

Water Policy Research

Highlight

**Groundwater and
Human Development:
Challenges and Opportunities in
Livelihoods and Environment**

Tushaar Shah



At less than 1000 km³/year, world's annual use of groundwater is 1.5 percent of renewable water resource but contributes a lion's share of the global water-welfare. Sustaining the massive welfare gains groundwater development has created is a key water challenge today. In exploring this challenge, we have focused a good deal on conditions of resource occurrence but less so on resource use.

This paper offers a typology of 5 groundwater demand systems as groundwater socio-ecologies (GwSEs), each embodying a unique pattern of interactions between socio-economic and ecological variables, and each facing a distinct groundwater governance challenge.

Download this paper from
<http://www.iwmi.org/iwmi-tata>

GROUNDWATER AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN LIVELIHOODS AND ENVIRONMENT¹


RESEARCH HIGHLIGHT BASED ON A PAPER WITH THE SAME TITLE

GLOBAL GROUNDWATER JUGGERNAUT

Rapid growth in groundwater use is a central aspect of the world's water story, especially since 1950. Shallow wells and muscle-driven lifting devices have been in vogue in many parts of the world for millennia. In British India (which included today's India, Pakistan and Bangladesh), wells accounted for over 30 percent of irrigated land even in 1903 when only 14 percent of cropped area was irrigated. With the rise of the tubewell and pump technology, groundwater use soared to previously unthinkable levels after 1970. In Spain, groundwater use increased from 2 km³/year to 6 km³/year during 1960-2000 before it got stabilized. In the US, groundwater

share in irrigation increased from 23 percent in 1950 to 42 percent in 2000. In the Indian sub-continent, groundwater use soared from around 10-20 km³ before 1950 to 240-260 km³ today. Data on groundwater use are scarce; however, Figure 1 attempts to backcast the probable trajectories of growth in groundwater use in selected countries. While in the US, Spain, Mexico, and north-African countries like Morocco and Tunisia groundwater use peaked during the 1980s or thereabouts, in south Asia and north China plains, the upward trend begun during the 1970s is still continuing. A third wave of growth in groundwater use is likely in the making in many regions of Africa and in some south and south-east Asian countries such as Sri Lanka and Vietnam.

Figure 1: Growth in Groundwater Use in Selected Countries



Source : Author's estimates

¹The research covered by this IWMI-Tata Research Highlight was carried out with generous support from Sir Ratan Tata Trust, Mumbai, under the IWMI-Tata Water Policy Program. The paper can be downloaded from the IWMI-Tata Website <http://www.iwmi.org/iwmi-tata>. It was first presented as a keynote paper for Stockholm World Water Week, 2004.

This is a pre-publication paper revised for the IWMI-Tata Annual Partners' Meet. This is not a peer reviewed paper; views contained in it are those of the author(s) and not of the International Water Management Institute or Sir Ratan Tata Trust.

TYOLOGY OF GROUNDWATER SOCIO-ECOLOGIES

At less than 1000 km³/year, global groundwater use is a quarter of total global water withdrawals but just 1.5 percent of the world's annually renewable freshwater supplies, 8.2 percent of annually renewable groundwater, and 0.0001 percent of global groundwater reserves estimated to be between 7 and 23 million km³. Yet its contribution to human welfare is huge in five distinct types of groundwater socio-ecologies (GwSEs) based on intensive groundwater use, each embodying a unique pattern of interaction between socio-economic, demographic and ecological variables, and each presenting a distinctive groundwater management challenge.

According to an estimate, over half the world's population relies on groundwater for drinking water supply.

Type I- Habitat support GwSEs: Groundwater has historically supplied water in numerous human settlements, urban and rural, around the world. According to one estimate, "...over half the world's population relies on groundwater as a drinking water supply." Seventy percent of piped water supply in the European Union (EU) is drawn from groundwater. Management of Type I GwSEs presents unique challenges since, in the process of urbanization, the population of a habitat generally grows faster than its geographic span; as a result, pressure on groundwater resources underlying the habitat increases rapidly as villages grow into towns and thence into cities. The ubiquitous response combines import of surface or groundwater from a distant source, volumetric pricing, improved water supply infrastructure, and service to crowd out private urban tubewells to reduce pressure on urban groundwater.

