**Overarching results/lessons**

* Macroeconomics couldn’t predict actual forest loss
* Macroeconomics could predict ELCs
* There is a clear link between the agricultural sector’s contribution to GDP (i.e., the size of the sector) and ELC allocation. This is expected
* The prices (commodity and producer) of valuable commodities are linked to new ELC allocation – likely to be drivers. Time lags are important.
* ELCs are commonly foreign-owned, and FDI is linked to new ELCs development. Can be used as a predictor.
* Development flows to the environment did not have an effect on new ELCs. Why was this?
* Far too much between-commune variation to capture any useful generalised / broad relationships. Predicting for certain individual communes may be possible, but that has limited usefulness.
* The change in direction of effect of ELCs on forest cover between commune level and province level highlights the complexity of modelling these relationships and how important scale is. This is also emphasised in the reversal of direction of effect of distance to international border and distance to provincial capital.
* One model suggests that smaller provinces which close to borders have higher forest cover, but then the other model adds nuance at a different scale – communed within those provinces will have higher forest cover if they are further away from the provincial capital and further away from the border.
* There are distinct socioeconomic clusters in Cambodia. Close similarity is often also geographic proximity (i.e., members of the same cluster are contiguous). But there are similarities between clusters on the other side of the country.
* Central strip of the country is the largest single cluster, and contains a wide variety of provinces
* Some agreement between cluster analysis and socioeconomic models – provinces with high elevation have more forest cover. Provinces with low education have high forest cover.

**Macroeconomic analysis**

* Rubber most common ELC
* Rubber most valuable crop (commodity prices), and second most valuable crop (producer price)
* Sugar most valuable crop (producer price), and third most valuable (commodity price)
* Rice second most valuable crop (commodity price)
* Largest effect – population density (negative). Fewer ELCs is high population areas
* Largest maroecon effect – agricultural proportion GDP (positive)
* FDI has positive effect on new ELCs (1-year time lag)
* No negative effect of dev flows to environment on ELCs
* Positive relationships between ELCs and market price of rubber, NFI, and sugar
* Effects of sugar are larger with 1 and 2-year time lag
* Producer price of rubber as positive effect on ELCs

**Socioeconomic analysis**

* Population density was the only non-control variable with an effect at the commune level. The effect was negative but weak
* Elevation was the strongest predictor of forest cover at the commune level
* Communes with ELCs predicted to have lower forest cover than communes without ELCs, and communes with PAs predicted to have higher forest cover than those without.
* Remote communes that are not near international borders have more forest cover
* Commune random effect was responsible for the most variance
* Extreme variation between communes. Caused issues with models – they are unsuitable for global predictions. Model predicts particularly poorly for lower values of the response.
* Provinces with ELCs and PAs predicted to have higher forest cover. Presence of PAs is the strongest effect. Interesting difference in the direction of the effect of ELCs between the commune- and province-level models.
* Provinces with low education levels have higher forest cover – remoteness. Provinces with smaller distances to schools have higher forest cover. This is not what I was expecting

**Cluster analysis**

* The largest cluster (5) represents mostly large provinces with high population density, high education, high primary & secondary sector employment, and high migration. Because there are so many provinces in this cluster, these are generalisations.
* Clusters with highest levels of migration also had highest numbers of land conflicts.
* Clusters 3 and 4 had highest population density, migration, education. These clusters have PP and Battambang, plus all of the urban sprawl and industry around them.
* Cluster 1 holds the most rural, most remote provinces with the lowest population density, education, secondary sector workers, and migration.
* Cluster 1 had the most forest by far, followed by cluster 5. Although cluster 5 forest cover will be largely the Cardamom mountains forest, the northern plains, and Stung Treng.