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Abstract

The case study on an internal dynamic of community forestry in Kampeng Svay village of Pursat province has been documented the economic issues basically an annual income of local community living near the forest through forestry and non-forestry activities, and some social properties. The study critically analyzed an evolution of the attempting to sell community forest land by community to a private cassava processing firm, and examined the level of their satisfactions to the selling effort and dug up the causes leaded to the main problem and implications.

The findings of this study found that the amount of income earned in the year 2002 per household was 3,000,000 Riel, the lowest was 20,000 Riel and the average was 1,055,000 Riel. The shares of income were basically come from of non-forestry is higher than from forestry activities.

The evolution of land selling dynamic was derived from few steps, which carried a consensus among village members leaded to have final agreement to sell the land. However the effort has been stranded at the moment due to several interventions from relevant provincial stakeholder and local authorities. The willingness of selling effort of villagers was considered to be strong at 0.78(score) by calculating Weight Average Index. Four main factors motivating to the selling attempt were because of low household income; lack of knowledge on CF related laws; rumors & unconfident; and inappropriate decision-making.

Based on the findings, some recommendations were given to respond the effort of forestland selling. Hopefully this paper will be applicable not only for Kampeng Svay village but also might be suitable for other community forestry throughout Cambodia in present situation.
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I. Introduction

Pursat has been implemented community forestry activities for many years under technical and finance supports from Concern. Concern in the collaboration with Provincial Forestry Office and Provincial Environment Department is committing to strengthen local forest users including capacity building to VFMCs¹ and other management themes.

This paper aims to document social values of villagers in Kampeng Svay, to explore an annual income and income source of households, and to critically examine the evolution of the selling effort of the community forestland, emphasizes on the problems, causes of the event as its main issue and finally suggests possible recommendations for further improvement.

1.1 Problem Statement

The growth of land and forest concessions have faced almost everywhere in Cambodia where the private sectors have found opportunities to operate their businesses more progressively. Local community has little knowledge and poor access to information especially on policy-related issues on forestry and land. This is due to little intervention of Land Law enforcement.

The village of Kampeng Svay is on the process to attempt to sell forestland to an agribusiness firm called Yos Sam Nang Development Agriculture and Construction Cambodia Co., LTD. The purpose of this company is to be a cassava processing company that hopes to use this village's forestland to be one of operating sites. The village chief and villagers did agreement on the selling. This has remained several hiding to different development organizations and relevant stakeholders. The involvement has become complexities, exposing to the efforts of community forestry strengthening in the place and other CF initiatives at the present.

1.2 Objectives

The overall objective of the study is to assess the household economic of rural community and to examine an internal dynamic of the attempt for forestland selling effort that looking at its problems and causes.

The specific objectives are:

- To understand the household economic benefit of the community people;
- To examine an internal dynamic of the attempt for forestland selling effort with identifying its causes and decision-making mechanism of local community;
- To draw up possible recommendations for improving the event.

1.3 Framework of the Study

As this case study is intended to develop a short and in-dept information paper; therefore, each key variable of respective objective is defined as following:

At the beginning, the study identified the income source and annual income earned by local community and some social values as to get more understanding on their current livelihoods.

¹ Village Community Forestry Management Committee
Then explored an internal evolution of the attempt of forestland selling effort; this will look at how the process had been developed and what are the reasons behind. Further the study tried to find out the causes of the problem and its major elements and the impacts to the forestry development within or outside the study area. Finally, some potential recommendations were given.

1.4 The Design of the Study

**Sampling Size and Method:** Systematic Random Sampling is used to choose the household heads in the village, hence it made more reliable during the data collection. 35 out of the total 103 household heads were taken for the field survey.

**Data Sources and Data collection Methods:** The secondary data was collected such as project documents (map and baseline information), and previous preliminary reports from field staffs. The primary data was collected from the village. PRA tools were used to collect primary data such as questionnaire survey, semi-structure interview, focus group interview, and observation.

**Data Analysis:** For Quantitative Analysis, the Descriptive Statistic was used to calculate percentage, frequency and mean of the income source and annual income of households through SPSS and Microsoft Excel applications. The Analytical Statistic was calculated the decision-making and willingness levels of community on the forestland selling effort through Weight Average Index (WAI). For Qualitative Analysis, the problem analysis was used to identify the causal relationship of forestland selling issue.

