
គណៈកម្មាធិការ សហប្រតិបត្តិការ ដើម្បីកម្ពុជា

**COOPERATION COMMITTEE
FOR CAMBODIA**



**THE IMPACT OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY
IN SIEM REAP
ON THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN ANGKOR PARK**

**ADI Team & Past Participants
with
Brett M. Ballard**



**Cooperation Committee for Cambodia
Analyzing Development Issues (ADI) Project
Phnom Penh, December 2002**

Acronyms

ADI	Analyzing Development Issues project
APDO	Angkor Participatory Development Organization
APSARA (Apsara)	l'Authorite pour la Protection du Site et l'Amenagement de la Region d'Angkor
CCC	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia
CDRI	Cambodia Development Resource Institute
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
VDC	Village Development Committee

Acknowledgements

The ADI team would like to thank the staff of the Angkor Participatory Development Organization (APDO) for their generous help in facilitating the fieldwork phase of this research. Their contributions included making the logistical arrangements in Siem Reap, organizing the visits to the villages, and providing meeting space. The ADI would also like to thank H.E. Cheng Limsreang, Vice Governor of Siem Reap Province, and H.E. Seung Kung, Vice General Director of Apsara, for taking time to meet with a team of ADI researchers. Their observations were especially useful in terms of focusing attention on how to increase the share of tourism benefits for Cambodians who live in and around Angkor Park. The research analysis and recommendations, however, are the sole responsibility of the ADI staff and consultant who have prepared this report.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

IV

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Objectives and Research Questions	3
III.	Methodology	4
IV.	Findings and Analysis	6
	Employment and Trade	7
	Social Impact	13
	Governance: The Role of Apsara and the Provincial Government	16
V.	Conclusions and Recommendations	20
	References	25
VI.	Annexes	26
	Table 1: Fieldwork Summary	26
	Household Interview Instrument	27
	Focal Group Discussion Guide	30
	Vendor Interview Guide	32
	Village Chief Interview Guide	33
	Apsara Authority Interview Guide	36
	Provincial Governor Interview Guide	38
	List of Participating Researchers	39

Executive Summary

The CCC Analyzing Development Issues Project (ADI) ¹ recently undertook a brief study of the impact of tourism in Siem Reap. The primary purpose of this study was to develop a better understanding of how people who live in Angkor Park are affected by the tourism industry so that government agencies, donors, and NGOs may better plan and target development assistance in the future. A second goal was to provide the ADI trainees with an opportunity to observe and then analyze how local people anywhere integrate into labour and trade markets that emerge as a result of large-scale economic development in or around their communities.

Since the late 1990s, the number of tourist arrivals in Angkor Park has increased dramatically. The result has been remarkable growth in the tourism industry that serves both domestic and international tourists. This growth has stimulated new employment and trade opportunities for people in the area, but has also exacerbated undesirable social problems such as school drop-outs and sex trafficking. With regard to the benefits associated with tourism, some officials estimate that approximately 70% of the income derived from tourism benefits people and businesses *outside* Cambodia. Only a small portion of the remaining 30% actually benefits the 24,000 or so people who live in Angkor Park. One of the key policy questions raised by this research concerns how the Royal Government of Cambodia, donors, and NGOs can work together to better plan and target development assistance in Siem Reap, as well as other areas affected by tourism, so that Cambodians receive a greater share of the benefits.

¹ The ADI project provides training in research and analysis for the Cambodian staff of local and international NGOs. The ADI project operates under the auspices of the Cooperation Committee for Cambodia (CCC).

Even though the distribution of benefits appears to favour outside people and businesses, many people who live in Angkor Park have in fact benefited from the tourism industry in terms of wage labour and small-scale trade. Such benefits, however, are not evenly distributed across all the villages in Angkor Park, as the location of one's village is a significant factor influencing people's employment in Siem Reap or Angkor Park. For example, people living closer to Siem Reap and along roads are more likely to work in the construction industry there than people who live further away. At the same time, people who live in villages along the roads near temples and markets are more likely to be engaged in handicraft sales or operate small-scale businesses that cater to tourists. Also, people who live in Angkor Park are much more likely to work there than people from outside the park, in large part because of Apsara's² preferential employment policy for park residents.

The exceptions to this general pattern suggest that village circumstances (e.g., land use and ownership patterns) and population shifts, also play an important role in determining who works or trades in the tourist industry. In some villages, people who have sold their land must now rely on wage labour for their primary source of livelihood. In the future, there is a real danger that unchecked population growth from natural birth rates and in-migration may exert unsustainable pressures on the local ecology, thus intensifying landlessness and social conflicts. Such pressures could eventually undermine the efforts of government agencies and NGOs to reduce poverty and the undesirable social impacts of tourism in the Siem Reap area.

Social networks also play an important role in helping people find employment and trade opportunities. People reported that they often found jobs through friends or relatives, paid middlemen a fee, or other people a bribe, to help them find jobs. Some people have found jobs in Angkor Park as a result of information or contacts provided by NGO staff. Conversely, people who had not found jobs often said that they lacked social connections or were unable or unwilling to pay such fees. Social relationships also played a role in helping people start up small businesses in Angkor Park. Vendors who were located near some of the busier temples also reported that they paid police a monthly fee, which enabled them to continue their

² The Autorite pour la Protection du Site et l'Amenagement de la Region d'Angkor (Apsara) was established in 1994 in order to preserve and protect the Angkor Wat World Heritage Site.

business on a preferred spot. They also often obtained start-up capital from friends and relatives. In this sense, both the labour and petty trade markets appear to be largely governed through informal social networks.

Location also appears to play a significant role in terms of the social impact of tourism. Those villages located along roads or near markets and popular temple sites reported a greater number of children who were engaged in selling handicrafts or other items to tourists than those villages located somewhat further away. However, it is not clear how many of these children may have actually dropped out of school for this reason. For example, some children may not continue with school beyond primary level anyway due to the fact that secondary schools are located some distance from their village. A recent CDRI study ³ also cites several reports indicating that the sex industry has grown significantly as a result of tourism. One report suggests that a number of children in the Angkor Park area have been approached for sex by certain tourists. Many of these children may have been those who were selling handicrafts or working in food stalls, or otherwise away from family supervision.

Officials at both Apsara and the provincial government are committed to increasing the share of tourism benefits for people living in and around Angkor Park and reducing the negative impacts of tourism. For example, Apsara has adopted a policy of preferential employment for people who live in Angkor Park, while the provincial government is studying ways to help local farmers sell more of their agricultural produce for the tourist markets. At the same time, both Apsara and the provincial government face certain constraints in implementing their policies effectively. Many people who live in Angkor Park appear to be unaware of the role and regulations of Apsara, and the provincial government is faced with a growing list of responsibilities associated with providing services and security in support of tourism without corresponding increases in their operating budgets.

Recommendations

The ADI researchers believe that the Royal Government of Cambodia, including Apsara and the provincial government of Siem Reap, and civil society organizations can promote positive benefits while reducing the negative consequences of rapid growth in the tourism industry

³ CDRI, Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia – 2001.

through pro-active planning and close collaboration. The following policy recommendations are made in the spirit of promoting such cooperation.

Employment and Trade: Government and NGOs should work together to design and then implement a “Cambodia First” policy that directs a greater share of tourism benefits to people who live in Angkor Park and the areas surrounding Siem Reap. Government agencies and NGOs should:

- help farmers increase their production of better quality agricultural products, including vegetables and meat, to sell in the tourist sector (e.g. hotels and restaurants). This would require more studies concerning the markets for such products, as well extension services to provide farmers with knowledge and information about how to produce such products.
- provide vocational and literacy training as well as job placement services for people seeking employment. This would require more studies concerning the labour markets in and around Siem Reap, especially the construction and service sectors.
- make more low-cost credit available to help people start or maintain small business enterprises, as well as produce and market new or better agricultural and handicraft products.

Social Impact: Government agencies and NGOs should work together to:

- promote school attendance among children who may otherwise leave school in order to work in tourist related activities. The recent example of Apsara’s rules restraining the mobility of child vendors is a good example of the positive role authorities can play in this regard. More effort is required to enable parents to participate in the development of appropriate responses to the problems associated with school attendance.

- promote public safety awareness among children, parents, and community leaders about problems associated with sexual advances and other inappropriate behaviour on the part of tourists or others.
- stabilize population growth in Angkor Park. Apsara and provincial officials should consider ways to regulate in-migration to Angkor Park. NGOs and the relevant government agencies should introduce family planning techniques to help reduce natural birth rates, and provide information about ways to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS and other STDs among people in the Siem Reap area.

