

Stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam

An analysis of the opportunities for successful stakeholder participation in Vietnam

<i>Course</i>	Bachelor thesis Milieu-maatschappijwetenschappen
<i>Course code</i>	GEO3-2137
<i>Faculty</i>	Faculty of Geoscience
<i>University</i>	Utrecht University
<i>Course coordinator</i>	Clare Barnes
<i>Thesis supervisor</i>	Carel Dieperink
<i>Date</i>	June 26th, 2013
<i>Student</i>	Jacqueline Schoneveld
<i>Student number</i>	3503968
<i>Word count</i>	5989

ABSTRACT - The Dutch stakeholder participation model might be suited for Vietnam, since Vietnam has a lot of water to manage as well, just like the Netherlands. Accordingly, the goal of this thesis is to find out what opportunities Vietnamese water management provides for successful stakeholder participation. To achieve this goal, an evaluative research will be done by conducting a literature analysis and an interview. Opportunities for stakeholder participation in Vietnam are analysed by evaluating practice, using conditions for successfulness. Conditions for successful stakeholder participation are present to a limited extent, but Vietnamese water management does provide opportunities for successful stakeholder participation. However, there are also barriers to overcome, and some conditions were not treated in the selected literature, so the author was unable to pronounce upon those conditions.



KEYWORDS - water management, Vietnam, successful stakeholder participation, conditions

Inhoud

Preface	2
Summary	3
1. Introduction.....	4
1.1. Stakeholder participation and Vietnam	4
1.2. Aim and research question	4
1.3. Method	5
1.4. Relevance.....	5
1.5. Outline	6
2. Successful stakeholder participation and its conditions	6
2.1 Successful stakeholder participation.....	6
<i>Stakeholder participation</i>	6
<i>Strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder participation</i>	7
<i>Successful stakeholder participation</i>	7
2.2. Conditions for successful stakeholder participation and the integrated area approach	8
<i>The integrated area approach</i>	8
<i>Strengths and weaknesses of the integrated area approach</i>	8
<i>Success conditions</i>	8
3. Water management in Vietnam	10
3.1 Organisation of water management in Vietnam	10
<i>Legal framework and institutions</i>	10
<i>State centered</i>	10
3.2 Vietnamese experience with stakeholder participation	11
4. Vietnamese water management and successful stakeholder participation	12
5. Discussion	15
6. Conclusion	16
List of References.....	17
Appendix 1: Presence of conditions for successful stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam	
Appendix 2: Report of an interview with Joost van Buuren (Vietnam expert) [in Dutch]	

Preface

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a bachelor's degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences with a specialization in sustainability and developing countries. The supervisor on this thesis has been dr. Carel Dieperink. This thesis has been made solely by the author, however, most of the text is based on the work of others and I have tried my best to make clear references to these sources.

When I had to choose a subject for this thesis in April 2013, water management in Vietnam caught my attention. I did not know anything about Vietnam yet, and I wanted to learn more about this country. Living in the Netherlands, I have always been interested in water management. So water management in Vietnam seemed like an appropriate subject for this thesis. It has been a very fascinating process to investigate the opportunities for successful stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam. Writing this thesis, I have learned a lot about Vietnam and about stakeholder participation and its approaches. It was also very interesting to analyse a specific country, because during the process, I discovered that the successfulness of stakeholder participation is very conditional upon the situation and context.

I would like to thank dr. Carel Dieperink for his supervision and his helpful suggestions for improvement during the process. My thanks also goes out to dr.ir. Joost van Buuren, who was willing to elaborate on his findings about Vietnam in an interview. Last but not least, I would like to thank the members of my intervention group for their useful feedback.

Summary

The Dutch see their lessons learned from experience with high water as an export product. The Dutch 'polder model' encompasses that a lot of stakeholders will have to participate in water management. In Vietnam, an increase in population and a rapid economic growth rate in the past years have put a large stress on water resources. Vietnam also is one of the five countries most threatened by climate change and contending with problems as a consequence of high water as well. Therefore, the Dutch stakeholder participation model might be suited for Vietnam as well. Accordingly, the goal of this thesis is to find out what opportunities Vietnamese water management provides for successful stakeholder participation. To achieve this goal, an evaluative research will be done by conducting a literature analysis and interviewing a Vietnam expert. Opportunities for successful stakeholder participation in Vietnam are analysed by evaluating practice, by using conditions for successfulness. The question that is central to this thesis runs as follows: *'What opportunities does Vietnamese water management provide for successful stakeholder participation?'* A literature analysis and an interview led to a lot of useful information to answer this question with.

When one wants to answer this question, one has to know what is understood by successful stakeholder participation and what its conditions are. It can be said that stakeholder participation is successful when it enlarges the social basis, leads to enrichment with respect to content and leads to improvement of the process. And, result of the stakeholder process must also be a coherent view: an integrated or creative idea or policy, derived from the ideas and visions of all the stakeholders involved. Otherwise there would of course be no use in bringing stakeholders together. In this thesis, 23 conditions for successful stakeholder participation were identified and presented in a table. These 23 conditions are used later on to elaborate on to what extent these conditions are present in water management in Vietnam. But first, it has to become clear in what way water management is organised in Vietnam and what experience Vietnam already has with stakeholder participation. Water management in Vietnam is organized as follows: it's formally divided into nine basins for water resource planning, the Law on Water Resources of 1999 and several other laws and regulation (like the Environmental Protection Law (1993) and the Ministerial Instruction) play an important part in the water management and the management in Vietnam is state centred. In this thesis, a few examples of projects that entail stakeholder participation that have taken or are taking place in Vietnam are given. It looks like Vietnam does not have that much (documented and available) experience with stakeholder participation yet. An evaluation of practice, while using the table with 23 conditions (and marking the conditions as present/in some form present/ non-present), pointed out that conditions for successful stakeholder participation seem to be present to a limited extent in water management in Vietnam. Key challenges include for example gearing different activities towards each other, allowing parties to act in concert (coordination), achieving good governance and creating the ability to incorporate new knowledge and views.

Overall it looks like a lot needs to change before a situation is achieved where all the conditions are present. Conditions are present to a limited extent, but Vietnamese water management does provide opportunities for successful stakeholder participation. To answer the central question; it can be said that the conditions which were marked as present are opportunities for successful stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam. The conditions that were marked as in some form present (but needing adjustment or more intenseness) can also be seen as opportunities, since they can be worked out to become fully present. The conditions that are marked as non-present are no opportunities, but rather barriers for successful stakeholder participation. Some conditions did not come up in the selected literature nor the interview at all, so on the basis of this thesis nothing could be said about those conditions and their opportunities.

1 Introduction

1.1. Stakeholder participation and Vietnam

'High water lessons a fine export product' runs the headline of a news article in a Dutch newspaper of March 22nd, 2013. Today, the Dutch see their lessons learned from experiences with high water (established in the 'polder model') as an export product. The Vietnamese would like to profit from this search by the Dutch (Eldert, van, 2013). In Vietnam, the increase in population and rapid economic growth rate in the years following the *Doi Moi* policy from 1987 onwards have put large stress on the water resources and environment (Duc & Truong, 2003). Therefore, Vietnam is contending with problems as a consequence of high water as well (Renaud & Kuenzer, 2012). And Vietnam also is one of the five countries most threatened by climate change (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2012). Taking this into account, Vietnam seems to be an exquisite target for this Dutch export product. Therefore, Dutch research organisations investigate the possibilities for marketing the Dutch 'polder model', that encompasses that a lot of stakeholders participate in water management. But the question arises if this stakeholder participation model would also work in a different institutional context like the one in Vietnam. And are the conditions under which this model works even present in Vietnam?

There is a great number of scientific articles and other literature available on stakeholder participation (also referred to as public participation) or approaches that entail it, like the integrated area approach or interactive policy-making. Although the approach of having all relevant stakeholders participate in a planning process is entrenched in Dutch policy-making tradition, comparable projects have been performed in other West-European countries as well. In former transition countries (like Vietnam), however, experiences so far have been limited (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61). And there is a lack of available literature that specifically studies the possibilities for stakeholder participation in Vietnam. But *"the basic hydrology, political, legal and environmental context that must be considered in developing a water resources management strategy is unique and specific for each country, region, and river basin"* (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.307). So when one wants to know whether the 'Dutch' stakeholder participation model would also work in Vietnam, it is important to take a country-specific consideration into account.

1.2. Aim and research question

Therefore, the goal of this thesis is to find out what opportunities Vietnamese water management provides for successful stakeholder participation. To achieve this goal, an evaluative research will be done. Evaluation can be defined as "judging a representation or observation of a certain phenomenon, by using certain criteria" (Bressers, 1998, p.199). In this case, opportunities for stakeholder participation in Vietnam will be analysed by evaluating practice, by using criteria (conditions) for successfulness. The central question that will guide this thesis run as follows:

What opportunities does Vietnamese water management provide for successful stakeholder participation?

In order to be able to answer this central question, a deductive method will be used, where one reasons from one or more general statements to reach a logically certain conclusion. Therefore, this thesis will be based on the following sub-questions:

1. *What is successful stakeholder participation?*
2. *What are conditions for successful stakeholder participation?*
3. *In what way is water management organised in Vietnam?*
4. *What experience does Vietnam have with stakeholder participation so far?*
5. *To what extent are conditions for successful stakeholder participation present in water management in Vietnam?*

With the answers to these sub-questions, a logically certain conclusion can follow which will form the answer to the central question.

