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The valuable contributions by all stakeholders are gratefully acknowledged.

By the time of finalization of this report, the process of implementing the Social Land Concession Program has moved a decisive step forward. The Royal Government of Cambodia has started the preparation of a “Land Allocation for Social and Social Development (LASED)” project. The project preparation team makes intensive use of the PSIA findings and recommendations and continues the transparent and participatory process which the PSIA team initiated.

The initial PSIA papers had very ambitious objectives, some of which could not be achieved. The knowledge gaps which remained after the initial PSIA are filled by specific additional
studies commissioned as part of the project preparation exercise. While the PSIA paper(s) provide ample information on implementation obstacles, the additional studies will supply more detailed answers to questions like minimum land size, economics of existing and potential smallholder farm models, optional mechanisms and expected costs of minimum infrastructure and service provision.

The PSIA needs to be understood as a mixture of both a product -the PSIA report- and a process. This distinguishes the PSIA from more standard studies. Information was collected and shared in a very transparent and participatory way. In this respect, the biggest achievement of the PSIA was the initiation of an open discussion among all stakeholders about the proposed Social Land Concession Program. A broad coalition between different stakeholders formed during the various meetings and workshops. A joint understanding between Government, NGOs, and donors about the problems, potentials and required actions has developed.

This open process is expected to continue throughout project preparation and implementation. The new partnerships will facilitate policy refinement and the formulation and implementation of a land allocation project which will address the needs of the rural poor and support RGC in its poverty-reduction and growth efforts.

Phnom Penh
November 2004
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Executive Summary

Background

The Poverty and Social Impact Analysis (PSIA) of Cambodia’s Social Land Concession Program was initiated in FY03 with a proposal for funding under the NTFESSD. Based on discussions with the Cambodia Country Team, members of the IMF Country Team, the GTZ PSIA Team, and with members of the Bank’s PSIA Core Team on Cambodia’s policy reform agenda, it was decided to research the potential impacts of the proposed land distribution program. Reforms of the policies regulating access to and management of natural resources, in particular land for agriculture, are expected to increase the potential for pro-poor growth, including the possibility for increased value added through processing, marketing and exports. The reforms, if implemented coherently and comprehensively, are expected to have a positive distributional impact and significant poverty reduction effects.

In support of RGC’s efforts for poverty reduction through improved access to land, the Bank was considering to prepare an investment operation\(^1\) to facilitate the full-scale implementation of the social concession program. The assessment of the potential impacts of social concessions formed an integral part of the Bank’s long term support strategy for poverty reduction in Cambodia.

Objective of the study

The PSIA focused on understanding the impacts of alternative policy measures that will govern the access to, and the utilization of land. The specific objectives of the PSIA were to determine the poverty and social impacts of land reform, i.e. implementation of the Sub-Decree on Social Land Concessions; assessing the likelihood of reaching full achievement, and the determinants for successful performance.

Research Approach

The poverty and social impact analysis of Cambodia’s planned Social Land Concession (SC) program was conducted between May 2003 and May 2004. It was a joint exercise between the Ministry of Land, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC), GTZ, Oxfam GB, Agri-Business Institute Cambodia (ABiC), and the World Bank.

Preparation of Concept Note

Between May and August 2003 a concept note for the PSIA was prepared. It explained the PSIA approach for analyzing the proposed land distribution program and outlined the multidisciplinary, participative and transparent research process that was suggested. On September 8, 2003, the Concept Note was peer-reviewed and received endorsement from the World Bank Country Director for Cambodia.

---

\(^1\) At the time of writing this report (October 2004) the preparation of the “Land Allocation for Social and Economic Development (LASED)” project is under way.
Methodology
To ensure representation of different stakeholders in the research, the team comprised different partners, covering different aspects of the research, based on their experience and comparative advantage in contributing to a comprehensive assessment of the SC program. The research was divided in different parts highlighting the important aspects of the SC program. The analysis was supposed to deal with four main issues:

1. **Potential social and economic impacts**
   - Who will benefit from the program considering the proposed implementation mechanisms? Who are the winners and losers?
   - What poverty reduction effects can be expected? How big/significant will be the impacts?

2. **Designs and implementation**
   - Which formal and informal institutions are, or should be, involved in the design and implementation of the reform?
   - What other institutions exist and how relevant are they to the reform?
   - Will these institutions work in an efficient and transparent way?

3. **Additionally required infrastructure and services**
   - What needs to be done to ensure maximum benefit from the land distribution program on a sustainable basis for the poor?
   - What is the current status with respect to infrastructure and services?
   - What other services are central for the long-term sustainability of the impacts of the reform? What importance / significance for the program has the social infrastructure?

4. **Landlessness and potentially available land**
   - What is the amount of land available for distribution (from agricultural/economic concessions, “unused land”, possessions of the armed forces, demined/demining areas, forest and degraded forests, etc.)? Is this land vacant? What is the agricultural potential of these lands? What are the regional patterns?
   - What is the extent of landlessness? What is the need for land distribution? What are the regional patterns?
   - To what extent does the land available match the needs?

The research process included as an integral part a series of consultations with government institutions, NGOs, and donors, at various stages of the PSIA exercises. Research topics and methodology have been discussed in workshops prior to finalization of research design and field work. The research team(s) benefited from the lively participation of different Cambodian institutions and development partners.

In addition to its original/primary analysis, the report draws on secondary data, i.e. existing (and ongoing) analytical work in the field of land-based and rural livelihoods. Research partners
produced individual (draft) reports which were jointly consolidated into the present PSIA report under the guidance of the World Bank consultant.

In order to obtain nationally representative results the study was carried out in two randomly selected provinces in each of four agro-ecological zones as defined by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) in 1986. The randomization was again applied for the selection of communes, villages and households. Five (05) communes were included in the sample from each province, and 15 villages from each commune. For certain provinces where the communes are small, all villages were taken without requiring the randomization procedure; and then the remaining were randomly chosen from other communes of the same province. This was the case for the provinces of Koh Kong, and Stung Treng. Finally, 10 households were selected from each village for household survey.

The PSIA did not manage to produce all the intended information as outlined in the Concept Note. Not all the data and information which was expected to be readily available for analysis could be found or collected in time. The analysis falls short of detailed quantification of benefits and costs. This vital information will be the outcome of studies which have been launched in the framework of preparing the “Land Allocation for Social and Economic Development (LASED)” project. The highly appreciated participatory and transparent process which started with the PSIA is expected throughout the next phases of project preparation and implementation.

**Major findings**

**Potential poverty and social impacts**

The social dimension

More than 80 percent of Cambodia’s population reside in rural areas and depend upon agriculture. In the PSIA survey 82.5 percent of FGD participants reported their dependence on rice (and other crop) farming as primary livelihood activity. Poverty for rural families is defined by them as not having enough to eat for some time in a year. Following their definition, the distribution of poverty rates follows similar patterns as landlessness. Owning a piece of land does not only have an important food security dimension but contributes also to families’ social (poverty) status in a community. Within the current socioeconomic framework conditions in Cambodia, **access to land is the most important social safety net in rural areas**

Very few respondents in the study disagreed on the proposed criteria for eligibility for participants in the SC program. However, respondents were aware that the set criteria would exclude some needy groups and some suggested to extend or modify the proposed selection. According to FGD in the villages, naturalized Cambodians of any ethnicity, who are well integrated into local communities should be given access to the program. The selection criteria

---

2 The paper by Philine Auffret (2003) provides an approximation of potential benefits and preferred strategies. However, the quality of data basis for his analysis is questioned by local researchers.

3 (a) Be a Cambodian national, legal person; (b) Be the head of family of two or more members related by blood or marriage residing in the same household; (c) Meet financial criteria established by a Prakas of the Ministry of Social Affairs; (d) Not be an owner of land as large as or larger than size of land to be given in the SC program as outlined in the SCS; (e) Be ready, willing and able to participate in the SC.
also seem to discriminate against single-person households, excluding for example young unmarried “farmers” and old villagers living alone.

Some respondents were worried about land grabbing when there is a 5 year period before titles can be obtained. Not being able to rent out or mortgage the land during the initial five years was also seen as a problem, in particular when emergency cash needs occur. Illness related expenditures were mentioned as prime issues. Experiences cited by Oxfam suggest that secret/informal markets for SC land will develop quickly. This is an important issue as the survey found 97 percent of potential beneficiaries from land distribution already being indebted, on average with USD117.

Financial and economic impacts
Available studies and research papers indicate that with any accessible land being preferably cultivated with rice for subsistence, the potentially derivable income within the current institutional and service delivery framework will be in the range of no more than USD100-200 per hectare⁴. Rice yields average barely 2 tons per hectare with many poor farmers harvest just 1000kg per hectare, just a fraction of potentially 5 tons under controlled irrigation. Small farmers seem to be less productive than farmers with medium-size holdings who are more productive than large farmers. Apart from the general lack of modern farming inputs, small farmers face the problem that they are forced into day-labor to supplement their agricultural income. Opportunities to do so are best during seasons when returns to labor inputs on their own farms would be highest. There is a vicious circle which leaves most small farmers impoverished. This has important implications for the amount of land that should be distributed per family under the SC program. The amount of land needs to be sufficient to ensure food security for the family. The required amount of land will of course largely depend on its suitability and productivity, however, it was generally stated that the envisaged 2-4ha per family will in most cases not be sufficient.

Institutional and policy issues
Provincial Land Use and Allocation Committees (PLUAC) are established in most of the provinces already. A self-assessment showed their confidence in being able to perform their assigned role in implementing the SC program. They were less confident concerning the capacity of their Technical Support Units (TSU). There is a large demand -and need- for training and capacity building. The same applies for District Working Groups (DWG), where there is limited knowledge concerning the guidelines and procedure for SC implementation. There is also a significant gender imbalance in staffing. The average number of women in DWG was just one, which is even lower than in PLUACs.

Commune Councils (CC) were elected (established) in February 2002. While the Commune Councils are envisaged to be the initiators of SC programs at the grassroots level, not even half of village population was aware of their general role and responsibilities. Of the average 6 members, there were nowhere more than one single female member. While their capacity is limited, CC are stretched out by not just their current multiple responsibilities but also by their obligations to their families and other works with local agencies and projects. With all these

---

⁴ Average gross margins for low input, smallholder rice production
challenges less than half of them believed that they could implement all the works that would be assigned to them in accordance with the SC program. The biggest obstacle for an active meaningful involvement of commune councils in the field of natural resource management, and SC planning and implementation in particular, is the lack of capacity at the commune level, the incomplete set of legislation and rules, and the weak cooperation between government institutions.

Discussions at different levels during the PSIA study showed that the vast majority of the study’s participants (more than 90 percent) said that engagement of informal, local groups is necessary in order to ensure effectiveness, fairness, acceptability, transparency and accountability of the program. The informal groups that should be involved in the SC process and implementation, as the study’s participants suggested, include: (i) village development committee (VDC); (ii) non-governmental organization (NGO); (iii) local farmer association (FA); (iv) wat/pagoda committee (PC); (v) religious committee; and (vi) school/parental committee. It was observed that more PLUAC, DWG, FGD, and HHS informants seemed to support more involvement of VDC, and NGO in most of the works relative to other groups.

A general tendency can be observed that capacities at further decentralized levels are overestimated by higher administrative levels. Overall, the rules and regulations intended to govern the SC program are in line with other legislation concerning decentralization and the assignment of tasks to decentralized government institutions. However, a prerequisite for moving ahead with the program beyond the pilot sites will be a clear legal regulation and enforcement of such. There is urgent need for a Sub-Decree, on state land inventory and management, the enforcement of revoking unused economic concessions, pro-poor land taxation and enforceable and enforced rules for the recovery of state land (Land Law 2001, Art. 18).

Support services and infrastructure

Land distribution, by itself, is not likely to have a significant impact on reducing poverty in rural Cambodia. However, land distribution under the SC program is expected to be accompanied and supplemented by the provision of at least a minimum set of support services and infrastructure. Looking in particular at improving rice production, survey results and secondary sources suggest that the main determinants are access to inputs and agricultural extension. Availability and accessibility would benefit not only SC participants but the wider rural population.

The majority of PSIA participants (70-90 percent) considered schools and education, water and sanitation, health center and healthcare, road, market facility/connection, and religious center/service important to make the program attractive, its impact sustainable and poverty reduction achievable. The importance of health services needs particular attention in the landlessness context. In addition, the poor and landless will need to get access to adapted technologies, extension, agricultural tools, and other inputs, maybe in form of an initial aid package. Most respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the accessibility and/or quality of existing social and production support services and infrastructure. Coverage and quality are low, respective assessments tend to be much worse at village level compared to perceptions of provincial or district staff.
An interesting observation was made regarding **credit services**. While identified by some studies as key to improved productivity through access to inputs, **some villagers raised concerns that subsequent debts in case of crop failure will trigger the loss of land.** Availability of formal and informal credit services in villages was reported to be 58 and 50 percent respectively. Interest rates were mentioned to be higher on informal credit (11 percent) than on formal credit (4 percent).

In most of the villages service delivery development work is supported through village development committees, religious associations (Pagoda committees) and NGOs. Of the villages of the PSIA study 80 percent reported at least one active NGO in their village. On average, there are 1.8 NGOs operating in a village. Their main involvement is in social services and credit operations.

**Extent of landlessness**

For the purpose of this report, “landlessness” is defined as not owning agricultural land and not having the means to purchase it. Land-poverty is defined as not having enough land. An approximation of one sixth of a hectare per family member was used, and adjusted according to the quality of agricultural land in each village.

The Oxfam survey showed that of the 22,193 families in the sample area **11.6 percent are landless.** Of 3,573 families headed by women in the sample, 18.9 percent were found to be landless. 4.6 percent of the families were found to be land-poor. Landlessness was generally more prevalent than land-poverty across the sample. Of the 2,641 landless families in the sample 32 percent owned residential land, while the remaining 68 percent did not. Results form ABiC’s survey indicate a slightly higher overall landlessness rate of 14.6 percent. Highest rates were found in the Tonle Sap zone. **The landlessness rate is highly variable among villages,** with highest variability found in coastal areas. These levels of landlessness are consistent with information found in other major databases and research projects.

Of the landless population, 80 percent had never owned land in their village, and the remaining 20 percent had previously owned land but had since lost it. Of those who had never had land, the largest two categories were couples who had not been allocated land when they married (33.5 percent) and families who had migrated into their village (33.4 percent). Of the families who had lost their land, **the majority (60 percent) reported health costs due to an illness in the family as the main cause of them losing their land.**

Demographic trends suggest that landlessness will continue to increase. Predictions based on FGD suggest a rate of 16 percent by 2005. In addition to those families losing their land, the most affected by demographic trends will very likely be young married couples who can not be provided with land.

**Land availability**

During the FGD and HHS **only 33 percent of the villages reported that they have vacant land which are unused degraded forest areas and/or unused arable land.** 53 percent
reported that forest areas exist in their communities. The sizes of vacant land and forestland vary from village to village. Stated figure ranged from 0 to more than 4000ha per commune. In the Mekong zone, none of the villages reported the existence of either vacant or forest land in their villages. Large tracts of land are reported vacant in the Northeast and Coastal zones. It needs to be noted that the legal mechanisms to convert these ‘vacant’ state property are not yet fully in place. This information was in a first approach collected in FGD at village level and has not been verified.

Although land is reported vacant in a number of villages, not everybody agreed that such land could/should be converted. While in interviews with individual households problems were hardly mentioned, a large number of FGD expressed concern that the conversion of their village vacant land would negatively affect their livelihoods and local environment. Types and sizes of impact would vary from village to village. Concerns were raised regarding the conversion of forest land (environmental impacts, impact on NTFP collection) and the conversion of grazing areas (common property resources). Villagers are aware that converting these areas to private use would prohibit access to resources that mostly the poorest (landless) depend upon.

Most villagers whose villages have vacant land which they think could possibly be converted agreed that they could be host communities for new settlers. They are ready to accept landless who would relocate in the frame of an SC program. However, some people had reservations, arguing that local landless should receive preferential treatment during land distribution. In turn, 70 percent of the landless in different places are also willing and prepared to move to places where they could find good land-based livelihoods. Almost 50 percent would move to anywhere in Cambodia. There are already large numbers of landless moving throughout the country in search of land and livelihood options.

The results from MLMUPC’s study on potentially available land did shed more light on perceptions about accessible and convertible land. Their survey with Commune Chiefs and village elders revealed only marginal land in terms of size and even more so in terms of quality, which was supposedly ready for distribution under a SC program. The identified land was for various reasons mainly unsuitable for sustainable smallholder agriculture.

**Recommendations for the Social Land Concession Program**

A poverty reduction oriented SC program will need to address the 3 issues surrounding the access of poor to land: *(1) there are poor families without land, (2) there are poor families losing their land, and (3) there is land without people.* Provided that minimum required support services are in place, bringing un-/underused land resources into production, and giving deprived poor population groups the possibility to participate in benefit as landowners will contribute to agricultural, pro-poor growth.

**Landlessness and land availability**

Setting (regional) priorities
When entering into full SC program implementation, the limited resources available will have to be spent according to priorities based on commonly agreed criteria. In the beginning, implementation could focus on areas with high landlessness rates and limited wage earning
possibilities. As competition for land is strongest, support for the landless is most needed there. Another option could be to continue with larger scale distribution in areas where land availability will not be a big problem. This could further broaden and improve experiences with institutional aspects of program implementation. A third option could be to chose areas where projects/donors are active in enhancing local level service delivery and infrastructure. Implementation costs (for RGC) are probably lowest in such geographical areas. Whatever single or combined strategy will be adopted, agreement and buy-in from all stakeholders will be of paramount importance.

Resettlement
The results of the survey work showed that potential land recipients would be willing to travel quite a distance within a commune and beyond if the potential of the land they receive warrants it. Movements within the country of people in search of land for cultivation are taking place already. At the same time, the local population in areas where land is not in short supply would be willing to give new arrivals a chance to integrate into their communities. Although this certainly cannot be an argument to promote resettlement in the framework of the SC program, mobility of families provides an opportunity for a country-wide program.

Indigenous peoples’ communities
The survey did not include any indigenous communities, nor does any of the SC pilot sites have to deal with the potential conflicts in such villages. The sample villages in Preah Vihear have a significant share of Por and Kuoy amongst their population. They are well integrated in the community. Indigenous communities are protected by special provisions in the land law. The provision of social land concessions in these communes is not applicable. However, if the demand for private land ownership increases, a change in approach may become necessary. Communication with interested communities, and a carefully designed pilot project should yield the required information to let those communities benefit from changes in land classification and a potential land distribution program.

Making land available
RGC needs to take serious steps towards implementing existing rules and regulation which address the problem of above limit economic concessions, and illegal land grabbing. The former might free up to 500,000ha for an SC program. The latter might be tackled by an initiative for enforcing the land law, specially the “Recovery of State Land” based on Art. 18 of the land law, and enforcing possibilities of recovery of illegally claimed or occupied areas. Although the detailed extent of this problem will depend on the political will of the RGC, there is most probably substantial opportunity for reallocation of land.

The size of agricultural land to be distributed to beneficiaries should not be fixed. The size and ceiling of agricultural land should be dependent on its (potential) productivity, and should take account of size of the beneficiary families/households. Farm sizes need to allow a sufficient living from agriculture. Very small holdings will yield less than their potential, limiting the poverty reduction effect of any land distribution. The 2-4ha limit will in many parts of the country not be sufficient.
Linkages to other land/NRM programs

The complementarities of the SC program and other NRM and land-based rural livelihood projects and programs need to be fully exploited. All stakeholders, RGC, NGO, potential beneficiaries, are aware of the social, economic, and environmental challenges in land distribution as proposed in the SC Program. There is interest (and need) at all levels to reconcile different demands and work jointly towards balanced and sustainable development. **To obtain the full poverty reduction benefits from Cambodia’s concession system, economic concessions, social concessions, forest concessions (or at least the concessions and/or regulations for community forestry projects) need to be redesigned and/or harmonized.** The poverty reduction and growth potential in agricultural production, processing and marketing will best be attained by simultaneously developing active and well-regulated economic concessions, and giving the landless better chances to participate in land-based economic activities.

State land classification and management
A supportive Sub-Decree which will regulate the process of state land identification, classification and management is a necessary step towards a larger SC program. When shaping the Sub-Decree on State Land Classification and Management, experiences from the pilot sites should be taken into consideration. With the multi-ministerial CLP leading for both efforts, coordination should not be a major issue. The passing and implementation (!) of a supportive Sub-Decree can be seen as an important step showing RGC’s commitment and intention to improve governance. One major issue that will need to be clarified with all state land stakeholders, especially the forest administration, is the **criteria which will allow the conversion of land in the public or private domain of the state into social land concessions.** While problems of acute landlessness and poverty remain important aspects, criteria and processes will need to balance economic, social and environmental concerns. Without clear guidelines at the national level, local level implementation of the SC program will not be feasible.

Economic concessions
Redesigning the economic concessions system is another key step towards the successful implementation of the SC program. The legal limit on economic concessions and tax collection for unused land needs to be enforced. At the moment the large amount of idle land in economic concessions limits the availability of land for distribution to needy landless. In addition, many economic concessions face conflicts with pre-existing settlements or squatters within the borders of the economic concessions. A revised system could benefit both the holders of economic concessions and the beneficiaries of the SC program by providing for secured access to land. Experiences for neighboring countries, such as Malaysia, Thailand show that mutually beneficial arrangements are possible. Important functions in the field of input supply, service delivery, processing and marketing of agricultural produce could be performed by the holders of economic concessions, e.g. through contract farming arrangements. Such arrangements might not be feasible everywhere. However, existing private sector and NGO initiatives, for example in vegetable or livestock production show that the income, and hence the poverty reduction potential of products including other than rice through increased yields, improved quality, processing and marketing has yet to be fully exploited.
Community forestry management

Community forestry management could perform vital functions for landless and land-poor who depend on a variety of options for their survival and wellbeing. In particular in the more densely forested areas, landless villagers depend to a larger share on forest products for their livelihood. Such areas would also play an important role as buffer zones between agricultural areas in a village, including SC land, and the permanent forest reserve. The challenge will be to harmonize any forestry activities that take place in a commune. The Community Forestry Management Sub-Decree specifies that “Community forest is state public property. Forestry Administration has the rights to give official recognition of the demarcation of each community forest boundary.” Any implementation rules (prakas) will again depend on the clear definition and demarcation of state land. The current sub-decree might have to be revisited when preparation for the state land classification and management sub-decree is finalized. This is particularly important with regard to potential forestry activities -private or community- that will take place on state public and private land, with allocation and/or management responsibilities lying with commune councils.

