



**Report on Impacts of  
Mega-Conferences on Global  
Water Development and Management**

*By*  
**Third World Centre for Water Management  
Mexico**

*Prepared with the Support of*  
**Sasakawa Peace Foundation  
USA and Japan**

April 2005

## **INTRODUCTION**

Since the early 1970s, the United Nations has organized a series of mega-conferences to address pressing global problems. It started with the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (1972), and was followed by Population (Bucharest, 1974), Food (Rome, 1974), Women (Mexico City, 1975), Human Settlements (Vancouver, 1976), Water (Mar del Plata, 1977), Desertification (Nairobi, 1977), Science and Technology for Development (Vienna, 1979) and New and Renewable Sources of Energy (Nairobi, 1981). Twenty years later, several of these issues were revisited: Environment (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), Food (Rome, 1994), Population (Cairo, 1994), Women (Beijing, 1995), and Human Settlements (Istanbul, 1996). Environment was further considered in Johannesburg in 2002. However, water was considered only once, in Mar del Plata in 1977: there has been no follow-up in terms of a mega-conference on this subject since then, under the aegis of the United Nations System.

The World Water Council initiated the World Water Fora. The First Forum, organized in Marrakech in 1997, was a modest affair. The Second Forum, in The Hague, in 2000, was attended by some 4,600 people, and thus became a mega-conference. According to the organisers, the Third Forum in Japan, in 2003, had some 24,000 participants. Many experts have questioned this high attendance figure as a serious over-estimate. The costs of these world water fora have escalated very rapidly. For example, the Secretariat cost of the Third Forum has been estimated at \$28 million, a sum that was more than 15 times the cost of the entire First Forum in Marrakech.

## **GLOBAL EVALUATION OF IMPACTS OF MEGA-CONFERENCES**

None of these water-related global mega-conferences had ever been evaluated independently, objectively and comprehensively. Their impacts and cost-effectiveness are now unknown, even though their costs have generally escalated very rapidly with each succeeding event. In order to determine the impacts of the global mega-conferences, the Third World Centre for Water Management, with the support of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, USA and Japan, conducted a global study on the perceived impacts of the global mega-conferences on the water sector. The events specifically evaluated were Mar del Plata, Dublin, Rio and Johannesburg Conferences, Freshwater Consultation (Bonn, 2002) and the three World Water Fora.

A questionnaire was sent to 2,698 people from all over the world, among whom were the members of the World Water Council and International Water Resources Association, as well as the participants of major water conferences, including every one that attended Stockholm Water Symposium of 2004. Participants were specifically requested to give their own personal views and not of their institutions. Special care was taken in order that the survey was universal and unbiased, and that study did not target any specific groups, countries or institutions, to obtain as objective and comprehensive picture as possible. All the persons contacted were specifically informed that their responses will remain confidential, and that these will not be shared with any other institution, or individuals not associated directly with the project. The access to the responses was strictly restricted to the core study group.

In addition, some special countries or regions were selected for in-depth studies. These special studies were focused on Australia, Brazil, India, Bangladesh, Japan, Scandinavia and Southern-Africa. Brazil, Japan and Southern Africa were specifically selected since these countries/regions were host to three mega-conferences: Brazil for the UN Conference on

Environment and Development, Japan for the Third World Water Forum, and Southern Africa for the UN Conference on Sustainable Development. Scandinavia was selected since the Stockholm Water Symposium has now become arguably the most important annual global event on water, and also because all the participants of the Stockholm Water Symposium on 2004 were contacted, and a significant percentage of these participants were from Scandinavia. The Indian subcontinent was selected because water is an important requirement for the social and economic development of this region. Australia was selected because it is the only continent where not even a single mega-conference of any type has ever been held. For each of these national/regional studies, an internationally well-known and respected water expert carried out the study. For Japan, the questionnaire was translated into Japanese, and the survey was conducted in Japanese to overcome linguistic constraints. Each national/regional study leader sent out the same, or very similar, questionnaire to hundreds of people in their study areas. Thus, with the overall global study, and specific national/regional studies, the views of a very large number of people were canvassed and obtained.

