

DAMS AND DEVELOPMENT
Philippines In-Country Workshop
ADB Headquarters, Manila, Philippines
30 August 2001

Summary of Proceedings

A. Introduction

1. The ADB/Philippines In-Country Workshop: Dams and Development, was held at the ADB Headquarters, Manila, Philippines, on 30 August 2001. The workshop was organized by the ADB under the ADB-funded technical assistance "Large Dams and Recommended Practices," mainly to review in what areas ADB and Philippines policies differ from those in the World Commission on Dams (WCD) Report, and to try to formulate a strategy for closing those gaps that would lead to better projects in the future.

2. The participants included invitees from Department of Agriculture, Department of Energy, Department of Environment and Natural Resources, National Irrigation Administration, National Power Corporation, National Water Resources Board of the Philippine Government as well as representatives from NGO Forum on the ADB, Freedom from Debt Coalition, Jubilee South, Advocates for Science and Technology for the People and Mr. Ranji Casinader, RETA Consultant and ADB staff. View the list of participants.

3. The Meeting was chaired by Mr. Preben Nielsen, Deputy Director, IWD, ADB. Read the Agenda and Program of the workshop.

B. Opening Session

a) Chairman's Opening Remarks

4. Mr. Nielsen commenced his opening address by welcoming the participants. He informed them that due to the diverse opinions on how to conduct consultations on the WCD Report received during the ADB's recent workshop in February 2001, ADB had decided that in-country workshops be conducted in a number of ADB's member countries of which this is the first. He then provided the background and summary of the WCD study and the recent developments in the debate on large dams. He also explained ADB's role in the dams debate and its commitment to help disseminate the Report's findings, to re-examine its own procedures, including the environmental and social policies, to determine the extent to which the Report's recommendations may necessitate changes in these policies, and to encourage its developing member countries to review their own policies. He also briefly discussed ADB's responses to WCD's Strategic Priorities. He stressed ADB's concern about WCD's recommendation for reviewing social impacts of existing projects if that meant meeting standards higher than those prevailing at the time of implementation. Mr. Nielsen invoked the participants active participation in the breakout group's discussion to address any concerns and deliberate on the "rights at risk " approach, options assessment, and how to address

existing dams. Finally, he hoped that through the workshop, a resolution on the next step toward better practices in line with the WCD guidelines would be formulated.

b) ADB'S Response to the WCD Guidelines

5. Mr. R. Dobias, NGO Network Coordinator, ADB, discussed ADB's ongoing and planned responses to the WCD's Strategic Priorities, Best Practices, and Institutional Responses. He briefly explained the 26 WCD guidelines divided into 7 strategic priorities and compared ADB's existing policies addressing these guidelines.

c) Philippines Practice Compared to WCD Guidelines

6. Mr. Victor Isidro, Head, Mini Hydro Department, Department of Energy, Philippines, represented the primary agencies involved in dam construction and development in the Philippines. The Regulatory Agencies comprising the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), the National Water Resources Board (NWRB), and the Department of Energy (DOE) are responsible for formulation of policies and regulations governing socio-environmental aspects. The Implementing Agencies were represented by the National Irrigation Administration (NIA), the Department of Agriculture (DA), and the National Power Corporation. Mr. Isidro began his presentation by saying that the Philippines has many strong NGOs that help them develop better ways of implementing dam projects in the Philippines. He also pointed out that the Philippines have many laws that actually parallel most, if not all, of the 26 guidelines proposed by the WCD, such as the Presidential Decree (PD) 1586, the Philippines Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) System. He also provided a brief description and functions of the various laws that govern and regulate the implementation of dam projects in the Philippines. The Phil EIS System embodies most of the guidelines as proposed by the WCD. He stressed that public consultation, including with NGOs, is automatic for all dams projects. Another special feature in the Philippine Government system is the provision of benefits to host communities. He was happy to note that the Philippines is at par or even ahead of some countries in implementing the concept of giving direct benefits to host communities. A certain amount of the revenues of the proponent of any dam project is required to be remitted to the National and Local Governments. These funds will directly translate into actual benefits to host communities. Another variation of this benefit is the allocation of one centavo per kwh of electricity sold by the proponents. This one-centavo collection is put into a trust fund which is used for rural electrification, to provide livelihood, for reforestation, watershed management, and other related activities to host communities.

