ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

Original Research Article
ISSN: 3041-556X
Journal homepage: https://er.researchfloor.org/

Sustainable Water Management; Understanding a Theoretical perspective

Niloufar Azmi[1*], Syed Feroz Ahmed[1] and Zeenathfar Azmi Syed[2]

[1]*Department of Sociology, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telangana, India*
[2]*Telangana Education Commission, Hyderabad, Telangana, India*

Citation: Niloufar Azmi, Syed Feroz Ahmed and Zeenathfar Azmi Syed (2024). Sustainable Water Management; Understanding a Theoretical perspective. *Environmental Reports; an International Journal*.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.51470/ER.2024.6.2.19

Corresponding Author: **Niloufar Azmi** | E-Mail: **(azminiloufar09@gmail.com)**

Received 29 August 2024 | Revised 27 September 2024 | Accepted 20 October 2024 | Available Online November 17 2024

ABSTRACT

Addressing the increasing global challenges associated with a shortage of water, changes in the climate, and population growth necessitates sustainable water management. This theoretical perspective explores the foundational principles, frameworks, and strategies necessary for effective water resource management. By integrating ecological, social, and economic dimensions, it emphasizes the need for a holistic approach to ensure equitable access, efficient use, and long-term sustainability of water resources. The study critically examines existing water management paradigms, highlighting the role of governance, technology, and community participation in fostering resilience and adaptability, it underscores the importance of interdisciplinary research and policy innovation to address the complexities of water distribution, quality, and conservation. This theoretical analysis aims to provide a robust framework for advancing sustainable water management practices, contributing to global efforts in achieving water security and sustainable development goals.

Keywords: *Sustainable water management, water scarcity, climate change, resource governance, conservation*

Introduction

Water is important for life, yet managing it is difficult due to its intrinsic physical properties. Water is utilized for a variety of human activities, including agriculture, industry, domestic use, and, most importantly, consumption. Water is crucial not just for human use, but also for the continuing existence of both animals and plants on our planet. Without water, human existence would be impossible. Water has several challenges in terms of management. The geographical distribution of it is uneven, necessitating expensive transportation infrastructure. Storing it poses challenges due to its propensity to evaporate and leak. Due to its high solvency, this substance is prone to rapid pollution, making it unsuitable for human ingestion without costly purification processes. Additional issues associated with water include waterlogging and floods. Notwithstanding the many challenges associated with the physical properties that water has, it is essential to effectively and responsibly regulate its use. Inadequate management is primarily responsible for the water crisis of the twenty-first century, not scarcity and stress. The Brundtland Commission's report "Our Common Future" defines sustainability as the ability to meet the demands of the current generation while ensuring that future generations have the ability to meet their own needs [1].

Understanding Sustainable Water Management

Sustainability is a collection of objectives and goals that are designed to guarantee a secure future. The goals and objectives encompass the preservation of the environment and ecology, the promotion of social justice, the sustainability of the economy, and the maintenance of physical stability. Consequently, sustainable management will encompass endeavors that are designed to accomplish these objectives and goals. In order to accomplish these goals within the water framework, a number of actions, concessions, and decision-making procedures are included in sustainable water management, or SWM.

Sustainable water resource systems are those that are intentionally established and managed to effectively advance the objectives of society, both in the present and in the future, while simultaneously safeguarding their ecological, environmental, and hydrological integrity, as per UNESCO. While alternative definitions may employ differently worded language, they share comparable objectives. For example, Alley et al., Mays, and Loucks and Gladwell. The objective of SWM is to establish a balance between the water needs of various sectors, including agriculture, industry, household use, and the environment. SWM, such as other sustainability concepts, prioritizes the long-term future.

