

Mapping and Prioritizing Sites for Ecotourism Development

Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project in the Cardamom Mountains and Tonle Sap Landscape

Neth Baromey, WB Ecotourism Consultant

Sovann Chansopheaktra, GIS Specialist

Approaches

- Identification of criteria and clusters for evaluating the suitability of ecotourism sites for ecotourism development and investment;
- Data collection and entering data (statistical reports, terrain recordings, different plans, cartographic documents, etc.) into GIS;
- GIS-MCDA focusing on the standardization, weighting (using AHP) and summary analysis of all critical criteria and clusters of criteria with supporting fundamental; and
- Reviewing the spatial analysis results using sensitivity analysis and final decision-making for selecting and prioritizing ecotourism sites for development and investment throughout the reviewing process (weighting exercise using AHP).

<u>Multi-Criteria/Layers for</u> <u>Ecotourism Site Assessment</u>



Ecotourism Development Spectrum Based Assessment





Figure 4: Suitable Zoning Map for Ecotourism Development with Future Tourist Spot

| Cluster | Criteria | Factors | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Geography / | Slope and orientation of the site | State the direction of the site's orientation Level of slope (how steen) of the site | | | | |
| ropography | Visibility of the site | View of site from other sides, etc. | | | | |
| | Elevation | How high or low is the site against sea level? Panoramic and secluded ambience and coziness of the site Air guality of the site | | | | |
| | Accessibility | Access from a main road or water body? Main attractions and their accessibilities from the site? | | | | |
| Natural | Precipitation | The amount of precipitation received by the site in different weather conditions as well as seasons | | | | |
| | Temperature | The average temperature of the site in seasonal context | | | | |
| | Geology cover and ease of construction | Availability of local building materials Level of earthwork required | | | | |
| | Soil cover | Type of soil Stability of soil | | | | |
| | Protection from weather | Site protected from extreme weather events or natural disasters | | | | |
| Environmental | Vegetation type and density | Type of vegetation and underlying value in the area Size of vegetation coverage of the site | | | | |
| | Land use / tenure / security | Land / resource tenure in the area Land / resource use in the area Community cohesion | | | | |
| | Sensitive area / reservation | Type of site as a protected area (PA) Zoning of site / PA | | | | |
| | Water availability | Distance from water resources Existence and amount or sufficiency of water supply | | | | |
| | Environmental impact | Possible harm to fauna and / or flora resources Possible impact on surface and / or underground water Possible impact on geology and soil Possible impact on natural landscape | | | | |
| Socio-economic | Distance from human settlements | Proximity of populated or urban areas to the site | | | | |
| | Distance from roads | Existence of inter- and intra-connection or roads in the area | | | | |
| | Distance from cultural sites | Proximity of cultural sites / attractions (events, objects, and activities) to the site | | | | |

| Distance from negative factors | Existence or future plan for road construction, power / telephone lines, fences, lighting projects, mining, landfills |
|------------------------------------|---|
| | and / or other industrial activities in, within or in close proximity to the site |
| Access to infrastructural services | Access to electricity grid system (station and sub-station) Access to internet / telecom services Access to water supply |
| Market demand | Number of annual arrival of domestic and international tourists Total annual tourism receipts from domestic and international tourists |
| Socio-cultural impact | Possible impact on socio-cultural fabrics / diversity and integrity / activities Possible impacts on culture of indigenous people as well as on indigenous vegetation Arrangements to be made for solid waste and wastewater management in the area |

Initially, 21 criteria divided into 4 main clusters were used as a framework to collect statistical and nonstatistical thematic data for entering into GIS. Due to sequential technical meeting with relevant stakeholders, particularly the Expert-Input Weighting Exercise, couple with the complexity and availability of data from different official sources, only 10 main criteria and 17 sub-criteria or factors were selected for the geospatial analysis of site potential for ecotourism development and management.

| No. Criteria Sub-Criteria | | Sub-Criteria | Selection & Remarks |
|---------------------------|---|---|------------------------|
| 1 | Accessibility | Elevation | Yes |
| | | Slope | Yes |
| | | Distance from roads | Yes |
| | | Seasonality | No, n/a |
| | | Distance from airport | Yes |
| | | Distance from major townships / communes / districts / provinces | Yes |
| 2 | Attractiveness | Scenic value | No, n/a |
| | | Aesthetic value | No, n/a |
| | | Uniqueness | No, n/a |
| | | Cultural importance | Yes |
| | | State of conservation (type of protected area) | Yes |
| 3 | Land use / tenure | Forest cover | Yes |
| | | Clear state-owned land only | No, n/a |
| | | Free from land conflict | No, n/a |
| | | Free from land encroachment | No, n/a |
| 4 | Sensitivity of | No mining concessions | Yes |
| | location | No ELCs | Yes |
| | | No core / conservation zone (no zoning system) | No, n/a |
| | | Proneness to flooding | No, n/a |
| | | Proneness to fire | No, n/a |
| 5 | Access to services | Water availability (distance from water sources) | Yes |
| | | Electricity (distance from electricity grid) | Yes |
| | | Telecommunication (distance from phone cable line) | No, n/a |
| | | Health Services (distance from health care centers) | Yes |
| 6 | Existing ecotourism / CBT / CBET sites | Existing ecotourism / CBT / CBET sites | Yes |
| 7 | Socio-economic | Community access (distance to the site) | No, n/a |
| | | Impact potential (potential beneficiaries) | Yes |
| | | Poverty | No, n/a |
| 8 | Market demand | Seasonality | No, n/a |
| | | Existing visitors | Yes |
| | | Gov't priority for tourism | No, n/a |
| 9 | Biodiversity | Biodiversity hotspot (distance from PAs) | Yes |
| | | Wildlife and species diversity | No, n/a |
| | | Conservation potential | No, n/a |
| 10 | Diversity of | Diversity of ecotourism offering | No, n/a |

ecotourism offering

List of Selected Criteria and Sub-Criteria for GIS-MCDA and AHP Based Suitability Analysis

Approaches (cont.)

- The GIS-MCDA process used for the spatial analysis involved the following key activities:
 - 1. Checking all existing or available statistical and non-statistical data;
 - 2. Identifying critical missing data and developing an immediate plan with MoE for rapid additional data collection;
 - 3. Designing suitability table and questionnaire;
 - 4. Designing pairwise analysis questionnaire;
 - 5. Entering data into GIS;
 - 6. Standardizing and comparing data;
 - 7. Running / overlaying spatial analysis using AHP suitability simulation;
 - 8. Analyzing and interpreting the results / maps of standardized criteria (refer to the table above) of the study sites;
 - 9. Using the analyzed data to support or guide stakeholder consultations and discussions on selection of priority sites for ecotourism development and investment; and
 - 10. Report writing.

Suitability Criteria Rating Reselected Value N٥ High Moderate Marginal Not Suitable Criteria Sub-Criteria Unit (Range) 1000-1813: <10 Elevation Meter (m) 0 - 1813 m 10-100 100-700 700-1000 0 - 35 % 0-5% 5-25% 25-35% >35% Slope Degree Distance from roads Kilometer (km) 0 - 20 km >20 km 0-5 km 5-10 km 10-20 Accessibility Seasonality 0 - 40 km 0-20 km Distance from airport 20-30 km 30-40 km > 40 km Kilometer (km) Distance from major townships / communes / districts / provinces 0 - 30 km 0-10 km 10-20 km 20-30 km >30 km Kilometer (km) Scenic value n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a Aesthetic value n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 2 Attractiveness Uniqueness n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a Cultural importance Kilometer (km) 0 - 45 km 0-15 km 15-30 km 30-45 km > 45 km State of conservation (type n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a of protected area) Forest (26-Forest (6-Evergreen, 25% semi 50% Forest (1-Rangeland and Forest cover Forest classes density) density) 5% density) others evergreen Clear state-owned land n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a Land use / З tenure only Free from land conflict n/a Free from land encroachment 0 to >20 km > 20 km 10-15 km 5-10 km 0-5 km No mining concessions Kilometer (km) Sensitivity of No ELCs 0 to >20 km > 20 km 10-15 km 5-10 km 0-5 km Kilometer (km) 4 location No core / conservation n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a zone (no zoning system) n/a n/a Proneness to flooding n/a n/a n/a n/a Proneness to fire n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 5 1200 - 2000 m (> Access to 600 services Water availability (distance 2000 m = verv from water sources) Meter (m) 0 - 2000 m 0 - 300 m 300 - 600 m 1200m unsuitable)

