

Eureka Journal of Humanities and Social Research (EJHSR)

ISSN 2760-4934 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/4>

LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF TRANSBOUNDARY RIVERS (THE AMUDARYA AND THE SYRDARYA)

Nurullayev Gayrat Pirnapasovich
Urgench State Medical Institute

Abstract

The article examines the key legal and institutional challenges in the management of transboundary rivers, using the Amudarya and Syrdarya basins as case studies. These rivers play a crucial role in the socio-economic development and environmental sustainability of Central Asia, yet their governance remains complex and contested. The study analyzes deficiencies in international legal frameworks, institutional fragmentation, and coordination mechanisms among riparian states. Special attention is given to the gap between formal legal norms and actual water management practices. The findings highlight the need for strengthened basin-level institutions, improved legal harmonization, and adaptive governance approaches in the context of climate change and increasing water scarcity.

Keywords: Transboundary rivers; Amudarya; Syrdarya; international water law; institutional governance; Central Asia; water security; legal frameworks; regional cooperation; climate change.

Introduction

Transboundary rivers constitute a critical component of global freshwater resources, serving as shared natural assets for multiple states. Their management requires coordinated legal and institutional arrangements to ensure equitable and

Eureka Journal of Humanities and Social Research (EJHSR)

ISSN 2760-4934 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/4>

sustainable use [4]. In Central Asia, the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers represent the most significant transboundary watercourses, supplying water for agriculture, energy production, and domestic use across several countries [1].

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, newly independent Central Asian states inherited complex water allocation systems that were not designed for sovereign governance. As a result, existing legal and institutional mechanisms have struggled to adapt to new political, economic, and environmental realities. This article aims to analyze the major legal and institutional difficulties in managing the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers and to identify structural factors that hinder effective transboundary water governance [9].

Literature Review

Scholarly research on transboundary water management emphasizes the role of international water law principles such as equitable and reasonable utilization and the obligation not to cause significant harm. Authors such as McCaffrey and Dellapenna argue that legal frameworks alone are insufficient without effective institutional implementation.

In the context of Central Asia, researchers highlight persistent governance challenges stemming from conflicting national interests, weak enforcement mechanisms, and limited institutional capacity. Studies by Wegerich and Rahaman note that regional cooperation in the Amudarya and Syrdarya basins is constrained by asymmetries between upstream and downstream states. Moreover, climate change has intensified existing tensions, further exposing the limitations of current governance structures.

Despite extensive literature on legal norms and cooperation models, fewer studies focus on the interaction between legal instruments and institutional practices, particularly at the basin level. This gap underscores the relevance of the present study.

Eureka Journal of Humanities and Social Research (EJHSR)

ISSN 2760-4934 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/4>

Discussion and Results

The analysis of legal and institutional arrangements governing the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers reveals a complex set of structural weaknesses that significantly limit effective transboundary water management in Central Asia. The results demonstrate that legal norms, institutional frameworks, and practical water governance mechanisms remain poorly aligned, resulting in fragmented and often ineffective cooperation among riparian states [2].

One of the central findings of this study is the lack of a unified, legally binding basin-wide agreement that comprehensively governs water allocation, environmental protection, and dispute resolution for the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers. Existing agreements, many of which date back to the early post-Soviet period, were primarily designed to preserve Soviet-era water distribution schemes rather than to reflect contemporary principles of international water law [6].

The principle of equitable and reasonable utilization, although formally recognized in several regional documents, is applied inconsistently in practice. Upstream countries tend to interpret equity in terms of national sovereignty and energy security, emphasizing hydropower development and reservoir operation. In contrast, downstream states prioritize agricultural irrigation needs and historical water use patterns. This divergence in legal interpretation weakens normative coherence and complicates negotiation processes.

Furthermore, the obligation not to cause significant harm remains largely declarative. Environmental impact assessments are not systematically conducted at the transboundary level, and enforcement mechanisms are insufficient to address downstream ecological degradation, including salinization, reduced river flows, and ecosystem loss.

