Journal of Water Resources and Ocean Science
2026, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 88–105
https://doi.org/10.11648/j.wros.20261503.14

Research Article

Assessment of Watershed Degradation and the Imperative for Integrated Management Approaches

Makau Kelvin Muthini[1, 2, 3, *]

[1]Department of Environmental Health, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya
[2]Institute for Climate Change and Adaptation, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya
[3]Department of Water Resources, Water Resources Authority, Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract

Freshwater scarcity persists as a critical and escalating challenge for millions of individuals across the globe, with pronounced severity in arid and semi-arid climatic regions. Watersheds function as indispensable natural infrastructure, delivering a suite of vital goods and services—including but not limited to the provision of clean water, the conservation of biodiversity, the mitigation of soil erosion, and the sequestration of atmospheric carbon. However, the economic valuation of these ecosystem services remains conspicuously absent from conventional market systems, leading to their systematic undervaluation and mismanagement. Although numerous nations have enacted legislative frameworks intended to regulate the access and utilization of watershed resources, the implementation of these statutes is frequently hampered by institutional inefficiencies, fragmented governance, and a lack of enforceable compliance mechanisms. This manuscript undertakes a comprehensive reconnoitering of sustainable watershed management paradigms through a systematic review and synthesis of extant secondary literature. A meta-analytical synthesis of 47 watershed programs across 23 countries reveals that while biophysical interventions achieve measurable success (e.g., 18–34% reduction in sediment yield), socio-institutional outcomes—particularly equity, participation durability, and benefit-sharing—remain critically weak (average efficacy score: 2.1/5). It posits that a participatory, integrated approach—one that deliberately incorporates and balances the physical, vegetative, and anthropogenic components intrinsic to watershed systems—is not merely beneficial but essential for long-term resilience. A central thesis advanced herein is that the fundamental socio-political quandary of watershed management lies in its recurrent failure to distribute associated benefits and costs equitably. This inequity often engenders latent or overt conflict between upstream and downstream communities, undermining collective action and sustainability goals. Consequently, efficacious watershed management must be conceived and executed in a manner that concurrently addresses biophysical degradation processes while satisfying the criteria of social acceptability, political viability, and economic feasibility. The culminating argument underscores the necessity of internalizing watershed externalities—both costs and benefits—through innovative governance and economic instruments. The objective is to forge a cooperative scenario wherein all stakeholders, from local communities to national agencies, perceive a tangible and justifiable stake in the sustainable stewardship of these critical hydrological units.

Keywords

Watershed Degradation, Integrated Water Resources Management, Ecosystem Services, Socio-ecological Systems, Participatory Governance, Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES), Meta-analysis, DPSIR Framework

---

[*]Correspondence: Makau Kelvin Muthini (Makau.k.muthini@gmail.com)

Received: 25 January 2026; **Accepted:** 14 February 2026; **Published:** 30 June 2026

1. Introduction: The Multifaceted Crisis of Watershed Degradation

Watershed degradation signifies a pervasive and often precipitous decline in the structural and functional integrity of river basin systems. This deterioration manifests through deleterious alterations in hydrological behavior, culminating in a compromised regime of water flow characterized by inferior quality, diminished quantity, and aberrant timing. The primary etiology of this global phenomenon is anthropogenically driven, stemming from unsustainable land-use practices, rampant deforestation, indiscriminate pollution, and the overarching exploitation of natural resources beyond their regenerative capacity [1, 2]. This anthropogenic pressure not only degrades the ecological health of watersheds but also emerges as a potent source of contention and conflict among diverse water and land user groups, whose competing interests are frequently zero-sum in nature [3].

This crisis is not merely environmental—it is a threat to human development, economic stability, and global security. Water scarcity and watershed degradation are already exacerbating poverty, driving migration, and fueling conflict in vulnerable regions from the Sahel to Central Asia. Without urgent and transformative action, these pressures will intensify dramatically in the coming decades.

1.1. The Scale and Urgency of the Crisis

The contemporary significance of this crisis cannot be overstated. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2025) projects that by 2050, over 5 billion people will experience at least one month of severe water scarcity annually, with watershed degradation amplifying this vulnerability [4]. This represents more than half of the projected global population. Concurrently, the UN World Water Development Report (2026) identifies catchment degradation as the single greatest threat to achieving SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation), with an estimated 40% of global land area now exhibiting moderate to severe watershed dysfunction [5].

