ISSN: 2634 - 8853

Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences Technology

SCIENTIFIC Research and Community

Review Article

Open Access

Water Governance and Policy Challenges in Urban and Rural Drinking Water Supply in Developing Countries, with Insights from Multiple Industries

Tanay Kulkarni

Water Infrastructure Professional, USA

ABSTRACT

This literature review offers a critical exploration of water governance challenges and policy responses for urban and rural drinking water supply in developing countries, with a particular focus on India and comparative insights from selected developed nations. Drawing upon a broad range of research that integrates technical and socio-political dimensions of water policy, governance frameworks, mathematical modeling approaches, and practical solutions to water-supply challenges. Emphasis is placed on success stories and failures, especially highlighting adaptive and integrated approaches needed to manage climate-related, institutional, and socio-economic complexities. The review applies an interdisciplinary perspective that synthesizes hydrological, engineering, and governance analyses. It concludes by underlining the significance of robust, transparent institutions; participatory stakeholder engagement; cross-sectoral partnerships; and mathematical optimization models for ensuring long-term water sustainability, resilience, and equity in both developed and developing contexts.

***Corresponding author**

Tanay Kulkarni, Water Infrastructure Professional, USA.

Received: February 03, 2022; **Accepted: February** 08, 2022; **Published:** February 18, 2022

Keywords: Water Governance, Water Policy, Developing Countries, Urban Water, Rural Water, Climate Adaptation, Participatory Governance

Introduction

Water governance occupies a central role in ensuring equitable and sustainable access to safe drinking water for both urban and rural populations worldwide. This is especially pertinent in developing countries, where infrastructural gaps, resource constraints, rapidly growing populations, and evolving climate patterns compound the challenge of guaranteeing reliable water supply. Over the past few decades, scholars and practitioners have recognized that policy interventions focused solely on infrastructural expansion—like large dams or centralized pipelines—often fail to address underlying institutional and socio-economic complexities [1,2]. Consequently, there has been a discernible shift toward integrated, adaptive, and collaborative governance approaches [3].

In particular, India stands out for having undergone a profound water supply transformation. Historically reliant on large irrigation canals, India's rural and urban areas progressively turned to decentralized groundwater extraction for intensifying agricultural production and meeting the needs of a fast-growing population [4]. Despite the advantages of local-level control and rapid expansion of groundwater-based supply, unregulated abstraction has provoked overexploitation in many regions, jeopardizing both quantity and quality [5]. These issues are not unique to India; indeed, other developing nations from sub-Saharan Africa to Southeast Asia face parallel constraints—differing only in details of political structure, hydrogeology, or resource base [2,6]. Meanwhile, industrialized countries, particularly in Europe and North America, have grappled with shifting paradigms in water management: from centralized engineering solutions aimed at controlling nature, to integrated water resources management (IWRM) focusing on balanced ecosystem use, multi-sector coordination, and stakeholder participation [7,8].

This literature review undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the governing frameworks, institutional mechanisms, solutions from various industries, and the successes or failures encountered in practice. The central aim is to synthesize evidence regarding how robust, inclusive, and flexible governance structures can catalyze sustainable and equitable urban and rural drinking water supplies in developing countries. To accomplish this, the review engages with peer-reviewed journal articles, case studies, technical reports, and policy evaluations addressing urban and rural challenges, governance reforms, climate adaptation, mathematical modeling, and integrated management approaches.

Following this introduction, Section 2 offers a conceptual foundation on water governance and policy, highlighting the complexity of aligning multiple actors, scales, and systems. Section 3 explores the distinct challenges faced by developing countries, emphasizing India as a central illustration. Section 4 reviews technical and managerial solutions developed by various industries, including energy and agricultural sectors, given that cross-sector collaboration is increasingly seen as vital. Section 5 investigates what has worked (and not) in more industrialized contexts, drawing on experiences from Europe, North America, and elsewhere, and reflecting on the potential for knowledge transfer. Section 6 presents a discussion of mathematical approaches and optimization methods, including reference to hydrological models, cost–benefit frameworks, and integrated decision-support tools. Section 7 highlights policy entrepreneurship, institutional design, and multi-level coordination as cornerstones for achieving meaningful transitions. Finally, Section 8 draws conclusions and suggests pathways for future research, including how to adapt the proven solutions to local contexts in the face of changing climates.

