

Highlights

- This meeting's focus was on the **annotated glossary** and **annotated atlas**.
 - We welcome you to share your input and feedback on these projects by filling out this survey:
 - <https://forms.gle/zARFn3sSWDJT4p9w6>
- If you are attending World Water Week 2022 in Stockholm and would like to meet other handbook contributors, email kevin.smith@tufts.edu so we can gauge interest and organize a small gathering.

Meeting Outline

- We held our August meeting at 1 PM GMT on August 18th, 2022.
- There were 21 contributors in attendance.
- We began the meeting with some administrative updates on open access and peer review.
- We then gave a presentation on the status **annotated atlas** and **annotated glossary** projects, shared some work in progress, and requested feedback on format, content, etc.
- We then went into breakout rooms to network and discuss those questions in more detail.
- We then closed with some feedback from the breakout room discussions.

Open Access Updates

This was announced at the last meeting, but we wanted to highlight it again here. We have a commitment to make the book open access under Routledge's "gold" open access model.

This means:

- the book will be freely available online (the hardcover book will still be available for the original price)
- you will retain the copyright to your work
- the previous agreements you signed will be voided (there may be alternative paperwork to come – we need to coordinate with the publisher to find out what that looks like)

Thank you to everyone who played a role in making this open access commitment possible, as well as to those who have shown patience with us as we explored different avenues to make this happen.

Peer Review Updates

Peer review is ongoing but has been slower than expected. We have granted extension requests where possible, but this has created delays in our ability to match chapters to potential reviewers. We appreciate your patience and will do our best to ensure you have ample time to incorporate feedback from peer review. You can read more about the peer review process by clicking this [link](#).

Atlas Project Overview

- The atlas project is a new initiative based on suggestions made at the June community meeting.
- Needs basic input on goals, format, etc.
- There are several ideas for what the atlas could be and why we might want one:
 - **To save space.** Many of our chapters are short. It would be nice to reference background material on an entity or conflict (e.g., the Silala) that is mentioned several times throughout the book but is not featured in a case study.
 - **To provide a common place for maps.** Maps used in figures throughout the book may conflict with each other re: boundaries. Providing a common reference – potentially highlighting these conflicting boundaries – could be clarifying for the reader.
 - **Provide a standalone visualization of water conflict and cooperation across the globe.** Create a collection of maps that highlights major areas of cooperation and conflict, as well as regions with easily identifiable exacerbating issues (water quality, scarcity, flooding, etc.).
- However:
 - We have **three** contributors who have expressed interest in working on the atlas.
 - We have **limited mapping and GIS resources** but could probably create a few high-quality maps.
 - We are starting this atlas quite late in the scope of the book.
- **Based on these limitations, what is a feasible path forward for the atlas that will be useful to readers?**
 - What do you see as the greatest benefit the atlas could provide to our readers?
 - Should the atlas be strictly for objective information (e.g., uncontested data, boundaries, etc.), or should it also include analysis and commentary?
 - Is it better to provide detail on a small number of places (mentioned frequently in the book) or roughly highlight many places (even some that may not be mentioned in the book)?
 - What elements are essential to an atlas entry – and which are simply nice to have? (maps, timelines, climate data, info on recurring water issues, etc.)
 - Should the atlas contents be linked to the “common challenges” and “tools” of water diplomacy identified in parts V and VI of the book?

Summary of Atlas Project Feedback from Breakout Room Discussions

Members of the OSU team suggested they may have some base maps we can build from. Recommended that the Atlas team get in touch to have an initial discussion.

Group A

- Maps and boundaries will often be contested. We need be careful not to endorse and disputed territories.
- Should include quantitative and qualitative information about a case
- Preferably it will be an online and evolving resource
- A combination of maps and data (qualitative and quantitative)
- The use of “common challenges” and “tools of water diplomacy” as attributes can connect multiple cases in an effective way.

Group B

- We don't often see maps in articles about waters diplomacy, help to give a sense of place and space
- Maps/ the Atlas can serve as a point of access for future exploration, something which could be facilitated by commentaries
- Should not only include “uncontested”/ “objective” data

- Can also have descriptive data through commentaries and regional specific considerations (E.g.: “climate variability data” as opposed to “climate change data” in the case of South Africa)
- Both Maps and timelines useful for discussions of water diplomacy
- Better to have “objective information”, to have a more appropriate final product which can be used as a handbook for all
- Ideally not only the most cited cases, but also more under-cited/overlooked cases
- Atlas a good idea, but political sensitivities make naming conventions difficult
- Maybe better to keep it more general, and have some limited commentary
- An added benefit would be if it were possible to highlight recurring water issues
- The Atlas (and glossary) could serve as a way to further the interest of the public/readership

Group C

- Geolocating issues is important, but:
 - We would have to be very sensitive about conflict and the information we provide to remain truly factual
 - Want to avoid taking a side with any labels we use
 - Don’t undermine the whole case and goal of the book- the atlas should be as ‘un-interpretable’ as possible
- Pitched just a hydrologic map with no borders, but breakout room felt like why have a map then - it almost removes any meaning or interesting parts of these cases and downplays them
- Would be better to have almost ‘too much’ in the map - i.e., all disputed borders, but this can be difficult in on-going conflict
- Challenge is really to decide what to include, because so many factors go into water conflict
 - Population, growth projections, etc.
- As a way to avoid taking full control over the maps, we could just state something like all maps are from X source (could be OSU, UN, etc.) and print as they are so we don’t change or add anything and avoid any kind of interpretation role
- having 1 or 2 in detail maps as an example is better than having many rushed maps
 - Add full detail
 - Have online features that you can add and subtract (potentially as layers for different stages of the conflict)
 - Could host on ESRI somewhere (ArcGIS storymaps perhaps?)
 - Could have a global map with areas of perceived or real conflict and then have 1 or 2 insets to zoom in