In addition, several papers were commissioned from distinguished water experts from different parts of the world, including a Deputy Secretary-General of one of the major UN mega-conferences. All these papers and the main findings of the global survey were discussed at a workshop in Bangkok, where leading water experts from different countries, institutions, sectors and disciplines were specifically selected, invited to review and discuss the findings and the commissioned papers. The workshop was held at the Asian Institute of Technology, Bangkok, 29-30 January 2005. A list of participants for this workshop can be seen in the Annex 3.

During the analysis of the questionnaires, it was noted that personal views of some of the correspondents were diametrically opposite to the views that they had expressed earlier in public on behalf of their institutions. This was probably due to the fact that the questionnaire very specifically requested personal views, whatever they may be. This process was continued with the Bangkok workshop, where the participants were very specifically invited in their personal capacities, and this factor was stressed in both the letter of invitation that was sent to them and during the workshop as well.

## **GLOBAL PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACTS**

Altogether 2,698 questionnaires were sent to people interested in water from governmental, intergovernmental and international institutions, academia and research institutions, private sector and NGOs, both national and international. The universe represented 121 countries. Even though latest available addresses were used, 372 questionnaires bounced back.

Out of the 2,326 questionnaires which presumably reached their targets, 651 responses were received. This is a response rate of 28 percent. Considering the global, multi-institutional and multi-sectoral nature of the survey, the response rate can be considered to be quite good. Of this number, 89 respondents said they not only did not attend any of the mega-conferences, but also they did not know enough about them to make any comment which could be meaningful for the study. This itself is an interesting finding of the study, since it indicated that some 14 percent of the respondents were not even aware of the proceedings and results of the mega-conferences. Of the balance of the 562 respondents, the extent of their personal participation rates to the various mega-conferences is shown in Table 1.

<b>Number of mega-conferences attended by the respondents</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
None	46.59
One	25.51
Two	11.36
Three	8.33
Four	4.54
Five	1.51
Six	0.37
Seven	0.37
Eight	0.37

Table 1. Percentage of respondent for mega-conferences

### **STRENGTHS OF MEGA-CONFERENCES**

Participants were asked to identify the three most important strengths of the mega-conferences. No list was provided of the strengths. Accordingly, the participants had to provide their own views. The main strengths identified were the following:

- Increased awareness of water as a global concern, and of multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral nature of the water problems;
- Increased awareness of water problems by various sectors of population;
- Interactions of diverse views, opinions and visions under different settings;
- Better understanding of how different countries are approaching to solve similar water problems;
- Bringing together of interested/relevant parties to one location for discussion of issues;
- Provides an opportunity for developing countries to raise their problems and concerns in an international setting;
- Critical water issues are identified, which subsequently become part of the professional agenda for further discussion;
- Promote professional-politician-NGOs interactions;
- Force attention on specific water issues which may not be receiving adequate attention;
- Meet and listen to global water experts from different sectors, disciplines and nations;
- Raise the profile of water in the international media during the events;
- Provide an opportunity for networking;
- Exchange of information on political, social and technical trends on water-related issues and problems.

### **WEAKNESSES OF MEGA-CONFERENCES**

Correspondents were similarly asked to identify three major weaknesses. Again no list was provided for this selection. More weaknesses were identified than strengths. The main weaknesses identified were the following:

- Talk, more talk, and yet more chatter;