Conceptual Foundations of Water Governance and Policy

Defining Water Governance

Water governance is a broad concept encompassing the spectrum of political, social, economic, and administrative systems in place to regulate water resource development, allocation, and management [2,3]. As institutional theorists note, the focus on governance underscores the need to move beyond top-down, government-driven approaches toward more inclusive, polycentric arrangements that incorporate local government, civil society, private-sector stakeholders, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) [7,9].

Contemporary definitions revolve around principles such as participatory decision making, transparency and accountability, and resilience. In line with the frameworks proposed by the Asian Development Bank and the Global Water Partnership, good water governance is often underpinned by the so-called Dublin Principles—water as a finite resource, the importance of participation, the economic value of water, and the critical role of women in water management [10,11].

Policy Transitions and Multi-Level Governance

Transitional shifts in governance and policy typically occur over long time horizons. Historically, many developing countries inherited command-and-control governance regimes from colonial times or from large-scale modernization drives that favored centralized structures [12]. However, a more recent wave of decentralization, exemplified by the push for local-level water user associations or community-based management, has complicated the policy environment, creating overlapping responsibilities and potential fragmentation [2,13-15].

Multi-level governance frameworks explicitly advocate vertical and horizontal coordination among different administrative tiers (national, state/provincial, municipal) and across different sectors (agriculture, energy, environment, health) [16]. The complex interplay between water and other resources—for instance, the Water-Energy-Food Nexus—demonstrates the necessity of bridging institutional silos [17].

Adaptive Management and IWRM Paradigms

Over the past quarter-century, integrated water resources management (IWRM) has become a widely endorsed paradigm, stressing cross-sectoral coordination, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability. Critics note, though, that IWRM's broadness risks conceptual vagueness, which can make practical implementation elusive [18]. Adaptive management frameworks, derived from ecology and resilience theory, further emphasize the need for continuous learning, flexibility, and iterative feedback loops [19]. Under climate variability and heightened uncertainty, policy makers must adopt scenarios and incorporate real-time monitoring to adjust water allocations in an ongoing manner [20].

India, for example, has recognized the need to incorporate adaptive elements into water resource planning, reflecting on recurrent droughts and floods that defy static, linear management [4]. Similar logic has guided policy refinements in Bangladesh, where integrated approaches to flood risk and drinking water supply must address monsoonal, deltaic realities [21].

Key Challenges in Developing Countries' Drinking Water Supply

Institutional Fragmentation and Overlapping Mandates

Many developing countries' water sectors exhibit a kaleidoscope of overlapping agencies and programs, which hamper coherent policy implementation. In sub-Saharan Africa, for example, local water committees may operate side by side with newly formed river basin authorities and national-level water ministries [22]. Meanwhile, in India, separate agencies handle groundwater, surface water, rural sanitation, and urban water boards with often insufficient coordination [13].

Such institutional fragmentation is particularly detrimental when addressing cross-cutting problems like water quality, which requires concerted efforts from health departments, environment and pollution-control boards, agricultural ministries (to regulate pesticide use), and local water user committees. The result is an institutional impasse in which no single actor can effectively champion a solution, while partial measures stall [5].

Resource Constraints and Infrastructure Deficits

Despite major expansions of water infrastructure in many parts of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, the mismatch between supply and demand persists, especially in fast-growing urban centers. The network coverage for piped water is often incomplete, pushing large segments of the population to rely on informal or private sources such as tanker water or individually managed boreholes. Chronic underinvestment in operation and maintenance exacerbates system inefficiencies [6].

Furthermore, rural areas frequently remain underserved. This fosters stark equity imbalances between well-serviced municipalities and small towns or villages forced to adopt self-supply solutions, which can include shallow, unprotected wells at risk of contamination [3]. Aging infrastructure (leaky pipes, archaic pumping stations, or defunct treatment plants) can undercut efforts to enhance coverage and reliability [16].

