Legal pluralism, hydraulic property creation and sustainability: the materialized nature of water rights in user-managed systems
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Worldwide, most irrigation systems are managed by farmer collectives, in contexts of legal pluralism. National and supranational legislation and policy-making, however, focus on governance frameworks established by State and market actors. Consequently, development planning often ignores farmers’ rationality regarding sustainable water control. This paper’s literature research examines how the notion of ‘hydraulic property creation’ in contexts of legal pluralism may support sustainable, self-governed irrigation systems. User-investment in hydraulic infrastructure generates collective water property relations. This socio-natural foundation of farmer-managed systems embeds (materializes) and entwines collective and individual water rights in hydraulic works, triggering collective action. Being fundamental to sustainable management, even well-intended policies and legislation ignoring this practice-based property notion may jeopardize well-functioning systems.
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Introduction
National and international water policies, legislative frameworks and water reform programmes commonly assume that irrigation water rights and rural water management institutions are framed, enacted and governed by State or market actors. In many parts of the world, however, most irrigation systems are managed by small-holder communities and farmer groups [1,2,3,⁴]. And in most places, these user-managed systems have developed their own traditional, diverse and often ‘hybrid’ water rights and management frameworks [5–8].

A literature review reveals how most countries’ national water intervention and development programme policies consider that water rights definitions are or should be universally applicable — or, at least uniform and enforceable nationwide [⁹,¹⁰,¹¹]. Water rights and governance institutions are conceptualized as a tool and condition for State regulation and/or to enable water exchange and trading through market regulation.

Adopting these State or market-centred normative views and conceptualizations of water rights commonly gears policy to socially and legally engineer rational water use organizations and efficient water management. This is often done by establishing ‘modern’ water rights and enforcing the Rule of Law [¹²–¹⁵]. This policy effort presents modern water rights simultaneously as representative technical-legal norms for understanding water governance, the legitimate instruments for monitoring and planning water development, and the ultimate objectives for accomplishing modern water governance [¹⁶].

Indeed, State and market-centred water rights and governance discourses both assume the existence of globally applicable water rules and universally valid water values and energetically institute them [¹⁷]. A direct consequence is little legal, financial and political support for local water control and rights realities, such as water rights and management forms in user-developed irrigation or drinking water systems [¹⁸,¹⁹,²⁰,²¹]. The basic rationality of well-functioning local water rights and governance institutions may remain unknown, be misrepresented, or become undervalued by this skewed water policy focus [²²,²³,²⁴,²⁵]. This paper’s literature review focuses on the consequences of such under-representation or misinterpretation of local governance systems by new water reforms and policy interventions [²⁶], and the implications for their socio-ecological and environmental sustainability (e.g., [²⁷,²⁸]).

The review concentrates on literature findings regarding one emerging and seriously undervalued fundamental mechanism for effective, sustainable management of
user-developed irrigation systems: creating and re-creating hydraulic property. Specifically, how user groups simultaneously generate, conserve and entwine the normative water allocation system, the technological water use system and the organizational water management system, thereby creating water property and functionally connecting individual water rights, collective water rights and infrastructure system management.

This primary water development and governance mechanism driving many smallholders/indigenous irrigation systems around the world goes unnoticed by most water policy frameworks, technological development interventions, and is even entirely absent from national water laws. Most scientific disciplines lack the trans-disciplinary perspective to identify and understand how water rights, firstly, operate in conditions of legal pluralism combining official and non-official legal systems; secondly, are embedded in contexts of cultural-historical specificity and socio-ecological settings that elude uniformity and universality, and finally go beyond just legal, sociological and political science disciplines to also deeply involve their moulding by material artefacts and technology use systems.

