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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Rationale

Participatory land use planning (PLUP) has recently been introduced to Cambodia as a modern tool for sustainable resource management in a rural setting. A number of field experiments have been undertaken at various places, mostly organized by NGOs and some bilateral projects. The experiences gathered so far are, however, still very limited in scope and the methodological framework of PLUP remains largely unknown to most of the staff and specialists involved in land use planning related activities both in the field and on provincial and national levels.

Representatives of the Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DF&W) within the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAFF), the Ministry of Environment (MoE), and several NGOs have engaged in discussions centered around the question of institutional linkages, exchange of experiences, and the formation of a Working Group on PLUP for Community Forestry. The importance of PLUP was furthermore highlighted during an international seminar on PLUP, organized by RECOFTC in April 1999, in which a number of interested and involved people from Cambodia participated.

Recognizing the relevance of the on-going process and the importance of PLUP in the context of sustainable resources management in Cambodia, the Sustainable Management of Resources Project (SMRP) has decided to directly and indirectly support the ongoing process of PLUP in Cambodia in two ways:

- To organize and facilitate, jointly with the Sustainable Forest Management Project (SFMP), a national workshop on PLUP with professional expertise of PLUP/ GIS specialists,
- To support PLUP at 2 to 3 field sites of NGOs and/ or projects for the development of robust mapping and planning techniques,

The present document summarizes the discussions and findings of the national workshop, held in Phnom Penh from September 14th to 15th 1999. The workshop was prepared and guided jointly by:

- The Deputy Director General of the DF&W
• Members of the national working group on Community Forestry,

• A consultant of the Sustainable Forest Management Project (SFMP),

• The GIS unit of the Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DF&W),

• The GIS consultant of the SMRP to the DF&W, and

• An international expert on PLUP (consultant).

The consultant on PLUP was charged with preparing the proceedings of the workshop and function as facilitator and resource persons during the discussions. In addition, he held discussions with representatives from the participating organizations and studied related documents. For this purpose, he spent a total of six days (September 11 to 17) in Cambodia.

The proceedings are organized in two parts: The main report contains a brief introduction to participatory land use planning, based on international experience and guidelines published by FAO and GTZ. This introduction is followed by a brief summary of the present state of affairs in PLUP and related institutional services in Cambodia. The summary is partially based on the presentations made during the workshop, completed by additional information collected by the Consultant prior to the workshop.

The second part of the workshop proceedings contains the workshop materials (agenda, speeches, workgroup results, participant list etc.). The handouts distributed during the workshop are not included in the proceedings, since they were directly distributed to the participants during the workshop.

1.2 Workshop Objectives

The objectives of the workshop were defined by the organizers as follows:

Provision of technical and institutional support to the process of PLUP in Cambodia has been clarified and planned. The support aims at clarifying appropriate procedures, workable and useful instruments, and institutional arrangements including involvement of local communities as well as national and provincial government line departments in participatory land use planning for community based forest management systems.

2. PARTICIPATORY LAND USE PLANNING

2.1 Basic Concepts

2.1.1 Definitions

Participatory land use planning has gained constantly in international recognition as an important tool for reaching sustainable resource management by local communities over the last two decades. Several organizations have been involved in defining the methodological framework for PLUP. Major contribution have come from FAO and GTZ, representing many years of experience in a multitude of projects carried out all over the world. The definitions proposed for PLUP by the two organizations are as follows:

\(\text{(Participatory) Land use planning is the systematic assessment of physical, social and economic}\\ \text{factors in such a way as to encourage and assist land users in selecting options that increase}\\ \text{their productivity, are sustainable and meet the needs of society (FAO 1993).}\)

and

\(\text{Land use planning is an iterative implementation-oriented process, based on dialogue between}\\ \text{all parties involved, aiming at reaching decisions on sustainable forms of land use in rural areas}\\ \text{(GTZ 1995).}\)

2.1.2 Principles

The "Participatory Land Use Planning" approach focuses on the capacities and needs of local land users,
based on the assumption that sustainable resource management can only be achieved if natural resources are managed by the local populations. This basic principle requires a strong bottom-up planning perspective. Land use planning is done both by and for the actual land users with minimal involvement of official or professional land use planning authorities. As a consequence, land use planning focuses on the village or traditional community boundaries. This is in contrast to planning for large “functional” areas such as watersheds or larger administrative units.

Putting local users in the center of interest, calls for the use of simple, low-cost planning techniques to foster active participation and consensus finding among villagers. Involvement of outsiders should be restricted primarily to moderation and facilitation of the planning process rather than to an advisory function.

2.1.3 Objective and Scope of PLUP

The Main Objective of PLUP can thus be defined as to create the framework for sustainable land use, i.e. land use that is socially acceptable, environmentally sound, politically desired and economically viable. This objective is pursued by assisting local stakeholders in planning the use of locally available resources and to strengthen their capacities for managing the resources in a sustainable way. PLUP tries to identify land use options which are acceptable to all stakeholders and satisfy the needs of all parties involved. Local land users must agree with the results of the planning process, as they will have to live with it. LUP resulting in regulations and prohibitions trying to prevent local people from carrying out land use activities which they do for pressing reasons are bound to fail.

Participatory land use planning thus aims at making best use of the available resources, both in the interest of achieving sustainability and finding effective solutions with available funds, staff and capacities. While this process may need an initial support from the outside, it has to become self-supported in the medium to long run in order to become sustainable.

Participatory land use planning comprises a number of tasks, typically carried out in a step-wise approach. The tasks required can be derived from four simple questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>LUP Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the present land use situation?</td>
<td>Assess present needs of local populations in terms of land for different purposes. Assess other factors influencing land use (socioeconomic conditions, demographic trends, farming systems, available extension services, land use claims from the outside, legal framework, etc.) Identify conflicts between competing uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What needs to be changed, what not?</td>
<td>Assess future needs of land for different purposes Evaluate the land’s ability to satisfy the identified needs and the conditions which have to be met. Identify unsustainable land use practices Identify ways to resolve conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can the changes be made and what are the best options?</td>
<td>Seek sustainable land use options Identify and test promising technological innovations Identify service and training requirements Choose those elements that best meet the identified needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How, when and by whom can the changes be implemented?</td>
<td>Document the desired changes and Plan for the implementation of the required measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It becomes obvious that the simple questions behind PLUP translate into a list of tasks which demand in-depth knowledge of (a) the local situation and (b) the factors influencing land use and the land’s ability to satisfy the needs of the local population. Without this knowledge, land use decisions based on the felt needs of the local population risk to be short-sighted, aiming at maximizing profits in the short-term. In order to achieve sustainable resource management, however, a long-term perspective has to be adopted to ensure that the existing natural resource base will be managed carefully so as to avoid overexploitation and will this provide the basis for the livelihoods of future generations.

2.1.4 When is PLUP useful?
A number of conditions must be met in order for PLUP to be useful and feasible:

- There is a perceived need for changes in land use or a need for action to prevent unwanted change.
- The different stakeholders involved must agree on the need for change and must be willing to cooperate in the planning process.
- There must be a clearly expressed political will and the ability to put agreed land use plans into effect.

In other words, there must be a demand for changes in land use and a positive political framework to put agreed land use decisions into action.

