



**PDP Center  
For Development and Peace**

**Project Evaluation Report  
Better Democracy For Community**

**Il Oeur  
Jan 2013**

## **Acknowledgement**

First of all, I would like to express sincere appreciation to all villagers and local authorities, whose names are listed in the appendix, for participating in the interviews and providing information and views which are the bases for writing this report.

Also, I would like to express much thank to the top management and staff of PDP Center in Phnom Penh and in provinces for spending good amount of time in the design of the evaluation framework, fieldwork and provided valuable comments to the design, fieldwork and also report.

Lastly, much thank is due to Abelardo Cruz for editing work of this report and sharpening all points.

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

This final evaluation seeks to document impacts and outcomes of the project implementation on the “Better Democracy for Community” for the three year period 2010-2012. The management of PDP Center stressed the importance of focusing on democracy, especially freedom of speech, community participation, responsiveness from authority and women participation, as the framework for which the expected impact and outcomes are evaluated. This evaluation adopted only qualitative approach, although questions and answers were consolidated as a quantitative form in some areas which gives some ideas of general trends. The sources of data in each province include interviews with key informants with commune councilors, focus group discussion with community organization, focus group discussion with villagers/village chiefs, and in-depth interviews with an active person within the community. Only one commune in each of the four target province was selected.

## Results

### **Output 1: Staff and community leaders have the capacity to run the program**

All trainers are articulate and confident to share ideas. In the process of implementing their work, the trainers in three of four provinces have made use of the knowledge gained from the courses. They received constant advice and support from PDP management and supervisors. These were key contributions to their performances and they all put high value on this support by management. Despite the effort that all trainers put in implementing and improving their work, they are still facing two important challenges. First, some trainers are challenged on how to transfer knowledge and skills about advocacy and negotiations to community organizations because they lack more appropriate techniques and examples that are link to daily realities. The second challenge is that they seem to have limited ability to reflect on lessons learned and how they put their project implementation in a wider context. This thinking process or lesson-learning practice is important when there is need to adjust project action or strategy.

### **Outcome Indicator 1.1: 20 commune councils (including 4 existing communes) adopted Anti-alcohol Abuse Policy to prevent violence and promote people’s health—youth policy and an anti-corruption law were adopted during the project period by the government.**

Many events were organized to create better awareness about the consequence of alcohol consumption, but little is known about the alcohol notification (Dekah) in Battambang. But Siem Reap has recently adopted it and is widely known. Likewise, Dekah in Svay Rieng is widely known. Awareness raising done before and after the issuance of Dekah played important role in community understanding of the consequences of alcohol consumption. The combined factor of the awareness raising and the issuance of Dekah on alcohol consumption has brought positive results: reduction of domestic violence, improved health, and some abandoned drinking altogether; although results vary from one place to another. While it has affected on users’ behaviors, it has not been so for producers.

People have heard of the National Youth Policy from workshops they attended and from the media, although they have not seen the details and the contents of youth policies. However, no specific strategies have been suggested on how the National Youth Policy will be embedded into the community development. The awareness raising on this policy was mainly at the general level because of the fact that PDP Center did not immediately include information-education materials through copies of the National Youth Policy and posters. All that has been done was to disseminate that there is a Policy but not to comprehensively educate the Sangkat councils and community organizations,

even youth about its contents. Even so, there were independent initiatives to involve youth in social and development activities.

Similar to youth policy, respondents in selected communes do not know the detailed contents of the policy nor did they have a copy of the policy in hand except commune/sangkat councils in Banteay Meanchey and Svay Rieng provinces. While they think it is important, they have not done any awareness raising about it. The community organization members in Siem Reap who attended the interview have a copy of the law. In Banteay Meanchey, there was a case of corruption that seems to be imposed from outside which has lasted for a few years now and still apparently continuing.

**Outcome Indicator 1.2: By 2013, 500 of targeted community people participating in networks to intervene in the decision making and problems solving processes at the grass root levels of authorities.**

When asked about rating the importance of the presence of the community organizations in the commune it is found that in all provinces they have given high value now compared to their rating in some places in 2010. There has been support between the PDP Center-initiated community organizations and commune authorities in all target provinces but have been confined to moral support, collective efforts and information sharing.

**Outcome Indicator 1.3: Fifteen communities attend meetings with commune council or other local authority levels in order to monitor the budget and commune development plan and raises up their needs/comments to put into the commune development plan in 2013**

Participatory planning is frequently reported as local communities have contributed ideas and that most if not all of it have been included into the commune plan. The participation in the planning process of all reflects well on the quality of cooperation which has improved remarkably in all selected provinces between community organizations and commune council. This suggests that there has been openness on the side of local authorities or they viewed the importance of inputs of local groups apart from the commune council themselves. However, not all of local groups including the community organization and villagers/chiefs are fully satisfied with the process and outcome.

There is an increased space for people's participation in planning according to the perceptions respondents in each province. It is clear that participation of villagers in planning process has increased over the past three years but generally they participated at the village level in all provinces, except the Siem Reap and Svay Rieng that they have gone up to the commune level. In addition, it appears that community has access to information of the commune council easily as they have built good relationship. Generally, respondents give high score for attending the meetings organized or attended by the commune council. But when asked about their understanding or rights it is clear that in all provinces except Svay Rieng province they have given high score.

**Outcome Indicator 3.1: twenty five percent of people access to commune council information (commune council's budget disclosure for people, civil status and other information that people needed) in 2013**

There has been hardly anyone inquiring about the planning documents or reports from the commune council. This has actually limited the people as to how much they could interact with the commune council. Different from villagers, the village chiefs whose roles are direct with the commune council have obviously gained access to all kinds of information. Apart from that there is hardly any villagers who have been interested or care to have information from the commune authorities. This is perhaps due to the lack of understanding about the right of access to information. With respect to the

understanding the budget and financial management of the commune council it varied from one place to another. In general, most citizens get information from councilors, village chief and community organization or NGOs but in some cases from notice board. This shows the important future channels for which sharing of information and reports would be made.

### **Outcome Indicator 3.2: thirty percent of elected officials (commune councils) response to community people on comments, requests and complaints in 2013**

Generally, the issues are presented to the commune authority through meeting channel. An impressive interaction is found between the local communities and their authority with regards to raising important issues that affected them including both infrastructural and a wide range of social issues, and their responses. As a matter of fact, demanding for price list display at the commune office has been successful for improving transparent practices; however, there is still a challenge in implementation in some target area. However, with regards to the case in Banteay Meanchey about the problem with electricity overcharging more than double the actual amount indicated in the receipts it has been interviewed by the sangkat authority. However, since 2001 but it has not been resolved up to now.

### **Outcome Indicator 3.3: (seventy percent of) 12 of 16 targeted commune councils have adopted the alcohol notification in 2013**

As mentioned in the earlier section, the Dekah has been issued in 22 communes/sangats of the four target provinces and the four selected communes for this project evaluation are amongst them. The aim of the Dekah and awareness raising covers several social aspects of community life and these aims are commonly understood in target provinces including reducing domestic violence, poverty reduction, reduce the use of alcohol and in compliant with commune safety policy, traffic accidents, waste of time, and loss of household savings. The process of issuing Dekah appears to have been good in Siem Reap through more thorough steps before finalizing which reflect the level of high awareness amongst stakeholders, but this is not clearly stated in other target provinces.

### **Impact Indicator 1: Freedom house 2013 put Cambodia in the rank at 5 for political rights and at 4 for civil rights**

At national level, there has been no change based on rating by Freedom house over the past three years. In fact, in 2013 it clearly indicates that it scores the same as 2009 which has put Cambodia in the rank at 6 for political rights and at 5 for civil liberties. However, while adopting many questions from Freedom House and is no composite index from these interviews, it has produced impressive results. The result indicated that local people have experienced more freedom in 2012 than in 2010. This means that there has been improvement over the past three years. However, some scores are quite low. On a separate account, there is a big jump of composition of women councilors in 2002 to 2007 and then slightly increased in 2012. Proportionally, women occupying the commune council seat were higher than expected in 2012.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

PDP Center has made positive contribution to social change in the communities and realization of rights based on expected impact despite remain unchanged at national level. The current and future efforts of PDP Center falls in line well with the recent UNGA resolution that strongly encourage Member States to integrate education for democracy, along with civic education and human rights education into national standards and program aimed at the promotion and consolidation of democratic

values and democratic governance and human rights, taking into account innovative approaches and best practices in the field, in order to facilitate citizens' empowerment and participation in political life and policymaking at all levels.

In order to give a more specific reflection of the results, some principles of democracy were drawn upon. The principles of Empowered Deliberative Democracy included - Practical Orientation, Bottom-Up Participation, and Deliberative Solution Generation: Also, new pattern of reform at the local level about a new public management style<sup>1</sup> describes several principles including democratic renewal, best value, community leadership, and community well-being.

With respect to *practical orientation* is that there has been a lot of focus of the infrastructural development which generally more practical and tangible things that local community could see even though they may not benefit them directly. *Bottom-Up Participation* is that there has been very good participation in planning but they are generally constrained by a pre-determined projects and budget but it is important to acknowledge that some time the proposed ideas by the community people reflected with those of local authorities. *Deliberative Solution Generation* is what could be challenging for NGO and community people as the evaluator did not see meetings in real action it is impossible to assess the quality of discussions that involved debating about reasons before making decision on any project or ideas.

In addition, *democratic renewal* is that it was clear that authorities have been very open and welcome the community people to approach them when they have problem, but it has been the people themselves who have not been able to engage with commune council for obtaining information or documents for increasing their understanding. *Best value* is that it reflected on real situation as the commune councils have been working hard to respond to social issues as well as economic ones. *Community leadership* is of course seen in commune development planning those local authorities that have been responsible for taking the lead with participation of community organization and others and have been appreciated to a high extent for integrating community's ideas into the plan. However, leaders have been no or less flexible to accommodate with regards to allocation of budget for community's ideas. *Community well-being* covered a wide spectrum of issues. However, because of the focus of expenditure has been mainly on infrastructure, the social issues and other soft ones have been to depend on the resource from external agencies.

In responses to several issues above, here are some broad ideas which would give some light for future direction for which PDP Center could use as a basis for discussion or in preparation for their planning including the strategic plan.

- It is important to maintain the two pronged approaches to do awareness raising about rights and democracy as well as other issues. One is to continue providing awareness to individual and household level and secondly is the general public events which draw participation from government agencies, and local people to increase understanding about law, regulations and so on.
- Institutionalize support by the commune council development fund into plan, implementation and monitoring such as allocation of commune resources for software rather than hardware alone. However, when it comes to the issues of democracy and rights, it is important not only to look at the outputs but more importantly the process in which they are involved or advocated for as it is a key to achieving the impacts.
- The commune development fund generally asserted to be small. However, if managed well and if this is a real bottom up planning, the local communities and authority should have a big say

---

<sup>1</sup> Moving from excellence models of local service delivery to benchmarking 'good local governance' Tony Bovaird and Elke Löffler, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 2002 IIAS. SAGE Publications, Vol. 68 (2002), 9–24

as to what kinds of project are important to them. While there are important infrastructural (the hardware) needs in the communities, so do the social needs (the software) in the communities.

- The current globalization processes are in its fast pace and its impact on the community could be enormous. When thinking about sustainability it should not only be the physical structure such as road or community organization, but also the capacity of the community, especially leaders or members of the community organization, to be able to analyze the local context change and its relationship to broader trends. This will become a focal point for which collective effort would be mobilized by and amongst the community themselves.

In addition to the broad ideas for the future, more specific recommendations based on output and outcome levels.

**Recommend that:**

PDP Center should continue to strengthen advocacy and negotiation skills and encourage critical thinking amongst trainers. This can be done by either coaching/mentoring or training of trainers (TOT). Trainers transfer knowledge and skills to community organization members and it is important for them to develop appropriate techniques to work with community people and to establish good relationship with local authority. An activity that management can do is to call trainers into a sharing session on what circumstances or challenge they face and on what technique they apply so that the circumstance/challenge is responded to. This sharing activity shall enable trainers to learn from successes or mistakes based on their experiences.

**Recommend that:**

PDP Center work closely with local groups and commune council to organize exchange visits between provinces to learn from each other about processes and steps in creating awareness as well as issuance of Dekah related to alcohol consumption as there are many lessons that may be learned by people from some provinces that still have misunderstanding between various groups.