Environmental Impact: Government and NGOs should explore ways to help people increase food production and income with minimal negative affects on the natural environment. One successful example of this has been APDO's ⁴ efforts to introduce in some villages new fuel-efficient stoves for producing palm sugar. In the future, farmers will need to adapt more efficient and environmentally friendly ways of increasing, vegetable, and livestock production. The introduction of irrigation infrastructure, where feasible and appropriate, along with Sustainable Agriculture (SA) techniques will help in this regard.

Governance: Apsara should pro-actively provide more information about its role so that people who live in the Angkor Park have (a) a better understanding of the rules, regulations, and enforcement provisions, *and* (b) opportunities to participate, as appropriate, in the development and implementation of such rules and regulations. NGOs can play an active role in promoting constructive dialogue between Apsara and the people who live in Angkor Park.

Apsara should also consider ways to formally regulate the vendor trade in Angkor Park according to clear and objective criteria so that vendors are aware of the rules and proper enforcement mechanisms. This could include an official licensing process that would involve a modest fee.

⁴ The Angkor Participatory Development Project is a local Cambodian NGO working in several villages in Angkor Park.

In terms of public finance, the government should consider ways to allocate a greater share of tourism revenue to the provincial government, which provides public services and security for the tourism industry. Two possible ways to do this are: (a) allocating a greater percentage of the park entrance fee revenue to the provincial government; and (b) allocating a certain percentage of the official vendor licensing fees to the provincial government. A third way to do this would be to allow the provincial government to levy a modest tax on certain business enterprises in Siem Reap. This step, however, would be feasible only in the context of more comprehensive public finance reform. All such efforts should be transparent and fully comply with the laws of the government.

Brett M. Ballard
ADI Project Advisor
24 December 2002

The Impact of the Tourism Industry in Siem Reap on People Who Live in Angkor Park

I. Introduction

The tourism industry is currently one of the fastest growing economic sectors in the world. In Cambodia, as in other countries, tourism forms an integral part of the country's development strategy for attracting foreign direct investment and stimulating people's income earning through new employment and commercial exchange. In rural areas such as Siem Reap, where the Angkor Park World Heritage Site is located, well-governed tourism can have a significant and positive impact on the livelihoods of local people.¹ However, people must have certain skills and access to resources in order to secure meaningful employment and trade opportunities. There must also be effective measures for minimizing the social costs associated with undesirable activities that often accompany rapid growth in tourism.²

Since the late 1990s, the number of international tourists arriving in Cambodia has increased dramatically. In 1996, the number of arrivals totaled 297,000, and in 2000 the number had increased to about 400,000.³ In the first five months of this year, 315,000 tourists had already arrived in the country.⁴ An increasing percentage of these tourists now go to Siem Reap to visit Angkor Wat and other ancient temples as a result of the government's "open skies" policy that allows direct international flights to Siem Reap. For example, the number of tourists arriving directly from Bangkok, Ho Chi Minh City, Vientiane, and Singapore increased by almost 30% over the first five months of 2002 as compared to the same period in 2001.⁵ The Ministry of Tourism estimates that by the year 2005 there will be 1 million foreign tourist arrivals in Siem Reap alone. The number of domestic tourists visiting Siem Reap is also increasing, although the number of arrivals often fluctuates due to the condition of transportation infrastructure.⁶

¹ Son Soubert and Suong Leang Hay (1995) provides an early discussion regarding the potential benefits and problems associated with tourism in Siem Reap.

² The British Department for International Development provides a concise overview of the current debates concerning the role that tourism can play in rural development. See the DFID Key Sheets series, No. 2 (11/97).

³ CDRI, Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia - 2001

⁴ *The Cambodia Daily*, 12 July 2002, pg. 14

⁵ *ibid.* The Khmer language Reaksmei Kampuchea (9-10 September 2002) also reports that the boarder crossings at O'Smach and Anlong Veng have been recently opened to tourist arrivals from Thailand.

⁶ CDRI, Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia - 2001

In response to the rapid increase in the number of domestic and international tourists, the number of hotels and guesthouses in Siem Reap has increased by 34.2% and 60% respectively compared to the year 2000, and the number of restaurants has increased by 50% since 2000. There are now 75 travel agencies operating in Siem Reap. Such activities have been promoted, in part, by a package of tax incentives introduced by the government to encourage more investment by foreign owned businesses.⁷ These activities have created many new employment and trade opportunities in the construction, transport, and service sectors in Siem Reap. For example, l'Authorite pour la Protection du Site et l'Amenagement de la Region d'Angkor (APSARA)⁸ estimates that perhaps as many as one thousand people from nearby villages have found employment in the construction sector. Apsara itself employs about 800 people as guards, cleaners, renovators and office staff and that as many as 90-95% of the guards and cleaners are from nearby villages. These estimates do not include vendors, tour guides, or people employed in service sectors such as transport, restaurants, and hotels.

Some officials, however, estimate that as much as 70% of the income generated by the tourism industry actually benefits people and businesses outside Cambodia. For example, many of the food products used by hotels and restaurants, as well as various handicrafts and other merchandise sold by local vendors, are imported from Thailand. The transportation sector is predominantly foreign-owned and other services, including tour operators, hotels, and restaurants are also frequently foreign-owned. The remaining 30% of income probably benefits mostly people and businesses in and around Siem Reap, with a smaller share of benefits going to Phnom Penh. Although these estimates are difficult to verify without more comprehensive study, they suggest that only a small portion of the income generated by the tourism industry actually benefits people living in and around Angkor Park.

In terms of other impacts, the tourism trade has also exacerbated various social and environmental problems in the area.⁹ For example, the Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI) cites a recent study that indicates approximately 22% of foreign tourists come to Cambodia for sex.¹⁰ Another report also suggests that more than 70% of children surveyed

⁷ Liberalized Investment Incentives include 9% corporate income tax rate, tax holidays up to 8 years, full import duty exemption, free repatriation of profits, and use of land up to 70 years. Source www.mot.gov.kh.

⁸ See below under Governance

⁹ CDRI, Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia - 2001

¹⁰ Nuon Rithy Niron, Yit Viriya, and Laurence Gray (200), Children's Work, Adults PLayer: Child Sex Tourism, a Problem in Cambodia, cited in CDRI (2001).

around Angkor Park and nearby communities said that tourists had approached them for sex.¹¹ The CDRI report also observes that environmental pollution as a result of uncollected trash and poor sanitation facilities is on the rise in and around Siem Reap. Other NGO researchers also report that the drop-out rate has increased in some villages as children leave school to sell handicrafts and work in food stalls.¹² Such problems are encouraged by the rapid growth in tourism, but the root causes are primarily associated with rural poverty and a lack of effective public policies and financial resources.

The above discussion raises many questions concerning the scope, scale, and nature of tourism's impact on people who live in and around Angkor Park. For example, how are the economic benefits associated with new employment opportunities distributed among the people in Angkor Park? What factors might influence or determine how people benefit from tourism? Moreover, what are the social consequences of large-scale tourism for people who live so close to the major tourist attractions? Unfortunately, the ability of government, donors, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to plan and then implement strategies designed to direct a greater share of tourism benefits to local people, while minimizing undesirable social effects, is compromised by a lack of information about the current trends in the local labor and trade markets as well as the nature and scale of certain social impacts.

II. Objectives and Research Questions

The primary purpose of this study, therefore, is to develop a better understanding of how people in Angkor Park are affected by the tourism industry so that government agencies, donors, and NGOs may better plan and target development assistance in the future. A second goal has been to provide the ADI research trainees with an opportunity to observe and then analyze how local people anywhere can be affected by large-scale external changes in their economic and social environment. Generally speaking, then, the research provides some insight into how people who are accustomed to traditional means of livelihoods are increasingly integrated into labour and small-scale commercial markets that emerge as a result of economic development in or around their communities. The specific objectives of the research were:

¹¹ Los Angeles Times, 12.December 2000, cited in CDRI, Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia - 2001

¹² Ly Thydeth, "Children Drop-outs Selling Handicrafts in Angkor Park," ADI Course Break Assignment research project, June 2002.

- to understand the economic and social affects of the tourism industry on people who live in Angkor Park;
- to understand how the management and governance of Angkor Park affects people who live there;
- to identify feasible policy and programming recommendations for government agencies and other organizations working in communities affected by tourism;
- and to identify questions and topics for follow-up research in areas affected by large-scale tourism development.

In order to achieve these objectives, the ADI team focused on the following key questions to guide their field research:

- How have people's employment and other income generating activities been affected by the tourism industry?
- How have land ownership and land use patterns been affected in villages located in Angkor Park?
- What are the social consequences of the tourism industry on people who live in Angkor Park?
- What are the roles and policies of the Apsara Authority and the Provincial government in terms of governing Angkor Park and the surrounding area?

