

ISSN: 2450-8160

Herald pedagogiki. Nauka i Praktyka

wydanie specjalne



Warszawa
2021

Editorial Team

Editor-in-chief: *Gontarenko N.*

EDITORIAL COLLEGE:

W. Okulicz-Kozaryn, *dr. hab, MBA, Institute of Law, Administration and Economics of Pedagogical University of Cracow, Poland;*

L. Nechaeva, *PhD, PNPUI Institute K.D. Ushinskogo, Ukraine.*

K. Fedorova, *PhD in Political Science, International political scientist, Ukraine.*

ARCHIVING

Sciendo archives the contents of this journal in ejournals.id - digital long-term preservation service of scholarly books, journals and collections.

PLAGIARISM POLICY

The editorial board is participating in a growing community of [Similarity Check System's](#) users in order to ensure that the content published is original and trustworthy. Similarity Check is a medium that allows for comprehensive manuscripts screening, aimed to eliminate plagiarism and provide a high standard and quality peer-review process.

About the Journal

Herald pedagogiki. Nauka i Praktyka (HP) publishes outstanding educational research from a wide range of conceptual, theoretical, and empirical traditions. Diverse perspectives, critiques, and theories related to pedagogy – broadly conceptualized as intentional and political teaching and learning across many spaces, disciplines, and discourses – are welcome, from authors seeking a critical, international audience for their work. All manuscripts of sufficient complexity and rigor will be given full review. In particular, HP seeks to publish scholarship that is critical of oppressive systems and the ways in which traditional and/or “commonsensical” pedagogical practices function to reproduce oppressive conditions and outcomes. Scholarship focused on macro, micro and meso level educational phenomena are welcome. JoP encourages authors to analyse and create alternative spaces within which such phenomena impact on and influence pedagogical practice in many different ways, from classrooms to forms of public pedagogy, and the myriad spaces in between. Manuscripts should be written for a broad, diverse, international audience of either researchers and/or practitioners. Accepted manuscripts will be available free to the public through HPs open-access policies, as well as we planed to index our journal in Elsevier's Scopus indexing service, ERIC, and others.

HP publishes two issues per year, including Themed Issues. To propose a Special Themed Issue, please contact the Lead Editor Dr. Gontarenko N (info@ejournals.id). All submissions deemed of sufficient quality by the Executive Editors are reviewed using a double-blind peer-review process. Scholars interested in serving as reviewers are encouraged to contact the Executive Editors with a list of areas in which they are qualified to review manuscripts.

DISPUTES ON SHARING TRANSBOUNDARY WATER RESOURCES IN CENTRAL ASIA

Abdukhaliil Abdusalimovich Tursunov,
Associate Professor,
"Business Law" department,
Tashkent State University of Law
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4332-1424
a.tursunov@tsul.uz

Prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, water sharing among Central Asian countries was a domestic matter, controlled by Moscow. After the six Central Asian states declared their independence across the second half of 1991, water sharing rapidly became a key regional issue. Although a range of bilateral and multilateral negotiations and agreements have taken place in the ensuing 25 years, it is fair to say that this issue has never been resolved satisfactorily, and remains a key bone of contention between the republics of Central Asia. This chapter traces the various attempts at developing legal frameworks to resolve regional water sharing disputes to date.

1. Regulation of Transboundary Water Resources in Central Asia

The Amu Darya and the Syr Darya Rivers and their tributaries form what is called the Aral Sea Basin, and include six nations. Figure 1 shows the map of the Aral Sea Basin, two main rivers in dispute, and the six countries making claims on water resources.



Figure 1: Map of Aral Sea Basin (Source: maps of Central Asia/the Toynbee Convector <http://davidderrick.wordpress.com/category/maps/maps-of-central-asia/>, accessed November 5, 2020)

Water resources are of significant importance for the Central Asian republics because

the region is very dry and since most of the various populations live along the few main rivers, the dominant economic activity rest in developing irrigated agriculture. Under the Soviet system, the crop fields of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan were Moscow's primary focus for irrigation while the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan managed the rivers for hydropower. Afghanistan, meanwhile, was not the under Soviet scheme and has struggled as a downstream nation.

