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Summary

1. Re-location and consolidation of villages is a very important strategy of District Authorities to contain shifting cultivation, reduce opium production, and to facilitate easier provision of services to larger village units located near roads.

2. The authorities have very clear plans regarding the number of villages that will be re-located or consolidated, however they lack resources to properly prepare for re-locating or consolidating villages, or to provide the support necessary to complete the plans effectively or adequately.

3. Land use difficulties are arising as a consequence of this incapacity to plan and support the villagers being consolidated. These problems include inequities between villagers to access agricultural land, inadequate land for sustainable agriculture, social incompatibility between villagers being merged, and inadequate land use planning practices when implementing the plans.

4. There have been voluntary or spontaneous migrations by villagers for several years from more isolated areas to areas close to roads which offer possibilities for improved services and potential to improve livelihoods. Villager ambitions are therefore fairly compatible with the thinking and plans of the District Authorities, as they too have indicated their desire to live in less isolated areas.

5. It is not clear if District Authorities would provide guarantees that village management areas and village boundaries in the re-location areas can be expanded to ensure adequate land is available for agricultural production for the increasing population. This requires further follow-up.

6. Villager communities often migrate gradually, with a few families moving to the new location first, after which others follow. Families from more than one village often move to the one location.

7. Villagers of Hmong ethnic origins are the group mostly affected by re-location and consolidation programmes. Not all villagers wish to migrate, some preferring to remain in their home village.

8. Villagers while wanting to access land near roads or planned roads, have strategies for retaining access to land in their home village areas, some distance from the road, to give them adequate land and also better land use options, eg, cattle raising, rain-fed crop production. Villagers are prepared to contribute to the improvement of access tracks to these areas to make transportation of produce more convenient.

9. The District proposals include the planting of introduced crops that are not or may not yet be climatically or market proven, ie coffee, head cabbages. The villagers, on the other hand, are considering crops and livestock options with which they are familiar (lower risk). Villagers are more concerned with organising land use zoning so that they can put these land use options into practice.

10. The land use planning and land allocation programs are largely undertaken in response to the GOL policies and plans for shifting cultivation and opium reduction. Re-location and consolidation of villages are key strategies to effect these policies. These two programs are managed by different agencies in the District, re-location by the District Administration and LUP/LA by the DAFO. Using LUP/LA to provide for villager livelihood improvement and land use security appears to be a secondary consideration and subservient to relocation ambitions.
1. Introduction

This is the first report prepared by the Land Management Component of the Lao Swedish Upland Agriculture and Forestry Research Programme (LSUAFRP). It concerns initial studies on a number of land use issues identified by diagnostic fieldwork teams in March and April, 2002. Field work was undertaken in Phonesay and Nam Mo Districts with the Socio-economic Unit of the programme during the period 6\textsuperscript{th} to 13\textsuperscript{th} June, with the co-operation and support of provincial and district staff.

The issues studied were:

Phonesay District, Luang Prabang Province.

“Insufficient land for production and livelihoods in the Khumu village of Huay Maha as a result of the re-location of families from six highland villages to Huay Maha. The six Hmong villages include; Ban Patoop, Ban Puou Soung, Ban Ja Nom, Huay Lon, Ban Mak Jong and Ban Pak Hok”.

Nam Mo District, Oudomxay Province.

“Disagreement over the merging of the Hmong village of Kok Fart with the village of Pangthong. The issues include a shortage of cultivatable land for Kok Fart villagers and disputes between Kok Fart and Panthong villagers over specific upland, paddy land and forest product collection areas”.

2. Objectives

The relevant research topic as expressed in the 2002 Research Agenda Document was:

“A field study of land use planning/land allocation issues and opportunities for improving the process”

The objectives of the field work undertaken were as follows:

1. To conduct follow-up enquiries on land use issues identified during the diagnostic field work conducted between 25\textsuperscript{th} March and 7\textsuperscript{th} April, 2002.
2. To better understand the land use issues that have been identified previously.
3. To identify farmer livelihood strategies for the future.
4. To consider the potential impacts and consequences of LUP programs in the villages.
5. To understand and document the procedures and methods of LUP/LA used by District Office and DAFO staff.
6. To identify future research issues and activities arising from the field study of the land use problems in the target villages.
7. To undertake field training in land use planning issues for the staff of the LUP/LA Unit and the Socio-Economic units of the programme.
8. To build up experience in conducting inter-disciplinary field research.
9. Document the results of the field studies.

3. Activities Undertaken

Luang Prabang Province and Phonesay District

- A visit was made to the PAFO to explain the objectives of the field trip and to seek co-operation in facilitating the visit to the District.
- The provincial co-ordinator, Mr Thongsavanh made arrangements with district authorities and accompanied the study team as a field work facilitator.
- The study team of six persons held discussions on the study objectives and activities with staff of the DAFO and the District Administration Office.
- Information was gathered on the LUP/LA procedures and activities conducted by the DAFO and the programme and activities of the village re-location programme being implemented by the District Administration.
- Discussions were held with the Village Administrative Authorities of Huay Maha village and several Hmong villagers from Ban Tatoop, Ban Puou Soong, Ban Ja Nom, Huay Lon, Ban Mak Jong and Ban Pak Hok villages who had relocated to Huay Maha in 2000, 2001 and 2002.
- Study team members held post field visit discussions to summarise findings of the field work and identify follow-up actions required.

Oudomxay Province and Na Mo District

- A meeting was held with the District Governor and DAFO Head to:
  • explain the objectives of the field trip and to seek co-operation in facilitating the visit to the District and to gather information on village re-location and merging programs.
  • To understand the LUP/LA procedures and methods practised in Nam Mo District.
  • To understand the district perspective on the dispute between the villages of Phangthong and Kok Fart arising from the district decision to merge the two villages.
  • To understand the district perspective on land use issues in Ban Maxay and Ban Phousang.
- Meetings were held at Phangthong and Kok Fart villages to discuss the controversy concerning the district plan to merge the two villages and land use issues between the villages.
- A meeting was held at Mixay village regarding land use issues identified during a previous project team visit.
- A de-briefing meeting was held with the deputy Governor after the completion of field activities.
4. Findings Phnom Penh District

The following is a summary of information gathered and findings during field work.

4.1 Land Use Planning and Land Allocation

The District follows the normal LUP/LA procedures that the GOL has adopted, i.e., the so-called eight step process. Staff normally accomplish six of the steps in the process, i.e., preparation, village boundary delineation, land use zoning, socio-economic and land use data collection, agricultural land allocation decisions, agricultural land parcel measurement, the preparation and issue of land use documents (temporary land use certificates, land use contracts and land parcel maps), the preparation of Village Forest and Agricultural Land Management Agreements.

In respect of the four target villages of the research programme the following progress has been made by DAFO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>LUP/LA Activities Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huay Maha</td>
<td>Boundary delineation, land use zoning, data collection, land allocation decisions, land parcel delineation, issue of temporary land use certificates, village land management agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban Tapo</td>
<td>Boundary delineation, land use zoning, data collection, land allocation decisions, land parcel delineation, issue of temporary land use certificates, village land management agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huay Man</td>
<td>Boundary delineation, land use zoning, data collection, land allocation decisions, land parcel delineation, issue of temporary land use certificates, village land management agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam Bo</td>
<td>Village boundary delineation (with help from the Province)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study team did not assess the quality of the LUP/LA undertaken on this occasion because the priority was to investigate the land settlement issues. A more detailed assessment of the quality of LUP/LA will be undertaken on a follow-up visit.