Similar to the potential synergies between economic and social concessions, (community) forestry on SC land and (commercial) forest activities could benefit from each other. The respective sub-decrees, however, need to be adjusted accordingly in order to allow the landless and land-poor to capture the potential benefits without sacrificing the principles of sustainability and environmental considerations. It is recommended to use the platform of PLUAC not only for social concession but as well for priority setting towards most sustainable and economic use of state land for the categories of community forestry, economic concession and conversion forest within a provincial development and conservation strategy.

Provision of support services and infrastructure

The list of priority services that need to be in place for communities to benefit from an SC program is different from a purely agricultural production oriented program. Services and infrastructure required will need to address two problems: (1) recipients should be able to make the best productive use of the land (including access of their products to markets), and (2) the problem of distress sales of land needs to be resolved.

Biggest improvements in agricultural production can be expected from appropriate advice on adapted and tested cultivation practices. An agricultural extension service with specific advice for small farmers will in the short run have a better impact than supply of modern inputs (on credit). As indicated by Auffret (2003), the presence of an agricultural extension worker or a permanent market in the village increases households’ income substantially. While his research results also suggest “that to have a sizable impact on alleviating rural poverty, policies need to focus on interventions that increase the availability of variable inputs at competitive prices, provide competitive prices for the sale of output, and improve productivity. The lack of access to liquidity restricts households’ access to important inputs and prevents households from allocating inputs in a manner consistent with profit maximization.” However, results from FGD

---

5 ADB is in the process of launching a study to identify strategies to increase the food and livelihood security of smallholder farm families and communities living in or near remote and inaccessible forests. It is also planned to assess the potential of community forestry to reduce poverty in upland communities and explore linkages to commercial forest operations.
discussion indicate that taking credit, from formal or informal lenders, is often a cause for indebtedness and subsequent loss of land.

An important intervention will be the provision of affordable and reliable health services in beneficiary communities. Illness-related expenditures are consistently mentioned as major reason why families lose their assets. Respectively, health centers and health care were mentioned in HHS and FGD as priority services to accompany a SC program.

Another form of social support service may be required to address the problem of already existing indebtedness and the daily struggle for survival of the landless. Unless provisions are made either in cash or kind which would cover the small -but for the very poor very substantive- investment outlays in necessary tools, and which would enable land recipients to bridge the period before any first harvest, the pressure to sell land will remain. It can be expected that the existing regulation, which prohibits the sale of land within the first 5 years, would be bypassed through informal arrangements.

Institutional and implementation issues

The requirements for additional legal provisions, the envisaged decentralized planning and implementation structure, and the necessary coordination and cooperation between different line ministries and government agencies gives the SC program a prominent role in proving RGC’s commitment to good governance. **Success in the implementation of the SC program depends on progress in governance issues directly linked to the success of a fair and equal land distribution.** An SC program will equally require components of an institutional change/good governance support program and rural development projects.

National level

Coordination and cooperation at the National Social Land Concessions Committee seems to be rather smooth. The Committee, with support and endorsement from from CLP will have to exercise pressure on lower level decentralized units to overcome mistrust and ensure collaboration. It will also be important to develop a realistic understanding of what technical support needs to be provided form the top. As higher administrative levels tend to overestimate the potential of decentralized units, there is the danger of neglecting required capacity building investments.

Provincial level

The newly established PLUAC will have to work closely together with the Provincial Rural Development Committee. As there is a significant overlap in membership, the coordination between any SC program and other development programs should not be a problem. However, there is a need for information, training, and capacity building campaigns, especially addressing the weaknesses in the technical support units at provincial level (and at further decentralized level).

District level

Coordination and cooperation between different government agencies seem to weaken in the decentralized structures. Resource availability and/or allocation issues can be constraints for field work required from district working groups. The district level may be the weakest in terms
of capacity and resource availability compared to their expected role in the program. Guidance on priorities and resource allocation, together with capacity building, will be required.

Commune and village level
Some villagers do not yet have full trust in the elected commune councils. Many would like to see an independent institution being part of the beneficiary selection and SC implementation group. Villagers appear to be open to let Non-Khmer citizens participate in SC programs. While, understandably, they would like to see their own demands for land being satisfied first, the program may face little local level resistance when including non-Khmer minorities living in border areas.

Technical aspects
There are a number of technical aspects in the SC program which will need careful consideration and/or refinement. The main ones are: The suitability of the distributed land for agricultural production needs to be ensured. Environmental considerations need to guide the conversion of degraded forest areas to farm land. Application and beneficiary selection procedures need to take local conditions/customs into account. Initiating SC projects might take longer than anticipated. SC planning and implementation training has to be scaled up. NGOs will have to play a prominent role in commune level implementation and should therefore be prime clients for SC-related training.

The role of government and NGOs
The surveys showed that NGO involvement in implementation of the SC program would be appreciated at all levels. In particular at the commune and village level there is a potentially extended role for NGOs experienced in community mobilization, natural resource management, and in particular agricultural/smallholder development. As SC projects will have to be embedded in local participatory land use planning (PLUP), an extension of NGOs’ involvement in local level planning seems natural. This is in line with villagers’ demand for external support (control) of the SC planning and implementation process. While decision authorities will rest with the commune councils, they themselves expressed a need for support on the technical aspects of the program. At the same time, villagers mentioned the need to have a support and control institution outside the formal government structure to ensure fair and equitable program implementation.

Trusted and capable NGOs can play a major role in a larger scale SC program which would certainly overstretch the capacities of government institutions. A careful screening and selection process for potential NGOs need to be designed. Existing NGO networks can play an important role in this process. While they would maintain their coordinating and control functions, village level implementation should be entrusted to NGO who would closely liaise with commune councils.

Donor involvement and coordination
At the moment a number of donors implement their own “social concession” projects. The distribution of de-mined land, land bought with donor/project funds, etc. is taken place in various communes throughout the country. On the one hand this poses a problem as legal arrangements are not always clear, on the other hand it clearly indicates the interest of donors to support land distribution. Learning from the experiences of these initiatives, and bringing all
interested donors in line will be part of MLMUPC’s (or any other suitable institution) coordinating function.

Donor involvement in SC program implementation could be in two different ways, which are not mutually exclusive but supplementing each other. An SC project could be linked to existing donor activities in villages, i.e. where vital services and infrastructure are provided to a commune, an SC project could extend the benefits. The other option would be financial support to an ‘SC Fund’ at MLMUPC (or any other suitable institution) through which activities are funded and coordinated. Experiences from other Asian countries show institutional options, for example establishing specialized and highly professional parastatal agencies like FELDA and FELCRA in Malaysia, linked to a Ministry.
1. Introduction

1.1. Land policy and land reform in Cambodia

Cambodia’s economy is growing, but the large rural population continues to experience high rates of poverty (40% of the rural population with less than $1/day income). Rural livelihoods are precarious, agricultural growth is slow and forestry is not yet delivering on its promise. Cambodia possesses one of the world’s richest freshwater fisheries, but it is troubled by disputes and enforcement issues which constrain access by the poor.

Land and natural resources are featured in the PRSP. Poverty reduction in the short-medium term depends on raising incomes and reducing vulnerability of the populations which obtain their livelihoods from land and resources and whose non-farm income is largely linked with these sectors, or on seasonal non-farm income. For this reason the patterns of ownership and access to land and natural resources are foundational elements for poverty reduction. The challenge is acute because it is precisely in these areas where some of Cambodia’s worst recent governance and human rights problems have occurred. In Cambodia poverty reduction depends on secure and sufficient access to land and resources by the poor. Access to land and resources depends on the natural endowment of the country, the existing distribution of resources, and governance.

A new set of laws and policies aims for greater security, transparency and accountability in the allocation and documentation of property rights (including private rights to land and use rights to forests and fisheries) They clarify the administrative processes for managing land and resources and attempt to sort out the governance framework from local to national levels. The Government is in the process of making these changes operational, through the Land Management and Administration Project and the Forest Concession Management Project.

There are several processes in terms of the role of natural resources, in particular land in the economy which are needed for pro-poor growth:

1) Cultivated areas used by smallholders need to both intensify and expand, but not at the expense of high-quality forest.

2) Improved allocation mechanisms for land to agribusiness investors need to be put in place to better tap the potential of plantations and contract farming.

3) Access to fisheries needs to be made more equitable and predictable, and the whole Tonle Sap ecosystem put under more sustainable pro-poor management as the world’s most productive freshwater fishery and ecosystem and home to a million people.
4) Standing forest needs to be sustainably managed, with a wide distribution of benefits, both through government services based on timber revenue, and on direct access to forest products by local inhabitants.

5) Decisions about how to utilize degraded forest areas for economic benefit need to be made which balance the needs of local communities as well as environmental services.

Land titling and registration are proceeding in areas characterized by a high degree of untitled, private tenure. At the same time, the broader questions of land distribution, and land allocation for multiple purposes are beginning to be engaged by government and donors. Improved interministerial coordination is developing with the CLP, and a better defined role emerging for local government in land use planning and land allocation. Inter-departmental land use and allocation committees have been formed at the provincial level to fill the coordination gap and improve transparency within government. Unequal land distribution and the trends in land markets are a major concern. A combination of social land concessions, land taxation, land sharing schemes, and improved rural finance is called for to improve land access by the poor. How to make this mixture of policy interventions effective requires much more research and adaptive evaluation. In the long-term, however, only improved non-farm income can meet the country’s employment demand. Those opportunities are not yet available in sufficient quantity, which means that land access still matters, particularly for the most vulnerable. Demography will put increasing pressure on cities to plan growth. The development of the housing policy and pilot projects in planning and settlement upgrading point the way to improved urban land management.

Land conflicts and the weakness of the court system remain problematic. The new Cadastral Commissions are staffed and trained but are only beginning to assume their caseload. Nevertheless, they represent a step towards a new paradigm of negotiated solutions to land disputes. Issues in the draft Civil Code which threaten the integrity of the property registry need to be resolved by government with donor technical assistance before the draft Civil Code becomes law. In general the governance framework for land needs to be suffused with transparency and intragovernmental transparency in order for the new paradigm of pro-poor land access to become successful.

Responding to these challenges requires intensive and long-term engagement, but is of fundamental importance as a foundation element of asset distribution to underlie agricultural intensification and diversification and improved access and management of common property resources. Although research is starting to clarify more aspects of the linkages between the land system and poverty reduction, important gaps remain, particularly in the area of land capability analysis, understanding of how land markets can work for the poor, and understanding of how to improve non-farm income opportunities.
1.2. Social Land Concessions

Landlessness and land scarcity is clearly a major contributor to poverty and vulnerability in rural Cambodia. It is an element of a larger failure of opportunity and employment in the rural areas. It needs to be understood from a perspective of diversified livelihoods (rice and fish, rice and other things, temporary wage employment; seasonal migration, etc). Putting the landless problem in perspective thus means accounting for both the causes and the distribution of landlessness, and contextualizing landlessness as a livelihood problem which is part of the broader challenges of the rural population. Nevertheless, land, especially for rice production remains a fundamental element of food security.

Land concession for social purposes is a legal mechanism of land transfer from the State which is established in the Land Law 2001. This form of land transfer is included in the Land Law to permit the orderly transfer of State land to private individuals or groups for social purposes. The sub-decree to regulate the process was approved by the Council of Ministers in March 2003. The sub-decree has importance well beyond just Social Concessions however, because it puts in place two key elements of a decentralized/deconcentrated approach to land management: (i) it authorizes land use plans to be drawn up at the local level, and (ii) it establishes the Provincial Land Use and Allocation Committee as an inter-departmental structure with the authority to approve Social Concession plans presented by Commune Councils. In other words it puts in place two key elements of a decentralized/deconcentrated approach to land management.

The purposes of social concessions in the sub-decree are:

- Provide residential land for people without housing
- Provide agricultural land for subsistence farming for poor families
- Resettle families who have been displaced by public infrastructure development
- Resettle families who have been displaced by natural disasters
- Facilitate economic development at grassroots level
- Facilitate economic concessions by providing housing and agricultural plots for workers
- Develop unused land in remote areas
- Provide land for the return of refugees
- Provide land for demobilized soldiers
- Provide land for government staff when they leave public service.

In this framework, State land needs to be identified, classified and plans for its use need to be enacted (this includes forests, waterways, roads and other transportation infrastructure, parks and protected areas, cultural heritage sites, public facilities and areas for military use, as well as unutilized areas). This is the purpose of the exercise in State land mapping which is now being initiated and will accompany the pilot projects.
To approve the social concession plans, a new committee is established at the provincial level called the Provincial Land Use and Allocation Committee (PLUAC). A multi-departmental committee is needed because the overall framework of State land management is multi-sectoral. A multi-sectoral committee takes into account urban land, agricultural land, forests, roads, waterways, governmental facilities, parks and protected areas, cultural heritages sites, military areas and others. Although formed in the Social concessions sub-decree, the PLUAC is expected to eventually be responsible for approving all land classification, land use planning and State land allocation decisions in the province. The PLUAC is expected to receive detailed land use plan proposals from the Commune Councils generated out of State land mapping and Participatory Land Use Planning Processes. PLUAC will approve or modify these plans.

Land concessions for social purposes are to be initiated and implemented at the commune level, for residents of the commune, utilizing land available in the commune or in nearby areas within the same district. The mission of the local level of administration is to initiate and implement land concession plans. Local administration will do this by taking applications, preparing a land use plan for social concessions annually, and implementing the land concession. In this regard, institutions responsible for implementing this sub-decree need to ensure that land concession for social purposes programs are consistent with commune development plans, pursuant to Chapter 6 of the Law on Khum/Sangkat Administrative Management, and national economic and social development plans, and that the proposed land uses are technically suitable for the land identified. The procedures and plans are being integrated into the local governance budget and planning process.

### 1.3. Piloting and assessing the proposed SC program

Because there are limited precedents and experience with making this type of land transfer, a process of learning and innovation to make it work is necessary. In the short term (1-3 years), the first priority for using the mechanism of land concession for social purposes to reduce poverty is to establish viable and transparent procedures which can be applied in different locations and contexts. In October 2003, three pilot project areas have been selected for implementing the sub-decree. On the basis of this pilot, instructions will be drafted and published by the MLMUPC on the implementation. The present PSIA report studies the national dimensions of social concessions in terms of the availability of land, the demand for social concessions, and the supporting services available for potential beneficiaries.
2. PSIA methodology and process

2.1. Origin of proposal

The PSIA of Cambodia’s Social Land Concession Program was initiated in FY03. Based on discussions with the Cambodia Country Team, members of the IMF Country Team, the GTZ PSIA Team and with members of the Bank’s PSIA Core Team on Cambodia’s policy reform agenda, it was decided to research the potential impacts of the proposed land distribution program. Reforms of the policies regulating access to and management of natural resources, in particular land for agriculture, are expected to increase the potential for pro-poor growth, including the possibility for increased value added through processing, marketing and exports, reforms. The reforms are expected to have a positive distributional impact and significant poverty reduction effects.

In support of RGC’s efforts for poverty reduction through improved access to land, the Bank was considering to support an investment operation to facilitate the full scale implementation of the social concession program. Based on the findings of the PSIA and the experience from pilot sites, a proposal is now under preparation. Hence, the assessment of the potential impacts of social concessions forms an integral part of the long term support strategy for poverty reduction in Cambodia.

2.2. Research design and partners

2.2.1 The Concept Note

Between May and August 2003 a concept note for the PSIA was prepared. It explained the PSIA approach for analyzing the proposed land distribution program and outlined the multidisciplinary, participative and transparent research process that was suggested. On September 8, 2003, a review meeting was held where valuable feedback for the proposed research was received.

Remarks from peer reviewers stressed the importance of the proposed research. It was suggested that implications of the research findings on policy and program design and on M&E activities were clearly spelled out. The study should look into related political economy issues and should identify the risks associated with the reform proposal. Land availability issues and resettlement options were seen as other key topics for the research. Survey activities were to be designed to give a country-wide representative picture of the problems. The proposed participative research approach was appreciated but it was also suggested that research partners should receive guidance and that close cooperation and coordination should be ensured.
2.2.2 Research team and task

To ensure representation of different stakeholders in the research, the team comprised different partners, covering different aspects of the research, based on their experience and comparative advantage in contributing to a comprehensive assessment of the SC program. The research was divided in different parts highlighting the important aspects of the SC program. The analysis was supposed to deal with four main issues:

1. **Potential social and economic impacts**

(1) investigate the poverty and social impacts of the proposed land allocation mechanisms;
(2) determine whether envisaged measures can protect the poor from land grabbing and support them in resolving land disputes; and

2. **Designs and implementation**

(3) focus in particular on the criteria proposed for land redistribution with regard to poverty, inclusion (ethnic minorities, gender), and vulnerability;
(4) assess the transparency and (social and legal) accountability mechanisms of the distribution process and the involved institutions;

3. **Additionally required infrastructure and services**

(5) assess the need of additional support measures to achieve value-added from distributed land;

4. **Landlessness and potentially available land**

(6) assess the potential availability of land for distribution in different parts of the country, and
(7) compare above figures with the degree of landlessness and the required regional priorities and expected implications for the program.

The poverty and social impact analysis of Cambodia’s planned Social Land Concession (SC) program was conducted between May 2003 and May 2004. It was a joint exercise between the Ministry of Land, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC), GTZ, Oxfam GB, Agri-Business Institute Cambodia (ABiC), and the World Bank. The PSIA was expected to provide valuable advice on potentials, constraints and practical recommendations for policy formulation, adaptation and implementation. With implications for a full-scale implementation of the social land concessions program well documented, the RGC would be able to mobilize donor support for such an ambitious program.
2.3. *Methodology*

The basic parameters for the research were laid out in the Concept Note and provided the basis for in-country discussions on the appropriate and adapted research methodology. Prior to designing the field research, compilation and reviews of literature and planned and ongoing survey works on land reform related issues were made. This was to ensure consistency of the study with the existing, ongoing and planned surveys in terms of the contents of the instruments.

The research design and instruments formulated in collaboration with the main research partners, Agri-Business Institute Cambodia (ABiC) and Oxfam GB were presented and discussed at technical workshops in Phnom Penh. The consultations and workshops were meant to (a) ensure appropriate design of the research, (b) validate the proposed methodology and instruments, and (c) establish a forum for collaboration and information-sharing with concerned institutions and researchers. Those involved in the process include, but not limited to, CDRI, Oxfam, GTZ, EIC, ADHOC, AusAid, LMAP/MLMUPC, ADB, NGO Forum, and representatives of various other projects.

The PSIA put much emphasis in the process, i.e. in creating a forum for openly discussing the proposed policy reform. This was seen as an equal part of the research, next to the providing the content for the answers of the formulated research questions. The PSIA could eventually not provide all the answer to the research issues described in section 2.2.2. Quantification of potential impacts and the costing of implementing the project suffered from the unavailability of respective data and information for analysis. The proposed approach worked under a partially wrong assumptions about available data and information, and insufficient provision was made for primary data collection on these topics.

A very strong part in the methodology was the participatory and transparent research process which provided ample space for exchange of ideas, concerns, and support offers between government, NGO/CSO, and donor community. This new approach made the PSIA distinctively different from other more conventional types of studies. The supportive working atmosphere that was created helped avoiding the more confrontational discussion which often dominate discussion on natural resource management policies in Cambodia.

### 2.3.1 Research tools

Participatory rural appraisal (PRA), focus group discussion (FGD), and selected household survey (HHS) were used to gather both quantitative and qualitative data for the study. The level of application of these tools was different.

PRA and FGD were conducted at commune, district, and provincial levels with key officials, and at village level with key informants, and poor and non-poor villagers to assess their views about the proposed land distribution program, while HHS was administered at household level. Research teams spent about 3 days in each sample commune.
Clear guidelines for the PRA, FGD, and HHS assessment tools were formulated, and pre-tested at a social land concession program’s pilot site in Kampong Speu. Technically appropriate and adequate applications of these tools were ensured by well-trained and experienced field survey staff. Prior to the pre-testing and field research the team received a one-week-refresher training. Relevant concepts of social land concession program were explained to the teams by an official of the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction (MLMUPC) who was present at all sessions of the refresher training.

2.3.2 Sampling

In order to obtain nationally representative results the study was carried out in two randomly selected provinces in each of four agro-ecological zones as defined by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) in 1986. The randomization was again applied for the selection of communes, villages and households. Five (05) communes were included in the sample from each province, and 15 villages from each commune. For certain provinces where the communes are small, all villages were taken without requiring the randomization procedure; and then the remaining were randomly chosen from other communes of the same province. This was the case for the provinces of Koh Kong, and Stung Treng. Finally, 10 households were selected from each village for household survey. Table 1 briefly presents information about sample sizes of the study for different levels of focus.

Table 1: Sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mekong</th>
<th>Tonle Sap</th>
<th>Coastal</th>
<th>North-East</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province PRA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District PRA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commune PRA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village FGD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household survey</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It needs to be noted that same sample sizes were applied across the board regardless of population size in each zone. This was aimed to capture the variations within zone to the extent possible in terms of livelihood practices, cultures and traditions. For example, in the northeast there are many different indigenous communities. In such an instance, proportional-to-size sampling that might result in smaller sample sizes might narrow the probability of selecting different groups / individuals; that was why it was not applied. In the following sections the findings of the study are presented.

2.3.3 Methodology for Assessing Landlessness (Oxfam GB’s LADIT)

For the detailed assessment of landlessness, land-poverty and the reasons therefore, Oxfam applied a “Landlessness and Development Information Tool (LADIT)” in the selected communes and villages.\(^6\)

The purpose of the LADIT is two-fold:

- To gather information on the extent and causes of rural landlessness and the impact of development activities on landlessness. Furthermore to gather information on land-poverty and the livelihoods of the landless and land-poor.\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) The LADIT was developed in 1999 by Oxfam GB and field-tested in cooperation with local NGOs Neak Aphiwat Sahakum and Santi Sena. It was used by Oxfam GB, the Ministry of Rural Development and 45 development organizations in the landlessness and development research written up in the Oxfam GB report ‘Making the Poor More Visible: Where has all the land gone? Volume 4’.
– To raise awareness of landlessness, specifically by creating a research process which involves the researchers going to villages and spending time meeting and listening to landless and land-poor people.

In order to carry out the research, the researchers go to a village and stay there to collect primary data. During that time the following tasks are executed:

• An interview with the village chief and/or other respected leaders.
• House to house survey of all the landless and land-poor families in the.
• A LADIT discussion group with participation by 16 villagers: 8 men and 8 women, comprising 4 older people, 4 leaders and members of 4 land-poor and 4 landless families.

