

ASSESSMENT OF THE RISK OF CONFLICT AROUND THE TRANSBOUNDARY WATER RESOURCES. CASES OF THE JORDAN BASIN AND THE GUARANI AQUIFER SYSTEM

M. R. Menani

Earth Sciences Department, Faculty of Sciences, Batna University, Algeria
menani_redha@univ-batna.dz, menani-redha@lycos.com

ABSTRACT

The water world-wide crisis will see the transboundary water resources becoming the object of tensions and litigations increasingly marked. Also, the transboundary conflicts on fresh water intended to the categories of traditional uses are subjected to a growing attention on behalf of national and international organizations. Each case of conflict has its proper characteristic and to appreciate its relative importance, it is necessary to consult a broad documentation based on reports of commissions, organizations or groups of research. According to criteria's and data's taken into account, the situation is some times appreciated differently. This note proposes a numerical indexing method of the risk of conflict around the transboundary water resources by taking into account indicators having weights proportional to their relative importance and rates which traduce the local conditions.

This method has been tested on two different cases. The first one concerns the transboundary water of the Jordan basin shared by Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Palestine (West bank and Ghaza) where concerned waters are essentially of surface while the second concerns groundwater of the Guarani aquifer shared by Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay.

In the two cases, results obtained by the pondered method seem to reflect correctly the current situation.

Keywords: Transboundary, Water Resources, Risk, Conflict, Jordan, Guarani

1. INTRODUCTION

The indicators considered in the method include for all parties concerned by the transboundary water resources:

- the dependence degree to the transboundary water resources;

- the degree of satisfaction of the needs;
- the geopolitical context of the zone;
- the geographical position in relation to the transboundary water resources;
- the water governance.

However, these indicators take different quotations according local conditions. (see table 1 and 2).

The combination of the fixed weight and of the reached rate by each indicator in a given region leads to a partial index of the risk concerning this indicator and the sum of the partial indices provides the global index of the risk of conflict around the transboundary water resources. The method is detailed in Menani [1].

The rating intervals proposed here are based on criteria's and standards which take into account results of research works carried out through actions at world scale (FAO [2], UN [3], SHI [4], JHSPH [5], Who/Unicef [6]) which target not only the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the resources, but also a broader vision which integrates the economic, social, educational and political aspects (Falkenmark and Widstrand [7], Gleick [8, 9], Gardner and Engleman [10], Wolf [11,12]).

Each indicator varies in a rating field according to well defined criteria's which take different values according to local conditions, thus providing a partial index of risk (multiplication of weight by rate) and the sum of these partial indices gives the global index of risk of conflict for a given region.

Based on indicators relatively easy to identify, this approach allows:

- a standardized qualification of the risk of conflict around the transboundary water resources;
- a fast comparison between different regions of the world exposed at this risk;
- to encircle the indicator firstly responsible of the risk of conflict
- a cartography of the zones at risk.

2. INDICATORS OF RISK

Indicators of risk have weights fixed which take into account their relative importance. The indicators proposed are summarized in table 1

Table 1. Risk Indicators and their respective weights

Indicators	Weights
The degree of dependence to the transboundary water resources	5
The satisfaction degree of the water needs	4
Geopolitical context of the zone of conflict	3
The geographical position in relation to the water resources	2
The water governance by parts in conflict	2

The relative weights assigned to the proposed indicators can lend to discussion, nevertheless the following remarks guided this choice. The various factors, which in certain situations can be redundant, are evaluated separately and in an independent way, because it is question of evaluating their intrinsic influences:

- The dependence degree of a country to the transboundary water resources for the satisfaction of its various needs is a decisive factor of conflict even if the other indicators have rates of weak risk. Even if a country has trumps of good governance or of effective governance (Rogers and Hall [13]), if it has normal relations with the concerned country or countries, if the geostrategic problems do not arise, the transboundary water resources are perceived like a vital energy resource on which one has a right of ownership and about which one does not make any concession.
- The satisfaction of the needs: if the various potentialities of provisioning of a country do not satisfy its traditional needs, or if for example the pressing need for a greater capacity of electric power becomes essential (hydroelectric stations), temptation to benefit from the transboundary water resources is increasing, by non consensual adjustments, derivations of river, excessive pumping... i.e. as many arguments of conflicts, this even if the other indicators have rates of weak risk, i.e. even if countries in question have normal diplomatic relations and efficient systems of water governance;
- The geopolitical context of a region is a critical factor. In the case of a political or armed conflict between countries, the management of the transboundary water resources endures the direct consequences. The cooperative committees of dialogue have then great difficulties to accomplish their missions if they are not straightforwardly blocked. However, in regions marked by normal political relations, the risk of conflict decreases very appreciably. One perceives better now the difference between the relative importance of the geopolitical context and the risk related to the degree of dependence to the water resources which is more important relatively, even in the case of good relations between the concerned countries.
- The influence of the geographical position or dominant position (natural or provoked) is related to the fact that a country which is located at upstream of a river or nearest the alimentation border of the transboundary aquifers has more benefits by this situation than the country located downstream, either naturally, or by a provoked way (non consensual installations and river derivations, discharge of polluted water, etc...). This indicator which is also a source of conflict has however a weight weaker than those enumerated previously.
- The water governance by the parts in conflict is not only an indicator of conflict, but also an indicator of a social, economic, and political development. According to Rogers and Hall [13], the water governance of a country can be evaluated according to basic principles and criteria's of performance. Poor governance of water in a cross border region is an undeniable source of local conflicts with a possibility of incidence on the transboundary resources. For example, losses in

distribution networks generate necessarily the recourse to an additional water supply, or the absence of sanitation networks and the inexistence of purification of the discharged water which lead to pollution of the surface water and groundwater. Conversely, an efficient system which has recourse to other forms of resources to satisfy its needs (purification, treatment, desalination...) will decrease the need for recourse to the transboundary resources. The incidence of the water governance on the risks of conflicts around the transboundary water resources is necessarily of relative weight weaker than the degree of dependence to this resource and than the geopolitical and geographical contexts of the area which are basically different indicators and intrinsically more incisive. Nevertheless, the degree of satisfaction of the water needs is improved by effective governance, all the more if it presents criteria of performance.

2.1 Rating intervals of the indicators of risk

According to local conditions, the indicators of risk take values varying between 1 and 10; the greatest dimensions indicate a high risk of tension and conversely.

It is obvious that these ratings must be established for each country concerned by the transboundary water resources. The partial index of risk is obtained by multiplying the fixed weight of an indicator by the rate reached in the studied case ($IPR = I_{iw} \cdot I_{ic}$), with: IPR: partial index of risk - I_{iw} : indicator fixed weight and I_{ic} : indicator rate (variable)

2.1.1 Example of the degree of dependence to the transboundary water resources

The degree of dependence to the transboundary water resource can be appreciated by the quotation indicated in table 2.

Table 2. Ratings intervals of the dependence degree to the transboundary water resources

Variation intervals	Rate
Total dependence	10
Partial dependence with difficulties of satisfaction of the needs by other resources (natural and technical difficulties)	8
Partial with possibilities of supplying by other resources but with a high capital cost	6
Partial with possibilities of supplying by other resources with an advantageous capital cost	3
Partial to weak with an effective supply by other resources	2

Partial index of minimum risk (PIR_{min}) = fixed weight. Minimum rate = 5. $2 = 10$

Partial index of maximum risk (PIR_{max}) = fixed weight. Maximum Rate=5.10= 50

The very weak dependence to the transboundary water resources cannot exist because no country can forsake its quota. The natural difficulties are related for

example to the rainfall deficit which influences negatively the filling of a dam even if enormous investments were made in this direction. The technical difficulties are for example those which can block projects of hydraulic transfers. When an investment on other forms of resources becomes profitable, the tension on the transboundary water resources decreases appreciably.

