

Policy Alignment, Logistics Infrastructure, and Supply-Chain Connectivity in Cambodia: A Descriptive Documentary Policy Analysis

Khim Khim^{1*} | Phon Sophat²

¹ Royal Academy of Cambodia, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

² Institute for Banking Study, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Khim Khim

Royal Academy of Cambodia,
120911, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.

Email: kangkangkhimkhim@gmail.com

ORCID

[0009-0003-8948-6907](https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8948-6907)

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Pages: 28–36

Language: English

Citation: 2016-2026

Abstract

This study examines whether Cambodia's policy architecture is aligned with documented constraints in logistics infrastructure and supply-chain connectivity. A descriptive documentary policy analysis was conducted using a structured coding matrix covering policy objective, target constraint, instrument type, implementing actor, financing or delivery mechanism, mode or corridor, implementation status, and monitoring indicator. Primary sources include the Industrial Development Policy 2015–2025, the 2021 Law on Investment, the 2021 Public–Private Partnership Law, the Comprehensive Intermodal Transport and Logistics System (CITLS) Master Plan 2023–2033, and official implementation records, complemented by World Bank Logistics Performance Index (LPI) evidence. Cambodia's LPI score was 2.58 (rank 98, 80% CI 2.38–2.78) in 2018 and 2.4 (rank 115, 80% CI 2.0–2.8) in 2023, the overlapping intervals mean the difference cannot be distinguished confidently from survey uncertainty. Because the 2023 LPI survey was conducted in September–November 2022, it is treated as a pre-CITLS benchmark. Official project records show implementation stages ranging from feasibility and preparation to construction and operation. Policy alignment is strongest where identified constraints are linked to specific instruments, responsible institutions, delivery mechanisms, and measurable outcomes, realised post-CITLS performance remains a question for subsequent evaluation.

KEYWORDS logistics policy; logistics infrastructure; supply-chain connectivity; Logistics Performance Index; Cambodia

HIGHLIGHTS

- The 2023 LPI is treated as a pre-CITLS benchmark because the survey was conducted in 2022, overlapping 80% confidence intervals also caution against reading the 2018–2023 score difference as a statistically established decline.
- Official records show that Cambodia's logistics portfolio spans feasibility, preparation, development, construction, and operation rather than representing uniformly delivered capacity.
- A transparent alignment framework links logistics constraints with policy instruments, responsible institutions, implementation status, and measurable outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Cambodia's manufacturing, agriculture, tourism, and export-oriented industries rely on domestic and cross-border logistics that connect production areas with border gates, ports, airports, warehouses, logistics facilities, and regional corridors. This article treats three concepts separately. Policy alignment is the documented correspondence between an identified logistics constraint and a policy objective or instrument, together with a responsible institution, a delivery or financing mechanism, a target mode or corridor, and a measurable outcome. Logistics infrastructure comprises the physical and operational assets used for freight movement, including roads, railways, ports, airports, waterways, border facilities, and logistics nodes. Supply-chain connectivity refers to how effectively goods move across these nodes and borders in terms of cost, time, reliability, service competence, and visibility. Keeping these concepts separate avoids using broad construction or investment indicators as substitutes for logistics performance.

The World Bank Logistics Performance Index (LPI) offers a comparable survey-based benchmark across six dimensions: customs and border-management efficiency, trade- and transport-related infrastructure, international shipments, logistics competence and service quality, tracking and tracing, and timeliness (World Bank, 2018, 2023). Cambodia's overall LPI score was 2.58 in 2018 and 2.4 in the 2023 edition. The reported 80% confidence intervals—2.38–2.78 and 2.0–2.8—overlap, so the difference cannot be distinguished confidently from survey uncertainty. The 2023 survey was conducted from 6 September to 5 November 2022, before the CITLS Master Plan was adopted in August 2023. It is therefore used here as a pre-CITLS benchmark rather than as evidence of post-policy performance (World Bank, 2023).