1.3. Method

The sub-questions will be answered by conducting a literature analysis and interviewing a Vietnam expert. A searching process on particularly Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, Omega and the university library catalogue – while making use of keywords like *stakeholder/public participation, integrated approach, stakeholder involvement, (success)conditions, water management, policy/decision-making, environmental management, Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh City, Mekong Delta region* – results in finding a lot of useful literature. Additionally to the literature analysis, an interview is done with a Vietnam expert: Joost van Buuren. Joost is has been staff-member of the department of environment technology in Wageningen for a long time and was involved in waste water purification and waste processing. He has a lot of experience in projects in developing countries, mainly in Vietnam. Interviewing an expert creates a more nuanced perspective, and allows a comparison between the results from the literature and the findings of an expert.

Sub-question 1 through 4 will be answered by analysing literature. Sub-question 1 will be answered by using theories about stakeholder participation and interactive policy-making. Sub-question 2 will be answered by using theories about the integrated area approach and about water allocation policy. This will result in a table with conditions for successful stakeholder participation. Sub-question 3 will be answered by mainly using a book by Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son. Sub-question 4 will be answered by discussing three examples of projects that entail stakeholder participation that have taken place in Vietnam. Sub-question 5 will be answered by analysing literature and using the information retrieved in the interview. Practice will be evaluated by searching for the presence or absence of the conditions for successfulness in six scientific sources (articles/report/thesis) and mark these conditions in the table of conditions (presented when answering sub-question 2). Then, the conditions that stand out by their markings will be discussed and compared to the results of the interview with the expert. Readers must be aware that the six articles do not deal with all the conditions that were presented while answering sub-question 2. But due to time and space, it is not possible to include all relevant literature on this subject. Besides, it was hard to find country-specific literature that was useful. The answers to all these sub-questions make answering the central question possible.

1.4. Relevance

Answering these central and sub-questions has theoretical as well as social relevance. The theoretical relevance of this thesis is to be found in discussing conditions for successful stakeholder participation and placing this into the context of Vietnam, because this may contribute to theories about stakeholder participation in Vietnam. Also, it contributes to the question how ecological and economical risks can be considered in decision-making and which factors and actors play a part in it (*sustainable use of space*). All this may turn out helpful for Dutch partners that want to market the Dutch polder model to Vietnam. The social relevance of this thesis is to be found in the fact that enlarging the understanding of Vietnamese water management and the opportunities it has for successful stakeholder participation allows a better coordination of stakeholder participation on plans for Vietnamese water management. Plans that are geared to a specific situation will probably

result in a better outcome and thus better water management. This will of course benefit the inhabitants of Vietnam.

1.5. Outline

The next section is about successful stakeholder participation and its conditions. In this part, sub-question 1 and 2 will be answered. Then, a section about water management in Vietnam follows. Here, sub-question 3 and 4 will be answered. Next, sub-question 5 will be answered in a section about Vietnamese water management and successful stakeholder participation. Then, a discussion about the findings is presented. Finally, this thesis will round up with a conclusion, in which the answer to the central question will be given and suggestions for further research are done.

2 Successful stakeholder participation and its conditions

2.1 Successful stakeholder participation

In order to be able to answer sub-question 1 (*What is successful stakeholder participation?*) it is important to first define the concept of *stakeholder participation*. This can be defined as a sensitizing concept, since an in-depth exploration of the concept is the goal here.

Stakeholder participation

Stakeholders are all the parties that have a stake in a certain process of decision-making with regard to forming plans or policy. Stakeholders can be defined as those organizations and individuals having some direct interest affected by the outcomes of water management decision making. The set of stakeholders thus includes actors, but is broader (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p.179). Stakeholders could for example be the government and its ministries, but also NGOs, inhabitants that drink water, grassroots organisations and farmers.

Stakeholder participation, also referred to as public participation, is described extensively by Rowe & Frewer (2005), and can in its broadest sense be defined as the “*practice of involving members of the public in the agendasetting, decision-making, and policy-forming activities of organizations/institutions responsible for policy development*” (Rower & Frewer, 2005, p.253). Yet this definition of stakeholder participation is too broad, they argue, because stakeholders could be involved in very different ways and levels. Therefore, Rowe & Frewer make a distinction between three kinds of public engagement, based on the flow of information between stakeholders (public representatives) and sponsors (the term *sponsor* is used to refer to the party commissioning the engagement initiative) (Rowe & Frewer, 2005, p.254-255). This distinction is represented in the table underneath:

	<i>Public communication</i>	<i>Public consultation</i>	<i>Public participation (or stakeholder participation)</i>
<i>Information flow</i>	sponsor → public repr.	sponsor ← public repr.	sponsor ↔ public repr.

Table 1: Three types of public engagement (based on Rowe & Frewer, 2005, p.255)
 NB: ‘public repr.’ stands for ‘public representatives’.

In the first form of public engagement, public communication, the information flow is directed from the sponsor to the public representatives. This is the case when, for example, the sponsor is only informing its society and other stakeholders about its decision-making and policies, without giving them the possibility to respond to it or have influence on it. With the second form, public

consultation, information is carried from public representatives to the sponsor, according to a process initiated by the sponsor. This is the case when, for example, the sponsor gets the opinions of others on the topic in question. With public participation, or stakeholder participation, information is interchanged between both public representatives and sponsors. So in this case, the information flow is two-way. This is the case when, for example, opinions of sponsors and public representatives are revised according to dialogue and negotiation (Rowe & Frewer, 2005, pp.255-256). This latter form of public engagement is the way in which the concept of stakeholder participation is used in this thesis.

Strengths and weaknesses of stakeholder participation

Water planning and management problems often come with high levels of complexity, uncertainty and conflict (von Korff et al., 2012). Many researchers identified stakeholder participation as a critical component towards overcoming these 'wicked problems' and achieving sustainable water resource management (see for example von Korff et al., 2012, Lamers et al., 2010, Manzungu & Kujinga, 2004 and Reed, 2008).

An article about a case study of the Water Needs Index, undertaken in Vietnam, also shows the advantages of stakeholder participation. In the article it is stated that the development of a Water Needs Index uncovers essential elements of the complex urban water supply, through a participatory approach. The Index provided *"a common language based on systems thinking, increased cross-sectoral communication, as well as increased recognition of problem issues; this ought to lead to improved urban water management"*. Also, the case study revealed that the approach can help overcome biases of local planners that they have due to their limited experience. This highlights an advantage of stakeholder participation as well of course, namely to overcome the information black spots that some stakeholders can have (Moglia et al., 2012).

The practice of stakeholder participation has also received some critique however. This shows for example from a case study conducted on ideas about what defines a good stakeholder participation process. Five different perspectives about good stakeholder participation emerged from this case study. Substantial differences among these perspectives reflect a major challenge for the sponsors. Conflicts could easily emerge about the designs of stakeholder participation processes because people disagree about what is good in specific contexts (Webler, Tuler & Krueger, 2001).

Others raise concerns about the quality of decisions in these processes, because it is said that stakeholders do not make adequate use of scientific information and analysis and trade technical quality for political remedies. However, case studies reveal that there should be little anxiety about stakeholder processes resulting in low-quality decisions (Beierle, 2002). In fact, there seems to be evidence that stakeholder participation *"can enhance the quality of environmental decisions, possibly due to more comprehensive information inputs"* (Reed, 2008, p.2426). So the quality of decisions might definitely be enhanced.

Successful stakeholder participation

It has been made clear what stakeholder participation entails and what its strengths and weaknesses are. But what is it that puts the *strengths* of stakeholder participation in the spotlight? What makes stakeholder participation successful? To define what is meant in this thesis by *successful stakeholder participation*, use will be made of a book by Pröpper & Steenbeek (2001). The authors write about interactive policy-making, which is an approach that also encompasses stakeholder participation. Evaluations of methods point out that the use of interactive policy has positive effects on the social basis (Edelenbos, 2000, Graaf, de, 2007, Pröpper & Steenbeek, 2001). The social basis here is meant as, for example, reducing the distance between government and citizens, commitment about dealing with the problem and satisfaction about the quality of information. Using interactive policy also led to positive effects that can be interpreted as enrichment with respect to content and to an improvement of the process (Pröpper & Steenbeek, 2001, p.23-24). So, to answer sub-question 1; it could be said that stakeholder participation is successful when it indeed enlarges the social basis, leads to enrichment with respect to content and leads to improvement of the process. And, result of

the stakeholder process must also be a coherent view: an integrated or creative idea or policy, derived from the ideas and visions of all the stakeholders involved. Otherwise there would of course be no use in bringing stakeholders together.

2.2. Conditions for successful stakeholder participation and the integrated area approach

To answer sub-question 2 (*What are conditions for successful stakeholder participation?*), an elaboration on the operational definition of the concept of *conditions for successful stakeholder participation* will now take place. A condition is the situation or environment in which something happens or exists, and can also be defined as a prerequisite; something that that must be true or be done before another thing can happen (MacMillan, 2013). To define conditions for successful stakeholder participation, use will be made of conditions for applying an integrated area approach, as extensively described by Dieperink et al. (2012).

The integrated area approach

The integrated area approach is a stakeholder participation approach. Dieperink et al., all Dutch researchers, set out the conditions that are required for the integrated area approach. These conditions will also be used in this thesis. In the integrated area approach, stakeholder involvement is arranged at the start of the planning process. It is an open and interactive process where stakeholders can share their own ideas and interests. *“The approach is based on five principles: take the wishes of stakeholders into account; jointly come up with innovative ideas and solutions; stimulate experts to develop novel solutions; creatively apply new technical means; and ‘learn by doing’.* Application of the approach must result in the development of a coherent view on the long-term development of an area and in the establishment of a package of measures to accelerate policy implementation” (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.59). This concurs with the above given definition of successful stakeholder participation, as the integrated area approach enlarges the social basis (takes the wishes of stakeholders into account), leads to enrichment with respect to content (jointly come up with innovative ideas and solutions), leads to improvement of the process (for example stimulate experts to develop novel situations) and of course results in a coherent view.