2.1.2 The total index of risk

It is the sum of the partial indexes: $GIR = \sum PIR = \sum I_{iw} * I_{ic}$

With GIR: global index of risk of conflict around transboundary water resources. According to this procedure, the global index of minimum risk of conflict is 25, whereas the maximum index is 152. We note generally that two countries or more which are involved in a transboundary water conflict do not present the same global index of risk because conditions which prevail in each one of these countries are different. For the whole zone, it's can be preferable to allocate the highest GIR obtained for the concerned countries, because it's the one which reflects the real tension which prevails around the cross-border water resources. For the entire zone, it east can be preferable to affect the highest GIR obtained for the concerned countries, because it is which reflects the real tension which prevails around the transboundary water resources.

3. CASES OF THE JORDAN BASIN AND THE GUARANI AQUIFER

3.1 The Jordan Basin

From the Hermon montain (Lebanon), the Jordan River with a course of 360 km joins the Dead Sea at the height of 392 m under the level of the oceans (the lowest of the world). This river crosses Syria, Israel, Palestine and finally Jordan. Waters of the Jordan River are among the most conflicting of the world and are entirely transplanted in the problem between Arab countries and Israel.

Rating intervals of the indicators proposed within the framework of this work, in term of definition of the satisfaction degree of the various uses, the geopolitical context, the water governance... rest on an analysis of a large literature which is detailed in Menani [1].

The synthesis of the consulted data within the framework of this work lets appear that those are countries which are confronted to water shortage which develop the most efforts in term of water governance, except the case of Ghaza due to an exceptional situation.

The final result (table 3) reflects in general the current situation, with a very high GIR for Gaza and the West Bank, whereas the low index of risk is that of Lebanon. Concerning the case of Israel, the total index of risk can evolve to the decrease in next years if the projects relating to the desalination of sea water,

which count on a variable surplus between 500 and 750 million m³/an, are realized.

Table 3. Global Conflict Risk Index around the Jordan Basin

Indicators	Partial Index of Risk (PIR)					
	Israel	Jordan	West Bank	Ghaza	Syria	Lebanon
Dependence degree to the transboundary water resources (W=5)	50	50	50	50	30	10
Satisfaction degree of the water needs (W=4)	9.5	28	36	40	16	14
Geopolitical context of the zone of conflict (W=3)	30	24	27	30	24	27
Geographical position in relation to the water resources (W=2)	6	14	14	14	20	14
Water governance by parts in conflict (W=2)	6	12	15.5	17	15	15
Global Risk Index per country	101.5	128	142.5	151	105	80

3.2 The Guarani Aquifer System

The Guarani aquifer system (GAS) is this vast aquifer of approximately 1.2 million km² of surface shared by 4 countries of Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) whose water is exploited unequally and for various uses by the bordering countries.

For these close countries, groundwater, especially of deep aquifers, constitute a strategic reserve for water supply in the future face notably to pollution of surface

water sources and the covetousness of this water for a commercial practice; the region is not concerned actually by scarcity.

The geological formations that comprise the aquifer are Mesozoic sandstones covered by thick layers of basalt that confined them.

Currently, the GAS is predominantly utilized to supply water for domestic and industrial/commercial use (nearly 90% of the extraction). Of this, 66% is used for public water supply, 5% for rural water supply, 16% for industrial use and 13% for recreation (thermal tourism) (World Bank [14]).

As for the case of the Jordan Basin, a very wide documentation was consulted for the case of the Guarani aquifer system (Menani [15]).

Table 4. Global Conflict Risk Index around the Guarani Aquifer System

Indicators	PIR			
	Argentina	Brazil	Paraguay	Uruguay
Dependence degree to the transboundary water resources	10	50	30	30
Satisfaction degree of the water needs	4	14	6	6
Geopolitical context of the zone of conflict	3	3	3	3
Geographical position in relation to the water resources	6	0	0	0
Water governance by parts in conflict	9	8	13	7
Global Risk Index per country	32	75	52	46

It seems that the risk indexes related to the two cases reflect globally the “tensions” degrees which prevail currently around the transboundary waters of the two regions; the value of the global risk index varying between a minimum of 25 and a maximum of 158.

4. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of 5 fundamental indicators characterized by fixed weights and variable rates which traduce the local conditions of these indicators, the combination of weights and rates lead to the numerical expression of the risk of conflict around the transboundary water resources. It's obvious that this approach can not be applied, at least with difficulty, to all situations because conditions are much diversified, but it allows an approach of the most common situations.

The databases of various organizations working in fields which are on relation with this context facilitate the acquisition of the majority of the data necessary for calculation of the various indices. These indices can be updated like the databases making it possible to follow the evolution of the global index of risk.

If the definition of certain ratings intervals can lead to discussion, the relative order of classification seems correct and the global index of risk of conflict around the transboundary water resources allows a classification of the zones relating to this risk and to focus on the indicators or sub-indicators responsible of the high risks of conflict.

REFERENCES

- [1] MENANI M.R. A Numerical Method to Index the Risk of Conflict around the Transboundary Water Resources. Validation by a Studied Case. *Water Resources*, Vol. 36, n°6, pp. 731–742. © Pleiades Publishing, Springer, Ltd., 2009.
- [2] FAO. *AQUASTAT: Système d'information de la FAO sur l'eau et l'agriculture*, 2008.
- [3] UN United Nations Organisation. Comprehensive assessment of the freshwater resources of the world, Commission on Sustainable Development, Report of the Secretary General. UN, NY, pp. 39, 1997.
- [4] SHI (2008) State Hydrological Institute of Saint Petersburg, Russia. *Data bank about world water use and water availability*, 2008.
- [5] Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. *Population Information Program*. Center for Communication Programs, Vol. XXVI, N°1, September, 1998.
- [6] WHO/UNICEF. *Water for life making it happen*, 2005. Available at: http://www.unicef.org/wes/files/JMP_2005.pdf
- [7] Falkenmark M. and C. Widstrand. Population and water resources: A delicate balance. *Population Bul.*, 47(3), pp. 1-36, 1992.
- [8] Gleick P. Basic water requirements for human activities: Meeting basic needs. *International Water*, 21(2), pp. 83-92, 1996.
- [9] Gleick P. *Water Conflict Chronology*, updated data. Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security, 2004.
- [10] Gardner-Outlaw T. and Engleman R. Sustaining water, easing scarcity. *Population Action International*, Washington DC, pp. 2-19, 1997.

- [11] Wolf A. Conflict and cooperation along international waterways. *Water Policy*, Vol. 1#2, pp. 251-265, 1998.
- [12] Wolf A, Yoffe S and Giordano M. *International waters: indicators for identifying basins at risk*. Dept of Geosc., Oregon State University. UNESCO/IHP/WWAP. IHP-VI/ Technical documents in Hydrology/ PCCP series, 2003, n° 20, SC-2003/WS/58. Available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001333/133306e.pdf>
- [13] Rogers P. & A.W. Hall. *Effective Water Governance*. Global Water Partnership, 2003.
- [14] WORLD BANK. *Environmental protection and sustainable development of the guarani aquifer system project*, Implementation completion and results report (Project ID: P068121 L/C/TF Number(s):TF-50950 TF-51223). Report n°: ICR00001198.. July 31, 2009.
http://www.wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2009/08/13/000333037_20090813231853/Rendered/PDF/ICR11980P068121IC0disclosed08112191.pdf. Consulted 04/24/2010.
- [15] MENANI M.R., Da Silva H.L., Lepri L.R., Franco I.L.C. Assessment of the risk of conflict around the water resources of the Guarani aquifer system. Oral Com., XIVth World Water Congress of IWRA, Porto de Galinhas, 25-29 sept. 2011. http://worldwatercongress.com/programa_wwc_silusba_site.pdf