The policy corpus contains four instruments that serve different functions. The Industrial Development Policy (IDP) 2015–2025 sets a broad strategy for industrial diversification and the enabling environment. The 2021 Law on Investment, administered through the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC), regulates investment and identifies eligible activities; Article 24 explicitly includes physical infrastructure, logistics, and activities that support regional and global production and supply chains (Council for the Development of Cambodia, 2021). The 2021 Law on Public-Private Partnerships (PPP), overseen by the Ministry of Economy and Finance (MEF), establishes rules for project preparation, procurement, contracting, and implementation. The CITLS Master Plan 2023–2033 is the sector-specific instrument that organises transport and logistics interventions across modes (Ministry of Economy and Finance, 2021; Ministry of Public Works and Transport, 2023).

Recent Cambodia-focused studies illuminate important parts of the logistics problem, but they tend to examine individual links in the policy-to-implementation chain. Kosuge et al. (2024) show that border-crossing time and cost, together with port-service frequency, can alter Cambodian container flows. Tan (2022) identifies operational customs and trade-facilitation constraints at Sihanoukville. Calabrese and Cao (2021) and Calabrese and Wang (2023) show that host-government agency, regulatory strength, and line-ministry capability shape infrastructure outcomes in Cambodia. At corridor level, the World Bank (2024) identifies high logistics costs and bottlenecks along the East-West road corridor, the Phnom Penh–Cai Mep waterway, and the

Poipet–Sihanoukville rail corridor. Cross-country evidence also links governance quality with logistics performance (Uyar et al., 2021), while Göçer et al. (2022) show that LPI benchmarking is most useful when it leads to targeted policy action rather than ranking alone. The Asian Development Bank (2022) similarly approaches trade and transport facilitation as an integrated readiness challenge. What is still missing from the Cambodia literature is a reproducible way to connect diagnosed constraints with policy instruments, responsible institutions, implementation stages, and measurable outcomes. This study addresses that gap.

Accordingly, this study pursues three objectives: (1) to establish a pre-CITLS logistics-capability benchmark using the full six-dimension LPI profile for 2018 and 2023 while accounting for survey timing and uncertainty; (2) to map the IDP, Law on Investment, PPP Law, and CITLS Master Plan against specific logistics constraints, instrument types, implementing institutions, delivery mechanisms, target modes or corridors, and documented implementation stages; and (3) to identify indicators that can be used to assess logistics outcomes as CITLS implementation progresses. The study offers a transparent framework for policy-to-logistics assessment; it does not attempt to estimate causal policy effects.

Operational definitions and analytical schema

The analytical framework has three layers. The first covers policy and institutional inputs: strategic objectives, legal incentives, PPP rules, master-planning provisions, and assigned responsibilities. The second covers implementation mechanisms and capabilities, including project preparation and procurement, financing arrangements, inter-agency coordination, regulatory and administrative capacity, service-provider capability, project stage, and monitoring arrangements. The third covers realised logistics outcomes: customs clearance, infrastructure quality and condition, shipment organisation, logistics competence, tracking visibility, timeliness, corridor transit time, terminal dwell time, freight cost, throughput, and reliability. The relationship between the layers is sequential, not automatic. Policy design can contribute to better logistics outcomes only when implementation capacity converts policy instruments into functioning infrastructure and services.

Policy alignment is assessed as stronger when the documents identify: (a) a logistics constraint evident in the LPI or Cambodia-specific literature; (b) a policy provision or project category that addresses that constraint; (c) a responsible institution or decision authority; (d) a delivery, regulatory, or financing mechanism; (e) a target mode, node, or corridor where relevant; (f) an observable implementation stage; and (g) an outcome indicator that can be monitored. Inter-agency coordination, regulatory strength, public-investment management, and logistics-service capability are treated as conditions that can strengthen or weaken the link between policy design and realised connectivity (Calabrese & Wang, 2023; International Monetary Fund, 2025).