III. Methodology

The research was guided by the general theory that the social organization of employment and agricultural production in villages located in Angkor Park is changing as a result of economic development in Siem Reap. More specifically, the research hypothesized that land use patterns within Angkor Park are changing as a result of Apsara rules governing access to natural resources as well as emerging land markets in the region, and that as result people will increasingly diversify their occupations and income sources in response to the availability of new employment and trade opportunities in Angkor Park and Siem Reap town. The research assumed that the recent growth in the tourism industry in Siem Reap is likely to continue for the foreseeable future, and that government agencies and NGOs can play a key role in shaping the balance between positive and negative consequences for people who live in the area.

The methodology used in the research and analysis was comparative in the sense that the experiences and perceptions of people in one village were compared to those of other villages in order to identify major factors that influenced how people in Angkor Park are affected by the tourism industry. In order to analyze the meaning of and relationships between such factors, one of the key analytic tasks was to identify similarities and differences across the village sample in terms of village circumstances (e.g. location, resources) and experiences (e.g. development activities, population changes). This particular approach was decided upon partly for teaching purposes, and partly for logistical reasons given the time constraints that limited the actual number of household interviews that could be completed. Of the 20 villages located in Angkor Park, the ADI trainees visited nine villages during two days of fieldwork, four of which served as pre-test sites for the interview questionnaires on the first day.

The research trainees used semi-structured questionnaires to collect quantitative and qualitative data from three different sources at the village level: household interviews; focal group discussions; and village chief interviews. Households were selected according to a purposive random sample in which rich and poor families were chosen from lists prepared in advance by the village chief. Focal group discussions in six villages were organized by gender in order to assess the differences, if any, between the experiences and impressions of men and women. We also wanted to ensure that women had ample opportunity to express themselves, as men often tend to dominate such discussions in mixed groups. In each village, a team of two trainees also interviewed the village chief and/or members of the village development committee (VDC). These interviews were designed to obtain statistical data about village population and resources as well as information about governance. (See Table 1, appendix)

One ADI team also interviewed an official from Apsara as well as the Provincial governors office. These two officials provided an important perspective concerning governance in Angkor Park from the level of policy planning and implementation. At a different level, a team of two trainees interviewed 15 vendors who sell handicrafts or operate food stalls in the park. These interviews provided a good opportunity to talk with people where they work and learn more about the constraints and opportunities they face in operating small business enterprises in Angkor Park.

Limitations

The small number of household interviews that could feasibly be completed in two days does not constitute a truly representative sample of the total households in Angkor Park. In this sense, the findings based on this set of interviews are not fully generalizable for the entire population. Rather, the observations based on these interviews are indicative, and are useful for suggesting certain possible trends as well as identifying potential areas for follow up study. This limitation is somewhat mitigated by incorporating the information from the village chief interviews and focal group discussions into the analysis.

The study focused primarily on employment and trade. As for social impacts, the ADI team had to limit itself because of time constraints to questions about school attendance in order to assess the degree to which children may be dropping out of school in order to sell handicrafts or work in food stalls. In terms of environmental impacts, the ADI team inquired about people's impressions of how Apsara rules and regulations affected their access to and use of land and nearby and forests. It was not at all possible to assess the degree to which the local environment has actually been affected by tourism.

The ADI team was able to interview several vendors located in different locations, but was unable to interview other service providers such as tour guides or *moto-taxi* drivers. The ADI team was also unable to interview children who sell handicrafts or work in food stalls. Finally, the ADI team was not able to interview police who appear to play a prominent role in providing security and regulating market activity in Angkor Park.

IV. Findings and Analysis

The main findings from the research are discussed below. The section on Employment and Trade focuses on factors that influence people's income opportunities: village location, social relationships, and village circumstances (i.e. land use patterns and in-migration). The section on Social Impact focuses primarily on school attendance, with a brief reference to the division of labour between men and women. The section on Governance focuses on people's understanding of the role of Apsara and their perceptions of the rules governing Angkor Park, and includes a brief discussion of the role of the provincial government.

Employment and Trade

Many people¹³ who reside in Angkor Park have benefited from the tourism industry, primarily in terms of employment and small-scale trade. However, the economic impact of tourism on local people depends a great deal on the location of their village. Generally speaking, more people in villages located along roads or near temples appear to receive economic benefits in terms of income from employment or small-scale trade, or both, than do people in more distant villages. Even though some people who lived in more distant villages reported finding construction jobs in Siem Reap or other jobs in Angkor Park, they did not have as many opportunities to engage directly in petty trade because of their location. Some of these households, however, reported making handicrafts and selling some local produce for tourists.

The role of village location as a factor of employment in Angkor Park is understandable given Apsara's preferential hiring policies for park residents. It is also understandable in the construction sector as people who live in villages closer to Siem Reap are able to travel there more easily, and may already have at least some experience in this new urban environment. This is especially evident in Tek Sean, which is located next to Siem Reap town. Nearly all the households there have at least one family member working in Siem Reap. In fact, people have become so deeply integrated into the local labour markets that nearly everyone in the village has sold their agricultural land to outside buyers. The other village closest to Siem Reap, Kravan, also has many people working in the construction industry in Siem Reap. The village chief there said that 30-40 people are working as wage labourers and park guards.

These numbers appear to drop off in some of the further villages according to the village chief interviews. In Rohal, about 5-6 people work in construction and 6-7 are employed by Apsara in the park. In Pradak, about 20 people work outside the village; and in Thnol Toteung about 20% of the families have someone working outside the village, though it is not entirely clear what portion of these have tourist-related employment. Meanwhile, there were very few reports of any outside employment in Arak Svay, which is located some distance from away from Siem Reap and is off the main road.

The two cases of Kok Thnaot and Nokor Krauv, however, suggest that location is not the only factor that influences how or where one finds employment or trade opportunities. In Kok Thnaot,

which is located several kilometers west of Angkor Thom, the village chief indicated that as many as 150 people – mostly young people (and 50% women) - work in construction and as park guards, and that this number is increasing each year. The village chief in Nokor Krauv, located several kilometers north of Angkor Thom, also reported that as many as 80% of the households have a family member working in construction in Siem Reap, while 30% of households also have a family member working in Angkor Park. It appears we must also look at other factors that may influence employment patterns among the villages in Angkor Park.

A second important factor concerns the role that social relationships play in helping people navigate their way through the tourist-related labour markets. People most often learn about jobs through friends and relatives, or in the case of employment in the park, sometimes through Apsara staff or village officials. In Kok Thnaot, the village chief said people paid money to middlemen to help them find jobs. In some cases, construction contractors, or their agents, went to villages to inform people about the availability of jobs. NGOs and other organizations may also play a role, as several people indicated they had heard about jobs from APDO staff.¹⁴ In response to a question concerning problems they had finding jobs, three household respondents each in Pradak, Thnol Toteung, and Nokor Krauv indicated that they lacked connections with family or friends who could help them find employment.¹⁵

Learning about the availability of jobs is one thing, however; actually getting the job is another matter. For example, in Nokor Krauv, several men said they tried to find jobs on their own, and sometimes they were successful and sometimes not. The village chief there said that people got their jobs through the party affiliations or bribes, while a few got jobs “fairly.” Several people also indicated that they did “not know how to find jobs” and could not afford to pay the necessary fees to middlemen or bribes to company staff or contractors. It appears, then, that labour markets in and around Angkor Park are governed by various kinds of social networks according to informal rules and regulations. In some cases friends and relatives play important

¹³ According to Apsara Authority, there are 43 villages with a total population of 57,267 in Zone 1.

¹⁴ The Angkor Participatory Development Project is a local Cambodian NGO working in several villages in Angkor Park.

¹⁵ A study of the Angkor Clearing and Cleaning Project (ACCP) by the International Labour Organization and the Ministry of Rural Development indicated that 68% of respondents said they found work in the ACCP through friends and relatives. Project staff contacted some workers directly (21%) and the rest were informed through various sources. The study covered the project period of 1992-1998.

roles, and in other cases people must rely on cash transactions involving fees for middlemen or bribes for potential employers.¹⁶

A similar picture emerges regarding people who were engaged in small-scale trade (e.g., handicraft sales, food stalls). For example, one household respondent in Tek Sean complained that people with family members who were police or officials were able to establish small businesses more easily. If one did not have relatives or other types of social connections, it was necessary to pay police fees for operating a small business. This assessment was confirmed by the vendors who were interviewed for this study. Of the 15 who were interviewed, only one said that they had not paid the police any money. The others reported paying various amounts each month, mostly in the range of \$5-10 per month. However, in response to a question concerning difficulties they faced, none of the vendors cited these fees as an obstacle that prevented them operating their small business. Rather, it was considered part of the ongoing operating expenses. It also appeared that at least some vendors felt they were benefiting from certain services that the police provided, such as protection and security.