The particular aspects of the LADIT which encourage reflection by development workers are:

• The LADIT Facilitator is required to visit each landless family at their houses, and therefore is directly exposed to the personalities and circumstances of these people.
• The LADIT Discussion Group exposes the development worker (LADIT Facilitator) to villagers' judgments about the effectiveness of development activities in relation to the issue of landlessness.

2.3.4 In-country consultation and workshops

Transparency and participation were key concepts throughout the research process. Individual consultations and a first information sharing workshop were conducted in Phnom Penh in May 2003 to inform interested stakeholder about the proposed PSIA research. The research concept was discussed during a broadly attended workshop in Phnom Penh to obtain last feedback for fine tuning of the approach. A separate workshop was conducted to obtain feedback on the proposed research methodology. Research results from the different “sub” studies were shared among the partners for comments and then distributed for wider discussion.

In May 2004 a one-day workshop was conducted to share findings and recommendations from the PSIA. Almost 100 workshop participants from different national and decentralized government institutions, donors, and NGOs discussed the findings and recommendations of the PSIA synthesis and provided useful advice for drafting the present PSIA report. Follow-up workshops are planned to continue dissemination and discussion in the provinces.

7 These latter were specific adaptations in order to tailor the LADIT for the PSIA research.
3. Findings of the studies

3.1. Potential poverty and social impacts

3.1.1 Eligible beneficiaries – the potential winners and losers

The FGD and HHS facilitated by Agri-Business Institute Cambodia (ABiC) found that most participants at the village level strongly support the proposed criteria to be an eligible beneficiary of the Social Land Concessions Program. The proposed criteria drew unanimous support for beneficiaries to be of Cambodian nationality, the non-owner of land as large or larger than proposed under the Program (although not all HHS indicated unanimity), and the ability and willingness to participate in the Program. The other criteria – heading a household where at least two members are related by consanguinity and meeting financial criteria developed by the Ministry of Social Affairs – are largely supported although not unanimously especially household membership criteria. Remarks by villagers on the eligibility criteria can be found in Appendix 3.

However, the FGD also reveal a more inclusive approach to what types of people should benefit. Rather than simply relying on nationality criteria some FGD participants argued people of any nationality should be eligible insofar as they resided permanently in Cambodia. Participants in FGD as geographically dispersed as Prey Veng a border province with Vietnam and Oddar Meanchey a border province with Thailand used such arguments. Perhaps this type of inclusive response reflects proximity close to border areas but the actual responses of FGD participants as documented in Appendix 3 provide good qualitative insights. Yet this also indicates that Cambodians think ethnic minorities (including upland indigenous peoples) should be included in the Program. Ability and willingness to participate elicited no negative response but in HHS (as also documented in Appendix 3) there was some opposition to upper limits being set on landholdings, the argument being that such criteria needed to be more flexible to accommodate different size of individual households.

Greater opposition was expressed to household size and consanguinity, especially from older people who argued it discriminated against them because they were not members of such households. The study also cited the example of an orphan who argued that as a young person it might be possible to rely on day labor but not when

---

8 (a) Be a Cambodian national, legal person; (b) Be the head of family of two or more members related by blood or marriage residing in the same household; (c) Meet financial criteria established by a Prakas of the Ministry of Social Affairs; (d) Not be an owner of land as large as or larger than size of land to be given in the SC program as outlined in the SCS; (e) Be ready, willing and able to participate in the SC.
9 The Sub-decree states that land recipient shall: (a) Build a shelter on part of the given land three months after the receipt of the land and a member reside there regularly more than six months a year; (b) Cultivate the given agricultural land in 12 months following the receipt of such land, and continue to use the land; (c) Be able to apply for title five years after complying with the SLCP requirements; (d) If died, transfer to his/her heir who shall comply with five-year period condition of the SLCP and be able to get title for ownership; (e) Not be allowed to rent, exchange, give or sell the given land within five-year period of the SLCP.
one gets older. Members of FFH, especially older women, are also opposed to this criterion because they perceive it discriminates against them. Ministry of Social Affairs financial (poverty) criteria was considered to be a little vague and it was suggested that even where landless people were not poor it was always possible they could become poor and having secure access to land would sustain their livelihoods. Hence lack of current financial poverty should not be the only criteria according to some FGD participants. Reasons for opposing this criterion voiced by HHS respondents are included in Appendix 3 but it can be tentatively concluded that gender, poverty and vulnerability related issues needs to be more carefully examined.

FGD participants and HHS respondents requested additional criteria. A majority (55%) of FGD participants and HHS respondents (63.9%) requested that newly married, poor landless, poor land-poor, and jobless households constitute an additional criterion. A slightly smaller number of FGD participants (49.2%) argued that single-headed households consisting of widow, widower and disabled household heads be another criterion compared to HHS respondents (24.8%). Households consisting of disabled landless members according to FGD respondents (10.8%) and HHS respondents (14.2%) should be another criteria. Households consisting of orphans or households where older people caring for orphans according to FGD respondents (7.5%) and HHS respondents (9.2%) are the other criteria. Other criteria – large land-poor households, large poor FFH, and poor households headed by demobilized soldiers – are covered under Article 11 of the sub-decree. Households consisting of internally displaced people as a result of war and households consisting of members repatriated from border camps are criteria that FGD participants (1.7%) and HHS respondents (0.9%) also identified. However, another small number of FGD participants (3.3%) and HHS respondents (2.8%) argued that existing non-poor households without reliable sources of employment should also be eligible.

Beneficiaries of the Social Land Concession Program (SLCP) would be expected to comply with at least five conditions according to both FGD participants and HHS respondents. These five conditions are related to building a shelter within 3 months and residing there for at least 6 months a year; cultivating land in 12 months following receipt and continuing use of the land; able to apply for title after 5 years of complying with SLCP requirements; able to transfer land via inheritance; and not permitted to rent, exchange, bequeath or sell such land within 5 year period of the SLCP.

Opposition to the requirement to build a shelter within 3 months was voiced by some poor FGD participants who argued they lacked the resources to do so and to the requirement to cultivate this land within 12 months by a group of disabled people who argued they live on a day-to-day basis relying on wage labor. Hence it would appear that both poor and vulnerable groups would seek to modify some of the compliance conditions.

Other groups seeking to modify some aspects of the compliance conditions include indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. Indigenous people in upland areas argue that in face of land alienation (land grabbing) by rich and powerful outsiders (including
military officers and high-ranking government officials) 5 years is too long to wait: that they will lose their land. This is in a livelihood context where these indigenous peoples are reducing their reliance on shifting agriculture. Ethnic Cham FGD participants also made the same point that eligibility for title should be after 3 years to avoid outside groups from alienating land.

Some worries were also expressed by a smaller number of people that if chosen heirs could not claim land other people could claim this land. Other FGD participants argue that land should be able to be used as collateral in times of livelihood shocks (e.g., sudden and unexpected illness).

There is also a minority of FGD participants (e.g. from one of the former Khmer Rouge strongholds) who argue that no one should be allowed to rent, sell or exchange land for a minimum of 10 years. Their argument was based on such households being able to dispose of land, move to another village, claim landless status once more, and in turn receive more land under the SCLP.

### 3.1.2 Social impacts

More than 80 percent of Cambodia’s population reside in rural areas and depend upon agriculture. In the PSIA survey 82.5 percent of FGD participants reported their dependence on rice (and other crop) farming as primary livelihood activity. Poverty for rural families is defined by them as not having enough to eat for some time in a year. Following their definition, the distribution of poverty rates follows similar patterns as landlessness. Owning a piece of land does not only have an important food security dimension but contributes also to families’ social (poverty) status in a community. Poverty means further (social) marginalization by becoming excluded from decision making and social events in villages.

Land is the most important safety net available in rural areas. Despite low productivity, and in the absence of other insurance options, access to a plot of agricultural land remains the insurance against failure of other sources of income.

### 3.1.3 Economic impacts

Different studies and research papers indicate that with any accessible land being preferably cultivated with rice for subsistence, the potentially derivable income within the current institutional and service delivery framework will be in the range of no more than USD100-200 per hectare. Rice yields average barely 2 tons per hectare with many poor farmers harvest just 1000kg per hectare, just a fraction of potentially 5 tons under controlled irrigation. A recent review of data by the World Bank (Auffret, 2003) showed

---

10 Average gross margins for low input, smallholder rice production.
that small farmers seem to be less productive than farmers with medium-size holdings who are more productive than large farmers\textsuperscript{11}.

Apart from the general lack of modern farming inputs, small farmers face the problem that they are forced into day-labor to supplement their agricultural income. Opportunities to do so are best during main land preparation and cultivation periods when returns to labor inputs on their own farms would be highest. There is a vicious circle which leaves most small farmers impoverished. This strategy by farmers to rather rely on (secure) income form daily labor has important implications for the amount of land that should be distributed per family under the SC program. The amount of land needs to be sufficient to ensure food security for the family. More research is needed to understand the threshold on available land area which would lead farmers to concentrate on own farming.

\textbf{3.2. Institutional and policy issues: Design and implementation of Social Land Concessions}

\textbf{3.2.1 Capacity of existing institutions to implement the reform}

Capacity of existing institutions to implement reform also has to be measured against willingness to do so. The Battambang and Koh Kong PLUAC refused to meet the PSIA study team even though the MLMUPC in Phnom Penh had requested they do so. Battambang is a large province in the Tonle Sap zone, has had older history of establishment and resettlement with recent experiences in distribution of land and demined land to returnees, displaced persons, and new settlers, and land conflicts. Koh Kong, in the coastal zone is the largest in terms of landmass with large areas reserved as national parks, protected forest and wildlife sanctuaries, and the PLUAC was already established. Of the other three provinces Kampot is in the process of establishing a PLUAC.

Overall, 33 members of PLUAC of the four provinces participated in the assessment under the PSIA study, including 3 female members. They represented different line agencies, which were members of the PLUAC.

The participating members of PLUAC were involved in assessing their own capacities and the capacities of district working groups and commune councils in the SLCP as specified in the Sub-decree on Social Land Concessions (SSLC). On average a PLUAC has 13.5 members, including 1.5 female members, and its technical support unit (TSU) has 1.5 staff, including female staff. Kampong Cham has no TSU staff yet. The size of PLUAC is large, while that of its TSU is very small.

The majority of PLUAC (75\%) believed that they could undertake all activities of the SSLC ranging from land classification and land use planning through to forwarding social land concessions plans and approved plan to the national committee for review. Even the PLUAC members of Kampot, whose memberships has yet to be formalized

\textsuperscript{11} Small farmers are those in the bottom third of the land size distribution, medium farmers are those in the second third of the distribution and large farmers are those in the top third of the distribution.
have the strong belief that they could undertake the activities specified in the sub-decree; but maintained that the PLUAC members and their TSU personnel should be provided with training on technical aspects such as land classification, identification and allocation procedures, selection of eligible beneficiaries, and development planning.

Education level of TSU staff is not high, but better than that of PLUAC members. Although many of them have education lower than technical college, the majority of them attained an education level higher than primary level.

The majority of PLUAC assess that they and their TSU personnel could undertake all activities assigned to them, but they repeatedly requested that assistance would be required from the national level. The assistance needed varies; but the necessary ones include funding, technical training, and provision of an adequate relevant legal framework to enforce the law and sub-decree such as Prakas, guidelines, and procedures.

At district level District Working Group was officially established in a number of provinces. In Kampot, Oddar Meanchey, and Stung Treng they were yet to be appointed. Some of them were only created by provincial draft Deika. Each DWG is supposed be staffed by a few personnel. According to PLUAC there were, on average, 9.3 members per DWG. However, PLUAC members were not able to assess the capacities of the DWG. In general, PLUAC members did not know the education level of the DWG members. The study revealed that on average, a DWG constituted about 8 persons, which is slightly lower than the figure reported by PLUAC and that the majority of DWG members had attained an educational level lower than upper secondary level. However, only 13.5 percent staff of existing DWG is female.

Although, their ability is not seemingly high, more than half of DWG claimed that they could undertake activities associated with the SSLC. DWG seems more confident to perform three tasks, namely land identification, planning and selection of eligible recipients, and implementation of an approved SLCP. According to the self-assessment of the DWG it seems that PLUAC members overestimated the ability of DWG to perform the tasks outlined in the SSLC, especially those related to land identification, land classification, land use planning, implementation of unspecified works to be given by PLUAC, and assurance of effective and transparent implementation process of SLCP. DWG requests assistance from the PLUAC as well as from the national level.

The authority to formulate and implement the SLCP at grassroots level is allocated to Commune Council (CC) under Article 28 of the SSLC. Commune councilors elected in February 2002 have discharged a number of responsibilities and undertaken activities as required of them under the Law on Commune Administration Management. At least half of CC met reported that they were undertaking activities related to the SLCP, especially dealing with local conflicts (60%), mobilizing people
for development related activities (62%) and dissemination of information on government formulated policies and procedures (48%).

Part of the PSIA was to explore with community people their knowledge of and perception about the works currently carried out by CC. FGD participants reported similar activities undertaken as claimed by CC members. However, perceptions of just how actively the CC were involved in the activities they claimed compared to the perceptions of villagers participating in the FGD are at variance with one another. Less than half of FGD participants (40%) perceived that CC dealt with local conflicts, one-third of these same participants (33%) with the mobilization of local people for development related activities and less than one-quarter (23%) with the dissemination of information on government formulated policies and procedures. Even in the area of maintaining local security over 60 percent of CC members think they provide this role but only 15 percent of FGD participants.

The CC in the selected communes had on average 6 members. In general, these communes are small in terms of population size. Commune councilors have lower educational levels than PLUAC and DWG members. Over 75 percent of commune councilors have not received any secondary education. Only 6 percent of commune councilors are females.

CC has some support staff such as clerks and village chiefs. In certain cases, they have some formal committees such as the VDC or pagoda committees to assist them in their works. However, the size of the support staff is very small and their capacity is also limited. The majority of these support staff (89%) either completed or attended primary school only. A very small minority (3.4%) completed their secondary schooling. Only 14 percent of this support staff is female. Therefore, the capacity of CC is still very low in terms of its human resource and knowledge. There is no surprise about this. However, majority of them (82.5%) proudly said that they could undertake any of the activities expected of the CC. Hence they are not lacking in confidence.

Unfortunately, while the capacity of CC is limited because of the above reasons it is also limited by their current multiple responsibilities, which include livelihood support to their own families, and activities with other local agencies and involvement on other projects, but also by their obligations to their families and other works with local agencies. This means their absorptive capacity is limited although over two-thirds (72.5%) stated they had the capacity to identify land, over half (57.5%) to classify land, nearly two-thirds (62.5%) to undertake land use planning, over three-quarters (80%) to plan and apply selection criteria to identify eligible beneficiaries. However, less than half (42.5%) stated they could fully implement SLCP.

The DWG considered the absorptive capacity of the CC to be higher than the CC. Over half (56.3%) of the DWG informants considered CC had the capacity to undertake all activities associated with SSLC and well over three-quarters (81.3%) considered the CC could implement SLCP.
The participants of FGD and HHS were optimistic about the ability of CC to implement SLCP. More than half of the FGD participants (62.5%) and HHS informants (62.7%) believed that CC could undertake some of the activities expected of them by the SSLC. The difference is quite small in percentage that commune PRA, village FGD, and HHS informants assigned to the tasks.

In recognition of the limited absorptive capacity of the CC assistance is requested for technical training (82.5%), funding (70%), technical and office equipment (52.5%), means of transport (32.5%), adequate guidelines to implement the law and technical support (27.5%) and legal training (27.5%). Over 90 percent of DWG staff and FGD participants argued the CC need technical training. Hence it can be tentatively concluded that all stakeholders, whether it be the DWG, villagers or the CC will not have the necessary trust and confidence in the SLCP process unless this technical training is provided.

3.2.2 Transparency and (social and legal) accountability issues

Modalities are contained within the SSLC framework to ensure effectiveness, fairness, acceptability, transparency, and accountability of the SLCP, and to especially achieve its wider goal of reducing poverty of landless and land-poor households. The PSIA study discussed all these issues with FGD participants and HHS respondents to understand the extent to which they believed it would be possible to ensure that all of these issues were addressed during the SLCP process.

Discussions at different levels during the PSIA study show that the vast majority of the study’s participants (more than 90%) said that engagement of informal, local groups is necessary in order to ensure effectiveness, fairness, acceptability, transparency and accountability of the program. However, less than 60 percent of HHS respondents considered that either VDC or NGOs should be involved but all PLUAC members argued both groups should be involved. FGD participants were more positive about these two groups being involved (over 70%) as were the CC although they assessed VDC more negatively (68%) than NGOs (80%) perhaps reflecting the CC’s opposition to horizontal groups at the village level and support for NGOs as source of patronage. HHS respondents were not very enthusiastic about NGOs or VDC being involved in land identification (although VDC are more welcome than NGOs), land classification, land use planning but both groups are more welcome to assist in the planning and selection of beneficiaries and implementation of SLCP (NGOs assessed as being more effective than VDC).

FGD participants were slightly more positive than HHS respondents (especially on planning for and selection of beneficiaries) as were CC members but interestingly while the PLUAC considered NGOs would be effective for all activities the DWG were far less positive. In fact the PLUAC appear to have little or no confidence in any village level group except the VDC. This could be that the PLUAC thinks the VDC should or does represent the voice of the village and during implementation phase it
would be easier to deal with just one group although the PLUAC is more positively
disposed to pagoda committees with 50 percent of respondents believing the pagoda
committees would do a good job. If a consensus were to emerge, with the exception of
HHS respondents, it can be seen that both VDC and NGOs would be accorded the
most confidence to be involved in the implementation of SLCP.

FGD participants and HHS informants made a few other suggestions to ensure
transparency, accountability, acceptability and fairness of the program. Over 40
percent of FGD participants sought to have older people and neighbors of landless
people involved in the SLCP, as they did with all concerned authorities at all levels
and all different political parties. Nearly 20 percent of FGD participants thought
Buddhist clergy should be involved (only half of HHS respondents are of the same
opinion) but interestingly less than 10 percent of FGD participants and just over 5
percent of HHS respondents thought landless people (or other beneficiaries) should be
involved during planning and implementation. This would not appear to bode well for
the active participation of beneficiary stakeholders in the SLCP but it is also useful to
refer to actual quotes made by FGD participants (see Appendix 3)

3.2.3 Conflict Resolution Mechanisms

The consensus that emerged during the PSIA study is that already there are a lot of
land conflicts in Cambodia so conflicts associated with SLCP would be nothing new.
However, at the same time there is also consensus that it is very worthwhile to avoid
or at least minimize conflict if possible. Therefore it is also suggested that mitigation
measures should be incorporated into SLCP to ensure such an outcome.

Land conflict has been on the increase since the late 1980s. It has been well
documented and analyzed. Based on United Nations World Food Program’s Protracted
Emergency Target Survey of 1998, CDRI in 2000 wrote, “since 1987, 217 large-scale
land disputes affecting 50 families and 120 hectares on average have been
inventoried”; and in 2001 it documented seven different types of land conflicts. In the
same paper CDRI reported that the most frequently reported conflict involved
boundary disputes between neighbors, and that many such conflicts occurred in the
early 1990s because proper measurement was not made when land was distributed in
1989. Though, it acknowledged, “in the mid-1990s the nature of the conflict changed
as land values rose; and “perhaps the most significant aspect of such changes is that in
a growing number of cases involving land grabbing, agricultural concessions, or
disputes involving collateral for loans, local people actually have begun to lose their
land to other people or institutions from outside the community”. Land conflicts are
never beneficial for the poor that generally involves the grabbing or the forced take
over of land. According to Shaun Williams, quoted in CDRI (2001), “land grabbing is
pervasive, and is dominated by people with more power than their victims”.

Although, land conflicts has been a hot issue over the years, the majority of PSIA
participants at village and household levels (80%) seemed to believe that there would
be no conflict, while about 40 percent of DWG, and more than 60 percent of CC
argued that conflicts would occur. The potential conflicts as envisaged by the PSIA participants could include conflict relating to jealousy and envy (27.5% of CC, 10% of FGD and 8% of HHS); illegal claims (22.5% of CC, 7% of FGD and 4% of HHS). Other conflicts envisaged might be over fertility of land and distance from village, inadequate land availability and forestland. CC members were more concerned about possible conflicts than people at the village level.

To resolve problems or disputes the PSIA participants made a number of suggestions. More CC trusted that district authorities together with the CC would be able to deal with the conflicts. Among FGD participants and HHS respondents it was suggested that the CC rather than the district would be able to resolve disputes. The DWG by way of contrast argues that if conflicts have to be resolved it is either necessary to resolve such issues at the provincial level or by reconciling differences among stakeholders.

3.3. **Legal issues**

The Sub-Decree on Social Land Concessions gives Commune Councils the most prominent role in implementation. At the same time there is a lack of clarity on the procedures which need to be followed. The actual decision-making authority of the Commune Councils remains unclear also because of the expected large amount of outside assistance they will need to receive for implementation of the Program. Commune Councils will for some time to come remain dependent on the technical support they will receive from district and provincial authorities, and probably even more so through NGO and other donor assistance. The accompanying guidelines (parkas) will have to spell out more in detailed the responsibilities at the different administrative levels.

The approval process for Social Land Concession projects is not fully in line with other planning procedures. While mainstreaming the SC projects in to the commune development plans is an important step, they both follow different approval processes. This could lead to a situation where a commune development plan is approved by the Commune Council and has not received an objection within 45 days from the Provincial Governor but it could then be rejected at a later point in time by MLMUPC who reviews the SC ‘component’. The two processes need either harmonization or separation.

The provision made for public displays and notices are not clear and don’t link well with other procedures prescribed under the Sub-Decree on Decentralization Power, Roles of the and Duties of the Commune Councils. Places and timing of public displays and accessibility of records require more specification.

The most pressing problem in the near term refers to the legal status of the land which should be made available for Social Land Concessions. In most parts of the country there is no formal delineation or demarcation of state land. The current work on the Sub-Decree on State Land Identification and Mapping is an indispensable piece of legislation for the implementation of Social Land Concessions. At the moment there is no legal basis for identifying and converting public or private state land for other uses.
3.4. Availability of support services and infrastructure

Older generations of Cambodians can recall when land was distributed during the time King Norodom Sihanouk was the ruler of Cambodia during the 1960s. Further land distribution occurred during the 1980s when the PRK/SOC decided it was necessary to dismantle the generally unpopular *krom samakii* (cooperative groups or production solidarity groups). In 1992-93 as part of the repatriation process land was also distributed to people who returned from the border with Thailand in the northwest, especially Battambang and Oddar Meanchey, and again in former Khmer Rouge strongholds. People are aware how effective or not these land distributions were, with the general consensus being that they were not always effective because issues of justice and equity were often promoted but not applied in practice where distribution practices were often lacking in transparency. Nevertheless, these land distributions have provided Cambodia with a wealth of experience for the planned social land concessions program.