Cambodia's policy and institutional architecture

The IDP 2015–2025 links industrial diversification, competitiveness, productivity, and enabling infrastructure, with CDC coordinating implementation monitoring (Royal Government of Cambodia, 2015; Council for the Development of Cambodia, 2022). The Law on Investment adds a more specific investment mechanism: CDC and subnational investment subcommittees administer registration and incentives, while Article 24 recognises physical infrastructure, logistics, and supply-

chain-supporting activities as eligible sectors (Council for the Development of Cambodia, 2021). These instruments can encourage logistics-intensive investment, but they are enabling policies rather than measures of logistics performance.

The PPP Law adds a framework for project governance and financing. MEF serves as the government's central PPP authority, supported by the General Department of Public-Private Partnerships, while line ministries and other implementing agencies identify, prepare, procure, and manage individual projects. The statutory project cycle distinguishes identification, selection, preparation, approval, procurement, contract negotiation, signing, and implementation (Ministry of Economy and Finance, 2021). For logistics analysis, this distinction is important: a project listed in a pipeline does not represent delivered connectivity until it advances through implementation and produces a measurable service outcome.

The CITLS Master Plan 2023–2033 is Cambodia's most direct logistics-policy instrument. It integrates road, rail, inland waterway, maritime, aviation, ports, logistics centres, special economic zones, and trade corridors, and identifies 174 hard- and soft-infrastructure projects with an estimated investment requirement of about USD 36.6–36.7 billion (Ministry of Public Works and Transport, 2023; International Monetary Fund, 2025). Responsibility is distributed across the National Logistics Council (NLC), National Logistics Steering Committee (NLSC), General Department of Logistics (GDL), customs, port authorities, transport departments, the civil-aviation authority, and other project-specific agencies. NLSC is tasked with facilitating implementation and preparing baseline indicators, while GDL coordinates implementation monitoring across ministries and stakeholders (General Department of Logistics, n.d.-a, n.d.-b).

Official reporting makes clear that the CITLS portfolio is not a portfolio of completed assets. The GDL publishes a 2025 Annual Progress Report and project-status information covering feasibility, preparation, development, construction, ongoing, operational, and not-yet-started stages (General Department of Logistics, 2026; General Department of Logistics, n.d.-c). Reported examples include road and rail debottlenecking works under construction, logistics-complex projects in feasibility or preparation, the Phnom Penh Air Cargo Hub under construction, border-clearance improvements under development, and customs or logistics-capacity initiatives at different stages. The practical question is therefore not simply whether a plan contains logistics projects, but whether those projects move through implementation and improve the logistics constraints they were designed to address.

The timing of the evidence also matters. The 2018 and 2023 LPI editions are treated as two survey benchmarks rather than as a continuous trend. Because the 2023 edition is based on fieldwork conducted in 2022, both observations predate full CITLS implementation. Post-CITLS evidence in this article is therefore limited to documented implementation status available through 29 August 2026 and is not used to infer a change in national logistics performance.

METHODS

Design and setting

This study uses descriptive documentary policy analysis combined with comparative logistics benchmarking. It is designed to assess policy alignment, institutional mechanisms, implementation status, and measurement readiness, not to estimate the causal

effect of policy on logistics performance or economic growth. The documentary corpus covers policy instruments introduced from 2015 onward and implementation evidence available up to 29 August 2026. The 2018 and 2023 LPI editions are used as benchmark snapshots, with the 2023 observation dated to its September–November 2022 fieldwork.

Data sources and procedures

Documents were retrieved purposively from official Royal Government of Cambodia portals and repositories, the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, and peer-reviewed journal databases. Search terms combined Cambodia with logistics policy, intermodal transport, supply-chain connectivity, economic corridor, customs, trade facilitation, Sihanoukville port, PPP, investment law, and CITLS implementation. A source was included when it provided an authoritative policy text, an official institutional or implementation record, a directly relevant logistics indicator, or peer-reviewed evidence explaining a Cambodia-specific constraint or transmission mechanism. The World Bank's 2024 corridor review was included because it documents post-CITLS corridor and border bottlenecks, but it is not treated as evidence that CITLS caused subsequent performance changes (World Bank, 2024). The 2018 and 2023 survey-based LPI editions were retained for historical benchmarking because they use the same broad framework. The redesigned LPI 2.0 uses shipment-level data for 2023–2024 and is therefore treated as a separate, forward-looking monitoring source rather than an extension of the historical survey series (World Bank, 2026). Primary legal and policy texts were preferred to summaries. Institutional and multilateral sources were used to verify implementation status and sector constraints, while peer-reviewed studies were used to interpret mechanisms and boundary conditions.