The DAFO staff said they faced the following constraints in implementing LUP/LA:
- Insufficient staff resources
- Lack of equipment/materials
- Insufficient budget and budget arriving late at District level
- Villagers not showing interest in participating and/or lack of understanding about LUP/LA

Generally the following approaches have been followed:
- Before 1995 land allocation was undertaken with very little budget; at that time forest categories were not delineated; checklists of families allocated land were prepared and families signed the checklist to indicate they had been given temporary use rights to parcels of land.
More formalised LUP/LA was started after 1995 at which time rough sketch maps of land parcels were prepared and temporary land use certificates were issued. Copies were given to families, the Village Head and a copy retained at the DAFO.

Village boundary delineation and land use zoning are given priority as these activities are more feasible or possible with the limited resources available.

Staff members explain government land use/management legislation and policies when LUP/LA is commenced in a village, i.e., land and forestry laws, LUP/LA and shifting cultivation reduction programs.

The villagers are requested to identify parcels of land they wish to claim and these are considered for allocation. It was said that the more “resourceful or intelligent” people asked for as many as 8-10 plots, while the less “resourceful or intelligent” asked for 1-2 plots. Generally a ceiling of 4 plots per family has been applied, however, those families who have adequate paddy land for rice production are allocated upland plots for fruit tree or commercial tree crops only.

Land tax is collected by District Authorities on allocated plots. K6,000 per hectare is levied on the plots cultivated in any particular year, and K3,000 per hectare on plots not cultivated in any particular year.

Land use zoning is done by combining existing forest and agricultural land use patterns or understandings the villagers have, with the categories as defined in the Forestry Law. Conservation, protection, regeneration, village use and production (agriculture) categories or zones usually result. Villages may have all or some of these categories depending on the land use characteristics in the village.

The DAFO Head said that the merging of villages in the project target area is causing land shortages for families, e.g., in Huay Maha village where the settlement of about 60 families from four other villages has occurred.

The cross-village utilisation of agricultural land and non-timber forest products (NTFPs) was discussed. The approach adopted is to encourage villages to have agreements which permit villagers to use agricultural land and to collect NTFPs in neighbouring villages, provided consent is given. Departmental and District rules concerning the extraction of commercial species, such as trees and bamboo, from village areas by outsiders are applied. Natural resources taxes are collected by district staff at pre-determined rates.

4.2 Village Migration and Re-location

The District Governor, Mr Khamphanh Ratsamy, explained District rural development organisation and programs.

Phonexay has a population of 24,000 people currently living in 72 villages. The population is comprised of the following broad ethnic groupings: Lao Theung; 60%, Lao Soong; 30% and Lao Lum 10%. There are only four villages in the District in which the residents are only Lao Lum, and of the 72 villages, 14 have mixed ethnic populations.

The District has 5 Administrative Zones and 4 Focal Development Areas (kaet boriven). Within these administrative and development areas, there are 11 groupings
or networks of villages referred to as “village economic or development groups”. For example, one such network is centred on the Project target village of Nam Bo, in which there are 7 villages. The criteria for determining these networks include:

- Villages have access to the same road/s
- Villagers are located along the same rivers or streams (occupy the same small watersheds)
- Government services such as schools and health posts are located to serve the network of villages
- A convenient central market location exists
- Agricultural and forest land used by the network villages is contiguous

The paddy area in the District is 168 hectares of which 44 hectares has potential for dry season production. Reports from Village Heads to the District indicate there is an area of approximately 3,000 hectares of upland rice cultivated annually.

Fourteen villages have road access, including the four project villages of Nam Bo, Huay Mun, Tapo and Huay Maha. Some “model farmers” have been selected in these villages.

4.2.1 District Plan for Merging or Re-location

The district strategy plan (“pan utasart”) includes a program to reduce the total of 72 villages to 41 by the year 2005. The approach proposed by the District is to consolidate small more isolated settlements with larger less isolated settlements, where possible along existing roads, or to locations where new roads are proposed.

In various villages, some voluntary migration has taken place. (see data above re. 14 mixed ethnic villages). This normally involves a “reconnaissance” migration of a small number of families from mountainous areas to villages in which various services are available. In following years, other families follow if the livelihood environment has been assessed as advantageous by the pioneer migrators.

An indication of how these migrations occur is provided in Table 1 “Villager Migrations to Huay Maha”.

The study team focussed on the village of Huay Maha in which the following land use issues had been identified during farming system analysis exercises in March/April:

- Land insufficiency problems arising from movement of additional families to Huay Maha
- Land disputes and problems in merging the old and the newly relocated villages.

The villages mainly concerned include: Ban Phou Soong Noy, Ban Ja Nom, and Ban Patoop. In addition some families from Ban Huay Lon, Ban Mak Jong, and Ban Pak Hok have moved to the Huay Maha area in more recent times. It is proposed by the District authorities that a total of 180 families would be relocated to Huay Maha and that other families would be merged into other villages, some in the target villages of the research project.
The reasons proposed by the District for wishing to relocate families were:
- Existing settlements have inadequate and poor quality domestic water supplies
- To provide villagers with access to services including, a clean and permanent water supply, a market for produce, a school, and health services
- To control the production of opium in the highland locations

The District has procured flat land in an area closely adjacent to the present Huay Maha settlement at a cost of K6,000,000, and has prepared a preliminary "settlement street plan". Approximately 15 new houses have been constructed and occupied by villagers at the new site. The proposal is to effect the movement of 180 families by 2003. To date 58 families have relocated to Huay Maha since the year 2000, there now being a total of 87 families resident in the village; 20 originals and 58 migratory families. Of the 58 families, it is understood that 27 have been allocated some land in the Huay Maha village management area, while the other 31 families who arrived in 2002, have not yet been allocated land. Three families of the original Huay Maha settlement have moved to the new village location recently. It is understood that the original village may be abandoned if families move to the new site, although it was observed there is a permanent village water supply there, *(one good reason it would seem for not abandoning the present site).*

The district indicated that agricultural and forest land in the former highland village areas would be merged with land of Huay Maha so that a rationalisation and re-distribution of land could be undertaken. The District officials indicated that they saw potential for the production of cash crops such as coffee, organically grown vegetables such as head cabbages and chokos, livestock grazing (cattle, buffalo), fruit trees and rain-fed soybean.

A document, "Sip Hok Tang Auk", "Sixteen Alternatives" *(to shifting cultivation and opium production reduction)*, which has been produced by the Province, and is being referenced by the District, was shown to the study team. This contains recommendations for alternate land use options, a copy of which is being provided to LSUAFRP.

The District advised that it has been undertaking market studies at three market locations, Nam Bo, Sop Gia and Hua Doi. A fourth location at Dong Kham has not been studied. These surveys acquire information on the range of produce traded in the markets and the prices.

4.2.2 Village Meeting on Merging Villages - Huay Maha
A meeting was held with the Village Committee and about 10 villages who have migrated from highland villages to Huay Maha.

Huay Maha was originally settled in 1986 by 16 families of the Khumu ethnic group. In the year 2000 migration of Hmong families from highland areas commenced, mainly from the villages of Pa Toop, Phou Soong Noy and Ja Nom. At the present time there are a total of 87 families in the village of which 58 are migrant families.
Table 1: Villager Migrations to Huay Maha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Fams.</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>From (village)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Khumu</td>
<td>Old village site</td>
<td>Original settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Khumu</td>
<td>Poung Pao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Pak Hok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Ban Patoop</td>
<td>New settlers; land allocated by villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Phou Soong Noy</td>
<td>New settlers; land allocated by villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Cha Norm</td>
<td>New settlers; land allocated by villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Huay Lon</td>
<td>New settlers; land allocated by villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Khumu</td>
<td>Mok Jong</td>
<td>New settlers; no land allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Ban Pa Toop</td>
<td>New settlers; no land allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Pak Hok</td>
<td>New settlers; no land allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Phou Soong Noy</td>
<td>New settlers; no land allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Cha Norm</td>
<td>New settlers; no land allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes original families, newly formed families and migrant families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Villagers reported that there were a further 149 families residing in the three Hmong villages from which the families had migrated over the last 2 years, ie,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pa Toop</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phou Soong Noy</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cha Norm</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hmong spokespeople at the meeting said that some villagers residing in the three villages are not interested in migrating. If the District target of moving 180 families was accomplished, 122 more families would be re-settled; which would leave about 27 families in the highland villages.