PDP Center should work with the Sangkat and village authorities to put in place regulations which will implement the Dekah, such as getting cooperation from store owners not to sell alcohol to minors, non-selling of alcohol at night, not selling to drunken customers and observance of a no-alcohol week.

**Recommend that:**

PDP and local groups should organize a series of meetings to stimulate the sufficient discussion amongst stakeholders such as community organizations and commune councilors about the process of formulating the Dekah before its formulation ever begins in areas or commune that have not had a Dekah yet. The ownership in Dekah is important to the awareness of and implementation by all stakeholders. The case of Siem Reap and Svay Rieng appears to give good examples of how people owned the process which has resulted in increased understanding. Having the Dekah in place legitimizes the efforts of existing stakeholders as well as the potential to influence drinking behaviors of entire communities including the local authorities.

**Recommend that:**

PDP Center in collaboration with other youth organizations should work together to promote better understanding of youth policy in the future and encourage debates about youth role within communities to engage actively in human rights and democracy work. Instead of forming new committees or groups related to youth, it is better to continue to institutionalize young people's participation in existing structures – the community organization or network or the work of the commune council.

PDP Center should produce copies of the National Youth Policy. It is already available in Khmer and is downloadable in the Ministry of Education (MOEYS) website<sup>2</sup> as well as the ILO website. This should be printed and distributed to all Sangkat Councils, community organizations and schools in the area. A simplified easy-to-understand poster should also be produced and posted in the Sangkat Offices or at schools and can be used to promote awareness about the policy.

**Recommend that:**

Similar to youth policy awareness, PDP Center along with relevant agencies develop a partnership agreement to promote a series of awareness raising sessions on corruption law to the public and bring out real case study as it will give the people the basics for which they could lean on when they witnessed any case. There has already been a good case of the community people who was working hard to get information regarding the electricity issue which they think this has something to do with corruption imposed by outsiders. This is a good signal of furthering the understanding of local authorities and villagers. Similarly, PDP Center should print copies of the law and disseminate it to Sangkat Councils and Community Organizations.

**Recommend that:**

PDP Center would be well placed to see how key community leaders instead of all kinds of community people to engage in the budgeting process in the future development planning, especially the community organizations and active individuals in a community. It appears that inclusion of ideas and initiative into the plan is not much of a problem. However, there is mismatch here of people's understanding between integrating issues or ideas into the commune development plan and budgeting. It seems that the former is considered the community people to be a sufficient task but the latter is another key issue to take into account as they both closely related.

**Recommend that:**

More awareness raising is required to increase better understanding about people's rights, especially when it comes to establishing the relationship with their elected leaders. This limited understanding could have a potential impact on how they would act to effect mainly community benefits. While in other target areas may also be necessary, the focus of efforts seems to be better for Svay Rieng area.

**Recommend that:**

PDP Center should work with community organizations who will advocate commune councils to produce short or one page message or information about the work, achievements or finance of the commune council and make use the link with young people to distribute or circulate to a wider community. Young people could also use their creativity to help the commune council to produce necessary information suitable to the community needs.

**Recommend that:**

PDP Center constantly identify most active persons in the community and encourage them to participate in existing community organizations or allow them to work alongside to deal with emerging issues as this may motivate him or her. In Banteay Meanchey, a person who is curious about the community issues has taken initiative to seek information from different angle before seeking response. This is the type of person that PDP Center could provide capacity support.

---

<sup>2</sup> See [www.moeys.gov.kh/en/policy.html](http://www.moeys.gov.kh/en/policy.html)



## Acronyms

ACU	Anti-Corruption Unit
CCWC	Commune Committee for Women and Children
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
ILO	International Labor Organization
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MOEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PDP Center	People's Center for Development and Peace
RBM	Results-Based Management
TOT	Training of Trainers
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly

## **List of tables and figures**

Table 1: Selected commune in each province .....	3
Table 2: Type of training courses trainers attended.....	4
Table 3: Rating of the quality of cooperation and level of satisfaction with planning process.....	13
Table 4: Level of participation in planning from the perspectives of each group.....	14
Table 5: Rating of the level of participation of the community in planning by trainers .....	15
Table 6: Usefulness of the attended meetings .....	16
Table 7: Understanding rights .....	17
Table 8: Importance of the community organization in the commune.....	18
Table 9: Responsiveness of the commune council .....	22
Table 10: Rating of freedoms related to political rights and civil liberties .....	24
Table 11: Composition of commune council members by party in each province .....	25

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	i
Executive Summary.....	ii
Acronyms.....	viii
List of tables and figures .....	ix
I. Rationale for Evaluation.....	1
II. Evaluation Purpose .....	1
III. Approaches and Tools .....	2
IV. Limitation .....	3
V. Results.....	4
Output 1: Staff and community leaders have the capacity to run the program.....	4
Outcome Indicator 1.1: 20 commune councils (including 4 existing communes) adopted Anti-alcohol Abuse Policy to prevent violence and promote people’s health—youth policy and an anti-corruption law were adopted during the project period by the government.....	5
Outcome Indicator 1.2: By 2013, 500 of targeted community people participating in networks to intervene in the decision making and problems solving processes at the grass root levels of authorities.....	12
Outcome Indicator 1.3: Fifteen communities attend meetings with commune council or other local authority levels in order to monitor the budget and commune development plan and raises up their needs/comments to put into the commune development plan in 2013.....	18
Outcome Indicator 3.1: twenty five percent of people access to commune council information (commune council’s budget disclosure for people, civil status and other information that people needed) in 2013.....	19
Outcome Indicator 3.2: thirty percent of elected officials (commune councils) response to community people on comments, requests and complaints in 2013.....	21
Outcome Indicator 3.3: (seventy percent of) 12 of 16 targeted commune councils have adopted the alcohol notification in 2013 .....	23
Impact Indicator 1: Freedom house 2013 put Cambodia in the rank at 5 for political rights and at 4 for civil rights.....	23
Impact Indicator 2: Twenty percent of women were elected as commune council members in 2012.....	25
VI. Conclusions .....	27
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference.....	30
Appendix 2: General Guide Questions for Focus Group Discussions and Key Informants .....	31
Appendix 3: List of participants .....	33

## **I. Rationale for Evaluation**

People Center for Development and Peace (PDP-Center) was registered with the Ministry of Interior of Cambodia in 2005 and has been in operation since 2006 the current project areas covers four provinces of Siem Reap, Banteay Meanchey, Battambang and Svay Rieng. In each province, PDP Center chose one or two districts to implement its program: Svay Chrum district in Svay Rieng, Siem Reap city and Pouk District in Siem Reap, Serey Sophorn city in Banteay Meanchey and Banan District in Battambang. Generally, the target groups are composed of people in the communities who are 18 years and older including elders, adults, monks, nuns, abbot, youth, teachers and commune council members.

PDP Center envisions “a society filled with glory and harmony”. In support of this vision, its mission is to “conceptualize democracy, defend human rights, transparency, and peace and improve health amongst people and youth in towns and rural areas. In its three-year program entitled “Better Democracy for the Community,” implemented from 2010-2012 in four provinces, PDP Center is expected to have the following impact:

“Improved civil rights, democratic space and a people free from fear, violations and intimidation in the communities.”

Based on these expected impact, the expected outcomes are specifically broken down as follows:

1. Improved confidence and ownership of marginalized members of the community (men, women, and youth) of the democratic developments of their own communities.
2. Empowered youth and women in the communities participated in commune development planning with commune councils.
3. Local governance has improved including freedom of meeting, speech, access to information at the grass-roots level.

It is close to three years of project implementation and the PDP Center as well as its development partners expects to see changes that occurred and its underlying factors in the four target provinces, mainly based on its expected impact and outcomes, and which would be beneficial in guiding the development of the next strategic plan.

## **II. Evaluation Purpose**

This final evaluation seeks to document impacts and outcomes of the project implementation on the “Better Democracy for Community” for the three year period 2010-2012 as mentioned above and based on the set indicators by the PDP Center. The management of PDP Center stressed the importance of focusing on democracy, especially freedom of speech, community participation, responsiveness from authority and women participation, as the framework for which the expected impact and outcomes are evaluated. The specific objectives of this project evaluation are:

- To describe changes and underlying factors contributing to the identified changes.
- To identify challenges or obstacles being faced by the communities (villagers in general and youth groups) and local authorities in the process of project implementation.
- To describe the perceptions of the community people and local authorities on how they suggested overcoming those challenges in the subsequent years.
- To propose some recommendations in taking into account of the perceptions raised by the communities and local authorities.

### III. Approaches and Tools

The adoption of participatory approach to evaluation has helped increase mutual understanding and expectations, and hence facilitated smooth processes for the design, fieldwork, and analyses and write up. Just before the field work, the evaluator contacted the President of PDP Center on September 26, 2012 to confirm the design and he gave the go-ahead to go to each commune in all four provinces and was satisfied with the guide questions. The fieldwork was done in between September and October 2012.

As there is no baseline data to evaluate changes against each indicators of expected impacts and outcomes, the evaluator used as basis some aspects of the annual reports produced by PDP Center. Hence, this evaluation adopted only qualitative approach, although question and answers were consolidated in quantitative forms in some areas and which gives some ideas of trends. The sources of data include interviews with key informants, focus group discussions, and in-depth interviews which are described in detail below.

For key informants, the evaluator interviewed a commune councilor or a group of them in selected communes of each province. There are two types of focus group discussion: one is composed of one or two villager(s) of both sexes together with a village chief of each village in a selected commune, and another is a group of community organization or network consisting of two or three representatives of each network in all communes in each province. The reason that evaluator brought them together was to hear a broader view about how they interacted with the villagers and the commune council in their area of responsibilities, and it was much easier logistically to bring them into a group as compared to bringing villagers from all communes. Lastly, the evaluator tried to talk to an individual in each selected commune—a commune councilor or a villager who is involved with the work of the PDP Center—to understand changes and challenges. In addition, the management of PDP Center has asked the evaluator to include an evaluation on the aspect of staff capacity building which was stated in *Output* level in its Logical Framework.

The evaluation design has gone through intensive review with the management of PDP Center before the final revision as attached in the appendix. Given the time and resources PDP Center has, the evaluator was able to visit four out of twelve target communes, which represented one third of total target communes. The table below summarizes the communes selected for interviews.

**Table 1: Selected commune in each province**

No	Name of Commune	Method use	Participants
1	Samrong Yea commune, Pouk district, Siem Reap	Key informant with commune councilors	2
		One FGD with community organizations or networks	8
		One FGD with villagers (men, women) and village chiefs	16
		In-depth interview with a villager	1
		Trainer of PDP Center	1
2	Phneat commune, Serei Sophoan city, Banteay Meanchey	Key informant with commune councilors	3
		One FGD of community organizations or networks	7
		One FGD with villagers (men, women) and village chiefs	8
		In-depth interview with a villager	1
		Trainer of PDP Center	1
3	Chheu Teal commune, Banan district, Battambang	Key informant with commune councilors	3
		One FGD with community organizations or networks	4
		One FGD village chiefs only	15
		In-depth interview with a villager	1
		Trainer of PDP Center	-
4	Pothireach commune, Svay Chrum district, Svay Rieng	Key informant with commune councilors	1
		One FGD with community organizations or networks	10
		One FGD with villagers (men, women) and village chiefs	11
		In-depth interview with a villager	1
		Trainer of PDP Center	1

Each interview, except the in-depth one, used guide questions which were developed based on outcome and impact indicators. Each interview lasted about 2 hours.

#### **IV. Limitation**

The time and resources allowed the evaluation to cover only one commune in each target **province out of the 12 communes** in the provinces covered by PDP Center. In addition, selected villagers and key leaders were approached for interviews as key informants and focus group discussion participants and not as individual villagers. Therefore, there are caveats to interpretation of the findings; it is indicative but is not intended to generalize all target areas.

## V. Results

The report is structured around the flow of the outputs mainly on staff capacity, outcomes and its impact, followed by a conclusion. Under each of the results, recommendations are provided. Of all the outputs, only output 1 was included in this evaluation. While staff capacities are discussed in this section, the community leaders' capacities are discussed in various sections of this report. Note that the community leaders referred to in this report is with the community organization or community network. There are 16 community networks in 2012 as opposed to 13 in 2009<sup>3</sup> as mentioned below.