Typical examples for situations where a need for PLUP can be perceived are:

- Degradation of the existing resources by overexploitation or other factors
- Lack of land resources due to population growth
- Land use conflicts due to competing claims to the available resources
- Resettlement of population groups
- Land allocation or re-allocation

2.1.5 Planning Levels

PLUP, as a bottom-up planning approach focuses on planning at local levels. Nevertheless, important activities related to land use planning have to be carried out at higher levels, ranging from districts to provincial and national levels. The main functions and tasks of higher level activities are to create the framework conditions in which local-level PLUP can function effectively. Without such an enabling framework (containing among others policy and regulatory guidelines, definition of roles and responsibilities, provision of resources, training etc.), successful PLUP will be impossible to achieve, since local-level decisions will be under the permanent threat of being challenged by outside interests and higher level interventions, and will lack the resources to be carried out effectively. An overview on typical land use planning functions associated with different planning levels is given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Level</th>
<th>Who is involved?</th>
<th>Planning Functions and Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National Assembly, Prime Minister, Ministries in charge of NRM (Agr. Forestry, Fisheries, Environment, Mining, etc.), Finance, Tourism, Industries etc.</td>
<td>• Define national goals and priorities (land use policy), expressed in national policies and guidelines&lt;br&gt;• Balance competing interests of different sectors of the economy, mitigate conflicts at lower levels&lt;br&gt;• Define authorities and mandates of sectoral and regional agencies&lt;br&gt;• Define the roles and responsibilities of government agencies, local communities, commercial bodies, private households etc.&lt;br&gt;• Coordinate activities of sectoral and regional government institutions&lt;br&gt;• Allocate resources to different sectors and regions&lt;br&gt;• Set up and enforce legislation and regulatory framework for land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional, Provincial</td>
<td>Regional equivalents to national organizations</td>
<td>• Co-ordinate national strategies at regional levels&lt;br&gt;• Set regional priorities&lt;br&gt;• Train and support staff at local levels&lt;br&gt;• Siting of large scale projects&lt;br&gt;• Allocate resources to the local levels&lt;br&gt;• Provide feedback to national level on planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 Steps in Participatory Land Use Planning

PLUP aims at achieving sustainable resource management by the local users. This implies that the planners have gained an understanding of all relevant factors governing the land use process. This requires among others an assessment of land capability, farming systems, socioeconomic conditions, land use options, institutional capacities and training needs. If PLUP is to be carried out thoroughly, these factors have to be analyzed and fed into a participatory planning process to facilitate and guide the decision making process. To gain the required knowledge, thorough preparation and compilation of background materials and data is essential.

However, local conditions vary considerably, and so do the associated land use planning processes. The application of a blueprint methodology for participatory land use planning should be avoided, but a series of steps has been found useful as a guide or checklist to use during the practical implementation of a participatory land use planning process:

- Preparation
- Organization and preparation of concerned parties
- Data Collection and Mapping
- Preparation of the Land Use Plan
- Implementation of the Land Use Plan

The main tasks to be carried out during the different steps in PLUP are as follows:

#### 2.2.1 Step 1: Preparation

- Determine the planning area (village, administrative unit, watershed).
- Identify and analyze relevant regulations, mandates, guidelines and procedures.
- Identify stakeholders and their specific interests (target group analysis).
- Identify and analyze available know-how, institutional capacities, suitable improved land use options, technological innovations and service offers.

- Determine contents of land use plan and related documents (types and names of land use units, criteria for identifying land classes, mapping methods, scales and tools, map layout and presentation, table of contents for report, etc.)

- Procure equipment, tools, maps, data, documents.

- Prepare general mapping, data collection instructions, forms and procedures.

- Select and train planning teams.

- Organize the planning work (assign responsibilities for tasks to be carried out, draw up work schedule, secure financial and logistical support)

- Inform concerned parties about envisaged planning activities

2.2.2 Step 2: Organization and Preparation of Concerned Parties

- Set up village committees, steering committees, LUP work group, planning task force, etc., as required.

- Inform/Agree on planning procedure (planning activities to be carried out, involved organizations, their respective mandates and responsibilities, financing regulations etc.). Special attention needs to be paid to conflict resolution.

- Inform/agree on contents of land use plan and associated documents.

- Agree on procedures for plan approval, implementation and follow-up.

- Train committee, work group and task force members according to their tasks.

2.2.3 Step 3: Data Collection and Mapping

- Identify available information, local knowledge and official data.

- Carry out joint problem analysis (strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and problems).

- Carry out base line surveys, PRA, farming systems analysis.

- Demarcate boundary of planning area.

- Prepare current land use maps.

- Compile, analyze and organize collected information.

- Agree with land users and stakeholders on improved land use options, area distribution of proposed changes.

- Prepare future land use maps, land allocation map, map of planned interventions

2.2.4 Step 4: Preparation of the Land Use Plan

- Finalize maps, prepare land use tables, ownership records

- Describe base line situation and objectives of the planned measures

- Enumerate costs and benefits of the interventions
• List parties involved in implementation, their respective contributions and responsibilities

• Specify principles and regulations for new land use practices, if proposed

• Consider and incorporate implementation capacities of involved organizations and elaborate implementation plan accordingly.

• Present Land Use Plan to Stakeholders for information and approval

• Revise Land Use Plan, if required

• Submit agreed Land Use Plan to relevant authorities for approval

2.2.5 Step 5: Implementation of Land Use Plan

• Implement land use changes, introduce new land use practices, technology innovations, services on a small scale.

• Monitor and evaluate successful implementation

• Update and revise land use plan based on M&E results

• Implement successful activities at a large scale

2.3 Instruments and Tools for PLUP

As the name suggests, participatory land use planning combines tools for target group participation with land use planning tools.

2.3.1 Participatory Tools

Participatory methods play an important role in PLUP, since they are the vehicle to gain access to the local knowledge and provide the tool kit which allows to communicate efficiently with the local stakeholders and to document the results. Even a brief description of the available methods and tools would, however, exceed the scope of this documents. A number of commonly applied tools and their objectives are listed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory situation analysis</td>
<td>To understand the needs and the potential of the target group (what are the problems and the potentials of the target groups; who are the actors in the local decision-making process; what are the training needs; what are appropriate methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Meetings and Workshops</td>
<td>To come to a common understanding and agreement on the situation in general, the views of different groups, the perceived needs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Questionnaires, Interviews with stakeholders</td>
<td>To identified their needs and perceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Mapping and Diagramming</td>
<td>To show and represent important aspects, like labor distribution, agricultural calendars, mobility etc.; to visualize changes and trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Analysis</td>
<td>To assess women’s role in the local economy and the targeted activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.2 Mapping Tools and Techniques

In addition to the use of participatory tools, PLUP typically requires the application of a number of mapping techniques, in order to create a reliable representation of the land use and land tenure situation, to localize and quantify land use changes and to provide a reference document for later and/or official use. The tools and techniques to be applied can range from simple sketch maps drawn in the sand to GIS-based land use maps combining different information layers including remote sensing data.

The identification of a locally adapted mapping methodology and appropriate tools is an important task, since present and future land use and land tenure maps generally play a key role in the PLUP process and serve as reference documents for local users and government agencies. The selected mapping methods therefore have to produce map documents which are both understandable for local users and satisfy the needs of government agencies. In general, local users will perceive their land and resources differently from outsiders. They use local names for land use systems or soil types that may have no equivalent in the "scientific" classification applied by government agencies. Defining a viable compromise for identifying and mapping the available resources is therefore a very important task during the PLUP process. The tools available for this purpose are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village survey, sketch mapping, topographic model</td>
<td>to discuss community boundaries, land use situation, relative extent and position of land use areas, planned land use changes and other interventions with local users and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transect Walks and Diagrams</td>
<td>to view and discuss ideas on land use, create a common understanding between local land users, planners and e.g. extension workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Maps, Measurement of Land Units</td>
<td>to identify the location, quantity and distribution of land resources; to facilitate discussions and document decisions on land use, to provide a reliable basis for planning of implementation measures, to serve as reference for future activities and legal documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographic maps, (enlarged) aerial photographs, satellite image maps, GPS measurements, GIS</td>
<td>to create a base map and reference system which allows to indicate the precise location of the planning unit and its boundaries; to determine the area of different land units, to verify claims to land and resources from the outside; to facilitate the preparation of land use maps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Conditions for Successful PLUP

Participatory land use planning techniques can be used to moderate land conflicts and to create a common basis for future land use.

Village meetings may provide the first opportunity for the different parties to listen to each other and to understand the respective problems. This is the first step towards common planning. The success of these meetings depends, however, on the way they are conducted. The use of a moderator/facilitator and visualization techniques may avoid misunderstanding and dominance by a single party. The role of the outsiders has to change, too. Whether expatriates or national counterparts - both have to change from instructors giving orders, towards acting as facilitators - a learning process which requires a substantial change in attitude.
Land use planning tools, have to be combined with participatory techniques. The use of GIS technology, can permit the combination of "scientific" and "indigenous" knowledge such as overlaying a soil classification derived from local knowledge with the scientific classification for the same area.