- Too many issues discussed superficially, and too many poor-to-mediocre sessions which often repeat the same old stuff;
- No time for discussions, too many conflicting views in different sessions, and no attempt is made at reconciling the different views;
- Very poor effort to disseminate the results and background documents, if any, both before and after the events; unless one attends the events, or even a specific session, documentations are simply not available; whatever general documentations are produced after the events are far too general for any concrete use and they are mostly suitable for public relations;
- Overall management of the events is poor; no strategic thinking from the organisers as to what they wish to achieve from these events; close interactions between participants are impossible; sessions and events are conspicuous by the absence of long-term, or even medium-term, thinking;
- Participants are only from the water sector; solutions are sought almost exclusively from within the water sector; no attempt is made for multi-sectoral approaches, which is essential for solution of complex water problems;
- Conferences primarily deal with donor's agenda, who have limited knowledge, understanding and appreciation of water problems of developing countries; events, outcomes and declarations to a great degree are controlled by certain group of individuals and institutions from developed countries;
- Too much repetition from one conference to another which often promotes bandwagon effects in certain areas;
- Conferences have degenerated to festivities rather than being serious events; outcomes are predetermined by certain groups, with preconceived ideas and hidden agendas rather than being generated from interactions between the participants;
- Unnecessary vast nature and format make the events impersonal and forgettable experiences; numerous activities are redundant or peripheral; events often degenerate into ritualistic fanfare;
- No attempt is made to prioritise critical water issues; thus wheat and chaff receive the same level of attention;
- Outputs lack specificity, cohesiveness and relevance; no thought is given to their implementation and also from where the funding for their implementation will come from;
- Policy dialogues dominated by certain international institutions, which have very specific ideas and agendas. These institutions are well-funded and come better prepared, and accordingly their ideas mostly prevail, even when participants propose different but more efficient solutions;
- No political commitment for implementing declarations at national, regional and international levels;
- Raise very high expectations, which are not fulfilled, as a result of which deep frustrations set in;
- Seldom provides any new insights of the future global, regional and national water scenarios, except in very general and superficial terms;
- No attempt is ever made to objectively evaluate the performance, outputs and inputs of the events;
- There are no mechanisms to promote and assess potential follow-up activities.

## **COST-EFFECTIVENESS**

Overall, the correspondents of the survey were very positive of the cost-effectiveness of the UN Water Conference at Mar del Plata. The general consensus was that no other mega-conference

exceeded, let alone equalled, the impacts of Mar del Plata. The respondents felt that the World Water Forums, very specifically the Japan Forum, were not cost-effective.

Overall, the Japan Forum specially came under severe criticisms for the following reasons:

- Badly organised with the strategic error to hold it in three different cities, which made it very difficult, if not impossible, for participants to attend the sessions they wanted;
- The main criteria for success appeared to be how many people participated in the Forum, but not on the quality of presentations, discussions and outputs;
- Cost went through the ceiling to the sky, and thus it is necessary in the future to prune non-essential activities and events and focus on result-oriented doable activities;
- All omelettes need eggs. Good ones are worth the effort and expenses. Bad ones are waste of eggs and efforts. Japan Forum was an expensive event with very limited outputs;
- Cost-effectiveness would have increased somewhat, had a serious effort been made for disseminating good information that were presented, and generated;
- Individual participation cost was mostly considered not worth the outputs

Nearly 90 percent of the respondents felt that in the light of the Japan Forum an attempt should be made to redesign/restructure/rethink the way mega-conferences are now being organised to increase their impacts and cost-effectiveness very substantially.

## **KEY LESSONS**

The general view that emerged from the survey was that the mega-conferences have their own momentum, and they respond to the needs and agendas of certain specific institutions and people. Accordingly, they are likely to continue for a while in their present format, perhaps only with marginal and incremental changes, irrespective of what the majority of water professionals and water-related institutions think about their impacts and effectiveness. Thus, it is somewhat unrealistic to expect that the Fourth World Water Forum in Mexico City, in March 2006, will be materially different from the Japan Forum. The perception is that the same group of people and institutions that were responsible for organising the Third Forum are the driving forces behind the 4<sup>th</sup> Forum. Thus, at most, one should realistically expect only minor changes.

