to achieving the CCBEN vision is increased.
2. Information, experiences and resources are efficiently shared between CCBEN members and local communities working towards the CCBEN vision, mission and objectives.
3. Awareness and advocacy of the role of CBET in community development, poverty reduction and resource conservation is increased.
4. Principles and guidelines that define what activities lead to the CCBEN vision are formulated and disseminated.
5. Strong and productive links with other networks with similar and supportive visions, missions and objectives are made.

CCBEN activities

CCBEN is working toward its objectives in cooperation with the government and other stakeholders related to CBET in Cambodia by building the capacity of its members and government staff and increasing the awareness of the local community as a form of CBNRM. Experience has been gained by carrying out field visits to other members' sites, and through sharing information amongst members during meetings to discuss programmes and action plans. Special guests and trainers have been invited to share knowledge and skills with members. This included a training course on Appreciative Participatory Planning and Action (APPA) and appreciative inquiry.

To improve the collaboration with government agencies as well as with the private sector, and in order to be recognized as having a strong status as an association to advocate CBET development in Cambodia, the network members intend for CCBEN
to be officially recognized and registered by the government. To support this initiative, final by-laws constituting structure and governance of the network have been developed. CCBEN has a website to promote CBET in Cambodia at www.geocities.com\cambodiacben.

FUTURE CBET DEVELOPMENT

CBET is still in its infancy in Cambodia, but it holds the potential to contribute substantially to conservation of biodiversity as well as poverty alleviation and the future diversification of livelihoods. This section outlines some of the steps to be taken in pursuing CBET in Cambodia.

Policy recommendation

As described earlier in this paper, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) has put development plans and policies in place which, in theory at least, support the development of CBET initiatives. International donors such as the World Bank, UNDP, and the ADB have promoted poverty alleviation, decentralization, and sustainable development through the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and initiatives such as the Greater Mekong Sub-Region Tourism Development Project. Nevertheless, the number of CBET initiatives and the investment in this type of tourism is limited in comparison to the enormous sums currently being invested in tourism by the private sector.

Laws and policies can work to level the playing field for local communities, but the political will to implement these policies is crucial. In order for CBET to contribute
Community Based Eco-Tourism (CBET) in Cambodia: networking and developing the concept

Significantly to the national strategy for tourism development in Cambodia, it is first necessary for laws and policies to specifically address CBET development. The second step could be an action plan for implementation. Owing to CBET’s cross-cutting nature, such a plan would require cooperation from a number of government ministries including the Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Rural Development, Ministry of Water Resources, Forest Administration, Ministry of Commerce, and Ministry of Culture and Fine Arts. A multi-stakeholder task force with members from each ministry and support from NGOs could guide and promote CBET through more supportive market and investment policies, land tenure and natural resource management laws, infrastructure for improved accessibility, and human resources development. This is clearly a significant challenge, but is worthy of consideration.

**Securing financial and human resources**

To date, CBET initiatives have been led by NGOs whose financial and human resources are limited. Fortunately, CBET is relatively inexpensive in terms of capital investment, since it uses existing resources as its tourism assets or attractions. Most NGOs can provide adequate facilitation skills to support community participation and involvement, but the understanding of the CBET concept is still limited. Among local authorities and communities themselves, CBET is still largely unknown. In order to support CBET development, it is necessary to assess the existing human resources and capacity, and to design training programmes that build related skills (management, business, accounting, natural resource management, conflict resolution, etc.) and foster creative attitudes. The CCBEN is currently aiming to address human resources and capacity-building requirements at the facilitator level. Further efforts will be directed to strengthen the understanding and skills related to CBET, if funding can be secured. Such training programmes should be directed at national, provincial and local government staff, as well as communities.

**Building and improving partnerships**

Successful CBET initiatives require strong partnerships to support the community in its efforts to conserve resources and promote sustainable livelihoods. From commune councils to government ministries, there needs to be collaborative efforts
to support local management control of resources. When possible, other community based natural resource management (CBNRM) initiatives such as land use planning, community forestry and community fisheries need to be linked with CBET in a wider approach to local natural resource management.

Strategic partnerships with tourism associations and the private sector, particularly with socially responsible travel agencies, should be developed. Attracting tourists who are sensitive to local culture and nature conservation requires building links to the tourism industry and specialized markets.

**Research and information sharing**

The future improvement of CBET implementation depends on research and information sharing among communities, NGOs, the private sector, and government authorities. The CCBEN is designed to act as a forum for information exchange, and this role will be further developed in the future by establishing a resource library, developing national guidelines, expanding the website and producing extension materials on CBET. In addition, the CCBEN aims to develop links with other groups in the region.

Case studies, project evaluations, action research, and academic papers on CBET experience are all necessary to develop theory, provide lessons learned and carry forth improvements for the development of CBET in Cambodia.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has introduced the concept of CBET in the context of Cambodia’s natural resource wealth and its growing tourism industry. It has introduced some field examples of current CBET initiatives and suggested ways of support to the field through policy development and legal frameworks, cooperation among various stakeholders, networking, capacity-building, research, and information sharing. As CBET is a relatively new concept in Cambodia, CBET practitioners should learn from other CBNRM experiences in Cambodia in sectors such as forestry, agriculture and fisheries.
There is a need for further research on the CBET concept as both a sustainable livelihood strategy to reduce poverty and as a method of natural resource conservation. CBET should be viewed as one potential intervention in assisting communities to better manage their resources. Unlocking the full potential of CBET as a CBNRM strategy will require strong community solidarity, long term commitment of donors and NGO facilitators, as well as a supportive policy and legal framework. Of equal, if not greater importance, are that the natural resources upon which eco-tourism depend, need to be conserved and the rights of local communities to sustainably manage these resources need national recognition and support.
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Chapter 9  Participatory Land Use Planning in Cambodia

By: Min Bunnara¹, Harald Kirsch² & Ignas Dümmer³ & 4

INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the participatory land use planning (PLUP) approach, experiences, and its relationship with community based natural resource management (CBNRM).

The experience with PLUP in Cambodia is relatively new. Following several workshops and seminars conducted by GTZ and national government institutions between 1999 and 2001, the official PLUP manual for Cambodia was completed and the first PLUP Training of Trainers (ToT) was conducted in February 2002 at the Department of Land Management and Urban Planning in Phnom Penh.

Subsequent training courses for provincial facilitators (TPF) were conducted by the national PLUP trainers in six provinces of Cambodia. The trainer team cooperates with two advisers from the German Development Service (DED).

BACKGROUND

In order to counter the negative impacts of declining natural resources and land conflicts on the livelihood of the rural population and the assets of the whole country, the application of new tools focusing on integrated long-lasting development are necessary. The Statement of the Royal Government of Cambodia on Land Policy (May 2001) and the Strategic Land Policy Framework (currently under preparation) suggest that local land use plans need to be developed for priority areas (tourism and investment zones) and for sustainable management of natural resources. At the same time, the national land management and planning authorities, which have been

¹ Min Bunnara is currently the Country Coordinator for the Watershed Management Component of the MRC-GTZ Cooperation Programme, based at the Forestry Administration. Prior to this, he was a project officer with MRC/GTZ-SMRP, the Cambodian German Forestry Project (GTZ-CGFP).
² Harald is supporting, coordinating and co-organizing activities on Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) in Cambodia and the region.
³ Ignas is currently a Technical NREM Advisor with the Seila Task Force Secretariat (funded by Danida). He previously worked with the German Development Service (DED) at Department of Forestry and Wildlife as a facilitator on PLUP and community forestry.
⁴ Contributions from the PLUP Training Team and Prak Angkeara, PLUP focal point at the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction- MLPNUPC
given the political mandate to carry out all kinds of land management activities, are being decentralized to local and provincial authorities in line with the current government policy.

**WHAT IS PLUP?**

PLUP is a modern tool for sustainable management of natural resources in rural areas. PLUP focuses on the capacities and needs of local land users and covers the allocation, use, and protection of all resources including forests, agricultural land, and water areas. PLUP recognizes that socio-economic as well as biophysical interactions take place between forests, agricultural land, and water areas and dialogue between all parties involved is seen as a precondition to reaching sustainable forms of land use.

**CONCEPT OF PARTICIPATORY LAND USE PLANNING**

PLUP is a planning process starting from the village level in which all villagers and all other stakeholders jointly plan the use, protection and allocation of all land and water areas within their village boundaries. In this process they are assisted by neutral facilitators from outside the village.

PLUP can extend to cover all land and water areas, such as all agricultural land, forest areas, settlement areas, fish ponds, lakes, minefields etc. PLUP assists villagers, in cooperation with the relevant government institutions, to clearly define how they will use or protect each of these areas in future.

**The comprehensive approach of PLUP...:**

- Identifies land use options acceptable to all stakeholders.
- Strengthens their capacity to manage resources in sustainable ways.
- Creates a framework that is socially acceptable, environmentally sound, politically desired, and economically viable.
- Overcomes "sector-thinking" attitudes of government departments and offices.
- Builds up or uses existing communal and village structures and committees as a frame for participatory processes.
In this process the management responsibilities are clarified and it is decided who will have the right to use which kind of land and natural resources. PLUP helps to identify unused areas that may be suitable for agricultural production, which can be allocated to poor and landless families in the village at a later stage. Villagers are encouraged to draft rules and regulations, based on the law and relevant sub-decrees, as well as prepare detailed management plans for community forestry or community fishery zones in these land areas.

**PLUP and CBNRM**

CBNRM is very closely related to PLUP as it deals with the entire spectrum of natural resources. PLUP may be regarded as a tool or a methodological approach towards achieving CBNRM.

**What are the PLUP principles?**

- PLUP starts from the village level and then moves up to the commune. This bottom-up planning perspective is in line with the government’s policy of decentralization.
- PLUP should cover every type of land and every type of resource.
- PLUP is a participatory process and focuses on strengthening local decision-making and management capacities.
- Outsiders perform the role of facilitators, neutral conflict moderators and general supporters.
- PLUP should prepare the ground for land allocation procedures by MLMUPC.
CBNRM in Cambodia: selected papers on concepts and experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CBNRM</th>
<th>PLUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual focus</strong></td>
<td>Strengthening management capacities for sustainable use and protection of natural resources</td>
<td>Planning process for future land use, future land tenure and all aspects of NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Parts of the open access common property resources, which effectively fall under community management (parts of the forest land, fishery areas, grazing land etc.)</td>
<td>All land units including agricultural land and housing areas, all tenure systems; very wide scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involved institutions, e.g. represented in the team of facilitators</strong></td>
<td>Mainly Forestry, Fishery, and Environment.</td>
<td>DLMUPC, PDAFF, DoE, and possibly PDRD, PDIME, DWRM, PDCT etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Important local organizations and institutions</strong></td>
<td>Community Forestry Management Committee, Community Fishery Groups, Village NRM Committee.</td>
<td>Commune NRM Committee, Commune Council, Village NRM Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mapping</strong></td>
<td>Common property resources and especially the forest or fishery areas under community management; selective mapping.</td>
<td>Administrative boundaries, present and future land use, state land and private land, concession areas; tool; complete area mapping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Working Steps</strong></td>
<td>Situation analysis, committee election, mapping, development of regulations and management plans, planning of NRM activities, implementation, monitoring and enforcement.</td>
<td>All CBNRM steps and about ±25% more on land issues, mapping and planning for the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: PLUP and CBNRM: Comparing the concepts

**PLUP in protected areas**

The jurisdiction of protected areas falls under the MoE Department of Nature Conservation and Protection. At the moment, the ministry is in the process of adopting PLUP as a catalyst to develop a zoning system for the overall management of these areas. The current draft Protected Area Law (see chapter 3) divides the
area into four zones: core zone, conservation zone, sustainable use zone, and the community zone. No private land titles are permitted.

This also implies that villagers cannot expand their village or use areas, and the use of resources are strictly controlled. Although the aspect of protection is essential, villagers should be encouraged to cooperate with park staff on protection and management issues. This includes aspects like the need for benefit sharing, the potential for eco-tourism or “soft” tourism, focusing on biodiversity conservation, how to effectively deal with an increased population, and the aspect of resettlement.

**PLUP at the commune level**

The Statement of the Royal Government of Cambodia on Land Policy (May 2001) and the Strategic Land Policy Framework (currently under preparation) both suggest that local land use plans need to be developed for priority areas (tourism and investment zones) and for sustainable management of natural resources. At the same time, the land management and planning authority need to be decentralized to local and provincial authorities in line with the overall governance policy of promoting deconcentration and decentralization.

**Why do we need PLUP at the commune level?**

PLUP includes the clarification of administrative boundaries and the analysis of present use of all land categories within the village or commune boundaries, whether they belong to the state public domain, the state private domain or the private domain according to the land law

PLUP is particularly useful in areas with many land use conflicts or high degradation of natural resources. PLUP will also prepare the ground for the creation of community forestry groups and/or community fishery associations, depending on the situation in each commune.
NATIONAL LAWS AND SUB-DECREES MOST RELEVANT TO PLUP

In recent months several important laws and sub-decrees with regard to land management and natural resources have been passed, or are currently being drafted, by the Royal Government of Cambodia. For a more in-depth look at these, see chapter 3 of this report.

These laws are:

- The Land Law
- The Land Policy Statement
- The Law on Commune Administration
- The Forest Law
- The draft Sub-Decree on Community Forestry
- The draft Law on Fishery Conservation, Management and Development
- The draft Sub-Decree on Community Fishery
- The Law on Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Management
- The draft Sub-Decree on the Management of Protected Areas

Specific national guidelines on PLUP do not exist at present. These will be developed in the next few years, based on the first experiences available in the country.

STEPS TOWARDS PLUP IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of PLUP in villages and communes takes place in 9 steps:

Step 0: Getting started

- Selection and training of PLUP facilitation teams.
- Assess existing data.
- Purchase required materials and equipment.
- Select the working area.
Step 1: Preparation of field work
- Inform local authorities.
- Conduct an introductory meeting in the selected village.

Step 2: Situation analysis in the community
- Analysis of socio-economic aspects.
- Analysis of institutional aspects.
- Analysis of past and present use of land and natural resources.
- Analysis of current land and NR use conflicts.
- Boundary demarcation, transect walks and mapping.
- Preparation of the final present land use map.

Step 3: Identification and screening of options for land use changes
This step is completed by villagers and facilitated by provincial/district staff.

Step 4: Creation of a village NRM committee.
This village committee operates as a sub-committee to the Village Development Committee.

Step 5: Preparation of future land use plan, village regulations and detailed management plans
- Future land use map.
- Facilitate drafting of village regulations.
- Community Forest or Community Fishery Management Plans.

Step 6: Submission of the land use plan, the regulations and the management plans for official endorsement and approval
- Typing of regulations.
- Signed and endorsed by village, commune, district and provincial authorities.

Step 7: Link to extension services and land registration by PDLMUPC
Linking to existing institutions supports the implementation of NRM activities in the village, such as land registration and land allocation. It may also help to reduce and resolve conflicts.
**Step 8: Monitoring and evaluation (M & E)**

In PLUP M & E compares the present situation with the situation before the implementation of certain activities, plans, regulations, and processes. M & E provides valuable information used to decide whether activities, plans, enforcement of regulations, and processes should continue in the future or if they need to be changed. These decisions have to be made in a participatory way.

![Diagram 1: Steps and procedures in PLUP](image-url)
The ideal time frame from step 1 to step 8 should be 4 - 6 months assuming that facilitators work approximately 10 days per month.

**EXPERIENCES**

In view of providing competent support to all commune councils with regard to participatory land use planning at the local level, a comprehensive training programme for PLUP facilitators has started supported by various donors. In a first step, nine active national PLUP trainers attended a training of trainers (ToT) course in March 2002. These trainers are currently working with the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, the Ministry of Environment and various donor-funded projects and programmes. The PLUP trainers are now able to work in small teams to train facilitators from NGOs and provincial and district government staff in various agencies related to natural resources (including Agronomy, Forestry, Fisheries, Land Management, Rural Development, and Environment). Following the training, participants from government agencies will form PLUP facilitation teams and will start supporting local level land use planning activities.

Training courses for PLUP facilitators have been conducted in many provinces in Cambodia. PLUP has also conducted training of provincial facilitators in protected areas, and the wildlife sanctuary, Somkoh (see chapter 13). This training was supported by FFI in cooperation with MoE.

Future activities have been defined and have already started in some areas. In many cases NGOs (including LWF, WWF, PRASAC EU, FFI and GTZ PRO) are taking the leading role in PLUP implementation. When funding is secured, work can be expanded to other provinces. Map 1 shows the extent of PLUP activities from 2002 to 2004.
Map 1: PLUP activities from 2002 to 2004
PROBLEMS AND OUTLOOK

The Department of Land Management, Urban Planning & Construction has the official mandate to carry out land-use planning, land classification and land allocation. However, many staff at both the national and provincial levels lack basic knowledge on natural resources. To overcome this, capacity building and close cooperation with professional institutions dealing with natural resources is recommended.

Successful implementation of PLUP at village and commune levels can only take place in Cambodia if:

- The government authorities clearly demonstrate the political will to support decentralization, transparency, and the bottom-up approach of the PLUP process by acting according to their written and oral statements.

- An agricultural extension programme is connected with land use planning, land classification and allocation. This will provide people with opportunities to generate food and income and reduce their dependency and encroachment on forests.

FUTURE ACTIVITIES

To further optimize and promote PLUP in Cambodia, it is planned to:

- Follow up, monitor and evaluate PLUP activities in the province
- Organize workshops among trainers to improve training modules and methods
- Initiate PLUP extension in commune councils
- Create a PLUP network between the national and provincial level under the leadership of the Department of Land Management and Urban Planning
- Hold a planning workshop to improve and update the PLUP manual
- Set up a PLUP database similar to the CF database
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This paper aims to give a general understanding of the participatory management approach for protected areas in Cambodia. The first section will give an overview of the background against which the participatory management approach emerged. The second section explains the different kinds of community protected areas and how they are used by different organizations. The third section outlines the problems with the current approach. The final section concludes and shows what still needs to be done.

BACKGROUND

In 1993, the Cambodian Royal Decree on the Designation and Creation of Protected Areas established 23 protected areas in Cambodia (see Annex 1). These 23 protected areas cover a total area of approximately 3.3 million ha, and represent about 18% of the total land in Cambodia. They consist of seven national parks, ten wildlife sanctuaries, three landscapes and three multiple use areas. The Ministry of Environment, Department of Nature Conservation and Protection established these areas without intensive consultation with relevant stakeholders. This was partly due to security issues in the field (Carew-Reid et al, 2002:7). At that time, protected areas were managed by a top down management approach, without the cooperation of communities living in these areas (Ken, 2003).

The top down management approach did not work because of four main reasons:

A lack of knowledge of where communities were living, and which resources they used for their subsistence (Ken, 2003). Local communities continued to use the forest as they had in the past, despite the new protected area status. As a result, natural resources were not protected in a sustainable way.

The lack of a legal framework meant that unsustainable harvesting of natural resources by outsiders as well as insiders could not be dealt with effectively.
However, an alternative way of managing was emerging, favoured by different Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), and projects working throughout the country. The different approach advocated the involvement of local communities in the management of protected areas. Local communities were taught to understand the significance of forest resources and were involved in the management, sustainable utilization, and prevention against illegal use of natural resources.

In practice, this approach proved to be more effective. Experience showed that involvement of local communities led to an improvement of community livelihoods, and helped to conserve biodiversity at the same time. However, the approach is more time consuming, as many stakeholders have to be consulted.

This experience, as well as encouragement from NGOs, has led to the government reconsidering its approach. Participatory management also fits in with the Cambodian government’s decentralization and poverty alleviation policy. The Ministry of Environment, Department of Nature Protection and Conservation, learned from this experience and issued a proclamation to introduce community protected areas management on 30 May 2003. This proclamation is the initial effort towards formal policy development on participatory protected area management in Cambodia. As a result of this proclamation there are now 69 Community Protected Areas (CPAs) in Cambodia, 24 of which already have the official approval from the Ministry of Environment (see Annex 2 and 3).

However, at present there are no specific technical guidelines nor legal framework established. Different organizations and bilateral projects are implementing community protected area management in their own way. The next section describes the main approaches taken within Cambodia.

A lack of information on biodiversity, so the government could not make the right decision on how to divide the protected area into core, conservation, sustainable use zone and community development zones.

The Cambodian government also had limited human resource capacity and financial resources to make this management approach work.
DIFFERENT TYPES OF COMMUNITY PROTECTED AREAS

Community protected area is one approach towards protected area management. There are four methodologies used for community protected area development: organized by zoning, organized by participatory planning process, community fisheries, community forestry, and sustainable livelihood development. Sometimes these methodologies are combined with each other. These methodologies have been promoted and facilitated by different projects and organizations working in different types of protected areas in Cambodia.

Table 1 gives an overview of some of the organizations working in protected areas and the primary method they use, according to the descriptions after the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>PROTECTED AREA</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flora and Fauna International</td>
<td>Cardamom Mountains Wildlife Sanctuary Project</td>
<td>Organized by participatory planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management Project (BPAMP) – supported by the World Bank</td>
<td>Virachey National Park</td>
<td>Organized by zoning, and organized by participatory planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Project – supported by DANIDA</td>
<td>Preah Sihanouk “Ream” National Park</td>
<td>Community fisheries and community forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Society</td>
<td>Kulen Promtep Wildlife sanctuary</td>
<td>Organized by participatory planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlup Baitong</td>
<td>Kirirom National Park</td>
<td>Sustainable livelihood development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry Research Project</td>
<td>Beung Per Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Community fisheries and community forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save Cambodia’s Wildlife</td>
<td>Bokor National Park</td>
<td>Community fisheries and community forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory management of mangrove resources project</td>
<td>Peam Krasaop Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Community fisheries and community forestry, and Sustainable livelihoods development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Organized by zoning, organized by participatory planning process, and community fisheries and community forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Examples of organizations and approaches used.
Organized by zoning

This type of community protected area is classified into the core zone, the conservation zone, the sustainable use zone and the community protected area zone. In the core zone, only the park rangers and the researchers are allowed to enter for researching and environmental protection. Entry into the conservation zone is allowed with permission from the park director.

The use of natural resources are limited for the local community. For the sustainable use zone, natural resources are used according to the prior agreement. Use may be eco-tourism, a community protected area, a heritage conservation area or a special use area. In a community protected area zone, the local community can have land ownership. The MoE and the World Bank use this approach in Virachey National Park.

Organized by participatory planning process

Participatory land use planning divides the area into the agricultural land, residential land, community protected area and conservation land. In the dividing area process, the local community is involved to understand the importance of these areas and to participate in management and conservation. This method is used in the Cardamom Mountains Wildlife Sanctuary project implemented by Fauna and Flora International (FFI).

Community fisheries and community forestry

Some parts of protected areas are given to the local community to manage and organize as the community protected area for forestry management and fishery management. For example, the community protected areas at Beung Per Wildlife Sanctuary and Preah Monivong “Bokor” National Park implemented by Community Forestry Research Project and Save Cambodia’s Wildlife; Preah Sihanouk “Ream” National Park implemented by Coastal Zone Management Project.
Sustainable livelihood development

In this kind of community protected area, local people get the opportunity to gain income from new sources, so they do not depend completely on using wild natural resources. Livelihood programmes can include chicken, pig and fish raising, small scale vegetable and fruit cultivation, and eco-tourism. For instance, at Preah Soramariddh Koh Somak “Kirirom” National Park, an eco-tourism area has been set up to benefit the local people.

PROBLEMS AND CONSTRAINTS

Communities in CPAs still encounter many problems related to boundary demarcations, inadequacy of implementation, presence of powerful outsiders, and insufficient authority to crack down on offenders. This is a short overview of the main constraints:

- **Facilitator's insufficient experience**

  Community protected areas preparation is a new concept and actions are carried out by facilitators with limited understanding and individual preparation. Materials from the Ministry of Environment are delivered without interpretation and explanation as to how to put them into practice.

- **Communities' insufficient involvement**

  Most community protected areas are in remote areas, and people's lives face many difficulties, so the community has limited time available to participate in patrolling. Furthermore, community committees are not familiar with the law and face threats made by offenders.

  Some community members also hesitate to participate or misunderstand the process. They think community protected area is under the management of a village leader, and community committee only. This may be a result of the incomplete training given to community members and facilitators mostly working with the community committee.

- **Budget constraints**

  As part of the decentralization policy in 2003, the Ministry of Environment was urged to prepare some community protected areas with a government budget and moderated by the directors of protected areas. As a result some communities have already determined
Currently CPA management is being implemented by many different organizations in Cambodia, using different approaches, and without a unified strategy. Experience shows positive results, but there are still some constraints to making it work. To be successful, we need to develop a unified policy, as well as a strategic plan with technical guidelines. As part of the effort to enhance communication, a network has already been established. Finally, there is a need for more capacity building.

**CONCLUSION- THE WAY FORWARD**

A strategic plan still needs to be developed to establish technical guidelines on how to set up community protected areas. At the moment, the strategic plan is being developed by the CPAD office with involvement of the Committee of Protected Areas.

- **Lack of clarity about confiscation and benefit sharing**

Not only the community protected areas, but also community forestry initiatives outside the protected areas are still unclear about confiscation and benefit sharing between the community and the government. This has affected the community’s willingness to be involved. Moreover, most community protected areas wish to get some direct benefits from forest products for their community development, which is not always compatible with the main objective of the protected area-conservation.
Enhance communication

It is important to enhance communication between implementing organizations, government, park directors, and communities. The first effort was done in 1998 when the CF network was set up to share ideas among stakeholders. The network dealt with both protected and non-protected areas. Quarterly meetings were organized and newsletters sent out.

After the 2003 proclamation it was decided to extend this network to include CPA participants. This includes members from community committees, park directors, park rangers, implementing organizations, and government departments. Participants exchange information, share experiences, and learn from each other. They are also updated about current policies that can then be implemented by members.

However, the network is still limited because of a lack of funding from the Ministry of Environment, so only a few community committee members can be invited. It is also limited to being a forum to share ideas and experiences, and not a forum to come up with solutions or decision-making.

Capacity Building

There is a need for more capacity building for facilitators and communities. Facilitators do not always understand their role. They do not always involve everybody and make all community members share their ideas. As a result, decisions are not always based on the real needs of the community.
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Annex 1: Protected areas of Cambodia

Sources:
- Protected Areas: Ministry of Environment (2001)
- Roads: Ministry of Planning (1999)
- Cities: UNEP (1999)

Projection: UTM Zone 4B
Spheroid: Everest 56
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### Annex 3: Summary Table of Community Protected Areas Development

*Source: Report on Community Protected Areas in Cambodia, April 2004*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Protected areas</th>
<th>Number of CPAs</th>
<th>Number of villages</th>
<th>Number of families</th>
<th>Size of CPA (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preah Monivong National Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preah Sihanouk- Ream</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>5188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Preah Soramirth-Kosamak ‘Kirirom’ National Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preah Chey Voroman-Norodom ‘Kulen’ National Park</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1,094,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Virack Chey National Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kep National Park</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Botumsakor National Park</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3348</td>
<td>9,628,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beou Per Wildlife sanctuary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>6,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Phnom Somkos wildlife sanctuary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Roneam Donsom Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Snoul Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oral Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>5,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Peam Krosop Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>10,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lumphat Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>3,401,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kulen Prum Tep Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Phnom Namlier</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Snuol</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>31,187,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bantey Chhmar Protected Landscape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Angkor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Purpose Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Somlot Multiple Purpose Use</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>6,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dang Peng Multiple Purpose Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Beoung Tonle Sap Multiple Purpose Use</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5815</td>
<td>3490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7212</td>
<td>12,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Steung Terng</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69 CPA</td>
<td>167 Villages</td>
<td>181,500 families</td>
<td>55,226,473 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 11  Lessons learned from CBNRM in Cambodia: drawing upon examples from case studies

By: Srey Marona¹, Hou Kalyan² and Rebecca Kinakin³

INTRODUCTION

Numerous lessons can be taken from the fledgling CBNRM experiences in Cambodia. This chapter uses examples drawn from case studies developed through co-facilitation by the CBRNM Learning Initiative (CBNRM LI) and partners to illustrate key learning involving: participation, capacity building, education and awareness raising, community organizing and institution building, development of supportive legal frameworks and policies, conflict resolution, gender and equity, traditional knowledge and practices, support networks for CBNRM practitioners, participatory land use planning, relationships with commune councils, and sustainable livelihoods. First, however, a background on the CBNRM LI's case study writing process is provided.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROCESS

Why case studies?

Over the years, there have been many CBNRM-type efforts implemented in Cambodia, however documentation is still lacking. Scoping and baseline surveys conducted by the CBNRM LI, together with a wide range of stakeholders, showed that case studies would be the most useful types of documentation because they involve an analytical research process, channelling into and building on technical and indigenous knowledge. As well, the resultant product is easily accessible information in basic formats requiring relatively small inputs. Also, although this communication form targets literate people, it offers other media opportunities (e.g. field manuals, videos, posters) that target larger audiences.

Since 2001, CBNRM LI's main activity has been to build capacity in research, analysis, documentation, and peer feedback, networking CBNRM supporters throughout the country and in the region, and providing support to consultative processes for the development of relevant legal frameworks.

¹ Srey Marona is Team Leader for CBNRM LI/WWF and the head of CPAD, MoE.
² Hou Kalyan is a consultant for CBNRM LI/WWF and vice-chief of CPAD, MoE.
³ Rebecca Kinakin is the Coordinator of the Mekong Learning Initiative based at Oxfam America.
Who is involved in case study writing?

The CBNRM LI is co-supported by WWF, Oxfam America, International Development Research Centre of Canada (IDRC), Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC), the Mekong Learning Initiative (MLI) and the Learning and Research Network for Community Based Coastal Resource Management (LEARN/CBCRM). The project supports linkages to locally based approaches that empower local communities to participate actively in the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources through community forestry, co-management of fisheries, participatory land use planning, and participatory protected area management. The overall goal of the project is to promote CBNRM as an integral component of the decentralization and socio-economic development policies and strategies of the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC).

CBNRM LI's Case Studies and Networking Initiative is facilitated by a cross-institutional, multi-disciplinary core group of researchers in Cambodia, with partners from various levels and departments of government, NGOs, networks, learning institutions, communities and other civil society groups working in upland, lowland, freshwater, and coastal areas.

CBNRM LI's strategy for extending case study writing

As seen in Appendix 1, which provides an overview of the process and key activities, the first major training workshop on case study writing was in Siem Reap in July 2001. This event brought together numerous stakeholders, some who had not come together for a decade, to discuss NRM experiences, analyse CBNRM concepts, and learn how to write a case study using a 10 step case study writing process (see Appendix 2). A proceedings report called "Stories from the Tonle Sap", and a revised Case Study Writing Tool Kit were produced that, together with the positive learning experience, generated demand for another training workshop in Ratanakiri in November 2001. This workshop produced the "Stories from the Uplands of Ratanakiri" Case Study Training report, and an updated version of the Case Study Writing Tool Kit.

Following this event, 10 locations around Cambodia were selected for case study development, representative of upland, lowland, freshwater, and coastal areas (see
Appendix 3). Focus issues were identified by local partners who work closely with the communities. Examples of the topics include: gender equity and forest management, conflict resolution and community fisheries, and shifting agriculture in dense and semi-dense forests. During May 2002, the CBNRM LI co-facilitated a Synthesis and Reflection Workshop in Koh Kong to review the draft case studies with local partners and related stakeholders. Finally, in November 2002, a national CBNRM workshop was held in Phnom Penh where the case studies and lessons learned were presented to a large gathering including upper level policy makers.

In October 2003, the CBRNM LI, in cooperation with Participatory Management of Mangrove Resources (PMMR) and Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP), organized a third training workshop. This event was in response to partners' needs, and wanted to explore and discuss the “hot topics” or challenging issues on NRM in Cambodia. It resulted in a new set of case studies. Attendance at a regional training course by a CBRNM LI representative produced another case study, making a total of eight cases developed in this new phase (see Appendix 4). Thus far, eighteen case studies have been produced (see Appendix 5).

RECOFTC has since consolidated the lessons learned from this process and published a case study writing manual for use in its regional training courses. Encouraged by the success of the CBNRM LI, other regional partners like MLI have started employing the case study as a method for sharing lessons and experiences, particularly with regard to project work in Southern Laos and the Vietnam Delta. The process of case study writing is reaching larger and larger audiences as time goes by. Most recently, students at Cambodian universities have begun to attend the trainings.

LESSONS LEARNED

Participation

Participatory approaches embraced by CBNRM projects have thus far helped to collaboratively define issues for research, build linkages between diverse groups and individuals, and support the development of better policy.

1 Contact the MLI Coordinator, Rebecca Kinakin for further information.
The PMMR project is an IDRC supported initiative of the Ministry of Environment in Cambodia. PMMR works with local communities to better understand livelihood and management issues in Peam Krasaop Wildlife Sanctuary (PKWS), a unique mangrove ecosystem spanning 23,750 hectares and 3 administrative districts (Marschke and Kim, 2001). Marschke and Kim (2001) describe a participatory adaptive management, or “learning and doing” approach as central to PMMR’s work on engaging various actors involved in resource management, from both an institutional and resource-user perspective.

Participatory methods have allowed for experimentation and for the facilitation and identification of issues affecting coastal communities and their environment (Ibid.). In this way, participation given transparency and open sharing of information has been seen as a way to build trust, help achieve the mandates of the communities, organizations, and levels of government involved, as well as help foster decentralization.

Another example from a case study in Boeung Chunlen, Kandal province, shows that with all the relevant stakeholders actively participating in the project there are increased chances of long-term sustainable natural resource management in the area. Additionally, the participatory implementation of work plans has reduced the negative impacts of participation, namely the loss of time from income generating activities (Heng et al., 2003).

**Important for any participatory approach is transparency. Without wide sharing of knowledge, information, and experience, trust cannot be built and participatory approaches will fail.**

### Capacity building

Training courses, workshops, networking meetings, study tours, and other learning opportunities of the CBNRM LI have been very popular and well received. These events are designed to bring CBNRM supporters and practitioners together and build skills and knowledge in a variety of facets including research, analysis, case study writing, monitoring, relevant laws, and ecology that can be directly and readily applied to local realities. Also, the "learning-by-doing" method of training has given the opportunity to people without a high level of skills to learn as they go, building on
their knowledge base and sharing their experiences. As Marschke (2002) describes about the PMMR experience, “villagers want to learn and tend to learn best from each other. Further, they are enthusiastic to ‘do something’; they want real activities such as patrolling, replanting, and to try alternative livelihood options”(Ibid.). Empowerment and a sense of ownership are developed through this process and by their voluntary participation in natural resource management. Similarly, training and workshops in communities in Ream National Park and PKWS have built capacity of communities, and in these cases the communities have learned to develop their own management plans.

Capacity building is not just needed at the community level, but at various levels of government and technical departments in order to change attitudes and behaviours. As can be learned from the case study in Boeung Chunlen village, Kandal province, capacity building through training courses and study tours to other places enabled the management committee to learn new experiences about fisheries resource management which they then could apply in Boeung Chunlen. It also enabled them to share their own expertise with others.

**Capacity building is needed to reform ineffective ways of decision making, encourage participatory approaches and decentralization, and to facilitate discussions with communities and other groups, and change attitudes.**

**Education and awareness raising**

Experiences have shown that increased CBNRM education and awareness has helped to reduce illegal natural resource activities. Such testaments can be read in several of the case studies produced, notably in Stung Treng (Khai and Thai, 2002), on the south coast in Ream National Park and PKWS (Chiy et al, 2002), and in upland Ratanakiri (Cheam et al, 2001).

Most of the case studies point to the need for more education and awareness-raising campaigns and greater information dissemination via various media. Importantly, education and awareness raising activities must employ language and approaches that fit the target audience. Additional study tours and lessons learning/sharing opportunities were also recommended to increase exposure and broaden knowledge.
For education and awareness raising to be effective, information needs to be brought down to communities in ways that they can understand and use.

Community organizing and institution building

Community organizing and institution building for CBNRM in Cambodia is recognized as central elements in the process. An example drawn from a case study on community participation in fisheries management in Stung Treng province describes how local people organised into community fisheries committees to decrease illegal fishing practices, to increase their participation in more sustainable fisheries management, and to deal with conflicts between villagers and outsider fishers. One obstacle to community organizing in Stung Treng, however, has been that local CBNRM committees are sometimes mistakenly perceived to be political parties, and so people refuse to participate.

More work needs to be done in the future to develop local institutions and bring about greater transparency, awareness, and clarity of role of such institutions in the CBNRM decision making process.