As part of this Special issue on Legal Pluralism, this paper reviews hydraulic property creation in smallholder irrigation systems, plus a broader search including water rights creation and connection with legal pluralism and environmental sustainability [29]. The paper presents, first, an overview of important conceptual building-blocks that connect the notions of water rights, legal pluralism and the creation of hydraulic property rights; second, three key domains that sustain hydraulic property rights and explain their relation to environmental sustainability; and third, an overview of the pitfalls in development of smallholder irrigation systems led by government agencies. The paper concludes with an overview of implications for water policies and irrigation development interventions.

**Water rights, legal pluralism and the creation of hydraulic property**

Irrigation systems controlled by smallholder groups and communities position water management within their social and production systems. Water allocation logic distributes a certain volume/time of water among various canals, fields or irrigators, reflecting not just the region’s agro-climatic and geophysical circumstances but equally the prevailing social, cultural and political forces. Water allocation rules, therefore, are entwined with a diversity of social norms in local community settings, inside and outside the domain of water control. These include overall community rights and obligations, family and gender relationships, political structures, historically generated organizational forms, etc., which vary from one locality to another.

Water distribution in collective smallholder systems has commonly become consolidated through lengthy experiments and modifications adapting to both social relations and physical needs. Therefore, irrigation water plays a social and technical role far beyond just helping plants grow efficiently. Literature shows that, beyond just ‘crop water requirements’, water distribution in many systems is concretely rooted in historically generating and conserving water rights, investments made by families to gain these rights, and the rules governing inheritance and exchange of rights [30–33].

In general terms, water rights in farmer-managed water use systems can be defined as ‘authorized demands to use (part of) a flow of water, including certain privileges, restrictions, obligations and penalties accompanying this authorization, among which a key element is the faculty to take part in collective decision-making about system management and direction’ [32: 3]. A water right legitimizes claims to use particular quantities and qualities of water and decision-making privileges, under specified conditions and for specified purposes. The terms, obligations, penalties (i.e., the definition and contents of ‘water rights’) differ per system, as do the mechanisms considered legitimate to acquire and maintain water rights.

Rather than embodying a natural or material object in a user’s hands, water rights are socio-technical arrangements and both constitute and distribute power relationships among humans. They involve distributing and deploying scarce resources and explain decision-making. Human-made patterning (ecology, including infrastructure, human skills and organizing collective labour) is essential to capture water, operate water use systems and materialize concrete rights. Therefore, beyond just legal constructs, water rights become manifest concurrently in hydraulic technology, normative arrangements and organizational frameworks — ingrained in particular political-economic and cultural-symbolic settings [33].

Literature references to distinctions among water governance property regimes commonly involve: public (State-owned), private (individual ownership), common (collective ownership) and free access (without regulations) (e.g., [34–36], and see also [29] for historical origins). In practice, at multiple scales, these regimes often combine and overlap. These distinctions clearly exemplify different ways of organizing water rights, whereby the authorizing entity and its regulations, powers and legitimacy are commonly contested [37,38–40].

Water user collectives in many parts of the world, particularly in contexts of (former) external occupation (e.g., [41–43]), inward colonization (e.g., [44,45]), and/or with polycentric governance traditions (e.g., [46,47]), perceive that legitimate water authority and rights are
not constrained to those deriving from State law. They commonly practice water rights constituted under legal pluralism, whereby rules and norms of different origin and legitimization co-exist and interact in the same water territory [48,49]. Most user-managed irrigation systems’ rights frameworks dynamically interrelate rules, rights and organizational forms from different sources, hybridizing local, national and global rule-making patterns [50].

In-house and outwardly, under circumstances of water conflict, cooperation and negotiation, water user collectives reinvent and experiment with their rights definitions and system operation codes. This continually shapes their collective water rights and their social and ecological boundaries, to defend against intruders and face outside authorities and adverse environmental threats. Simultaneously, they organize each family’s internal rights, in order to regulate day-to-day water practices and enable system operation and maintenance. Individual water rights are therefore embedded in the user group’s collective rights — whether these two levels are recognized by official law or not — and together they inform multi-layered bundles: rights to use and withdraw, rights to operate, supervise and manage, and rights to control (i.e., define, regulate and represent water uses and users).

