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ABSTRACT: Although Cambodia might have achieved self-sufficiency and an exported surplus in rice production, its rice-based farming systems are widely associated with low productivity, low farmer income and rural poverty. The paper is based on a questionnaire village survey in 14 communes containing 97 villages of Kampong Chhnang Province from March to June, 2011. It analyzes the prevailing rice-based cropping systems and evaluates options for their improvement. Differences in cropping systems depend on the distance from the Tonle Sap water bodies. At distances greater than 10 km, transplanted wet-season rice cropping system with low productivity of about 1.6 t/hm² prevails. This deficiency can be primarily attributed to soils with high coarse sand fractions and low pH (< 4.0), use of 'late' varieties, and exclusive use of self-propagated seeds. For improving this cropping system, commercial 'medium' cultivars help preventing crop failure by shortening the cultivation period by one month and complementation of wet-season rice with non-rice crops should be expanded. Areas adjacent (≤ 1 km) to the water bodies become inundated for up to seven months between July until January of each year. In this area, soils contain more fine sand, silt and clay, and their pH is higher (> 4.0). Farmers predominantly cultivate dry-season recession rice between January and April. 79% of the area is sown directly and harvested by combine. Adoption of commercial rice seeds is 59% and yields average 3.2 t/hm². Introduction of a second dry-season rice crop between April and July may double annual yields in this rice cropping system. Besides upgrading other cultivation technologies, using seeds from commercial sources will improve yield and rice quality. Besides rice, farmers grow non-rice crops at different intensity ranging from single annual crops to intensive sequences at low yields.
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While annual growth of the world’s population between 2009 and 2015 is estimated 1.1% (World Bank, 2011), annual growth of the world’s rice production is about 4.5% (FAO, 2011). The latter growth is due to expansion in rice-cultivation area and increases in productivity. There are, however, large differences in productivity between rice-growing nations and particularly in mainland Southeast Asia which is home to Thailand and Vietnam as the world’s two prominent rice-exporting nations. While the world’s paddy rice yield in 2009 averaged 4.3 t/hm² and that of Vietnam 5.2 t/hm², Cambodia’s average yield reached only 2.8 t/hm² (FAO, 2011), which is one of the reason why Cambodia’s export of milled rice (4 299 t in 2008) is only a fraction (0.05% and 0.09%) of that of Thailand and Vietnam.

Although its land endowment predestines Cambodia to exporting rice (Dawe, 2004), Cambodia’s predominant rice cropping system is the wet-season crop, which accounts for over 86% of the total rice area. Ninety percent of this area is rainfed (USDA, 2010). Although some authors have highlighted innovations in Cambodia’s rainfed rice cultivation (Mak, 2001), others have pointed to the relationship between human poverty and such rainfed cropping systems (Fujisaka, 1991). In addition to the wet-season crops, Cambodia produces dry-season rice which includes irrigated dry-season and ‘recession rice’ crops (USDA, 2010). Recession rice is crops planted into receding floodwaters from Cambodia’s major water bodies that comprise the Tonle Sap Lake, and the Tonle Sap River and the Mekong River which merge in Phnom Penh to become the Tonle Bassac River.

Low productivity is symptomatic for Cambodia’s
production of non-rice crops as well. For example, Cambodia’s total production of vegetables in 2009 was only 21% of that of Thailand and 11% of that of Vietnam. Yields for these crops averaged 37% below yields in Thailand and 48% below those in Vietnam (FAO, 2011). The primary objective of the study is to provide an overview of existing rice cropping system in selected communes of Cambodia’s Kampong Chhnang Province. The study also classifies these cropping systems by identifying the main factors which determine their prevalence and evaluates solutions for improving these rice cropping systems within and beyond Cambodia’s Kampong Chhnang Province.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study area

Cambodia comprises 24 provinces which are divided into 185 districts, 1 621 communes and 14 073 villages (NIS, 2008). Our study area encompasses 14 communes within three districts of Kampong Chhnang Province (Fig. 1). Their total population of 87 400 represents 19% of the province’s total and 0.6% of Cambodia’s populace. Communes were selected on rural-development indicators including population density, poverty and human-development index (ADB, 2007). In comparison to Cambodia’s national average, the region is characterized by high population density and above-average percentage of households living below the poverty line (NCDD, 2009).

Kampong Chhnang Province is located in the basin of the Tonle Sap Lake and the Tonle Sap River. The Tonle Sap Lake is the largest freshwater lake in Southeast Asia, covering an area of about 3 000 km² in the dry season (November-April) and about 16 000 km² in the wet season (May-October). The difference in the area between seasons is primarily due to the
Tonle Sap River which drains the lake during the dry season and replenishes it when the waters of the Mekong River cause the reverse flow into the lake during the wet season. The seasonally inundated area of up to 13 000 km$^2$ is usually referred to as ‘floodplain’.