Very often projects have just started to initiate concepts of participatory planning. To achieve real participation, projects must take the time to build confidence and strengthen the capacities of local users. Participatory methods may not be supported because government does not support them, since they contradict the top-down planning processes in place. In addition, there is a pressure to achieve physical targets. Participatory planning can only be carried out with a significant shift in many areas including role reversal and this will take a long time. It should be made clear to all decision-makers that participatory planning is a long process and not a blueprint that can be implemented anywhere and anytime. The following 10 points represent the most important conditions for successful participatory land use planning:

1. PLUP is a bottom-up planning approach, where local land use plans are inserted into a regional or national planning framework. This framework has to be flexible and adaptable to the diversity of local conditions and needs. For the preparation of higher level plans, information derived from local plans can be aggregated and generalized, but not the other way around.

2. Planning has to be based on a dialogue between all stakeholders and a balance of interests. Local users, concerned Government agencies, NGOs and private organizations all have to be involved in the planning process.

3. Planning decisions have to be based on a real consensus and common understanding between the parties involved. Decisions have to be respected by all.

4. Mandates and responsibilities of the involved parties have to be clearly defined and respected by all.

5. The planning process and the reaching of planning decisions has to be transparent to all parties involved. The planning results need to be documented in an easily understandable, reliable and reproducible fashion. Equitable access to information for all concerned parties (especially ethnic minorities) has to be ensured, e.g. through the use of local languages.

6. LUP is an iterative process, not a one-time exercise, where planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation follow one another and plans are updated and revised regularly.

7. Land use planning should precede land allocation decisions and implementation activities and not vice versa;

8. PLUP requires an integrated planning approach, where all kinds of land within the planning area are considered and interdisciplinary planning teams cooperate. Planning procedures should, however, be kept as simple as possible to allow implementation by local level staff.

9. Training and capacity strengthening of local user groups, government agents and other organizations is required to enable all concerned parties to carry out their tasks.

10. Local users have to be qualified to improve their living conditions through improved land use practices.

3. CURRENT SITUATION IN CAMBODIA

3.1 Field Experiences with PLUP

During the workshop, several organizations and projects presented their experiences with participatory land use planning. The selected experiences had been selected to represent the most advanced levels of PLUP application in Cambodia to date. Most projects used one or several participatory tools and techniques to determine the needs of local populations or to discuss implementation measures as part of their programs. However, none of the project practiced a land use planning approach, which requires a series of steps from land resource inventory to the preparation of a land use plan based on an agreement reached with the stakeholders involved.

In general, the presented experiences were restricted to partial land areas within a community (e.g. a
community forest area) or focused on specific resource management issue and/or land tenure aspect. The discussions following the presentations showed clearly, that the current status of PLUP application and the knowledge of the methodological framework and the set of techniques and tools associated with PLUP is still quite rudimentary in Cambodia. This applies to both the national and the international staff present in the workshop and to the field experience so far acquired in the country. It is noteworthy, however, that many of the participants recognized the need to introduce a more integrated planning approach and to take a larger view at the resource situation in the local communities they work with.

3.2 Available Services

Contrary to the level of practical field experience, the available mapping resources and services for land use mapping and local level resource planning are quite advanced within the Department of Forestry and Wildlife GIS unit. This unit has extensive experience in preparing maps on forest and land resources at national and provincial levels. Its staff has access to and experience with the technologies required to prepare base maps from aerial photography and satellite image data and can provide local-level users with technical advise and direct input for their mapping needs.

Given the poor quality of the available topographic maps, and the recent status of aerial photography available for the whole country, enlarged and geometrically corrected aerial photo maps would provide an ideal base map for local-level resource inventories, land use planning and land allocation activities. Since the services are already available, organizations involved in PLUP can have access to these base maps at relatively low cost and in a short period of time.

4. FINDINGS OF THE WORKSHOP

4.1 Main issues

During the workshop, participants identified and agreed upon the main issues and problems related to land use planning at different levels. It was found that the issues and problems identified could be grouped according to the following areas:

- Institutional
- Legal
- Resources (funding, staff, qualifications)
- Attitude, skills, awareness
- Technical

The institutional issues identified can be summarized as a lack of coordination and communication, both within (some) line ministries and between the different levels. There is insufficient delegation of authority to lower hierarchical levels and a lack of confidence in lower level staff’s abilities to prepare or take decisions. In the absence of a legal and regulatory framework, the lines of authority in natural resources management, land use planning and land allocation remain vague. The roles and responsibilities of the different government agencies at different levels are inadequately defined, causing conflicts and competing efforts in some areas and a power and decision making vacuum in others.

On the legal side, the incomplete legal framework and more specifically the lack of legal regulations pertaining to customary land tenure and land use rights were cited as important issues. Some experiences were cited where projects have completed important steps in documenting indigenous land tenure systems or where provincial authorities have granted land and land use rights to local communities. These unofficial land titles are, however, not recognized by the land titling department. On the other hand, concessions for timber extraction are being granted on national level and imposed on local communities living in or close to forest lands. These concessions are granted without prior consultation of the local communities and government authorities, so that conflicts between legitimate local user interests and concessionaires are common place.
Another set of issues is related to insufficient funding levels and a shortage of qualified staff to provide technical support. Most field activities are initiated by NGOs or donors, who provide the majority of the financial and technical resources. While individual projects may certainly have a positive local impact, the isolated, donor-driven character of most activities means that programs are not based on national or regional priorities and are not part of a coordinated effort to make best use of the scarce resources. In the absence of defined priorities and donor coordination, duplication of efforts is unavoidable and no synergetic effects between different project can be expected. The workshop itself, however, is proof that a number of government agencies, NGOs and bilateral projects are aware of the situation and are undertaking serious efforts to improve the situation.

The lack of experience with and awareness regarding PLUP and other participatory resource management approaches among all parties involved, can lead to resistance towards these unknown approaches, where a change of behavior is required and the results cannot be controlled by the outsiders. This resistance may be found on all levels and can become a major obstacle for the successful introduction of PLUP, if it isn’t addressed carefully and systematically.

With regard to technical aspects, the main issues identified are (a) the lack of access to detailed resource information including reliable socioeconomic data and indigenous knowledge, (b) insufficient knowledge about appropriate techniques to assess and map the situation accurately and efficiently, with active participation of villagers.

A complete list of the identified issues is included in the Annexes.

4.2 Need for Action

During the discussions on the identified issues and problem areas, the workshop participants agreed on the need to restrict further discussions to issues within reach of the participants and the mandate of their organizations. In addition, some issues appeared to be the effects of problems in other areas or on other levels and would therefore not require action by themselves. The issues and problems belonging into these two categories were thus isolated and eliminated from further discussions (see Annexes).

In a final step, the remaining issues where analyzed and discussed in two workgroups to identify the priority actions that should be undertaken by the participants and their organizations.

The formulated priority actions can be summarized as follows:

- Develop a methodological framework for PLUP in Cambodia through a number of steps: (1) analyze the needs, strengths and weaknesses of currently applied approaches; (2) provide information about PLUP methodologies applied in neighboring countries; (3) identify and document best practices; (4) adapt and test promising methodologies under local conditions.
- Develop a training system for PLUP, with elaboration of training manuals, training of trainers, study tours and monitoring of local experiences.
- Start an information, dissemination and documentation campaign on PLUP, both on national level and in the provinces, with workshops at provincial level and dissemination of the results to higher levels.
- Improve the focus and coordination of efforts by creating PLUP working groups at provincial levels and by maintaining a communication network between the working group members.
- Investigate possibilities to combine and coordinate local level technical support efforts in the fields of community forestry, agricultural extension, veterinary services, community development etc.
- Provide technical support to introduce and disseminate improved mapping techniques, by (a) elaborating an easily understandable technical documentation on available mapping options for boundary demarcation, site mapping, and mapping of indigenous land use and tenure systems using different techniques; (b) assessing training needs, (c) offering training courses on the required techniques.
The detailed list activities, together with the respective responsible organizations and funding sources, as formulated by the participants, is given in the Annexes.

4.3 Comments by the Consultant

The main shortcoming in introducing PLUP in Cambodia at the present date is the lack of practical experience on all levels. Neither government agencies, NGOs and donor-funded projects have gathered enough local experience to be able to carry out sound participatory land use planning programs without external support. So far, no project with a clear focus on PLUP has been put in place and most national and international specialist working in the field have little experience in the subject.

