Article

Not peer-reviewed version

The Transformation of Water Management: From Market Solutions to Rights-Based Approaches

Jan C Verwoerd *

Posted Date: 27 November 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202411.2083.v1

Keywords: Water governance; Water privatisation; Public-private partnerships; Environmental sustainability; Universal water access

Article

The Transformation of Water Management: From Market Solutions to Rights-Based Approaches

Jan C Verwoerd

Independent Researcher; jancverwoerd@gmail.com

Abstract: This article analyses how the debate over water privatisation has changed since it became popular in the 1980s, moving from a simple public-versus-private argument to a nuanced discussion of resource management, human rights, and environmental sustainability. The study illustrates how the results of privatisation are inextricably tied to institutional capability, regulatory frameworks, and local socioeconomic circumstances through the examination of international case studies. Three key aspects are examined in the study: the conflict between market-based techniques and universal coverage ambitions, the issue of corruption in the intricate technical and governance frameworks of the industry, and the need to strike a balance between affordability concerns and efficiency improvements. Recent developments reveal a shift towards domestic and regional enterprises gaining prominence, particularly from developing nations, alongside the emergence of hybrid models combining private sector participation with public oversight. The findings suggest that future water privatisation will be predominantly shaped by political considerations, requiring innovative approaches that balance commercial viability with social responsibility and environmental stewardship.

Keywords: water governance; water privatisation; public-private partnerships; environmental sustainability; universal water access

---

Introduction

Since its broad implementation in the 1980s, the debate over water privatisation has changed dramatically on a global scale, moving from a simple argument over public versus private ownership to a nuanced discussion about resource management, human rights, and environmental sustainability. Originally promoted as a remedy for ineffective public utilities and insufficient infrastructure investment, the privatisation of water services has had a variety of effects in various socioeconomic and geographic situations. As more data becomes available about the diverse effects of private sector participation on pricing mechanisms and water access, this fundamental change in the management of water resources has drawn close attention from scholars, decision-makers, and civil society organisations. The experiences of numerous countries, from the UK's full privatisation model to various public-private partnerships in developing nations, have demonstrated that the effectiveness of water privatisation is intrinsically linked to regulatory frameworks, institutional capacity, and local socio-economic conditions.

The theoretical underpinnings of water privatisation rest upon neoliberal economic principles that suggest private sector efficiency, market discipline, and capital investment capabilities can address the limitations of public sector management. However, the practical implementation of these principles has revealed a more nuanced reality, where success stories coexist with cautionary tales of failed privatisation attempts. Empirical evidence from both developed and developing economies suggests that the outcomes of water privatisation are heavily influenced by factors such as regulatory oversight, market structure, political stability, and existing infrastructure quality. The experience of Latin American countries, for instance, demonstrates how similar privatisation models can yield markedly different results depending on the institutional context and regulatory framework in place. These variations in outcomes have led to a growing recognition that water, as both an economic good

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 November 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202411.2083.v1

and a fundamental human right, requires governance models that can effectively balance commercial viability with social responsibility and environmental stewardship.

As we advance into an era characterised by unprecedented environmental challenges and resource constraints, the discourse surrounding water privatisation must evolve to address emerging complexities. Climate change, population growth, and urbanisation are exerting increasing pressure on water resources, while technological advancements and shifting societal expectations are reshaping the possibilities for service delivery. The intersection of these factors with existing debates about privatisation creates new imperatives for policy innovation and institutional adaptation. Contemporary approaches to water privatisation must now consider not only traditional metrics of operational efficiency and service quality but also broader considerations such as environmental sustainability, climate resilience, and social equity. This paper examines these evolving dynamics, offering new perspectives on how privatisation models can be adapted to address future challenges while ensuring universal access to safe, affordable water. Through analysis of recent developments and emerging trends, this research contributes to our understanding of how water privatisation can be effectively implemented within a framework that prioritises both economic sustainability and social justice.

