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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
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
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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 Sreyom, 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
experiences of CF & community based natural resource management (CBNRM) practice in Cambodia.

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.

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

---

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)
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.\(^\text{10}\)

---

\(^\text{10}\) 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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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 km$^2$ 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.
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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.
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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 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". (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.

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).
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.

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.
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.
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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

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

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

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

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 CFAs 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of CBNRM Networks in Cambodia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Forestry Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kg Chomphu, Pursat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor NRM Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Forestry Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Fisheries Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries Law Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Law Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Eco-Tourism Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Fig 1.12)
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,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community Managed Area</th>
<th># of Community Managed Areas</th>
<th># of Villages</th>
<th># of Families Households</th>
<th>Size of Community Managed Area (ha)</th>
<th>Source of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Fisheries</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>302,705</td>
<td>227,785 ha</td>
<td>Cambodian Development Resources Institute (CDRI): 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO): 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Protected Areas</td>
<td>69 CPAs</td>
<td>167 villages</td>
<td>18,121 families</td>
<td>56,817 ha</td>
<td>Community Protected Area Development Office, DNCP/MoE: 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Land Use Planning</td>
<td>20 Communes (Ratanakiri)</td>
<td>96 villages</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Ashish John, PLG: 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Available data on Community Managed Areas in Cambodia

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.
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.
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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
conceptual framework below and chapter 17 for more details).

![Governance Framework](image)

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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Chapter 3

Overview of the policy and legal framework related to CBNRM

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.

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 Law⁵. 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

---

6 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**

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\(^{10}\):

---

\(^{1}\) Constitution, Chapters 7-11  
\(^{9}\) 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\(^\text{12}\). 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)**

- **STATE PROPERTY**
  - **STATE PUBLIC PROPERTY** (Government cannot sell)
    - Natural lands & waterways
    - Protected areas
    - Permanent forest reserve
    - Administrative buildings
    - Public roads & paths
    - Railway stations / airports
  - **STATE PRIVATE PROPERTY** (Government can sell)
    - Excess or idle land
    - Land concessions

**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. 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. 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

---

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.

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.
Overview of the policy and legal framework related to CBNRM

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:  

Community Forestry Sub-Decree (2003)

This sub-decree, specifically authorized by the Forestry Law, outlines the general rules and procedures for community forestry within Cambodia. Detailed procedures and requirements necessary for implementation will be laid out in the guideline Prakas that are being drafted at the moment. It is expected that the guideline Prakas will be enacted by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in 2005.
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 legislation of Cambodia.
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
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

---

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.
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governance system. The programme focused particularly on decentralized governance, and was aimed at poverty reduction. In its first phase it was supported by the CARERE Project, under the auspices of UNDP.

The Seila Programme builds the capacity at national, sub-national and grass roots levels 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.

---

3 CARERE- Cambodian Area Regeneration and Rehabilitation Project.
4 After the historic elections of February 2002 elected Commune/Sangkat Councils were established as local governance bodies.
5 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor governance</th>
<th>Insufficient respect for local community rights</th>
<th>Poor local consultation for NR use</th>
<th>Communities lose their land and forest</th>
<th>The existing land law does not include provision of land title to communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient law enforcement</td>
<td>Barriers to participation by communities</td>
<td>Poor communications among development agencies</td>
<td>Land use conflict</td>
<td>Uncontrolled logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to information by local communities</td>
<td>Local communities receive conflicting information</td>
<td>Limited studies on traditional conflict resolution systems</td>
<td>- Outsiders enforce their ideas on local communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.

Figure 3. NREM Mainstreaming and Existing Governance Structures

---

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</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collect rattan vines growing in rice fields, and to make them into mats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting and using the vines is an alternative to burning them and helps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cope with problem of dependent rain fed rice cultivated in the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group are currently searching for a market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing fruit trees, as a means of stopping people from cutting fruit</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees in the forest.</td>
<td></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?

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

- 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.

- 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.

- 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**

- Community representatives need to feel accountable to their constituents.

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

- 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.

- 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:
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 Somony¹, Sim Bunthoeun² and So Srey Mom³

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

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.
⁴ Contributions by Ngin Navirak, programme officer for the Livelihood Study Project of Oxfam Great Britain, and Ly Vuthy, Chief of Community Fisheries Development Office.
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

*Fish: an affordable food source. More than 75% of Cambodian's intake of animal protein is from fish.*
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 daïs “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 population at

1 Feast or Famine? and Cambodia's Essential Fisheries Resource Under Threat
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, overfishing 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 globalization 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.\(^8\)

\(^{5}\) Bruce et al., 2002:54.
\(^{6}\) Degen and Nao, 2000 in Bruce et al., 2002:54
\(^{7}\) 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.