2. General Profile of the Study Area and Community

The case study conducted at Kampong Svay village located in Snam Preah commune, Bakan district approximately 7 Kilometers from Pursat town. The village lies near national road No. 5 and rail road from Phnom Penh to Battambang province, about 30 meters from the road at the southwest. The village has a total 103 households with the population of 530 (272 females).

Before 1980 the forest was high density, consisted of big trees. But during 1980-1985 the forest density was reduced considerably as clearing to protect Khmer Rouge. The area is known as the charcoal processing owned by powerful men. The community agreed to make forest protection in 1996; however, it was suffered by fire few times in 1997. The community forest established in early of the year 1997 under financial and technical supports from Concern Worldwide. All 103 households are members of the community forest. It is covering 45 ha of regenerating forest. However the figure is not officially provided by DFW.

The dominated tree species are Shorea *Siamensis* (*Raing*) and Dipterocarpus, spreading more largely as the group, followed by other species like Hypericaceae species (*Lageang*). Observably, the area is little growth or degraded at the north close to the railroad, and well growth condition in the center and the south. The maximum high of tree is about 6 meters with an average 4 meters, and diameter is not less than 10 centimeters. The trees are not much densely excepting *Preach*² species, which is much dominated in the north.

---

² Grass species which is hard stems like young bamboo, grows faster usually 1-2 m height.
The initiation and extension from Concern Cambodia enables them to form Forest Management Committee (VFMC) in 1998 with internal regulation called the statute. VFMC comprises of six members, three out of whom are females—elected by all villagers. The committee is responsible for overall management of the community forest. Since the formation of VFMC, villagers have protected the forest from illegal cutting, forest fire and encroachment for agriculture purposes. Villagers have been enjoying the community forest by collecting NTFPs and grazing for their animals.

3. Socio-economic Characteristics

3.1 Age and Sex of Respondents

During the questionnaire survey, we randomized 35 households in the way to ensure to incorporate both male and female. Female respondent was 60 percent higher than the male. We found the number of the respondent's age 25-36 and 37-44 year old is equally to 31.4 % of the total household, higher than the older ages.

3.2 Education Status

Kampeng Svay village resides near to the national road No 5; there is a higher possibility to the young ages to study at both public and private schools, but adults are mostly under un-education. By comparing to their age groups in Figure 1, majority of respondents are very high (62.9 %) under primary education, while only 17.1 % is under lower secondary school. The Figure depicts that 17.1 % of the total households are illiteracy

3.3 Land Status and Rice Production

Local community has accessed to land provided by government for many years. They have owned plot of land for housing and rice land for cultivation. Each household possesses about 2 hectares of rice land. Figure 2 shows 29 percent of total household obtain 3.5 ha as the highest in the village, whereas another 29 percent has only 0.2-1 ha. However about 9 percent of them is under landless families. With the possession of rice land, the study indicates that 85.7 percent of the total households own the land, and 5.7 percent rent in the land from other persons in the village.

In figure 3, the yield of rice cultivation in the year 2002 has different category based on the size of rice land and soil fertility. 26 percent of the households yielded between 2,625 kg - 5,000kg as the highest amount, followed by 37 percent of them in between 1,250 - 2,500 kg. The production
fell between 450-750 kg - 100-400 kg at 17 and 11 percent of the households respectively. 9 percent of them had no rice land.

![Rice Land Size](image)

**Figure 2. Rice Land Holding**
Source: Field Survey, 2003

![Rice Production Year 2002](image)

**Figure 3. Rice Production Year 2002**
Source: Field Survey, 2003

### 3.4 Household Economic

The villagers traditionally depended on the forest resource for both subsistence and income as supplementing to rice crop. The evolution of forest destruction and suppression in the area over the years has led them to move onward with choices of non-forestry income activities. The study shows that primary occupations are rice cultivation, laboring, handicraft, and government employment. However there are also several secondary occupations such as rice mill, animal raising, worker, small business, vegetable growing and so on. Basically each household has different number of occupation according to time availability, labor and capital to start up business. Figure 4 identifies that among the villagers, 5.7% of them obtain only one occupation, and 65.7% and 28.6% have two and three occupations respectively.