Type II- Nonrenewable GwSEs: Arid and semi-arid countries in the middle east and north Africa (MENA) region—Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Jordan, Oman, Bahrain, UAE, Iran, Libya, and Egypt—depend on either fossil or limitedly renewable groundwater. Some, such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Yemen and Libya, experimented

with intensive groundwater use in agriculture to secure food self-sufficiency; however, it is increasingly realized that the use of fossil groundwater—even in large reserves such as the Nubian aquifer—needs to be managed in a planned manner using different criteria than used for managing renewable groundwater. Virtual water imports, off-farm livelihoods, shifting and reduction in agricultural areas, wastewater treatment and reuse and desalination are elements of strategies used to ease pressure on fossil groundwater.

Four Groundwater Socio-Ecologies (GwSEs)

<p>Habitat-Support GwSEs</p> <p>Where: Most Cities, Towns and Villages Driver: Population Density and Industry Challenge: Depletion; Land Subsidence; Pollution</p>	<p>Non-Renewable GwSEs</p> <p>Where: Arid and Semi-arid Regions; MENA; Nubian Driver: Urban Growth and Agriculture Challenge: Planned Utilization of a Non-renewable Resource</p>
<p>Livelihoods-Support GwSEs</p> <p>Where: India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, north China plains Driver: Small-holder subsistence Agriculture Challenge: Sustaining Massive Livelihoods and Protecting the Resource</p>	<p>Wealth-Creating GwSEs</p> <p>Where: Western US; Israel; Turkey; Spain; S. Africa; Morocco; Tunisia Driver: Industrial, High-value Agriculture Challenge: Depletion; Drying up of Wetlands and Streams; Non-point Pollution</p>

Type III- Wealth-creating GwSEs: In recent decades, groundwater has become increasingly important in meeting water needs of industries and industrial agriculture in many developed countries such as Spain, US, and Australia. Three key characteristics of Type III GwSEs are: [a] users are normally few, large, and identifiable; as a result, it becomes possible to create and enforce rules, norms, rights, and economic incentives to regulate use by creating a formal economy; [b] using groundwater as a factor of production, Type III GwSEs generate substantial wealth which is shared by a relatively small number of resource users; [c] as a result, these attract and support scientific and technical wherewithal for intensive management of the resource and its use.

Out of the global annual groundwater use of 950-1000 km³, half or more is used to sustain agrarian economies of south Asia and north China where over half of the total population has a livelihood-stake in well irrigation.

Type IV- Livelihood supporting GwSEs: In terms of groundwater quantity and numbers of people involved, by far the largest growth in groundwater use has occurred in sustaining subsistence crop and livestock farming which is the mainstay of billions of poor people in developing agrarian economies around the world such as India, Bangladesh, Nepal, and China (Figure 2). Out of the global annual groundwater use of 950-1000 km³, half or more is likely accounted for by Type IV GwSEs. From the resource governance viewpoint, these represent a different ballgame altogether because: [a] they are dominated by large diffuse masses of small users who are neither registered, nor licensed, operating as they do in totally informal irrigation economies untrammelled by laws and regulations; [b] unlike Type III GwSEs of Spain, US and Australia, Type IV GwSEs support large numbers of poor people but generate little wealth in absolute or relative terms. A groundwater user in south Asia produces a gross output of US \$ 400/ha from irrigating crops; in contrast, a Spanish farmer in the Andalusia region generates gross output/ha of US \$ 8000 on average but can go up to US \$ 75000; [c] despite these apparently low returns, small holders in Type IV GwSEs have huge stakes in groundwater irrigation because it has served as one of the largest and most potent 'poverty


reduction' programs in recent decades; [d] since science, technology, and management tend to get attracted to wealth generation more easily than to poverty reduction, Type IV GwSEs attract far less of groundwater management inputs than Type III GwSEs.

Type V- GwSEs based on trans-boundary aquifers : Numerous aquifers in the world are shared by two or more sovereign states; most of these are small but some—like the Nubian with an estimated reserve of over 500,000 km³—are huge. As intensive groundwater use emerges in these aquifers, their effective governance becomes subject to a new class of problems needing unique institutional responses and mediating mechanisms. Management of shared aquifers between Israel and Palestine, between the US and Mexico, and amongst countries of the Nile basin who will share the Nubian illustrate these unique issues. For the purposes of this highlight, however, we will ignore Type V GwSEs, important as they are in the global groundwater setting.