As these experiences can show, land by itself will not ensure that the program is attractive to the potential beneficiaries, and that it could really help reduce poverty in an effective and sustainable manner. Meijers (1994), quoted by CDRI (2001), claimed that the agricultural population was not well off, even though the 1962 census (no census was then conducted until 1995) showed that 84 percent of the 800,000 agricultural families were “owners only”. Therefore, the questions for the planned social land concessions program are (i) will it assist in the reduction of poverty and (ii) is it worthwhile to pursue? An additional question is what other measures are necessary so the SLCP can attain its objectives and maximize its impact on poverty reduction?

It is a generally accepted fact that the provision of economic and social infrastructure and services in rural areas is currently almost everywhere very weak, and worsening with the remoteness of communes and villages. To ensure that the program is attractive to potential, eligible candidates the PSIA participants suggested that certain services and infrastructure should be in place and fully operational prior to or synchronized with the program implementation. The infrastructure and services prioritized by FGD participants and HHS respondents in descending order of priority include (i) improved access to education (96%); (ii) improved road access (95%); (iii) improved access to healthcare services (94%); (iv) improved RWSS (95%); (v) construction of functioning market (75%); (vi) pagoda and monks in residence (74%); (vii) rural electrification (28%); improved access to affordable credit (24%); vocational training (13%) and non-Buddhist (mosque for Cham) religious center.

Although, the majority of FGD participants and HHS respondents considered the provision of these services and infrastructure as necessary for an effective social land concessions program, they argued that these interventions and not the SLCP *per se* were adequate interventions to reduce poverty. Less than 60 percent of FGD participants and HHS respondents believed that the SLCP linked to such interventions would contribute to poverty reduction. Among the main reasons for this rather pessimistic attitude towards the SLCP is the experience with previous land distribution programs and the obvious problem
of population growth.\textsuperscript{12} By way of contrast all PLUAC members met by the study team strongly believed that the SLCP would contribute to total reduction in poverty, especially if the program included a range of development related interventions. Among the DWG about 75 percent saw a causal connection between the two whereas slightly more than 50 percent of CC met made a similar connection.

For the program to contribute to an overall reduction in poverty, certain interventions were prioritized to generate outcomes that would reduce poverty. Many participants at CC, village, and household levels mentioned the types of interventions they would like to see incorporated in the program. More than two-thirds of FGD participants and one-third of HHS respondents sought livestock related interventions. The next major priority was food assistance for FGD participants (30.8\%) and HHS respondents (13.7\%) although slightly more of the HHS respondents (16.1\%) prioritized improved access to farming tools and implements ahead of food assistance compared to FGD participants (24.2\%). Other interventions were related to agricultural productivity improvements and value added agricultural processing. Smaller numbers argued that improvements to social capital (social organizations and organizational networks) were also mentioned. CC members identified a smaller range of interventions.

Assuming that all social infrastructure and services, and associated interventions indicated above were provided along with the SLCP, PSIA participants believed that these interventions would help reduce poverty. PLUAC (75\%), DWG (69\%) and CC (62\%) believe the Program would obviate the need to migrate in search of employment. Equal numbers of DWG and CC members (62\%) but no PLUAC participants believe that access to agricultural and residential land improves livelihoods. The PLUAC (50\%) believe that a reduction in social crime would occur, a slightly smaller number of DWG (44\%) but only a very small number of CC (10\%) accept this as an explanation. Only PLUAC participants (75\%) believed that the provision of social infrastructure and services linked to the SLCP would facilitate a reduction in poverty while a smaller number of these same participants (25\%) believed linking SLCP to improved agricultural techniques.

### 3.4.1 Education infrastructure and service

Within the PSIA sample, the average number of schools at the district level are 37 and at the commune level 4. At district level, there are 380 teachers teaching 16,149 school age children (1 teacher for 42.6 pupils). It is estimated that over 8 percent of school age children are not actually attending school. Gender disaggregated data was not made available to the PSIA but it can be assumed based on school attendance nation-wide that more girls than boys would not be attending school. Moreover, there needs to be a distinction made between school attendance on a regular basis and irregular basis: girls because they have to assist as caregivers are less likely to attend class on a regular basis than boys. Additionally, no data is available on the quality of teaching or whether all teachers are actually delivering lessons on either a regular or full day basis during the time school is in session. Issues of quality aside many FGD participants reported that there were

\textsuperscript{12} For villagers’ statements refer to Appendix 3, section ‘Service and Infrastructure’.
no schools in or nearby their villages (37.5%), classrooms were not enough (52.5%), and teachers were not adequate (40.8%). Basically parents assess the effectiveness of schools on whether or not their children develop greater levels of literacy in the Khmer language.

3.4.2 Healthcare infrastructure and service

Health centers exist in all district visited. However, they are not well staffed with qualified medical staff, there being on average only one qualified medical doctor and 17 trained nurses for the whole district. In communes where there is a health center there may be a qualified medical doctor in attendance on a part-time basis and 1 or 2 nurses. There are also health posts in some communes but a qualified medical doctor staffs none and a qualified nurse might work on a part-time basis. In general, people complained of the shortage of medical supplies and other services. They also complained about the negative attitude of healthcare staff. At the village level, 88.3 percent of FGD reported that there was not any health center in or nearby their villages. In areas where health center does not exist people could only have access to just traditional healers. For those who could have access to health care center, only a small proportion of them reported the shortage of staff (5.8%), and supplies (10.0%).

3.4.3 Water supply

In rural Cambodia, the important sources of water supply for home use and consumption come generally from wells, ponds, rivers, and lakes. Wells, in the definition of participants of FGD, constitute hand-pump, ring well, and open well. At the district level, 302.1 wells were reported, on average, while at commune level 72.1 wells were reported. Approximately 80 percent of wells could be used year-round since the recharge capacity of the water table during the dry season is very low. However, ponds are the only source of water supply for many communities. On average, 15.1 and 2.3 ponds were recorded at district and commune level, respectively. Of these wells only 56.6 and 28.5 percent were reported useable year-round. Of the rivers 95.0 percent could provide year-round water supply for home use and consumption at district, and commune level. At the district level, DWG reported that 52.2 percent of lakes could provide year-round water supply, while at commune level CC reported only 19.0 percent of lakes could do so. At the village level, FGD reported an average of 20 wells and 1 pond as sources for domestic water use. Over half of FGD (55%) reported their dependence on rivers and a smaller number (20%) on rivers and lakes as sources of water for domestic use. and 20.8 percent, respectively, reported their dependence on rivers and lakes as sources of water for domestic use.

3.4.4 Lighting

Fuel is the main source for lighting for the majority of Cambodian households in rural villages. Village level FGD participants reported that lighting from fuel source was up to 62.7 percent and the use of battery power for the same purposes 31.5 percent. Access to electricity is very limited; and electricity is only available in areas closer to, particularly, district centers or small townships. The availability of electricity is only for a very short period of time in the evening, usually 3 – 4 hours a day between 18:00 p.m. and 22:00 p.m.
3.4.5 Market infrastructure and service and road access

On average, about 3 markets exist at the district level. Of this number only one market is open full-day daily. The presence of market is rare at the commune and village level. Only 8.3 percent of the villages visited had market(s) of which 2.5 percent were open the full day. Absence of market in the villages may not be problematic for most community people, since they are too poor and perhaps have nothing for exchange. Though, the problem is limited accessibility to markets that are in existence at district or provincial level. The distance from villages is not really far to the district center, but road conditions are the main constraints that limit accessibility and availability of transport services. Average distance from the villages visited, to the district center, is only about 19 km. Average distance from commune center to district center is 16.4 km, while that from the district to provincial center is 39 km. However, accessibility to the communes and villages is limited especially during wet season. FGD participants reported that 60.6 percent of their village roads could be used year-round by motorbikes and during the dry season by truck and trailer and pick-up trucks and vans. Just under 10 percent of villages in the study area could only be accessed by boat.

The cost of transport service provided by different mode of transport is very expensive, on average, relative to the living standards of local people. At village level, a trip by motorbike, trailer, pick-up truck and boat to the district center was Riel 6,805.7, Riel 2,609.6, Riel 3,093.3, and 5,663.6, correspondingly. A trip from the commune center to the district center / township by motorbike, trailer, pick-up truck/van, and sedan taxi cost Riel 6,569.4, Riel 1,653.8, Riel 978.6, and Riel 2,500.0, respectively. A trip from the district center to provincial town by the same mode of transport was Riel 15,493.3, Riel 2,166.7, Riel 5,950.0, and Riel 8,875.0, respectively. At these prices, one could safely assume that the majority of people at the village level have rarely gone to the provincial towns.

3.4.6 Credit

Availability of credit from both informal and formal source was very high, 81.3 and 75.0 percent respectively, according to the report of DWG members. The information provided by the CC in this regard is quite similar. However, at the village level far less number of communities reported the availability of such service. Of all FGD, 50.8 and 58.3 percent, reported availability of informal and formal credit service, respectively. Although credit is available, only half of people living in villages are able to access credit possibly because they lack suitable collateral or only borrow for livelihood purposes (such as treating ill people in the household from close kindred). Interest rates for informal credit vary from over 6 percent per month to 30 percent per month while for formal credit from over 3 percent per month to 14 percent per month.

3.5 Other Services Providers

In addition to the above infrastructure and services, participants of PSIA study also identified other providers of services possibly of importance to them. These include
services provided by religious centers such as Buddhist temples, Christian churches and Muslim mosques, NGOs, farmers groups, and village development committees.

3.5.1 Religious Groups

In all communes there are at least 2 pagodas with an average of 11 monks and nuns and at least 3 temple committees consisting of at least an average of 11 members (usually older males). Not all villages are able to build a pagoda and support Buddhist clergy on a full-time basis but where they are able to do so temple committees can also be found.

Not like the Khmer Buddhist pagodas and monks during the French rule, present-day Buddhist pagodas and monks offer generally religious and traditional services, for example for weddings, funerals, New Year celebrations, and other traditional festivities and observations, provide Buddha’s teachings, and mobilize local and external resources for Buddhist temples, local roads and schools. During the French colonialism Cambodia Buddhist temples were the place where Cambodian culture was preserved, vocational training was conducted, and nationalism against the French occupation was built and solidified, while monks were among the nationalists who fought for Cambodia’s identity and independence.

However, unlike in the past where Buddhist temples were actively involved in the dissemination of Cambodian cultural values, the provision of vocational training and even political education they are now providing instead a wide range of Buddhist rituals that strike a resonance with Cambodian culture and in about one-third of temples according to FGD participants lending their support to social mobilization activities including labor-intensive infrastructure construction activities.

The Cham ethnic minority group who consider they are Muslims will normally consider the mosque to be at the center of the village’s cultural and religious life. In some villages mosques are only used for worship and dissemination of religious ideas but in other villages the mosques also play a social role by supporting poor and vulnerable households based on contributions made by better-off villagers. Likewise in some villagers where a significant number of people have converted to Christianity (historically these were most ethnic Vietnamese but now with greater activity by Protestant sects in Cambodia including in upland areas) some churches are only concerned with spiritual development but in other villages the churches are also concerned with improving the material livelihoods of people including those who do not seek to become Christians.

3.5.2 Non-governmental Organizations

NGOs have been active in Cambodia since 1979 (were a few urban based before 1975) but they have only mushroomed since the early 1990s. In all villages there is at least one NGO that is currently operating. The NGOs found in these villages have different functions and projects. Most of them facilitate the provision of social services and are more welfare orientated but others are facilitating a range of development projects including local capacity building projects to enable community-based organizations to be formed that
include empowering poor and vulnerable groups, especially women. Some NGOs such as Oxfam, CIDSE and PADEK have been actively involved in dealing with land related problems but the reality is that all newer-generation NGOs are now seeking to actively address developmental issues utilizing a generic livelihoods approach.

### 3.5.3 Farmers Association

Very few villages reported the existence of farmer associations/groups. Of the 120 villages, only 13.4% of FGD participants reported the existence of farmer groups. Average number of farmer group of all villages visited is only 0.1. These farmer groups are not actively involved in livelihood improvements via production support groups or disseminating new knowledge about improved farming techniques.

### 3.5.4 Village Development Committee

VDC were first established in Cambodia in the early 1990s facilitated by the Ministry of Rural Development, the Government’s SEILA program, and by many NGOs. The main roles of these VDC according to FGD participants is to seek out and coordinate assistance for external development assistance (28.3%), mobilize people for village level development activities (24.2%) and disseminate information about healthcare programs (10%). There is at least one VDC per village. An assessment of whether they are effective or not is problematic but they do offer networks of a horizontal nature that could increase people’s trust and ability to work together and expand their access to non-village institutions. Theoretically they offer an institutional opportunity for poorer and more vulnerable groups, including (especially) women to participate where they are hitherto excluded from vertical networks. They can provide a platform to discuss village priorities and are actively involved in village/commune development planning.
4. People and land: landlessness and potential availability of land for distribution

4.1. Extent of Landlessness

Landlessness within the LADIT 2004 sample of 22,193 households in eight provinces of the four agro-ecological zones in Cambodia is 11.9 percent ranging from a high of 25.4 percent of households in Battambang Province in the Tonle Sap agro-ecological zone to 4.4 percent in Preah Vihear in the Upland agro-ecological zone. Landlessness among female-headed households within the sample is 18.9 percent ranging from a high of 42.2 percent also in Battambang to a low of 7.9 percent in Kampot in the coastal agro-ecological zone. Comparisons with the landlessness figures from the 1999 Socio-Economic Survey (SES 99), which had some methodological sampling problems, are included in Appendix 1, Table 1. There is broad similarity between the two sets of figures, however the landless estimates are higher than in the PSIA surveys.

The Oxfam-funded LADIT study concluded that the issue is not simply quantifying the incidences of landlessness within specific villages or even on the number of households that have left the village because they were or became landless but also on the extent of landless households that remain within specific areas. This study argues that generalizations are difficult to make but suggests that if there is a high incidence of landlessness in some villages, such as in Battambang or in Koh Kong, it could indicate areas where poor and marginal households might survive without land assets. Both Battambang and Koh Kong are in agro-ecological zones where local communities can still access water-based and forest-based natural resources and where the demand for daily labor, inside and outside agriculture is high.

A variation between different provinces in the same agro-ecological zone confirms the extent to which these zones are not broadly homogenous. For instance in Battambang (overall incidence of 25.44% and for FFH 36.62%) the highest incidence of landlessness is in the village of Bak Prea, where 81.57 percent of all households and all FHH are landless compared to the village of Ta Ngean where only 2.88 percent of all households are landless and only 6.25 percent of FHH. However, in the same agro-ecological zone two of the sample villages in Oddar Mean Chey (overall incidence of 5.09% and for FFH of 12.98%) have no landless households and the highest incidence of landlessness is 12.24 percent in the village of Prasat but with an incidence of landlessness amongst FFH of 36.71 percent. Other differences within the same agro-ecological zones are illustrated in Appendix 1, Table 3.

4.1.1 Ownership of residential land

Ownership of residential land is import to the SLCP because it makes the poor less vulnerable and also less willing to relocate than households that do not own residential land. Of the 2,641 landless families in the sample 844 (32%) owned residential land, while the remaining 1,793 (68%) did not. There are four communes in the sample where owning residential land would not be practicable for most villagers because their village areas are
located in the Tonlei Sap or the sea. These account for 714 of the families without residential land.\textsuperscript{13} If these are discounted one is still left with 56\% of landless families in the sample not owning residential land.

Families who do not own residential land are likely to be more vulnerable, poorer and more willing to travel than those who own their own residential land.

4.1.2 Causes of landlessness

Over one-third of households sampled argued they had no land because they were recently married. Another one-third argued they had no land because they changed village. The study suggests a trend whereby an increasing proportion of the rural population is migrating in search of new opportunities, as they are unable to survive in their own villages. However, the study also makes the point that when village people interviewed categorize themselves or others as never having owned land in their current village of residence this does not necessarily include households who formerly owned land in another village, but lost or sold it there. Other causes of landlessness include floating villages (features of some fishing villages in Battambang) and coastal villages in Kampot and Koh Kong. Living on boats is another reason for landlessness while refugees repatriated and internally displaced persons and demobilized soldiers constitute another smaller category. Tabular details of these causes can be found in Appendix 1, Tables 1 and 4.

4.1.3 Reasons for losing land

The overwhelming reason for losing land is illness: 60 percent of households state they lost land for this reason. Eleven percent of households state they lost land because they lacked food; 8 percent due to indebtedness; 6 percent due to poverty; 3 percent due to marriage breakup; 2 percent due to transfer of land to offspring; 1 percent due to the costs associated with weddings and funerals; and, another 1 percent due to business failure.

4.2. Land poverty

The study broadly defines land poverty as households who have access to less than one-sixth of a hectare per household member, although the study also took into account the quality of agricultural land and the actual situation of the household. The study found that 3.8 percent of households are classified as land poor with 6.7 percent of FFH being in a similar category. However, the highest incidence of land-poor households is in the upland province of Preah Vihear where 11.6 percent of households are in this category with 19.8 percent of FFH being in a similar category. The least number of land-poor households are found in Battambang with just 0.8 percent of households and 1.3 percent of FFH being in this category. Tabular details of these causes can be found in Appendix 1, Table 6.

\textsuperscript{13} These are 20506 Prey Chas commune (356 families), 90302 Koak Kapi commune (176), 90403 Steung Veng (116) and 70711 Prek Tnaot (66 families).
4.2.1 Causes of land poverty

Just over 25 percent of people interviewed cited the reason for being land poor was because they had insufficient land to begin with. Just under 15 percent claimed they had already given land to children and just over 13 percent cited recent marriage as the cause. Illness accounted for just over 11 percent, change of village for 10 percent, receipt of insufficient land from parents accounted for 8 percent, poverty in 4 percent of cases, too many children 3 percent and lack of land just under 3 percent. Indebtedness accounted for 2 percent of the primary causes. Other causes included demobilization of soldiers, being internally displaced or repatriated from border camps, lack of draft animals, failed livestock rearing venture, purchase of housing land, lack of access to fishing and forestry resources, expropriation of land, and livelihood shocks associated with funerals and natural disasters.

Changes to land poverty have followed a broadly similar trend over time although the incremental increase has been less severe from a baseline figure of 3.24 percent in 1989 to 3.80 percent in 2004 (estimated to be 4.11% in 2001) but by 2006 the incidence of land poverty is estimated to be 8.06%.  

4.3. Potential land for social concession

The ABiC study found that only 33.3 percent of the villages reported that they have vacant land, comprised of unused degraded forest areas and unused arable land; and 53.3 percent reported that forest areas exist in their communities (See Tables 9-10, Appendix 2). The sizes of vacant land and forestland vary from village to village. In the Mekong zone, none of the villages reported the existence of either vacant or forestland in their villages. Large tracts of land are reported vacant in the Northeast and Coastal zones. The mean size of unused land per village in the Northeast being over 1,300 hectares and in the Coastal zone over 460 hectares. Large tracts of forestland are also found in the two zones: over 1,300 hectares in the Northeast and 4,500 hectares in the Coastal zone. Many FDG considered forestland vacant that they could use for agriculture, especially in the Tonle Sap where the village mean for unused flooded forestland is over 1,290 hectares but only 56 hectares of unused non-forestland is available (See Tables 9-10, Appendix 2) But, the conversion of this forestland should be viewed cautiously as it is very difficult to reverse deforestation especially of slower, growing indigenous tree species.

Although land is reported vacant in a number of villages, not everybody agreed that such land could be converted. Over one-quarter of FGD (36.7%) but much fewer HHS (6.6%) disagreed on the conversion of their village vacant land. However, over one-third of FGD (36.7%) and fewer HHS (29.4%) agreed that land could be converted for this purpose.

---

14 Participants in the focus group discussions in each village were asked to recall the population (as a number of families) and the number of landless families in 1969 (‘before the coup and the war’) and in 1984 (‘after starting to farm again and after the land distribution within the collective system’). They were also asked to predict the likely landless population in two years time: this was done on the basis of separate predictions of the change in the number of families in the village (due to marriage migration and deaths), families who currently own land becoming landless and families who do not own land acquiring it.
Over 13 percent of FGD think that converting vacant village land for SCLP would have a negative impact on livelihoods, the environment and sites of historical and cultural value. Simply stated, under certain conditions the vacant land cannot be used, as it is infertile and/or stony. Furthermore, there are instances where certain vacant land cannot be converted because some party has already made a prior claim on this land. It is illegally fenced up, and in many areas it is just left idle.

The Oxfam PSIA study looked at land availability in seven different villages covering 3 of the 4 agro-ecological zones in Cambodia. Details of land availability in each of these villages are presented in Appendix 2, Table 10. It can be noted that the examples illustrate the variation in livelihoods of landless and land-poor households in the same agro-ecological zones, the livelihood coping strategies of these households, the availability or lack vacant land.

Similar results on potentially available land were found in an assessment undertaken by the Social Land Concession Working Group of MLMUPC. The results are documented in Table 11, Appendix 2. Their research revealed the largest obstacle to identifying suitable land for distribution. In general, the areas identified by local authorities as vacant and distributable are often not suitable for agriculture. Forest land, degraded areas, inundated areas were largely part of what was considered ‘vacant land’. It confirms that there are claims on most of the fertile land already, either legally or illegally. As long as there is no very strong political commitment and order to identify the illegally claimed areas, local authorities cannot and will not identify such areas.