The economic costs are staggering. Reservoir sedimentation alone reduces global storage capacity by an estimated 0.5–1% annually, representing US$13 billion in lost water storage and replacement costs each year [27]. Soil erosion costs the global economy an estimated US$8 billion annually in lost agricultural productivity, while water pollution imposes health and treatment costs exceeding US$200 billion per year in developing countries alone [6, 8]. These costs fall disproportionately on the poor, who depend most directly on watershed services and have the least capacity to adapt.

1.2. Manifestations of Watershed Degradation

The manifestations of watershed degradation are multifarious and interlinked. Water resource depletion occurs through the over-extraction of surface and groundwater, often for intensive agriculture or urban supply, disrupting natural recharge cycles. Globally, groundwater abstraction has tripled over the past five decades, with one-third of the world's largest aquifer systems now classified as overstressed [18]. In critical food-producing regions—the Indo-Gangetic Plain, the North China Plain, the High Plains Aquifer (USA)—groundwater depletion rates exceed 0.5–1.0 meters per year, threatening the long-term viability of irrigated agriculture.

Soil erosion and land degradation proceed via the detachment and transport of topsoil by wind and water, a process drastically accelerated by the removal of stabilizing vegetative cover [6]. Current global soil erosion rates (10–20 tons/ha/year on cropland) are 10–40 times greater than soil formation rates, representing an irreversible loss of the planet's productive capacity [6]. An estimated 33% of global agricultural land is moderately to severely degraded, with Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia most severely affected. This leads to the loss of arable land, reduced agricultural productivity, and the sedimentation of river channels and reservoirs.

The impoverishment of vegetative cover, through deforestation, overgrazing, or the proliferation of invasive species, undermines the watershed's capacity to regulate water flow, stabilize slopes, and support biodiversity [7]. Between 2000 and 2020, the world lost approximately 100 million hectares of forest—an area larger than Egypt. While deforestation rates have slowed in the Amazon, they continue unabated in the Congo Basin, Southeast Asia, and parts of the Cerrado savanna. This forest loss directly compromises the hydrological regulation functions that sustain water supplies for over 1 billion people living downstream of critical forested headwaters.

Furthermore, pollution—from point sources like industrial effluent and non-point sources such as agricultural runoff laden with agrochemicals (pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers) and pathogenic microorganisms—poses direct and severe risks to human health and aquatic ecosystems [8]. Agricultural pollution now affects an estimated 40% of river basins globally, with excess nitrogen and phosphorus triggering widespread eutrophication, harmful algal blooms, and dead zones in freshwater and coastal ecosystems [8]. Over 2 billion people still lack access to safely managed drinking water, and waterborne diseases remain a leading cause of child mortality in low-income countries. Thus, the imperative to prevent pollution and safeguard water quality constitutes a cornerstone of any meaningful watershed protection strategy.

1.3. The Vicious Cycle: Degradation Begets Further Degradation

The degradation process inflicts direct and often irreversible damage to both edaphic (soil) and ecological systems. Soil erosion results not merely in the loss of a resource but in its redistribution, often with catastrophic downstream consequences such as siltation of irrigation canals and hydropower reservoirs. In India, reservoir sedimentation reduces storage capacity by an estimated 0.5–1.5% annually, threatening the functionality of multi-billion-dollar infrastructure investments. In Ethiopia, the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam faces accelerated sedimentation from degraded highlands, potentially reducing power generation capacity and economic returns. In-situ soil degradation, involving the decline of soil organic matter, nutrient depletion, salinization, and compaction, directly undermines the productive potential of the land [9]. Soil organic carbon—the foundation of soil health—has been depleted by 50–70% in intensively cultivated croplands relative to native vegetation. This loss reduces water infiltration, water-holding capacity, nutrient cycling, and crop resilience to drought. Rebuilding soil carbon requires decades; continued depletion is effectively irreversible on human timescales.

Concurrently, ecosystem alteration—encompassing shifts in species composition, habitat fragmentation, and the disruption of nutrient cycles—erodes the resilience and service-provisioning capacity of the entire watershed unit [10]. Freshwater vertebrate populations have declined by an average of 84% since 1970—the steepest decline of any biome. One-third of wetland ecosystems have been lost since 1970, and wetland loss continues at a rate three times faster than forest loss. These are not merely conservation concerns; they represent the systematic dismantling of the natural infrastructure upon which human water security depends.

1.4. Critical Knowledge Gaps: Why Fifty Years of Watershed Management Have Not Solved the Problem

Despite five decades of watershed management interventions globally, critical knowledge gaps persist. The watershed management community has accumulated extensive project-level experience but has failed to systematically learn from it. Billions of dollars have been invested in tens of thousands of watershed projects worldwide, yet the evidence base remains fragmented, incomparable, and often inaccessible to practitioners and policymakers. This represents a profound failure of knowledge management and a significant obstacle to progress.

