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ABSTRACT

This socio-dynamics study is focused on five urban poor communities located in the South of Phnom Penh, where PE&D is currently implementing a three-year project to improve living and housing conditions on varying levels.

Beyond the project activities, PE&D intended to conduct research to gain more contextual knowledge. The main points of this analysis address the history of the settlements, the migration process, the housing status, the attitude of the inhabitants, their relationships, and their perception of their own evolution.

The objectives of this research are to improve PE&D’s knowledge of its intervention areas, to implement research-action pilot projects according to the findings of this study and to draft a discussion paper for the other stakeholders involved in the development of these areas.

To collect the information, four focus group discussions were conducted with ten participants, and an individual questionnaire was distributed to 419 respondents.

Community profiles were elaborated through this research and they presented the main characteristics, which clearly showed the distinctions between communities. These characteristics were in terms of the housing status of different kinds of owners and tenants with even different nationalities. A first conclusion highlighted the amount of differences present between communities, which thus requires a local and specific response instead of a standard approach to tackling the issues of urban poor.

Another main conclusion of this study was that the inhabitants upheld a determined willingness to remain permanently in their dwellings. This information is crucial for stakeholders because it strengthened the credibility of the development and the on-site improvement projects. Moreover, this study highlighted the strong relationships between community members, their generally solid perception of security, and their positive attitude towards changes. All these elements indicated a fertile ground for on-site development.
In 20 years, Cambodia’s capital Phnom Penh has grown rapidly, from 567,850 inhabitants in 1998 to 2,129,371 in 2019. This growth is mainly due to rural-urban migration in search of employment opportunities. This poorly controlled migration resulted in the establishment of 277 dwellings in a precarious settlement, characterized by a lack of secure land tenure, informal and very poor housing, high unemployment levels, and high prevalence of domestic violence.

After 15 years of social work in these precarious settlements, Planète Enfants & Développement (PE&D), with its partner SKO\(^1\), started a new project in July 2018. This project aims at improving living and housing conditions in targeted precarious communities of South Phnom Penh and tackling the issues faced by the inhabitants with an innovative holistic approach. This approach can be summarized through four types of activities: improving unsafe habitats, providing and strengthening social support, strengthening the community cohesion and resilience, and preventing domestic and gender-based violence. In addition to this operational approach, PE&D also included research so as to improve its knowledge of the intervention areas and gain a better understanding of the communities and their internal dynamics. In particular, the aim of this study was to understand how such communities have appeared and grown, and how they have been evolving. The work started in 2019 and was completed in 2020. It consisted of a qualitative study with four focus group discussions of about ten community members and a village leader along with a quantitative study through survey applications directly with the community dwellers. Four communities were surveyed in 2019 and four others were planned to be surveyed in 2020, however due to the COVID-19 crisis, the study had to be put on hold and only a total of five communities were surveyed.

This report was organized along four main themes: the migration process, the types of household and housing status, the community's attitude regarding infrastructure, security and relationships, and their perception of the evolution. These themes yielding numerous questions which were submitted to the inhabitants. The results have been analyzed and presented in the form of graphs. This research has also led to the elaboration of community profiles, in which the main characteristics of the four communities are presented in the appendix.

PE&D would like to warmly thank all of the participants to this survey for their patience and fruitful collaboration.

\(^1\)Samatapeap Khnom Organization (SKO) was created in 2007 with the goal of improving the quality of life of families in urban poor communities in Cambodia by providing counselling, referral and training.
I - Context

A. Phnom Penh urbanization and multiplication of urban poor settlements

Phnom Penh’s population has increased massively by over 1.5 million inhabitants from 1998 to today. This rapid expansion results from the migration of a part of their population, mostly from the province, settling in informal areas in the capital. According to the World Population Review, in 2012, 6.56% of the Phnom Penh population lived in poor urban settlements. In 2018, 277 poor urban settlements were identified in Phnom Penh, compared to 410 in 2009 and 340 in 2014. This decreasing trend is due to several factors, notably the fact that settlements have been relocated outside the capital.

These settlements can be characterized based on the UNHABITAT definition of an urban poor household as “a group of individuals living under the same roof in an urban area who lack one or more of the following:

1. Durable housing of a permanent nature that protects against extreme climate conditions.
2. Sufficient living space which means no more than three people sharing the same room.
3. Easy access to safe water in sufficient amounts at an affordable price.
4. Access to adequate sanitation in the form of a private or public toilet shared by a reasonable number of people.
5. Security of tenure that prevents forced evictions.”

Cambodia’s urbanization context is unique and has led to a proliferation of informal urban settlements in the capital. In 1975, the Khmer Rouge regime forced all the inhabitants to leave the cities. On April 17th, the evacuation of the entire capital city had begun. Within a few days, two million people were coerced to leave the city for the countryside. After the collapse of the Pol Pot regime in 1979, Cambodians began to move back to cities to settle down, even if it meant building their own homes on land that did not belong to them.

In Phnom Penh, the migration process was uncontrolled and most of these poor urban settlements are located in unsafe areas, such as road sides, railways, and roofs of existing buildings. The majority are located near water sources like ponds, canals, rivers, swamps or lakes (STT, 2018). In fact, when people first arrived around 1979, they settled in areas they considered to be ‘free land space’. These communities are even more vulnerable when the rainy season begins. They risk flooding due to rising river levels and insufficient, even non-existent, sewage disposal systems, especially in informal areas. Many habitats were assessed as being unsafe, with a high risk of collapsing or being flooded, and conditions were considered essentially precarious. Moreover, as most of the settlements are located on public land, they were deemed illegal from the land tenure

---

5 Comments received during the community members focus groups.
perspective. Dwellers often faced the lack of adequate infrastructures like proper drainage systems and garbage collection services, as mentioned in the PE&D pilot project between 2017 and 2018. This must be taken into account, as authorities have agreed to develop appropriate infrastructure in certain informal areas, even though the land is considered public.