- Svay Rieng province: 5 community networks
- Siem Reap province: 4 community networks
- Banteay Meanchey province: 3 community networks
- Battambang province: 3 community networks
- Phnom Penh Capital: 1 community network

### Output 1: Staff and community leaders have the capacity to run the program

The evaluation assumed that all staff members attended courses or sharing session on concepts of democracy and training of trainer (TOT) on how to effectively transfer the knowledge to the people in the community before the project period. Some have attended more than others given the period they have been working for PDP Center, but a trainer in Banteay Meanchey has attended less number of training because he only joined PDP Center for about six months. These are some of the important knowledge that they have gained as a result of attending several training courses:

From discussions with all trainers, they are articulate and confident to share ideas. They knew well the work they are doing (see table 2). However, when asked about what they have learned from the courses, they seem to have difficulty in describing them. Key learning from each course is that they know the process of how to advocate with village and commune authority; they learned how to evaluate the project implementation; and know how to write reports, as mentioned by a trainer in Siem Reap. The trainer in Banteay Meanchey learned about how to encourage women to participate in sharing of ideas; about the Civil Code on the issue of how to compensate and lodge complaints; and, learned how to write reports. As for the trainer in Svay Rieng, he attended most training courses listed here were which should indicate a wide range of knowledge that prepared him to work with the communities. This knowledge helped to mobilize the community people, to document results and write reports, to coordinate project implementation and to strengthen the relationship with local authority.

**Table 2: Type of training courses trainers attended**

Particulars	Siem Reap	Banteay Meanchey	Battambang	Svay Rieng
Advocacy	✓	n/a	n/a	✓
M&E and RBM	✓	n/a	n/a	✓
PCM and report writing	✓	✓	n/a	✓
Gender	✓	✓	n/a	✓
Media	✓	✓	n/a	✓
Climate change	✓	✓	n/a	✓
Inter-religion and peace building	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
Criminal code and procedure	n/a	✓	n/a	✓

Note: n/a = not available

<sup>3</sup> Annual report 2012 for IOGT, final version

In the process of implementing their work, the trainers in three of four provinces have made use of the knowledge gained from the courses. They received constant advice and support from PDP management and supervisors. These were key contributions to their performances and they all put high value on this support by management. They get advice when there are doubts, for example, what kinds of achievement can be classified as outcome and impact in the report. In addition, they get support from colleagues or supervisor on gender issues and on methods to encourage women to participate in development activities. Trainers from all sites believed that these advices were helpful to their work. All of them expressed the opinion that staff at management level have done close follow up for trainings and awareness sessions that trainers have conducted for the communities. Generally, they made suggestions for improvement: two trainers expressed the need for additional guidance or advice related to financial and expenditure issues in implementing projects. It is important to address this issue although this is not in the scope of this evaluation.

Despite the effort that all trainers put in implementing and improving their work, they are still facing two important challenges. First, some trainers are challenged on how to transfer knowledge and skills about advocacy and negotiations to community organizations because they lack more appropriate techniques and examples that are link to their daily realities. The members of community organizations kept changing their composition; hence, their knowledge and skills need to be enhanced constantly in order for them to work effectively since they are the ones who take the lead role in influencing local policy change and in monitoring project implementation. The second challenge is that they seem to have limited ability to reflect on lessons learned and how they put their project implementation in a wider context. This thinking process or lesson-learning practice is important when there is need to adjust project action or strategy.

---

Recommend that:

PDP Center should continue to strengthen advocacy and negotiation skills and encourage critical thinking amongst trainers. This can be done by either coaching/mentoring or training of trainers (TOT). Trainers transfer knowledge and skills to community organization members and it is important for them to develop appropriate techniques to work with community people and to establish good relationship with local authority. An activity that management can do is to call trainers into a sharing session on what circumstances or challenge they face and on what technique they apply so that the circumstance/challenge is responded to. This sharing activity shall enable trainers to learn from successes or mistakes based on their experiences.

---

While this output also include capacity of community leaders--referred as the community organization or network chosen from among the community, monks and others – the discussions on this are interwoven in most of the following sections.

**Outcome Indicator 1.1: 20 commune councils (including 4 existing communes) adopted Anti-alcohol Abuse Policy to prevent violence and promote people’s health—youth policy and an anti-corruption law were adopted during the project period by the government.**

### *Alcohol consumption awareness raising and outcome*

This section describes the results of the awareness raising on the effects of alcohol-abuse based on the local government’s notification or *Dekah* and the behaviour change of alcohol consumers.

As background information, take note of a very positive achievement in the increase of the number of commune councils that adopted alcohol notification: a total of 22 commune councils in 2012 compared to only 4 commune councils in 2009. These include<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>4</sup> Annual report 2012 for IOGT, a final version



- Svay Rieng province: 14 commune councils adopted alcohol notification including the selected commune for this evaluation.
- Siem Reap province: 3 commune councils adopted alcohol notification including the selected commune for this evaluation.
- Banteay Meanchey province: 3 commune councils adopted alcohol notification including the selected commune for this evaluation.
- Battambang province: 2 commune councils adopted alcohol notification including the selected commune for this evaluation.

While there were many events organized to create better awareness about the consequence of alcohol consumption, little is known about the alcohol notification (Dekah) in Battambang. The community organization in Battambang have never seen or heard of alcohol Dekah but they remember the workshops organized at the village level attended by students, principals of schools, health center staff, commune and village authority, and police. The focus group with village chiefs in Battambang also agreed that there is no Dekah. Through awareness raising, they understood that alcohol consumption may result in negative activities such as stealing, effects on mental health, sexual abuse, drug abuse, health, accidents, and reduction of household savings. In contrast, the commune council in Battambang said the Dekah of alcohol was approved since 2010 and the interviewed councilor added that he has gone to the National Assembly to attend the meeting in 2009 and issued the Dekah afterward. This suggests that there is still a misunderstanding as to what the Dekah meant to commune councilors and how it should be formulated. If the process has been properly followed through local communities then the community organization as a stakeholder in the community would have known this.

Similarly, there is no common understanding whether the Dekah ever existed in the commune level. According to interviewed sangkat councilors, the Dekah was adopted since 2009. In the process, PDP promoted awareness raising where by two Commune deputies were involved, selected a community that will address the issue of alcohol and conducted training in Siem Reap town attended by commune councilors. The two deputies interviewed said they shared with the chief of sangkat and village chiefs what they learned and these agreed to the idea. The PDP Center organized many meetings including the one in Kantout village and invited villagers to participate and discuss the idea. These ideas were integrated into the Dekah. The Dekah aims at reducing alcohol consumption therefore, reducing domestic violence, poverty, and gangster activities. The sangkat council thinks that it is very important and decided about it without hesitation. The councilor even asked the relevant people including monks to promote awareness and at the village level by CCWC (Commune Committee for Women and Children) for four times a year. However, the Dekah is not known to villagers and village chiefs, except that there was awareness raising sessions about alcohol consumption organized by PDP Center.

Different from Battambang, Siem Reap has recently adopted alcohol notification and it is widely known by all interviewed people. The interviewed commune councilor in Siem Reap pointed out that the alcohol Dekah was adopted in June 2012 and in the process of adoption there have been participation from commune councilors, staff of the health center, the school director and community organization. The reason for adoption is that the commune chief has seen major consequence of alcohol consumption on the health of the villagers, traffic accidents and domestic violence. The community organization in Siem Reap is aware of it and considered that the Dekah is very important since its adoption. The focus groups of villagers and village chiefs in Siem Reap also stated the same and explained that the issuance has something to do with consequences of alcohol consumption on health, on domestic violence, traffic accident, death, and loss of trust from relatives.

Similar to Siem Reap, the Dekah in Svay Rieng is widely known. It was issued in 2009 in order to reduce the consumption of alcohol, thus reduce accidents, reduce incidence of rape and domestic violence. It was considered by the commune council as very important for the communities. A similar high value was given the Dekah by the community organization. The focus group of villagers and

village chiefs also rate it important. It is recognized that PDP Center has played an important role to facilitate the process for the Dekah to be enacted.

---

Recommend that:

PDP Center work closely with local groups and commune council to organize exchange visits between provinces to learn from each other about processes and steps in creating awareness as well as issuance of Dekah related to alcohol consumption as there are many lessons that may be learned by people from some provinces that still have misunderstanding between various groups.

PDP Center should work with the Sangkat and village authorities to put in place regulations which will implement the Dekah, such as getting cooperation from store owners not to sell alcohol to minors, non-selling of alcohol at night, not selling to drunken customers and observance of a no-alcohol week.

---

Awareness raising that has been done even before and after the issuance of Dekah played important role in community understanding of the consequences of alcohol consumption. The community organization in Siem Reap has taken a lead role in creating awareness in the community by organizing village meetings and home visits by meeting villagers individually. In Battambang, the focus group of village chiefs said that the campaign organized about domestic violence using loudspeakers worked in close collaboration with the village authorities, police and PDP centre. The focus group of villagers and village chief have seen the campaign organized in the past three years including human rights day, alcohol consumption awareness raising activities and environmental awareness in 2011 were supported by many participants including villagers, local authorities and students. They said there were no such campaigns before 2010. Many expressed the sentiment about the need to increase this type of campaign including the one on corruption and domestic violence against the children so that people will have better understanding. In Banteay Meanchey, the focus group of community organizations has made campaigns against alcohol consumption and children's rights participated in by some 100 people including villagers, Sangkat, district, and city officials. In Svay Rieng, the community organization conducted the campaign in five villages; organized trainings and awareness in each village; and, conducted home visits to share the knowledge directly.

The awareness raising and the issuance of Dekah on alcohol consumption in other areas has brought positive results: reduction of domestic violence, improved health, and some abandoned drinking altogether; although results vary from one place to another. The community organizations and the commune councilors in Battambang mentioned that awareness raising has an impact on lesser cases of domestic violence, as no case was reported, that the health of individuals has improved, and that gangster activities were not as frequent as before. The focus group of village chiefs in Battambang also mentioned the reduction of domestic violence, reduced traffic accidents (2010 many cases, now have not seen any case), in some cases some people stopped drinking, although this cannot be accurately quantified. The commune council in Battambang raised many successful cases as a result of awareness raising: at least three persons in Bay Damram, Chheu Teal and Borbos villages stopped drinking completely and now they become advisor to provide lessons to other drinkers. The community organization in Siem Reap pointed to a case of family re-union in Chambak Hae community. In Banteay Meanchey, the villagers and village chiefs have not seen cases of stealing. One commune council in Siem Reap is quoted, *"As a commune councilor, I am tasked to implementing alcohol and so I had conveniently withdrawn from drinking practice and it has been satisfying thus far."* In Svay Rieng, while the community organization recognized the reduction in domestic violence and the change of behavior of people who stop selling alcohol in schools and at pagoda, the commune council also saw some changes, for instance, a man in Tamom village stopped drinking completely. The focus group of villagers and village chiefs has a pessimistic view on this case but agreed to the other cases cited by the community organization.

These are additional examples of successful cases where drinking alcohol stopped. In Siem Reap, according to the focus groups of villagers and village chief, an example was cited in Taches village for a man who created problem in his family and also affecting other people; another example in the village of Prasat with a person who separated from his wife for six years and who reconciled when he stopped drinking and changed behavior. They added that since the adoption of the policy the community people are more at ease and happy because there is lesser, physical and verbal abuse, less psychological stress and other related problems brought about by drunken people. The reduced number of days where alcohol is sold has cut down the volume of alcohol consumed. There are reduced cases of domestic violence. There is another cited example of someone who completely stopped drinking in Prasat village. Because of public awareness and the influence of Buddhist monks, this man realized that he is losing money, employment opportunity and health, and when he changed his behavior his children organized a ceremony to honor him. There is also another case in Prey Veng village that stopped drinking as a result of awareness raising by PDP center. Similarly, in Banteay Meanchey, the awareness raising and the Dekah encouraged people's knowledge of many types of problems they get from alcohol consumption, and also affected many people's behavior. For example, in Kantout village, a few of them have finally stopped consuming alcohol. In Thmei village, a man who has been a long time drinker finally stopped, too. In Neak Ta village, a person stopped drinking because of some health issues and as a result of awareness raising as mentioned by Sangkat councilors in Banteay Meanchey.

While awareness raising activities has affected on users' behaviors, it has not been so for producers. The number of shops selling alcohol shops was not reduced. There were no big shops opening up in the commune in Siem Reap and the existing one still sells alcohol, asserted the commune councilor in Siem Reap. In Banteay Meanchey, the shops producing alcohol was reduced from seven to six and this is due to the profitability of selling alcohol, cited the Sangkat councilor. The community organizations and the commune councilors in Battambang mentioned that shops selling alcohol increased attributing it to the role of advertisements in radio and television. In Svay Rieng, a focus group of villagers and village chief saw no change with regard to the persons who sell as they still continue the business.