GROUNDWATER AND POVERTY IN ASIA

Globally, growth in groundwater irrigation has had, until recently, little to do with the occurrence of the resource; if anything, led essentially by

Figure 2: Groundwater Irrigated Area in Countries with Intensive Groundwater Use in Agriculture




Source : FAO Aquastat 2003 and other sources

demand-pull, intensive development has tended to occur in arid and semi-arid regions with relatively poor groundwater endowments. Regions with abundant rainfall and recharge—much of south America, Canada, south-east Asia, and southern China—make little use of groundwater in agriculture. Intensive groundwater use, where extraction per km³ of annual recharge is high, has also had little to do with the geology of regions. Instead, Type IV GwSEs have: [a] high population density; [b] high livelihood dependence on peasant farming dominated by small, fragmented land holdings; and [c] arid to semi-arid and often monsoon climate. Of the 300 million ha of irrigated land in the world, some 85-95 million depend on groundwater; over 85 percent of these areas are in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Iran and north China plains. All these have all the three characteristics outlined above. Bangladesh, with high precipitation, is more like south-east Asian countries; but its flood-proneness makes groundwater irrigation critical for improved agricultural productivity it needs to support its very high population density. As a result, from only a few thousand shallow tubewells in 1980,

Bangladesh has added nearly a million since then, raising its groundwater irrigated area from close to nothing in 1980 to 2.8 million ha in 2000, which is 90 percent of its irrigated land. Figure 3, which overlays tubewell density (each black dot represents 5000 groundwater structures) over population density in India and Pakistan Punjab, shows that high tubewell densities follow high population density in the Indo-Gangetic basin where the resource is abundant to southern India where the resource is very limited. However, tubewell density is low in central India where population density is low but untapped resource is available. This is perhaps why Africa with its low population density will never experience the kind of groundwater irrigation explosion that south Asia is experiencing.

Globally, growth in groundwater irrigation has had, until recently, little to do with the occurrence of the resource. Led essentially by demand-pull, intensive development has tended to occur in arid and semi-arid regions with relatively poor groundwater endowments.

Figure 3: Density of Population and Distribution of Energized Pumps in India and Pakistan



Type IV GwSEs of south Asia and north China plains represent a veritable anarchy functioning on a colossal scale. India, for instance, has been adding 0.8-1 million new tubewells every year since 1990; and there is no sign of deceleration in this trend. One in four of India's farmers has invested in irrigation wells; most of the remaining buy pump irrigation service from their tubewell-owning neighbors. Government of India claims 60 percent of India's irrigated areas is served by groundwater wells; independent surveys suggest the figure may well be 75 percent; and even more if conjunctive use areas are included. Much the same is true of Pakistan, Nepal *terai*, Bangladesh, and Hebei, Shandong, and Henan provinces in the Yellow river basin in north China plains. Governments and donors have invested heavily in building major dams and canal irrigation projects in these regions; but, as of now, by far the bulk of the irrigation — and livelihood benefits — is delivered by groundwater wells. Over half of the total population of India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh has a livelihood-stake in well irrigation. During the 1970s, India discussed different strategies for irrigation command areas and for rainfed farming regions. Thanks to groundwater development, there are hardly any rainfed farming 'regions' or even villages in India; there are just rainfed and mostly groundwater irrigated plots.

Thanks to groundwater development, there are hardly any rain-fed farming 'regions' or even villages in India; there are just rain-fed and mostly groundwater irrigated plots.

GROUNDWATER GOVERNANCE: INSTITUTIONS, LAW, POLICIES

This runaway growth in Type IV GwSEs in developing countries in Asia exemplifies best how poverty works as the enemy of the environment. High population pressure on agriculture has induced farmers to overwork their tiny land holdings in search of more livelihoods per unit of all that land has to offer — soil nutrients, moisture, and underlying groundwater. Widespread indications of groundwater depletion and deterioration, rising energy use and pumping costs, well failures, and weakening drought-

protection suggest that the 'groundwater boom', which has done more to sustain the poor than all poverty eradication programs, will burst, sooner or later. There are also environmental repercussions in the form of drying up of wetlands and streams, reduced lean season flows of rivers, and salinity ingress in coastal areas. Groundwater quality issues too have assumed serious proportions in many parts of the world; irrigating with saline groundwater, as in the Indus basin and in Australia, have raised the specter of soil salinization on large areas. People and policy makers in many parts of the world—but especially in south Asia and north China plains—are waking up to the dangers of drinking poor quality groundwater high in arsenic or fluoride or other contaminants.