4.4. Differences in livelihoods of land-poor and landless

The Oxfam study also utilized a truncated sustainable livelihoods analytical approach to analyze the key differences between the variety of income/livelihood activities of the land-poor and the landless that are highly relevant to understanding the potential livelihood impact of access to Social Land Concessions. Noteworthy among these differences are:

1. While both landless and land poor families rely on hiring out their labor on a daily basis, land-poor families are much more likely to have agricultural day labor as their main source of income (roughly 50% versus roughly 30%), while landless families are much more likely to have non-agricultural day labor as their main source (roughly 30% versus roughly 10%).
2. Landless families are more likely to have fishing as their main source of income (24% versus 11%). This is largely explained by the fact that a number of large villages in the sample are fishing villages, and these have very large landless populations, but few or no land-poor families.
3. Land-poor families are much more likely to rely on forestry products as their second most important source of income/livelihood support (15.5% versus 4%). Again, the geographical distribution of land-poor people largely explains the difference. In forested areas there are more likely to be substantial land-poor populations, in particular in the sample villages in Preah Vihear province. The explanation for this is that probably that land availability is not an issue in these
remote forested areas. It is relatively easy for people to acquire some land by clearing it, but the remoteness, disease and lack of capital mean that it is very difficult for that land to be ‘enough land’ for the family to other than very poor and vulnerable

The study concluded that landless households need not only land but sustainable livelihoods. The current research indicates that landless and land-poor families have a range of livelihood activities within which agricultural labor, non-agricultural labor, forestry and fishery dependent activities are all important. This confirms what is already widely understood, namely that it is vital to look at land as just one element in a family’s livelihood.

It is very rare that a plot of land in Cambodia can on its own provide a family with a secure livelihood. Generalizing across Cambodia, Murshid (1998) found that farming income was not actually predominant within the range of income sources in rural Cambodia. This is further borne out in recent work analyzing the livelihoods in selected villages in the four agro-ecological zones (Chan Sophal and Acharya, 2002: 51-7). This is unsurprising given that the weather and hydrological conditions are unpredictable, soil quality is generally poor and much of the agricultural land is either flood-prone or drought prone. Every year, therefore, a large proportion of the population is the victim of natural ‘disaster’. More intensive forms of farming also carry risks, with (for example) irrigated wet season rice crops being vulnerable to attack from rodents and insects. Poor rural Cambodians are generally only able to survive in their villages because of the diversity of their livelihoods. (a sophisticated livelihoods analysis would look at vertical and horizontal networks or their absence thereof that constitute an essential component of Social Capital)

This implies that if families are to be at all secure when they move on to Social Concession land, it is essential that they have access to diverse sources of livelihood support.

The implication for Social Land Concession programming is that when assessing the viability of any potential Social Land Concession site it is essential that an analysis of the potential livelihoods of the beneficiaries are considered. This must include access to either natural resources or employment opportunities or (ideally) a combination of the two, in order that families can have a diversified livelihood and therefore withstand the inevitable years when the crop fails or is very poor.

The exercise that Oxfam carried out with its field researchers to classify villages according to productivity of land, availability of natural resources and availability of employment opportunities might serve as a starting point for the design of a simple tool for assessing whether a site is suitable for Social Land Concessions. Implicit in the approach must be the understanding that the opportunities and constraints for sustainable livelihoods will differ greatly from place to place and therefore Social Land Concessions will need to be carefully planned on a case-by-case basis. If Social Land Concession plans look rather similar to each other that will be an indication that the plans are not adequately grounded in the local situation.
4.5. Problem with landlessness as main criterion

The Oxfam study also concluded that ascertaining whether landlessness should be the main criterion for access to Social Land Concessions is problematic. Neither the LADIT research, nor the Livelihoods RRA exercise that Oxfam conducted to follow it up enabled it according to Oxfam to draw general conclusions about the relative prosperity/poverty of land-poor families as opposed to landless families.

From a research point of view, according to Oxfam, it was much easier to define landlessness and then to identify and double-check who was landless. Land-poverty, on the other hand is a much more difficult concept to define. Land that is ‘enough’ when there is rain and the family is healthy will not be ‘enough’ if there is not rain or if someone in the family is ill. Furthermore, when double-checking, it is very difficult to establish what people mean when they confirm or deny that a family has little land.

A possible consequence of the intrinsic vagueness of ‘land-poor’, according to Oxfam, is that this will make corruption and favoritism easier. If there is a clear message that only landless families are eligible for Social Land Concessions it may make it easier to build in some local accountability. Given that the rural population includes well over a million people who are poor and have no agricultural land, there is no realistic prospect of the supply of suitable land outstripping demand.

Within the category of landless families, there will be significant potential to disaggregate and prioritize according to the objectives of the Social Land Concessions program (nationally or locally). Targeting newly married couples may, for example, give the best chance of the family having adequate labor, and may also prove to be politically more acceptable. People without residential land may be an obvious target group if Social Land Concessions sites are chosen that are remote from existing settlements. Certainly it will be important not to overlook the heterogeneity of the potential participants in a Social Land Concession program.
5. Initial assessment of the Social Land Concession pilots

There are currently 3 pilot projects for Social Land Concessions under implementation. The pilots are located in the provinces of Kampong Speu, Battambang, and Kampot. The intention of starting Social Land Concessions in three different places was to gain experience with the institutional arrangements and identify and learn from the practical problems encountered during implementation. The different backgrounds of the pilots should provide specific information about

- How to link Social Concessions to an existing Economic Concession (Kampong Speu);
- How to cooperate with rural development programs in the province (Kampot);
- How to cooperate and coordinate with demining activities.

The identification of the pilot sites took place in early 2003. Implementation, however, was delayed and is still far from completion. Various reasons can be identified for the slow and cumbersome process, and they provide valuable lessons for a broader implementation of Social Land Concessions.

The envisaged procedure was to

1. Identify the local pilots
2. Establish the institutional framework
3. Identify suitable land
4. Develop the procedures for implementation
5. Organize public information and awareness campaigns
6. Prepare technical procedures
7. Identify eligible families
8. Elaborate land use and allocation plan
9. Public display of the allocation plan (short list of participants)
10. Approval of the plan

The biggest obstacle to smooth implementation of the envisaged approach was the incomplete legal framework for Social Concessions. While the Sub-decree on Social Land Concessions was endorsed by the Council of Ministries in March 2003, implementation procedures needed considerably more time to prepare. The process of learning from the pilot sites for the drafting of the implementation guidelines was difficult to achieve as the implementation process got stuck at an early stage. Local authorities do not have the power to take sensitive decisions, for example on land allocation.

The established process of participatory land use planning can facilitate decisions on village and commune level spatial planning but the process is not designed to legally allocate land to new users. The decision to release an area of land from its current ‘state ownership’ to a private use under a Social Land Concession is supposed to be taken by the Provincial Land Use and Allocation Committee (PLUAC). The legal framework for this decision is still incomplete. Moreover, the political commitment of different line ministries
to discuss and agree on the release of land for social purposes is not yet very well developed. Reaching agreements in particular with representatives of the Forestry Departments tend to be very difficult.

The main lesson to be learned for the broader SLCP is that the legal framework must be put in place before any implementation work can start. A detailed assessment of the institutional procedures from the 3 pilot sites is not (yet) possible. More piloting work will be required with all rules and regulations in place.

A second lesson concerns the quality of the land identified for distribution. Without land suitability criteria in place, and without legal mechanisms to recover illegally claimed agricultural land for Social Concessions, the land offered and available will often be of inferior quality and/or remote location. Part of this problem might be possible to overcome by higher investments in the Social Land Concession area. However, as returns might still be limited, high investment costs are not everywhere justifiable.
6. Conclusions and recommendations for the SC program

6.1. Prerequisites and conditions for Social Land Concessions

The precondition for any meaningful SC implementation are

- a Sub-decree on state land identification and mapping;
- a Sub-decree on (reduction of) economic concessions; and
- implementation guidelines (prakas) and the coherent enforcement of the existing land law (Article 18).

The biggest challenge for a successful Social Land Concession program is the problem of identifying and releasing sufficient suitable land for distribution. The quality and amount of land distributed must be sufficient to provide a family with sustainable food security. Experience from the studies and the SC pilots shows that if identification of land is left to decentralized institutions without clear mandate and authority for the land law, there is little land identified as vacant and ready for distribution. Moreover, most of this land is not suitable for a SC program either because of land quality or location or both. Without clear mandate and training local institutions will not identify and propose suitable land. There are no maps which would assist in clearly identifying state private land. Concessions granted under different, sometimes unclear circumstances and conditions are hardly ever successfully challenged at the local level. The same applies to the occupation or claim of other larger land holdings by powerful people, often either military commanders or people with close (personal) links to government and party officials.

In order to free up land for distribution, the SC program will have to develop mechanisms by which the interests of different stakeholders are taken into consideration. Under the current political conditions, a negotiation process with land claimants and concession holders appears to be a promising way forward. At the same time it is necessary to develop the legal framework further, and ensure enforcement and compliance with existing rules and regulations which govern land allocation.

Discussions at district and commune level also indicated that clear guidelines (environmental, social, economic) for land classification, including the re-classification of concession land are required. This applies to all types of concessions, economic, forest, and social, as well as to general classification questions of state land. These guidelines need to be elaborated enough to ensure due diligence in land allocation, at the same time they need to take into account the capacities and requirements for decentralized planning and decision taking.
6.2. Linkages between SC, economic concessions, and state land classification and management

6.2.1 State land classification and management

Without a supportive Sub-Decree which will regulate the process of state land identification, classification and management discussed and in place, no further steps towards a larger SC program should be undertaken. When shaping the Sub-Decree on State Land Classification and Management, experiences from the pilot sites should be taken into consideration. With CPL leading both efforts, coordination should not be a major issue. The passing of a supportive Sub-Decree can be seen as an important step showing RGC’s commitment and intention to improve governance of land resources. One major issues that will need to be clarified are the criteria which will allow the conversion of land in the public and private domain of the state into social land concessions. While problems of acute landlessness and poverty remain important aspects, criteria and process will need to balance economic, social and environmental concerns. Without clear guidelines at the national level, local level implementation of the SC program will not be feasible.

6.2.2 Economic concessions

Redesigning the economic concessions system, must be seen as an important element for the successful implementation of the SC program. Enforcing the legal limit on economic concessions and starting tax collection for unused land need to be encouraged. While at the moment the large amount of idle economic concessions limit the availability of land for distribution to needy landless, a revised system could benefit both the holders of economic concessions and the beneficiaries of the SC program. Experiences for neighboring country show that mutually beneficial arrangements are possible. Important functions in the field of input supply, service delivery, processing and marketing of agricultural produce could be performed by the holders of economic concessions, e.g. through contract farming arrangements. Such arrangements might not everywhere be on top of the landless’ list. However, existing private sector and NGO initiatives, for example in vegetable or livestock production show that the income, and hence the poverty reduction potential of products including other than rice through increased yields, improved quality, processing and marketing has yet to be fully exploited.

The active promotion of linkages between small holders and investors around active economic concessions could take advantage of synergies and provide benefits to all the wider population in the area. Different models, ranging from contract farming to the Malaysian FELDA/FELCRA examples need to be considered. As a general proposal, applicants for economic concessions who submit a development plan which includes adjacent land and involves the local inhabitants should receive preferential treatment.

6.2.3 Community forestry management

Community forestry management could perform vital functions for landless and land-poor who depend on a variety of options for their survival and wellbeing. In particular in the
more densely forested areas, landless villagers depend to a larger share on forest products for their livelihood\textsuperscript{15}. Such areas would also play an important role as buffer zones between agricultural areas in a village, including SC land, and the permanent forest reserve. The challenge will be to harmonize any forestry activities that take place in a commune. The Community Forestry Management Sub-Decree specifies that “Community forest is state public property. Forestry Administration has the rights to give official recognition of the demarcation of each community forest boundary.” Any implementation rules (prakas) will again depend on the clear definition and demarcation of state land. The current sub-decree might have to be revisited when preparation for the state land classification and management sub-decree is finalized. This is particularly important with regard to potential forestry activities -private or community- that will take place on state public and private land, with allocation and/or management responsibilities lying with commune councils.

Similar to the potential synergies between economic and social concessions, (community) forestry on SC land and (commercial) forest activities could benefit from each other. The respective sub-decrees, however, need to be adjusted accordingly in order to allow the landless and land-poor to capture the potential benefits without sacrificing the principles of sustainability and environmental considerations.

\textbf{6.3. Linkages to other land issues/programs}

The complementarities of the SC program and other NRM and land-based rural livelihood projects and programs need to be fully exploited. All stakeholders, RGC, NGO, potential beneficiaries, are aware of the social, economic, and environmental challenges in land distribution as proposed in the SC Program. There is interest (and need) at all levels to reconcile different demands and work jointly towards balanced and sustainable development. Different government institutions, NGOs, and donors expressed their interest in support the Social Land Concession Program. While the SC pilots are already joint efforts between different development partners, the nation-wide implementation of the program will need and benefit from a broad coalition of supportive stakeholders. To obtain the full poverty reduction benefits from Cambodia’s concession system, economic concessions, social concessions, forest concessions (or at least the concessions and/or regulations for community forestry projects) need to be redesigned and/or harmonized. The poverty reduction and growth potential in agricultural production, processing and marketing will best be attained by simultaneously developing active economic concessions, and giving the landless a chance to participate in land-based economic activities.

\textsuperscript{15} ADB is in the process of launching a study to identify strategies to increase the food and livelihood security of smallholder farm families and communities living in or near remote and inaccessible forests. It is also planned to assess the potential of community forestry to reduce poverty in upland communities and explore linkages to commercial forest operations.
6.4. Landlessness and land availability

6.4.1 Setting (regional) priorities

The first three pilot sites for the SC program were chosen in areas were land availability was not expected to be a constraint for implementation, and implementation support through NGOs already operating in the communes was possible. The “piloting” should be extended to gain experience in regions with different natural, physical and institutional endowments.

When entering into full SC program implementation, the limited resources available will have to be spent according to priorities based on commonly agreed criteria. In the beginning, implementation could focus on areas with high landlessness rates and limited wage earning possibilities. As competition for land is fiercest, support for the landless is most needed there. Another option could be to continue with larger scale distribution in areas where land availability will not be a big problem. This could further broaden and improve experiences with institutional aspects of program implementation. A third option could be to chose areas where projects/donors are active in enhancing local level service delivery and infrastructure. Implementation costs (for RGC) are probably lowest in such geographical areas. Whatever single or combined strategy will be adopted, agreement and buy-in from all stakeholders will be of paramount importance.

6.4.2 (Re-)Settlement

The results of the survey work showed that potential land recipients would be willing to travel quite a distance within a community if the potential of the land they receive warrants it. Movements within the country of people in search of land for cultivation is taking place already. At the same time, the local population in areas where land is not in short supply would be willing to give new arrivers a chance to integrate into their communities. Although this certainly cannot be an argument to promote resettlement in the framework of the SC program, mobility of families provides an opportunity for a country-wide program.

6.4.3 SC and indigenous peoples’ land rights

The survey did not include any indigenous community, nor does any of the SC pilot sites have to deal with the potential conflicts in such villages. Communication with interested communities, and a carefully designed pilot project should yield the required information to let those communities benefit from changes in land classification and a potential land distribution program.

6.5. Provision of support services and infrastructure

The list of priority services that need to be in place for communities to benefit from an SC program is different from a purely agricultural production oriented program. Services and infrastructure required will need to address two problems: (1) recipients should be able to
make the best productive use of the land, and (2) reasons for distress sales of land need to be dealt with.

Biggest improvements in agricultural production can be expected from appropriate advice on cultivation practices. An agricultural extension service with specific advice for small farmers will in the short run have a better impact than supply of modern inputs (on credit). As indicated by Auffret (2003), the presence of an agricultural extension worker or a permanent market in the village increases households’ income substantially. While his research results also suggest “that to have a sizable impact on alleviating rural poverty, policies need to focus on interventions that increase the availability of variable inputs at competitive prices, provide competitive prices for the sale of output, and improve productivity. The lack of access to liquidity restricts households’ access to important inputs and prevents households from allocating inputs in a manner consistent with profit maximization.” However, results from FGD discussion indicate that taking credit, from formal or informal lenders, is often a cause for indebtedness and subsequent loss of land. This can be interpreted as an indication for prioritization and sequencing of service provision.

An important intervention will be the provision of affordable and reliable health services in beneficiary communities. Illness-related expenditures are consistently mentioned as major reason why families lose their assets. Respectively, health centers and health care were mentioned in HHS and FGD as priority services to accompany a SC program.

Another form of social support service may be required to address the problem of already existing indebtedness and the daily struggle for survival of the landless. Unless provisions are made either in cash or kind which would cover the small -but for the very poor very substantive- investment outlays in necessary tools, and which would enable land recipients to bridge the period before any harvest, the pressure to sell land will remain. It can be expected that the existing regulation, which prohibits the sale of land within the first 5 years, would be bypassed through informal arrangements.

6.6. Institutional and implementation issues

The requirements for additional legal provisions, the envisaged decentralized planning and implementation structure, and the necessary coordination and cooperation between different line ministries and government agencies gives the SC program a prominent role in proving RGC’s commitment to good governance. Any support for the implementation of the SC program should be dependent on progress in governance issues directly linked to the success of a fair and equal land distribution. In this sense, an SC program will fall into the category of institutional change/good governance support projects as well as into the rural development category.

6.6.1 National level

Coordination and cooperation at the National Social Land Concessions Committee seems to be rather smooth. The Committee will have to exercise pressure on lower level
decentralized units to overcome mistrust and ensure collaboration. It will also be important to develop a realistic understanding of what technical support needs to be provided from the top. As higher administrative levels tend to overestimate the potential of decentralized units, there is the danger of neglecting required capacity building investments.

6.6.2 Provincial level

The newly established PLUAC will have to closely work together with the Provincial Rural Development Committee. As there is a significant overlap in membership, the coordination between any SC program and other development programs should not be a problem. However, there is a need for information, training, and capacity building campaigns, especially addressing the weaknesses in the technical support units at provincial level (and at further decentralized level).

6.6.3 District level

Coordination and cooperation between different government agencies seem to weaken in the decentralized structures. Resource availability and/or allocation issues can be constraints for field work required from district working groups. The district level may be the weakest in terms of capacity and resource availability compared to expected role in the program. Guidance on priorities and resource allocation, together with capacity building, will be required.

6.6.4 Commune and village level

Villagers do not yet have full trust in the elected commune councils. Many would like to see an independent institution being part of the beneficiary selection and SC implementation group. Villagers appear to be open to let Non-Khmer citizens participate in SC programs. While, understandably, they would like to see their own demands for land being satisfied first, the program may face little local level resistance when including non-Khmer minorities living in border areas.

6.6.5 Technical aspects

There are a number of technical aspects in the SC program which will need careful consideration and/or refinement. The main ones are: The suitability of the distributed land for agricultural production needs to be ensured. Environmental considerations need to guide the conversion of degraded forest areas to farm land. Application and beneficiary selection procedures need to take local conditions/customs into account. Initiating SC projects might take longer than anticipated. SC planning and implementation training has to be scaled up. NGOs will have to play a prominent role in commune level implementation and should therefore be prime clients for SC related training.
6.6.6 The role of government and NGOs

The surveys showed that NGO involvement in implementation of the SC program would be appreciated at all levels. In particular at the commune and village level there is a potentially extended role for NGOs. As SC projects will have to be embedded in local participatory land use planning (PLUP), an extension of NGOs’ involvement in local level planning seems natural. This is in line with villagers’ demand for external support (control) of the SC planning and implementation process. While decision authorities will rest with the commune councils, they expressed a need for support on the technical aspects of the program. At the same time, villagers mentioned the need to have a support and control institution outside the formal government structure to ensure fair and equitable program implementation.

Trusted and capable NGOs can play a major role in a larger scale SC program which would certainly overstretch the capacities of government institutions. While they would maintain their coordinating and control functions, village level implementation should be entrusted to NGO who would closely liaise with commune councils.

6.6.7 Donor involvement and coordination

At the moment a number of donors implement their own “social concession” projects. The distribution of demined land, land bought with donor/project funds, etc. is taking place in various communes throughout the country. On the one hand this poses a problem as legal arrangements are not always clear, on the other hand it clearly indicates the interest of donors to support land distribution. Learning from the experiences of these initiatives, and bringing all interested donors in line will be part of MLMUPC’s (or any other suitable institution) coordinating function.

Donor involvement in SC program implementation could be in two different ways, which are not mutually exclusive but supplementing each other. An SC project could be linked to existing donor activities in villages, i.e. where vital services and infrastructure are provided to a commune, an SC project could extend the benefits. The other option would be financial support to MLMUPC (or any other suitable institution) through which activities are funded and coordinated.

6.7. Additional research required

More information is needed about the possibilities and limitations of agriculture-based livelihoods in beneficiary communities. The Social Land Concession Program will broaden the basis for land-based income generation and food security. Data shows that productivity is very low in existing farming systems. Their potential remains unexploited. More research is need on how to better enable and empower villagers to make better use of their land resources.

Capacity building programs to learn from, adopt and adapt successful approaches to improved farming need to be developed. The coverage will have to include small scale,
mainly subsistence farming, models for linking smallholders to markets, and everything in between. At the same time these programs need to be very cost effective as requirements throughout the country will be large.

The main SC-complementary service required in beneficiary communities is affordable health care. Research is needed to evaluate experiences with health care provision and identify a feasible, cost-effective delivery mechanism, probably with strong local involvement.

The comprehensive nature of the SCLP could make implementation in general very costly. It will be important to investigate possibilities for strong local level involvement in all aspects of the program, in particular in service delivery and infrastructure provision. More research is need to be able to adapt the experiences from Social Fund projects and other local level initiatives.

6.8. Proposed next steps

The PSIA exercise could broadly assess the likely magnitude of benefits from a land distribution program. More detailed figures can only be obtained when a clear decision on a specific area for distribution is made. It is important to identify suitable pilots -beyond the 3 pilots under implementation- which could serve as examples for (a) setting the institutional framework right, and (b) for conducting a detailed impact analysis.

The work on the 3 pilot projects should be reconsidered, and, if necessary, suspended until all the legal provisions for successful implementation are in place. Expectations have been raised in the villages, however, at the moment it is difficult to see how these can be fulfilled.

Completing the work on the legal framework for Social Land Concessions is of paramount importance. The missing pieces in the legislative framework which at the moment prohibits the identification of suitable SC sites need to be put in place as soon as possible. Only then will any (pilot) project have the chance for success. The ongoing work on the Sub-decrees on state land management and on Economic Concessions needs to be supported and accelerated. However, quality will have to have priority over speed.

The time until larger scale implementation will start should be used to put in place a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system. The experience gathered from this unique program for the region should be documented and made available. Processes and impacts could be analyzed for the benefit of refinement of the program and, if considered successful and appropriate, to facilitate similar programs in other parts of Asia.
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APPENDIX
Appendix 1: DATA ON LANDLESSNESS

Table 1

Comparison of PSIA Data with 1999 Socio-Economic Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>HH</th>
<th>Land Less HH</th>
<th>% Land Less HH</th>
<th>Left because landless</th>
<th>% Left because landless</th>
<th>Total FHH</th>
<th>Land Less FHH</th>
<th>% Land Less FHH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Mekong</td>
<td>3449</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td></td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>Tonle Sap</td>
<td>3561</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oddar Meanchey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>2422</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td></td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22193</td>
<td>2641</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.8*</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>3573</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is the SES-99 country average for rural areas, and not just for the 8 provinces in the PSIA sample.