Universal Coverage

The conceptualisation of water access as a fundamental necessity emerged in the 1970s, marking a pivotal shift in global development discourse. This paradigmatic change reflected growing awareness of water's essential role in human development and public health outcomes. The United Nations' ambitious proclamation in November 1980 heralded a decade dedicated to universal water and sanitation provision, embodying the international community's commitment to addressing this critical infrastructure challenge. Kurt Waldheim, the UN Secretary-General, expressed confident optimism in achieving this objective, characterising it as an attainable goal within the prescribed timeframe. Despite doubling the implementation rate of water infrastructure compared to the previous decade, as reported by the World Health Organisation, the ambitious target remained frustratingly elusive when stakeholders convened in Delhi, India, for global consultations in September 1990.

The resultant Delhi Declaration advocated equitable distribution through its philosophically significant motto 'some for all, rather than more for some', which was subsequently endorsed by the UN General Assembly as the strategic framework for the 1990s. This approach represented a fundamental shift in development thinking, prioritising broad access over concentrated advancement. In retrospect, the widespread acceptance of such an egalitarian stance appears remarkable, given the predominance of neo-classical economic thinking that characterised the era. The declaration challenged prevailing market-oriented paradigms by emphasising collective welfare over individual market efficiency.

Predictably, the World Bank and donor nations found the declaration's welfare-oriented implications problematic, reflecting deeper ideological tensions in development policy. The neoliberal influence manifested prominently in the 1992 Dublin Principles, particularly in its fourth tenet, which emphasised water's economic value across various applications. This perspective attributed historical resource mismanagement to the failure in recognising water's economic worth, advocating enhanced market involvement in water resource administration. The Dublin Principles represented a significant ideological counterpoint to the Delhi Declaration, exemplifying the ongoing tension between market-based and rights-based approaches to water provision.

International aid organisations' embrace of these principles sparked considerable debate within the development community. Critics suggested that bilateral agencies' support stemmed more from commercial interests in their domestic water sectors than genuine universal access concerns. This critique highlighted the complex interplay between development assistance and national commercial interests, raising questions about the true motivations behind water sector reforms in developing nations. The movement to establish water access as a human right emerged as a powerful counterforce to privatisation trends. The campaign by anti-privatisation advocates campaign represented a strategic effort to embed water access within the international human rights framework, thereby protecting it from pure market forces.

The journey towards recognition faced significant obstacles, notably from developed nations especially Canada. It exemplified the resistance to incorporating water rights into international law, reflecting concerns about national sovereignty and resource control. Nevertheless, following extensive advocacy from developing country governments and developed countries NGOs, the UN Committee issued the landmark "General Comment" No. 15, effectively incorporating water rights within the International Covenant.

This 2002 declaration established a comprehensive framework for water rights, articulating everyone's entitlement to adequate, safe, accessible and affordable water. Though not legally binding, this interpretation garnered substantial support, including from the World Bank, representing a significant evolution in institutional thinking about water access. The UN General Assembly's 2010 non-binding resolution acknowledging water access as integral to human rights marked another milestone, despite 41 abstentions. The Human Rights Council's subsequent unanimous adoption further strengthened the international consensus, although significant opposition persists from Canada, the United States and numerous European Union members.

The corporate sector's human rights obligations in water provision remain a contentious issue within international law. The UN's rejection of proposals for imposing state-level treaty obligations on private enterprises, following business community opposition to draft norms in 2005, highlighted the challenges of regulating corporate responsibilities in human rights contexts. The 2011 approval of Ruggie's "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights" represented a compromise approach, primarily addressing workplace and specified rights while leaving water rights in a somewhat ambiguous position.

The practical implementation of water rights presents numerous challenges for water service providers. Water rights jurisprudence remains underdeveloped, with limited cross-sectoral understanding amongst water industry stakeholders. While water quantity typically meets technical requirements, pricing mechanisms and service denial policies for non-payment require careful consideration, particularly in contexts where alternative sources are unavailable. The frequent shortfall in coverage expansion following privatisation raises questions about the effectiveness of market-based solutions in achieving universal access.

Contemporary water enterprises face complex challenges in balancing commercial viability with human rights obligations. They must demonstrate their commitment through comprehensive policy statements, developed with expert input and senior management approval. These policies should outline clear expectations for personnel and partners, ensure effective stakeholder communication, maintain public accessibility and integrate seamlessly into operational procedures. The establishment of robust non-judicial grievance mechanisms, developed in collaboration with rights organisations, has become increasingly important for addressing community concerns and maintaining social licence to operate.