Table 1 presents an overview of our study area and the extent of seasonal flooding within the communes covered in this study. The average distance of each commune from the Tonle Sap River or Tonle Sap Lake was calculated as the mean of the geographical distance of each commune’s village to the closest water body. For this, GPS data was recorded using a mobile phone and ‘My BB GPS’ software version1.6.0.

Fine and coarse sands are the prominent soil fraction across the study area (data not shown). In communes at distances greater than 10 km from the Tonle Sap soils with high coarse sand fractions and low pH (particle size: 1.6% clay, 2.6% silt, 28.7% fine sand, 67.1% coarse sand; EC: 0.01 dS/m; pH (1:5 CaCl$_2$): 3.8; exchangeable Al: 0.14 cmol/kg) prevail while soils in areas adjacent (≤1 km) to the water bodies are higher in fine sand, silt and clay fractions with higher pH (2.7% clay, 5.8% silt, 37.1% fine sand, 54.3% coarse sand; EC: 0.02 dS/m; pH: 4.3; exchangeable Al: 0.07 cmol/kg).

**Surveys**

The study was designed as a village survey in a total of 97 villages (2–14 villages per commune, data not shown). It encompassed interviewing key informants such as the Commune Councilor, other Commune Council members, and a varying number of Village Chiefs and farmers between March to June 2011.

While the survey questionnaire was divided into a total of five sections, two of these sections focused on rice cropping. Section one covered socio-economic indicators including household size and farm area and section two focused on on-farm activities associated with rice production.

The commune-based interviews of key informants were conducted following the Delphi method (Linstone and Turoff, 1975) and divided into a maximum of three rounds. During the first round of interviews, the representatives of communes were asked to answer the questionnaire. These answers were reviewed and summarized by the interviewers for encouraging the informants to revise their earlier answers considering the answers of the other commune representatives. After such discussion, consent was usually reached in the second round.

**Statistical analysis**

Basic statistics including sums, means and standard deviations (SD), and analysis of variance (ANOVA) and multivariate analysis (cluster analysis) were calculated with SAS software version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary). Differences between districts, clusters and between groups of geographical distance were analyzed with one-factorial ANOVA and means separated with the Duncan test ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Table 1. Selected characteristics of surveyed communes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area (hm$^2$)</th>
<th>Population density (km$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>Ratio of agricultural area (%)</th>
<th>Farm size (hm$^2$)</th>
<th>Distance from Tonle Sap Lake (km)</th>
<th>Flooding (months)</th>
<th>Ratio of flooding area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anhchanh Rung</td>
<td>Baribour</td>
<td>5 269</td>
<td>6 954</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khon Rang</td>
<td>Baribour</td>
<td>7 288</td>
<td>4 207</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Preah Kokir</td>
<td>Baribour</td>
<td>1 983</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melum</td>
<td>Baribour</td>
<td>3 916</td>
<td>5 300</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar</td>
<td>Kampong Laeng</td>
<td>6 759</td>
<td>8 500</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Hau</td>
<td>Kampong Laeng</td>
<td>8 078</td>
<td>4 803</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pou</td>
<td>Kampong Laeng</td>
<td>5 249</td>
<td>9 350</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samraong Saen</td>
<td>Kampong Laeng</td>
<td>1 555</td>
<td>4 454</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trangel</td>
<td>Kampong Laeng</td>
<td>6 226</td>
<td>10 910</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampil Tuck</td>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>12 530</td>
<td>4 518</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chouk Sa</td>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>9 083</td>
<td>3 753</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>6 519</td>
<td>1 599</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peani</td>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>7 723</td>
<td>1 798</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thma Edith</td>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>5 222</td>
<td>3 648</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

Mean 6 243 5 200 163 41 1.6

**Total**

Total 87 400 72 794

*Average distance from Tonle Sap River or Tonle Sap Lake.

Period during the wet season when waters from the Tonle Sap Lake or Tonle Sap River floods the area between ca. July and December.
RESULTS

Basic characteristics of the study area

The study area covers a total area of 72,794 hm² of which an average of 41% is used agriculturally (Table 1). While the latter ratio exceeds 20% in 13 communes, only 7% of the total area of Samraong Saen commune is used for agricultural purposes. This can be attributed to a flooding period of approximately 7 months (July-January) during which the area is totally inundated. While the total population of this area is 87,400, the population density ranges between 35 and 430 per km² and averages 163 per km². With 18,193 households in total, the average household size is 4.7. Farm size averages 1.6 hm², ranging from 0.4 hm² in densely populated Peani commune to 4.0 in Anhchanh Rung commune.