4.2.3 Impact of Growth in Family Numbers in Huay Maha Village

New settlers are using a variety of ways to access agricultural land, including:

- borrowing land and paying the land tax instead of the owner
- renting land from resident families
- purchasing land from families who have migrated out of the village (four families)
- using land which original settlers have not claimed or used, usually maturing secondary forest.

With the influx of new families the villagers reported that "confusion" over land occupancy and use had arisen. The Village Head observed that as more families arrive there will be greater confusion. The effects have been:

- Most families have only 1-2 plots of agricultural land to use; in the past they normally had 3 or 4
- Some of the recent arrivals do not have parcels of land, ie, they have not been able to claim land
The quality of land some families have access to has decreased because they have to choose marginal land.

The cycle of land usage by families with 4 parcels has been disrupted because they have loaned land to new settlers and now rotate between fewer parcels.

New settlers borrow land and pay the land tax to the lands Office instead of the owner

Farmers have adopted practices such as the sub-division of parcels and crop rotations as an alternative to plot rotations. Villagers referred to this as prayat din (save land). The new land use practices on the one plot of land may involve continuous cropping for three years as follows:

Year 1: Whole plot: upland rice
Year 2: Sub-division: half upland rice; half job's tear and/or sesame
Year 3: Sub-division and rotation: half job's tear and/or sesame; half upland rice
Year 4: Fallow

Imperata cylindrica grass has infested cropping fields

4.2.4 Villager Proposals for Resolving Land Shortage in Huay Maha

The villagers proposed the following solutions to overcome land shortages:

Expand the village boundary of Huay Maha to include land in the village areas from which they are migrating.

Allocate land so that families have about 1-2 plots in the area adjacent to the road and about 2 plots in the management areas of their old villages, ie, some "near fields" and some "far fields". They suggested to accomplish this the villagers of Huay Maha could acquire land in their old village areas of Ban PaToop, Phou Soong Noy and Cha Norm in exchange for land in the Huay Maha area, "laek plian din".

Plant crops such as upland rice, maize and job's tear in the old village areas where soils and climatic conditions were more favourable

Pool labour to improve the walking track to the highland areas so that the transportation of these cereal crops by horses to the road and markets was made easier.

Raise goats, cattle and buffalo in areas further away from the road, ("far fields")

Construct fish ponds and undertake fish pond and frog culture in the areas near the road ("near fields").

4.2.5 Villager Perceptions about Merging with Huay Maha Village

Residing in mixed ethnic communities. Villagers appeared not to be concerned about this providing they had access to reasonable amounts of land. There are four Hmong clans represented in the three Hmong villages, Song, Va, Hur, Lee, and Tor, and villages claimed they would be more "socially comfortable and secure" if all these clans were represented in the new village site.

Some Families not Wishing to Re-settle. The meeting was informed quite openly that some families do not wish to re-settle, and would prefer to continue farming in the uplands/highlands. (although the villagers did not offer reasons, it is assumed that it
would be advantageous for them to continue opium production in the areas of higher elevations). The Village Head (Khumu) suggested that it would be better if all families were included in the merging in Huay Maha, so that a systematic rationalisation of land use could be undertaken for all families. He envisaged problems if those remaining wished to exact conditions for tenure rights to land and forest areas upon those who migrated, and for the Khumu families who wished to enter into land exchange arrangements (laek plian din) as mentioned above.

Population Increase and Increasing Land Shortage. The Hmong representatives proposed that higher education for the younger generation would enable villagers to seek off-farm employment to help relieve land pressure.

Access to Non Timber Forest Products. At present, NTFPs do not constitute a significant proportion of family incomes; they are important for domestic consumption. Villagers rated Por Sa as a less important cash crop than job's tear and sesame.

One tentative suggestion for managing NTFPs was made by villagers:

a) If all families migrated: Create common access areas for all families using agreed rules of management

b) If some families remained in the highland villages: Have arrangements where permission would be sought by the people in Huay Maha to gather NTFPs in the old village areas; (rules would have to be negotiated between the parties)

4.2.6 Benefits of Merging with Huay Maha Village
The representatives of the new settlers at the meeting indicated they would derive benefits from re-locating to Huay Maha, including; access to road/transportation, the ability to readily buy and sell produce, improved access to health services, better educational opportunities, and access to better domestic water supply.

5. Issues Identified – Phonesay District

5.1 Population Increase
Accurate figures on population increase in Huay Maha village were not gathered during the visit. Until 1990 there were 18 families in the village, and the Village Administration Authorities advised that since the year 2000 a total of 58 new families had been recorded in the village register and the total number of families at present is 87. This indicates that between 1990 and 2000 there was a natural increase of 9 families.

Based on a calculation of 6 persons per family the population would have been in the order of 162 in 2000 and presently would be in the order of 522, an increase of approximately 322%. If villagers were confined to the agricultural land within the existing Huay Maha village boundary, the demand for agricultural land has therefore increased proportionately, ie about 320%.
5.2 Land Carrying Capacity

The District authorities appear to have a market orientated plan to resolve the land use issues in Huay Maha, including the planting of long-term (eg, coffee) and short term (eg, organically grown cabbages) cash crops. To effectively undertake this plan the District would require an assessment of the available arable lands for the various land use options envisaged. To date the District Administration has not undertaken such an assessment, and so are not yet in a position to determine the number of families that could be sustained on the available land.

Given the villagers aspirations for land use, and the land use options being proposed by the District, this assessment would need to be done for two situations;

- The Huay Maha village land area
- The Huay Maha village land area and the old village land areas of Ban Patoop, Phou Soong Noy and Cha Norm.

With this information it would be possible to advise the District authorities on resettlement alternatives. An initial calculation by the socio-economic unit staff based on a population of 800 people, indicated that there was approximately a total area of 3.41 hectares of land per person in the Huay Maha village area. The area of arable agricultural land was approximately 0.54 hectares per person or about 3.24 hectares per family.

5.3 Guarantees from District to Expand Land Area for New Settlers

The District authorities in explaining their strategies for resettlement in Huay Maha indicated that economic crops such as coffee and cabbages would be introduced. This implied that land at higher altitude would be available to the villagers under the resettlement plan. Land at higher altitude is available in the village areas of Phou Soong Noy, Phou Soong, Pa Toop and Cha Norm. If so, the visions of the District and the villagers appear to be similar in principle. The crude analysis on land carrying capacity above indicates that land in Huay Maha is grossly inadequate for the population envisaged and that additional land in the H'mong villages would have to be included in the plan.

This matter needs further clarification with the District authorities, and it is believed that guarantees that adequate additional land will be made available should be sought from the District authorities. If not, it is very likely that settlers would return to use such land when they become aware that there is insufficient land available in the Huay Maha village area.

5.4 Transportation of Produce From Far Lands to the Road Head

While villagers expressed the view that they would participate in work to improve the access tracks to the old village sites to facilitate the transportation of produce by portage and pack animals, the District authorities did not express any intention or indicate that a plan had been prepared by the District to support such access track improvement under the "plan utasart". The transportation of produce over distances of four hours and more using walking tracks may well prove to be impractical and
therefore not feasible. This matter also requires further assessment by the District and the villagers when the questions of land availability and distances from marketing points at the road head are examined.