---

Recommend that:

PDP and local groups should organize a series of meetings to stimulate the sufficient discussion amongst stakeholders such as community organizations and commune councilors about the process of formulating the Dekah before its formulation ever begins in areas or commune that have not had a Dekah yet. The ownership in Dekah is important to the awareness of and implementation by all stakeholders. The case of Siem Reap and Svay Rieng appears to give good examples of how people owned the process which has resulted in increased understanding. Having the Dekah in place legitimizes the efforts of existing stakeholders as well as the potential to influence drinking behaviors of entire communities including the local authorities.

---

### ***Awareness on Youth Policy and its applications***

This section describes the awareness about the policy and its content, the participation of young people in social and development activities in the communities, and the effects of these efforts.

It is important to take note that the National Youth Policy was adopted in June, 2011<sup>5</sup> after active advocacy work from youth groups, including the PDP-Center. The policy is a commitment of government to develop youth in Cambodia and includes assuring their rights to participate in politics and decision-making. The policy is enlarging the space for young people's participation at the sub-national democratic development.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Full text of the Adopted National Policy on Cambodian Youth Development (khmer) available in [ap-youthnet.ilobkk.or.th/.../adopted-national-policy-on-cambodian-youth](http://ap-youthnet.ilobkk.or.th/.../adopted-national-policy-on-cambodian-youth)

<sup>6</sup> PDP Center Annual Report 2011

Most organizations, including the youth, have heard of the National Youth Policy from workshops they attended and heard it from the media, although they have not seen the details and the contents of youth policies. The community organization in Battambang heard about youth policy. The community organization and young people have participated in the activities initiated by commune council. They have participated in workshops and facilitated information activities directly with those who drink a lot at their homes. Community people appreciated the youth involvement. However, the numbers of young that participate are reduced because many look for jobs outside of their villages, in the cities or out of the country. The focus group of village chiefs as well as the commune council in Battambang also has not seen the youth policy. However, young people participated in awareness raising and listen when monks attended to do preaching. They proposed to have this policy widely disseminated by schools and during village events so that all young people are made aware. Dissemination in schools would be a good venue because it is where the minds of young people are shaped. There should also be easy-to-understand slogans related to the youth posted in the village. In Svay Rieng, the focus group of villagers and community organization and commune council has not heard of the policy. However, they know that the village chief mobilize young people to participate in the election process of youth representatives at the provincial level. They added that generally young people in the commune tend to leave their villages in search of job opportunity elsewhere, especially in Phnom Penh. Positively, more than half of members of the community organization who attended the interviews have seen the policy but they do not remember the contents.

Young people has played important role in contributing to the development as well as social activities in communities, especially in Siem Reap and Banteay Meanchey. While Sangkat councilors in Banteay Meanchey and in Siem Reap have not heard about the National Youth Policy, they encouraged young people to participate in development activities. But here, there are many youth who migrate in search of wage work elsewhere. Those who stayed behind in the villages participated in regular monthly meeting of Sangkat council and young people recognized the contribution of Sangkat council. Based on the focus groups, villagers and village chiefs and community organization in Banteay Meanchey are aware of the youth policy. They also involved young people to join public awareness programs as well as in infrastructure development projects. Before, young people were not so interested but by encouraging them, young people become active in organizing Pchum Ben ceremony and other activities. The community organization in Siem Reap observed that young people now get away from drug use and they want to demonstrate their contribution in development activities in the community. Surprisingly, many villagers and village chiefs in Siem Reap heard about youth policy through awareness raising done by Youth Council of Cambodia (YCC) about participating in elections and on the importance of youth in their future role. The commune council has already provided opportunity for young people to participate and share their ideas in monthly meeting. In Battambang, the commune council is planning to integrate aspects of youth-related activities into the commune development plan in 2013. However, they would like to know more about the contents of the National Youth Policy.

No specific strategies have been suggested on how the National Youth Policy will be embedded into the community development. This is maybe because of the lack of understanding about the contents of the policy and the lack of opportunity to link up with others to increase better understanding. However, they believe it is important to engage the young people and embed their participation in the work of the commune council. The community organization in Battambang plans to encourage young people to participate in all activities of the commune council by involving them during ceremonies, events or activities. They are convinced that it is important to choose young people to work with the commune council. The commune council in Battambang has heard of youth policy but has not been able to promote awareness of it mainly because they do not have a copy of the policy. However, they have engaged young people to participate *in pagoda event*. They planned to include young people in next year planning. The focus group of villagers and village chiefs in Siem Reap mentioned that since the awareness raising they have seen changes in behavior of young people such as respecting others, participating in infrastructure in development activities even without some kind of financial support.

For example, they worked hard to improve roads in Doun Sva, Prasat and Ampil villages in 2011. In all selected communes, it is clear that the understanding of policy is quite low but their commitment to provide young people the opportunity to participate has hardly been ignored.

---

Recommend that:

PDP Center in collaboration with other youth organizations should work together to promote better understanding of youth policy in the future and encourage debates about youth role within communities to engage actively in human rights and democracy work. Instead of forming new committees or groups related to youth, it is better to continue to institutionalize young people's participation in existing structures – the community organization or network or the work of the commune council.

PDP Center should produce copies of the National Youth Policy. It is already available in Khmer and is downloadable in the Ministry of Education (MOEYS) website<sup>7</sup> as well as the ILO website. This should be printed and distributed to all Sangkat Councils, community organizations and schools in the area. A simplified easy-to-understand poster should also be produced and posted in the Sangkat Offices or at schools and can be used to promote awareness about the policy.

---

The awareness raising on this policy was mainly at the general level because of the fact that PDP Center did not immediately include information-education materials through copies of the National Youth Policy and posters. All that has been done was to disseminate that there is a Policy but not to comprehensively educate the Sangkat and Community Organizations, even youth about its contents. Even so, there were independent initiatives to involve youth in social and development activities. The focus group of villagers and village chiefs in Banteay Meanchey as well as in Siem Reap noted that engaging young people in development activities resulted in the reduction of gangster activities, reduced violence among children and encouraged children/young people to continue to go to schools. The community organization in Banteay Meanchey said that the parents of young people welcome their children participation in meetings and in helping to work in infrastructure because it lessens their idle time or time spent in unnecessary excursion. This community organization added that young people at schools who have some knowledge about the importance of youth participation encouraged other students to be aware and that teachers have also encouraged them to participate in social work. However, none of these interesting results was described by respondents in Svay Rieng and Battambang.

### ***Awareness on Anti-Corruption Policy***

This section illustrates the awareness about anti-corruption policy, the challenges to create awareness and pending case of corrupt practice.

It is important to take note that the Law on Anti-Corruption was approved by the National Assembly on March 11, 2010<sup>8</sup>.

Not much different from the youth policy, respondents in selected communes do not know the detailed contents of the policy nor did they have a copy of the policy in hand except commune/sangkat councils in Banteay Meanchey and Svay Rieng provinces. While they think it is important, they have not done any awareness raising about it. According to the focus group of community organization and villagers/village chiefs in Battambang and Svay Rieng, they do not have any copy of anti-corruption

---

<sup>7</sup> See [www.moeys.gov.kh/en/policy.html](http://www.moeys.gov.kh/en/policy.html)

<sup>8</sup> Downloadable text at [ww.cambodiainvestment.gov.kh/anti-corruption-law\\_100417.html](http://www.cambodiainvestment.gov.kh/anti-corruption-law_100417.html)

policy but they used to hear through different form of media and there has been no case of corruption found in the commune. The community organization in Battambang is interested to have this policy fully shared in the entire community and to publicize any corruption case in the future if any case transpire within community. The village chiefs in Battambang asserted that they knew of transparent practices of the commune council on financial management and they used to ask for report and they got it as they expected. Village chiefs added that villagers could ask for information but nobody ever comes to get it. Different from the two focus groups above, the commune councilors in Battambang have seen the anti-corruption law and have not witnessed any case in the commune. They maintained that they themselves should be a role model, and in monthly meeting they will continue to discuss this issue.

The community organization members in Siem Reap who attended the interview have a copy of the law, except one organization. All of them see the importance of the law. However, no awareness raising was done on the law in the community yet. Likewise, the community council in Siem Reap has a copy of the anti-corruption law; although they consider it important, no public awareness activity was done, except as raised in the meetings. So far they have not seen any corruption cases in the commune and have no other idea on how to promote this law widely. As for the focus group of villagers and village chiefs and focus group of community organization in Siem Reap, they heard about the law; they think it very important but still do not know the details of the law yet because of the absence of the public awareness. They have not heard of any corruption cases in this commune.

When talking about local governance the transparent practice such as information sharing is one of the aspects. With the support of PDP Center the focus group of villagers and village chiefs in Banteay Meanchey mentioned that the price lists of services is now on public display which provides readily available information for all people. They added that the sangkat council did not initiate this but PDP center together with community organization and villagers asked the commune council to display price list to make it easier for community people, and they did it. This statement is also reflected in a staff presentation at a Partner Meeting.<sup>9</sup>

---

**Recommend that:**

Similar to youth policy awareness, PDP Center along with relevant agencies develop a partnership agreement to promote a series of awareness raising sessions on corruption law to the public and bring out real case study as it will give the people the basics for which they could lean on when they witnessed any case. There has already been a good case of the community people who was working hard to get information regarding the electricity issue which they think this has something to do with corruption imposed by outsiders. This is a good signal of furthering the understanding of local authorities and villagers. Similarly, PDP Center should print copies of the law and disseminate it to Sangkat Councils and Community Organizations.

---

In Banteay Meanchey, there was a case of corruption that seems to be imposed from outside which has lasted for a few years now and still apparently continuing. The commune council denied any such case, but the in-depth interview suggested otherwise. This was the case that the electric company has charged higher fees than what was officially announced. Many people have already paid but local people are still pursuing their complaint. According to a focus groups of villagers and village chiefs in Banteay Meanchey, the commune council agreed to deal with the electricity issue and community people have tried to report it to the accountability box<sup>10</sup>, but the issue has not been resolved. An interviewed active community member, of about 40 years old, expressed the slow response of the sangkat council despite complaints made by people by talking to the council directly and placing their

---

<sup>9</sup> Second Partner Meeting 17-20 December 2012 Mondulkiri

<sup>10</sup> Anti-Corruption Unit (ACU) box where the public can drop their complaints

complaints in the accountability box. While this case is widely known the sangkat councilor did not share this issue during the interview. Not only specific to this issue, this seems to suggest an innovative approach to transparency and continuous processes of debates with key stakeholders.

**Outcome Indicator 1.2: By 2013, 500 of targeted community people participating in networks to intervene in the decision making and problems solving processes at the grass root levels of authorities.**

This section describes process of commune development planning and integration, level of participation, usefulness of the meetings that people have attended, and understanding of rights.

There have been frequent citations of the participatory planning where local communities have contributed ideas and that most if not all of it have been included into the commune plan. The commune councilor in Battambang have said that the council has integrated, health, domestic violence, right to voice in order to stabilize society and promote women participation because women normally stay home. They have implemented the plan like health education, domestic violence, agriculture, reproductive health by RHAC and alcohol awareness by PDP Center Team. Similarly, the community organization in Siem Reap mentioned that the participation of community organization in the planning process has been beneficial because the commune authority openly responded to the ideas of community organization. The commune authority has dealt with it step by step and the community organization has appreciated that their ideas have been integrated into the plan. Likewise, during the planning process several issues have been raised including alcohol use, domestic violence, democracy, and advocacy, and the commune council helped with ideas, and awareness about public orders, etc, as explained by the community organization in Battambang. Not surprisingly, all village chiefs have participated in annual planning processes at the village level and commune level.

The participation in the planning process of all the different sectors and groups reflects well on the quality of cooperation which has improved remarkably in all selected provinces between community organizations and commune council. This suggests that there has been openness on the side of local authorities or they view the importance of inputs of local groups apart from the commune council themselves. However, not all of local groups including the community organization and villagers/chiefs are fully satisfied with the process and outcome. While generally the rating is high for Siem Reap and Battambang it is relatively less for Svay Rieng and Banteay Meanchey. It is surprising to see that the rating by villagers/chiefs in Banteay Meanchey is too low which appear to reflect some disappointments over the lack of sufficient infrastructural projects as mentioned below while the commune council operates under limited budget (see table 3).