The main key lessons identified by the respondents are the following:

- Mega-conferences generalise problems and solutions even though the world is not homogenous. They override a country's specific needs and requirements, and consideration of the availability of management, technical and financial capacities. The devil is in the details and not in large generalised talk fests.
- It is not rewarding to assemble thousands of people with different views, agendas, interests and expertise, to discuss unreachable goals and targets, without considering possible implementation of what often are wishful-thinking decisions.
- Mega-conferences should be specifically focused on perceived needs and issues and they should have clearly stipulated goals and objectives. The process used for their organisation should assure formulation of understandable and implementable recommendations for actions, and provide mechanisms to ensure the availability of realistic levels of funding to implement the recommendations. Regular repetition of the same old water issues and problematic is a sure recipe for overkill in terms of impacts and relevance, both inside and outside the profession. The conferences appear to have

already reached the point of diminishing returns. They do create temporary awareness of water-related issues, which evaporate quickly in the absence of follow-up actions, monitoring and evaluations. The events have thus lost their moral authority.

- Donors are still influencing the outcomes to suit their own views and agendas, irrespective of actual needs and requirements of developing countries.
- They should make country or region-specific recommendations, and should not be overloaded with pedestrian, outdated and irrelevant presentations.
- One way to look at mega-conferences is that they are social events. Thus, people should not have high expectations of their impacts.

## OVERALL IMPACTS

Nearly 44 percent of the respondents felt that mega-conferences had no perceptible impacts, or at best marginal impacts, on the individuals concerned and their institutions. Another 11.5 percent were even more negative on their views.

In contrast, 7 percent felt that the events were “excellent,” and 26 percent felt that the conferences have significantly changed the policies, programmes and projects of their institutions. It should be noted that the majority of those who felt that the policies of their institutions have changed, referred very specifically to the UN Conference on Environment and Development at Rio, which seemed to have injected strong environmental components in the policies and programmes of the water institutions. Besides Rio, other mega-conference did not produce similar impacts. Another 11.5 percent of the respondents did not express any view. An important observation is that the respondents from USA, Canada and Western Europe were notably more sceptical of the benefits and impacts of the mega-conferences. In contrast, the participants from developing countries had a somewhat more positive view.

## OVERALL VIEW ON THE MEGA-CONFERENCES

The overall views of the mega-conferences can be summed up by the following table:

Views	Percentage
The concept of such global conferences is good, but the present framework for organisation needs to be changed radically. The events should be more focused and output-oriented. The main criteria for success should not be the number of people who attended the conference, but the quality of the results and their impacts.	48.37
Instead of the global mega-conferences, it would be desirable to organise regional meetings, dealing with regional problems and issues, and which could be focused and impact-oriented.	30.70
The conferences have now become one big “water fair,” with a lot of activities but without much thought as to their relevance, appropriateness, outputs or impacts. There is no coordination between events, no clear focus, and their cost-effectiveness leaves much to be desired.	11.48
The global mega-conferences are useful and cost-effective. We should continue with them, but only with marginal changes.	2.27
No view	7.18

The overall view indicates that the people are now highly sceptical of the benefits of the present form of the global mega-conferences on the water sector. While they feel that there are needs for global and regional water policy dialogues, the general feeling is that these events should become more focused, and problem-and solution-oriented. They should be planned with clearly identified goals and objectives. Equally, there should be mechanisms in place to monitor the follow-up activities and impacts of the events, and also for objective evaluations by independent and capable experts of the processes used to organise each event and the event itself. These evaluators must not only be independent, but also must be perceived by the water profession to be independent, so that their assessments are considered to be accurate, objective, comprehensive and without hidden agendas. The evaluators should not be linked to the conference organisers in any way to avoid pseudo-evaluations.

## **BANGKOK WORKSHOP**

The objective of this workshop was to discuss with a small group of specially selected experts the impacts of mega-conferences on global water development and management. Nearly all of the participants had participated in at least one of the mega-conferences, and have been involved in global water issues and/or global development policy issues for many years. The programme for the workshop, and the list of participants are given in the Annexes 2 and 3. This two-day workshop started with a series of presentations, including the results of the global regional and national surveys, all of which were based on background papers circulated well in advance, followed by extensive and frank discussions.