5.5 Identification of Village Management Areas

Village boundary and land use maps of Huay Maha and Poung Pao prepared in 1997/98 by District land use planning teams were shown to the research team. These two contiguous areas constitute what is now considered as the Huay Maha village area. Information was gathered by the socio-economic team members from villagers which indicated that there was 437 hectares of farming land available in 1998.

The village management areas of the H'mong villages from which villagers will be relocated have not been mapped so it is not possible to estimate the area of land in these village areas. As an initial step in calculating land carrying capacities it will be necessary to identify the traditional boundaries of each of these villages, following which areas of the different forest and land categories need to be calculated. This information will enable some objective land capability assessments to be made, upon which rational re-settlement decisions could be taken. These assessments and decisions would indicate the efficacy of the proposed plan and changes that would be desirable to ensure it does not fail.

6. Findings – Na Mo District

6.1 Land Use Planning and Land Allocation

The DAFO staff use a land use zoning approach. Only permanent agricultural land is allocated, ie, new paddy land, tree plantations or fruit tree orchards. The procedures followed are broadly as follows:

- Staff and materials preparation
- Village boundary delineation and village boundary dispute resolution in co-operation with neighbouring villages.
- Village boundary mapping and Village Boundary Agreement preparation and signing
- Forest and agricultural land use zoning and mapping.
- Village land use agreement preparation (not in all cases)

Many villages have been completed, at least to the forest and land use zoning stage. Data is still being collated.

6.2 Village Migration and Re-location
6.2.1 District Village Re-location Program
There were a total of 105 villages in the District until recently. The District Administration has a plan to consolidate these 105 villages to 77 by the year 2005. To date some have been merged and the total of 105 villages has been reduced to 91.

The District authorities explained that it was a policy of government to increase the size of villages of 10 - 20 families to 50 families to improve the convenience of administration, with a view to:
- Improving access to government services such as education and health
- Facilitating access to agricultural extension services
- Improving access to commodity markets

The reasons for selecting particular villages for merging or re-location were difficult to identify, although it was stated that villages would be re-located or merged where the following circumstances existed:
- There was potential for road access in the future, (if roads were not available at present)
- Locations where adequate land use areas were available for additional settlers, ie, in selected or focal areas.
- The identification of traditional village land and forest management areas from land use planning work to enable decisions to be made about the most suitable villages and areas for re-location or merging.

The District authorities believed that the introduction of cattle and pig raising and facilitating access to marketable NTFPs, such as bitter bamboo, cardamom, "puak muak" and rattan, fruit trees and commercial trees such as rubber and teak, would provide income for re-settled villagers. While these ideas for improving livelihoods were put forward, there did not appear to be a substantiated proposal or assessment available indicating how sustainable re-location would be achieved.

6.2.2 Village Settlement at Phangthong and Kok Fart Villages
There is quite a long history of re-settlement in the Phangthong – Kok Fart area from a number of villages in the mountainous areas on both sides of the road linking Na Mo and Luang Namtha. This started about 10 years ago, some as a result of government programs, and some as a consequence of villagers desiring more convenient land use and wishing to improve livelihoods. Villages involved in this movement include Ban Kiew Lan, Ban Pangban, Ban Lao Vieu, Ban Tien Sang, Ban Phou Thong.


Kok Fart village was established by villages from Ban Phou Thong, who first moved to Ban Nam Hom and then to the present village site at Kok Fart. This movement
occurred between 1991 –1994 and involved all families previously located at Ban Nam Hom.

The voluntary movement of villages occurred to:
- Improve convenience with land use
- Increase possibilities for livelihood improvement

6.2.3 District Plans in Project Target Villages

a) Phousang and Mixay
The District administration's intention was to merge the villages of Phousang (Phousang ethnic group) and Mixay (H'mong ethnic group) into one village and land use area. A land use planning exercise was undertaken in 1998 during which a land use map was prepared indicating that this merging had been effected. However, continuing vehement objections from the Phousang villagers, mainly that they do not share a friendly and common social relationship with Mixay villagers, (which they believe would negatively affect there livelihood development potential), has forced the District Administration to re-consider its options. This has resulted in a tentative proposal to merge the H'mong village of Phou Lee with Mixay, which appears to be a much more acceptable solution. In addition, the construction of a new road, by-passing Phousang, from Na Mo Tai to Na Mo Neua, Mixay, and the Chinese border, would provide road access to the Mixay/Phou Lee group. It was stated that the aim was to merge these two villages by the year 2005.

b) Pangthong and Kok Fart
The District Administration decided to merge Pangthong and Kok Fart in 1997 at which time land use planning was undertaken in Pangthong/Kok Fart. The village boundary and land use map indicates that they are one village, however meetings at both villages indicated that there is a very unhealthy social relationship between the two villages, and in the minds of the people of Pangthong they strongly disagree with the proposal.

c) Ban Pangdou -Settlements 1 and 2
The first settlement is next to the main road and took place in 1998. The second settlement is next to Huay Sang about 1.5 kilometers distant from the first settlement. The plan is to complete the settlement of Pangdou by 2002/03

6.3 The Situation in Pangthong and Kok Fart Villages
The District Administration and DAFO staff were interviewed regarding the conflict that exists between Pangthong and Kok Fart villages. Separate meetings were also held by the study team in Pangthong and Kok Fart villages to assess the perceptions of villagers on the proposed merging of the villages. The perceptions of each of these parties is summarised below.
6.3.1 District Perceptions
The District perception of the problem between the two villages is that there are some older persons in Pangthong village who object to the Kok Fart villagers collecting NTFPs in their village area. Collection fees are levied by Pangthong villagers at K5,000 per time which is an irritant for the Kok Fart villages. In addition there are upland farming areas which Kok Fart villagers wish to use which Pangthong villagers are reluctant to provide or release.

The District stated that "an agreement" had been brokered between the two villages following rules and procedures of the government and the District, which the Kok Fart villagers respected but the Pangthong villagers did not. To resolve the issue they proposed the following:

- Change the name of the village
- Do more detailed land use planning
- Do land allocation so that the land parcels were identified for particular persons.

The District staff explained that they had insufficient funds in the past to undertake detailed land use planning and land allocation and this may have given rise to dissatisfaction between the villages.

6.3.2 Village Statistics

Pangthong Village
The village was first settled in 1990 when seven families moved from Lao Vieu village. Since then there has been a gradual influx of people from a number of villages until the present when the number of households has risen to 49 with 63 families and a population of 324 people. The following is record of migrations to Pangthong village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of hhs.</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>From (village)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Lao Vieu</td>
<td>Original settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Lao Vieu</td>
<td>Voluntary settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Kiew Lan</td>
<td>Voluntary settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Kiew Lan</td>
<td>Voluntary settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1995</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Lao Vieu</td>
<td>Voluntary settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2002</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 63 families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kok Fart Village
The village of Kok Fart originated from the former village of Phou Thong. The residents of Phou Thong village moved firstly to Bang Ban village, from which, some moved to Na Hom, Pangdou and Kok Fart. The first people of Kok Fart arrived in 1991. The population at present is 185 of which 79 are females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of hhs.</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>From (village)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>No. of hhs.</td>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>From (village)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>White Hmong</td>
<td>Phou Thong-Bang Ban</td>
<td>Original settlers (17 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>White Hmong</td>
<td>Phou Thong-Bang Ban</td>
<td>Voluntary new settlers (8 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total of 33 families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The village committee of Pangthong advised that they are discussing the movement of more people from Bang Ban to Pangthong. This is preferred to merging with Kok Fart.