Strengths and weaknesses of the integrated area approach

However, some weaknesses of the integrated area approach are also defined. For example, in general, politicians seem to feel uncomfortable playing a more modest part in these open planning processes. Their role is now comparable to the roles of other stakeholders (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61). The integrated water resource management approach (comparable to the integrated area approach, but with a focus on water resource management) also is reproached of being too ambitious and vague. But some state that this weakness could also be considered its strength: *“Rather than a tightly defined blueprint with detailed prescription, [integrated water resource management] is based on some general principles.”* (Butterworth et al., 2010, p.78). This may make the approach applicable in more contexts.

Success conditions

The integrated area approach has been very successful in the Netherlands, of which a lot of examples are on hand (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61), but the question still remains under what conditions this might also be successful in Vietnam. Dieperink et al. stated that a successful application of the integrated area approach requires certain conditions. Malano, Bryant & Turrall (1999), specialised in water resources or law, also identified some fundamental and unavoidable success conditions for water allocation policy. It stood out that there are a lot of conditions which the *stakeholders* have to fulfil and that the *process* requires certain conditions. Table 2 represents the conditions that derived from the articles of Dieperink et al. and Malano, Bryant & Turrall, in random order - but sorted by the object of the condition: stakeholder or process.

Stakeholder related conditions
1. Important stakeholders perceive a situation as undesirable; there should be a shared sense of urgency in society to improve the quality of an area. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
2. Those stakeholders who are absolutely indispensable in making strategic decisions and implementing policies are willing to participate. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
3. Stakeholders with similar backgrounds and representing similar interests should be organized and speak with one voice. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
4. Stakeholders should (be able to) respect each other's opinions and commitment. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
5. Stakeholders have insight into mutual interdependencies and take major dependency relations between public and private actors into account. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
6. Stakeholders should be able to incorporate new knowledge and views. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
7. There must be a good community understanding of risk and effective tools to allow users to make informed decisions in coping with uncertainty in allocation. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
8. Participants must be willing to negotiate with each other: they must have enough scope to defend their own interests, but are also willing to consider new ideas and solutions. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
9. Participants should have flexible mandates from their constituencies and the representatives should have authority within their stakeholders' community. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
10. Personal and financial means are made available to organize and to participate in the process; stakeholders are willing and able to organize or host meetings, put forward discussion topics and time schedules. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
11. Stakeholders have a clear image of the role they have to play (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66). Dieperink et al. also stress that it is important that the stakeholders participating in the process are aware of the success conditions. This is because in this way the participants get the responsibility to meet these conditions. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.69)
Process related conditions
12. The process should be transparent (at least within the stakeholders' community) and clearly documented. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
13. Intermediate and small step results should be emphasized to show the added value of the approach and act as a catalyst for next steps. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
14. The results are accepted in formal political decision-making processes. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
15. Process results can be formalized using existing legal instruments. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
16. Apart from the politically responsible initiator a dedicated neutral and skilled process manager should be present who organizes the entire process in such a way that participants are kept at the table, remain interested and learning. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
17. There must be effective water measurement, both of the available resource and actual use, to establish and maintain a viable water accounting system. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
18. There must be clear specification of rights or licences or shares to a resource. Some form of volumetrically-based specification is essential and is likely to be a necessary step to developing more sophisticated property rights systems. This must include a transparent process of registering and quantifying existing and customary rights to water use. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
19. There must be effective hydrological tools that allow planners and managers to take full account of medium- and long-term variability in hydrology and in resource availability. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
20. There should be good governance: initiatives have to be developed that bring stakeholders together, get them to communicate with each other and develop creative ideas. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)
21. There should be coordination: different activities have to be geared towards each other, allowing parties to act in concert. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)
22. There should be monitoring: monitoring is important for being thorough with regard to content and legal, financial and administrative issues. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)
23. There should be accountability: accountability calls for reporting on all activities that take place in the course of the policy process. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)

Table 2: Success conditions for successful stakeholder participation

So, to answer sub-question 2; the listed conditions in the table above are conditions for successful stakeholder participation. This list of conditions will be used later on in this thesis to elaborate on to what extent these conditions are present in water management in Vietnam.

3 Water management in Vietnam

3.1 Organisation of water management in Vietnam

To answer sub-question 3 (*In what way is water management organised in Vietnam?*), the legal framework, institutions and state-centeredness in Vietnam will be discussed.

Legal framework and institutions

Vietnam is formally divided into nine basins for water resource planning (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p.169) and is in an evolutionary stage of water resource development (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p.190).

In 1999 and 2000 Vietnam had some major reforms, among which the framework Law on Water Resources (LWR) of 1999, and the decision on the establishment of the National Water Resources Council (NWRC) in June of 2000 (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p. 177-178). The LWR was a major development of existing legislation. The Law was up-to-date in the issues it addresses, dynamic in its approach, and practical (GWP, 2008). The LWR indicates that the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) is in charge of overall management of the country's water resources. The government may, however, delegate authority for specific water uses to other ministries. MARD and provincial governments are in charge of setting up plans for floods and droughts in the country's river basins. Besides the LWR, several other laws and regulations are important for water resources management in Vietnam as well, including the Environmental Protection Law (1993) and the Ministerial Instruction from the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (MOSTE) entitled *Guiding Environmental Impact Assessment for Operating Units*. Based on the LWR, a national-level umbrella organization was founded in 2000: the National Water Resources Council (NWRC). The NWRC has an office in MARD and a number of permanent members who represent the range of ministries and organizations that are involved in water resources management in the country (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, pp.178-179).

As a result of all these changes, the country is moving away from *"a water sector that is fragmented and weakly coordinated"* and is instead approaching a *"more holistic, decentralized and integrated management of the country's water resources at the river basin level"* (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p. 178).

State centered

It is of importance to understand the concept of State management that is prominent in Vietnam. *"State management gives pre-eminence to the State across a wide range of public decisions. The key actor in this is the government, which is embodied in the office of the Prime Minister. Ultimate State management responsibility resides here, and the most important decisions are made by this office."* Although this concept of State management (which is applied to State companies) seems to evolve slowly to allow more autonomy, it still forms a strong and integral part of Vietnam's governance (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, pp.178-179).

A lot of companies that play a part in the Vietnamese public administration are created by government ministries and departments at both national and provincial levels. These companies are owned by the State and typically closely attached to their parent ministry or department. They often share staff, functions and budgetary resources. But, *"[t]he government is moving slowly to privatize*

these engineering design and construction companies, and to put them into competition with a growing number of private firms in the same field.” However, in practice the private firms are for the most part limited to subcontractor roles and lots of functions are still reserved for State firms (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, pp.179-180).

This represents the great role of the State in water resources management. Actors in basin management in Vietnam tend to be government organizations rather than associations of individuals, trade organizations and other civil society groups. (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p. 179). Also, *“Civil society organizations, such as trade and professional groups, commodity producers, environmental and other issue based non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and landowner groups are nonexistent or relatively unimportant in Vietnam, at least in so far as water resources and agriculture are concerned.”* This absence of stakeholder representation in Vietnam has to be taken into consideration when designing basin management organizations and discussing their future development (Svendsen, Ringler & Duy Son, 2005, p.183). More recent resources tell a different story however. *“While the private sector is still limited in size, it is evident that it is growing and will engage in a much wider range of activities in the future. This could include self-management [...], provision of water delivery services and collecting water fees, rehabilitation of these works, provision of labor force and skilled workers to implement water works, supplying goods and accessories in water related sectors, provision of technological application and training services”* (SIWRP, 2011, p.36). Also, it is stated that hundreds of NGO’s in Vietnam are operating both nationally and internationally. Water sector problems are treated by a number of these NGO’s (SIWRP, 2011, p.35). Apparently, Vietnam has already taken some big steps in its evolution of water resource management.

To answer sub-question 3; in short we can say that water management in Vietnam is organized as follows: it’s formally divided into nine basins for water resource planning, the Law on Water Resources of 1999 and several other laws and regulation (like the Environmental Protection Law (1993) and the Ministerial Instruction) play an important part in the water management and the management is state centred.

3.2 Vietnamese experience with stakeholder participation

To answer sub-question 4 (*What experience does Vietnam have with stakeholder participation so far?*), some experiences that Vietnam has already had with stakeholder participation projects will be described. In the literature three examples of Vietnamese projects were found that included stakeholder participation.

In a research report about irrigation and water policies in the Mekong region that discusses current discourses and practices, debates between stakeholders are described: *“debates [...] are sometimes lively but often limited to discursive struggles through the media or publications. [...] Tensions between local management and the necessity to integrate uses at the basin level, contradictions between top-down blueprint-based state policies, the diversity/complexity of local settings, conflicts between recommendations or “best practices” drawn from global “toolboxes” and stakeholders’ aspirations are pervasive. Enabling governance structures for water management in the Mekong region will be a journey towards bridging these divides.”* (Molle, 2005). So this case is an example of a stakeholder participation project, but there are a lot of aspects (like tensions between local management, contradictions between top-down blueprint-based state policies, etc.) that keep the stakeholders divided and are in the way of successful stakeholder participation.

