

Adaptive Governance of Water Conflicts

John Scholz and Bruce Stiftel,
Editors

Resources for the Future, 2005



New Water Conflicts

Specialized Agency Success

+ Growth

+ Natural System Capacities

=

Agency Externalities and
Conflicts

Adaptive Governance

- develop institutions capable of
 - shaping Multi-agency conflicts into resolvable issues
 - channeling them into arenas capable of resolving them.

Our Approach to Understanding Challenges

- Nine case studies of water conflicts
 - Water Quality, Quantity, and Ecosystems
 - Interstate, statewide, regional, single localities
- Workshop, Analysis and comments
 - Four Practitioners
 - Four Planners
 - Five Political Scientists

Five Challenges to Adaptive Governance

- Decision Process Design
- Representation
- Scientific Learning
- Public Learning
- Problem Responsiveness

Five Challenges

- Decision Process Design
 - Elicit clear understanding of interests
 - Translate interests into compatible policy options
 - Clarify relevant consequences of policy options
 - Develop process to reach consensus

Five Challenges

- Representation
 - Include all affected interests
 - Develop/ ensure ***effective*** representation

Five Challenges

- Scientific Learning
 - Incorporate existing knowledge in developing options
 - Adaptive Management: Plan implementation process to test scientific assumptions
 - Develop specific research and monitoring program for future policy development
 - Consider social basis of science as a process, not as a static body of knowledge

Five Challenges

- Public Learning
 - Translate science into public understanding to
 - Convince users to comply with new rules
 - Convince stakeholders to maintain support for consensual agreement when further adaptation is required
 - Convince public managers, political authorities and broader public to
 - support legitimacy of agreements
 - provide government resources

Five Challenges

- Problem Responsiveness:
 - Human and Natural Systems in equilibrium
 - Natural system capable of supporting user demands
 - Rules accommodate expected natural variations in both systems
 - Improvement in efficiency and equity over status quo

Conclusions

- **Stronger Collaboration**
 - Develop authoritative guidelines for process
 - Improve design, enhance legitimacy, reduce startup costs
 - Balance standardization with needed flexibility
 - Enhance leadership
 - programs, careers, professionalization
 - Clarify Authority structure
 - Create specialized final appeal authority/process capable of addressing scientific and public learning issues

Conclusions

- Pragmatic Science
 - recognize the partisan nature of scientific debate and link to public learning
 - Develop balanced, adequate technical representation from beginning
 - Define disagreements and needed research
 - Maintain scientific criteria in seeking consensus
 - Design ongoing monitoring program

Conclusions

- **Wiser Competition**
 - Develop creative incentive-based systems when practical to minimize rule-based controls
 - Advantage: adaptive, avoid cumbersome bargaining and rulemaking process
 - Challenges
 - Ensuring ecosystem integrity, adequate monitoring
 - Establishing equity across user types
 - Maintaining adaptive nature of pricing

When Collaboration Succeeds

- Consensual approach allows for broader search, more novel compromise solutions
- Local focus encourages stronger links of scientific and public learning
- Consensual, local processes may encourage adaptive management
- Local nexus might integrate land use planning and natural resource management
- Enhance social capital and fairness

Limits to Collaboration

- Fear of capture by locally dominant groups
- Process is very costly, requires “hurtful stalemate.”
- Difficulty of replicating well-financed “showcase” collaborations in less-endowed locations.
- Limited resources for scientific learning.
- Agency motivated to retain autonomy– adaptability vs efficiency.