Effective management of groundwater demand to match available recharge is considered central to sustaining intensive groundwater use in Type IV GwSEs; strategies recommended for this purpose are those that have been tried out in Type II and III GwSEs. Community management of groundwater as a common property resource is widely espoused to south Asian policy makers based, for example, on the experience of countries like Spain and Mexico. The issue is if such models can or should be transplanted without ascertaining their effectiveness on their home turf. Spain's 1985 Water Law mandated water user associations at aquifer level; but of some 1400 that were registered, Martinez-Cortina and Hernandez-Mora could identify “only 2 which have actively managed their aquifers, financing all their activities from membership fees”. One reason why these failed, as Llamas points out, was that these users associations mandated top-down by law have been “fraught with strong resistance from farmers”. Mexico likewise has been experimenting with COTAS (Technical Committee for Aquifer Management); these too are yet to begin playing an effective role in aquifer management. Groundwater districts of US are often held out as a model in community groundwater management; however, the US experience itself is a mixed bag. Beginning 1949, Texas allowed the creation of Underground Water Conservation Districts (UWCDs) with discretionary power to regulate groundwater withdrawals and space wells as well as their


production. However, Smith, a US researcher, notes: “Although over forty UWCDs have been created in Texas, they have not been effective managers of groundwater...” and further that “...creating groundwater districts is not—in and of itself—going to ensure sound groundwater management”.

Groundwater demand restriction has normally worked only when alternative supplies are arranged. In effect, then, what has commonly worked is not demand management, but 'groundwater substitution' with imported water.

Demand restriction has also been tried through a combination of pricing, legislative and regulatory action, licensing and permits, and specifying property rights. Direct regulation worked better in countries with a hard state as in Iran which imposed an effective ban on new tubewells in one-third of its central plains or the Soviet Union which banned the use of groundwater for irrigation to protect it for domestic use. However, bans proved counter-productive in Mexico which has issued 14 bans on new tubewells since 1948; however, “every announcement of an imminent ban stimulated a flurry of tubewell making activity”. Mexico also tried, in the early 1990s, creating tradable private property rights in groundwater by issuing 'concessions' to tubewell owners with pre-specified volumes of groundwater to be pumped every year. The idea was that, once private water rights are created, users would have strong incentive in protecting the resource, especially if such rights were valuable and tradable. Concessions have led to registration of tubewells, useful in itself; but enforcing the groundwater quota has proved administratively impossible even though Mexico has all of 90,000 irrigation tubewells, compared to north China's 4.5 million and India's 20 million. China's water withdrawal permit system and withdrawal fees have not helped reduce agricultural withdrawal although it has helped control urban groundwater depletion somewhat. Saudi Arabia has begun controlling groundwater irrigation by paying farmers for supplying water to towns.

In transposing the lessons from Mexico, Spain and western US experiments to Asian contexts, several issues come up: [a] there is no evidence that these experiments have actually led to effective demand management in Mexico, Spain or the US. Western US has been struggling with groundwater governance for over 50 years now; yet horror stories of groundwater abuse in the US galore (for a recent one, see, Glennon's book 'Water Follies'); [b] groundwater demand restriction has normally worked only when alternative supplies are arranged; thus many cities in North China have been able to crowd out private urban tubewells but only after importing surface water and providing it in lieu of pumping groundwater. Similarly, 50 years after it began depleting its groundwater, Arizona could control groundwater demand only by providing farmers subsidized Colorado River water in lieu of

80 Percent of India's Rural Households Self-supply their Domestic Water Requirements



pumping groundwater. Spain's 2001 National Water Plan's response to groundwater depletion on its south-eastern Mediterranean coast is importing surface water from the Ebro river basin. In effect, what has commonly worked is not demand management, but 'groundwater substitution' with imported water; [c] finally, the socio-economic context of Type III and Type IV GwSEs are so vastly different that copycat transfer of lessons from former to later would be bound to fail as can be inferred from Table 1.