The evolving nature of water rights necessitates ongoing human rights due diligence reflecting changing operational contexts. This includes regular assessment of human rights impacts, integration of findings. Water service providers must also consider broader social and environmental factors, including climate change impacts, demographic shifts and evolving regulatory frameworks.

The tension between treating water as an economic good and recognising it as a fundamental human right continues to shape policy debates and operational practices in the water sector. Resolution of this tension requires innovative approaches that can balance commercial viability with social responsibility, ensuring sustainable service provision while protecting vulnerable populations' access to this essential resource.

Water Business and Corruption

The water industry's relationship with corruption presents a complex and deeply concerning phenomenon that has manifested persistently across both industrialised and emerging economies throughout history. A particularly illustrative historical case study can be found in the 1900 Grand

 doi:10.20944/preprints202411.2083.v1

Rapids water controversy in Michigan, where a remarkable £100,000 bribe exemplified the sort of municipal malfeasance that not only undermined public trust but paradoxically captivated public attention “akin to sensational literature”. This historical precedent has been followed by numerous contemporary instances of misconduct, encompassing high-profile legal proceedings against executives and representatives of prominent firms. These include French entities Lyonnaise des Eaux and Veolia (formerly Vivendi), alongside cases involving industrial giants such as Siemens, Pirelli, BICC, and Asian conglomerates Marubeni and Tomen in Singapore. These cases, whilst significant, merely scratch the surface of the widespread misappropriation prevalent in developing nations, where regulatory frameworks often struggle to maintain effective oversight.

The water sector’s particular vulnerability to impropriety stems from several intrinsic characteristics that create an environment conducive to corruption. Foremost among these is the exceptionally complex technical specifications required for water infrastructure development, which inherently obscure public scrutiny and create significant information disparities between industry insiders and oversight bodies. This technical opacity is further complicated by the industry’s multifaceted nature, involving an intricate web of stakeholders ranging from local authorities and national governments to private contractors and international development organisations. Such complexity results in fragmented governance across jurisdictional boundaries and multiple authorities, creating a labyrinthine regulatory environment that severely hampers effective oversight and accountability mechanisms.

The resulting environment of discretionary decision-making creates numerous vulnerabilities throughout the entire water management chain. These vulnerabilities become particularly acute when heightened service demand strengthens suppliers’ negotiating positions, creating an imbalanced power dynamic that can be exploited for personal gain. The substantial capital requirements characteristic of water infrastructure projects, often reaching into billions of pounds for major developments, coupled with frequent interactions between suppliers and procurement officers, render contract allocation and implementation particularly susceptible to manipulation. This susceptibility is further enhanced by the long-term nature of water infrastructure projects, which often span multiple political administrations and oversight regimes.

Kiltgaard’s theoretical framework provides a particularly useful lens through which to analyse this phenomenon, expressing corruption as the mathematical sum of monopolistic control and discretionary authority, minus accountability. This elegant formulation illuminates why impropriety pervades every aspect of water provision, from initial policy formulation through fiscal allocation to operational management and maintenance. The Global Corruption Report 2008 provides empirical support for this theoretical framework, indicating that in more affluent nations, misconduct centres primarily on municipal infrastructure contract awards, with annual market valuations reaching the staggering figure of approximately £210 billion across Western Europe, North America and Japan alone.

The ramifications of such corrupt practices extend far beyond financial considerations, resulting in tangible consequences for water security and accessibility. In nations such as Spain, corruption has directly contributed to water scarcity, demonstrating how financial malfeasance can translate into practical resource management challenges. The situation appears even more dire in developing economies, where the report suggests that corruption inflates the Millennium Development Goal achievement costs for potable water access by an estimated £48 billion, a figure that represents not merely lost funds but lost opportunities for millions to access clean water.