Analysis and evaluation

The unit of analysis was a documented policy provision, institutional responsibility, project-status item, or logistics indicator. Each item was coded across eight fields: policy objective, diagnosed logistics constraint, instrument type, implementing actor, delivery or financing mechanism, target mode/node/corridor, implementation status or horizon, and monitoring indicator. Alignment was assessed by tracing connections across these fields rather than by relying on temporal coincidence. When sources differed, the higher-tier source in the hierarchy was preferred and the more conservative interpretation was retained. Triangulation compared official policy and implementation records with World Bank logistics measures and Cambodia-focused academic evidence. The LPI comparison covers all six components, and differences in scores and ranks are interpreted alongside the World Bank's 80% confidence intervals and survey timing. Shipment-tracking indicators reported in 2023 were reviewed as complementary operational evidence but were not merged with the 2018–2023 survey-score comparison because they use a different measurement approach.

Research ethics

Ethical review was not required because the study used only publicly available documents and aggregate secondary data and involved no human participants.

RESULTS

Pre-CITLS logistics-capability benchmark

Table 1 presents Cambodia's complete six-dimension LPI profile. The overall score and rank were lower in the 2023 edition than in 2018, but the 80% confidence intervals overlap substantially. The difference should therefore be read with caution rather than as a statistically established deterioration. Infrastructure remained one of the weakest dimensions, at 2.14 in 2018 and 2.1 in 2023. Customs moved from 2.37 to 2.2, international shipments from 2.79 to 2.3, logistics competence from 2.41 to 2.4, tracking and tracing from 2.52 to 2.7, and timeliness from 3.16 to 2.8. Because the 2023 survey was conducted in 2022, these values describe logistics conditions before CITLS implementation rather than outcomes produced by the plan (World Bank, 2018, 2023).

Table 1 Cambodia's survey-based LPI benchmarks before CITLS implementation

Measure	2018 benchmark	2023 benchmark / interpretation
Overall LPI	2.58; rank 98; 80% CI 2.38–2.78	2.4; rank 115; 80% CI 2.0–2.8; intervals overlap
Customs	2.37	2.2
Infrastructure	2.14	2.1
International shipments	2.79	2.3
Logistics competence	2.41	2.4
Tracking and tracing	2.52	2.7
Timeliness	3.16	2.8

Source: World Bank (2018, 2023). Note: The 2023 LPI survey was fielded from 6 September to 5 November 2022. Overall-score intervals are approximate 80% confidence intervals reported by the World Bank; overlapping intervals mean the 2018–2023 difference is not statistically established.

Policy-to-constraint alignment and implementation evidence

Table 2 applies the alignment criteria to the six LPI dimensions. For each constraint, it identifies a policy or institutional response, the responsible actor and documented implementation stage where available, and an outcome measure that could be incorporated into Cambodia's logistics-monitoring system. The table separates enabling instruments, such as the Investment and PPP laws, from direct logistics interventions under CITLS and treats project stage as evidence of implementation progress rather than evidence of an outcome.

Table 2 Auditable mapping of logistics constraints, policy responses, implementation status, and monitoring

Constraint / baseline evidence	Policy, institution, and implementation evidence	Outcome monitoring
Customs & border management LPI 2023: 2.2; Cambodia-specific evidence identifies customs and trade-facilitation constraints at Sihanoukville.	CITLS border-clearance improvement: GDCE, development stage. Bavet cross-border improvement: MPWT/relevant institutions, ongoing; official tracker reports 10% progress for the associated customs-capacity work. Trade/cross-border agreement initiatives are under development.	Clearance hours; documentary processing time; inspection/queue time. Data owner: GDCE with GDL. Quarterly.