So legal pluralism and rights diversity may emerge from divergent legal-administrative systems in contexts of colonization and resistance, or from water users’ confrontation with local and wider power structures. However, they may also intrinsically result from historical, on-going matching of regulatory norms, organizational patterns and hydraulic infrastructure to the (ever-changing) socio-environmental and political-economic constraints and opportunities in each locality. Contemporary in-the-field ‘water law’, in user-managed systems, embodies specific amalgamations of diverse socio-legal sources, both official and non-official, to crystallize in context-specific irrigation systems.

Boelens and Doornbos [49] distinguish among a number of prevailing mechanisms for acquiring rights in user-managed irrigation systems — arrangements that in a given irrigation system may operate concurrently or as mixtures. Sometimes ‘official’ and ‘non-official’ rights acquisition mechanisms entwine; and they may reinforce or oppose each other.

- **Concession**: water rights granted by the State administration to individual or collective applicants;
- **Historic rights**: authorized claims considering a form of ‘prior appropriation’ (‘first-in-time, first-in-rights’);
- **Socio-territorial rights**: authorized claims to water flows originating in or flowing through a socio-geographical territory (e.g., ‘riparian rights’ based on possessing land with a water source, or located along a stream);
- **Transfer of water rights between right-holders**: as in the case of sale, rental, inheritance, barter, donation, or marriage. Each mechanism is attached to particular norms (obligations, restrictions) on the conditions of transfer, the universe of possible transferees, etc.;
- **Acquisition of water rights by force**: coercive appropriation of rights, subsequently legitimized and institutionalized in local procedures and within prevailing power structures;
- **Users’ investment**: Communities and families invest their resources (in-kind, labour, capital, time and intellectual and ritual contributions) to build or rehabilitate irrigation facilities, creating rights for water users providing the labour.

For sustainable construction, operation and maintenance of user-managed irrigation systems, the last mechanism is of great importance. Coward [31] initially coined the rationality of this human-environment interaction as ‘hydraulic property creation’. By investing in water facilities, user families create common ownership of the system. Recent research has extended this notion (e.g., [13,51–55]). It explains how hydraulic property creation links individual irrigators to each other and to the collective system; entwines human-built property rights and material artefacts; and drives the formation of local water culture and identity, water rights defence, and collective social action in irrigation.

**Hydraulic property creation and environmental sustainability**

A widespread norm in user-managed systems is that actors who invest in generating irrigation infrastructure and artefacts generate or reorganize property rights over the hydraulic works they construct. As Coward [56: 12 and 4] argued, ‘one cannot build facilities without establishing property (…) The creation of irrigation works establishes among the creators property relations, which become the social basis for their collective action in performing various irrigation tasks’ (see also [57,58]). This rights-building mechanism significantly contributes to socio-environmental system sustainability, guaranteeing the diverse required operation and management activities: regulation and enforcement; coordination, communication and monitoring; conflict management and negotiation; and mobilizing human and non-human resources [27,59]. The property creation mechanism thereby also guarantees that users, as collective bodies, will have effective control over development and application of their own norms for system management [49,60,61].

In this hydraulic property based governance mechanism, each individual user appropriates rights as the community constructs collective rights; individual rights to access water and participate in decision-making are directly linked to the collectively-owned infrastructure and sustain its collective management. Commonly, in many
smallholder and indigenous systems, ‘investments’ can also be inherited (by families and communities as a whole): people inherit investments made by their ancestors. Such property notions are commonly upheld by the many rituals connected to irrigation practice — which in turn are also seen as investments [33].