7. He observed that the 26 WCD guidelines are mostly addressed by the EIS System. The policy is continuously being updated and upgraded to adjust to changing times and conditions. Through the EIS System, the Philippine Government has succeeded in implementing a number of hydropower, irrigation, and other dams projects. He pointed out that some of the other features of the WCD guidelines such as baseline ecosystem surveys and baseline social conditions are also the basis of the EIS System. He believed that the EIS system has gradually improved and now incorporates most of the major concerns that many NGOs have raised. The public consultation feature of the EIS system, which had not been observed before, have now been made an integral part of the EIS system. Mr. Isidro then commented on WCD's seven Strategic Priorities.

8. **Gaining Public Acceptance** - The existing laws of the Philippines ensures that stakeholders are consulted and that the project gains acceptance by various groups before being implemented.

9. **Comprehensive Options Assessment** - The Department of Energy, in compliance with the new Electric Power Industry Reform Act of 2001 formulates an indicative Philippine Energy Plan providing the private sector a free choice/selection of energy/fuel sources for their power generation projects. The NIA, on the other hand, implements irrigation projects after completing a Strategic Impact Assessment (SIA) during the feasibility study stage. The SIA involves a multi-criteria analysis from which the most feasible option is adopted.

10. **Addressing Existing Dams** - The NPC which maintains most of Philippines existing hydropower facilities, ensures that facilities are well maintained to ensure that they operate optimally and without financial losses. In DOE, mini hydropower plants that are constructed and operated by the private sectors are regularly monitored. NIA addresses its dams concerns through flood forecasting and, in case of spillway release, flood warning in low-lying areas. Safety inspection is conducted twice a year during high and low water level periods.

11. **Sustaining Rivers and Livelihoods** - The stringent Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) requirements include mitigating measures to minimize the effects of dam projects to the river system and the environment. The National Water Resource Board requires proponents and water users to ensure sustenance of the river system, as well as fish and aquatic resources that may thrive in the river. Selection of a dam site for a hydropower project goes through a series of screenings to determine the most viable location in terms of structural stability and benefit/cost ratio. In NIA, maintenance of fish and aquatic resources is being complied with within the reservoir area.

12. **Recognizing Entitlements and Sharing Benefits** - The social responsibility concept in the hydropower projects constructed over the last five years, have been contributing to development by including a local electrification component and in creating livelihood programs for communities directly hosting hydropower projects. Likewise, the administration of energy projects ensures provision of appropriate benefits to communities hosting those projects in compliance with the governing laws.

13. **Ensuring Compliance** - The Philippine EIS System and the Philippine Clean Air Act, include penalties and incentives for power generation projects. Such provisions are included in the issuance of the Environmental Compliance Certificate.

14. **Sharing Rivers for Peace** - The NWRB has the exclusive authority in appropriating water allocations to address the various needs of the different sectors, in accordance with the Philippine Water Code.

d) Large Dams & Recommended Practices

15. Mr. Ranji Casinader, Consultant of ADB RETA 5828: Study of Large Dams and Recommended Practices, discussed the ADB-financed RETA which was used as a contribution to the WCD Report. Mr. Casinader highlighted the different emphasis between the WCD and ADB Terms of Reference. He discussed how the choice of the 4 case study dams came about, considering geographical and age spread. He then proceeded by presenting the Case study findings. A matrix of project characteristics and aspects of the four case study dams, the

expected and actual cost, and economic and technical performance were highlighted during the presentation. He then presented what the study consultants considered to be the major steps in an ideal project development and decision-making process: needs evaluation, options assessment, pre-feasibility study, feasibility study, final design, construction, and operation. Specific milestones for each of these steps were presented. The actual performance of the four (4) case studies, namely, Nam Ngum (Lao PDR), Victoria (Sri Lanka), Magat (Philippines), and Lingjintan (PRC), were compared with the ideal process.

16. Mr. Casinader pointed out that the actual number of people resettled is greater in all the projects than actually planned largely due to the exclusion of the people whose livelihoods were affected in the list of project affected people (PAP) at the planning stage. Other factors contributing to the increase in the number of PAPs are inclusion of the effects of health, and lack of a proper study of environmental aspects, before the projects were constructed (with the exception of Lingjintan).