### 6.3.3 Land Use Information

Boundary and land use zoning completed by the District in 1997 indicated that the village area of Pangthong is approximately 2,200 hectares. The village has a LUP and LA Committee, ie,

1. Mr Bounsom Nai Ban and Chairman
2. Mr Somsee Vu Member
3. Nang Por Sua Lao Women's Union and Member
4. Mr Tong Yar Village "Khon Lon"
5. Mr Lao Lua Village Militia
6. Mr Pa Chong Ya Neau Hom and Member

The land use zones defined in the villages of Pangthong and Kok Fart by the District LUP team in 1997 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Pangthong Village (ha)</th>
<th>KokFart Village (ha)</th>
<th>Areas per Family (ha) Phanthong Kok Fart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection Forest</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>21.36 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Forest</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>6.98 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Use</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.46 0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.25 ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>4.50 4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (inc. teak areas)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.34 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200 ha</strong></td>
<td><strong>280 ha</strong></td>
<td><strong>35 ha 8.5 ha</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boundary of Pangthong village is adjacent to eight other villages: Bang Ban, Huay Sang (Khumu), Huay Sang, Kiew Lan, Na Mo Neua, Kok Fart, Na Mo Tai and Nam Paeng. Of these villages they have had disputes with Kok Fart and Na Mo Neua. The Kok Fart disputes remain unresolved. However they claim that since 2001 when they imposed fines of K15,000 on five Na Mo Neua families using land without permission in their village area, there has been no more trespassing by the Na Mo Neua villagers.

The Pangthong villagers still retain usage of some land in the Bang Ban village area, near Na Mo Neua village. They have an idea to allocate parcels of land equitability to families in the village and to include other villagers from Bang Ban who are
proposing to settle in Pangthong. It would be allocated on a nuclear family basis. The land use categories or zones would be re-adjusted to accommodate more people, and paddy areas in the Bang Ban village area would be maintained. They believe that permanent tree crops and cardamom should be grown near to the main road while rice fields and cattle raising areas should be located further away from the road. Livestock owners would have to accept the responsibility of managing and preventing damage to field crops.

Pangthong Perceptions of Land Use Conflicts
The village committee and others who attended the meeting said they absolutely did not agree to have Kok Fart village merge with them. They claim that the Kok Fart villagers broke the "land use contract" which had been made and cultivated land in their village management area without seeking permission. Another cause of discontent is that a tree used for housing, "Mai Xay Soy" is not available in the area allocated to Kok Fart by the District, and the Kok Fart villagers wish to use trees in the Pangthong village area. The location of the primary school established by the District for both villages is under dispute, the Pangthong villagers claiming it's location favours the Kok Fart group.

They also claim there was insufficient dialogue with them about the merging proposal before it was implemented, and when land use problems arose in the past the District made quick decisions in consultation with Kok Fart with out sufficient reference to Pangthong. The Pangthong villagers did not make any proposals to resolve the conflict with Kok Fart village. They have on-going dialogue with Bang Ban villagers and would prefer to deal with that group regarding the distribution of land. The problem of merging with Kok Fart village appears to be intractable.

Kok Fart Perceptions of Land Use Conflicts
When the Kok Fart villagers moved to their present location and before the District did village boundary delineation and land use zoning the two villages managed the land as common land (din ruam). In 1997 the land use zoning was undertaken by the District. This divided the area between Pangthong and Kok Fart with Pangthong being allocated a much larger area than Kok Fart. Forest conservation or protection areas and agricultural areas were delineated. Kok Fart village did not receive a copy of the land use map. The total area allocated to Kok Fart, including protected forest land was claimed to be 180 hectares, or for the 33 families currently living in Kok Fart, 5.45 ha per family.

They said they negotiate each year with the neighbouring villages of Pangthong, Bang Ban, Na Mo Tai, Na Mo Neua and Huay Sarn to access agricultural land in order to have enough land and to maintain some sort of rotation of land. On occasions these villages did not agree to provide the land requested. They had only three hectares of paddy in the village which is owned by five families. There is about 2-3 plots of land per family in the village which is inadequate for productive rotations. Three families have no land and rent land at a cost of K200,000 /plot/year. They complain that Pangthong village charges them K5,000 each time they harvest NTFPs.

The Kok Fart people believe they are more clever than the Pangthong villagers and say this may be recognised by the Pangthong villagers, who are therefore reluctant to
allow them to merge into their community for fear that they will gain the ascendancy in land use and management issues. This may be true as it was evident that the Kok Fart group were displaying initiatives to improve their livelihoods. For example, they had successfully introduced village rules outlawing the smoking of opium and tobacco which were being respected by all members of the community, and they had initiated a plan during 2001 and 2002 to purchase paddy land from the neighbouring villages of Huay Sang, \textit{(lanten ethnic group)}, Na Mo Tai and Pang Dou to overcome their land shortage problem. To date 17 families had purchased 10 hectares of paddy land. The cost of the land ranged between K2,000,000 to K8,000,000 per 0.4 hectare.

The Kok Fart villagers stated they still wish to merge with Pangthong village if Pangthong villagers were willing to do so.

\textbf{Solutions Proposed by Kok Fart Villages}

- Define the village areas of Pangthong and Kok Fart as one management area.
- Redistribute and allocate agricultural land to all families of both villages within the one management area
- Continue to buy paddy land from other villages (see above)

\textbf{6.4 Situation in Mixay Village}

A meeting was held in Mixay village on 13\textsuperscript{th} June attended by 12 villages. Matters discussed included:
- Village settlement history
- Problems associated with the cultivation and exploitation of \textit{Pa Goh} forest areas used for NTFP collection, notably the valuable red mushrooms, \textit{het daeng}
- Land use zoning and management of forest areas.
- The tentative District proposal to merge Ban Phou Lee with Ban Mixay

The District attempted to merge Mixay (Hmong) and Phousang (Phousang) in 1998. Administratively the villages have been referred to since then as Saysamphan. This has met with strong objections from Phousang village and has resulted in the District Administration reconsidering this proposal. The District Administration now tentatively proposes that Ban Phou Lee be merged with Mixay and Phousang remain as a separate village entity.

\textbf{6.4.1 History of Settlement of Mixay Village}

Settlement at the present village site commenced in 1997. Previous to that the people of Mixay had moved their village location on six occasions. At present there are a total of 14 households and 19 families in the village with a population of 104 people, 56 females and 48 males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of hhs.</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>From (village)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997 (start)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Huay Kating</td>
<td>Original settlers (5 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 (end)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Huay Kating</td>
<td>Voluntary new settlers (12 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>From (village)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hhs.</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Keola</td>
<td>Voluntary new settlers (2 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Phou Lee</td>
<td>Voluntary new settlers (2 families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Migrated out -2 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4.2 Land Use Information

The village has a LUP and LA Committee comprised as follows:

1. Tau Tor - Previous Nai Ban - Chairman
2. Tau Phor - Village Protection - Member
3. Tau Sangphone - Village Tax Collector - Member
4. Tau Phonesy - Village Forestry Volunteer - Member
5. Nang Por Sua - Lao Women's Union - Member

Village boundary delineation and land use zoning was done in 1998. The following land use zones were defined:

- Protection Forest: 760 ha
- Production Forest: 70 ha
- Conservation Forest: 322 ha
- Regeneration Forest: 40 ha
- Agriculture: 40 ha
- Other: 4 ha
- Total: 1,236 ha

### 6.4.3 NTFP Collection - Red Mushroom (*het daeng*)

The socio economic unit previously reported the concerns of Mixay villagers about the cultivation of Pa Ko forest areas from which the valuable *het daeng* is harvested. The habitat of the mushroom is a mixed natural forest commonly called "Pa Ko" in which the species of Mai Ko, Mai Ha and Mai Tro grow. The mushrooms occur in small plots within the forest of 0.5 to 1.0 "rai" or 1,000 to 2,500 m². Quantities of 2-3 Kgs are usually harvested from such plots each year.