During the Soviet period, rivers in Central Asia were under the control and management of the Soviet Union. For example, the USSR was often involved in disputes that emerged over demands of usage of the important Amu Darya and the Syr Darya Rivers. The Soviet Ministry of Reclamation and Water Management had a final word in any dispute among the various autonomous republics when issues over water allocation occurred in any water basin within its boundaries. In 1991 the USSR fell and the situation changed dramatically. The Aral Sea basin came to be no longer controlled by one major-power and instead, the water resources came under heavy demand by following seven states (Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Afghanistan - Central Asian states and also to a lesser extent, Iran).

In February 1992, the five former Soviet Central Asian states signed an agreement proclaiming that the water allocation scheme under the Soviet regime should remain in place in order to maintain the status quo. The Kyrgyz Republic, an upstream nation for the Syr Darya River, and Tajikistan, an upstream country for both the Syr Darya and Amu Darya rivers, complained about the allocation scheme. Under the Soviet system Kyrgyz Republic was allocated 13% from the Syr Darya River and Tajikistan 15.4% from the Amu Darya River. In fact, these two nations want considerably more of the flow allocated to them (so they can expand irrigation) and more freedom to generate winter hydropower. In the Soviet period huge dams were built throughout these five countries in order to provide the lower regions with sufficient water in the summer and not for hydropower purposes. Since the independence of the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan, these two nations endeavored to change the purpose of the dams from a reservoir that provided summer irrigation water to hydro-dams that produced more energy for winter usage in their countries.

Namely, in case of the Syr Darya River basin, in 1997 the Kyrgyz Republic demanded payment from Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan for water that flowed from the rivers originating within its territory claiming that water was a state property. Uzbekistan found such demands unreasonable and refused, while Kazakhstan agreed to pay for water flowing from only the Chu and Talas rivers. In 1998, the opportunity arose to establish the first international consortium to deal with the water resources in the Syr Darya Basin, which included four out of the five Central Asian countries. Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan were invited to build a consortium. The Kazakh, Kyrgyz and Uzbek governments agreed to establish the Syr Darya Energy Consortium, later Tajikistan joined in 1999. Yet this consortium collapsed in 2002. On the meantime, the nations in this basin began to build reservoirs to meet water needs of their own respective interests.

For example, the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan began to build reservoirs in 2007 on the Syr Darya River to the concern of the other nations.

Meanwhile, similar sort of issues and problems emerged over water resources in the Amu Darya Basin. In 1996, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan concluded an agreement to divide water from the Amu Darya equally. Turkmenistan sought to lengthen the Karakum canal from this river, which would have increased the diversion of water resources. Uzbekistan strongly opposed such diversions. In addition, Tajikistan is intent on overbuilding the Rogun hydropower station - a 335 meter high dam - that would give it complete control over the Amu Darya and maximize hydropower production. Meanwhile, it causes possible conflicts with the downstream, especially with Uzbekistan, since this project reduces the water allocated to the lower riparian states. At present, the World Bank and the Central Asian states require Tajikistan to refrain from further construction of the dam until the World Bank finishes its environmental and trans-boundary impact assessment on this project. Finally, Afghanistan seeks to increase its water diversion from the Amu Darya for its irrigation, which most likely will be vehemently opposed by the other three riparian states. Overall, the Syr Darya and Amu Darya Rivers have become the major source of water conflicts between the region nations.