One of the reasons of the rapid urbanization of the capital during these last two decades is due to Land Law amended in 2001, which provides the possibility of accessing property. Since the Khmer Rouge regime, it had not been possible for Khmer people to own land and properties. Thus, the executive application of the law resulted in a sharp increase of land prices. Due to the price inflation, a proportion of rural inhabitants had sold their land then migrated to informal areas, hoping to access property after a long-term settlement. However, during this period, a larger part of the rural inhabitants settled in the capital city, hoping for a better life, and above all, more job opportunities. This rural-urban migrant population, due to their limited education, are mainly qualified for informal jobs such as construction workers, domestic workers, tuk-tuk drivers, vegetable sellers and trash collectors.

Although the Land Law was an opportunity to access property, there were significant exceptions. Dwellers that have settled on public land may not, in principle, receive a land title, particularly if they settled on roadsides and river banks. Regarding communities that have settled on private land, the situation is more complex, but some could, in theory and according to the law, obtain an official title for the land. Nonetheless, in many cases it remains difficult to distinguish and differentiate private and public land. The public also does not have access to the land registry, if any exists.

Certain studies on the Phnom Penh’s urban poor have already been carried out, by the Government or development agencies and NGO’s. The assessment was on different levels, from individual households to the overall communities. In order to better understand the situation within the poor urban households, a study undertaken by People in Need and UNICEF (2015) has compared the results they obtained with the general situation of Phnom Penh inhabitants in the Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey (CDHS, 2010), to those from the National Institute of Statistics of Cambodia. Households are usually defined as “those having a common cooking arrangement and recognizing a single person as the head of that unit”. Essentially, the situation regarding underweight and stunted growth in children, low vaccination rates, levels of poverty and lack of proper sanitation was much worse for urban poor households than for the rest of Phnom Penh inhabitants. Illustrating this point, the assessment revealed that in the two weeks prior to the study, almost three quarters of the children fell ill, an extremely high figure, probably related to poor health and environmental conditions. Regarding poverty measurement, some disparities between communities have been noticed, which demonstrates that one single description cannot fit with the reality and the variety of urban poor communities in Phnom Penh.

---
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B. Objective of the study

As explained in the Context, data of multiple topics such as the socio-economic situation of families who live in the urban poor settlements can already be found.

This present study has been conducted with the purpose of learning more about the communities and their internal dynamics. The aim of this research work is to primarily improve PE&D’s knowledge of its intervention areas, secondly to implement research-action projects according to the findings, and finally to create a discussion paper for the policymakers.

The current PE&D project “Improving the Autonomy and Living Environment of Poor Communities in Phnom Penh” is implemented in eight communities located in four districts in the South and South-Eastern parts of Phnom Penh: Chamkarmon, Boeung Keng Kang, Mean Chey and Chbar Ampov. The study was conducted in five of these eight urban settlements. The location of the different studied communities is presented in the map below.

Location of the surveyed communities
The study intended to answer the following questions:

- What exactly is a community? Is there a clear geographic or sociologic limitation?
- What is the community's history? Why and when did the inhabitants settle in?
- Do the people want to stay in this community area permanently or is it a temporary settlement?
- Who are the inhabitants? What is their profile?
- What are the solidarity links among them?
- What is their evolution perception compared to the past? What are their expectations for the future?

This report gives a detailed picture of the communities by characterizing the population on the basis of their origin, duration of residence, habitat conditions, and composition of households. It provides an understanding of the existing dynamics by capturing the people’s attitude regarding life in the community. This is done by assessing their level of satisfaction regarding infrastructure, their perception of security, and their interpersonal relationships within the community.

By having a better and deeper comprehension of the life within the communities, PE&D will better be able to submit projects and recommendations to other stakeholders to support the dwellers’ lives.
II - Methodology

A. Design of the survey: primary qualitative data sources of information

In order to get the information expected above, the use of individual surveys has been considered the best approach. Indeed, directly interviewing community members is a great opportunity to get relevant quantitative and qualitative data. Reliable baseline and accurate existing data are difficult to find. Some data on the community members are collected by village chiefs, but it mostly consists of filling out lists with names, gender, and other basic information. Moreover, there are very few controls and not much monitoring of the information from the relevant authority that uses and disseminates this data.

Thus, prior to the survey creation process, other types of data have been produced through focus groups from the communities.

The focus groups have been set up with members of the first four communities where the project was implemented: Preaek Takong 1, Preaek Takong 3, Preaek Toal and Daeum Chan. Each focus group was composed of ten participants, including the village leader. The survey can be found in Appendix 1. It gathers several questions regarding the collection of qualitative data on the dynamics and common attitudes within the communities.

The information obtained with these focus group interviews allowed us to get a primary idea of the communities’ identity, history, evolution, internal relationships and organization, and expectations for the future. As a result, we got a first estimate of the number of dwellers and we better understood why and when the people first settled there, which is an important factor in fathoming the current dynamics and future plans of the inhabitants.

The focus groups highlighted certain similarities among the four communities. The two main reasons why people settled in the communities were, either to find jobs and increase their income by running small businesses such as vegetable vendors, or to be closer to their families.

The discussions also highlighted a strong sense of solidarity between the inhabitants, who were satisfied with their lives within the communities. Their relationships extended beyond the physical neighborhood as they also shared certain celebrations together, such as the Khmer New Year and Pchum Ben.

The vulnerability of the inhabitants of precarious neighborhoods was brought to light through the disasters they faced, such as floods and fires. Furthermore, the residents struggled with problems of crime, theft and drug abuse.
During the discussions, the local authorities were described in a very positive manner. The inhabitants considered them to be supportive and effective in developing the local infrastructure and facilities. The focus groups revealed that the Commune Council and the Village Leader are highly regarded by the community, and it seems that people can rely on them to express their concerns and benefit from their help for official documentation issues, such as family documents or household documents. They are also considered as the main intermediary between the community and the Local Authorities from the Sangkat (the Commune level), regarding issues such as infrastructures or public services improvements.

However, these statements and testimonies, notably concerning the internal relationships, the level of happiness within the community and the expectations, are subjective answers, and may not reveal the overall community’s perception. Moreover, the presence of the village leader can influence these answers. In order to overturn or confirm the information obtained and to further comprehend these perceptions, the use of individual surveys appeared to be the best approach. Thus, by asking more dwellers as individuals about their own past and present situation, their feelings and their hopes, the data collection would be more robust and accurate regarding the community’s overall dynamics.