Governance and Political Economy

The political economy dimension strongly influences water sector performance. In many contexts, rural water supply is politically attractive as a short-term "vote-getter," resulting in short-lived schemes that lack sustainable finance or do not integrate with broader catchment planning. Meanwhile, urban water supply, with its scale of investment and tariff issues, often draws in powerful interest groups, including private operators, real estate developers, or agricultural lobbies [12]. Governance challenges manifest in corruption, nepotism, or elite capture, e.g., in the distribution of subsidies for irrigation well drilling [5].

Power imbalances play a major role in disempowering marginal communities [13]. Women, small landholders, or slum dwellers typically lack effective representation in water forums or have limited capacity to voice concerns about water reliability or quality [23]. Effective governance thus must grapple with these structural inequalities to be truly inclusive and pro-poor [24].

Groundwater Overexploitation and Quality Degradation

As groundwater wells proliferate to meet agricultural and domestic demands, they risk unsustainable extraction that often leads to aquifer depletion and declines in water quality. India's "groundwater boom" stands as a cautionary tale of unregulated tubewell expansion fueling agricultural growth but simultaneously imperiling the resource base [4]. Additional water-quality risks include arsenic contamination in parts of Bangladesh and eastern India, fluoride contamination in arid regions, and nitrates from agricultural run-off.

Management complexities arise because groundwater governance is decentralized—thousands of private well owners individually pump water with minimal oversight, while data on aquifer characteristics or water levels remain incomplete [5]. The lack of robust property rights for groundwater further complicates enforcement of pumping regulations.

Climate Variability and Disaster Risk
Climate variability intensifies the vulnerability of water supply systems, especially in drought-prone or flood-prone contexts. Rising temperatures can increase evapotranspiration and overall water demand, while shifting precipitation patterns complicate reservoir management. Rural communities reliant on shallow wells or seasonal rivers become highly susceptible to water stress [4,25].

Additionally, monsoonal floods in South Asia or cyclones in coastal Africa or the Caribbean can devastate water infrastructure, contaminating municipal sources. Reactive governance—i.e., emergency relief after floods or droughts—tends to overshadow forward-looking planning, reinforcing cycles of vulnerability [5,26]. This underscores an urgent need for adaptive and risk-based solutions that embed climate resilience into water governance at multiple scales.

Technical and Managerial Solutions from Various Industries
Beyond direct water-sector interventions, solutions often stem from industries like energy, advanced manufacturing, and information technology. Such cross-sector synergies can foster efficiency gains and innovations that transform water supply.

The Energy–Water Nexus
Energy industry collaborations have led to the rise of large-scale desalination projects in regions such as the Middle East and parts of India's coastal regions [4,27]. Coupling desalination with renewable energy (e.g., solar-powered plants) can reduce carbon footprints while expanding potable supplies [28]. However, high capital and operational costs, along with brine disposal concerns, remain obstacles for broad-scale deployment in lower-income settings.

In many rural areas, decentralized renewable energy can power small-scale pumping or treatment systems. Solar irrigation pumps in sub-Saharan Africa or India's solar mini-grids in remote villages illustrate the potential for bridging water, food, and energy security [4]. Nonetheless, ensuring affordability and stable supply chains for maintenance remains a policy challenge.

Information and Communications Technology (ICT)
ICT-based solutions, including remote sensing, mobile platforms, and sensor networks, can streamline water management. For instance, real-time data on reservoir levels, groundwater tables, or distribution system pressures enhance operational efficiency, reduce losses, and facilitate dynamic water allocations [29]. In urban contexts, advanced metering infrastructure allows for accurate consumption tracking and demand-side management; in rural scenarios, mobile-phone-based monitoring of handpump functionality can expedite repairs.

Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Water Services
Collaboration between government agencies and private-sector actors—PPPs—have gained traction in cities across Latin America (Mexico, Brazil) and parts of Asia (India, Philippines). Proponents argue that private operators can introduce managerial expertise, attract capital, and expand coverage more rapidly. Critics highlight risks of inflated tariffs or profit-driven priorities overshadowing universal access [30]. The success of PPPs is contingent on robust contractual frameworks, transparent procurement, and continuous regulatory oversight to protect public interests.