During the Workshop, Jon Lane was appointed as the Rapporteur. His report was circulated to all the participants. The report was then finalised by the Third World Centre for Water Management based on the comments received.

**Overall Conclusions of the Workshop** - The impacts of mega-conferences can be increased if the organisers of these events make a special effort to maximise their benefits and minimise their disadvantages. Thus, it is important that issues such as creating a link between ministerial declarations and subsequent local actions as well as providing a path to apply new knowledge to real life situations in a particular region should be taken into account. Additionally, the success of these conferences should be measured in terms of outputs and impacts, and not by the number of people who participate or the number of countries that are represented, as seemed to have been the case in the past. However, so far, mega-conferences have had very limited impacts on global water development and management.

**Alternatives to the Mega Conference Approach** – The Workshop did not restrict itself solely to analysis of the mega-conference programme to date. It was noted that the mega-conferences were in fact only part of an overall process, with many other actors, which produced an exponential increase in understanding of better ways of managing water. Despite this, there is still very much to do to improve water management, for the benefit of the poor, of the environment, and of future generations. For many prominent international water specialists, progress in reforming the institutions and policies involved in water managing, has been unacceptably slow.

Among a number of barriers to effective action are: inertia, with its related sources and attributes such as ignorance, scepticism, fatalism etc which are powerful forces to sustain the status quo; aversion to risk taking in the face of uncertainty, and its implications; vested interest in the status quo, particularly among those who fear they would bear the lion's share of the

financial and other costs of change, without assurance of commensurate benefits or pay off; failure to articulate a strong, convincing fully costed and quantified case and plan of action for a programme of needed institutional and policy reform; the factor of complexity of the water management challenge; and finally and most importantly, the lack of strong and determined national and international leadership.

There was a strong feeling that the mega conferences are not the way to overcome these barriers. Most of the participants were strongly for a much more tightly focussed process, consisting of a thorough analysis of: water cross-sectoral issues, processes, sub-sectoral issues and processes etc. This process would be wide ranging, comprehensive and extremely thorough, carried out by focused expert groups, using high quality personnel from within and outside the water sector, all well versed in top quality analytical and critical skills. The process would include, inter alia, pinpointing the central issues of water institutional reform, articulating carefully researched and quantified benefits of reform, producing convincing arguments for accelerating the reform process, identifying the essential institutional services and underpinning values for improved water management, stating accurately the real investment and operating costs of an improved sector, and much more; then, synthesising all of this into a feasible action plan. The plan could be presented to a conference of key leaders and decision makers in governments most affected, and their commitment to it should be sought. Leadership of the process would be provided by a strong, internationally respected agency or group of agencies, with experience of this kind of very focussed, intensive activity.

**Recommendations** - The above conclusions represent a strong consensus view among water professionals around the world, although there is a less clear consensus on how to change the current system of mega-conferences to make them more productive and future-oriented.

The workshop recognised that it is unlikely that the governments and organisations that host mega-conferences will immediately stop doing so on the basis of these surveys and the results of the Bangkok workshop. However, the findings of the global survey and the conclusions and recommendation of the Bangkok survey would be important inputs to a global discussion as to how the future mega-conferences should be organised to maximise the benefits of the results, outputs and Impacts.

The workshop made the following recommendations for consideration of the governments and organisations concerned:

1. Significantly reduce the frequency and expense of mega-conferences.
2. If a conference is considered necessary, analyse its purpose rigorously with a view to achieving it through a smaller regional and/or sectoral meeting, and not necessarily through a multi-sector global mega-conference.
3. Improve the planning, clarity of purpose, structure, attendance and follow-up of each mega-conference and of each smaller meeting.
4. Link each mega-conference firmly into the regular ongoing processes of water development and management.
5. Evaluate each mega-conference using independent evaluators.