17. In the Consultants' report, there are about 80 lessons to be learnt. The Consultants made recommendations/solutions for each of the lessons learnt, but these can be summarized by stating that significant deficiencies in the performance of a project arise when its development and decision-making process fail to include all the steps and activities of a comprehensive, progressive, project development process in which engineering, social and environmental aspects are co-ordinated. In all the projects very little was done with regards to options assessment. No full environmental studies were done, specifically for Victoria, due to the Government's wish to accelerate the economic development of the country unlike with Lingjintan where implementation was done progressively and thoroughly with the assistance of ADB.

18. The Consultants recommended that for all dam projects a comprehensive development process be adopted which has the following characteristics: (a) a progressive study commencing with evaluation of the needs and options assessment, and proceeding through feasibility studies, design, and construction, in which technical, economic, social and environmental issues are co-ordinated, with well-defined decision points in the process; (b) appropriate public and agency participation at all stages of the process; and (c) continuation of the process into the operational phase of the project to permit monitoring of project effectiveness and remedial action as necessary.

C. Breakout Groups

1st Breakout Group Discussion - Gaining Public Acceptance, Recognizing Entitlements and Sharing Benefits

19. The delegate-participants split into two working groups (A, and B) of manageable size. Each group discussed the same topic at the same time, and the main conclusions were reported to the plenary meeting by the group facilitators.

Group A

20. Group A commented that there should be a clear definition of what a stakeholder is in the scoping stage. A suggestion is that instead of using "stakeholders" it should be "stakeholders-partners" so as not to confine the meaning of the word "stakeholders" to the

interest of the communities affected by the project but viewed in terms of mutual benefits for the community as well as the benefits for the country.

21. Questions raised by the group were (1) how to define public acceptance, (2) how is public acceptance measured, and (3) when is an environmental impact acceptable?

22. Group A suggested that there is public acceptance when all the major issues and concerns are addressed properly. In connection to this suggestion, the question arose of how mistrust can be erased in order to gain public acceptance. Factors to be considered are past experience, compromise between developer and affected communities and the valuing concepts of the developers vis-a-vis the affected communities.

23. The group suggested that in order to mitigate all the problems that may arise from public acceptance, proper information/transparency in all issues and concerns, be it negative or positive, must be through public consultation at varying levels within the communities affected. Technical matters and financial issues should be addressed through public consultation involving technical experts within the community or region including the concerned NGOs.

24. Issues and concerns must be explained to the community in their respective dialects so as to have a free-flowing communication. The communities must be educated on the positive impacts of the project as well as the negative impacts. There should be skills training and public consultation for the project personnel involved particularly in the pre-construction stage.

25. Lastly, the group suggested that public acceptance should be rated in percentage in terms of impact, nature of projects, cost of projects, benefits, environmental assets and optimum utilization of resources. There should be a defined limit on when to proceed and not to proceed with the project. Upon determination of the "percentage", the community can decide when to say "yes" or "no" to a project.

26. After Group A's presentation, Mr. Nielsen commented that by fixing a "percentage" the group will tie itself down to a mathematical figure and flexibility is sacrificed. He advised that there must be a discussion and agreement among people and this involves skills, which in turn involves a mutual process with give and take in order to reach a fair agreement.

Group B

27. Group B came up with the questions of (1) how the benefits will be shared, (2) is 100 percent public acceptance possible or is it necessary, and (3) how do you deal with the people who object.

28. As part of the public acceptance process, more information dissemination is required. They agree with Group A's view that information must be disseminated in words that the public will understand in order to be able to accept or reject the project.

29. In the case when 100 percent acceptance is not possible, they suggest that a detailed recording of the acceptance should be made. With the question of how benefits are shared, the group stressed that a thorough study be done. Two options suggested were either that the benefit should be spread according to the amount of disturbance the community has had, or to raise everybody to the same level.

2nd Breakout Group Discussion - Options Assessments, Sustaining Rivers and Livelihoods

Group A

30. According to the representative from NIA, there's no other option but to develop dams as they represent the least cost as compared to groundwater, which is technically difficult for irrigation purposes.

31. Several options were named by the group for power generation i.e. thermal (natural gas and coal-fired, geothermal, solar, wind). Given the options above, one of the group members chose mini-hydro and micro-hydro over and above large dams. The issue of a sustainable value of resettlement of affected families was raised along with the cost to the community of the project vs. the opportunity cost if the project will not push through.

