SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Stakeholder engagement and participation in integrated river basin management: Individual perspectives in Malaysia

Chow Hock $\operatorname{Lim}^{*1} \boxtimes$, Rahmah Elfithri²⁾ \boxtimes \bigcirc , Christopher Gibbins¹⁾ \boxtimes , Fang Yenn $\operatorname{Teo}^{*1} \boxtimes \bigcirc$

Table S1. Summary of responses to the survey questionnaires

Factor impacting stakeholder engagement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree			
Pre-engagement Pre-engagement								
Proper planning	189	57	2	1	1			
Credible and legitimate	165	83	1	0	1			
Flexible arrangement for conducting engagement	154	90	4	1	1			
Identifying relevant key stakeholders:								
Inclusive of all relevant and interested stakeholders	161	83	5	0	1			
Stakeholders consist of multi-discipline	188	61	0	1	0			
Have experience in IWRM	102	134	9	2	3			
Have experience in IRBM	164	70	11	2	3			
Ability to access and comprehend technical information	78	144	21	6	1			
Local population within the river basin	141	102	6	1	0			
Purpose of the engagement:								
Enhance the IRBM plan	178	67	5	0	0			
Fulfil the TOR of the IRBM study	146	88	13	3	0			
FFulfil water policy and legislation requirements	131	100	15	4	0			
For formality	120	61	25	44	0			
Contribute expertise and experience	160	81	9	0	0			
Effective communication:	•			-	-			
Clear and concise TOR	178	66	6	0	0			
Transparent of organiser	181	65	4	0	0			
Trust between stakeholders and the organiser	179	65	6	0	0			

¹⁾ University of Nottingham Malaysia, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Jalan Broga, Semenyih, 43500, Selangor, Malaysia

²⁾ UNESCO, Division of Water Sciences, Intergovernmental Hydrological Programme (IHP), 7, Place de Fontenoy, 75007, Paris, France

^{*} Corresponding author

Factor impacting stakeholder engagement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree				
Competency:									
Facilitators/consultants are independent and certified	100	121	27	2	0				
Suitable duration of the stakeholder engagement/workshop:									
Two days	46	130	46	24	4				
Three days	108	51	50	33	8				
Inclusion of ESG	150	96	3	0	1				
During en	gagement								
Characteristics of the stakeholders:									
Willing to compromise	44	133	43	28	2				
Willing to seek amicable solutions acceptable to all parties	157	68	18	6	1				
Free from political interference	131	99	13	6	1				
Collaboration and coordination among all levels of the sectors	153	79	15	2	1				
Recognising cultural and religious values:									
Cultural respect	144	87	17	2	0				
Religious tolerance and respect	148	69	26	7	0				
Leadership role in engagement:									
Organiser	175	74	1	0	0				
Management of the workshop:									
Structured and orderly manner	173	71	5	1	0				
Productive discussion on a level playing field	170	74	5	1	0				
Resolve any conflict that arises	174	66	8	2	0				
Accommodate multiple views	171	69	8	2	0				
The whole of government and society approach	152	80	15	3	0				
Post engagement									
The organiser is fully committed to implementing the outcome	186	60	2	2	0				
The outcome is used to formulate the IRBM plan	177	65	8	0	0				
A mechanism to monitor the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement	170	70	10	0	0				

Explanations: IWRM = integrated water resources management, IRBM = integrated river basin management, TOR = terms of reference, ESG = environmental, social, and governance elements.

Source: own study.