After creating property rights, the mechanism requires users to consolidate them. This is done, again, through the logic of investment: by fulfilling operation and maintenance obligations to the irrigation system. Also here, labour input in collective work parties both creates and re-creates rights. But other investments in the upkeep of the irrigation system are also important: financial contributions; goods (agricultural produce, materials, instruments, etc.); intellectual inputs and organizational efforts (attending meetings; operational contributions to water distribution); and ‘cultural investments’ such as joining in ritual irrigation activities.

Sustainable irrigation system upkeep to consolidate water rights therefore includes conserving works’ social and physical infrastructure and the natural environment. This also involves mobilizing ‘outside’ laws and policies. Many water user organizations demand, for instance, land use and conservation regulations to prevent others’ unsustainable land use practices that affect their system. They themselves also take water conservation measures in the catchment area that supplies river water for their irrigation system: this expands their hydraulic property water rights claim to include a territorial claim to the river’s headwater areas [62]. They often aim to impose rules on upper catchment land use or actively conserve upper catchment resources, for instance, by afforestation [63]. The relation with the upper catchment may also extend to conserving the ‘metaphysical environment’. These investments both conserve one’s rights and keep the irrigation system itself working. Conserving water rights, infrastructure, and the supply catchment plays a key role in effective, sustainable irrigation system management.

In sum, user investment in constructing irrigation facilities creates (mutually connected) individual and collective water rights, while user investment in operation and maintenance reaffirms and re-creates these water rights.

Rights are earned by labour and other investments. Systems differ strongly in the quantitative relationship between investment and ‘rights creation’, and what is perceived as equitable. Commonly, within systems and with outside actors, this is negotiated intensively. Who will the community admit as ‘rights-builders’ (only adult male irrigators or also women, youngsters, newcomers, landless, etc.); are their contributions valued as equal, and how much do they need to contribute? And so on.

In Bolivia’s Oruro Department, communities with very similar backgrounds established quite different agreements for hydraulic property creation, in terms of user inclusion/exclusion and the input/benefit ratio. In Jalqueri, all families contributed the same amount of labour for infrastructure construction, and all obtained the same water access. In Yanuma, labour input was in accordance with each family’s land ownership, and water rights were proportional to land ownership. In Yucasa, all families had to contribute an equal number of labour days for infrastructure building, even though their land tenancy was not equal and water rights were allocated according to this unequal ownership. In Lucumpayapahua, labour input was equal for everyone and the corresponding water rights were also the same for all but, unlike the other communities, users lacking community-member status were allowed to join and gain water rights, because labour to build the system was short. In Chillcani, new users were allowed to join and earn equal water rights, but only when they contributed an extra amount of labour days. Tail-enders on that same system were allowed to contribute only half the workdays, since their water access rights were less assured [64].

Literature shows that, in some systems, everyone contributes equally to construction (obligations) and all receive the same amount of water (rights). In others, they also work equally but they receive water according to land area; and in others, families work equally in construction, but for maintenance they must contribute proportionally to each one’s irrigated land area. User organizations with sustainable systems generally establish clear conditions regarding minimum and maximum ‘investment’ opportunities [10,13,16,32,45,48,49].

Water rights creation and re-creation follows a central feature of user-managed irrigation: strong interdependence among three key domains:

- Generating and reconfirming rights (creating and recreating the normative framework);
- Constructing and rehabilitating infrastructure (creating and recreating the technological framework);
- Creating and strengthening the organization (creating and recreating the organizational framework).

Developing and sustaining a user-managed irrigation system presupposes an on-going process of interaction among these three elements: users attempt, consciously
or unconsciously, to synchronise and harmonise these main aspects. The heart of a sustainable irrigation system is not so much the hydraulic infrastructure itself, or its management framework, but the permanent interaction between the infrastructure sub-system, the organizational sub-system and the normative sub-system. As explained above, changes in one directly and necessarily imply changes in the others. The degree of synchronisation and coherence in this change significantly characterizes system sustainability.

