

INDIVIDUAL REPORT
ON
LESSONS LEARNED IN THE TRAINING COURSE

By: Tony Lio Repollo, ARBDC

The concept of integrated water resources management (IWRM) has been in practice in the Philippines for quite sometime now though under a different name. Thus, for me, the concept can be understood in this manner:

I – innovative practices in

W – water usage for effective

R – river basin *administration* through

M – maximum *participation* of all *stakeholders*

From the definition, the following salient lessons can be deduced, namely: (1) the value of participation, (2) the value of power (administration), and (3) the value of people (stakeholders). These are what I call the 3 Ps of IWRM.

1. PARTICIPATION

Since day one until the time we had our field trips, the concept of participation has been emphasized more often. It comes in different forms. There is participation in the decision-making process, the planning exercise, the implementation stage, the monitoring phase, and in the post- implementation stage like the evaluation and review phases.

Participation also comes in various modes. It can be construed as involvement, linkages, networking, cooperation, coordination, synergy, and integration.

Participation becomes a very important ingredient that it serves as the heart and soul of the integrated water resource management (IWRM) activities.

Thus, rendering IWRM a “we” concept rather than an “I” one.

2. POWER

Another salient point that surfaced in the discussions and interviews is the lack of administrative power or authority among river basin organizations (RBOs).

RBOs are usually composed of various key government agencies directly or indirectly involved in river basin interests. In reality, however, these agencies which are

usually national in scope have their respective national agenda wherein river basin interest are the least.

Though organized for the noble cause of taking care and managing river basins, RBOs remain ineffective and inefficient bodies because of inadequate defined authority and unclear roles vested on them.

For this reason, RBOs are limited to river basin planning, policy recommendation, and capacity building functions.

Instead of adopting an active role in river basin management and IWRM, RBOs fall short in assuming advisory and coordinating roles which often is understood as temporary and *ad hoc* in nature, making them prone to any abolition policy of the central government.

Thus, it becomes imperative to create and organize RBOs under stronger legislative measures.

3. PEOPLE

The concept of people was given equal emphasis in the training course, particularly under the category of stakeholders.

For the sake of clarity, a stakeholder is an entity affected by change. Under this concept, the following fall under this definition with respect to river basin interest, namely; indigenous cultural people living in the river basin area; local farmer-irrigators; business people with stakes in the area; local people communities; government people directly or indirectly involved in the basin's interest; and in some cases, outlaw people encamped in the head waters of the river basin. Somehow, these different stakeholders make substantial impact to the river basin and its resources.

The problem arises when any of the stakeholders refuses to contribute to the integrity and wellbeing of the river basin. As a consequence, a lot of issues crop up and make things bad in the basin.

It is, therefore, paramount to acquire the commitment of all stakeholders for the greatest welfare of the whole river basin area.

ACTION PLAN

Activities	Target Indicator	Time Frame				Total
		1Q	2Q	3Q	4Q	
1. Participation component	No. of TWGs organized and maintained			1	1	2
2. People component	No. of stakeholder committees (SC) organized			1	1	2
	No. of SCs assisted and facilitated			1	1	2
3. Power component	No. of legislative proposals (LP) prepared and submitted			1		1
	No. of LPs supported in congress				1	1