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

---

10 A regional learning newsletter in CBCRM July 2002.
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.

11 Thay, 2002
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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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.
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-

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

The Chief and the Vice Chief of the Organizing Committee are chaired by the representatives from FA and MoE and rotated every six months.

1 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:

![Diagram of the spectrum of co-management arrangements](image)
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.)
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](chart)

*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 (education, quality of schools, etc.)</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 Loam 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 Loam 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.
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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\cambodiacbenn.

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
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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.
<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 made in a participatory way.

*Diagram 1: Steps and procedures in PLUP*
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

  - Implementation since Jan. 03

  - Implementation in Kampot from 10/03 on

- **Kampot Thom:** Training of 20 PLUP Facilitators March 2003
  - Implementation since May Jan. 03

- **Preah Vihear:** Training of 18 PLUP Facilitators January 2004
  - Implementation in CBNRM Project since end of 2003

- **Ratanakiri (incl. Stung Treng):** Training of 25 PLUP Facilitators July 2003
  - Implementation in CBNRM Project since end of 2003

- **Siem Reap:** Training of 18 PLUP Facilitators for MRC-GTZ August 2004

- **Battambang:** Training of PLUP Facilitators for LMAP February 2004

- **Kampot Chhnang (incl. Battambang):** Training of 19 PLUP Facilitators October 2002
  - Implementation since Jan. 03

- **Pursat:** Training of 20 PLUP Facilitators for FFI Cardamom May 2004

- **Kampong Speu:** Training of 18 PLUP Facilitators April + June 2002, second training for 28 facilitators in April 2003
  - Implementation since Sept. 2002

- **Koh Kong:** Training of 25 PLUP Facilitators August 2003
  - Implementation since January 2004

- **Mondulkiri:** Training of 24 PLUP Facilitators December 2002
  - Implementation from June 03 on

- **Kratie:** Training of 20 PLUP Facilitators June 2002
  - Implementation September - November 02
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.
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.

- 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.

CONCLUSION- THE WAY FORWARD

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.

Develop unified policy

Currently there are different approaches working towards biodiversity conservation and improving local livelihoods. It appears that different organizations and government departments are implementing CPA management in their own way. At this stage the ministry is trying to bring together all the approaches currently used in practice, to develop a unified policy.

Develop strategic plan

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.
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 2: Community Protected Areas In Cambodia
### Summary Table of Community Protected Areas Development

<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><strong>National Park</strong></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 Soramarith-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><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3348</td>
<td>9,628,775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife Sanctuary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beoun 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><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>31,187,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protected Landscape</strong></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><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Purpose Use</strong></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><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7212</td>
<td>12,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ramsar Site</strong></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><strong>Total</strong></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>

*Annex 3: Summary Table of Community Protected Areas Development
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**Glossary**