**Table 3: Rating of the quality of cooperation and level of satisfaction with planning process**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about the relationship between the Commune Council and the community organizations.		Community Organization	Commune Council	Villagers/ chiefs
The quality of cooperation between the commune council and the community organization has improved. [ON THE SCALE OF 1 -4, LOWEST = 1 AND HIGHEST = 4]	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	4	4
	Svay Rieng	4	4	4
Thinking about meetings you went to regarding the planning, how would you rate your level of your satisfaction with planning process and outputs? [ON THE SCALE OF 1 -10, LOWEST = 1 AND HIGHEST = 10]	Siem Reap	8	n/a	10
	Banteay Meanchey	7 & 8	n/a	2
	Battambang	8	n/a	8 & 10
	Svay Rieng	5, 6 & 7*	n/a	7

\* The two or three numbers indicate different responses; and n/a for omission in the design

During the period there is an increased space for people's participation in planning according to the perceptions of the three sources in each province. It is clear that participation of villagers in planning process has increased over the past three years but generally they participated at the village level in all provinces, except the Siem Reap and Svay Rieng that the participation has gone up to the commune level. This may be explained by the fact that the village chief who has the direct relationship with the commune council might have provided these answers while that might not be the case for any villagers. In contrast to the view of commune councilors none of the responses from the community organization to say that the participation has gone up to a commune level (see table 4).

Despite integrating ideas into the plan, implementing it is another issue. While there have been some fruitful results there are also constraints by some factors – one of the most obvious ones is the budget constraint. As reported by focus group of village chiefs in Battambang, the bridge and culverts in villages have been constructed but not yet fully completed because of insufficient fund. The domestic violence have reduced because before 2010 there are some people who come to file complaints but now have reduced because of the commune safety policy and the awareness raising by PDP center. The community organization have raised about bridge, pond rehabilitation, wells, roads and canals during the planning process and all have been integrated because it is important. Road that have been built in Daung village about 2,500m and the road in Anlong Koang 1,600m by using commune development fund, but not other aspects that are raised above. The benefit is that having road making it easier for women to travel and also young people and for children to go to the hospital.



**Table 4: Level of participation in planning from the perspectives of each group**

Particulars	Province	Community Organization			Commune Council			Villagers/chiefs		
		Yes	Level		Yes	Level		Yes	Level	
			Village	commune		Village	commune		Village	commune
Has there been an increase in villagers' participation in the annual planning process in the past three years?	Siem Reap	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	✓
	Banteay Meanchey	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none
	Battambang	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none
	Svay Rieng			none	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	none
Has there been an increase in women's participation in the annual planning process in the past three years?	Siem Reap	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Banteay Meanchey	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none
	Battambang	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none
	Svay Rieng			none	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has there been an increase in young people's (in the community) participation in the annual planning process in the past three years?	Siem Reap	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Banteay Meanchey	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none
	Battambang	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none
	Svay Rieng	-	-	-	✓	-	-	none	none	none
Have the community organization have been participating in the annual planning processes in the past three years?	Siem Reap	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	none	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Banteay Meanchey	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Battambang	✓	✓	none	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Svay Rieng	-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	n/a	n/a	n/a

Note: n/a = the design of this question was omitted.

Similarly, the focus group of villagers/chiefs in Siem Reap has raised many issues in the planning process over the last few years and they have integrated all of them. For example, animal raising technique, road, the canals, the culvert, health, public order including alcohol consumption and domestic violence, the construction of high school building. With regard implementation the commune council has been able to mobilize support from organizations working on animal raising technique, and mobilizing people contribution for high school building. But culverts, canals, and roads have already been built. At the same time, domestic violence and sanitation, particularly for the poor have been implemented through CCWC with the amount of money 1,000 US dollars as mentioned by focus group of villagers/chiefs in Siem Reap. For focus groups of community organization and villagers/chiefs in Banteay Meanchey, they and villagers raised issues at planning sessions including village culverts and roads, bridges, and they have integrated into the plan but have not implemented.

**Table 5: Rating of the level of participation of the community in planning by trainers**

<b>Particular (Rating on a scale 1-10)</b>	<b>Siem Reap</b>	<b>Banteay Meanchey</b>	<b>Battambang</b>	<b>Svay Rieng</b>
How would you rate the level of community participation in planning?	10	9	n/a*	7
How would you rate the level of women participation in planning?	8	6	n/a	4
How would you rate the level of young people participation in planning?	9	8	n/a	7
How would you rate the level of community organization's participation in monitoring of project progress?	8	9	n/a	9
How would you rate the level of women participation in monitoring of project progress?	9	7	n/a	7
How would you rate the level of young people participation in monitoring of project progress?	9	8	n/a	6
Rate the level of access to information at the commune level by the communities.	9	8	n/a	8
Rate the level of active engagement of the community organizations.	8	9	n/a	7

\* PDP Center's trainer in Battambang province was not available for interview or any correspondence

Trainers were also asked about their perception about the participation of the community people in all target areas that they are responsible in the process of promoting local democracy. On the scale of 1-10, it is revealed that generally the level of community participation in development planning and project monitoring is high. Likewise, it is seen high with respect to community access to information at the commune level and the engagement of the community organization organized by PDP Center. However, when one examines this closely it is clear that women participation in development planning is lower in Banteay Meanchey and Svay Rieng than in Siem Reap province. Similar pattern is also found in participation of young people in both aspects of development planning and project progress monitoring. Interestingly, the community organization's engagement is high across three provinces. Both trainers in Banteay Meanchey and Siem Reap provinces have expressed the same thing that women and young people have actively participated in the development activities (see table 5).

In addition, it appears that community has access to information of the commune council easily as they have built good relationship. Trainers in the three provinces described that the rate of access to information is high in all communes. The trainer in Siem Reap added that the challenge is that the communities have limited knowledge about what to ask for. However, engagement of the community, especially in Siem Reap and Banteay Meanchey, has been active while the rate is low for Svay Rieng.

---

Recommend that:

PDP Center would be well placed to see how key community leaders instead of all kinds of community people to engage in the budgeting process in the future development planning, especially the community organizations and active individuals in a community. It appears that inclusion of ideas and initiative into the plan is not much of a problem. However, there is mismatch here of people's understanding between integrating issues or ideas into the commune development plan and budgeting. It seems that the former is considered the community people to be a sufficient task but the latter is another key issue to take into account as they both closely related.

---

Generally, respondents give high score for attending the meetings organized or attended by the commune council. The fact is that in all provinces they have been able to raise ideas, suggestions, and inclusion of the community issues into the agenda for discussion. It is important to know that before, commune councils tend to ignore agenda proposed by others for meetings, especially in Siem Reap and Banteay Meanchey. Should this continue it may affect future participation of local people and community organizations which the commune council also viewed as one of the important actors (see table 6).

**Table 6: Usefulness of the attended meetings**

Thinking about the meetings that your group went to, do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements: [Rate from 1 to 4]	Siem Reap			Banteay Meanchey			Battambang			Svay Rieng		
	Community Organization	Commune Council	Villagers/chief	Community Organization	Commune Council	Villagers/chief	Community Organization	Commune Council	Villagers/chief	Community Organization	Commune Council	Villagers/chief
The meeting was useful because you learned about Commune Council activities	4	n/a*	4	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4	3	n/a	4
The purpose of the meeting was made clear	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4
Include your suggestion to add new agenda	2	n/a	2	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4
The meeting was useful because you were able to tell the Commune Council about your needs	3	n/a	3	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4	4	n/a	4

\* n/a refers to omission in question design.

When asked about the understanding or rights based on table 7, it is clear that in all provinces except Svay Rieng province they have given high score. Therefore, they know what to do and what to expect from the commune council. In Svay Rieng, the responses from the community organizations and villagers/chiefs are rather low compared to those of the commune council but this is totally contrasted to the view of the commune councilors. This seems to be explained by a perception that the rate is low for the reason that they have not applied their rights and hence giving low score.

**Table 7: Understanding rights**

Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with the following statements [on a scale of 1-4]		Community Organization	Commune Council	Villagers/chiefs
Any citizen has the right to know when the Commune Council will meet	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	4	3
	Svay Rieng	2	4	1
Any citizen has the right to know what the Commune Council will talk about in its next meeting	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	3	3
	Svay Rieng	2	4	1
Any citizen has the right to know what the Commune Council has decided	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	3	3
	Svay Rieng	2&3	4	1
Any citizen has the right to know how much money the Commune Council received, and how it spent the money?	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	4	4
	Svay Rieng	2&3	4	1
Any citizen has the right to attend a meeting of the Commune Council even without an invitation	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	4	4
	Svay Rieng	2&3	4	1
Any citizen has the right to come to the Commune Office and look at documents they keep there, for example the Commune Plan or the Commune Budget?	Siem Reap	4	4	4
	Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4
	Battambang	4	4	4
	Svay Rieng	1	4	1

Note: two numbers indicates difference of perceptions of participants

---

**Recommend that:**

More awareness raising is required to increase better understanding about people's rights, especially when it comes to establishing the relationship with their elected leaders. This limited understanding could have a potential impact on how they would act to effect mainly community benefits. While in other target areas may also be necessary, the focus of efforts seems to be better for Svay Rieng target area.

---

**Outcome Indicator 1.3: Fifteen communities attend meetings with commune council or other local authority levels in order to monitor the budget and commune development plan and raises up their needs/comments to put into the commune development plan in 2013**

When asked about rating the importance of the presence of the community organizations in the commune it is found that in all provinces they have given high value now compared to their rating in some places in 2010. In Siem Reap, the commune councilors have rated very low in 2010 but have increased remarkably in 2012. In Banteay Meanchey, the rating rise rather steadily. Different from others, Battambang has rated high before as now. In Svay Rieng, the commune councilor rated high both now and then. This could be attributed to the active engagement of the community organizations in the development activities in the commune (see table 8).

**Table 8: Importance of the community organization in the commune**

How would you rate the importance of the community organization(s) or group(s) for this commune? [ON THE SCALE OF 1 -10, SELECT 1 = LOWEST AND 10 = HIGHEST]	Community Organization		Commune Council		Villagers/chief	
	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	7	9	3	8	5	10
Banteay Meanchey	5	8	7	8	7	10
Battambang	8, 9 & 10*	8 & 10	7	10	9	9
Svay Rieng	6	9	10	10	7	9

Note: two or three numbers indicates difference of perceptions of participants

There has been support between the PDP Center-initiated community organizations and the commune authority in all provinces but have been confined to moral support, joint efforts and information sharing. According to the commune councilor in Siem Reap and the focus group of community organization in Beanteay Meanchey, the community organization has provided materials support, moral support and information sharing to the commune council while the community organization receive the same types of support from the commune council. In addition, the focus group of community organization in Beanteay Meanchey helped other Sangkat council in drama plays at the community event. Similarly, the focus group of villagers and village chiefs in Banteay Meanchey told that the community organization has provided them information, and moral supports while the villagers provide support in organizing events. The Sangkat councilors in Banteay Meanchey have decruded similar kinds of exchange but added that young people are given opportunity to help to collect money used in awareness raising activities.

In addition, the commune councilors in Battambang mentioned that community organization provided moral support to commune council, information and help in circulating invitations, while the commune council provided the community organization the same kinds of support including occasional fuel support. The focus group of community organization in Siem Reap acknowledged their role in providing support to the commune council in terms of to joint efforts, information sharing, and sharing of ideas. Aside from the same kinds of support that the commune council in Battambang provided to community organization as mentioned above, the commune council also have loaned out some materials such as tables and chairs for them to organize any events.

### **Outcome Indicator 3.1: twenty five percent of people access to commune council information (commune council's budget disclosure for people, civil status and other information that people needed) in 2013**

This section covers aspects of inquiring about commune council documents and reports, financial information sharing, and regular channel of information.

#### ***Inquiring about commune council documents and reports***

There has been hardly anyone inquiring about the planning documents or reports from the commune council. This has actually limited the people as to how much they could interact with the commune council. As told by the focus group of community organization in Battambang that villagers have not accessed any documents from the commune council while some community organizations have asked for them and they got them without any problems. Villagers only accessed personal documents such as birth, marital status and death certificates from the commune council and actually secured them promptly.