The US has a small number of large capacity pumping plants that produce 110 km³ of groundwater for a wealth-generating irrigation machine on which less than 2 percent of Americans depend for their livelihood. India, in contrast, has around 20 million small pumps scattered over a vast countryside, each pumping on average 10,000 m³ to irrigate tiny parcels in a peasant economy that has 55-60 percent of Indians as direct or indirect stakeholders. Here, resource management capacities are poor. Regulatory agencies are skeletal and the numbers of tiny users to be regulated huge and scattered over a vast countryside. Because groundwater irrigation is central to their livelihoods, farmers organize readily—and often violently—to oppose any effort that hits their irrigation economy. Above all, many environmental ill-effects of intensive groundwater use begin to occur at low levels of groundwater development. Drying up of wetlands, reduction in summer flows in rivers and streams, and increased fluoride levels in groundwater are examples. Reversing all these

would require restoring pre-development conditions by cutting the present rate of groundwater use by 70 percent or more in many regions. Even if possible, doing this would throw out of gear millions of rural livelihoods and cause massive social unrest.

CONTEXT SPECIFIC STRATEGIES: THE CASE OF INDIA

This is why people, agencies, and leaders in Type IV GwSEs are often lukewarm to groundwater demand restriction approaches even as concerns about resource protection and sustainability are mounting. While learning intelligently from the experiences of Type II and III GwSEs, Type IV socio-ecologies need to build their homegrown approaches that strike a balance between the need to protect the resource and support their poor people. India exemplifies this challenge in its most serious form. It is facing unsustainable groundwater use in western unconfined alluvial aquifers, very much like the north China plains, as well as in peninsular hard-rock India where aquifers have little storage but precipitation is relatively better. Three large-scale responses to groundwater depletion in India have emerged in recent years in an uncoordinated manner, and each presents an element of what might be its coherent strategy of resource governance:

Energy-irrigation nexus: Throughout south Asia, the 'groundwater boom' was fired during the 1970s and 80s by government support to tubewells and subsidies to electricity supplied by

Table 1: Structure of National Groundwater Economies of Selected Countries

Country	Annual Ground-water Use (km ³)	No. of Groundwater Structures (million)	Extraction/ Structure (m ³ /year)	Percentage of Population Dependent on Groundwater
India	185-200	20	9000-10,000	55-60
Pakistan	45	0.5	90,000	60-65
China	75	3.5	21,500	22-25
Iran	29	0.5	58,000	12-18
Mexico	29	0.07	414,285	5-6
USA	110	0.2	550,000	<1-2

state-owned electricity utilities to farmers. The invidious energy-irrigation nexus that emerged as a result and wrecked the electricity utilities and encouraged waste of groundwater are widely criticized. However, hidden in this nexus is a unique opportunity for groundwater managers to influence the working of the colossal anarchy that is India's groundwater socio-ecology. Even while subsidizing electricity, many state governments have begun restricting power supply to agriculture to cut their losses. Much IWMI research has shown that with intelligent management of power supply to agriculture, the energy-irrigation nexus can be a powerful tool for groundwater management in Type IV socio-ecologies. IWMI research has also shown that after all its labor to create tradable property rights in groundwater and creating COTAS, Mexico has finally had to turn to electricity supply management to enforce its groundwater concessions.

Inter-basin transfers to recharge unconfined alluvial aquifers: In western India's unconfined alluvial aquifers, it is being increasingly realized that groundwater depletion can be countered only by importing surface water, Arizona-style. Jiangsu province in eastern China has implemented its own little inter-basin water transfer from Yangzee to counter groundwater depletion in the northern part. Similarly, one of the major uses Gujarat has found for the water of the by now famous Sardar Sarovar Project (SSP) on the Narmada river is to


recharge the depleted aquifers of north Gujarat and Kachchh. A key consideration behind India's proposed mega scheme to link its northern rivers with peninsular rivers too is to counter groundwater depletion in western and southern India.

The groundwater economy in India has never suffered for want of people's participation. What it has lacked is appropriate and intelligent participation from public agencies, science institutions, and the international community.