Flooding by waters from the Tonle Sap Lake and Tonle Sap River

Fig. 1 and Table 1 illustrate that only four of the 14 communes, i.e., Anhchanh Rung, Chouk Sa, Peani and Thma Edth, are more than 10 km away from the Tonle Sap Lake and/or the Tonle Sap River, and do not become flooded during the wet season. All other communes become inundated when the waters of the Mekong River flow into the Tonle Sap River and Lake during that season. Communes in close proximity to the water bodies including Kampong Preah Kokir, Kampong Hau, Samraong Saen, Ampil Tuek and Kampong Tralach experience 3–5 months of flooding during the wet-season months from the end of July until the end of December (Samraong Saen: from the middle of July until the beginning of February). The wet-season flooding does not only affect these communes for a longer period of time but also affects a greater percentage of their area (Table 1).

Rice cropping systems

About 34% of the total area of the 14 communes is used for rice production (Table 2) which corresponds to 83% of the arable land (Table 2). Rice cropping systems can be divided into wet-season (about 69% of total rice cultivation area) and dry-season production (31%). Except Kampong Tralach and Khon Rang communes where 30 hm² and 360 hm² are double-cropped, all other area in the study area is single-cropped, i.e. used for cultivating one rice crop per year. Only in Pou and Trangel communes, some area (13% and 5% of total arable area respectively) is currently not used for rice cultivation. Farmers singled out lack of labor as a primary reason for this.

In areas which are comparably distant from the Tonle Sap Lake or the Tonle Sap River (Anhchanh Rung, Chouk Sa, Peani and Thma Edth) farmers exclusively cultivate wet-season rice. While late cultivars mature within 5-6 months between June and November/December, medium cultivars require only 4-5 months between June and September/October. Farmers plant late rice cultivars for 33% and medium cultivars for 66% of the total area. This distribution does not only apply to the total area but also to the area on individual farms, i.e., a majority of farmers cultivate late and medium cultivars on different fields.

Table 2. Characteristics of rice cultivation in surveyed communes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Area (hm²)</th>
<th>Wet season</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dry season</th>
<th></th>
<th>Directly sown</th>
<th>Transplanted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>late</td>
<td></td>
<td>first crop</td>
<td>second crop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhchanh Rung</td>
<td>4,646</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khon Rang</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Preah Kokir</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melum</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Hau</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pou</td>
<td>1,690 a</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samraong Saen</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trangel</td>
<td>2,582 a</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampil Tuek</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,937</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chouk Sa</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Tralach</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peani</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thma Edth</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,788</td>
<td>11,304</td>
<td>5,846</td>
<td>7,620</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>18,146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Cultivation period: Jun-Oct (4-5 months). b Cultivation period: Jun-Nov (5-6 months). c Cultivation period: Jan-Apr. d Cultivation period: May-Jul. e Sown directly in the field and harvested with combine harvesters. f Transplanted: seedlings raised in a nursery, transplanted into the field and harvested by hand. g Transplanted into areas with a subsequent wet season rice crop. h Not all arable area currently used for cultivation.
of their farm.

Although some farmers plant floating rice (Khon Rang, 380 hm²; Dar, 140 hm²; Pou, 220 hm²; Trangel, 128 hm²), the predominant cropping system in areas which become flooded between July-December (Kampong Preah Kokir, Kampong Hau, Samraong Saen an Ampil Tuek) is a (first) dry-season rice crop. The seeds of this crop are sown in January immediately after the floodwaters from the Tonle Sap recede from the fields (‘recession’ rice) and harvested during April. This cropping system offers the opportunity of cultivating another (second) crop from April/May until the onset of flooding in late July. Currently, however, only about 30 hm² in Kampong Tralach commune have been planted this crop and only since 2010. Although most of the production areas are only meters away from the waters of the Tonle Sap River/Lake, lack of irrigation equipment was singled out as the major hindrance to growing the second dry-season crop.

In communes geographically located between wet-season or dry-season rice areas (Khon Rang, Melum, Dar, Pou, Trangel and Kampong Tralach), farmers cultivate both crops. Depending on the natural water supply, these crops are grown on different fields within individual farms.

The cropping system determines the mode of cultivation. In contrast to wet-season crops which are (traditionally) pre-nursed, transplanted and harvested by hand, farmers usually sow dry-season rice directly and harvest those crops with combine harvesters. While 60% of the dry-season cultivation area of 992 hm² in Kampong Hau commune is directly sown, the total dry-season cultivation area of 2 937 hm² in Ampil Tuek commune is cultivated using these practices. In Kampong Tralach, farmers have extended direct-sowing practices beyond the dry-season crop: not only 733 hm² of dry-season cultivation area but also 115 hm² of wet-season rice cultivation area are seeded directly and harvested by combine harvester (Table 2).