Constraint / baseline evidence	Policy, institution, and implementation evidence	Outcome monitoring
Trade/transport infrastructure LPI 2023: 2.1.	CITLS multimodal portfolio; responsible agencies include GDPW/MPWT, rail department, PAS, PPAP, SSCA and GDL. Official tracker lists road/rail/port projects in construction, logistics complexes in feasibility/preparation, and the Phnom Penh Air Cargo Hub under construction.	Corridor travel time; asset/project stage; port/terminal dwell time; availability. Data owners: MPWT/project agencies/ports. Quarterly-annual.
International shipments LPI 2023: 2.3.	Investment Law Article 24 recognises supply-chain-supporting activities, physical infrastructure and logistics; CDC provides the investment-registration channel. CITLS links corridors, ports and logistics nodes; PPP rules provide a project-preparation/procurement mechanism where applicable.	Freight cost; booking/service availability; cross-border shipment time; throughput. Data owners: GDL, ports, operators. Semiannual-annual.
Logistics competence LPI 2023: 2.4.	CITLS human/technical-development projects include customs and broker capacity building and a logistics technical training centre; relevant projects are listed in development stages under GDCE/GDLT/MPWT.	Training completion; service-quality survey; broker/provider capability. Data owners: GDL/GDCE. Annual.
Tracking & tracing LPI 2023: 2.7.	The NLC mandate includes information systems to monitor flows; NLSC is tasked with preparing baseline data and indicators, and GDL coordinates monitoring across ministries and stakeholders.	Digital visibility coverage; shipment-status availability; data completeness. Data owners: GDL/GDCE/operators. Quarterly-annual.
Timeliness LPI 2023: 2.8.	Corridor bottlenecking projects are in construction; Bavet service-hour/cross-border measures are ongoing; port and air-cargo capacity projects are at different delivery stages.	End-to-end transit time; on-time delivery; border/terminal dwell and queue time. Data owners: GDL/GDCE/ports. Monthly-quarterly.

Source: Council for the Development of Cambodia (2021); Ministry of Economy and Finance (2021); Ministry of Public Works and Transport (2023); General Department of Logistics (2026, n.d.-a, n.d.-b, n.d.-c); World Bank (2023, 2024); Tan (2022).

DISCUSSION

Policy alignment, governance, and implementation capacity

The mapping indicates that policy alignment is strongest when the policy system goes beyond acknowledging a logistics problem and specifies how it will be addressed. The four instruments play complementary roles: the IDP sets strategic priorities, the Investment Law provides an investment-regulation channel, the PPP Law structures project preparation and contracting, and CITLS identifies the multimodal interventions to be delivered. Together they create a plausible route from policy intent to project action, but only when responsibility, delivery mechanisms, and implementation stages are clear. This reading is consistent with Göçer et al. (2022), who argue that LPI-based diagnosis should lead to specific policy action, and with Uyar et al. (2021), whose cross-country evidence links governance quality with logistics performance. In Cambodia, governance is central to this process. Calabrese and Cao (2021) show how the government exercises agency by diversifying infrastructure partners, while Calabrese and Wang (2023) demonstrate that differences in line-ministry capacity can produce markedly different development outcomes. Policy alignment is therefore a starting condition; implementation capability is what determines whether that alignment translates into logistics performance.

The official CITLS project tracker makes this implementation layer visible. It includes road and rail works under construction, logistics complexes in feasibility or preparation, border-related measures under development, operational assets, and projects that have not yet started. The 174-project portfolio is therefore better understood as a set of commitments at different levels of readiness than as a stock of delivered capacity. This matters because large public-investment programmes can exceed the capacity available for project preparation, procurement, supervision, and staffing. Gurara et al. (2021), using road-project evidence from developing countries, show that rapid investment scale-ups can be associated with higher unit costs when investment efficiency is weak. The IMF's assessment of Cambodia also identifies weaknesses in capital budgeting, procurement, project implementation, and portfolio monitoring (International Monetary Fund, 2025). For CITLS, sequencing and project readiness are therefore as important as the headline investment requirement.