Suitability criteria rating matrix for ecotourism potential assessment

| | | | | | | | | 1000 0000 m |
|------|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| | | Fla atriaity (aliatava e a franc | | | | | /00 | 1200 - 2000 m |
| | | Electricity (distance from | | 0.0000 | 0.000 | 000 /00 | 600 - | (> 2000 m = very |
| | | electricity grid) | Meter (m) | 0 - 2000 m | 0 - 300 m | 300 - 600 m | 1200m | Unsuitable) |
| | | Telecommunication | | | | | | 1200 - 2000 m (> |
| | | (distance from phone | | | | | 600 - | 2000 m = very |
| | | cable line) | Meter (m) | 0 - 2000 m | 0 - 300 m | 300 - 600 m | 1200m | unsuitable) |
| | | | | | | | | 1200 - 2000 m (> |
| | | Health Services (distance | | | | | 600 - | 2000 m = very |
| | | from health care centers) | Meter (m) | 0 - 2000 m | 0 - 300 m | 300 - 600 m | 1200m | unsuitable) |
| | Existing | Existing ecotourism / CBT / | | | | | | |
| | ecotourism / | CBET sites | | | | | | |
| | CBT / CBET | | | | | | | >15 (> 20 km = |
| 6 | sites | | km | 0 to > 20 km | 0-5 km | 5-10 km | 10-15 | very unsuitable) |
| | | Community access | | | | | | |
| | | (distance to the site) | | | | | | |
| | Socio- | | Population | | | | | |
| 7 | economic | Impact potential (potential | (commune | 0 - 20000 | 10000 - | 5000 - | | |
| | | beneficiaries) | level) | elaoea | 20000 | 10000 | 1000 - 5000 | < 1000 |
| | | Poverty | Poverty rate | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Seasonality | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Market | | Tourist arrivals | | | | | |
| 8 | demand | | at provincial | 0 - 2000000 | 1000000 - | 100000 - | 50000 - | |
| Ŭ | aomana | Existing visitors | level | tourists | 2000000 | 1000000 | 100000 | <50000 |
| | | Gov't priority for tourism | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | | Biodiversity botspot | 11,70 | Inside to 20 | Inside to 5 | 1.,, G | 11/0 | 1,70 |
| | | (distance from PAs) | Kilometer (km) | km | km | 5-10 km | 10-20 | >20 km |
| | Piediversity | Wildlife and species | | | | | n/a | n/a |
| 7 | biodiversity | diversity | 170 | l li/d | 11/4 | l li/a | 174 | n/a |
| | | Conservation potential | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Diversity of | | n/a | n/u | n/u | n/u | n/a | n/u |
| | | l n/a | n/a | 1/4 | I n/a | l n/a | n/a | n/a |
| 10 | ecotourism | | | | | | | |
| 1 10 | offering | | | 1 | | 1 | | |

Expert Inputs in Weighting Exercise for Suitability Criteria and Sub-Criteria Rating

| No. | Selected Criteria | Expert | Expert 8 | Expert | Expert | Expert | Expert | Total Average |
|-----|-----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------------|
| | | | 2 | v | - | 2 | • | , | | | 10 | | 12 | Scores |
| 1 | Accessibility | 9 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 15 | 15 | 14 |
| 2 | Attractiveness | 16 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 20 | 13 |
| 3 | Land use/tenure | 9 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 9 |
| 4 | Sensitivity of location | 4 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 8 |
| 5 | Access to service | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
| 6 | Existing ET sites | 4 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 2 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 9 |
| 7 | Socio-Economic | 14 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
| 8 | Market demand | 12 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 7 |
| 9 | Biodiversity | 18 | 25 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 30 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 14 |
| 10 | Diversity of ET offering | 11 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| | Total | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N | Veighted Scores | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Expert input meeting for weighting exercise organized by the World Bank and Ministry of Environment on 27th February 2019

9

÷‡•

| | | | Total Suitability Score | | Suitability (| <u>riteria Rati</u> | ng |
|----|--|--|-------------------------|---------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | | | (100 points for all of | | | | |
| N° | Reselected Criteria | Sub-Criteria | the classes) | High | Moderate | Marginal | Not Suitable |
| 1 | Accessibility | Elevation | | | | | |
| | | Slope | | | | | |
| | | Distance from roads (5) | 14 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Seasonality | 14 | 1010 | 0 10 0 | 5 (0 5 | |
| | | Distance from airport (4) | | | | | |
| | | Distance from major townships / communes / districts / provinces (5) | | | | | |
| 2 | Attractiveness | Scenic value | | | | | |
| | | Aesthetic value | | | | | |
| | | Uniqueness | 13 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Cultural importance | | | | | |
| | | State of conservation (type of protected area) (13) | | | | | |
| 3 | Land use / tenure | Forest cover (land cover 2016) (9) | | | | | |
| | | Clear state-owned land only | Q | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Free from land conflict | | 1010 | 0.000 | 5 (0 5 | - 5 |
| | | Free from land encroachment | | | | | |
| 4 | Sensitivity of location | No mining concessions (4) | | | | | |
| | | No ELCs (4) | | | | | |
| | | No core / conservation zone (no zoning system) | 8 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Proneness to flooding | | | | | |
| | | Proneness to fire | | | | | |
| 5 | Access to services | Water availability (distance from water sources) (4) | | | | | |
| | | Electricity (distance from electricity grid) (1) | 9 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Telecommunication (distance from phone cable line) | , | 7 10 10 | 0 10 0 | 5 (0 5 | |
| | | Health Services (distance from health care centers) (4) | | | | | |
| 6 | Existing ecotourism / CBT / CBET sites | Existing ecotourism / CBT / CBET sites | 9 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| 7 | Socio-economic | Community access (distance to the site) | | | | | |
| | | Impact potential (potential beneficiaries) (8) | 8 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Poverty | | | | | |
| 8 | Market demand | Seasonality | | | | | |
| | | Existing visitors 2017 (8) | 8 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Gov't priority for tourism | | | | | |
| 9 | Biodiversity | Biodiversity hotspot (distance from PAs) (14) | | | | | |
| | | Wildlife and species diversity | 14 10 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | | Conservation potential | | | | | |
| 10 | Diversity of ecotourism offering | Diversity of ecotourism offering | 8 | 9 to 10 | 6 to 8 | 3 to 5 | < 3 |
| | Т | otal Weighted Scores | 100 | | | | |

Summary table of remaining criteria and their suitability rating derived from the literature review and validated by consultative expert input meeting

| No. | Reselected | Sub-Criteria | Unit | Value (Range) | Criteria Suitability Rating | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Criteria | | | | High | Moderate | Marginal | Not Suitable |
| 1 | Accessibility | Distance from roads | Kilometer (km) | 0 - 20 km | 0-5 km | 5-10 km | 10-20 | >20 km |
| | | Distance from airport | Kilometer (km) | 0 - 40 km | 0-20 km | 20-30 km | 30-40 km | > 40 km |
| | | Distance from major townships / communes / districts / provinces | Kilometer (km) | 0 - 30 km | 0-10 km | 10-20 km | 20-30 km | >30 km |
| 2 | Attractiveness | State of conservation (type of protected area) | Category of protected area | Marine National Park, Multiple Use Management Area, National Park, Natural Heritage Site, Protected Landscape, Ramsar Site, Wildlife Sanctuary | Wildlife Sanctuary, Protected Landscape, Ramsar Site | Multiple Use Management Area, National Park, National Park, Natural Heritage Site | | Outside protected area |
| 3 | Land use / tenure | Land cover 2016 | Land cover class | Surface water, Mangrove forest, Flooded forest, Deciduous forest, Orchard or plantation forest, Evergreen broadleaf alpine, Evergreen broadleaf, Evergreen needle leaf, Evergreen mixed forest, Mixed evergreen and deciduous, Urban and build up, Cropland, Rice paddy, Mudflat and intertidal, Mining, Wetlands, Barren | Wetlands, Flooded forest, Evergreen broadleaf alpine, Evergreen broadleaf, Evergreen needle leaf, Evergreen mixed forest, Mixed evergreen and deciduous, | Deciduous forest, | Orchard or plantati on forest, Croplan d, Rice field | Mining, Mudflat and intertidal, Urban and build up |
| 4 | Sensitivity of location | No mining concessions | Kilometer (km) | 0 to >20 km | > 20 km | 10-15 km | 5-10 km | 0-5 km |
| | | No ELCs | Kilometer (km) | 0 to >20 km | > 20 km | 10-15 km | 5-10 km | 0-5 km |