The United Nations Agenda 21 aims to achieve a comprehensive goal for Solid Waste Management (SWM), which is to guarantee the availability of sufficient quantities of clean water for the global population, while also protecting the chemical, biological, and ecological processes of ecosystems. This involves adjusting human activities to align with the natural boundaries of the environment and addressing the sources of waterborne diseases (Down to Earth Report). The attainment of Sustainable Water Management (SWM) is confronted with a multitude of difficulties and barriers, including rapid urbanization, limited availability and increased pressure on water resources, the effects of globalization, climate change, problems with infrastructure, fluctuating water demand, water pollution, and inadequate water governance. To get a comprehensive grasp of the sustainable use of water and the current level of research on this topic, please refer to the study conducted by Durán-Sánchez et al. Sustainable development and solid waste management (SWM) are intricately interconnected, since water plays a vital role in the process of development.

Effective water resource management promotes sustainable agricultural production, poverty reduction, and the mitigation of waterborne illnesses via the enhancement of water quality. Water is included into the UN's Sustainable Development Goal 6, usually referred to as SDG6, because to this rationale [3].

Water system sustainability assessment is a complex process with no one-size-fits-all method. The sustainability of water management systems in individual administrations can be assessed using models that are location-specific rather than generic. These models may incorporate indices that enable the comparison of management practices across various organizations and environments. Quantitative assessments are valuable for evaluating the effects of systems on the environment, economy, and society. However, there is presently a scarcity of accurate quantitative assessment techniques for modeling the socio-cultural elements and their interactions with the biological and physical components of complex water management systems. Integrated assessment, product-related evaluation, and indicators and indices are the three primary methods for evaluating solid waste management (SWM). Watershed Sustainability Index, Water Poverty Index, Environmental Performance Index, and Canadian Water Sustainability Index are well-known indices and indicators. Common methods for evaluating products include ecological footprints and Water Footprint analyses. Integrated assessments consist of impact assessments, systemic dynamic modeling, risk analysis, and cost-benefit analyses.

Theoretical perspective of water governance and management

Water governance is generally regarded as having a broader scope than the management of water. The process by which governments make decisions to efficiently manage water systems is often referred to as water management. The processes that civilizations use both internally and externally to control and manage their water resources are collectively referred to as water governance.

According to Lautze *et al*., [4] there is a distinction between water governance and water management.

Water governance refers to the institutions and procedures that are used to identify management objectives, while water management is responsible for implementing the necessary strategies to reach those goals. Water management focuses on directly enhancing results, In contrast, water governance aims to define desired results while coordinating water management activities to achieve those goals [4]. Lautze, De Silva, Giordano, and Sanford's argument is unequivocal: water governance encompasses water management. Water governance is a complex topic, and researchers frequently describe and understand it in accordance with their respective areas of expertise. The Global Water Partnership (GWP) defines water governance as the collection of social, economic, political, and administrative structures that exist to regulate the development and supervision of water resources at various societal levels (IPCC, 2014) [5].

Water governance, according to Pahl-Wostl, is the social responsibility of controlling the use and management of water resources as well as the delivery of water services at different societal levels. It entails shifting these resources away from an unwanted condition and toward a desired one. The water crisis is primarily the result of insufficient water governance, as indicated in the 2006 UN World Water Report. Prioritizing water governance is essential for guaranteeing the world's water resources' long-term sustainability.

The concept of water governance is characterized by a comprehensive and expansive interpretation. In recent times, scholars have engaged in discussions and introduced several contemporary ideas in the field of water governance, such as Integrated Water Resource Management, or IWRM, and Adaptive Co-Management (ACM). As a result of the shortcomings of traditional water management, various measures have been devised to tackle the issues concerning water and its impact on both humans and the environment. This has led to a significant change in water governance, which now encompasses aspects related to humans, ecology, and collaboration. There are things called water governance systems (WGM) that make water governance work in the real world (Girija K Baharat, 2018) [6]. The WGMs include a variety of elements such as institutions, formal as well as informal regulations, stakeholders, networks, and systems. Water governance choices are translated into water management activities via the use of Water Governance Mechanisms (WGMs), resulting in specific results. Consequently, incorporating sustainability principles into water governance will result in initiatives that advance the sustainable administration of water resources, often known as SWM. Consequently, we may draw a link between modern water management, the advancement of sustainable development, and the accomplishment of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) via Solid Waste Management (SWM).