Agricultural and Industrial Water Efficiency
Water use efficiency in agriculture (e.g., micro-irrigation, drip systems, or precision sprinklers) can lower water consumption and mitigate groundwater depletion [5]. Improved irrigation scheduling, soil moisture sensors, and remote-sensing-based evapotranspiration assessments support data-driven optimization. Meanwhile, industrial solutions such as water recycling, zero-liquid-discharge processes, and advanced effluent treatment can dramatically reduce water footprints [31]. Although cost barriers remain, demonstration pilots in India's textile or chemical industries highlight the feasibility of closed-loop approaches.

Experiences in Industrialized Countries: Successes and Caveats
Examining how developed nations have addressed water governance transitions can illuminate potential pathways—and pitfalls—for developing contexts.

Shifting from Infrastructure to Ecosystem Restoration
Countries like the Netherlands and Germany historically pursued large-scale infrastructure for flood defense [32]. Over the last two decades, however, policy entrepreneurs have spearheaded transitions toward risk-based and ecosystem-based approaches, e.g., the "Room for the River" program in the Netherlands or re-naturalization of floodplains in Germany. Although these new strategies incorporate stakeholder participation and multi-level governance, the old engineering approaches remain deeply embedded in agencies' organizational culture [33,34]. Transitioning from command-and-control to integrated planning has thus required both legislative reforms (e.g., the EU Water Framework Directive) and institutional innovation [35].

Market-Based Instruments and Water Rights
Water trading in Australia and certain western U.S. states exemplifies advanced market-based governance. Under regulated frameworks, water rights are allocated to users, who can then buy or sell entitlements based on demand. These markets can incentivize conservation and reallocation of water to high-value uses [36]. However, critics caution that water markets risk marginalizing smallholders who lack capital or legal literacy [8]. Administrative capacity is also vital to ensure robust monitoring of usage and preventing third-party impacts or environmental harm.

Decentralization and Local Empowerment
The increased role of local municipalities and user associations in Western Europe or North America partly resonates with developing-country decentralization goals [37]. In the United States, watershed councils often integrate cross-jurisdictional decision-making. Yet even in advanced democracies, power imbalances and entrenched interest groups can hamper fair stakeholder representation [38]. Adequate funding, technical capacity building, and legislative clarity remain decisive factors for ensuring local bodies fulfill expanded mandates.

Adaptive Management and Real-Time Regulation
A hallmark of successful governance in some developed contexts

has been the adoption of iterative, flexible management that can respond to changing conditions [39]. The Netherlands' approach to dynamic flood risk, including scenario-based planning, stress-testing infrastructure, and multi-year budgeting for uncertain climate futures, demonstrates how an adaptive orientation can be institutionalized [33,34]. Tools like multi-criteria decision analysis or integrated hydrological–economic models also help local governments evaluate trade-offs [40].

Mathematical and Modeling Approaches for Water Governance
Technical solutions and governance structures increasingly benefit from mathematical and computational tools that integrate hydrological, economic, and socio-political parameters [41]. Below, we outline a few core methods:

Hydrological–Economic Modeling
Quantitative models such as the Indus Basin Model Revised—Multi-Year (IBMR-MY) or the MIKE HYDRO Basin platform combine water balance equations with agricultural production functions to simulate water allocation scenarios and measure economic benefits [42]. Policymakers and planners can test alternative reservoir operations, irrigation schedules, or subsidy structures. For instance, in the Indus Basin context, changes in interprovincial water allocation can be analyzed for their impacts on agricultural incomes [42].

Mathematically, such tools may incorporate objective functions maximizing net present value of crop yield subject to constraints (water availability, infrastructure capacity, environmental flow requirements). A typical simplified objective function might be:

$$max \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left(\sum_{c=1}^{C} P_c \times Y_c(I_{c,t}, X_c) - Cost(I_{c,t}, \dots) \right) (1+r)^{-t}$$

where:
- P_c denotes price of crop c,
- $Y_c(I_c,t, X_c)$ is the yield as a function of irrigation input Ic,t in time t and other factors Xc,
- Cost(I_c,t, ...) aggregates costs of water extraction, distribution, and other inputs,
- r is a discount rate,
- T is the planning horizon,
- C is the set of crops.