| 5 | Access to services | Water availability (distance from water sources) | Meter (m) | 0 - 2000 m | 0 - 300 m | 300 - 600 m | 600 - 1200m | 1200 - 2000 m (> 2000 m = very unsuitable) |
|---|--|---|---|-----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|---|
| | | Electricity (distance from electricity grid) | Meter (m) | 0 - 2000 m | 0 - 300 m | 300 - 600 m | 600 - 1200m | 1200 - 2000 m (> 2000 m = very unsuitable) |
| | | Health Services (distance from health care centers) | Meter (m) | 0 - 2000 m | 0 - 300 m | 300 - 600 m | 600 - 1200m | 1200 - 2000 m (> 2000 m = very unsuitable) |
| 6 | Distance from existing potential ecotourism / recreational sites (2018) | Existing ecotourism site 2018 V.2 | Kilometer (km) | 0 - 30 km | 0-10 km | 10-20 km | 20-30 km | >30 km |
| 7 | Socio- economic | population (commune | People | | 10 k-20k | 5k - 10k | 1k-5k | <1000 |
| 8 | Market demand | Total existing visitors 2017 by province | Tourist arrivals at provincial level | | 1000k-2000k | 100k-1000k | 50k-100k | <50k |
| 9 | Biodiversity | Biodiversity hotspot (distance from PAs) | Kilometer (km) | Inside to 20 km | Inside to 5 km | 5-10 km | 10-20 | >20 km |

Summary table of suitability score for each sub-criterion used for suitability analysis

| No. | Reselected Criteria | Sub-Criteria | Total | Criteria Suitability Rating | | | ng |
|-----|---|---|---|-----------------------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| | | | Suitability Score (100 points for all of the classes) | High | Moderate | Marginal | Not Suitable |
| 1 | Accessibility | Distance from roads | 5 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| | | Distance from airport | 5 | | | | |
| | | Distance from major townships / communes / districts / provinces | 5 | | | | |
| 2 | Attractiveness | State of conservation (type of protected area) | 14 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 3 | Land use / tenure | Land cover 2016 | 10 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 4 | Sensitivity of location | No mining concessions | 4 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| | | No ELCs | 4 | | | | |
| 5 | Access to services | Water availability (distance from water sources) | 4 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| | | Electricity (distance from electricity grid) | 1 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| | | Health Services (distance from health care centers) | 4 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 6 | Existing ecotourism / CBT / CBET sites | Existing ecotourism site 2018 V.2 | 10 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 7 | Socio-economic | population (commune level) | 9 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 8 | Market demand | Total existing visitors 2017 by province | 10 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 9 | Biodiversity | Biodiversity hotspot (distance from PAs) | 15 | 9.5 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| | Sum of | f Weighted Scores | 100 | | | | |

Results



Results (cont.)

Maps of prepared suitability rating of the criteria uses for weighted overlay analysis

Results of the Simulation

Suitability map for ecotourism in the seven provinces of Cambodia with different scenarios of defining suitability scores for high, moderate, marginal and not suitable classes

List of Ecotourism Sites with Their Computed Suitability Score (the Higher, the More Potential)

| N. ID_Nev | Name of Ecotourism Sites | Name of PA | Suitability score Notes1 | Notes2 |
|-----------|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| 1 | 57 Boeung Pear Raing | N/A | 79.7 Outside PA 1.5 km | |
| 2 | 3 Boeung Kachhang | Peam Krasoab Wildlife Santuary | 79.1 Inside PA | Close to PA boundary 255 m |
| 3 | 16 Prek Toal CBET | Tonie Sap Core Area | 74.2 | |
| 4 | 8 Steung Veng | Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary | 72.9 | |
| 5 | 38 Tatai Krom | South Cardamom Mountains and Middle Cardamom Mountains | 70.5 | |
| 6 | 41 Peam Krasob | Peam Krasoab Wildlife Santuary | 68.8 | |
| 7 | 10 Samros Tek Tleak Chay 12 | Botumsakor National Park | 67.2 | |
| 8 | 36 Samros Tek Tleak Chay 12 | Botumsakor National Park | 67.2 | |
| 9 | 31 Boeng Tonle Sap | Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve | 66.3 | |
| 10 | 4 Reaksmey Phum Pi Kiri Beoung Kra Nhak community | Prey Lang Wildlife Sanctuary | 65.6 Outside PA 4.8 km | |
| 11 | 40 Koh Por | Nature and Wildlife Reserve | 65.4 | |
| 12 | 37 Koh Sralau | Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary | 65.0 | |
| 13 | 42 Toul Ko Ki Leu | Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary | 62.8 | |
| 14 | 39 Trapaing Roung | Beneath Cardamom and Elephant Mountains in Koh Kong | 62.2 | |
| 15 | 17 Kampong Phlok | Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve | 61.8 | |
| 16 | 56 Kbal Spean Waterfall | Kulen National Park | 61.8 | |
| 17 | 5 Beoung Tor Tel | Beoung Pe Wildlife Sanctuary | 61.8 Outside PA 3.5km | |
| 18 | 58 Veal Presh Kral | N/A | 60.5 | |
| 19 | 63 Kirirom (Waterfall III and IV near Wat Chas Pagoda) | Kirirom National Park | 58.9 Inside PA | Outsdie study area 2.9 |
| 20 | 77 O Ta Vao Waterfall | N/A | 58.4 Inside PA | Ouside study area 8.1 km |
| 21 | 13 Prey Thom Por Pel | Phnom Kulen National Park | 58.2 | |
| 22 | 44 Chiphat | South Cardamom Mountains and Middle Cadamom Mountain | 56.8 Outside PA 1.2 km | Inside ELC |
| 23 | 32 Anlong Khmeng Leng | N/A | 53.8 Inside PA | Outsdie study area 7.2 km |
| 24 | 78 Elephant Head Waterfall | N/A | 53.4 Inside PA | Ouside study area 4.9 km |
| 25 | 14 Chub Tasok | Phnom Kulen National Park | 50.3 | |
| 26 | 71 Prey Long Wildlife Sanctuary | Prey Lang Wildlife Sanctuary | 48.4 Inside PA | Outside study area 33.73 |
| 27 | 52 Phnom Somkos | Somkos Wildlife Sanctuary | 47.9 | |
| 28 | 43 Cardamom Mountain | N/A | 47.0 | |
| 29 | 26 Anlong Svay Waterfall | Aural Wildlife Sanctuary | 47.0 outside PA 5.5 km | |
| 30 | 81 Boeng Tonle Sap Multiple Use Area | N/A | 45.5 Outside PA 4.5 km | Inside ELC |
| 31 | 7 Phnom Cherng Leang | Aural Wildlife Sanctuary | 42.3 Outside PA 1km | inside ELC |
| 32 | 25 Leap Kuy Waterfall | N/A | 42.3 inside PA | Near ELC 135m |
| 33 | 2 Chrok La Eang Waterfall | Aural Wildlife Sanctuary | 40.4 | |
| 34 | 1 Chambok | Preah Suramarit-Kossamak Kirirom National Park | 38.3 Inside PA | |
| 35 | 15 Tmor Rong | N/A | 38.3 Inside PA 1.6 km from the PA border | outside study area |
| 36 | 23 Phnom Chreav Waterfall | Aural Wildlife Sanctuary | 38.3 Outside PA 16km | Inside ELC |
| 37 | 12 Tmatboey | Kulen Prom Tep Wildlife Sanctuary | 38.0 Inside PA | Outside study area 50 km |
| 38 | 30 Boeng Tonle Chhmar Core Area / Ramsar | Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve | 37.4 | |
| 39 | 86 Stung Sen Core Area / Ramsar | Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve | 37.2 | |
| 40 | 9 Koh Don Tey | Aural Wildlife Sanctuary | 34.1 | |
| 41 | 6 Areng CBET | South Cardamom Mountains and Middle Cardamom Mountains | 25.7 | |