Conflict resolution

The importance of establishing effective mechanisms locally, provincially, and nationally for conflict resolution is a theme echoed loudly throughout most of the case studies. Indeed, where there are resources there is conflict over their use, ownership, and management. A case study in Ream National Park on conflict resolution and community fisheries reflected the key learning that resolving disagreements over mangrove forest management required the participation of the local community and support from the local authorities, experts, and concerned institutions.

Another case study from Sre Ambel, Koh Kong province (Tong et al, 2003) also shows a strong effort by committee members to prevent conflict, particularly the committing of illegal activities. The community forestry committee and its members believe that if they reinforced the cooperation between community, local authorities and technical institutions they could reduce or stop all anarchic activities happening
Lessons learned from CBNRM in Cambodia: drawing examples from case studies in the community forestry area. This would then lead villagers to participate more fully in community forestry management, trusting that they could receive the benefits as a community.

Establishing sound conflict resolution mechanisms, as part of strengthening traditional/local institutions and existing resolution practices, can increase the openness and participation of people in community activities such as community forestry management.

Development of supportive legal frameworks and policies

A case study from Ratanakiri province featuring the implementation of community forest by-laws (Kim and Real, 2002) shows that to effectively implement these regulations, involvement and clear understanding of local communities, technical institutions, and local authorities is needed. Also critical is that these regulations comply with national legislation; a key challenge remains that some community forestry and community fisheries rules are not enforced at the national level, even if the provincial authorities recognizes them. As well, “clear and widespread dissemination and interpretation of the regulations for both the local community and outsiders is necessary” (Ibid.:7).

Also required are policy and procedures supportive of decentralization, which promote participation and cooperation of a broad range of stakeholders in planning, management, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Moreover, in some cases, the granting of legal tenure rights to communities according to traditional use, access, and proximity is necessary.

There is a need for clear mandates for provincial and national government, as well as laws with “teeth” to help support local management and enforcement, decrease illegal activities, provide legal rights (particularly to indigenous communities), and encourage decentralization.

Gender and equity

Although relatively new concepts for research in Cambodia, a case study on gender in community forestry (Sun and Kouk, 2002) in Pursat province was written illustrating
that successful community forestry management requires the participation of both men and women in decision making and implementation. This conclusion was drawn from the realization that men and women use and perceive forest products differently and have different knowledge and relationships with the forest. The case study recommends further investigation into gender roles in decision making, as well as equity in the distribution of benefits of, and responsibility for, CBNRM activities.

**There needs to be greater attention to power relations and social dynamics at work in communities (e.g. economic, gender, age, ethnicity, class, influence, and ability) in order to make CBNRM more in tune with local realities.**

**Traditional knowledge and practices**

Information gathered during many of the CBNRM case studies suggests that traditional knowledge and practices are important and useful sources for understanding natural resource management in Cambodia. A case study on shifting (slash and burn) agriculture in Mondulkiri province looked at the process of traditional agriculture practices, and it discovered that little is actually known about indigenous livelihoods, knowledge, or the effects of such practices.

**Traditional knowledge and practices remain little known in Cambodia, and need to be explored further in order to see where they may be part of maintaining or improving NRM systems.**

**Support networks for CBNRM practitioners**

Generally, cooperation and communication among NGOs, communities, and the government has been weak, requiring the building of better linkages between and among groups.

All case studies supported the creation and/or improvement of linkages and networks for CBNRM supporters and practitioners, both horizontally (between and among communities also dependent upon the local ecosystem) and vertically (between organizations, nationally and internationally). This is critical to the wider sharing of lessons learned and the expansion of successful experiences. One case study also suggested a support network with a women-environment focus (Sun and Kouk, 2002).
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Participatory land use planning (PLUP)

As was seen in the case of Tuol Sambo village, the application of PLUP (see chapter 9) strategies has increased the involvement of villagers and relevant departments in forest protection and has prevented many kinds of illegal activities both within and outside the community forestry area (Ouk and Ou, 2003). Using PLUP tools to work out land use issues with relevant stakeholders before feeding these plans up to high policy levels for approval, helped to resolve the problem of forest land encroachment in the area. A main finding of the case study shows that solving this conflict, primarily requires the recognition of the importance of all stakeholders in the process of establishing NRM. It is equally important to promote and encourage community participation in forestry resource management.

Relationships with commune councils (CC)

The case study in Chumkiri district shows that the CC play a crucial coordination role in the process of preparing and implementing community forestry. This is because they have defined roles and responsibilities for each member (Im, et al. 2003). It was seen that when this role is played properly, organizing for community forestry can be accelerated with positive results. By being active, the CC gain support from community members. However, if the CC uses its role and position for personal benefit, local people’s trust and participation in the community development process will be limited.

Commune councils are required to mediate conflict as well as actively promote and coordinate mechanisms for consultation with residents, civil society organizations, and community groups.
Sustainable livelihoods

In light of efforts to protect and conserve natural resources, communities are left to wonder how they will be able to maintain their livelihoods. From the case studies it is seen that communities are interested in exploring alternative livelihood options. In PKWS, multiple factors are described that affect people's livelihoods, including government policy, environmental degradation, illness, illegal activities, and market conditions (PMMR, 2002). This study shows that participatory resource management is helping to facilitate the shift towards more sustainable resource practices, for example, from charcoal production to mangrove restoration and small-scale aquatic resource harvesting. This new shift is also encouraging the exploration of alternative sustainable livelihood options.

Another case study in Peam Krosop explains in more detail how seasonal factors affect fishers' livelihoods. According to a local villager: "In the rainy season, I cannot go to fish with crab traps; I have to ask my son to go fishing in the open sea with my neighbours. They have to spend two or three nights on the boats in order to find fish..." (in Khim et al, 2004). Low fish catch during the rainy season makes lives and livelihoods difficult and vulnerable, and therefore it is necessary to explore other livelihood options (Ibid.).

CONCLUSION

Many lessons can be learned from the actual process of case study writing. This chapter, however, focused largely on exploring the lessons that came out of the case studies. Key learnings can be summarized as follows:

- Important for any participatory approach is transparency. Without wide sharing of knowledge, information, and experience, trust cannot be built and participatory approaches will fail.
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- Capacity building is needed to reform ineffective ways of decision making, encourage participatory approaches and decentralization, facilitate discussions with communities and other groups, and change attitudes.
- For education and awareness raising to be effective, information needs to be brought down to communities in ways that they can understand and use.
- More work needs to be done in the future to develop local institutions and bring about greater transparency, awareness, and clarity of the role of such institutions in the CBNRM decision making process.
- Establishing sound conflict resolution mechanisms, as part of strengthening local institutions and existing resolution practices, can increase the openness and participation of people in community activities such as community forestry management.
- There is need for clear mandates for provincial and national government, as well as laws with “teeth” to help support local management and enforcement, decrease illegal activities, provide legal rights to (particularly) indigenous communities, and encourage decentralization.
- There needs to be greater attention to power relations and social dynamics at work in communities (e.g. economic, gender, age, ethnicity, class, ability, influence) in order to make CBNRM more in tune with local realities.
- Traditional knowledge and practices remain little known in Cambodia, and need to be explored further in order to see where they may be part of maintaining or improving NRM systems.
- For CBNRM to be effective, reflective, replicable, and sustainable in Cambodia, supportive alliances are needed.
- PLUP helps to improve CBNRM by bringing together all stakeholders into a process of preparing a local resource management plan and addressing potential conflicts. They can then be fed to upper levels of policy and planning.
- Commune councils are required to mediate conflict, as well as actively promote and coordinate mechanisms for consultation with residents, civil society organizations, and community groups.
- More exploration into how SL concepts and approaches can help to improve CBNRM by addressing issues and problems of livelihood vulnerability is needed.
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**APPENDIX 1: Case study writing strategy and key activities (2001 - 2004)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Workshop/ Training Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Key Learning Outputs and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM Case Study Writing Training #1: Stories from the Tonle Sap</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>July 2001</td>
<td>Case study training report, case study writing tool kit and proceedings report that was used as a basis for improving future training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Reflection and Planning Workshop: ToT on Case Study Writing and Facilitation Skills</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>November, 2001</td>
<td>Was a good opportunity to reflect on the Siem Reap case study writing workshop and learned how to develop/improve agenda design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM Case Study Writing Training #2: Stories from the Uplands of Ratanakiri</td>
<td>Ratanakiri</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>November, 2001</td>
<td>Case study training report, updated version of the case study writing tool kit and proceedings report to be used as a basis to assess progress and improvements of future training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis and Reflection Workshop</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21-25 May 2002</td>
<td>Constructive peer feedback on the case studies in the form of ideas maps, a SWOT analysis on the case study writing process, and team action plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National CBNRM Workshop</td>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>13-16 Nov 2002</td>
<td>Final proceedings report in Khmer and English. Prelude to enable people involved in natural resource management to understand the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Writing Training #3: Hot Topics From Around Cambodia</td>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13-24 Oct 2003</td>
<td>Two training reports, &quot;Reflections on the CBNRM Case Study Writing Course&quot;, and &quot;Training Considerations for Case Study Writing: Lessons from Cambodia&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on Pen to Paper at RECOFTC</td>
<td>Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>Kalyan</td>
<td>7-18 Oct 2002</td>
<td>Clarified case study writing and improved knowledge/skills for analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:

CASE STUDY WRITING PROCESS

Realising that participants tend to interpret the 10-steps writing process too linear and literal, the flow has been revised to reflect the iterate nature of the writing process better. Although the steps as such remain the same, they are now clustered as 'eggs in several baskets'. The baskets illustrate natural clusters of activities during the writing process.

Placed in the very centre of this model is analysis, in the realization that all the other steps rely on this skill. This process serves as a map for participants during the writing process.
# Appendix 3: Case studies topic and location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Partner Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender in Community Forestry Management</td>
<td>Pursat</td>
<td>Sun Vann, Kouk Theun, Samrang Dy Vicheth, Chean Thayuth</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Concern Worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community Participation In Fisheries Management</td>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>Kai Syrabo, Thai Kimseng, Oul Kim</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Oxfam Community Aid Abroad (OCAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fisheries Policy Reforms and Current Perceptions about Community Fisheries or Co-management of Fisheries</td>
<td>Siem Reap &amp; Battambang</td>
<td>Thay Somony</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Participatory natural resource Management (FAO Siem Reap) and DoF/CFDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mangrove destruction and community fisheries management inside and outside Ream National Park</td>
<td>Kom-Pong Som</td>
<td>Leng Som Ath, Khev Sunho, Men Vuthy, Man Dort, So Srey Mom, Ouk Ly Khim, Suy Thea</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ream National Park, MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finding Sustainable Livelihoods in Peam Krasaop Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>PMMR Team</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>PMMR Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Community Based Coastal Resources Management (CBCRM)</td>
<td>Koh Kong &amp; Kom-Pong Som</td>
<td>Chey Pichrathana, Som Chea, Suy Thea, Leng Somath, So Srey Mom, Ouk Ly Khim</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>PMMR Project and Ream National Park, MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implementation of Community Forestry Regulations</td>
<td>Ratana-kiri</td>
<td>Real Sina, Kim Sat, Son Bora</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Partnership for Local Governance (PLG) and CBNRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Influence of Cashew Crop Expansion</td>
<td>Ratana-Kiri</td>
<td>Meas Sokhum, Prum Meta, Mom Kun Thav, Em Tray</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Non Timber Forest Products (NTFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Depletion of Dense and Semi-Dense Forest Areas</td>
<td>Mondul-Kiri</td>
<td>Din Yim Sreng, Ngin Lina Janet, Ngorm Sophal, Lun Somphos, Cheam Mony</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Provincial Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DoFW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Under-Estimated Importance of Freshwater Shrimp Fisheries and Processing to Local Families</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>Thay Somony</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Participatory Natural Resource Management (FAO Siem Reap) and DoF/CFDO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Case studies topic and location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Partner Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Role and Responsibility of Commune Councils and Local Communities in Natural Resource Management</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Im Maredi, Sok Mary, Heng Sokla</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP) CIDSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conflict Management within the process of Community Forestry Management</td>
<td>Sre Ambel Koh Kong</td>
<td>Tong Sokunthea, Phan Kamnap, Meas Sothun Vathanak, Meas SamSocheath, Meas Sam Sothun Vathanak</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP) AFSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Challenges of Community Based Protected Area Management in Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods</td>
<td>Kom-Pong Thom</td>
<td>Seng Leang, Pouk Bunthet, Dul Vuth, Kim Sarin</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP) DNCP/MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Action Planning of Boeung Chunlen Community Fishery</td>
<td>Kandal</td>
<td>Heng Ponley, Sung Sokunthea, Chheun Sarik, Yim Lam</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sustainable Livelihoods in Anlong Rieng Community Fishery</td>
<td>Pursat</td>
<td>Ken Sopheap, Ros Chhorvivorn, Horn Honey, Tit Phearak, Nouv Buntha</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Integrated Participatory Land Use Planning Tools in Community Forestry Establishment Process</td>
<td>Kom-Pong Cham</td>
<td>Ouk Thira, Ou Sopheary</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Concern Worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seasonal Factor affect Fishers’ Livelihoods</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Eam Dyna, Khim Wirya</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>PMMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Land Concessions to Reduce Poverty: A Questionable Policy!</td>
<td>Kom-Pong Thom</td>
<td>Srey Marona, Adelina Piso, Maria Latumahina</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>RECOFTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Map

Case Study Sites in Cambodia (Community Based Natural Resource Management)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>PROVINCE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Implementation of Community Forestry Regulations</td>
<td>O Yadao</td>
<td>Rattanakiri</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Influence of Cashew Crop Expansion</td>
<td>Kon Morn</td>
<td>Rattanakiri</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Depletion of Dense and Semi-Dense Forest Areas</td>
<td>Pichrada</td>
<td>Mondulkiri</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Community Participation in Fisheries Management</td>
<td>Siem Bok</td>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The Under-Estimated Importance of Freshwater Shrimp Fisheries &amp; Processing to Local Families</td>
<td>Sour Nikom</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fisheries Policy Reforms &amp; Current Perceptions on Community Fisheries or Co-Management of Fisheries</td>
<td>Pouk</td>
<td>Siem Reap</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gender in Community Forestry Management</td>
<td>Bakan</td>
<td>Pursat</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Learning Cycle: Case Study Writing as a tool for Networking &amp; Lesson Learning</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mangrove Destruction &amp; Community Fisheries Management inside &amp; outside of Ream National Park</td>
<td>Prey Nob</td>
<td>Sihanouk ville</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Community Based Coastal Resources Management (CBCRM)</td>
<td>Prey Nob</td>
<td>Sihanouk ville</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Finding Sustainable Livelihoods in Ream Krasaop Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>Smach Mean Chey</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Role &amp; Responsibility of Commune Councils &amp; Local Communities in Natural Resource Management</td>
<td>Chum Kiri</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Conflict Management within the Process of Community Forestry Management</td>
<td>Sre Ambel</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>The Challenges of Community Based Protected Area Management in Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods</td>
<td>Rovieng</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Action Planning of Boeung Chunlen Community Fishery</td>
<td>Muk Kampol</td>
<td>Kandal</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Sustainable Livelihoods in Anlong Rieng Community Fishery</td>
<td>Krakor</td>
<td>Pursat</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>How can PLUP help to solve Land Encroachment ?</td>
<td>Dambae</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Seasonal Factor Affect on Fishers’ Livelihoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Land Concessions to Reduce Poverty: a Questionable Policy!</td>
<td>Tumrinh</td>
<td>Kampong Thom</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 12  
Community forestry action research: experiences from the field

By: Sy Ramony¹, Phan Kamnap², and Kim Sarin³ & ⁴

INTRODUCTION

Cambodia's forests have declined substantially over the last 20 years because of war, agricultural expansion, and over harvesting of timber. Conventional forest management policies and widespread corruption have caused increasing resource scarcity, higher resource prices, and contributed to rural impoverishment. Lack of capacity and motivation has led to poor forest management and continued forest destruction. Forest users need to be empowered and motivated to sustain forest resources and a fundamental change in forest management policies is necessary to achieve socially responsible governance of forests, improve the supply of forest resources to rural people, and encourage sustainable forest resources use and management.

This paper presents an overview of participatory action research (PAR) in community forestry (CF), based on the experiences of CF & community based natural resource management (CBNRM) practices in Cambodia. Readers may find that the methods used and the key lessons learned can be applied to their own situations.

WHY CF ACTION RESEARCH?

Community forestry (CF) is increasingly recognized as an important strategy for sustaining forest resources and for contributing to improved rural livelihoods and environmental security.

¹ Ramony is Team Leader of the Community Forestry Research Project, within the Department of Nature Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Environment.
² Kamnap is working as Deputy Project Leader for Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP) and Deputy Director of Forestry and Wildlife Training Centre.
³ Sarin is currently a Field Coordinator for the Community Forestry Research Project supported by IDRC, and he is actively providing a technical support to five research sites.
⁴ With contributions from: Ken Serey Rothe, Nhem Sovanna, Srey Marona, Hou Kalyan, Toby Carson & Doug Henderson
The expanding role of CF in Cambodia is evident:

- The number of field-level CF initiatives has increased substantially over the past decade, from one or two a decade ago to about fifty at the present time.

- Institutional support for CF has expanded at national and especially provincial levels, and through the establishment of inter-institutional mechanisms for CF, such as a national network, various working groups, workshops, and training.

- The policy environment has become more favourable for CF, with enabling provisions in the Forest and Environment Laws, the sub-decree on forest concession management, and a recently endorsed sub-decree on CF (see chapter 3).

The concept of CF action research is one of “learning by doing” in which learning is perceived as experiential and reflective, followed by change and more learning. It recognizes that people learn through the active adaptation of their existing practices and knowledge in response to their own experiences and with other people and that of their environment. Hence, action research is a continuous process including reflection, action and then learning which is cyclically repeated (see Figure 1).
The action research cycle is a process whereby members of an interest group and/or local communities jointly define their own goals and objectives, collect and analyse information, develop strategies and act upon a plan to meet their needs at the same time taking into account three main aspects: social, political and ecological soundness.

Many projects and programmes have realized that action research can provide the most up-to-date and accurate information, which can be of inestimable help when planning and decision-making. Action research increases the capacity to identify issues and problems, and gives an opportunity for participants to share knowledge about possible interventions and develop strategies towards social, political and environmental improvements. In many community development projects, outsiders guide local communities towards identifying their perceived problems. In the CF PAR context local communities must be fully involved in problem definition to assure that research will meet their needs for livelihood improvement.

When undertaking a participatory action research strategy, local communities will be able to develop an understanding of broader social and environmental issues such as rapid natural resources degradation. By appreciating the issues of cause and effect, communities can learn how to use and manage their resources in a sustainable manner.
Participatory action research has been the core strategy in the Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP), supported by the International Development Research Centre of Canada (IDRC) and the Regional Center for Community Forestry Training (RECOFTC). CFRP is jointly implemented by three Cambodian national partner institutions: Department of Nature Conservation and Protection (MoE), Forestry Administration (MAFF), and the Faculty of Forestry Science of the Royal University of Agriculture (RUA).

Participatory action research on community forestry has been implemented to understand and characterize the present CF situation in Cambodia and to develop appropriate strategies to advance and expand opportunities for sustainable community-based forest use and management as well as to improve local livelihood opportunities. Research findings and results have been checked and applied to inform local, provincial and national policy makers in order to influence and promote the development of appropriate policies and programmes for sustainable forest management.

WHAT CHANGES HAVE CF ACTION RESEARCH ACHIEVED?

a. **Local communities are motivated to manage forest resources when they are encouraged with resource-use rights and practical knowledge:** Participatory action research has increased understanding and strengthened capacity for CF in a range of collaborating organizations and target communities. CF groups are strongly supportive of CF and the commune council and other groups are asking for assistance to help establish more groups. Existing groups also see significant benefits from CF in the short and long term uses of some NTFP products and in the longer term from timber. CF groups are now speaking for themselves and are confident that with some help they can manage their forests successfully. They also note significant natural re-growth when trees and forest are protected from continuous use and cutting. Allowing forests to regenerate naturally allows mixed forests to grow, and communities value these more highly than single species forests. This increased understanding and strengthened capacity at the local level should also be targeted towards strengthening provincial capacity. The initial steps in the process, which are mainly supporting local CF groups and local commune council groups, need to be expanded to understanding the knowledge needs at the local level.
WHAT IS THE ACTION RESEARCH PROCESS?

Action research is an intentional, rational, and systematic process comprised of a series of activities that involve planning, data collection and analysis, conclusions, and action (Daniel, 1997:123).

Action research is undertaken to improve effectiveness and increase productivity in an organization, and plays an important role in making linkages to the policy level and key decision makers. It helps to inform or update decision makers of the current situation at the grassroots level, and enables them to make decisions and develop new strategies to address outstanding issues.

**Team building**

Forming a research team generally takes place at the initial stage of the project and requires special consideration. Some team members can be officially nominated, particularly in the case of recruiting government officers for project counterparts. Recruiting interviews for support staff are conducted to assess the applicant's interest and capacity.
Team members review the project's goal and objectives and receive training in group dynamics and research techniques. Training includes the basic concepts for research, why we need participatory research and intervention, and what type of research methods are needed. The team must work in an environment of mutual cooperation and understanding of each other. Building strong working relationships among a team comprised of individuals from different backgrounds and experiences is not too difficult, however, maintaining these relationships can be challenging. The site team leaders and field coordinator must demonstrate commitment, patience, and facilitation skills.

During the team building stage the research team must establish relationships with local leaders, grassroots organizations, and national institutions and also work on defining the institutional, conceptual, and methodological framework of the project.

The following actions contribute to CF action research cycle:

**Site selection and understanding**

The preliminary assessment of a site may include identifying the social structure of the population concerned in order to differentiate their needs and problems related to forest resources use. The research team and key people in CF action research normally use set criteria to judge a potential area, based on forest eco-type and conditions, local interest, conflicts and resources available.

The actual site selected will reflect institutional desires and concerns, whether partners have a high level of forest resource dependency, if local agencies show interest and support,

**LIST OF KEY CRITERIA FOR SITE SELECTION**

- Different forest eco-type and condition (dense, semi dense or degraded forest and within and/or outside protected area or within concession area)
- Conflict over resources use (conflicts between neighbouring communities, outsiders, powerful individuals, and the private sector)
- High pressure on forest resources and environmental degradation
- Level of dependency on forest Resources
- Local organization and community interest in CF & CBNRM
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and the practical issue of a site being in an area that is easily reached by central based project members.

**Identification of research methods**

Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) is recognized as one tool for collecting and analysing information. PRA comprises of many methods including participatory mapping, semi-structured interviews, transects, wealth ranking, seasonal calendar, sketch map, aerial photo, and resource flow. A brief summary of key PRA method used in CF action research in Chumkiri district, Kampot province is presented in Box 1.

**Participatory mapping**

Participatory mapping is often one of the first methods used in CF research. It customarily starts by holding a meeting with local people, the village chief and key informants. The starting point of this method is to highlight the proposed teamwork and purposes of the information gathering. The participants are asked to draw their community from a well-recognized starting point, which is easy to understand on the ground or flip chart. After finishing the interview the team copies the sketch map and compares it to the official map of the area. The purpose of this method is to gain information related to the geography, source and use of resources that are available in the community.

The selection of techniques and tools for mapping should ensure that the maps produced are both understandable for local users and satisfy the needs of government agencies. Forest maps used at the first stage should be reliable and readily interpreted by villagers as well as technical staff. Given the poor quality of available topographic maps in Cambodia, enlarged and geometrically corrected aerial photo maps would provide an ideal base map for local-level resource inventories, land use planning and land allocation activities. Community forestry mapping strives to create a reliable representation of forest conditions, tenure and use for discussion and planning purposes, and to provide a reference document for official use. Technical mapping tools should be combined with participatory techniques for information gathering, interpretation and participatory mapping. The tools and techniques applied can range from simple sketch maps based on local knowledge to GIS-based maps combining existing map data, remote sensing data and geo-referenced sketch map data. The use of GIS technology permits the combination of "scientific" and "indigenous" knowledge for an area.

**Secondary data gathering**

Is implemented before commencing research in the community. Existing data are collected including: maps, demographic statistics and other documentation that relates to the study area.
Semi-structured interview
Researchers conduct interviews with households or individuals to obtain more information about each individual household. The practice is to start with a set of specific questions, which have been prepared in advance, based on the purpose of the research and the types of information needed. Researchers will deviate from the standard set of questions if they want to pursue a certain line of questioning.

Resources flow
This method presents the changing flow of forest resources in the village, especially through past political regimes. It also documents the causes of those changes. Because this activity records different periods of time, participation from many people, (men and women, old and young) is essential to obtain sufficient and accurate information. Frequently this method heightens people’s awareness of the pace of forest degradation.

Transect
A transect examines features that were presented in the participatory map and looks for additional information related to the resource use in each area. The transect is conducted by walking with key informants through the research area and focusing on areas of forest resource use, areas of agricultural encroachment on former forestland, and where the collection of forest resources and NTFPs take place. Problems are identified as well as opportunities to improve peoples’ livelihoods.

Sketch map
A sketch map helps in conducting semi-structured interviews with households or individuals and facilitates communication during the interview. A sketch map is modified from the participatory map and people are encouraged to draw on the sketch map to provide additional information that may have been missed. Respondents are able to identify and name locations of resource use within the community.

Aerial photo
Aerial photographs may be used instead of sketch maps; however the photograph shows an actual picture of each area. This may be difficult for community people to understand. Thus, time is needed for facilitating and demonstrating landmarks which are most easily recognised. Unfortunately, until recent times, Cambodia has lacked up-to-date aerial photographs.

Target group meeting
This method is used in conjunction with the resources flow method and facilitates getting people to meet as a large group. The target group meeting verifies information from other sources and seeks additional information which may have been missed, allowing researchers to better understand the knowledge and concepts of local people concerning forestry issues.
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Box 1 Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) methods

Not all PRA tools listed above are appropriate for every research subject. Generally, a number of methods are selected for obtaining the specific information needed. The selection is based on the subject, topic, and field of research. For CF action research, participatory resources mapping was commonly selected to identify resource allocation, and followed by transect walks and semi-structured interviews. Although PRA methods are recognized as effective tools for information collection and analysis, other skills, including appropriate behaviour by the field practitioners, are essential for building a good relationship with local communities. A good relationship is key to collecting accurate information.

Information Analysis

Data analysis is usually facilitated by the action researchers composed of members from different organizations and local communities. Researchers, together with members of local community groups, collaboratively analyse feedback and further explore the nature, causes, and consequences of problems presented from different angles and perspectives including social, political, economic and environmental. Identifying the root of the problem, and developing a strategy to

Skills in Building Rapport

- Speak in the local language;
- Introduce yourself and the objectives;
- Find appropriate times to meet and try to keep meetings short;
- Meet regularly in both casual and work settings;
- Encourage and support new and creative ideas;
- Encourage participation of women;
- Encourage local organizations and community interest in CF & CBNRM.
address the problem can only occur after this collaborative analysis. An important feature of strategy design will be an analysis of its potential for success.

**ACTION PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

In the planning process, the research team first presents a series of research findings, describing alternative solutions to the problem. These findings include suggestions for possible action, their rationale, and resources needed for their implementation. After identifying several alternatives, the research team should attempt to define an action goal and objectives. The goal and objectives should be defined in such a way as to ensure the organization's interest, commitment, effort, and logistical support.

After the research team has decided on an overall goal and objectives, these must be translated into planning operational activities which need to be implemented in order to achieve the goal and objectives. A general plan with a tentative course of action should be developed, which details activities, their timing, and the responsibility of researchers from each organization.

**Evaluation and feedback**

The action plan includes evaluation procedures to be implemented during and following each action stage. Evaluation is necessary to determine the impact of action, to assess whether the overall objectives of the project have been fulfilled, and provides a base level of information from which future action plans and activities can be developed. The evaluation should also contain a definition and a description of the process by which a project achieves a certain outcome.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

**Action research cycles**

Participatory action research is not limited to conducting a single period of research, but is rather a series of research activities or case studies during a project’s life. Action research can be seen as a cycle which includes reflection, identifying key research questions, field-work research, implementation and then returning to
reflection again. Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation ensures that the project adheres to its objectives and goal (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Diagram of CF action research & learning cycle
IMPACTS

By being involved in CF action research, people can see why community forestry and natural resource management are important for themselves and future generations. They begin to understand their own interests and roles in natural resource management as well as that of other stakeholders. Local people can gain an appreciation for their own capacity to work and plan collaboratively to address issues and conflicts, and achieve common goals and interests. Local planning capacity is strengthened, and people are better empowered to address their own problems and conflicts related to CF/CBNRM.

Furthermore, people understand the need for support and recognition from government CF/CBNRM policy, law and regulations to ensure local participation in long term, sustainable natural resources management. Policy makers can make use of research findings to help develop supporting CF/CBNRM laws and regulation. Major impacts of action research can be summarized as local empowerment, organizational change and gaining policy support.

CHALLENGES

The key successes of action research include participation, commitment and policy support. Though 'participation' is a very popular term in development, it is not easy to turn this word into practice. Field practitioners spend a great deal of time getting local communities and related stakeholders to understand each other and work together. Good collaboration can take time to develop and may easily break down due to internal or external conditions.
Similarly, getting people to commit to a long term goal, and believe that it is possible to achieve it, is not done overnight. This requires a strong sustained commitment from researchers and community leaders, as some people need to see a result first before they believe it. Additionally, gaining policy support contributes to success in action research, but this kind of support is not possible unless key policy and decision-makers clearly understand the situation, issues and problems at the ground level, so that they can formulate laws and regulations accordingly. These policy makers are also difficult to influence. Therefore, researchers are always thinking how action research can link with and help the policy makers.

**CURRENT CF AND CBNRM IN CAMBODIA**

Both government and NGOs are working and supporting the development of CF/CBNRM in Cambodia. These approaches to natural resources management are gaining awareness and support in many local communities, and also receiving greater policy support from the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC). With approval of the Community Forestry Sub-Decree in 2003, capacity for participatory planning for community forestry needs to be strengthened at national, provincial and local levels in order effectively implement and mobilize CF nationwide.

The Forestry Administration and its provincial offices require extensive re-orientation and capacity building in order to fulfil their role in supporting the development of community forestry. However, a flexible approach needs to be adopted to allow for the participation of other agencies so that as many available staff as possible, with appropriate skills for community forestry, are involved in initiating and supporting community forestry.

The need for research oriented approaches and effective local participation in developing local community-specific CF regulations and management plans is now recognized and valued.

**CONCLUSION**

Participatory action research is an important contribution to local empowerment and development. The approaches used can themselves be empowering depending on
who is interested in participation and how, when, where and what kind of action is taken.

However, participatory action research in promoting community forestry deals with a unique and complex set of tasks. Clear goals must be set, which identify targets for 5 - 10 years, and ensuring that key stakeholders in CF activities know their roles and responsibilities in addressing the critical issues related to CF/NRM in each key step.

In conclusion, participatory action research is designed to promote social change, encourage democratic forms of interaction and decision making, which ultimately leads to empowering and benefiting people.
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Chapter 13

Management of strategic areas for integrated conservation

By: Andy Maxwell¹, Cheam Mony² and the MOSAIC Team³

This paper presents highlights of a new approach to resource management and biodiversity conservation in the Eastern Plains of Cambodia.

BACKGROUND

Eastern Cambodia is increasingly recognized as one of the most important areas for wildlife conservation in Southeast Asia, and harbours remnant populations of several species of mammals and birds that are no longer found anywhere else on earth (Timmins and Ou, 2001; Maxwell & Pinsonneault, 2001; Goodman, et al., 2003; Tordoff et al., 2004). These globally significant wildlife species live in a landscape marked by large expanses of diverse habitat mosaic, ranging from open seasonal wetlands to tall and dense evergreen forests. Much of the landscape is covered by open deciduous forest that supports large grazing mammals like Asian elephant, banteng, wild water buffalo, gaur, plus associated predator carnivores including tiger, leopard, dhole (Asian wild dog), amongst others. The conservation value of the landscape is enhanced by the presence of large waterbirds including Sarus crane, giant ibis, and storks. This remarkable biological value, and the serious threats that exist in this area of Cambodia, has led several international conservation organizations (WWF, WCS, FFI, CAT), their government agency partners in the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, together with donors, to heavily invest in protecting remaining wildlife populations and their habitat mosaic.

While the investment in wildlife protection is justified to maintain a valuable resource, there has been a gap in addressing basic livelihood issues of the people that live throughout this landscape. Most importantly, conservation agencies and organizations have not been able to address how communities might sustain
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¹ Andy Maxwell is currently Dry Forest Species project manager at WWF Cambodia, and is also working as an advisor to the MOSAIC-EP project.
² Cheam Mony is a Team Leader with the MOSAIC-EP project at WWF, and a staff member of the Community Forestry Office at the Forest Administration.
themselves when the option of unsustainable hunting and wildlife trade, which has gone on uncontrolled for almost 20 years, is suddenly prohibited.

However urgent the need for strict protection of remaining key wildlife populations, there is a growing concern within Cambodia, considering conservation situations in developing countries throughout Asia, Africa, and South America, that the lack of real engagement of local communities in conservation and resource management decision making will result in those communities eventually rejecting the conservation mandate because it is perceived as opposing basic livelihood needs.

In 2001 WWF initiated a project called MOSAIC-Eastern Plains (Management Of Strategic Areas for Integrated Conservation), to facilitate the coordination of conservation and land use planning at the landscape scale. This project grew out of the CBNRM Case Study Initiative, which provided MOSAIC staff with a strong base in networking, participatory land use planning (PLUP), and community based natural resource management (CBNRM). The project recognized that previous conservation awareness-raising activities in Mondulkiri had been limited to lecturing on relevant wildlife protection laws which did not indicate to local communities how their livelihood needs are addressed or even acknowledged in conservation policy.

Pre-MOSAIC surveys in Mondulkiri, including wildlife surveys by WWF and partners, indicated that certain communities were strategically placed to play important roles in landscape conservation and the MOSAIC project used this information when considering potential project sites. Project sites were selected based on their...
proximity to high priority conservation areas, particularly in and around Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary and the Mondulkiri Protected Forest. These sites are remote and most of the villages are difficult to access and take at least one day's travel from the provincial town.

The first phase of MOSAIC was primarily outreach and broad research into village histories, livelihoods, and their relationship to local biodiversity. Many of these villages were not included in the national geographic database, and therefore were not included in the 1998 national census. Some did not participate in 2002 commune elections, and some were not recognized by the provincial government. MOSAIC devoted a significant amount of time and effort simply accessing remote villages and collecting basic geographic and demographic information relevant to landscape planning and resource management.

DEVELOPING PARTNERSHIPS

The Seila Programme has facilitation and support for local development planning at the heart of its objectives. This national-scale programme supports Cambodia's 1,623 freely elected commune councils to develop Commune Development Plans (CDPs) which, when approved, make the commune eligible for limited development funding. The Seila Programme (see chapter 4) started in Mondulkiri in March 2003, where the first priority was to build the capacity of both provincial and commune officials to develop sound CDPs.

Following Seila's recommendation, the MOSAIC project is collaborating with Seila teams in their provincial and commune trainings and workshops, to ensure that natural resource management issues are integrated within CDPs. The MOSAIC
project has learned from PLG-Seila in Ratanakiri, where successful models of participatory planning and CBNRM have been developed in indigenous communities for more than 6 years. Other organizations working on natural resource management in Ratanakiri include NTFP-Ratanakiri and CIDSE.

In addition to Seila-Mondulkiri, MOSAIC cooperates closely with the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), which has pushed strongly for provincial PLUP and supervises a pilot project in communal land titling. Also, as MOSAIC activities expand into the Mondulkiri Protected Forest there will be closer cooperation with the Community Wildlife Ranger Project (CWRP), which has the longest track record of conservation activities in the Mondulkiri Protected Forest. Activities under the MOSAIC project complement CWRP's awareness-raising activities as the project works through existing community representatives to promote participatory land and resource management, including dissemination of key points from other relevant laws, such as the Land Law, Forest Law, Protected Areas Law, and Fisheries Law.

Other significant partners include government agencies (staff from the provincial Departments of Environment, Agriculture, Land Management, Rural Development and Tourism) and NGOs (WCS, SSP, CIDSE, and Nomad) who participated in the 2002 and 2004 PLUP training workshops in Mondulkiri (led by the MOSAIC team), or who are following the PLUP approach to land management.

MOSAIC's long term vision is that:

"Cooperation between conservation institutions (international, national, and provincial levels) and local communities enables local-national collaboration in conservation and management of critical natural resources, including biodiversity, while provincial and national institutions facilitate and advocate for community resource tenure and sustainable community based resource management."