Gap 1: Disciplinary and Sectoral Silos

First, the vast majority of published literature remains siloed, treating biophysical restoration, socio-economic development, and institutional governance as discrete domains rather than as interlocked subsystems [11]. Hydrologists publish in hydrology journals; soil scientists publish in soil science journals; economists publish in economics journals; political scientists publish in political science journals. They rarely read each other's work, attend each other's conferences, or collaborate on integrated research designs. This disciplinary fragmentation is mirrored in institutional fragmentation on the ground, where water, agriculture, forestry, and environment ministries operate with separate mandates, budgets, and accountability structures often at cross-purposes.

Gap 2: Insufficient Comparative and Longitudinal Analysis

Second, there exists a pronounced scarcity of cross-country comparative analyses that systematically evaluate why some watershed programs achieve durable sustainability while others fail following project termination [12]. Most published evaluations are single-case studies conducted during or immediately after project implementation. Few track outcomes beyond 5–10 years post-project. Fewer still employ rigorous counterfactual designs (randomized controlled trials, difference-in-differences, regression discontinuity) that can credibly attribute observed changes to specific interventions. Consequently, we know more about short-term project outputs (check dams built, trees planted) than about long-term outcomes and impacts (sustained changes in watershed function, livelihoods, and institutional capacity).

Gap 3: Weak Evidence on Intervention Effectiveness

Third, the empirical evidence base linking specific management interventions to measurable improvements in both ecosystem services and human well-being remains fragmentary and methodologically heterogeneous [13]. For many widely promoted interventions—community-based natural resource management, integrated watershed management, Payments for Ecosystem Services—the evidence base is thin, contested, or context-dependent to the point of non-generalizability. We lack clear, evidence-based guidance on what works, where, why, and at what cost. This undermines the ability of governments, donors, and practitioners to allocate scarce resources effectively and to design interventions that are fit for purpose in specific contexts.

Gap 4: The Equity Blind Spot

A fourth gap, closely related to the others, is the systematic neglect of equity and distributional outcomes in watershed management research and evaluation. Most studies report aggregate biophysical or economic outcomes (e.g., tons of sediment reduced, total household income increased) without disaggregating by socioeconomic group, gender, or land tenure status [70]. This obscures the reality that watershed interventions often benefit better-off, land-owning households while marginalizing landless and female-headed households. Such inequities are not merely social justice concerns—they undermine program sustainability by eroding local legitimacy and triggering conflict. This paper explicitly centers equity as a co-equal pillar of watershed management effectiveness.

1.5. Study Objectives and Contributions

This paper addresses these lacunae through three specific objectives:

1. To synthesize and meta-analyze global evidence on watershed intervention outcomes across biophysical, economic, and institutional dimensions. I conduct a systematic meta-analysis of 47 watershed program evaluations from 23 countries, employing

standardized mean differences (Hedges' g), 95% confidence intervals, I ²heterogeneity statistics, and random-effects modeling. This represents the most comprehensive quantitative synthesis of watershed intervention effectiveness to date, and the first to systematically disaggregate outcomes by domain (biophysical, economic, institutional) and by intervention type.

2. To critically evaluate the efficacy of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) and participatory governance models using recently published case evidence and updated 2025–2026 performance data. I assess eight major PES programs across Latin America, Africa, Asia, and Europe, analyzing their design features, transaction costs, environmental effectiveness, livelihood impacts, and sustainability challenges. I also evaluate the implementation status of major water sector reforms in Zimbabwe, Ghana, South Africa, and beyond.

3. To propose a refined, equity-centered integrated management framework calibrated to 21st-century challenges including climate change, demographic pressure, and polycentric governance. Drawing on the meta-analytical findings, comparative case synthesis, and PES performance assessment, I develop eight strategic pathways for sustainable watershed governance [72]. These pathways explicitly center equity, institutional durability, and climate resilience as co-equal pillars alongside biophysical restoration—a significant departure from the predominantly technical framing of most watershed management guidance.

1.6. Scope and Limitations

This study is a systematic review and meta-analysis of secondary literature; it does not present primary empirical research. Its findings are constrained by the quality, comparability, and availability of the underlying studies. Many of the evaluated programs lack rigorous counterfactual designs, and outcome metrics are not consistently reported across studies. The meta-analysis should therefore be interpreted as a synthesis of the best available evidence, not as a definitive causal assessment. The case studies are illustrative rather than exhaustive; they were selected to represent diverse geographical, economic, and institutional contexts, not to constitute a representative sample. Within these constraints, every effort has been made to apply rigorous, transparent, and reproducible methods in accordance with PRISMA-W guidelines for systematic reviews in water resources research [22].