Another project that brings stakeholders together is Vietwater. In 2012, UBM (a global events-led marketing and communications services business) organised an event called Vietwater. It will be held in October 2013 again. This event is promoted as ‘Vietnam’s no.1 international water supply, sanitation, industrial wastewater treatment & purification event’. Vietwater is a comprehensive event that will showcase a wide range of services, technologies, systems, purification processes and equipment for the Integrated Water & Wastewater Industry, including for example

water resource management, industrial water treatment, wastewater treatment and management and sewerage and pollution prevention (Vietwater, 2013). So this event seems to try to bring stakeholders together and give them more and comprehensive information.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), a global environmental organization, also started a water programme in the Mekong region. The programme focusses on the Mekong river basin and tries to mobilise grassroots engagement and facilitate high-level dialogue for transboundary water management (IUCN, 2012). Including grassroots organisations also is a good example of stakeholder participation.

So, to answer sub-question 4, the examples mentioned above are a few examples of projects that entail stakeholder participation that have taken or are taking place in Vietnam. It was hard to find more examples of stakeholder participation projects in Vietnam. So, apparently Vietnam does not have that much (documented and available) experience with stakeholder participation yet.

4 Vietnamese water management and successful stakeholder participation

In this chapter, sub-question 5 (*To what extent are conditions for successful stakeholder participation present in water management in Vietnam?*) will be answered by evaluating practice on the basis of literature. The literature used consist of six scientific sources, which now will be introduced shortly.

In an article by Duc and Truong (2003), some suggestions for improvement of water management in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC) are proposed. A report by the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research (2009) studied the river basin management of five areas in the Asia-Pacific region, including Vietnam (Red river and Mekong river basin). An article by Vo (2008), argues that a shift to a new paradigm of water resources management is necessary to underpin the on-going industrialization and modernization in HCMC. In another article by Vo (2007), research about stakeholders is being done. Dan et al. (2011) write in their article about lowering the Water Stress Index in HCMC. Van Buuren has written a thesis about a participatory multi-criteria method for drainage and sanitation system selection in developing cities applied in HCMC. In this thesis, he discusses a sanitation and urban upgrading project that entails stakeholder participation.

Findings from these six sources were interpreted and held next to the list of conditions, as given in table 2 in chapter 2.2 (sub-question 2). A detailed description of these interpretations is to be found in Appendix 1. By studying the six sources, the conditions could be marked present, not present, or in some form present but needing adjustment or more intenseness. This resulted in table 3, presented hereunder.

Stakeholder conditions	D&T	APN	Vo	Dan	vB
1. Important stakeholders perceive a situation as undesirable; there should be a shared sense of urgency in society to improve the quality of an area. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)	o		xo		
2. Those stakeholders who are absolutely indispensable in making strategic decisions and implementing policies are willing to participate. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)			o		o
3. Stakeholders with similar backgrounds and representing similar interests should be organized and speak with one voice. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)		o			
4. Stakeholders should (be able to) respect each other’s opinions and commitment. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)					

5. Stakeholders have insight into mutual interdependencies and take major dependency relations between public and private actors into account. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)		x			
6. Stakeholders should be able to incorporate new knowledge and views. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)		-	-		
7. There must be a good community understanding of risk and effective tools to allow users to make informed decisions in coping with uncertainty in allocation. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)					o
8. Participants must be willing to negotiate with each other: they must have enough scope to defend their own interests, but are also willing to consider new ideas and solutions. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)		o	o		
9. Participants should have flexible mandates from their constituencies and the representatives should have authority within their stakeholders' community. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)					
10. Personal and financial means are made available to organize and to participate in the process; stakeholders are willing and able to organize or host meetings, put forward discussion topics and time schedules. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)	o				o
11. Stakeholders have a clear image of the role they have to play (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66). Dieperink et al. also stress that it is important that the stakeholders participating in the process are aware of the success conditions. This is because in this way the participants get the responsibility to meet these conditions. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.69)	-				-
Process conditions					
12. The process should be transparent (at least within the stakeholders' community) and clearly documented. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)	o				
13. Intermediate and small step results should be emphasized to show the added value of the approach and act as a catalyst for next steps. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)					
14. The results are accepted in formal political decision-making processes. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)					
15. Process results can be formalized using existing legal instruments. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)					
16. Apart from the politically responsible initiator a dedicated neutral and skilled process manager should be present who organizes the entire process in such a way that participants are kept at the table, remain interested and learning. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)					
17. There must be effective water measurement, both of the available resource and actual use, to establish and maintain a viable water accounting system (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)					
18. There must be clear specification of rights or licences or shares to a resource. Some form of volumetrically-based specification is essential and is likely to be a necessary step to developing more sophisticated property rights systems. This must include a transparent process of registering and quantifying existing and customary rights to water use. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)				o	
19. There must be effective hydrological tools that allow planners and managers to take full account of medium- and long-term variability in hydrology and in resource availability. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)					
20. There should be good governance: initiatives have to be developed that bring stakeholders together, get them to communicate with each other and develop creative ideas (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)	o		-		-
21. There should be coordination: different activities have to be geared towards each other, allowing parties to act in concert (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)	--	-	- o		o

22. There should be monitoring: monitoring is important for being thorough with regard to content and legal, financial and administrative issues (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)					
23. There should be accountability: accountability calls for reporting on all activities that take place in the course of the policy process (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)	o				

Table 3: Success conditions for successful stakeholder participation, marked according to literature

x = condition is present in (parts of) Vietnam

o = condition is in some form present in (parts of) Vietnam, but needs to be adjusted or intensified

- = condition is not present in Vietnam

D&T: Article by Duc & Truong (Duc & Truong, 2003)

APN: Report by Asia-Pacific Network (APNGCR, 2009)

Vo: Two articles by Vo (Vo, 2008 and Vo, 2007)

Dan: Article by Dan et al. (Dan et al., 2011)

vB: Thesis by van Buuren (Buuren, van, 2010)

Now, the results from table 3 that have more than one mark will be discussed. (There is not much foundation to say something about a condition that has only one mark.) In the interview with Joost van Buuren, a Vietnam expert, these results were also brought before him. Therefore, some results from the interview will be mentioned. A report of the entire interview is to be found in Appendix 2.

The first condition that stands out is condition 1. The conditions got marked with an 'o' two times. This is marked this way because laws are not always enforced by stakeholders and not all inhabitants have enough knowledge and information about the water situation in their city. But there also seems to be situations where water concerns have drawn attention from various stakeholders, therefore condition 1 also got marked one 'x'. Van Buuren agrees more with this latter view, when thinking of Vietnamese inhabitants (see Appendix 2). He states that, in general, people really tend to form a strong opinion about situations. The public often uses media to express their opinion. Sometimes there are even pretty heavy conflicts between companies and citizens.

The second condition that stands out is condition 2, which got marked with an 'o' two times. This is because in projects, some stakeholders did not have enough knowledge to participate in the project or not all stakeholders are mobilized enough to be able to participate.

The third condition that stands out is condition 6, which got marked with an '-' two times. This is because there is still a major struggle to get institutional arrangements or cooperation structures among different elements of the bureaucracy working together and the government is not willing to incorporate the ideas of for example urban dwellers, who don't get access to information. Van Buuren agrees with this and adds that the government often really stresses capacity building and awareness raising, but does not create the objective situations that enable an incorporation of new knowledge and views.

Condition 8 was marked with an 'o' two times. This was especially because stakeholders did not seem to have enough scope to defend themselves. Some stakeholders did not get access to information, and other stakeholders tended to overestimate themselves. When one overestimates itself, one sets goals but does not have the ability to realize them. This is not a good way to negotiate, because while negotiating one has to have a clear and truthful image of what the other has to offer.

Condition 10 got marked with an 'o' twice, because stakeholders were not willing or able to organize meetings etc. or stakeholders didn't have enough willingness and capacity to involve the community.

Condition 11 got marked with a '-' twice, because stakeholders did not have a clear image of the role they had to play. There were ill-defined responsibilities or unclear management and a lack of cooperation. Van Buuren adds that this is an important condition. It has to be clear what the roles of stakeholders are and how these roles relate to each other, otherwise it is very difficult to have

stakeholders participate successfully.

Condition 20 is an important condition. Vo states that a failure of governance underlies most environmental problems (see Appendix 1). In table 3 the condition got marked with an 'o' and two '-s'. This is because there was no development of initiatives that bring stakeholders together and get them to communicate in the *early* stage of the process, and because the government refuses to put water supply higher on the agenda in most cities. Also, another project had inadequate local governance. Van Buuren adds that creating a good governance structure is complicated, because it takes a lot of time. Slowly but surely there has to arise some kind of consensus. But this takes a lot of time, a lot of consideration, consultation, and 'poldering'. But not every country possesses this 'polder model' culture.

Condition 21 scores an '-' four times and an 'o' twice. In a lot of scientific articles it stood out that coordination is not (or only to very little extent) present in Vietnam. Van Buuren points to the fact that this is a big problem in a lot of countries.

There are already a few 'x's' in table 3, and a lot of 'o's' have been placed, which can be worked out to become 'x's'. But unfortunately there are also a lot of '-s' in the table; here Vietnam still has some work to do if it wants stakeholders to participate successfully. To answer sub-question 5; conditions for successful stakeholder participation seem to be present to a limited extent in water management in Vietnam. Key challenges include for example gearing different activities towards each other, allowing parties to act in concert (coordination), achieving good governance and creating the ability to incorporate new knowledge and views.