Another major obstacle for vendors concerned the lack of capital with which to open a stall and acquire merchandise or food for sale. All of the respondents except one reported that they had to borrow money from one source or another, including neighbours, relatives, and in one case, the Aceda Bank, in order to start their business. Most of the vendors also said they had to acquire merchandise on credit from suppliers in Siem Reap or local producers. All of the vendors said they owned their own stall, except for one who rented the space. This suggests that people must rely primarily on social connections in order to secure sufficient capital with which to start up a small business. It also suggests that people who are able to start up small businesses may be somewhat better off initially than most other people in their villages.

Location and social relationships therefore seem to play a significant role in influencing who benefits from tourism in terms of employment and trade opportunities. There is also a third factor that requires some consideration, namely that of village circumstances and certain social characteristics. The two most relevant factors identified in this context concern land use patterns and population growth.

¹⁶ Several respondents cited “no skill” or “illiteracy” as further obstacles to finding employment.

Land Use Patterns

One of the most consistent observations across all of the villages was the impression that land use patterns had not appreciably changed over the past several years in terms of the amount of village land classified as rice, *chamcar*, and forest. All of the village chiefs indicated that this was because Apsara's rules and regulations have more or less prevented people from expanding the amount of land used for rice cultivation and *chamcar* plantations, as well as limited people's ability to harvest forest products, such as rattan and various resins (e.g. *chor chheu*). Moreover, people are not allowed to cut firewood or make charcoal in Angkor Park.

Land use and ownership patterns, however, are in fact changing in several villages where both the price of land and the number of transactions have been increasing recently. In Tek Sean, as noted above, some residents said that nearly all the families have sold their agricultural land to outside buyers, while retaining their residential plots. In effect, the people of Tek Sean have switched out of agriculture in favour of wage labour in tourist-related employment in Siem Reap. These families were motivated to sell their land by the rapidly increasing land prices in the area, as well as a belief in the continued growth of tourism that guarantees jobs for the foreseeable future. In Nokor Krauv, where 11% of the households do not have land, the village chief reported that a high number of people are seeking construction jobs and other forms of employment in Siem Reap. Families there are selling their land for distress reasons, and employment in Siem Reap may only be enabling these families to maintain subsistence level livelihoods. In Tek Sean, families are making more calculated and deliberate land transactions that may help them advance up the socio-economic ladder a rung or two.

In some villages, farming has been intensified on current land holdings as a result of the introduction of small-scale irrigation technology. The effects of irrigation, however, vary from one village to another. In Nokor Krauv, competition over scarce productive land resources appears to be increasing, and is played out in terms of distress sales, and – in some cases - land-grabbing. But in Kok Thnaot, Pradak, and Thnol Toteung, all of which have small-scale irrigation systems, the number of land transactions has not increased significantly recently. In Thnol Toteung, where people are otherwise not so actively engaged in the tourist industry, land continues to be the primary source of family livelihoods. In Pradak, the same is true despite the fact that many people are engaged in selling handicrafts and other local products to tourists. In

Kok Thnaot, there are some land transactions, but they involve people selling land to one another within the village and the price has not changed.

One possible explanation for such variations is that in the two most distant villages, Thnol Toteung and Pradak, there is sufficient land for most people to produce at least some rice, as well as opportunities for people to earn additional money from handicrafts sales and other products to supplement household incomes. As a result, people may not yet feel compelled to make the long trips to Siem Reap or within Angkor Park in search employment. Moreover, many people in Thnol Toteung appear to have continued with traditional means of earning income from cutting firewood and selling charcoal. The only difference is that they no longer do this in their own village because of the Apsara rules. Rather, they now travel further away to Banteay Sre and even more distant Phnom Kkulen to cut firewood and collect charcoal for sale in Siem Reap. In this sense, while Apsara has indeed been effective in terms of reducing de-forestation *within* Angkor Park, the net effect is that the ecological problems associated with cutting firewood or making charcoal have been exported outside the park boundaries.

Population Pressures

It is also important to consider the population pressures on the local ecology associated with natural birth rates and increasing in-migration. In effect, the Apsara rules and regulations have locked in place the amount of land that can be cultivated for rice, while reducing or eliminating *chamcar* production and access to nearby forests. As a result, increasing population relative to fairly constant rice production (excepting for the irrigation) and limited access to forest products may be pushing a number of people into the labour markets. This is probably most evident in Kok Thnaot where existing land is increasingly being sub-divided to accommodate the growing number of young families, which ultimately reduces the amount of land each family has to cultivate. Under these circumstances, young people are now joining the labour markets in order to maintain a certain level of livelihood.

In terms of in-migration, the most visible impact was observed in Tek Sean village. Both the village chief and a women's focal group indicated that over the past several years as many as seventy families have migrated from elsewhere in Siem Reap province, or other provinces, and occupied public land along some of the village roads. In this sense, this may be one of the first squatter settlements to appear in Siem Reap as a result of the tourist industry. These migrants

have come to Siem Reap in search of jobs in the construction industry or other forms of employment. The women in the focal group believe this has caused public health problems, and some expressed worries about security. They also said that the village chief or the VDC was not able to do anything to resolve this problem, though they felt that these people would move if and when Apsara needed the space, perhaps for road construction.

There is also some evidence of increasing in-migration in other villages, though not on the scale observed in Tek Sean. At least some of this migration may be attributed to the employment and trade opportunities associated with the tourist industry. For example, in Nokor Krauv the village chief said that ten families had migrated there recently from Kompong Cham and Phnom Penh in order to earn money. In Kravan, the village chief said that ten families, who had once lived in the village, had now returned in order to find jobs in the tourism industry. In Pradak, the village chief knew of three families (one each from Kompong Cham, Phnom Penh, and Siem Reap) that had migrated there in order to earn money from the tourist trade.

Not all migration is related to the tourist trade, though. For example, two families have migrated to Thnol Toteung from Svay Rieng. They buy and sell fish in the local markets as their main occupation. Meanwhile, there are no reports of recent in-migration for any reason in Kok Thnaot, Kok Beng, and Arak Svay. It is interesting to observe that two of these villages, Thnol Toteung and Arak Svay are also the least affected by tourism in terms of a number of other factors. In Kok Thnaot, which is also more distant, the scarcity of productive land resources may also inhibit people from migrating to this area.

Summary

The research affirms at least the basic premise of the original hypothesis; namely, that land use in certain villages within Angkor Park is changing as a result of Apsara rules governing access to natural resources as well as emerging land markets in the region. As a result, people are seeking new employment and trade opportunities in Angkor Park and Siem Reap in order to diversify their occupations and income sources. These trends are likely to continue, especially if in-migration and natural birth rates increase population pressures on land resources. This is especially so in the case of Tek Sean, Nokor Krauv, and Kok Thnaot. These and other cases, however, suggest that factors such as location and social connections must also be included in any analysis of how people in Angkor Park are affected by the tourism industry in Siem Reap.

Social Impact

There is no doubt that tourism has had a significant social impact on people living in and around Angkor Park. For example, several studies, as noted above, have observed that sex trafficking is increasing in conjunction with the tourist industry. Another study by a former ADI trainee has also documented some of the social consequences of sex tourism in one village in Angkor Park.¹⁷ The CDRI study referred to above raises the spectre of sex tourism contributing to the spread of HIV/AIDS and other STDs in areas affected by tourism, including Siem Reap. Certainly more study and action is required in order to reduce sex trafficking and the possible spread of HIV/AIDS related to tourism.

As for other social impacts, some children in Kravan were observed to be dropping out of school in order to sell handicrafts to tourists.¹⁸ In this sense, the ADI team also looked at school attendance in order to assess how tourism might be affecting children in other villages. Another important social impact concerns the apparent division of labour in tourism-related employment and trade activities according to gender. Though this was not a specific objective of the research, some general observations about the potential implications of such a division of labour are discussed.

School Attendance

Village location appears to play at least some role in the case of school drop out rates associated with children selling handicrafts. For example, in Pradak village, which is situated along the road to Banteay Sre temple, the village chief reported that as many as fifty children who had dropped out of school over the past two years are now selling handicrafts to tourists. The men's focal group in Pradak also indicated that more children were engaged in selling handicrafts, but also suggested that the increase in numbers did not necessarily represent an increase in school drop-outs. They observed that children could attend school near the village until grade six, at which time they would have to go to Siem Reap in order to continue their studies. As a result, some older children who sell handicrafts may have stopped going to school because of the distance and expenses – like many children elsewhere - and not just solely because of the opportunity to earn

¹⁷ Nop Sarin Srey Roth, "Livelihood Responses of Women and Children in the Tourism Industry," ADI Course Break Assignment research project, 16 June 2002.

¹⁸ Ly Thydeth, cited above.

money from tourists. It also appears that some children who attend school also sell handicrafts when not in class. Therefore, it is not entirely clear how many of these children have dropped out of school over the past two years for the specific reason of selling handicrafts.