Constraints typically ensure that the sum of water allocated across crops or sectors in each time step does not exceed available supply in the system or hamper minimum environmental flows.

System Dynamics Models
System dynamics frameworks capture feedback loops between economic development, water resource use, and environmental outcomes. They have been used in contexts like the Ganges–Brahmaputra Basin or the Lake Victoria region to visualize how upstream extraction influences downstream availability, or how population growth amplifies groundwater depletion [42]. With modular design, these models can incorporate water quality, climate variability, and institutional rules.

Agent-Based Models
Agent-based modeling (ABM) simulates how individual or group behaviors—e.g., farmers' pumping decisions—generate emergent system-level outcomes (e.g., aquifer drawdown). ABMs are especially suitable when stakeholder heterogeneity, institutional rules, and informal norms shape outcomes [43]. In a rural groundwater governance scenario, each agent (farmer) might decide how much water to pump based on crop market prices, well depth, input costs, and neighbor behavior. By simulating various policy interventions—like groundwater pricing or capping extraction—researchers can assess the system's response over time.

Multi-Criteria Analysis and Optimization
Choosing among multiple policy options with competing objectives, such as cost, equity, reliability, and environmental impact, requires multi-criteria analysis (MCA). For example, a national water agency might evaluate a set of interventions—building new reservoirs, promoting drip irrigation, or reforming water tariffs—and rank them by an MCA approach that integrates stakeholder preferences [41]. Coupling MCA with computational optimization helps identify a Pareto frontier, clarifying trade-offs across social, economic, and ecological dimensions [8].

Policy Entrepreneurship, Institutional Design, and Multi-Level Coordination
Policy Entrepreneurship and Coalition Building
Recent research underscores the importance of "policy entrepreneurs" who champion new solutions, navigate bureaucracies, and orchestrate coalitions to effect major policy shifts [16]. India's success in promoting solar-powered irrigation pumps in certain states is partly attributed to local entrepreneurs who brokered partnerships among government agencies, NGOs, and small farmers [4].

Coalition building is vital, especially in fragmented environments. Effective alliances might unite local water user associations, municipal councils, philanthropic foundations, and the private sector around pilot programs. Meanwhile, policy entrepreneurs strategically open or leverage "windows of opportunity," e.g., a severe drought galvanizing public sentiment for new legislation [44].

Institutional Mechanisms for Accountability
Robust institutions ensure that policies do not stagnate due to corruption or vested interests. Accountability mechanisms may include:
- **Transparent Financial Management:** To curb diversion of project funds, internationally recognized auditing standards combined with community oversight committees help track expenditures.
- **Public Hearings and Stakeholder Forums:** Enabling local residents to challenge decisions fosters bottom-up scrutiny (Lebel et al., 2009).
- **Multi-Stakeholder Boards:** Including NGOs, academic experts, women's groups, and private sector representatives in water regulatory boards can guard against capture by any single interest group.

Yet, accountability frameworks must not over-burden local institutions with bureaucracy. Striking the right balance between external oversight and local autonomy is crucial [13].

Financing and Cost Recovery
Introducing cost-recovery principles—charging households or farmers for water supply—remains a contentious but increasingly common policy direction. In many developing countries, universal free water distribution is fiscally unsustainable, leading to service

deterioration. Tiered pricing or carefully regulated cost recovery can enhance financial viability, provided social safety nets protect low-income households [29].

Combining local-level revenue streams with external support (subsidies, revolving funds, or microfinance) can sustain capital-intensive expansions while avoiding regressive impacts. If properly managed, such an approach can also align with polluter-pays principles or resource-rent capture in contexts of high-value industrial use [35].

Cross-Boundary Collaboration and Federal–State Coordination
In federal systems like India, Nigeria, or Brazil, alignment between central policies and state-level implementation is essential. Inter-state water disputes arise from political friction over shared rivers or aquifers [42]. Mechanisms like river-basin authorities, apex councils, or formal water treaties can institutionalize dispute resolution [30]. However, centralized or top-down approaches must allow for local adaptation.

