APRODEV CAMBODIA
PARTNER MAPPING REPORT
BASELINE DECEMBER 2006

Data collection and analysis:
Roger Henke (ICCO/KiA)
Hong Huong (CAS)

Data production and checks:
Eija Alajarva (FCA)
Herman Brouwer (ICCO)
Cecelie Bjørnskov-Johansen (DCA)
Henrik Dahl (Diakonia)
Odile Ruijs (ICCO)
Nadia Saracini (CA)
Karl Schoenberg (EED)
Carsten Trier Høj (DCA)

DRAFT FEBRUARY 2007

CONTENTS

1. RATIONALE AND INFORMATION COLLECTED

This partner mapping was agreed upon during the APRODEV Cambodia group meeting 27 November 2006.

The objectives as formulated duting this meeting were[1]:

Do a mapping of APRODEV members activities in Cambodia. Roger Henke (ICCO) will collect information and produce an overview of partners of all organisations as well as a map of capacity building initiatives.

To be mapped:
  a) Current partners (partner name, geography, programme/theme, phasing out)
  b) Capacity building initiatives/approaches (Secondment, training, courses, which themes, past experiences)

Expected outcome:
  a) identify shared partners
  b) identify potential for joint capacity building
  c) identify geographical coverage

Annex 2 contains the data collection spreadsheets that were used and the original raw data received.

As could be expected, some of the raw data needed (limited) recoding and/or interpretation to become fully comparable. The data where then entered into a SPSS database to allow for easier frequency and cross-tabulation analysis.

Both the raw data and the SPSS database are annexed so as to allow for a check on the recodes/interpretations made.

---

[1] See MINUTES APRODEV Meeting 27th of November 2006, p.1

Table A: The variables in the SPSS database

Variable	Values
Partner NGO	Acronym
ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA support	Yes No
Type of ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA support	Funding TA Both funding and TA No support
Core or program support ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
Sector partner NGO works in [MULTIPLE SECTORS POSSIBLE]	Good Governance Advocacy Training Youth Media & Information Legal Aid Community development Community Mobilization (fishermen) Community Mobilization (farmers) Gender, incl. GBV Disability Ethnic Minorities Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance HIV/Aids Diabetes Health education Health service provision Human Rights and Democracy Relief Aid Kampuchea Krom Labor Mediation Mental Health Demining NGO Networking and Advocacy Organisational Development Peace Building Research Street children Child rights Land rights

Variable	Values
Areas NGO partner works in [MULTIPLE AREAS POSSIBLE]	Cambodia Phnom Penh Kandal Kampong Cham Kampong Chhnang Kampong Thom Kampong Speu Prey Veng Siem Riep Svay Rieng Takeo Kampot Koh Kong Rattanakiri Mondolkiri Preah Vihear Battambang Bantey Meanchey Otdar Meanchey Pursat Kratie Stung Treng Sihanoukville Kep Tonle Sap area Cross border thai Costal Zone
Phasing out by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No Unsure
Co-funding sought by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
Long-term TA by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
Short-term TA by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
Program TA by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
CB by partner NGO of ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
CB by external service provider (group) funded by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No
CB by external service provider (individual) funded by ICCO, DCA, EED, Diakonia, CA, FCA	Yes No

2. RESULTS
2. 1 Overview of NGO partners by Agencies
This table summarizes the information collected about:

- The NGOs supported by each APRODEV donor
- The current status regarding which NGO is being phased out by which APRODEV donor
- The current status of co-funding sought

The table adds totals to show:

- Which NGOs are currently supported by more than one APRODEV donor
- Which NGOs will be supported by more than one APRODEV donor after all currently planned phasing out is done

This table is a summary. It is followed by more specific tables and figures to highlight particular aspects of the information

Legenda

	NGO supported by more than 1 donor long-term
	NGO currently supported by more than 1 donor but single donor in the future
	NGO being phased out by all APRODEV donors currentlu supporting them
	Donor phasing out
	Donor looking for co-funding
Total1	Donor support to all current NGO partners
Total2	Donor support after phasing out

Table1: Overview of NGOs by APRODEV agency

NGO Partners	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total1	Total2
ACF	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
ACT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
ADHOC	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2
AFSC	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	2
AMARA	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
APP/PACT	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
CAAFW	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
CAS	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
CCC	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	2
CDP	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
CEDAC	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
CEDAW	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
CHEC	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
CHED	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Chet Tor	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
CIPERAD	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
CLEC	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
CNRO	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
COSECAM	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
CPRWCA	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
CRF	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
CRWRC	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0
CSD	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
CSDA	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
CVS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
CWCC	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
CWS	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	2