Descriptive statistics of suitability score

| N. | Commune Name | District Name | Province Name | COM_CODE * | DIS_CODE P | RO_CODE | A | REA MIN | | MAX | RANGE | MEAN | STD | SUM |
|-----|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|------------|---------|----|------------|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| 107 | 8 Chong Khneas | Siem Reap | Siemreap | 171007 | 1710 | 17 | 7 | 28556100 | 0 | 92.15144 | 92.15144 | 68.62472 | 20.82595 | 2177393.81 |
| 107 | 6 Nokor Thum | Siem Reap | Siemreap | 171005 | 1710 | 17 | 7 | 54836100 | 0 | 92.15144 | 92.15144 | 67.79074 | 32.68983 | 4130421.86 |
| 68 | 6 Tuol Kokir | Mondol Seima | Koh Kong | 90503 | 905 | 9 | Э | 71073900 | 0 | 89.84303 | 89.84303 | 66.31539 | 12.0782 | 5236992.56 |
| 67 | 9 Ta Tai Kraom | Kaoh Kong | Koh Kong | 90303 | 903 | 9 | Э | 201516300 | 0 | 84.30286 | 84.30286 | 65.3821 | 6.275867 | 14639509 |
| 68 | 5 Peam Krasaob | Mondol Seima | Koh Kong | 90502 | 905 | 9 | 9 | 46171800 | 0 | 88.64265 | 88.64265 | 62.9575 | 17.11946 | 3229845.39 |
| 107 | 4 Kok Chak | Siem Reap | Siemreap | 171003 | 1710 | 17 | 7 | 38111400 | 0 | 100 | 100 | 62.56381 | 37.72346 | 2649327.11 |
| 68 | 1 Smach Mean Chey | Khemara Phoumin | Koh Kong | 90401 | 904 | 9 | 9 | 57294000 | 0 | 97.6916 | 97.6916 | 61.65055 | 35.81581 | 3924673.68 |
| 67 | '8 Kaoh Kapi | Kaoh Kong | Koh Kong | 90302 | 903 | 9 | • | 61309800 | 0 | 78.39335 | 78.39335 | 60.58286 | 14.83708 | 4127025.28 |
| 68 | 0 Trapeang Rung | Kaoh Kong | Koh Kong | 90304 | 903 | 9 | Э | 906822900 | 0 | 78.94737 | 78.94737 | 59.00443 | 6.354863 | 59451738.7 |
| 68 | 4 Pak Khlang | Mondol Seima | Koh Kong | 90501 | 905 | 9 | 9 | 1365601500 | 0 | 98.70729 | 98.70729 | 57.61842 | 21.65586 | 87426444.3 |
| 10 |)7 Kaoh Chiveang | Aek Phnum | Battambang | 20507 | 205 | 2 | 2 | 446190300 | 0 | 91.22807 | 91.22807 | 57.28091 | 13.72797 | 28397986.1 |
| 110 | 3 Khnang Phnum | Svay Leu | Siemreap | 171303 | 1713 | 17 | 7 | 201821400 | 0 | 76.08495 | 76.08495 | 56.28867 | 11.69092 | 12622508.5 |
| 67 | O Andoung Tuek | Botum Sakor | Koh Kong | 90101 | 901 | 9 | • | 407924100 | 0 | 79.68606 | 79.68606 | 54.75964 | 18.16418 | 24819749.7 |
| 65 | 2 Srae Ambel | Srae Ambel | Koh Kong | 90606 | 906 | 9 | • | 56415600 | 0 | 72.29917 | 72.29917 | 53.26623 | 9.246509 | 3338940.13 |
| 68 | 3 Stueng Veaeng | Khemara Phoumin | Koh Kong | 90403 | 904 | 9 | Э | 41094000 | 0 | 87.16528 | 87.16528 | 51.12485 | 32.27532 | 2334360.64 |
| 65 | 6 Ruessei Chrum | Thma Bang | Koh Kong | 90704 | 907 | 9 | Э | 579934800 | 0 | 84.30286 | 84.30286 | 50.33664 | 9.927206 | 32435520.6 |
| 50 | 6 Peam Bang | Stoung | Kampong Thom | 60807 | 608 | 6 | 5 | 243610200 | 0 | 72.29917 | 72.29917 | 49.59265 | 10.84835 | 13423638.4 |
| 65 | 95 Chumnoab | Thma Bang | Koh Kong | 90703 | 907 | 9 | Э | 65566800 | 0 | 57.98707 | 57.98707 | 48.28432 | 5.064187 | 3517609.29 |
| 65 | 8 Thma Doun Pov | Thma Bang | Koh Kong | 90706 | 907 | 9 | 9 | 506939400 | 0 | 69.15974 | 69.15974 | 47.32528 | 6.97246 | 26656718.5 |
| 108 | 4 Tuek Vil | Siem Reap | Siemreap | 171013 | 1710 | 17 | 7 | 45225900 | 0 | 96.30656 | 96.30656 | 46.41967 | 41.55711 | 2332634.94 |
| 45 | 5 Phat Sanday | Kampong Svay | Kampong Thom | 60206 | 602 | 6 | 5 | 225492300 | 0 | 71.00646 | 71.00646 | 42.21264 | 17.45318 | 10576249.6 |
| 108 | 1 Srangae | Siem Reap | Siemreap | 171010 | 1710 | 17 | 7 | 37391400 | 0 | 88.91967 | 88.91967 | 39.91111 | 36.93198 | 1658147.15 |
| 105 | 7 Pou Treay | Puok | Siemreap | 170709 | 1707 | 17 | 7 | 74901600 | 0 | 74.14589 | 74.14589 | 39.85665 | 23.01035 | 3317029.66 |
| 13 | 2 Ta Taok | Samlout | Battambang | 20901 | 209 | 2 | 2 | 179006400 | 0 | 54.38597 | 54.38597 | 39.51221 | 10.12369 | 7858820.3 |
| 67 | 73 Thma Sa | Botum Sakor | Koh Kong | 90104 | 901 | 9 | Э | 242477100 | 0 | 58.54109 | 58.54109 | 39.05757 | 10.65247 | 10522850.9 |
| 68 | 8 Chi Kha Kraom | Srae Ambel | Koh Kong | 90602 | 906 | 9 | 9 | 71550000 | 0 | 54.38597 | 54.38597 | 38.62526 | 6.18153 | 3070708.26 |
| 108 | 8 Kampong Khleang | Soutr Nikom | Siemreap | 171104 | 1711 | 17 | 7 | 210138300 | 0 | 78.7627 | 78.7627 | 38.04795 | 26.13749 | 8883700.82 |
| 47 | 2 Sakream | Prasat Ballangk | Kampong Thom | 60404 | 604 | 6 | 5 | 345037500 | 0 | 58.91044 | 58.91044 | 37.98019 | 13.04904 | 14560653.9 |
| 102 | 8 Anlong Samnar | Chi Kraeng | Siemreap | 170401 | 1704 | 17 | 7 | 276634800 | 0 | 78.7627 | 78.7627 | 37.93786 | 29.08956 | 11661035 |
| 48 | 5 Mean Chey | Sandan | Kampong Thom | 60605 | 606 | 6 | 5 | 146447100 | 0 | 76.45429 | 76.45429 | 37.8885 | 22.43558 | 6165178.2 |
| 48 | 6 Ngan | Sandan | Kampong Thom | 60606 | 606 | 6 | 5 | 136296900 | 0 | 74.60757 | 74.60757 | 37.51985 | 22.45583 | 5682043.98 |
| 105 | 3 Kaev Poar | Puok | Siemreap | 170704 | 1707 | 17 | 7 | 102923100 | 0 | 91.22807 | 91.22807 | 37.40925 | 40.09151 | 4278084.73 |
| 65 | 3 Ta Tey Leu | Thma Bang | Koh Kong | 90701 | 907 | 9 | Э. | 1780687800 | 0 | 63.98892 | 63.98892 | 37.05572 | 8.417355 | 73316291.9 |
| 10 | 06 Prey Chas | Aek Phnum | Battambang | 20506 | 205 | 2 | 2 | 324299700 | 0 | 73.68421 | 73.68421 | 36.14079 | 14.76389 | 13022720.6 |
| 65 | 1 Dang Peaeng | Srae Ambel | Koh Kong | 90605 | 906 | 9 | 9 | 1282868100 | 0 | 70.45245 | 70.45245 | 34.80485 | 18.83223 | 49611152.6 |
| 65 | 14 Pralay | Thma Bang | Koh Kong | 90702 | 907 | 9 | Э | 764273700 | 0 | 56.60203 | 56.60203 | 34.50269 | 9.35668 | 29299438.8 |
| 102 | 3 Khun Ream | Banteay Srei | Siemreap | 170302 | 1703 | 17 | 7 | 212087700 | 0 | 76.45429 | 76.45429 | 34.25943 | 33.85575 | 8073337.65 |
| 67 | 77 Chrouy Pras | Kaoh Kong | Koh Kong | 90301 | 903 | 9 | 9 | 430668900 | 0 | 77.46999 | 77.46999 | 34.12068 | 20.99801 | 16327460.8 |
| 67 | 6 Preaek Khsach | Kiri Sakor | Koh Kong | 90203 | 902 | 9 | Э. | 289773000 | 0 | 60.29548 | 60.29548 | 33.93831 | 6.594893 | 10927117.4 |
| 67 | 4 Kaoh Sdach | Kiri Sakor | Koh Kong | 90201 | 902 | 9 |) | 174043800 | 0 | 47.46075 | 47.46075 | 33.31461 | 9.491487 | 6442446.5 |
| 67 | 75 Phnhi Meas | Kiri Sakor | Koh Kong | 90202 | 902 | 9 | 9 | 216456300 | 0 | 45.5217 | 45.5217 | 32.05135 | 5.40518 | 7708573.69 |
| 67 | 2 Ta Noun | Botum Sakor | Koh Kong | 90103 | 901 | 9 | 9 | 267804900 | 0 | 51.06186 | 51.06186 | 31.20525 | 7.529287 | 9285465.93 |
| 38 | 2 Ta Sal | Aoral | Kampong Speu | 50405 | 504 | 5 | 5 | 1297206900 | 0 | 65.00462 | 65.00462 | 30.66048 | 8.851755 | 44192208 |
| 48 | 37 Sandan | Sandan | Kampong Thom | 60607 | 606 | 6 | 5 | 256403700 | 0 | 79.40905 | 79.40905 | 30.33019 | 27.48354 | 8640857.88 |
| 107 | 9 Sngkat Sambuor | Siem Reap | Siemreap | 171008 | 1710 | 17 | 7 | 26970300 | 0 | 90.76639 | 90.76639 | 30.04462 | 35.70834 | 900346.985 |
| 68 | 9 Chi kha Leu | Srae Ambel | Koh Kong | 90603 | 906 | 9 | • | 595638000 | 0 | 62.04986 | 62.04986 | 29.65785 | 20.08649 | 19628158.9 |