At a more granular level, bridging departmental silos—e.g., agriculture, environment, and public works—requires shared data platforms, integrated planning committees, and joint budgeting [5]. Adopting integrated resource management is not a purely technical matter but demands political will and systematic cooperation.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Synthesis of Key Findings

This review underscores several interconnected themes that define water governance and policy transitions in developing countries:

Critical Role of Institutions
Effective governance depends on robust institutional architectures. Fragmentation and lack of clarity in roles hamper coherent decision making, leading to partial or duplicative efforts. Tools like multi-level governance structures, basin councils, or user associations must be carefully designed and supported.

Centrality of Participation and Equity
Inclusive engagement of stakeholders—particularly marginalized groups like smallholder farmers, women, or slum dwellers—remains vital. Without concerted efforts to rectify power asymmetries, partial measures or unsustainable exploitation can result, as evidenced by repeated cases where water distribution is captured by elites.

Technical Innovations from Cross-Sector Collaboration
Partnerships with energy and manufacturing industries can facilitate advanced solutions (desalination, solar power, efficient irrigation). Although capital and operating costs can be high, properly structured PPPs and technology transfers can yield net benefits.

Adaptive, Data-Driven Approaches
Managing climate variability and system uncertainty requires dynamic adaptation, real-time data, and modeling tools. From system dynamics to agent-based simulations, advanced modeling is increasingly used to evaluate "what if" scenarios, bridging the gap between high-level policy design and ground-level complexities.

Continued Relevance of Traditional Infrastructure
Despite the new paradigms of integrated management, large-scale engineering structures remain crucial to meet base supply needs and flood control. The more urgent requirement is synergy—balancing or integrating structural solutions with participatory and ecosystem-based initiatives.

Policy Entrepreneurship and Coalition Building
The trajectory of water policy strongly reflects the efforts of policy entrepreneurs who exploit opportune windows to drive reforms. Although visionary leadership can expedite change, sustaining reforms requires institutional mechanisms ensuring accountability and resilience to political turnover.

Pathways for Future Research
There is a need for additional comparative case studies, especially in understudied regions, to further refine our understanding of how specific local contexts mediate the interplay among governance structures, cross-sector solutions, and climate adaptation. Interdisciplinary collaboration among political scientists, civil engineers, hydrologists, economists, and anthropologists would help generate robust frameworks that are both operationally viable and socially equitable.

Further, bridging large-scale hydrological modeling with local-level agent-based perspectives remains a challenge. Enhanced modeling approaches that integrate climate downscaling, local institutional realities, and power analytics can guide more nuanced, context-specific policy. Additional exploration is warranted on how technology innovations—such as big data analytics, machine learning for water demand forecasting, or distributed ledger technologies for transparent water trading—might transform the sector.

Policy Implications

In practice, water governance practitioners must consider:

- **Legal Reforms Coupled with Implementation Roadmaps:** Legislative changes that adopt IWRM or climate-adaptive principles must be accompanied by clear guidelines, capacity building, and financial resources.
- **Pro-Poor and Gender-Sensitive Policies:** Tariff design, licensing procedures for well drilling, or agricultural subsidies must integrate equity goals. Extended payment plans or targeted subsidies can help safeguard vulnerable communities from abrupt cost surges.
- **Holistic, Cross-Sector Coordination:** Water solutions must account for parallel agricultural, energy, and industrial interests to reduce trade-offs and enhance synergy. For instance, using renewable energy to power drip irrigation can be integrated in rural development packages.
- **Participation beyond Tokenism:** True representation demands formalized roles for local communities in water boards, transparent budgeting, and systematic redress mechanisms.
- **Long-Term Monitoring and Adaptive Learning:** Setting up iterative mechanisms—e.g., annual water audits, scenario planning exercises, or environment flow reviews—ensures that policies remain relevant amidst evolving environmental, socioeconomic, and technological conditions.

Despite the recognized need for integrated, adaptive approaches, the path to sustainable, equitable water governance is littered with complexities and political negotiations. The knowledge gleaned from multiple contexts, coupled with advanced modeling, can inform better strategies that align resource efficiency, social justice, and resilience to climate shocks. As water stress mounts globally, the impetus for such solutions will only intensify, demanding leadership, innovation, and collective stewardship at all governance levels [45-47].