A feature across rice cropping systems is the use of self-propagated seeds. Exceptions from this practice include Ampil Tuek (2 937 hm²) and Kampong Tralach (993 hm²) where seeds for the dry-season crops are typically acquired from private seed companies. Seed rates exceed recommended rates (directly sown in the dry season, 60–70 kg/hm²; directly sown in the wet season, 80–120 kg/hm²; transplanted in both seasons, 20–30 kg/hm²) up to five-fold: The overall seed rate in the study area is 115 kg/hm², and for wet-season transplanted rice 105 kg/hm² and for dry-season directly-sown rice 122 kg/hm². The highest seeding rates were recorded for Kampong Hau commune (195 kg/hm² for the first directly-sown dry-season rice crop) and Ampil Tuek commune (180 kg/hm² for the first and the second directly-sown dry-season crop).

Compared to the world’s average paddy-rice yield of 4.3 t/hm² in 2009 (FAO, 2011), average productivity of rice in the surveyed communes is significantly lower (2.5 t/hm², Table 3). Only yields in Kampong Tralach (3.5 t/hm²), Kampong Preah Kokir (4.5 t/hm²) and Kampong Hau (4.8 t/hm²) approach or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>Wet season</th>
<th></th>
<th>Dry season</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medium cultivar</td>
<td>late cultivar</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>first crop</td>
<td>second crop</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anhchanh Rung</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khon Rang</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Preah Kokir</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melum</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampong Hau</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pou</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samraong Saen</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trangel</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampil Tuek</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chouk Sa</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peani</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thma Edth</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.6</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>3.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Standard deviation. b Cultivation period ca. Jun-Oct (4-5 months). c Cultivation period ca. Jun-Nov (5-6 months). d Cultivation period ca. Jan-Apr (3.5 months). e Cultivation period ca. Apr-Jul (3.5 months).
exceed the world’s average. The factors which influence productivity are, however, confounded by four factors including geographic location, season, cultivation mode and source of seeds. All communes with above-average rice productivity are located in close proximity to the Tonle Sap River where dry-season rice is the predominant cropping system, where crops are almost exclusively sown directly, and where commercial cultivars are cultivated on 59% (Ampil Tuek and Kampong Tralach) of the total area. On average, dry-season rice yields (3.2 t/hm$^2$) exceed those of wet-season crops (1.6 t/hm$^2$) by 100% (Table 3). Low productivity of rice prevails in communes at distances from the Tonle Sap exceeding 10 km: rice yields in Anhchanh Rung, Thma Edth and Chouk Sa communes reached only 0.9, 1.4 and 1.8 t/hm$^2$. Farmers grow no dry-season crops in these communes and crops are exclusively transplanted.

While rice cultivation covers a total area of 24 788 hm$^2$ in the study area, other crops occupy 2 699 hm$^2$ which corresponds to 11% of the paddy area, 9% of the agricultural area and 4% of the total area. This non-rice crop production is restricted to areas adjacent to the Tonle Sap Lake/River.

### Categorization of cropping systems

The first approach of explaining differences in cropping systems between surveyed communes was categorizing communes into districts (data not shown). This clustering explains only that the average geographical area of communes between districts is statistically significantly different, i.e., communes in Kampong Laeng district are larger than those in Kampong Tralach district and that the reverse is true for population density and the quotient between agricultural area and total area.

The second approach was a multivariate analysis based on the parameters distance to Tonle Sap, total area, total agricultural area, rice agricultural area, non-rice agricultural area, flooding period, flooding area, wet-season rice area, dry-season rice area, transplanted rice area, directly-sown rice area, rice yield and rice seed rate. This analysis results in three clusters (data not shown). Cluster 1 contains only Anhchanh Rung commune in Baribour district, cluster 2 comprises Dar, Pou and Trangel communes which all belong to Kampong Leaeng district and cluster 3 is composed of the ten remaining communes across districts. The results of this analysis are primarily based on highly significant ($P < 0.001$) differences in total area, agricultural area, wet-season rice area and transplanted rice area between clusters. Anhchanh Rung commune with a total area of 6 954 hm$^2$, of which 4 646 hm$^2$ are exclusively used for transplanted wet-season rice is classified in a different cluster than all other communes. Cluster 2 comprises the three communes with large total area but more diversified rice production (wet-season and dry-season cultivation) whereas cluster 3 combines the communes of smaller individual area.

The third approach of differentiating cropping systems in the study area was categorizing communes according to their distance from the Tonle Sap Lake or Tonle Sap River (Table 1). Among the 27 parameters subjected to analysis of variance, ten parameters revealed significant differences between the following groups of communes: (1) up to 1 km distance from the Tonle Sap (five communes including Kampong Preah Kokir, Kampong Hau, Samraong Saen, Ampil Tuek and Kampong Tralach), (2) between 1-10 km distance from the Tonle Sap (five communes including Khon Rang, Melum, Dar, Pou and Trangel) and (3) beyond 10 km distance from the Tonle Sap (four communes including Anhchanh Rung, Chouk Sa, Peani and Thma Edth, Table 4).

