

# **NPRS Monitoring Field Survey Results 2005**



**Prepared by:**

**NGO Forum on Cambodia with Inputs from CNAC and  
Star Kampuchea and Technical Support from VFI  
For  
Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural  
Development (ANGOC)**

## Table of Contents

<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SAMPLING.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SURVEY RESULTS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Basic Information of the Households.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Food Security and Income.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Rural Development and Agrarian Reform.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>WORKSHOP COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>ANNEX I: SELECTED VILLAGES AND SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>ANNEX II: HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ANNEX III: VILLAGE CHIEF QUESTIONNAIRE.....</b>	<b>22</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1: Respondent Gender .....	5
Table 2: Descriptive Variables .....	5
Table 3: Total by House Type .....	6
Table 4: Home Ownership .....	6
Table 5: Change in Food Consumption by Change in Income 2003 - 2005 .....	6
Table 7: Income by Source of Income .....	7
Table 8: Change in Income by Source of Income .....	8
Table 9: Village Chiefs – Change in Income .....	8
Table 10: Reason for Increase in Income by Source of Income .....	8
Table 12: Household – Main Source of Income .....	9
Table 16: Households – Land Disputes by Land certificates .....	9
Table 17: Households – Development of Roads and Irrigation Facilities.....	10
Table 18: Village Chiefs – Development of Roads and Irrigation Facilities.....	10
Table 19: Households – Satisfaction with Current Roads and Irrigation Facilities.....	10
Table 20: Households – Water Source .....	11
Table 22: Households – Satisfaction with Access to Clean Water by Current Water Source .....	11
Table 24: Village Chiefs – Obstacles to Reducing Poverty .....	12
Table 25: Awareness of NPRS.....	13
Table 26: NPRS Projects Identified .....	13

## **Acknowledgement**

This report is made available with financial support Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development.

Thank the local NGO membership organisations, Star Kampuchea and CNAC, for organising the survey work, and the eight local NGOs – CDRCP, CREDO, PKFDA, SEDOC, WOSO, SIT, CWARO, and CCPCR – for carrying out the surveys.

Thank the Village Focus International, especially Ms. Lindsay MacLean and her assistant, for providing technical support.

## **Introduction**

The following report outlines the content of NGO Forum's recent initiative in the area of monitoring the Royal Government of Cambodia's National Poverty Reduction Strategy, while simultaneously building the capacity of local organisations in the areas of monitoring and data collection.

Findings from the field were presented at a National Workshop which was held in Phnom Penh on November 25, 2005. Over 90 people attended the workshop, including participants from the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, Ministry of Rural Development, various NGOs and CSOs, village chiefs, interviewers from local organisations, the media and other interested parties. Following the presentation, participants raised questions related to the data and offered comments and suggestions for future studies of the same nature.

The main purpose of this study was to assess the progress of the government implementation of the National Strategic Development Plan (NPRS). The study focuses on Food Security and Rural Development/Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction Obstacles.

## **Background and Methodology**

NGO Forum and their partner organisations researched various NGOs and CSOs involved in the monitoring of government policies across Cambodia, specifically those related to poverty reduction. This research was primarily carried out using the Capacity-Building Needs Survey provided by ANGOC and was conducted in order to ensure that suitable organisations would be selected to conduct the monitoring required for this project.

A number of capacity building needs were identified as a result of this survey, including basic research skills, proposal planning, accounting, advocacy and vocational training. Above all though, the results showed a clear need to enhance the monitoring capabilities of these organisations, as the majority of them were not engaged in any form of monitoring. Training aimed to focus mainly on the use of quantitative and qualitative questionnaires, data collection and data analysis as a means of monitoring projects and activities. Based on their capacity and experience, eight organisations were selected by NGO Forum to receive training and to carry out the monitoring of government NPRS programs. Five provinces and 40 villages in which these organisations operate and in which no other monitoring activities were being conducted were subsequently selected. For a complete list of organisations, provinces and villages involved, please refer to Annex I.

A monitoring and advocacy framework was then developed based on existing poverty reduction government programs, the capacity needs of NGOs/CSOs and their available resources, as well as on financial constraints associated with the project. The strategy was officially endorsed by all Cambodian partner organisations at a joint meeting between NGO Forum, Star Kampuchea, Cambodian NGO Alliance for Cooperation (CNAC) and Village Focus International (VFI).

Monitoring was done primarily through a household-level survey in 40 rural villages across Cambodia, with the help of the eight local partner organisations mentioned above. Survey results obtained not only provide some measure by which to monitor government initiatives, but also serve as a benchmark for future comparisons. Changes over time could not be precisely measured without a basis for comparison, but were addressed using perception-based questions.

A smaller second survey was also administered for the village chiefs, in order to determine their awareness of government initiatives and to assess their perceptions of priority issues.