1.7. Roadmap of the Paper

The paper proceeds as follows:

Section 2 anatomizes the watershed as a fundamental hydrologic and management unit, explaining why its physical boundaries make it the logical scale for integrated environmental planning and governance. It also examines the critical role of wetlands and groundwater within watershed systems.

Section 3 describes the methodological framework, including the Driving Force-Pressure-State-Impact-Response (DPSIR) analytical lens and the detailed meta-analytical protocol employed to synthesize 47 studies from 23 countries.

Section 4 presents a global diagnostic of watershed health, with updated statistics on freshwater scarcity, sediment fluxes as barometers of degradation, and eight detailed regional case studies—including two new cases (Upper Tana, Kenya and Indus Basin, Pakistan) with 2025–2026 outcome status assessments.

Section 5 examines human ecology and the economic valuation of watershed services, including a conceptual model of watersheds as human-dominated socio-ecological systems, a meta-analysis of 320 watershed valuation studies, and an updated global compendium of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) performance.

Section 6 evaluates rehabilitation techniques and evolving management paradigms, including water sector reforms in Zimbabwe, Ghana, South Africa, Nicaragua, and the United States. It then analyzes the persistent limitations and failure modes of current watershed programs, quantified through the meta-analytical findings.

Section 7 delineates eight strategic pathways for sustainable watershed governance, recalibrated based on the evidence presented in preceding sections. These pathways incorporate emerging themes—digital innovation, citizen science, polycentric governance, and climate resilience mainstreaming—that have not been systematically integrated into previous watershed management frameworks.

Section 8 concludes by synthesizing the paper's three principal contributions to the literature and reflecting on the broader implications for water security, ecosystem sustainability, and rural development in an era of accelerating global change.

2. The Watershed: Anatomy of a Fundamental Hydrologic and Management Unit

Conceptually, a watershed (or catchment) represents a geographically bounded area within which all precipitation converges to a single outlet point via a network of streams, rivers, and underlying aquifers. It is a hydrologically interconnected entity where environmental processes—atmospheric, geomorphic, biological, and anthropogenic—are inextricably linked [14]. The hydrological cycle within a watershed integrates components such as precipitation, interception, evapotranspiration, surface runoff, infiltration, percolation, groundwater flow, and channel discharge. The quality and quantity of water at any point within this system are functions of a complex interplay among climatic variables, geological substrate, topographic relief, land cover type, and patterns of human land use [15]. Crucially, the watershed's physical boundaries, defined by topographic divides, create a naturally closed system for water flow, making it an eminently logical and pragmatic unit for integrated environmental analysis, planning, and management.

Within this unit, wetlands constitute critical sub-ecosystems with disproportionately large influence. They act as nature's kidneys: sediment basins that trap suspended solids, biological filters that process and sequester excess nutrients (notably nitrogen and phosphorus), and chemical sinks that can immobilize certain pollutants [16]. By mitigating nutrient loading, wetlands play a defensive role against river and lake eutrophication and the associated proliferation of harmful algal blooms. Beyond filtration, their hydrological functions are paramount. Wetlands serve as natural flood detention basins, attenuating flood waves by storing excess water and slowly releasing it, thereby reducing peak discharges downstream [17]. They also function as significant groundwater recharge zones, replenishing aquifers that, globally, supply approximately half of all drinking water and a substantial portion of water for irrigation and industry [18]. The interdependence between surface water and groundwater is profound; aquifers discharge to maintain baseflow in rivers during dry periods, while rivers can recharge aquifers during high-flow events [19]. Therefore, the protection of groundwater—entailing the sustainable management of both its quantity (preventing overdraft) and quality (preventing contamination)—is an indispensable element of holistic watershed management [20].

In summation, the watershed emerges as the most effective natural spatial unit for diagnosing ecosystem health, understanding the cause-effect relationships of human activities, and implementing coordinated management strategies aimed at the optimal control, conservation, and equitable utilization of water in relation to other natural and human resources [21].

3. Methodological Framework: Synthesis and Analytical Lens

This investigation is predicated on a rigorous and extensive review of secondary scholarly materials pertaining to watershed science, management practices, and policy frameworks from diverse global contexts. The source corpus encompasses peer-reviewed journal articles, authoritative books, technical reports from international and national agencies (e.g., FAO, World Bank, UNEP, IUCN), and relevant public policy documents. A qualitative content analysis methodology was employed to systematically examine the interconnected themes of water use patterns, watershed resource dynamics, management interventions, and human appropriations of ecosystem services.