Different from villagers, the village chiefs whose role are direct with the commune council has obviously gained access to all kinds of information. The focus group of village chiefs in Battambang has asked for all kinds of information and documents from the commune council over the past three years. The commune council in Siem Reap recognized that most villagers receive information about their activities mostly from the village chief, community organizations and teachers. Also, villagers can get information about the council's activities from the commune council members themselves and from notice boards at the commune and village levels as well from their family members. The focus group of commune council in Siem Reap told that this information include traffic laws, fishery laws, and alcohol consumption, free grazing the abuse of the road site, social work, constitution, corruption and wedding.

Apart from that there is hardly any villager who have been interested or care to have information from the commune authorities. This is perhaps due to the lack of understanding about the right of access to information. In fact, the sangkat council in Banteay Meanchey as well as in Battambang have stressed that the villagers have never asked for planning, budget and reports produced in the past three years, except the birth, marital status certificate and death certificate which the commune have responded as per requests. If they come to ask for them, the commune authority is open to all requests.

While there are claims of openness, there is a case of a road construction that villagers have asked for documents of but Sangkat council have given the people a run-around and seem do not want to show until the road is completed. And the villagers have talked to the road construction company but have not received exact information either, according to villagers/chiefs in Banteay Meanchey.

#### ***Financial Information sharing***

Understanding the budget and financial management of the commune council varies from one place to another. Even in the same province, the people in some communes are aware of them while others are not. It was not sure if the village chiefs further disseminate the information about the final commune or village expenditures after it was reported to him or her. The Community organization in Battambang was aware of the financial management data of the commune council but not the case in Prek Norin and Chheu Teal communes. Given their direct role, village chiefs in Battambang knew well the financial management data of the commune council, and they know about expenses and income for each project implemented. Similarly, the community organization in Siem Reap

recognized that the financial management council in Somrong Year and Chambak Hae are open and they could provide the report when asked for.

In addition to the above, in Kok Chork as well as in Angkor Thom communes, their financial reports are available when asked for. But the commune council in Siem Reap acknowledged that the community people know a little bit about the financial management of the commune but they don't know about the details of how the expenditures were made and how they were recorded. According to villagers/chiefs in Siem Reap, the community representatives and village chiefs have been working closely to monitor the financial management of the commune council but before 2010 people were never interested in this kind of activities. They recalled the Seila program which they never cared about. The community organization in Banteay Meanchey fully recognized that they and the community people know very openly in the last two years this financial information as the sangkat council has been very open. This response reflected the sentiment of Sangkat council that the sangkat fund and expenses have been announced annually and placed on the notice board of sangkat and also shared in the village meeting.

---

Recommend that:

PDP Center should work with community organizations who will advocate commune councils to produce short or one page message or information about the work, achievements or finance of the commune council and make use the link with young people to distribute or circulate to a wider community. Young people could also use their creativity to help the commune council to produce necessary information suitable to the community needs.

---

### ***Regular channel of information***

Understanding sources of information that people get could help for future channel for which sharing of information and reports. In general, most citizens get information from councilors, village chief and community organization or NGOs but in some cases from notice board. They got report of activities of commune council through councilors, village chief, but occasionally through community organization as described by Sangkat council in Banteay Meanchey. Whereas, the focus group of villagers/chiefs in Siem Reap that people get information about commune council activities from village notice board in village or commune. Members of commune council in Battambang is frequently contacted by the people to get information, village chiefs, community organization, NGOs, notice board in village and commune level, but the notice board in village is now broken. Information through teachers is also frequent.

Also, focus group of villagers and chiefs in Banteay Meanchey have described that they, mostly villagers, did not know that they have the rights to know but now they are committed to learn and know all activities of the commune council. The persons that the villagers normally talk to are commune councilors, elders and monks. The most frequent people that villagers talk to include village chief, elder, commune council and Achars and the monks as reported by focus group of villagers/chiefs in Siem Reap. The frequent persons that community organization in Battambang approached to share their view or problems include village chief, commune council and women focal point. Interestingly, most citizen got information about the activities of the commune council through village chief and public announcement through loud speakers as told by Community organization in Battambang. Not much different from others the focus group of village chiefs in Battambang added that political parties and NGO staff has played important roles.

## **Outcome Indicator 3.2: thirty percent of elected officials (commune councils) response to community people on comments, requests and complaints in 2013**

### ***Successful Responses***

There has been an impressive interaction between the local communities and their authority with regards to raising important issues that affected them including both infrastructural and a wide range of social issues, and their responses. The community issues that community organization in Siem Reap seeks response from the commune council included migration, children situation in squatter in Veal and Tak Sen village of Kok Chak commune, domestic violence, drug use, the issue of animal meat with disease on sale on the market in Samrong Yea commune. The focus group of villagers/chiefs in Siem Reap reported that in the past three years villagers have raised many issues with the commune council including domestic violence, health sanitation, flood, land conflict and the sale of poke with disease which has resulted in the commune council to issue a policy or Dekah. In addition, the provincial authority have promised to build concrete road but was not implemented yet. Also, while some cases have been addressed successfully there are a few cases left that people could not solve the problem. A social issue in this case is about a problem between villagers who blocked the road and now this case is brought to the district level for the intervention, it is a case of cousin. There is another case the commune council trying to work out about road block as well when the other person doesn't respect the contract. These are some of existing challenges to social problem facing the commune council and community groups.

There were several requests described by the community organization in Battambang that they have sought support from the commune council such as road in Phnom Sampov which was done in 2010. Chheu Teal villagers asked for road in the village but it was not approved, and the same way for Prek Norin commune was also disapproved because of lack of funds. However, several other issues have been responded such as intervention in violence by strange person (was seized and sent to police), flood (provided seeds), drought (provided seeds), drug use by gangsters (now no cases), and land allocation boundary conflict (not yet solved). Community Organization in Battambang normally attended meetings with commune council, to present information or issues above. The commune council in Battambang illustrated several achievements that in 2010 the road in Chamkar Svay village 2,500m was done, Phum Daung 1,600m done in 2011, and in 2012 solved land conflict about boundary and sent to provincial court, fire burned 1 household only and poor together with 40 households were given rice, fish source and 20,000 riels for those who fired burn except the poor.

Demanding for price list display at the commune office has been successful for improving transparent practices; however, there is still a challenge in implementation in some target area. Before signing any document the commune council charges some money as processing fee. They have reduced the amount of these fees but the community organization is demanding that the list of fees be displayed on a board but they have not done so. The sangkat council in Banteay Meanchey separately said that without taking some money it is not possible for them to do their work, but stressed that youth groups and sangkat council work together to produce and issued the price list.

### ***Pending issues or complaints***

The community organization in Banteay Meanchey raised a problem with electricity in Thnoat and the sangkat authority has intervened. It is about overcharging of electricity bill. In receipt 170,000 riel but charged 380,000 riels. Sangkat promised to resolve the case since 2001 but it has not been resolved up to now. There was also a request for building a school in 2010, and currently the soil work is being done by the community to cover an old pond and the sangkat council is responsible to build the structure. The community organization presented the issues through meetings rather than other forms.



Several issues that sangkat council seek responses from the community organization in Banteay Meanchey including the road damaged by flood, canal, and the response was that roads have been repaired using community contribution, money from generous people to pay for excavator digging soils for the road but have not responded to the request for using gravel for road. Also, a request to support in building a canal has not yet been responded by community organization, as told by Sangkat councilors in Banteay Meanchey.

---

Recommend that:

PDP Center constantly identify most active persons in the community and encourage them to participate in existing community organizations or allow them to work alongside to deal with emerging issues as this may motivate him or her. In Banteay Meanchey, a person who is curious about the community issues has taken initiative to seek information from different angle before seeking response. This is the type of person that PDP Center could provide capacity support.

---

**Table 9: Responsiveness of the commune council**

In your opinion, do you feel that commune councils are helpful at solving problems raised by the communities over the past three years? [Rate from 1 to 4]		Community Organization		Commune Council		Villagers/chiefs	
		2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	Very responsive						
	Somewhat responsive	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Somewhat unresponsive?						
Banteay Meanchey	Very responsive	✓*					
	Somewhat responsive	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
	Somewhat unresponsive?	✓	✓				
Battambang	Very responsive						
	Somewhat responsive		✓				
	Somewhat unresponsive?	✓				✓	✓
Svay Rieng	Very responsive			✓	✓		✓
	Somewhat responsive	✓				✓	
	Somewhat unresponsive?		✓				

\* Some of them have different views

When designing this question the evaluator was sure that this would be interpreted in many different ways – as some would refer to access to information while others for infrastructure development. Generally, across the four communes of four provinces there is a general pattern of appreciating the work of the commune councils as somewhat responsive to the needs and complaints before and now. Despite one could see the uniformity in the responses for Siem Reap, other three provinces are somewhat divided. Of important note is that although there were different responses for 2010 by the community organizations in Banteay Meanchey, all agreed that commune council is currently somewhat unresponsive. Similar pattern is also founded in Svay Rieng. However, Battambang was indicated as opposite to Siem Reap and Banteay Meanchey provinces [see table 9].

### **Outcome Indicator 3.3: (seventy percent of) 12 of 16 targeted commune councils have adopted the alcohol notification in 2013**

The aim of the Dekah and awareness raising covers several social aspects of community life and these aims are commonly understood in target provinces. The community organization in Siem Reap mentioned that the Dekah will be the basis for reducing domestic violence, poverty reduction, reduce the use of alcohol and in compliant with commune safety policy, the community organization have submitted a letter to the community authority in order to adopt the policy which was finally agreed on by the community council. The villagers and village chiefs in Svay Rieng mentioned that there are many reasons that commune council adopted the alcohol policy: it is for the benefit of all, reduce domestic violence, traffic accidents, waste of time, loss of household savings because they use the money to buy alcohol as well as not being able to work because of drunkenness.

The process of issuing Dekah appears to have been good in Siem Reap through more thorough steps before finalizing which reflect the level of high awareness amongst stakeholders, but this is not clearly stated in other target provinces. The focus group of villagers and village chief in Siem Reap described that the process of issuing or approving of alcohol is that they have organized discussions at the commune level and shared with community people and they have talked about it for about two years because it involved villager participation in the process that was why they have to adapt this policy.

### **Impact Indicator 1: Freedom house 2013 put Cambodia in the rank at 5 for political rights and at 4 for civil rights**

According to the report of Freedom House there has been no change in the score over the past three years. In fact, in 2013, it clearly indicates that it scores the same as 2009 which has put Cambodia in the rank at 6 for political rights and at 5 for civil liberties. This indicates the needs for more effort as a country. However, it is worthwhile to examine the situation at the community levels based on the perception of different stakeholders although no composite index is provided. But what the table 10 offers is the viewpoints from interviews by making comparison from one period to another. The questions were asked to cover the situation at local as well as national levels.

The result indicated that local people have experienced more freedom in 2012 than in 2010. This means that there has been improvement over the past three years. However, some of the scoring is quite low. For example, in Battambang the community organization made 2 on the scale for a first question about open and free private discussion. Generally, it is observed that the trend should not be markedly different. In Svay Rieng while they are low on many questions they also score high from other. Banteay Meanchey also shows low score in 2010 while scoring highest in the current period (see table 10).