The benefits and drawbacks of India's democratic and bureaucratic standards have a significant influence on water, a state topic in the nation, as mentioned in the Introduction. The federal government lacks the authority to impose any regulations on states with respect to water. The central government exerts its influence on the governance of water at the state level primarily via financial support and suggestions. To get more funding, state governments often align their policies and aims with the vision of the national government. Consequently, individual nations have a significant amount of responsibility in order to accomplish the water objectives set by the SDGs. Contributing to the SDGs, numerous state-level actors are engaged in the sustainable administration of water resources. These players include consultancies, NGOs, community organisations, and government agencies. Efforts have been undertaken to enhance the availability of potable water, particularly in remote regions. The attainment of the SDG6 objectives by India by the 2030 deadline remains uncertain owing to the magnitude of the duties and the intricate nature of reaching these targets [3].

Water governance assessment is a multifaceted undertaking for which there is no universally accepted methodology. This is precisely what Knieper, Pahl-Wostl, Holtz, and Kastens emphasise: *"Identifying overarching patterns that account for the successes or failures of regimes of governance presents formidable obstacles."* Governance acknowledges the complete intricacy of numerous processes and their interrelationships. Comprehending the manner in which the diverse processes that describe these systems affect specific policy outcomes under specific structural conditions, as well as the manner in which changes in governance regimes occur, is a substantial challenge (Verma, 2007) [7].

Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index and the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators are two examples of overarching frameworks that are frequently integrated into water governance assessments. Water governance assessments predominantly centre on the enhancement of the environment and the effectiveness of the

participating institutions. A framework referred to as the Water Governance Indicator Framework was recently established by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This framework comprises 36 water governance indicators that are implemented across various dimensions and for distinctive water management functions. Although water governance frameworks based on indicators are beneficial, it is generally accepted that identifying and developing these indicators is a difficult undertaking, as it may take years for them to gain global recognition and applicability. As a result of their reliance on expert opinion, numerous indicators are susceptible to judgmental bias. Formally acknowledged governance structures and those that are actually executed in practice might diverge substantially. As stated by the OECD, significant challenges in establishing causal relationships between policies and outcomes, as well as ensuring data capture and comparability across time and space, are central to governance indicators. However, indicators are acknowledged as a crucial method for monitoring whether nations are making progress towards enhancing their water governance and, consequently, attaining the objective of SWM.

By using a conceptual model of governance inability to the Jakarta, Indonesia water supply system. The research concluded that a breakdown in governance was the main obstacle preventing Jakarta from establishing a universally accessible water supply. According to the study, governance challenges that emerged predominantly during the public administration of the Jakarta, Indonesia water supply—including high transaction costs, inflexible payment alternatives for impoverished households, and precarious tenure—were not effectively resolved by the 1998 privatisation.

Findings

The results presented in this research may be summarised as follows. The amount of economic growth in a nation is positively correlated with some characteristics of its water laws. These features include the incorporation of water legislation with laws pertaining to land, forests, and the environment, the centralization of water administration, and the responsibility of water sector authorities. Countries exhibiting greater economic growth tend to own more complex water legislation. Water laws are contingent upon numerous other factors besides a nation's economic development, according to the study. These include, but are not limited to, political economy, water endowments, historical water law patterns, and cultural influences. The studies also indicate that the relationship between water legislation, policy, and access to finance differs depending on a country's degree of economic development. Wealthier nations often allocate more resources to the water industry and prioritize cost recovery by implementing appropriate pricing strategies for water services. Nonetheless, the research reveals an inverse correlation between the degree of private sector involvement and the economic development of a nation. Wealthier nations possess more proficient public sectors, however this is not the situation in impoverished nations, where the private sector plays a more significant role in financing new ventures.

Araral and Wang utilized the similar approach mentioned before to establish a link between water administration and the water sector's performance in ten provinces of China (Araral, et. al, 2013) [8]. Various performance indicators of the water sector are found to be positively correlated with water governance, according to the study.