It is all the more remarkable that this short workshop managed to produce a clear picture of the issues related to the introduction of PLUP approaches in Cambodia, and that the participants have been able to identify and agree upon a well-defined set of priority actions to be undertaken to improve the situation. The need to introduce PLUP in order to promote sustainable resource management in Cambodia is clearly felt and now the stage for the process to start has been set.

The Consultant would like to congratulate the workshop participants for their clear vision and systematic approach to the issues identified. The summary of priority actions shows a cohesive and comprehensive set of activities, which, if planned and implemented carefully, should provide a fertile ground for the successful practice of PLUP.

Since PLUP has been practiced for many years in other countries and a fair number of programs with sound PLUP approaches exist in the Mekong region, an overview on existing methodologies and lessons learned in the region could be gained quickly. Government official and local staff can be taken on exposure trips to projects in neighboring countries, field workshops on PLUP techniques can be organized locally with support from regional trainers, and conceptual and policy-oriented support can be provided by regional experts. Assuming that the experience presented during the workshop corresponds with the best practices in PLUP currently applied in Cambodia, priority should be given to the study of experiences and lessons in the region, before focusing on improve and completing the currently practiced PLUP approaches in Cambodia.

By adapting methodologies developed in other projects to the local conditions and carrying out field-tests in a number of communities, the development of a methodological framework for PLUP, answering to the needs of Cambodia society, can be vastly accelerated. At the same time, the lessons learned in the region should be used to start an information, dissemination and documentation campaign on PLUP, both on national level and local levels.

Training materials on PLUP techniques developed elsewhere can be revised and translated to suit the local conditions in order to start the process of training staff at all levels in the concepts and tools related to PLUP. In order to implement PLUP successfully, staff has to have completed initial PLUP training and therefore the development of a training program should start as soon as possible. Care has to be taken, though, that under the given conditions in Cambodia, PLUP training activities will not focus too strongly on technical mapping and land use classification techniques, due to the availability of support services from the GIS unit of the DFW. An essential element in PLUP is the use of participatory planning and analysis tools, as has been described earlier. Both technical mapping tools and participatory planning and analysis tools have to be introduced and promoted. Due to the well-advanced level of available services of the former, priority should be given to develop a training program for trainers of the latter.

Urgent additional support is needed to assist the on-going process of formulating the policy and regulatory framework regarding land use planning and natural resources management, in order to ensure that participatory planning approaches can be implemented successfully. The relatively low level of experience currently available in the country could quickly lead to the formulation of policies and guidelines promoting a top-down planning approach with insufficient flexibility for local-level decision-making and consideration of customary land use and tenure systems. Since these issues were not further elaborated during the workshop, the Consultant is lacking the details for a more concrete analysis of this subject but feels that this on-going process should be monitored and assisted very carefully.
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1. WORKSHOP PROGRAM

September 14

8:00  Participant registration
8:15  Opening Ceremony
   Chea Sam Ang, Deputy Director, Department of Forestry and Wildlife
   Hans Helmrich, CTA, Sustainable Management of Resources Project
   Mr. Ith Nody, Undersecretary of State, MAFF
9:15  Break
9:30  Workshop Objective and Program (Dr. Hans Helmrich, CTA of SMRP)
10:00 Participant Introductions
10:30 Introduction to Participatory Land Use Planning (Herbert Christ, PLUP expert)
11:15 Presentation: Practical field experiences on PLUP
   Current Condition and Situation for PLUP initiation in Integrated Food Security Program Kampot
   (GTZ), Cambodia (Mr. Kornelius Schiffer)
12:00 Lunch
14:00 Presentation: Practical field experiences on PLUP (continue)
   PLUP/PLA related activities within CONCERN CF Program (Mr. Pel Piseth)
   Community Forestry Development in the Tonle Sap region (Mr. Prak Marina, FAO-Siem Reap)
   Case-study on Land-Use Planning in Krala village, Poey commune, O Chum district, Ratanakiri
   province (Mr. Chea Phalla, NTFP officer)
15:00 Separation in work groups on PLUP in practice
15:30 break
16:00 Continuation of Workgroups
17:00 end of Day 1

September 15

8:00  Presentation of workgroup results
9:30  Break
10:00 Input Presentation of Services related to PLUP:
   Mapping Options for PLUP (Mr. Christoph Feldkoetter, GIS expert, DFW)
   Land titling techniques and procedures (Mr. So Vanna)
11:30 Discussion of issues and problems identified
12:00 Lunch
14:00 Grouping of issues and problems identified
14:20 Workgroup discussions on actions to be taken
15:30 Presentation of workgroup results, discussion of action plan
16:00 Closing Ceremony
   Hans Helmrich, CTA, Sustainable Management of Resources Project
   Chea Sam Ang, Deputy Director, Department of Forestry and Wildlife
   Mr. Ith Nody, Undersecretary of State, MAFF
18:00 Workshop End
2. Objective of the Workshop (presented by Hans Helmrich)

1. Identification

2. Specification of Technical/Institutional Support for PLUP in Cambodia

3. Planning

through

- Appropriate procedures
- Development of workable and useful instruments
- Agreement on institutional arrangements

Provision of technical and institutional support to the process of PLUP in Cambodia has been clarified and planned. The support aims at clarifying appropriate procedures, workable and useful instruments, and institutional arrangements including involvement of local communities as well as national and provincial government line departments in participatory land use planning for community-based forest management systems.

3. LEVELS AND TASKS OF LUP

At which levels is PLUP practised in Cambodia? Who are the actors involved on each level, what is the difference in the objectives and tasks at each planning level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Level</th>
<th>Who is involved?</th>
<th>What are the Objectives and Tasks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National       | National Assembly, Prime Minister, Ministries in charge of NRM (Agriculture Forestry, Fisheries, Environment, Mining, etc.), Finance, Tourism, Industries etc. | - Define national goals and priorities (land use policy), expressed in national policies and guidelines.
- Balance competing interests for different sectors of the economy, mitigate conflicts at lower levels.
- Define authorities and mandates of sectoral and regional agencies.
- Define the roles and responsibilities of government agencies, local communities, commercial bodies, etc. |
| Provincial     | Government       |                                    |
| Local          | Communities, NGOs, Projects |                                    |

Table 1: Land Use Planning Levels
### 4. WORK GROUP RESULTS

#### Tasks at different planning levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Level</th>
<th>What are the Objectives and Tasks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National       | • Define national goals and priorities (land use policy), expressed in national policies and guidelines  
• Balance competing interests for different sectors of the economy, mitigate conflicts at lower levels  
• Define authorities and mandates of sectoral and regional agencies,  
• Define the roles and responsibilities of government agencies, local communities, commercial bodies, private households etc.  
• Coordinate activities of sectoral and regional government institutions  
• Allocate resources to different sectors and regions  
• Set up and enforce legislation and regulatory framework for land use |
| Regional, Provincial | • Co-ordinate national strategies at regional levels  
• Set regional priorities  
• Train and support staff at local levels  
• Siting of large scale projects  
• Allocate resources to the local levels  
• Provide feedback to national level on planning and implementation progress on local and provincial levels  
• Help resolve conflict between local groups and between local level and national levels  
• Approval of district plans (or other local level plans) |
| District        | • Setting of local priorities  
• Siting of development projects (infrastructure, forest plantations, settlements etc.)  
• Allocation of land for different uses  
• Aggregation of local level plans  
• Approval of local plans  
• Implementation of larger projects  
• Provide feedback to high level about planning + implementation progress  
• Train and support local staff |
| Local Level (village, commune, watershed) | • Inventory and analysis of available resources  
• Communication with local land users  
• Allocation of land for different uses  
• Preparation of all plans  
• Implementation of plans and activities  
• M&E of plans and implementation |
### 4.2 PLUP in practice