This vision was written to support the broader goals of the Lower Mekong Dry Forest Ecoregion and guided development of the immediate and medium term objectives for the MOSAIC project (See Box 1).
BOX 1: GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR MOSAIC IN THE EASTERN PLAINS OF CAMBODIA

Goals from the Dry Forests Ecoregion programme
- Priority species are present in viable populations throughout the landscape.
- A representative and viable sample of all broad habitat units is conserved, and the ecological and evolutionary processes driving natural communities are preserved.
- Natural resources support socio-economic development, and appropriate development ensures biodiversity conservation.
- Efforts to protect and conserve the dry forests landscapes are socially, financially, and politically sustainable.

Immediate objectives (during the first two years of the MOSAIC process) are to:
- Build trust and involvement, and disseminate information to communities and relevant stakeholders on the Wildlife Protection Proclamation, Protected Area (PA) Law, Land Law, other relevant laws, and principles of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.
- Build capacity, and support communities to develop conservation and resource management agreements between communities and relevant authorities through participatory planning; for protection, conservation, and sustainable use of biodiversity in order to integrate within a strategic plan.

Medium term objectives (next 2 - 5 years) are to:
- Lead the implementation of participatory assessments of the sustainability of existing livelihood practices.
- Promote and advocate for sustainable livelihoods, including action research on alternative livelihoods in cases where current resource uses are not sustainable.

MOSAIC is working towards these goals and objectives through a four step strategic process, which is summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Four step strategic process
Capacity building

All four of the main steps in the MOSAIC strategy call for capacity building. Initially, the national staff received training, through formal instruction, networking, and on the job learning in community based natural resource management (CBNRM), participatory land use planning (PLUP), and community forestry (CF). Part of this training included awareness-raising of the staff in laws and regulations affecting nature conservation, and some of the scientific rationale behind those laws and regulations. Subsequent training and capacity building has been directed at the provincial level, to build similar levels of expertise as the national staff, in addition to facilitation skills to assist in organizing and training the community representatives in subsequent steps of the strategy. Throughout all of this process, networking and learning are integral to the project.

Outreach and reconnaissance

Using selected participatory rural appraisal (PRA) tools, the team conducted rapid geographical assessments of communities adjacent to high priority conservation areas. The assessments involved both outreach to many marginal communities in remote areas, as well as research and the initial steps of awareness-raising, which was mostly confined to the reasons why MOSAIC was conducting this outreach and research, and how the information would be used by MOSAIC and partners. This involved dispersing the MOSAIC team, in cooperation with PA or...
FA staff, to survey approximately 15 communities in northwestern Mondulkiri province, and one large commune in eastern Kratie province. These assessments emphasized the geographical range and impacts of resource use outside the immediate village area. This information, together with indications of the willingness of communities to invest time in PLUP and CBNRM, was used by WWF and partners to identify priority areas for project intervention.

**Research**

MOSAIC selected the highest priority communities to implement participatory biodiversity assessments (PBA). Two villages were chosen as targets, Sre Thom in Sok San commune, Koh Nhek district; and Khnhaeng in Chong Plah commune, Keo Seima district (see Figure 1). Following the research phase, these two villages remain the focus of the participatory planning component that is being initiated in 2004.

*Figure 1. Communes and target communities in the Eastern Plains*
Although this stage is primarily research, it is important to take time to build a relationship of trust and respect between the communities, the MOSAIC team and partners.

The PBA process includes several research components including:

- Customary use of natural resources by local communities, with emphasis on globally significant wildlife species, mapping community perceptions of key species' distributions and abundances, resource distributions and abundances, and documenting critical threats to biodiversity and resources;

- Customary habitat classification, ranking habitat importance for supporting key species, identifying threat levels in these habitats and mapping the distribution of key habitats.

Information from the PBA is used to determine conservation priority actions, including: focused biological/ecological research, focused action research to develop or promote alternative livelihoods, advocacy for protection of community resource management rights, law enforcement, and improved monitoring and reporting.

Support for community organization

MOSAIC focused on supporting local communities to organize and implement PLUP and CBNRM. For PLUP in particular, MOSAIC followed a process that has been formalized at the national level, with adaptations for the context of indigenous communities in northeast Cambodia. The PLUP process supports initial stages of CBNRM and is discussed in greater detail in chapter 9 of this status report.
Support for livelihoods improvement

Once structures and some capacity are in place for CBNRM, the project should then build capacity among local communities for research and analysis of sustainability, to enable local promotion of sustainable livelihoods. In order to provide this type of guidance, MOSAIC staff themselves require more specific and in-depth technical training (including microeconomics, agriculture, fisheries management, wildlife management, and NTFP processing and marketing). This will be a lengthy process, since sustainability must be evaluated within the context of constantly changing social and environmental conditions. However, the goal is to promote and support improvement of livelihoods, based on participatory research and community decision making. Once communities have the capacity and adequate resources to conduct action research and use results to make effective decisions, the role of an external partner such as MOSAIC or government agencies should, ideally, be limited to providing occasional technical advice.

EXPERIENCES ON THE GROUND

The participatory planning process is slow, and MOSAIC is committed to ensuring that the process works effectively in the two pilot villages/communes before it is extended widely throughout the landscape. However, the threats to biodiversity are not waiting, so MOSAIC will be exploiting opportunities as they arise to extend the process to the remainder of communities scattered across the landscape.

One significant new threat is the upgrading of the road between the Mondulkiri provincial capital and the district of Koh Nhek, which has led to an acceleration of new land claims and land clearing in the vicinity of Pu Chri commune, Pichrada district. Pu Chri is located wholly within the Mondulkiri Protected Forest. This land encroachment has caused at least three major, interrelated problems:

- Loss of forest habitat through forest clearance,
- Loss of resources for customary use by the indigenous people of Pu Chri commune,
- Increased conflict between humans and wildlife, including illegal hunting, trapping, and human-elephant conflict.
From a nature conservation standpoint, this area is extremely important as a corridor for the natural migration of Asian elephant between Phnom Prich Wildlife Sanctuary (PPWS) and the Srepok Wilderness Area within the Mondulkiri Protected Forest (MPF). New settlements in this area increase the risk that humans could be killed by elephants following habitual migration routes. MOSAIC, following a request from the commune, has chosen to support a concentrated PLUP process in the commune, coupled with patrolling and enforcement by FA to directly reduce the rate of encroachment. This strategy serves the dual functions of maintaining natural ecological processes, while also maintaining the natural resource base of local indigenous communities.

In addition to these communities in the MPF, community involvement in conservation is essential in two areas in western PPWS, namely the Sre Khtong- Antrong area and the Sre Chih area. However, outreach and initial surveys in these areas suggest that these communities are not currently receptive to the full participatory planning process. Reducing threats to biodiversity in this area may be more effective by supporting PA authorities to implement strict law enforcement there, while also exploring possible livelihood alternatives to the extensive illegal hunting, fishing, and wildlife trade that currently occur.

LESSONS LEARNED

Site Specific Lessons

MOSAIC-EP outreach and research efforts yielded some important findings in relation to the situation of local communities in the Eastern Plains.

- These communities are situated in areas where human population density has always been low, the vegetation is open and the terrain is relatively flat, so they have relatively easy access to large areas of land. But soils suitable for agriculture are rare, and water is scarce, unreliable, and often of poor quality, especially during the dry season. Dense forest areas that may contain more valuable NTFPs, including liquid resin, also are scarce.

- Despite the remote situation of the villages, most have been strongly affected by Cambodia’s political turmoil over the past 30 years. Most of these villages were
relocated to central Koh Nhek district between 1970-1979, and many villagers have only returned to their ancestral lands in the last 5 years, since the Khmer Rouge quit their insurgent activities.

The landscape as a whole is relatively rich in natural resources, but 20 years (1979-1999) of uncontrolled wildlife poaching, together with recent increase in illegal fishing and gold mining, have depleted the natural resource base and disrupted some customary livelihoods. For example, elephant-based culture is weaker than before the wars, use of poison and electricity is depleting the fishery, and gold-mining is leading to water pollution, and drastic changes in local economies and cultures. These changes are not necessarily detectable in technical habitat analysis methods such as remote sensing.

Although the communities are generally poor and appreciate improvements in water security, health, and education, many villagers recognize the most urgent need as controlling unsustainable resource extraction by outsiders. In other words, alternative livelihoods are not needed as urgently as planning and regulated management of existing local resources, including controlling access to forest lands and local fisheries.

PROGRAMME LESSONS

- **Cooperation:** With a large, remote area to cover, it has been most important to learn from PLUP, CF, and CBNRM experiences in other areas and use tried and proven methods in the Eastern Plains. PLUP and CBNRM models developed both in Ratanakiri and nationally have provided very useful guidance for building participation among local communities in Mondulkiri’s priority conservation areas.

- **Progress:** The objectives and rationale of participatory planning and management are understood and accepted by MOSAIC, partners, and many donors, but capacity building in the communities to promote local decision making is a very slow process, and there are numerous dangers involved in pushing too hard for rapid implementation. Communities should not be led to expect too much from outside guidance. MOSAIC must ensure that the basic steps of awareness-raising
and building community support are not compromised by rushing to report on concrete achievements.

**Participation:** Although the PLUP and CBNRM processes are based on sound concepts, some communities may have valid reasons for choosing not to invest their time in these types of participatory management. In such cases, MOSAIC can inform these communities of their options, and can indicate a willingness to support participatory processes in the future, if the community attitude changes.

**NEXT STEPS**

The MOSAIC-EP team has learned about, and adopted, nationally recognized processes of PLUP leading to CBNRM. But implementation of these processes has only just begun on the ground. The team must continue to build and monitor the process in the target communities for another year or two before the project can move on to the next phase in existing communities, or be expanded to new communities. As of late 2004, very few communities in the Eastern Plains can confidently invest time in planning.

As the programme unfolds, and especially once local zoning and initial resource-use regulations are negotiated, there will be a need to offer concrete technical advice leading to improvement of livelihoods. National and provincial staff will need to build their expertise in various technical fields (possibly fisheries management, agriculture, and NTFP processing and marketing, to name a few) to target communities and to effectively research, analyse, monitor and evaluate their impact. The emphasis in this training should be on capacity for action research, monitoring and evaluation, and with increased emphasis on building skills in quantitative analysis.
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Chapter 14

Linking CBNRM to local planning processes

By: Ashish John

INTRODUCTION

This paper is written to summarize experiments fusing community based natural resource management (CBNRM) and local planning process (LPP) approaches in Ratanakiri, in an attempt to make these more relevant and appropriate to the situation and people in this part of Cambodia. It gives an overview of the country wide SEILA LPP and the Ratanakiri specific LPP.

Ratanakiri is the northeastern most province of Cambodia, bordering Vietnam and Laos (see Figure 1). The indigenous communities who live in Ratanakiri have a livelihood system that is dependent on natural resources. Natural resources supply their needs such as food, construction material, and income in times of scarcity. Their culture is also intricately linked to the natural resources: spirits inhabit their environment, having their base in spirit forests.

CARERE PROJECT

In 1996 the CARERE project introduced the SEILA decentralized governance, planning, and finance project to Ratanakiri. These projects introduced a 'bottom up' development process that required community involvement in the formulation of prepared plans for the province. Communities prepared their development plans based on visions of what
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1 Ashish John is the International Research Coordinator for the NRM research project in Ratanakiri.
2 This paper was initially prepared for a discussion with CARERE Management on the planning process being implemented in Ratanakiri. After the discussion it has been modified for a wider audience.
3 Local Planning Process is the planning process used in the SEILA programme of the Government of Cambodia.
4 The SEILA Programme of the Government of Cambodia promotes decentralized planning, implementation and funding of development.
5 CARERE-Cambodian Area Regeneration and Rehabilitation project. This is a UNDP funded project implemented through UNOPS. In July 2001 the project was renamed “Partnership for Local Governance (PLG).
they want their village to be in the future. Village and commune development committees (VDC, CDC)⁶, together with villagers, developed these plans. Provincial and district facilitation teams (PFT, DFT), who are employees of the SEILA programme, facilitated the process. Based on these plans, sectors and NGOs supported activities in the communes. The provincial rural development committee (PRDC) managed and executed the development process. A brief outline of the major steps of the local planning process (LPP) is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step1: Introduction to LPP</th>
<th>The village representatives and CDC are introduced to the SEILA structure by the facilitators at the commune. They verify the data in the commune data base records (CDB)⁷. They then formulate the draft commune goals and make a draft commune sketch map. Once the draft goals have been developed these are prioritized. The facilitators then provide guidance to formulate the village 3-year activity plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step2: Develop village priorities</td>
<td>The results of the commune meeting are presented and validated with villagers. Village goals for a 3-year period are prioritized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step3: Formulation of commune development plan (CDP)</td>
<td>Based on village discussions, the commune sketch maps and goals are finalized. The 3-year priorities are then prioritized by sector. The villages are then ranked by poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step4: District Integration Workshop</td>
<td>The CDP is presented to the NGOs and departments in a district integration workshop. NGOs and departments plan interventions based on the CDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step5: Formulation of commune investment plan</td>
<td>The CDCs prepare an investment plan. CDCs allocate local development funds based on criteria and prepare the commune investment plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Local planning process steps.*

*Source: Modified from LPP process in Battambang (September 1999).*

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (LDF)**

In addition to sectoral and NGO support, each commune is provided with funds from local development funds (LDF). These funds have been allocated by the central government to the PRDCs and are to be used for implementing short or medium term projects that are identified in the commune development plans (CDP). Although these funds could be used for a variety of purposes at the beginning of the
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⁶ Members of the community who have been elected by the community to represent the community. The government establishes VDCs and CDCs.

⁷ The provincial planning team collects data from the villages and develops the commune data base.
project (1996), these funds have been directed only towards 'public goods' projects (i.e. infrastructure projects such as roads, bridges, schools etc.) in the last five years.

In Ratanakiri the SEILA wide LPP process does not respond adequately to the specific local conditions. This paper presents the evolution of the modified LPP process as it was developed in Ratanakiri.

THE BLIND SPOT IN LPP

The communities in Ratanakiri are facing many external pressures which threaten their livelihood. Traditional land and forests are being lost to concessions, land grabbing, illegal logging and land sale. Table 2 provides a typical example from Som Thom commune.

This table shows that in 1996/1997 and 1998 the villagers were desperately arguing with the palm oil company and authorities about loss of much needed community land to the company, and even went so far as sending a formal petition to the Environment Department (in November 1997) to protect their forests. However, these fundamental problems were not mentioned in the situation analysis conducted as a part of the LPP process in the commune, and were not recorded as priorities in the LPP. Instead, the commune prioritized things like schools, and village health centres, but not land or forest protection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Situation in Somthom</th>
<th>Identified Problems</th>
<th>Identified Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPP</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>20,000ha oil palm concession that stretches over several communes granted by the Council of Ministers. Company clears 300m on either side of road 19 in Somthom commune and plants 20ha of oil palm trees and 100 - 200ha of coffee.</td>
<td>High mortality of animals, food shortage, insects destroy rice crops, many villagers sick, low rice production.</td>
<td>Community forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Company clearing village land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Company staff intimidating the villagers. Some company staff bring guns and shoot some village animals. Villagers are worried about the company occupying land. Villagers voice their concerns in an international workshop. It is said that villagers led a procession to the district (between 1995-1997).</td>
<td>People are sick there is no health centre. People use unclean water. Water is very far from the village. Lack of draft animals.</td>
<td>Land security&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; Intensive logging&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Company occupying land&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; Intense logging of forests&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Intense logging in Oyadao in Somthom commune. The villagers of Somthom meet district officials and call a meeting with the governor. The villagers also meet the company to discuss the issue. The provincial governor meets the villagers in February 1997 to discuss the land issue. Villagers voice their concern about the intensity of logging occurring in the commune. Villagers are very worried about the situation and send a petition to the Department of Environment in November 1997.</td>
<td>People are sick there is no health centre. People use unclean water. Water is very far from the village. Lack of draft animals.</td>
<td>Land security&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; forest loss&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Company occupying land&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; Intense logging of forests&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Intense logging in Somthom continues. District authorities and company permit 50 x 100m plots by villagers along the main road. Villagers plant tree crops in plots of land on the roadside to claim ownership. CBNRM activities start in the commune. It identifies land security and loss of natural resources as major concerns for the villagers. Villagers and CBNRM team start to map the area and start to make rules and regulations.</td>
<td>People are sick there is no health center, people use unclean water, water very far from the village, lack of draft animals.</td>
<td>Land security&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; forest loss&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Company occupying land&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt; Intense logging of forests&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Villagers and Department of Environment map Somthom commune and start presenting draft rules and regulations to district and provincial authorities.</td>
<td>The IPP process is experimented in Somthom commune. This time villagers include community forestry in their long term planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Problems and priorities and the situation in Somthom commune, Ratanakiri province.


<sup>1</sup>This omission is even more surprising given that in 1995 the analysis and planning team (AP Team), as a part of the experimental process used before the LPP, did note the commune’s concern about the company taking their land and their request for community forestry. The problem analysis approach used by the AP Team was not used in the later LPP process.
There are many examples of similar situations in which the LPP process showed a blind spot for major problems and concerns communities were struggling with. Other examples are Yeak Loam commune, where the town is squeezing the highlanders from their land; Ochum, where a forest concession started logging within the highlanders' spirit forests, and Kalaeng, where gem mining is threatening the livelihood of highlanders.

**THE CORE PROBLEM**

Without exception, reports on the indigenous communities in Ratanakiri highlight the importance of natural resources to these communities. The communities themselves are aware of, and actively voicing the need to protect their natural resources, and raising their concerns in workshops and meetings on natural resources. Indigenous representatives have met with national government officials to voice their concerns over the loss of natural resources in Ratanakiri.

Development workers working in Ratanakiri are continuously confronted with, and cannot ignore, these issues.

The rampant exploitation of natural resources in Ratanakiri and the vulnerability of indigenous communities cannot be side stepped and cannot be excluded from the CARERE/SEILA LPP. For the Ratanakiri LPP team, and for others working on sustainable development in the area, there is no other option than to continue to pay attention to these issues.

**THE CBNRM PROCESS**

At the same time as CARERE started the LPP process, IDRC\(^9\) began to implement community based natural resource management (CBNRM) projects in Ratanakiri. The CBNRM approach looks at problems and issues from a resource perspective, and develops strategies to deal with resource problems reflected in longer term plans.\(^{10}\) It also emphasizes natural resource management (NRM) by communities. In 1997, IDRC and CARERE merged in Ratanakiri. This provided the CARERE programme with an opportunity to experiment with the CBNRM approach. The CBNRM process also introduced the idea of commune facilitators\(^{11}\) who were responsible for assisting/ facilitating communities to develop their maps, plans, rules,
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\(^9\) IDRC - International Development Research Centre, Canada.
\(^{10}\) Short term plan: activity, to respond directly to immediate village need; long term plan: activity, to respond strategically to root causes underlying village needs/problems (Srey, 1999:5).
\(^{11}\) Members of the community selected by the community to facilitate the management of natural resources
and regulations, and for bridging the language and culture gap between provincial and district facilitators, and local communities.

The CBNRM approach was initially tried in 3 communes: Ochum, Yeak Loam and Somthom. Traditional land management systems were used to develop land use maps, rules and regulations. The positive response generated from the process in these communities and at the provincial level convinced CARERE-Ratanakiri that CBNRM was very important for implementing future development activities in Ratanakiri. The important steps are presented in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong> Introduction</td>
<td>Representatives from the district and communes are introduced to the project and agree to the project implementation. Commune representatives (CR) are selected and trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong> Presentation of project to village</td>
<td>The provincial core team visits the villages with the commune representatives, introduces the project to the villagers and obtains permission to implement the project in their commune. Natural resource management committee members are then elected and trained. Four or five members per village are selected including women members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong> Information gathering</td>
<td>Existing secondary information about the village is collected. For primary data various PRA tools are used e.g. resource and social mapping, transect walks, problem tree/analysis/ranking, seasonal calendars etc. The data gathered is then presented to the villagers for verification and clarification. The information is then analysed with villagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4:</strong> Develop management plans</td>
<td>The customary land use is studied and then participatory land use planning is conducted. Participatory mapping of different identified zones and general land use plans for each zone are developed. This is then presented to villagers and neighbouring villagers for comments and modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5:</strong></td>
<td>Detailed management plans for each zone are developed with villagers*. Community forestry rules and regulations developed with villagers*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 a. Detailed management plans for each zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 b. Community forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For further details refer to Nhem, 1999

Table 3: Community Based Natural Resource Management steps

As a result of the CBNRM activities, the province reduced a 20,000ha palm oil concession in Oyadao district to 500 hectares. The province also recognized the land use management map of Somthom commune and the 3,334ha community forest. Subsequently, the villagers have been officially permitted to manage. The commune now has management rights to the land they traditionally had been living on.
The CBNRM process empowered communities to discuss and negotiate with the provincial authorities on their right to use the land they had traditionally used for generations. The CBNRM approach was particularly suited to the highlanders because the approach focuses on natural resources. This is similar to the way highlanders view their world - that is, a complex of forces related to natural resources. The CBNRM process highlights the traditional land and forest management systems of the highlanders. It shows the importance of natural resources for the survival of highlanders (see chapter 19). The process demonstrates the need for long-term plans in order to address the fundamental problems of communities. Thus, a process that combines LPP with the CBNRM approach has been shown to be more suitable than either approach alone for Ratanakiri.

MODIFIED PLANNING PROCESSES

In 1999 a consultant was hired to develop a process that combines both CBNRM and LPP processes. The planning flowing from this was called integrated community and natural resource-based planning process (IPP). This was implemented in three communes: Tinchak, Laminh and Somthom. The use of commune facilitators as in the CBNRM approach was continued under a new name of commune representative facilitators (CRF).

The IPP was developed in a series of steps, which were modified to resemble the steps of the LPP process. This modified process was included in the SIDA funded Community Natural Resources Management Project (Integrated/Extended Planning Process (I/E-LPP)). It was introduced to seven communes in Oyadao district. This is presented in Table 4.

---


13 The commune representative facilitators (CRFs) take on the role of PFT/DFT in facilitating communities to develop their VDPs and CDPs etc. They also ensure NRM is included in the planning. They are selected from the communities they facilitate and the CDC recruits them.
Table 4: Integrated / Extended Local Planning Process
Source: Modified from the Community Natural Resources Management project document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1: Orientation for CDC</td>
<td>Village and commune chiefs are invited to the commune. They are introduced to community development, SEILA, CBNRM and gender concepts and are provided with a summary of the LPP process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Village orientation</td>
<td>Trained village leaders return to the village and present the concepts to villagers, facilitated by PFT, DFT, CF and CDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3: Village appraisal and village visioning</td>
<td>Data collection and analysis, village visioning, and village proposal formulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4: Formulation of CDP (contents)</td>
<td>Develop commune profile, commune visioning, natural resource management framework, and formulate commune project proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5: Commune investment plan</td>
<td>Prepare the written commune development plan, present it to sectors, and verify agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6: District co-ordination feedback meeting</td>
<td>Meet with village representatives and finalize which villages will be targeted. Villagers prepare themselves whilst different sectors, NGO/IOs co-ordinate their visits to villages to avoid ‘development fatigue’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7: VDC/CDC establishment</td>
<td>If these have not been established at an earlier stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of incorporating NRM into LPP was presented at the LPP workshop in Bantaey Meanchey (September, 2000). The workshop emphasized integration of NRM into the LPP process. However, there was strong pressure to continue to use a uniform planning process in all the provinces. This emphasis was not incorporated into the LPP process manual that was being prepared. In 2001, the Ratanakiri LCB team used the generic LPP process decided upon at Bantaey Meanchey in September 2000, but added some natural resource (NR) tools into the planning process. This was extended to the seven communes targeted for 2001.

Most of the communes in which this process was experimented included forest management and land use planning in their long term plans. Somthom commune was able to include protection of forests as a priority in their planning in 1999 (see Table 2) when the IPP process (combining LPP and CBNRM) was introduced to the commune, four years after it was brought up in the initial planning done by the SEILA analysis and planning team (see chapter 9). From 1995 to 1999 the LPP had turned a blind eye on these problems.
In March 2001 the LPP manual was circulated to the provinces. The process developed was based on the SEILA wide LPP process. The manual emphasized the need to integrate NRM and gender into the process though these inclusions still had to be become operational. However, the Ratanakiri team felt more confident to incorporate NRM tools into this process again.

**RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

The next phase of the SEILA Programme included NRM as a cross cutting theme for all its projects. This has brought much interest to the Ratanakiri experiments, which incorporated natural resources into its projects.

CARERE management has visited Ratanakiri more frequently, focusing on the planning process being implemented in Ratanakiri and the menu for LDF funds. The Ratanakiri team was requested to evaluate the two different planning processes being implemented in Ratanakiri (LPP and Modified LPP). The Ratanakiri team will compare the level of community/facilitator satisfaction and NRM awareness between the two processes and the CDPs and commune priorities for both processes. The team was also requested to start the initial process to develop different forms and contracts that will be required, should the LDF menu be expanded.

The Ratanakiri team initially listed the village needs included in the CDP. They then discussed what could be supported through LDF funds, if the funding menu was to be expanded. In a later meeting with the CARERE management these were expanded to include the types of public services that the LDF could support. The results are presented in Table 5.
Table 5. Potential Public Goods/Services Supported if the LDF Menu is expanded

### Public Goods
- Roads
- Schools
- Culverts
- Dams
- Wells
- Toilets
- Health posts
- Water tank
- Rice mill
- Irrigation scheme (including dam canals)
- Commune resource Centre
- Village meeting hall
- Water pump
- Rice bank
- Motor boat

### Public Services
- Training
  - Agriculture
  - Adult literacy
  - Pesticide use
  - VV, VAV
  - Health worker
  - Midwife
  - NFE teachers
- Extension
  - Demonstration farm
  - Village nursery
- Technical Assistance
  - Lawyer for land conflicts
  - Management of public land/amenities
  - Community forestry formulation and training
  - Land use planning (mapping)
  - Land title
- Awareness Raising
  - Reproductive health care
  - Importance of education awareness raising for parents
  - Documents/videos
  - Rights/laws
  - Hygiene education
  - Land use planning
  - Land conflict
  - TV shows
  - Information flow
- Disaster relief funds
- Conflict resolution (court fees)

### Criteria for Public Services
- Should be contract
- Whole village/commune benefits
- Target groups could benefit (women, poor etc.)
- Prior agreement on types of services and distribution of benefits
- Selection criteria for contractors
- Time (realistic)
- Clear outputs/results
- Clear link to vision (CDP)
- Local contribution
- Client-contractor-TA relationship remains
- Can be used for only when government, NGOs and IOs cannot supply service
- Priority to government institutions, NGO and private sectors

Note: A World Bank consultant reviewing the LDF menu on 7th June 2001 voiced strong opposition to using LDF funds to support government departments to provide services.\(^\text{14}\).

---

\(^\text{14}\) The argument was that if LDF is used to fund what the government departments are mandated to implement, it would be hard in the future to prevent the departments from demanding that the practice continue. The consultant argued that LDF funds should be used only to fund private sector initiatives. In areas like Ratanakiri where there is a weak private sector, community groups could be formed and used as private sector initiatives. However, forcing departments to work more competitively, having to raise part of their funds from service delivery, may considerably improve performance.
ISSUES
Local planning process

A participatory planning process is very important and allows communities to present their needs and aspirations in a clear and concise manner. This process should allow communities to present what they consider to be their needs and aspirations. The resulting plans should enable communities to attract support from a variety of sources, such as different NGOs and IOs within their specific fields of specialization.

The focus of the generic LPP is neither strategic nor focused on long term planning. Rather, it focuses on the preparation of short/medium term local investments with an annual action plan and budget. There is little or no relationship with the longer term vision of the community and the constraints they face to achieve that vision. The limitation of the LPP approach is illustrated clearly in the example of Somthom: while the LPP was developing short term plans, the commune was facing a major threat to its very livelihood. This was not recognized in the LPP process. The short term planning was not responding to the immediate needs of the commune that was essential for their survival: land and forest security.

In Ratanakiri, this experience shows that by fulfilling only short term needs, one will not resolve the root cause of poverty among the highlanders, unless consideration is given to broader issues that underlie their livelihood, and which need a long term approach, at the same time.

Visioning- The Livelihood Analysis Approach

For an effective planning process, visioning is very important. Goals or visions describe the destination hoped for, and objectives are specific results seen as intermediate steps in reaching the goal/vision (Bunch, 1982). Based on the objectives one-year targets are developed (see Diagram 1). Visioning focuses long, medium and short term planning, linking them together to achieve a final outcome.

Based on the vision, project planners need to learn about the needs of the people and the constraints which they perceive as preventing those needs from being fulfilled (Cook, 1991). Identifying the opportunities that exist is also important. Then strategies can be developed to overcome the constraints, and to make best use of the opportunities.

The livelihood analysis approach can help to improve the depth of visioning when discussed with the community and focused on the four main aspects of the analytical framework\(^\text{16}\). Based on analysis of the four aspects of their livelihood the community then develops their vision. They then identify enabling and disabling factors that are important to achieve their goal and develop strategies to overcome the disabling factors and make best use of the enabling factors. Based on the strategies to achieve the vision, consideration of strategic constraints and strategic opportunities,

\(^\text{16}\) Socio-cultural, economic, institutional and natural resources (see Nooyens and Meijers, 2001).
and taking into account potential opportunities for external support, objectives for 3-5 year projects are developed, which form the basis of 3-5 year plans. Based on the project plan, communities develop one year targets, and after considering practical constraints and opportunities (including external support), communities develop the action plan for the year.

All of this calls for an analytical process that looks at fundamental issues, rather than a planning process that asks for immediate needs and actions with little concern for the relationships between needs and actions, and the long term goal of the community.

**Local Development Funds**

The availability of LDF funds for only certain projects restricts development options for communities. Communities are not able to choose issues that they need to address such as identified 'strategic needs', instead, they only have the options the project offers.

At present there is discussion to increase the menu of the LDF, which is proving complicated. Using LDF for projects that can increase immigration of non-indigenous people into communes and villages belonging to indigenous communities. This is a serious concern, and should be considered when identifying potential projects to be funded using LDF.

The expansion of the LDF menu to include funding to private institutions for services needs to be considered carefully when implemented in Ratanakiri, as the indigenous communities there have an extremely weak private sector. Therefore, it could potentially cause increased migration of private sector enterprises to these areas, including non-indigenous people to these communities.

Indigenous communities are relatively uniform in wealth, and in their community based decision-making processes. Introducing private enterprise into these communities should be done carefully with due consideration of the social and cultural impacts. Otherwise they could easily destroy the communal nature of these communities.
Facilitation

For an effective participatory process, good facilitation skills are essential. In Ratanakiri the facilitation of the LPP is across cultural and language barriers. Cultural bias can easily become incorporated into the facilitation process and into the plans. Different languages must be interpreted precisely. For example, for Khmers food shortage is "rice shortage" while for highlanders it means there is no food in general (no rice, but also no tubers, no meat, etc). A Khmer facilitator may conclude that there is a shortage of rice when the villagers mean food, and then facilitate the discussion towards rice production only, without considering other options.

Another problem is that most facilitators come from the "majority" or "superior" culture and are trying to help communities that are a part of the "minority" or "inferior" culture. Therefore, the negative and superior attitude of facilitators in many cases is not beneficial towards the community members. There is a tendency to view the farmers as "poor", "ignorant", or "unbelievers", and this results in a tendency to pity, patronize or convert highlanders.

Rigid organizational structures with rigid implementation strategies reduce the flexibility of the facilitator. In these situations the facilitator does not facilitate but conducts activities in automation, which poses a problem because facilitators are told to be participatory and flexible while the training/methodology they receive is not flexible. As a result the facilitation becomes less participatory.

LESSONS LEARNED

Relevancy of a local planning process that pays attention to resource issues

The local planning process has been developed to assist the people to present their needs, problems, and aspirations. The issue in Ratanakiri is whether the process allows the communities to present their ideas and opinions on this.

In many of the villages where E/I-LPP was experimented, the villagers requested protection of their natural resources in their CDPs. Somthom commune, Leunkrien village and Yeak Loam commune have been able to successfully negotiate with the province and now manage community forests in their communes. There is a strong
interest among many communities to start CBNRM in their communities. The province has also shown interest in the CBNRM approach and has requested that more communes be covered by CBNRM. The suggestion by villagers that they prefer the E/I-LPP to the LPP should be taken seriously.

**Time, money and facilitation**

The generic LPP process is relatively easy and fast and requires less time and input from the facilitator in the field per village/ commune compared to the E/I-LPP. This is more costly as it uses more tools and needs better-trained facilitators who need to be aware of the different issues confronting highlanders. Because facilitators need salaries and per diems the cost difference for facilitation between the two processes can be considerable.

**Community facilitators**

Experience has shown that if facilitators are chosen from or nominated by the communities, many of the cultural and language problems can be overcome. Commune facilitators also tend to be more motivated than staff that are not directly affected by the outcomes, and are less costly as they do not need to travel long distances to work in the villages.

**WHO IS THE BENEFICIARY?**

LPP is a very important process of the SEILA Programme and this paper does not question the usefulness of the process. Rather, it presents some constraints in Ratanakiri due to the specific situation there, and documents attempts to modify the process to make it more situation specific. The experiences in Ratanakiri raise certain issues regarding improving the efficiency of a local planning and facilitation process while at the same time trying to maintain and increase its relevancy.

The big question is: Can a LLP process, which may be less costly and less time consuming, but which has a limited support menu, provide what the villages need or, does it represent an outsider driven exercise with limited benefits for the villagers? Might a broad focused LPP project, that spends more money and time on facilitation
so that the causes of poverty can be analyzed in detail, villagers can plan properly, and a strategic approach can be applied using a variety of resources from different sources, be more effective?

LOCAL PLANNING PROCESSES AND THE COMMUNE COUNCILS

The LPP and the Modified LPP process was implemented by the village and commune development committees that were established through the Seila Programme. Following the commune council elections in 2002, the governance structure and functions changed. The commune councils replaced the village and commune development committees and a new planning process based on LPP was developed for the commune councils. The Seila NREM Mainstreaming Strategy used experience from Ratanakiri to develop a modified planning process in the provinces piloting the NREM Mainstreaming Strategy; as a result Ratanakiri was able to continue including natural resource considerations in the new planning process used by the commune councils.

CONCLUSION

Complex situations need complex solutions. In Ratanakiri providing simple solutions (covering short term plans) does not alleviate the fundamental problems and needs in this province and can result in an increase in poverty. Complex problems need more detailed participatory analysis before planning. The Ratanakiri specific LPP is an attempt to improve the analysis before planning, giving explicit attention to the resource situation and placing a stronger focus on solving strategic needs and constraints. Carefully widening the menu for LDF projects can provide more relevant assistance to villagers; it is expected that this will result in a more appropriate disbursement and allocation process.
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This paper reflects on one project's insight into CBNRM within the Cambodian context, and on local experiences in working on resource management with village management committees (VMCs). Furthermore, an analysis of what VMCs are able to carry out at the village level, and the implications of these experiences for CBNRM in Cambodia will be shared. The project used as the basis for this paper is the Participatory Management of Mangrove Resources (PMMR), a research project that uses a participatory approach to help coastal communities to solve coastal resources management issues. PMMR has been especially active in mangrove resources management in Peam Kraraop Wildlife Sanctuary (PKWS), Koh Kong province for both forestry and fisheries.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY CBNRM IN THE CAMBODIAN CONTEXT?

CBNRM refers to managing natural resources by communities with the involvement of relevant stakeholders, who mostly belong to provincial and national technical departments. A key element of CBNRM is that the communities are organized (a process known as community organizing) into some structure, i.e., to have groups, group leaders, and a committee with the community regulations approved by local authorities and relevant institutions.

Though it is called community-based natural resource management, in practice it is more likely to be a co-management approach which involves sharing responsibilities between government agencies and local communities, with government agencies playing a strong role in this process (Marschke and Nong, 2003). In many projects, communities do not undertake all resource management tasks by themselves, but rather involve others, such as technical departments of the local government. Local authorities are extremely important in terms of enforcement, conflict resolution, and so on. Within Cambodia, this process is widely referred to as CBNRM.

---

1 Nong is Deputy Director of the Department of Environmental Education at MoE and PMMR project leader.
2 Ouk Ly Khim is Socio-economic Advisor of the Environmental Management of the Coastal Zone project (MoE and DANIDA).
3 Khy An is the Natural Resource and Environmental Management Advisor of the Seila Programme in Koh Kong.
To better understand what CBNRM means in the Cambodian context, the following words need to be clearly understood: community and community organizing.