While the average period and area during which waters of the Tonle Sap Lake and Tonle Sap River inundate parts of the surveyed communes decreases with distance from the water bodies, the share of dry-season rice area decreases and that of wet-season rice area increases. Since nearly all of the wet-season rice crops are transplanted, the area of transplanted rice increases and that of directly-sown rice decreases (n.s.) with distance from the lake/river. Due to this, there is a highly significant inverse relationship between dry-season rice area and wet-season rice area per total commune area. Since yields are better for dry-season rice crops and the share of dry-season rice decreases with distance from the Tonle Sap, average rice yields are more than double (3.6 t/hm$^2$) in communes close to the Tonle Sap compared to communes at distances beyond 10 km from the Tonle Sap (1.5 t/hm$^2$).

Table 5 summarizes the typical cropping systems prevailing in the study area of Cambodia’s Kampong Chhnang province throughout a year. While intensification of land use is restricted by seasonal flooding in close proximity (0-1 km) to the Tonle Sap, cultivation of a second dry-season rice crop can be expanded beyond Kampong Tralach commune (System 1). The least extensive cropping system...
prevails at greater distance to the water bodies (>10 km; System 1) where farmers typically cultivate only a single wet-season rice crop during a year.

### DISCUSSION

#### Study area in the context of Cambodian and Southeast Asian agriculture

Approximately 83% of the study area’s arable land is used for cultivation of rice. As such, the study area within Kampong Chhnang Province represents the structure of Cambodian and ‘monsoon’ mainland Southeast Asian rice production (Masumoto, 2005). While the household size of 4.7 (data not shown) equals that of Cambodia’s average (NIS, 2008), farm size (1.6 hm²) is 33% greater than the national average of 1.2 hm² per household (USDA, 2010). Mean population density (163 per km²) in the study area is,

---

Table 4. Selected agricultural indicators by distance from Tonle Sap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural indicator</th>
<th>0–1 km</th>
<th>1–10 km</th>
<th>&gt;10 km</th>
<th>Mean ± SD*</th>
<th>P²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (commune⁻¹)</td>
<td>5 647</td>
<td>6 253</td>
<td>6 824</td>
<td>6 243 ± 2 816</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density (km⁻²)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>163 ± 131</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size (household⁻¹)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total area (hm² commune⁻¹)</td>
<td>3 393</td>
<td>7 178</td>
<td>4 038</td>
<td>5 200 ± 2 771</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural area (hm² commune⁻¹)</td>
<td>1 404</td>
<td>2 164</td>
<td>2 223</td>
<td>1 963 ± 1 158</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural area per total area (%)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41 ± 19</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm size (hm²)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6 ± 1.0</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice cultivation area (hm² commune⁻¹)</td>
<td>1 180</td>
<td>1 907</td>
<td>2 149</td>
<td>1 768 ± 1 159</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-rice cultivation area (hm² commune⁻¹)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>193 ± 242</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-rice area per agricultural (%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 ± 19</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-rice area per rice area (%)</td>
<td>59 a</td>
<td>14 b</td>
<td>4 b</td>
<td>24 ± 43</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding period (months)</td>
<td>5 a</td>
<td>3 ab</td>
<td>1 b</td>
<td>3 ± 3</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding area (hm² commune⁻¹)</td>
<td>3 245</td>
<td>1 162</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 427 ± 1 900</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding area (% of total area)</td>
<td>91 a</td>
<td>23 ab</td>
<td>&lt;1 b</td>
<td>36 ± 45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice area (hm² commute⁻¹)</td>
<td>1 187</td>
<td>1 909</td>
<td>2 149</td>
<td>1 771 ± 1 157</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry-season rice area (hm² commute⁻¹)</td>
<td>1 130 a</td>
<td>522 ab</td>
<td>0 b</td>
<td>546 ± 761</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet-season rice area (hm² commute⁻¹)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>193 ± 242</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transplanted rice area (hm² commute⁻¹)</td>
<td>205 b</td>
<td>1 455 ab</td>
<td>2 149 a</td>
<td>1 296 ± 1 308</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly-sown rice area (hm² commute⁻¹)</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>474 ± 895</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry-season rice area per total area (%)</td>
<td>94 a</td>
<td>35 b</td>
<td>0 c</td>
<td>42 ± 43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet-season rice area per total area (%)</td>
<td>6 c</td>
<td>65 b</td>
<td>100 a</td>
<td>58 ± 43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry-season rice seed rate (kg/hm²)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>122 ± 39</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet-season rice seed rate (kg/hm²)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105 ± 14</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rice seed rate (kg/hm²)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>115 ± 33</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry-season rice yield (t/hm²)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet-season rice yield (t/hm²)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.5</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rice yield (kg/hm²)</td>
<td>3.6 a</td>
<td>2.4 ab</td>
<td>1.5 b</td>
<td>2.5 ± 1.3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standard deviation; * Significance group effect (ANOVA). Data followed by different superscript letters differ significantly-DUNCAN (0.05), within row comparison.