## **DISSEMINATION OF STUDY RESULTS**

In order to ensure that the results of the study are brought to the attention of the water and development professions, a determined effort is being made to disseminate the results as

widely as possible. Accordingly, following arrangements are being made for the dissemination of results:

1. The results of the survey and the papers commissioned are now being edited for publication as a book by a major international publisher, which is likely to be either Oxford University Press or Springer;
2. A summary of the project is being prepared for publication in the newsletter of the Sasakawa Peace Foundation, and also in several water-related journals;
3. A substantive paper is now under preparation on the results of the global survey for publication by a major international journal;
4. The summary of the findings will be presented at the Stockholm Water Symposium in August 2005, and also at other appropriate water-related meetings.
5. The results of the analysis for Japan are already in the website of the University of Tokyo in Japanese. Other national regional studies will be posted in the website as soon as the results are finalised.
6. The summary of the findings of the global study is being sent to all the respondents, with a request to share them as widely as possible.

## ANNEX 1

### PAPERS FOR THE PROJECT

1. Mega-Conferences: Help or Hindrance  
**Morris Miller**
2. Mega-Conferences: View from Southern Africa  
**Anthony Turton, Anton Earle and Mikael Drackner**
3. Mega-Conferences: View from Nordic Countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden)  
**Olli Varis and Terhi Helmio**
4. Mega-Conferences: View by Australia  
**Roderic Gill**
5. Impacts of global mega-conferences on the Water Sector 1977-2003  
**Asit K. Biswas**
6. International Water Conferences and Water Sector Reform – A different Approach  
**Anthony Milburn**
7. Global Water Initiatives: What do the Experts Think?  
**Robert G. Varady and Matt Iles-Shih**
8. Mega-Conferences: Some Views from Japan  
**Mikiyasu Nakayama and Kumi Furuyashiki**
9. Summary of Responses from India  
**C. D. Thatte**
10. Mega-Conferences: View from Bangladesh  
**A. T. M Shamsul Huda**
11. **Summary of Responses from Brazil**  
Henrique Chavez
12. **Global Review of Impacts of Mega-Conferences**  
Asit K. Biswas and Cecilia Tortajada

## ANNEX 2

### PROGRAMME OF THE BANGKOK WORKSHOP

**Saturday, 29 January, 2005**

#### **Opening Session, Chair: Asit K. Biswas**

09.00 – 9.30: Welcoming Statements by:

Mario Tabucanon, Provost and Acting President, AIT

Sim-Yee Lau, Programme Advisor, Sasakawa Peace Foundation

09.30 – 10.00: Background and Expectations of the Workshop, by Asit K. Biswas

10.00 – 10.30: Coffee Break

#### **First Session, Chair: Sim-Yee Lau**

10.30 – 11.30: Impacts of Global Mega-Conferences, by Asit K. Biswas and discussion

11.30 – 12.30: Mega-Conferences: Help or Hindrance, by Morris Miller and discussion

12.30 – 13.30: Lunch Break

#### **Second Session, Chair: C.D. Thatte**

13.30 – 14.30: A Personal View, by Gourisankar Ghosh and discussion

14.30 – 15:30: Overall Perspective based on University of Arizona survey, by Robert Varady and discussion

15.30 – 16.00: Coffee Break

#### **Third Session, Chair: Anthony Turton**

16.00 – 17.00: Overall Perspective based on TWCWM survey, by Asit K. Biswas and discussion

17.00 – 17.30: Discussion on the day's proceedings

19.00 – 20.30: Dinner at AIT Centre

**Sunday, 30 January, 2005**

**Fourth Session, Chair: Morris Miller**

08.30 – 09.30: TWCWM survey results from Southern Africa, by Anthony Turton and discussion

09.30 – 10.30: TWCWM survey results from Scandinavia, by Olli Varis and discussion