5 Discussion

The evaluative research that has been done in this thesis concerns mainly a literature analysis. It was hard to find a lot of country-specific literature, and a lot of literature used was only about one specific part of Vietnam: the Mekong region or HCMC. I think it was particularly hard to find country-specific literature because 'water management' is a very broad concept. Maybe it would have been easier when the focus would have been on one specific form of water management, like drinking water, agricultural water or waste water. Also, filling out table 3 was done according to scientific articles, but it did of course require some form of interpretation. Therefore, this part of the analysis might be dictated by my unconscious social prejudices, values and personal experiences. I also wonder if a literature analysis is a well-chosen method for this thesis. If one really wants to be able to make grounded statements about successful stakeholder participation conditions in water management in Vietnam, I think one has to go to the country and conduct for example a case-study and a stakeholder analysis. Luckily, aspects of this did come forward a little bit in the interview, because the Vietnam expert (van Buuren) did have a lot of experience in Vietnam.

All in all the research done in this thesis resulted in a lot of information about stakeholder participation in Vietnam. But one question that remains for me lies at the heart of this thesis. Answering the central question indicates that stakeholder participation is suitable for Vietnam. But stakeholder participation and the polder model are very democratic approaches, while – like discussed in chapter 3 – Vietnam seems to be a very State centred country and the views of Vietnamese on the stakeholder participation approach have not been considered in this thesis. So for me the question remains if stakeholder participation is the best approach for water management in Vietnam. Nevertheless, the results of this thesis can be useful, because in order to discover whether or not stakeholder participation might be a good approach for Vietnam, it is important to consider the presence and absence of conditions for it.

6 Conclusion

The question that was central to this thesis runs as follows: *'What opportunities does Vietnamese water management provide for successful stakeholder participation?'.* A literature analysis, complemented by an interview with a Vietnam expert, resulted in a lot of information. Conditions are present to a limited extent, but Vietnamese water management does provide opportunities for successful stakeholder participation. To answer the central question; we can say that the conditions which were marked as present are opportunities for successful stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam. The conditions that were marked as in some form present (but needing adjustment or more intenseness) can also be seen as opportunities, since they can be worked out to become fully present. The conditions that are marked as non-present are no opportunities, but rather barriers for successful stakeholder participation. Some conditions did not come up in the selected literature at all, so on the basis of this thesis nothing could be said about opportunities with regard to those conditions.

This thesis has provided insight in possibilities for stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam and therefore might turn out helpful for Dutch partners that intend to market the 'polder model' to Vietnam. It could also form the background for a more philosophical debate on the question whether Vietnam should adopt a stakeholder participation approach. To improve this research, I suggest doing it in Vietnam. Also, it might be useful to make a distinction between the presence of conditions for successful stakeholder participation in different areas of water management, for example irrigation water, drinking water and waste water. The presence of these conditions might differ among sectors. For further research, I suggest researching the views of inhabitants of Vietnam on stakeholder participation. If they are comfortable with such an approach, a research about improving the conditions for successful stakeholder participation mentioned in this thesis might be interesting. But even if the conditions are present in Vietnam, and the stakeholder participation model could technically be transferred to Vietnam, there is no formula for doing so yet. It is not just a matter of copying and pasting. Therefore, this might also be a relevant topic for further research.

List of References

- APNGCR (2009). *Reducing water insecurity through stakeholder participation in river basin management in the Asia-Pacific*. Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research. Project Reference Number: ARCP2009-03CMY-Nikitina. Retrieved from <http://www.apngcr.org/resources/archive/files/4010d468435f760b5883fa0b96ecf4f8.pdf> on 5/6/2013.
- Beierle, T.C. (2002). *The quality of stakeholder-based decisions*. Risk Analysis, volume 22, issue 4, pp. 739-749.
- Bressers, J.Th.A. (1998). *De evaluatie van beleid*. Uit: A. Hoogerwerf en M. Herweijer (red.) (1998). *Overheidsbeleid. Een inleiding in de beleidswetenschap*. Alphen aan den Rijn: Samson, pp. 119---140.
- Butterworth, J., Warner, J., Moriarty, P., Smits, S. & Batchelor, C. (2010). *Finding practical approaches to integrated water resources management*. Water Alternatives, volume 3, issue 1, pp.68-81.
- Buuren, van, J.C.L. (2010). *Sanitation Choice Involving Stakeholders: A participatory multi-criteria method for drainage and sanitation system selection in developing cities applied in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*. Wageningen: Wageningen University.
- Dan, N.P., Khoa, L.V. , Thanh, B. X., Nga, P. T. & Visvanathan, C. (2011). *Potential of Wastewater Reclamation to Reduce Fresh Water Stress in Ho Chi Minh City-Vietnam*. Journal of Water Sustainability, volume 1, issue 3, pp.279-287.
- Dieperink, C., Boesten, R., Hovens, J. & Tonkes, H. (2012). *Sustainable coastal development and open planning? Transferring the integrated area approach to Bulgaria*. Sustainable Development, volume 20, issue 1, pp. 58-70. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/doi/10.1002/sd.464/full> on 5/5/2013.
- Duc, H.N. & Truong, T.P. (2003). *Water resources and environment in and around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*. Electronic Green Journal [1076-7975] Duc, H N yr:2003, issue 19.
- Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2012). *Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and water management in Vietnam*. [video online] Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vYwok1B9ypY> on 9/5/2013.
- Edelenbos, J. (diss.) (2000). *Proces in vorm. Procesbegeleiding van interactieve beleidsvorming over lokale ruimtelijke projecten*. Utrecht: Lemma.
- Eldert, van, B. (2013). *Hoogwaterlessen prima exportproduct*. Newspaper article in the Dutch newspaper *Algemeen Dagblad* of Friday March 22nd, 2013 about lessons of high water being a good export product. Byline by Bart van Eldert. Section: Algemeen – Economie, p.19, length: 556 words.
- Graaf, de, L. (2007). *Gedragen beleid*. Delft: Eburon.
- GWP (2008). *Website page "Vietnam: Water Law and related legislation for implementation of IWRM (#112)"*. Global Water Partnership (GWP) Toolbox: Integrated Water Resources Management. Retrieved from http://www.gwptoolbox.org/index.php?option=com_case&id=68 on 11/6/13.

IUCN (2012). *Mekong River Basin: Mobilising grassroots engagement and facilitating high-level dialogue for transboundary water management*. IUCN water programme, demonstration case study no.3, by IUCN & Water and Nature Initiative (WANI). Retrieved from <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/2012-009.pdf> on 11/6/2013.

Korff, von, Y., Daniell, K.A., Moellenkamp, S., Bots, P. & Bijlsma, R.M. (2012). *Implementing participatory water management: Recent advances in theory, practice, and evaluation*. Ecology and Society, volume 17, number 1, article 30. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-04733-170130> on 9/5/2013.

Lamers, M., Ottow, B., Francois, G. & Korff, von, Y. (2010). *Beyond dry feet? Experiences from a participatory water-management planning case in the Netherlands*. Ecology and Society, volume 15, number 1, article 14. Retrieved from <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss1/art14/> on 9/5/2013.

MacMillan (2013). *Webpage of MacMillan Dictionary on the definition of 'condition'*. Macmillan Publishers Limited 2009-2013. Retrieved from <http://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/condition> on 5/5/2013.

Malano, H.M., Bryant, M.J. & Turrall, H.N. (1999). *Management of water resources: Can Australian experiences be transferred to Vietnam?* Water International, volume 24, issue 4, pp.307-315. Retrieved from: <http://www.tandfonline.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/doi/abs/10.1080/02508069908692182#.UYyqP7UvUXA> on 5/5/2013.

Manzungu, E. & Kujinga, K. (2004). *Enduring contestations: Stakeholder strategic action in water resource management in the save catchment area, Eastern Zimbabwe*. Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review, volume 20, issue 1, pp.67-91.

Moglia, M., Neumann, L.E., Alexander, K.S., Nguyen, M.N., Sharma, A.K., Cook, S., Trung, N.H. & Tuan, D.D.A. (2012). *Application of the Water Needs Index: Can Tho City, Mekong Delta, Vietnam*. Journal of hydrology, Volume: 468-469 (October 25, 2012), pp. 203-212.

Molle, F. (2005). *Irrigation and water policies in the Mekong region: Current discourses and practices*. Colombo, Sri Lanka: IWMI. 43p (Research report 95). Retrieved from <http://www.cabdirect.org.proxy.library.uu.nl/abstracts/20093261024.html;jsessionid=9660E70BD60FEFDDAEF3C3EF7E2E6572> on 5/5/2013.

Pröpper, I & Steenbeek, D. (2001). *De aanpak van interactief beleid: elke situatie is anders*. Bussum: Coutinho.

Reed, M.S. (2008). *Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review*. Biological Conservation, volume 141, issue 10, pp.2417-2431.

Renaud, F.G. & Kuenzer, C. (2012). *The Mekong Delta System: Interdisciplinary analyses of a river delta*. Springer Environmental Science and Engineering, XV, p.463. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1007/978-94-007-3962-8> on 25/4/2013.

Rowe, G. & Frewer, L.J. (2000). *Public participation methods: A framework for evaluation*. Science Technology & Human Values, volume 25, number 1, pp.3-29. Retrieved from <http://sth.sagepub.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/content/25/1/3.full.pdf+html> on 5/5/2013.

Rowe, G. & Frewer, L.J. (2005). *A typology of public engagement mechanisms*. Science Technology & Human Values, volume 30, number 2, pp. 251-290. Retrieved from <http://sth.sagepub.com.proxy.library.uu.nl/content/30/2/251.full.pdf+html> on 5/5/2013.

SIWRP (2011). Vietnam-Netherlands Mekong Delta Masterplan project: DRAFT REPORT ON WATER FOR FOOD IN THE MEKONG DELTA. Retrieved from <http://www.partnersvoorwater.nl/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/WATERFORFOODfinaldraft.pdf> on 27/05/2013.