## Sampling

Each of the selected organisations was assigned 4 villages to monitor, with the exception of SEDOC and CCPCR, who were given 8 each based on their capacity (see Annex I).

As pointed out in the Monitoring and Advocacy Framework, there were virtually no frames available to properly select a sample (no detailed maps, house numbers, etc); the only information available was the number of households in each village. As such, an allocation proportional to village (stratum) size within each organisation was therefore employed, under the operational constraint that each organisation must conduct 100 interviews (or 200 in the case where an organisation is responsible for 8 villages). Stratifying in this way allowed for more evenly distributed sampling ratios at the organisation level and helped to reduce the interview burden in particularly small villages. A complete table of sample distribution is summarised in Annex I.

Interviewers selected households based on two simple concepts in order to allow for the most varied sample possible. First, they obtained information from the village chief regarding a basic ratio of rich to poor households in each of the selected villages. Based on this ratio, they selected the same proportion of rich and poor households for their sample. Therefore, if the village chief indicated that 5% of the community was rich, an equal percentage of rich households was subsequently interviewed.

Next, they spread the sample of households evenly across each village by dividing the total number of households in the village by the number of surveys to be completed in the village. This number (n) then served as their guide for interviewing every “n<sup>th</sup>” household.

## Survey Results

### *Basic Information of the Households*

This National Poverty Reduction Strategy monitoring survey includes results obtained from 1000 respondents, interviewed throughout 5 provinces and 40 rural villages across Cambodia. As the data in Tables 1 and 2 show, the average respondent age is 44.7 years, with a greater number of female respondents (64.4%). The mean household size of those included in the sample is 6 people, with an average of 4.1 dependents.

**Table 1: Respondent Gender**

	Male	Female	Missing Cell
Total	35.5%	64.4%	0.1%

**Table 2: Descriptive Variables**

Variable	Average
Respondent Age	44.7
Household Size	6.0
Number of Dependents	4.1

As these interviews were administered in mostly rural areas, it is not surprising that the vast majority of respondent houses are constructed with light materials and wood or only light materials (95%). The figures in Table 3 are difficult to compare against national statistics as the

categories are described in different ways; however, if the categories for outer wall materials of wood, logs, plywood, bamboo, thatch, makeshift material and other light materials are summed, the results for rural Cambodia are very similar at 95.4%.<sup>1</sup>

**Table 3: Total by House Type**

	Light Materials	Light Materials + Wood	Wood + Concrete	Concrete	Missing Cell
Total	36.2%	58.8%	4.3%	0.5%	0.2%

In terms of home ownership, there is once again a similar pattern observed in these survey results and those from the national survey conducted in 2004. The results presented here in Table 4 show that 98.5% of all the households sampled own the home they live in, while national statistics suggest that a slightly fewer 96.2% of rural villagers own their homes.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 4: Home Ownership**

	Own	Do not own	Missing Cell
Total	98.5%	1.3%	0.2%

## ***Food Security and Income***

Table 5 shows the change in household food consumption since 2003 in relation to the change in household income. As expected, the households which indicate that their income increased also show that they are now consuming more food. Likewise, those households which experienced a decrease in their income indicate a drop in food consumption. Overall, more than half of the households surveyed responded that they are now consuming more food than they were 2 years ago, which could be the result of any number of factors aside from an increase in income. It does not however, categorically suggest that individuals are consuming more; it could simply be the case that the number of household members has increased. These figures are useful, particularly in combination with information related to household size, as they serve as baseline data which can be compared against equivalent data in the future.

**Table 5: Change in Food Consumption by Change in Income 2003 - 2005**

Change in Income	Change in Food Consumption		
	More	Less	No Change
More	66.2%	14.2%	17.8%
Less	21.9%	63.5%	13.2%
No Change	30.6%	19.4%	47.6%
Total	51.9%	25.7%	20.6%

The availability of various food types as shown in Table 6 is also of significant interest, not only in terms of obtaining current knowledge of food security, but again as baseline data. It is crucial to

<sup>1</sup> Cambodia Socio-economic Survey 2004, Sponsored by the UNDP and the World Bank. National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cambodia Socio-economic Survey 2004, Sponsored by the UNDP and the World Bank. National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, p. 9.

recognise the fact that this data is based on perception, and is therefore most useful when compared across two or more points in time to obtain relative information.

The households interviewed for this survey indicate overwhelmingly that they rarely have sufficient amounts of any food type, although the most available food as anticipated is rice. These figures, although perception-based, are somewhat alarming as they certainly point out the fact that households in this sample generally do not feel that they have enough food. Poor diets inevitably lead to other issues such as increased medical problems and reduced productivity levels and should not be dismissed as insignificant.

Availability of or access to fresh fruit and fish seem to be the lowest of all food types, which is not surprising at least in terms of fish considering that all of the villages selected for this sample are inland and therefore not in close proximity to dominant fishing areas. The information obtained from these villages is not necessarily indicative of food availability across Cambodia, but will nevertheless once again prove to be useful as benchmark data.