In Nokor Krauv, which is located north of the Angkor Thom complex, the village chief estimated that 5% of the children had dropped out of school to sell handicrafts. The women's focal group also suggested that there were as many as 20 families with children who had dropped out of school to sell handicrafts. However, among the household informants the number of children dropping out of school to sell charcoal, tend animals, or help with rice farming was greater than the number of those children who were selling handicrafts. This suggests that the problems associated with school drop out rates cannot be attributed solely to tourism, but rather to the realities of poverty in which children are an important source of labour and income in the household production system. For example, in Rohal, where there were few drop-out problems reported, the village chief observed that many children were engaged in handicraft production while not attending school. If this is the case, then handicraft sales to tourists represent another, albeit more attractive, alternative for some children to contribute to their family's income.

In other villages, including Thnol Toteung, Kok Thnaot, Arak Svay, and Kok Beng, neither the village chiefs, the focal groups, nor the household informants indicated there were any problems linking school drop-out rates with handicraft sales. While these villages appeared to be similar to the other villages in terms of economic circumstances, they are all located at least some distance away from the main road or markets, as well as from any of the frequently visited temples in Angkor Park. It seems, then, that location and distance may play an important role in terms of providing children with access to handicraft markets.

The case of Tek Sean is interesting in this respect, as it is one of the most significantly impacted villages in the entire park given its proximity to Siem Reap town. It is, however, located some distance away from the temples themselves, and is not located on the main road. Although this may help explain why there were no reports of children dropping out of school to sell handicrafts to tourists, another factor may be related to household resources. Some families may be somewhat better off as a result of steady employment in Siem Reap, and therefore more willing and able to send their children to school. In terms of follow-up study, it would be useful to look

at the relationship between household income levels and school drop-outs associated with handicraft sales in villages located near tourist markets.

Even though village location does in fact seem to play a significant role in influencing school-drop rates related to handicrafts sales, there may also be other reasons why the ADI team did not find much evidence linking school-drop rates to handicraft sales and other tourist related activities. One possible explanation concerns the fact that Apsara has tried to prevent people from moving around in the park and near temples to sell handicrafts and other items. As a result, the role of children as mobile vendors may have been reduced by this regulation. Finally, it is also possible that village officials and parents did not wish to discuss such sensitive matters with people from outside the community. After all, the researcher in the Kravan study was known by the people in Kravan and perhaps more trusted with such information.

The Division of Labour Between Men and Women

The division of labour, at least in certain types of activities, appears to be a function of gender. Among the interview respondents, men held nearly all the construction jobs in Siem Reap as well as temple renovation jobs in the park, while two-thirds of the vendor operators were female. However, based on observations and discussions in the field, there seems to be a greater mix between men and women in terms of employment by Apsara for cleaning and grounds maintenance jobs in the park.¹⁹ Not surprisingly, some women indicated that child-care represented a significant obstacle limiting employment options, particularly with respect to potential employment in Siem Reap or further away from home within Angkor Park. It also appears that low literacy rates among women, especially young adults, may also limit their employment options in Siem Reap. Several men also mentioned a lack of literacy as a factor that limited their employment options.

The fact that many park workers and vendors are female suggest that women are now playing a greater role in terms of household income. It is interesting to note that the income earned by the vendors who were interviewed is used to supplement household incomes in about half of the families whose primary occupation is either rice farming or wage labour, and in one case, a teacher. The other half reported that their primary occupations and sources of income involved

¹⁹ The ILO/MRD study concerning the ACCP interviewed 66 workers: 36 of whom were women, and 30 were men. However, the study does not provide overall employment figures for women and men during the project period.

small-scale trade, which suggests that a number of vendors may now depend almost entirely on the tourist industry for their main source of livelihood. The income earned varied from one vendor to the next in the range of \$3-20 per day. Not surprisingly, monthly income also varied according to seasonal fluctuations in the number of tourists: income declines during the rainy season when there are fewer tourists, and increases during the dry season when the number of tourists peaks. It would seem that any such fluctuations in income would be most difficult for single women heads of household to manage.

Because the sample size in this study was so small, more comprehensive surveys are needed in order to better understand the patterns and trends in the labour markets pertaining to men and women. More study is also required to understand the social implications of such patterns and trends. For example, what are the implications for women in terms of managing the household while their husbands are away working in Siem Reap or elsewhere? What are the implications for child care and school attendance when parents work away from home? Another important question concerns the potential problems associated with the possibility of people working away from home in Siem Reap eventually spreading HIV/AIDS or other STDs back to their families and communities. While there is no evidence of this from our study, observations in other parts of the country suggest this is a real possibility, especially in an area where the sex industry appears to be expanding as a result of tourism.

Governance: The Role of Apsara and the Provincial Government

Angkor Park is protected by the Royal Government of Cambodia under the authority of the Superior Council for National Culture. The *Autorite pour la Protection du Site et l'Aménagement de la Région d'Angkor* (Apsara) was established in 1994 in order to preserve and protect the Angkor Wat World Heritage Site. The activities of Apsara include the restoration and protection of the temples, as well as the conservation of natural resources and cultural traditions within the boundaries of the 400 km² area of the park. Apsara is also responsible for the maintenance and up-keep of park grounds. Apsara is governed by an inter-ministerial board, which is designed to promote coordination and cooperation across the various ministries concerned with various aspects of park management.²⁰

²⁰ The board consists of a representative from the Council of Ministers, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Finance and Economy, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning, and Construction, Ministry of Public Works and Transport, as well as the Provincial Governor of Siem Reap, a representative from Apsara, and an advisor from the Royal Government who liaises with Apsara.

Apsara is financed by park entrance fees collected from foreign tourists by Sokimex, a private company. According to their agreement, if the fees total \$2 million, or less, per year the two parties divide the income equally, but if the total fees are more than \$2 million per year, then Apsara will receive a 70% share. However, the income does not go directly to Apsara, but rather goes first the Ministry of Finance, which manages the national budget. Eighty percent of the Apsara budget is used for administration and salaries, protection and conservation activities, and the development of the Borei Angkor area.²¹ Fifteen percent of the budget goes to the provincial tourism office, and the remaining 5 percent goes to the provincial cultural department. Apsara provides salary supplements of \$10 per month to the park police who are under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Interior.

The framework for regulating economic activities and their spatial implications is set in the law for L'Aménagement du Territoire. Under the overall supervision of a National Committee, the Provincial Governor is responsible for enforcing the law through a Provincial Sub-Committee. On the provincial level the co-ordination of development activities and the enforcement of the Royal decree on the Zoning and Management of Angkor lie with the Governor, who liaises with the technical agencies of the Royal Government as required.²² The Governor, along with the Provincial Department of Rural Development leads a provincial committee that oversees rural development activities province-wide, including the areas around Angkor Park and Siem Reap town.

The Provincial Government also plays an important role in terms of managing many of the changes associated with the increase in tourism fall to the provincial government. For example, the local authorities must provide public services such as electricity, clean drinking water, and sanitation. The authorities must also deal with problems associated with crime, sex trafficking, and other aspects of public security. The added responsibilities associated with the increase in tourism raise important issues associated with public finance and development planning. The provincial administration does not appear to have any mechanism for collecting taxes or fees from service providers that could be used to finance the increased responsibilities. The provincial

²¹ Apsara has designated approximately one thousand hectares for the future development of a “Cite Touristique d’Angkor,” located several kilometers northeast of Siem Reap town.

²² This information is contained in an APDO briefing document.

government also appears not to have received sufficient resources from the national government commensurate with its increased responsibilities for managing the public impact of tourism in Siem Reap. As for development planning, the provincial governor's office is considering ways to stimulate agricultural production for the tourist markets. This represents a significant step in the direction of helping more local people benefit from tourism, but the implementation of any such policies will require significant levels of support, both technical and financial, from a variety of sources.

Perhaps one of the most interesting findings concerned the large number of people who appeared to be unaware of Apsara's roles and responsibilities. This was somewhat surprising given the fact that Apsara plays such an important role in formulating and then implementing rules and regulations that directly affect the lives of people who live and work in Angkor Park. While many interviewees expressed at least vague impressions of what Apsara did, they were not at all sure of Apsara's role. For example, many people could name one or two things that Apsara did, with temple renovation and security high on the list, along with restriction on the access to and use of forest resources. However, ten out of 14 people interviewed in Pradak responded that they did not know who Apsara was or where it came from. Nor did they know about Apsara rules and regulations. In Kok Thnaot, nine of fifteen interviewees indicated they did not know about Apsara, while one person said they had heard about Apsara but did not know any of the rules. The remaining three said the main role of Apsara was temple protection and that a soldier had told them not cut wood in the forest.