32. The group recommended that the Government intensively study the agreements with IPPs so as not to sacrifice the public's welfare and to bear in mind that the cost of the benefits per project varies according to area. Further, the group recommended that DOE review the performance of large dams before it be considered an option.

33. A comprehensive study of the various options should include among the parameters the environmental feasibility, social acceptability, financial viability, technical viability and economic viability.

34. Another issue presented is the discrepancy or gaps between the findings when scientific/technical studies are conducted by the proponent compared to those of an independent entity. Given this, the legitimate issues, raised by the independent study are not being addressed by the Government. The group's consensus view was that all NGO studies should be forwarded to the respective agencies for consideration.

35. The group's last proposal for the civil society including the NGOs is to conduct a joint evaluation of the project proposal, to sit as one body and find the merit in the project before allowing any group to proceed with the project. This move is already initiated by Environmental Management Bureau (EMB) by incorporating this in the scoping and consultation, embodied in the EIS system.

36. The Chair commented on the last suggestion of the group. It shows a willingness to close of the gap between dam proponents on one hand and civil society on the other.

Group B

37. Group B noted that there are relatively limited options in the Philippines to dams for electric power (e.g. geothermal, natural gas, etc.) and irrigation (e.g. to pump surface water or groundwater). Although there are a number of renewable energy schemes (in the Philippines) such as wind, solar, wave, one cannot help but ask if these are real options for large-scale power developments.

38. Rehabilitation of dams should be given priority for development but in reality rehabilitation only serve existing demand. A particular example is Magat - the reservoir is filling with sediment and needs to be rehabilitated just to maintain existing output.

39. On sustaining rivers, the group noted at the moment that the amount of water released is 10 percent of the flow which has 80% probability of exceedence. However, the group questioned if this is really sufficient. The group remarked that release flow should to some extent mimic the actual flow of rivers. (i.e. low flows and floods)

40. To end, Group B mentioned that in most cases the quality of the water is not looked at and suggested it be done to assure best quality of the water is released.

3rd Breakout Group Discussion – Addressing Existing Dams

Group A

41. The group noted that there are a lot of regulations and policies promulgated to ensure compliance. Checks for technical compliance are built-in to the project specifications and to the ECC, which requires a multi-partite monitoring team composed of the representatives of affected communities, Local Government Units (LGUs), NGOs, the church, the proponent and the DENR, which conducts regular scientific measurements.

42. With the above, the question arises of why do projects proceed without any approval or endorsements from the LGUs. **The problems and objections should be resolved and careful consideration given to whether the project should be implemented or not. It is further moved that all resolutions of legitimate and valid concerns should be resolved just the same.**

43. Group A recommended that all resolutions of legitimate and valid concerns be monitored for compliance during implementation.

Group B

44. The Group noted that the compliance plan (ECC), independent review panels, performance bonds, trust funds, integrity pacts & MOA have all been used in some form in the Philippines, although, NGO's have some concerns that compliance is not guaranteed.

45. The facilitator congratulated the Philippines in putting these in place, which very few other countries in this region have done.

D. The NGO Perspective

46. Ms. Natalie Pulvenar, NGO representative from Advocates for Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM) read ***the People's Declaration Against Large Dams*** made during the National Workshop on Dams held in Baguio City in March 2001 participated in by 35 People's Organization, NGOs Environmental Organization and other concerned groups.

47. They declared that water as a vital element of life is providing nourishment, livelihood and the means to sustain existence. However, the Philippine Government arbitrarily used the river systems for energy development. Dams were built to facilitate development but development was defined from the perspective of foreign investors, dam builders, international funding agencies and the Government.

48. The Philippine Government's subservience to foreign capitalists in its policies toward deregulation, liberalization and privatization resulted in displacement of thousands of families, homes were destroyed without compensation, heritage was lost, and harassment and militarization have become a common experience by communities directly affected by these developments.

49. Profits flowed into the hands of the foreign energy corporations, local partners, international funding agencies and the bureaucracy from the start of the project until they become operational but the people displaced continue to live life in difficulty, even more so as a result of the development. This experience is not only felt by the Filipinos. According to the World Commission on Dam's Report, dams built around the world have failed to produce as much electricity, provide as much water, and control as much flood damages as their sponsors claim. With these experiences, dams are not development effective and have not addressed methods to sustain life and facilitate development.