2. Literature Review of Relevant Academic Sources

There are a number of academic papers written in the field of Central Asian water disputes. Leading ones are written by Vinogradov and Ziganshina since they extensively analyzed the water law issues and policies in Central Asia. In particular, Vinogradov notes that though "the use of trans-boundary water resources is still influenced by the practices established in the former Soviet Union, there is a tendency towards greater reliance upon international law in addressing water-related issues of common concern." On the other hand, Ziganshina criticizes that "the textually indeterminate standards such as equity, reasonableness, and appropriateness that dominate the law of international watercourses generally make it more difficult to define certain obligations and to verify their fulfillment." Similarly, Dinar argues that "the international legal principles that have evolved over the years have provided states with only contradictory and vague directions for resolving conflicting uses for, and interests in, a shared international river." Meanwhile, discussing the regional legal framework in terms of cooperation and compliance, Vinogradov underlines that the 1992 Agreement "does not contain any specific rules regarding the management or exploitation of shared natural resources" though it was signed by five Central Asian states - that is, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

3. Compliance and Performance of Current Regional Legal Framework in Central Asia

In this section, the article analyzes how the current water allocation agreements are working in practice. And to what extent, they are capable of preventing disputes effectively in terms of sharing trans-boundary rivers. So to speak, substantive and procedural

norms in those treaties will be elaborated .

To begin with, the paper notes two main groups of the water disputes in Central Asia:

- 1) Equitable sharing of water resources among the five states;
- 2) The appropriate allowable usage for upstream hydropower plants.

The first group of legal issues relates to disputes over the fair usage of water resources between Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Afghanistan as the set of upstream states, and Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan as the lower stream nations. For the second group of the issues, the contention revolves around the use and development of hydropower. Under the previous Soviet system, hydropower was developed in Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan as part of a plan to manage and allocate water to the downstream agricultural states. Yet this set of legal issues does not include Afghanistan. At present, Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan desire to develop and increase hydroelectricity for winter use which would affect the summer allocation of water to downstream states. In terms of these legal issues, the upstream nations invoke the theory of absolute territorial sovereignty while the downstream countries invoke the theories of limited territorial sovereignty and community of interests.

The next problem is the absence of long-term water sharing agreement, which in turn intensifies tensions between these states. For instance, the omission of clear written and binding water sharing formula in the form of treaty between the watercourse countries of Central Asia further contributes to the strengthening of water tensions. Therefore, depoliticizing the water sharing process through normative treaty is indispensable for all Central Asian riparian nations.

Moreover, the most serious problem, breach of the agreements, arises, particularly when the river flow drops or the downstream countries (for example, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan) fail to deliver regularly fossil energy to the upstream (Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan). For example, in the 1992 Almaty Agreement, the parties agreed "to refrain from actions on their territories that might have affect interests of other parties and cause harm to them, lead to deviations from the agreed volumes of water flow and pollution of water sources." However, this agreement does not state whether harm must be significant or not. As noted by Ziganshina, "the question may arise whether this provision indeed prohibits any transboundary harm, whether it in fact asks for the impossible." On the other hand, the technical data of basin rivers flow is not comprehensive, that is, the actual amount of following year's river flow (in particular, the Amu Darya and the Syr Darya) is unpredictable. Therefore, water sharing agreements do not take into account the fluctuation of the flow, causing the lack of flexible clauses in the agreements relating to this issue. Finally, "making matters even worse is the basin states' tendency to overestimate their rightful share of water resources."

Also, there is no cooperation under the international water law rules below between Central Asian states. In fact, among Central Asian states only Uzbekistan has ratified the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International

Watercourses (hereinafter, the 1997 UN Convention). The reason of such ratification lies on the fact that article 6 of this convention determined "geographic, hydrological character; existing and potential uses of the watercourse; the population dependent on the watercourse" in the list of related factors in terms of water sharing. Thus, this provision is to a large extent, consistent with Uzbekistan's interests in transboundary water apportionment in the region. Even though other Central Asian countries are not yet member to the 1997 UN Convention, entrance into force of this convention in August 2014 strengthens the argument of member countries. In addition, the 1997 UN Convention "has already had a positive impact on the international legal environment through the process of codification and crystallization of the customary rules of international water law." To be specific, the 1997 UN Convention sets out the obligations of "timely notification", "consultations over planned measures." At last, article 8 of this Convention provides that watercourse states "shall co-operate on the basis of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, mutual benefit and good faith in order to attain optimal utilization and adequate protection" of the watercourse.