From project delivery to corridor connectivity

Completing individual assets does not automatically create supply-chain connectivity. A road, port, airport, or logistics centre adds capacity at a particular node; connectivity improves when those assets function as a network and when administrative interfaces do not become the next bottleneck. Evidence from transport-network studies supports this distinction. Zhao et al. (2022) show that planned transport investment can change accessibility unevenly across locations, while Qi et al. (2020) find that the spatial spillovers of logistics infrastructure vary by mode and region. In Cambodia, Kosuge et al. (2024) demonstrate that border-crossing time and cost and port-service frequency materially affect container-route choices. The World Bank's corridor review reaches a similar practical conclusion: the East-West road corridor, Phnom Penh–Cai Mep waterway, and Poipet–Sihanoukville rail

corridor each combine infrastructure gaps with operational and border constraints (World Bank, 2024). This suggests that CITLS should be evaluated at corridor and node level, not simply by counting completed projects.

Cambodia's mixed LPI profile points in the same direction. Infrastructure, customs, and international shipments were weak in the pre-CITLS benchmark, while tracking and tracing performed relatively better. Physical investment alone is unlikely to improve all six dimensions at the same pace. Wahyu et al. (2026), using a staggered difference-in-differences design across 105 countries, find that participation in the Belt and Road Initiative improves the infrastructure component of logistics performance but does not automatically produce gains in customs, tracking, logistics-service quality, or timeliness. Tan's (2022) study of Sihanoukville gives the institutional side of this argument a local grounding: customs performance depends on risk management, information systems, procedures, and administrative capability as well as port infrastructure. For Cambodia, hard investment under CITLS will need to be accompanied by border-process reform, digital data exchange, service-provider development, and inter-agency coordination if physical connectivity is to translate into dependable supply-chain performance.

Monitoring and policy learning after the pre-CITLS baseline

The 2023 survey-based LPI remains useful as a pre-CITLS benchmark, but it should not be the only scorecard for the next phase. The World Bank has replaced the legacy survey series with LPI 2.0, which uses shipment-level data for 2023–2024 to measure connectivity and time across maritime, aviation, and postal modes (World Bank, 2026). Because the measurement basis is different, LPI 2.0 should not be appended mechanically to the 2018–2023 survey series. Its value is prospective: it can complement Cambodia's corridor data with observed measures of dwell time, delivery time, and connectivity. That approach is well suited to a master plan whose effects are likely to emerge project by project rather than as a single national break in 2023.

Monitoring should therefore be tied to specific interventions. At Bavet and other major border nodes, project milestones can be paired with median and upper-tail clearance time, queue time, inspection rates, and documentary-processing time. At Sihanoukville and Phnom Penh ports, terminal dwell time, throughput, schedule reliability, and hinterland transit time can be tracked alongside capacity additions. For road, rail, and waterway corridors, useful measures include travel-time variability, freight cost per shipment or tonne-kilometre, service frequency, and disruption days, not only average travel time. Göcer et al. (2022) treat logistics benchmarking as a basis for targeted policy development; in Cambodia, that principle becomes practical when each indicator has a named data owner, reporting frequency, baseline, and project milestone. When performance falls short, the binding constraint can then be reviewed before further projects are scaled up.

The wider economic implications should also be interpreted carefully. Better corridor connectivity can support trade, investment, and regional development, but these outcomes lie beyond what this documentary analysis observes. Li et al. (2023) find lasting regional economic effects from improved maritime connectivity, and Qi et al. (2020) show that logistics-infrastructure effects can spill across regions rather than remain confined to a project site. These studies make the potential payoff of

Cambodia's multimodal strategy plausible, but they do not show that CITLS has already produced such gains. A later evaluation will need project-completion dates, corridor-level performance data, and an identification strategy capable of separating policy effects from trade cycles, private investment, and regional shocks.