Svendsen, M., Ringler, C. & Duy Son, N. (2005). *Water resource management in the Dong Nai basin: Current allocation processes and perspectives for the future*. Chapter 10 of: Svendsen, M. (2005). *Irrigation and river basin management : options for governance and institutions*. [electronic resource] Retrieved from <http://www.cabi.org.proxy.library.uu.nl/CABeBooks/default.aspx?site=107&page=45&LoadModule=PDFHier&BookID=241> on 9/5/2013.

Vietnam Embassy (2013). *Website of the embassy of the socialist republic of Vietnam in the Kingdom of the Netherlands*. Retrieved from http://www.vietnamembassy.nl/en/nr070521165956/news_object_view?newsPath=/vnemb.vn/cn_vakv/euro/nr040819111317/ns070921100044 on 11/5/2013.

Vietwater (2013). *Website about the event Vietwater*. Retrieved from <http://www.vietwater.com/contact/index.html> on 11/5/2013.

Vo, P.L. (2007). *Formulation of an integrated approach to sustainable water management in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/2440/49486/1/02whole.pdf> on 13/5/2013.

Vo, P.L. (2008). *Urbanization and water management in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam-issues, challenges and perspectives*. *GeoJournal* (2007), 70, pp.75–89. DOI 10.1007/s10708-008-9115-2.

Webler, T., Tuler, S. and R. Krueger (2001). What is a good public participation process? Five perspectives from the public. *Environmental Management*, 27(3): 435-450.

Appendix 1:

Presence of conditions for successful stakeholder participation in water management in Vietnam

The findings from four articles were interpreted and compared to the list of conditions, as given in table 2 in chapter 2.2 (also presented on the last page of this appendix). This is a description of this interpretation and comparison, which resulted in table 3 (see chapter 5, on page 12-14).

Article by Duc & Truong

In an article by Duc and Truong, entitled *Water resources and environment in and around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam* (2003), some suggestions for improvement of water management in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC) are proposed. The authors start by elaborating on public participation. Public participation is organised via public campaigns in the environmental issues in HCMC. The press media is a means through which the local population expresses its meaning, concerns and complaints. Demonstrations are very rare though. However, the situation seems to be changing, because people are more aware of the environmental situation and the public demands more transparency and accountability (Duc & Truong, 2003, p.8-9). This has to do with condition 12 (transparency) and 23 (accountability) in the upper table. These two conditions are in HCMC apparently conditions that need to be strengthened.

Duc and Truong also bring to the attention that both the local government and the local population are taking up flexible and innovative measures. So it looks like at least aspects of condition 1 (shared sense of urgency) are present in HCMC. However, this contrasts with *“the weakness in the area of enforcement of the environment law by the various responsible agencies and with the lack of coordination between agencies established at different levels of governments or in different regions”* (Duc & Truong, 2003, p.9). So condition 1 probably does need some adjustment, and condition 21 (coordination) is absent in HCMC, Vietnam.

The authors also state that public participation in the environmental review processes should be addressed and enhanced. Besides having the public express their complaints through the press, it is also beneficial to bring about earlier public consultation well before the outcomes of any environment decisions or development plans (Duc & Truong, 2003, p.10 & p.15). But this doesn't happen enough in HCMC. This points to the (partial) absence of condition 20 (good governance), because there is no development of initiatives that bring stakeholders together and get them to communicate in the early stage of the process. So condition 20 needs improvement. And apparently, not all stakeholders are willing and able to organize or host meetings, put forward discussion topics and time schedules (condition 10), otherwise earlier public consultation would have been arranged. It can also have to do with the absence of a dedicated neutral and skilled process manager (condition 16), but the authors do not mention this in the article.

The authors also point to the lack of cooperation and clear management roles between the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) and the Department of Science, Technology and Environment (DOSTE), who(m?) are managing the surface and underground water resources and environment (Duc & Truong, 2003, p.14). So DARD and DOSTE do not have a clear image of the role they play (condition 11), and again condition 21 (coordination) proves itself to be absent, because their different activities are not geared towards each other, therefore not allowing DARD and DOSTE to act in concert.

Report by APN

A report by the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research, entitled *Reducing water insecurity through stakeholder participation in river basin management in the Asia-Pacific*, studied the river basin management of five areas in the Asia-Pacific region, including Vietnam (Red river and Mekong river basin). Analysis of stakeholder interests, goals and needs in many cases showed that in

practice these do not always correspond to the stakeholder's capacities and abilities to realize them. Usually, the most powerful and active groups are those whose interests and ability to take actions – correlate (APNGCR, 2009, p.20). This indicates that condition 8 (willingness to negotiate) is not fully present. Namely, the participants do not have enough scope to defend their own interest: they tend to overestimate themselves, when they set goals but do not have the ability to realize them (like is stated in the report).

In Vietnam, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) and Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MoNRE) are major actors in water management and about 90% of finance is provided by the public sector (APNGCR, 2009, p.20). So the role of the government authorities is high. It can probably be said that stakeholders have insight into mutual interdependencies and take major dependency relations between public and private actors into account (condition 5).

The report also compares differences in legal framework between countries. *“Vietnam passed its framework “Law on Water Resources” in 1998; in contrast the draft water law in Thailand has been in discussion for more than a decade without being passed. This fundamental difference in legal framework has made rather little difference to practice or performance. In Vietnam there is still a major struggle to get institutional arrangements or cooperation structures among different elements of the bureaucracy working together”* (APNGCR, 2009, p.25). So there is some work left to do if the Vietnamese want the conditions 6 (ability of stakeholders to incorporate new views) and 21 (coordination) to be present in their country.

The authors also state that local participation in local management and decision-making is often not translated into a voice when it comes to large water infrastructure projects (APNGCR, 2009, p.31). The only means that for example poor farmers and fishers have to influence decision-making are protest, mass-media and networking (APNGCR, 2009, p.31). So condition 3 (organization of similar stakeholders) is often not present in local management and needs to be intensified. The authors also state that further expansion of public participation in water management in Vietnam could be achieved by strengthening and implementing the existing framework. The media could also play a role here (APNGCR, 2009, p.30). So apparently the existing framework is working, but needs to be strengthened and implemented better.

Articles by Vo

An article by Vo, entitled *Urbanization and water management in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam-issues, challenges and perspectives* (2008), argues that a shift to a new paradigm of water resources management is necessary to underpin the ongoing industrialization and modernization in Ho Chi Minh City (Vo, 2008). Vo construes that, in general, a failure of governance (condition 20) underlies most environmental problems. Namely, in most cities, the lack of piped water supply is not the result of fresh water resources shortages, but of the government refusing to put water supply higher on the agenda (Vo, 2008, p.83).

The article also pointed out some strengths and weaknesses of management practices of water resources in HCMC. A strength of the management is that water concerns have drawn attention from various stakeholders and interest groups (Vo, 2008, p.86). This is a clear indication that condition 1 (shared sense of urgency) is present in HCMC, Vietnam. A weakness that was identified is the fact that the planning, development and management of water resources have been fragmented among a number of agencies or departments. This sometimes leads to conflicting missions or goals. Also, a lack of horizontal coordination between government departments that leads to overlapping responsibilities and missions (Vo, 2008, p.86). This points to the absence of condition 21 (coordination), because there is a lack of coordination and the activities are not geared towards each other but fragmented, which causes the parties to be unable to fully act in concert.

In another article by Vo, *Formulation of an integrated approach to sustainable water management in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam* (2007), research about stakeholders is being done. *“The research results show that stakeholders have different perceptions of water resources. Overall, water value has been considered as a social and economic good by both the urban respondents and*

government officials. However, most urban residents view water as a social good rather than an economic one. Public involvement in the water sector is limited. Most urban dwellers have little understanding and knowledge about the city's (HCMC) water issues or the available channels to access information on water resources" (Vo, 2007, p.ii). The authors also propose educating the stakeholders better, because the stakeholders often do not have enough knowledge about water management and about the value of water resources (Vo, 2007). So in this case, there needs to be more focus on condition 21 (coordination), because the stakeholders have different perceptions of water resources. Their activities and perceptions should be geared to each other much more. Also, urban dwellers have little understanding and knowledge about the city's water issues, so Vietnam has to focus on condition 1 (shared sense of urgency) more as well, because now the urban dwellers do not necessarily perceive the situation as undesirable because they do not have enough knowledge of the situation. This also affects condition 2 (participation of indispensable stakeholders). The urban dwellers also do not have access to information on water resources. In this way, they do not have enough scope to defend their own interests and consider new ideas and solutions. So condition 8 (negotiation) also needs adjustment in HCMC. But, for all this to work, government officials have to be able to incorporate new knowledge and views (condition 6) from for example the urban dwellers, which now does not seem to be the case.

Article by Dan et al.

Dan et al., in their article *Potential of Wastewater Reclamation to Reduce Fresh Water Stress in Ho Chi Minh City-Vietnam* (2011), state that good policies are important, because then for example water can be reused, which will lower the Water Stress Index in HCMC: "If HCMC authority has right policies to encourage and even forcing the wastewater reuse, total reclaimed water demand can be up to 2.3 million m³/day, which lower WSI to 10%." (Dan et al., 2011, p.286). This can be connected to condition 18 (rights or licences), which apparently could be intensified or adjusted in Vietnam.

