



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal

– The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL TEAM

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service officer



Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala . He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University . He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and diploma in Public

a professional Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM-degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur, M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US



WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal providededicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

W H I T E B L A C K
L E G A L

THE TUMULTUOUS TRIBUTARIES: AN ANALYTICAL EXAMINATION OF RIVER WATER DISPUTES AND RESOLUTION MECHANISMS IN INDIA.

AUTHORED BY - AISHWARYA TIWARI &
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, KHALEEQ AHMED

KEY WORDS: River Water Disputes, the Indian Constitution, Articles 262 and 253, the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956.

ABSTRACT:-

This article, "The Tumultuous Tributaries: An Analytical Examination of River Water Disputes and Resolution Mechanisms in India," undertakes a comprehensive legal analysis of the contentious and complex river water disputes that pervade the Indian subcontinent. Grounded in the constitutional framework of India, the study meticulously examines the interplay between the provisions of the Indian Constitution¹ particularly Articles 262 and 253, and the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956². Through an in-depth exploration of these legal provisions, the article elucidates the mechanisms established for the adjudication and resolution of inter-state river water conflicts.

The article further delves into the jurisprudential interpretations and landmark judgments delivered by the Supreme Court of India, which have significantly shaped the contours of river water law in the country. It scrutinizes the efficacy of the various tribunals constituted under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, assessing their role in mitigating disputes and fostering cooperative federalism.

The analysis extends to relevant international treaties and comparative legal frameworks, drawing parallels and highlighting divergences with global practices. The study also addresses the environmental and socio-economic implications of river water disputes, advocating for a balanced and sustainable approach to water resource management.

¹ The Indian Constitution, 1950.

² THE INTER-STATE RIVER WATER DISPUTES ACT,
1956 <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/1664/3/A1956-33.pdf>

The article proposes legislative and policy reforms aimed at enhancing the existing legal architecture, promoting equitable water distribution, and ensuring the harmonious resolution of river water disputes. Through this scholarly inquiry, the article contributes to the ongoing discourse on water law and policy, underscoring the imperative for a robust and adaptive legal framework to navigate the turbulent waters of inter-state river disputes in India.

INTRODUCTION

In the complex landscape of water law in India, river water disputes have emerged as a critical focal point, necessitating intricate legal analysis and resolution mechanisms. The Constitution of India, as the supreme legal document, lays down foundational principles guiding water management and allocation among states. Article 262 of the Constitution vests the Parliament with the authority to adjudicate inter-state river water disputes through adjudicatory bodies or tribunals, thereby emphasizing the constitutional imperative of addressing disputes over shared water resources. This constitutional framework underscores the importance of structured mechanisms to resolve disputes that arise in the context of inter-state river waters.

Various statutes complement and elaborate upon the constitutional provisions. The Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956,³ provides a statutory framework for the adjudication of disputes concerning waters of inter-state rivers and river valleys. This Act empowers the central government to constitute river water disputes tribunals upon the occurrence of disputes between two or more states over the utilization, distribution, or control of waters of any inter-state river or river valley. The Act ensures that disputes are resolved through specialized adjudicatory mechanisms, thus mitigating potential conflicts arising from competing claims over limited water resources.

Judicial decisions rendered by the Supreme Court of India have significantly shaped the legal landscape concerning river water disputes. Landmark cases such as *Babulal Parate v. State of Bombay*⁴ and *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India*⁵ have established pivotal precedents regarding the allocation of river waters and the protection of environmental interests in the context of large-scale water projects. These judicial pronouncements underscore the judiciary's role in interpreting constitutional provisions and statutory frameworks concerning river water disputes, thereby contributing to the evolution of water law jurisprudence in India.

³ Ibid

⁴ *Babulal Parate v. State of Bombay* (AIR 1960 SC 51)

⁵ *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India* (AIR 2000 SC 3751)

The complexities inherent in resolving river water disputes are compounded by socio-economic and environmental considerations, necessitating a nuanced approach towards equitable distribution and sustainable management of water resources. Issues such as the impact of hydroelectric projects on downstream states, ecological sustainability, and the rights of indigenous communities underscore the multidimensional nature of river water disputes. Effective resolution mechanisms must therefore balance legal principles with scientific evidence and socio-economic imperatives to ensure fair and sustainable utilization of shared water resources.

The examination of river water disputes in India requires a comprehensive understanding of constitutional provisions, statutory frameworks, and judicial interpretations that collectively define the legal contours governing inter-state water allocations. The evolving nature of water law necessitates continuous adaptation to address emerging challenges and uphold the principles of equity, efficiency, and sustainability in the management of river waters. This article aims to delve into these complexities, offering a critical analysis of existing legal frameworks and proposing pragmatic solutions to enhance the effectiveness of resolution mechanisms in mitigating disputes over India's tumultuous tributaries.