#### National Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activities Carried out in Practice</th>
<th>If none, Explain Why</th>
<th>Problems Encountered/Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate activities of sectoral and regional institutions</td>
<td>Occasionally only</td>
<td>Competence / authorities for a structured coordination not clear</td>
<td>Lack of delegation of responsibility to the next lower levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Ministers for passing decrees / sub decree</td>
<td>Coordination on dispute basis</td>
<td>Decision always taken at highest level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define national programs, policies and guidelines</td>
<td>Land law under revision</td>
<td>Case to case solution which often do not last long</td>
<td>Lack of co-ordination between line ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest policy under revision</td>
<td>Competing claims not always negotiable to the satisfaction of all parties concerned</td>
<td>Provincial capacities / importance not recognised at national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF sub decree and land title sub decree not passed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest concession sub decree disc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance competing interests, investigate conflicts on provincial level</td>
<td>Depends on the type of land and land classification. Eg. Forest land - DFW</td>
<td>Recognised data / maps displaying the legal status of land missing. Maps show physical properties</td>
<td>Encroachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protected areas - MoE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taking possession w/o legal basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define the roles and responsibilities of the different sections of society regarding land use</td>
<td>NGOs/lots/Donors on national level are being consulted on a case by case basis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isolated activities in pockets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define authorities and mandates of sectoral and regional agencies</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not clear, what could be the roles / responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate resource (staff, budget) to different sectors and regions</td>
<td>Hardly any by government, some by NGOs / Projects</td>
<td>Resource - carriers are largely NGOs, Projects. Allocation is donor driven</td>
<td>Insufficient staff capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-consider demarcations of forest land (protected areas, agriculture land, concession areas, fishing lots, reserved land)</td>
<td>Some forest concessions have been cancelled</td>
<td>Misappropriation of state property</td>
<td>No proper assessment / inventory of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADB: concession performance review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Techniques for getting to realistic demarcations not in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fishing lot boundaries are re-considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Provincial Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activities Carried out in</th>
<th>If none, Explain Why</th>
<th>Problems Encountered/Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and analysis of available resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with local land users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of land for different uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of all plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of plans and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E of plans and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### District and Local Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Activities Carried out in Practice</th>
<th>If none, Explain Why</th>
<th>Problems Encountered/ Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of local priorities</td>
<td>Site selection by NGOs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local need</td>
<td>Operates in CARERE &quot;SELA&quot; provinces but hardly in others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No other NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siting of development projects</td>
<td>Site selection by FAO basing on village request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FAO: commune forest management committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District and Local Levels:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate national strategies at regional levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set regional priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train and support staff at local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siting of large scale projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate resources to the local levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide feedback to national level on planning and implementation progress on local and provincial levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help resolve conflict between local groups and between local level and national levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of district plans (or other local level plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote participation from district and village in PLUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Practice
- Some areas being defined for concessions
- Land has been allocated to private
- Facilitation on land allocation to community
- Training people in land use planning
- Using CARERE (NGO funds - Ratanakiri)
- For some small concessions and projects
- Hand-over large scales to private company (or associate)
- Joint research with local people
- Facilitate in resources allocation to community (utilisation/ protection)
- Insufficient resources to allocate to do PLUP
- Describe on reality in the field for promoting to continue
- Land conflict resolution committee set up in Ratanakiri
- Co-ordinate and link to national level
- Establish of management plan at local level

#### Issues
- Lack of clarity of national policy
- Concessions imposed at national level
- Lack of provincial land use planning
- Lack of study / or baseline info
- Conflict between local and national goals
- Mostly dependent on donor funds
- Highlander / Lowlander
- Limited understanding and capacity
- Large concessions imposed from national level
- Insufficient resources information e.g., maps, land use planning
- Lack of legal framework for land use and land use planning
- Shortage of technical support and fund support
- Lack of secondary …, information, precise …
- Poor communication between different level
- Sometimes participation is discouraged by Top Down approach
- Corruption at any level discourages participation
### 4.3 Issues and problems

Based on the identification of issues and problems at different levels, the identified issues were combined and grouped. The participants agreed that the issues and problems identified could be grouped according to the following areas:

- **Institutional**
- **Legal**
- **Resources (funding, staff, qualifications)**
- **Attitude, skills, awareness**
- **Technical**

In a second step, the issues and problems beyond reach of the participants and their organizations were isolated and eliminated from further discussions. This included the whole "resources" group as well as some of the institutional aspects.

The remaining issues where then discussed in two workgroups in order to identify the actions that should be undertaken. One workgroup discussed the institutional and legal aspects and the other tackled the technical and attitude related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aggregation of local level plans</th>
<th>Approval of local plans</th>
<th>Implementation of larger projects</th>
<th>Provide feedback to high level about planning + implementation progress</th>
<th>Train and support local staff</th>
<th>Inventory and analysis of available resources</th>
<th>Communication with local land users</th>
<th>Allocation of land for different uses</th>
<th>Preparation of all plans</th>
<th>Implementation of plans and activities</th>
<th>M&amp;E of plans and implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create VDC, CDC and at prov. PDRDC's (not clearly written)</td>
<td>No feedback from PRDC / Depts.</td>
<td>Projects are implemented by NGO staff with co-operate from relevant gov. institutions</td>
<td>Feedback to PDRDC / Line Dept.</td>
<td>Agro-ecological mapping and training implemented in nearly all provinces for and with agr. extension staff.</td>
<td>Following initial external support, local authorities are taking on follow up survey (w/o external support)</td>
<td>Cultural resources study base on forest for identifying the significance of culture and environment Potentilal (Ratanakiri)</td>
<td>Various land allocation activities take place thro out the country (customary + legal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Issues beyond reach or not needing action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Resources (funds, staff, qualifications)</th>
<th>Attitudes, skills, awareness</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td><strong>Legal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resources (funds, staff, qualifications)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes, skills, awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provincial capacities / importance not recognised at national level</td>
<td>- Insecure legal basis for unofficial allocation</td>
<td>- Scarce resources of government not enough to speed up LUP / LA in Cambodia</td>
<td>- Lack of experiences</td>
<td>- Techniques for getting to realistic demarcation are not in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of delegation of responsibilities to the next lower level</td>
<td>- Lack of legal framework</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
<td>- Lack of acceptance bottom up participatory planning approach</td>
<td>- Insufficient resource information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Case to case solution which often do not last long</td>
<td>- Only in target areas of los and NGOs</td>
<td>- Local level activities only take place if external support is provided initially</td>
<td>- Some GIS type mapping but no &quot;people&quot; data</td>
<td>- Mostly depend on donor fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Missing legal basis for allocation based on customary right</td>
<td>- Mostly depend on donor fund</td>
<td>- Shortage of technical support and fund support</td>
<td>- Lack of accurate mapping technique</td>
<td>- Limited understanding and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community forestry extension system not yet defined</td>
<td>- Limited understanding and capacity</td>
<td>- Encroachments</td>
<td>- Insufficient staff capacities</td>
<td>- Competing claims not always negotiated to the satisfaction of all concerned parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of coordination between line ministries</td>
<td>- Competing claims not always negotiated to the satisfaction of all concerned parties</td>
<td>- Isolated activities in pockets</td>
<td>- Natural resources being allocated along rested interest of individuals, sometimes influenced by power</td>
<td>- Encroachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PRDC's established by degree, but inoperational in some provinces</td>
<td>- Overlapping claims</td>
<td>- Encroachments</td>
<td>- Large concession imposed from national level</td>
<td>- Overlapping claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inefficient coordination in some ministries between national, provincial and local levels</td>
<td>- Taking possession w/o legal basis</td>
<td>- Isolated activities in pockets</td>
<td>- PRDC's established by degree, but inoperational in some provinces</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of acceptance of a bottom-up participatory planning approach; Lack of experience</td>
<td>- Natural resources being allocated along rested interest of individuals, sometimes influenced by power</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
<td>- Lack of acceptance bottom up participatory planning approach</td>
<td>- Inoperational in some provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provincial capacities / importance not recognised at national level</td>
<td>- Natural resources being allocated along rested interest of individuals, sometimes influenced by power</td>
<td>- Lack of acceptance bottom up participatory planning approach</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
<td>- Inefficiency in some provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community development teams versus subject matter oriented community program</td>
<td>- Lack of acceptance bottom up participatory planning approach</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
<td>- Insufficient budget to implement land use planning at village / commune / district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4 Action Plan for Introducing PLUP in Cambodia