LIMITATIONS

The findings should be read with seven limitations in mind. First, a documentary design cannot estimate causal effects or separate policy influence from regional trade conditions, macroeconomic shocks, private investment decisions, or changes in global shipping. Second, the survey-based LPI provides only sparse, perception-based benchmarks; the 2018 and 2023 confidence intervals overlap, and the 2023 survey was fielded in 2022 before CITLS adoption. Third, LPI 2.0 is based on shipment-level operational data and is not directly comparable with the legacy survey series, so it cannot be used as a simple continuation of the 2018–2023 benchmark (World Bank, 2026). Fourth, documentary coding necessarily involves judgement and source-selection risk, even with an explicit coding matrix and source hierarchy. Fifth, official project-status reports show implementation stage but do not reveal procurement quality, budget execution, contractor performance, or the quality of completed assets. Sixth, the analysis is limited to publicly accessible documents and English-language sources or official English translations available by 29 August 2026. Seventh, it cannot observe day-to-day coordination within responsible agencies or the behaviour of private logistics operators. The results therefore indicate documented alignment and implementation readiness rather than policy effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This study examined whether Cambodia's policy architecture is aligned with documented constraints in logistics infrastructure and supply-chain connectivity. The evidence shows a clear multimodal logistics orientation across the IDP, 2021 Investment Law, 2021 PPP Law, and CITLS Master Plan, although each instrument works through a different institutional mechanism. The Investment and PPP laws provide enabling investment and project-governance channels, whereas CITLS identifies multimodal logistics interventions and distributes implementation responsibilities across transport, customs, port, aviation, and logistics institutions.

The LPI results require a cautious reading. Cambodia's overall score was 2.58 in 2018 and 2.4 in the 2023 edition, with ranks of 98 and 115 respectively, but the reported 80% confidence intervals overlap. The observed difference therefore cannot be separated confidently from survey uncertainty. The 2023 survey was also conducted in 2022, so it is best treated as a pre-CITLS benchmark. Official implementation evidence available through 29 August 2026 shows a portfolio spread across feasibility, preparation, development, construction, ongoing, operational, and not-yet-started stages. Inclusion in the project pipeline should therefore not be equated with delivered logistics capacity.

The study contributes a transparent analytical framework that separates policy inputs, implementation mechanisms, and realised logistics outcomes and requires a traceable link among constraints, instruments, institutions, project status, and monitoring indicators. The practical implication is straightforward: Cambodia's logistics strategy should be judged less by the number of policies adopted or projects listed than by whether corridor

bottlenecks are reduced and service performance improves. Post-CITLS monitoring can combine national institutional reporting with measures of corridor travel time, border clearance, terminal dwell time, freight cost, throughput, reliability, service competence, tracking visibility, and timeliness. LPI 2.0 can add shipment-level measures of connectivity and time for the forward-looking period, but it should be treated as a new measurement system rather than as a continuation of the 2018–2023 survey series (World Bank, 2026). Future research should combine project-completion dates with corridor-level panel data and, where feasible, quasi-experimental or other causal designs to test whether specific investments and institutional reforms translate into measurable logistics and economic gains.

DECLARATIONS

Ethics, participation, and publication. Ethical review was not required because the study used only publicly available documents and aggregate secondary data and involved no human participants.

Funding. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability. All data analysed in this study are publicly available from the official, multilateral, and scholarly sources cited in the article.