**The Problem**

Other villagers from Natao, Kiew Lan and Phousang collect the mushrooms indiscriminately from two "forest zones" which villagers refer to as Phou Nam Lao and Phou Pa Saang. In addition forest areas have been cleared in these zones for agricultural production since 1973, sometimes with insufficient regard for the presence of the type of forest that supports the mushrooms. At that time, and until recently, there was a lot of village movement and the areas were used as common land. This is endangering the sustainability of the mushroom population.

The villagers have prepared a "Village Agreement" with a view to protecting the mushroom resource, which includes the collection fees of K200/harvest. However this agreement has not been properly formalised and is not respected by the other villagers and is therefore not effective, although it was stated that the agreement was drawn up
in consultation with the District staff. The villagers of Mixay themselves do not have a unified view on how this problem should be resolved.

6.4.4 Merging Mixay and Phou Lee Villages
The District Administration appears to be prepared to abandon the idea of merging Mixay and Phousang (Sysamphan) because of the opposition expressed by the Phousang villagers. There has been some voluntary movement of Phou Lee villagers to Mixay in recent times, ie, two families in 1998. Phou Lee and Mixay are both Hmong villages and a merging of these villages based on ethnic considerations would appear to be compatible. To date there has been no official discussions held by the District Administration with the Mixay villagers on this matter. The Mixay people at the meeting indicated they would be in agreement with such a proposal and they stated that "some people" of Phou Lee would be interested in such a merger.

7. Issues Identified - Na Mo District
A number of issues which warrant further investigation and/or research were identified during this initial visit to project target villages. These are summarised below.

7.1 Criteria for Selecting Villages for Consolidation
Discussions were held with District Administration and DAFO representatives regarding the criteria by which villagers were selected for merging or consolidation with other villages. The policy to increase the size of villages to 50 family units was clear, ie, to improve the convenience and efficiency of delivering government services to villages. Nevertheless the way the policy is applied is less clear. The fact that there are concerns in the villages about merging with other communities which, eg, Pangthong/KokFart and Phousang/Mixay, indicates that the eagerness to achieve consolidation targets is not backed-up with sufficient assessment of the socio-economic situations in either the villages targeted for re-location or the villages which will receive new settlers, prior to decisions being taken to re-locate villages. The consequences can be very serious, the most serious one being villagers having insufficient arable production land and basic food requirements.

7.2 Villager Livelihoods Assessment Prior to Re-location
The discussions held and the observations made indicate that assessments of current livelihood status of families being considered for re-location are not undertaken in order to have some benchmark or base line to assess and compare with livelihood possibilities and potential at the new location. Commodities or activities that villagers might take up to secure livelihoods in new locations are proposed by District officials, however assessments of their potential and effectiveness are not undertaken. This places the onus on the villagers "to make a go of it" in their new location which has the potential to cause severe hardship, while they go through the process of testing livelihood possibilities.
7.3 Merging Socially Incompatible Villages

The situation observed at Pangthong and Kok Fart where deep dissatisfaction exists about the merger of these two villagers, despite the fact that they are both of the Hmong ethnic group, indicates that they will probably never live coherently and in harmony. While the inequity in access to agricultural land appears to be the root cause of on-going disagreements, there appear to be a major social variance or contrariety between the two groups which has led to unconditional distrust. It is also said that the two groups did not get on before they moved to their present locations. It would be advantageous for these issues to be considered in the planning of village consolidation programs.

7.4 The Pangthong/ Kok Fart Village Merger

As mentioned above there appear to be intractable social and land use problems between these two villages, although officially they remain as one village. Land use zoning was undertaken by the District in 1997 which "amalgamated" the groups but this activity unfortunately has heightened the discrepancy in access to land between the two groups and has caused distrust. The Kok Fart villagers are still amenable to a merger, apparently on the basis that it would give them more agricultural land, however the Pangthong villagers are most reluctant to do this. They are however continuing discussions with Bang Ban village about merging with them and being allocated land in the Pangthong management area, an initiative which would exclude Kok Fart. It appears that seeking alternatives to the official merger of Pangthong and Kok Fart villages would be beneficial.

In a de-briefing session the Deputy District Governor offered the suggestion that Kok Fart be merged with Pangdou village. This may be an alternative, however the same principles of prior socio-economic assessment should still apply, because, while it might overcome the District embarrassment of achieving a merger of Kok Fart village, it may have similar consequences as the Pangthong/Kok Fart merger.

7.5 Land Inequities and Inadequacies Caused by Village Mergers

This relates to the issue of inadequate criteria for assessing the efficacy of village relocations and mergers explained above. If criteria to back up the policy for relocating and merging villages are not defined, the potential for land inequities and inadequacies will remain as evidenced in Kok Fart village. The allocation of land parcels may itself cause hardship if undertaken in such situations. Therefore adequate land use planning prior to finalising village mergers is very important, and, along with livelihood assessments, should be part of the criteria for village consolidation.

7.6 Village Initiatives and Proposals to Improve Access to Land

It was observed that villagers have taken initiatives and also put forward proposals for accessing adequate land while remaining resident close to roads and other services provided both by government and private entrepreneurs. The Hmong settlers in Huay Maha village and the Huay Maha villagers themselves proposed that there be land exchange between the two groups in defined management areas, so that both groups had access to "near land" and "far land" for different land uses. They thought this
would alleviate problems of some families having inadequate and poor quality land. It was also thought this would also broaden the land use options available to families.

In the case of Kok Fart where most families suffer land shortage, the villagers made temporary arrangements with neighbouring villages to rent or borrow land while they searched for paddy land in other villages. They also saved money from other activities to purchase the paddy land they had identified in nearby villages. This enables them to remain in their present location near the road and other services, where there is land shortage, but to undertake agricultural production activities elsewhere.

7.7 Phousang/Mixay Consolidation
As mentioned above the Phousang villagers do not wish to merge with Mixay village and the District Administration is considering merging Phou Lee village with Mixay. Both are Hmong villages and there have been some voluntary migrations of families from Phou Lee to Mixay. A new road is proposed from Na Mo Neua to Mixay and then to the Chinese border which would give both villages improved road access. An socio-economic assessment and a land capability assessment in these villages would provide information for the District to assess the feasibility of such a proposal. The Project could consider including such assessment activities in future work plans.

7.8 Management Agreements for Forest Areas and NTFPs
The discussions with the Mixay people indicated that the problem with agricultural cultivation encroaching into forest areas that support the het daeng arises from inadequate inter-village land use regulations of forest areas. Although Mixay village has some rules regarding het daeng collection, the rules are not respected by neighbouring villages which renders the rules ineffective. There is a need for land use planning activity to clearly define the forest areas of Mixay village, and each of the surrounding villages with an interest in this valuable NTFP. The rules need to be developed co-jointly between the concerned villages and recognised and supported by the District Administration. The Project could assist the villagers and the District with this activity which could be conducted in association with the socio-economic and land capability assessment referred to above. The Project as part of its research effort, could monitor the effect of the forest and NTFP management rules after they are established.

8. Initial Conclusions and Recommendations

8.1 General Conclusions
The initial discussions with District authorities and villagers in both Phonesay and Na Mo Districts indicate that the land use issues in both Districts, particularly those related to re-location or consolidation of villages, are very similar. It is therefore possible to generalise on a number of main conclusions drawn.