#### 4.4.1 Results of Group I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>What needs to be done (by us)</th>
<th>Organisation / Person in charge</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Techniques for getting to realistic demarcation are not in place | • Inventory existing participation methodologies  
• Inventory information requirements  
• Collect information by on existing methodologies in projects in Vietnam and Lao (SMRP) | • ADB – SFMP  
• SMRP / DoFW | • ADB-SFMP  
• SMRP |
| Insufficient resource information | • FAO Siem Reap  
• CARERER Ratanakiri  
• CONCERN  
• Describe their current methodologies  
• Initiate PLUP technical task force | | |
| Some GIS type mapping but no "people" data | • Build / develop methodological framework  
• Meta-data preparation (information on sharing) | IRIC | NGOs, IOs, UNDP |
| Lack of accurate mapping technique | • Describe available mapping techniques and distribute papers to potential users  
• Sketch mapping / technical map (GPS)  
• Ground checking  
• Short term / long term boundary demarcation  
• Inventory mapping GIS training requirements (after training) | • SMRP  
• DoFW  
• LTD | • NGOs  
• GTZ  
• IOs |
| Insufficient staff capacities  
Atitudes, skills, awareness | • Building up capacity for the staff regarding on what field required  
• Training need assessment | DoFW | GTZ  
CGFP |
| Lack of experiences | Provide with:  
• Training  
• Study tour  
• Workshop | • PLUP networking  
• CF working group | |
| Lack of acceptance from bottom up participatory planning approach | Demonstrate pilot project participatory planning | OIs, NGOs | |

#### 4.4.2 Results of Group II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems / Issues</th>
<th>What needs to be done (by us)</th>
<th>Organisation / Person in charge</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Community forestry extension system not yet defined  
• Community development teams versus subject matter - oriented community program | • Explore possibilities to combine agriculture and CF extension service  
• Clarifying options of cooperation VDC with extension services / CD  
• Develop extension program packages (EPP) for various forestry | • Cambodia-German Forestry project  
• IFSP Kampot  
• NGOs (Concern, NTFP, …)  
• FAO Siem Reap | • GTZ (German)  
• CAAEP (Australia & German)? |
| • Not clear what could be the roles / responsibilities for different | • Documentation of existing "best practices" and process analysis | • Working group on community forest | • GTZ  
• Respective projects |
5. The SMRP contribution to the process of "Participatory Land Use Planning" in Cambodia

(Paper presenting the rationale for the workshop)

1. Rationale

The process of PLUP has started in Cambodia with a number of practical field work at various places, mostly organized by NGOs. There were also a few discussions in Phnom Penh with representatives of the DFW, the MoE, and NGOs. The discussions held in Phnom Penh centered around the question of institutional linkages, exchange of experiences, and the formation of a Working Group on PLUP for Community Forestry. Furthermore, a number of interested and involved people from Cambodia participated in an international seminar on PLUP, which was organized by RECOFTC in April 99. This seminar again helped to provide an overview of the philosophy, available instruments, and lessons learnt in the region.

2. The proposal

The Sustainable Management of Resources Project (SMRP) undertakes to directly and indirectly support the ongoing process of PLUP in Cambodia in two ways:

- to jointly with the Sustainable Forest Management Project (SFMP) organize and facilitate a national workshop on PLUP with professional expertise of PLUP/GIS specialists,
- to support PLUP at 2 to 3 sites of NGOs and/or projects with development of robust techniques which include GIS based detailed mapping and ground truthing,

2.1. National workshop on PLUP

It is planned to organize and facilitate a national workshop on principles and opportunities of PLUP in Cambodia on 14th and 15th September 99. The purpose of this workshop would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Provision of technical and institutional support to the process of PLUP in Cambodia has been clarified and planned. The support aims at clarifying appropriate procedures, workable and useful instruments, and institutional arrangements including involvement of local communities as well as national and provincial government line departments in participatory land use planning for community based forest management systems.

The workshop would be prepared and guided jointly by

- the Deputy Director General of the DF&W
- members of the national working group on Community Forestry,
- a consultant of the Sustainable Forest Management Project (SFMP),
- the GIS unit of the Department of Forestry and Wildlife (DF&W),
- the GIS consultant of the SMRP to the DF&W, and
- an international expert on PLUP (consultant).

The consultant on PLUP would spend a total of five to six days for this purpose in Cambodia. The following table suggests some organizational arrangements:

**Organizational arrangements for a national workshop on PLUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Organized/conducted by</th>
<th>time frame</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>getting interested participants together through e-mail, tel. and personal contacts</td>
<td>Members of the WG PLUP, SMRP, SFMP consultant</td>
<td>1 month, starting 16.8.99</td>
<td>List of proposed participants exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual discussions between the consultants and stakeholders of PLUP in Cambodia</td>
<td>Members of the WG PLUP, SMRP, SFMP consultant</td>
<td>1 day on 13.9.99</td>
<td>Results of talks should help to organize discussions on following days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.00 Chea Sam Ang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.30 Wayne Gum, Pel Piseth, Lun Kim Hy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 Gordon Patterson, partic. from Kampot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 Patrick Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 GIS unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation and discussion of present ongoing activities in PLUP in Cambodia</td>
<td>Stakeholders and practitioners ; Participants from the 3 field sites</td>
<td>0.5 day of the workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three case studies from on experiences, concepts, methods applied, expectations, 15 min each, plus discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation and discussion of principles, instruments, and utilities of PLUP for CFM</td>
<td>PLUP-Consultant SMRP consultant to the GIS unit of the DF&amp;W</td>
<td>0.5 day of the workshop</td>
<td>Presentation incorporates results from discussions on 13.9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion on further directions and ways to go with PLUP for CFM in Cambodia, commitments and planning of follow up activities</td>
<td>Stakeholders, practitioners and PLUP-Consultants</td>
<td>0.5-1.0 day of the workshop</td>
<td>The result of this should be an action plan, which incorporates activities of the GIS unit DF&amp;W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financing

The workshop would be jointly financed by SMRP and SFMP. All three consultants, who are involved in preparation and conduction of the workshop, work for both projects.

2.2. Support PLUP with GIS based detailed mapping and ground truthing

Following the workshop, the envisaged field work, as planned and agreed upon during the workshop, would be further supported by SMRP and SFMP.

At various sites in Cambodia processes of participatory land use planning for identification and documentation of land uses happen already or have been planned. The purpose of this exercise is mostly to secure user rights for people, which are based on their traditions and customs or on existing practices of utilization for agriculture and/or as forest land. Security of user rights is only possible with recognition of tenure by the government offices and is considered to be a necessary prerequisite for peoples’ long term investment on their land as well as for protection of their customary rights from encroachment on their land by other parties.

Very often it was found that recognition from relevant government offices on provincial or national level could not be obtained because of unclear borderlines of community land or because of inaccurate and therefore misleading boundaries.

SMRP and SFM address this issue jointly with selected partner organizations by organizing support from the GIS unit of the DFW by using aerial photography in combination with locally available knowledge and the existing data base on forest cover in Cambodia (with the help of digital satellite images, Landsat 7).

It is envisaged that with an initial time input of 2 weeks the national GIS unit and their consultant can jointly with partners gather first practical experiences.

Purpose

Locally adapted robust techniques, that allow for officially recognizable and acceptable documentation of planned and/or agreed land use have been developed. Those techniques should incorporate local knowledge, land use planning methodologies, GIS/ RS/ GPS based detailed mapping. The development of the techniques are based on customary resource tenure or other acknowledged arrangements.

Organizational arrangements

The main organizer for the process would be partner organizations, which already practice PLUP or plan to use PLUP in their field work, together with provincial forest offices. The GIS unit of the National DF&W (Mr. Makara and C. Feldkoetter) would facilitate the process with development of GIS/ RS/ GPS based detailed mapping methodology.

The field work would start in October 99 on two to three selected sites, which have enough infrastructural support from projects or NGOs. The participation of the provincial forest offices of the Agriculture Departments is envisaged.

An essential element and outcome of the process would be the professional interaction between national and provincial level forest departments.

Initially one week for each project site for a total of two to three sites in 1999 (and beginning of 2000) would be the envisaged time frame for support from the national level.

Technical details would include mapping based on

- aerial photography
local expertise, which would be verified by local teams (commune leaders, government, NGOs, project staff) and supported by GPS, digital satellite images from Landsat 7.