10.30 – 11.00: Coffee Break

**Fifth Session, Chair: Ashim Das Gupta**

11.00 – 12.00: TWCWM survey results from Japan, by Kumi Furuyashiki, and discussion

12.00 – 13.00: Lunch Break

**Sixth Session, Chair: Jon Lane**

13.00 – 13.10: Case study of one session at the Third World Water Forum, by Mikiyasu Nakayama

13.10 – 14.00: TWCWM survey results from India and brief overview of the internal appraisal of the Third World Water Forum, by C.D. Thatte, and discussion

14.00 – 15.00: TWCWM survey results from Bangladesh, by A.T.M. Shamsul Huda, and discussion

15.00 – 15.30: Coffee Break

**Final Session, Chairs: Asit K. Biswas and Sim-Yee Lau**

15.30 – 16.30: A Different Approach by Anthony Milburn, and discussion

16.30 – 17.20: Overall discussion

17.20 – 17.30: Concluding Remarks by the Co-chairs

19.00 – 20.30: Dinner at AIT Centre

## ANNEX 3

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS BANGKOK WORKSHOP

#### Convenor:

- **Asit K. Biswas**, President, Third World Centre for Water Management; Past President, International Water Resources Association; Member, World Commission on Water, Avenida Manantial Oriente No. 27, Los Clubes, Atizapán, Estado de México, C.P. 52958, MEXICO, Tel: 52-55-5379-5429, Fax: 52-55-5379-5439, E-mail: [akbiswas@att.net.mx](mailto:akbiswas@att.net.mx), [akbiswas@thirdworldcentre.org](mailto:akbiswas@thirdworldcentre.org)

#### Participants:

- **M. S. Babel**, Coordinator, Water Engineering and Management, School of Civil Engineering, Asian Institute of Technology, P.O. Box 4, Klong Luang, Patumthani 12120, Thailand, Tel: 66-2-5245790, Fax: 66-2-5246425, E-mail: [msbabel@ait.ac.th](mailto:msbabel@ait.ac.th)
- **Ashim Das Gupta**, Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Asian Institute of Technology; Past Vice President, International Water Resources Association, P.O. Box 4, Klong Luang, Patumthani 12120, Thailand, Tel: 66-2-5246051, Fax: 66-2-5246059, E-mail: [adg@ait.ac.th](mailto:adg@ait.ac.th)
- **Kumi Furuyashiki**, Institute of Environmental Studies, Graduate School of Frontier Science, University of Tokyo, Takeda Building, Room 314, 2-11-16 Yayoi, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8656, Japan, Tel: 81-3-58417935, Fax: 81-3-58417957, E-mail: [kumif@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:kumif@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp)
- **Gourisankar Ghosh**, Executive Director, Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council, International Environment House, 9 Chemin de Aénemones, CH 1219 Chatelaine, Geneva, Switzerland, Tel: 41-22-9178653, Fax: 41-22-9178084, E-mail: [ghoshg@who.int](mailto:ghoshg@who.int)
- **Watchara Hemruchatanan**, Senior Engineer, Hydropower Engineering Division, Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand, Charansanitwong Rd., Bang Kruay, Nonthaburi, Thailand. 11103, Tel +66 0 2436 0482, Fax +66 0 2436 0487, Email: [watchara.h@egat.co.th](mailto:watchara.h@egat.co.th)
- **ATM Shamsul Huda**, Former Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources, House No. 8, Road No. 90, Gulshan Circle 2, Dhaka, 1212, Bangladesh, Tel: 880-2-8813802, E-mail: [shuda@bangla.net](mailto:shuda@bangla.net)
- **Sam H. Johnson**, Former Director, Mexico Office, IWMI, 8460 East Fernhill Drive, Tucson, AZ 85750-9543, USA, Tel: 1-520-7219543, Fax: 8858093, E-mail: [shj3@aol.com](mailto:shj3@aol.com)
- **Jon Lane**, Consultant on water and sanitation in developing countries, Chair of BPD, Steering Committee Member of Global Water Partnership, Former Director, WaterAid, P.O. Box 2270, Blantyre, Malawi, Tel: 265-1-622507, E-mail: [jonlane@africa-online.net](mailto:jonlane@africa-online.net)