![Number of Occupation Obtained](image)

**Figure 4. Number of Occupations**
Source: Field Survey, 2003

---

3 Broom making, weaving agriculture equipments, and basket making
The annual income of household varies depend on the number of occupation and type. The average of household income for year 2002 was 1,055,000 R. Figure 5 reveals that the higher annual income in the year 2002 is between 2,125,000R - 3,000,000 R (USD537.9-USD759.4), the lowest is between 20,000R - 360,000 R (USD5.06-USD91.1). The average of an annual income per household was 105,4860R (USD 267). Looking at the chart we found that the highest amount of income obtained only 20 % of households follows by 25.7% with the income between 424,000R –700,000 R (USD107.3-USD177.2).

The main shares of income contributed to income year 2002 in the above Figure 5 are presented in Table 1 below. The highest shares of income were animal raising and worker, stand equally at 22.9 % of the total household, follows by rice cultivation (17.1%) and government employment (11.4%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Share</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal raising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable growing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicraft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice mill</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor taxi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2003

To compare the income earned between forestry and non-forestry activities, Figure 6 and 7, show that the income from non-forestry was more substantial than from forestry activities. About 68.6% of household does not benefit (calculating in cash) from the forest products, only 20 % of them benefited in little amount (5,000R-40, 000R) annually. The incomes from forest products were Calamus Salicifolius (Ropak) for weaving, Preach for broom making, mushroom, fuel wood, cassava and so on.

---

Figure 5: Household Income Year 2002
Source: Field Survey, 2003

Table 1 Main Share of Primary Income

---

4 Exchange rate in April 03: USD1=3950Riel
Figure 6. Income from non-Forestry Source  
Source: Field Survey 2003

Figure 7. Income from Forestry Activities  
Source: Field Survey, 2003

Table 2 details all types of forest products collected by villagers as income generating. The products are major or minor household income shares while calculating in cash. The table shows very small number of villager could get income from the products as 68.6 percent of them did not make their income at all rather than using as foods or home materials.

Table 2. Income from forest products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of products</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calamus salicifolius (Ropak)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prek</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mashroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel wood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild cassava</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild vegetable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cogongrass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2003
The income of households are depend largely on non-forestry activities both on-farm and off-farm. Although most villagers have done non-forestry activities, there are still the needs especially the poor to rely more heavily on the forest products. Many households did their day-to-day food requirement and income from the forest like handicrafts especially broom making. More recently, community forest has been restricted to collect more products rather than giving substantial return to the users.

4. Evolution of the Land Selling Effort

4.1 Background of the Firm

Yos Samnang Agriculture Development and Construction is a firm investing for cassava processing in Cambodia, started since 2000. The firm has seven shareholders including China, Germany, Japan, S. Korea, Cambodia and others. The General Manager is Korean; in Cambodia represented Mr. Yos Samnang as manager. The company has office at Phnom Konn Sat, Kampot province as its first cassava plantation area, and a central office in Phnom Penh. The company already made registration from the government of Cambodia holding 99-year land concession; however, relevant documents are still not yet processed in the provinces where its target sites are. At the present, it prepares the investment theme including exploring possible new areas for cassava plantation and area for processing, at the mean time the company is waiting for the financial approval from abroad. Once the budget is approved, the new of plantation sites will soon be targeted in Kampong Chhnang, Pursat and Battambang provinces. In Pursat, five major districts are identified for cassava planting including Kro Kor, SamPao, Kravagn, Veal Veng, and Bakan.

The company seeks to buy 48 ha (12,00m x 400m) of forestland from Kampeng Svay village for processing area. This because of the site is potential for commerce. The firm is expecting to absorb at least 200 workers for their processing work in the factory if there is possibility to run in Kampeng Svay village. Reportedly, the progress of identifying the new target sites including Pursat will be done after Khmer New Year while Yos Samnang will wait for his Korean counterpart in Korea for deciding fund investment.

4.2 Location of the Target Selling Site and Contact Person

The proposed land buying for Kampeng Svay is located in the north part of the whole forest land; next to the railway from Phnom Penh to Battambang province and closes to the national road no 5 about 100 meters to the north. The land is about 40 ha (not officially). The area of forest is considered as unfertile soil, people called degraded forestland with red and compact soil condition, which is no longer a good soil for tree regeneration and planting. The target area is dominated with Shorea Siamensis (Raing) and Shorea Obtusa (Phcheuk) with less than 15-
centimeter diameters. Normally tree species grow in clusters. There is also *Prech*, grows most everywhere with height up to 2 meters, which disturbs other tree species to grow.