Hydraulic property creation among three interdependent domains also makes it clear that irrigation technology in-the-field expresses or materializes property rights. Main and lateral canal dimensions and proportions of material artefacts (such as distribution boxes) are based on water distribution agreements among rights creating user groups. And when water rights change, infrastructure must also be adapted. Otherwise, it will not follow rights and schedules established in the common normative framework. Irrigation technology is a social construct; social and normative relationships among human actors shape irrigation works and their organization. Individual and collective water property rights are embedded (concretely) in infrastructure; irrigation artefacts’ social contents comprise operation and distribution mechanisms. Conversely, contributions to constructing and maintaining this infrastructure shape organizational and property relationships among these actors, a socio-natural and socio-technical process basic to constituting ‘hydraulic identities’ and ‘hydraulic cultures’.

**Pitfalls in agency-led development of smallholder irrigation systems**

In practice, irrigation systems in/for smallholder communities are not always designed, validated or adapted with respect for this interdependence and unity among sub-systems’ triangular logic. When an external design agency transfers irrigation technology to farmer communities, operational norms and social requirements (including knowledge and skills) to use artefacts are ‘externalised’: users no longer ‘embed’ their own objectives, organizational norms and property rights in the irrigation design. To operate and maintain the irrigation technology, many of the designing agency’s central (explicit and implicit) assumptions regarding the technology’s use and effect must be borne out in reality. It often becomes ‘necessary’ to restructure the local situation (organizing labour, defining roles, and distributing means of production, property rights and water), in accordance with designers’ socio-cultural worldviews and political economy [65–68].

Most countries’ legal frameworks, similarly, tend to deny legal pluralism and disrupt this hydraulic property creation rationality. The authority of users assemblies to establish context-particular irrigation rules, rights and obligations is often overridden by blanket national regulations, and States claim monopoly over rights concessions [12,69,70]. State-individual irrigator relationships and fee-payments become mandatory and replace the creation of bonds among individual property rights and collective system ownership. Most national irrigation regulations and legal blueprints contain detailed technical prescriptions allocating water to irrigable land areas, not to people according to local agreements on property rights creation or other notions of site-specific equitable distribution (e.g., equal water distribution among all users in times of scarcity). Water rights acquisition stops sustaining collective system development and upkeep. An Ecuadorian water leader reacts: ‘Those who never showed up at collective working parties and user meetings now just claim water rights and take the water. They reason: ‘Since water is from the State, the State will have to build and maintain the system’. They say that there is no need to work or organize for your water rights’ [[71: 244–245]]. Many user collectives in fact see State investment in building irrigation facilities as (State) property creation or reinforcement, since after agency-led investment the State normally strengthens its control over water resources, and may decide to delegate parts of system control [72,73*]. Current market-based water rights allocation also blocks property rights creation sustaining collective action. Multiple, conflicting private rights replace collectively embedded individual rights, and water users confront each other as competitors to defend or extend their private property [74–76]. State and market regulations tend to foster ‘strong contrary relationships’ among prevailing legal systems (see Type 2 relationships of the framework presented by Bavinck and Gupta [29]).

In many systems (co-)constructed by intervening State or non-governmental agencies, research shows that part of the problem is a lack of correspondence and synchronisation among these sub-systems. Irrigation interventions, often unconsciously, break up this unity by establishing rigid, separate planning of infrastructure, organization and operational and distributive norms. Projects often start with infrastructure planning, design and implementation, generally led by civil engineers, hydrologists and planners. In a second phase, social promoters arrive to set up the water user association and ‘get the system running according to the technical design’, often — ironically — with participatory methods. Next, legal training explains the rules of play to irrigators. Agronomists and economists join the last phase to train on the production logic under the new conditions of irrigated agriculture. Such multi-disciplinary projects, based on institutional timetables, separate phases, and ‘adding on disciplines’ rather than integrating them, tend to be recipes for failure [45,57,59,68,74]. Literature shows different direct negative consequences of such State interventions: for example, dysfunctional infrastructural design [13,64]; disputes over water rights [50,51,57]; deficit irrigation system operation and maintenance [20,42]; distrust by
water users to engage in new collaborative water development projects [45,50]; and abandonment of State-intervened infrastructure [20,33,73*].