Proposed inputs and outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>OUTPUTS</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology: a real photography for mapping, GPS and local knowledge for ground truthing, Landsat 7 digital images, Organizational support from provincial organizations Participation of provincial staff of forest offices</td>
<td>Development of a robust methodology for PLUP in Cambodia, qualified by accurate and verified mapping and local knowledge</td>
<td>Following demands articulated by various organizations working in provinces The national DF&amp;W Decentralization of the clientele of the national GIS unit in the DP&amp;W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of national and provincial staff Training manual and trained staff</td>
<td>A first draft of a training manual needs to be refined and further developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and documentation of the process Documents on PLUP in 3 provinces Document on the development of PLUP approaches</td>
<td>Can be used and developed further for identification of forest management systems involving private sector, communities and government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing

Funds for this operation would be coming from SMRP, SFMP, and the involved partner organizations.

6. INAUGURATION SPEECHES

6.1 Speech by Mr. Ith Nody, Undersecretary of State, MAFF

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear Colleagues, Guests, and Consultants,

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome you to the first workshop in Phnom Penh on Participatory Land Use Planning.

I like to welcome all participants of this important event, some of them have come from far as Hanoi or Bangkok, many of them have come from projects in various provinces of Cambodia. I see a large number and a variety of organizations participating in this workshop, there is the DF&W, the MoE, the Land Titles Department, many projects from this country, international organizations, and donors. This variety reflects not only the importance of the issue, it also shows the intention to address essentially a topic, which only can be dealt with through cooperation of institutions and organizations.

Land resources are limited and finite. If human population continue to increase at the present rate, if economic growth continues to bless our country, if the demand for agricultural products and forest products remains to increase, there is a great need to match land types and land users in the most rational way possible. Our target for development of rural areas definitely is to reduce poverty through production and raising incomes, which is not possible without more investments, and long term planning for our land resources and forest resources. This should lead ultimately to higher productivity and better utilization of our resources.

Land use planning is fundamental to this process for many reasons. One of course, is the technical reason, which is to use our natural resources in the most productive and sustainable way. Another argument is to provide security to the managers of those resources, who are the farmers and people living in rural areas. Land use planning is perhaps the first important steps towards a process, which ultimately should clarify what resources are to be transferred to who with what rights and obligations. Only with this clarification, people would invest in their natural resources, and would protect those resources from any threats from outside.
We have been in that process for some time now: The land law has been formulated, the laws for managing the forests are being looked at, the sub-decree for community forestry is under discussion, the mechanisms for transferring ownership of land to individuals and communes are becoming clearer and will shortly be finalized by the government.

Land use planning is not a process, where planners tell people what to do. Land use planning is very much a process, where people and planners from many institutions jointly take decisions on the future use of lands. These decisions have to be based on a precise and systematic assessment of many factors, which deal with the best use of land. Without the knowledge and experience of local people, who have used these resources over a long time period, the assessment would not be possible.

Therefore, we use the term: Participatory Land Use Planning. In its strongest meaning, the participating partners are the institutions, which come from outside, and the main actors should be the local people. We know, it is not always possible that way, but we should think of ways to get close to practices, which follow this philosophy.

This workshop has taken on the mandate to talk about development of techniques and instruments in a development process, which would bring about clearer ideas of how Participatory Land Use Planning can be performed at local level with involvement of District, Provincial, and even National Line Departments and Administration. It is an important task to develop simple procedures, which we then can follow with a minimum of required financial and personnel resources. We want to see a product developed in near future, which is applicable under various conditions, of course, with necessary modifications, and which is agreed upon the many actors, who are necessarily involved in the process. The task is not easy but of fundamental importance to our nation and our people.

I wish this workshop success and good results. I wish to see results, which are practical and promising and will be further used and built up. I wish to see this workshop as a beginning of a process, not as an event in itself. I encourage all of you to dedicate your energy and efforts to this process.

Before coming to an end, I would like to express my appreciation to all of you, who are here today. I am particularly grateful to the Department of Forestry and Wildlife, who is the host of this workshop. I like to thank the members of the National Working Group on Community Forest Management, who is the main organizer of this workshop. I express my gratitude to the Sustainable Management of Resources in the Lower Mekong Project (financed by the GTZ) and the Sustainable Forest Management Project (financed by the ADB) for their financial assistance to this workshop.

I wish you success in your undertaking and declare the workshop opened.

6.2 Speech by Chea Sam Ang, Deputy Director General, DF&W

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear Colleagues, Guests, and Consultants,

On behalf of the DF&W I wish to welcome all participants of the National workshop on Participatory Land Use Planning, which is held today and tomorrow in Phnom Penh. I am proud of the fact that our Department has decided to host this event. I can see a great range of participation, which clearly indicates that the issue of Participatory Land Use Planning is of great interest in Cambodia and attracts professionals from many organizations.

The DF&W has over the past number of months undertaken many steps towards finding and defining a clearer role of local people in joint management systems for our most valuable natural resources, forest land and forests. We have started to frame a strategic plan for making community forestry an integral part of the programs of the Department, we have submitted to the government the community forestry sub-decree. And we are committed to build up sufficient capacity in our department for keeping our planning alive and bring it into practice.

We are aware of the key role of the concept of Participatory Land Use Planning within the framework of participatory and collaborative forest management systems. It is becoming increasingly clear that only with the commitment by local people towards protection and sustainable management of their resources, our national assets will be used productively on the long run. We have learned that our forests will only then be available for our children also, when we identify and implement mechanisms of effective protection and rehabilitation. An important step towards this end is a better integration and incorporation of local knowledge with the objectives and planning of national level and provincial level authorities. Participatory Land Use Planning has been identified as a powerful and effective instrument for this undertaking.

Participatory Land Use Planning (PLUP) is perhaps a pre-condition for follow up processes of allocation of land use rights, or even land property to the managers and users of our forest land. To do this in a meaningful way the participation of local people, and the incorporation of their knowledge, their customs, their wisdom and their
So far, there is only little experience of PLUP in Cambodia. Some NGOs and some projects have started their activities in land use planning with various degrees of success and recognition, and it is felt that a strong support from the national level, in particular from the DF&W is essential to bring these initiatives forward. We are aware that other government organizations, e.g. the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction, and in particular the General Department of Cadastre and Geography will play also a key role in that process. I am glad to learn that we have today and tomorrow also participation of that organization in our workshop.

We hope that by the end of the second day our workshop will have produced some practical ideas of how to continue and how to follow our ambition. We are sure that with some of the resources of the DF&W, we can be helpful to those who already have started building capacity at local level. We are looking forward to building strong partnership with those, who took a commitment for making PLUP in the long run a successful undertaking.

The DF&W considers a joint approach with partner organizations in the field to be a learning process for either side. In the DF&W we very much feel the necessity of making better use of our resources at national as well as provincial level for people who live in and from our forests. We are aware that only with a strong commitment to decentralization of resources and authorities the concern of community based forest management systems can be effectively addressed. We are prepared to provide our expertise, time, and manpower as far as possible and necessary.

The issue of Participatory Land Use Planning in Cambodia is relatively new. I am glad that the organizers and supporters of this workshop were able to bring in regional and international expertise. I hope that this support can sustain and help us getting across difficult times, which might come in one or the other form. I would like to remind our supporters to remain practical and simple. Our field approaches as well as our department do not require high tech complicated procedures or fancy reports. What we require most are simple, robust approaches, which help us to create learning and sharing with others in a difficult process.

I would also like to address our need for a high level of transparency and co-operation. Since a number of organizations and institutions are to be involved in Participatory Land Use Planning, and later perhaps in processes of allocation of user rights and even property rights, and since our governmental resources will remain scarce, we need to keep each other informed. And we need to share our struggle as well as our responsibilities. I know it will be hard to identify workable ways of working at the same task jointly in a complementary way. But I am convinced that we can find and develop those ways and get into a fruitful cooperation.

I see this workshop as a first major step towards this direction. I am happy to see our concern addressed by the outline and the organization of our workshop. Thank you for joining the DF&W in this event.

6.3 Speech by Hans Helmrich, CTA, SMRP

Honorable Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen, dear Colleagues, Guests, and Consultants,

On behalf of the Sustainable Management of Resources Project I welcome all of you to our National Workshop on Participatory Land Use Planning. In my short welcome speech I should perhaps try to elaborate a bit on this term, which up to now, is familiar only with a few development workers in this country. I do believe that all of you have some picture in your mind what this term could mean. The more open the ideas are the higher the expectations go. Our international consultant Herbert Christ at a later stage will give you some very practical explanations of the concept of Participatory Land Use Planning. So I will try to prepare the ground for his explanations with a few thoughts.