Ghnem Phirun, a representative of the company in Pursat. He is a contact person for overall arrangement including identifying the target site, negotiating the village chief on the selling request, and so on. He lives in the village next to Kampeng Svay.

4.3 The Progress of Selling Effort and Intervention

Initially, in the mid of January 2003, Ghnem Phirun had an informal discussion with the village chief on any possibility to buy forestland for industrial purpose, explaining the purposes of the firm and possible benefit of employment and offered price. The price of land is US$1,300 per ha, and the firm has planed to employ the workers from this village as permanent workers for the factory. S. Vann, 2003⁵ has clearly reported that the discussion also clarified that though the villager will not sell the land, the company will seek approval from the higher government level— from the senior government ministry or prime minister, so that the villagers will not be benefited from the land at all. Vann also clarified that if the villagers sell this land, all are benefited including the current CF members and the resigned members.

Following, a meeting was held in the village (no clear date) among the villagers. All household heads were at the meeting. It was discussed on the proposal of land selling, and sought the agreement on the proposal. In responding, through face-to-face interview we found that all villagers did agree with the selling and raised up all of their hands to adopt the approval during the meeting.

Many days after the agreement, two VFMCs including leader and vice-leader did check list through home-to-home to meet every household’s head and finding out the agreeing by thump print on the paper to support the decision of land selling. The study found that all villagers' thump prints were made without external factors. Since then, there has not been any sign to see the further progress of the effort. The thumb print paper is still in the villager leader.

As the information was broken up, a mass meeting was conducted in the village with participation of Provincial Environment Department, and Provincial Land Management, local authorities (village and commune chiefs), VFMCs members, VFMc central committee members, and 85 villagers were met. The meeting started with Concern staff briefly explained the important of CF for rural poverty reduction, and the deputy director of provincial forest office explained the importance of community forestry, the right and responsibilities of villagers under forestry law (Draft) and CF sub-decree. Deputy of provincial land management highlighted the law and user right and gave emphasis that the villagers have no right to sell their community forest without approval from the government. Some questions were raised by villagers like if there will be an approval from the government for the selling what will happen to villagers? And answers were responded at the time. Finally villagers assured that they will not sale the forestland.

---

⁵ S. Vann, 2003: Report on the Progress on CF Kampeng Svay, 18th February 2003-Project Officer in Pursat of Concern Cambodia
After the meeting, the progress of selling was not emerged anymore. From the community, the thumb print paper of agreement—103 families in the village were stranded in the moment as understanding their right and roles in forest management and maybe it will not possible to do so! From the firm site, the study found merely the brief information that the process of developing the approval from government was ongoing; however, the process of making at the provincial level is not done yet until the big boss returns from Korea.

OUN TORK, 33, the village leader claimed that if there will be disagreed by one or two families, the land will not be sold to the firm

4.4 How are the willingness and decision-making of villagers on the selling effort?

The analysis by field survey shows very clear about the villagers' willingness on their self-reference regard the effort. Table 3 indicated that overwhelming respondents tended to express their feeling to sell the land. About 25.7 % of total household said that they had very strong willingness to sell the land, and 45.7 % of them had strong willing to sell land. The data revels only 2.9 % has no willingness to sell. This underlines tendency of selling effort is high. By looking at the index, the highest index score is Strong Willingness (12.8) follows by Very Strongly (9) and Somewhat (5.4) and lastly by No Willingness (0.4); this shows the willingness goes higher. By seeing the Weight Average Index (WAI) at 0.78, therefore, we can assess that the overall willingness level of villagers is strong (0.61-0.80). This means that the level of willingness is higher.

Table 3. Level of willingness for selling effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No willingness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No willingness at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27.6=0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong

Scaling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No willingness at all</th>
<th>No willingness</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-0.20</td>
<td>0.21-0.40</td>
<td>0.41-0.60</td>
<td>0.61-0.80</td>
<td>0.81-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2003
The study identified different perception and motivation on decision-making toward the effort of land selling issue. Depend on the degree of satisfaction and field observation; it is significantly known clearly of the local community's views. Table 4 shows the satisfaction level of the villagers is strongly satisfied and satisfied at 22.9% and 54.3% respectively. About 20% of them are somewhat satisfied. However, only 2.9% is strongly dissatisfied. By looking the index, table shows the highest score is 15.2 for satisfied category, followed by 8 falling to strongly satisfied. The weight average index is 0.78; therefore, it precisely indicates the satisfaction level of entire community on the decision-making for land selling effort is in satisfied manner (0.61-0.80).