**WHAT IS COMMUNITY?**

According to Collin’s Dictionary, community means “all the people who live in a particular area or place”. While this simplistic notion of community is critiqued (see, for example, Agrawal & Gibson, 1999), often donors assume that community refers to the entire village. In contrast, when Cambodian government officials or villagers use or hear the word community, most people assume that it is a group of people who have been organized or supported by development projects or programmes. Villagers not involved with these community development projects or programmes, are not considered part of the community. Thus, in Cambodia, “community” has come to mean a special group of people interested in doing something organized together with the support of NGO or government agency programmes. This refers to such things as: community forestry, community fisheries, community land use planning, and community protected areas.

**WHAT IS COMMUNITY ORGANIZING?**

Community organizing (CO) is the process of setting up or strengthening a village structure, which is called a village management committee (VMC). The objective of CO is to strengthen existing community structures or to create institutions to better involve people in sustainable natural resources management. Furthermore, CO can help transform people who are powerless into people who are powerful.

In the PMMR experience, CO is a technique for problem solving and also a way to improve income for people, strengthen local awareness, and enhance the natural environment. Communities are enabled to consider their economic, political, and social needs, and initiate conflict resolution within a natural resource management framework. In many rural areas of Cambodia CO develops leadership to manage natural resources using support from external institutions.

---

*The PMMR team calls the structure of CO the VMC; many people in Cambodia refer to this as the community committee.*
DO ALL VILLAGES NEED TO BE 'ORGANIZED'?  

This paper focuses on PMMR's experience of CO, which is chiefly helping to establish resource management committee. Some villages in PKWS felt they already had an active presence in resource management, and did not require further 'organizing or committees'. PMMR gave support to village and commune leaders, upon request, but played a less active role in these situations.

COMMUNITY STRUCTURES DEVELOPMENT  

VMC structure facilitated by PMMR

The VMC structure is not officially part of the government, and is likely created under the facilitation of project practitioners through community elections at village level. Elected by the villagers, the role of the VMC is to lead the process of resource management in the community's designated areas. Other committees have been formed by various NGOs, usually by sector to address other issues such as health care, maintaining dams, agriculture etc.

Other structures

Since PMMR began working with VMCs, a new governance structure has emerged in the form of commune councils (CC) at the commune level. These local government administrative bodies were elected by the people in each commune in Cambodia in February 2002. Prior to the CC elections, many Cambodian provinces were part of a decentralization experiment where provincial level, district level, commune level and village level committees were formed around different issues including resource management. However, in Koh Kong province this programme was not implemented. Only in 2003, after the commune council elections, did Koh Kong become a pilot province for decentralization, therefore activities within this programme are just beginning.

PMMR recognizes the Royal Government of Cambodia's decentralization policy, known as the Seila Programme, and links village-level work to this structure so as
not to create parallel planning systems. Figure 1 gives an overview of how decentralized policy works in Cambodia.

**Figure 1: Decentralization structure and NRM in Cambodia**
Adapted from: Seila Programme 2004

**BACKGROUND TO LEARNING AREA**

In PKWS area there are three districts, in which there are six communes, twelve villages, and a population of over 10,000 people (PMMR 2000). These coastal communities are dependent upon the rich resources found in the protected area. Most villagers migrated to the area from elsewhere in Cambodia over the past twenty years. Many came because of the rich coastal resources found in the area and the lure of high profits. However, numerous resource extraction activities threatened the sustainability of people's livelihoods: destructive fishing gear, extensive mangrove cutting for charcoal production and areas cut for shrimp pond culture. Moreover, the international markets of Thailand and Vietnam put additional pressures on these
resources. Such activities threatened the ecosystem, biodiversity and the communities' living standards.

In the past, people did not show an interest in resource protection because of strong management from technical departments and low population pressures. However, as natural resources have become further degraded, the population has increased and opportunities for people to make high profits from illegal resource extraction activities have declined, people have shifted their thinking and have become more interested in management and protection measures. Local villagers recognize that if there are to be any livelihood opportunities for their children, something needs to be done now to ensure enough resources.

PMMR AND COMMUNITY BASED MANAGEMENT

Within its mandate, the team has begun to understand natural resource use and management systems in the area. Emphasis has been on gaining the trust and building the capacity of the resource users, local authorities, technical sectors, and other relevant stakeholders (see figure 2).

![Figure 2: Adaptive management: the evolving structure of PMMR](source: Marschke and Nong 2003)

The PMMR project arranged a series of workshops, and study tours inside and outside the country for key villagers, local authorities and the PMMR team members
to build local capacity. The aim of these were centred around learning about coastal resources and linking livelihood activities with resource management. Following the workshops and study tours community members expressed an interest in working with the PMMR team and relevant government agencies to develop a community management strategy that would work in this area. The first step towards reaching this goal was to start with CO, followed by developing and implementing community action plans.

THINKING THOUGH COMMUNITY LEVEL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Planning for CO

When PMMR began the CO process in PKWS, meetings were held to discuss the CO approach as neither the PMMR team nor villagers had any idea on how to start the CO process.

Both the national and provincial teams held discussions to examine potential strategies for community establishment. Koh Sralao and Koh Kang villages, where most of the villagers are fishers using small scale fishing gear, were targeted for the community organizing work based on discussions and their requests for PMMR to help them facilitate this process. Many questions emerged, and it was clear that the team itself was not sure how the CO work would unfold. See Box 1 for a list of key questions the team considered.

With good facilitation by the PMMR research team, and having learned from other experiences through study

**BOX 1: KEY QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER IN PLANNING FOR CO**

- What are the villagers' concepts / ideas for protecting their fishing grounds?
- Are the identified fishing grounds to be co-managed more or less free from interruptions by outsiders?
- Should the boundary for the community managed area follow an administrative boundary or a natural physical boundary?
- What are the steps in establishing community fishing areas?
- Who is involved in the process of community regulation development?
- How does one gain official recognition of community regulations from local authorities and technical departments?
- What will community by-law look like? For example, will fining be included, what sizes of gear will be restricted?
tours and workshops, four communities were established with strong support from the provincial governor and the Minister of Environment. These communities were officially recognized in the form of signed maps and community by-laws.

**An outline of CO process**

During earlier trainings held by PMMR and other partner organizations many participants requested that a CO model be developed for Cambodia. After discussions amongst participants with experience in CO in Cambodia, it was concluded that this would be difficult because people in each area have different interests and situations. A similar process, however, could be developed within different ecosystems i.e., coastal zone, Tonle Sap Great Lake, and Mekong River fishery. Ironically while such a flexible approach towards community fisheries management was initially agreed upon, as the movement in community fisheries has grown, the Department of Fisheries is planning to introduce a step-by-step process for the entire country.

Approaches to the CO development process in Cambodia differ in both community forestry and community fisheries, largely dependent on the geography of the area, ideas of the local community, local authority’s support and the conceptual basis of involving inside and outside organizations. Generally, the PMMR team found that local NGOs/ donor supported projects and government institutions use different approaches to CO. There are different strategies to develop the CO process and while it is not necessary to follow these steps in sequence, the important points are firstly, how each community worker interprets the meaning of community organization; and secondly how community organization can support the local community’s vision and resolve conflicts in their own community. Building the capacity of the local community is a central point, and is necessary for execution of the CO process. The community development worker or field facilitator must have a good understanding of any issues and factors that affect villagers’ participation in the CO process. Table 1 shows an outline of the process for community fisheries organizing support from local NGOs and government sectors.

---

1 Local authority refers to the Ministry of Interior (see Table 1) and the administrative levels falling under this. For example, the governor falls within this line structure as do the police.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DONOR'S SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Clearly identify objectives and working area  
* Understand area background using PRA with community  
* Area selection and groundwork, including cooperation with concerned institutions | Clearly identify objectives and working area  
* Understand background area through secondary data collection  
* Select working area |
| 2 | Time discussing NRM with key persons  
* Using PR/PRA tools  
* Participatory study of ecological and environmental initiative (trainings, workshops, study tours on CBNRM)  
* Participatory decision making approach | No groundwork |
| 3 | Establish the process of CFM  
* General objective identification  
* Seek support from provincial authorities / relevant technical departments  
* Identify key persons in target villages  
* Hold a general training/workshops  
* Identification of NRM target area  
* Community organization formation. i.e. holding elections, forming VMCs | Establish the process of CFM  
* General objective identification  
* Identification of key persons in target villages  
* Community organization formation. i.e. holding elections, forming VMCs |
| 4 | Community regulation development  
* Community by-law development i.e. developing management guidelines with VMC over time  
* Get approval from government agencies | Community regulation development  
* Community by-law development i.e. developing management guidelines  
* Get approval by government agencies |
| 5 | Education and implementation  
* Boundary demarcation  
* Support for work (dissemination of regulations, implementation)  
* Participatory monitoring & evaluation | Education and implementation  
* No action |

Table 1: The main steps for the process of community fisheries management  
Source: Community Fisheries Training Manual, Kompong Cham and Phnom Penh, 2002 (Oxfam GB/America; WWF; IDRC (PMMR, CFDO); PMMR experience.

* Donor, in this case, refers to donor agencies i.e. the IDRC or DANIDA and to NGOs i.e. WWF or Oxfam.
At present, based on the policy of the RGC all technical departments have been instructed (especially MoE and MAFF) that responsibility for NRM must include local villagers and local NGOs. Until the middle of 2003 MoE and MAFF have organized:

- 329 Fisheries communities with 20 community fisheries in coastal areas (Thouk, 2004)
- 237 Forestry communities (McKinney & Tola, 2002)
- 17 Natural protected area communities (both fisheries and forestry)

Among these communities, some communities have strong organizations for participation in NRM, especially the communities that have been supported by NGOs. Some NGOs are able to spend extensive time working with a committee to develop and support local needs in resources management. In contrast, local communities that have been supported by government agencies often lack organizational strength and effectiveness. Table 2 summarizes conditions that enable or ‘disable’ community organizing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENABLING</th>
<th>‘DISABLING’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (having skills/knowledge and an interest in building on such skills/knowledge) in place for the local community.</td>
<td>A lack of capacity within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field workers have good skills and methods to help the local community.</td>
<td>Government staff lack knowledge and skills in participatory approaches and use top down approaches inappropriate for working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good cooperation exists between field workers and representatives of local villagers. Enough opportunities for the local community and stakeholders to be involved in participatory research, especially for planning, decision-making, monitoring and evaluation.</td>
<td>Insufficient funding for the process to help CO due to limited budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good plan to help the local community for self-management on natural resources.</td>
<td>Natural conservation and protection not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient financial support for the planning process for CO.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of ideas between local community and field workers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy support for CO by RGC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Conditions that enable or ‘disable’ CO.
BACKGROUND TO VILLAGES

The PMMR team has focused particular attention on the four villages of Koh Kang, Koh Sralao, and Koh Kapik, which are inside PKWS, and Chrouy Pros outside the protected area. All of these villages are surrounded by abundant mangrove forests. Koh Kang and Koh Sralao were the initial focus for PMMR on community based management work, since they were seen to be more dependent on natural resources and showed more willingness to participate in the project (see chapter 16). These villages are under pressure from inter-provincial migrants, nearly all of whom are former charcoal producers or labourers.

**Koh Sralao (KSL):** is a traditional fishing village. People who have lived in this area for a long time refer to themselves as Koh Kong Thai, since older residents also speak Thai. Many residents escaped to Thailand during the Khmer Rouge, and only a few original villagers returned in the 1980s. Large numbers of outsiders came into this village to earn money by harvesting wood from the mangrove forest during the 1990s; many outsiders have remained in the village, and have now turned to fishing activities.

**Koh Kang (KK):** is a small island that had no inhabitants until the late 1980s when it was used as a place for charcoal kilns, and then shrimp farming from the early 1990s. Almost all of the kilns and the shrimp farms were owned by middlepersons from Koh Kong town. Most of the immigrants initially sold their labour to kilns or shrimp farms. In 1998 the kilns were destroyed by the Department of Environment, and shrimp farming collapsed. Some people returned to their home village, but most stayed and became fishers.
HOW THE VMCS WERE ESTABLISHED

Although the PMMR team has worked with these communities since late 1997, the first community organizing process only started in 2000 in KSL and KK villages. The procedures started by conducting meetings and training workshops with key villagers to introduce the concept of CBNRM, coastal resources management issues, and to discuss the possibility of establishing fisheries co-management in the area. After the training, key informants in the villages were identified (twelve people in KK and 25 people in KSL), and temporary VMCs were created from these key informants (three persons in each village). The main purpose of having the temporary VMCs was to work with the PMMR team to interact with villagers and develop community by laws (local level resource management guidelines created by the villagers). With facilitation by the PMMR team, community by laws were established in each village, and villagers then created an elected VMCs. The KK committee has three members, while the KSL committee has seven members.

The creation of VMCs in CP and KKP were different as there were no temporary village management committees. Instead the community by-laws were drafted by holding workshops and an election for the resource management committees took place.

Koh Kapik (KKP): is a fishing island where the central commune office is located. Some people who live in this village are government officials at the district level, while others are fishers who use trawler and pushing net (medium scale) fishing. There is tension between these fishers and small-scale fishers from KSL and CP villages, especially in the fishing area of Chouy Pros Bay.

Chrouy Pros (CP): is outside the PKWS, and is an important fishing village and neighbour to KSL. Most villagers in CP fish at Koh Kong Bay because this bay has played an important role in supporting local community livelihoods. Following PMMR's work in PKWS, in 2001 the fisher folk in this commune requested the project team to help them in organizing the community for ensuring sustainable use of fisheries resources in Chouy Pros Bay.
MAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE VMC

After the VMCs were elected members developed community action plans for fisheries resources management and livelihood issues with facilitation and assistance by the PMMR team. These action plans included:

**Protection/prevention of illegal activities:** Protection of natural resources is mainly addressed by making a patrolling system using community checkpoints. In some communities patrolling duties are rotated between all community members (KK), but in others only VMC take responsibility. Fishery staff and the police assist in protection activities.

**Mangrove replanting:** Mangrove replanting has been implemented every year from 1998 to 2003, and now covers over 70ha of formerly degraded areas in PKWS. VMCs are leading this activity in KK and KSL with strong participation from villagers. Since 1998, the mangrove condition in PKWS has greatly improved by both natural re-generation and by local replanting efforts.

**Home gardening:** Small home gardens were established in order to reduce family expenses for spices and vegetables. The PMMR project cooperated with selected villagers to grow vegetables with the support from VMCs. This small livelihood project has stimulated the local community to think more about generating income and becoming self-sufficient.

**Community "order":** In order to reduce the problem of stolen fishing gear, both the VMCs of KK and KSL have developed community internal orders for enforcement within their communities. Traps were painted with a different colour according to the group fishers belong to. This made it difficult for the culprits to use stolen gear.

**Drinking water supply:** KK, surrounded by salt water, is sometimes flooded during high tide, especially from November to January and no source of fresh water is available on the island. A project initiated by the VMC, supported by PMMR and the Danida-funded Coastal Zone Management (CZM) projects, formed a committee responsible for managing this issue, and developed a community "order" to reduce the cost of water.

---

7 Community order is a type of regulation developed by communities with no need to seek approval/ signature from concerned government authorities.
Community protected areas: Informal discussions with three VMCs has shown that action is needed to solve conflicts between fisher folk using different types of gear in the area, conserve seagrass and grouper species, and to improve livelihoods. In June 2002, conditions were developed through a multi stakeholder workshop to establish a sanctuary, evaluate its results and consider next steps. Small protected zones were established in Chrouy Pros Bay in order to protect juvenile grouper from hand push nets, seine nets and motorized-boat push nets. Communities now understand that these methods have long term impacts on the ecosystem and associated species.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FOUR VMCS

Though these VMCs were each created under the facilitation of the PMMR project, they differ slightly in terms of structure and working procedures as each village made their own decisions on how to run the committees within a general framework for resource management.

Management structure

The numbers of elected members varied between villages because it was left to each village to decide how many people they felt would be needed to work on resource management issues. Each VMC includes one woman, although a quota-system was not introduced by the facilitators.

After one year the VMC in KK increased to seven people, and KSL to nine, following requests by community members. The VMCs in CP and KKP were established one and two years later respectively. These villages were able to see how the first VMCs functioned in the initial villages, and wanted to form their own committees in a similar manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ELECTED MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKP</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VMCs working procedure

- **KK**: The head of the VMC is a vice village chief. His position provides him with many opportunities to engage with villagers, and it is easy for him to mobilize villagers to take part in community activities. VMC members work well together; for instance they developed a Community Order for drinking water management, and sometimes they share responsibilities among themselves for patrolling. The weakness of this VMC is its top down approach, as the VMC head does not share responsibility for key decisions and events. One such situation was when rice was to be distributed to the villagers the head of the VMC requested VMC members to refrain from distributing rice until he returned to the village from a trip.

- **KSL**: This VMC is very strong compared to other villages. Its members show strong commitment, and the head of the VMC provides opportunities for his members to do things. Two of the most active VMC members are women. The head of the VMC is a middleman who arrived in the village in the early 1990s, who worked himself up from a migratory worker to his current status. Most people in the village say he is kind and helpful. The VMC head is also deputy chief of the commune council and head of the pagoda committee. The VMC has been able to resolve committee problems through facilitation, communication and discussions. Many community activities are now proudly moving forward under the leadership of the VMC. The regular VMC meeting schedule is set by members who can often facilitate the discussions themselves, additional meetings are held according to needs. Initiatives frequently originate from the VMC rather than outsiders. For example, the VMC developed a “Community Order” for the community’s protected area (the sea grass sanctuary), and waste management action in their village though support from community members.

- **CP**: This VMC differs from the others, as all seven members are activists who used to be involved in mobilizing the local fisher folk to act against the illegal activities operating in the fishing areas. None are from the local government authority or middlemen. This VMC has not been overly functional in terms of sharing responsibility, but this is likely due to its recent creation and the fact that its members do not have much experience regarding the concept of CBNRM. The VMC and community members, are almost all small-scale fishers, and are eager to immediately eliminate all illegal fishing activities. Whilst the willingness to address these serious issues is desirable, the VMC has frequently exhausted its members’ enthusiasm. The group requires capacity building for improved communication and cooperation with their partners, especially with local authorities and technical departments. The management situation is improving with help from the PMMR team and members of the KSL committee. This VMC is now supported by the commune chief and has the cooperation of local police when they patrol.

- **KKP**: This VMC was established in 2003 and does not yet have strong activities, aside from mangrove replanting and meetings supported by PMMR.

---

*The procedure used by these VMCs have different characteristics.*
CHALLENGES OF RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

VMCs have become members of political parties at the local level. Some members of the VMCs joined campaigns for commune council and national assembly elections. Party politics has made VMC and villagers distrust each other in matters of natural resources management and other village development activities.

Some issues have arisen in these villages due to lack of communication. Illegal activities backed by powerful people, may contribute to the difficulty of constructing close relations between the VMC and stakeholders, particularly the armed forces (police and navy) in the area.

The VMC does not always have the communication or negotiation skills to create good relationships with other stakeholders. Many of the VMC members complained that local governments did not care enough about resource management, and that they backed illegal activities. Therefore, these VMCs do not enjoy the full support of villagers who may see the VMC as a political party rather than recognizing that their mandate is to focus on resources, and the community often challenges them about their activities.

Although the main activities of the VMCs are moving forwards, not all villagers or competent institutions participate fully in coastal resources management. Poverty of local people in this area is a key issue, and many people are small-scale fishers that face many pressures. Most fishers in the area are able to fish only in shallow water, and it is difficult to fish in the rainy season, when freshwater flows increase, fish move to deeper water, and fishers then have to compete with outside fishing boats. VMCs and fishers request that the PMMR research team continues to assist them until the decentralization policy of the Royal Government of Cambodia is in place.

RELATION OF CC, VMCS, AND OTHERS TECHNICAL DEPARTMENTS

Commune councils (CC) were formed in March 2002, following local elections. The CC’s challenge is to handle development and poverty alleviation in their commune according to the government policy on decentralization.
Each commune council, working with the planning and budgeting sub-committee, prepares an annual commune investment plan (CIP), which enables the commune to prioritize issues, and potentially access government and donor funds to support development in their area. Discussions with the CC in PKWS show that the villagers' needs include: schools, safe drinking water, hospitals, roads, dams, and dredging Koh Kapic stream.

Although resource management planning, such as mangrove replanting, were part of the CIP they were not ranked as priority issues. This is not surprising, as the desires of local people are seldom exclusively ecological or NRM in nature. Like people everywhere, residents in coastal communities desire practical services such as health, education, infrastructure, etc. Even though KSL residents consider NRM important, they have many other needs.

The CC is responsible for a wide range of tasks regarding the development of the commune while the VMCs focus mainly on one area, resource management, but link to other concerns. Provincial technical departments' work supports the VMC mandate, i.e. the Fishery Department focuses on the development of the fisheries sectors including tax collection and monitoring gear types, while the Environment Department concentrates on conservation and protection rather than development or generating government revenue.

Since each department has its own agenda, the combination of different interests is very important in order to accomplish resource management.

Stakeholders (local communities, village, commune and district authorities, armed forces, and relevant technical departments) in Koh Kong province recognize that coastal resources have been degraded due to illegal fishing activities, over-fishing, destruction of coastal forests, pollution and increasing population pressures. Degraded coastal resources affect rural coastal livelihoods. Cooperation amongst all stakeholders (including all levels) and active participation in the management of coastal resources can strengthen and rehabilitate coastal resources. This can be done through the elimination of illegal fishing activities, strengthening law enforcement, creating and strengthening fishery communities, and ensuring the sustainable use of coastal resources. This will not only serve an ecological purpose, but also benefit the social-economical environment of rural communities. Eco-tourism may be one other way to improve coastal livelihoods.

Source: Vision On PMCR in Koh Kong province, January 14-16, 2004
within any village. Recently, the PMMR organized a workshop on “Creating a Vision of Coastal Resources Co-Management” in PKWS and Chrouy Pros Bay to assist stakeholders in the coastal community to work together for sustainable development.

**IMPACTS OF HAVING A VMC**

CO is a process by which a community empowers itself by working to identify its needs and to resolve its problems in a collective manner (IIRR, 1998). Forming VMCs is ideally aimed at those organizing communities with a focus on natural resource management. Although these communities are not yet officially supported by the law (a sub decree on community fisheries management is being prepared), there is an informal policy of support from local authorities and technical departments.

Local authorities recognize that there are many positive changes, and the condition of the coastal resources has significantly improved since the VMCs have been in place. VMC activities have had many positive impacts: enhanced community members' understanding of CBNRM, improved the coastal environment and livelihoods, built the capacity of local resource users, and improved the relationship and cooperation among stakeholders from local to international levels with the expectation of sharing sustainable resource management and livelihoods.

**CBNRM concept goes into practice:** Before the PMMR project was implemented in the PKWS areas, local communities thought that the task of coastal resource management was the responsibility of government officers. Following the introduction of the CBNRM concept through training workshops and study tours, communities are willing to participate in the conservation and protection of natural resources. The VMC members have started to discuss the effects of participatory protection of resources and are finding ways to improve participatory NRM. Activities have made local villagers and stakeholders change attitudes towards mangrove resources management: some community members joined in patrolling, mangrove replanting, and some report illegal activities to the VMC.
Resources management system improved: The resources in these areas were severely depleted due to improper use and ineffective management. The VMCs have worked hard to mobilize communities, disseminating by-laws and regulations, preparing action plans, initiating patrols, and seeking support from local authorities and concerned departments to provide technical advice and help solve specific problems. In the community managed areas patrolling activities have been conducted by communities with the rangers or local police outside PKWS. Illegal activities have been reduced, and offenders are educated and agreements made to stop their illegal activities.

Relationship and cooperation: VMCs pay attention to building relationships, and seeking support and cooperation from local authorities and concerned stakeholders. With no policy support for community fisheries management, it is hard for the VMC to convince local villagers and relevant government officials to join in their activities. These difficulties can be overcome when they (the communities, local and concerned authorities) understand each other, and there is friendship between one another. Although VMCs are not directly under the government bodies, the VMCs have initiated discussions with government departments and dialogues have taken place in more informal ways. The VMCs regularly report to the commune police, commune council, and government staff to inform the authorities of their activities. The VMCs now have considerable support from stakeholders due to these efforts at building good relationships. Commune police in KSL and CP, who were previously reluctant to help the communities, are now active in many activities.

Improvement within the VMCs: The capacity of the VMCs has grown steadily, and the committees can now perform many tasks themselves such as holding discussions among VMC members or group leaders, organizing patrols with rangers, seeking help from the commune police when necessary, and initiating and developing a community order. As the VMCs get stronger, they support local government authorities. The head of KSL stated that the establishment of the VMC has reduced local conflicts, and villagers’ livelihood activities are shifting towards more sustainable ways.

POTENTIAL OF CO

This paper has focused on the creation and activities of four local-level resource management institutions, facilitated by the PMMR project. PMMR used two methods to support community based management in PKWS, Koh Kong province.
Supporting and strengthening local management systems (as shown in Figure 1) in instances where there was strong local knowledge, people were already engaged in resource management activities, and new institutions did not need to be created given the strong leadership on resource management. Supporting existing leaders through workshops and regional activities was felt to be more appropriate.

Villages with less resource management experience requested the organization of management systems (CO/VMC), which were mainly intended to establish fisheries and coastal resources management in each respective villages.

This paper illustrates how community based management is working on the ground in one area of coastal Cambodia. Although guidelines are now needed to help with community based management throughout the country, it is important that such guidelines are broad enough to allow villages to find the best means of addressing their problems, which may or may not involve the creation of a village management institution. In some cases village chiefs can be supported, in other cases village management committees can be created. There are benefits to both: working through an elected resource management committee results in greater representation of villagers and joint decision making; and working through a village head person and traditional village-based institutions, carries significant weight. Each ‘system’ has its own merits.

CONCLUSION

CBNRM is a new concept in Cambodia; faced with rapid decline of natural resources in both coastal and inland areas, the RGC has made efforts to promote the new resource management systems. Policy reforms have helped both the PMMR project and the VMCs move forward with high expectations from the local community, who now know that formal policy will eventually support the VMC work. PMMR has facilitated a process that is more appropriately termed co-management, but commonly called community based management in Cambodia, to bring all stakeholders into the process, including fisher communities, technical institutions, and local authorities.
As a result of creating VMCs, the target villages are better able to control and manage their own resources, and participate in improving the coastal environment. The villagers have an increased understanding of the role that mangrove forests have in providing habitats for fish and, consequently, their daily livelihoods. Members of the VMCs are actively working with their fellow villagers and the PMMR team to share the responsibility of coastal resource management. Furthermore, they work with other stakeholders under direct and indirect facilitation by PMMR on other village development activities.

CBNRM experiences are being mainstreamed into the commune council planning process through the decentralization policy of the RGC. Positive experiences from ground level fieldwork in Koh Kong and other parts of Cambodia are contributing to community development under the Seila Programme and other projects. The VMC’s activities on natural resources and environment management in particular are favourably looked upon by decision makers at all levels.

However, effective local community participation at the management level requires more time and skills in order to achieve self-responsibility in the future for sustainable natural resource management. Furthermore, technical and financial support from outsiders is still needed. Key lessons from PMMR’s work are that VMCs will differ as each context varies, and that good facilitation of the VMC, by provincial level government or NGO staff, is an important part of addressing and solving resource management issues.
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“I did not really think that resource management would improve our livelihoods. But, we are now able to solve some problems... We feel that our resources are improving a little bit as a result of our work”.

(a resource management committee member and fisher, 2003)

In part as a response to declining access to natural resources, community based management (also known as community fisheries, community forestry or co-management) has emerged in Cambodia. Although approaches can vary, communities are actively establishing their own management areas and plans often with support from NGOs or government institutions. In 2002, for instance, there were an estimated 162 community fishery sites and 237 community forestry sites in Cambodia (McKenney & Prom, 2002). Moreover, a policy environment, albeit disjointed, is being developed to support some forms of community involvement in resource management. Community forestry and community fisheries sub-decrees have been drafted and are currently under review.

Many of the community forestry and fishery sites in Cambodia have an elected resource management committee (also known as a community fisheries or forestry committee) that is responsible for guiding resource management activities. This article, based on preliminary findings from an on-going study (August 2002 - July 2003) of rural livelihoods and

---

1 This article is reprinted with permission from Cambodia Development Review. Marschke, M. “From planning to action: what can resource management committees do ‘on the ground’?” Cambodia Development Review. 7(3): 7-10, 12.

2 Melissa is completing her Ph.D. at the University of Manitoba, Canada.
Community based management in Koh Sralao, Koh Kong province and Kompong Phluk, Siem Reap province, seeks to bring to light the various 'on the ground' activities of two such resource management committees. The research has involved both qualitative and quantitative research methods, including participatory research tools, in-depth household discussions, and a survey of 148 households.

Kompong Phluk is a commune on the Tonle Sap Lake that has been practising community based management since the 1940s, perhaps one of the oldest examples of resource management (forestry and fisheries) known around the Tonle Sap Lake. Koh Sralao is a coastal community in Koh Kong province that became actively involved in community based management once their resources began being depleted. Both field sites have had donor support (more technical support than financial support), and are acknowledged as success stories for community based management; other communities are not necessarily as well organized, interested or as active (Poffenberger 2002; PMMR 2003).

Although much could be gained from an analysis of how donor support and management planning affects community based management activities, the focus here is on what villagers are doing 'on the ground' once they are organized and have their management plans approved. This article provides an overview of two resource management committees, highlighting how community based management can unfold at a local level and why villagers are participating in such activities. Also probed are the strategies undertaken by resource management committees, and their ability to address issues and problems at a local level. Lessons learned include that villagers are most willing to engage in community based management strategies when they believe that they can improve livelihoods within their community.

**COMMUNITY BASED MANAGEMENT: AN OVERVIEW OF TWO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEES**

Community based management approaches in Cambodia tend to have some similar characteristics: rules and regulations, formation of resource management committees to guide community based management initiatives, thumb prints from villagers indicating their support for such work, demarcated areas for management and approval from some government level (i.e., provincial governors and/or national
level). Although these structures may appear similar, according to management plans and approval mechanisms, experience shows that what is happening 'on the ground' may be quite different. For instance, some resource management committees, although recognized by an appropriate government institution, remain inactive while community based management is active in some villages even in the absence of formal organizations or official recognition/support.

Composition and operations of resource management committees vary, as illustrated by the two resource management committees discussed here. In Koh Sralao, prior to holding a committee election, villagers developed and accepted rules and regulations pertaining to resource management. Villagers then elected a committee of seven people, including two women, to oversee resource management activities. The committee holds monthly meetings, but additional meetings may be held when problems arise. In contrast, the resource management committee in Kompong Phluk was elected after several meetings, and then worked together to form rules and regulations. This committee consists of nine representatives (including two women) from the three villages that form the commune. The area under management expanded with the release of fishing lot areas to the community in 2001; hence, the committee was expanded and roles and responsibilities were updated. This resource management committee holds meetings whenever something needs to be discussed or when problems arise.

Table 1 highlights key characteristics of the resource management committees in Koh Sralao and Kompong Phluk, including: when resource management committees were established, legal status, resource management issues addressed, examples of strategies for addressing issues, and reasons for villagers’ support of the resource management committee in their village or commune (see chapter 15). Although both committees are relatively young, having been established in 1999 and 2000 respectively, they both have been able to experiment with different resource management strategies, thinking about what could work within their context.

For example, in Koh Sralao initial resource management practices emphasized environmental education and patrolling to prevent illegal activities, such as trawling and dynamite fishing, theft of fishing gear and charcoal production. However, over time, the resource management committee decided to enhance this work through
facilitating conflict-resolution mechanisms in an attempt to find solutions that more villagers could engage in and could be implemented without donor support. One such mechanism, which will be expanded upon later, addresses conflicts over stolen fishing gear.

Although both resource management committees were initially formed to address community based resource management issues, they view their mandate more broadly. For example, in Koh Sralao the resource management committee is also finding solutions to other community problems, such as supporting the schoolteacher to stay in the village. In Kompong Phluk the resource management committee helps poor families in times of need, such as by providing support for funeral ceremonies. Initial analysis suggests that most villagers view their resources holistically (i.e. fishery and forestry issues are linked), and see the resource management committee as an organized body that can address issues beyond resource management. In each village, resource management committee members expressed that villagers support their work because of: trust, a belief that their livelihoods are improving as a result of this work, and good leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KOH SRALAO</th>
<th>KOMPONG PHLUK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year established</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal status</strong></td>
<td>Informal – supported by agreements with provincial governor and Minister of Environment (is within a protected area).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management issues addressed</strong></td>
<td>Illegal fishing, from within and outside their community; charcoal production; stealing of fishing gear; declining resources; waste management; and other community issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples of management strategies</strong></td>
<td>Solving theft through innovative solutions (painting crab traps, patrolling); supporting local schoolteachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for villagers’ support</strong></td>
<td>Key community members are involved in the committee; people trust that this committee is working for the people and see good results; village leaders openly support committee, delegating responsibilities to it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: An overview of two resource management committees
In each area there is appropriate political support for community based management. For example, in Koh Sralao the resource management committee leader is also a member of the commune council; in Kompong Phluk a member from the commune council acts in an advisory role to the resource management committee. While having informal or formal policy support (legislation remains pending) is one factor that can support successful community based management, further analysis suggests that it requires motivation and problem-solving skills from the resource management committees themselves to drive this work. For instance, in both Koh Sralao and Kompong Phluk multiple strategies are used for dealing with illegal activities and resource declines, including creating local systems of support, getting police and technical departments to engage in patrolling and enforcement activities together with villagers, disseminating rules and regulations, and networking amongst villagers to support the resource management committee's work.

WHY PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY BASED MANAGEMENT?

Villagers choose to participate in community based management initiatives for a vast number of reasons including: spiritual (e.g. to protect the forests near their pagodas), political (e.g. for personal benefit or prestige), historical (i.e. a tradition of resource management in the village), environmental (e.g. to stop rampant resource declines), economic (i.e. a belief that protection can lead to income generation for community development) and relationship building (e.g. the donor can help facilitate/negotiate requests on behalf of the village). In Kompong Phluk, for example, villagers engage in resource protection for traditional reasons and as a response to farmland encroachment and resource decline.

“Long before the fisheries community was set up, people loved and took care of the forest. It was not perfectly managed, though, especially in recent times. So, it was good timing to work with [NGO], for them to help us. We wanted to stop the mung bean farming near our commune and needed outside support” (an elder, 2003).

For this Elder, having lived in Kompong Phluk all his life, flooded forest protection made sense since there is a history of resource management in Kompong Phluk. Elders recall protesting against watermelon farms encroaching on their village area to allow for natural regeneration of the flooded forest near their village in the 1940s (Poffenberger, 2002).
The experience in Koh Sralao has been quite different. Most villagers migrated to Koh Sralao after the Khmer Rouge era with the hope of cashing in on lucrative resource extraction opportunities. Resources remained relatively abundant until the 1990s, but more recent rapid resource declines have greatly affected local livelihoods, thereby motivating villagers to 'do something' (Marschke, 2000).

This is not to suggest that all villagers in the two communities are active in supporting the work of the resource management committees; participation does remain an issue. Multiple factors can affect who, in a community, is active. For example, women tend to have less opportunity to participate in management activities. In other cases, villagers cannot afford to volunteer their time towards resource management or other community activities. Consider the comment of one former resource management committee member:

“Right now my livelihood situation is not very good. I need to focus on my family first. When I find a job with a secure income and finish building a house for my family then I can return to working with the resource management committee. It takes up a lot of time, and I am too worried about my family right now” (a fisher, 2003).

Households do not necessarily have the choice of active participation when their immediate livelihood concerns are quite pressing. For these reasons, resource management committee members tend to be villagers that have a decent livelihood within the village context and are more influential in the village. Often, they have strong networks and relationships that they can call upon to support their work.

VILLAGERS' RESOURCE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

“Since our commune is small, we work easily together. Each village is responsible for protecting one part of the forest and we are all responsible for protecting the forest near the village” (a fisher, 2003).