Table 2

Causes of Landlessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main reason reported by family member interviewed</th>
<th>Number of families</th>
<th>Percentage of families who have never had land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newly married</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>33.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed village</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>33.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village in water&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>13.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from refugee camps</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live on a boat</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from military service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from being an IDP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Code</td>
<td>Village Name</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010501</td>
<td>Rung</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010504</td>
<td>Thngor</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010506</td>
<td>Changhour Svay</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010805</td>
<td>Ta Ngaen</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010806</td>
<td>Prey Phdau</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010899</td>
<td>Dongkut Thnung</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040304</td>
<td>Dang kao</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040305</td>
<td>Ream Sena</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040306</td>
<td>Doun Aok</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050601</td>
<td>Prey Chas</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050603</td>
<td>Anlong Sandan</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050605</td>
<td>Bak Prea</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080501</td>
<td>Prey Chaek</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080504</td>
<td>Kampong Preah</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080506</td>
<td>Srah Kaev</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Code</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>LL Family</th>
<th>% LL</th>
<th>FHH</th>
<th>FHHLL</th>
<th>FHH LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7030401</td>
<td>Kra Sang</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030402</td>
<td>Chheu Teil</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030404</td>
<td>Kra Houng</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030901</td>
<td>Khos Sla</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030905</td>
<td>Srea Leav</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030910</td>
<td>Prey Peay</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050102</td>
<td>Angk Ropeak</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050104</td>
<td>Tro peok rei sey</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050105</td>
<td>Krag Ampoy</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7060902</td>
<td>Tiem Kanthaor</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7060905</td>
<td>Beog Tom Kag Lex</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7060906</td>
<td>Bounk tom kag koet</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7071102</td>
<td>Preak Kraeng</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7071103</td>
<td>Preack Tnout</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7071104</td>
<td>Choug houn</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kampong Cham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Code</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>LL Family</th>
<th>% LL</th>
<th>FHH</th>
<th>FHLL</th>
<th>% FHH LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3030301</td>
<td>Phdau Chum Lech</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030303</td>
<td>Cher til</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3030304</td>
<td>Cham neang</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080206</td>
<td>Ti 6</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080212</td>
<td>Ti bei</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3080213</td>
<td>Phnom dabbei</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090302</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3090306</td>
<td>Ti 6</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120402</td>
<td>Bosknor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120404</td>
<td>Veal</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3120413</td>
<td>Tual Chumcar</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3131405</td>
<td>Samraong</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3131408</td>
<td>Tro Mukh Ti Muoy</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3131410</td>
<td>Doung</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Koh Kong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Code</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>LL Family</th>
<th>% LL</th>
<th>FHH</th>
<th>FHLL</th>
<th>% FHH LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9030201</td>
<td>Phum Ti Mouy</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>43.04</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9030202</td>
<td>Phum Ti Py</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73.49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9030203</td>
<td>Kaoh Sralau</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9040301</td>
<td>Stueg Veng</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9040302</td>
<td>Prek Svay</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9060101</td>
<td>Ou Chrov</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9060102</td>
<td>Boeng Preav</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9060103</td>
<td>Chrour</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9060104</td>
<td>Plaong</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9060105</td>
<td>Sala Mneang</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9060107</td>
<td>Tuek Paung</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9070401</td>
<td>Preak Svay</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9070402</td>
<td>Koh</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9070403</td>
<td>Korki Chrum</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9070404</td>
<td>Trapeang Chheu Trau</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>38.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Code</td>
<td>Village Name</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>LL Family</td>
<td>% LL</td>
<td>FHH</td>
<td>FHHLL</td>
<td>% FHH LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22020301</td>
<td>Kork Kpors</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22020305</td>
<td>Tonle Sor</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22020309</td>
<td>Srah Srang</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22030306</td>
<td>Romlom Veng</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22040201</td>
<td>Bos Sbov</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22040202</td>
<td>Krasang</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22040206</td>
<td>Prasat</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222221</td>
<td>Sam Bor</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222222</td>
<td>Khouk Samreac</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222223</td>
<td>Chek Kbor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222224</td>
<td>Toul Borseu</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222225</td>
<td>Paav</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222226</td>
<td>Meancheay</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222227</td>
<td>Thakaov</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22222228</td>
<td>Ou Chik</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Code</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>LL Family</th>
<th>% LL</th>
<th>FHH</th>
<th>FHHLL</th>
<th>FHHLL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13040501</td>
<td>Chhuk</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13040503</td>
<td>Boribour</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13040504</td>
<td>kdak</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13050201</td>
<td>Damnak Chen</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13050203</td>
<td>Cham Bak Phlaem</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13050204</td>
<td>Trpeang Ruessei</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13050501</td>
<td>Pal Hal</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13050502</td>
<td>Boh</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13050503</td>
<td>Doung</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13051001</td>
<td>Thnal Kaong</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13051003</td>
<td>Khouk Ampil</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13051004</td>
<td>Ovlock</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13060401</td>
<td>Ta Bas</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13060404</td>
<td>Trpeang Thlok</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13060405</td>
<td>Trpeang Thlaeng</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main reason reported by family member interviewed</td>
<td>Number of families</td>
<td>Percentage of families who have lost their land</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave land to children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding/funeral ceremony costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business failure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>527</strong></td>
<td><strong>101%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

**Extent of Land Poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Land poor Families</th>
<th>% Land poor families</th>
<th>Left village because Land poor</th>
<th>Left village because Land poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Mekong</td>
<td>3449</td>
<td>150</td>
<td><strong>4.3</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td></td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>128</td>
<td><strong>4.1</strong></td>
<td>909</td>
<td>29.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>Tonle Sap</td>
<td>3561</td>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>0.8</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odtar Meanchey</td>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>62</td>
<td><strong>4.4</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Upland</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>218</td>
<td><strong>11.6</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td></td>
<td>2422</td>
<td>81</td>
<td><strong>3.3</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>3691</td>
<td>91</td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>76</td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22193</strong></td>
<td><strong>835</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1374</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.19%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3573</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **% FHF LP Families** | **7.8%** | **8.0%** | **1.3%** | **12.2%** | **19.8%** | **5.2%** | **3.4%** | **6.7%** | **6.7%** |
Table 6

Causes of Land Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason reported for being land-poor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having small land from the beginning</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>25.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave land to children already</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New marriage</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change village</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive small land from parent</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons for losing land</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from military service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack animal draft power</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failed animal raising/no animal to sell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House construction/buy house land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disaster</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expropriated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack access to forest resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/funeral ceremony</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack access to fish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>835</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Comparison of Households That Never Had Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Marriage</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Village</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons for never had land</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned from military service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally Displaced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Owned Land But Lost It

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for losing land</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expropriated</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business failed/change business</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons for losing land</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave land to children already</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage/funeral ceremony</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE LAND

Table 9

Estimates of Existing Vacant Land and Forestland (ABIC Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean (ha)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (ha)</th>
<th>Standard Error (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mekong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused land</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forestland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonle Sap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused land</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forestland</td>
<td>1290.3</td>
<td>2563.5</td>
<td>534.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused land</td>
<td>463.9</td>
<td>446.5</td>
<td>157.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forestland</td>
<td>4526.1</td>
<td>10188.6</td>
<td>2172.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused land</td>
<td>1301.8</td>
<td>1392.6</td>
<td>296.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forestland</td>
<td>1319.7</td>
<td>1328.9</td>
<td>304.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unused land</td>
<td>932.4</td>
<td>1221.3</td>
<td>206.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forestland</td>
<td>2411.3</td>
<td>6307.3</td>
<td>788.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 10**

**Available Land in LADIT Surveyed Villages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village code</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>Vacant land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7071103</td>
<td>Prek Tnaot</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7060905</td>
<td>Boeng Thom Leik</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19051102</td>
<td>Ov Trael</td>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19051104</td>
<td>Veal Ksaich</td>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14090705</td>
<td>Boeung Snao</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14090704</td>
<td>Thum</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010501</td>
<td>Rung</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20108??</td>
<td>Dangka Knongt</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DETAILED EXPLANATION:**

**COASTAL AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE**

1. Prek Tnaot Village

   **Physical Location**
   Located on the coast in Kampot province sandwiched between the coastal foreshore and hills covered in scrub.

   **Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families**
   According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 276 families of whom 21 are landless and 7 are land poor. Compared with most other villages in the research, the villagers have good opportunities for accessing natural resources and supporting themselves. They collect shrimps and snails from the sea, vines and firewood from the nearby forests and are able to hire out their labor to landowning households.

   **Available land in the village**
The village reported 259.2 hectares as vacant. This is scrub at the foot of the hills behind the village. Already some families have cleared some of this land. Villagers reported that this land could be viable for Social Land Concessions, but that there would be a need for proper road access and also for wells to be provided.

2. Boeng Thom Kang Leik village

Physical Location
The village is built along side a reservoir in the rice plains of Kampot province.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 256 families of whom 10 are landless and 21 are land-poor.

Available land in the village
The 200 hectares of land reported vacant by the village chief during the LADIT research is part of the reservoir basin that floods every year. The status of that land was not clear: the village chief thought that it may be State Public land that could not be turned over to private use. However, he and the team thought it would be possible by building dykes on the land to plant receding rice on that land and get a crop from it each year.

MEKONG AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE

3. Ov Trael Village

Physical Location
Located on the banks of the Mekong in the upland agro-ecological zone of Stung Treng.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the villages comprises 240 families of whom 25 are landless and 9 are land-poor. Landless and Land-poor families rely on tapping resin from hard wood trees. This is their major source of income in the dry season. In the wet season it is supplemented by income from hiring out agricultural labor. Whole families tend to travel together to either tap resin or work in rice-fields. As a result of deforestation, it now takes a family 2 to 3 days to collect the amount of resin that they used to be able to collect in a morning. The village is generally not accessible by car, although one truck does make it there in order to buy resin. The villagers also catch fish in the Mekong both for their own consumption and for sale at the market. Even landless and land-poor families are able to grow some vegetables on the banks of the river during the dry season. Each family is allocated a place where they go and wash and do their laundry. It is in this area that they are able to grow vegetables. Both long-term residents and newcomers are given access to such opportunities.
Available land in the village
The village chief reported that 110 hectares of the village’s land were vacant. However, this is forestland, including some old forest, and therefore cannot be assumed to be available for Social Land Concessions.

4. Veal Ksaich Village

Physical Location
Veal Ksaich is located on three islands and also on the opposite shore of the Mekong across from Ov Trael.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 122 families, including 19 landless and 5 land-poor families. Similar to Ov Trael, these landless and land-poor families depend heavily on resin tapping and fish from the Mekong. Because of the difficulty and expense involved in crossing the Mekong they buy and sell much less at the local market, tending more to subsist on what they can gather or grow. People here appear to be extremely poor, striking manifestations of this are a lack of clothing and cooking equipment.

Vacant land in the village
The village chief had reported 1,212 hectares of vacant land in the village area. Again, this was chiefly forestland. According to the researchers, the village would be considered to be too poor and problematic (because of remoteness and malaria) for most families to consider living in, and therefore they did not imagine that it could be viable for a Social Land Concession.

MEKONG FLOOD PLAIN AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE

5. Boeung Snao Village

Physical Location
Boeung Snao is located in the lower reaches of the Mekong flood plain in the province of Prey Veng. It floods completely in the wet season meaning that people can only move from house to house by boat for that part of the year. The village is so remote from forests that they no longer use wood for cooking fuel, preferring instead to dry out animal dung and burn that to cook on.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 166 families, 12 are landless and 11 are land-poor. They hire out their labor especially at harvest and planting time. Men often take laboring jobs at the ferry port of Neak Loung. Women collect vines and weave them to make baskets for sale.
Available land in the village
According to LADIT 2004/120 there were 6 hectares of vacant land in the village. However, this is land that is already owned by villagers, but is so infertile that they never use it.

6. Thom Village

Physical Location
Thom is located in the same commune as Boeung Snao, but nearer to the main road that also has a canal running along-side it. As a result, the villagers are usually able to obtain both a wet season and a dry season crop from their land.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 132 families, 20 are landless and 19 are land-poor. There is more work available hiring out agricultural labor because of the two harvests of rice each year. Outside the rice season many men migrate to Phnom Penh to work there, leaving wives and children in the village. There is no tradition of weaving vines and making baskets in this village.

Available land in the village
No vacant land was reported as being available in this village (14 out of 15 sample villages in Prey Veng reported no vacant land).

TONLE SAP AGRO-ECOLOGICAL ZONE

7. Rung Village

Physical Location
The village is located in an area near hilly land, where there is both rice and chamcar land in Battambang Province.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 194 families, 39 are landless and 4 are land-poor. The landless and land-poor families earn their living hiring out their labor to owners of rice and plantation land (especially orange plantations). There is not much migration out from the village in order to earn money.

Available land in the village
According to LADIT 2004/120, there are 291 hectares of village land are vacant. According to the team’s follow-up interviews, some of this land has potential to be used as both residential land and chamcar land. There would be a need for roads, wells and also some land preparation work to clear scrub and stones from the surface. There is a possibility that some of this land would be classified as forest.
8. Dangkat Knong Village

Physical Location
The village is quite remote from the provincial capital (approximately 70 kilometers further out than Rung). It is at the foot of hills and most of the agricultural land in the area is chamcar land.

Livelihoods of Landless and Land Poor Families
According to LADIT 2004/120 the village comprises 232 families, 33 are landless with no land-poor households. The abundance of large landowners in the area means that there is quite a good supply of opportunities for day-waged agricultural laboring. The proximity of the Thai border means that many families also find work there. During the dry season ‘prick’ is collected.

Available land in the village
According to LADIT 2004/120, there were 383 hectares of vacant land in the village. This includes good quality land, some of which is being farmed by military commanders and other ‘big people’. In the past villagers had marked out land but were driven out by military commanders and other powerful people. The latter appear to claim private ownership of this land rather than to be saying that it is state land. In addition to that better land, there is also land within the 383 hectares which is very hilly and of poor quality and could not be used for agriculture.
### Table 11: Available Land for Social Land Concession in 8 Studied Provinces (MLMUPC Assessment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Available land by commune (ha.)</th>
<th>Type of land cover</th>
<th>Possible land suitability</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>Banon</td>
<td>Chaeng Mean Chey</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Deciduous forest</td>
<td>Agricultural production</td>
<td>Mine land, flooded in rainy season. Lack of water in dry season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>Banon</td>
<td>Ta Kream</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Deciduous forest</td>
<td>Agricultural production</td>
<td>Mine land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>Bavel</td>
<td>Lvea</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Degraded forest</td>
<td>Farming and housing</td>
<td>People have cleared some parts for farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>ÉkPhnum</td>
<td>Prey Chas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Battambang</td>
<td>Sangke</td>
<td>Kampong Preah</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Inundated forest land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Cheung Prey</td>
<td>Phdau Chum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bare land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unused land (Private land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Kaoh Soutin</td>
<td>Kosotin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Kroch Chhmar</td>
<td>Kampong Treas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Pomhea Krek</td>
<td>Kandaol Chrum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kampong Cham</td>
<td>Prey Chor</td>
<td>Tong Rong</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lack of water in dry season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Chuk</td>
<td>Chuk</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Degraded forest</td>
<td>Housing, paddy and farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Chuk</td>
<td>Trapeang Plang</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Degraded forest and grazing land</td>
<td>Housing, paddy and farming</td>
<td>Could be more available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Dong Tung</td>
<td>Damnak Srok</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Kampong Trach</td>
<td>Kanthaor Khang Lech</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Kampot</td>
<td>Preaak Tnaot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>National Park and protected area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mangrove Protected area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Commune</td>
<td>Available land by commune (ha.)</td>
<td>Type of land cover</td>
<td>Possible land suitability</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Kaoh Kapi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Smach Mean Chey</td>
<td>Steung Veang</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Sre Ambil</td>
<td>Beong Preav</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Thmabang</td>
<td>Russei Chrum</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Degraded forest and old paddy field</td>
<td>Rainy season cultivation and housing</td>
<td>Under the management of International Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Koh Kong</td>
<td>Thmabang</td>
<td>Thma Doun Pov</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Thbeng Mean Chey</td>
<td>Phnum Tbaeng Pir</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>Deciduous forest, degraded forest, bamboo forest land</td>
<td>Difficult for agricultural production because it lacks water</td>
<td>There are 4 places in the commune. There is a conflict related to commune boundary. Forest land is being cleared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Raveang</td>
<td>Reaksmei</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Raveang</td>
<td>Rik Reay</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>Sandy loam land and upland</td>
<td>Housing and Paddy cultivation</td>
<td>There are 2 different places along national road No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Raveang</td>
<td>Rum Daoh</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Deciduous Forest</td>
<td>Paddy and farming</td>
<td>There are different 6 places in the commune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td>Sang Kum Thmay</td>
<td>Sdau</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Degraded and deciduous forest</td>
<td>Difficult for agricultural production because it lacks of water</td>
<td>There are different 3 places in the commune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6125</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Kampong Trabek</td>
<td>Kampong Trabek</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Peam Ror</td>
<td>Kaoh Roka</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Inundated forest land</td>
<td>Dry season rice cultivation</td>
<td>Conflicting land, closed to Vietnamese boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Commune</td>
<td>Available land by commune (ha.)</td>
<td>Type of land cover</td>
<td>Possible land suitability</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Preah Sdach</td>
<td>Lvea</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shrubland</td>
<td>Housing and Paddy cultivation</td>
<td>In the Kampong Thnol Prey Kduch village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Popueus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Paddy and farmland</td>
<td>Paddy and farming</td>
<td>Distributed land in 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Prey Veng</td>
<td>Sithor Kandal</td>
<td>Ampil Krau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>878</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>Sesan</td>
<td>Phluk</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Old Jungle</td>
<td>Housing, fruit tree planting, paddy and farming</td>
<td>There is in the Banbung and Phluk villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>Seam Pang</td>
<td>Thmakaeo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>Srah Russei</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Old Jungle</td>
<td>Fruit tree planting, paddy and farming</td>
<td>There are different 6 places in the commune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>Thalaborivat</td>
<td>Chamkar Leu</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>Old Jungle and degraded forest</td>
<td>Housing and farming</td>
<td>There are in 3 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Steung Treng</td>
<td>Thalaborivat</td>
<td>Thala</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>Old Jungle and degraded forest</td>
<td>Housing and farming</td>
<td>There are in 4 villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7570</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Banteay Ampil</td>
<td>Kouk Khpos</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50% is semi-degraded forest, 40% wetland and 10% grazing land</td>
<td>Housing, farming and protecting the forest</td>
<td>There is a lake named Trao having mine around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Banteay Ampil</td>
<td>Kouk Khpos</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Degraded forest and wetland (mine land)</td>
<td>Paddy and rice farming</td>
<td>For demobilized soldiers and landless people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Chong Kal</td>
<td>Krosang</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Degraded deciduous forest and Scrubland</td>
<td>Paddy and rice farming</td>
<td>There are cart roads and tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Chong Kal</td>
<td>Krosang</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>Degraded deciduous forest and Scrubland</td>
<td>Paddy and rice farming</td>
<td>There are cart roads and tracks and good water sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Commune</td>
<td>Available land by commune (ha.)</td>
<td>Type of land cover</td>
<td>Possible land suitability</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Samraung</td>
<td>Bos Sbau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bare land</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Samraung</td>
<td>Bos Sbau</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bare land</td>
<td>Public services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Trapang Brasat</td>
<td>Bak Anlung</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>Mine land and Scrubland</td>
<td>Paddy and housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odormean Chey</td>
<td>Trapang Brasat</td>
<td>Pha’v</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Old Jungle</td>
<td>Housing and rice farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1692.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commune has land available  
26 communes

Commune has no land available  
14 communes

There are cart roads and tracks and good water sources.
Appendix 3: PERCEPTIONS OF VILLAGERS

This appendix includes a selection of quotes attributable to a variety of participants in the PSIA Study. It is deemed useful to include these quotes because they are the voices of stakeholders who are or are likely to be involved in the SLCP. As is typical with a study of this nature there are many more quotes that could have been included but the report’s author considers these illustrate the points that were made in the PSIA Study.

IMPORTANCE OF FARMING FOR RURAL LIVELIHOODS

Female participants of a FGD in Chamcar Leu of Stung Treng explained:

_Rice is our staple food, but we do not have it enough every year. We need land and draft animals to reduce our hunger, and finally poverty. Without adequate land we are not able to grow anything meaning that we will starve._

MULTIPLE CAUSES OF LANDLESSNESS

Among these root causes illnesses are not uncommon as an old Por\(^{18}\) lady of a FGD in Ov Loek village of Preah Vihear complained:

_In the Khmer Rouge my family had a piece of land on which we rely for growing crops for family’s consumption. But we are now landless; we have no land and we are very poor._

_Few years back my husband got malaria; and we had to sell part of our land for his medical treatment. However, he later died. Then, my children also became contracted with malaria. We sold the whole land we owned for their medical treatment. Unfortunately, they also died and are survived by four young children. They all depend on me. Currently, my only source of income for the family is from making thatch-roofing materials. We wish to have land so that we can grow crops to at least ensure that we are not hunger._

---

\(^{18}\) There are more than 17 indigenous groups in Cambodia. Por is one of them. This group is found mainly in Preah Vihear; but little is known about them.
CRITERION FOR ELIGIBILITY TO PARTICIPATE IN SLCP

The first criterion states that to be eligible the applicant shall be a Cambodian/Khmer national and legal person who is entitled to land ownership. An old farmer in his 70s in Ksaok Tbong village of Prey Veng resented the first criterion:

*There should not be any discrimination. Not only should a Cambodian/Khmer be eligible for the program. Other nationals should be eligible as long as they live permanently in Cambodia; and they could perhaps legally obtain citizenship. They cannot be left landless, if they are also poor.*

Another farmer supported this view in her 40s in Sambor village of Oddar Meanchey:

*Whoever is landless should be eligible to receive land for his/her livelihoods. It does not matter what nationality he/she was born to as long as he/she lives in the same village as we do. The authorities can decide upon the size of residential land; but agricultural land should be at least 2 ha per household.*

A farmer in his 40s of Ropeak village of Kampot province echoed these views. The man elaborated:

*It is unfair to consider that only Khmer/Cambodian national is eligible under the program. Other nationals are also human. They have the rights to life. As long as they are humans and have labor power to till the land they should be eligible.*

Second criterion states that to be eligible the beneficiary shall be the head of family of two or more members related by blood or marriage residing in the same household. This criterion seems to discriminate against single person households, who may be the poorest, but hardworking. An elder of FGD in Srae Ambel district of Koh Kong disputed this criterion.