Sub-Saharan Africa emerges as a particularly challenged region in this context, with nearly half of the twenty lowest-ranking nations in Transparency International’s annual corruption perception indices originating from this region. This correlation between high corruption levels and poor water infrastructure development is particularly concerning given the region’s simultaneous demonstration of insufficient progress towards water-related MDG targets. This creates a vicious cycle where corruption impedes development, while underdevelopment creates conditions that facilitate further corruption.

The global movement towards water privatisation presents another complex dimension to this challenge. Whilst privatisation initiatives have advanced on sound economic grounds, they have consistently encountered significant political resistance due to widespread perceptions of corrupt dealings in the privatisation process. This public sentiment has significantly influenced political outcomes across multiple continents. Numerous privatisation initiatives have collapsed across the world due to sustained obstruction from civic organisations. These groups have raised legitimate concerns regarding the transparency of arrangements that have frequently led to unreasonable tariff increases and unfulfilled service enhancement commitments.

A particularly instructive example of privatisation reversal occurred in Cochabamba, Bolivia, in 2000, where negotiations were controversially limited to a single firm, highlighting the importance of competitive bidding processes in ensuring transparency and public trust. This case study demonstrates that for privatisation to achieve political legitimacy, transparency must be prioritised throughout the entire process. Governmental entities can effectively combat corruption by enhancing public access to information regarding transactions, providing detailed disclosure of state-owned enterprises' financial and operational performance pre-sale, and establishing clear, measurable expectations for post-privatisation performance.

The private sector's role in addressing corruption has evolved significantly over recent decades. Historically, the practice of bribing officials in developing nations was not only acceptable but was actually tax-deductible in numerous developed countries, reflecting a troubling normalisation of corrupt practices in international business operations. While legislative frameworks such as the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act existed since 1977, they remained largely overlooked and underenforced. However, sustained pressure from civil society organisations has prompted Western governments to adopt increasingly stringent positions on international corruption.

Recent years have witnessed a marked increase in both anti-bribery legislation and enhanced enforcement of existing regulations. Britain's 2010 anti-bribery legislation represents a particularly robust approach, notably criminalising even minor facilitation payments for routine business processes, thereby eliminating the traditional distinction between "grease payments" and outright bribery. The OECD's anti-bribery convention has further strengthened this trend, requiring member states to modify their legal frameworks and subject their procedures to rigorous examination, with public censure for violations. The dramatic increase in FCPA enforcement actions, rising from mere 5 in 2004 to 74 in 2010, reflects this shifting landscape, making it increasingly untenable for executives to dismiss kickbacks as standard practice in any market, including traditionally challenging environments such as African business operations.

Progressive initiatives within the water sector demonstrate potential pathways forward in combating corruption. Rather than forming traditional industry cartels, some businesses have taken the innovative approach of establishing independent ethics committees. A noteworthy example can be found in Columbia, where major water pipe suppliers constituted an ethics committee incorporating external specialists following allegations of unjustified price inflation. This initiative has demonstrated considerable success in identifying specific procurement irregularities, compelling governmental authorities to implement corrective measures.

The future of anti-corruption efforts in the water sector will likely require a multi-stakeholder approach combining enhanced regulatory frameworks, improved transparency mechanisms, and proactive industry initiatives. The integration of digital technologies and blockchain-based procurement systems offers promising avenues for reducing information asymmetries and enhancing accountability. However, such technical solutions must be accompanied by sustained political will and robust civil society engagement to ensure effective implementation and oversight. The stakes could not be higher, as corruption in the water sector directly impacts the fundamental human right to access clean water, making this not merely an economic or political issue, but a crucial humanitarian challenge for the 21st century.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 November 2024 doi:10.20944/preprints202411.2083.v1

Efficiency and Cost

The operational excellence of privatised water services typically surpasses that of their public counterparts, which frequently struggle with excessive staffing, technological deficiencies, and administrative impropriety. Nevertheless, this enhanced efficiency does not invariably translate into reduced consumer costs. The principal opposition to water sector privatisation stems from concerns regarding price escalation, which potentially renders water services financially prohibitive for impoverished populations. Given their position as natural monopolies, private enterprises often favour price augmentation over expanding their consumer base to achieve economies of scale. One proposed solution involves implementing competitive bidding processes, whereby private entities vie for market access rights, with contracts awarded to those proposing the most competitive tariffs.