50. The Declaration claimed that there are alternatives to large dams that are more economically viable and have less social and environmental costs. It stressed that the recommendations and feasible options presented by local groups to the WCD have to be seriously considered by those in Government, dam builders, and the funding agencies. The participants called for: (1) a stop to all constructions of dams in the country, (2) moratorium on the construction of new dams, (3) full compensation and provision of sustainable livelihoods to communities affected, and (4) immediate rehabilitation of the damage to eco-systems along the area of existing dams.

51. The Declaration also appealed on the present Government headed by President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo to: (1) respect and uphold the right of dam affected peasants and indigenous peoples, (2) seek and develop efficient, equitable and sustainable options for water and energy development, (3) fully compensate victims of existing and on-going projects, and (4) scrap globalization as the thrust of the Philippine economic program. The three-day Baguio workshop ended with a declaration to commit participants to establish a network of dam-affected communities for the protection of the rights of the people and environment for pro-people development.

E. Open Discussions

52. Mr. Nielsen opened the floor for discussion and asked the participants if they wanted to respond to the declaration read by the NGO representative.

53. The NGO representative of AGHAM appealed to all (Filipino) development scientists that, aside from choosing projects with the least cost and maximum benefit to country, the framework of development must yield a better life. She also appealed to the fellow scientist and engineers present not to be representatives of the foreign investors when conducting consultations in the local communities. Compassion to improve the economy is not enough. So long as the country is debt-driven and not geared toward strengthening the local economy, no energy project will solve the crisis, no irrigation project will answer food insufficiency, and poverty will not be answered

54. **Comments:** A NIA representative commented that instead of fighting against people's poverty, we are increasing people's poverty when we reject an irrigation project, thereby resulting in importing rice from abroad and promoting foreign rice instead of our local rice. He

pointed out that large dams are made to irrigate bigger areas and dam builders optimize water resources by letting the water pass through generation plants.

55. **Responses:** Ms. Pulvenar rebutted that the declaration is based on analysis of the past and present experiences of the people. For decades now, even with the presence of these large dams the Filipinos have not experienced a better life. The whole development framework that the Government must adhere to must be examined thoroughly as the success of these projects are anchored on it. AGHAM's stand is that the Government can use any or a mixture of technology that are available as long as they will really benefit the Filipino people and not burden them more.

56. **Comments:** The Government representative challenged the NGO representative that it is not only the energy production that are causing poverty in the Philippines.

57. **Responses:** Ms. Mary Carling, representative from Cordillera People's Alliance added that in relation to the benefits of affected communities, she requested NPC to review and assess all the large dam projects, as WCD did, and see if they have indeed uplifted the lives of the Filipino family. She further requested NPC and concerned government agencies to go an extra mile to talk to the affected families, see if they are better off compared to before the resettlement and come up with recommendations.

58. Mr. Nielsen mentioned that for ADB projects in Nepal and Laos, they had looked into existing dams constructed years ago to see how they are performing and if the people have been better off or not. He noted that owners of dams built years ago – late 1980s, early 1990s, committed mistakes, as there were not enough consultations. There was little awareness on the development banks like ADB. Specifically with Theun Hinboun and Nam Leuk projects in Laos, ADB has a program of reactive mitigation as not all aspects of mitigation had been investigated earlier. The follow-up now will cost between \$5-6 million to rectify the damage and recompensate. In future, money could be put in a trust fund for mitigation that would be accomplished during operation. WCD states that it is imperative to consult, come up with an agreement regarding compensation, particularly the type of compensation.

59. Mr. Marasigan stated that most of the concerns brought to their attention by communities hosting energy projects are not about the projects' after-effects but rather who are really entitled to compensation and how people can make use of these benefits constructively.

60. He also stressed that better energy projects can be achieved if the benefits provided are properly managed. It is imperative that people are educated on the appropriate use of the funds. DOE is enjoining the civil societies, and the NGOs to sit down and educate the communities and join hands with them in evaluating the projects and share expertise in identifying the alternatives. He also challenged the participants, if they think the Filipinos are really ready to shoulder the cost of monitoring livelihoods'. If this can be answered by everybody, then, he thought the Filipinos will be ready to accept any alternative projects in providing not only the power but also the means of livelihood that could be generated out of energy projects.