Table 5. Typical cropping systems (land use) by distance from Tonle Sap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>0–1 km</th>
<th>1–10 km</th>
<th>&gt;10 km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System 1</td>
<td>System 2</td>
<td>System 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>DSR1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>DSR1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>DSR1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>DSR1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>DSR2 b</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>VEG2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>DSR2</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>VEG2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>DSR2</td>
<td>VEG1</td>
<td>VEG2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
<td>Flooded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chouk Sa commune. * Kampong Tralach commune; Late cultivar. DSR, Dry season rice crop (directly sown); VEG, Vegetable crop; WSR, Wet season rice crop (transplanted).
however, approximately double that of Kampong Chhnang Province (85 per km$^2$) and Cambodia (75 per km$^2$, NIS, 2008). The highest population density prevails in Kampong Tralach (408 per km$^2$) and Peani (430 per km$^2$). In comparison, population density of Southeast Asia is 126 per km$^2$ including the Philippines (288 per km$^2$), Vietnam (254 per km$^2$), Thailand (127 per km$^2$) and Laos (26 per km$^2$). The study area can, thus, be characterized as a region with high population density but relatively low population pressure on farmland (Chhetry, 2001).

Southeast Asia’s cropping systems are defined by distinct wet and dry seasons (Huke and Huke, 1997; Lau and Yang, 1997). In contrast to Thailand (25%) and particularly Vietnam (53%), however, only 16% of Cambodia’s rice area is irrigated (Jamora, 2010). Largely because of this, rainfed wet-season rice dominates its cropping systems, which accounts for over 90% of its total wet-season crop area (USDA, 2010). Three of the 14 communes included in this study area (Anhchanh Rung, Peani and Thma Edth) represent this traditional cropping system with a single wet-season rice crop cultivated without supplemental irrigation. While these communes are at least 10 km away from the waters of the Tonle Sap Lake and Tonle Sap River, the predominant rice cropping system changes with decreasing distance from the water bodies. In communes located at 1–10 km distance to the Tonle Sap (Khon Rang, Melum, Dar, Pou, Trangel and Kampong Tralach), farmers grow both wet-season and dry-season rice which makes them less vulnerable to shocks like crop failure in either one season. Communes in direct proximity to the river (0–1 km distance to the Tonle Sap) have no option to cultivate a wet-season crop since they get inundated by the waters of the Tonle Sap during this season. Farmers in these communes (Kampong Preah Kokir, Kampong Hau, Samraong Saen and Ampil Tuerk), hence, exclusively grow dry-season crops. Since the natural environment close to the Tonle Sap provides a source for irrigation during the dry season, farmers in these communes compliment rice crops with extensive to very intensive cultivation of non-rice crops. While 100% of communes at a distance of up to one kilometer from the Tonle Sap cultivate non-rice crops, this percentage drops to 80% for communes at distances between 1–10 km and 25% for communes at distances greater than 10 km from the Tonle Sap.

### Wet-season rice cropping systems

Although some farmers plant floating rice in communes close to the Tonle Sap (Khon Rang, 380 hm$^2$; Dar, 140 hm$^2$; Pou, 220 hm$^2$; Trangel, 128 hm$^2$) during the wet season, this area is rapidly declining, e.g., from 900 to 140 hm$^2$ in Dar commune during the past three years. Reasons for this decline include the long cultivation period (8 months between June and January) and low yield (about 1.2 t/hm$^2$).

In areas at greater distance to the Tonle Sap and particularly in Anhchanh Rung, Chouk Sa, Peani and Thma Edth communes, the traditional crop is the late wet-season crop with a cultivation period of 5–6 months. This crop is increasingly being replaced by medium crops with a cultivation period of 4–5 months. Farmers already cultivate them on 66% of the total wet-season rice production area of 17 150 hm$^2$ and usually plant both types on different fields of their farms to alleviate the risk of crop failure. The advantage of medium cultivars is that they are less affected by drought during grain growth and ripening (Fukai, 2006). In Anhchanh Rung and Peani communes farmers estimate the risk of losing a whole (late) crop due to drought during the end of the cultivation period at 40%. While this risk is circumvented by medium cultivars, the disadvantage of the latter is that their harvest during the end of the wet season may be hindered by submerged field conditions and/or localized flash floods during that time. The high rate of adoption of medium cultivars, however, illustrates the success of their promotion by the local authorities including the Provincial Department of Agriculture.