Notwithstanding such measures, consumer costs typically rise as governmental subsidies are either eliminated or substantially diminished. In developing nations, these subsidies constitute approximately 45 billion pounds annually, typically offsetting roughly 70 per cent of operational expenses. Optimally, reforms encompassing tariff adjustments should precede privatisation initiatives. This approach was successfully demonstrated in Gabon, where a decade of preparatory measures was required to align tariffs with operational costs. Subsequently, Vivendi secured a concession agreement by proposing a 17.25 per cent reduction in existing rates.

Private sector management often demonstrates superior revenue collection capabilities. In Buenos Aires, for instance, the private operator's audit revealed that 11 per cent of properties categorised as residential were actually commercial establishments, whilst an additional six per cent had understated their dimensions. This reclassification exercise resulted in enhanced revenue from 425,000 customers. However, privatisation typically engenders tariff increases, often implemented in an irregular fashion. Despite initial reductions of 27 per cent in Buenos Aires, subsequent years witnessed incremental increases of 13 per cent and 27 per cent, with further adjustments continuing until 2002, when the currency crisis intervened. By early 2002, real terms prices had escalated by approximately 93 per cent compared to pre-privatisation levels.

Research regarding price implications has predominantly concentrated on consumers with existing connections to municipal water networks. Those lacking such access typically resort to purchasing inferior quality water from vendors at rates averaging 12 times higher than standard utility charges. Consequently, even doubled utility rates would represent significant economic advantages for disadvantaged populations. However, these potential beneficiaries, constrained by poverty, lack effective advocacy channels. No coherent coalition exists to represent their interests. Conversely, current utility customers, benefiting from subsidised services, form powerful interest groups alongside utility employees and anti-privatisation NGOs, collectively advocating for maintaining the existing framework.

Ferment and the Future

Recent developments in the water sector reveal a striking shift: domestic and regional enterprises are increasingly securing contracts that were historically dominated by international corporations. A particularly noteworthy transformation has been the rising prominence of companies from developing nations in securing these agreements—a domain that, prior to 1995, was almost exclusively controlled by organisations from industrialised countries. Significant contractual arrangements, such as those implemented in Buenos Aires (1993) and Jakarta (1997), generated considerable discord, laying the groundwork for subsequent conflicts over water rights. This ultimately prompted a transition towards more modest, less controversial agreements. Whilst contract magnitudes have generally diminished since the 1990s, this trajectory may not persist indefinitely, as evidenced by the 2010 initial public offering for an extensive water provision scheme in Chongqing, China.

The water industry finds itself in a state of flux, with commercial entities demonstrating a somewhat sluggish adaptation to emerging challenges. Although economic obstacles remain formidable, political considerations must take precedence. Industry stakeholders ought not to find it peculiar that a substantial portion of the population considers profit generation from water services morally objectionable. This sentiment parallels the education sector, where profit-oriented institutions constitute a remarkably small fraction compared to public and non-profit establishments. Attributing water companies' occasional difficulties to oppositional interests and anti-commercial factions proves counterproductive. Given historical water-related disputes, future privatisation trajectories will likely be predominantly shaped by political factors. Whilst business prospects for private entities may expand, neither the United States nor developing nations are likely to witness privatisation comparable to that implemented in Britain.

In regions where privatisation initiatives encounter robust opposition and social tension, opportunities are limited to service and management contracts. This approach appears particularly relevant for South Asia and certain Latin American nations, including Bolivia and Peru. Subsequent progression might lead to Affermage and leasing arrangements. Regarding concessions, businesses must carefully evaluate foreign exchange risks, as demonstrated by Argentina's 2002 peso devaluation, which rendered a water utility's net worth negative. The practice of submitting artificially low bids, prevalent in Latin America where three-quarters of 1990s contracts underwent renegotiation within approximately 19 months, may become untenable due to public scrutiny. Future operations will necessitate more precise cost assessments and risk mitigation strategies. The water sector presents increasingly complex challenges compared to other infrastructure domains, where technological considerations typically predominate.