61. On account of the alternative energy options, Mr. Nielsen remarked that in an analysis made in Maldives where income is generated mainly from tourism, it turned out that it is not viable to put capital investment into windmills that you cannot recover during the non-windy days. These things goes in to the economic assessment of alternative options. Mr. Nielsen also mentioned that during the last WCD meeting in Cape Town, the Commission did not discredit

dams per se - dams are not good, dams are not bad, but dams are. The Commission assessed that things should not be done the way they were done in the past. There must be a balance between affected people against those who benefit. Those who benefit are consumers. The consumers can share the benefits in certain terms with the affected people so that they are made much better off, enhancing their livelihood and this is what ADB is doing now.

62. As a control measure, Mr. Nielsen also advised the body that the ADB is institutionalizing third party monitoring by inviting NGOs to participate very early in the process. This way NGOs would know the whole sequence on working for the betterment of the people is livelihood which is primarily the overarching goal.

63. **Additional comments:** Four points were shared by Mr. Isidro of DOE. First, both NGOs and Government are in agreement that energy growth is inevitable and that the agricultural sector needs to be developed. Second, although there are disagreements, ways are now being sought on how to pursue these energy and agricultural development thrusts of the Government. Third, he believed that the Government's approach is progressing. Its record has improved tremendously from questionable dam projects of the past as they have now added NGOs' inputs as well as people's organizations' inputs in their procedures which led them to develop the Philippine EIS system which has been continuously been modified to adopt to changing times, mainly in consideration of the people who are being affected by the dam projects. Lastly, he challenged the NGOs to have a mutual partnership with Government in participatory mode, act as an equal (with Government) in pointing out and identifying recommendations, concrete actions that would be beneficial noting that if both would work together, higher goals may be reached whether it be dam or non-dam projects.

64. Mr. Nielsen gave credit to the NGOs for bringing the agenda forward and making the conference possible. He enjoined everyone to look forward and not just look at the past mistakes. However, we must be able to put in some money to rectify the ill-effects just as what ADB is doing now in Laos.

65. Ms. Mary Carling requested the government agencies to study thoroughly the WCD Report and to conduct their own assessment based on this experience. She reiterated that the NGOs cannot effectively work with the Government if the Government does not have the full grasp of the impact of dam projects in the communities as the NGOs have. She also requested the agencies to consult with the participants present in the WCD forums to enable them to start at a certain level of recognition of the good and bad effects of dams.

The Next Steps

66. Mr. Nielsen suggested that everybody should be very pragmatic in the approach in addressing the next steps. There should be a clear definition of NGOs involvement with the other stakeholders. NGOs have full power to make alliances with the people in those areas. He believed that the statement from the Commission's Report regarding the principle of recognition of rights and assessment of risks as the basis for identification and inclusion of stakeholders in decision-making on energy and water resources development is a very wise statement. It is also a request for us to closely work together although it is almost impossible to have 100 percent consensus. Mr. Nielsen further added that we must negotiate in an open atmosphere with NGOs present since we are not culturally sensitive enough to deal with indigenous people in certain areas. To express our willingness in working alongside NGOs, we are enjoining them to criticize policies and procedures and back out of the process anytime they think necessary.

67. Mr. Nielsen also noted that there is always a mismatch between policy and practice. For example, with ADB some guidelines do not tally with legislation in the different countries, which we need to rectify. Due recognition was given to NAPOCOR for having training programs for field workers.

68. Mr. Nielsen remarked that this one-day workshop is not enough to be able to conclude and set up a resolution on how to go forward. He invited the agencies to look into the WCD's 26 guidelines under the 7 strategic priorities. He then distributed diskettes containing ADB's responses to the WCD guidelines to all government agencies and NGOs for them to use as a model when considering their own response to the guidelines. He suggested that each agency and the NGOs fill-in the responses based on their own practice, then prepare an agenda, and organize internal meetings with DoE as lead to prepare a joint response. As it would not be wise to put a time limit on this, a conference will be scheduled late this year or early next year on how we can converge. Mr. Nielsen specifically stated that ADB will not be in a position to respond to WCD without these inputs from its developing member countries. Consequently, it would be best to conduct similar conferences in other countries to be able to come up with resolutions unique and tailor-made to each country.

Closing Remarks

69. In closing, Mr. Nielsen thanked all the participants for being very cooperative and working very hard. He also encouraged every one to get to know these problems and listen to the NGO's request to read the WCD report and read it in the spirit of rectifying the mistakes of the past. We should always strive to do things better and make a better world. With this, he wished the participants a safe journey home..