**Table 6: Availability of Food**

Food Type	Sufficient	Insufficient at Times	Insufficient
Rice	22.7%	32.1%	45.2%
Vegetables	17.4%	38.1%	44.3%
Fruit	6.3%	23.1%	70.6%
Meat	15.8%	41.5%	42.7%
Fish	6.2%	33.9%	59.9%

Income data in Table 7 reveals that almost 60% of the rural Cambodian households surveyed register an average monthly income of less than US\$30. With a mean household size of 6 people, this value translates to a monthly average of US\$5 per individual. It should be noted that household income may be considerably less than US\$30 – bringing the average per person even lower.

Not surprisingly, an even greater percentage of farmers fall into this income bracket, while those households whose main income is derived through a different source tend to be slightly wealthier. These households may receive the majority of their income from a business or through paid work. Close to an additional quarter of the sample population indicated a household income of less than US\$60, leaving only a marginal 15% earning more than US\$61 a month.

**Table 7: Income by Source of Income**

Income Source	< \$30	\$31 - \$60	\$61 - \$90	\$91 - \$120	> \$120	Don't Know
Farming	68.5%	19.7%	7.3%	1.6%	0.3%	2.5%
Other	44.1%	29.4%	15.0%	6.5%	4.0%	1.1%
Total	59.8%	23.2%	10.0%	3.3%	1.6%	2.0%

Despite these low monthly incomes, the majority of households surveyed (65.3%) reveal that they are taking in more money than they were 2 years ago (Table 8). This, however, does not necessarily imply that monthly income per household member has increased; it could simply be indicative of more household members. These results will serve as useful baseline data to be matched against future studies of income and household size. There was very little variation in these results from farming and other income-generating activities. As shown in Table 9, the 40 village chiefs who were interviewed yield similar results, with 65.0% of them indicating that the households in their villages are earning more money than they did 2 years ago.

**Table 8: Change in Income by Source of Income**

Income Source	More	Less	Same	Don't Know	Non-Response
Farming	63.6%	23.3%	13.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Other	68.4%	19.5%	11.3%	0.6%	0.3%
Total	65.3%	21.9%	12.4%	0.3%	0.1%

**Table 9: Village Chiefs – Change in Income**

	More	Less	Same
Total	65%	17.5%	17.5%

Tables 10 and 11 explore one potential reason for this increase in income. Only those respondents who indicated their household was taking in a higher monthly income answered this question. Here, there is some discrepancy between the perception of villagers and the village chiefs. Very few households (11.4%) felt that the increase in their earnings was due to government initiatives, whereas a higher 22.5% of village chiefs indicated this as being the primary factor. The reason for this difference could be due to ignorance on behalf of the villagers, or to loyalties within the government structure. In any case, both the households and village chiefs interviewed agreed that government programs were not the main cause, with 51.2% and 42.5% citing other reasons for the rise in income, respectively.

**Table 10: Reason for Increase in Income by Source of Income<sup>3</sup>**

Income Source	Because of RGC	Other	Don't Know	Non-Response	Missing Cell
Farming	12.9%	47.9%	1.4%	0.8%	0.5%
Other	8.8%	57.1%	1.4%	0.3%	0.8%
Total	11.4%	51.2%	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%

**Table 11: Village Chiefs – Reason for Increase in Income<sup>4</sup>**

	Because of RGC	Other
Total	22.5%	42.5%

Results show that approximately 65% of the households surveyed draw their primary income through farming activities. This number was expected to be high as farming is the predominant occupation in rural Cambodia; in fact, national statistics collected in 2004 indicate that an even higher 82.6% of households are involved in crop production during the rainy season.<sup>5</sup> Fewer households reported being involved in agriculture during the dry season, however, this questionnaire does specifically ask if farming is the *main* source of income and thus cannot be directly compared to national statistics.

<sup>3</sup> Please note that the totals for Farming, Other and Total rows add up to 63.6%, 68.4% and 65.3% respectively. Only those respondents who indicated they are now earning more income answered this question.

<sup>4</sup> Please note that the total adds up to 65%; the percentage of village chiefs who indicated that household incomes in their village have increased.

<sup>5</sup> Cambodia Socio-economic Survey 2004, Sponsored by the UNDP and the World Bank. *Crop Production in Cambodia, 2004*. National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning, p. 3-4.

**Table 12: Household – Main Source of Income**

	Main Income from Farming	Other Source	Don't Know
Total	64.5%	35.4%	0.1%

### ***Rural Development and Agrarian Reform***

Questions regarding land certificates<sup>6</sup> were only asked to those respondents who said that their household's chief income source was farming. Of the entire population surveyed, 46.3% of villagers stated that they do hold a land certificate for the land on which they farm, the great majority (43.5% of the total sample) of which were acquired prior to 2003.