Thank You!

Ecotourism Development and Management Models in Cambodian Protected Areas

Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project in the Cardamom Mountains and Tonle Sap Landscape

Neth Baromey

WB Ecotourism Consultant

Cambodian Ecotourism Landscape: Emergence of Ecotourism Development

- The emergence of ecotourism in Cambodia was as early as in other developing countries around the world – mid 1990s – specially via CBNRM programs
- The earliest ecotourism projects in Cambodia: 1) Yak Loam CBET, Ratanakiri founded in 1996; 2) Chambok CBET in Kampong Speu founded in 2000 (Rith, et all, 2009).
- In 2007, there were around 36 CBET and ecotourism projects in Cambodia (Men, 2007)
- Currently, there are up to 146 ecotourism and CBET project implementing in the country (MoE, 2019)

Scenic Tatalkrom Community Based Ecotourism began in 2008 as commune development project to attract tourists to this spectacula natural area and improve the livelihoods of local residents. Support wa provided by Danish and British aid, the Koh Kong Department of Tour ism and the Fine Arts Association. In 2009, Tatalkrom was one of th winners of the Hidden Treasures Contest funded by the USAID Cambodia MSME Project.

View fascinating wildlife variet
 Hike in that natural forest
 Visit an ancient Buddhist temy
 Camp overnight in the forest
 Watch fireflies light up the nig
 View the river landscape from
 Observe the spectacular watce
 Learn culture from the local v

Tataikrom is accessed by a 4.5 hour drive from Phnom Penh on National Road No. 4. Take the Sre Ambel turnoff and continue on National Road No. 48 to Koh Kong. Accessible in the dry and rainy seasons.

Cambodian Ecotourism Landscape: Emergence of Ecotourism Development

Motivations behind the country's move to develop ecotourism/CBET include:

- Its commitment to Biological Diversity Convention (BDC, 1992), thus reenactment of PA system and environmental management frameworks
- Its commitment to implement SD policies, especially democratization and resource decentralization (after the election in 1993)
- Its needs to develop national economy and install self-financing mechanism for conservation, while alleviating poverty among nearly 80% of grassroots communities, particularly those residing in or adjacent to PAs

Ecotourism Actors and Models

Two major DRIVERS and strategies for ecotourism and CBET development, which draw on its own development models and participating actor

DRIVER 1: An international intervention strategy for ICDPs – Conservation NGO Model

DRIVER 1: An international intervention strategy for ICDPs – Government Agency / Industry Association Model

Cambodian Ecotourism & CBET Goals and Purposes

Ecotourism & CBET were developed mostly via CBNRM employing Integrated Conservation and Development programs (ICDPs)

DRIVER 2: Economic Development Strategy via Ecotourism Concession

Ecotourism enterprise initiated and self-funded by private sector has no precise development model but come in the form of ecotourism concession through three channels

Large scale ecotourism development project (50-99 years): register with MoC and CDC but need to undergo MoE and inter-ministerial approval through environmental social impact assessment (ESIA) process

Small scale ecotourism development project (50 years): access to only land area in PA that is below 10 hectares and register through MoE

Small scale ecotourism and CBET development project: time period was unclear, register with Mol within framework of Decentralization and Deconcentration (D&D) as cooperative or association when ecotourism initiative is integrated in commune development plan (CDP) or commune investment plan (CIP)

List of large scale ecotourism projects in PAs

| No. | Company | Land Area (ha) | Duration | Location |
|-----|---|----------------|----------|---|
| 1 | Union Development Group Co., Ltd. | 36000 | 99 | "Botum Sakor NP" Koh Kong |
| 2 | SOKIMEX Investment Group (Sokha Hotel) | 18987 | 99 | "Bokor NP" Kampot-Preah Sihanouk |
| 3 | A2A Town (Cambodia) Co., Ltd. | 2000 | 70 | "Kirirom NP" Kampong Speu |
| 4 | A2A Town (Cambodia) Co., Ltd. | 7668 | 70 | "Kirirom NP" Kampong Speu-Preah Sihanouk |
| 5 | Yee Jia Tourism Development Company., Ltd. | 3300 | 70 | Preah Sihanouk NP (Ream), Preah Sihanouk |
| 6 | Royal Group Co., Ltd. | 1408 | 90 | Preah Sihanouk NP (Ream), Preah Sihanouk |
| 7 | Evergreen Success and Asia Resort Development Co., Ltd. | 1480 | 99 | Preah Sihanouk NP (Ream), Preah Sihanouk |
| 8 | SINOMEXIM Investment Co., Ltd. | 4280 | 80 | Botum Sakor NP, Koh Kong province |
| 9 | Sok Kong Import Export Co., Ltd. | 2200 | 90 | Preah Soram Rith-Kosomak "Kirirom" NP, Kampong Speu and Preah Sihanouk |
| 10 | JW (Cambodia) Eco Holiday PET. LTD | 5000 | 50 | Botum Sakor NP, Koh Kong province |
| 11 | Kirirom Ecotourism Investment | 2000 | 70 | Preah Soram Rith-Kosomak "Kirirom" NP, Kampong Speu |
| 12 | CAM-AG Import Export Co., Ltd. | 4350 | 50 | Kulen Promtep Wildlife Sanctuary, Oddormeanchey |
| 13 | MDS Thmor Da EZ Co., Ltd. | 2265 | 70 | Somkos Wildlife Sanctuary, Pursat province |
| 14 | Celestial Star Limited Company | 406 | 50 | Koh Thmei "Ream" NP Preah Sihanouk |
| 15 | HTTH Island Investment Co., Ltd. | 1668 | 50 | Koh Thmei "Ream" Np Preah Sihanouk |