The privatisation of water services in England serves as a compelling cautionary narrative. The 1989 Thatcher government's privatisation of nine water systems, whilst generating £7.6 billion in immediate revenue, involved the government assuming £4.9 billion in existing debt and providing £1.5 billion in operational capital. These privatised entities, some collaborating with French conglomerates Veolia and Suez, subsequently expanded into Central and Eastern European markets following the Cold War's conclusion, and into Latin America and Africa. Despite minimal initial benefits to British taxpayers, the privatised companies have dispersed their entire declared profits as dividends. Whilst privatisation has facilitated increased investment, substantial cash disbursements have necessitated debt-financing of capital expenditure, complicated by higher private sector borrowing costs compared to government rates. Although operational metrics such as network pressure, supply consistency, complaint handling, and leakage prevention have improved, tariffs have increased disproportionately to inflation, creating affordability challenges for economically disadvantaged households. Additional concerns include health and safety violations, excessive executive compensation exceeding £2 million annually, and deteriorating working conditions.

Conclusions

Water service privatisation creates a complicated and multidimensional environment that is difficult to categorise as entirely positive or negative. The data analysed in this study shows that the effectiveness of water privatisation programs is inextricably tied to the strength of institutional capacity, regulatory frameworks, and local socioeconomic circumstances. Growing awareness of water's dual character as an economic good and a fundamental human right is reflected in the evolution of the discourse surrounding water privatisation from a public-versus-private debate to a sophisticated examination of hybrid approaches.

The examination of universal coverage initiatives highlights the persistent tension between market-based approaches and rights-based frameworks. Whilst the Dublin Principles emphasised water's economic value, counterbalancing forces have successfully advocated for the recognition of water access as a human right, culminating in significant UN declarations. However, the practical implementation of these rights remains challenging, particularly in contexts where commercial viability must be balanced against social responsibility.

The endemic nature of corruption within the water sector, spanning both developed and developing economies, underscores the critical importance of robust oversight mechanisms. The sector's technical complexity, substantial capital requirements, and fragmented governance structures create numerous vulnerabilities throughout the water management chain. Recent legislative developments, particularly enhanced anti-bribery frameworks and increased enforcement actions, represent promising steps toward addressing these challenges, though significant obstacles remain.

The efficiency gains promised by privatisation have materialised in some contexts but have often been accompanied by controversial pricing increases, highlighting the delicate balance between operational improvement and affordability. The experience of England's privatised water systems serves as a particularly instructive case study, demonstrating how initial efficiency gains can be offset by concerns about affordability, environmental performance, and the long-term sustainability of debt-financed infrastructure investment.

Looking forward, the water sector appears to be entering a new phase characterised by the rising prominence of domestic and regional enterprises, particularly from developing nations. The trend toward more modest, less controversial agreements suggests a growing recognition of the need to balance commercial viability with social acceptability. The emergence of Private-Public-Community collaborations and various partnership frameworks indicates a more nuanced approach to private sector participation, acknowledging the distinct objectives of different stakeholders.

Political issues, not just economic ones, will probably have a greater influence on the future of water privatisation. Innovative strategies that successfully strike a balance between business needs and social responsibility, environmental stewardship, and climate resilience will be necessary for success in this changing environment. The need for equitable and sustainable water management approaches is growing as a result of urbanisation. In order to ensure that water services continue to be both economically feasible and socially just, the way forward may involve hybrid models that combine the efficiency benefits of private sector involvement with strict governmental monitoring and community engagement.

References

ILO International Labour Office (1976). *Employment Growth and Basic Needs: a one-world problem: Report of the Director-General of the International Labour Office.* I.L.O.

World Bank. (1980). *Poverty and Basic Needs*. World Bank.

Asthana, A. N. (1994). *Demand analysis in a basic needs framework: The case of rural water supply in central India.* Fordham University.

Asthana, A. N. (2010). Descentralización y necesidades básicas. *Politai*, *1*(1), 13-22.

WMO World Metereological Organisation (1992). *International Conference on Water and the Environment: the Dublin Statement and Report of the Conference.* Geneva: WMO.

Pereira, M. C., Simões, P., Cruz, L., Barata, E., & Coelho, F. (2022). Mind (for) the water: an indirect relationship between mindfulness and water conservation behavior. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, *21*(4), 673-684.