**Table 13: Households – Land certificates<sup>7</sup>**

	Have Land certificate	No Land certificate	Don't Know
Total	46.3%	18.1%	0.1%

**Table 14: Households – Acquisition of Land Certificates<sup>7</sup>**

	2003 – 2005	Prior to 2003	Don't Know
Total	2.5%	43.5%	0.2%

**Table 15: Households – Land Disputes<sup>7</sup>**

	Land in Dispute	Land not in Dispute	Don't Know	Missing Cell	Total
Total	55.2%	6.5%	2.4%	0.3%	64.5%

Despite the fact that almost all of those households with farming as their primary income source have land certificates for the land on which they farm, an incredibly high number of respondents in this category (90.7%) also indicate that the ownership of their land is in dispute. Curiously, only 72.4% of respondent households with *no* land certificates say their land is in dispute. It is important to keep in mind that disputes related to ownership could also include minor disagreements between neighbours in terms of legal boundary lines and does not necessarily mean they are at risk of losing their land entirely.

**Table 16: Households – Land Disputes by Land certificates**

	Land in Dispute	Land not in Dispute	Don't Know	Missing Cell
Have Land Certificate	90.7%	5.8%	2.8%	0.6%
No Land Certificate	72.4%	21.0%	6.1%	0.6%

<sup>6</sup> A land certificate is generally referred to by villagers as a document which shows that their request for a land certificate has been officially recognised by local authorities. To date, very few Cambodian farmers hold official land certificates, although a systematic land titling program is currently in progress to address this problem.

<sup>7</sup> Please note that the totals in Tables 13, 14 and 15 add up to 64.5%; the percentage of respondents whose main household income is derived through farming.

A little more than half of the households interviewed affirm that new roads have been built in their village or existing roads repaired in the last 2 years (Table 17). At 65%, this figure is slightly higher for the village chiefs in the sample, which could simply point to the fact that some villagers may not be aware of roads being built or repaired in all areas of their village (Table 18). Both groups, however, clearly assent that road work of some kind has occurred in the majority of sampled villages over the last couple of years.

Data in Table 17 show that the opposite appears to be true in terms of irrigation facilities, with approximately 3/4 of households in the sample stating that none have been built or repaired since 2003. This amount coincides with the number of village chiefs who offered the same answer. A greater percentage (10% more) of village chiefs interviewed indicate that some facilities have been built or repaired compared with the villagers in the survey, a figure which corresponds almost exactly to the number of household respondents who were unsure whether any new facilities had been built or repaired in their village. This relatively high number of villagers who did not know of any irrigation activity may simply be ignorant to projects going on in their area.

This seemingly low construction activity in the area of irrigation does not necessarily suggest inactivity throughout Cambodia. It is imperative to remember that this survey was conducted in only 40 villages throughout the country and therefore entirely possible that the government is in fact involved in the building or repairing of irrigation facilities elsewhere.

**Table 17: Households – Development of Roads and Irrigation Facilities**

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Non-Response	Missing Cell
New Roads	52.5%	44.8%	2.6%	0.1%	0.0%
New Irrigation Facilities	14.5%	74.2%	10.5%	0.6%	0.2%

**Table 18: Village Chiefs – Development of Roads and Irrigation Facilities**

	Yes	No
New Roads	65.0%	35.0%
New Irrigation Facilities	25.0%	75.0%

Household satisfaction in terms of roads is fairly high, with over half of respondents indicating that they are either satisfied or very satisfied with the current roads in their village. This figure is consistent with the villagers' impression of road maintenance as expressed above. Likewise, more than 60% of the households in the survey are either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the irrigation facilities currently available to them. Once again, almost 1/10 of respondents did not know how satisfied they were, which would imply their lack of knowledge in this area, or perhaps a misunderstanding of the question being asked (Table 19).

**Table 19: Households – Satisfaction with Current Roads and Irrigation Facilities**

	Roads	Irrigation Facilities
Very Satisfied	10.8%	3.9%
Satisfied	45.3%	22.1%
Dissatisfied	33.5%	49.8%
Very Dissatisfied	10.2%	13.4%
Don't Know	0.1%	8.1%
Non-Response	0.1%	2.4%
Missing Cell	0.0%	0.3%

Survey results in Table 20 show that approximately 62% of the households surveyed use well or pumped water as their main source of clean water. This is fairly consistent with data derived from national statistics collected in 2004, which state that 62.3% of households use some kind of well water as their main source of drinking water during the dry season, and a somewhat reduced 52.6% during the monsoon season.<sup>8</sup> The next most popular water source is river and stream water, accounting for almost a quarter of all respondents. Again, this figure is more in harmony with the national figures for the rainy season, which is appropriate considering this survey was carried out predominantly during the wet season.