From an institutional perspective, the study reveals significant fragmentation in the governance architecture of transboundary rivers in Central Asia. Multiple regional bodies exist, yet their mandates frequently overlap, and their decision-

Eureka Journal of Humanities and Social Research (EJHSR)

ISSN 2760-4934 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/4>

making authority is limited. These institutions often function as coordination platforms rather than as regulatory bodies with enforcement capacity.

A critical institutional weakness lies in the lack of binding compliance mechanisms. Decisions adopted by regional water commissions are frequently based on consensus and voluntary implementation, which reduces accountability and undermines long-term planning. Financial constraints further restrict institutional effectiveness, limiting technical monitoring, data collection, and infrastructure maintenance.

Additionally, weak data-sharing frameworks exacerbate mistrust among riparian states. Hydrological data, reservoir operation schedules, and climate projections are not consistently exchanged, hindering joint planning and adaptive management. As a result, institutions struggle to respond proactively to droughts, floods, and long-term climate variability.

The results also highlight the importance of political and economic asymmetries in shaping transboundary water governance outcomes. Upstream states possess strategic control over water storage and flow regulation, while downstream states depend heavily on predictable water deliveries for agricultural production. This asymmetry creates power imbalances that influence negotiation dynamics and institutional behavior.

Water management decisions are often subordinated to broader geopolitical considerations, including energy trade, regional security, and economic development strategies. Consequently, legal and institutional frameworks are frequently instrumentalized to advance national interests rather than collective basin sustainability.

Climate change emerges as a critical factor intensifying existing legal and institutional shortcomings. Increasing temperature trends, glacier retreat, and altered precipitation patterns have introduced higher uncertainty into river flow regimes. However, current governance arrangements lack adaptive legal provisions and flexible institutional tools to address these evolving risks.

Eureka Journal of Humanities and Social Research (EJHSR)

ISSN 2760-4934 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/4>

The absence of climate-responsive mechanisms such as dynamic water allocation rules or joint risk assessment frameworks limits the resilience of transboundary water governance systems. This finding underscores the urgent need to integrate climate adaptation into both legal instruments and institutional practices.

Overall, the results demonstrate that transboundary water governance in the Amudarya and Syrdarya basins operates within a fragmented system where legal norms, institutional capacities, and political realities are misaligned. While formal agreements provide a foundational framework, their effectiveness is undermined by weak implementation, limited enforcement, and insufficient adaptability to environmental change.

The discussion confirms that sustainable transboundary river management cannot rely solely on legal codification. Instead, it requires institutional strengthening, enhanced cooperation mechanisms, transparent data-sharing, and a shift toward ecosystem-based and adaptive governance models.

Conclusion

The management of the Amudarya and Syrdarya rivers faces persistent legal and institutional challenges rooted in fragmented governance, outdated legal arrangements, and conflicting national priorities. While international water law provides a valuable normative foundation, its effectiveness depends on strong, well-coordinated institutions capable of translating legal principles into practice. To enhance transboundary river governance in Central Asia, it is essential to strengthen basin-level institutions, harmonize legal frameworks with international standards, and adopt adaptive, ecosystem-based management approaches. Addressing these challenges is crucial not only for regional stability but also for long-term water security and sustainable development in the region.

Eureka Journal of Humanities and Social Research (EJHSR)

ISSN 2760-4934 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/4>

References

1. McCaffrey, S. (2019). *The Law of International Watercourses*. Oxford University Press.
2. Dellapenna, J., & Gupta, J. (2019). *The Evolution of the Law and Politics of Water*. Springer.
3. Salman, S. M. A. (2018). *International Watercourses: Cooperation and Conflict Prevention*. World Bank.
4. Wegerich, K. (2011). Water resources in Central Asia: Regional stability or patchy make-up? *Central Asian Survey*, 30(2), 275–290.
5. Rahaman, M. M. (2012). Principles of transboundary water resources management. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 28(3), 403–418.
6. United Nations. (1997). *Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses*. New York.
7. UNECE. (1992). *Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes*. Helsinki.
8. Zeitoun, M., & Warner, J. (2006). Hydro-hegemony theory. *Water Policy*, 8(5), 435–460.
9. World Bank. (2020). *Central Asia Water and Energy Program*. Washington, DC.
10. Global Water Partnership. (2019). *Transboundary Water Governance in Central Asia*. Stockholm.