**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.”
**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 Fisheries NRM</td>
<td>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 Fisheries NRM</td>
<td>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@czmcam.com">coastal@czmcam.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>Activities</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Contact Information</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 • Environmental Awareness • 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>Forestry</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>Forestry</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>Fisheries</td>
<td>063 963 525, 063 963 462 <a href="mailto:pte@online.com.kh">pte@online.com.kh</a> <a href="mailto:faofor@online.com.kh">faofor@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</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>
<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>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Danish International Development Agency (Danida) | ▪ Decentralization with focus on NREM at commune level  
▪ Land management  
▪ Civil societies and local NGO's  
▪ Pro-Poor Market | NRM                      | 023 987 629, 023 211 484 danida@online.com.kh |
| Department for International Development (DFID) | ▪ Rural Livelihoods  
▪ Decentralization with focus on NREM  
▪ Land management  
▪ Civil societies and local NGO's | NRM                      | 023 430 240 c-price@dfid.gov.uk       |
| Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) | ▪ Forestry Policy and Planning  
▪ Working Group on NRM Secretariat | Agriculture Forestry NRM | 023 216 566, 023 211 702 www.fao.org   |
| German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)    | ▪ Administrative Reform and Decentralization  
▪ Land Management and Administration Project (LMAP) | Land                     | 023 726 228                           |
| Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) | ▪ Capacity Building for Forestry Sector  
▪ Forestry Training Center (FA/JICA)  
▪ Environmental degradation and forestry management | Forestry Fisheries       | 023 212 142, 023 211 673 jica@online.com.kh  
023 211 695, 015 851 935 www.jica.go.jp |
| Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) | ▪ Decentralization  
▪ Land management | NRM                      | 023 212 259 claes.sida@online.com.kh   |
| United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) | ▪ Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI)  
▪ GEF Small Grants Programme | Environment              | 023 216 167, 023 216 217 douglas.gardner@undp.org  
www.un.org.kh   |
| USAID                                 | ▪ Governance  
▪ Human Rights  | Environment              | 023 213 538, 023 217 310 www.worldbank |
<p>| World Bank                            | ▪ Reconstruction and development | Environment              |                                      |</p>
<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>Community Fisheries Development Office (CFDO) Department of Fisheries</td>
<td>• Research and Development • Legal and Accreditation • Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>023 210 154 <a href="mailto:cfdo@camnet.com.kh">cfdo@camnet.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Forestry Office (CFO) Forestry Administration</td>
<td>• National Community Forestry Programme • Community forestry extension and development</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sokhhengpiny@yahoo.com">sokhhengpiny@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Protected Area Development Office (CPADO) Department of Nature Conservation and Protection, MoE</td>
<td>• Research and Capacity Development • Participatory Protected Area Management • Community Development and Networking • Policy Development</td>
<td>Conservation Environment</td>
<td>023 721 462 <a href="mailto:mvathanak@yahoo.com">mvathanak@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:leakhena_san@yahoo.com">leakhena_san@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUP Focal Point Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction</td>
<td>• Participatory Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Land</td>
<td>012 869 377, 012 873 560 <a href="mailto:plup@online.com.kh">plup@online.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLG-Seila Programme Support-Ratanakiri</td>
<td>• Participatory Land Use Planning • LCRT, IFS, CFAR, AAR • Educational Information • Community Based Eco-Tourism • Formal Research</td>
<td>Forestry PLUP NRM</td>
<td>075 974 058, 075 974 016 <a href="mailto:carererat@camintel.com">carererat@camintel.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seila Task Force Secretariat</td>
<td>• Rural Investment and Local Governance Project • Decentralization</td>
<td>Agriculture, Fisheries Forestry Land, NREM</td>
<td>023 362 175, 023 361 900, 023 723 844 <a href="mailto:scott@sella.gov.kh">scott@sella.gov.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seila/Partnership for Local Governance</td>
<td>• Natural Resources and Environment • Decentralization • Poverty Alleviation • Good Governance</td>
<td>Agriculture Fisheries Forestry Land, NREM</td>
<td>012 812 301, 016 995 501 <a href="mailto:yanara@camnet.com.kh">yanara@camnet.com.kh</a> <a href="mailto:scott@sella.gov.kh">scott@sella.gov.kh</a> <a href="mailto:sovanna@sella.gov.kh">sovanna@sella.gov.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Water Resources Management and Conservation, Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology</td>
<td>• Water Resources Management • Community Based Irrigation</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>012 970 232 <a href="mailto:taraitheng@cttnet.com.khs">taraitheng@cttnet.com.khs</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 <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) - based in Yunnan, China</td>
<td>• Participatory research • Indigenous knowledge • Biodiversity</td>
<td>NRM Conservation Environment</td>
<td>(+86 871) 4162736 <a href="mailto:wangyu@cbic.ac.cn">wangyu@cbic.ac.cn</a> <a href="http://www.cbik.org">www.cbik.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) - based in Indonesia</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> <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) - based in Cambodia</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> <a href="mailto:marona@everyday.com.kh">marona@everyday.com.kh</a> <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 <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) - home office based in Canada and regional office based in Singapore</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> <a href="mailto:bdavy@idrc.ca">bdavy@idrc.ca</a> <a href="http://www.idrc.ca">www.idrc.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) - based in the Philippines</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> <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>Focus Area</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@cbcrmlearning.org">emferrer@cbcrmlearning.org</a>, <a href="mailto:tatadelacruz@cbcrmlearning.org">tatadelacruz@cbcrmlearning.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, Capacity Building Services, 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</td>
<td>012 694 460, 035 940 740 <a href="mailto:012694460@mobilcom.kh">012694460@mobilcom.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, Protected Area Management, Integrated Conservation and Development</td>
<td>Conservation, Environment</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, Livelihood Security</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, Community Protected Area, Education</td>
<td>Conservation, Environment</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, Review of mangrove conservation activities, Review of the protected area system</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:jvcp@bigpond.com.kh">jvcp@bigpond.com.kh</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Projects/Activities</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran World Federation (LWF)</td>
<td>• Integrated Rural Development Project&lt;br&gt;• Water and sanitation&lt;br&gt;• Education</td>
<td>Forestry&lt;br&gt;Fisheries&lt;br&gt;Water&lt;br&gt;023 881 100, 023 883 254&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:rep@lwfcambodia.org.kh">rep@lwfcambodia.org.kh</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:lwf@lwfcambodia.org.kh">lwf@lwfcambodia.org.kh</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Central Committee (MCC)</td>
<td>• Takeo Community Forestry Development Association</td>
<td>Forestry&lt;br&gt;023 215 994, 023 216 387&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:mcc@online.com.kh">mcc@online.com.kh</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam America</td>
<td>• Mekong River Basin Management&lt;br&gt;• Food and Income Security&lt;br&gt;• Community Finance, Trade</td>
<td>Fisheries&lt;br&gt;023 210357&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:info@oxfamamerica.org">info@oxfamamerica.org</a>&lt;br&gt;www.oxfamamerica.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam Community Aid Abroad (OCAA)</td>
<td>• Integrated Community Development Program&lt;br&gt;• Community-Based Fisheries Management</td>
<td>Fisheries&lt;br&gt;023 720 928&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:ocaast@camintel.com">ocaast@camintel.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam GB</td>
<td>• Cambodia Livelihood Study Project&lt;br&gt;• Community Forestry&lt;br&gt;• Community Fisheries&lt;br&gt;• Land</td>
<td>Forestry&lt;br&gt;Fisheries&lt;br&gt;Land&lt;br&gt;023 720 928, 023 720 036&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:mbird@oxfam.org.kh">mbird@oxfam.org.kh</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:kdinravy@oxfam.org.kh">kdinravy@oxfam.org.kh</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO)</td>
<td>• Secure Livelihoods Programme</td>
<td>Forestry&lt;br&gt;Fisheries&lt;br&gt;NRM&lt;br&gt;023 167 734, 023 365 380&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:james.whitehead@vsoint.org">james.whitehead@vsoint.org</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:rob.hartnell@vsoint.org">rob.hartnell@vsoint.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)</td>
<td>• Fisheries management in upland indigenous communities&lt;br&gt;• Upper Mekong, Sre Ambel River, and Tonle Sap conservation projects&lt;br&gt;• Biodiversity conservation in forest concessions&lt;br&gt;• Landscape management in the northern plains</td>
<td>Conservation Environment&lt;br&gt;Fisheries&lt;br&gt;Forestry&lt;br&gt;Land&lt;br&gt;023 217 205, 023 219 443&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:jwalston@wcs.org">jwalston@wcs.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)</td>
<td>• CBNRM Learning Initiative&lt;br&gt;• Management of Strategic Areas for Integrated Conservation (MOSAIC), in Eastern Plains Landscape&lt;br&gt;• Lower Mekong Dry Forest Ecoregion&lt;br&gt;• Sustainable Forest Management</td>
<td>Conservation Environment&lt;br&gt;Fisheries&lt;br&gt;Forestry&lt;br&gt;Land, NRM&lt;br&gt;023 218 034&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:teak.seng@everyday.com.kh">teak.seng@everyday.com.kh</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:amaxwell@online.com.kh">amaxwell@online.com.kh</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:cheammony@everyday.com.kh">cheammony@everyday.com.kh</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:toby@everyday.com.kh">toby@everyday.com.kh</a>&lt;br&gt;www.panda.org</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 Warrnambool, 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 a Bachelor of Forestry Degree from the Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia and has attended numerous trainings, conferences, workshops and study tours related to community development in Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia and Nepal. 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 secretory 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.