**Table 20: Households – Water Source**

	Well/Pumped	Public/Piped	River/Stream	Rain
Total	61.7%	11.6%	23.3%	3.2%

Table 21 looks at households' perception of change in their access to clean water. Overall, the majority of respondents felt that their access had improved, with about a third indicating no change and a quarter revealing that their access is worse. The great majority of this last group, however, comes from those households who collect their clean water from rivers or streams, which could indicate an increase in pollution levels or perhaps reflects increasingly drier rainy seasons. Those respondents whose families' main source of drinking water is public or piped water show that their access has greatly improved; perhaps a reflection of initiatives to improve water systems in rural areas.

**Table 21: Households – Change in Access to Clean Water by Water Source 2003 – 2005**

Current Water Source	Better	Worse	No Change
Well/Pumped	46.9%	17.4%	35.6%
Public/Piped	72.4%	4.3%	23.3%
River/Stream	16.3%	55.8%	27.9%
Rain	6.3%	28.1%	65.6%
Total	41.5%	25.1%	33.3%

In terms of satisfaction with their access to clean water, most households indicate they are either satisfied or very satisfied (70%). Again, respondents who rely on rain, river or stream water show higher levels of dissatisfaction than those who use well, pumped, public or piped water. An extremely low percentage of the sample population (5.5%) expressed high dissatisfaction with their access to clean water.

**Table 22: Households – Satisfaction with Access to Clean Water by Current Water Source**

Current Water Source	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dis-satisfied	Very Dis-satisfied	Don't Know	Missing Cell
Well/Pumped	23.1%	49.8%	22.2%	4.5%	0.2%	0.2%
Public/Piped	27.6%	58.6%	12.1%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
River/Stream	13.3%	40.8%	35.2%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Rain	6.3%	62.5%	31.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

<sup>8</sup> Cambodia Socio-economic Survey 2004, Sponsored by the UNDP and the World Bank. National Institute of Statistics, Ministry of Planning.

Total	20.8%	49.2%	24.3%	5.5%	0.1%	0.1%
-------	-------	-------	-------	------	------	------

Two significant barriers to poverty reduction emerge from the household data – poor irrigation systems and poor access to medical care (Table 23). This lack of proper irrigation is a point that consistently reappears throughout the data for both villagers and their chiefs. This does not, however, imply that no irrigation facilities have been build or improved across Cambodia; it simply indicates that very little activity in this area seems to be happening in the villages selected for this sample. It is entirely possible that water system projects are being developed in other areas of the country but have yet to benefit the villages who participated in this survey.

Difficulty in accessing medical care was actually the most popular response overall. Again, it is important to remember that health facilities may exist, and barriers could be financial, physical or a result of misinformation or a lack of awareness. In any case, the households interviewed identified this as being a major contributor influencing poverty levels. Access to electricity and education consistently appear to be somewhat less of a concern to the households surveyed.

**Table 23: Households – Obstacles to Reducing Poverty**

Obstacle	1	2	3	Total
Poor Irrigation System	25.7%	11.7%	8.2%	45.6%
Poor Access to Clean Water	13.7%	14.0%	13.5%	41.2%
Lack of Proper Roads	12.5%	15.8%	16.9%	45.2%
Lack of Jobs	15.1%	16.0%	13.8%	44.9%
Lack of Available/Reliable Electricity	7.3%	12.0%	14.0%	33.3%
Poor Access to Medical Care	15.0%	19.4%	18.3%	52.7%
Poor Access to Education	8.9%	10.2%	14.4%	33.5%

The village chiefs overwhelmingly identified the lack of adequate irrigation systems as being the greatest obstacle to reducing poverty in their villages, mirroring the views expressed by the household respondents. The second major barrier identified, however, was a lack of access to clean water – an obstacle not predominantly selected by the village households interviewed. Poor access to medical care does appear as the most often chosen response for the third obstacle, but overall does not stand out as being a major problem according to the village chiefs surveyed. This highlights a certain discrepancy between the views of the villagers in this sample and their leaders; namely that although medical services may be available, the average household does not seem aware of them or does not know how to access them.

**Table 24: Village Chiefs – Obstacles to Reducing Poverty**

Obstacle	1	2	3	Total
Poor Irrigation System	45.0%	15.0%	10.0%	70.0%
Poor Access to Clean Water	22.5%	22.5%	7.5%	52.5%
Lack of Proper Roads	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%	40.0%
Lack of Jobs	5.0%	17.5%	15.0%	37.5%
Lack of Available/Reliable Electricity	7.5%	20.0%	7.5%	35.0%
Poor Access to Medical Care	2.5%	5.0%	30.0%	37.5%
Poor Access to Education	7.5%	10.0%	7.5%	25.0%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%

Table 25 looks at the level of understanding of the Government's National Poverty Reduction Strategy (NPRS) among the 40 village chiefs interviewed in this survey. At 95%, almost all of the chiefs have heard of NPRS, and 84% of them indicated that there have been NPRS projects launched in their villages in the past 2 years. It appears, therefore, that this government policy has been visible, at least to the village chief level.