Projects that modify irrigation infrastructure always change existing water rights but few development interventions explicitly address this or comprehend the relationship between prior and new user investments and collective hydraulic property creation. This misunderstanding of local systems’ foundations makes the often-promoted ‘user participation’ policies void or even counterproductive. User participation is not recognized or strategized as individual investments in a co-owned system (which requires prior agreements on each user’s contribution/benefits relationship, and the connection with the collective ownership of the system and water). After such disorganized investment, commonly, previous property foundations have been muddled and users fight over property relations and maintenance responsibilities [13,32,50,57].

Therefore, development professionals and agencies must realize that they are the ones participating in water users’ reality, and not the other way around. So, understanding the fundamental notion and context-specific expressions of hydraulic property creation and recreation is crucial.

Implications for water policies and irrigation development interventions
In user-managed systems around the world, smallholders actively create their water property rights by collectively constructing irrigation facilities. They embed their individual rights — to use water and infrastructure and participate in local water governance decisions — in the collective system ownership. This property creation and conservation, grounded in mutual dependence among users in contexts of adverse power and environmental conditions, establishes context-particular cultural and socio-territorial water bonds. Far from being intrinsic ideological solidarity, the rationality of creating, affirming and defending water rights, and (re)producing their own hydro-social community, relates to the material creation of hydraulic property. In many smallholder and indigenous irrigation systems, this socio-physical creation process — entwined with historical struggles to access water, defend community authority and develop a community’s own hybrid rules and customs — is at the heart of collective action in local water governance.

Therefore, hydraulic property creation and reaffirmation dynamically shapes local ‘hydraulic identities’ and ‘hydraulic cultures’ and materializes socio-material environmental sustainability. This also highlights the need to comprehend a fundamental aspect of sustainable user-managed systems: simultaneous, interdependent creation of infrastructure, organization and rights. Not recognized by any water law — and by few water policies and development programmes (cf. [29]) — rights creation necessarily precedes entwined ‘creation’ of technological, organizational and normative system frameworks.

Understanding the ‘materialization’ of water rights in user-managed systems — including embedding property rights and social norms in material artefacts, in contexts of legal pluralism — requires transdisciplinary cutting across the boundaries of social and natural sciences and also entwines with ‘non-academic’ knowledge systems. Research evinces how local property notions shape on-the-ground water governance systems, their opportunities and threats, and that neglecting users’ involvement in irrigation infrastructure design, creation or rehabilitation prevents their creation or rearranging of property rights and, thus, of sustainable organization. Too often, interveners are unaware of muddling and eventually undermining existing property relations that sustain local water control.

Creating water rights is dialectical: people strive for sustainable water-use systems and thereby create the world they live in. For sustainable hydraulic property management, aside from users’ investments through their own communities and networks, claiming government support is generally indispensable and backing by other institutions may prove important — providing there is respectful hybridization of knowledge and capacities. Far beyond agency-led participation discourses, this is essentially about the down-to-earth, interactive, endogenous design of people’s own technological, organizational, and normative frameworks.

Thus, at diverse scales of water governance, policy makers need to build in-the-field understanding of the diversity, richness, problems and solutions of local water control contexts, through organized knowledge exchange and conscious policy interaction with grassroots water user collectives. Next, they should start with granting full recognition of the authority of the local water user associations (at various levels) to take decisions on water governance in their use systems. Rather than imposing uniform policy ideas and water regulation, policy makers and implementers need to engage in policy dialogue with the water user groups, considering the latter as deeply knowledgeable peer colleagues in water governance. Through critical engagement that does not deny but recognizes the existence of cultural and power differentials, interactive policy and water design can be crafted to sustain territorial water governance by water user associations.
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