**Table 10: Rating of freedoms related to political rights and civil liberties**

Please rate the following [0 = smallest degree of freedom, 4 = greatest degree of freedom]	Community Organization		Commune Council		Villager/village chiefs	
	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
<b>Is there open and free private discussion?</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	3	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	3	4	4	4	3	4
Battambang	2	3	3	3	4	4
Svay Rieng	2&3*	3&4	4	4	2&3	3&4
<b>Is there freedom of assembly, demonstration, and open public discussion?</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	3	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	2	4	4	4	2	4
Battambang	3	4	2	3	3	4
Svay Rieng	4	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Is there freedom for nongovernmental organizations? (Note: This includes civic organizations, interest groups, foundations, etc.)</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	2	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	2	3	4	4	3	4
Battambang	3	4	3	4	4	4
Svay Rieng	0	2	4	4	4	4
<b>Do citizens enjoy freedom of travel or choice of residence, employment, or institution of higher education?</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	4	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4	4	4	4
Battambang	4	4	3	4	4	4
Svay Rieng	4	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Are there personal social freedoms, including gender equality, choice of marriage partners, and size of family?</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	2 & 3	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	4	4	1	2	3	3
Battambang	4	4	3	3	4	4
Svay Rieng	4	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Are there equality of opportunity and the absence of economic exploitation?</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	3 & 4	3 & 4	3	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	2	3	4	4	2	3
Battambang	2 & 4	2 & 4	2	2	2	3
Svay Rieng	4	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Are the people's political choices free from domination by the military, parties, religious hierarchies, economic oligarchies, or any other powerful group?</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	3 & 4	3 & 4	3	3	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	3	4	4	4	4	4
Battambang	2 & 4	2 & 4	3	4	4	4
Svay Rieng	4	4	1	2	4	4
<b>Is the local government (cc) accountable to the electorate between elections, and does it operate</b>	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012

with openness and transparency?						
Siem Reap	3	3	4	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	2	3	2	3	dk	2&3
Battambang	2 & 3	2 & 4	2	4	2&3	2&3
Svay Rieng	2	2	3	3	4	4
Are religious institutions and communities free to practice their faith and express themselves in public and private?	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	4	4	3	3
Banteay Meanchey	4	4	4	4	4	4
Battambang	3 & 4	3 & 4	4	4	4	4
Svay Rieng	4	4	4	4	4	4
Do laws, policies, and practices guarantee equal treatment of various segments of the population?	2010	2012	2010	2012	2010	2012
Siem Reap	4	4	4	4	4	4
Banteay Meanchey	2	3	4	4	2	2
Battambang	3 & 4	3 & 4	3	3	3&4	3&4
Svay Rieng	1	2	4	4	3	3

\* Note: any two numbers indicated different views, and dk means don't know

## Impact Indicator 2: Twenty percent of women were elected as commune council members in 2012

Overall, there is a big jump of composition of women councilors in 2002 to 2007 and then slightly increased in 2012. Proportionally, women occupying the commune council seat were higher than expected in 2012 (see table 11). While women are elected to the seat they have also gained in confidence in performing their role and were very articulate. Women in commune council have actively participated in sharing their ideas as appreciated by the interviewed commune council in Battambang. Similar to Battambang, the commune council in Siem Reap and in Banteay Meanchey agreed that the woman commune council members have been very good in raising problems and participating in discussions and decision-making because commune council members created the opportunity for women to talk in meetings and outside meetings.

**Table 11: Composition of commune council members by party in each province**

What is the composition of the commune council now? From how many party? How many women?		2002		2007		2012	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Siem Reap	CPP Party	4	1	4	1	4	1
Banteay Meanchey	CPP Party	5	-	4	1	4	1
	SRP Party	-	-	2	-	-	-
	FUNCINPEC Party	1	-	-	-	-	-
Battambang	CPP Party	4	2	4	2	6	3
	SRP Party	2	-	4	-	2	-
	FUNCINPEC Party	3	-	-	-	-	-
	Ranariddh Party	-	-	1	-	-	-
Svay Rieng	CPP Party	-	-	4	2	4	2
	SRP Party	-	-	1	-	1	-
Total		19	3	24	6	21	7
Percent of women against total		14		20		25	

Source: interviews with commune councilors in each province

From the interviews, there are other impacts perceived by the community people and local authorities over the past three years. These are:

***Status of women and children***

There is recognition in selected provinces that women have access to information quicker. In addition, the fact that it has better road network this makes it easier for women who usually brings goods to the markets or go to health centers. They have also provided an observation that there is an increase in number of women who understood about rights because they participated in village level activities. Also, there is an equal recognition that children has enjoy their four basic rights as their parents have better understanding and given improvement in infrastructure facilitating them well to schools.

***Better living condition***

The awareness about rights and responsibility as citizen and the understanding about the need to establish and maintain relationship between villagers and local authorities have resulted in recognized cases of solidarity and cooperation to improve the communities where they live. Road infrastructure and irrigation system and technical support, especially in Siem Reap and Banteay Meanchey, has led to increase access and mobility from one place to another, improve agricultural productivity, and created a condition for safer living and mutually supportive environment in communities in pursuit of social and economic development within their communities.

## VI. Conclusions

There has been remarkable and impressive progress made in all target provinces over the years in contributing to the set impacts and outcomes despite variation from place to place which are mainly discussed in the result section. PDP Center has made positive contribution to social change in the communities and realization of rights. The efforts of PDP Center falls in line with the recent UNGA resolution that strongly encourage Member States to integrate education for democracy, along with civic education and human rights education into national standards and program aimed at the promotion and consolidation of democratic values and democratic governance and human rights, taking into account innovative approaches and best practices in the field, in order to facilitate citizens' empowerment and participation in political life and policymaking at all levels. In addition, it also calls for Governments, agencies and organizations of the United Nations system and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to intensify their efforts to promote education for democracy.<sup>11</sup> While many improvements have been made there are also external factors and national measures that helped to shape this outcome and impacts. For practical purposes, it is worthwhile to reflect both a more specific achievements and gaps based on some key concepts as follows:

It is important to revisit some of the key concept of democracy and try to find out areas which can be further advanced the steps. In their article on Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance<sup>12</sup> Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright, offer three principles of *Empowered Deliberative Democracy*, they mentioned three principles, First is about *Practical Orientation* which means the focus on practical problems such as providing public safety, training workers, caring for ecosystems, or constructing sensible municipal budgets. They would deliver goods to sectors of society that are often most grievously denied them. This practical focus also creates situations in which actors accustomed to competing with one another for power or resources might begin to cooperate and build more congenial relations. Second is *Bottom-Up Participation*: refers to new channels for those most directly affected by targeted problems—typically ordinary citizens and officials in the field—to apply their knowledge, intelligence, and interest to the formulation of solutions. The effective solutions to certain kinds of novel and fluid public problems may require the variety of experience and knowledge offered more by diverse, relatively more open-minded citizens and field operatives than by distant and narrowly trained experts. Lastly, the *Principle: Deliberative Solution Generation*: In deliberative decision making, participants listen to each other's positions and generate group choices after due consideration. In contemplating and arguing for what the group should do, participants ought to persuade one another by offering reasons that others can accept.

Also, new pattern of reform at the local level about a new public management style<sup>13</sup> describes several principles including *democratic renewal*, particularly through restructuring political management in local authorities, so that local political decision-making is more transparent to local communities; *best value*, which places upon local authorities the duty of continuous improvement of their services, in relation to the achievement of economy, efficiency and effectiveness; *community leadership*, which makes local authorities responsible for taking the lead in the preparation of Community Strategies, which set out how all the partnership arrangements in the local area will be used to deliver a better quality of life for all stakeholders in their area; and *community well-being*, under which local authorities have a new power, enabling them to undertake a much wider range of economic, social and environmental improvement initiatives than before, as long as their local communities agree.

As a reflection of these principles and real practices, the first one about practical orientation is that there has been a lot of focus of the infrastructural development which generally more practical and tangible things that local community could see even though they may not benefit them directly.

---

<sup>11</sup> UN General Assembly resolution on Education for Democracy adopted November 21, 2012

<sup>12</sup> POLITICS & SOCIETY, Vol. 29 No. 1, March 2001, 5-41

<sup>13</sup> Moving from excellence models of local service delivery to benchmarking 'good local governance' Tony Bovaird and Elke Löffler, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 2002 IIAS. SAGE Publications, Vol. 68 (2002), 9–24

Second principle is that there has been very good participation in planning but they are generally constrained by a pre-determined projects and budget but it is important to acknowledge that some time the proposed ideas by the community people reflected with that of authorities. Another principle is what could be challenging for NGO and community people. As the evaluator did not see meetings in real action it is impossible to assess the quality of discussions that involved debating about reasons before making decision on any project or ideas. PDP Center could look into this and promote quality debates.

When reflecting to principles of another author is that first *democratic renewal* is that it was clear that authorities have been very open and welcome the community people to approach them when they have problem, but it has been the people themselves who have not been able to engage with commune council for obtaining information or documents for increasing their understanding. While low education may be one of the factors, there should be some other ways to promote this. For *best value* principle is reflected on real situation as the commune councils have been working hard to respond to social issues as well as economic ones. *Community leadership* is of course seen in commune development planning that local authorities has been responsible for taking the lead with participation of community organization and others which have been appreciated to a high extent for integrating community's ideas into the plan. However, leaders have been no or less flexible to accommodate local needs when it comes to allocation of budget. Lastly, *community well-being* covered a wide spectrum of issues. However, because of the focus of expenditure has been mainly on infrastructure, the social issues and other soft one has been to depend on the resource from external agencies. What is the role and responsibility of the government, or commune council in this case?

In responses to several issues above, here are some broad ideas which would give some light for future direction for which PDP Center could use as a basis for discussion or in preparation for their planning including the strategic plan.

- PDP Center is generally known to the community and local authority for its well-known reputation in promotion and mobilization of efforts against alcohol consumption. However, PDP Center engaged with the local community and authority on a wide range of issues by adopting principles of democracy to guide their work. It is important to maintain the two pronged approaches in working for all kinds of issues or project it will undertake. While PDP Center has already moving into this approach it is important to re-emphasize it. It is about the approaches to do awareness raising about rights and democracy as well as other issues – It has been appreciated so far to create awareness raising. One is to continue providing awareness to individual and household level, particularly, those who are affected; and secondly is the general public events which draw participation from government agencies, and local people to increase understanding about law, regulations and so on.
- Institutionalize support by the commune council development fund into plan, implementation and monitoring such as allocation of commune resources for software rather than hardware alone. However, when it comes to the issues of democracy and rights, it is important not only to look at the outputs (generally mentioned by people about infrastructure) but more importantly the process in which they are involved or advocated for as it is a key to achieving the impacts. The process is this: the community organization is already in place and there are also emerging active villagers who are not necessarily members of the community organization and they could be considered as volunteers. These volunteers work for without receiving considerable or sustained incentive in terms of skill and monetary values. This is key issue to long term commitment. Where could this long term benefit for volunteers come from? Stakeholders should accept that PDP Center will phase out in the area at some point. If the commune council see this voluntary groups of people as their helping hands who can provide support or services to the community directly, especially on awareness raising, information dissemination, report writing, and learning leadership skills and taking up position in the future, there should be a way to steadily mainstream this volunteerism or tape into this

opportunity with incentives supported in some way by the resources of the commune council as they ultimately work to achieve the common vision. However, this should be moved more cautiously as it may affect their independency in the end. From the rights-based perspective, these groups of volunteers could demand support from the commune council for their vital services to the community. Stepping on to this path is a challenge but it is worth trying.

- There has been a complaint that commune development fund is small. However, if managed well and if this is a real bottom up planning, the local communities and authority should have a big say as to what kinds of project are important to them. While there are important infrastructural (the hardware) needs in the communities, so do the social needs (the software) in the communities, for example, the domestic violence issue, dealing squatter in a commune in Siem Reap, youth participation, etc. Can some of these commune funds that have been used for infrastructure be shifted or allocated for some of these needs? Then, the second point above also comes in by encouraging volunteers to do mentoring and coaching to victims of alcohol consumption or domestic violence and perpetrators to change their attitude, etc. This work requires skills in counseling, and identifies creative space for young people to participate. The shift in distribution of the resources is a major challenge but it is something that PDP could focus on in the next few years to establish the foundation, in other words to build movement that would look into the issue.
- The current globalization processes are in its fast pace and its impact on the community could be enormous. When thinking about sustainability it should not only be the physical structure such as road or community organization, but also the capacity of the community, especially leaders or members of the community organization, to be able to analyze the local context change and its relationship to broader trends. This will become a focal point for which collective effort would be mobilized by and amongst the community themselves.

In addition to the broad ideas for the future, more specific recommendations based on output and outcome levels are also offered in the text while repeating in Executive Summary section for quick references.