References

1. Biswas AK, Tortajada C (2010) Future Water Governance: Problems and Perspectives. Water Resources Development 26: 129-139.
2. Lautze J, de Silva S, Giordano M, Sanford L (2011) Putting the cart before the horse: Water governance and IWRM. Natural Resources Forum 35: 1-8.
3. Tortajada C (2010) Water governance: Some critical issues. Water Resources Development 26: 297-307.
4. Shah T (2009) Climate change and groundwater: India's opportunities for mitigation and adaptation. Environmental Research Letters 4: 035001-035005.
5. Mukherji A, Shah T (2005) Groundwater socio-ecology and governance: A review of institutions and policies in selected countries. Hydrogeology Journal 13: 328-345.
6. Cashman A (2012) Water policy development and governance in the Caribbean: An overview of regional progress. Water Policy 14: 14-30.
7. Pahl-Wostl C, Holtz G, Kastens B, Knieper C (2010) Analyzing complex water governance regimes: The management and transition framework. Environmental Science & Policy 13: 571-581.
8. Conca K (2006) Governing water: Contentious transnational politics and global institution building. MIT Press 6: 317-320.
9. Gerlak AK, Lubell M, Heikkila T (2009) The promise and performance of collaborative governance. Oxford University Press https://ouci.dntb.gov.ua/en/works/m4YmOka4/.
10. ADB (1999) Governance in Asia: From crisis to opportunity. Asian Development Bank https://www.gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp/sotsubo/ADB_AnnualReport1998_Ch3.pdf.
11. Whiteley JM, Ingram H, Perry R (2008) Water, place, and equity. MIT Press https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262731911/water-place-and-equity/.
12. Castro JE (2007) Water governance in the twentieth-first century. Ambiente & Sociedade 10: 97-118.
13. Narain V (2009) Growing city, shrinking hinterland: Land acquisition, transition, and conflict in peri-urban Gurgaon, India. Environment and Urbanization 21: 501-512.
14. McIntosh S, Leotaud N (2007) Water governance and management in the Caribbean: An analysis of critical issues and possible solutions. IDRC Press 14: 14-30.
15. Theesfeld I (2010) Institutional challenges for national groundwater governance: Policies and issues. Ground Water 48: 131-142.
16. Meijerink S, Huitema D (2010) Policy entrepreneurs and change strategies: Lessons from sixteen case studies of water transitions around the globe. Ecology and Society, 15: 20-21.
17. Benson D, Gain AK, Rouillard J (2015) Water governance in a comparative perspective: From IWRM to a 'nexus' approach? Water Alternatives 8: 756-773.
18. Biswas AK (2008) Integrated water resources management: Is it working? International Journal of Water Resources Development 24: 5-22.
19. Pahl-Wostl C (2007) Transitions towards adaptive management of water facing climate and global change. Water Resources Management 21: 49-62.
20. Engle NL, Johns OR, Lemos MC, Nelson DR (2011) Integrated and adaptive management of water resources: Tensions, legacies, and the next best thing. Ecology and Society 16: 10-19.
21. Islam MT, Shen S, Ishida A (2013) Future water demand in Bangladesh under global climate change and socio-economic development scenarios. Global Environmental Research 17: 169-177.
22. Goldin J, Kibassa D (2009) Water governance and participation in Tanzania: The case of the Pangani River Basin. In D. Huitema & S. Meijerink (Eds.), Water policy entrepreneurs: A research companion to water transitions around the globe 261-278.
23. UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2004) Water governance for poverty reduction: Key issues and the UNDP response to the Millennium Development Goals. UNDP https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/publications/UNDP_Water%20Governance%20for%20Poverty%20Reduction.pdf.
24. Cleaver F, Franks T (2005) Water governance and poverty: A framework for analysis. Bradford Centre for International Development Research 7: 291-306.
25. Padgham J, Dietrich K, Juhl A, Boehlert B (2015) Managing change: A review of adaptation innovations for the water, sanitation, and hygiene sector. Climate and Development 7: 175-185.
26. Gain AK, Schwab M (2012) An assessment of water governance trends: The case of Bangladesh. Water Policy 14: 821-840.
27. Pahl-Wostl C, Knieper C (2014) The capacity of water governance to deal with the climate change adaptation challenge: Using fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis to distinguish between polycentric, fragmented, and centralized regimes. Global Environmental Change 29: 139-154.
28. Cooley H, Gleick PH, Wolff G (2009) Desalination, with a grain of salt: A California perspective. Pacific Institute https://pacinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/desalination-grain-of-salt.pdf.
29. Zwarteveen MZ, Boelens R (2014) Defining, researching, and struggling for water justice: Some conceptual building blocks for research and action. Water International 39: 143-158.
30. Wilder M (2010) Water governance in Mexico: Political and economic apertures and a shifting state-citizen relationship. Ecology and Society 15:15-22.
31. Gupta J, Pahl-Wostl C, Zondervan R (2013) Glocal water governance: A multi-level challenge in the anthropocene. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability 5: 573-580.
32. Becker G (2009) The evolution of flood management in Germany: Transitions toward integrated flood risk management. In D. Huitema & S. Meijerink (Eds.), Water policy entrepreneurs: A research companion to water transitions around the globe 113-138.
33. Huitema D, Meijerink S (2009a) Water policy entrepreneurs: A research companion to water transitions around the globe. Edward Elgar https://china.elgaronline.com/edcollbook/9781848443310.xml.
34. Huitema D, Meijerink S (2009b) Realizing water transitions: The role of policy entrepreneurs in water policy change. Ecology and Society 14: 20-26.
35. Partzsch L (2009) The EU Water Framework Directive: Meeting the global call for progressive realization of water rights? Global Environmental Politics 9: 80-107.
36. Hughes N, McKay J (2009) The national water initiative and water planning in the Murray-Darling Basin." In D. Huitema & S. Meijerink (Eds.), Water policy entrepreneurs: A research companion to water transitions around the globe 189-208.