Mass-based recharge movement: In many parts of hard-rock India, groundwater depletion has invoked wildfire community-based mass movement for rainwater harvesting and recharge, which interestingly has failed to take off in unconfined alluvial aquifers. It is difficult to assess the social value of this movement partly because formal hydrology and popular hydrology have failed to find a meeting ground. Scientists want check dams sited near recharge zones; villagers want them close to their wells. Scientists recommend recharge tubewells to counter the silt layer impeding recharge; farmers just direct floodwaters into their wells after filtering. Scientists worry about upstream-downstream externalities; farmers say everyone lives downstream. Scientists say the hard-rock aquifers

have too little storage to justify the prolific growth in recharge structures; people say a recharge structure is worthwhile if their wells provide even 1000 m³ of life-saving irrigation/ha in times of delayed rain. Hydrologists keep writing the obituary of the recharge movement; but the movement has spread from eastern Rajasthan to Gujarat, thence to Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh. Protagonists think—as caricatured in Figure 4—that, with better planning of recharge structures and larger coverage,

Figure 4: Farmers' Perception of Potential Impact of Decentralized Recharge Movement in India




decentralized recharge movement can be a major response to India's groundwater depletion because it can ensure that water tables in pockets of intensive use rebound close to pre-development levels at the end of the monsoon season every year they have a good monsoon, which is at least twice in five years. They surmise that this is not impossible because, even today, India's total groundwater extraction is barely 5 percent of its annual precipitation.

An important aside to India's groundwater story is that it has emerged as a truly people's GwSE. Indian governments at central and state levels have been trying for decades to secure people's participation in improving the management of canal systems, water supply and sanitation systems, drainage systems, and so on, but to little avail. As a result, under remote, bureaucratic

management, public water infrastructure and services have steadily deteriorated. The groundwater economy, in contrast, has never suffered for want of people's participation. What it has lacked is appropriate and intelligent participation from public agencies, science institutions, and the international community. Indian engineers take pride in having built some of the finest dams in the world; but India is yet to see large-scale initiatives in ASR (Aquifer Storage and Recovery) as in New South Wales, or learn to operate major groundwater banking operations as in Arizona, or master the art of depleting and refilling aquifers on an annual basis as the French do with the Montpellier aquifer.

Considered from this perspective, one can stand India's groundwater problem on its head; and



Note : Each dot in the maps represents 5000 wells

argue that the emergence of intensive groundwater use in regions with 1000-1400 mm normal rainfall may well be a great hidden opportunity. Through their 20 million tubewells, India's farmers have created a 185-200 km³ reservoir in the form of dewatered aquifers—which can regularly collect, store, and deliver at the users' doorstep a relatively high quality water service that in some ways is 'self-regulating and self-financing'. Like all surface reservoirs, the underground reservoir has limitations; but this is precisely why science and management are required. Using this opportunity would require investing—in creating scientific capability and infrastructure for groundwater recharge a top priority for Type IV GwSEs such as India and Bangladesh with significant renewable water resources. Hundred years ago, when India did not use much groundwater and the tubewell-pump-recharge technologies were not available, it was understandable for the colonial government to concentrate resources on building great canal irrigation systems. But today—when wells, pumps, and recharge structures are the dominant choice of millions of India's small holders, within and outside canal commands—a smart water policy might focus on devoting resources to supporting this people's GwSE rather than throwing good money after bad, as India is intent on doing, in pursuing an irrigation development strategy based on canal irrigation that has left a great deal to be desired.

Conclusion

If the world's water crisis is “mainly a crisis of governance”, groundwater represents the grimmest side of this crisis in Asia. The Australian Groundwater School at Adelaide is apt in its credo which says, “Groundwater will be the enduring gauge of this generation's intelligence in water and land management”. In exploring the nature of the global groundwater challenge, this paper has [a] highlighted the tremendous contribution groundwater has made to human welfare globally; [b] analyzed socio-ecological implications of runaway growth of groundwater irrigation, especially in some Asian countries; and [c] argued why groundwater governance strategies must be context-specific to be effective.

Type IV GwSEs—where protecting the resource is often in direct and immediate conflict with livelihood support to rural poor—presents the most complex resource governance challenge facing the world's water professionals. Groundwater managers in Type IV GwSEs need to learn intelligently from approaches tried in Type II and III GwSEs which have been evolving refined structures of groundwater governance through demand and supply side management. Their challenge, however, is to fit these approaches into the unique contextual realities of Type IV GwSEs.