**Table 25: Awareness of NPRS**

	Yes	No
Aware of NPRS	95%	5%
NPRS Projects in Village	84%	16%

Specific projects that have been initiated are broken down in Table 26, the most common being road and waterway construction. Again, this reflects the high number of households responding that roads have been built or repaired in their village since 2003. The second most frequently mentioned project is the promotion of health education related programs, specifically in the area of HIV awareness and prevention.

**Table 26: NPRS Projects Identified**

NPRS Projects	Frequency
Health Education (HIV)	7
Road/Well/Canal Construction	16
Road Repair	1
Distribution of Supplies to the Poor/Farmers	3
School/Hospital Construction	3
Water Pump Provision	1
Infrastructure Development	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>

## Workshop Comments, Questions and Suggestions

A number of participants expressed sincere interest in the findings, but were curious as to how these findings would be used.

It was explained and stressed throughout the workshop that this project was not only designed to monitor government activities through the collection of household level data, but also to create a framework for which other organisations could model future projects on. It was made clear that the experience as a whole would be documented in an official guide book, available for distribution amongst NGOs, CSOs and other interested parties. It was also pointed out that the data have already been distributed to various government departments and also to a number of local and international NGOs as well as other relevant organisations. Finally, it was reiterated that the data collected would also be used in the future as baseline data against which to compare results of future studies – monitoring that NGO Forum intends to continue supporting in the coming years.

Given that food security appeared to be somewhat of an issue according to the villagers surveyed, participants were interested in the way food sufficiency had been defined. It was explained that respondents were simply asked whether or not their household had sufficient amounts of various food types. These data, therefore, are perception-based and do not reflect calculated amounts of food – either produced or available for sale. Despite this, perception-based answers are still compelling and should not be dismissed as insignificant.

A few participants expressed the desire for even more detailed information, curious as to whether it was the government or aid organisations who had financed the construction or repair of roads in the rural villages surveyed, whether or not village chiefs truly understood the concept of NPRS or had simply heard of the term, and finally what respondents felt was the reason for their increase in income if not owing to government initiatives. One participant stated that he would have liked to have seen a greater number of poverty indicators utilised, particularly ones related to education issues. Another suggested that the expression “dispute” as it relates to land ownership should have been more clearly defined – as it stands, the data only reveal how many respondents claim their land is in dispute but do not clarify the nature of these disputes.

While all of the suggestions offered were useful, it was pointed out that most of these had been considered prior to carrying the survey. Unfortunately, there are limitations associated with any research, be they financial, time or resource-related, and therefore priorities must be considered and informed choices made. Perhaps as a result of this initiative, donors will be willing to provide additional funding in the future for even more comprehensive studies.

The question was raised as to why only households had been surveyed and not officials who are authorised to carry out NPRS activities at the local or provincial level. It was explained that the goal of this research was to assess any changes that have occurred at the village level in the last 2 years. Interviewing individuals charged with implementing government NPRS activities would surely lead to more bias as respondents would be inclined toward answering positively in order to protect their jobs.

Participants also expressed interest in conducting further studies which would involve the collection of data from every province in the country. It was felt that such results would carry more weight in terms of actually influencing government policy.

Overall, feedback was very positive and participants were interested in the findings being presented. Many offered their approval and congratulations for the initiative taken by NGO Forum and their partners.

## Annex I: Selected Villages and Sample Distribution

NGO/CSO	Province	Village	Households	No. of Surveys	Sampling Ratio
<b>1. CDRCP</b>	Banteay Meanchey	98	285	33	11.6%
		99	296	34	11.5%
		Snoul Tret	156	18	11.5%
		Banteythmey	135	15	11.1%
<b>2. CREDO</b>	Prey Veng	Prey run	180	25	13.9%
		Boeungdol	235	32	13.6%
		Por	226	31	13.7%
		Kork Sampov	85	12	14.1%
<b>3. PKFDA</b>	Kampong Speu	Teapphearum	109	27	24.8%
		Domkvet	129	32	24.8%
		Kraingdong	86	21	24.4%
		Thnal bambek	79	20	25.3%
<b>4. SEDOC</b>	Prey Veng	Boeung Edh	91	25	27.5%
		Tamuy	123	34	27.6%
		Ping Pong	72	20	27.8%
		Ampel	74	21	28.4%
	Banteay Meanchey	Rongmachine	426	24	5.6%
		Korkrathan	602	34	5.6%
		Pongror	317	18	5.7%
		Sophy	429	24	5.6%
<b>5. WOSO</b>	Kampong Speu	Lor	64	13	20.3%
		Taingport	61	12	19.7%
		Chomboksar	159	33	20.8%
		Toeuk Lorig	205	42	20.5%
<b>6. SIT</b>	Kandal	Phum Krom	474	37	7.8%
		Prek Thmey	392	31	7.9%
		Prek Taben	219	17	7.8%
		Phum Kandal	185	15	8.1%
<b>7. CWARO</b>	Kandal	Prek Tapov	904	42	4.6%
		Taktol	383	18	4.7%
		Kra Bao	316	15	4.7%
		Prek Raing	532	25	4.7%
<b>8. CCPCR</b>	Kampot	Kampong Thot	376	34	9.0%
		Kampong Nong	283	26	9.2%
		Boeun Tapream	322	30	9.3%
		Phum Sre	259	24	9.3%
		Ta Ang	172	16	9.3%
		Chum Kreal	333	32	9.6%
		Trophang Thom	226	22	9.7%
		Kampong Samrong	174	16	9.2%