There are several possible reasons for the public's apparent lack of awareness of Apsara. First, Apsara – contrary to our initial assumptions – may actually play a somewhat insignificant role in the lives of many of the people who were interviewed. For example, a large percentage of respondents indicated that they did not perceive themselves as benefiting from Apsara, unless they or a family member had job in the park. Some of the village chiefs also made this observation, saying the people who benefited from Apsara were those who had jobs with Apsara. At the same time, many respondents also frequently indicated that they had not experienced any problems with Apsara. The only problems people mentioned concerned rules preventing them from cutting wood or harvesting forest products. These perspectives constitute a rather narrow view of benefits and problems, which suggests that if people are not directly affected one way or another, they are not aware of, or concerned about, Apsara. In this sense, it appears people may

not necessarily consider how Apsara might affect other people, or the general public. If so, it may have important implications for good governance in Angkor Park.

Second, the way that information about Apsara has been disseminated may also affect people's perceptions of it. Apsara has used workshops and television broadcasts as the primary ways of informing people about their work. Some meetings have in fact been held in which Apsara teams informed village chiefs and others about the rules and regulations. It is then left to the village authorities to explain to people about the rules and regulations. However, in at least one village the chief indicated he had never attended any of these meetings, and that he was not sure of the role of Apsara. In several villages, the village chiefs did have meetings with some people in which Apsara rules and regulations were discussed, but it not clear how many people attended such meetings. For example, in Thnol Toteung, eleven out of fifteen respondents reported they had not participated in any kind of extension or information meetings concerning Apsara. Most people living in Angkor Park also do not have access to television. It appears that most people who know about Apsara hear about it by word of mouth from neighbors, friends, relatives, or police and others.

Third, the way the rules and regulations are actually formulated and then implemented may also help explain why people do not seem to be aware of Apsara. In this sense, many of the rules and regulations are developed elsewhere and then left to Apsara for implementation. There does not appear to be any mechanisms for consultation between the rule-making authorities, those responsible for implementing the rules, and those actually subject to the rules. Without any means of consulting with people or their village leaders (or VDCs), there is no formal route for feedback into the management system governing Angkor Park. For example, when asked how they could solve any problems they may have with Apsara, some people said that they were afraid to protest to the authorities, some said they might go to the village chief, and others said they might try to resolve a problem by paying someone. Of the three options, going to the village chief is certainly the most appropriate, even though it is not clear what links the village chiefs actually have with Apsara.

Officials of both Apsara and the provincial government felt that the Royal Government's "open skies" policy had played a significant role in promoting the recent growth in tourism in Siem Reap which provided many new job opportunities for local people. However, they estimated that

as much as 70% of the income generated by the tourism industry actually benefits people and businesses outside Cambodia, and expressed some degree of concern about the distribution of benefits from such growth in the future. For example, they observed that large transport companies may eventually crowd *moto-taxi* drivers and other small providers out of the local transport markets. They also expressed concern that an “open borders” policy may enable traders from Thailand to more easily transport food and merchandise to Siem Reap, thus making it more difficult for local farmers to compete in such markets. They also suggested that an open border policy would enable some tourists to only make brief day trips to Siem Reap, thus reducing the potential income for local services providers. In this sense, they observed that security would play an increasingly important role in terms of sustaining the benefits of tourism in the future.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Many people who live in Angkor Park have benefited from the tourism industry in terms of employment and trade opportunities. However, the economic benefits are not evenly distributed across all the villages in Angkor Park. It appears that the location of one's village is a significant factor influencing people's employment in Siem Reap or Angkor Park. For example, people living closer to Siem Reap and along roads are more likely to work in the construction industry in Siem Reap than people who live further away. At the same time, people who live in villages along the roads near temples and markets are more likely to be engaged in handicraft sales or operate small-scale businesses that cater to the tourist trade. Also, people who live in Angkor Park are much more likely to work in Angkor Park than people from outside the park, in large part because of Apsara's preferential employment policy for park residents.

The exceptions to this general pattern suggest that village circumstances (e.g., land use and ownership patterns) and population shifts also play an important role in determining who works or trades in the tourist industry. In some villages, people who have sold their land must now rely on the labour markets for their primary sources of livelihood. In the future, there is a real danger that unchecked population growth from natural birth rates and in-migration may exert unsustainable pressures on the local ecology, thus intensifying landlessness and social conflicts. Such pressures could eventually undermine the efforts of government and civil society organizations to reduce poverty and the undesirable social impacts of tourism.

Social networks also play an important role in helping people find employment and trade opportunities. People reported that they often found jobs through friends or relatives, paid middlemen a fee, or paid other people a bribe, to help them find jobs. Some people have found jobs in Angkor Park as a result of information or contacts provided by NGO staff. Conversely, people who had not found jobs often said that they lacked social connections or were unable or unwilling to pay such fees. Social relationships also played a role in making it easier for people to start up small businesses in Angkor Park. Vendors who were located near some of the busier temples also reported that they paid police a monthly fee, which enabled to continue their business on a preferred spot. They also often obtained start-up capital from friends and relatives. In this sense, both the labour and petty trade markets appear to be largely governed through informal social networks.

Location also appears to play a significant role in terms of the social impact of tourism. Those villages located along roads or near markets and popular temple sites reported a greater number of children who were engaged in selling handicrafts or other items to tourists than those villages located somewhat further away. However, it is not clear how many of these children may have actually dropped out of school for this reason. For example, some children may not have continued school beyond primary level anyway due to the fact that secondary schools are located some distance from their village. As noted above, a recent CDRI study, also sites several reports indicating that the sex industry has grown significantly as a result of tourism. One report suggests that a number of children in the Angkor Park area have been approached for sex by certain tourists.²³ Many of these children may have been those who were selling handicrafts or working in food stalls or otherwise away from family supervision.

Officials at both Apsara and the provincial government are committed to increasing the share of tourism benefits for people living in and around Angkor Park and reducing the negative impacts of tourism. For example, Apsara has adopted a policy of preferential employment for people who live in the park, while the provincial government is studying ways to help local farmers sell more of their agricultural produce for the tourist markets. At the same time, both Apsara and the provincial government face certain constraints in implementing their policies effectively. Many people who live in Angkor Park appear to be unaware of the role and regulations of Apsara, and

²³ Los Angeles Times, 12.December 2000, cited in CDRI, Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia – 2001

the provincial government is faced with a growing list of responsibilities associated with providing services and security in support of tourism without corresponding increases in their operating budgets.

Recommendations

The ADI researchers believe that the Royal Government of Cambodia, including Apsara and the provincial government of Siem Reap, NGOs, and other donors can promote positive benefits, while militating against negative consequences of rapid growth in the tourism industry, through pro-active planning and close collaboration. The following policy recommendations in the areas of employment and trade, governance, and finance are made in the spirit of promoting such cooperation.

Employment and Trade: Government and NGOs should work together to design and then implement a “Cambodia First” policy that directs a greater share of tourism benefits to people who live in Angkor Park and the areas surrounding Siem Reap. Government agencies and NGOs should:

- help farmers produce more agricultural products, including vegetables and meat, to sell in the tourist sector (e.g. hotels and restaurants). This would require more studies concerning the markets for such products, as well extension services to provide farmers with knowledge and information about how to produce such products.
- provide vocational and literacy training as well as job placement services for people seeking employment. This would require more studies concerning the labour markets in and around Siem Reap, especially the construction and service sectors.
- make more low-cost credit available to help people start or maintain small business enterprises, as well as produce and market new or better agricultural and handicraft products.

Social Impact: Government agencies and NGOs should work together to:

- discourage children from leaving school in order to work in tourist related activities. The recent example of Apsara's rules restraining the mobility of child vendors is a good example of the positive role authorities can play in this regard. More effort is required to enable parents to participate in the development of appropriate responses to the problems associated with school attendance.
- promote public safety awareness among children, parents, and community leaders about problems associated with sexual advances and other inappropriate behaviour on the part of tourists or others.
- stabilize population growth in Angkor Park. Apsara and provincial officials should consider ways to regulate in-migration to Angkor Park. NGOs and the relevant government agencies should introduce family planning techniques to help reduce natural birth rates, and provide information about ways to prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS and STDs among people in the Siem Reap area.

Environmental Impact: Government and NGOs should explore ways to help people increase food production and income with minimal negative affects on the natural environment. One successful example of this has been APDO's efforts to introduce in some villages new fuel-efficient stoves for producing palm sugar. In the future, farmers will need to adapt more efficient and environmentally friendly ways of increasing rice and vegetable production. The introduction of irrigation infrastructure, where feasible and appropriate, along with Sustainable Agriculture (SA) techniques will help in this regard.

Governance: Apsara should pro-actively provide more information about its role so that people who live in the Angkor Park have (a) a better understanding of the rules, regulations, and enforcement provisions, *and* (b) opportunities to participate, as appropriate, in the development and implementation of such rules and regulations. NGOs can play an active role in promoting constructive dialogue between Apsara and the people who live in Angkor Park.