- **Sim-Yee Lau**, Program Advisor, Sasakawa Peace Foundation, Nippon Foundation Building, 1-2-2 Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-8523, Japan, Tel: 81-3-62295435, Fax: 81-3-62295473, E-mail: [lau@spf.or.jp](mailto:lau@spf.or.jp)
- **Anthony Milburn**, Former Executive Director, International Water Association, Ambourne Environments, 34 Church Meadow, Surbiton, Surrey KT6 SEW, U.K., Tel/Fax: 44-208-3984061, E-mail: [tony@milburnt.freeserve.co.uk](mailto:tony@milburnt.freeserve.co.uk)
- **Morris Miller**, Former Assistant Deputy Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Government of Canada; Former Executive Director, World Bank; Deputy Secretary-General, UN Conference on New and Renewable Sources of Energy, 81-263 Botanica Private, Ottawa, Canada, K1Y 4P9, Tel: 1-613-7250049, Fax: 1-613-7250197, E-mail: [miller0049@rogers.com](mailto:miller0049@rogers.com)
- **Mikiyasu Nakayama**, Institute of Environment Studies, Graduate School of Frontier Science, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan, Tel: 81-3-58417935, Fax: 81-3-58417957, E-mail: [nakayama@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:nakayama@k.u-tokyo.ac.jp)
- **Vanchai Prapaisuan**, Chief Water Resources Management Division, Electricity Generating Authority of Thailand, Charansanitwong Rd., Bang Kruay, Nonthaburi, Thailand. 11103, Tel +66 0 2436 0830, Fax +66 0 2436 0893, E-mail: [vanchai.p@egat.co.th](mailto:vanchai.p@egat.co.th)
- **Aly Shady**, Senior Water Policy Advisor, Canadian International Development agency; President, International Water Resources Association; Past Vice President, World Water Council; Past President, International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, Canadian International Development Agency, 200 Promenade du Portage, Hull, Canada KIA OG4, Tel: 1-819-9944098, Fax: 9538058, E-mail: [aly\\_shady@acdi-cida.gc.ca](mailto:aly_shady@acdi-cida.gc.ca)
- **Yutaka Takahasi**, Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo; Past Vice President, International Water Resources Association, Todoraki 5-18-7, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo 156-0082, Tel/fax: 81-3-37013027, E-mail: [takahasi@re-c.co.jp](mailto:takahasi@re-c.co.jp)
- **C.D. Thatte**, Former Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources, Government of India; Former Secretary-General, International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage, C-16 Parnali Society, Damle Path, Law College Road, Pune 41104, India, Tel: 91-20-25410223, E-mail: [cdthatte@yahoo.co.in](mailto:cdthatte@yahoo.co.in)
- **Anthony Turton**, Gibb-SERA Chair in Integrated Water Resources Management, Environmentek, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), Pretoria, South Africa, Tel: 27-12-8413957, Fax: 27-12-8427735, E-mail: [aturton@csir.co.za](mailto:aturton@csir.co.za)
- **Robert G. Varady**, Deputy Director and Research Professor, Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, University of Arizona, 803 East First Street, Tucson AZ 85719, USA, Tel: 1-520-6264393, Fax: 1-520-6263664, E-mail: [rvarady@mail.arizona.edu](mailto:rvarady@mail.arizona.edu)
- **Olli Varis**, Laboratory of Water Resources, Helsinki University of Technology; Director, International Water Resources Association, P.O. Box 5200, 02015 Espoo, Finland, Tel: 358-50-3516484, Fax: 4513856, E-mail: [olli.varis@hut.fi](mailto:olli.varis@hut.fi)