



WATER LAW IN FEDERAL COUNTRIES

Dr. Gabriela Cuadrado-Quesada and Dr. Susanne Schmeier

IHE Delft Institute for Water Education



Deltares











Content

- Differences of law between unitary countries and federal countries
- Overview of federal countries and their role in water issues
- Water law in federal countries
- Examples of the use and complexities of water law in federal countries
- Conclusions



Unitary and federal countries

Unitary countries

- Generally have one water law for the whole country and one set of laws on other related issues (e.g., agriculture, environment) that apply to the country.
- It can be seen as coherent, top down, and general.

Federal countries

- Generally divide topics such as water into federal and state responsibilities based on the principle of subsidiarity.
- Many have decentralized water issues/laws/regulations to states.
- However, they retain control over water when it is an issue of interstate importance or when it concerns transboundary rivers.



| Countries | Role of central government * | Defining roles | State law | Examples of basins | Water-sharing problems in these basins |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---|
| Argentina | Joint | Constitution, Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Trahunco Basin | Between users |
| Australia | Joint | Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Murray-Darling Basin | Between human and nature |
| Austria | Joint | Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Danube Basin | Between uses and users concerning water-related risks |
| Belgium | Joint | Constitution, Law | Yes | River Meuse | Between uses (water quality) - international river |
| Brazil | Joint | Constitution, Law | Yes | São Francisco River | Between human and nature and users |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | Joint | Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Sava River Basin | Between uses (lack of drinking water) |
| Canada | Dominant | Constitution, Law | Yes | Mackenzie River Basin | Between states |
| Emirates | Dominant | Law | No | Groundwater | Between uses (lack of drinking water) |
| Ethiopia | Dominant | Ad hoc | No | Nile River Basin | Between other countries part of the same river basin |
| Germany | Joint | Law | Yes | Elbe River Basin | Between uses (water quality) |
| India | Joint | Constitution, Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Cauvery River | Between states |
| Mexico | Dominant | Constitution, Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Valley of Mexico basin | Between uses and human and nature |
| Nepal | Dominant | Constitution | No | Pandai river | Between other countries part of the same river basin |
| Russia | Dominant | Law, Ad hoc | No | West of Russia | Between regions |
| Switzerland | Joint | Law | Yes | Melting glaciers | Between uses |
| South Sudan | Dominant | Law, Ad hoc | No | Nile Basin | Between other countries part of the same river basin |
| Pakistan | Join | Constitution, Law, Ad hoc | Yes | Kabul River Basin | Between states/countries |
| United States | Joint | Constitution, Law | Yes | Colorado River Basin - | Between uses |
| Venezuela | Dominant | Law | No | Tuy river basin | Between uses |



Water law in federal countries

- Water law is the specialized area of legislation and statutes that govern the ownership, usage, rights and protection related to a surface and groundwater within a country.
- In federal states, water law tend to be characterised by a multiplicity of complex legislation, (federal, state and local levels), making it difficult to work with
- However, water law can also contribute to address disputes that might exist between states (for example, giving the central government powers to address interstates disputes).
- It provides the central government control to mediate regarding problems with transboundary rivers and aquifers.



Example: India

- Water is a state subject; however, the central government has authority when it concerns a transboundary river and covering two Indian states
- Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Kerala and Puducherry have conflicts with each other on water sharing on the Cauvery
- Government of India is trying to mediate between the conflicting states
 - Decades of negotiations between the parties
 - However, there were not fruitful until the Government of India constituted a tribunal in 1990 to look into the matter.
 - After hearing arguments of all the parties involved (16 years), the tribunal delivered its final verdict on 5 February 2007.
 - It did not end there, as all four states decided to file review petitions seeking clarifications and possible renegotiation of the order.



Example: Australia

- Until the 1980s, water resources law was mainly state based, especially when referring to the conferral and regulation of water access rights.
- Water is a state subject; however since the last two decades the Commonwealth has been more involved in water issues.
- This gradual evolution of Commonwealth involvement in Australian water law has created a multiplicity of complex legislation, making it difficult to work with and to address water challenges.
- 2007 Water Act it was introduced and premised on a complete federal takeover of management of the Murray-Darling Basin. However, this Act never received support from the Basin states to enable the takeover to fully occur.
- Therefore, when disputes arise the Commonwealth intervenes and try to mediate



Example: Germany

- Germany consists of 16 states that hold the primary responsibility for water law and management
- Federal level provides the overarching framework with Federal Water Act
- States have their own state water acts that detail national level in different ways
- Local level (counties, cities) also have certain responsibilities, especially in water supply, permit issuance, etc.)
- Coordination not only between states and between states and federal level, but also at catchment level
- Also bound to supra-national and international water law (EU WFD, international water law)
- Dispute resolution politically or in court (Federal Administrative Court)

| EU WFD | | |
|--|--|--|
| Rhine RBMP and PoM | | |
| Transboundary sub-basin RBMP and PoM (e.g. Moselle-Saar) | | |
| Federal <u>Water</u> Act (WHG) | | |
| Chapeau Chapter | | |
| State Water Act Länder-RBMP and PoM | | |
| Sub-Basin RBMP and PoM (e.g. Main, Neckar) | | |
| Local PoM implementation | | |
| | | |



Conclusions

- Water law in federal countries provides for decentralization of regulation (access, sharing, protection) of water issues.
- Decentralization of water management has various advantages (subsidiarity, political power distribution), but also comes with certain challenges.
- Water law in federal countries creates a multiplicity of complex legislation (country level, state level, local level), which makes it difficult to work with and to address some more local water challenges.
- Water law in federal countries retains control of the central government over water when it is an issue of interstates importance or when it is related to transboundary rivers.
- Water law in federal countries also plays a role of addressing interstates disputes and mitigating interests between different states.