## Annex II: Household Questionnaire

---

### Questionnaire Identification:

Questionnaire Number	
Interviewer	Name:
	Signature:
Name of NGO/CSO	
Director of NGO/CSO	
Date and Time of Interview	Date: ____/____/____ (day/month/year)
	Start:
	Finish:
Name of Village	

---

### Interviewer Instructions:

1. Any **boldface** text is not to be read to the respondent. It is only to aid the interviewer and provide instructions.
  2. Underlined words and sentences are used to emphasise a point.
  3. If the respondent does not understand a question, the interviewer can re-read the question, but should try not to rephrase the question. Doing so could unintentionally lead the respondent towards a certain answer.
  4. Try to interview the respondent alone. This will increase the likelihood of the respondent providing honest answers.
  5. Do not read out response categories unless otherwise stated.
- 

### Introduction/ Selecting the Respondent

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am working with an organisation that is trying to help Cambodians. We are interested in assessing the current poverty level in Cambodia and in determining whether or not the situation has improved in the last two years. It is important to give honest answers so that we can properly understand what people need to improve their living situation. The survey should only take about 20 minutes to complete and we would really appreciate your participation.

All of your information is completely confidential and will be used only in combination with other respondents' information to determine the poverty level in Cambodia. No information we use can be traced back to you.

- A. Who is able to answer questions about this household and is available for an interview now?

**If only one person is available for the interviewer, go to question C.  
If more than one person is available, go to question B.**

- B. Who is a current resident of this village and has been for at least the past 2 years?

Interviewer: You now have a group of potential respondents. Put the appropriate amount of number cards in your bag and have each potential respondent select one card. The person holding the card with the number one is the person selected for the interview.

Go to D.

- C. Have you been a resident of this village for at least the past 2 years?

**If yes, go to D.  
If no, go to E.**

- D. You have been selected to answer this questionnaire. Is there somewhere private we can go to conduct the interview?

**Go to "General Household Questions" and begin the interview.**

- E. Unfortunately, we will not be able to interview you. Thank you very much for your time.

### **General Household Questions**

**Interviewer: Please check (✓) if the respondent is male or female**

- Male  
 Female

1. Interviewer: Is the respondent's house made of ...

- Light materials such as bamboo?  
 A combination of light materials and wood?  
 A combination of wood and concrete?  
 Concrete?  
 Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

I would like to begin by asking you some basic questions about you and your household. Please remember to give honest answers.

2. What is your date of birth? \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ (day/month/year)  
3. How many people live in your household?

\_\_\_\_\_

4. How many members of your household are income earners?

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Is your house owned by a member of this household?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

**Food Security**

Next, I would like to ask you some questions about the amount and quality of food available to members of your household.

6. Please categorize your rate of consumption for the following food items as “sufficient”, “insufficient” or “insufficient at times”:  
**Interviewer: Read out food categories. The respondent must only choose one category for each food item. Please mark their selection with a checkmark (✓).**

Food Item	Sufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient at times
a. Rice			
b. Vegetables			
c. Fruit			
d. Fish			
e. Meat (pork, beef, chicken) or eggs			

7. Do you think your household consumes more, less or the same amount of food as it did 2 years ago?

- More
- Less
- Same amount
- Don't know
- Non-response

8. What would you say is the total monthly income for this household? Please include income from all household members.

**Interviewer: Read out responses. If respondent is unsure, ask for their best estimate.**

- Less than \$30
- \$31 - \$60
- \$61 - \$90
- \$90 - \$120
- More than \$120
- Don't know **(Do not read)**
- Non-response **(Do not read)**

9. Do you think your household has more, less or the same amount of disposable income as it did 2 years ago?"

- More
- Less
- Same amount
- Don't know
- Non-response

**If More, go to question #11.  
If Less, Same amount, Don't know or Non-response, go to question #12.**

10. Do you think your household has more income than it did two years ago as a result of government activities?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

11. Is your household income derived mainly through farming activities?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

**If Yes, go to question #13.  
If No, Don't Know or Non-response, go to the Rural Development/Infrastructure section.**

12. Does your household hold a land title for the land on which you farm?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

**If Yes, go to question #14.  
If No, Don't Know or Non-response, go to question #15.**

13. Was this land title acquired during the last 2 years, or did your household possess it prior to 2003?

- Acquired during the last 2 years
- Possessed prior to 2003
- Don't know
- Non-response

14. Is the ownership of your land in dispute?

- Yes
- No

- Don't know
- Non-response

**Rural Development/Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction Obstacles**

Next I would like to ask you some questions about infrastructure and water in this village.