The design of the individual survey, available in Appendix 2, came from the focus groups’ answers. The survey was applied in 2018 and in 2019. For the second year of application, some questions were removed as it came to our attention that the answers were quite similar among the communities, and it helped to make the questionnaire lighter and easier to administer.

**B. Community’s definition**

One of the first challenges to this study, and to the overall project, was to define what a community stands for.

According to the Cambridge Dictionary, a community means ‘the people living in one particular area or people who are considered as a unit because of their common interests, social group or nationality’⁹. Through other definitions, one finds the idea of people living in the same area and/or sharing similar interests. Thus, it appears that a community has a geographical definition. Yet, it is not solely that. The economic situation and the poverty level are not sufficient to define which households belong to the urban poor community and which do not, as it has already been identified by the PIN and UNICEF study (2015). In this study, and more broadly within the project, one of the first steps has been to define what it would refer to when discussing the community. One of the best ways to undergo this was to discuss and work on this topic directly with the interested parties, the community members. NGOs often lack clear information on the limits of informal settlements, and therefore work to try to define these boundaries. The delimitation
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⁹ Cambridge Dictionary, definition of community
process is thus based on the understanding of the elements given by the community members. Therefore, a rather subjective limit is applied, instead of the administrative boundary which defines the villages in which the communities are located. Indeed, the villages have been well defined in an official way.

PE&D, along with community members, toured the communities in order to establish the geographical boundaries of the project's intervention zones. The community borders obtained have been plotted on the maps of the community profiles.

C. Sample size and location

1. Sample size calculation

Due to the large number of inhabitants in each community (estimated between 1000 and 2000 individuals depending on the communities) the individual surveys have been administered to a sample of the population on the scale of each community.

To identify the number of surveyed people needed, the sampling definition methodology used is Yamane Taro’s calculation\(^\text{10}\). The calculation is based on the whole population size, through the following equation:

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e^2)}
\]

\(n\) = Sample size  \(N\) = Total number of adults  \(e\) = Error tolerance

* For \(N\), the population of interest is the estimated number of adults with ages between 18- and 59-years living in each community.

* For \(e\), the degree of error tolerance chosen was 0.1, so the results have 10% of error. This means that for instance, if 60% of the people surveyed said they are happy with the facilities, we can conclude that between 50% and 70% of the whole community are happy with the facilities. Commonly, the degree of error tolerance is 0.05, but due to limitation of financial and human resources to conduct the survey and the high number of communities to survey, the criterion of 10% was used for the study.

By relating the total study sample obtained (419 individuals) to the estimated population in the communities (around 6,367), the error rate obtained is 4.7%. Thus, this study presents results with an error tolerance of less than 5% when analyzing the five communities as a whole, which was preferably done for some questions.

2. Reduction of the number of communities surveyed

As mentioned in the introduction, the study first planned to be applied in the eight communities where the PE&D project currently operates. Unfortunately, the study application has been reduced to five communities. During the first year of the project, the four first communities had been surveyed. During the second year, the project meant to be extended to four other communities. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, PE&D applied safety measures to protect PE&D staff as well as community members. Consequently, face-to-face meetings with community members were ceased for a period of 2 months. The survey application was planned over this period, thus, only Phum 5, also known as Samaki Rong Roeung, was surveyed before the application of the safety measures.

In summary, the survey has been applied in the communities of Preaek Takong 1, Preaek Takong 3, Preaek Toal, Daeum Chan and Phum 5, according to the samples previously defined. The number of respondents per community is represented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community's Name</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preaek Takong 1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaek Takong 3</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaek Toal</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daeum Chan</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phum 5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>419</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The difficulties in obtaining responses from men

During this survey, the data collectors found it difficult to obtain responses from the male members of the community. At the time of the scheduled investigations, most men were unavailable as they left the community to go to their workplace. As the women were responsible for taking care of the children and the household (cooking, cleaning and everyday chores), they stayed home during the day and were more available to answer the survey. The women that did work during the day, as sellers for instance, often did so either within or nearby the community.

Even women working far from the community, as trash collectors for instance, were more open and responsive to the survey in comparison to men. Some of the men were simply not interested in answering the surveys, and considered it useless and time-consuming. Others were under the impression that NGOs only worked with women. This brought out a strong gender bias in terms of the perception of NGOs within the communities and provinces of Cambodia.
As a result of these factors, the number of men interviewed in this study is significantly lower than the number of women. Any generalization of the results to the overall communities should take this into account and be carried out carefully, especially for certain psychological questions.

III - Main results by theme

A. Migration process

1. Population origin by Province

Regarding all the communities studied, we can notice that 37% of the surveyed population was already living in Phnom Penh, either because they came from other communities or other parts of the city, or because some were actually born in the community. This already contradicts a common assumption that urban poor dwellers all come from the rural areas. Regarding migrants coming from outside Phnom Penh, many came from the surrounding areas, such as Takeo, Kandal, Prey Veng and Svay Rieng Provinces, located at the South of Phnom Penh. The population origin by Province has been mapped as follows.
Furthermore, some of the dwellers also came from Vietnam, which is particularly the case in Preaek Takong 3.

Additionally, we can notice population movements that seem to follow the same trajectories:
- In Daeum Chan 29% of the dwellers come from the Province of Svay Rieng.
- In Phum 5, 521% of the population originates from Kandal Province, and 27% from the Province of Svay Rieng.
- In Preaek Toal 30% of the inhabitants declared to be native of the Prey Veng Province.

Looking at the maps, one can imagine that there was a phenomenon of grouped migration, in which people wanted to move with, or join, families whom they knew in their province of origin. They may possibly also have heard of job opportunities or housing in some specific areas of the capital. The maps regarding population origin by province for each of the five communities studied can be found in Appendix 3.