Training of Trainer (AI & APPA). His main interests include participatory action research and training on eco-tourism concept and development; environmental education; social and organizational change; newsletter article writing & publication; networking, group learning & facilitation, team work; and community development.

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 CFBAC. 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 is a senior lecturer at the Royal University of Phnom Penh. He has been teaching both English and tourism subjects at the university for four years. He worked as eco-tourism officer for Developing Remote Indigenous Village Education (DRIVE) project for one and half year. He also worked as national eco-tourism consultant for Ratanakiri Provincial Rural Development Committee (PRDC) for 9 months. He helped to make an eco-tourism plan for the province.

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
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 Austria from 1989-2001, on geoecology, 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 Master’s Degree in Veterinary Surgery from Assam Agri University.

He has been working in Ratanakiri for almost seven years and is interested in the myths, realities and practicalities of development activities. People’s response to a changing political, administrative, geographical landscape is a special area of interest.

Contact information: carat@camintel.com; ashishingty@yahoo.com;

**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 has a Bachelor's Degree in Agricultural Science from 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 is currently completing a Masters Degree in International Agricultural Science at the Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany. She is supporting the General Secretariat of the Council of Land Policy in developing the socio-cultural aspects of indigenous legal and policy framework for the communities in Malaysia and registration of indigenous land rights in Indonesia. Katrin is specifically interested in questions regarding common property resources.

Contact information: katrin-seidel@camnet.com.kh

Steph Cox

Steph is an independent consultant who spends her time between the fields of environment and creative arts. She has an MSc in Protected Landscape Management and is particularly interested in the collaborative management of natural resources and the harmonious integration of development and conservation.

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