Apsara should also consider ways to formally regulate the vendor trade in Angkor Park according to clear and objective criteria so that vendors are aware of the rules and proper enforcement mechanisms. This could include an official licensing process that would involve a modest fee.

In terms of public finance, the government should consider ways to allocate a greater share of tourism revenue to the provincial government, which provides public services and security for the tourism industry. Two possible ways to do this are: (a) allocating a greater percentage of the park entrance fee revenue to the provincial government; and (b) allocating a certain percentage of any future official vendor licensing fees to the provincial government. A third way to do this would be to allow the provincial government to levy a modest tax on certain business enterprises in Siem Reap. This step, however, would be feasible only in the context of more comprehensive public finance reform. All such efforts should be transparent and fully comply with the laws of the government.

End Text

Brett M. Ballard
ADI Project Advisor
24 December 2002

VI. References

Cambodia Development Resource Institute, “The Tourism Industry in Cambodia: Performance, Challenges, and Policies,” *Cambodia’s Annual Economic Review – 2001*, Chapter Five, pg. 63-77.

Department for International Development (DFID), *Tourism*, Key Sheets for Development in the Natural Environment No. 2, Diana Carney, ODI Series Editor, November 1997

Kay Kimsong, “International Arrivals to Siem Reap Rise Sharply,” *The Cambodia Daily*, 12 July 2002, pg. 14.

Los Angeles Times, 12.December 2000, cited in CDRI, *Annual Economic Survey of Cambodia - 2001*

Ly Thydeth, “Children Drop-outs Selling Handicrafts in Angkor Park,” ADI Course Break Assignment research project, June 2002.

Ministry of Rural Development and the International Labour Organization, “Impact of Employment Generation in the ILO Supported Angkor Park Clearing and Cleaning Project, 1992-1998,” Socio-Economic Series, 10, August 2002.

Nuon Rithy Niron, Yit Viriya and Lawrence Grey (200), *Children’s Work, Adult’s Play: Child Sex Tourism, A Problem in Cambodia* (Phnom Penh: World Vision-Cambodia). Cited in CDRI, *Cambodia’s Annual Economic Review – 2001*.

Nop Sarin Srey Roth, “Livelihood Responses of Women and Children in the Tourism Industry,” ADI Course Break Assignment research project, 16 June 2002.

Son Soubert and Suong Leang Hay (1995), “Case Study on the Effects of Tourism on Culture and the Environment: Cambodia,” RACAP Series on Culture and Tourism in Asia, No. 3, Bangkok: UNESCO.

VII. Annexes

Table 1: Fieldwork Summary

Village	HH Interviews	Focal Group	Village Chief	Comment
Arak Svay				pre-test
Kok Beng				pre-test
Kok Thnoat	13	men (9)	yes	
Kravan	3		yes	partial visit
Nokor Krauv	15	women (10)	yes	
Pradak	14	men (10)	yes	
Rohal	6	men(10)		pre-test
Teak Sen		women (8)	yes	pre-test
Thnol Toteung	15	women (8)	yes	
Total				

Household Interview

Interviewee Male _____ Female _____ Age _____

Village _____

Commune _____ District _____

Number of People in the Household _____

Please list Children by Gender/Age

How long have you lived in this village?

If less than five years (since the last election in 1998), ask next two questions?

When did you come to this village? Why did you relocate at that time?

What was your primary occupation (source of income) at that time?

Occupation/Employment

What is the primary source of income/livelihood in your family now? What is the secondary source of income/livelihood?

How has your family's livelihood changed over the past two and a half years? Are you able to produce more or less food for your family? Is it enough? Do you earn more money now, or less?

How many family members help earn income for the family? What do they do – where do they work?

Do any family members work outside the village in Siem Reap or elsewhere – what do they do?

Do any family members work in the Angkor Park? What do they do? Are any of them employed by the Apsara Authority?

If any family members work in the Park or Siem Reap as a result of tourism, how do they get their jobs? How much money do they earn each day? About what percentage is this income out of the total family income? If this job stopped, what would they do?

What problems, if any, do members of your family have in terms of finding a job?

If any children in the household work in the Park, such as selling things, how much do they earn each day? About what percentage of household income does this represent?

Has this child (or these children) stopped going to school in order to do this work? Please explain.

(If anybody in the family runs a small business. How much money did they need to start up the business? Where did they get the capital to start up the business?)

Land

How much land does your family own? _____

Has this amount decreased/increased in the past two and a half years? _____ Please explain?

How do you and your family use this land?

How does your family use other land (e.g. forest land) elsewhere around the village?

Has land use changed in any way over the past two and a half years? How has it changed?

Have you bought or sold land in the past two and a half years? Why?

What is the price of land in your village? Has this increased or decreased over the past two and a half years?

Have you or any member of your family been involved with a conflict over land over the past several years? If so, please describe the conflict – who was involved and what was the problem? How was the conflict resolved?

Other Assets

How many head of cattle and buffalo does your family own?

Has this number increased or decreased over the past two and a half years? Why?

Have you bought or sold any large animals during the past two and a half years? Why?

Social Consequences

In general, how else has your family been affected by tourism in the Angkor Park?

Have you or other family members had any problems/benefits as a result of tourism?

How do you think other people in the community have been affected by tourism? What about women and children specifically?

Apsara Authority

Have you ever participated in any extension/information meetings about the role of Apsara and the rules and regulations regarding the Angkor Park?

What do you know about the role of Apsara Authority? And the rules and regulations of Angkor Park?

What benefits do you and your family receive from the rules and regulations? How does this benefit you and your family?

What problems do you and your family experience from the rules and regulations? How does this affect you and you family?

How have you been able to solve any of these problems? Who has helped you?

{Are you or any member of your family employed by the Apsara Authority? If so, what do you do? How much do you earn? How did you or your family member get a job with Apsara Authority?}

Focal Group Discussion

(1) Background

Village _____

Commune _____ District _____

Number of People in the Group _____ Men _____ Women _____

Generally speaking, how has life in your village been affected by the tourism industry in Siem Reap?

How have people in your village benefited from tourism? Please explain?

Have there been any problems associated with tourism? Please explain?

(2) Social/Economic Consequences

In general, how have people in this village been affected by tourism in Angkor Park?

What are the main benefits for people in the village associated with tourism increases?

Who benefits – and why?

Are there any problems for people in the village associated with tourism increases?

Who has problems – and why?

Do many children earn money – such as selling handicrafts or other things in the park? How has this changed over the past two years?

Do many children drop out of school in order to earn money? How has this changed over the past two years?

(2a) Possible Follow-up Questions

Land

How has land use changed in the village over the past two or three years?

Do people buy and sell land in the village? Does this increase over the past two years? Has there been any increase in the number of landless households? (If yes, why?)

Why do people sell the land? Who do they sell land to?

What is the price of land? Does the price of land increase over the past two years? Why?

Have there been any land conflicts in the village over the past two years? Does this increase or decrease? Why are there conflicts – who is involved?

How have these conflicts been solved?

Occupation/employment

Do most people rely on farming and other natural resources for their main source of income, or do they rely on other occupations?

How have people's occupations and incomes changed over the past two years? Why?

How many people work outside the village – who are they, and what do they do? How has this changed over the past two years?

How many people have jobs in Angkor Park – who are they, and what do they do? How has this changed over the past two years?

How do people find jobs outside the village – either in Siem Reap, Angkor Park, or elsewhere? Please explain.

Generally speaking, have household incomes increased/decreased over the past two years? Why?

(3) *Apsara Authority*

What is the role of Apsara Park Authority?

How have you learned about the rules and regulations of Apsara Park Authority? How did people in the village participate in the process of making rules and regulations?

How do the rules/regulations affect people in your village? How do people benefit from these rules and regulations? Who benefits?

Are there any problems? If so, what are they, and who is affected?

If there are ever any problems, how are they solved?

Vendor Interviews

Location _____ Product(s) _____

Man _____ Woman _____ Age _____

Where do you live now? How many years have you lived there?

(Where did you come from? What did you do before? Why did you move?)

What is your family's main occupation and source of income?

Do you or you family own this stall? If not, who owns this business?

How many years have you been selling things to tourists?

On average, about how much money do you earn each day selling things to tourists? Is it enough to support your family? What percentage of your family's income comes from vendor income?

Is your income always the same, or does it ever change? What are the best times of the year for selling things? What are the worse? During the worse time, what do you do to earn more money?

Do you always sell things in the same place, or have you moved around? What are the best places in the Park to sell things? Why don't you sell there?

How did you get this job? Do you have to have permission (a license) to sell things in Angkor Park? How do you get permission? Do you have to pay anyone for selling things? How often, how much?

Where do you get your products? Do you have to buy them, or do you get them on credit? Who do you get them from?

In order to start this business, did you have to have any capital before hand to buy things or set up the stall, how much? Where did you get it from?

What difficulties do you have as a vendor selling things here? If you ever have any problems, how do you solve them – who helps you?