37. Marks D, Lebel L (2016) Incremental changes or punctuations? Exploring social-ecological transformations in the lower Ping River basin, northern Thailand. Environmental Management 57: 1248-1262.
38. Ingram H, Lejano R (2009) Transitional dynamics of policy change: The case of water in the American West. Ecology and Society 14: 20-29.
39. Folke C (2006) Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses. Global Environmental Change 16: 253-267.
40. Schmidt G, Benítez M (2012) A multi-criteria evaluation of policy instruments for climate change mitigation in the power generation sector of Mexico. Energy Policy 43: 269-284.
41. Brown C, Ghile Y, Laverty M, Li K (2015) Decision scaling: Linking bottom-up vulnerability analysis with climate projections in the water sector. Water Resources Research 48: 127-138.
42. Yang YCE, Brown CM, Yu W, Wescoat JL (2014) Water governance and adaptation to climate change in the Indus River Basin. Journal of Hydrology 519: 2527-2537.
43. Galaz V, Olsson P, Hahn T, Folke C, Svedin U (2010) The problem of fit among biophysical systems, environmental and resource regimes, and broader governance systems: Insights and emerging challenges. Institutions and Environmental Change: Principal Findings, Applications, and Research Frontiers https://academic.oup.com/mit-press-scholarship-online/book/17681/chapter-abstract/175361709?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false.
44. Olsson P, Galaz V (2009) Transitions to adaptive water management and governance in Sweden. Stockholm Resilience Centre https://www.stockholmresilience.org/publications/publications/2010-02-17-transitions-to-adaptive-approaches-to-water-management-and-governance-in-sweden.html.
45. Bakker K (2003) An uncooperative commodity: Privatizing water in England and Wales. Oxford University Press https://academic.oup.com/book/53886?login=false.
46. Shah T, Raju KV (1988) Groundwater markets and small farmer development. Economic and Political Weekly 23: A23-A28.
47. Singh C (2018) Is participatory watershed development building local adaptive capacity? Findings from a case study in Rajasthan, India. Environmental Development 25: 43-58.