The issues of non-settled transboundary water resources bring a bunch of problems to local businesses too. Many companies of the region are not likely to launch production in such areas, whereas the state aims to develop the localization of production, increase job places and adopt other unilateral measures to ease its use of natural resources.

On the other hand, if water market approach is ought to be applied to a transboundary river like the Syr Darya as argued by the Kyrgyz Republic, this approach would surely raise a new set of confusing legal issues between the regional watercourse states. For example, "if a State introduced water-efficient technology and then marketed the water it saved, would it be considered a reasonable and equitable use?" If no, then why should the State bear the burden of such technology? Also, there will be a question whether the watercourse states have to guarantee that no eventual significant harm reaches the downstream users. Overall, "will the marketing of water essentially creates a parallel system of agreements on the watercourse, which could upset the balance sought under the principles of equitable and reasonable use and no significant harm?"

Riparian states	Issues concerned	Riparian states
Uzbekistan	Equitable sharing of water resources	Afghanistan
Uzbekistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of upstream hydropower dams, for instance, the Rogun and Nurek dams	Tajikistan
Uzbekistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Further lengthening of the Karakum canal	Turkmenistan
Afghanistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of upstream hydropower dams, for instance, the Rogun and Nurek dams	Tajikistan
Afghanistan	Equitable sharing of water resources	Turkmenistan
Tajikistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of upstream hydropower dams, for instance, the Rogun and Nurek dams	Turkmenistan

Figure No 2. Controversial issues in the Amu Darya River Basin

Riparian states	Issues concerned	Riparian states
Uzbekistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Proper management of the Chardara reservoir	Kazakhstan
Uzbekistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of upstream hydropower dams, for example, the Kayrokkum, the Farkhad, and the Yavansk dams	Tajikistan
Uzbekistan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of new upstream hydropower dams, for instance, the Tokhtagul, Kambarata I and Kambarata II dams	Kyrgyz Republic
Kazakhstan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of upstream hydropower dams, for instance, the Kayrokkum, Farkhad dams	Tajikistan
Kazakhstan	Equitable sharing of water resources; Construction and operational regime of new upstream hydropower dams, for example, the Tokhtagul, Kambarata I and Kambarata II dams	Kyrgyz Republic
Tajikistan	Equitable sharing of water resources	Kyrgyz Republic

Figure No 3. Controversial issues in the Syr Darya River Basin

4. Summary

Overall, while a range of bilateral and multilateral agreements have been implemented over the past quarter century, these agreements have often been short-lived, valid for as little as a year. And even when a longer-term treaty has been put in place, it has sometimes been ignored in practice by both sides. Further, some issues such as the question of whether water is an economic good, and how equitable and reasonable use should be determined, remain completely unaddressed. The result of this piecemeal approach has been constant regional political tension, uncertainty for the agricultural sector, and dissatisfaction for the hydro-energy sector in upstream states, which have suffered consistent disadvantage under the agreements that have been entered into.

Used literature.

I. Treaties and Statements

1. Agreement on Interaction in the Field of Ecology and the Environmental Protection, (Moscow, February 8, 1992)
2. Agreement between the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Republic of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and the Republic of Uzbekistan on co-operation in interstate sources' water resources use and protection common management (1992)
3. Agreement between Republic of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Republic of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Republic of Uzbekistan on joint activities in addressing the Aral Sea and the zone around the Sea crisis, improving the environment, and enduring the social and economic development of the Aral Sea region (1993)
4. Agreement between Turkmenistan and the Republic of Uzbekistan on Cooperation over Water Management Issues (Chardjev, January 16, 1996)
5. Columbia River Treaty, 17th January, 1961 and 23th January, 1964, 542 UNTS 244
6. Convention on Cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the Danube, 1994
7. Helsinki Rules on the Uses of the Waters of International Rivers and Comments, Committee on the Uses of the Waters of International Rivers, International Law Association (1966) ('Helsinki Rules')
8. Indus Waters Treaty, 19th September, 1960, 419 UNTS 125
9. Nile Waters Treaty, 8th November, 1959, 453 UNTS 51
10. Statement of heads of water economy organisations of Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan (1991)
11. UN International Watercourses Convention, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 May 1997, General Assembly resolution 51/229, annex, Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 49, (A/51/49)
12. Benvenisti, Eyal. *Sharing Transboundary Resources: International Law and Optimal Resource Use*, Cambridge University Press, 2004
13. Dinar, Shlomi. *International water treaties: Negotiation and cooperation along transboundary rivers*. Routledge, 2007
14. Kaya, Ibrahim. *Equitable utilization: the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses*, Ashgate, 2003
15. Weiss, Edith B., Chazaournes L.B., and Bernasconi-Osterwalder N., *Fresh water and International Economic Law*, Oxford University Press, 2008
16. Kasymov, O.S., "Politicheskiye aspekty razresheniya vodnykh problem v Centralnoy Azii" [Political aspects of resolving water disputes in Central Asia], Akademiya Gosudarstvennogo i obshchestvennogo stroitelstva pri Prezidenta Respubliki Uzbekistan [Academy of State and Society-building under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan], Tashkent, 2005