The resource management committee in Kompong Phluk knows that the forest near their commune protects them from wind and storms. Issues that the committee addresses include: forest protection, illegal fishing activities, resource decline,
farmland encroachment, and other community activities. Multiple strategies are used to tackle these issues, some of which are working better than others. For example, while patrolling activities may seem to be the obvious solution to stopping illegal activities near the community, patrolling is expensive (i.e. fuel costs; community cannot generate enough income to support consistent patrols), risky (i.e. can escalate into conflict) and difficult to organize (i.e. lack of consistent technical support). Although resource management committee members do engage in patrolling activities with police and technical staff, they also focus on networking within the village, and outside, to strengthen their own practices and that of neighbouring communes and districts. As elsewhere in the world, peer pressure can work wonders for compliance to rules and regulations! Table 2 highlights some of the issues and the strategies devised by the resource management committee to solve these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGEMENT ISSUE</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT STRATEGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flooded forest cutting</td>
<td>Committee directs villagers to manage specific parts of the forest, reporting any illegal activities to the committee, which then investigates and tries to solve the issue (if possible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal fishing gear (push nets, electro fishing, long bamboo traps) and theft</td>
<td>Patrolling and fining activities for illegal gear; discussions with other communes about Kompong Phluk’s rules and regulations; community members working closely with committee to stop illegal activities and to monitor their own fishing practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining resources</td>
<td>Creation of a 1km² fish sanctuary; educating people about the rules of the community; villagers encouraged to collect floating wood for firewood and to collect fuel wood outside of mature forest area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland encroachment</td>
<td>Work with provincial authorities and NGO staff to stabilize encroachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>Supporting poor villagers in times of need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Table 2: An example of village management strategies in Kompong Phluk"

Many small-scale Cambodian fishers face similar problems: declining resources and stolen fishing gear. Moreover, stolen or destroyed gear leads to conflict, both among villagers, and with those using the same fishing grounds. In Koh Sralao, for example, crab traps were constantly being stolen, mostly by outside fishers but sometimes by villagers themselves. After several brainstorming sessions, the resource management committee decided to devise a system to enable villagers to recognize
their own crab traps more easily. A resource management committee member further explains:

“After many discussions we had an idea. Each group [of the eight that the village is divided into] has to mark their crab traps with the same colour. Individual owners then, using this colour, have a specific sign i.e. slash marks in certain directions, which indicates whose traps these are. So far, painting the crab traps has been a good solution for cutting down the stealing of crab traps. People that are caught with the wrong colour traps are fined. Or, they are asked to give back new traps. We cannot solve all the problems, but this is helping” (2003).

In general, villagers are happy with this solution. One fisher commented, “I have had less traps stolen than last year. I now can sleep in the village at night, and am not afraid to leave my traps”. This solution is providing some security for fishers, and villagers are working together to watch out for boats that they do not recognize. Although crab traps do continue to get stolen, villagers felt that there was a decrease in theft and a better chance of recovery of stolen crab traps. This is one example of the type of local problem-solving initiatives engaged in by resource management committees.

Another management strategy, both in Kompong Phluk and in Koh Sralao, is the creation of fish sanctuaries within community management boundaries. A significant fishing area, such as spawning grounds or seedling area, is demarcated for strict protection. As one fisher noted, “our fish sanctuary is located near our fishing grounds so it is easier for us to protect this area. Plenty of fish can now be found there, and this makes us realize that we need more areas where we protect fish”. Fishers themselves, along with local authorities, can monitor what is going on. Of course, if large-scale fishers decide to not respect local rules, greater technical/ outside support is needed to help fishers solve the problem. The resource management committees recognize that they cannot solve all problems but with creative thinking, some issues can be addressed.

LESSONS LEARNED

Research undertaken on resource management committees in Kompong Phluk and Koh Sralao highlights how community based management can evolve at a local
level. Villagers are concerned about their forests and fishing areas, along with other community-level problems. Resource management committees see their work as enhancing community livelihoods, and they are willing to experiment with a range of strategies.

Villagers also perceive tangible results from this work: a few less crab traps stolen per year; denser forests; less farmland encroachment; and increased cooperation amongst villagers.

“We know that the resource management committee will help us. They have taught us about mangrove replanting and about protecting our resources. There are more crabs this year near the mangroves, and we now understand the relationship between mangroves and a healthier fishery” (a fisher, 2003).

Although there is no baseline data to supplement villagers’ perceptions of increased resources, what is important, at this point, is that villagers believe in this work.

Another important factor for the success of these two resource management committees is support from the commune council. Leadership, including the willingness to take risks, is also seen as critical to garnering the support of the local community. Both resource management committee leaders are respected within their village, and tend to be more influential within their community. Without such determination, commitment and support, these resource management committees could not be so successful.

Resource management committees have had the flexibility to address issues as they have arisen in the community. Neither committee is strictly bound by their mandate, recognizing that they have the ability to problem solve around different community issues, whether they are environmental or social. For example, villagers recently hauled cement and other materials for the construction of a pagoda hall, used as a meeting place for different community events, up a steep hill in Koh Sralao upon request of the resource management committee. Resource management, in a way, is a vehicle for committees to address and problem-solve a range of community-level issues!
Legislation is being drafted to support community-level initiatives, however, a critical question remains: how can policy best be implemented to serve the interests of villagers, especially for those who do not separate their resources by sector (e.g. forest, fishery)? Further investigation is required to assess how different community based policies identified in a range of legislation and programmes (e.g. Community Fisheries Sub-decree, Community Forestry Sub-decree, Protected Areas Law, Land Law, local governance programmes, etc.) can best support village-level work, rather than lead to fragmentation via the creation of multiple committees doing similar work. As has been shown by experiences in Kompong Phluk and Koh Sralao, community based management can emerge in many ways. Finding flexible approaches that support creative learning and problem-solving opportunities represents an important challenge for local resource management and development.
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INTRODUCTION

Forests are sources of wealth, valued for a broad range of economic, cultural, and environmental goods and services by an array of stakeholders that includes, to some degree, everyone. This paper discusses how the governance of forests determines which values are emphasized (and which are not), the distribution of forest-related benefits (who gains and who doesn't), and productivity of forest assets over time.

Although often discussed in technical terminology, forest governance (and its expression in 'forest management') is fundamentally a political process, often involving highly charged and contentious relationships between different stakeholders. In recent decades, increasing global inter-connectedness, rapidly declining forest resource stocks, and conflicts arising from forest use have elevated concerns about forest sustainability to the forefront of national and international agendas. However, while broad support for sustainable forest management (SFM) is often expressed in principle, achieving forest governance that results in SFM has so far proved frustratingly elusive in most parts of the world.

Towards the end of the 1990s Cambodia's forests were in a period of destruction and corruption that could only be characterized as a governance failure. This contributed to socio-economic impoverishment, environmental degradation, and a radical reduction in future forest productivity. In recent years, widespread 'anarchic' logging has been reined in, the rate of forest loss has been reduced, and the industrial forest concession system\(^2\) has been increasingly recognized as inappropriate. Whether this situation reflects fundamental improvement in forest governance and management remains uncertain. It is clear, however, that without sustained progress in improving forest governance and management, Cambodia's forests will become, like the Angkor temples, a memory of past wealth.

---

\(^1\) Doug has advised several IDRC projects in Cambodia since 1996, and currently advises the Community Forestry Research Project, a multi-institutional framework for action research on community forestry.

\(^2\) The main forest management strategy adopted in the mid 1990s by the Royal Government of Cambodia and especially encouraged by the World Bank in Cambodia until recently.
While the 'anarchic' conditions of the late 1990s have been constrained and replaced by a stronger centralized forest administration system, forest governance continues to be characterized by lack of participation, transparency, or accountability.

Improving the contribution of forest resources to the country's development will require a fundamental reform of forest governance, to provide for much greater participation of forest stakeholders in the processes that determine how forests are used and how benefits are distributed.

The vast majority of Cambodians depend on forests for their livelihoods, and many directly access and use forests on a regular basis. It is these Cambodians who have the greatest incentive and valuable 'local knowledge' for SFM. Both good forest governance and sustainable forest management require genuine local participation in forest governance; without this participation neither can be achieved.

**WHAT IS FOREST GOVERNANCE?**

A forest, as a biological entity, exists at a defined geographic location. However, what happens to a forest depends heavily on human factors that influence who uses it, how it is used, even whether it continues or ceases to exist as a forest. Because social conditions determine to a large extent the fate of a forest, it as much a social entity as a biological one. Many of the human influences that affect a forest are determined by matters far from the geographic or biological forest itself. The effort to manage these influences is governance. Governance, as a general concept, refers to the institutions of human society that together 'manage' public affairs. Governance involves:

- a process (or processes) by which governing bodies are selected, held accountable, monitored, and replaced;

---

3 The ecological linkages of a forest can extend over a large geographic scale.

4 This section draws heavily from B. Hillman. 2003 *Understanding Governance: a conceptual framework*. Centre for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge.
Management of public affairs requires the use of political authority and exercise of control in society. The role of state institutions (government) is critical for establishing an environment in which society's objectives can be defined and achieved; governance includes the process(es) by which the state (government, through its agencies) wields power and authority to make and enforce decisions concerning the public's social, economic, and cultural welfare.

Sometimes the important role of the state in governance is interpreted to mean that governance and government are synonymous: that government bears full responsibility and authority for governance. Political and economic systems that emphasize state institutions while prohibiting or minimizing non-state institutions are expressions of this concept of governance.

Governance encompasses more than government agencies and actions under direct state control: “it is the exercise of economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels and comprises mechanisms, processes, and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their legal obligations, and mediate their differences,” (UNDP, quoted in Hillman, 2003).

This concept highlights that governance is about how citizens manage their affairs, and recognizes that much of this management takes place outside the agencies that are under the direct authority of the state. Governance encompasses both government and non-government institutions, and includes a wide diversity of organizations, processes, and mechanisms; together these comprise “a framework of social, cultural, and economic systems, legal and political structures within which humanity organizes its affairs” (Hillman 2003). This recognition of the importance and validity of institutional diversity in governance is generally referred to as pluralism.
Governance is achieved through a complex mosaic of institutions, processes, and mechanisms that, altogether, enable people to live collectively as a society. Within each society, what constitutes “good” governance reflects the values of the society.

**Governance takes place through…**

...**institutions** such as state agencies, village councils, private companies, member associations, NGOs, religious organizations, the media, professional organizations, political parties, and diverse forms of social organization.

...**processes** that formulate and implement, and enforce rules such as policies, laws, and agreements of many types, and negotiate conflicts.

...**mechanisms** that facilitate communication between individuals, between institutions, and between individuals and institutions.

However, a number of principles of good governance are generally recognized. These include:

| **dialogue** | Dialogue is essential to make decisions and achieve development that benefits local people. Dialogue is two-way communication between individuals and institutions, and between the state, civil society and the private sector. Those who are usually excluded should take part in discussion and decision-making. |
| **clarity** | Genuine dialogue gives clarity. All actors need to be clear about their own and others’ roles, responsibility and relationships so that the development process can be easily and efficiently managed. |
| **agreement** | When things have been discussed and clarity achieved, the actors can reach an agreement. What has been decided must also be clearly expressed and widely known, so that everybody is familiar with others' commitments and expectations. |
| **respect** | All parties must respect the agreements. Clarity and transparency ensure that there is accountability between the state, civil society and the private sector. That in turn increases mutual confidence, and the process of cooperation and development can continue. |

Other key attributes of good governance, closely associated with principles, include:

| **participation** | Members of society have the means to articulate their interests and to meaningfully participate in decision-making processes. |
| **accountability** | Decision-makers (officials in institutions) are answerable to their constituents and there are efficient ways to check and amend their performance. |
| **transparency** | Constituents know how decisions have been reached. |
| **rule of law** | The legal system is just, impartial, and effective. |

---

5 These good governance principles are identified by the Seila Programme in Cambodia.
The conventional concept of forest governance emphasizes the rights, authority, and role of the state in managing forest resources. By convention, rights, authority, and responsibilities for managing forests are vested in a state agency; the agency typically seeks to conduct its authority and control through a 'line of command' bureaucracy that extends from the 'centre' (usually a national agency) to the 'field' (officers responsible to the central agency, who are responsible for 'control' of forest use). This conventional concept is founded on a 19th Century model of bureaucratic government, wherein a state agency staffed by a technically trained cadre (such as "foresters" or "rangers") is vested with authority to manage forest resources for the 'public good'. Historically, the agency and cadre have substantial discretion in specifying what comprises the 'public good' and how to achieve it. Evidence suggests that the conventional concept (as it has been institutionalized) is unlikely to achieve public objectives or to optimize the 'public good'. However, while shortcomings of conventional forest management are often recognized, fundamental changes in forest governance (rights, authorities, and roles) are highly resisted by foresters, authorities, and political leaders who benefit from existing conventions.

In recent decades, significant changes have taken place in 'conventional wisdom' about how forests should be governed and managed. Forests are recognized as valuable for a wide range of interests and concerns; and forest management is recognized as needing to accommodate and respond to these interests and concerns if it is to be effective. In many countries, forest management objectives have opened up, from overriding concerns with forests as timber resources or land banks for development, to a wide range of forest goods and services and stakeholder needs which must be reflected in forest management. Forest policy-setting and implementation is understood to involve multiple stakeholders and partnerships. And in some countries, forest-dependent communities are gaining forest tenure and management rights, to enable them to be effective forest managers.

Cambodia has, unfortunately, lagged behind these advances in forest governance and management. The disposition of forest resources in Cambodia has continued to reflect a predominant emphasis on timber extraction, linked to the drive for 'revenue capture' by authorities and a well-connected elite. Where new forest law and procedures threaten to constrain timber extraction, forests may be re-designated to non-forest status to circumvent legal constraints. Multi-stakeholder participation is not
well understood or valued in the forest sector, and stakeholder perspectives that conflict with the government encounter resistance, and occasionally violent reactions. A new Forest Law, drafted in 2000-01, makes few provisions for participation, transparency, or accountability in forest policy setting and implementation (see chapter 3 of this status report). Policy, legal mechanisms, and procedures to enable local forest users to establish rights and responsibilities in forest management remain under-developed and uncertain.

**MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION: A KEY TO IMPROVING FOREST GOVERNANCE**

The range of interests and concerns reflect the different perspectives, needs, and objectives of society with respect to forests. These different perspectives, needs, and objectives are held by a diverse set of stakeholders. Meaningful participation of stakeholders in forest management, rather than only government and some historical elites, is essential for effective forest policy setting and implementation. The process(es) by which this can be achieved are determined by the institutional and policy environment. Over the last two years in particular, a wide range of international fora have identified better ‘forest governance' as an important goal.

Achieving better forest governance requires processes that enable effective participation of different stakeholders in decision-making about forest management. The outcome of good forest governance is forest sustainability, based on broadly based social agreement about forest use. Multi-stakeholder processes are essential throughout all aspects of forest management, to ensure that the range of different interests and concerns are articulated and addressed, and to validate the decision-making process and the decision outcomes.

Virtually all Cambodians depend on the nation's forests and have an interest in their sustainability: for inputs used directly in daily livelihoods, for raw material inputs to the

---

6 The law re-established an institutional form wherein the national Forest Administration is a largely stand-alone agency with broad authority over forests extending from national to field level. Under this law, forestry is separate from and not accountable within the main decentralization structure (SEILA) that is intended to provide good governance.

7 For example, the forest sector-related efforts of WSSD; World Bank and CIFOR Forest Governance Programmes; IIED forest governance learning group; and Asia-Pacific Good Forest Governance Initiative.
expanding market economy, and as part of the environmental system in which people and communities exist. Tapping this broad public interest in sustaining forests offers the strongest potential support for sustainable forest management, and is also a major challenge. The failure to mobilize broad participation in forest governance to date has been arguably the most significant shortcoming and constraint to achieving reform in the forest sector.

Participation in forest governance has many aspects and can take many forms. Forest governance occurs at different 'levels' (local to national to international), involves a wide range of stakeholders, is framed by ecological and institutional conditions, and is dynamic in terms of issues, priorities, and strategies. Achieving 'good governance' requires harmonizing forest management from local-to-national levels, while at the same time accommodating differences between levels in terms of stakeholders (and how they relate), issues/priorities/objectives, and strategies.

**HOW COMMUNITY FORESTRY CONTRIBUTES TO GOOD FOREST GOVERNANCE (GFG)**

Community forestry (CF) is a cornerstone of sustainable forest management in Cambodia. It enables the effective participation of local people and communities in managing forest resources, by focusing on the forest resources on which they depend. Community forestry involves developing capacities and processes for local people, acting through community based organizations and institutions, to manage a defined set of forest resources and is essential for meeting the forest-related needs and development objectives of local people, both in terms of resources needed to sustain livelihoods and as part of the local governance framework that enables people to influence their collective future. A failure to effectively engage local people in forest management contributes to forest degradation, to the failure of forest management, and to shortcomings in socio-economic development and governance in a variety of ways.

CF has gained recognition and expanded significantly in Cambodia over the past seven or eight years. Initially perceived as a minor strategy with limited scope, appropriate for degraded low-productivity forests, community forestry is now recognized as an important strategy that is appropriate for a range of contexts that
include a significant portion of Cambodia’s forest resources. Support for community forestry by two Ministries, a number of provincial governments, and NGOs and IOs has resulted in expanding awareness, de facto policy, legal recognition, and increasing experience and capacity for community forestry.

Although the actual area under community forestry in Cambodia is still small, it is significant because:

- It is the only forest in Cambodia that is actively under forest management; an especially stark contrast to the millions of hectares of forest allocated to forest concessions.
- It directly meets the needs of rural people and contributes to major objectives of the RGC, such as sustainable socio-economic development, integrated rural development, and decentralization in ways that state-based and concession-based forest management do not.

Community forestry initiatives are spread around the country in a variety of social and environmental contexts, with support from different government levels and agencies and a number of international donors and NGOs. This diversity demonstrates the wide applicability and broad cooperation that is possible in community forestry. These projects are actively networked through a national CF Network (see chapter 6) and several other networks, some are linked through various collaborative mechanisms, and some cooperate in advocacy efforts.

Community forestry will continue to expand in Cambodia, as it gains wider acceptance and as experience and capacities strengthen. The potential for CF is large although not yet specifically defined. Correlation of human settlement data and

---

1. MoE and NGOs have actively promoted and supported community forestry since 1993. DFW has adopted a noticeably more favourable position toward community forestry over the past several years, encouraged by its own staff, technical advisors, donors, NGOs, and regional institutions such as RECOFTC.
2. The most comprehensive forest policy effort to date, the Forest Policy Reform Project (commissioned by the World Bank in 1997), promoted expanded participation including community forestry in many of its recommendations, and technical advice for improving concession management identified the need to address community concerns in allocating and managing concessions. Existing projects have established de facto policy precedents for several different community forestry strategies, including “co-management” of state forest, community “concessions” based on recognition of customary tenure rights, and allocation of “forest commons” for community forestry. After several efforts to establish a formal policy and specific legal basis (sub-decree) for community forestry were stalled by grassroots opposition, a broadly consultative process was undertaken which resulted in a widely supported draft policy and sub-decree for community forestry. This draft sub-decree was altered substantially by the government without stakeholder consultation, and then in spite of criticism by CF advocates, officially adopted to demonstrate compliance with donor pressures for forestry reform.
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Forest areas indicate that a major portion of Cambodia’s population is in close enough proximity to forests that local people will use and influence these forest areas, with or without official recognition and involvement in management regimes. In the future, predictions are that a larger portion of the population will live in proximity to forest areas, as the increasing population expands into less-populated areas. The World Bank suggested in 1999 that approximately half the area allocated to concessions should be withdrawn, with a large portion presumably shifted to non-concession forest management including community forestry. A number of forest concessions have been cancelled, although subsequent intentions regarding forest management in these areas have not been clarified.

The development and expansion of community forestry can both contribute to better forest governance in Cambodia, and benefit from improved governance. Community forestry is founded on multi-stakeholder processes to establish and implement forest management regimes that achieve sustainable forest management in target areas. These multi-stakeholder processes are an integral part of effective forest management regimes, and therefore an important component of good forest governance.

Diagram 1: Improving forest governance and community forestry: meaningful participation and multi-stakeholder processes incorporating good governance principles
TOWARD GOOD GOVERNANCE FOR COMMUNITY FORESTRY

As discussed earlier, the future of a forest is ultimately determined by the institutional and policy environment that influences stakeholder actions and interactions related to that forest. The institutional and policy environment extends from the local level to the national level, and to the regional/international level. Improving governance for community forestry, and thereby realizing CF’s contribution to improving forest governance, involves reforming the institutional and policy environment to enable community forestry, based on good governance principles and processes, at all levels.

Most efforts to change and improve the institutional and policy environment focus on the national level, often with strong links to the regional/international level, and with some provision for 'bottom up' input through links to local- and field-level contexts. Often, however, local-level links are extremely limited, and consequently local-level input and influence are relatively minor in 'higher' level processes to change the institutional and policy environment. This poses a major concern for community forestry because local communities, who have the most direct interest in improving the institutional and policy environment for CF and in ensuring that institutional and policy reforms are favourable at a local level, have the least input and influence in higher level processes that shape the institutional and policy environment.

Improving the institutional and policy environment for CF depends on strengthening the influence of local communities in the institutional and policy environment related to forest resources, thereby enabling local communities to play a significant institutional role in sustaining forests. This needs to occur at all levels throughout the institutional and policy environment. All levels are important as they are linked, and it would be misguided to prioritize one level as more important than another.

Many efforts to improve the institutional and policy environment focus on the national level, however reform at this level is far from local and field realities. Improving the
institutional and policy environment, as it exists in local contexts (i.e. at local level), can contribute significantly to overall improvement in the institutional and policy environment, for several reasons.

Community forestry needs to be feasible first and foremost at the 'local' level, in terms of enabling relationships among resource stakeholders with an active interest in the forest resources. There is often some scope for CF in local contexts, within the existing institutional and policy environment, based on improving stakeholder relationships at the local level\(^{11}\).

Learning about “what works” (and what doesn’t work) at the local level is important for identifying enabling and constraining factors in the institutional and policy environment, and for clarifying what changes are most important to make it more enabling for CF. Strengthening understanding about the institutional and policy environment in relation to local contexts, and building capacities to make this environment more enabling for CF, can provide a foundation for understanding and engaging in the broader institutional and policy environment.

A single community or small group of communities may improve the institutional and policy environment in relation to local contexts, but it is unlikely that it alone can significantly influence 'higher' level institutional and policy environment related to forest resources. Strengthening the influence of local communities in the 'higher' level institutional and policy environment requires these communities to develop a stronger “voice” in this environment. This can happen through expanding the constituency for CF by linking up different communities and CF stakeholders, and undertaking collective efforts, such as through coalitions that advocate for CF in the institutional and policy environment.

Improving governance for CF at higher levels can evolve from improving the institutional and policy environment as it exists in local contexts (i.e. at the local level) by a process involving three elements:

\(^{11}\) This approach has been demonstrated in many places. A survey in 2002 (supported by GTZ Cambodia-German Forest Project) identified over 200 communities involved in community forestry. These were initiated in spite of conflict and ambiguity in the national-level institutional and policy environment related to CF.
The final section of this paper presents a practical approach for getting started on improving governance for CF, beginning with improving the institutional and policy environment, as it exists in local contexts. When engaging at the local level this...
approach is both practical and appropriate. The approach can be linked to higher-level efforts, and eventually it needs to link to the higher-level institutional and policy environment. However, many communities, organizations, and stakeholders engaged in CF are not prepared or able to engage effectively in the higher-level institutional and policy environment, nor can they ensure adequate local-level participation in higher-level reform processes. A local-level approach complements decentralization and devolution processes, which enable local communities to more effectively participate in governance and decision-making processes.

Improving governance for CF at the local level involves improving stakeholder relationships at the local level, so that key stakeholders are supportive of CF for a specific community (or set of communities) and defined forest area/resources.

To improve stakeholders' relationships for CF in a local context, it is important to understand:

- **stakeholders**: how & why they are stakeholders;
- **relationships among stakeholders**: how these relationships affect CF, which relationships are helpful to CF and which are harmful, and whether the relationships incorporate and express principles of good governance;
- **How these relationships could be improved for CF**: particularly by putting good governance principles into practice in the relationships.

Improving stakeholders' relationships for CF also involves understanding the “rules of the game” that define and influence different stakeholders in terms of their roles, options, power, and behaviour in relation to resources and to each other. There are usually a number of different “rules” in every situation, such as customs, laws, policies, agreements, and procedures. Often there is ambiguity or inconsistency in the different “rules” that are in effect, such as between different laws, between customs and laws, and between laws and *de facto* policies or procedures. Although addressing sources of inconsistency or conflict in “rules” is usually beyond the local level, it is important to explore whether stakeholders at the local level can come to agreement regarding a set of “rules” that will enable stakeholder cooperation for CF.
Thus, to improve stakeholders’ relationships for CF in a local context, it is also important to clarify and understand:

- The “rules” that shape and influence stakeholders’ relationships to resources and to each other such as customs, laws, policies, agreements, and procedures.

- How these “rules” can enable CF at the local level through agreement among stakeholders regarding a set of “rules” that will enable stakeholder cooperation for CF, the “rules” that shape and influence stakeholders’ relationships to resources and to each other, such as customs, laws, policies, agreements, and procedures.

Putting this together, improving governance for CF at the local level involves:

- Improving understanding about stakeholders, in a way that leads to shared understanding among stakeholders and provides a basis for…

- Improving relationships among stakeholders at the local level, so that key stakeholders are supportive of CF for a specific community (or set of communities) and defined forest area/resources.

- Improving understanding about the “rules of the game” that shape and influence stakeholders in relation to CF, and establishing agreement among stakeholders regarding a set of “rules” that will enable stakeholder cooperation for CF.

Improving understanding about stakeholders, relationships, and “rules” should be done in a participatory way with stakeholders, since it is stakeholders who can most directly contribute to and benefit from improved understanding. Improving understanding also needs to proceed modestly; at a pace and in a way that information does not overwhelm understanding.

The specific stakeholders and relationships vary from one CF situation to another. Some stakeholders and relationships, however, are always important:
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A “governance framework” that depicts stakeholders, relationships, and “rules of the game” can be helpful by clarifying the local governance context for CF. This framework can be developed starting with a model of key stakeholders and relationships (see Diagram 3) and subsequently expanded to incorporate “rules of the game” and more information about specific stakeholders and relations (see Diagram 4). The framework can also help distinguish broadly between 'civil society' (non-government), government, and the political environment that encompasses both civil society and government agencies.

- Resource users in the local community & from outside local community
- Resource management agency especially the “front line” agency staff that interact with other local stakeholders
- Local government
- "Higher" level authorities with roles & responsibilities related to the local communities and/or forest resources with active interest in a local CF situation
- Stakeholders active in the “political environment” involved in decision-making on national policies & law, senior appointments, implementation of major programmes, etc with active interest and influence on CF in a local situation.

Diagram 3: A governance framework for community forestry: stakeholders & relationships
Understanding about stakeholders and relationships in a local CF situation should be developed by participatory research with key stakeholders involved in the local context. The research process can also be led from the local level, through discussions within the community and between the community and other key stakeholders.

Guiding questions include:

- Who are the (key) stakeholders? What are their “stakes” in CF? (Interests, rights & claims, responsibilities)
- Which relationships between stakeholders are helpful to CF? Which are harmful? Why?
- What are the 'mechanisms' of the relationships? Are good governance principles expressed in these relationships/mechanisms?
- Which relationships can be improved for CF? How? (putting good governance principles into practice)

Expanding understanding about stakeholder relationships to include understanding about the “rules of the game” is challenging for a variety of reasons. Relevant information about some “rules” such as laws is often not available to most stakeholders, and therefore requires specialized expertise that may not be readily available. Other important “rules” may be 'invisible' and undocumented, such as local resource tenure systems or patronage systems in organizations. Still other rules may be widely known but awkward to discuss openly, such as intimidation, bribery, and 'extra-judicial' systems.

An operational understanding of the actual “rules” that determine stakeholder positions and relationships is important, however, to take advantage of “rules” that can be enabling for CF in a local context, and to reduce the effect of “rules” that constrain or block CF. Because this understanding can involve 'sensitive' information, it is especially important that it be gained through a gradual and participatory process. Guiding questions include:

- What are the “rules of the game” that define and empower (key) stakeholders & relationships? (such as customs, laws, policies, agreements, procedures, etc) How are the “rules” expressed?
• What “rules” provide opportunities for local people to undertake CF? What “rules” impede/constrain local people from undertaking CF?
• How do different “rules” relate and interact? Which "rules” complement and enable CF? Which “rules” constrain or obstruct CF? When “rules” conflict, which prevail (in practice)?
• Can the “rules” be harmonized by agreement among stakeholders at the local level, into a set of “rules” that will enable stakeholder cooperation for CF?

Diagram 4: A governance framework for community forestry: stakeholders and “rules of the game".
BEYOND GETTING STARTED...

The degree of improvement that can be achieved in different local contexts for CF will vary significantly. In some situations, relationships among stakeholders can be significantly improved and become enabling for CF, based on improving relationships in the local context, within the existing 'higher' level policy and institutional environment. Many examples of this exist in Cambodia, involving a wide range of stakeholders that previously experienced conflict over local forest resources. In other situations, relationships among stakeholders can remain non-cooperative or conflictive in relation to CF, thereby preventing a local enabling environment for CF.

While improving the institutional and policy environment can begin in local contexts, expanding and sustaining improvement inevitably requires engaging with a broader set of stakeholders beyond the local level. The higher-level policy and institutional environment influences all local contexts in terms of providing incentives for, and/or imposing constraints on, stakeholders and relationships in CF; and an enabling institutional and policy environment is necessary for 'scaling up' and sustaining community forestry beyond a pilot or experimental stage.

Understanding and improving the institutional and policy environment for CF at the local level contributes to good forest governance in the immediate local context. In turn, this can contribute to improving the higher-level policy and institutional environment for CF, especially through multi-stakeholder communication. Stakeholders involved in CF can draw on experience in improving multi-stakeholder relationships, when expanding efforts to the broader policy and institutional environment for CF (see Diagram 5) thus mobilizing collective efforts to advocate for CF based on common interests and guided by a shared strategy. In this way the combined influence of improving governance for CF in local contexts can contribute more broadly to good forest governance at higher levels and in wider contexts.
Diagram 5. Governance framework: more detailed model
Linking human rights to environmental management in Cambodia: concepts and reflections

By: Frank van Acker

AN INCREASINGLY UNDENIABLE RELATIONSHIP

In the foreword to his recent report on land concessions, Peter Leuprecht, special representative of the UN Secretary-General for Human Rights in Cambodia, stated:

“Cambodia must implement its land law in full, in accordance with the international human rights treaties by which it is bound, and with encouragement from donors and development agencies which have their own responsibilities to promote human rights and justice under international law.”

Of course, given his brief, the choice of words is not surprising. However, it does make you wonder why so little of the analysis related to natural resource management in Cambodia specifically refers to human rights instruments, or even plainly to human rights. Is the decimation of forests on the ancestral lands of indigenous people a violation of their right to development, or their right to life? Are issues to do with the denial of access to land, fisheries, forests, not also human rights issues, as they keep people mired in poverty despite huge inflows of aid? If they are, has part of the analysis not been missing?

Initially, even rural development and environmental protection were seen as mutually exclusive practices: it was thought that people, progress and protection did not mix well. Gradually, natural resources and environmental management (NREM) came to a common perception of livelihoods as set in a landscape with varying intensities of production and protection. The recent decentralization exercise has strengthened such alignment; commune councils have been designated as the star performers in development as well as environmental protection, however vaguely defined their powers and functions are. Nevertheless, the “development school” and “human rights school” in Cambodia still seem to inhabit parallel universes with very limited

---

1 Frank Van Acker works as an independent consultant, mainly in the field of NRM and decentralization. He is currently working as a consultant with GTZ to the DOLA project at the Ministry of Interior.
exchange and interaction. Also the protection of human rights and environmental protection have developed largely independently from each other.

Things are changing though. As development theory and practice increasingly adopt normative approaches, they come closer to human rights approaches, which by definition are normative. The two fields have undergone a degree of convergence despite differences in priorities and emphases. The concept of human rights based approaches (HRBA), which has been gaining currency recently, exemplifies this. So, what is it about and does it add any value to current understanding? A human rights based approach suggests an ethical dimension both to what should be done (desired outcome), how it should be done (process), and why it should be done. The last element means it goes beyond a needs-based approach, which focuses on enlarging people’s choices through increased incomes and better service-delivery. In the limited space available for this concept note, it will not be possible to delve deep into various details. Rather, the paper will give a brief outline of the main underpinnings of a rights-based approach in the context of natural resource management. This will require a look at the fundamentals of a rights-based approach, and how the issues of natural resource management come into the picture.

WHAT IS A HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH?

The UN Millennium Declaration in 2000, and the agreement on a set of specific Millennium Goals, is based on the respect for all internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms. This spurred all UN agencies to recognize human rights in their work, and inspired UN development agencies to develop a 'human rights based approach to development programming'.

HUMAN RIGHTS: SOME BASIC JARGON

Unsurprisingly, an HRBA requires an understanding of the basics of human rights, such as origin, concepts, and principles. These will be very briefly sketched.

Modern understanding of human rights is enshrined in the International Bill of Human Rights, which is formed by the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, two International Covenants (Civil and Political Rights or ICCPR, Social Economic and
Cultural Rights or ICESCR), and additional UN Conventions, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. Social, Economic and Cultural Rights have to be progressively realized, because they place financial obligations on the state. In the 1980s, an additional category of rights obtained recognition, i.e. the right to peace, to development, and to the environment.

The key principles of human rights are that they are indivisible and interdependent, universal, and inalienable. In the past, the communist group of states expressed a preference for economic, social, and cultural rights, whereas western states showed a preference for civil and political rights. This unproductive debate was resolved by declaring them indivisible and interdependent, which means that human rights cannot be prioritized in a particular hierarchy: no rights are more basic than others. This is best illustrated by two simple examples: without access to education, one cannot meaningfully enjoy political rights; without freedom from torture, one cannot meaningfully enjoy the right to health.

The universality of rights means that they can be claimed by every human being, without any form of discrimination on the basis of race, sex etc. Inalienability signifies that rights are morally forceful and cannot be taken away, not even with the consent of the person: they can be compromised, but never lost. The state can restrict some rights in exceptional circumstances, for example the freedom of movement or assembly. This merely compromises the right and does not remove it. However, no restrictions are ever allowed to certain, so-called non-derogable rights, such as the right to life, prohibition of torture and of slavery.

Consequently, it is imperative to safeguard human rights against violations, even – and quite often - against the actions or inaction of the state, which is accountable as prime duty-bearer. To make sure the state is meeting its obligations, international monitoring of its performance has been instituted for most of the international conventions. This can take many forms, such as reporting duties, complaints procedures, special rapporteurs etc.

2 The US only ratified the ICCPR, China only the ICESCR.
Clearly, human rights practice requires an understanding of the extent of accountability. Signatories to a UN Convention have three types of obligations: to respect, protect, and fulfil. The duty to respect requires the duty-bearer to refrain from interfering directly or indirectly with the enjoyment of the right, e.g. freedom of expression. The duty to protect requires the duty-bearer to take measures that prevent third parties from interfering with the enjoyment of the right, e.g. interference by employers with the freedom of association of employees. The duty to fulfil includes obligations to facilitate and provide. The obligation to facilitate requires duty-bearers to adopt appropriate legislative, budgetary, judicial and other measures towards the full realization of rights, e.g. the right to development. The obligation to provide requires duty-bearers to directly provide assistance for the realization of the right, e.g. the right to education.

HUMAN RIGHTS BASED APPROACH

A human rights based approach (HRBA) recognizes that human rights must be realized by those whose development is at stake. Human development is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for achieving human rights. HRBA focuses on accountability and identifying those responsible for human rights realizations (duty-bearers), whose capacities to meet their responsibilities must be strengthened. In other words, a HRBA focuses strongly on political and institutional issues and makes the questions of rights and power more prominent. In particular, there are two main differences with a needs-based approach.

First, a needs-based approach does not imply the existence of a duty-bearer. When nobody has a clear-cut duty to meet needs, rights are vulnerable to continued violation. For example, the statement “there is a lack of political will to enforce the ban on logging” is qualitatively different from “the government chooses to ignore its duty by failing to enforce the logging ban”. Second, actions undertaken from a needs-based perspective recognize the ‘target group’ as objects of benevolence, not necessarily as subjects of rights. Actions do not imply duties, although they may be based on promises, contrary to an approach where rights always imply duties. For example, stating that 60% of all children have had their needs met to be vaccinated, implies that 40% of all children have not had their right to be vaccinated realized.
HRBA are often criticized for imposing external definitions of what rights should be, in contrast to a needs-based approach that starts from people’s understanding of their resources and needs. A number of arguments bolster the case for a HRBA. To start, rights-definitions are never external; every human being has them by virtue of being human. The ratification of certain rights instruments by a state does not create rights where there were none before. Rather it constitutes an undertaking to its citizens and the international community for accountability against internationally agreed standards.

Also, for all sorts of reasons, a needs-based approach may fail to recognize what the needs of the people are. Frequently in Cambodia, one hears it said that people lack the capacity to properly analyse and prioritize the issues affecting them. Yet, there are cases where villagers clearly want to see certain action taken, for example on over fishing by foreign trawlers in their coastal waters or the decimation of their resin trees, and be offered a signboard on pollution control in response. In other words, development practitioners may not be ready to acknowledge the priorities that people determine. Crucial natural resources in Cambodia continue to dwindle, even as hefty amounts of money are poured in. This underscores a fundamental imbalance between development interventions and recognition of key issues.