## **Appendix 1: Terms of Reference**

## Appendix 2: General Guide Questions for Focus Group Discussions and Key Informants

Intervention Logic	Objectively verifiable indicators (OVI)	Some Guide Questions
<b>Impact</b>		
Improved civil rights, democratic space and people free from fear, violations and intimidation in the communities <sup>14</sup>	<p>1. Freedom house 2013 put Cambodia in the rank at 5 for political rights and at 4 for civil rights</p> <p>2. 20% of women were elected as commune council members in 2012</p>	How many commune council members of each commune? How many from each political party? How many women members? What motivate them to stand for election? Of those elected, have they had experience as council members in the previous terms?
<b>Outcomes</b>		
1. Improved confidence and ownership of marginalized community members (men, women, youth) of the democratic development of their own communities	1.1. 20 commune councils (included 4 existing communes) adopted alcohol policy to prevent violence and promote people health—youth policy and anti-corruption law were adopted during the project period by the government.	<p>When did the commune council adopt alcohol policy? Why did they do so? How has this adoption affect the local community perception? Has this adoption directly or indirectly change the types and degree of violence? Give example. How has this adoption contributed to people's health?</p> <p>Ask similar questions for adoption of youth policy and anti-corruption policy</p>
	1.2. By 2013, 500 of targeted community people participating in networks to intervene in the decision making and problems solving processes at the grass root levels of authorities.	What are the existing networks or community organization in the community? How do they relate to each other? How do they make decision? Please give examples. What kinds of community problems have they been facing? How did they respond? How did other actors such as government authority involved in the process? Please give examples.
2. Empowered youth and women in the communities participated in commune development planning with commune councils	2. 1. 15 communities attend meetings with commune council or other local authority levels in order to monitor the budget and commune development plan and raises up their needs/comments to put into the commune development plan in 2013	Have people or community organizations been participating in planning process organized by the commune council in the past? What about the current year? What kinds of ideas have been raised? Give examples. Have these ideas been integrated into the plan? If not, why not? Can people have access to commune budget and finance report?
	2.2. 8 advocacy campaigns on health, commune development (land disputes...) and violence have been performed by community people	How many campaign conducted? What type of issues that the campaign was organized for? Please give examples/ How important is the campaign? Do they see the needs for future campaign? How organized and participated in the campaign?
3. Local governance has improved including freedom of meeting, speech, access to information as grass-root people are equipped with a better tool to hold local elected officials more accountable (the alcohol policy, youth policy and anti-corruption law)	3.1. 25% of people access to commune council information (CC's budget disclosure for people, civil status and other information that people needed) in 2013	Did people have access to information and how did they get it? What kinds of information did they get?
	3.2. 30% of elected officials (commune councils) response to community people on comments, requests and complaints in 2013	Did councilor respond to needs and complaints of people? What kinds of complaints?

<sup>14</sup> Space of democracy is enlarged for people's participation in commune development (land disputes...), health and domestic violence (such as organizing forums, participate in commune council meetings, development plan, demand cc to meet their needs "transparency, alcohol policy, youth policy, commune development ...") in the community without harm or intimidation from authorities

	3.3. (70 % of) 12 of 16 targeted commune councils have adopted the alcohol notification in 2013	Did councilors who adopted and disseminate alcohol policy in the community?
	3.4. The national alcohol policy was adopted by government in 2013	Progress of national policy on alcohol
	3.5. The national youth policy have adopted by government in 2012	adoption of youth policy and its effects on the commune program
	3.6. An anti-corruption law adopted by National Assembly in 2012	adoption of anticorruption law and its effects on the commune program
<b>Outputs</b>		
1.1. People in the community increase understanding about concepts of democracy, human rights and advocacy	1.1. 65% of participants in the trainings, workshops, answered correctly the post-test	What is the number and types of trainings conducted? Who are the participants? How articulate they were?
1.2. More projects initiated and implemented by the communities during project period	1.2. 15 communities are organized and functioning community group complied on a set criteria (bylaws, policies, structure, job description, accounting system) in 2013	Number and kinds of community groups organized? How important and how functional it is now? Kind of projects they are doing? The challenges they are facing?
	1.3. 20 % of community group's participation in communities to demand local government to respond to people's needs in 2013	What kinds of issue that community people are facing? What kinds of issues that they have asked the government to respond? How effective has been the responses?
2.1 People in the community increase their knowledge on advocacy and formed their own group in each community by participating from youth and women for doing advocacy work	2.1. 15% of youth and women participated in advocacy campaign to include their concerns in commune development plan in 2013	Have youth participated in commune development planning? Have women participated in commune development planning? Have their concerns been included into the plan? What preparation have they done (campaign, community forums conducted by community people) prior to joining the commune planning process?
2.2. Youths in PDP and FS's Partners' target areas can spread their advocacy on their rights through "National Youth Policy"	2.2. 20% of youths are available to understand benefits and concepts of "NYP" to increase standard of their living in 2013.	What is the level of understanding of youth about youth policy? How have they realized their needs?
2.3. Most of Forum Syd's partners would like to share ideas and increase their knowledge related to Alcohol effect in the communities.	2.3. 35% of Fs's partners will be happy to cooperate in the purpose to accelerate alcohol policy to be approved in 2013.	Who are the partners of FS? How have they worked together to push for the adoption of alcohol policy? What has been their perception of working together?
2.2 Marginalized community members join the group for their advocacy on alcohol policy, youth policy, anti-corruption law and solving their community problems	2.2. 10 advocacy groups established in the community with functioning structure in 2013	Number of advocacy group formed and their achievements? What is the level of functioning of these groups?
3.1 Local authorities (Commune Council) has changed their attitude by including people in the process of development and problem solving	3.1. 20% of community people participated commune council development plan and problem solving in 2013	Meetings between youth and Commune Council? Community forums conducted by community people?
	3.2. 35% of their demands and proposals have accepted by commune councils in 2013	Type of proposal that have been forwarded and accepted by the commune councils?
4.1 Staff and community leaders have capacity to run the program	4.1. 25% of staff's and community leaders knowledge concerning the programs in 2013	Type of training and its usefulness for community leaders and staff? How have they put into application?

### Appendix 3: List of participants

#### Interviewed Trainers

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Province
Mai Sam Aun	M	Trainer	-	Siem Reap
Yib Sophal	M	Trainer	-	Banteay Meanchey
Ssssss	M	Trainer	ss	Svay Rieng

#### Interviewed Commune/Sangkat councilors in

Name	Sex	Position	Commune	Province
Hourt Saveu	M	First deputy chief of Sangkat	Phneat	Banteay Meanchey
Kert Nhean	M	Second deputy chief of Sangkat	Phneat	Banteay Meanchey
Tum Meal	M	Chief of Sangkat	Phneat	Banteay Meanchey
Koh Seng Hav	M	Deputy commune chief	Chheuteal	Battambang
Mao Soeub	M	Deputy commune chief	Chheuteal	Battambang
Chhoeum Chhean	M	Deputy commune chief	Chheuteal	Battambang
You Dara	M	Second deputy commune chief	Pothireach	Svay Rieng
Lach Soeun	M	Commune chief	Samrong Yea	Siem Reap
Pan Poch	M	Deputy commune chief	Samrong Yea	Siem Reap

#### Focus Group Discussion with village chiefs in Chheu Teal commune in Battambang Province

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Chhoum Thi	M	Village Chief	Bay Damram	Chheuteal
Ry Chhon	M	Village Chief	Kompong Chlong	Chheuteal
Yerm Yom	M	Village Chief	Chheuteal	Chheuteal
Bi Vahorn	M	Village Chief	Kna	Chheuteal
Sen Yoeut	M	Village Chief	Anlak Koang	Chheuteal
Muy Yoeut	M	Village Chief	Enta Chit	Chheuteal
Khoeun Meak	M	Vice-village Chief	Anlong Tamey	Chheuteal
Tes Chheak	F	Village Chief	Bot Sala	Chheuteal
Doung Raing	M	Village Chief	Chamkar Svay	Chheuteal
Chav Chooun	M	Village Chief	Tkov	Chheuteal
Chhom Yun	M	Village Chief	Borbos	Chheuteal
Brong Mao	M	Village Chief	Chhork Pothi	Chheuteal
Phi Phal	M	Village Chief	Svay Prokeab	Chheuteal
Vet Savong	M	Village Chief	Kampong Srobor	Chheuteal
Chhit Chhun Hak	M	Vice-village Chief	Daung	Chheuteal

#### Focus Group Discussion with community organization or network in Battambang Province

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Tan Kimsan	F	Administrator	Chamkar Russey	Prek Preah Sdach
Sem Chanthan	F	Treasurer	Samnanh	Phnom Sampov
Ly Bunrath	M	Village Chief/community leader?	Rumchey	Sneung
Yoem Thy	M	Administrator	Chheuteal	Chheuteal

**Focus Group Discussion with community organization or network in Svay Rieng Province**

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Va Sinat	M	Community Chief Chambok	Chambok	Chek
Ou Saray	F	Community Chief Sok San	Kandal	Kok Pring
Chhoum Theth	F	Secretary Community Sok San	Kandal	Kok Pring
Mom Samai	M	Vice-Community Chief?	Pothireach	Pothireach
Chim Samphos	M	Member	Pothireach	Pothireach
Sok Chandy	M	Community Chief	Pothireach	Pothireach
Ou Saren	F	Member of Community Sok San	Kandal	Kok Pring
Khim Sreyrov	F	Member of Community	Pothireach	Pothireach
Va Nat	F	Member of Community	O'Samdey	Pothireach
Khert Sitha	M	Member of Community	Ta Mom	Pothireach

**Focus Group Discussion with villagers and village chiefs in Svay Rieng Province**

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Va Sathon	M	Villager	O'Samdey	Pothireach
Mov Saron	M	Village chief	Khleang	Pothireach
Pov Saroeun	M	Village chief	O'Samdey	Pothireach
Sao Yeang	M	Vice-village chief	Chensa	Pothireach
Meas Yean	M	Vice-village chief	Tropeang Thlok	Pothireach
Koy Saphon	M	Village chief	Prey Damlong	Pothireach
Meas Sarin	M	Village chief	Tropeang Thlok	Pothireach
Roth Sea	F	Villager	O'Anchanh	Pothireach
Cheang Ra	F	Villager	O'Anchanh	Pothireach
Oung Sea	F	Villager	O'Samdey	Pothireach
Prak Savan	M	Villager chief	Tbeng	Pothireach

**Focus Group Discussion with community organization or network in Banteay Manchev Province**

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Hout Vichai	M	Community chief Kantout	Thmey	Phneat
Chhouy Mouy	F	Member of Community Kantout	Phneat	Phneat
Phen Sokha	M	Member	Deylor	Phneat
Rin Sothea	M	Community chief	Prohout	Phneat
Non Ny	M	Community chief	Deylor	Phneat
Hun Mony	M	Member of community	Rong Masin	Phneat
Hout Sivan Chang	M	Member of community	Thmey	Phneat

**Focus Group Discussion with villagers in Banteay Meanchey Province**

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Prak Phoan	M	Villager	Neakta	Phneat
Vang Phoy	M	Villager	Neakta	Phneat
Sman Koeung	M	Community Chief	Kam Pring	Phneat
Oem Virak	M	Villager	Thmey	Phneat
Kae Visoth	M	Villager	Thmey	Phneat
Yin Oun	M	Villager	Thmey	Phneat
Teav Kollayanney	F	Villager	Phneat	Phneat
Soun Sereyrath	F	Villager	Phneat	Phneat

**Focus Group Discussion with community organization or network in Siem Reap Province**

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Meas Thenna	F	Treasurer	Veal	Koak Chork
Heng Sikhoeun	F	Member	Chambok Hae	Pouk
Chherp Aun	M	Member	Veal	Koak Chork
Chhem Mao	M	Community chief	Prasat	Samrong Yea
Kae Heab	M	Vice-community chief	Prasat	Samrong Yea
Kat Sareth	M	Member of Koak Chork	Slor Kram	Slor Kram
Chhoy Rattanak	M	Member of Koak Chork	Treang	Slor Kram
Chhan Tola	M	Member	Anchanch	Angkor Thom

**Focus Group Discussion with villagers and village chiefs in Siem Reap Province**

Name	Sex	Position	Village	Commune
Mean Ra	M	Villager chief	Tachek	Samrong Yea
Rem Sokha	F	Villager	Daun Sva	Samrong Yea
Sorn Seap	F	Villager	Daun Sva	Samrong Yea
Suy Sin	F	Villager	Prey Veng	Samrong Yea
Kae Heab	M	Villager	Prasat	Samrong Yea
Pin Toek	F	Villager	Prey Veng	Samrong Yea
Cheng Choeung	M	Villager chief	Prey Veng	Samrong Yea
Mai Kun	M	Villager chief	Prasat	Samrong Yea
Chea Savern	F	Member	Samrong Yea	Samrong Yea
Sip Kunthea	F	Villager chief	Ampil	Samrong Yea
Van Leap	F	Villager	Samrong Yea	Samrong Yea
Moun Phaneth	M	Vice-village chief	Samrong Yea	Samrong Yea
Tol Veus	M	Villager	Samrong Yea	Samrong Yea
Chun Cheung	M	Village chief	Daun Sva	Samrong Yea
Chhiv Lon	M	Village	Prey Veng	Samrong Yea
Uk Arn	M	Village	Prasat	Samrong Yea