*That is unacceptable. What do you think? Do you think that old people such as me do not eat to live? Do you think that old people swallow the stone to survive because they look stony? I am in my late 70s, but I still need to eat to survive and have enough strength to work the land. Currently, I totally depend on day labor. This policy is very discriminatory against elder, single person household like mine.*

A young farmer in his early 20s in Samraong district of Oddar Meanchey expressed his concern over this criterion:

*I am an orphan. My parents died poor many years ago of ill health. They left me no heritage. I live on my own. As you can see one of my*
palms is defective; but I am a hired laborer. I live on a day-by-day basis. If I could not find work for the day I would go hungry. Now, I am still strong and I could find some works but not enough for a living. When I grow older, what will be my future if I do not have land? Will I be able to sell my labor forever until the end of my day?

An old woman in a FGD in Sangkum Thmei district of Preah Vihear complained about unfair treatment of this criterion:

I am alone, poor, landless, and aging. When I was younger I could sell my labor for a living. Now I am too old to do that. If I am not eligible to receive land I will not have anything to live on as you can see. Sometimes I go hungry. Thanks to my neighbors who sometimes share with me their ration. The government should distribute land to single person household – either old or young person. Because even we do not have adequate manpower, we can sharecrop our land. What is the government’s support for single person household, and old lady like me? They have no program for old aged people. They do not care about us. And, they are perhaps happy to see us begging on the streets in urban centers.

The assumption was that the financial criteria would be based on poverty threshold. Majority of the FGD participants and interviewees agreed on this; but also made some suggestions. The participants of Prek Svay village in Koh Kong suggested:

Although some people are not poor financially, they should be given land because they do not need to take away their income for purchasing land. As they take away their income for acquisition of land, they do not have enough for consumption. They need land as a security. When they are unemployed they can depend on their land. Our economy is precarious, and off-farm employment is never a guarantee.

The fourth criterion as stipulated in the sub-decree is the eligible applicant shall not be an owner of land that has the size as large as or larger than the size of land to be given in the social land concessions program. A few people were annoyed with this. A farmer in Samroang of Oddar Meanchey expressed her view:

Of course 2 ha of land for certain families are not going to be enough. Even they own this much land they would need more land because some of them have many children; and they need land to distribute to their offspring. Land is static, while people multiply.

The fifth criterion demands that the eligible applicant be ready, willing and able to participate in the social land concessions program. This criterion was well received. No
one objected to that. The participants of a FGD in Takream commune of Battambang remarked:

*We should not discriminate against single household person. As long as he/she is ready, willing and able to participate in the program he/she should be eligible. If he/she were not allowed to participate they would feel abandoned by the society, and may commit wrongdoing.*

**COMPLIANCE WITH ELEGIBILITY CONDITIONS**

Those who argued against them gave their reasons. The FGD participants in Chekbor village of Oddar Meanchey resisted the first condition:

*The RGC should not set that condition. Poor people will not have necessary resources to just build even a small hut (chicken house) in three months time. Most poor people in our village do not have a proper hut to live in, and they have lived here years and years. So what can they build in three months on the land they will be given?*

The participants of a FGD in Prey Peay village of Trapeang Phleang commune in Kampot, who were all disabled people, reacted against the second condition:

*We live on hand to mouth. If we were given land and then required to cultivate it in twelve months it will be very difficult for us. While we will have to prepare our land given by program we will not be able to have anything to eat and feed our families. We are selling our labor for daily living. The RGC should relax the condition, if the poor like us are to be assisted.*

The condition states that the recipient of land shall be able to apply for land title five years after complying with the SLCP. A few FGDs and household informants got worried about that. The FGD participants in Phum Leu of Stung Treng who were mainly Lao-Khmer expressed their disagreement:

*Five years to get title after the start of the program is too long. We need security and guarantee against land grabbers. Only land title could perhaps ensure that. Our village is remote and located almost in the heart of the jungle. We have practiced shifting cultivations for generations. We return to our old plots between 5 and 7 years depending on the re-growth of the bushes and scrubs. Now when we returned somebody took away our village land. When you entered the village you might have observed that outsiders who are military officers, rich and powerful, fence our land up.*
We want to get it back. We told them it is our shifting land. But, they asked, what do you have as proof? Do you have title to prove ownership of the land? We cannot claim it back. So now many of us are almost landless, we have only small piece of land that could not support our families. And, we dare not move anymore to practice shifting swidden agriculture.

Cham participants in a FGD in Phum Dabbei Leu in Kampong Cham have similar reasoning. They explained:

*We request that government should allow us to have land title only after three years. Because we would be able to rest assured that no one would take it from us. We have heard over the radio that there is a lot of land grabbing around the country, and the losers are always the poor who have no land title, and the winners are the military, rich and powerful.*

For the fourth condition people generally want to have the assurance that their heir either young or old shall be eligible to benefit from the land. In Chheu Teal village of Kampot the people of the FDG maintained:

*It is good that the RGC would allow the heir to take over the land once the original recipient passed away. But, we want to make sure that no matter how old is the heir he/she should eligible to enjoy this right. We suggest that the RGC should make appropriate arrangement to ensure that the land is really handed down to or protected for the young heir, otherwise someone may take land powerful. The government may think of setting up a village land safeguarding committee consisting of elders, Buddhist priests, and village head to safeguard the land properly for the eligible heir before he/she can manage it herself [legally].*

There were a few people interviewed at household level and in the FGD resisted the fifth condition. The participants of FGD in Srah Russuei of Stung Treng expressed their worries about this:

*If we are not allowed to rent or use the given land as collateral we may face some hardships when we really need cash to meet emergency expenses especially when we get sick or malaria. We need money to pay for the treatment but we always do not have a Riel. If we can use land as collateral we could get some credit to get treatment, otherwise we will be in trouble, or the government has to have good healthcare services for us.*
The FGD participants in Prek Thnaot village of Kampot supported this view. The participants of this particular FGD who are Cham and Khmer agreed:

*The fifth condition should be relaxed. The government should make an exceptional case for pawn or sale of the given land. The pawn or sale of part of the land should be allowed if the recipient needs to cope with emergencies, for example serious illness or he/she should be left dying.*

However, those supported the conditions even requested that the allowable period for rent, sale, and exchange should be extended longer. FGD participants in former KR zone of Trapeang Prasat in Oddar Meanchey argued:

*If the recipient really needs land and wants to live in the village with us he/she would not sell the land given to him/her. Therefore, he/she should not be allowed to rent, sell, or exchange at all. Land title could be given after five years; but only after 10 years he/she would be allowed to rent, sell, and exchange the land. Because, when they sell they would become landless again, and leave the village; and perhaps would try to get land elsewhere.*

**AVAILABILITY OF LAND**

The FGD participants in Prek Thnaot village of Kampot explained why vacant land in their village could not be converted.

*Unused land exists in our village; but it cannot be converted. The land is infertile. It is stony. However, it is used for grazing our livestock. It is not good for crops production. If we convert it, we will lose grazing value. Also, we want to develop it as community forestland, although it is degraded.*

FGD participants in Run village of Stung Treng had some similar reasons:

*About 50 ha of land in our village are not used. It can be turned to SLCP, but there will be negative impacts on livelihoods of our villagers. The fact is once it is converted we cannot harvest resin anymore. In addition to crops cultivation we depend on resin collection.*

A female participant in Chheu Teal village’s FGD in Kampot complained:

*There is land available in our village. It is our former village and paddy land. But we were chased out by the military. We cannot use it anymore. They stake the claim to land so that we could never get it*
back. Who can help us? If this land can be given back to us, we do not need to move.

Below is the quote from a FGD in Nhaing Sum village of Stung Treng who agreed that land vacant in their village could be distributed to new settlers / outsiders; but their village landless families should be given first.

The idle land in our village can be distributed under the SLCP. But we suggest that the government distribute land to all the landless and land poor-households of our village first and foremost before giving this land to new settlers. Once everybody here has adequate land the land left over after the distribution can be given to any Cambodians from anywhere of Cambodia.

An old lady in her 50s from a landless family in a FGD in Chheu Teal village of Kampot disagreed strongly with all her counterparts for resettlement. She argued:

*We are landless because of the military. They evicted us from our land. Even my family is landless and poor I do not agree that we shall be relocated. We will stay here in this village, because it is our native place. All relatives, friends and acquaintances are all here. Moving to new location means that we have to adapt ourselves to new situation and conditions, e.g. climate, new community, new problem, and so on. We continue to sell our labor here for day-to-day living. If the government is kind enough take the land from the military and give it back to us or the government should have a better program for the poor by generating employment in situ.*

People in other places have other reasons, which encourage them not to relocate. However, they do not object completely to the relocation. The FGD participants in Thmar Baing district in Koh Kong argued:

*We are landless, but we do not want to move away from our village because we have been able to depend on forest. We have lived on collecting resin, cardamom, wild vegetables, vines, rattans, honey, and other non-timber forest products. However, recently our livelihoods have been deprived of because we are banned by the conservation organizations on following these livelihoods activities

*There is degraded forestland, which is not used. It used to be shifting cultivation plots in the 1960s; but we are not allowed to use it anymore. Look, even just land behind our houses in the backyards is not allowed for cultivations. These conservation people tell us that we are not permitted to plant any crops on this land because this is bad for environment. They said that we are destroying environment and biodiversity.*
We never slashed big trees and burned them to get land for farming. Our ancestors instructed me not to do so. They said that powerful spirits of the jungle always occupies land with big trees. Thus, if we dared touch that land we would be in big trouble. We cleared only bush and scrubland with some trees and grew crops on it. We always returned to our shifting cultivation plot every 5 years or so when the trees were big enough to indicate that soil fertility returned. And, the plot was always smaller than one hectare per household. If we really needed to cut any big trees, e.g. cardamom, we had to perform traditional ritual and asked for permission of the jungle’s spirits. Though, we rarely cut big trees.

Now, these conservation people do not know much about our traditions, but blame us for destroying the forest, environment and biodiversity. We are perhaps lorded it over. Look, if the government really cared about the poor we demand that the government do not give total authority to these long-nosed conservationists, but work with them to demarcate clearly their conservation areas and relax certain rules so that we could continue our livelihoods activities. A few years back when the forest concessionaires managed the forest we were able to follow our normal livelihoods activities. These new people care more about environment than they care about our rights to survive as human.

CAPACITY OF PROVINCIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT STAFF

While the majority of PLUAC reported that they were able to do most of the tasks assigned to them in the SSLC, half of them expressed concerns over the capacities of their TSU’s personnel in supporting them. Only half of them were convinced that their TSU’s personnel would be able to provide them with technical support in all aspects of the tasks. For example, in Stung Treng the PLUAC members present at the meeting with the field team explained:

Our technical support unit’s personnel could do technical works; but they will need some training. The problem for them will lie in the development works. They will have difficulties in ensuring that relevant and associated infrastructure; services and materials are integrated in the plan and in monitoring development works. They will need a lot of training in these aspects.

In Oddar Meanchey, PLUAC members had specifically concerns over technical aspects related to land for their TSU’s staff.
Our province is a new province with limited capacity of staff. The difficulties for our technical support unit’s staff will lie in the identification and selection of eligible beneficiaries, monitoring the program and beneficiaries, rationalization of land plots/parcels and number of beneficiaries, and ensuring the integration of relevant and associated infrastructure, services, and materials in the plan. They will need training on these aspects and guidelines. Though, budgetary resources will be the constraints as well.

PLUAC members in Kampong Cham explained:

Even we believe that we can do all of the works assigned to us, we still need supports from the national level. Technical training will be very crucial, and then technical tools and equipment such as land measuring equipment, computers, and printers, and means of transport. Of course, we will also need financial resources to perform the tasks, since we do not have enough funding.

PLUAC members in Kampot had similar views on the assistance they would need from the national level, though adding:

Funding and material support from the national level will not be enough. Technical training will be needed, for example, on land identification, classification, selection of beneficiaries, etc. But, the most important thing is the relevant law, sub-decrees, and Prakas must be widely disseminated; and supporting guidelines and procedures need to be in place for us to follow, otherwise the law and sub-decrees remain useless.

CAPACITY OF DISTRICT WORKING GROUPS

Number of women as members of DWG is scarce. On average, there was only one female member per DWG. It is relatively lower than the number of women membership within PLUAC. In Stung Treng, PLUAC gave the reason behind low membership of women in DWG.

On average, there are 7 persons in each District Working Group in our province, who are appointed for the SLCP. There is rarely a woman in the group. Of our five district working groups only one has a female member. It is difficult for us to get women onto the membership in our province. The fact is there are very few women who have an education to be part of DWG.

About one-fifth of DWG wanted to get assistance from provincial and national levels. DWG in Stung Treng district of Stung Treng expressed their demand for assistance.
As we said earlier we could do the works as stipulated in the SSLC, because we have done similar works here in our district, but on a small and sporadic basis. Now there are legal frameworks that we have to comply. To understand and comply with all of the legal frameworks is no easy task. Therefore, we will need support from both national and provincial levels. Technical training for our DWG members is the priority. They have to be enabled to transfer technical knowledge through training to commune councilors. Dissemination of legal frameworks and information about the program to the public is second most important. Finally, during the implementation of the program we will need support from technical person of PLUAC.

In Srae Ambil district of Koh Kong, DWG expressed similar, but more specific demand for assistance.

Prior to the actual implementation of the program, technical training on land identification, land classification, land use planning (e.g. PLUP), identification and selection of potential recipients, and relevant legal framework (including land law) should be given to all members of DWG. At least a technical person should be assigned to work with us for one village as a pilot so that we could get real life experience on the ground. In addition, to allow office equipment, and us to implement the program we will need technical means of transport, and funding.

DWG in Sangkum Thmey of Preah Vihear, where accessibility is the major issue had requested for only one assistance:

There is a lot of land available here. Now, the government has this SLCP. What we need is technical training on land administration and management, sub-decree number 19 [SSLC], and guidelines and procedures for implementing the social land concessions program. However, you should note that, similar to other government institutions, our district never has enough funding resource for our own operation.

CAPACITY OF COMMUNE COUNCILS

The works, responsibilities and roles they have performed were summarized by a PRA with the commune councilors in Bak Anlung commune of Oddar Meanchey:

Our commune councilors have performed following roles and works: (i) collection of and reporting on population / demographic and production statistics; (ii) vital records keeping (registration of births, marriages, and deaths); (iii) formulation of commune development

---

19 Bak Anlung is a former Khmer Rouge stronghold in Trapeang Prasat district.
and investment plans; (iv) giving advice to the subjects on farming and relevant aspects; (v) dealing with local, minor conflicts; and issuance and enforcement of local by-laws.

The participants of a FGD in Thnal Kaong village of Preah Vihear elaborated their knowledge of the CC works.

_We do not really know much about what commune councilors are doing. As far as we know they do a few things. They have worked closely with NGOs to get their support for drilling wells, building schools, and local roads._

In Thala Barivat of Stung Treng, villagers in the FGD seemed to have similar views about the works done by CC to what CC reported above.

_Commune councilors in our area have been working to develop our localities and maintain security. They have coordinated for road building, and improvement of water and sanitation. Also, they help deal with local conflicts among local people._

Participants of FGDs in Russey Chrum commune of Koh Kong spoke of CC’s works with disappointment.

_We do not know what commune councils are doing after their election. They have collected population statistics and documented parcels of land used and occupied by the villagers. And, they also told us not to cut any trees in the area anymore as it turned into protected area._

However, they suggested that CC should be given adequate support technically, materially and financially. FGD in Koh Sla village of Kampot suggested:

_Although, CC can do some of the works, they will not be able to do them on their own; they will need supports. These supports could include training on technical and legal aspects, money and more human resources. At the moment, CC is almost stretched out even they do few things such as dealing with local conflicts, and preparing development plan. This is simply because it does not have enough people._

FGD participants in Chaeng Meanchey village of Battambang seemed to agree on this comment, especially on issue of technical capacity of CC. They recommended:

_CC could not do the works on their on. We recommend that they should first get a good technical training; and during implementation_
technical persons, perhaps from NGO, should assigned to works closely with them to provide technical assistance.

The participants of a FGD in Pal Hal village of Preah Vihear contributed their view on this.

*Even we think that CC could do all the works related to social land concessions program we should say that CC would need to be provided with means of transport, technical equipment, and adequate funding. But, what they will need the most will be technical training on, for example land use planning, and land classification.*

One of CC message coming out from PRA works with them is quoted below.

*No doubt, we will be able to do some of the works as specified in the sub-decree. To be able to good works on social land concessions program, we will requires three important assistance: (i) provide appropriate technical training to us on land classification and management of program implementation; (ii) assign a land management and administration specialist to provide us with regular backup support; and (iii) give us financial support.*

PRA participants of Chhuk DWG in Kampot supported the view.

*CC will need technical person to provide regular assistance in order that they can do the works. In addition, they will have to be provided with technical and legal training. Of course, they will not be able to implement the program without funding, technical tools, and means of transport.*

In Banbung village of Stung Treng, the participants of the FGD argued that CC could not do the works without proper assistance.

*CC will not be capable of doing the works of and implement the social land concessions program. They will be able to perform these tasks only if they would have adequate technical support from provincial and district land titling and management offices and NGOs.*

CC in Rikreay commune of Preah Vihear also candidly admitted their limited capacity to implement the SLC program, and appealed for assistance.

*Honestly, our commune council members will not be able to implement the social land concessions program because we do not have enough people, and especially we do not have technical skills and our education/knowledge is very limited. In addition, we do not have previous experience related to the program. In order that we
would be able to implement the program we will need all technical assistance that will have to be provided from DWG, and we will need someone knowledgeable of the program to assist us all along.

PARTICIPATION OF OTHER GROUPS

Discussions were developed with FGD participants and HHS interviewees to delve into the reasons behind their thinking about involvement of informal groups in the SLCP, and SLCP activities. People in Lakay village of Stung Treng explained their reasons for suggestions to involve above-mentioned groups and people.

There need to be participation of elders in the village. We have respect for and trust in them. They can help identify the right beneficiaries, and witness the process and implementation of the program. Also, officials of national government, especially from the Ministry of Justice, should participate in the program to ensure justice and fairness.

Participants of FGD in Rolum Veng of Oddar Meanchey why they suggested that lottery drawing should be applied to ensure fairness and acceptability.

There may be problem of corruption in terms of cronyism and money taking. For example, people who may have good connection with officials who are responsible for land distribution would get good land, or when land is scarce they would be the priority beneficiaries. To avoid that first available land should identified, and number or a blank should be assigned to the existing or non-existing parcels to be distributed. Then, the landless, i.e. the potential beneficiaries of the program, should be called in to draw the lottery randomly.

People in Pha-av of Oddar Meanchey put their trust in NGO. They were sure that NGO could ensure transparency and acceptability of the program. They explained:

While the government agencies will implement the program, we think NGO should be involved. NGO can be observer who will have to check on honesty and accountability of government officials responsible for the program.

People in Srae Poh of Stung Treng had nothing to disagree on this. They explained why they wanted NGO to get engaged in the program, and what NGO should do.

We suggested that NGO should be involved as observer to make sure that the program is fair and unbiased, because they do not belong to any interest, but the people’s. They should be involved, especially, during land identification, beneficiary selection, and distribution stages.
DISSEMINATION OF SSLC PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Sharing of information and legal framework related to the program with the public was considered necessary for a number of communities to ensure the transparency of the program. These communities wished that public announcement about the program prior to the actual implementation of the program should be made so that people would be well informed of the it and could come forward to discuss about it. People in Bos of Preah Vihear voiced their views on this.

The government has policy, and legal framework for the program. To ensure transparency, the government should make public announcement about it. People need to be informed of what is going on. When they are informed they could be aware of it, and discuss about the problem it may create.

People of Sambor village in Oddar Meanchey gave similar views.

The government has the legal framework that specifies clearly the criteria for the eligible candidates for the program. This legal framework must be widely disseminated and circulated among the people so that they are well informed of the program. When they are informed they would know whether the criteria are fair or not. And then, when they know well of the criteria they can judge whether the program implementation is fair or not during the implementation stage.

INEVITABILITY OF LAND CONFLICTS

DWG members in Bavel District of Battambang had this to say

In Battambang, there are a lot of land conflicts. For SLCP, conflict may also arise. But the important thing is to avoid or minimize it. It is difficult to deal with it when it arises. It gives you a big headache, is very costly. One thing to minimize the conflict is to widely disseminate relevant legal frameworks, and provide training to all concerned stakeholders on law, especially local people. Explain them clearly land distribution policy, and criteria for eligible candidates. (DWG members in Bavel district of Battamabang expressed the view).

During the PRA in Bak Anlung20 commune of Oddar Meanchey CC members pointed out their concern about a type of the conflict.

20 Bak Anlung is a former Khmer Rouge stronghold.
Land is available here in our area. But, as you could have seen along the way through that the vacant land is being cleared and fenced up. Many of the grabbers have claimed the land illegally, and we think they are doing speculation. But, what could we do? So, assuming that we take such land for the social land concessions program, these speculators will resist and no doubt, there will be grand disputes.

PLUAC members in Kampot had also their own concern about the conflict; but different from above.

PLUP will be used to identify and classify vacant land in the domain of State private and public land. Although, we could identify vacant land in the domain of State private land, we perhaps will not be able to convert it for the program, as there may be conflict over its uses. It may be forestland, which could have negative impact on the environment, and may not be sacrificed by concerned agencies.

In Boeng Preav village in Koh Kong, FGD participants maintained that only minor conflict would happen during the implementation of the social land concessions program.

Minor problem or conflict will occur because people may get envy of each other. For example, land will not be available for everybody. This means that there will be people who can and who cannot get the land. In that case there may be some disputes among them. Such conflict could be mediated and settled by commune council.

Participants of O Chik village in Oddar Meanchey envisaged that serious conflict might be arising among the recipients of the program.

Serious problem may occur between the recipients who may receive parcels of land adjacent to each other. We think there may be some violent disputes could happen. For example, when land is given the recipients may not have any resources to demarcate or fence or put the levee around it. Then, there may be mis-claim over the boundary of one another, which will lead to fighting among them.