Table1 (continued): Overview of NGOs by APRODEV agency

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total1	Total2
DPA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
FACT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Friends	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
GAD/C	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
Helen Keller	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
HU	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
ILDO	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
KAH	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1
KFD	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
KKKHRDA	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
KRDA	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
KROM	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	2
KYA	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
LAC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
LICADHO	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	3
LWF	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	3
Maryknolll	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
MODE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
MOPOTSYO	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
NCDP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
NGO Forum	1	1	0	1	1	0	4	4
NGO Network BTB	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Open Forum	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
PADV	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	2
PJJ	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
PNKS	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Ponleur	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
RCEDO	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
SABORAS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
SCC	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
SSC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Star Kampuchea	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2
STT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
TDSP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tean Thor Ass.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
TPO	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
VAWCC	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
VBNK	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	2
Wathnakpheap	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
YFP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
67 NGO partners	34	20	17	16	10	1		

Figure 1: Close to one-third of NGOS currently receiving support from an APRODEV agency receive support from at least one other APRODEV agency

All current partners

21 (31%)

46 (69%)

☐ All current single agency partners
■ All currently shared partners

Figure 2: The picture does not change when one only looks at the subgroup of NGOs that are not on the list of being phased out

Longer-term partners

16 (28%)

41 (72%)

☐ Longer-term single agency partners
■ Longer-term shared partners

Figure 3: All APRODEV agencies share a substantial (at least 45%) to large proportion of partner NGOs with at least one other APRODEV agency

Shared and non-shared partner NGOs per APRODEV Agency

Agency	Not Shared	Shared
ICCO/KiA	19	15
DCA	10	10
EED	6	11
Diakonia	7	9
CA	4	6
FCA		1

Legend: Shared, Not Shared

2.2 The partners shared

Table 1.1: Currently and longer-term shared partners

NGO Partners	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total1	Total2
ADHOC	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2
AFSC	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	2
APP/PACT	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
CAAFW	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
CAS	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
CCC	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	2
CRWRC	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0
CSDA	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
CWS	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	2
GAD/C	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
KAH	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1
ILDO	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
KROM	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	2
LICADHO	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	3
LWF	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	3
NGO Forum	1	1	0	1	1	0	4	4
PADV	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	2
SCC	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
Star Kampuchea	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2
TPO	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
VBNK	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	2
Currently								
21 NGO partners	15	10	11	9	6	1		
Total partners	34	20	17	16	10	1		
% Shared	44%	50%	65%	56%	60%	100%		
Longer-term								
16 NGO partners	12	6	8	7	2	1		
Total partners	32	13	13	13	5	1		
% shared	38%	46%	62%	54%	40%	100%		

When inspecting table 1.1. it is important to keep in mind that the window it provides into the future does only include the partners that already receive support now. With respect to the December 2006 baseline picture, the partners that are being phased out disappear from the screen but the new partners that are not yet selected are per definition still invisible. The only reason to draw this partial picture is to see if and how phasing decisions that have already been taken affect the current picture of shared partnerships.

Figure 4: Most shared partner NGOs receive funding from two APRODEV agencies

Shared partner NGOs

The following figures show which APRODEV agency shares which which other Agency

Figure 5.1 Across 15 of its 34 current partners ICCO and has a total of 23 sharing relationships with other APRODEV agencies

ICCO Shares partners with:

Figure 5.2 Across 10 of its 20 current partners DCA and has a total of 16 sharing relationships with other APRODEV agencies

DCA shares partners with:

Agency	Value
ICCO	5
EED	4
Diakonia	4
CA	2
FCA	1

Figure 5.3 Across 10 of its 17 current partners EED and has a total of 17 sharing relationships with other APRODEV agencies

EED shares partners with:

Agency	Value
ICCO	7
DCA	4
Diakonia	1
CA	5
FCA	1

Figure 5.4 Across 9 of its 16 current partners Diakonia and has a total of 14 sharing relationships with other APRODEV agencies

Diakonia shares partners with:

	ICCO	DCA	EED	CA	FCA
Value	7	4	1	2	0

Figure 5.5 Across 5 of its 10 current partners CA and has a total of 12 sharing relationships with other APRODEV agencies

CA shares partners with:

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diakonia	FCA
Value	4	2	5	2	0

**Figure 5.6 Across 1 of its 1 current partners FCA and has a total of 2 sharing relationships with other APRODEV agencies**