Farmers exclusively propagate seeds for their wet-season rice crops by themselves. In Trangel commune farmers grow a wet-season cultivar introduced in 1979. During the past 32 years, they consequently used part (7%) of their annual harvest for sowing the crop in the subsequent season. It can be presumed that the poor quality of the seed material particularly in terms of genetic consistency contributes to the low yield potential of 1.6 t/hm$^2$ which is 63% below the world’s average paddy rice yield of 4.3 t/hm$^2$ (FAO, 2011). Poor germination might be one of the reasons for high seed rate of 105 kg/hm$^2$ which highly exceeds the recommended rates for transplanted rice (20–30 kg/hm$^2$). Local authorities have just initiated a program of distributing seeds of commercial varieties under the precondition that farmers do not propagate them for longer than three seasons.
The most significant contributor to low yields, however, appears to be prevalence of sandy acid soils at the southern end of the Tonle Sap Lake (Hin, 2010). Low water-holding capacity and low fertility of these soils were singled out as the predominant factors negatively affecting yields in this zone. Although the introduction of improved (medium) rice cultivars has lowered the risk of crop failure in some locations, they have not significantly improved yield levels. Experiences with inorganic fertilizers including urea and diammonium phosphate have apparently not appreciably improved productivity either. This might presumably be related to inappropriate scheduling of applications and/or leaching. Development of permanent irrigation, i.e., switching from rainfed to irrigated cultivation may have a significant impact on improving productivity in this area albeit with low water-use efficiency. Another reason for limited use of inorganic fertilizers is their cost (about US$0.60 kg⁻¹ for urea and US$0.80 kg⁻¹ for diammonium phosphate) since they are exclusively imported (legally or illegally) from Thailand or Vietnam. It can only be speculated if additions of organic sources of fertilizers including compost might be able to improve water-use efficiency and productivity by increasing the water-holding capacity of soils (Leu et al, 2010). Such practices are, however, currently practiced only on a very limited scale.

Wet-season rice crops are entirely pre-nursed, transplanted and harvested by hand, with one exception in Kampong Tralach commune. In line with 763 hm² of dry-season area, farmers sow 230 hm² of their wet-season rice area directly and use combines for their harvest. Although this figure is currently marginal (1.3%) for the total wet-season rice area of 17 150 hm² in the study area, it may be expected that the share of directly sown rice in the wet-season cropping systems will increase in the future (De Datta, 1986).

Dry-season rice cropping systems

Due to seasonal flooding, communes less than one kilometer away from the Tonle Sap (particularly Kampong Preah Kokir, Kampong Hau, Samraong Saen, Ampil Tuek and Kampong Tralach) have no agricultural area available to cultivate a rainy-season crop. The total area affected by seasonal flooding in these communes is 20 039 hm² (92% of their total agricultural area) and the number of affected people 36 653. Since this land becomes completely inundated during 3–7 months of each year (between the end of July and December), people can farm their land for only 5–9 months of each year and resort to fishing activities during the flooding period. Despite this apparent disadvantage, this area is comparably highly populated with up to 430 heads per km². People in the area have adopted their livelihoods to the prevailing natural conditions by modifying their cropping systems so that these do not resemble the typical rice-cultivation system in the greater part of Cambodia.

Dry-season flood-recession rice is the major land use in the area which Fox and Ledgerwood (1999) called an extremely productive and sustainable ‘ancient land-use system’. The share of dry-season rice cropping systems in this area is 95%. The (first) dry-season rice crop is cultivated from the beginning of January when the floodwaters of the Tonle Sap recede from the fields. During the 3-month cultivation period until April, this crop may be additionally irrigated by farmers who own or rent irrigation pumps. Since natural soil water reserves only last for a few months, farmers in this agro-ecological zone require short-season rice cultivars. Seeds for this crop are not as readily available as for the wet-season rice crops, consequently, a greater percentage of those seeds (59%) are acquired from commercial sources.

Rice yields for the (first) dry-season crop average 3.2 t/hm² which doubles the yield level of the wet-season rice crops (1.6 t/hm²). Yields in Kampong Preah Kokir (4.5 t/hm²) and in Kampong Hau (4.8 t/hm²) even exceed the world’s average paddy rice yield of 4.3 t/hm² (FAO, 2011). Availability of water and soils with greater water-holding capacity ease soil water management in this area while fertile silt which deposits during the annual floods (Fox and Ledgerwood, 1999) contributes to soil fertility. Both conditions improve productivity of rice in this area.