List of small scale ecotourism projects in PAs

| No. | Company | Land Area (ha) | Duration (Year) | Location |
|-----|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---|
| 1 | SBPH Engineering and Construction | 2.30 | 50 | Ream NP, Sihanouk province |
| 2 | Emeril Sen Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.60 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 3 | Hill & Beach Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.60 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 4 | Natural New Island Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.80 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 5 | Sea Bridge Investment Co., Ltd. | 9.60 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 6 | Sea Bridge Investment Co., Ltd. | 0.66 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 7 | Joy Island Entertainment Co., Ltd. | 8.36 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 8 | Natural New Island Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.38 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 9 | Sea Bridge Investment Co., Ltd. | 9.78 | 50 | Ream NP. Koh Thmei island. Preah Sihanouk province |
| 10 | Hill and Beach Resort Co Ltd. | 9.66 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island. Preah Sihanouk province |
| 11 | LCGFX Investment Co., Ltd. | 8.38 | 50 | Ream NP. Koh Thmei island. Preah Sihanouk province |
| 12 | Emeril Sen Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.52 | 50 | Ream NP. Koh Thmei island. Preah Sibanouk province |
| 13 | IFT's Group Co. 1td | 9.98 | 50 | Preah Monivong NP (Bokor) Kampot |
| 14 | Mrs. Heang Kunthei | 9.66 | 50 | (Anlong Khmeng Leng) Kampot |
| 15 | Racing Corporation | 9.65 | 50 | Keb NP. Keb province |
| 16 | Racing Company | 9.65 | 50 | Keb NP, Keb province |
| 17 | CKK Investment Co., Ltd. | 9.73 | 50 | Keb NP, Keb province |
| 18 | H.E. Sear Rethy | 9.95 | 50 | Keb NP, Keb province |
| 19 | JET's Group Co., Ltd. | 9.95 | 50 | Te Teuk Pos, Kampong Speu province |
| 20 | Our HS Convenience Co., Ltd. | 9.83 | 50 | Te Teuk Pos, Kampong Speu province |
| 21 | UID Development Co., Ltd. | 9.97 | 50 | Te Teuk Pos, Kampong Speu province |
| 22 | Mrs. Sut Sothet | 9.85 | 50 | Te Teuk Pos, Kampong Speu province |
| 23 | Joy Island Entertainment Co., Ltd. | 9.94 | 50 | Cardamom Mountains Biodiversity Corridor, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 24 | Natural New Island Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.86 | 50 | Cardamom Mountains Biodiversity Corridor, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 25 | Sea Bridge Investment Co., Ltd. | 9.81 | 50 | Cardamom Mountains Biodiversity Corridor, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 26 | Hill and Beach Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.80 | 50 | Cardamom Mountains Biodiversity Corridor, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 27 | LCGFX Investment Co., Ltd. | 9.91 | 50 | Cardamom Mountains Biodiversity Corridor, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 28 | Emeril Sen Resort Co., Ltd. | 9.87 | 50 | Cardamom Mountains Biodiversity Corridor, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 29 | Mr. Sarom Radi | 5.75 | 50 | Keb NP, Keb province |
| 30 | Mr. Pov Ponnarak | 1.75 | 50 | Keb NP, Keb province |
| 31 | Mrs. Thong Danet | 9.80 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 32 | Mrs. Seng Socheta | 9.90 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 33 | Mr. Ho Sethivon | 9.80 | 50 | Ream NP, Koh Thmei island, Preah Sihanouk province |
| 34 | Mr. Chhem Phan | 9.73 | 50 | Koh Thmei island, Ream NP, Preah Sihanouk |
| 35 | Mrs. Heng Malen | 6.13 | 50 | Koh Thmei island, Ream NP, Preah Sihanouk |
| 36 | Mrs. Chan Sok Cheng | 10 | 50 | Southern Cardamom Mountains, Koh Kong province |
| 37 | Mr. Ly Sen Serey | 10 | 50 | Southern Cardamom Mountains, Koh Kong province |
| 38 | Mrs. Teub Chan Theoun | 10 | 50 | Ta Ngol Mountain, TaTai Wildlife Sanctuary, Koh Kong province |
| 39 | Mrs. Teub Chan Theoun | 5.39 | 50 | Koh Moul, Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary, Koh Kong province |
| 40 | Mrs. Heng Sokhen | 10 | 50 | Koh Moul, Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary, Koh Kong province |
| 41 | H.E. Chheoung Sokuntheavy | 10 | 50 | Kbal Preah Waterfall, Mondulkiri |
| 42 | H.E. Chheoung Thean Keat | 10 | 50 | Kbal Preah Waterfall, Mondulkiri |
| 43 | Her Excellency Lav Sokhuy | 10 | 50 | Kbal Preah Waterfall, Mondulkiri |
| 44 | H.E. Chheoung Thean Seng | 10 | 50 | Kbal Preah Waterfall, Mondulkiri |

List of Small and Large Scale Ecotourism Enterprises Located in Protected Areas in the Target Provinces

| No | Company | Land | Duration | Туре | Location | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Area (ha) | (Year) | | | | | | |
| | Koh Kong Province | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Mrs. Chan <u>Sok</u> Cheng | 10 | 50 | Small | Southern Cardamom Mountains, Reussei Chhrum commune, Thmar | | | | |
| | | | | | Bang district, Koh Kong | | | | |
| 2 | Mr. Ly Sen <u>Serey</u> | 10 | 50 | Small | Southern Cardamom Mountains, <u>Reussei Chhrum</u> commune, <u>Thmar</u> | | | | |
| | | | | | Bang district, Koh Kong | | | | |
| 3 | Mrs. <u>Teub</u> Chan <u>Theoun</u> | 10 | 50 | Small | Ta Ngol Mountain, Koh Andet village, Tatai Krom commune, Koh | | | | |
| | | | | | Kong district, Koh Kong province (TaTai Wildlife Sanctuary) | | | | |
| 4 | Mrs. <u>Teub</u> Chan <u>Theoun</u> | 5.39 | 50 | Small | Koh Moul, Mux village, Koh Kapi commune, Koh Kong district, Koh | | | | |
| | | | | | Kong province (Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary) | | | | |
| 5 | Mrs. <u>Heng Sokhen</u> | 10 | 50 | Small | Koh Moul, Mux village, Koh Kapi commune, Koh Kong district, Koh | | | | |
| | | | | | Kong province (Peam Krasob Wildlife Sanctuary) | | | | |
| 6 | Union Development Group Co., Ltd. | 36,000 | 99 | Large | " <u>Botum Sakor</u> National Park", <u>Koh</u> Kong province | | | | |
| 7 | SINOMEXIM Investment Co., Ltd. | 4,280 | 80 | Large | Botum Sakor National Park, Koh Kong province | | | | |
| 8 | JW (Cambodia) Eco Holiday PET. LTD | 5,000 | 50 | Large | <u>Botum Sakor</u> National Park, <u>Koh</u> Kong province | | | | |
| | Kampong Speu Province | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | A2A Town (Cambodia) Co., Ltd. | 2,000 | 70 | Large | "Kirirom National Park" Kampong Speu province | | | | |
| 10 | A2A Town (Cambodia) Co., Ltd. | 7,668 | 70 | Large | "Kirirom National Park" Kampong Speu-Preah Sihanouk provinces | | | | |
| 11 | JET's Group Co., Ltd. | 9.95 | 50 | Small | Te Teuk Pos, Aural district, Kampong Speu province | | | | |
| 12 | Sok Kong Import Export Co., Ltd. | 2,200 | 90 | Large | Sustainable Use Area of Preah Soram Rith-Kosomak "Kirirom" | | | | |
| | | | | | National Park, Kampong Speu and Preah Sihanouk provinces | | | | |
| 13 | Our HS Convenience Co., Ltd. | 9.83 | 50 | Small | Te Teuk Pos, Aural district, Kampong Speu province | | | | |
| 14 | UID Development Co., Ltd. | 9.97 | 50 | Small | Te Teuk Pos, Aural district, Kampong Speu province | | | | |
| 15 | Mrs. Sut Sothet | 9.85 | 50 | Small | Te Teuk Pos, Aural district, Kampong Speu province | | | | |
| 16 | Kirirom Ecotourism Investment | 20 | 50 | Small | Preah Soram Rith-Kosomak "Kirirom" National Park, Kampong Speu | | | | |
| | Pursat Province | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | MDS <u>Thmor</u> Da EZ Co., Ltd. | 2,265 | 70 | Large | Somkos Wildlife Sanctuary, Thmor Da village, Veal Veng district, | | | | |
| | | | | | Pursat province | | | | |

Cambodian Ecotourism & CBET Goals and Purposes

Ecotourism concession & CBET projects were developed via enterprise-based small and large scale approach

2. Ecotourist Arrivals and Receipts

- Tourist arrivals increased around 9.5% to 10 % from 2016 to 2017
- International tourists to ecotourism destinations increased around 8% from 2016 to2017

| | 2016 | | | 2017 | | | |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|--|
| Cambodia | Domestic | Int. | Receipt | Domestic | Int. | Receipt | |
| Tourist Arrivals | 10,642,081 | 5,011,712 | \$3,212M | 10,864,368 | 5,602,157 | \$3,638M | |
| Ecotourist Arrival s | 510,381 | 66,349 | N/A | 497,651 | 71,697 | N/A 14 | |