THE SCARCITY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF WATER IN INDIA:-

Water, an indispensable resource for life and development, assumes profound significance in the socio-economic fabric of India. The nation's vast and diverse river systems, cradles of civilization, and crucial lifelines for agricultural, industrial, and domestic purposes, underscore its strategic importance. However, the burgeoning demands of a rapidly growing population coupled with climatic variability have exacerbated water scarcity issues across the country, intensifying the complexity of managing its water resources.

In India, the management of water resources is governed by a layered legal framework that begins with constitutional principles. Article 21 of the Constitution of India⁶, enshrining the right to life, includes the right to access to clean drinking water as a fundamental right. This constitutional recognition amplifies the imperative for equitable distribution and sustainable utilization of water resources amidst escalating demands and depleting reserves.

Moreover, statutory instruments such as the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974

⁶ Ibid

⁷and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986,⁸ complement constitutional provisions by addressing pollution control and environmental conservation, crucial aspects in safeguarding the quality and availability of water resources. These legislative measures underscore the intersection of environmental protection with water management, necessitating a harmonized approach to mitigate adverse impacts on water quality and availability.

Judicial intervention through landmark decisions has also shaped the discourse on water scarcity and management in India. Cases such as *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*(1997)⁹ exemplify judicial activism in addressing pollution of water bodies and promoting sustainable water resource management practices. These judicial pronouncements reinforce the judiciary's role in interpreting and enforcing legal provisions aimed at preserving water resources for present and future generations.

The challenges posed by water scarcity are further compounded by inter-state river water disputes, where competing claims over shared river basins often lead to protracted legal battles. The resolution of these disputes necessitates not only legal acumen but also an understanding of socio-economic dynamics and environmental considerations that underpin water resource management. Effective resolution mechanisms, including specialized tribunals and adjudicatory bodies empowered by statutory frameworks like the Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956¹⁰, play a pivotal role in mitigating conflicts and fostering cooperative federalism in the governance of water resources.

While India grapples with the complexities of water scarcity and the management of its tumultuous tributaries, a holistic approach encompassing constitutional principles, statutory enactments, judicial precedents, and effective dispute-resolution mechanisms is indispensable. The pursuit of sustainable development goals necessitates a paradigm shift towards equitable distribution, efficient utilization, and conservation of water resources, ensuring their availability and accessibility for all segments of society. This article endeavours to critically examine these facets, offering insights into the legal dimensions and challenges surrounding river water disputes and their resolution mechanisms in India's evolving legal landscape.

CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK CONCERNING RIVER WATER

⁷ The Water (Prevention And Control Of Pollution) Act, 1974

⁸ The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986,

⁹ *M.C. Mehta v. Union of India*(1997) 1 SCC 388

¹⁰ The Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956

DISPUTES AND RESOLUTION MECHANISMS IN INDIA:-

The constitutional framework governing river water disputes in India delineates a complex interplay of legislative competence, adjudicative mechanisms, and fundamental rights, reflecting the nation's commitment to equitable distribution and sustainable management of water resources. At the heart of this framework lies Article 262 of the Constitution, which confers upon Parliament the authority to adjudicate inter-state river water disputes through adjudicatory bodies or tribunals. This provision underscores the constitutional imperative to resolve disputes arising from competing claims over shared water resources among states.

Article 262 operates within the broader framework of legislative powers enumerated in the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. Entry 17 of the State List grants states jurisdiction over water, subject to the provisions of Entry 56 of the Union List, which empowers the Union government to regulate and develop inter-state rivers and river valleys. This dual authority necessitates cooperative federalism in water resource management, balancing state autonomy with central oversight to ensure effective coordination and resolution of inter-state disputes.

Furthermore, the constitutional guarantee of the right to life under Article 21 encompasses the right to access to clean drinking water, amplifying the constitutional mandate for equitable distribution and sustainable utilization of water resources. Judicial interpretations have affirmed this fundamental right and its implications for water governance. In *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India*¹¹, the Supreme Court emphasized the constitutional duty to protect the right to life by ensuring adequate water supply, particularly in areas affected by large-scale water projects.

The judiciary, through its expansive interpretation of constitutional provisions, has played a pivotal role in shaping water law jurisprudence in India. In *Babulal Parate v. State of Bombay*¹² the Supreme Court elucidated upon the scope of legislative competence in relation to water resources, highlighting the intersection of state and union powers in resolving disputes over water allocation. These judicial pronouncements underscore the judiciary's role as a custodian of constitutional values and principles, ensuring that legal frameworks governing water disputes are aligned with constitutional mandates and rights.

The Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956¹³, complements constitutional provisions by

¹¹ Ibid

¹² Ibid

¹³ Ibid

providing a statutory framework for the adjudication of inter-state river water disputes. This Act establishes river water disputes tribunals empowered to resolve conflicts arising from competing claims over the utilization, distribution, or control of waters of inter-state rivers and river valleys. The Act exemplifies legislative efforts to operationalize constitutional mandates through specialized adjudicatory mechanisms, thereby facilitating cooperative federalism in the resolution of complex inter-state water disputes.

The constitutional framework governing river water disputes in India embodies a delicate balance between federal principles, fundamental rights, and legislative competence. The synergy between constitutional provisions, statutory enactments, and judicial interpretations underscores the nation's commitment to equitable and sustainable water resource management. This article aims to critically analyse these constitutional dimensions, offering insights into the legal complexities and challenges surrounding river water disputes and their resolution mechanisms within India's evolving legal landscape.

Legislative Framework Concerning River Water Disputes and Resolution Mechanisms in India:-

India's legislative framework addressing river water disputes extends beyond constitutional provisions to include specialized statutes designed to facilitate resolution mechanisms and promote cooperative federalism among states. Central to this framework is the Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956,¹⁴ which provides a statutory mechanism for the adjudication of disputes arising from the utilization, distribution, or control of waters of inter-state rivers and river valleys.

The Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956¹⁵, establishes a framework for the constitution of river water disputes tribunals by the central government upon the occurrence of disputes between two or more states. These tribunals are vested with quasi-judicial powers to investigate and adjudicate upon inter-state water disputes, ensuring impartiality and expertise in resolving complex legal and technical issues. The Act mandates that decisions of these tribunals are binding on the parties involved, thereby promoting compliance and facilitating peaceful resolution of disputes. Under the Act, the central government is empowered to constitute river water disputes tribunals upon the occurrence of disputes between two or more states. Section 3 of the Act outlines the conditions under which such disputes may be referred to a tribunal, emphasizing the necessity of central intervention to resolve conflicts that transcend state boundaries. This statutory provision

¹⁴ Ibid

¹⁵ Ibid

underscores the legislative intent to mitigate interstate tensions and promote cooperative federalism in the management of shared water resources.

Section 4 of the Act delineates the composition and powers of river water disputes tribunals, specifying their authority to adjudicate disputes and make binding decisions on water allocation and utilization. These tribunals operate as specialized bodies equipped with quasi-judicial powers, ensuring impartial and expert resolution of complex water disputes through hearings, evidence examination, and legal deliberations.

The effectiveness of the legislative framework is further bolstered by Section 5, which mandates the tribunal to submit its report to the central government upon the completion of adjudication proceedings. The central government, in turn, is entrusted with the responsibility to publish the tribunal's findings and recommendations, thereby facilitating transparent and accountable decision-making in matters of inter-state water allocation.

The Act incorporates provisions for the enforcement of tribunal awards through Section 6, which stipulates that the award shall be final and binding on the parties involved. This statutory mechanism promotes certainty and stability in water resource management by precluding further litigation on settled matters, thereby fostering compliance and cooperation among disputing state

The functioning of river water dispute tribunals under the Interstate River Water Disputes Act has shaped India's approach to managing inter-state water conflicts. Tribunals such as the Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal¹⁶ and the Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal¹⁷ have addressed long-standing disputes over water allocations among riparian states, demonstrating the efficacy of specialized adjudicatory bodies in resolving contentious issues through evidence-based decision-making.

The legislative framework governing environmental protection and water quality standards also intersects with river water disputes. The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974¹⁸, and the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986¹⁹, impose regulatory obligations on industries and municipalities to prevent pollution of water bodies, thereby safeguarding the quality and availability of inter-state river waters. These legislative measures underscore the holistic approach required to address the multidimensional challenges posed by river water disputes, integrating environmental considerations with legal and administrative frameworks.

¹⁶ The Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal <https://jalshakti-dowr.gov.in/cauvery-water-dispute/#:~:text=The%20Government%20of%20India%20constituted,Formed>.

¹⁷ the Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal [https://jalshakti-dowr.gov.in/krishna-water-disputes-tribunal/#:~:text=The%20Central%20Government%20vide%20Notification,\(ISRWD\)%20Act%2C%201956](https://jalshakti-dowr.gov.in/krishna-water-disputes-tribunal/#:~:text=The%20Central%20Government%20vide%20Notification,(ISRWD)%20Act%2C%201956).

¹⁸ The Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974

¹⁹ The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986

Recent legislative developments such as the National Water Framework Law have aimed to provide a comprehensive framework for the management and regulation of water resources in India. Proposed reforms include the establishment of River Basin Organizations (RBOs) to facilitate integrated water resources management at the basin level, promoting sustainable development and equitable distribution of water resources among stakeholders.