Finally, a needs-based approach takes a strong provider perspective. It concentrates on how to make providers more responsive to needs, rather than empowering users to demand rights and gain access to entitlements themselves. It is harder to deny rights than needs, even though budgetary or other constraints may imply a prioritization of responses by the duty-bearer. In other words, a HRBA is a more powerful point from which to advocate for change.

**WHAT IS A RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO NATURAL RESOURCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT?**

There are two complementary approaches, which refer to the words fulfil and respect/protect, mentioned earlier. One is to support the fulfilment of certain rights outcomes (right to health, development etc.) by incorporating human rights guarantees into NREM work. The other is to monitor the state obligation to respect or protect rights, by invoking human rights guarantees when environmental harm occurs.
The first selects from a menu of human rights those 'rights to processes' most relevant for integration into NREM, such as freedom of association, the right to justice, the right to information concerning potential threats to the environment, the right to participation etc. The alternative approach monitors the impact of NREM on fundamental human rights; natural resources and the environment should not deteriorate to the point where the right to life, health etc., are seriously impaired. For example, the state should prevent a corporation from dumping toxic waste into a water supply, and provide the people with redress when such a violation occurs. A famous case involves the African Commission on Human Rights; in 2001 it found the Nigerian state in violation of the right to health of the Ogoni people, because of the environmental degradation on their land caused by oil production.

INCORPORATING HUMAN RIGHTS GUARANTEES INTO NREM INSTRUMENTS

This section considers four areas: right to information, access to justice, rights of indigenous people, and right to participation.

Right to information

Information flows reflect power relations, and the extent to which human rights are realized. The right to information underpins any meaningful participation and hence outcome of development support, and entails access to state records, including those which the state keeps on private sector activity. The right to information in the context of NREM requires establishing mandatory systems to obtain information on proposed and existing activities which could significantly affect the environment, and taking steps towards the creation of compliance procedures and enhancement of public participation.

In Cambodia’s context, information is generally very restricted, and cannot be demanded by citizens because there is no freedom of information law. Access to information, relevant for NREM, would mean a publicly accessible inventory of state public land, public availability of the details of approved forest and economic concessions, including contracts and maps and revenues gained, a publicly accessible registry of companies with information about shareholders, and public disclosure by all politicians and senior government officials, including provincial and district governors, provincial line department heads, and commune councillors and clerks, of financial assets and shareholdings.
Access to justice

Existing compliance mechanisms in Cambodia are notoriously weak. The opportunity for local people to have violations established and grievances heard, is the point where the concerns of ‘traditional’ human rights work and NREM most naturally coincide. Rights guarantees cannot be incorporated into NREM without attention to issues of enforcement and arbitration. Good precedents exist within the sphere of NREM in Cambodia; for example, the Cadastral Commissions arbitrate land disputes in a decentralized manner. Yet, a lot of problems still linger.

NREM related civil cases that are not land disputes must be settled through administrative adjudication, for example the Fisheries Department adjudication procedure, or the courts. Access to these procedures is known to be problematic, especially for the poor. Procedures internal to a ministry are obviously not examples of an independent tribunal, and therefore their impartiality and fairness is in doubt. Serious concerns, citing corruption, have also been expressed on the impartiality of the courts. Hence, it is essential to highlight the role that institutionalized discrimination can play in denying access to justice through the police and court system. There is also an element of distributional justice, as the poor and marginalized disproportionately suffer from environmental harm.

In the space of this article there is hardly room to delve far into these matters. Attention to rights guarantees cannot overlook these or other aspects, such as clarity of the status of various environmental treaties ratified by Cambodia in domestic law. It is important to stress the role of civil society in pushing these agendas. Some organizations have worked hard to set up legal aid mechanisms that support access to the courts for the poor and monitor fairness of the hearings. Others, such as Global Witness, monitor violations (in forestry) and bring these to the attention of the media.

Rights of indigenous people

Indigenous people in Cambodia have their own NREM concerns, such as communal land titling. It would not be too wide off the mark, to state that CBNRM in Cambodia originated with prolonged and sustained attention to their plight. Hence it is relevant to indicate separately existing human rights guarantees that can underscore such work. Since 1982, a UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations discusses ways to promote and protect their human rights, in particular regarding their relationship to land. In 2001, a UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People was appointed, and a UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues was created in 2000. On the side of rights guarantees in environmental treaties, the Convention on Biological Diversity for example, calls on its parties to encourage customary use of biological resources, exchange traditional and indigenous knowledge, and develop methods of cooperation for the development and use of indigenous and traditional technologies.
Right to participation

In Cambodia as elsewhere, to the extent that there is collusion between political and corporate interests, citizens are denied the space to actively participate in public matters that affect life. The right to public participation is widely expressed in human rights instruments. For example, Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms everybody’s right to take part in governance of their country. It is also widely expressed in international environmental treaties, such as the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, its plan adopted as Agenda 21, the Climate Change Convention, the Desertification Convention etc. These all contain references to, or guarantees of, public participation.

The right to participate has two aspects: the right to be heard in decision-making by a third party, especially in environmental impact or other permitting procedures, and the right to make decisions. Agenda 21 encourages governments to create policies that facilitate a direct exchange of information between the government and the public in environmental issues, suggesting the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process as a mechanism.

The Climate Change Convention obliges Parties to promote public awareness and to encourage the widest participation in this process. The Convention on Biological Diversity also underlines public participation in EIA procedures. In Cambodia, a sub-decree on EIA has been enacted, and although mandatory for certain projects, is rarely used. There is no monitoring of the adequacy of EIA reports, or of the compliance with proposed measures to mitigate adverse impact.

However, the full implications of the right of public participation extend to local management, particularly in respect to NREM. This is particularly relevant for Cambodia and for the scope of this volume, which concentrates on CBNRM. In Cambodia, decentralized modes of NREM have been established through the channels of commune councils, as well as community fisheries/forestry/protected areas. This indicates (at least in principle) a preference for choices based on the particularities of local conditions, especially where the local population will bear the highest environmental and developmental costs. This approach follows the principle of subsidiarity, which means making and implementing decisions without interference at the lowest effective level of government or other organization. Each higher level of government only steps in when the lower level cannot resolve a problem. So, when the scope of a fisheries problem exceeds individual capacities, the next higher level of governance (CF association) becomes the subsidiary decision-maker. Only if this is ineffective to resolve the problem, does the commune step in, then the province, state and so on.

Subsidiarity is an organizing principle found in recent environmental treaties. For example, Agenda 21 calls for delegation of water resources management to the lowest appropriate level, including decentralization of government services to local authorities, private enterprises and communities. The role of the national level is to develop integrated water resources planning and to establish regulation and monitoring of freshwater. The core of
HOW CAN THE INSIGHTS OF HRBA BE INTEGRATED IN CBNRM?

A HRBA can easily mean all things to all people. It is simple to go off on a tangent and cite, for example, much-needed advocacy work on the current legal drafting process for protected areas. I would rather conclude here with some implications of HRBA for those organizations grappling with the nitty-gritty of CBNRM in the mud of the forests and rice fields.

Although there should not be a hierarchy of human rights, in the real world characterized by scarcity, action to realize rights must be prioritized. An organization’s comparative advantage should decide its entry-point: what action to address and support. What is important is that all actors should recognize that CBNRM is embedded in a process to guarantee respect for, and protection, facilitation, and fulfilment of, human rights. This starts with the realization that involvement in NREM means not just benevolence; it propels one to the status of duty-bearer. This means:

- Larger awareness of human rights issues among organizations involved in NREM, and building community capacity for people to understand and claim their rights, and make meaningful contributions to realize these rights;

- Refining of stakeholder analysis to identify key-relations between all claim-holders and duty-bearers; frequently claim-holders will also be duty-bearers, e.g. households living near a protected area core zone have a right to development, but a duty to protect the biodiversity. This involves analysis of the capacity of duty-bearers: do they know they should act (responsibility), may they act (permission), can they act (human, financial, organizational resources)?
• Obligations of conduct and of result must be made explicit and constantly checked. The right to development for example, implies disparity reduction, which demands action to eliminate the worst manifestations of human rights violations. This implies the use of sufficiently dis-aggregated data to monitor whether there is indeed progressive realization starting from a given base-line, or whether development actions harm the rights of sections of the population such as women or indigenous people.

• Recognizing that participation is not just a development intervention tool to engineer a better match between needs and outcomes, but a right in itself.

REFERENCES


The following websites contain a wealth of resources related to human rights and environmental treaties:

Child Rights Information Network (CRIN), Overview of Rights-Based Approaches to Programming; http://www.crin.org/hrbap/index.asp?action=theme.subtheme&subtheme=16

Environmental Treaties and Resource Indicators (ENTRI); http://sedac.ciesin.org/entri/

Chapter 19  The role of CBNRM in the recognition of indigenous land rights in Cambodia

By: Katrin Seidel\(^1\&2\)

INTRODUCTION

Experiences from various countries throughout Southeast Asia illustrate how the lack of recognition of the cultural diversity characterizing the region has lead to increased poverty, displacement and disintegration of communities, loss of cultural heritage and even incidences of violence. In developing the legal and policy framework in relation to indigenous ethnic minorities, currently Cambodia is standing at a crossroads between a monocultural or multicultural nation. Recognizing the rights of indigenous ethnic minorities to their land and natural resources is one important step towards preserving the country’s cultural diversity. This paper highlights the role of community based natural resource management (CBNRM), especially participatory land use planning (PLUP), in the process of registering indigenous land rights in Cambodia.

INDIGENOUS ETHNIC MINORITIES IN CAMBODIA

Ethnic minorities

Cambodia is a multi-ethnic society. However, with approximately ninety percent\(^3\) of the population being ethnic Khmer, Cambodia has the smallest ethnic minority population, both relatively and in absolute numbers, in Southeast Asia (Ovesen and Trankell, 2004). It includes the Vietnamese, Cham and Chinese and the indigenous ethnic minorities, referred to as hill tribes, highlanders, highland people, indigenous people, and *Khmer Leu* (‘upland Khmer’).

---

1 Katrin Seidel is currently supporting the General Secretariat of the Council of Land Policy in developing the legal and policy framework for the registration of indigenous land rights.

2 Susie Brown contributed to this paper by way of conceptual support and editing the first draft paper.

3 Statistics on ethnic groups in Cambodia are unreliable and vary substantially according to different sources. A survey by the Administration Department of the Ministry of Interior in July 1996 estimated 502,369 as the number of persons legally registered as ethnic minorities. Independent observers’ estimates of 500,000 to one million ethnic Vietnamese and at least 300,000 ethnic Chinese point to gross underestimation in the 1996 survey which stated totals of 109,512 and 47,180 respectively (Dareth, 1996). Using figures suggested by independent observers, the minority population in Cambodia is approximately 1.15 million, or 10 percent of the total population of 11.5 million (1998 Population Census Cambodia).
For the purpose of this paper 'indigenous ethnic minorities' will be used as the closest translation to ‘*chuncheat daum pheak tek*’, the official term in Khmer referring to the indigenous minority population, as distinct from other ethnic minorities in the country. The term 'indigenous peoples' will be used synonymously with 'indigenous ethnic minorities' throughout the paper. This is consistent with relevant definitions of indigenous peoples as “tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, or by special laws or regulations” (Article 1 of Convention 169 of the International Labour Organisation (ILO), 1989).

**Indigenous peoples**

Today two-thirds of the indigenous ethnic minority population are found in the two northeastern provinces of Ratanakiri and Mondulkiri, forming the majority of the population of those two provinces. Belonging to two distinct linguistic families, the main groups are the Austronesian speaking Jarai (in Ratanakiri) and the Mon-Khmer speaking Brao and Tampuan (in Ratanakiri) and Phnong (in Mondulkiri). The indigenous ethnic minorities in the northeast are a part of a larger indigenous cultural area extending beyond Cambodian borders. Besides the regionally concentrated groups of the northeast, Mon-Khmer speaking indigenous ethnic minorities also inhabit the hilly forests of Kampong Thom, the Dangrek Mountains in Siem Reap, and the Cardamom and Elephant Mountains in Pursat and Koh Kong (Ovesen and Trankell, 2004) (see Figure 1).

According to the 1998 Population Census, seventeen different indigenous ethnic minority groups were identified numbering 101,000 or 0.9% of the total population. Since the census asked about peoples' mother tongue, this figure is most likely an underestimate and could be as high as 160,000 or 1.5% of Cambodia's population.  

---

1 The same or closely related ethnic groups are found from the Boloven Plateau in southern Laos, known as 'Lao Theung', to the Central Highlands of Vietnam where they are called 'montagnards' (Evans, 2003, Ovesen and Trankell, 2004).

2 Based on empirical research, a World Bank Screening Study (Helmers and Wallgren 2002), estimated the Kuy population at almost 20,000. This estimate is four times larger than that given in the 1998 census (4,536). The estimated figure for the Kuy population given by the non-governmental organisation (NGO) International Cooperation of Cambodia (ICC) working with indigenous peoples is even higher (23,000). Based on their work experiences with indigenous groups all over the country, ICC estimates (2003) the total population of indigenous peoples in Cambodia to be 160,000 or almost 1.5 percent of the total population.
Despite major linguistic differences and clear variations with regards to habitation and kinship organization, the indigenous ethnic minority groups in Cambodia share common socio-economic and cultural features. For centuries indigenous peoples have almost entirely depended for their livelihoods on their natural environment. Traditionally occupying a common territory, the majority of the country's indigenous communities practise a system of swidden cultivation supplemented by collecting forest products. The close relationship with their environment has shaped their religious belief system (see chapter 14).

The prosperity and well-being of the community depend on the blessing of ancestral and nature spirits. Traditional institutions and customary law govern both the people,
spirit and interpersonal relationships in indigenous communities and create a strong social and spiritual cohesion between all members of the community (see Box 1).

**BOX 1: Excerpt from the statement by indigenous people made in Trang village, Chh'en commune, Oral district, Kompong Speu province, 12 September 2004**

- We, the indigenous people in Cambodia, like other citizens of Cambodia, are happy to fulfill our role as citizens of Cambodia.

- We have discovered that all of the different indigenous communities have a lot in common.

- We, the indigenous people are those people with an indigenous identity that comes from our ancestors, and we all respect our traditions and way of life.

- It is indigenous people, especially elders and village headmen, who can define in more detail who are within indigenous ethnicities and indigenous communities.

- Some of our indigenous peoples have lost some parts of our traditions. Some of us no longer speak our traditional languages. This does not mean that we are no longer indigenous people. We still retain many other parts of our indigenous identity.

- Our communities are generally defined by a common belief in a village Neak Ta or Arak. Ceremonies to these Neak Ta or Arak are generally performed on an annual basis with many variations and similarities between indigenous groups.

- Our indigenous communities have a traditional form of management that is different from the new structure that includes village and commune authorities. Traditional structures are usually characterized by traditional leaders, elders and often involve participation by the entire village in decision-making.

- The new structures imposed from the outside are eroding the role of traditional structures and systems and this is of great concern to our communities.

In addition to socio-economic and cultural similarities, indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia also share the disadvantage of being isolated from mainstream society. The resulting limited access to public services such as health care and education leads to poor health and nutritional status and high rates of illiteracy among indigenous peoples (FAO, 2003; Hiett, 2003).
TRADITIONAL INDIGENOUS NATURAL RESOURCE USE AND TENURE SYSTEMS

Traditional natural resource management systems

The traditional livelihood system of most indigenous ethnic minority groups in Cambodia is comprised of three main components (Paterson and Thomas, 2003):

- land for planting upland rice and other crops in a system of swidden cultivation
- forest for collecting non-timber forest products and construction material
- natural fisheries and water resources

Often regarded as a wasteful use of natural resources and harmful to the environment by many Khmer people (White, 1996; Ovesen and Trankell, 2004), the traditional system of rotational agriculture or swidden cultivation, if well-practiced, represents a sustainable form of upland agriculture maintaining a high percentage of forest cover (Fox, 1998). Using natural forest regeneration to allow the soil to regain its fertility after a period of intense cultivation avoids the use of chemical inputs and does not significantly disturb forest and wildlife. The number of years of active cultivation, and the fallow period necessary to restore soil fertility, varies according to the specific physical conditions of the area.

The swidden system presents a locally adapted well-balanced livelihood system developed over centuries. As long as there is no drastic reduction in land available for swiddens or a sudden increase in people using the area, it provides substantial food security to indigenous communities supplemented by forest products as a safety-net in times of crop failure. However, the system of swidden cultivation depends on well-developed tenure regimes and traditional institutions regulating access to and protection of the natural resources base of the community.

---

6 For example on flat red soils rice might be cultivated for four subsequent years followed by a fallow period of ten to fifteen years. On stony soils, slopes, or areas prone to be infested by weed growth two years of cultivation are followed by fifteen to twenty years of forest regeneration.
Traditional tenure systems

Traditional tenure systems of indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia can be described as a type of stewardship rather than human ownership (Paterson, undated). Land and natural resources are seen as owned by the spirits. In order to ensure the approval of the spirits for clearing and cultivating the land, different rites are performed at certain stages of the agricultural cycle. After clearing and planting, a family acquires full rights over the produce of the land they cultivate and over the produce of fallow swidden plots.

The cultivation of swidden is restricted to community members and fields must be located within the customary boundaries of the community, which are often defined by natural landmarks such as streams and ridges. Strong traditional taboos prevent villagers from encroaching onto land of another group. In the past, a clear delineation of village boundaries only seemed necessary where swidden fields of two adjacent communities met. In this case village elders, the traditional leaders of the affected communities, would consult on the boundaries and seek agreement from the spirits through sacrifices.

“This is what the elders did. If there were a dispute in the village, they would help to resolve it. They taught us to be good and get along with each other, not to argue. They helped us to stay together as a village. They helped the village not to break apart. They encouraged unity in the village. That is what the elders did. When someone was sick they led the village to gather firewood or water for them. Our children went to help the other family that had the problem. That is what made us a village. We did not abandon each other. We helped our relatives and we helped others in the village too. This was the work of elders.”

Box 2: Role of the elders described by a 50-year old women from Gok Village, Ratanakiri (Mallow, 2002: 53)

All members of the community are expected to respect the authority of the village elders. Mostly older male villagers, elders are chosen by dreams or community consensus on basis of their traditional knowledge, personal qualities and leadership

---

7 The user area of some Phnong communities in Mondulkiri is not clearly defined, because swidden fields of neighbouring villages have never been in close proximity.
skills. As both the keeper and implementer of customary law, the elders play a crucial role not only in decision-making and resolving internal conflicts but also in preserving the collective identity of the community (White, 1996).

Traditional indigenous tenure systems are characterized by village-based communal management of land and natural resources with each family sharing equal access to the resource base of the community and only acquiring temporary individual rights only over areas under cultivation.

PAST AND CURRENT CHALLENGES FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN CAMBODIA

Past challenges

As previously self-governing societies, that have been incorporated involuntarily into a larger nation state, indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia share the same fate as many indigenous peoples worldwide. This has presented them with various challenges in keeping their cultural integrity throughout the country’s eventful history.

As part of his strongly nationalistic rhetoric Prince Sihanouk (1953-1970) created the image of a river connecting the culture and lifestyle of the hill tribes of the northeast with the Cham communities along the river banks and the Lowland Khmer living in the Mekong Delta belonging to Vietnam. All of these different groups forming a part of a homogenous Khmer community (Collins, 1996). This policy of embracing indigenous ethnic minorities as ‘disinherited brothers’ was furthermore underlined by creating the term ‘Khmer Leu’ meaning 'Upland Khmer' referring to the highland communities in the northeast (White, 1996).

Years of intense integration efforts with Khmer pioneers from other provinces showing how to become ‘proper’ Khmer (White, 1996) were followed by chaos and fear due to the US bombings of the northeast during the course of the war in Vietnam. Forcefully dislocated and deprived of performing traditional rituals and

---

1 The deeply rooted understanding of all people in the country belonging to one Khmer community was translated into the Cambodian Constitution of 1993. The terms ‘Khmer citizens’ and ‘Khmer nationality’ in Chapter 3 of the Constitution are overly inclusive rather than exclusive as they might seem at first. They ensure equality before the law of all citizens “regardless of race, colour, sex, language, religious belief, political tendency, birth origin, social status, wealth or other status (Article 38 of the Cambodian Constitution 1993, emphasis added).
spiritual ceremonies during the Pol Pot period (1975-1979), indigenous communities returned to their traditional village sites either soon after the arrival of the Vietnamese in 1979 or when the area finally became safe after the successful policy of reintegration of the Khmer Rouge in 1998. Most indigenous peoples were able to re-establish their traditional institutions and customs. However, depending on the length of the time spent apart, the disruption impacted to various degrees on the social, cultural and economic structures of indigenous communities.

Current issues

The problems faced by Cambodia's indigenous ethnic minorities today are different from the past. Economic and infrastructural development promoted by the Royal Government of Cambodia, spontaneous or encouraged immigration and the impact of the market economy present difficult challenges for indigenous peoples in the country. The single biggest concern, however, is the loss of access to and control over their land and natural resources.

In the 1990s substantial parts of traditional areas of Cambodia's indigenous ethnic minorities were allocated as forest and economic concessions by the government. Capitalizing on people's ignorance of their legal rights and fair market prices for their land, powerful individuals and officials either appropriated or 'bought' land from indigenous communities employing various methods of fraud and intimidation. Despite the current moratorium on forest concessions, the pressure on land and natural resources of indigenous ethnic minorities has increased over the past two years (NGO Forum, 2004). The lack of an operational regulatory framework has created a de facto situation of anarchy leading to a rapidly increasing loss or depletion of land and natural resources due to illegal activities.

This has had a deep impact on the livelihood situation of affected indigenous communities. Owing to the reduction of land available for agricultural production and restricted access to forest resources, the incidence of poverty has already increased,

---

9 A famous case involved an area of 1,250ha of traditional Jarai and Tampuen land in Bokeo district, Ratanakiri province. By promising a development project, and in exchange for two kilos of salt, Cambodian Armed Forces General Nuon Pheap collaborating with district and commune officials, persuaded villagers to thumb print an application for individual land certificates. Upon registration, rights to the village land were transferred to the General. Seven years later, and after receiving considerable national and international attention, a court decision returned the rights over the land to the villagers.
The health situation will potentially get worse, and food security is seriously threatened. A shortening of the traditional swidden cycle has led to lower yields, encroachment on formerly protected forest areas and degradation of the natural resource base (ADB, 2002). Under such circumstances the traditional agricultural practice of swidden cultivation ceases to be sustainable. In addition, continuous external pressure has caused an erosion of social cohesion and customary law. Traditional patterns of leadership and traditional institutions are changing. This process is further aggravated by a widespread ignorance among members of the majority culture. The prevailing lack of appreciation of the particular characteristics of indigenous peoples needs to be seen in context of the above described tradition of 'Khmerization' of indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia.

The decline in authority of traditional natural resource management due to the lack of official recognition, and erosion of traditional informal laws, in addition to the lack of or poor enforcement of formal legislation has led to open access of formerly well-protected common property resources. The developing mentality of realizing quick gains through unsustainable resource extraction or grabbing of land areas is threatening both indigenous communities and Cambodian society as a whole.

INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK REGARDING INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ RIGHTS TO LAND

International policy framework

The situation of indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia calls for effective institutional regulation. Indigenous peoples' rights are recognized internationally, and the significance of their problems acknowledged. This is reflected in more specific and more sophisticated norms in the international legal and policy framework with regards to indigenous peoples compared to the norms applying to other groups.

Many international instruments, such the ILO Convention No. 169, recognize the "importance of land and natural resources as the principle source of livelihood, social and cultural cohesion, and spiritual welfare of many indigenous peoples" (Article 13 to 19). Land for many indigenous peoples does not only constitute a commodity.

---

10 Owing to land alienation, one indigenous community in Ratanakiri has lost their entire agricultural land.
The territories and natural resources of indigenous peoples form the material bases of their cultural integrity. Convention No. 169 calls for recognition of the special relationship of indigenous peoples with their lands including the collective aspect of this relationship. Traditional tenure patterns of many indigenous peoples include private management rights but community ownership, with land and natural resources belonging to all generations and hence cannot be disposed or destroyed.

**Cambodia’s legal and policy framework**

Cambodia has acceded to a number of international declarations and conventions recognising indigenous peoples’ rights. Moreover it is in the process of adopting a policy for the development of indigenous peoples in the country. The draft highland peoples’ policy (1997) clearly recognizes indigenous peoples’ rights to land, and stresses the authority of communities over individuals in decisions relating to land and natural resources. This government policy is further enshrined in Cambodia’s Land Law, promulgated in 2001. According to chapter 3 part 2, indigenous communities shall be granted collective ownership rights to their land. However, not one indigenous community in the country has yet received land title for its collective property.

One reason for the slow progress of the registration of indigenous land areas is the lack of a necessary sub-decree detailing guidelines for implementation. The wording of the six articles on the lands of indigenous communities in the Land Law gives way to different interpretations (see chapter 3 of this report). The development of detailed guidelines, however, is hindered by: the lack of resources, the lack of understanding of the management and tenure practices of the various indigenous communities in the country, and more importantly, the lack of clearly defined roles and mandates of the various government agencies involved.

---

11 This includes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Convention on Economic Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and the Convention on Biological Diversity. Some of those key human rights conventions are also effectively incorporated into Cambodian Law by Article 38 of the Cambodian Constitution.

12 Supported by ILO, the 1997 draft of the highland peoples’ policy was developed by the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Ethnic Minority Development. After receiving comments from all concerned ministries, a revised general policy on indigenous and minorities peoples’ development has been drafted and is currently being discussed with indigenous communities. No English translation of the latest draft was available at the time of writing.
There is still serious dissent among government stakeholders about the fundamental question of whether indigenous peoples' rights to land and natural resources should be codified as collective ownership rights.

THE REGISTRATION OF INDIGENOUS LAND RIGHTS IN CAMBODIA
The challenge of formalizing customary tenure systems

NGOs working with indigenous peoples strongly advocated the inclusion of a chapter on collective ownership for indigenous ethnic minorities in the Land Law of 2001. The primary concern was potential food security for present and future generations of indigenous peoples. If at all possible, collective ownership would at least require the majority of the villagers to approve sales of community land. Thus, the common good of the community could be protected from the temptation or defrauding of individuals. The call for legal recognition of collective ownership was supported by research commissioned by the Council of Ministers in May 1999 which showed that indigenous peoples strongly preferred a collective type of tenure.

Many Cambodian government officials, however, would argue for the opportunity of individuals in indigenous communities to develop like other Khmer people in the country. This attitude clearly translated into Article 27 of the Land Law enabling the transfer of community land to individuals as private ownership (See Box 3). They argue that privatization of indigenous land would stimulate further economic development, allow higher mobility of citizens, and facilitate better resource allocation through land markets.

For the purpose of facilitating the cultural, economic and social evolution of members of indigenous communities and in order to allow such members to freely leave the group or to be relieved from its constraints, the right of individual ownership of an adequate share of land used by the community may be transferred to them.

Box 3: Article 27 of the Land Law 2001

Another frequently expressed opinion relates to the role of the state with regards to the conservation of land and natural resources. According to government officials of the Forest Administration, parts of indigenous territories would need to be registered as State Public Land in order to avoid the degradation of natural resources.
A thorough analysis of institutional options for the formalization of customary tenure systems is beyond the scope of this paper. However, new research by institutional economists (Ostrom, 1990; Bromley, 1992) has provided independent verification of the empirical observation that common property regimes are often superior to private property with regards to equitable, efficient and sustainable management of natural resources. Numerous examples from all over the world have shown that the privatization of land under indigenous customary management has not led to cultural, economic and social evolution of community members but rather to land loss, and disintegration of social support systems, and hence an increase in poverty.

As described above, the situation of de facto anarchy in the distribution and exploitation of land and natural resources in Cambodia clearly shows that the state is currently incapable of providing and enforcing tenure security for indigenous ethnic minorities. This is the result of lack of capacity within responsible government agencies, and the remoteness of the area. However, there are ample opportunities to reduce poverty and create sustainable and equitable growth by venturing into co-management agreements between the state and indigenous communities.

Full recognition of indigenous rights to their land and natural resources, and strengthened traditional institutions that have proven to be capable of protecting common property resources are needed. In the light of a rapidly changing environment indigenous communities also need to be supported in developing locally adapted solutions for effective management of land and natural resources.

**The challenge of developing a procedure for the registration of indigenous land rights**

The process of registering indigenous land rights as collective ownership is currently being piloted in three villages in Cambodia’s northeastern provinces\(^\text{13}\). The results of the pilot activities shall support policy-makers at the national level in developing a common strategy for the registration of indigenous land rights which will eventually be translated into a sub-decree detailing the legal procedures for registration.

\(^{13}\)Two of the pilot villages are located in Ratanakiri province: L'eun Kraen, Ou Chum commune, Ou Chum district and La En, Toen commune, Koun Mom district. The third village, Andoung Kraloeng is located in Saen Monourom commune, Ou Reang district, Mondulkiri province.
Participatory land use planning (PLUP) as a specific approach to CBNRM (see Chapter 9), has been identified as the first step in registering indigenous common property as collective ownership.

In the pilot sites, the process of land use planning shall support villagers in identifying their traditional user areas and developing rules and regulations to manage the common property resources of the community. It moreover shall provide answers to still unresolved questions related to the registration process, such as what is the unit managing the resources, who is a member of this unit, what landscapes are part of the traditional livelihoods.

Owing to the wealth and diversity of traditions and land management systems among indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia there are no simple answers to these questions (see Box 4). In order to protect common property resources and the rights of members of indigenous communities, a certain level of formalization is needed. Legal procedures that are locally adaptable and culturally sensitive need to be developed in order to allow indigenous peoples to maintain their culture and traditions.

**Box 4: Examples of traditional customs of indigenous peoples.**

**The newly-weds’ home**

Amongst many indigenous groups in Ratanakiri the groom follows the bride to live with the bride’s parents after their wedding. After a number of years the couple moves to stay with the groom’s parents. The precise time varies among indigenous groups, and it is negotiated individually. In a matrilocal marriage system the couple finally settles in the bride’s village (White, 1996).

**Spirit forests**

Certain old growth forest areas are believed to be inhabited by spirits. These forests are well protected by traditional institutions. The cutting of timber must be punished by the spirits resulting in sickness or even death of the violator. Spirit forests can be clearly located by elders of the community. However, the specific location might change or the presence of spirits might grow stronger in other areas.

**Land for swidden fields**

The new plot to be opened and cleared for a swidden field is chosen according to a variety of criteria, such as soil type, distance to water sources, terrain and forest regeneration. Dreams accompanying the early steps of the clearing and other signs and omens around the field are traditionally equally important as the above mentioned criteria. Negative dreams, or the appearance of certain animals, will urge the farmer to abandon the site and choose another plot of land.
POTENTIAL AND LIMITATIONS OF PLUP AND CBNRM

Starting from the village level, the approach of PLUP and community based management approaches of common property resources could theoretically accommodate and acknowledge the diversity of traditions and customs of the various indigenous groups in Cambodia. These approaches, if carefully implemented, could provide an opportunity to formalize and protect customary systems without imposing destructive changes that can jeopardize the social capital of indigenous communities.

PLUP and CBNRM could also provide protection of the resource base of indigenous communities even before a collective ownership title is issued. Building on traditional institutions, the process of community based planning and managing of land and natural resources contributes to community building, creates awareness of legal rights and strengthens indigenous communities to cope with external and internal threats.

Even after the registration of indigenous land rights, the ownership title itself does not provide sufficient tenure security. Effective community based management structures are needed to successfully protect the common property resources of indigenous communities.

Concerned stakeholders have not reached consensus yet about which landscapes should be included in the collective title. Article 25 of the Land Law specifies that residential land and land for traditional agriculture, including land reserved for shifting cultivation, are eligible for collective ownership. In order to sustain traditional livelihoods, indigenous communities need secure access rights to all natural resources in their customary user area, including forests. PLUP and CBNRM could contribute to an increased appreciation of the close relationship of indigenous communities to their land and natural resources by defining the user area and developing management regulations for the entire natural resource base. On the other hand tenure security provided by PLUP and CBNRM is limited, and legal mechanisms need to be developed to secure tenure rights to natural resources that will not be registered under the collective land title.
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PLUP and CBNRM contribute to identifying overlapping claims, but they cannot solve conflicts over land. Both approaches to community based planning and managing need to be conducted in an enabling environment with full commitment of all stakeholders. Conflicts over land and natural resources that cannot be solved by the community itself pose a serious threat on the process. Effective mechanisms for conflict resolution need to be in place before land use planning can be initiated.

The reality of implementation

CBNRM has already been implemented in the two pilot communities in Ratanakiri, with the support of external agencies. Although the process has provided important findings in the light of formal registration of ownership rights the results need to be reviewed. PLUP is currently ongoing in the pilot community in Mondulkiri (see chapter 13).

There is clearly a need for detailed analysis of PLUP and CBNRM in the context of registration of indigenous land rights. However, results from the pilot activities show an obvious discrepancy between the potential of CBNRM and the reality of implementation. Examples of these demonstrate the potential risks of PLUP and CBNRM (see Box 5).

Only an in-depth analysis can provide a balanced picture of the situation in the pilot villages. However, it is hoped that this first critical review of PLUP and CBNRM activities in indigenous areas will encourage policy makers and practitioners to reconsider the objectives and long-term goals pursued by community based management approaches among indigenous communities.
The manual on Participatory Land Use Planning was developed as a tool for practitioners based on experiences from various field sites in Cambodia.

See chapter 9 for the steps of the PLUP Manual. Also see table 3 of chapter 14.

Recruiting for committees

In the process of reviewing the Land Use Planning Management (LUPM) Committee in La En a dilemma became obvious. Before the land use planning activities in the village started a Community Forest Management (CFM) Committee was already formed and operating. For this committee knowledgeable and respected representatives were chosen. When selecting people for the LUPM Committee the most suitable candidates were already tied up with their work for the CFM Committee. The villagers are not happy with some of the people finally elected for the LUPM committee. There are rumours that members of the LUPM committee have been involved in sales of community land. However, they are reluctant to change it because this committee was created by an external NGO.

Doing gender

The Natural Resource Management (NRM) Committee in L'eun Kraen consists of eight members, two of them being women. One woman is the accountant. But since no fines have been collected yet there is no money to take care of. Asked about her role and responsibility, the other woman explained she was doing gender. Encouraged to describe her activities involving gender, the woman could not answer. She finally admitted that she had no idea what gender actually meant.

Retiring of elders

The newly elected deputy head of the village NRM committee in Andoung Kraloeng is not too sure yet how the village is going to benefit from PLUP. Apart from replacing the head of committee in case of his absence, he is not too sure either of his role and responsibilities. But the feedback from the villagers clearly demonstrates the importance of the committee. According to him, all internal and external problems and conflicts should be solved by the NRM committee. Asked about the role of the elders as the traditional authority, he explains that the committee has been elected by all villagers, so the interests of the elders are also represented. Now that the NRM committee exist, the elders can retire.

Box 5: Experiences from the field

Two main issues were identified during field work: changes in traditional leadership brought about by the introduction of new governance structures, and the question of ownership.

Changes in leadership

Step 4 of the PLUP manual and step 2 of the Steps and Activities for CBNRM outline the process of forming a committee for the management of community land.

---

14 The manual on Participatory Land Use Planning was developed as a tool for practitioners based on experiences from various field sites in Cambodia.

15 See chapter 9 for the steps of the PLUP Manual. Also see table 3 of chapter 14.
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and natural resources. The PLUP Manual further recommends: “Due to the documentation work (...) and accounting responsibilities, all members of the committee should normally be literate” (Rock, 2001: 55).

Introducing a new governance structure into indigenous communities clearly holds risks. Unless it is carefully linked to existing traditional institutions it could prove ineffectual, or undermine traditional institutions and disrupt the social cohesion of the community. There is clear empirical evidence of changes in leadership where young literate members of the community challenge the role of traditional elders (McAndrew, 2001; Mallow 2002). However, there is also evidence of traditional leaders successfully integrating the new structures into existing customary institutions sometimes by altering the formal requirements of PLUP and CBNRM. The PLUP Manual recommends that “especially the representation of a sufficient number of women on the committee should be taken seriously for gender reasons” (Rock, 2001: 55). This is often formally followed and can prove to be totally ineffective if roles and responsibilities are not clear or the community is not yet ready for externally introduced ideas of gender sensitivity.