Asthana, A. N. (2022). Impact of mindfulness on irrigation water consumption. *Frontiers in Water*, *4*, 1062835.

Budds, J., & McGranahan, G. (2003). Are the debates on water privatization missing the point? Experiences from Africa, Asia and Latin America. *Environment & Urbanization* 15(2): 87-113. https://doi.org/10.1177/095624780301500222

Clarke, G. R. G., Kosec, K., & Wallsten, S. (2009). Has Private Participation in water and sewerage improved coverage. *Journal of International Development* 21(3): 327-361.

Gonzales, C. (2023). Privatisation of water: New perspectives and future challenges. *Public Enterprise, 27* (1), *26-38*.

Asthana, A. (2013). Decentralisation and supply efficiency: Evidence from a natural experiment. *International Development Planning Review*, *35*(1), 67-86.

Asthana, A. (2003). Decentralisation and supply efficiency of RWS in India. Loughborough University.

Klitgaard, R. E. (1988). *Controlling Corruption.* University of California Press.

Transparency International (2023). *Global Corruption Report: Corruption in the Water Sector.* Transparency International.

Rinaudo, J. D. (2002). Corruption and allocation of water: the case of public irrigation in Pakistan. *Water Policy*, *4*(5), 405-422.

Asthana, A. N. (2022). Increasing production efficiency of irrigation systems through stakeholder participation. *Water Policy*, *24*(6), 1061-1072.

Anbarci, N., Escaleras, M., & Register, C. A. (2009). The ill effects of public sector corruption in the water and sanitation sector. *Land Economics*, *85*(2), 363-377.

Whittington, D. (2024). Policy Nook—Investigating Corruption in the Water Sector: An Interview with Lance Williams, California Investigative Reporter. *Water Economics and Policy*, 2371006.