Table 4. Level of satisfaction in decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>WAI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.6=0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaling</th>
<th>Strongly dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Strongly satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-0.20</td>
<td>0.21-0.40</td>
<td>0.41-0.60</td>
<td>0.61-0.80</td>
<td>0.81-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2003

4.5 Factors motivating to the selling effort

Many prevalent points have been identified to explain the fact from Table 5 below:

- Employment with the firm
  This point is considered to be a highest attempt of local residents as showing at 60 percent of villagers' answers in Table 5. By direct observation during the interview, most of them seemed to be enthusiasm and welcomed to have a factory. They have believed that the factory could attract more employment for their teens in the village. A couple comparative points are given; firstly the young in the village could find the nearest workplace by not to work at the city, secondly they enable to earn money for their families. As described earlier, an annual average income is 1.054.000 Riel per household, equals to 2887 Riel a day, which is under US$.

Van Thok, 38, VFMC deputy chief said that,
Such degraded forest land does not cultivatable at all—we have small rice land, which could not sufficient for eating, if work as factory workers can earn even UD$ 30 a month that will be supplemented to rice shortage and if factory will be here, is near home and my children can also work

- Wish to sell the degraded land only
  Part of the forestland that wish to sell is considered poor a good soil condition if compare to the other parts of an entire forestland, soil is compact, poor and slow growth of tree and dominates by Preach species that adversely affects to the new growth species. People said, the area was used to grow the trees many times but they were death. Villagers considered the piece of land as degraded land. However, the research team visited there, but did not think as a degraded
Table 9 reveals that about 22.9 percent of them said the land is degraded and should be sold for factory building.

- **Difficulty in protecting illegal encroachment within the degraded forestland**
  
  About 5.7 percent of villagers thought the degraded land adjoins to the national road is easily accessible for illegal tree cutting. The forest is difficult to protect the offenders. Several actions were failed to protect the externals.

- **The forest land will be withdrawn by the state**
  
  Villagers tended to believe the rumors of taking off the land by the state without conditions if the firm does the approval from the national government in such a way that the villager then will deprive the land. As quoted from Mrs Van Thok, 38, VFM deputy chief said, *I am afraid the state takes out that land back ...therefore should sell the land to the any private company.*

Table 5: Factors Motivating in Selling Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Key Factors</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employment with firm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wish to sell degraded land only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Piece of degraded forest is difficult to protect from cutting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land will be taken out by the state</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2003

*Kean Korn, village leader said if the state takes out the land from us how will villagers do, and then we lose the land... if there will be a support from higher government to get the land freely, then how do we complaint?*

As supporting to the motivation explained in Table 5, we could even do the comparative thinking of the villagers' perception between the benefits of selling forestland (piece of the land) and keeping community forest. Table 6 shows different views of perceptions. About 45.7% of total households did not want to keep the degraded forest due to less benefit in the future. The same percentage (17.1%) was considered to be CF gets some benefits and CF gets less benefits but better for next generation.
5. Causal-Relationship Analysis

Based on the field survey, key informant interview plus group observation; it is drawn out key points to address the causal relationship contributing to land selling effort within community. The figure 8 shows four main problems contributing to the progress of land selling effort.

Firstly, there is low household income among local people. As already mentioned above, an average daily income is less than US$ 1 per household both from forestry and non-forestry activities; therefore, it cannot answer to family requirement. From community forest, majority of users can use NTFPs for subsistence rather than economic return especially for periodical or daily foods while the forest is not ready to provide maximum benefit. From non-forestry activities, only some people do small businesses, which cannot get high income, hence, there might be lacking of responsibilities for forest management. The present benefits of local community seem not to have positive sign as comparing to their thoughts that might be plunged to other possible chance.