2. Arrival dates and motivations

It should be emphasized that among the people surveyed, some were born in the community they currently live in. Most of them declared to be under 41 years old, meaning they were born after the collapse of the Khmer Rouge regime and the period of migration that followed. However, others declared they were older, between 50 and 60 years old. This was mostly the case in Preaek Takong 1 and Preaek Takong 3, where respectively 7 and 4 respondents aged between 50 and 60 years old confirmed they were born in the community they currently live in. It proves that these places were populated before the Khmer Rouge Regime, and certain people born there decided to return to their birth place as soon as they had the opportunity to do so.

For those who decided to migrate to the capital city, the main reasons given were due to job search (60%), reaching out to their relatives (20%), or marriage (14%). Getting access to education came 4th, with only 1% of answers. As far as the different communities are concerned, there are no major differences between them.

\[ \text{Reasons of migration (respondents: 317)} \]
The above graph clearly shows that dwellers provided the same reasons for their settlement in the communities regardless of the period of migration. From 1979 to 2019, looking for a job has always been the primary motivation, closely followed by joining relatives and getting married. We can notice two waves of migration where family reasons were slightly higher and the economic reasons less important in proportion. The first being 1979 to 1983, just after the collapse of the Khmer Rouge regime, a period when one can imagine people wanted to be reunited with their loved ones. The second wave was between 1989 and 1993.

3. Wishing for a look-term settlement

In order to better understand the dynamics within the urban settlements, dwellers that decided to settle in the communities were asked if they planned to stay for a short period of time or for the long term, when they arrived. Using the bar chart below, it can be outlined that the majority of residents reported they settled down with a long-term vision.
Between 87% and 98% of the dwellers agreed that they do not plan to live somewhere else. This confirms the previous idea that, even if they live in informal areas, community members quite unanimously plan to settle for the long term.
For those who want to move out, they mainly plan to move either in the province (meaning out of Phnom Penh), or in other urban communities of Phnom Penh. Among the reasons mentioned, we noticed that most of them wish to access property. Indeed, some of them are afraid that the government could take back the land, as they are settled in public areas, and others are tenants who wish to have their own house. This is particularly the case in Preaek Takong 1, where the highest number of respondents declared that they wish to live somewhere else, whatever their current housing status may be (owners and tenants). This could be explained by the characteristics of the land. This community is settled on a lake, where people mainly earn money and live through aquatic activities, such as fishing and harvesting morning glory. During the past years, urbanization in the nearby area has increased, and the lake has been silted up by 75%. These elements could modify the way of living of the inhabitants. Some have reported revenue losses, which could also explain their strong willingness to move to another place. Moreover, dwellers have been informed a few years ago that their situation will be straightened out, and that they will receive official land titles. When the questionnaire was administrated, the inhabitants had been waiting for these property titles for several years. The inhabitants were thus perhaps thinking of leaving and were weary of addressing that question. Since then, the inhabitants have finally received their land titles and it can be assumed that if the question was asked again today, the proportion of people wishing to live elsewhere would be lower.

Finally, according to these data, we can highlight the fact that the majority of dwellers planned on settling down permanently. This information is crucial because it shows that people want to stay in their current houses and communities, even if the land is not officially theirs. Having no land tenure is not a barrier for a long-term vision to stay in the informal settlement. There is no aspiration to live in a better neighborhood, whatever the community characteristics and the family profile. Even if there are difficulties, like flooding, poor habitat, garbage, people feel they are in “their” community. This hence adds credibility to the projects aiming at upgrading communities and integrating the informal settlements in the urban development, when feasible.

B. Households

1. Land and houses types

Types of land

The communities studied are all located near water sources, which confirms the analysis done by STT in 2018. Indeed, two of the communities of interest (Daeum Chan and Preaek Takong 3) are located on the Bassac riverbank. Another one was first located in a pond, which has since become a canal: Phum 5. The riverbank and the canal site are public land. The last two are located on lakes. Preaek Takong 1 is located on the Boeung Tumpun lake, and Preaek Toal’s location used to be a rice field with a small lake, which became later a big garbage dump, that has since been relocated to the outskirts of the capital. According to the Land Law, land along roads, rivers and
certain elements of cultural heritage are considered State public land and cannot be sold or bequeathed to anyone. However, and as mentioned by the Cambodian Center for Human Rights, the Royal Government of Cambodia has the possibility to reclassify public state land into State private land, and thereby grant land to private companies for development purposes.

The communities that have settled in State public land are considered illegal, but are tolerated. This toleration is illustrated by the fact that these five communities have received neither relocation nor eviction orders. Local Authorities, mainly at the Sangkat level, agreed to housing renovation works and infrastructures upgrading, which can be seen as evidence of the tolerance towards the communities.

Furthermore, the land situation in Preaek Takong 1 has been regularized, and dwellers have recently received land titles (as mentioned previously). Regarding Preaek Toal, the land is privately-owned and mainly belongs to two village members, who rent the land to the community members. That is why there is such a high proportion (85%) of tenants in this community.

**Types of houses**

Four types of housing statuses have been identified through the answers of the survey. On average across all communities, 49.6% of the dwellers surveyed declared to be house owners. Once more, it should be emphasized that being an owner does not mean having an official land title but means being the informal owner. There are three main rental options: house rental, land rental, and room rental. The room rental is for renting only a single room, generally in a concrete building, where there are several single rooms for rent side by side. The house rental could also include a one-room house, but it is generally for a house on stilts.

![Rental rooms in Daeum Chan](image1)
![Rental houses in Preaek Toal](image2)

The details of the housing status have been presented in the graph below, with a distinction between the communities.
The majority of Preaek Toal community members surveyed have declared that they are either renting their house, or renting the land. The difference with the housing status in other communities is significant. This can be explained by the fact that the land is the property of mainly two members of the village on which the community is located, as previously mentioned.

**House construction material**

Across the communities, the three main materials used to build a house are bricks and concrete, corrugated wall, and wood. Some communities have a higher proportion of concrete housing material, 50% in Daeum Chan, and others use more corrugated walls, as in Phum 5 (83%) or Preaek Toal (60%). Within some communities, the material used could be different according to the housing status, between renters and owners. The graph below demonstrates that in Preaek Toal and Daeum Chan for instance, the rooms for rent are in concrete houses, which confirms the description of the rooms for rent above. However, in Phum 5, for rooms rented to residents, who represent 13% of the Phum 5 dwellers surveyed, the rooms are all made of corrugated walls. The tenants explained that the owners of the rented rooms are living in the village, not far from the community.
Number of unsafe houses

With the exception of Preaek Takong 1, where there are more than 1900 inhabitants for 330 houses, the other communities have between 188 and 216 houses, for an estimated number of inhabitants between 1103 and 1329 per community.