15. Have any new roads been built or repaired in your village in the last 2 years?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

16. How satisfied are you with the current roads in your village?

**Interviewer: Read out responses**

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know **(Do not read)**
- Non-response **(Do not read)**

17. What is your household's main source of drinking water?

- Well/pump
- Public/Piped water
- River water/Stream water
- Rain water
- Don't know
- Non-response

18. How satisfied are you with your household's current access to clean water?

**Interviewer: Read out responses**

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know **(Do not read)**
- Non-response **(Do not read)**

19. Do you think your household's access to clean water is better, worse, or the same as 2 years ago?

- Better
- Worse
- Same
- Don't know
- Non-response

20. Have any irrigation facilities been constructed or repaired in your village in the last 2 years?

- Yes
- No

- Don't know
- Non-response

21. How satisfied are you with the current irrigation facilities in your village?

**Interviewer: Read out responses**

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know **(Do not read)**
- Non-response **(Do not read)**

22. From the following list, please rank the top 3 obstacles to reducing poverty in your village:  
Interviewer: Read out responses. Write a "1" in the box beside the obstacle the respondent selects as the most significant, followed by a "2" for the second most significant obstacle and a "3" for the third most significant.

- Poor irrigation system
- Poor access to clean water
- Lack of proper roads
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of available and/or reliable electricity
- Poor access to medical care
- Poor access to education
- Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_ **(Do not read)**
- Don't Know **(Do not read)**
- Non-response **(Do not read)**

This concludes our survey. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in answering these questions.

## Annex III: Village Chief Questionnaire

---

### Questionnaire Identification:

Questionnaire Number	
Interviewer	Name:
	Signature:
Name of NGO/CSO	
Director of NGO/CSO	
Date and Time of Interview	Date: ____/____/____ (day/month/year)
	Start:
	Finish:
Name of Village Chief	

---

### Interviewer Instructions:

6. Any **boldface** text is not to be read to the respondent. It is only to aid the interviewer and provide instructions.
7. Underlined words and sentences are used to emphasise a point.
8. If the respondent does not understand a question, the interviewer can re-read the question, but should try not to rephrase the question. Doing so could unintentionally lead the respondent towards a certain answer.
9. Try to interview the respondent alone. This will increase the likelihood of the respondent providing honest answers.
10. Do not read out response categories unless otherwise stated.

---

### Introduction

Hello, my name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am working with an organisation that is trying to help Cambodians. We are interested in assessing the current poverty level in Cambodia and in determining whether or not the situation has improved in the last two years. We have randomly selected your village along with 39 other villages across the country and are hoping to administer a survey in this area with your permission.

We would also like to ask you a few questions about the living conditions in this village. It is important to give honest answers so that we can properly understand what people need to improve their living situation. The questionnaire should only take about 10 minutes to complete and we would really appreciate your participation.

### Awareness of NPRS/Rural Development/Poverty Reduction Obstacles

1. Have you ever heard of the government's National Poverty Reduction Strategy?

- Yes
- No
- Non-response

**If Yes or Non-response, go to question #2.  
If No, go to question #3.**

2. Are you aware of any National Poverty Reduction Strategy policies being launched in your village in the last 2 years?

- Yes **(Please specify)** \_\_\_\_\_
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

3. Have any new roads been built or repaired in this village in the last 2 years?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

4. Have any irrigation facilities been constructed or repaired in this village in the last 2 years?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

5. Overall, do you think the households in this village have more, less or the same amount of disposable income as they did 2 years ago?

- More
- Less
- Same amount
- Don't know
- Non-response

**If More, go to question #6.  
If Less, Same amount, Don't know or Non-response, go to question #7.**

6. Do you think the households in the village have more income than they did 2 years ago as a result of government activities?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Non-response

7. From the following list, please rank the top 3 obstacles to reducing poverty in your village:

**Interviewer: Read out responses. Write a “1” in the box beside the obstacle the respondent selects as the most significant, followed by a “2” for the second most significant obstacle and a “3” for the third most significant.**

- Poor irrigation system
- Poor access to clean water
- Lack of proper roads
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of available and/or reliable electricity
- Poor access to medical care
- Poor access to education
- Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_ **(Do not read)**
- Don't Know **(Do not read)**
- Non-response **(Do not read)**

This concludes our survey. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation in answering these questions.