The indicators include the sufficiency of potable water, overall efficiency of water use, efficiency of water usage in industries, and productivity in agriculture. Araral and Ratra conducted a comparative analysis of water administration in India and China, using a same approach. The research employs survey data. A poll was conducted with 93 Chinese officials and 89 Indian officials. For both nations, standardized scores on water policies, laws, and administration were computed (Araral, et. al, 2015) [9].

China's water governance is significantly superior to India's in all three respects, according to the findings of the study. In addition to the India-specific data, the study incorporated the findings of a recent survey conducted in 2017-2018 into its analysis. Cambodia's Phnom Penh Water Supply Authority (PPWSA) is one of the best models of how transparent water government can lead to long-term water management. A water utility that was on the verge of insolvency due to poor performance was converted into a profitable, tax-paying entity within a mere fifteen years. This entity now ensures that the inhabitants of the capital city of Cambodia have access to water supply without interruption for twenty-four hours a day. This was accomplished through a strategic emphasis on various facets of water governance, including but not limited to legal and regulatory considerations, human capital, cost recuperation, and financial viability (Araral, et. al, 2012) [10].

Conclusion

The research suggests that the instance of PPWSA may have relevance to India, given both countries are emerging nations situated in South and Southeast Asia, respectively. (Bromley and Anderson's study and Thang et al) study both illustrate the benefits of water management on sustainable development. In order to meet the drinking water objectives outlined in SDG6, India must enhance its water administration. The experiences of Jakarta and Phnom Penh serve as illustrative instances of the potential trajectory of the water sector, contingent upon the condition of water administration.

About Authors

Niloufar Azmi is pursuing her PhD in Sociology at Osmania University, Hyderabad, Telangana. Her research interests include sustainable and environmental development. Syed Feroz Ahmed is a Senior Research Fellow in Sociology at Osmania University, specializing in advanced sociological research and analysis. Dr. Zeenathfar Azmi Syed serves as an Executive Research Officer at the Telangana Education Commission, Hyderabad, specializing in educational policy and research.

REFERENCES

1. Brundtland, G.H.; Khalid, M.; Agnelli, S.; Al-Athel, S.; Chidzero, B, (1987), Our Common Future; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK; New York, NY, USA, 1987.

2. India world's 13th most water-stressed country: WRI. Available online: https://www.downtoearth.org.in/news/water/india-world-s-13th-most-water-stressed-country-wri-66066.

3. SDG India Index, (2018), a Baseline Report. Available online: https://in.one.un.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/SDX-Index-India-21-12-2018.pdf.

4. Lautze, J.; De Silva, S.; Giordano, M.; Sanford, L, (2011), putting the cart before the horse: Water governance and IWRM. Nat. Resour. Forum 2011, 35, 1–8.

5. IPCC, (2014), Climate Change Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.

6. Girija K Baharat, N.B.D, (2018), Aligning India's Water Resource Policies with the SDGs, TERI Discussion Paper; The Energy and Resources Institute: New Delhi, India.

7. Verma, S.; Phansalkar, S.J, (2007), India's Water Future 2050: Potential Deviations from 'Business-as-Usual'. Int. J. Rural Manag. 2007, 3, 149–179.

8. Araral, E.; Wang, Y, (2013), Water governance 2.0: A review and second generation research agenda. Water Resour. Manag. 2013, 27, 3945–3957.

9. Araral, E.; Wang, Y, (2015), Does water governance matter to water sector performance? Evidence from ten provinces in China. Water Policy 2015, 17, 268–282.

10. Araral, E.; Yu, D, (2012) Water Governance: Critique, Theory and Evidence from Asia.Working Paper.2012. Available online https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Eduardo_Araral2/publication/268029924_Water_governance_Critique_Theory_and_Evidence_from_Asia_1/links/567e367108aebccc4e040d1f/Water-governance-Critique-Theory-and-Evidence-from-Asia-1.pdf.