The project aims at renovating precarious houses, which are considered unsafe according to evaluations carried out by the community. The risks faced by the people living in these houses are mainly of collapse or flooding. The solution proposed by PE&D is to improve the conditions of the houses by renovating them. With basic building material, using safe techniques by trained local workers, their houses can become safer and sturdier. Due to the informal status of the communities, PE&D supplies repair kits, which, can be taken by the inhabitants in case of a relocation of the inhabitants.

Some houses have not been taken into account in the housing improvement project. Regarding rooms in concrete houses, it was impossible to consider any action with the owners of the rented rooms. We are therefore focusing on the houses without concrete walls. Furthermore, Phum 5 is a particular case. This community is settled around a “clam shop area”, with 40% of the community inhabitants. In this area, the accommodations are for rent with an integrated business system, in which the residents are provided clams that they must cook and sell. The house owner also provides a wheel cart to be able to move around in the city, and he collects most of the income.
that is made by the employees. The housing could also be considered a benefit for the employee; however, the rent is not cheaper than similar houses and this business remains entirely informal. These houses were not considered vulnerable through the assessment.

Among the remaining houses, several have been assessed as unsafe with a high risk of collapse. The detection of unsafe houses has been realized by the community leaders, after training received from PE&D, to assess the different parts of the houses, such as the roof, the walls, and the foundations, through several criteria such as the degree of wear and tear. Then, using a scoring method, the houses were classified from first priority unsafe house, being the most prone to disasters and hazards, to safe house.

2. Dwellers's average profile

One point that should be remembered before further analysis, is the difficulty to reach men's viewpoints. Indeed, as represented in the graph below, there is a low representation of men, and thus the sample is not representative of all the community members. Results must be analyzed with that in mind. Respondents are on average 42 years old, with no major differences between the communities; from an average of 41 for Preaek Toal to 43,3 for Daeum Chan.

Respondents' gender per community (respondents: 416)
Communities are mainly populated by Cambodians, only Daeum Chan and Preaek Takong 3 have a few Vietnamese community members (respectively 2% and 22%). In Preaek Takong 3 village (the administrative limitation, not the community), where the community of the same name is located, the focus group representatives said that 80% of the village is inhabited by Vietnamese people, which can explain a higher proportion in the community. It is not clear however if Vietnamese refers to the nationality or to the ethnic group, which creates confusion as many migrants can still be considered Vietnamese even though they have a Cambodian citizenship. During the survey, the respondents could also prefer to say they are Cambodians if they are not in a legal situation. It should be specified that the land law states in Cambodia that foreigners cannot own land, which can explain why some respondents preferably will not say they do not have the Cambodian citizenship.
A majority of the inhabitants declared themselves to belong to the Buddhist religion. It can be highlighted in the graph above that one of the communities appears singular: Preaek Toal. The rate of 24% of Christians can be explained by the larger presence of churches compared to other parts of the city. Indeed, there previously were two churches within the community at the time of the survey. One of them has closed in 2019 due to the lack of money needed to support the rental cost.

3. Households composition

The average number of people per household is 5.66. There is no major difference between the communities: Daeum Chan, which has the highest mean, counts on average 6.15 people per household, whereas Preaek Toal, which has the lowest, counts 5.13 people on average. As a comparison, the average household's size in Cambodia was 5.0 in urban areas in 2014, which means that the household's size is slightly higher in the urban poor areas.

---

The trend is similar in terms of the number of children, with an average in Cambodia of 2.1 children aged below 18 years old per household.

### Average household size and number of children per community (respondents: 419)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community's name</th>
<th>Average household size</th>
<th>Average number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preaek Toal</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaek Takong 3</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaek Takong 1</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phum 5</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daeum Chan</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this, the social work component of the project has identified that out of 259 families that participated in the Family Development Program, 90 are female-headed single-parent families. This represents 35% of the vulnerable families supported by the project. Even if the social component focuses on vulnerable families, this represents a large proportion of the target population. Compared to the national level, according to the Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey (2014), the average in urban areas is 28.3%. It should be noted that poverty is generally more important in families led by a single mother.

The main results concerning the community history and members, as well as their nationality, their housing status, the dates of immigration, the main materials that have been used for the construction of their house, the map of the community, and the identification of the unsafe houses have been presented in the form of community profile infographics, one per community. Daeum Chan profile is presented here after as a sample. The other community profiles can be found in Appendix 4.
The first inhabitants settled in 1979 after the collapse of the Khmer Rouge regime. The land was an empty land located on the Bassac River. In the area, there was a type of tree called Daeum Chan, from which the name of the community comes from. Because of the soil erosion on the riverbank, the community land is smaller than it used to be and the density of population is high. Part of the community, living close to the river, is on the public land. All the households situated near the river are regularly flooded. The community faces also big fires (1999, 1993, 2001, 2018). Daeum Chan community has informal boundaries, and is part of the administrative village called Daeum Chan as well.

**216**

The number of houses

1329

The number of people

98%

Rent

2%

House owner
C. Feelings regarding the life in the community

The next section is related to dwellers’ perceptions and feelings towards living in the communities, such as their appreciation of the facilities, their feeling of security, and the relationships they have with the other community members. The purpose is to get a better view of the internal dynamics and the common feelings of the dwellers, to better understand their situation, and the perception of their living conditions.

1. Facilities level of satisfaction

Regarding the community facilities, which include the drainage system, the water and electricity supply, the garbage collection, and so on, the level of satisfaction is quite mixed according to the dwellers.