- Re-location and consolidation of villages is regarded as a very important strategy of District Authorities with a view to contain shifting cultivation,
reduce opium production, and to facilitate easier provision of services to larger village units located near roads.

- The authorities have very clear plans regarding the number of villages that will be re-located or consolidated, however they lack resources to properly prepare for re-locating or consolidating villages or to provide the support necessary to complete the plans effectively or adequately.

- Land use difficulties are arising as a consequence of this incapacity to plan and support the villagers being consolidated. These problems include inequities between villagers to access agricultural land, inadequate land for sustainable agriculture, social incompatibility between villagers being merged, and inadequate land use planning practices when implementing the plans.

- There have been voluntary or spontaneous migrations by villagers for several years from more isolated areas to areas close to roads and areas which offer possibilities for improved services and potential to improve livelihoods. Villager ambitions are therefore not incompatible with the thinking and plans of the district authorities, as they too have indicated their desire to live in less isolated areas.

- It is not clear if District Authorities would provide guarantees that village management areas and village boundaries in the re-location areas can be expanded to ensure adequate land is available for agricultural production for the increasing population. This requires further follow-up.

- Villager communities often migrate gradually, with a few families moving to the new location first, after which others follow. Families from more than one village often move to the one location.

- Villagers of Hmong ethnic origins are the group mostly affected by re-location and consolidation programmes. Not all villagers wish to migrate, some preferring to remain in their home village.

- Villagers while wanting to access land near roads or planned roads, have strategies for retaining access to land in their home village areas, some distance from the road, to give them adequate land and also better land use options, eg, cattle raising, rain-fed crop production. They are prepared to contribute to the improvement of access tracks to these areas to make transportation of produce more convenient.

- The District proposals include the planting of introduced crops that are not or may not yet be climatically or market proven, ie coffee, head cabbages. The villagers, on the other hand, are considering crops and livestock options with which they are familiar (lower risk). Villagers are more concerned with organising land use zoning so that they can put these land use options into practice.

- The land use planning and land allocation programs are largely undertaken in response to the GOL policies and plans for shifting cultivation and opium reduction. Re-location and consolidation of villages are key strategies to effect these policies. These two programs are managed by different agencies in the District, re-location by the District Administration and LUP/LA by the DAFO.

- This is one reason that LUP/LA is done hastily and often with undesirable
• consequences. In view of these realities, the approach that the project might adopt in relation to land management, is to assess and study the various issues arising in selected villages and provide information to District authorities which will assist them to achieve these policy objectives more effectively.
8.2 Recommendations
The recommendations for follow-up research are discussed in a number of categories. It is believed this will assist in organising the orientation of future research activities based on the component objectives and activities as defined in the Programme Document.

The field activities undertaken by the Land Management Component and the Socio-economic Unit on this field trip were concerned with the component objectives and activities presented in the "Back to the Office Report" of 13th June, 2002 by the Socio-economics Adviser, John Raintree, reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Socioeconomic constraints and potentials of upland production systems are identified and impacts of technological and marketing interventions and government policies on upland livelihoods are better understood | • Conduct diagnostic, socioeconomic and marketing studies for development of upland production systems  
• Coordinate and cooperate with other research units to provide concepts, methodology and assistance in meeting their needs for socioeconomic and marketing studies  
• Conduct studies of impacts of technological and marketing interventions and government policy on upland livelihoods  
• Develop monitoring and feedback system for planners, policy makers and other stakeholders |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Current land use systems are described and appropriate land use zones in the uplands are identified, demarcated and mapped | • Study existing land use systems and determine the natural resources assets and the carrying capacity of ecosystems for various land uses in the uplands (diagnose constraints and potentials).  
• Develop agroecological and forest land use zoning (in collaboration with other activities in this field) |
| Impact of land use planning and land allocation are identified and appropriate procedures and methods of Land Use Planning and Land Allocation are developed/refined to suit the upland conditions | • Undertake studies of impact of land allocation (in cooperation with the Socio-economic Unit)  
• Undertake research to improve land use planning and land allocation procedures (issues relating to flexibility, limitations and improvement of procedures and systems, co-ordination, and the implications between land use zoning and land allocation).  
• Register and systematically manage agricultural land allocation information |