FCA shares partners with

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diakonia	CA
Value	0	1	1	0	0

2.3 Co-funding sought

Table 2: DCA and CA, both phasing out many partners, are looking for new funding for some of these

NGO Partners	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total1	Total2
APP/PACT	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
CCC	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	2
CEDAW	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
CWS	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	2
Friends	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
KA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
PADV	1	0	1	0	1	0	3	2
VAWCC	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Wathnakpheap	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
9 NGO partners	0	5	0	0	4	0		

2.4 Type of support provided

Table 3: Only ICCO and EED second TA to partner NGOs. Funding is the predominant support instrument

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diakonia	CA	FCA	Total
Funding	22	20	15	16	10	1	84
TA	5						5
Both funding and TA	7		2				9
Total	34	20	17	16	10	1	

Table 4: Two thirds core funding, one third funding specific programs

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total
Core funding	33	2	12	16	3		66
Funding of specific program	1	17	5		7		30
Both of Core and specific		1				1	2
Total	34	20	17	16	10	1	

2.5 Sectors

The overview provided in table 5 below takes account of the fact that many NGO partners have programs that cover more than one sector. The Percentages indicate number of NGOs that have programs in sector X and thus add up to more than 100%.

The grouping of sectors is somewhat arbitrary. Other ways of aggregating are equally defensible. The sectors descriptions were not predefined and descriptions used by agencies (see annex) needed some interpretative streamlining to fit one scheme.

The most dominant sectors that APRODEV agency NGO partners work in are sustainable livelihoods/Integrated rural development (incl. local governance) and community development. These are followed by Gender, HIV/Aids, Human Rights/Legal Aid and Peace Building

Other interesting aggregate NGO categories that receive support are target group specific NGOs (14 = 20.6%), intermediary service providers (7 = 10.3%) and NGO networks, including an advocacy role (6 = 8.8%).

Table 5.1: Sector overview of APRODEV agency NGO partners

Sectors	Nr.	% of cases	
Relief Aid	2	2.9	**4**
Demining	2	2.9	
HIV/Aids	**9**	13.2	**12**
Diabetes	1	1.5	
Health education	1	1.5	
Health service provision	1	1.5	
Sustainable livelihood,incl.local good governance	20	29.4	**20**
Community development	15	22.1	**15**
Community Mobilization(fishermen)	1	1.5	**2**
Community Mobilization(farmers)	1	1.5	
Mental Health	2	2.9	**9**
Peace Building	**7**	10.3	
Human Rights and Democracy	4	5.9	**9**
Media & Information	1	1.5	
Legal Aid	4	5.9	
Land rights	3	4.4	**14**
Gender, incl. GBV	**10**	14.7	
Labor Mediation	1	1.5	
Kampuchea Krom	1	1.5	**4**
Ethnic Minorities	2	2.9	
Disability	1	1.5	
Youth	4	5.9	**10**
Street children	1	1.5	
Child rights	5	7.4	
NGO Networking and Advocacy	6	8.8	**6**
Advocacy Training	3	4.4	**7**
Organisational Development	3	4.4	
Research	1	1.5	
Total	**112**	**164.7**	

Table 5.2: Sectors per NGO partner

ACF	Labor Mediation
ACT	Peace Building
ADHOC	Human Rights and Democracy
AFSC	Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + Peace Building
AMARA	Gender, incl. GBV
APP/PACT	Advocacy Training
CAAFW	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
CAS	Research
CCC	Good Governance + NGO Networking and Advocacy + Organisational Development
CDP	Legal Aid
CEDAC	Community Mobilization farmers) + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
CEDAW	Gender, incl. GBV + NGO Networking and Advocacy
CHEC	HIV/Aids
CHED	HIV/Aids + Health education
Chet Tor	HIV/Aids
CIPERAD	Ethnic Minorities
CLEC	Legal Aid
CNRO	Legal Aid
COSECAM	NGO Networking and Advocacy + Child rights
CPRWCA	Gender, incl. GBV
CRF	Child rights
CRWRC	Gender, incl. GBV
CSD	Human Rights and Democracy
CSDA	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
CVS	Youth
CWCC	Gender, incl. GBV
CWS	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + Relief Aid + Demining + Organisational Development + Peace Building
DPA	Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
FACT	Community Mobilization (fishermen)
Friends	Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + Street children
GAD/C	Gender, incl. GBV
Helen Keller	Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + Health service provision
HU	HIV/Aids
ILDO	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
KA	Peace Building
KAH	Peace Building
KFD	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
KKKHRDA	Human Rights and Democracy + Kampuchea Krom
KRDA	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
KROM	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
KYA	Youth
LAC	Legal Aid
LICADHO	Gender, incl. GBV + Human Rights and Democracy + Child rights + Land rights
LWF	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + HIV/Aids + Relief Aid + Demining