Group D

- Think about what it will look like in the hardbound version vs. the E-version. One group suggested that maybe it should only be an electronic resource.
- Look at 1 or 2 cases, especially where the issue has been resolved, as a way of highlighting key themes in disputed territories.
- Use Atlas as a way to refer and link different chapters in the book.
- Go through the chapters and number of cases and group together the cases
- The Atlas could provide basic information about what the conflict is and do some grouping.
- If there are maps added, maybe there could be 1 overarching map and a second set of regional maps to locate places, geographic info, name of a case, and chapter number.
- Interpreted information about the conflict would be like another volume.
- There will be some commonalities in terms of geography, general information about region and context as to not repeat that context in different chapters.
- Go through the chapters to see what case is a case study and what case is mentioned just briefly.

Glossary Project Overview

- The glossary is an ongoing initiative started based on recommendations in prior community meetings.
- Needs feedback on specific terms, format, etc.
- Motivation for the glossary:
 - We will have 90+ contributors to this Handbook.
 - Our contributors span academia to practice in water, law, diplomacy, anthropology, etc.
 - Even within disciplines we have trouble agreeing on what is meant by often-used, but important phrases.
 - **No matter what we do, readers will be confronted with divergent usages of key phrases.** How can we help them navigate this issue?
- The glossary is an attempt to help readers navigate key phrases used throughout the book, not by giving them a singular definition, but by clarifying and contrasting their use in a particular context.

Current Process for Selecting Terms

- Exploration of terms with repeated occurrences in chapters
 - e.g., find 3-word phrases that occur at least twice in two chapters
- Quick read through of all chapters to identify possible terms
- Compare term usage throughout the chapters to decide its suitability for the glossary

Current Wordlist

- Equitable and reasonable
- Water allocation
- Right to water
- Governance
- Transboundary
- Stakeholder participation
- Joint fact-finding
- Uncertainty
- Fairness
- Managing the commons
- Adaptive processes
- Fragmentation
- Conflict resolution
- Power Relations
- Complexity
- Values
- Harm

Example Entry – Equitable and Reasonable

The term ‘equitable and reasonable’ is used in the handbook primarily to refer to a legal principle found in Article 5 of the UN Watercourses Convention. In the context of international water diplomacy, this principle can be used to guide allocation and appropriation mechanisms, as well as to ensure an adherence to baseline human rights. It also structures the process by which parties evaluate the status of water sharing agreements.

Although it is used in the Convention, the term ‘equitable and reasonable’ is vaguely defined and open to interpretation. In Chapter 39, Campbell-Ferrari and Wilson elaborate on this ambiguity and its implications in the UN Watercourses Convention. Evaluations of whether agreements are ‘equitable and reasonable’ are decided on context and can be different on case-to-case basis. For water negotiations to be effective, parties must come to an understanding of what is deemed ‘reasonable’ and ‘equitable’ in a given context. Examples of challenges surrounding the lack of clear definition of ‘equitable and reasonable’ and the use of the phrase can be found in chapters 25, 47, and 49, which detail specific cases for the Silala River, the Helmand River, and the Sava River, respectively (Spijkers; Faizee; Komatina).

In addition to the legal definition, the terms ‘reasonable’ and ‘equitable’ are used in their generic sense throughout the Handbook, without explicit reference to Article 5.

Summary of Glossary Project Feedback from Breakout Room Discussions

Group A

- Preferred format is hybrid format: first, show in which chapters a particular term appears and how is it defined, and then provide a summary paragraph about the term highlighting possible sources of ambiguities and how those are addressed in a given context.
- Provide 30-40 terms

Group B

- Avoid water diplomacy as a term - too broad, topic of whole handbook, impossible to define
- Could be useful to add page numbers in addition to chapters - would have to be done at a later date once final book is assembled

Group C

- Would it make sense to limit the terms in the glossary only to water related terms (e.g.: transboundary)?
- There is a distinct tendency in the Peace-building/Peace & Conflict Studies communities to use vague terms deliberately (floating signifier)
- However, many legal terms are tied to a specific context
- “Governance” can have many meanings that are not necessarily in opposition to one another but rather have slightly different meaning based on context of usage (e.g.: European and African understandings of Governance)
- Would be good to have the glossary terms cross-reference, as a way to link different authors/fields
- Ideally glossary would have its own introduction
- Important to consider not only geographical/disciplinary differences in the use of terms but also historical differences.

Group D

- Illustration was a good example, but a little bit long.
- Have everyone go through their own chapter and come up with 5 to 10 terms that are ranked (ones they feel are important, if everyone does that we can see which terms are scoring the highest.
- We should have a common definition of what is in the glossary OR have an agreement on the different ways the same word is used.
- Start a list of the words and reduce and define them afterwards.
- Round of definitional engagement of all of the authors before the team digs in.
- How do we cross-reference within the book?