As a vendor, how do you learn about the Apsara rules and regulations? How do these rules and regulations affect you? What are the benefits? Are there any problems?

Do you have any comments or suggestions?

Village Chief Interview

Village _____

Commune _____ District _____

How many years have you served as village chief? _____

What is the population of your village? _____ Men _____ Women _____

Number of Households _____

How many households are headed by single women? _____

Has the population of the village increased/decreased since the Millennium 2000 celebration two and a half years ago? Why?

Has there been any in-migration? Why do people come to this village, and where do they come from? Has this increased over the past two years?

Has there been any out-migration? Why do people leave this village? Has this increased over the past two years?

Where do children go to school?

Where is the nearest health post – are services easily available for people?

Social Structure

About what percentage of people in the village are Rich? _____ Middle _____ Poor _____

Is this the same as it was during the Millennium 2000 celebration two and half years ago? If not, how has it changed since then?

Land

How many hectares of land in the village?

How do people use land in the village? Has this changed over the past several years? If so, how? If not, why?

What is the average landholding in the village – how much land do most people in the village have?

What is the largest land holding in the village? How many households?

How many households in the village have no land? How has this changed over the past two years?

Do people buy and sell land in the village? How many transactions this year?
Does this increase over the past two years?

Why do people sell the land? Who do they sell land to?

What is the price of land? Does the price of land increase over the past two years? Why?

Have there been any land conflicts in the village over the past two years? Does this increase or decrease? Why are there conflicts – who is involved?

How have these conflicts been solved?

Other Resources

How many cattle and buffalo are there in the village?

What is the average household herd? How many households own this many animals?

What is the largest household herd? How many households own this many animals? Does this increase/decrease over the past two years? Why?

How many households have no large animals? Does this increase/decrease over the past two years? Why?

Do people buy and sell large animals in the village? Does this increase over the past two years?

Why do people sell – and who buys?

Occupation/employment

What are the main occupations of people in the village? Have these occupations changed over the past two years? Why?

How many people work outside the village – who are they, and what do they do? How has this changed over the past two years?

How many people have jobs in Angkor Park – who are they, and what do they do? How has this changed over the past two years?

How do people find jobs outside the village – either in Siem Reap, Angkor Park, or elsewhere? Please explain.

Do many children earn money – such as selling handicrafts or other things in the park? How has this changed over the past two years?

Do many children drop out of school in order to earn money? How has this changed over the past two years?

Generally speaking, have household incomes increased/decreased over the past two years? Why?

Social Consequences

In general, how have people in this village been affected by tourism in Angkor Park? Please explain.

What are the benefits for people in the village associated with tourism increases? Please explain.

Who benefits – and why?

Are there any problems for people in the village associated with tourism increases? Please explain.

Who has problems – and why?

Apsara Authority

What is the role of Apsara Park Authority?

How did you learn about the rules and regulations of Apsara Park Authority? How did you participate in the development of these rules and regulations?

How do the rules/regulations affect people in your village? What the benefits – who benefits?

Are there any problems – who is affected?

What is your role as village chief with respect to the Apsara Park Authorities?

If there are ever any problems, how do you solve them with the Apsara Park Authorities?

General (only if there is time)

What are the main sources of development assistance for the community? What kind of development activities have taken places over the past several years?

In your opinion, what more does your village need to do to help people adjust to the affects of increased tourism in the Angkor Park? (In order to gain more benefits, or in order to solve problems?) Please give examples.

Apsara Authority

Background of Apsara Authority

When was Apsara Authority established? What was/is the purpose of Apsara Authority?

How is Apsara Authority structured?

Rules and Regulations

What are the rules and regulations governing the Angkor Park? How do they affect the people who live in the Angkor Park?

How have the rules and regulations governing the Angkor Park been established? Who participated in the formulation of these rules and regulations?

How has the Apsara Authority disseminated the information about the rules and regulations to the people who live in the Angkor Park?

How are the rules and regulations enforced? What difficulties do the Apsara Authorities face in implementing the rules and regulations? How are such problems resolved?

How is land use planned/regulated in the villages within Angkor Park? Are land use regulations different for each of the three zones? If so, how?

How is land use planned/regulated for business investment in Angkor Park and Siem Reap town?

Has there been an increase in the number of land transactions in Angkor Park? What has been the affect on land prices in the Angkor Park? Has there been any increase in the number of landless households in villages within Angkor Park?

Apsara Revenue

What are the sources of revenue for the Apsara Authority? How much do they make from park fees? Other sources?

How much is re-invested back into the Park? How much is allocated for village development in the Park?

Tourism in Angkor Park/Siem Reap

What are the number of tourist arrivals for 2000 and 2001? Does it appear that tourist arrivals are increasing in 2002? Do you expect this trend to continue in the future?

How many new hotels and restaurants have been started in and around Siem Reap town since the Millennium 2000 celebration? Where does the investment for the new hotels and restaurants come from?

How are people who live in Angkor Park affected by the tourism industry? What are the benefits? What are the problems?

How many people does Apsara Authority employ? What kinds of jobs? Where do these people live/come from?

How many vendors are there in the Park? What are the procedures for people to set up a small business? Do they have to pay a fee for a license?

Long term Plans

What are the long-term planning objectives of the Apsara Authority?

Provincial Governor

How have people who live in the Angkor Park been affected by tourism in the Angkor Park area? What are the main benefits? What are the biggest problems?

How many new hotels and restaurants have been established since the Millennium 2000 Celebration? Where does the investment come from for these new business start-ups?

What about in-migration to the Angkor Park and Siem Reap town area? Has the population increased? How much? Where do people come from?

How has employment been affected by the increase in tourism? How many and what kinds of jobs have been created in the past two and a half years? What kinds of skills and education do people need to get better jobs in the area?

Has there been an increase in the number of land transactions in Angkor Park and Siem Reap town? What has been the affect on land prices? Has there been any increase in the number of landless households?

What are some of the other most important social consequences of the increase in tourism in the area? Is HIV/AIDS a concern for local authorities? Are there any problems associated with increased crime? What about school attendance – are there many children who drop out of school to work in the tourism industry?

What can/should be done about these kinds of problems? What is the role of the provincial government for addressing these kinds of problems?

Are the affects of tourism primarily confined (limited) to Angkor Park and Siem Reap town, or are the effects more widespread? What are some examples of more widespread affects?

In terms of planning and governance, what is the role of the Provincial Governor's office in relation to the Apsara Authority?

LIST OF PARTICIPATING RESEARCHERS

Yim Nimola	F	KWVC	Khmer Women Voice Center
Ean Van Roeup	M	WV-C	World Vision – Cambodia
Orm Sovannavuth	M	WV-C	World Vision – Cambodia
Sok Bun Sean	M	CADET	Cambodian Association for Development of Economy Together
Neup Ly	M	USG	Urban Sector Group
Sok Sovannarith	M	MEDiCam	MEDiCam
Sem Thul	M	FAKP	Farmer Association of Kg Speu Province
Suon Sareth	M	DCA	DanChurchAid
Chhoeung Sun Lay	F	CWDA	Cambodian Women Development Association
Dy Ratha	F	IDA	Indra Devi Association
Ea Tharady	M	Star Kampuchea	Star Kampuchea
Sok Sophal	F	CORD	Christian Outreach Relief and Development
Voeut Vanny	F	ARUN REAH	ARUN REAH
Ouk Chettra	F	WGWR	Working Group on Weapon Reduction
Duong Vuthy	M	AFSC	American Friends Service Committee
Sok Sophal	F	CDRCP	Cambodian Development and Relief Center for the Poor
Ly Thideth	F	APDO	Angkor Participatory Development Organization
Hok Buntheoun	M	CREDO	Cambodian Rural Economic Development Organization
Pen Vuthy	M	VBNK	Vicheasthan Badosbondal Neakropkrong Kangea Aphivath
Koy Veth	F	KWVC	Khmer Women Voice Center
Kheav Thuon	F	CWCC	Cambodian Women Crisis Center
Lok Vichet	M	CHED	Cambodian Health Education Development
Hen Heang	M	WV-C	World Vision – Cambodia
Nhoung Polita	M	WV-C	World Vision – Cambodia
Ly Khom	M	WV-C	World Vision – Cambodia
Nop Sarin Srey Roth	F	CWCC	Cambodian Women Crisis Center
Nuth Vutha	M	HU	Health Unlimited

CCC-ADI TRAINING TEAM

Ang Sopha	F	CCC-ADI	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia Analyzing Development Issues Project
Il Oeur	M	CCC-ADI	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia Analyzing Development Issues Project
Seng Savuth	M	CCC-ADI	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia Analyzing Development Issues Project
Brett Ballard	M	CCC-ADI	Cooperation Committee for Cambodia Analyzing Development Issues Project