Maryknoll	Youth + HIV/Aids
MODE	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + HIV/Aids
MOPOTSYO	Diabetes
NCDP	Disability
NGO Forum	Good Governance + Advocacy Training + Gender, incl. GBV + Ethnic Minorities + NGO Networking and Advocacy + Land rights
NGO Network BTB	NGO Networking and Advocacy
Open Forum	Media & Information
PADV	Gender, incl. GBV + Peace Building
PJJ	Child rights
PNKS	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
Ponleur	Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
RCEDO	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
SABORAS	Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
SCC	HIV/Aids
SSC	Mental Health
Star Kampuchea	Advocacy Training + NGO Networking and Advocacy
STT	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance
Tean Thor Association	HIV/Aids
TPO	Mental Health
VAWCC	Gender, incl. GBV
VBNK	Organisational Development
Wathnakpheap	Community development + Sustainable livelihood, incl. local good governance + Child rights
YFP	Youth + Peace Building

2.6 Areas of operations

Figure 6: Phnom Penh and the Northwest show highest partner NGO density

NGO area of operation

34 of the 68 partner NGOs have Cambodia-wide activities; the above figure only visualizes the areas wherein NGOs have substantial programs.

Annex 1 contains an overview of provinces by NGO partners.

2.7 capacity Building

Explanation of the categories of CB:

TA long-term	An expat CB seconded to the partner NGO for 6 months or more; CB is primarily accountable to NGO
TA short term	An expat CB seconded to the partner NGO for more than 6 months; CB is primarily accountable to NGO
Program TA	Expat CB(s) based at donor office, primarily accountable to donor
TA through partner	CB service provider is partner NGO; service provider not only implementer but also involved in neesd assessment
Service provider group	CB needs defined by (program) group of partner NGOs; donor then makes resources available for buying in the required services, be it from a service provider partner or an outside service provider
Service provider individual	CB need defined by individual partner NGO and/or donor; donor provides resources to partner to buy in the required services

Table 6: Great diversity in CB support

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak*	CA	FCA	Total
TA long-term	10		2				12
TA short term	3		1				4
Program TA				16			16
TA through partner	17	1					18
Service provider group		11					11
Service provider individual		1		16		1	18

Table 7: Nearly half of the shared partners receive CB support from more than one APRODEV agency

APRODEV Agencies providing CB support	NGO Partner	
ICCO & Diakonia	CSDA	
	GAD/C	
	ILDO	
DCA & Diakonia	ADHOC	9
	PNKS	
ICCO, DCA & Diakonia	LICADHO	
	NGO Forum	
DCA & EED	Star Kampuchea	
DCA & FCA	LWF	
Total nr. of currently shared partners		20

ANNEXES
Annex 1: Additional tables

Table 1.2: Overview of longer-term NGO partners by APRODEV agency
Table B: Overview of NGO partners per province/area

ANNEX 1

Table 1.2: Overview of longer-term NGO partners by APRODEV agency

NGO Partners	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total
ACF	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
ACT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
ADHOC	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
AFSC	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
APP/PACT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
CAAFW	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
CAS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
CCC	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
CDP	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
CEDAC	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
CEDAW	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
CHEC	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
CHED	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Chet Tor	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CIPERAD	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
COSECAM	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
CRF	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
CSD	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
CSDA	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
CVS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
CWCC	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
CWS	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
DPA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
FACT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Friends	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
GAD/C	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Helen Keller	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
HU	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
ILDO	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
KAH	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
KFD	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
KKKHRDA	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
KROM	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
KYA	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
LAC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
LICADHO	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
LWF	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
Maryknolll	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
MODE	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
MOPOTSYO	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
NCDP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
NGO Forum	1	1	0	1	1	0	4
PADV	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
PJJ	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
PNKS	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Ponleur	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
RCEDO	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
SCC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Table 1.2 (continued): Overview of longer-term NGO partners by APRODEV agency

	ICCO	DCA	EED	Diak	CA	FCA	Total2
SSC	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Star Kampuchea	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
STT	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
TDSP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tean Thor Ass.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
TPO	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
VAWCC	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
VBNK	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
YFP	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
57 NGO partners	32	13	13	13	5	1	