Traditionally, during large village meetings, the community reach consensus about important issues such as village representation. Now, foreign concepts of electing PLUP or CBNRM committee members, and ballots may undermine traditional leadership.

“We used to have village elders. They would help us to make sacrifices to the banana trees. They would help to take care of the villagers. They kept peace in the village so people did not fight and hurt each other. They would help to grow the banana tree and to ‘Bum Bras’ [sacrifice to the farm]. The elders would help us to do this. We no longer have this now. Now we have a younger generation who ‘Bum Kan’ [have a job to do with development work or government].”

Box 6: A change in the role of elders, described by a 58-year old woman from Gok village, Ratanakiri (Mallow, 2002: 58)

Ownership

The question of ownership is also critical. Despite clear recommendations in the update of the PLUP manual focusing on the process of PLUP for indigenous
communities, Khmer language is predominantly used in the process rather than the appropriate indigenous language. This is related to the fact that the majority of PLUP facilitators are ethnic Khmer. Khmer facilitators are from mainstream society and often lack respect and understanding of the customs and traditions of indigenous communities. Although PLUP or CBNRM are frequently regarded as processes owned by the external agencies, facilitators should be neutral.

**Risks and opportunities of CBNRM in the context of registering indigenous land rights**

The opportunity of providing effective institutions for the management of common property resources through PLUP or CBNRM should not be compromised by introducing governance structures that compete with existing traditional ones. In view of the challenges faced by indigenous communities in a rapidly changing environment, the strengths of PLUP and CBNRM lie in supporting traditional institutions to cope with newly emerging problems. PLUP and CBNRM can play a significant role in re-establishing structures in situations where indigenous communities have already suffered substantial erosion of traditions and customs.

Positive experiences with CBNRM in the process of indigenous land rights registration could counter the lack of appreciation among many Cambodian government officials of the capacity of traditional indigenous institutions in regulating the use of natural resources. During a workshop on land use planning in Mondulkiri province, the head of the Department of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction, and Cadastre stated that indigenous people form the majority of the province’s population, which is one of the major problems in the province. CBNRM could clearly contribute to realize the potential of co-management agreements developed in partnership with indigenous communities for the sustainable management of land and natural resources, and help government officials to see indigenous peoples as part of the solution and not the problem.

However, there is a risk in overemphasizing official sanctioning of PLUP or CBNRM approaches. The indigenous communities themselves must be the owners of the process. In order to function in a sustainable manner, PLUP or NRM committees need both the authorization of the communities and official government
endorsement. There is a clear risk that PLUP and CBNRM could be used by external agencies to control, rather than to support, community management of land and natural resources. Rules and regulations of CBNRM and PLUP have to be developed in accordance with relevant legislation. However, the local governance structures should not be used as tools to enforce government laws. This structure should not be exploited as a means to enforce government laws, as it will compromise the concept of CBNRM as a whole. In the context of indigenous rights to land and natural resources, community based management approaches should support, and not compromise, the rightful claims of indigenous societies to their traditional land areas.

CONCLUSION

In many ways community based approaches of land and natural resource management can contribute to the recognition of indigenous land rights in Cambodia. PLUP and CBNRM are powerful tools to support indigenous communities in protecting and managing their common property resources prior to land rights registration, during the registration process, and after a title has been issued. Raising awareness among members of the communities about the vulnerability of the natural resources base, strengthening the solidarity among community members and developing plans for the sustainable management of natural resources, supports indigenous communities in protecting their common property resources and maintaining their cultural integrity. Successful community based management of natural resources could also challenge prevailing prejudices of government officials towards the management capacities of indigenous communities.

Indigenous communities should not be forced to choose between tenure security and their cultural integrity. Special attention needs to be paid to the question of who owns the process, and how it impacts on traditional institutions. The traditional communal management structure of indigenous societies forms an ideal basis for CBNRM. PLUP and CBNRM for indigenous communities need to build on this unique social capital in order not to jeopardize the very basis for successful community based management.
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Chapter 20 The sustainable livelihoods approach and links to CBNRM in Cambodia

By: Rebecca Kinakin

(Excerpts from a Masters Degree major paper: “Learning the Livelihoods Way: Understanding rural livelihood sustainability in Northeastern Cambodia”.)

INTRODUCTION

In rural areas worldwide, poverty is becoming more widespread as inequities in asset ownership and access to common property become more problematic, populations grow, traditional income activities decline, and ecosystems fall into disrepair. Such factors illustrate and emphasize the need for new approaches to socio-economic development and conservation. In Cambodia, as in many countries, CBNRM is being endorsed as a way to increase local empowerment and rural livelihood sustainability, essentially to make environmental and developmental ends meet. Although fledgling experiences are, for the most part, positive and promising, great challenges remain. There is still a long way to go in building and strengthening the institutional and community capacity, and supportive legal and policy frameworks, required for sustainable natural resource management. Also, data available on rural Cambodia for making policy and program decisions is scant as the complexities, tradeoffs, and diminishing choices facing rural dwellers remain under-documented, thus less understood. Making development, CBNRM in particular, compatible with local needs, goals, and priorities presents another hurdle.

The Sustainable Livelihoods (SL) approach has been touted as a way to deepen understanding of the challenges to rural livelihood sustainability. Its appeal lies in a broader scope for analysis, a participatory, strengths-based, people-centred action strategy, and a focus on fostering the micro and macro linkages necessary to improve, support, and sustain local livelihoods. Proponents believe that a SL approach can provide greater insight into rural dynamics and realities and, in turn, yield a wider reach for reducing poverty and enhancing social and ecological well-being. Further, in facilitating a deeper understanding of rural life, the planning and implementation of better projects and programmes is assumed.

1 Presently, Rebecca is the Coordinator of the Mekong Learning Initiative based at Oxfam America.
2 The meaning of well-being used here includes increased self-esteem, sense of control and inclusion, physical safety, health, access to services, political enfranchisement, and maintenance of cultural heritage (DFID, 1999)
This concept paper serves two main purposes: to introduce the SL concept, framework, and applications, and to consider the implications of using a SL approach for CBNRM purposes in Cambodia.

**SL OVERVIEW**

**What is a “Sustainable Livelihood”?**

According to Chambers and Conway (1992), a livelihood comprises of the capabilities, assets (both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is viewed as sustainable when it can cope with, and recover from stresses, shocks, and other context-based constraints and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base (Ibid.). Bebbington (1999) defines a sustainable livelihood as including:

- Diverse assets;
- Ways in which people are able to access, defend, and sustain these assets;
- Abilities to combine/transform assets into income, dignity, power, and sustainability so to reduce poverty and increase living quality and human and social capability;
- An asset base that will continue to allow for the same sort of transformations; and
- Abilities to change the rules and relationships governing how resources are controlled, distributed, and transformed into income streams.

Using a SL approach, described below, it is possible to uncover the opportunities and relationships among and within capabilities, assets, and activities.

**What is a SL approach?**

The SL approach, often simply referred to as a livelihoods approach, is a way of thinking about the objectives, scope, and priorities for development; it is an attempt to counter conventional development rhetoric by “putting people at the centre of development” (APRLP, 2001; DFID, 1999; Scoones, 1998; Chambers and Conway,
In contrast to narrow-focused or single objective development strategies, the concept considers a broader scope within which to address and scale up poverty reduction and enhance well-being by addressing what people do and can do, as well as the various factors that affect people’s lives. The SL approach builds on the strengths of past development concepts, but it sets out to do development differently by premising itself on participatory, strengths/assets-based (as opposed to needs-based), people-centred (as opposed to technical or project output-based) ways of thinking. This links the micro and macro in ways that improve, support, and sustain livelihoods (DFID, 1999).

How is a SL approach different?

In many respects, the SL approach is not new at all, as it builds upon decades of thinking about the best ways to approach development problems and incorporates many familiar tools and methods (APRLP, 2001). Differences include stronger emphases on participation, multi- and cross-sectoral coordination, flexibility, and context sensitivity.

The SL approach necessitates more authentic participation by calling for an understanding of people’s unique strengths, values and priorities, as well as community-held notions and definitions of livelihoods, poverty, and sustainability—an understanding that can only be achieved by working with local people. This participation provides the opportunity to gain important insight into the realities facing rural households, especially poor families. In this way, a wider range of livelihood strategies can be illuminated, as well as broader notions of livelihood outcomes that include much more than just income levels or food security (Adato and Meinzen-Dick, 2002).

Because livelihoods are complex, the SL approach attempts to avoid sectoralism and conventional reductionism. It looks beyond the local environment, but is neither exclusively bottom-up, nor top-down; it stresses flexibility and that all levels should work together (APRLP, 2001). A primary objective of SL analysis is to understand how wider policies, institutions, and processes affect local livelihoods and this includes thinking about issues of vulnerability, power, access, and influence (Ibid.).
SL-informed programmes aim to engage and connect the various levels (individual, household, community, district, provincial, national, and even international) and make this wider environment supportive of local livelihood sustainability through policies, laws, networks, and other enabling processes and relationships.

Another main difference of SL approaches is that they are not pinned to any rigid theory or implementation guidelines. As described by the Andhra Pradesh Rural Livelihoods Project (2001): *“There is no need to work with the complex-looking DFID SL framework if this does not suit your needs: feel free to break the framework into pieces and redraw it in a way that is more logical for you and your partners.”*

It can be argued that SL approaches are (i.e. participatory, people-centered, strengths-based, multi-level), not guidelines or how-to's driving SL thinking and doing.

**A SL Framework**

The emergence of SL thinking can be traced back to discussions on poverty in the 1980's, particularly Sen's (1981) work on famine and entitlements that led to deeper probes into issues of poverty, power, access, and equity. Later, Chambers and Conway (1992) produced a discussion paper on sustainable rural livelihoods which influenced a flurry of writing, action and investigation into livelihood issues and analysis. One of the most notable outputs inspired by these debates was the sustainable livelihoods framework put forth by Britain’s Department for International Development (Figure 1).
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Livelihood Context
- Legal/Policy
- Social/Culture
- Geography
- History
- Etc.

Livelihood Resources
- Assets
- Capabilities
- Entitlements

Livelihood Strategies
- Stinting
- Diversifying
- Moving
- Etc.

Livelihood Outcomes
- Increased well-being
- Reduced vulnerability
- Improved food security
- More sustainable use of NR base

Livelihood Assets
- Vulnerability Context
  - Shocks
  - Trends
  - Seasonality

Policies Institutions Processes
- Levels of government
  - Private Sector
- Laws
- Culture
- Policies
- Institutions

Figure 1: The DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (DFID, 1999).

Figure 2 illustrates a modified SL framework. Both models aim to reflect and facilitate the understanding of rural realities based on an analysis of livelihood (or vulnerability) context, livelihood resources (assets, capabilities, and entitlements), mediating institutions, livelihood strategies, and outcomes.

Figure 2: An alternate Sustainable Livelihoods framework, adapted from Sen (1981), Scoones (1998), and Bebbington (1999).

A main critique of the DFID framework is that it is far too intellectual and conceptual to have practical, on-the-ground application. A central question is: How are field-level staff and practitioners supposed to implement this framework? Other criticisms
include the concept's donor-centric nature, as well as the reality of competition between livelihood strategies as development projects tend to favour one over another (DFID, 1999). Also, the frameworks are complicated by the non-straightforward tradeoffs and choices involved with livelihood dynamics (for instance, local livelihood security is often at tension with environmental sustainability). Moreover, important, defining aspects, such as culture and history, as well as intangible, yet crucial assets, such as imagination and ambition, are often not given adequate treatment within these particular models. In response to these criticisms, efforts have been ongoing to develop SL frameworks with greater on-the-ground applicability.

Livelihood (or vulnerability) context

Sen (1981) suggests that a person's “bundle of commodities”, or what he or she can command, depends on the various contexts, including the legal, political, social, cultural, geographical, and historical. Livelihoods are shaped by various levels and forces of vulnerability, and the associated factors referred to as trends, shocks, and stresses (DFID, 1999). Trends include population rates, demographics, governance, and political regimes. Shocks are often intense and unexpected such as floods, health epidemics, and violent conflict. Stresses are longer term, such as drought, seasonality pressures, and prices.

Livelihood resources

Livelihood resources refer to the assets, capabilities, and entitlements available for livelihood building. Assets, also referred to as ‘capitals’, are explained by DFID (1999) as being human, social, natural, physical (or material), and financial (or economic) (Box 1). Bebbington (1999) suggests that capitals are not only inputs, but are also outputs. Moreover, capitals are not static but constantly changing as meanings of development, poverty, and livelihood change. Bebbington (Ibid., 2003) further broadens out the idea of livelihood resources by saying that there should be more concern with not only ways in which assets translate into income, but also how assets impact people's sense of well-being and the "human experience".
Capabilities, or what Sen (1981) refers to as “what a person can do or be”, combine with and transform assets and entitlements into income, opportunities, and dignity, among other outcomes (Bebbington, 1999). Within capabilities, other personal and psychological aspects that drive human action and thinking should be included. Meijers and Nooyens (2001) suggest that people's perceptions of poverty and of their own poverty situation are critical in livelihoods analysis. Factors such as aspirations, dreams, passions, determination, beliefs in possibility and impossibility, fears, doubts, leadership potential, spirituality, and religious/cultural dedication should also be included as critical livelihood building blocks.

Entitlements control access to policy, power, rights, and claims (e.g. ownership rights, contract obligations, and legal exchanges) (Sen, 1981). Entitlement relations, in a large part, govern possession and use of livelihood resources.

**Institutions**

From tenure policies to market networks and credit arrangements, institutions mediate and determine access to livelihood resources and affect the choice of strategies employed (Scoones, 1998). Institutions are comprised of structures and processes. DFID (1999) defines structures as the 'skeleton' or determinants of access to various assets. Institutional structures organize, coordinate, and make processes function. Networks to promote information flow and exchange, as well as task forces to collect information are examples of structures. Change within structures can result from various factors, including education and training, as well as organizational transformation like decentralization.

---

**Box 1: Livelihood Assets**

**Human** assets include skills, knowledge, and experience, as well as ability to work and good physical health.

**Social** assets refer to relationships, for example: the network between individuals and groups to allow for working together and increasing access to wider institutions (i.e. power); membership of formalized groups with rules, norms, sanctions; and relationships of trust, reciprocity, and cooperative exchanges that form informal safety nets.

**Natural** assets include natural capital, meaning the harvestable stocks of resources as opposed to their flows, intangible goods and services like atmosphere, aesthetics, and biodiversity, and tangible goods and services such as trees, fish, and land.

**Physical** assets refer to basic infrastructure as usually a public good or service not requiring direct payment for use, and goods needed to support livelihoods (e.g. tools and equipment). Physical assets include: affordable transportation, secure shelter and buildings, adequate water supply and sanitation, clean, affordable energy, and access to information (communications).

**Financial** assets refer to financial resources used to achieve livelihood objectives. These can include savings, regular income or pensions, loans and access to credit, and liquid assets like land, livestock and jewellery.

Source: DFID, 1999
Processes define how people relate to each other and include policy (e.g. terms or rules of exchange and returns), legislation (e.g. roles, responsibilities, rights, and relationships), institutions (e.g. markets), culture (e.g. societal norms and beliefs), and power relations (e.g. gender, caste, class, and age) (Ibid.). Just as assets, capabilities, and entitlements can be harnessed to offset vulnerability and enhance well-being, establishing and strengthening institutions can significantly improve livelihood situations.

Livelihood strategies

Livelihood strategies involve combining what can be accessed with what one has control over. Chambers and Conway (1992) term this combining of tangible and intangible resources to reduce vulnerability a "livelihood portfolio". A livelihood portfolio can comprise strategies such as stinting, hoarding, protecting, depleting, claiming, and moving (Ibid.). In considering the sustainability of livelihood strategies, Bebbington (1999:2003) raises an important point:

“Livelihood strategies are attempts, from existing and often severe constraints, at a continuous management and modification of these substitutions, tradeoffs and draw downs on different capital assets. How these trade-offs are made, and which ones are preferred, vary across life cycle and also across the short term. At certain points the resulting strategy may seem sustainable, at other points not.”

Clearly, livelihood strategies, like livelihood systems in general, are not static over time. And, because livelihood outcomes are also not fixed, strategies are even more mobile. Livelihood analysis has a difficult task to address and work within this context of moving targets.

Livelihood outcomes

Livelihood outcomes are the results of livelihood strategies and include increased well-being, income, jobs, economic linkages, human and environmental health, education and the re-circulation of knowledge, decreased vulnerability, risk, and instability, and meaningful life experiences. Outcomes feed back into the livelihood system; they are inputs and outputs in an open and dynamic system.
How can SL frameworks be used?

Applications of the SL approach are numerous and varied. Frameworks can be used as a checklist for asking broad questions in initial livelihood investigation, preventing important aspects being missed out (APRLP, 2001). Frameworks can also be broken down to focus on particular aspects in greater detail, such as gender or institutions. In some cases, SL-guided programmes operate primarily at a policy level. Where this is the case a key objective is to ensure that the policy-making process is adequately informed by local-level realities and outcomes (Ibid.). Such a framework can also be used to recognize and address linkages between livelihood issues, as well as identify new projects, programme areas, and partnership building opportunities. Further, a SL framework can be useful in conceptualizing monitoring and evaluation activities, incorporating, for instance, local dimensions and definitions of poverty, well-being, and sustainability and how to measure these (Adato and Meinzen-Dick, 2002).

SL AND CBNRM

Linking SL to CBNRM in Cambodia

SL approaches and frameworks are based on participatory, asset-based, people-centred ways of thinking and doing that link micro and macro policies, institutions, and processes in such a manner as to facilitate sustainable livelihoods. In many ways, Cambodian CBNRM initiatives are already using these ideas and concepts through:

- Interdisciplinary and multi-sectoral planning and cooperation;
- People-centred thinking and doing, evident in the strong leaning towards the use of participatory approaches (e.g. PRA methods);
- Attention to context specificity;
- A dedication to understanding livelihood coping strategies;
- Building resources, assets, and capabilities:
  - human capacity (enhancing skills, knowledge, lessons learning, and experience);
  - social capital (strengthening participation, networks, linkages, and connectedness);
natural capital (promoting sustainable resource management and broader valuation of ecosystem goods and services); and
- Building, strengthening, and transforming structures and processes, and making micro-macro linkages:
  - involving various stakeholders, organizations, and levels of government;
- Strengthening local institutions;
  - assisting in the development and enhancing of institutional and organizational structures through supporting training, workshops, and forums for learning, decision making, and reforming policy;
  - supporting the development of enabling policy and legal frameworks and structures (e.g., the Community Forestry Working Group and the Fisheries Law Working Group) to help communities in their livelihood endeavours and scale up their CBNRM efforts; and
  - educating broad-based stakeholder groups on policy, legislation, and other processes (e.g. resource roles, rights, and responsibility workshops and training).

Taken together, these aspects are helping to decrease vulnerability, increase resilience, and foster new coping strategies, improving livelihood realities and outcomes.

**Implications of broader application of a livelihoods approach for CBNRM**

In general, looking through the lens of another framework or approach is a good exercise and can help to identify gaps, weaknesses, and opportunities in current projects, plans, and action. Since SL does not use reinvented language, but instead terms already found within the CBNRM lexicon, the concept is readily accessible to CBNRM practitioners. A SL framework can facilitate a more comprehensive inquiry, as it guides us to ask many questions. Improved and broader understanding can shed light into which CBNRM activities are most compatible with local situations, how to undertake them, when, via who, and why. Increased operational and strategic effectiveness, such as in the sequencing and timing of projects and activities and stakeholder identification, are among the most direct advantages of working with a livelihoods framework.
CBNRM frequently comes under the criticism of having a 'communities as homogenous units' perspective that neglects the differences within and among communities (Li, 2002). This is particularly problematic in Cambodia where many communities are not natural units at all as war and government resettlement policies have shaped and reshaped the geography and composition of communities over time. Moreover, current CBNRM in the country neglects the diversity among the various levels of a community. Instead it remains focused on the larger, rather superficial level of the community. Without understanding the dynamics and workings at the household and individual levels, CBNRM is poised to reinforce and perpetuate existing power, social, and economic imbalances. A livelihoods approach to CBNRM can help to counter this.

SL works within an understanding of scale, peeling back the perception of homogenous, unified communities by identifying and addressing the variations in activities, access, power, and influence among and between households and individuals sharing the same geography. Such an understanding of individual and household strengths, needs, goals, and priorities is likely to produce a profoundly different programming reality for CBNRM, and present both challenges (eg. increased research resource requirements) and opportunities (eg. increased relevance and more targeted activities and outcomes). Further, in arriving at an understanding of the unique situations of people and ascertaining context-specific targets and goals, numerous implications for monitoring and evaluation arise. With CBNRM assessment rather weak in Cambodia, SL presents itself as an opportunity to aid in developing new and effective forms and roles for monitoring and evaluating livelihood sustainability reflective of local meanings, experiences, and indicators.

In Cambodia, although the notion of community based resource management has existed for generations, the formal concept of CBNRM is relatively recent (Hou and Carson, 2001). This newness affords the opportunity for groups and practitioners to 'do CBNRM differently' by embracing a livelihoods approach that considers how CBNRM can more fully contribute to the overall improvement of livelihood security (eg. better health care, infrastructure, education, and access to credit). CBNRM already focuses on building and strengthening natural, social, and human capital, as well as the associated institutional arrangements. With wider knowledge of
livelihood realities and conditions, these efforts can be deepened and even extended to address other aspects and issues of livelihoods, in particular issues of gender equity, indigenous land rights, governance, power, access, and influence. There is a chance that findings from broader livelihood analysis may show a reduced fit for donors regarding a project or programme; CBNRM mandates may be required to expand or refocus. However, the opportunity to build networks and partnerships is immense, given that environmental organizations in Cambodia can and are willing to pool together their knowledge, information, networks, and contacts.

CONCLUSION

The SL approach builds on the strengths of past development concepts, but it sets out to do development differently by premising itself on participatory, asset-based, people-centred ways of thinking and doing that link micro and macro policies, institutions and processes in such a manner as to facilitate sustainable livelihoods. For Cambodia, presently working to enhance its socio-economic profile and attempting to make environment and development ends meets, such a concept may be useful. Indeed, CBNRM stands to play a pivotal role in shaping a future of social, ecological, and economic well-being; already there are numerous benefits of the CBNRM strategy currently being employed in Cambodia. However, there are also lessons to be learned from the SL concept and frameworks being endorsed internationally. The linking of the CBNRM and SL has the potential to improve not only CBNRM practices, but enhance rural livelihoods as well. Efforts now have to concentrate on ways to bring the SL concept and its various frameworks down from abstract theory to field level application.
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**Biodiversity:** The variability among organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine, and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are a part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems.

**Chhbab:** are laws passed by the National Assembly (lower house) and the Senate (upper house).

**Circulars**, or *Sarachor*, are instruments that are issued by the Prime Minister or a minister to explain or clarify certain legal or regulatory measures, or to provide instructions.

**Collaborative forest management/ collaborative natural resource management/ co-management:** Refers to a partnership in which various stakeholders agree on sharing the management functions, rights and tenure, returns and responsibilities for an area of forest. The stakeholders usually include the agency, in whose charge the resource is currently vested, and various associations of local residents, local and traditional authorities, industries, businesses, research institutions and others.

**Co-management** is a "formalized and replicable process of sharing of authority and responsibility by government and organized user groups in decentralized decision making aiming at improved resource management".

**Commune councils:** This is the lowest elected administrative level with authority to plan, manage and use natural resources in a sustainable manner; the exact role with regard to their area of jurisdiction has yet to be fully clarified.

**Community** refers to a group of residents in one or more villages in the Kingdom of Cambodia who share a common social, environmental, cultural, traditional and economic interest and use the natural resources in an area (where they live or nearby) in a sustainable way for subsistence and livelihood improvement purposes.

**Community Based Eco-Tourism** (CBET) are practised where local people have substantial control and involvement in eco-tourism projects in order that the majority benefits can remain in the community.

**Community based forest management:** Refers to forest management by or with the local community that includes traditional forms of forest management. This entails self-mobilized community forestry initiatives, in commune or municipal forests, possibly sharing ownership with the state, and forms of collaborative management between state and community organizations.

**Community based natural resource management:** A diversity of co-management approaches that strive to empower local communities to actively participate in the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources through different strategies including community forestry, community fisheries, participatory land use planning, and community protected area management.

**Community fisheries:** This refers to a "group of people who voluntarily cooperate in order to manage, conserve, develop and use fisheries resources sustainably". It protects the rights and benefits of the people in accordance with other legislations related to the fishery sector.

**Community forestry:** A broad term that includes indigenous forest management systems as well as programmes initiated by communities or the government. Community forestry now is widely used to denote many forms of people-based forest management.
**Community organizing**: is a process by which a community empowers itself by working to identify its needs and to resolve its problems in a collective manner.

**Community protected area management**, known as participatory protected area management: A process which aims to achieve a win-win situation; enables both resources managers to meet their biodiversity conservation objectives, and resources users to sustain their livelihoods, and cultural and spiritual values.

**Deika**: Deika are orders given by provincial governors or commune councils that have the force of law within the geographical limit of their territorial authority.

**Eco-tourism** refers to the responsible travelling to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people.

**Farm forestry**: Refers to tree planting on private land by farmers, who are often from community groups, with aims such as joint marketing, processing and mutual learning.

**Financial assets** refer to financial resources used to achieve livelihood objectives. These can include savings, regular income or pensions, loans and access to credit, and liquid assets like land, livestock and jewelry.

**Fisheries facilitators working group**: The main purpose of this working group is to support and facilitate the development of Fisheries Law, the draft fisheries sub-decree and other guidelines, and provide training courses related to fisheries development.

**Fisheries policy reforms**: The release of 56% of fishing lot areas under commercial operations potentially for areas of community fisheries came as the government’s response to rising tensions between fishing lot owners and poor local fishing communities.

**Governance**, in general, refers to the institutions of human society that together 'manage' public affairs. It involves the process (or processes) by which governing bodies are selected, held accountable, monitored, and replaced; a capacity by governing institutions to manage resources efficiently, including the formulation and implementation of policies (objectives) and regulations (rules), maintenance of law and order, and provision of conditions necessary for social and economic stability; and ongoing (re-) validation of institutions within the social matrix.

**Government policy of decentralization**: The Seila government programme assists in developing the capacity for decentralized development planning so that the majority of decision-making takes place at the commune level, where Commune Development Committees (CDCs) decide on local activities and budget allocations.

**Human assets** include skills, knowledge, and experience, as well as ability to work and good physical health.

**A human rights-based approach** is based on the respect for all internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms. It (HRBA) recognizes that human rights must be realized by those whose development is at stake.
Indigenous peoples are described as “tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions, or by special laws or regulations”

Joint forest management: Sharing of products and responsibilities between the forest department and user groups. Involves a contract specifying the distribution of authority, responsibility and benefits between villagers and state forest services. Originally involved plantations on state land in India but now the term has wider use.

Local forest management: The actions of people living near a forest to maintain or enhance the forest and improve their well being. It assumes that local people help to enhance the sustainability of forest, acquire a share or benefits, maintain control over decisions related to resources, and that competing demands are resolved in ways that reduce conflict, and enable synergies.

A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living.

Livelihood outcomes are the results of livelihood strategies and include increased well-being, income, jobs, economic linkages, human and environmental health, education and the re-circulation of knowledge, decreased vulnerability, risk, and instability, and meaningful life experiences.

Livelihood resources refer to the assets, capabilities, and entitlements available for livelihood building.

Livelihood strategies involve combining what can be accessed with what one has control over. “Livelihood strategies are attempts at a continuous management and modification of substitutions, tradeoffs and draw downs on different capital assets.”

National Environmental Action Plan: The focus of this plan was on six priority areas and recognized the link between poverty alleviation and environment, the importance of communities in natural resource management, the need for institutional capacity building, and the importance of an integrated approach to environmental planning.

National Forest Policy: This includes national goals of environmental protection, biodiversity conservation, poverty reduction, economic development and good governance. It recognises the legal protection of “traditional rights of local communities in use of forest resources...”, and endeavours to "increase the benefits of local communities from the use and management of forest resources through community based forest and wildlife conservation”.

National Poverty Reduction Strategy: This strategy highlights that one of the priority poverty reduction actions is to strengthen institutions and improve governance, including reform of natural resources management (land, agriculture, forestry and fisheries).

A network is any group of individuals or organizations who, on a voluntary basis, exchange information or undertake joint activities and organize themselves whilst maintaining their independence and individual autonomy.

Natural assets include natural capital, meaning the harvestable stocks of resources as opposed to their flows, intangible goods and services like atmosphere, aesthetics, and biodiversity, and tangible goods and services such as trees, fish, and land.
Participatory forestry, also known as participatory forest management: an umbrella term that could include all the above terms and forms.

Participatory land use planning is a planning process initiated at village level in which villagers and other stakeholders jointly plan the use, the protection and the allocation of all land, forest, agricultural and water areas within their village boundaries.

Physical assets refer to basic infrastructure as usually a public good or service not requiring direct payment for use, and goods needed to support livelihoods (e.g. tools and equipment). Physical assets include: affordable transportation, secure shelter and buildings, adequate water supply and sanitation, clean, affordable energy, and access to information (communications).

Prakas are ministerial or inter-ministerial regulations that are used, like sub-decrees, to implement and clarify specific provisions within higher level legislative documents.

Public participation in forestry: A very broad term used to include the many ways people can influence forestry, but not necessarily in shared (collaborative) decision making.

Rectangular Strategy: This strategy aims to enhance growth, employment, equity and efficiency through the implementation of SEDP II and NPRS. At the core of the strategy is good governance, focusing on four areas including anti-corruption, legal and judiciary; public administration and decentralization.

Royal Government of Cambodia’s Socio-Economic Development Plan 2001-2005: This is a policy document charting the course for the government focusing on a broad variety of developmental issues with a concentration on actions to be taken to stimulate economic growth and private sector development.

Social assets refer to relationships, for example: the network between individuals and groups to allow for working together and increasing access to wider institutions (i.e. power); membership of formalized groups with rules, norms, sanctions; and relationships of trust, reciprocity, and cooperative exchanges that form informal safety nets.

Social forestry: First used by Indian government as a land tenure term for forestry on village land (not forest reserve). Now the term means forest management with a social purpose aiming to benefit local people.

Statement on Land Policy (2001) and the Strategy of Land Policy Framework: Articulates government policy on land management, administration and distribution. It states that “the people who use land are the day-to-day land managers, their participation in land use planning is essential” and that “concepts of community forestry and community fisheries...imply that community land use planning and land management are expected nationwide.”

Sub-Decrees, or Anu-Kret, are legislative documents that are generally used to implement and clarify specific provisions within laws.

Sustainable livelihood: “A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks, and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base.”
**Glossary**

**Sustainable Livelihoods Approach** refer to a way of thinking about the objectives, scope, and priorities for development in an attempt to counter conventional development rhetoric by “putting people at the centre of development”.

**Sustainable Livelihoods Framework** is a tool for improving our understanding of people’s livelihoods; presents the main factors that affect people’s livelihoods, including human, social, natural, physical, and financial assets that people can hold, and typical relationships among these.

**Swidden agriculture**: An agricultural system in which fields are cleared by the use of fire, and periods of fallow (when fields are allowed to rest) are on average longer than periods of cropping (when fields are in use). Often, unused fields are allowed to grow back to secondary forest before being cleared and planted again.

**Tenure**: Socially defined agreements held by individuals or groups, recognized by legal statutes or customary practice, regarding the bundle of rights and duties of ownership, holding, access and/or usage of a particular land unit or the associated resources there within (such as individual trees, plant species, water, minerals, etc.).

**Traditional tenure systems** of indigenous ethnic minorities in Cambodia can is a type of stewardship over land and natural resources.

**Trends** include population rates, demographics, governance, and political regimes.

**Use rights**: Rights for the use of natural resources that can be defined by local custom, mutual agreements, or prescribed by other entities holding access rights. These rights may restrict the use of particular resources to specific levels of consumption or particular harvesting techniques.

