Transformative Analysis of transboundary water arrangements
A. Conventional Diplomacy
Water diplomacy for conflict management in context of ‘late upstream development’

- Diplomacy underpinning conflict (by pushing for status quo)
- Diplomacy creating conflict (by stifling change)
- Diplomacy ignoring conflict (through lack of relevance)
B. Transformative Analysis
**Goal:** ‘improvement’ of tbw arrangements to become more ‘equitable and sustainable’

Equitable = fair, adaptable (but to whom?)
inequitable = not sustainable

**Focus:**
- alteration of structures that sustain any arrangement
- on the *harm* experienced, and ways to address it (rather than simply benefits derived from interventions, which may only be realised for some)

**Object of study**

**Transboundary Water Arrangement**

= agreements, protocols, river basin commissions and other institutional structures that shape policy and use of transboundary waters (primarily) between states.

- best understood as a result of interacting social and biophysical processes
• Water ignores borders... but is subordinate to politics and power

• Conflict transformation > conflict management

• Consider all water flows (soil water, virtual water) + what makes them flow (power)

• Conflict and Cooperation co-exist (destructive cooperation) [Mirumachi (2015)]

• *Conflicts transform along pathways that can be described*
Opportunities for transformation are created by breaking consent / constructive conflict, or ad-hoc or risk-taking cooperation.

Diplomacy which improves a TBW arrangement can be reformist or transformative.

TBW Arrangements are subject to structural and more accessible forces that lead to status quo; degradation; or ‘improvement’.

Tendency towards status quo and ‘destructive cooperation’ (esp. when conflict management is the goal).

Transformative Analysis should:
- be aware of the processes their analysis is taken up by
- understand the processes and structures that maintain them
- look for destructive conflict or cooperation
- elaborate the constructive forms of cooperation and of conflict (and spot opportunities to move this along)
Parting thoughts to discuss:

- Who benefits from a transformed arrangement?
- Does transformation oblige challenging what is politically acceptable?
- Risks of analysts being subjective (is anybody objective)?
- How can non-state actors be best integrated into the analysis?
- others?
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