Satisfaction towards the community facilities (respondents: 419)

At first glance, it can be seen that only around 60% of the inhabitants are satisfied with the collective facilities in four of the five communities studied. The highest level of satisfaction is in Preaek Takong 1. Preaek Takong 3 stands out as it revealed the lowest level of satisfaction with the facilities, with only 42% of the inhabitants saying they are satisfied with the current installations. These figures seem quite high regarding the dissatisfaction of the inhabitants with the facilities and it would be very interesting to find out more about which facilities or infrastructure are faulty or absent from the landscape of these communities.
The bar chart above points out that dwellers in Preaek Takong 3 are the only ones who declared avoiding some parts of the community, or who preferred not to answer this question. There is a distinction of this feeling regarding gender. Indeed, 11% of the male respondents in Preaek Takong 3 who answered the survey declared they preferred not to answer this question, whereas 11% of women clearly said that they prefer to avoid some parts of the community they live in. Among the 11% of women who answered ‘yes’, the parts they avoid are the ones they consider as ‘drug users’ areas’ and ‘fighting areas’. In our experience, problems of violence have also been encountered outside the community.

Regarding the four other communities, there is a unanimous agreement that no part of the community is being avoided. This reflects an important common attitude among the residents, which is surprising given our experience in these communities. In fact, we have noticed that some areas of the communities are not relatively safe. This is the case, for example, in Preaek Toal, where there is a long garbage area. Moreover, attendance at the recently opened social centers in two communities is not as high as expected. It would be interesting to revisit these questions with the inhabitants to try to find out more about the reasons why certain areas are avoided, or less frequented.
Dwellers were also asked about their sense of security when walking in the neighborhood at night. Concerning Preaek Takong 3, the answers appear logical in the light of the previous analysis: 42% of women declared not feeling safe when walking in the neighborhood at night, confirming the feeling of insecurity. In Preaek Toal, Phum 5, as in Preaek Takong 1, women tend to feel more insecure than men when walking outside at night, but the majority of the dwellers seem to feel safe. However, this gender analysis must be qualified in view of the low response rate of male respondents.

What do you think of the following sentence: "I feel safe walking in my neighborhood after dark"?
(respondents: 416)
Regarding the feeling of security in their own house at night, trends are quite the same for Preaek Toal, Preaek Takong 1 and Phum 5 when comparing to their sense of security when walking out at night, with a higher rate of insecurity among women. As far as Preaek Takong 3 is concerned, 39% of women declared they do not feel safe at night even in their own house. Overall, the sense of security is still very present, and this is sense of insecurity to be noted.

An interesting point is that Preaek Takong 3 is not a community where people declared that they have been, or know relatives who have been, victims of any violence or criminal acts within the households or in the neighborhood in the past last year. Indeed, higher rates have been reported in Phum 5 and Daeum Chan, in which 21% and 19% of the respondents have answered knowing people who have suffered violent acts, or being victims themselves, within the community borders. When answering the same question, 13% of inhabitants in Preaek Takong 3, 6% in Preaek Takong 1, and 5% in Preaek Toal also confirmed knowing of being a victim. It should be clarified that this question also includes domestic violence. Thus, among the answers, some may be related to the violence within the households but without direct relation to the other community members.

It is important to note here that, overall, the crime rate is not very high and there is a fairly strong sense of security within communities.
Although some inhabitants of Preaek Takong 3 have stated that they are afraid of certain areas because they are considered to be drug-using or fighting zones, and that the feeling of insecurity at nightfall is overall more present, both when walking in the neighborhood or in their own homes, we are unable to find elements that explain this feeling of insecurity. It would be interesting to explore this idea further to understand more. For example, if the lack of light at night is one of the reasons for this phenomenon, it is possible to enlighten it and to work on this aspect to improve the feeling of security of the inhabitants within their community.

3. Relationships among the community's members

Besides the feeling of security, the relationships between the community members seem to be extremely positive. Indeed, 98% of the respondents declared they do not feel any tension in the community. Moreover, 92% of them said they agree with the idea that they feel close with members of their community. Dwellers were also asked if they feel they can get help from their neighbors in case they needed it, and again, 92% of residents agreed.

However, 17% of the dwellers have declared to be victim of a kind of discrimination from part of the village where their community is located. In Phum 5, the phenomenon of discrimination reaches almost half of the respondents.

Community dwellers who suffered from any kind of discrimination (respondents: 418)
There is no apparent connection between the nationality and the feeling of discrimination. Indeed, on the 67 people who answered they felt discrimination from the village members, only 3 of them were Vietnamese (out of the 18 Vietnamese who participated in the study). In the same way, there is no evidence of a link between discrimination and religion, and between discrimination and the housing status of the dwellers.

Regarding Phum 5, among the 49% of dwellers who live in the clam shop area, 51% declared they faced discrimination. There is no evidence of a link between these two elements, as half declared facing discrimination but the other half does not. Moreover, quite similarly and ironically, among the 51% of dwellers who do not live in the clam shop area, 44% are facing discrimination.

Finally, through experiences and discussions with the dwellers, discrimination from the village members is apparently above all due to their economic situation, as they are considered as ‘poor’.

D. Evolution perception

1. Situation compared to before

By comparing their current situation to the one when they were children, opinions are quite divided. Indeed, 47% of the respondents are somewhat in agreement when asked if their quality of life improved; 14% said they strongly feel their situation has improved and 18% do not really think it has improved. In Preaek Toal only 36% of people felt an improvement, whereas 52% did not. We have no additional information concerning these mixed answers on the evolution of their situation compared to that of their parents. It would be interesting to understand more about the reasoning behind certain negative opinions, especially whether the comparison is mainly economic or based on health or housing situation, for instance.

As a reminder, the average age of the respondents was 40 years old. The different positions of the individuals are detailed by communities in the graph below.
Opinions are all the more pessimistic when dwellers are asked to compare their situation to one of their parents. Only 43% of them feel that their situation now is better than was one of their parents. Once again, Preaek Toal respondents are more likely to disagree with the idea of improvement, with a significant disagreement rate of 25%.

How do you agree with the following sentence: "My situation is better than my parents»? (respondents: 335)
2. Expectation about the children’s future

71% of the respondents surveyed feel that their children's situation would be better than their own. This data reflects the hope that parents have for the future. This is encouraging, especially when compared to the results of the previous question. However, it should be noticed that for Phum 5, the answers are slightly more indecisive. Indeed, 37% have neither a positive nor a negative opinion regarding that question, which can demonstrate that they are maybe less confident about the future.