Participants of the FGD in O Trel village of Stung Treng believed that there would not be any conflict, and that conflict could be avoided. They explained:

There will be no dispute in the program, because we could avoid it. To avoid it we should make the process and implementation of the program more participatory and transparent. We need to get all parties concerned to participate, to witness and to observe; and we
People in Bak Anlung of Oddar Meanchey explained what dispute in the social land concessions program CC could deal with and how.

As we told you earlier that CC could deal with minor disputes within the commune. In the case of social land concessions program they will be able to deal with small conflict as well. The conflict could be just among the beneficiaries; and if so they could mediate and resolve it; but not big conflict involving powerful figures

CC members in Rikreay commune of Preah Vihear also assured that they could only mediate in or resolve small conflicts related to the program.

We could coordinate and facilitate reconciliation among parties in disputes; we cannot do more than this

DWG members in Koh Kong had similar view on the ability of CC to deal with conflicts in the program.

There will be small sporadic conflicts, which can be dealt with by CC and district concerned authorities. Such conflicts will not need any complicated mechanism to address. Mediation and reconciliation among parties in disputes would be a workable approach.

In Kampong Preah commune of Battabang CC members during the PRA process agreed on these; but added:

We should not underestimate the scope of the disputes. As CC members we could only deal with small conflicts that we have done so far. But when the disputes involve powerful land speculators, we should say that such conflicts should be referred to and addressed by the land conflict mechanism existing at the district and provincial levels. This sort of conflicts is beyond our authority and capacity.

However, when the conflicts involve, for example, the military or high-ranking people the provincial mechanism will not be useful. PLUAC members in Oddar Meanchey described their relevant experiences.

We are only concerned about the military, which may come to claim the land we will distribute to the people, like what is happening. Land was given to communities, then the military come in and chases the civilians away from their land claiming it belongs to them. Then they continue to claim more land under the forest cover. We cannot deal
with this sort of situation unless the national government or ministry of defense intervenes.

**SUPPORT SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

An elder in his 70s who participated in FGD in Tabas village of Preah Vihear recounted his experiences about poverty and land-based livelihoods, and explained why road and market connection were important.

*I have been through all the hardships in life. I have lived since the French rule. Land alone can never help reduce poverty. You need land of course for land-based livelihoods and agricultural production.*

*In our village, poverty exhibits in both the landless and non-landless households. Some land in our village is very productive. Some of our villagers produce rice and cash crops such as soybean, sesame, mung bean, and maize. We can produce a lot of these crops, but we cannot sell them because we have no connection to the market, and road is almost unusable.*

*When you do not have market access, and the road is very poor you could perhaps sell the produce, but at very low price. For example, we can sell the produce at a farm gate price of Riel 1,000 per kilogram; but when the road is very poor, the buyer would be willing to pay only Riel 100 per kilogram because they claim that they have to pay a lot for transportation, fuel, security personnel along the way, etc. Then we remain poor because the produce is so cheap that we cannot even cover the cost of production.*

*Now, you have seen the condition of the access road our area. It is crisscrossing though the jungle, and is bumpy passing across small streams. It is OK during the dry season like this. During the wet season it is not useable. Worse than that there are a lot of mines. There are tens of minefields along the road. In wet season when the road is a soft and muddy mine explode so often and damage trucks, and even claim lives of travelers and middlemen.*

*The Seila program has funded a school construction for more than a year. The construction of the school is not yet done; and three contractors have run away and have cancelled the contracts. It takes so many months for the construction materials such as cement, steel bars, bricks, etc. to reach here. While waiting for the supplies to arrive many workers have to stay here spending all their money*
without pay. They became broke and then they did not want the contract anymore. So who wants to come here for a business?

People in Koh Rokar Krao of Prey Veng said that credit was necessary, as farmers would need cash resources for their production. They explained this from their experiences.

*When you have land you need capital and cash, because they are important for production and daily living. In our village, farmers who have enough land is as poor as the landless, because they are in debts. They borrow for production and for emergency expenditures. They need cash to buy agricultural inputs and fuel for watering their crops and rice.*

*Now they do not borrow from moneylenders or any local credit service providers anymore since they charge high interest rate. They always borrow from Vietnamese and Vietnamese government. They do not charge anything; our farmers only need to sell their produce to the creditors. If the harvest is poor they never ask for the repayment. Instead, they give additional loans for the next crops.*

*The loan our villagers could get from local creditor has an interest of about 50 percent or more per annum. We suggest that credit should be incorporated in the social land concessions program so that farmers could borrow for agricultural inputs; and that credit should have interest charge as low as 10 percent per annum.*

People in FGD in Trapeang Prasat district of Oddar Meanchey requested that social infrastructure and services should be attached to the program. They made their point.

*Land distribution will not be able to lift people from poverty. Look! After defecting to the Royal Government of Cambodia our commanders allowed us to claim one hectare of land per head; in some cases people just took 1.5 ha per person. But, we are still poor even we could have 1-1.5/person. Why is it so?*

*Some of the families needed to sell or pawn their land for money, which was used for healthcare. The land can be kept; but the patient would die. Many families have never been able to get the land back. Therefore, we suggest that functional healthcare services should be included in the program, not for just a few years, but forever.*

Participants of FGD in Prey Phdao village of Battambang supported the view. They told of their experiences.

*When land was distributed to our villagers back in the late 1980s, each family got really a big tract of land because land was abundant...*
here, except security was not good. A family got between 10 and 15 hectares. But, now we are poor and landless. The Chinese vendors in Battambang town own all of our land. Do you know why?

The only most problem we have faced is the ill health. When we are sick there is no healthcare service for the poor like us. What many of us have done is to sell or use our land as collaterals to get money to buy medical treatment and service. Debts have accumulated and many households have not been able to repay the loans. Finally, we end up giving land to our Chinese creditors or sell them at a very low price. We are placed in a no option position. As such, we think that land alone will never help us out of poverty; except there has to be something more such as healthcare services.

In Ovlock village of Preah Vihear where live the indigenous people of Por ethnicity, participants of the FGD had similar idea, but added another point to the need for a public health service.

Giving land away to people is very good. But, land is static, while people are born everyday. Many of our villagers started to live together at very young age. Some even get married as young as 12 years old. We do not have any lavish wedding celebrations because we do not have any valuable tributes. People just fall in love and live in co-habitation. What we do now is just give small tribute to the spirits of the village and jungle such as wine and chicken. By the age of 14 many people have two children. Our households are large. We want to have fewer children; but we do not know what to do. When there is land distribution program this issue should be taken into account.

During FGD in Meanchey village of Oddar Meanchey the participants who were former Khmer Rouge members said that education and religious services should be in the package of land distribution program. They offered their reasons for the need for education and religious infrastructure and services.

Now, it is difficult for children to go to school because it exists only at the district center of Trapeang Prasat. Although, you have land you will never be sure that poverty is reduced. We think that having education and Buddhism along with the program would be good and would help reduce conflict in our society, which will finally alleviate poverty in a sustainable manner.

When you are well educated you will likely to resolve conflicts using your brains rather than resort to armed conflicts that we have gone through. Also, education would allow us to have access to information about developing our livelihoods, and new agriculture
technologies. Education has to come with Buddhism, because Lord Buddha teaches us to live in harmony, in peace with everything in human community and in wilderness. We need religious service and center because in our tradition this is important. We need monks and Buddhist priests to perform traditional and cultural rituals for the weddings, funerals, New Year celebration, Phchum Bind, and so forth.

Commune councilors of Bak Anlung commune in Oddar Meanchey who participated in the commune PRA defended their proposal for the package of associated assistance.

After being given land the recipients are required to build shelters on their residential plots, and farm their agricultural land. How can they do that since these poor landless have no food reserve, no money to buy construction materials, and they have no farm implements, and draft animals to till the land? Most of them work only hand to mouth. What can they do?

May be some food assistance at the early stage, temporary shelters, farm implements, and draft animals should be provided.

Commune councilors of Kanthor Khang Lech of Kampot expressed similar view, but further requested for a well setup of administrative structure that would function in any new villages.

Food reserve is very important, that the government should give to the program recipients in the first 6 months at least, because the landless poor always do not have anything. Temporary shelters, and farm implements and draft animals should be also given so that people can have the roofs to reside under, and have the means for subsistence production. But, most importantly, a good administrative structure should be in place to ensure security, and sustainable development.

DWG members of Banteay Ampil in Oddar Meanchey participating in the PRA explained how the SLCP would contribute to poverty alleviation.

The social land concessions program will contribute to poverty alleviation because our landless people will be able to have land for shelters, and for agricultural production. They will be self-employed on their own farms to produce rice for home consumption, and may be some cash crops for sale. As such they will be able to generate income, at least on annual basis, for their families; and they will not have to be cheated to go across the border to Thailand for jobs.
In Trapeang Khcheng village of Preah Vihear, participants of FGD explained why they thought that the social land concessions program would be able to help reduce poverty.

We have requested that social infrastructure, and services and some initial supports should be coming along with the social land concessions program. If our demands are given due consideration and met, we are sure that the program will help reduce poverty. For example, when we have land we can produce rice for home consumption, and the surplus can be sold to the market, when road and market are there. And, we will ensure that we will maintain the infrastructure well so that we can get sustainable benefit. Our ancestors taught us a saying, “When we take advantage of the shade of any trees, we have to protect and maintain such trees very well for future uses”. While maintaining these infrastructures we have to work harder to produce more so that we can maximize benefit from them and improve our living.

People in Prek Svay village of Koh Kong gave their comments on why they believed the program would contribute to poverty alleviation with a different perspective.

The program will reduce poverty if social infrastructure and services such as health center and healthcare service are provided. You have land, but you cannot produce anything if you are ill. It is worse if the health service and health center is far away. Our experience is we have to pay a lot to go to the health center. Only the travel costs us a full bag of milled rice of 50 kg. We are sure that when the program bring along such service, a lot of money can be saved; and poverty will be reduced.

Participants of FGD in Kok Samrech village of Oddar Meanchey complained about the conditions and inadequacy of school for their children.

There is a temporary school in our area. 7 teachers man it. The school is located more than 1 km away in Kol village on a pagoda compound. The school consists of 7 classrooms. A classroom is in a school structure with a poor, dilapidated, thatched roof. One classroom is under Buddhist monastery, and another under the mango tree.

Participants of FGD in Thnal Chey village of Prey Veng were not happy with the lack of school for their children too.

As far as we know there is only a school building of five classrooms in our area. The school is never enough for our children. More classrooms and teachers are needed.
During PRA process, commune councilors of Tbeng Pi commune of Preah Vihear told the team about the healthcare service in their area.

*A district health center is located in this commune. Five personnel are working there. But, the supplies and services are always a shortage.*

During FGD session in Toek Paong village of Koh Kong participants contended.

*There is a referral hospital in this area. We think that there are enough healthcare personnel running the hospital. But most often when visit the hospital for medical services no one is there to see us, because they are not paid adequately to support their livelihoods; so they are always out for other businesses. Also, the supplies are always lacking. The hospital could provide only treatment for common diseases, for any severe sickness and surgical operation we are referred to Phnom Penh hospitals, which are very expensive in terms expenses for travel and cares.*

In Boeng Preav village of also Koh Kong, the participants of FGD agreed on the views expressed above, and added:

*We really need doctors and skilled healthcare personnel to work at the health center and referral hospital. Medical materials and medicines are always in short supply. Even worse is the behavior of healthcare personnel; they always used bad and abusive language with us like mad.*

Many communities have difficulties for water supply during dry season. Participants of Cham community in Dabbei village in Kampong Cham explained about access to water supply of their community.

*In our village we do not have a single well. But, we are very lucky, because we are very close to the Mekong. The Mekong is the very source of water supply for us for everything. We get water direct from there.*

During discussion in a PRA session with commune councilors in Phluk commune of Stung Treng the participants also complained of shortage of water supply.

*In our commune there is neither river nor lake. There is no natural water body. Eight hand-pump wells were drilled and provided by PFD, an international NGO. The provision of the wells was linked to child’s rights program. The eight wells have never been able to generate enough supply for our whole commune residents. We have*
asked for another four wells; but do not get any response yet. Our commune residents have a lot of difficulties related to the lack of water supply.

Commune councilors of Sdao commune in Preah Vihear explained the condition of local road and accessibility to the market.

No market is nearby the commune. The villages of this commune are 6 – 18 km away from the district center. And only at the district center a small market exists, and it can be reached only by motor dup that cost you 10,000 riel/trip. People go also to Phnom Tbeng market. The closest distance, 6 km, is from this commune center to the market in Phnom Tbeng market. And as you can see, the road in our area is in very bad condition.

Participants of FGD in Chamcar Leu village of Stung Treng explained about road condition in their area.

Roads are very bad here. Only 50 percent of village road could be traveled by motorbike during wet season. Road to the district is much worse in both seasons. It is beyond repair. During wet season it is flooded. The distance from the village to the district is just only 27 km; but we can reach there on foot, or bicycle, or motorbike. Most often villagers walk on foot to the district center, if they have to go there, as the motorbike fare is very expensive, Riel 40,000 per trip.

In Prey Chas, participants told the team that they could reach the district center and provincial town only by boat, which was easier.

Our mode of transport here is boat. It is available and useable year-round. We have to take boat from here to district and provincial town; and only there motorbike is available. The distance from here to the district is about 43 km, but the fare is Riel 10,000 per boat trip.

DWG members of Kampong Trabek district of Prey Veng talked about credit service in their area.

Many credit operators’ work in our district. These include Chinese moneylenders, ACLEDA, PRASAC, and GRET. Chinese moneylenders charge an interest of 10% per month, while ACLEDA, PRASAC, and GRET charge 4% per month. Although, there exist many credit operators the coverage is between limited and wide (i.e. more than 50 percent of borrowers). On the other hand, to get credit from PRASAC, ACLEDA, and GRET villagers need to have
collaterals / guarantees such as land title, which is very difficult for them.

Participants of FGD in Prey Chas village of Battambang complained of limited availability of credit service in their area.

Only informal credit given by rich families exists in our area; and borrowers are very selective. Creditors give credit to only those borrowers whom they know well or with whom they have good relation. But, even so, they charge an interest up to 15% per month.

In Stung Veng village of Koh Kong, participants of FGD complained that interest charged by informal and formal credit sources were expensive and requested a lower interest rate.

Both informal and formal credits are available in our village. But the interest rate is expensive. The formal credit source charges 4% per month, while the informal source charges 3 – 5%. The formal source requires collaterals in the form of land title that we do not have. For the informal source, we do pay only 3% of interest rate if we have guarantee, for example, gold. The government should consider providing credit to people for their livelihood activities at lower interest rate. We think 1% interest rate a month will be helpful for us.

As CC members of Koh Sotin commune of Kampong Cham put it:

Monks and pagoda committees mobilize people and raise funds for building local roads; and repairing and maintaining schools. They raise fund for traditional festivities as well.

The statement was echoed by other DWG in other places. Commune councilors of Ampil Krao commune of Prey Veng echoed on similar roles of Buddhist monks and priests in their district.

Buddhist monks and clergymen are playing good roles. They help build schools on the Buddhist temples’ premises, and village and commune road networks. Of course, they build also Buddhist temples.

Commune councilors of Chhouk commune in Kampot expressed similar statement.

Monks, besides providing Buddhist teachings, have raised funds for the construction of schools and ponds for water supply.

In Thmar Daupeou commune the commune councilors said,
Buddhist monks and priests raise fund to build Buddhist temple. They also help provide education to our children, as we do not have enough schools and teachers”.

Commune councilors in Pha-av commune of Oddar Meanchey provided different accounts on the roles of Buddhist monks and priests.

Buddhist monks raise funds to build the Buddhist pagoda, and disseminate Buddha’s teachings. They offer Buddha’s teachings to local people and educate them about non-violence so that our communities could progress, and crime and violence could be eliminated.

Participants of FGD in Phdao Chum Lech village of Kampong Cham added their voice. Thy said:

Besides being preoccupied with Buddhism, Buddhist monks and priests contribute to building, and maintaining local road networks, school, and rest houses.

Participants of FGD in Phum Ti Pramuoy village of Krochmar in Kampong Cham gave their brief explanation about the roles of Islam religion in their village.

Islam in our village does not do anything. The followers only spread their religion and teach their children the religion and their belief.

Phum Dabbei of Koh Sotin, people gave different account about the roles of Islam followers in their village.

Islam leaders in our community teach us religion, but do other works. They help resolve domestic conflicts, and decide on and witness inheritance of family’s wealth to the heirs. They also raise money to help the Islam poor in the village, aging people, and orphans.

For those communes where Christian churches existed explained about the roles Christians played in their villages.

As far as we know, Christian followers in our commune only work to deliver message of their God Jesus Christ, and teach their members the Christian belief.

DWG of Sangker district in Battambang had same explanation about what Christians did in their district.
There are three Christian churches in our district. They work to help orphans, but for religious purpose. They mainstream Christian belief among community members, and followers.

Participants of Prey Toch village in Prey Veng explained what NGO did in their village.

Three angkar are working in our village. They work in different areas of their interest. AQIP works in developing and improving rice production. Oxfam provides wells, and build schools. PADEK helps create savings associations that give loans to local people at low interest rate.

In Kdak village in Preah Vihear NGO work on other aspects, as FGD participants elaborated.

There are a number of NGO which are working in our village since the last 2 – 3 years. 8 persons man AAH. It has established cow bank for local people, and provided two wells. MAG has de-mined the area, and run an “exchange arms/explosives with foods program”. The program is aimed reducing arms. RAT has helped in kindergarten activities and has also established cow bank. HU has four personnel who work to collect health information from the villagers and train them about good health practice and hygiene.

Participants of FGD in Banbung village of Stung Treng gave a different account of the works and roles of NGO active in their village.

There are perhaps three NGO active in our village. CEPA works to protect and to raise awareness about natural environment. CAA works to protect fishery and river resources, and to raise awareness about protection of fishery resources. ADHOC provides training on human rights, non-violence and democracy, to villagers, village chief, and commune councilors.

CC in Kandaol Chrum commune of Kampong Cham cited the works of NGO working in their commune.

A number of NGO operate in our commune. We do not remember very well the names of all of them. Many of them have projects to raise awareness of communities about HIV/AIDS, birth spacing, and provide child vaccination. WFP of the UN provides food to schools to improve nutrition of school children, and provides food for work for constructing rural roads.

CC in Lvea commune of Battambang presented their knowledge about the NGO that worked in their locality.
Two NGO work in our commune; both of them work in micro-credit sector. CARITAS deals with micro-credit that gives out loans to community people at low interest rate, while CARE helps local communities set up savings associations. Community savings association gets involved also in disbursing small loans at low interest rate. Besides, there is a government-funded Seila program that has been involved in decentralization and development projects at community level.

Commune councilors in Takream commune of Battambang, during PRA, claimed that there were 19 NGO working actively in their commune. They explained:

There 19 NGO working in this commune. Some of them set up and operate cash credit, rice bank, and animal banks. Some provide healthcare education and assistance to handicapped persons. Other are involved in rehabilitating small- and medium-scale irrigation systems, and provide agricultural extension and training to the communities to improve their agricultural production. Human rights NGO conduct training on and raise awareness among community members of non-violence, human rights and democracy.

In Koh Kapi commune of Koh Kong, commune councilors provided their own information about works of NGO and donor’s project.

DANIDA has a coastal zone development project here. The project supports replanting of mangrove forest, creates community natural resources management and protection, and provides training for the establishment of village livestock agents. An NGO works in health sector. It provides training on birth-spacing and trained 16 health messengers/agents to work with communities.

For participants of Prek Svay village of Koh Kong, NGO seemed not to work for their interest. Instead, NGO seemed to leave them no opportunity for livelihoods. These villagers resented what NGO did in their village.

Why does the RGC not come to assist us? We have only seen CI – [an international NGO] – come and crackdown on us. CI people do not allow us to do have livelihoods activities such as collection of resin, cardamom, [yellow] vines, as we get accustomed. These are traditional livelihoods of our communities practiced by our ancestors.

Participants of FGD of Veal Ksach village Stung Treng described the works and roles of the existing farmer group in their village.
There is a fishers group in our village operated by 7 members. These people monitor fishing practices to ensure that no one uses illegal fishing tools. They disseminate and share information about best fishing practices, organize meeting with villagers, and raise awareness about use of appropriate fishing tools and protection of fishery resources.

Participants of FGD in Changhaon village of Kampot reported that there was a community group in their village. They depicted the works the group did.

A community-based natural resources protection group was set up. The group works generally to maintain and protect mangrove forests, which are the main habitat of aquatic lives. We believe that when mangroves are well maintained and protected our fishing and catches will also improve.

Khmer Islam village of Kampong Cham, people described the works and roles of their local association that worked to preserve their identity and belief, and to help their poor members.

We have set up a small Khmer Islam association here. What our association does is to ensure that our Khmer Islam community members have good welfare, and free from poverty. We also raise fund for building and maintaining Khmer Islam school for education and Islam teachings.

Participants of FGD in Anlung Sandan village of Battambang described the works of their local farmer group, which seemed to work for local development.

We have a villager association in our village. The major work the association does is to mobilize local resources for the construction and maintenance of local bridges and roads, and rest houses for travelers.

We will take some quotes from the discussions with the FGD participants from different locations. Participants of FGD in Chheuteal village of Kampong Cham told about their VDC’s works.

Our village development committee mobilizes local labor and financial contribution for maintenance of local village road networks, and schools.

In Tuol Chrey village of Prey Veng participants of FGD told about different works done by their VDC.
Our village development committee sets up a few credit schemes that deal with cash, and draft animals. They manage cash credit and savings scheme that charges low interest rate from local borrower; and they manage and maintain cattle and buffalo banks.

According to participants of FGD in Krain Ampil village of Kampot,

“Theyir village development committee works closely with government’s Seila program. VDC members monitor and supervise the construction of local bridges and other infrastructure funded by the Seila program”.

O Chrov villagers of Koh Kong who participated in FGD elaborated on the works of their village development committee.

Village development committee formulated with local villagers local development plan. In the plan priority needs of villagers are identified. These priorities are hand-pump wells, rural roads, credit scheme, cow bank, and health post and healthcare service.

In Damnak Chen village of Preah Vihear, participants of FGD cited similar works undertaken by their VDC.

A village development committee was established. It comprises five members including a woman. The VDC members work generally under the Seila program. They formulated local development plan in accordance with Seila requirements.

In Rumdeng village of Stung Treng, people described similar works of their VDC members, but added that the plan was given to NGO for assistance.

Major works of village development committee in our village were to prepare local development plan for local developments, which was submitted to NGO for support. In the plan, villagers requested to have wells for water supply, and local roads.