Tourist Arrivals and Revenue in CBET Sites

| No. | Site | Ave. Daily Expense (USD) | Tourist Arrival in 2017 | Tourist Arrival in 2018 | Income 2017 | Income 2018 |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | Chiphat CBET | 23\$** | 3395 | 2583 | 158,379\$ | 163,396\$ |
| 2 | Chambok CBET | 13.3\$* | 12650 | 12707 | 53,950\$ | 12,688\$ |
| 3 | Chrok La Eang Waterfall CBET | 10\$** | 121788 | 91193 | 54,277\$ | 26,008\$ |
| 4 | Peam Krasob CBET | 14.64\$** | 75314 | 95575 | 61,072\$ | 87,965\$ |
| 5 | Beoung Ka Chhang | 15\$* | 476 | 160 | 2,350\$ | 473\$ |
| 6 | Anlong Svay CBET | 5\$* | 3000* | 5000* | 15,000\$ | 25,000\$* |
| 7 | Dong Phlet CBET | 62.56\$** | 164 | 91 | 10,261\$ | 3,600\$ |
| 8 | Phnom Chreav Waterfall | 25\$** | 1800 | 23831 | 750\$ | 5,286\$ |
| 9 | Reaksmey Phum Pi Kiri Beoung Kra Nhak CBET | 13\$** | 10040 | 4730 | 1,250\$ | 3,875\$ |
| 10 | Areng CBET | 40\$* | 884 | 802 | 35,360\$ | 11,958\$ |
| 11 | Koh Sralau CBET | 10\$* | 700 | 250 | 7,000\$ | 25,000\$* |
| 12 | Samros Tek Tleak Chay 12 | 40\$* | 20* | 0 | 800\$ | N/A |
| 13 | Preak Thnot CBET | N/A | 30288 | 91666 | 7,727\$ | 20345\$ |
| 14 | Mondol Yorn CBET | 32.6\$* | 158 | 48 | 290\$ | 176\$ |
| 15 | Tmatboey CBET | 39\$* | 279 | 322 | 27,000\$ | 14,190\$ |
| 16 | Tmor Rong CBET | N/A | 15794 | 19894 | 3,075\$ | 7,257\$ |
| 17 | Prek Toal CBET | 110\$* | 1,184 | 1,029 | 130,240\$** | 113,190\$** |
| 18 | Kampong Phlok CBET | 30\$* | N/A | 10,000* | N/A | 300,000\$** |

3. Best Practices of Ecotourism Development

- Literature concerning performances of private ecotourism resorts or enterprises is limited yet
- There is a recent assessment conducted by the MoT, "Model Tourism Resort Award," offering 26 medals to both ecotourism and non-ecotourism resorts in Cambodia based on three broad criteria that have not entirely included ecotourism pillars / principles yet:
 - 1) best resort management,
 - 2) good environmental consideration, and
 - 3) extensive information dissemination, well safety performance, and high tourist satisfaction (MoT, 2018).

3. Best Practices of Ecotourism Development

- Best practices concerning CBET projects is well-known nationally and recognized by some international accreditation organizations
- Best practices concerning small scale CBET include:
 - 1) Engage communities and stakeholders in conservation and endogenous development that contribute to enhance enabling frameworks, resources, capacities, community solidarity, and collective actions for both endeavors;
 - 2) Promote partnership building and increase opportunities for income generation, livelihoods diversification which contribute to self-reliance, self-efficiency, improved welfare and local living standards;
 - 3) Promote environmental awareness, education and conservation among communities, stakeholders and visitors that lead to changes of attitudes, more self-regulated activities and less destructive practice concerning the environment
 - 4) Increase capacity and leadership for development and management of decentralized institutions at either commune level and community-based organization (CBOs)

To Do 2013! Cambodian Award Winner (Socially Responsible Tourism) March 5th, 2014, Berlin, Germany http://www.todo-contest.org/preistraeger-en/kambodscha14-02.html

ទទួលពានរង្វាន់សម្ដេច នាយករដ្ឋមន្ត្រី ស្ដីអំពីធុរៈកិច្ចបៃតង វិស័យទេសចរណ៍

ខែកញ្ញាឆ្នាំ២០១៦

4. Challenges of Ecotourism Development in Cambodia

- PA system is conductive to large-scale development or spontaneous and impulsive actions (e.g. large-scale infrastructures and facilities) due mainly to shortage of legal frameworks (esp. PA management plan)
- The problems of overuse and confusion between ecotourism and nature-based mass tourism (esp. in large scale ecotourism site) due mainly to limited mechanisms to regulate use (e.g. contracts on design, product offer, energy consumption, etc.)

 Limited human capital and financial resources allocated to manage PA ecotourism appropriately

4. Challenges of Ecotourism Development in Cambodia

- Limited coordination among different influential stakeholders / actors in ecotourism context
- Donor and civil society driven initiatives (esp. CBET projects) lead to adequate support and partial involvement from relevant government agencies / stakeholders
- Sudden increase in demand for diversifying ecotourism experiences and corresponding proliferation of ecotourism and CBET sites with limited quality of services and under qualified products
- Quality of basic infrastructure required by visitors are minimal and often below acceptation to even down-toearth ecotourists

- **CBET Enterprise Model:** strengthen the current CBET ventures and nurture their entrepreneurship aspects.
- 3 criteria that identify CBET enterprise include:
 - Local community ownership of the venture
 - Full community involvement in the venture's operation and management
 - The community as the main beneficiary of the initiative

- Partnership between CBET community and private enterprise (Community-Private Sector Partnership Model)
 - May be promoted at an early stage with facilitation from government agencies, PA authority or NGOs
 - Need precise "contractual agreements" and time to develop a shared understanding of expectation and benefit sharing
 - Benefits from encouraging the partnership:
 - 1) greater security for CBET managers than short term funds from philanthropic and donor agencies;
 - 2) better position for CBET managers to undertake market research and marketing to ensure there is a market for the offering CBET experience;
 - better access to skills and funds needed for diversifying and unique ecotourism or CBET experiences while complying with PA's regulations and guidelines or master plan.

1. A private lodge or resort built in CBET land but operated privately and voluntarily share a mutually agreed upon portion of their revenue with the CBET community A marketing partnership with tour operator: increase synergy for ecotourism and CBET enterprise (e.g. Osmose, CRDTour, Sam Veasna Center, etc.)

A joint venture lodge / resort as a partnership between a private investor and the local community. A private investor builds and operate the lodge / resort, but in a contractual relationship with the CBET community, which makes a recognized contribution to the enterprise in return for a share of the financial and other benefits.

• Private ecotourism enterprise model

- Need concession endorsement from relevant authorities (e.g. MoE)
- Need precise "contractual agreements" with PA management / MoE on designs, products offer, EUF/PES, employment, etc. based on broader master/management plan of each specific PA
- Benefits from encouraging the private enterprise:
- 1) Private sector participation in defending forest, biodiversity and environment in PA setting;
- 2) better position for market research and marketing to ensure there is a market for the offering ecotourism experience;
- Access to skills and funds needed for diversifying and unique ecotourism experiences while complying with PA's regulations and guidelines or master plan.

- Partnership between CBET community and PA Management Model
 - May be promoted in context where CBET community is residing in or adjacent to a PA (gateway community) but operating ecotourism activities within the PA boundary
 - Need various contractual agreements on commercial licenses or entry fee (gateway community), sharing of benefits on finishing goods and services, permitted activities, designs and products offer, etc.
 - Benefits from encouraging the partnership:
 - 1) Endorse community and stakeholders' participation in conservation and provide incentive for diversifying local livelihoods from destructive forest-based activities;
 - 2) Fund for additional financing of PA management activities and conservation initiatives;
 - 3) better cooperation for ensuring that CBET activities comply with PA's regulations and guidelines or master plan.

7. Mechanisms for Implementing Proposed Models

- Develop the guideline and M&E toolkits for the development and management of CBET sites in PAs or CBET sites (gateway community) using PA resources for their ecotourism operations;
- Encourage and facilitate the registration of CPA and CBET (as a sub-management of CPA or a sole management by itself) to operate CBET services within PAs;
- Formulate a contractual agreement between CPA/CBET community and PA management for CBET operation, resource decision-making and planning, benefit sharing based on equity considerations, and comanagement;
- Develop standardization and accreditation or certification mechanisms for CBET operation in and around PAs (using PA resources as core attractions);
- Provide capacity building programs and acceptable hard ecotourism infrastructure to CPA/CBET community;
- Conduct regular trainings and M&E of CBET operation by PA authority;
- Encourage joint marketing and promotion, joint product development and diversification as well as joint trainings with other responsible bodies (i.e. MoT and MAFF); *and*
- Encourage and facilitate active support and involvement from local government, especially village and commune authorities in the areas.