Thesis by Van Buuren

Van Buuren has written a thesis entitled *SANitation CHOice Involving Stakeholders (SANCHIS): A participatory multi-criteria method for drainage and sanitation system selection in developing cities applied in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam*. In this thesis, he discusses a sanitation and urban upgrading project that was done at the Tan Hoa - Lo Gom canal. Overcoming flooding seemed the hardest infrastructure problem in the project zone, because great interventions in land heightening, water retention basins and/or run-off pumping would have been needed. Steps have also been taken to bring the state-actors and system end-users together in the planning process (Buuren, van, 2010, p.282).

Evaluation of the project led to the conclusion that a lot of work is to be done at the level of city authorities, "to increase willingness and capacity to take the road of community involvement in future upgrading projects" (Buuren, van, 2010, p.281). So it seems like condition 10 (personal and financial means) needs to be intensified, because the stakeholders do not seem willing and able to organize or host meetings for example. Later on in the project, the project staff also became aware of the need of community self-management (Buuren, van, 2010, p.282). Apparently, this did not happen, probably due to a lack of community understanding or a lack of tools or information. Therefore, condition 7 (community understanding) needs to become more intense. It also became clear that one of the societal weaknesses of the project at household and neighborhood level was inadequate local governance with regard to land management, plan implementation and building supervision (Buuren, van, 2010, p.283). In this case, again, good governance (condition 20) does not seem to be present. Some societal weaknesses at city and river basin level were also set out. It is stated that there is "inadequate land management, planning and plan enforcement due to ill-defined

responsibilities, lack of coordination and lack of technical capacity and political strength amongst urban institutions” (Buuren, van, 2010, p.284). The ill-defined responsibilities indicate that stakeholders do not have a clear image of the role they have to play (condition 11). Condition 21 (coordination) also does not seem to be present in a good way yet, which also becomes clear of other weaknesses: it is stated that there is “inadequate coordination among stakeholders in infrastructure development and environmental protection” and a “lack of coordinated and adequate urban research and information exchange” (Buuren, van, 2010, p.284). The coordination apparently needs to be adjusted because it is not present in an adequate way. It is also said that the project ran into “insufficient mobilization of communities and local human resources for infrastructure improvement and environmental protection” (Buuren, van, 2010, p.284). It seems that not all stakeholders that are indispensable are willing to participate, because they are not mobilized yet. So there is some work to be done to reach a situation in which condition 2 (participation of indispensable stakeholders) is present.

Stakeholder conditions
1. Important stakeholders perceive a situation as undesirable; there should be a shared sense of urgency in society to improve the quality of an area. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
2. Those stakeholders who are absolutely indispensable in making strategic decisions and implementing policies are willing to participate. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
3. Stakeholders with similar backgrounds and representing similar interests should be organized and speak with one voice. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
4. Stakeholders should (be able to) respect each other's opinions and commitment. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
5. Stakeholders have insight into mutual interdependencies and take major dependency relations between public and private actors into account. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
6. Stakeholders should be able to incorporate new knowledge and views. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
7. There must be a good community understanding of risk and effective tools to allow users to make informed decisions in coping with uncertainty in allocation. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
8. Participants must be willing to negotiate with each other: they must have enough scope to defend their own interests, but are also willing to consider new ideas and solutions. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
9. Participants should have flexible mandates from their constituencies and the representatives should have authority within their stakeholders' community. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
10. Personal and financial means are made available to organize and to participate in the process; stakeholders are willing and able to organize or host meetings, put forward discussion topics and time schedules. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
11. Stakeholders have a clear image of the role they have to play (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66). Dieperink et al. also stress that it is important that the stakeholders participating in the process are aware of the success conditions. This is because in this way the participants get the responsibility to meet these conditions. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.69)
Process conditions
12. The process should be transparent (at least within the stakeholders' community) and clearly documented. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
13. Intermediate and small step results should be emphasized to show the added value of the approach and act as a catalyst for next steps. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
14. The results are accepted in formal political decision-making processes. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
15. Process results can be formalized using existing legal instruments. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
16. Apart from the politically responsible initiator a dedicated neutral and skilled process manager should be present who organizes the entire process in such a way that participants are kept at the table, remain interested and learning. (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.66)
17. There must be effective water measurement, both of the available resource and actual use, to establish and maintain a viable water accounting system (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
18. There must be clear specification of rights or licences or shares to a resource. Some form of volumetrically-based specification is essential and is likely to be a necessary step to developing more sophisticated property rights systems. This must include a transparent process of registering and quantifying existing and customary rights to water use. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
19. There must be effective hydrological tools that allow planners and managers to take full account of medium- and long-term variability in hydrology and in resource availability. (Malano, Bryant & Turrall, 1999, p.314)
20. There should be good governance: initiatives have to be developed that bring stakeholders together, get them to communicate with each other and develop creative ideas (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)
21. There should be coordination: different activities have to be geared towards each other, allowing parties to act in concert (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)
22. There should be monitoring: monitoring is important for being thorough with regard to content and legal, financial and administrative issues (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)
23. There should be accountability: accountability calls for reporting on all activities that take place in the course of the policy process (Dieperink et al., 2012, p.61)

Table 2: Success conditions for successful stakeholder participation (retrieved from chapter 2.2)

Appendix 2:

Report of an interview with Joost van Buuren (Vietnam expert) [in Dutch]

Het interview met dr.ir. J.C.L. (Joost) van Buuren is op 11 juni 2013 van 16:00-17:00 uur te Wageningen afgenomen door Jacqueline Schoneveld. Het interview werd gehouden naar aanleiding van de bachelor thesis die de interviewer destijds schreef. Het doel van het interview was dan ook te achterhalen hoe Van Buuren over de onderwerpen dacht die in de thesis naar voren kwamen, om zo tot een genuanceerder perspectief te kunnen komen.

Van Buuren is lange tijd staflid geweest van de vakgroep Milieutechnologie in Wageningen. Hij heeft zich vooral bezig gehouden met afvalwaterzuivering en gedurende de laatste jaren ook met vast-afval verwerking. Hij heeft vanaf de jaren '70 veel ervaring met projecten in ontwikkelingslanden opgedaan. Hij is actief geweest in o.a. de Kaapverdische eilanden, Tanzania, Mozambique (Afrika) en Vietnam (Azië). Met name in Vietnam heeft hij veel ervaring (sinds de jaren '82). Hij is sinds 2009 gepensioneerd, maar is zeker nog niet helemaal teruggetrokken uit het werk. Hij is bijvoorbeeld nog steeds betrokken bij de vakgroep Milieutechnologie.

In dit verslag wordt beschreven hoe Van Buuren over stakeholderparticipatie in watermanagement in Vietnam heeft gesproken.

Het land Vietnam

Vietnam heeft zo'n 80 miljoen inwoners, maar in het zuiden en het noorden is het veel dichter bevolkt dan in het midden. Midden-Vietnam is een bergachtig gebied. De industrie zit vooral gecentreerd in Hanoi en in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC). HCMC telt circa 8 miljoen inwoners. Op de vraag of Van Buuren Vietnam vandaag de dag als een ontwikkelingsland zou bestempelen, antwoordt hij dat hij dit een lastige vraag vindt. Er zijn namelijk enorme verschillen in Vietnam. HCMC is bijvoorbeeld al een enorm sterk ontwikkeld gebied, maar als men naar de hooglanden of naar midden-Vietnam afreist, dan komt men – vooral op het platteland – in best arme omstandigheden terecht. Vietnam is als geheel dus nog niet heel sterk ontwikkeld. Er zijn veel ontwikkelde gebieden, maar er zijn grote verschillen in de maatschappij. Dit is op het moment erg typerend voor ontwikkelende landen.

Er is in Vietnam veel water; er is veel regenval en er zijn veel stromen water. Maar er is ook veel watergebruik, vooral in het zuiden van het land. Er is namelijk veel industrie, veel bevolking, veel landbouw en daarnaast hebben de Vietnamezen wateronttrekkingsproblemen met de zee (zout intrusie). De kwaliteit van de rivieren wordt dus steeds minder, men moet steeds hoger op gaan met het innemen van rivierwater omdat er verzilting van het zoete water optreedt. Maar het klimaat in Vietnam kent ook grote verschillen. Van december tot en met maart is het namelijk heel droog in Vietnam. Zeker in het midden van Vietnam is het erg droog en daar bestaat het landschap dan ook vooral uit woestijnen.

De overheid

De overheid is in Vietnam verdeeld over verschillende niveau's. Je hebt een centrale overheid, een overheid op het niveau van provincies (er zijn ca. 81 provincies in Vietnam), een overheid op het niveau van districten (in een district kunnen gemakkelijk 500.000 mensen wonen, is in feite dus al gauw zo groot als een stad) en een overheid op het niveau van wards of sub-districten (in een ward wonen vaak ca. 20.000 mensen). Een ward is dus ongeveer het kleinste overheidsniveau, maar een ward is ook weer onderverdeeld in zogenaamde cellen. De overheid heeft dus een sterk vertakte organisatie. Het gaat van de regering in Hanoi (centrale overheid) helemaal naar wijkniveau (wards). Daarnaast heb je ook nog de Communistische Partij, die net zo'n soort parallellen heeft. Deze Partij heeft dezelfde top-down structuur. De Communistische Partij gaat namelijk ook van Hanoi (centraal) tot in de fijnste geleidingen van de buurten (cellen). In die cellen zijn celvertegenwoordigers

aangesteld, dus in principe weet de Communistische Partij tot op het laagste niveau wat daar speelt. Ze hebben dus heel goed in de gaten wanneer ergens onvrede over is. Het is een heel gevoelig mechanisme voor onvrede.