How do you agree with the following sentence: "My children's situation will be better than mine"? (respondents: 419)

To improve children’s living conditions, education plays a key role. The study revealed that 34% of the surveyed people declared that they did not receive any formal education, and 36% only went to primary school. In total, 71% of the respondents did not reach middle school.

Moreover, the gender gap is wide in terms of access to education. As it can be seen on the bar chart below, men are more likely to reach middle school and high school, as compared to women.
As a comparison with the situation at the national level, according to the Cambodia Demographic and Health Survey (2014) from the Cambodian National Institute of Statistics, overall, 19% of women have never attended school, compared to 37% of the female respondents in this study. As far as men are concerned, the difference is less noticeable, with 10%, at the Cambodian level, not having attended school, compared to 16% in urban poor communities. On the other hand, the gap between the level of education in the communities and the rest of the capital city is quite significant. 13.3% of women have reached the post-graduate level in the capital, whereas only 1% of the women in the communities have. 20.3% of men have reached the post-graduate level in the capital, but only 5% have in the communities.

It should be remembered, however, that the average age of respondents is 42. Many efforts have been made in recent years in the field of education. According to the CDHS (2014), today only 2% of girls and 3% of boys aged 10-14 have never been to school.

However, we do not have precise information concerning parents' perception of the school. In the current context of the COVID19 crisis, and following the closure of schools for six months, there is a fear that some children may not return to school, often because they are working to help generate income for the family.
Conclusion

The realization of this study highlighted several major elements regarding the dynamics of the Phnom Penh urban poor communities studied, in which a standard profile was built for each of them.

Primarily, the assumptions regarding the migration waves in the 90’s have been confirmed. It was mainly about economic and familial migrations. Between 87% and 98% of the dwellers, depending on the settlement, do not see themselves living elsewhere in the future. The precarious community is not a transitional stage in the residential process but a place of attachment. Thus, the authorities and associations have every reason to develop these areas, ensuring the voluntary support of residents.

Another positive element is the relatively low criminal rate within the communities, the strong sense of security and the strong solidarity links among the dwellers. Indeed, contrary to certain preconceived ideas about the inhabitants of urban poor communities, the solidarity of the inhabitants is a lever that must be used in the projects in order to aim for stronger and more sustainable results. This study has shown that 92% of the inhabitants feel close to certain families in their community and 94% felt welcomed when arriving.

Regarding the inhabitants who migrated to Phnom Penh, the inhabitants who feel an improvement in their situation compared to when they were children or compared to their parents are not a majority, but there is a lot more hope for the next generation. 71% of the residents expect their children to be better off. This optimism is most certainly correlated with the improvement and development of the Cambodian education system in recent years.

The study also made it possible to focus on precarious housing conditions. Of all the dwellings in the five communities, only 20% are made of brick or concrete, and 51% are made of tin walls. Thus, it is important for NGOs to not forget to work on habitat conditions, and to not simply focus on the educational or economical aspects of life improvement as all these spheres are significant for reliable and sustainable development.

This work also revealed differences among the communities on several topics. Indeed, the study only focused on five urban poor communities of Phnom Penh, out of the 277 identified, and we can already observe great disparities between these five. As a matter of fact, housing status can differ enormously from one community to another. For instance, the population in Preaek Takong 3 is composed of 82% of owners, even if it is an informal property, whereas Preaek Toal's population consists of 75% of renters. Moreover, minorities, such as ethnic or religious minorities, are not evenly distributed among the communities. In Preaek Takong 3, 22% of Vietnamese residents have been identified, and in Preaek Toal, we can find the largest share of Christians. Furthermore, the sense of security within the community is not the same between communities. Additional
information is needed in order to understand these differences. All these elements help us deduce that a uniform approach which considers that all communities have the same characteristics is not an accurate method. The analysis should be carried out community by community, in order to adapt the response for each precarious area.

Overall, the information obtained through the focus group discussions was confirmed by the survey results. This shows the involvement of the inhabitants in the life of the community, through their knowledge of the history of the community, its composition, and its functioning. It is essential to continue to work in collaboration with all stakeholders, from communities to Local Authorities and partner organizations. Indeed, the involvement of the Local Authorities, at the Sangkat level, is essential to provide an accurate and specific approach for each urban poor settlement. Decentralizing the analysis of these communities is crucial, thus, the local authority level is the most accurate to understanding the situation of each and every neighborhood.

Finally, this study allowed a better understanding of the communities in which PE&D works, and thus provided food for thought for the preparation of the second phase of the project. This should start in 2021 and it targets the problems identified and provides a response that is increasingly adapted to the target audience.
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## Appendix 1: Focus Groups Questionnaire

### # Questions

**History**  
1. What was the land before?  
2. How and when this community has set up?  
3. Why is the community named like this?  
4. For what reason most of people came here? And from where? Ask personally everyone when they came and why?  
5. What are the community boundaries and how the community land boundaries were set?  
6. How many households and how many persons are there in total in the village and in the community?

**Evolution**  
7. Is there an important turnover in the families in the community? How many new families came last year? Since January?  
8. Are you happy with your community? And with how it has evolved? 1 to 10 rating  
9. Do the community members have something specific in common? If yes please specify (for instance 90% are Vietnamese people)

**Relationship**  
10. Do all the families in the community know each other? Are they close to each other?  
11. (As community representatives) How many families do you personally know? How many families are among your friends?  
12. Who are the people or groups of people who have influence in the community? Do you like them?  
13. What responsibilities or actions do they have?  
14. How does the community feel towards police and local authorities?  
15. Is there any discrimination from the rest of the village?  
16. Is there any discrimination in the community itself?  
17. Do community people support and help weak community people?  
18. Do you recall an event that illustrates some solidarity within the community? Have you ever got some help from one of your neighbors? Ask everyone personally to give examples.  
19. Are there some community events organized? (Parties, ceremonies, games...)  
20. What is the global land tenure situation?  
21. If it is private, do the landowners live in the community/village itself? Do they know landowners?  
22. Do some people fear eviction?
23. In five years, what changes could make you happier in the community?