- 17.Kumar, Shashank. "The Indus Waters Kishenganga Arbitration (Pakistan v. India)" American Society of International Law Insights 17, no. 13, (2013)
- 18.Paisley, Richard. "Adversaries into partners: International water law and the Equitable sharing of downstream benefits", Melbourne Journal of International Law, Volume 3, (2002)
- 19.Vinogradov, S., "Managing transboundary water resources in the Aral Sea Basin: in search of a solution." International journal of Global Environmental Issues, Vol.1, Nos. (2001)
- 20.Vinogradov, S., "Transboundary water resources in the Former Soviet Union: between conflict and cooperation." Natural Resources Journal, Vol.36 (spring 1996)
- 21.Weiss, Edith B. "The evolution of international water law", Hague Academy of International law, 2007
- 22.Ziganshina, D. "International Water Law in Central Asia: commitments, compliance and beyond." The Journal of water law, volume 20, 2009: 96 - 107
- 23.Ziganshina, D. "International Water Law in Central Asia: the Nature of Substantive Norms and what flows from it." Asian Journal of International Law, volume 2, issue 01, (January 2012): 169 - 192
- 24.Oqyulov O., Tursunov A. Creating Appropriate Legal Environment for Technology Transfer by Foreign Investors in Uzbekistan //Solid State Technology. - 2020. - T. 63. - №. 5. - C. 10497-10508. <http://solidstatetechnology.us/index.php/JSST/article/view/9257>
- 25.Djumanov A. K. State Regulation of Prices for Medicines in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan //Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology. - 2021. - C. 4471-4476. <https://www.annalsofrscb.ro/index.php/journal/article/view/588>
- 26.Ruzinazarov, Sh. N. and Achilova, L. I. (2021) "A new stage in the development of the civil code of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the context of digital reality," International Relations: Politics, Economics, Law: Vol. 2020: Iss. 1, Article 6. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/intrel/vol2020/iss1/6> <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/intrel/vol2020/iss1/6/>
- 27.Gabcikovo - Nagymaros Project (Hungary/Slovakia), Judgment, ICJ Reports, 1997
- 28.The Indus River case, http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/research/case_studies/Indus_New.htm (accessed September 1, 2020)
- 29.The Mekong River case, http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/research/case_studies/Mekong_New.htm (accessed November 22, 2020)
- 30.The Nile River case,
http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/research/case_studies/Nile_New.htm
(accessed November 22, 2020)
- 31.The Tigris - Euphrates case,
http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/research/case_studies/Documents/euphrates-tigris.pdf (accessed September 1, 2020)

32.<http://wwf.panda.org> - the web site of World Wildlife Fund, an international environmental organization

33.www.internationalrivers.org - the web site of non-governmental organisation "International Rivers"

34.www.cawater-info.net - the official web site of the Inter-state Coordination Water Commission of Central Asian states

35.www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/index.html - the web site of the Program in Water Conflict Management and Transformation, Institute for Water and Watersheds, Oregon State University