Vanwege de top-downgerichtheid van deze dubbele organisatie (overheid en Communistische Partij), zijn de mensen in Vietnam gewend dat de overheid altijd alles regelt. Er is in de laatste jaren ook veel wetgeving op gang gekomen.

Er is bijna niemand die de top-down besluitvorming kan tegenspreken. Slechts de veteranen uit de oorlog ('the fatherland front') zijn heel invloedrijk en hebben een onaantastbare status. Alleen zij kunnen er wat tegenin brengen zonder dat ze vervelende gevolgen moeten ondervinden. De rest van de bevolking is best voorzichtig met uitspraken die een hoger politiek niveau betreffen. Maar hoe sterk deze voorzichtigheid precies is, is moeilijk te zeggen. Naar aanleiding van het boek "*Het zijn net mensen*" van Joris Luyendijk geeft Van Buuren aan dat Vietnam in zekere mate eigenlijk ook een soort dictatuur is. Niemand kan eigenlijk helemaal open zeggen wat die vindt. Maar er lijkt dan ook een enorm verschil te zijn tussen wat er op papier verlangd wordt en wat er in de praktijk gebeurt. In Vietnam zegt men altijd: "there is the law, but there is also the practice". Je hoeft ook maar één blik op het verkeer te werpen en je begrijpt precies wat men daarmee bedoelt. De mensen doen gewoon wat ze willen. Het blijft gelukkig wel redelijk praktisch. Maar dit soort dingen is lastig te interpreteren, geeft Van Buuren aan. Het is lastig om te interpreteren hoe men Vietnam moet begrijpen en hoe hetgene wat wij governance noemen dan precies zou werken in Vietnam.

Watermanagement

Als Van Buuren naar het water management wordt gevraagd, geeft hij aan dat het water management in Vietnam veel aspecten heeft. Er wordt daar bijvoorbeeld onderscheid gemaakt tussen water voor de landbouw en water voor de stad. Water voor de landbouw valt onder het Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), terwijl water voor de stad onder een water company (in HCMC: Saigon water company (Sawaco)) valt en bestaat uit twee componenten: water voor burgers (drinkwater) en water voor de industrie. Water company's zijn heel belangrijk in Vietnam; ze zijn invloedrijk en hebben veel geld. Een andere belangrijke stakeholder is het Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MoNRE). Zij beheren vooral de milieukant van water, zoals waterkwaliteit en afvalwaterzuivering. In Vietnam is ook sprake van grondwaterproblematiek. Hierbij speelt vooral het Department of Natural Resources and Environment (DoNRE) een belangrijke rol. Zij hebben echter weinig geld te besteden, dus zijn minder invloedrijk.

Op het gebied van water lijkt de overheid iets minder sterk vertakt en top-down gericht te zijn. Van Buuren geeft aan dat in HCMC voor drinkwater Sawaco bijvoorbeeld een belangrijke rol speelt, maar dat de mensen ook hun eigen waterbronnen hebben. Dit leidt echter tot uitputting. Deze private onttrekking geschied namelijk terwijl de overheid tegelijkertijd bezig is de watervoorziening in de steden te regelen. Dit loopt dus enigszins langs elkaar heen. Op het gebied van riolering en afvalwater is de overheid wel verdeeld op verschillende niveaus, weet Van Buuren te vertellen.

Succesvolle stakeholder participatie

Van Buuren vertelt dat stakeholderparticipatie vaak wordt weergegeven op een schaal, met als laagste score bijvoorbeeld 'consultative processes' en als hoogste score 'echt meebeslissen'. Daar tussen in zitten dan gradaties.

Als Van Buuren gevraagd wordt naar de ervaringen die men in Vietnam heeft met stakeholderparticipatie, haalt hij een project aan waar hij zelf over geschreven heeft. Dit project over het Tan Hoa-Lo Gom kanaal betrof 'urban upgrading'.

Het project ging over de stedelijke vormgeving van milieu. In HCMC heb je veel kanalen en daar wonen veel mensen langs in woningen op palen. Deze mensen vervuilden het water echter sterk door hun afval en ontlasting in het water terecht te laten komen. De stad wilde dit daarom afschaffen en kozen voor een urban upgrading project. Het stedelijk milieu en het wonen langs het kanaal moest beter worden. Daarin zijn wel voorbeelden geweest van stakeholderparticipatie op

milieugebied.

Van Buuren vertelt ook over een Belgisch ontwikkelingsproject in Vietnam wat een nieuwe benaderingswijze van stedelijke ontwikkeling betrof. Hierbij onderzocht men echt wat de inwoners wilden. Het was een poging tot participatie van bevolking in de stedelijke ontwikkeling. Maar in hoeverre dit ook gedragen wordt door een hoger niveau vraagt Van Buuren zich af. Hij heeft twijfels of men zoiets soortgelijks bij een volgend stedelijk ontwikkelingsproject weer zou doen.

Ook als je naar landbouwprojecten kijkt, vindt je ongetwijfeld projecten waarin boeren worden gevraagd naar hun praktijken en hoe de overheid daarop in kan spelen. In Vietnam wordt namelijk veel met boeren overlegd. De enige manier waarop men de landbouw kan intensiveren en daarbij wel beter gebruik te maken van irrigatie, is namelijk om direct met de boeren te praten. De landbouwdiensten proberen dus zo veel mogelijk met de boeren samen te werken.

Stakeholderparticipatie vindt dus zeker plaats in Vietnam. Maar Vietnam is geen schoolvoorbeeld van het makkelijk laten participeren van burgers. Het is een moeizaam proces, want de cultuur is erg top-down en traditioneel. Men verwacht dat de overheid alles gaat regelen. Dit is onder andere te wijten aan de sterk vertakte organisatie van de overheid.

Stakeholderparticipatie in watermanagement in Vietnam

De tabel met condities voor succesvolle stakeholderparticipatie wordt aan Van Buuren gepresenteerd en verschillende condities worden besproken.

Conditie 1: In het algemeen hebben mensen best een mening. Er is ook milieuprotest aangetekend in diverse situaties in Vietnam. Er vinden af en toe behoorlijke conflicten tussen bedrijven en burgers plaats. De media wordt hier ook voor gebruikt. Maar echte opstand zul je in Vietnam niet gauw zien (tot nu toe).

Conditie 6: De overheid benaderd 'capacity building' en 'awareness raising' heel erg. Soms wordt je er zelfs moe van. "Als we mensen maar vertellen wat ze moeten doen, dan gaan ze het wel doen". Er is een sterk geloof in onderwijs en mentaliteitsverandering. Dat is natuurlijk ook belangrijk, maar soms zijn er meer praktische dingen nodig. Van Buuren geeft hier een voorbeeld van een poging tot afvalscheiding in Vietnam. De overheid deed veel aan 'awareness raising' bij burgers; zij moesten hun afval gaan scheiden. Uiteindelijk resulteerde dit in afvalscheiding door burgers. Maar wanneer de afval-inzamelaars het afval kwamen ophalen, gooien ze alles weer bij elkaar. De afval-inzamelaars waren dus niet 'aware' genoeg, of hadden de capaciteiten of middelen niet om het afval gescheiden in te zamelen en te verwerken. Dat is natuurlijk dodelijk voor zo'n project. Voor de burgers lijkt het vervolgens namelijk zinloos om afval te scheiden en zij stopten hier dan ook weer mee. Dit soort situaties komen iedere keer weer voor in Vietnam, geeft Van Buuren aan. Zo wordt er bijvoorbeeld op televisie ook van alles aan gedaan om burgers tot 'de goede burger' te maken. Burgers moeten 'braaf' zijn, terwijl er lang niet altijd de objectieve omstandigheden worden geschapen die dat mogelijk maken. Dit terwijl mentaliteit en structurele maatregelen juist hand in hand moeten gaan, volgens Van Buuren.

Conditie 8: Het is absoluut een voorwaarde dat stakeholders bereid moeten zijn om met elkaar te onderhandelen.

Conditie 11: Mensen weten vaak wel welke rol ze hebben. Maar als het om grote problemen gaat, zoals water management op basin niveau, dan is de coördinatie wel heel lastig (conditie 21). Je krijgt dan namelijk weer met verschillende provincies te maken die samen moeten werken. Het is altijd moeilijk als er iets nieuws moet gebeuren, om dan te bepalen wie de leiding heeft, wie geld krijgt, wie wat te zeggen heeft en wie niet etc. Maar deze conditie is wel erg belangrijk. Als de rollen, de verhoudingen van deze rollen tot elkaar en de verschillende posities niet duidelijk zijn, dan wordt het ontzettend moeilijk.

Conditie 20: Dit is ook een belangrijke conditie. Het lastige aan governance is echter dat er langzamerhand een soort consensus moet ontstaan, maar dat kost veel tijd. Ook moet er dan veel overlegd en 'gepolderd' worden, maar niet overal is die poldercultuur aanwezig.

Conditie 21: Coördinatie is inderdaad erg belangrijk. Maar in Vietnam is dit vaak heel lastig. Het is in veel landen een groot probleem.

Samenvattend stelt Van Buuren dat de condities van succesvolle stakeholderparticipatie niet helemaal vervuld zijn in Vietnam. Er zijn wel initiatieven om dingen te organiseren en men is ook wel blij is als een groep burgers zegt 'kom we pakken het op'. Alleen als dit niet onder de leiding van de Communistische Partij of de regering gebeurt, dan is men daar bang voor, denkt Van Buuren. Het idee dat wij in Nederland overal inspraak in moeten hebben is ook eigenlijk al een heel progressief idee, vindt Van Buuren. Daar is bij ons alles op gebaseerd, maar dat is nog niet overal zo. Misschien gebeurt dat ook wel nooit overal.