7. Mechanisms for Implementing Proposed Models

- Develop PA ecotourism destination or hub management office / body to improve the cooperation and coordination among all key stakeholders and with travel and tourism companies;
- Develop management frameworks in the forms of guideline, M&E mechanisms and associated supports (i.e. task force, supporting infrastructure, financing strategy, M&E toolkits, etc.) for the development, management and operation of ecotourism enterprises / services in PAs;
- Ensure regular communication and consultation with concerned private ecotourism enterprises on and enforcement of relevant legal, policy, and regulatory frameworks and advices of the MoE and PA management (and other responsible bodies, i.e. MoT and MAFF) by ecotourism concessionaires operating in PAs and by external travel and tourism companies;
- Facilitate regular information exchange between private enterprises, PA authority of MoE and other key stakeholders (including local communities and authorities and other responsible ministries / authorities) in order to help the private ecotourism industry develop more sustainable ecotourism operations and products in PAs;
- Introduce sustainable PA management awareness creation measures to ecotourism concessionaires and other travel and tourism industries as well as encourage and incentivize them to adopt sustainable procedures (including also 3Rs practice in waste management, energy efficiency, and water resource management) for their businesses in PAs;

7. Mechanisms for Implementing Proposed Models

- Promote sustainability standardization, certification and accreditation schemes that encourage responsible and sustainable entrepreneurship among concerned private enterprises;
- Raise and acknowledge the profile of socially and environmentally responsible investment issues within ecotourism concessionaires and other concerned tourism industries;
- Provide information on and regulate development of uses of proper and responsible ecotourism infrastructure (including also sewage treatment plants), facilities, and products (attractions, services, amenities, and activities) in PAs; and
- Facilitate multi-stakeholder engagement from other responsible agencies in joint marketing and promotion, in joint product development, and in joint planning processes.

Priority Investments for Ecotourism Development

Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project in the Cardamom Mountains and Tonle Sap Landscape

> Neth Baromey WB Ecotourism Consultant

Approaches

0

0

Desk Review **Field Visits**

- Stakeholder Consultations & Group Interviews Non-Participant Observation

- Ecotourism information centers / Visitor information & welcome centers \checkmark
- Toilet facilities with onsite treatment system 222
- Solid waste management facilities (trash-bins for waste separation, waste collection and transport facilities, incinerators, composing facilities, etc.) $\checkmark \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark$
- Pay-toll facilities at the entrances to PAs \checkmark
- Access roads in the forms of BTSD roads and / or concrete paved roads 4 4 4 4
- Clean water supply facilities (i.e. wells / tube / pump wells, water storage tanks, water filters, etc.) A A A

- Tourist boat docks (i.e. Tatai Krom, Peam Krasob, Chong Kneas, etc.) A A A
- Sub-stations or guard stations for PA rangers \overleftrightarrow
- Ecotourism maps and circuits \overleftrightarrow
- Ecotourism signage A A

 \bigcirc

- Interpretive or pedestrian paths for ecotourists and visitors inside CPAs / PAs \checkmark
- Sewage system (e.g. using French drain) to avoid pollution of surface water & underground water

- Energy efficiency system (i.e. improved cook stoves, solar panels, biomass and biogas, etc.) \checkmark
- Risk management facilities (including ranger facilities, i.e. patrol facilities and equipment, wooden staircases with handles, etc.) $\checkmark \checkmark$
- Parking facilities (Tatai Krom, Kulen National Park, etc.) location specific International Park, etc.)
- Ecotourist facilities (i.e. bird-watching or natural landscape viewing towers, camp grounds, mountain bikes, kayaks / rowing boats, leisure cottages / kiosks, etc.) these could be considered in next phases of the project

 Improve management frameworks for sustainable PAs and CPAs management

2. Capacity building

3. Establish PA ecotourism knowledge management platform

\rightarrow Improve management frameworks for sustainable PA and CPA management $\checkmark \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark$

- 1. PA land registration
- 2. PA boundary demarcation and zonation
- 3. Management plan (strategic and action plans included)
- 4. Guidelines for ecotourism development and management in CPAs
- 5. Guidelines for ecotourism concessions in PAs
- 6. M&E measures and toolkits (incl. criteria, indicators, checklists, etc.) for both ecotourism development and management by CPAs and PA concessionaires
- 7. Ecotourism handbook / blueprint in PAs and CPAs

Existing Policy and Regulatory Frameworks Related to Ecotourism Development and Concession in Cambodia

| Existing Laws / Regulations / Framework | Year |
|---|----------|
| Sub-Decree on the Development of Supreme Tourism Sites | 2019 |
| 10th Draft Environmental and Natural Resources Code of Cambodia | 2018 |
| National Ecotourism Policy | 2018 |
| National Protected Area Strategic Management Plan 2017-2031 | 2017 |
| National Protected Area System Strategic Management Framework | 2014 |
| Guidebook on Environmental Impact Assessment in the Kingdom of Cambodia | 2012 |
| Cambodia Environment Outlook | 2009 |
| Prakas on Guideline for Conducting Environmental Impact Assessment Report | 2000 |
| Tourism Reform Plan 2015-2020 | 2015 |
| Tourism Development Strategic Plan 2012-2020 | 2012 |
| National Forest Programme 2010-2029 | 2010 |
| Law on Tourism | 2009 |
| Protected Area Law | 2008 |
| Law on Concession | 2007 |
| Sub-Decree on Environmental Impact Assessment Process | 1999 |
| Tourism Master Plan Development for Mondulkiri Province as an integrated | On-going |
| ecotourism development hub in Northeastern Cambodia | |
| Tourism Master Plan Development for Keb Province | On-going |
| Master Plan for Tourism Product Development and Tourism Industry | On-going |
| Development | |

- Capacity building A related to: (1) PA and CPA management; (2) relevant legal, policy and regulatory frameworks; (3) ecotourism and hospitality skills trainings; (4) ecotourism entrepreneurship; (5) environmental management system and related skills and practices; (6) green standardization & eco-certification; and (7) language and communication skills.
 - MoE & PA management: (1), (2), (5), and (6)
 - PA rangers: (1), (2), (5), (6) and (7) *in case they are collaborating with or supporting CPAs, (3) is also vital for them*
 - Ecotourism concessionaires: (1), (2), (5) and (6)
 - CPA & CBET management committees: (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7)

• Establish PA ecotourism knowledge management platform $\checkmark \checkmark \checkmark$ incorporating the following functions:

- 1. Gather up-to-date ecotourism information (principles and concepts, orientations, legal and regulatory frameworks, research papers and case studies, destinations / sites and their histories, products, communities, ecosystems, special events, lessons learnt and best practices, contact information, etc.) in PAs and CPAs in the target provinces and across Cambodia
- 2. Digitalize, host, and publish PA ecotourism information through interactive and proactive online platform
- 3. Conduct marketing and coordination of PA ecotourism through online platform
- 4. Collaborate with relevant stakeholders and development partners to innovate ecotourism products and services in PAs and CPAs through R&D
- 5. Perform as capacity developers and accreditors of green standardization and eco-certification of ecotourism sites / destinations / investments in PAs and CPAs
- 6. Organize PA ecotourism knowledge sharing events for all relevant stakeholders

Proposed outline of guidelines for ecotourism concession in PAs

- Introduction
- Getting to know relevant legal and regulatory frameworks
- Ecotourism concession rights in PAs
- Steps in planning and applying for ecotourism concession in PAs
- Master plan development and feasibility study for ecotourism concession
- Environmental impact assessment
- Licensing ecotourism concession and awarding protocol

- Dealing with contractual agreements, revenue management and distribution
- Managing and monitoring ecotourism concession performance
- Develop PA management capability
- Visitor impact management and quality visitor experience under concession scheme
- Risk and crisis management strategies
- Partnership between ecotourism concessionaire and PA authority
- Sustainable pathways and illustrative activities
- Conclusions

Proposed outline of guidelines for ecotourism development and management in CPAs

- Introduction
- Getting to know relevant legal and regulatory frameworks
- Ecotourism development rights in CPAs
- Steps in registering CPA and in planning for ecotourism development in CPAs
- Conducting feasibility study for ecotourism development in CPAs
- Management plan (environmental management & ecotourism management plan) formulation
- Awarding ecotourism development in CPAs and licensing protocol

- Developing contractual agreements, revenue management and distribution mechanism
- Monitoring ecotourism business performance
- Building community capability for ecotourism
- Visitor impact management and quality visitor experience through ecotourism in CPAs
- Risk and crisis management strategies
- Partnership between CBET community and PA authority
- Sustainable pathways and illustrative activities
- Conclusions

Thank You!