The legislative framework governing river water disputes in India encompasses specialized statutes aimed at facilitating resolution mechanisms and promoting cooperative federalism among states. The Interstate River Water Disputes Act, 1956²⁰, stands as a cornerstone in this framework, providing a structured approach to adjudicate inter-state water conflicts through tribunals empowered with quasi-judicial powers. This legislative architecture, supplemented by environmental protection laws and proposed reforms, reflects India's commitment to addressing the challenges of water scarcity, quality degradation, and equitable distribution in its management of tumultuous tributaries.

Landmark Case Law

M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (1987 SCC 1086)²¹

In the seminal case of M.C. Mehta v. Union of India, the Supreme Court of India enunciated the public trust doctrine, asserting the state's fiduciary duty to protect and conserve natural resources, including rivers, for the public's benefit. The Court underscored that rivers are vital public resources that must be safeguarded against over-exploitation and degradation. This landmark judgment reinforced the principle that the state must act as a trustee of all natural resources, emphasizing the government's responsibility to manage these resources sustainably and equitably. The public trust doctrine, as articulated in this case, serves as a foundational tenet in environmental jurisprudence, ensuring that the management and distribution of river waters are conducted with an overarching obligation to protect the environment and public interest.

Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India (2000 SCC 353)²²

The Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India case further shaped the legal landscape of river water disputes by emphasizing the necessity of sustainable water management practices. In this case, the Supreme Court highlighted the critical importance of conducting thorough environmental impact assessments (EIAs) before embarking on large-scale water projects that could affect inter-

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ M.C. Mehta v. Union of India (1987 SCC 1086)

²² Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India (2000 SCC 353)

state river waters. The Court's decision underscored the need for a balanced approach that takes into account both developmental imperatives and environmental preservation. By insisting on rigorous EIAs, the judgment aimed to ensure that any adverse environmental impacts are identified and mitigated, promoting sustainable development in the context of inter-state river water disputes. This case also reaffirmed the judiciary's role in scrutinizing state actions and policies to safeguard environmental and public interests.

CHALLENGES AND CONSIDERATIONS

Despite the existence of a legislative framework and landmark judicial pronouncements, the resolution of river water disputes in India remains an intricate and protracted affair. One of the primary challenges lies in the delays associated with the formation and functioning of Tribunals under the Interstate River Water Disputes (ISWD) Act²³. These delays often exacerbate inter-state tensions, prolonging conflicts and impeding timely resolution. The protracted nature of adjudication not only strains inter-state relations but also hampers the effective management of river waters, leading to inefficiencies and potential misallocation of resources.

Furthermore, the burgeoning pressures of population growth, climate change, and escalating industrial demands compound the complexities of river water disputes. As populations increase and urbanization accelerates, the demand for water for domestic, agricultural, and industrial use intensifies. Climate change adds another layer of unpredictability, affecting river flows and water availability, thus complicating existing allocation mechanisms. Industrial expansion further strains water resources, necessitating a delicate balance between economic development and sustainable water use. These multifaceted challenges underscore the need for a dynamic and adaptive legal framework capable of addressing the evolving demands on river water resources.

CONCLUSION

In the analytical examination of river water disputes in India, it becomes evident that a multi-pronged approach is essential for effective resolution. The existing legal and institutional frameworks must be strengthened to ensure timely adjudication and enforcement of tribunal awards. Enhancing the capacity of tribunals, streamlining procedures, and imposing strict timelines for adjudication can mitigate delays and improve the efficiency of dispute-resolution mechanisms.

Fostering cooperative federalism is crucial for pre-empting and resolving river water disputes.

²³ The Interstate River Water Disputes (ISWD) Act

Establishing inter-state councils and promoting continuous dialogue among states can facilitate collaborative water management and mitigate conflicts. Encouraging states to engage in negotiations and mediation, supported by the central government, can lead to more amicable and sustainable solutions.

Integrating hydrological data and environmental considerations into legal frameworks is imperative for sustainable river water management. Comprehensive environmental impact assessments and the incorporation of scientific data in decision-making processes can ensure that water allocation is both equitable and ecologically sound. This holistic approach can help balance the competing demands of various stakeholders and promote the long-term sustainability of river water resources.

In conclusion, while landmark case laws have significantly shaped the legal landscape of river water disputes in India, ongoing challenges necessitate continuous adaptation and reform of existing mechanisms. By enhancing institutional capacities, fostering cooperative federalism, and integrating environmental considerations, India can develop a more resilient and effective framework for resolving river water disputes and ensuring the sustainable management of its vital water resources.



WHITE BLACK
LEGAL