National Policy Makers, Donors, Researchers Must Get their Priorities Right...

<u>Governments and donors focus on</u>	<u>Critical need is to work on</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing the formal water economy • Instruments of direct management • Canal irrigation receives resources, staff, authority and technologies • Improving the performance of the bureaucracy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving the working of the informal water sector • Instruments of indirect and strategic management • Groundwater management is crying for resources, staff, authority, and technologies • Support community coping initiatives

HEADQUARTERS

127, Sunil Mawatha, Pelawatte, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka
Mailing Address : P. O. Box 2075, Colombo, Sri Lanka
Telephone : +94 11 2787404, 2784080
Fax : +94 11 2786854; E mail : iwmi@cgiar.org

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTH ASIA

C/o ICRISAT, Patancheru 502324
Andhra Pradesh, India
Telephone : +91 40 30713071
Fax : +91 40 30713074; E mail : iwmi-southasia@cgiar.org

NEW DELHI

South Asia Liaison Office
2nd Floor, NASC Complex, DPS Marg
PUSA Campus, New Delhi 110012, India
Telephone : +91 11 25840811-2
Fax : +91 11 25841294; E mail : b.sharma@cgiar.org

NEPAL

Department of Irrigation, Room # 412 and 413
Jawalkhel, Lalitpur
GPO 8975 EPC 416, Kathmandu, Nepal
Telephone : +977 1 5542306
Fax : +977 1 5536219; E Mail : d.pant@cgiar.org

CHINA

Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy
Chinese Academy of Sciences
Building 917, Datun Road, Anwai
Beijing 100101, China
Telephone : +86 10 64889440
Fax : +86 10 64856533; E Mail : i.makin@cgiar.org

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR CENTRAL ASIA (Pakistan)

12KM, Multan Road, Chowk Thokar Niaz Baig,
Lahore 53700, Pakistan
Telephone : +92 42 5410050-53
Fax : +92 42 5410054; E mail : iwmi-pak@cgiar.org

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR CENTRAL ASIA (Uzbekistan)

Apartment No. 123
Home No. 6, Murtazaeva Street,
Tashkent 700000, Uzbekistan
Telephone : +998 71 1370445
Fax : +998 71 1370317; E Mail : m.hassan@cgiar.org

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR SOUTHEAST ASIA

P. O. Box 1025, Kasetsart University,
Bangkok 10903, Thailand
Telephone : +66 2561 4433
Fax : +66 2561 1230; E mail : iwmi-sea@cgiar.org

REGIONAL OFFICE FOR AFRICA

Private Bag X813, Silverton 0127, Pretoria, South Africa
Telephone : +27 12 845 9100
Fax : +27 12 845 9110; E Mail : iwmi-africa@cgiar.org

SUB REGIONAL OFFICE FOR WEST AFRICA

IWMI Ghana, PMB CT 112, Cantonments, Accra, Ghana
Telephone : +233 21 784752-4
Fax : +233 21 784752; E Mail : iwmi-ghana@cgiar.org



IWMI-Tata Water Policy Program

The IWMI-Tata Water Policy Program was launched in 2000 with the support of Sir Ratan Tata Trust, Mumbai. The program presents new perspectives and practical solutions derived from the wealth of research done in India on water resource management. Its objective is to help policy makers at the central, state and local levels address their water challenges – in areas such as sustainable groundwater management, water scarcity, and rural poverty – by translating research findings into practical policy recommendations.

Through this program, IWMI collaborates with a range of partners across India to identify, analyse and document relevant water-management approaches and current practices. These practices are assessed and synthesised for maximum policy impact in the series on Water Policy Research Highlights and IWMI-Tata Comments.

The policy program's website promotes the exchange of knowledge on water-resources management, within the research community and between researchers and policy makers in India.

IWMI-Tata Water Policy Program

Elecon, Anand-Sojitra Road
Vallabh Vidyanagar 388120, Gujarat, India
Telephone: +91 2692 229311-13
Fax : +91 2692 229310
E-mail: iwmi-tata@cgiar.org
Website: <http://www.iwmi.org/iwmi-tata>

IWMI
International
Water Management
Institute

FUTURE
HARVEST

IWMI is a Futures Harvest Center
Supported by the CGIAR