Asthana, A. N. (2012). Human rights and corruption: Evidence from a natural experiment. *Journal of Human Rights*, *11*(4), 526-536.
Asthana, A. N. (2004). Corruption and decentralisation: evidence from India's water sector. Loughborough University.
Segerfeldt, F. (2005). *Water for Sale: How Business and Market can resolve the World's Water Crisis.* Washington DC: Cato Institute,
World Bank (2006). *Approaches to Private Participation in Water Services.* Washington DC: World Bank.
Tremolet S, and Neale J (2002). *Emerging Lessons in Private Provision of Infrastructure Services in Rural Areas: Water and Electricity Services in Gabon.* Washington DC: World Bank.
Delfino, J. A., Casarin, A. A., Delfino, M. E. (2007). *How far does it go? The Buenos Aires concession: A decade after the reform.* Geneva: UNRISD
Guasch, J. L. (2004). *Granting and Renegotiating Infrastructure Concessions: Doing it Right.* Washington, DC: World Bank.
Hall, D., & Lobina, E. (2012). The Birth, Growth and Decline of Multinational Water Companies. In T. Katko, P. S. Juuti & K. Schwartz (eds.). *Water Services Management and Governance*. London: IWA Publishing.
Bieler, A., & Moore, M. (2023). Water Grabbing, Capitalist Accumulation and Resistance: Conceptualising the Multiple Dimensions of Class Struggle. *Global Labour Journal*, *14*(1).
World Bank Water Demand Research Team. (1993). The demand for water in rural areas: determinants and policy implications. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *8*(1), 47-70.
World Bank Water Demand Research Team. (1993). Household Willingness to Pay for improved Water Supplies: Implications of a Multi-Country Study of Willingness to Pay. *The World Bank Research Observer*, *8*.
World Bank Water Demand Research Team. (1993). Towards a new rural water supply paradigm: Implications of a multi-country study of households' willingness to pay for improved water services. *World Bank Res. Observer*, 8
Durgaprasad, P., & Sivaram, P. (2007). Good governance and HRD: case studies of user managed safe drinking water and health projects in India. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Rural Development*, *17*(1), 95-112.
Asthana, A. N. (2012). Decentralisation, HRD and production efficiency of water utilities: evidence from India. *Water Policy*, *14*(1), 112-126.
EPA Environment Protection Agency, Government of UK (2022). *Water and sewerage companies in England: environmental performance report 2021*. London: EPA.
Orlove, B., & Caton, S. C. (2010). Water sustainability: Anthropological approaches and prospects. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *39*(1), 401-415.
Asthana, A. N. (2014). Voluntary Sustainability Standards in Latin American Agribusiness: Convergence and Differentiation. *American-Eurasian Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences*, 1262-1274.
Collins-Day, J., Slaughter, C., Smith, A., Anderson, L., Peterson, A., Trexler, S., ... & Degnan, A. (2023, December). Enhancing Social and Emotional Awareness through Culturally Relevant Water Justice Education: Mindfulness of Student Empowerment in Urban Schools. In *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts* (Vol. 2023, pp. ED52A-03).
Asthana, A., & Asthana, A. N. (2012). Yogic science for human Resource management in business. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, *19*(1), 120–130. https://doi.org/ 10.5829/idosi.wasj.2012.19.01.619 1
Asthana, A. N. (2023). Prosocial behavior of MBA students: The role of yoga and mindfulness. *Journal of Education for Business*, *98*(7), 378-386.
Dalziel, P. C. (1987). Optimal water storage and pricing: The effect of monopoly. *New Zealand Economic Papers*, *21*(1), 3-16.
Asthana, A. N. (2013). Who Do We Trust for Antitrust? Deconstructing Structural IO. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 22 (9), 1367-1372.
Naziz, A. (2020). The Privatisation of Water in Developing Countries. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, *24*(3), 130-141.
Orlove, B., & Caton, S. C. (2010). Water sustainability: Anthropological approaches and prospects. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *39*(1), 401-415.
Keairns, D. L., Darton, R. C., & Irabien, A. (2016). The energy-water-food nexus. *Annual review of chemical and biomolecular engineering*, *7*(1), 239-262.
Asthana, A. N. (2009). What determines access to subsidised food by the rural poor? Evidence from India. *Intrnational Development Planning Review*, *31*(3), 263-279.
Lu, F., & Astruc, D. (2018). Nanomaterials for removal of toxic elements from water. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews*, *356*, 147-164.
Asthana, A. N. (2014). Thirty years after the cataclysm: toxic risk management in the chemical industry. *Journal of Toxicological Sciences*, *6*(1), 01-08.
Adeel, Z. (2004). Focus on new water issues—perspectives at the end of the International Year of Freshwater. *Global Environmental Change*, *14*, 1-4.
Asthana, A. (2003). Water: Perspectives, Issues, concerns. *Journal of Development Studies*, *39*(6), 188-189.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202411.2083.v1

Bakker, K. (2014). The business of water: Market environmentalism in the water sector. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *39*(1), 469-494.

Asthana, A. N. (2011). The business of water: fresh perspectives and future challenges. *African Journal of Business Management*, *5*(35), 13398-13403.

Correa-Parra, J., Vergara-Perucich, J. F.; Aguirre-Nuñez, C. (2020). Water Privatization and Inequality: Gini Coefficient for Water Resources in Chile. *Water*, *12*(12), 3369. https://doi.org/10.3390/w12123369

Asthana, A. N. (2023). Reskilling business executives in transition economies: can yoga help? *International Journal of Business and Emerging Markets*, *15*(3), 267-287. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBEM.2023.10055609

Oriordan, T., & More, R. J. (2019). Choice in water use. In *Introduction to geographical hydrology* (pp. 175-202). Routledge.

Blamey, R., Gordon, J., & Chapman, R. (1999). Choice modelling: assessing the environmental values of water supply options. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, *43*(3), 337-357.

Asthana, A. N. (1997). Household choice of water supply systems. Loughborough University.

Greiner, P. T. (2020). Community water system privatization and the water access crisis. *Sociology Compass*, *14*(5), e12785.

Stottmann, W. (2011). The role of the private sector in the provision of water and wastewater services in urban areas. In J. I. Uitto, & A. K. Biswas (eds.). *Water for Urban Areas*,. Tokyo: United Nations University Press. pp. 156-199.