Participatory Land Use Planning has a number of words, and beyond that, a very special meaning in itself.

Firstly, we talk about Planning. Planning is a never ending process. Even, if planning has been formalized and comes up with a documented plan, we know, that in the minute we start implementing this plan, reality has moved forward meanwhile. Then the plan has to be revised and adapted and adjusted to the new reality, which perhaps generates another document, and so forth. Professionals call this a planning cycle.

Secondly we have the term Land Use. Land, and particularly forest land is becoming a scarce commodity in Cambodia. With scarcity conflicting interests and claims arise. When we think of Forest Land Use automatically we have in mind concepts of traditional practices, of tenure, of customary rights, and we also think of production, and integrating higher income with sustainability. But we have to remember, that the way, people and organizations use scarce land, is determined by a variety of other factors as well. Very often development planners overlook the facts, that people do not only use land for highest possible productivity or for income. Often land use is influenced by authority, or by power. People encroach land without respecting authorities or regulations, sometimes influential persons occupy land disregarding legitimate claims of others. Land may be used for speculation only or for
demonstrative purposes.

The third catch word: Participatory. This term indicates that there are more parties than only one involved. The question always arises: who takes action and who participates? Do governments allow people to participate in a process of planning or are governments invited to participate in a process, which is carried out by people? Participation in its real sense goes far beyond informing somebody about a taken decision. It means to do things jointly from the very beginning, when the plans are being made, and carry through the process jointly until decisions are being made, which can be implemented and will be implemented by all those who participated.

Finally now, the whole term Participatory Land Use Planning seems to have a lot of meaning. We understand that there may be different claims by various parties on land, which should be used productively. A process of planning produces documents, which are respected by all those, who participated. Usually, we talk here of the stakeholders. In this process, the stakeholders, who have claims, are willing and capable to implement these plans. During implementation the need for revised planning may come up. The process is not dominated by those who have most power or the best weapons. The participatory process gives equal rights to all parties who bring forward legitimate claims.

Why are we here today and tomorrow? We do not rewrite the laws, we do not formulate a recipe for all of Cambodia, we certainly do not do Land Use Planning practically. We are here to share our views, our experiences, our knowledge. We have come together to learn from each other. All of us are stakeholders in some way. We will find out about our stakes immediately after this inauguration session. We also have the ambition to discuss possibilities of sharing our resources for the future. We are all committed to contribute to building up the process of Participatory Land Use Planning in Cambodia. We all feel that we need to have a clearer understanding of participation, a better understanding of Land Use and be equipped with more powerful planning tools and planning approaches.

We are happy that our project has the opportunity to support this workshop. We will gladly look also into possibilities to carry the process of clarification and facilitation, of sharing knowledge, and giving technical assistance beyond this workshop. We look at this workshop as a starting point of mutual support and assistance. I am very grateful to the ADB project on Sustainable Forest Management, that they share our ambition and share their resources with us and with you.

We note with great pleasure that the National Department of Forestry & Wildlife has taken the decision to have this workshop and also host it. We understand this as a signal for their commitment to Participatory Land Use Planning.

The large number of participants here, coming from various organizations, indicates clearly the wide range of stakeholders, and there are many more, who could not come today. The ones, who came today for this workshop, hopefully will become the driving engine for the process of Participatory Land Use Planning in Cambodia.

I again welcome you. Not only on behalf of our project, but on behalf of all development professionals in this country, who are committed to bring forward ideas, energy, and joint action for Participatory Land Use Planning in Cambodia.

Thank you

Hans Helmrich, 14.9.99

7. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Training Background</th>
<th>Experience with PLUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUSAID – CAAEP</td>
<td>Norman Welsh</td>
<td>Training co-ordinator (HRD Advisor)</td>
<td>Agricultural Scientist Project Management</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDSE</td>
<td>Phung Sila</td>
<td>Training/ Tech. Support Unit for Field Program</td>
<td>BSc. Forestry (sylviculture)</td>
<td>2 yrs. participatory village upland demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>Chean Thayuth</td>
<td>CF Policy Officer</td>
<td>Forestry &amp; community development</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>Elizabeth Weight</td>
<td>CF Program Advisor</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>Ly Chou Beang</td>
<td>NCF Program Manager</td>
<td>Forestry Technique; Community Forestry; Little experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERN</td>
<td>Pel Piseth</td>
<td>CF Program Officer</td>
<td>Attended the regional workshop on PLUP / PLA, in Bangkok; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAFF, Siem Reap</td>
<td>Van Sophanna</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Forester; Field experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFA</td>
<td>Va Hong,</td>
<td>Technical Supervisor</td>
<td>Agronomy in VN and agriculture NR RDP AIT Master degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoFW</td>
<td>Chea Sam Ang</td>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>Forestry and CF; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoFW</td>
<td>Lao Sethaphal</td>
<td>Technical CF</td>
<td>Forester; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoFW</td>
<td>Meas Makaphal</td>
<td>Chief of GIS Unit</td>
<td>Forestry; GIS; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoFW</td>
<td>Ung Sam Ath</td>
<td>Vice chief of Afforestation office</td>
<td>Forestry technical; Community forestry; Less experience on PLUP, PCAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTEE</td>
<td>Heng Sokhena</td>
<td>In charge of Agro Info System</td>
<td>Extension and rural development; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Project</td>
<td>Kim Sovann</td>
<td>Community Forestry Officer</td>
<td>Forester; Land allocation for forest commune to use NR in sustainable way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO Project</td>
<td>Prak Marina</td>
<td>Community Forestry Officer</td>
<td>Forester; Participatory approach, Facilitation, CF management plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO, Siem Reap</td>
<td>Delattre Etienne</td>
<td>Cartography / GIS Associate Professional Officer</td>
<td>Natural Resources Management Research / Action; Photo-Interpretation, Vegetation Mapping Cartography / GIS; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-lance Consultant</td>
<td>Doug Henderson</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
<td>Formal: forestry Interest: as if people matter; CF planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free-lance Consultant</td>
<td>Herbert Christ</td>
<td>PLUP Consultant</td>
<td>Agriculture / Rural Development; 12 years worldwide, 3 years SE Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Jurgen Fichtenau</td>
<td>CF Advisor</td>
<td>MSc. Forestry; 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ - IFSP Kampot</td>
<td>Khem Ponna</td>
<td>Fish Farming Trainer / Fishery Officer</td>
<td>Fishery –Aquaculture; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ - IFSP Kampot</td>
<td>Kornelius Schiffer</td>
<td>Agricultural Advisor</td>
<td>Agricultural Engineer; some PULP experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTD – GDCG</td>
<td>So Vanna</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Technical Dept.</td>
<td>GIS / Cadastre; Agronomy; little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Lun Kimhy</td>
<td>Deputy of Community and Buffer Zone Unit</td>
<td>Economist CF; No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE - CARERE in Ratanakiri</td>
<td>Graeme Brown</td>
<td>Community Forester</td>
<td>Forestry Adult Education Development Studies; Some - not much 0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC / GTZ - SMRP</td>
<td>Kol Vathana</td>
<td>National Project Liaison Officer</td>
<td>No training; Forester and Geologist; Attended regional PLUP workshop in BKK Member of Cambodian PLUP Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC / GTZ –</td>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>GIS / RS Consultant</td>
<td>Forestry GIS / RS; little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMRP</td>
<td>Feldkotter</td>
<td>CTA</td>
<td>Rural Development Institutional Dev. Agriculture/Extension</td>
<td>only theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC / GTZ – SMRP</td>
<td>Hans Helmrich</td>
<td>Operation Thai and Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFP</td>
<td>Chea Phalla</td>
<td>Natural Resources and Advocacy</td>
<td>Community Forestry; Land Title Extension; PRA, NRM</td>
<td>PLUP experience 2 years and a half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOFTC</td>
<td>Cor Veer</td>
<td>Observer / Outsider</td>
<td>Community Forestry</td>
<td>Long and superficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>