REFERENCES

- Asian Development Bank. (2022). Integrated approach to trade and transport facilitation: Measuring readiness for sustainable, inclusive, and resilient trade. <https://doi.org/10.22617/TCS220596-2>
- Calabrese, L., & Cao, Y. (2021). Managing the Belt and Road: Agency and development in Cambodia and Myanmar. *World Development*, 141, 105297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105297>
- Calabrese, L., & Wang, Y. (2023). Chinese capital, regulatory strength and the BRI: A tale of 'fractured development' in Cambodia. *World Development*, 169, 106290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106290>
- Council for the Development of Cambodia. (2021). Law on Investment of the Kingdom of Cambodia. <https://cdc.gov.kh/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/20220114-Law-on-Investment-English-Version-443pm.pdf>
- Council for the Development of Cambodia. (2022). Mid-Term Review Report of the Cambodia Industrial Development Policy 2015-2025. https://cdc.gov.kh/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/REV310322ENG_IDP_MTR.pdf
- General Department of Logistics. (2026). 2025 Annual Progress Report on the Implementation of the Comprehensive Master Plan on Cambodia's Intermodal Transport and Logistics System 2023-2033. <https://logistics.gov.kh/en/documents/publications-statistics/progress-reports/document>
- General Department of Logistics. (n.d.-a). About National Logistics Council. Retrieved August 29, 2026, from <https://logistics.gov.kh/en/about/nlc>
- General Department of Logistics. (n.d.-b). About National Logistics Steering Committee. Retrieved August 29, 2026, from <https://logistics.gov.kh/en/about/nlsc>
- General Department of Logistics. (n.d.-c). Project progress. Retrieved August 29, 2026, from <https://logistics.gov.kh/en/projects>
- Gocer, A., Özpeynirci, Ö., & Semiz, M. (2022). Logistics performance index-driven policy development: An application to Turkey. *Transport Policy*, 124, 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2021.03.007>
- Gurara, D., Kpodar, K., Presbitero, A. F., & Tessema, D. (2021). On the capacity to absorb public investment: How much is too much? *World Development*, 145, 105525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105525>
- International Monetary Fund. (2025). Cambodia: 2025 Article IV consultation-Press release; staff report; and statement by the Executive Director for Cambodia. IMF Staff Country Reports, 2025(317). <https://doi.org/10.5089/9798229027755.002>
- Kosuge, N., Shibasaki, R., Sanui, K., & Okubo, K. (2024). Impact of Cambodian international logistics policies on container cargo flow in a comprehensive intermodal transport network. *International Journal of Logistics Research and Applications*, 27(3), 386-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13675567.2021.1967898>
- Li, W., Bai, X., Yang, D., & Hou, Y. (2023). Maritime connectivity, transport infrastructure expansion and economic growth: A global perspective. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 170, 103609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2023.103609>
- Ministry of Economy and Finance. (2021). Law on Public-Private Partnerships. https://ppp.mef.gov.kh/fileadmin/user_upload/PPP_LAW_BOOK_New.pdf
- Ministry of Public Works and Transport. (2023). Comprehensive Master Plan on Cambodia Intermodal Transport and Logistics System 2023-2033. <https://www.mpwt.gov.kh/en/documents/other/712>
- Qi, G., Shi, W., Lin, K.-C., Yuen, K. F., & Xiao, Y. (2020). Spatial spillover effects of logistics infrastructure on regional development: Evidence from China. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 135, 96-114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2020.02.022>
- Royal Government of Cambodia. (2015). Cambodia Industrial Development Policy 2015-2025: Market orientation and enabling environment for industrial development. <https://cdc.gov.kh/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/IDP-English.pdf>
- Tan, A. (2022). Strengthening customs control and trade facilitation: A case study of Sihanoukville International Port, Cambodia. *World Customs Journal*, 16(2), 99-114. <https://doi.org/10.55596/001c.116323>
- Uyar, A., Fernandes, V., & Kuzey, C. (2021). The mediating role of corporate governance between public governance and logistics performance: International evidence. *Transport Policy*, 109, 37-47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2021.05.023>
- Wahyu, M., Thariq, R., & Lusiantoro, L. (2026). Breaking connectivity barriers: Does China's Belt and Road Initiative affect global logistics performance? *Transport Policy*, 184, 104185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2026.104185>
- World Bank. (2018). Connecting to compete 2018: Trade logistics in the global economy-The Logistics Performance Index and its indicators. World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/29971>
- World Bank. (2023). Connecting to compete 2023: Trade logistics in an uncertain global economy-The Logistics Performance Index and its indicators. World Bank. https://lpi.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/2023-04/LPI_2023_report.pdf
- World Bank. (2024). Cambodia's regional connectivity: Unlocking the full potential of transport corridors. World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099111924101028412>
- World Bank. (2026). Connecting to compete 2025: The new Logistics Performance Indicators 2.0. World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/099042226142014971>

Zhao, J., Sun, G., & Webster, C. (2022). Does China-Pakistan Economic Corridor improve connectivity in Pakistan? A protocol assessing the planned transport network infrastructure. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 100, 103327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103327>