9. Follow-up Study
It is concluded that follow-up study is required on the issues tabulated below.

9.1 Follow-Up Study Required in Phonsay District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research to Improve Land Use Planning and Land Allocation Procedures</td>
<td>• More detailed investigation on the &quot;history&quot; of LUP/LA activities in the District&lt;br&gt;• More detailed assessment of LUP/LA methods used in target villages&lt;br&gt;• Assess District criteria for village land use zoning and land allocation&lt;br&gt;• More detailed assessment of DAFO constraints with LUP/LA to define:&lt;br&gt;  a) Knowledge constraints&lt;br&gt;  b) Training needs&lt;br&gt;  c) Human resource constraints&lt;br&gt;  d) Equipment &amp; materials constraints</td>
<td>• Follow-up discussions with District Administration and DAFO staff&lt;br&gt;• Gather detailed data on the actual LUP/LA activities done in the 4 Project target villages from:&lt;br&gt;  • District Administration and DAFO staff&lt;br&gt;  • Village Administration Authorities and Villagers&lt;br&gt;• Follow-up discussions with District Administration and DAFO staff&lt;br&gt;• Study Village Land Use Zoning maps and Land Use Agreements with staff and villagers&lt;br&gt;• Discussions on past programs, work plans and activities with District and DAFO staff&lt;br&gt;• Observations in villages in which LUP/LA has been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of existing land use systems and determine the natural resources assets and the carrying capacity of ecosystems</td>
<td>In Huay Maha Village and in the Hmong Villages: Pa Toop, Phou Soong Noy, Ja Nom (and others):&lt;br&gt;• Calculation of population densities and carrying capacities of existing land areas and options based on the consolidation plans of the District and villagers intentions&lt;br&gt;• Land areas of different slope classes&lt;br&gt;• Agricultural land availability in the different slope classes&lt;br&gt;• Land use/ownership of families in Huay Maha since village re-settlement started in 2000;&lt;br&gt;  a) Original families and,&lt;br&gt;  b) New settlers;&lt;br&gt;• Location, area, quality of land, yield potentials etc&lt;br&gt;• NTFP availability, current use and possible potential&lt;br&gt;• Undertake market research on the commodities that the District is claiming it</td>
<td>• Assessment by LM component&lt;br&gt;• Calculations based on slope category maps (Soils Div.)&lt;br&gt;• Calculations based on slope class potentials&lt;br&gt;• Focal group discussions with the villagers of each of these villages.&lt;br&gt;• Focal group discussions observations, district yield data, farming systems data&lt;br&gt;• Market studies by SEU including assessment of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Activity</td>
<td>Research Activity</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Undertake studies of impact of land allocation and village re-location and consolidation (in cooperation with the Socio-economic Unit) | Village Migration and Re-location: Gather more information on;  
- District Administration Zones, Focal Development Areas, and "Village Economic or Development Groups" (LM)  
- District process/method for deciding on "Village Consolidation" (LM)  
- Study the migration and "voluntary" or "spontaneous" re-location phenomena  
- Study the "Sixteen Alternatives" policy (for reducing shifting cultivation)  
- Socio-economic impacts of migrations:  
  a) In the host village on original residents  
  b) In the host village on migrants  
  c) In the villages from which people migrated (on people who decide not to move)  
- Assess village proposals for resolving land shortage, ie, improving access tracks to more distant farming areas, land sharing and exchange etc. | Discussions with District Administration Authorities  
Discussion with District Administration Authorities  
Migration history study (SEU)  
Livelihood strategy study (SEU)  
Discussion with District Administration Authorities  
SEU study on impacts  
Review by LM with District Administration Authorities. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop agro-ecological and forest land use zoning | Undertake the following assessments in Huay Maha and re-location villages  
- Calculation of population densities and carrying capacities of existing land areas and options based on the consolidation plans of the District, and villagers intentions  
- Land use certificates issued (to whom, when, how much land etc) in Huay Maha & the other villages  
- Assessing the potential for utilising land for migrating families in Huay Maha and the villages from which they are migrating  
- Land use zoning and slope class definition to assess land availability for different land use options.  
- Alternative village land boundaries and village management areas to accommodate increased population  
- District commitment to village land boundary changes to satisfy the calculated land demand. | Assessment by LM component  
Village Committee & villagers  
Land use potential assessment by LM  
Land use zoning exercise and assessment by LM  
Village boundary definition and land use categories of the target villages by LM  
Consultations with District Authorities by LM |
9.2 Follow-up Study Required in Na Mo District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research to Improve Land Use Planning and Land Allocation Procedures</td>
<td>• More detailed investigation of the &quot;history&quot; of LUP/LA activities in the District</td>
<td>• Follow-up discussions with District Administration and DAFO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More detailed assessment of LUP/LA methods used in target villages</td>
<td>• Gather detailed data on the actual LUP/LA activities done in the 4 Project target villages from:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess District criteria for village land use zoning and land allocation</td>
<td>• District Administration and DAFO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More detailed assessment of DAFO constraints with LUP/LA to define:</td>
<td>• Village Administration Authorities and Villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Knowledge constraints</td>
<td>• Follow-up discussions with District Administration and DAFO staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Training needs</td>
<td>• Study Village Land Use Zoning maps and Land Use Agreements with staff and villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Human resource constraints</td>
<td>• Discussions on past programs, work plans and activities with District and DAFO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Equipment &amp; materials constraints</td>
<td>• Observations in villages in which LUP/LA has been undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More detailed understanding of District NTFP harvesting and marketing regulations</td>
<td>• Discussions on past programs, work plans and activities with District and DAFO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study of existing land use systems and determine the natural resources assets and the carrying capacity of ecosystems</strong></td>
<td><strong>In Ban Phang Thong and Kok Fart Villages</strong></td>
<td>• Assessment by LM component. Use existing LU data and LU Maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Research Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Calculation of population densities and carrying capacities of existing land areas and options based on the consolidation plans of the District</td>
<td>Village Committees, family interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study details of villager plans for land use in both villages</td>
<td>Calculations based on slope category maps (Soils Div.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land areas of different slope classes in both villages</td>
<td>Calculations based on slope class potentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agricultural land availability in the different slope classes in both villages</td>
<td>Focal group discussions and family interviews with the villagers of each of these villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land use/ownership of families in Pang Thong and Kok Fart since village settlement started in 1990 and 1991; a) Original families and, b) New settlers;</td>
<td>Focal group discussions observations, District yield data, Farming Systems data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Location, area, quality of land, yield potentials etc</td>
<td>Focal group discussions with the villagers of each of these villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NTFP availability, current use and potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research Activity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source of Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undertake studies of impact of land allocation and village re-location and consolidation (in cooperation with the Socio-economic Unit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Village Migration and Re-location:</strong> <strong>Gather more information on;</strong></td>
<td>• Discussions with District Administration Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• District Administration Zones, Focal Development Areas, and &quot;Village Economic or Development Groups&quot; (LM)</td>
<td>Discussion with District Administration Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• District process/method for deciding on &quot;Village Consolidation&quot; (LM)</td>
<td>Migration history study (SEU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study the migration and &quot;voluntary&quot; or &quot;spontaneous&quot; re-location phenomena</td>
<td>Livelihood strategy study (SEU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study the &quot;Sixteen Alternatives&quot; policy (for reducing shifting cultivation) &amp; application</td>
<td>Discussion with District Administration Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Socio-economic impacts of consolidation proposal: a) In Pang Thong village b) In Kok Fart Village</td>
<td>Social and economic impact study (SEU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Assess village proposals for resolving land shortage, ie, land use zoning, land sharing and exchange, land purchasing etc
- Assess alternatives to the present proposal for consolidating Kok Fart with Pang Thong

- Review by LM with District Administration Authorities.
- Consultation between LM and District Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop agro-ecological and forest land use zoning</strong></td>
<td>Undertake the following assessments in Phang Thong and Kok Fart Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Calculation of population densities and carrying capacities of existing land areas and options based on the consolidation plans of the District and villagers land use proposals</td>
<td>Assessment by LM component</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment of land areas available in each village management area from village boundary definition</td>
<td>Land use zoning exercise by LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land use zoning and slope class definition to assess land availability for different land use options.</td>
<td>Village boundary definition and land use categories of the target villages by LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assess alternative village land boundaries and village management areas to accommodate Pang Thong and Kok Fart populations equitably</td>
<td>Village Committee &amp; villagers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Land use certificates issued (to whom, when, how much land etc) in Pang Thong and Kok Fart villages</td>
<td>Consultations with District Authorities by LM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- District commitment to village land boundary changes to satisfy the calculated land demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undertake studies of impact of land allocation and village re-location and consolidation (in cooperation with the Socio-economic Unit)</strong></td>
<td>In Mixay, Phousang and Phou Lee Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Migration and Consolidation: Gather more information on;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential socio-economic impacts of the District consolidation proposal:</td>
<td>Social and economic impact study (SEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) In Mixay village</td>
<td>Migration history study (SEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) In Phousang Village</td>
<td>Livelihood strategy study (SEU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assess village proposals for resolving land use problems, eg, land development, land use zoning, land sharing and exchange, land purchasing etc</td>
<td>Discussions with Village Authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation between LM, the Village Committees and District Authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Assess alternatives to the present proposal for consolidating Phou Sang and Mixay villages, including the latest suggestion from the District that Mixay and Phou Lee villages be consolidated.

- Consultation between LM, the Village Committees and District Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study of existing land use systems and determine the natural resources assets and the carrying capacity of ecosystems</td>
<td>In Phousang, Mixay, and Phou Lee Villages Research Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment by LM component. Use existing LU data and LU Maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village Committees, family interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculations based on slope category maps (Soils Div.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculations based on slope class potentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village committee and focal group discussions and family interviews with the villagers of each of these villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village committee and focal group discussions observations, District yield data, Farming Systems data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Village committee and focal group discussions with the villagers of each of these villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing study by SEU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Activity</th>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop agro-ecological and forest land use zoning</td>
<td>Undertake the following assessments in Phou Sang, Mixay and Phou Lee Villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment by LM component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment by LM component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Activity</td>
<td>Research Activity</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Land use zoning and slope class definition to assess land availability for different land use options.</td>
<td>• Land use zoning exercise by LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess alternative village land boundaries and village management areas to accommodate Pang Thong and Kok Fart populations equitably</td>
<td>• Village boundary definition and land use categories of the target villages by LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigate land use certificates issued (to whom, when, how much land etc) in Phou Sang and Mixay villages, if any)</td>
<td>• Village Committee &amp; villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Check District commitment to village land boundary changes to satisfy the calculated land demand.</td>
<td>• Consultations with District Authorities by LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess the weaknesses of the Village Agreement for the management and use of <em>het daeng</em> and facilitate proposals to villagers and the District for the improvement of the Village Agreement.</td>
<td>• Village Committees of each village and District Authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>