Note: The definitions given in this glossary are taken from the chapters in this status report. Please refer to the individual chapters for further clarity and references.
# List of relevant organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Relevant Area of Focus</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia Fuelwood Saving Project (CFSP)</td>
<td>Efficient use of fuelwood and alternative sources for energy</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 986 891 <a href="mailto:mclequan@cfsp.org.kh">mclequan@cfsp.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry Alliance for Cambodia (CFAC)</td>
<td>Community Forestry</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 220 714, 012 909 502 <a href="mailto:cfac1@online.com.kh">cfac1@online.com.kh</a> <a href="mailto:cfac2@online.com.kh">cfac2@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP)</td>
<td>Community Forestry Action Research Capacity Building to enhance security and livelihood opportunities in rural communities</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 211 381 012 832 933 <a href="mailto:ramony@online.com.kh">ramony@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Legal Education Center (CLEC)</td>
<td>Legal education, Land and Natural Resources Project</td>
<td>NRM Land</td>
<td>023 215 590, 012 695 706 <a href="mailto:usfpp@online.com.kh">usfpp@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Environment Preservation Association (CEPA)</td>
<td>Community Forestry Project Community Fisheries Project Sesan River Project</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Fisheries NRM 023 720 062 <a href="mailto:cepa@online.com.kh">cepa@online.com.kh</a> <a href="mailto:cepa@forum.org.kh">cepa@forum.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Appropriate Technology (DATE)</td>
<td>Fuel efficient cooking stoves</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>012 851 161 <a href="mailto:san_you@online.com.kh">san_you@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity (CIDSE)</td>
<td>Integrated Community Development Programme</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Fisheries NRM 023 216 369, 023 216 495 <a href="mailto:mam.sambath@everyday.com.kh">mam.sambath@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management of Coastal Zone (Danida/MoE) project</td>
<td>Coastal Resources Management</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>023 216 510, 034 934 121 <a href="mailto:coastal@online.com.kh">coastal@online.com.kh</a> <a href="mailto:coastal@czmcamb.com">coastal@czmcamb.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Remote Indigenous Village Eco-tourism (DRIVE) project</td>
<td>Education and Eco-tourism Community Forestry Natural Resources Management</td>
<td>Eco-tourism NRM</td>
<td>012 981 226 <a href="mailto:graemb@camintel.com">graemb@camintel.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Action Coalition Team (FACT)</td>
<td>Community Fisheries Advocacy</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 213 482, 012 906 279 <a href="mailto:fact@everyday.com.kh">fact@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## List of Local NGOs and Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Project</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khmer Youth and Social Development Organization (KYSD)</td>
<td>Environmental degradation and forestry management</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>011 970 868, 012 964467 <a href="mailto:kysd_org@hotmail.com">kysd_org@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlup Baitong</td>
<td>Community Forestry, Community Based Eco-Tourism, Gender and Environment, Education and training</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 214 409 <a href="mailto:mlup@online.com.kh">mlup@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum</td>
<td>NGO coordination/networking, Analyzing Development Issues, Resource Centre</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 360 119 <a href="mailto:russell@ngo.forum.org.kh">russell@ngo.forum.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Timber Forest Products (NTFP), Ratanakiri</td>
<td>Non Timber Forest Products, Sesan River Protection Network</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>075 974 039 <a href="mailto:ntfp@camintel.com">ntfp@camintel.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Management of Coastal Resources (PMCR) project</td>
<td>Participatory Research, Community Organizing, Management of Coastal/Mangrove Resources</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 214 108, 023 211 406 <a href="mailto:pmmr@online.com.kh">pmmr@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Natural Resources Management in the Tonle Sap Region (FAO Siem Reap)</td>
<td>Community Forestry, Community Fisheries, Institutional Strengthening</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>063 963 525, 063 963 462 <a href="mailto:pte@online.com.kh">pte@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia Development Program (SADP)</td>
<td>Community Forestry, Community Fisheries</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 217218 <a href="mailto:sadp@online.com.kh">sadp@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save Cambodia's Wildlife</td>
<td>Education and Training, Community Outreach, Environmental Awareness</td>
<td>Environment Conservation</td>
<td>023 211 263 <a href="mailto:wildlife@online.com.kh">wildlife@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strey Daoembey Santepheap Nung Parethan (SSP)</td>
<td>Forest Management</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>012 670 188 <a href="mailto:ssp_org@yahoo.com">ssp_org@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List of Local NGOs and Projects*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Relevant Area of Focus</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank (ADB)</td>
<td>Agriculture, Environment and Natural Resources Division</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adb.org">www.adb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish International Development Agency</td>
<td>Decentralization with focus on NREM at commune level</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>023 987 629, 023 211 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Danida)</td>
<td>Land management</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td><a href="mailto:danida@online.com.kh">danida@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil societies and local NGO's</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-Poor Market</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
<td>Rural Livelihoods</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>023 430 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DFID)</td>
<td>Decentralization with focus on NREM</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c-price@dfid.gov.uk">c-price@dfid.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land management</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil societies and local NGO's</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organization</td>
<td>Forestry Policy and Planning</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>023 216 566, 023 211 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)</td>
<td>Administrative Reform and Decentralization</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>023 726 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Management and Administration Project (LMAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
<td>Capacity Building for Forestry Sector</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 212 142, 023 211 673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JICA)</td>
<td>Forestry Training Center (FA/JICA)</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jica@online.com.kh">jica@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental degradation and forestry management</td>
<td></td>
<td>023 211 695, 015 851 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.jica.go.jp">www.jica.go.jp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>023 212 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SIDA)</td>
<td>Land management</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:claes.sida@online.com.kh">claes.sida@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(UNDP)</td>
<td>GEF Small Grants Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:douglas.gardner@undp.org">douglas.gardner@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.un.org.kh">www.un.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Reconstruction and development</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>023 213 538, 023 217 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.worldbank">www.worldbank</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organization</td>
<td>Relevant Area of Focus</td>
<td>Sectors</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO) | • Research and Development  
• Legal and Accreditation  
• Monitoring and Evaluation | Fisheries | 023 210 154  
cfdo@camnet.com.kh |
| Community Forestry Office (CFO) | • National Community Forestry Programme  
• Community forestry extension and development | Forestry | sokhhengpiny@yahoo.com |
| Community Protected Area Development Office (CPADO) | • Research and Capacity Development  
• Participatory Protected Area Management  
• Community Development and Networking  
• Policy Development | Conservation Environment | 023 721 462  
mvathanak@yahoo.com  
leakhena_san@yahoo.com |
| PLUP Focal Point Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction | • Participatory Land Use Planning | Land | 012 869 377, 012 873 560  
plup@online.com.kh |
| PLG-Seila Programme Support-Ratanakiri | • Participatory Land Use Planning  
• LCRT, IFS, CFAR, AAR  
• Educational Information  
• Community Based Eco-Tourism  
• Formal Research | Forestry Fisheries PLUP NRM | 075 974 058, 075 974 016  
carererat@camintel.com |
| Seila Task Force Secretariat | • Rural Investment and Local Governance Project  
• Decentralization | Agriculture, Fisheries Forestry Land, NREM | 023 362 175, 023 361 900, 023 723 844  
scott@sella.gov.kh |
| Seila/Partnership for Local Governance | • Natural Resources and Environment  
• Decentralization  
• Poverty Alleviation  
• Good Governance | Agriculture Fisheries Forestry Land, NREM | 012 812 301, 016 995 501  
yanara@camnet.com.kh  
scott@sella.gov.kh  
sovanna@sella.gov.kh |
| Department of Water Resources Management and Conservation, Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology | • Water Resources Management  
• Community Based Irrigation | Water | 012 970 232  
taratheng@cttnet.com.khs |

*List of Relevant Government Agencies*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Relevant Area of Focus</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI)</td>
<td>• Research on natural resources and environment</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>023 883 603, 023 881 701, 023 881 384, 023 881 916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdri@camnet.com.kh">cdri@camnet.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre d'Etude et de Developpement Agricole Cambodgien (CEDAC)</td>
<td>• Agricultural research and extension</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>023 880 916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge (CBIK)</td>
<td>• Participatory research • Indigenous knowledge • Biodiversity</td>
<td>NRM Conservation Environment</td>
<td>(+86 871) 4162736 <a href="mailto:wangyu@cbik.ac.cn">wangyu@cbik.ac.cn</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbik.org">www.cbik.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)</td>
<td>• Forestry research • Forestry and livelihoods</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>(+62 251) 622 622 <a href="mailto:w.sunderlin@cgiar.org">w.sunderlin@cgiar.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cifor.cgiar.org">www.cifor.cgiar.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Natural Resource Management Learning Institute (CBNRM LI)</td>
<td>• Good Governance and Sustainable Livelihoods • Human Resources Development • Knowledge Building • Partnerships and Networking • Institutional Arrangements and Policy Support</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>023 224 171 <a href="mailto:sereyrotha@everyday.com.kh">sereyrotha@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:marona@everyday.com.kh">marona@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:toby@everyday.com.kh">toby@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry Training Centre (FA/JICA)</td>
<td>• Capacity building for forestry sector</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 212 142, 023 211 673, 023 211 695, 015 851 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jica@online.com.kh">jica@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Fisheries Research and Development Institute (IFReDI)</td>
<td>• Biological division • Socio-economic division • Kandal Stung research station</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>(855) 723 275 <a href="mailto:IFRIC@online.com.kh">IFRIC@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Research Centre (IDRC)</td>
<td>• Community Based Natural Resource Management • Action research</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>(613) 236 6163 <a href="mailto:hmailee@idrc.org.sg">hmailee@idrc.org.sg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bdavy@idrc.ca">bdavy@idrc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.idrc.ca">www.idrc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)</td>
<td>• Learning Community • Education and Training • Publications and Communication</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>(+63 46) 414 2417 <a href="mailto:information@iirr.org">information@iirr.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.iirr.org">www.iirr.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List of Relevant Research and Training Institutions (national and regional)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Research Network (LeaRN) - based in the Philippines</td>
<td>CBCRM Resource Center, Learning and Research Network</td>
<td>NRM, <a href="mailto:emferrer@cbcrmllearning.org">emferrer@cbcrmllearning.org</a>, <a href="mailto:tatadelacruz@cbcrmllearning.org">tatadelacruz@cbcrmllearning.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekong Learning Initiative (MLI)</td>
<td>CBNRM Curriculum Development, Learning and Extension, Governance and Livelihoods, Policy support</td>
<td>Fisheries NRM, 023 210 357, <a href="mailto:rkinakin@online.com.kh">rkinakin@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prek Leap National School of Agriculture</td>
<td>Agricultural, Fisheries, Forestry</td>
<td>Agriculture, Fisheries, Forestry, 023 219 872, 012 802 890, <a href="mailto:pnsa@mail.com">pnsa@mail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Community Forestry Training Center (RECOFTC) - based in Thailand</td>
<td>Regional Analysis and Representation, Country Program Support, Program Planning and Delivery</td>
<td>Forestry, (+66-2) 9405700, <a href="mailto:info@recoftc.org">info@recoftc.org</a>, <a href="http://www.recoftc.org">www.recoftc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal University of Agriculture (RUA)</td>
<td>Agriculture, Faculty of Fisheries, Faculty of Forestry</td>
<td>Fisheries, Forestry, 012 807 506, 023 219 612, 012 868 827, 023 364 138, <a href="mailto:treypra@forum.org.kh">treypra@forum.org.kh</a>, <a href="mailto:vmonin@forum.org.kh">vmonin@forum.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP); Department of Environmental Science</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Science</td>
<td>Environment, 023 882 976, 012 933 089, <a href="mailto:environment.rupp@everyday.com.kh">environment.rupp@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP); Department of Tourism</td>
<td>Tourism Department</td>
<td>Tourism, 016 859 780, <a href="mailto:rupptourism@yahoo.com.au">rupptourism@yahoo.com.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBNK</td>
<td>Training institute for managers of organizations working for the development of Cambodia</td>
<td>Management, 023 722 115, <a href="http://www.vbnk.org">www.vbnk.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) - based in the Philippines</td>
<td>Transforming lives and landscapes, Capacity building</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, (+63 49) 5362925, (+63 49) 5367341, <a href="http://www.icraf.cgiar.org/sea">www.icraf.cgiar.org/sea</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Fish Centre - based in Malaysia</td>
<td>People, Science, Environment, Partners</td>
<td>Fisheries, (+60-4) 626 1606, (+60-4) 626 5530, <a href="http://www.worldfishcenter.org">www.worldfishcenter.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List of Relevant Research and Training Institutions (national and regional)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Relevant Area of Focus</th>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA)</td>
<td>• Capacity Building for Food Security</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 884 365, 023 880 693 <a href="mailto:mark@adracambodia.org">mark@adracambodia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friend Service Committee (AFSC)</td>
<td>• Integrated Sustainable Livelihood Program (ISLP) - Natural Resource Management Component</td>
<td>Forestry, Fisheries, NRM</td>
<td>012 694 460, 035 940 740 <a href="mailto:012694460@mobitel.com.kh">012694460@mobitel.com.kh</a>; <a href="mailto:afsc@online.com.kh">afsc@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian People for, Education and Development Abroad (APHEDA)</td>
<td>• Aquaculture</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 216 034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE Cambodia</td>
<td>• Community Development</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>023 215 267 <a href="mailto:brian.lund@care-cambodia.org">brian.lund@care-cambodia.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation International (CI)</td>
<td>• Biodiversity Conservation</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>023 214 627, 012 974 332 <a href="mailto:ic@everyday.com.kh">ic@everyday.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern Worldwide</td>
<td>• Community Forestry</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>023 210 314 <a href="mailto:cfppenh@concerncambodia.net">cfppenh@concerncambodia.net</a> <a href="mailto:piseth@concerncambodia.net">piseth@concerncambodia.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church World Service (CWS)</td>
<td>• Community Development Project</td>
<td>Fisheries, Forestry</td>
<td>012 708 193, 023 217 786 <a href="mailto:kptcws@bigpond.com.kh">kptcws@bigpond.com.kh</a> <a href="mailto:cwsc@online.com.kh">cwsc@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fauna and Flora International (FFI)</td>
<td>• Conservation</td>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>023 211 142 <a href="mailto:fficambodia@online.com.kh">fficambodia@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World Conservation Union (IUCN)</td>
<td>• Development of a sustainable wetlands programme for Stung Treng Province</td>
<td>Conservation, Environment</td>
<td>023 211 944 <a href="mailto:iucn@forum.org.kh">iucn@forum.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan International Volunteer Center (JVC)</td>
<td>• Network for Fisheries Communities</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 882 841, 016 963 398 <a href="mailto:jvcpp@bigpond.com.kh">jvcpp@bigpond.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of International Organizations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Projects/Programs</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran World Federation (LWF)</td>
<td>Integrated Rural Development Project, Water and sanitation, Education</td>
<td>Forestry, Fisheries, Water, 023 881 100, 023 883 254 <a href="mailto:rep@lwfcambodia.org.kh">rep@lwfcambodia.org.kh</a>, <a href="mailto:lwf@lwfcambodia.org.kh">lwf@lwfcambodia.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee (MCC)</td>
<td>Takeo Community Forestry Development Association</td>
<td>Forestry, 023 215 994, 023 216 387 <a href="mailto:mcc@online.com.kh">mcc@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam America</td>
<td>Mekong River Basin Management, Food and Income Security, Community Finance, Trade</td>
<td>Fisheries, 023 210357 <a href="mailto:info@oxfamamerica.org">info@oxfamamerica.org</a>, <a href="http://www.oxfamamerica.org">www.oxfamamerica.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam Community Aid Abroad (OCAA)</td>
<td>Integrated Community Development Program, Community-Based Fisheries Management</td>
<td>Fisheries, 023 720 928 <a href="mailto:ocaast@camintel.com">ocaast@camintel.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
<td>Cambodia Livelihood Study Project, Community Forestry, Community Fisheries, Land</td>
<td>Forestry, Fisheries, Land, 023 720 928, 023 720 036 <a href="mailto:mbird@oxfam.org.kh">mbird@oxfam.org.kh</a>, <a href="mailto:kedinravy@oxfam.org.kh">kedinravy@oxfam.org.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO)</td>
<td>Secure Livelihoods Programme</td>
<td>Forestry, Fisheries, NRM, 023 217 734, 023 365 380 <a href="mailto:james.whitehead@vsoint.org">james.whitehead@vsoint.org</a>, <a href="mailto:rob.hartnell@vsoint.org">rob.hartnell@vsoint.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)</td>
<td>Fisheries management in upland indigenous communities, Upper Mekong, Sre Ambel River, and Tonle Sap conservation projects, Biodiversity conservation in forest concessions, Landscape management in the northern plains</td>
<td>Conservation, Environment, Fisheries, Forestry, Land, 023 217 205, 023 219 443 <a href="mailto:jwalston@wcs.org">jwalston@wcs.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ken Serey Rotha

Rotha has recently been promoted from the head of the Community Protected Areas Development (CPAD) Office to the Deputy Director at the DNCP, Cambodia Ministry of Environment (MoE) and is also an Advisor to the CBNRM LI.

Rotha has a Master’s Degree in Environmental Management and Development Studies and a graduate diploma in Environmental Management and Development, both of which are from the Australian National University, in Australia. His research was on protected area management and the role of co-management in southwest Cambodia. Rotha also holds an Engineering degree in Water Supply and Irrigation from the Institute of Technology of Cambodia. He has worked for over 10 years with multi-lateral, bi-lateral, international and national non-government organizations. His area of expertise is with community-based initiatives including biodiversity conservation, eco-tourism, environmental planning, forestry and sustainable resource use. Rotha is particularly interested in policy development, increasing participation in resource management and conservation and building national capacity.

Contact information: Sereyrotha@everyday.com.kh

Toby Carson

Toby is an advisor to the CBNRM LI (WWF, IDRC, Oxfam, RECOFTC) which focuses on capacity building, networking, lessons learning and policy support for community based natural resource management.

Toby has a Masters in Environmental Studies focusing on Environmental Planning from York University, Canada and a Bachelor’s Degree in Geography and Environmental Science from the University of Toronto. Toby has worked on natural resource management in Cambodia for the past 10 years. His interests include: interdisciplinary & participatory approaches to environmental planning, biodiversity conservation and resource management, participatory action research, sustainable livelihoods development, participatory monitoring & evaluation, environmental education, conflict resolution, social and organizational change.

Contact information: toby@everyday.com.kh

Kalyan Hou

Kalyan is an Advisor to the CBNRM LI and a Vice Chief of the CPAD Office, Department of Nature Conservation and Protection, MoE.

Kalyan holds a Bachelor of Forestry degree from the Royal University of Agriculture in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. Additionally, she has a graduate diploma’s degree in Environmental Management and Development from the National Centre for Development Studies, at Australian National University (ANU), Australia. Her professional and academic interests include: interdisciplinary and participatory approaches to resource management and conservation; the role of community and other stakeholders in protected areas management; action research, environmental education; networking, group learning and facilitation, teamwork and leadership dynamics.

Contact information: houkalyan@ everyday.com.kh or houkalyan@yahoo.com
Srey Marona

Marona is a Team Leader for the CBNRM LI and National Advisor for Management of Strategy Areas for Integrated Conservation, based at WWF. He has recently been promoted to be the Head of the CPAD Office at the MoE.

Marona received a Bachelor degree in Technology of Food Production at the Institute of Technology of Cambodia in Phnom Penh. Working since 1995 with the MoE, IDRC and WWF, he has attended numerous trainings, conferences, workshops and study tours in various Asian countries and Canada related to community forestry, policy development, community development in rural areas and case study writing. Marona has been involved in the community forestry network in Cambodia since 1997. His main professional interests include using PRA methods to increase understanding of the multiple factors and multiple cross-sectoral issues influencing CBNRM in Cambodia, as well as exploring how principles, criteria and indicators methodology can be used for sustainable CBNRM.

Contact information: marona@everyday.com.kh

Robert B. Oberndorf, J.D.

Robert is currently working as the Legal and Policy Advisor for Community Forestry International's Community Forestry Alliance for Cambodia project. He is also contracted as the Technical Legal Expert for the ADB Commune Council Development Project in Cambodia.

Robert graduated from the University of Colorado with a BA in Communication, and from Case Western Reserve University School of Law with a Juris Doctorate degree. He was admitted to the Ohio Bar as a lawyer in 1993. He practiced environmental, construction, contract and real estate law for a regional water pollution control district in the USA for seven years before moving to Southeast Asia to work as a legal consultant in 2001. He has been living and working in Cambodia since that time, and has worked for ADB, FAO, GTZ, Danida, East/West Management, Community Forestry International, WWF, Village Focus International and others on issues relating to natural resources law, land management and governance reform.

Contact information: oberndorfr@yahoo.com

Nhem Sovanna

Sovanna is an advisor to the Seila Natural Resource and Environment Management Mainstreaming Project focusing on developing strategies. He has been working on CBNRM and decentralization in NREM issues with IDRC/CARERE since 1996.

He has a Masters degree in Agriculture Engineering from Ukraine Republic, USSR. He has attended many short and medium training courses related to natural resource, environment and watershed management, PLUP and community development.

Sovanna was involved in debating to develop the PLUP manual for Cambodia and advocacy for inclusion of indigenous issues into the land law, high land people policy and community forestry policy. He has also involved in regional debate on developing strategies to use CBNRM research to influence policy-maker. His interests include environmental education, conflict resolution, awareness raising, gender and advocacy.

Contact information: sovanna@seila.gov.kh
Sim Bunthoeun

Bunthoeun is a Fisheries Advocacy Officer for Oxfam America East Asia Regional Office and is based in Phnom Penh.

Recently, Bunthoeun studied Research, Media and Advocacy under the Environmental Justice Foundation, UK. Bunthoeun has long been involved in community development in Cambodia from coordinating the Public Management Centre for the United Nations Border Operation Relief from 1989-1993, and many community development projects in Cambodia’s northwest. From 1994-2000, he was the Team Leader for the Tonle Sap Conservation Project of Leucaena Communications Japan, based in Battambang Province. With Oxfam America, Bunthoeun has coordinated the NGO Fisheries Law Working Group at the provincial and national level, and organised trainings on participatory community fisheries management and planning for NGO staff and Fisheries officers. He has been closely involved in the development of the Draft Community Fisheries Sub-Decree and coordinated the consultation workshop at provincial, regional and national levels in 2002.

Contact Information: sbunthoeun@oxfamamerica.org

Thay Somony

Somony is currently the Acting Country Director for International Crane Foundation, and he was recently the Acting Chief of CFDO, Department of Fisheries, MAFF.

Somony has an MBA in Business Management in Food and Agricultural Industries from Royal Agricultural College in Cirencester, England, a M.Sc. in Aquaculture from Deakin University in Warnambool, Australia, and a Bachelor of Fisheries Degree from the RUA, Phnom Penh. He has attended many international trainings, conferences and workshops. Somony has worked at the local and national level to promote fisheries and aquaculture development in Cambodia and has worked closely with relevant Ministries and Departments, NGOs/IOs and local communities. He has been involved in the community fisheries network in Cambodia since 2001. His area of interest is fiscal reform for sustainable fisheries management, institutional change and assessment, fisheries co-management, CBNRM, study and assessment of community livelihoods, aquatic resources evaluation and pro-poor policy implication, and the interface between poverty and aquatic resources.

Contact Information: icfcambodia@online.com.kh; thaysomony@hotmail.com.kh

So Srey Mom

Srey Mom is a Team Leader of the CBNRM LI (WWF, IDRC, Oxfam, RECOFTC) which focuses on capacity building, networking, lessons learning and policy support.

Srey Mom is currently completing a Masters Degree at the Royal University of Agriculture in Cambodia. Her research topic is Fisheries Co-Management in Cambodia’s Coastal Area. She has a Bachelor of Fisheries Science Degree from RUA and has attended training courses on CBNRM, policy analysis and sustainable livelihoods in Canada, Indonesia and the Philippines respectively. Her area of interest and expertise is participatory approaches in NRM & conservation including assessing the impact of policy reform.

Contact information: sreymoms@everyday.com.kh;
Chean Thayuth

Thayuth has worked as a technical assistant and project advisor for the CBNRM Learning Initiative. He used to work with Concern Worldwide and PRASAC/European Union since 1995. Thayuth has worked closely with the MoE, Department of Forestry and Wildlife, NGOs/IOs and local communities, particularly on community development and community forestry. He has been involved in the community forestry network in Cambodia since 1999.

Contact information: thayuth@everyday.com.kh

Ou Sopheary

Sopheary is an Assistant to the Community Forestry Programme at Concern Worldwide Cambodia. Her role is mainly focused on provision of secretarial assistance to the CF/CPA Network Committee in organizing a quarterly network meetings and production of quarterly CF/CPA newsletters.

Sopheary is going to complete her degree in International Relations at Pannasastra University of Cambodia by the end of 2005. Sopheary’s interests include: public relations, international cooperation, social works, education, livelihoods development, environmental protection and management, research and writing.

Contact information: sopheary.ou@concern.net

Khy An

Khy An obtained a Bachelors degree of Fisheries Biology from the RUA, Phnom Penh and Masters degree of Marine Science from the University of Aarhus, Denmark. He has attended training courses and workshops in the fisheries and in social science fields relating to CBNRM or CBCRM both inside the country and abroad.

He has worked as fisheries officer and deputy chief of Koh Kong Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries. He was in charge of Marine and coastal fisheries, coastal aquaculture, mangrove management, coastal management, and as well as in small scale agriculture and farming. Khy An lead the field team for PMMR of IDRC in Peam Krasop Wildlife Sanctuary, Koh Kong. Thereafter he was a Provincial Technical Advisor of the Commune Community Based Natural Resources and Environment Management project (CCB-NREM) in Koh Kong. He assisted the TFT, CCs, Planning Budget Committee (PBC), local community, local authority, and provincial line department to work together on NREM of both coastal and upland areas.

Contact address: an_khy@yahoo.com
Huy Vong Rasmey Dara

Dara works on the Cambodia Community Based Eco-tourism Network (CCBEN) Training Team focusing on networking, capacity building, and newsletter development.

He has a Masters in Development Management and Bachelor’s Degree in Education. Dara has completed a Certificate course in economics and environmental policy from the Fletcher School at Tufts University in the US.

Contact information: hvr_dara@yahoo.com

Amanda Bradley

Amanda is a Project Advisor with the local Cambodian Environmental NGO, Mlup Baitong, as well as a Programme Coordinator for the CFAC. She has been working in Cambodia for the past 6 years. Amanda has been active in establishing CCBEN, and is also a Board member of the local NGO CEPA (Culture and Environment Preservation Association).

Amanda has a Master’s Degree in Law and Diplomacy with concentrations in development communications with a programme in the Philippines, Isang Bagsak. Amanda has been involved in advising a number of CBNRM projects, including community forestry, gender and natural resource management, and community based eco-tourism. Her interests include community-based natural resource management, environmental policy, and environmental education.

Contact information: cfac1@online.com.kh; amandamlup@online.com.kh

Yin Soriya

Yin Soriya has a Master’s Degree in Tourism Development with concentrations in eco-tourism planning from the Royal University of Phnom Penh in collaboration with the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia and the University of Bologna, Italy (UNIBO). Soriya has researched and published several academic articles, namely Potential and Challenges for CBET Development, and Developing Eco-tourism Guidelines for Protected Areas. His interests include tourism planning, CBET development, planning and managing tourism in protected areas and community development.

Contact Information: yinsoriya@yahoo.com
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Min Bunnara

Bunnara is currently the Country Coordinator for the Watershed Management Component of the MRC-GTZ Cooperation Programme, based at the Forestry Administration. He used to be a project officer with the Cambodian German Forestry Project (GTZ-CGFP).

Bunnara graduated from Dresden University of Technology, Germany with a Master’s of Forestry Science, specialising in Forest Economy and Policy. He also studied Business Administration. He is currently a National Trainer for Integrated Watershed Management Planning. He used to coordinate the Community Forestry Working Group at the national level and provides training on Participatory Land Use Planning for Rural Areas in Cambodia.

Contact information: bunnara@mrcmekong.org;

Harald Kirsch

Harald is supporting, coordinating and co-organizing activities on PLUP in Cambodia and the region.

Harald has an M.Sc. in Geography, Hydrology, and Botany and a Ph.D. in Physical Geography from Frankfurt, Germany. Prior to his work in Cambodia Harald worked in Thailand from 1989-2001, on geography, land use mapping, and soil surveys. Harald’s interests are in assessing PLUP training needs and designing training courses, and post-training services for PLUP facilitators in various provinces.

Contact Information: HaraldCM@hotmail.com

Ignas Dümmer

Ignas is currently a Technical NREM Advisor with the Seila Task Force Secretariat (funded by Danida). He used to work with the German Development Service (DED) at Department of Forestry and Wildlife as a facilitator on PLUP and community forestry.

Ignas has qualifications in Environmental studies/GIS and Food Technology in addition to an M.Sc. Tropical and subtropical Agriculture specialising in soil science and water management. Before moving to Cambodia Ignas worked on agro and community forestry in Thailand and used participatory methods for watershed areas in the Netherlands. His area of interest is supporting activities on Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) for rural areas in Cambodia, including stimulating use of GIS in Cambodia, developing a database of community forestry and researching policy and implementation.

Contact Information: ignas@seila.gov.kh
Meas Sothunvathanak

Vathanak is a Technical Official with the CPAD, DNCP, Ministry of Environment. He is also a Team Leader with the Community Forestry Research Project.

Vathanak has a Bachelor Degree in Animal Health and Production Science from the Royal University of Agriculture, Phnom Penh, Cambodia from 1993-1997. His experience and focal interests include: field research and rapid rural appraisal of local community and natural forest resources in Toeuk Phos district, Kampong Chhnang province. Community Forestry activities have included research and mobilization in Sre Ambel and Kampong Seila districts, Koh Kong, province, research on Community Protected Areas in Cambodia and organizing Community Protected Area in Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary in Preah Vihear province.

Contact information: mvathanak@yahoo.com

San Socheatleakhena

Leakhena is a Technical official at the CPAD Office, DNCP, Ministry of Environment.

Leakhena has a BA in Khmer Literature from the Royal University of Phnom Penh and a BA in Management, from the National Institute of Management. She has worked on field surveys regarding Community Protected Areas in Cambodia. She was a counterpart with DANIDA on the National Capacity Development Project.

Contact Information: leakhena_san@yahoo.com

Rebecca Dawn Kinakin

Rebecca is the Coordinator of MLI based at Oxfam America (East Asia Regional Office).

Becky holds a Bachelor’s degree in Geography from Simon Fraser University (Burnaby, Canada) and a Master’s degree in rural livelihood sustainability from the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University (Toronto, Canada). Previous employment experiences include heritage and environmental stewardship planning with First Nation in Western Canada, and a UNDP internship in Cairo, Egypt, assisting in the development of a National Environmental Action Plan. In recent years, Becky has also worked with WWF Cambodia-CBNRM LI on the Case Study and Networking project.

Rebecca’s professional and academic interests include: using a livelihoods approach and participatory action research to gain insight into sources of vulnerability and community-held definitions/experiences of sustainability, poverty, and well-being; and exploring how CBNRM can be made more compatible with community needs, goals, and priorities. She is also interested to explore natural resource use and conflict Cambodia, and by using a political ecology framework, consider how local responses and landscapes are linked to national and global processes.

Contact information: bequee@yahoo.com
Sy Ramony

Ramony is currently a Team Leader of the Community Forestry Research Project (funded by IDRC), within the Department of Nature Protection and Conservation, Ministry of Environment.

Ramony has a Masters of Science in Natural Resource Management, from the Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok, Thailand and a B.Sc. in Agronomy, from RUA in Cambodia. His areas of interest are promoting multi-disciplinary team work on NRM, networking and inter-institutional learning, participatory monitoring and evaluation, and identifying criteria and indicators for community forestry management. He is also interested in conflict management, personal empowerment and leadership.

Contact information:
ramony@online.com.kh

Phan Kamnap

Kamnap is the Deputy Project Leader for Community Forestry Research Project (CFRP) and Deputy Director of Forestry and Wildlife Training Centre, Forestry Administration.

Kamnap received a Master Degree on Natural Resources Management from Asian Institute of Technology in Thailand and Bachelor Degree in Forestry Science from the Royal University of Agriculture in Phnom Penh. He has attended numerous trainings, conferences, workshops and study tours in Sweden, China, Thailand, Vietnam, and Philippine related to community development.

Kamnap worked with the Non-Timber Forest Product Project (NTFP) and Asian Development Bank (ADB) on the Sustainable Forest Management Project. Kamnap’s interests include community forestry policy development, community development in rural areas and case study writing.

Contact Information:
phankamnap@online.com.kh; phankamnap@hotmail.com

Kim Sarin

Sarin is a Field Coordinator for the Community Forestry Research Project supported by IDRC, and he is actively providing technical support to five research sites.

Sarin has a Diploma of Civil Cultures at the Prek Leap Agriculture College. Sarin’s interests including multi-disciplinary team work, participatory action research good governance, networking, principal criteria and indicator for CBFM and personal empowerment and leadership. Sarin has been involved in field based action research for natural resource management for the past 9 years.

Contact Information:
CFRP@online.com.kh
Cheam Mony

Mony is Team Leader of the MOSAIC project of WWF in Cambodia.

Mony holds a Master's Degree in Economic and Management of Agriculture from the High Institute of Economics in Sofia, Bulgaria. Before joining the MOSAIC project he worked for the Forestry Administration on a range of sustainable natural resource management projects. Mony is interested in collecting information on customary use of natural resources by local communities, with emphasis on globally significant wildlife species; mapping of key species distributions and abundances, resource distributions and abundances, mapping of critical threats. Mony is an experienced trainer and has trained provincial level and conservation staff in laws and regulations affecting natural conservation and on community based natural resource management and Participatory Land Use Planning when relevant to biodiversity conservation. Mony encourages discussion between conservation staff and local communities of how legal responsibilities and rights affect biodiversity conservation and the sustainable development of communities.

Contact information: cheammony@everyday.com.kh

Andrew L. Maxwell, Ph.D.

Andy is currently Dry Forest Species project manager at WWF Cambodia, also working as an advisor to the MOSAIC-EP project.

Andy received his Ph.D. in 1999 from Louisiana State University in the USA. His ground-breaking graduate research on environmental change in northeastern Cambodia, based on analysis of lake sediments, earned him the title "Dr. Mud". As the graduate work was winding down, Andy joined the growing WWF Cambodia programme in the northeast, first as an advisor to the Virachey National Park project, then later as advisor to ecoregional, Species and Mosaic projects.

Contact information: amaxwell@online.com.kh

Ouk Lykhim

Lykhim is currently working as the National Socio-Economist (NSE) for the Environmental Management of the Coastal Zone (EMCZ) project-Cambodia. He coordinates the project activities along the 4 coastal provinces including CBCRM, Livelihood Intervention (improved and alternative livelihoods), and Environmental Education in schools. His main area of responsibility is on socio-economic aspects.

Lykhim graduated in 1996 with a Diploma Degree on Pedagogy from Pedagogical Faculty in Phnom Penh; and in 1995 graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Biology from Phnom Penh University.

Previous employment experiences include: technical staff of Department Natural Conservation and Protection, MoE, WWF, NTFP, Environmental Technical Advisory Programme (ETAP)/UNDP, Wetland International (WI), American Friends Services Committee (AFSC), Participatory Management of Mangrove Resources (PMMR)/IDRC, and EMCZ/DANIDA.

Contact Information: Khim@czmcam.com
Ashish John

Ashish is the Research Coordinator of the Natural Resource Management Research Project in Ratanakiri that focuses on CBNRM for indigenous people. The project is a part of the decentralized governance programme of the RGC. He has been/is working on farmer-based experimentation, PLUP, Community Forestry, CBET, communal land titling, etc.

Ashish’s mother is a Mikir/Karbi from the northeast of India and he has a

Kim Nong

Nong is the Deputy Director of the Environmental Education Department and Team Leader of the Participatory Management of Coastal Resources Project, based at the Ministry of Environment.

Nong has Diplomas on Environmental Protection of Coastal Water and Community-Based Development from Bremen, Germany and Antigonish, Canada respectively. He has also attended many training courses, workshops and study tours related to community development, sustainable livelihoods and coastal environmental conservation and protection in Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, China, Germany and Canada.

Before moving into environment and development Nong was a qualified Chemistry Engineer, and studied at the High Technology Institute, Cambodia. Nong is particularly interested in project planning, monitoring and evaluation and ensuring that CBNRM research teams and other project partners have the capacity to conduct high quality research.

Contact information: pmmr@online.com.kh

Ken Sopheap

Sopheap is Sustainable Livelihoods Assistant of the CBNRM Learning Initiative, based at WWF.

Sopheap has a Bachelor of Business Administration from the National University of Management, Cambodia. Her areas of interests include community-based eco-tourism (CBET) and the development of sustainable livelihoods. She focuses on human resources development, knowledge building and sharing, partnerships and networking as well as institutional arrangements and policy support.

Contact information: sopheap.wwfcam@everyday.com.kh
Melissa J. Marschke

Melissa is a Ph.D. Candidate, at the University of Manitoba, Canada.

She has a B.A. Environmental Resource Studies/Comparative Development Studies at Trent University, Canada; M.E.S. in Environmental and Resource Management at Dalhousie University, Canada. Melissa has worked and studied in SE Asia (Thailand, Lao PDR, Cambodia, Vietnam) since 1995 in several capacities: as a student, learning and volunteering with several environmentally-focused organizations; as an advisor to several IDRC-funded community-based management projects; and as a facilitator for case study writing and livelihood issues (RECOFTC, WWF).

Melissa is interested in adaptive co-management and issues surrounding rural livelihoods and notions of sustainability. On a more practical level, she is interested in how communities/households experiment with different livelihood and resource management strategies, and the implications of such experimentation for provincial and national policy makers.

Contact Information: mjmarschkeca@yahoo.com

Doug Henderson

Doug has advised several IDRC projects since 1996 and currently advises the Community Forestry Research Project, a multi-institutional framework for action research on community forestry.

Doug has a Master of Forest Science from Yale University School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, and a Bachelor of Science in forest management from North Carolina State University, USA. His primary interest is institutional change to expand participation in natural resource management.

He has worked in 10 countries in Asia, involved in a diversity of situations and programmes; and for 8 years in Cambodia he has been dedicated to strengthening colleagues, broadening constituency, and reforming institutions for community forestry.

Contact Information: dhenderson@zonnet.nl

Frank van Acker

Frank van Acker works as an independent consultant, mainly in the field of natural resource management and decentralization. He is currently a consultant with GTZ to the DoLA project at the Ministry of Interior.

He holds a Masters in Public Economics and a Masters in Development Studies. He has worked on integrated rural development with local government in Tanzania for four years, land rights and human rights issues for NGO networks in the Philippines and the Central African Region (Congo, Rwanda, Burundi) for six years, and directed the European Union Human Rights Programme in Uganda for four years. As a research fellow with Belgian universities for three years, he also worked on issues of social capital, land rights, and common property (inland fisheries) in Cambodia.

Contact Information: ackersimons2@hotmail.com
Katrin Seidel

Within the framework of technical assistance provided by the German Technical Cooperation GTZ to the Land Management and Administration Project (LMAP) Katrin is supporting the General Secretariat of Council of Land Policy in developing the legal and policy framework for the registration of indigenous land rights in Cambodia.

Katrin is currently completing a Masters Degree in International Agricultural Science at the Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany. She has conducted her fieldwork among indigenous communities in Ratanakiri and Mondulkiri looking at traditional tenure and land management systems.

Katrin has a Bachelor's Degree in Agricultural Science from the Humboldt University in Berlin. She worked on socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects of indigenous communities in Malaysia and Indonesia. Katrin is specifically interested in questions regarding common property resources, institutions and institutional change.

Contact information: katrin-seidel@camnet.com.kh

Steph Cox

Steph supports a relationship-based approach to both development and conservation and is experienced in facilitating creative workshops and drama training. Steph has worked in the region for five years, and has recently moved to Cambodia from Vietnam.

Contact information: stephjcox@yahoo.co.uk

Erika von Kaschke

Erika is currently working as an independent communications consultant. She specializes in desktop publishing, journalism and creative writing.

Erika studied Language Practice at the University of Technology, Cape Town, South Africa. After her graduation in 1995, she worked for various printing houses, and the community press. She received recognition as one of the top ten journalists of small town papers in South Africa. The newspaper she worked for has won the prize for best motoring supplement, best frontpage and best small newspaper, the last two years.

After her arrival in Cambodia in July 2004, she has worked for CBNRM-LI.

Contact information: erika@everyday.com.kh
Goal and Objectives of the CBNRM Learning Initiative:

The overall goal of the Learning Initiative is to analyze and improve CBNRM as an integral component of the poverty alleviation, sustainable livelihoods and resource management, conservation, and decentralization policies and strategies of the Royal Government of Cambodia.

- Human Resources Development
- Knowledge Building and Sharing
- Partnerships and Networking
- Institutional Arrangements and Policy Support

CBNRM Learning Institute
38, Street 9, Tonle Bassac
P.O. Box 2509, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Tel: (855 23) 224 171
cbnrmli@everyday.com.kh
Email: marona@everyday.com.kh
toby@everyday.com.kh
Sereyrotha@everyday.com.kh
houkalyan@everyday.com.kh
sreymoms@everyday.com.kh
Sopheap.wwfcam@everyday.com.kh