Table B: Overview of NGO partners per province/area

	ACF	ACT	ADHOC	AFSC	AMARA	APP/PACT	CAAFW	CAS	CCC	CDP	CEDAC	CEDAW
Cambodia	.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	.	1
Phnom Penh	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kandal	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Cham	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Chhnang	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Thom	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Speu	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Prey Veng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Siem Riep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Svay Rieng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Takeo	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampot	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.
Koh Kong	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rattanakiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mondolkiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Preah Vihear	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Battambang	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Bantey Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Otdar Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pursat	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kratie												
Stung Treng	.											
Sihanoukville	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tonle Sap area	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cross border thai	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Costal Zone	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

Table B (continued 1): Overview of NGO partners per province/area

	CHEC	CHED	Chet Tor	CIPERAD	CLEC	CNRO	COSECAM	CPRWCA	CRF	CRWRC	CSD	CSDA
Cambodia	.	.	.	1	.	1	1	.	.	1	1	.
Phnom Penh	1	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.
Kandal	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.
Kampong Cham	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.
Kampong Chhnang	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Thom	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Speu	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Prey Veng	1	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.
Siem Riep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Svay Rieng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Takeo	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampot	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Koh Kong	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rattanakiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mondolkiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Preah Vihear	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Battambang	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Bantey Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1
Otdar Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pursat	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kratie												
Stung Treng												
Sihanoukville	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tonle Sap area	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cross border thai	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Costal Zone	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.

Table B (continued 2): Overview of NGO partners per province/area

	CVS	CWCC	CWS	DPA	FACT	Friends	GAD/C	Helen Keller	HU	ILDO	KAH
Cambodia	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.
Phnom Penh	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Kandal	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Cham	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Chhnang	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.
Kampong Thom	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Speu	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.
Prey Veng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Siem Riep	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Svay Rieng	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Takeo	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampot	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Koh Kong	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Rattanakiri	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
Mondolkiri	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Preah Vihear	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Battambang	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.
Bantey Meanchey	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Otdar Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pursat	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kratie											
Stung Treng	.				.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sihanoukville	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tonle Sap area	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cross border thai	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Costal Zone											

Table B (continued 3): Overview of NGO partners per province/area

	KFD	KKKHRDA	KRDA	KROM	KYA	LAC	LICADHO	LWF	Maryknolll	MODE	MOPOTSYO	NCDP
Cambodia	.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	.	.	.	1
Phnom Penh	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	1	.	1	1
Kandal	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	1	1	.	.	1
Kampong Cham	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Chhnang	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.
Kampong Thom	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	.
Kampong Speu	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	1
Prey Veng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Siem Riep	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Svay Rieng	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.
Takeo	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.
Kampot	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Koh Kong	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.
Rattanakiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mondolkiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Preah Vihear	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Battambang	.	.	1	1	.	1	1	1	.	.	.	.
Bantey Meanchey	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Otdar Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pursat	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.
Kratie												
Stung Treng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sihanoukville	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.
Kep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tonle Sap area	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cross border thai	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Costal Zone												

Table B (continued 4): Overview of NGO partners per province/area

	NGO Forum	NGO Network BTB	Open Forum	PADV	PJJ	PNKS	Ponleur	RCEDO	SABORAS	SCC	SSC	Star Kampuchea
Cambodia	1	.	1	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Phnom Penh	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
Kandal	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Cham	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Chhnang	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Thom	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Speu	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1
Prey Veng	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.
Siem Riep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
Svay Rieng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Takeo	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampot	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Koh Kong	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rattanakiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mondolkiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Preah Vihear	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Battambang	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	1
Bantey Meanchey	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.
Otdar Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.
Pursat	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kratie												
Stung Treng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sihanoukville	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tonle Sap area	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cross border thai	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Costal Zone												

Table B (continued 5): Overview of NGO partners per province/area

	STT	TDSP	Tean Thor Association	TPO	VAWCC	VBNK	Wathnakpheap	YFP
Cambodia	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	1
Phnom Penh	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	.
Kandal	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Cham	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Chhnang	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kampong Thom	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.
Kampong Speu	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Prey Veng	.	.	.	1	1	.	.	.
Siem Riep	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.
Svay Rieng	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.
Takeo	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.
Kampot	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Koh Kong	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rattanakiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Mondolkiri	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Preah Vihear	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Battambang	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.
Bantey Meanchey	.	1	.	1	.	.	.	.
Otdar Meanchey	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pursat	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.
Kratie								
Stung Treng	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sihanoukville	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kep	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tonle Sap area	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cross border thai	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Costal Zone	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.