A distinguishing feature of the dry-season cropping systems compared to the wet-season cropping systems is the use of direct-sowing and combine-harvesting practices. Commune members singled out two primary reasons for this very recent development. The first reason is limited availability of labor for nursing, transplanting and harvesting rice crops by hand, and the second reason is the unpredictability of the exact time when the receding floodwaters allow establishment of the crop. The first reason appears questionable since household size in the communes close to the Tonle Sap is not different from that of communes more distant from the waterway. The
second argument may be more significant: if the floodwaters recede too early, seedlings are too young to be transplanted. In contrast, if the floodwaters recede just one or two weeks after the anticipated date, rice seedlings in the nursery may become over-mature since they should be transplanted within a short window of three weeks after sowing. The other disadvantage of nursing seedlings in this area is that seedlings need to be raised in elevated nurseries or fields which are not submerged beyond a few centimeters during that time. To avoid the risk of raising seedlings and to save cultivation time in the field, some farmers sow germinated seeds, a cultural practice between sowing seeds and transplanting seedlings.

Both commune council and farmers have singled out cultivation of a second dry-season rice crop as the primary development goal in the area. This crop can be cultivated after the harvest of the first dry-season crop in April until the onset of flooding during late July. Currently, only 30 hm² in Kampong Tralach commune have been planted the crop and only since 2010. Communes with the greatest potential of introducing and expanding cultivation of the second dry-season crop include Kampong Preah Kokir (700 hm²), Kampong Hau (992 hm²), Samaaong Saen (118 hm²), Ampil Tuke (2 937 hm²) and Kampong Tralach (703 hm²). Communes with less potential comprise Khon Rang (360 hm²), Melum (200 hm²), Pou (610 hm²) and Trangel (480 hm²). If only 50% (3 500 hm²) of these 5 450–7 100 hm² are used for producing the crop at an average yield of 3.2 t/hm², it will result in an extra production of 11 200 t of rice. This extra quantity almost doubles the total rice production (23 914 t) within the communes Kampong Preah Kokir, Kampong Hau, Samaaong Saen, Ampil Tuek and Kampong Tralach, and increases the total rice production within the study area (53 219 t) by 21%. At a producer price of US$199 t⁻¹ in Cambodia in 2008 (FAO, 2011), this production has a total value of US$2.2 million.

The most significant prerequisite for cultivating the second dry-season rice crop is irrigation. Farmers indicate that appropriate irrigation pumps cost around US$250 and require about 120 L/hm² of fuel. While this is a significant investment for many or most farmers in the study area, farmers spent US$75 per hm² for harvesting the (first) directly-sown crop by combine. If the yield of 3.2 t/hm² is completely sold at a producer price of US$199 t⁻¹, a farmer receives a return of US$637 per hm² or US$828 for the average farm size of 1.3 hm² in these communes. In other words, a farmer has to sell the production of about 0.4 hm² to offset the costs of a newly-acquired pump and about 0.7 hm² to offset those for a new pump and fuel (US$1.5 L⁻¹). If only fuel costs are taken into consideration, these costs can be offset by selling the harvest of only 0.3 hm², i.e., 1 t of rice. The fuel requirements can be reduced by saving irrigation through raising rice seedlings and transplanting the second dry-season crop. This technique does not incur the risks prevailing for the first dry-season crops, but farmers might be reluctant or unable to switch (back) to this labor-intensive form of rice cultivation.

Much similar to the wet-season cropping systems, seed rates for directly-sown dry-season rice crops exceed recommended rates up to 3.5 times: while 60–70 kg/hm² are recommended, farmers on average use 122 kg/hm² with 195 kg/hm² in Kampong Hau and 180 kg/hm² in Ampil Tuke commune. Since not all seeds are self-propagated like in the wet-season rice cropping systems, these practices waste farmers’ agricultural, nutritional as well as financial resources. For improving these as well as other cultural practices, the commune council members in this area call for better training of farmers preferably by way of demonstration fields.

**CONCLUSION**

The high percentage of 83% of the study area’s arable land used for cultivation of rice predisposes the area to producing rice in excess of its population own requirements. This can potentially contribute to Cambodia redeeming its traditional role as a rice-exporting nation. The study highlights that there is no single solution for improving rice production not even within the geographically localized region covered by this survey. While two approaches of clustering cropping systems failed, the approach of categorizing them by distance from the Tonle Sap Lake and River was successful and pointed towards routes for improving productivity. Establishing irrigation infrastructure is a prerequisite for expanding production of rice and non-rice crops. In areas distant to the Tonle Sap, introducing high-yielding medium maturing varieties in the wet-season rice cropping system has already proven its potential for leveraging the risk of crop failure caused by occasional drought.
during grain ripening stage at the beginning of the dry season in November. In the prevailing dry-season cropping system of communes adjacent to the Tonle Sap, introduction of a second dry-season rice crop between April and July can possibly double annual yields and contribute to Cambodia’s efforts to expand production of export-quality rice crops. Complementation of rice with non-rice crops should be promoted in these cropping systems. Marginal to low yields call for transfer of improved cultivation technology in these crops as well.
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