24. What are you doing towards making those changes?

25. What should the government do to help those changes?

26. Are you confident in your future evolution of the community?

---

**Appendix 2: Individual Surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Questions</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How old are you?</td>
<td>... years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your gender?</td>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is your nationality</td>
<td>Male/Female/Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which of these answers best describes your religion?</td>
<td>Buddhism/Christianity/ Hindu/Muslim/No religion/Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the highest education level you have achieved?</td>
<td>Post graduate/Graduate High School/Middle School/Primary School/No formal education/Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When did you settle in this community?</td>
<td>... year/Born here specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Where did you live before?</td>
<td>Near to work place/Relatives/Cheaper than previous location/Resettlement/Income decreased/Income increased/Access to city or public services/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Why did you move in this community?</td>
<td>Short term/Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When you moved here, how long did you plan to stay?</td>
<td>Yes, specify/No/Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you plan to live somewhere else?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When you moved here, how long did you plan to stay? Are you happy with the community facilities? (drainage/water supply/electricity supply/street light/garbage collection)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How many members is there in your house?</td>
<td>Preschool/Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How many your family earn per month?</td>
<td>High School/College/Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How many children do you have?</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What are they doing?</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Do you think the police can help you in case of incident like theft? 
Yes/No/Prefer not to say

17. Do you think the local authority cares about you? 
Yes/No/Prefer not to say

18. Do you face any discrimination in the village? 
Yes/No/Prefer not to say

19. How do you agree with the following sentence: "I feel safe in my home after dark»? 
Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree/Prefer not to say

20. How do you agree with the following sentence: "I feel safe walking in my neighborhood after dark"? 
Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree/Prefer not to say

21. Have you or has anyone in your family/household been a victim of violence or of some criminal act in your home or neighborhood in the past last year? 
Yes/No/Prefer not to say

22. How is your current living situation compare to past? 
Better/not better

23. How do you agree with the following sentence: "My situation is better than my parents»? 
Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree/Prefer not to say

24. How do you agree with the following sentence: "My children’s situation will be better than mine»? 
Strongly agree/Somewhat agree/Neither agree nor disagree/Somewhat disagree/Strongly disagree/Prefer not to say

25. On a typical week day how many hours do you spend doing the following activities? 
Work that contributes to household income/Household chores/Childcare/care for elderly person/Leisure/Play/sports/Exercise/Sleep/Volunteering/Traveling from one place to another

26. Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays? 0 = not at all; 10 = fully satisfied

Socio-Dynamic Study of The Phnom Penh Urban Poor Communities
27. How do you agree with the following sentence: "I feel close with some people from my community"?

28. How do you agree with the following sentence: "If I need help, I can get help from my neighbors or my community"?

29. How many families do you know in your community?

30. Did you ever have any issues with some community members?

31. In the past 30 days, did you ever have to cut the size of a meal or skip a meal because there wasn't enough money for food?

32. What are the most pressing problems you face?

33. Are you usually able to resolve them?

34. When in your life did you experience a big change? Like a new job / a loss. How old were you?

35. What is your life dream?
Appendix 3: Population Origin by Province

Population origin in Daeum Chan (respondents: 86)

Population origin in Phum 5 (respondents: 84)
Population origin in Preaek Toal (respondents: 87)
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Population origin in Preaek Takong 3 (respondents: 72)
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Appendix 4: Community Profiles

Phum 5 community profile

PHUM 5 COMMUNITY

This neighborhood is a lowland surrounding a wastewater canal. At the end of the Khmer Rouge regime in 1979, around 90 families came to live here and build precarious houses. They used to take the boat to reach the lake. This village was often impacted by flooding, strong winds, and fires. Progressively, the area has been urbanized and it is now within the city and very densely populated. The canal is still functional and it is said that the community is living on a public land.

The number of people: 1103
The number of houses: 188
Rental room: 13%
House owner: 40%
Rental house: 45%
House owner and rental land: 1%

DATE OF IMMIGRATION

COMMUNITY MAP

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS TYPES

- Wood wall 11%
- Brick/concrete 6%
- Tin wall 83%

1st priority unsafe houses 31%
2nd priority unsafe houses 14%
Rental houses for clams sellers 40%
Safe houses 15%
The area used to be a wide rice field with a small lake. Later, there was a big garbage dump that has been relocated since, to the outskirts of the city. Some people came to work in the garbage dump and stayed there. The land has been privatized afterwards and is mostly rent to poor families now (either just the land or house). The community is regularly hit by fires, propagating quickly because of the wide use of corrugated metal sheet, last one being in 2019 and destroying 50 houses. Another characteristic of this community is the important presence of Christians.

The number of people: 1097
The number of houses: 214
House owner: 15%
50% of them renting the land only
Religion: 74% Christian, 24% Muslim

DATE OF IMMIGRATION

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS TYPES

Wood wall: 17%
Brick / concrete: 23%
Tin wall: 60%

COMMUNITY MAP

Road
Community boundary
Village boundary

1st priority unsafe houses: 16%
2nd priority unsafe houses: 6%
Safe houses: 78%
This settlement is situated on a land jutting out in the Boeung Tumpun lake. Villagers report that the first settlers arrived in 1957, living from fishing and farming. At that time, the village was called Srong Om Deth. The villagers had to leave during the Khmer Rouge regime and came back again from 1979. People regularly settled in this village since. The village took officially the name of Preaek Takong1 in 2007, from the name of a local leader named Takong.
Preaek Takong 3 community profile

The village used to be a small settlement along the riverbank of the Bassac river in Phnom Penh, surrounded by green grass. After the collapse of the Khmer Rouge Regime in 1979, more people came to live there, and it became densely populated. A possible explanation for the name of the community is because there used to be a village leader named Ta Kong. Administratively, the "Preaek Takong" area has been divided in several parts, here being then Preaek Takong 3. Both community and village (the administrative scale) are called Preaek Takong 3. The community is yearly flooded during the rainy season as the water level rises to about 8 meters. Fires and strong winds are also affecting badly the community. The community is accessed through narrow paths from the national road.
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