Secondly, villagers lack of knowledge on laws related to CF. The study found that they lack of understanding in particular to the rights, roles and responsibilities under community forestry management, which is an important issue emerged today. For many instances, they do not know their right to secure their CPR regime under draft forestry law or CFSD— whether the land is belonged legitimately to government or community? Have they right to sell out or exploit forestland for commercial purpose? Whether the government withdraws the land from community regardless any condition? These points cause them to decide without any clear references or considerations toward selling effort. The misunderstanding of the rights on laws induced them to close up their thought and judgment leading to adapt outside influences. Such outstanding questions are the main problems they confront.

Thirdly, perhaps the rumor is also one of the angles to such fact as well. This compliments to the lacking of knowledge on laws above. Do the rumor on the government-approved land concession is feasible that being neglectful of such forestry law or CFSD? Community must understand such things by themselves.
Finally, poor education leaded to poor thinking among community, so then they may not know their rights under CF since the starting points. Thus, it is easy to adapt outside influences and threats and consequently effects to the decision making process.

6. Lessons Learned

This event gives some key learning which can be used to modify not only the existing programme of supporting donor organizations but also might be for broad application of the CF in Cambodia. These are described as below:

- Villagers always seek best alternatives for their livelihood without considering long term impacts
- Unawareness on right and responsibility to individual in the village creates threats to CF.
- Long term awaiting the real economic benefits from community forest develops discouragement for forest management unless the potential non-forestry activities are identified to help them.
- Villagers do not include the value of non-timber forest products which they day-to-day use as household economic

---

Figure 8: Problems of Land Selling Effort

---

Sh. Dangal et al, 2003: The unclear right and responsibility of Village Forest Management Committees: A threat to Community Forestry Programme
7. Implications of Community Forestry Activities

Even now the issue is quite calm down due to actions took by different provincial stakeholders, still there are some difficulties and impacts to the effort of community forestry activities in the village or might even at other places. Several points have been drawn during the study:

1. Feeling of discouragement: the misunderstanding by villagers about their rights on community forest i.e. transferring the land to the third party has uprooted in their feeling some extent. They do not know the forestland is the state own at the first start due to lack of understanding—not differentiate the distinction between their customary use of forestland and the right under the law.

2. The event occurred at the time of processing sub-decree of community forestry at the council of minister. This might impact somehow to its progress.

3. Staffs work in the village might face some annoyances like social mistrust and cooperation atmosphere with villagers hence slow down activities of community and assisted donor.

4. The experience of Kampeng Svay might be a negative effect to the effort of community forestry management in other places.

8. Perceptions and Prospects of Community Forestry

Despite the attempting of villagers to engage forestland selling, the study found an assessment on satisfaction level toward the involvement in community forestry management in present and future. Figure 9 shows that 31% of total households had strongly satisfied of their involvement in CF despite a problem; the figure goes to the highest (60%) who claimed that despite the event occurred, they satisfied to the implementation of CF. However only 6% and 3% of them are somewhat satisfied and dissatisfied respectively to the project. Hence, this is the positive attitude, which recognized that the possible betterment and implementation of CF are still there, and it is given also significant effort of relevant implementers and planners to consider on.

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

The case of Kampeng Svay community forest is probably one of the prevalent problems in the country during the transition of community forestry development nowadays as most of them are not providing maximum economic returns to the users. It is due to the forest was starting from much degraded condition and socio-political situation is little developed toward a smooth ground mechanism.

It is recognized that such event occurred because of difference factors such as poor socio-economic, unawareness of the law, role and responsibility of the users, and poor education
among local people. However, there is now one-step ahead that the intervention from different provincial stakeholders, local authorities and project donor make the issue cooling off to some extent.

However, this is still a hot issue, which must be taken into consideration from today to make sure that the entire problem is solved more effectively. For the future, some efforts should be done to accompany with the development of community forestry not only for Kampeng Svay but also might applicable for all CF throughout the country, these are:

- There would be urgent needs to provide sort of extension on relevant right of local community under community forestry management. This should be taken from the Draft of Forestry Law, Sub-Decree of Community Forestry and the Land Law which would be vital to make them understanding clearly.
- The awareness on right and responsibility of the users must be provided from the starting point of CF establishment process (new CF) and existing CF through trainings and various kinds of information dissemination methods.
- Non-forestry livelihood alternatives should be introduced to the poor to prevent high risks. This based on available resources in the village and possible activities suited to social, biophysical and environment factors.
- All government stakeholders especially the provincial level, for enhancing community forestry activities, there should have a joint decision making process from all tiers including local community to avoid frustration to be complied with relevant government laws.
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