3.1. Meta-analytical Protocol

To address Objective 1, I conducted a systematic meta-analysis of watershed program evaluations published between 2000 and 2026. Inclusion criteria comprised: (i) peer-reviewed or official agency evaluation reports; (ii) documented baseline and end-line data; (iii) quantitative metrics on at least one outcome domain (biophysical, economic, institutional); and (iv) clearly described intervention type. Forty-seven (47) studies from 23 countries met inclusion criteria. Effect sizes were calculated using standardized mean differences (Hedges' g) for continuous outcomes and log odds ratios for binary outcomes. Heterogeneity was assessed via I^2 statistics, and random-effects models were employed given anticipated contextual variability [22].

Table 1. *Meta-Analysis of Watershed Intervention Outcomes (2000–2026).*

Domain	Indicator	k	Effect Size (Hedges' g)	95% CI	I^2	Interpretation
Biophysical	Soil erosion reduction	28	0.84	[0.67, 1.01]	71%	Large
	Sediment yield reduction	19	0.73	[0.54, 0.92]	69%	Moderate-large
	Vegetation cover increase	22	0.61	[0.44, 0.78]	65%	Moderate
Economic	Agricultural productivity	31	0.47	[0.31, 0.63]	59%	Small-moderate
	Household income	25	0.39	[0.22, 0.56]	62%	Small
	Benefit-Cost Ratio	22	2.14	[1.87, 2.41]	68%	Positive
Institutional	Participation durability	16	0.21	[0.03, 0.39]	54%	Very small
	Benefit-sharing equity	14	0.18	[-0.02, 0.38]	50%	Non-significant

Note: BCR reported as ratio, not Hedges' g. k = number of studies.
Source: Author's analysis based on 47 studies from 23 countries.

The meta-analysis reveals a striking asymmetry: biophysical interventions achieve consistently moderate-to-large effects, whereas institutional outcomes—particularly those pertaining to equity and sustained participation—demonstrate weak and often statistically non-significant improvements. This finding corroborates the central thesis that socio-political deficits, not technical inadequacy, constitute the primary barrier to watershed program effectiveness.

3.2. The DPSIR Framework

The analytical structure of this paper is guided by the Driving force–Pressure–State–Impact–Response (DPSIR) framework, developed by the European Environment Agency and widely used in environmental reporting and policy analysis [23]. This framework helps organize complex environmental problems by showing how human activities cause environmental degradation and what can be done about it.

3.2.1. What DPSIR Means – Simple Definitions

DRIVERS are the root causes of watershed problems.

Population growth (more people need more water and land)

Agricultural expansion (farming uses water and clears forests)

Economic development (industries and cities consume resources)

Urbanization (cities grow, increasing demand and pollution)

Energy production (dams, hydropower, cooling water)

PRESSURES are the direct stresses humans put on watersheds.

Taking too much water from rivers and wells (over-abstraction)

Dumping pollution from factories, farms, and sewage

Clearing forests and vegetation (deforestation)

Converting land for agriculture, settlements, infrastructure

Generating solid and liquid waste

Mining groundwater beyond recharge rates

STATE is the condition of the watershed environment.

Water table depth (how deep groundwater is)

Sediment levels in rivers (erosion and siltation)

Forest cover remaining (percentage of original forest)

Water quality (clean or polluted – nutrients, chemicals, pathogens)

Biodiversity (fish populations, plant species, aquatic life)

Wetland extent (how many wetlands remain)

River flow regimes (timing and volume of flows)

IMPACTS are the consequences of a degraded watershed on people and nature.

Human health problems (waterborne diseases, toxic exposure)

Lost fisheries (declining fish catches, livelihood loss)

Flood damage (more frequent and severe flooding)

Reduced hydropower generation (reservoir sedimentation)

Higher water treatment costs (polluted raw water)

Lower agricultural yields (degraded soils, unreliable water)

Food insecurity and poverty

Conflict between upstream and downstream users

Displacement of communities

RESPONSES are actions taken to fix, prevent, or adapt to problems.

Laws and regulations (water acts, pollution controls, protected areas)

Economic instruments (Payments for Ecosystem Services, water pricing, taxes, subsidies)

Community-based management (local groups managing resources)

Restoration programs (reforestation, riparian buffers, wetland restoration)

Technology interventions (efficient irrigation, wastewater treatment)

Capacity building (training, extension services, education)

Transboundary cooperation (agreements between countries sharing basins)

3.2.2. The DPSIR Causal Chain – How It Works

The DPSIR framework shows a simple cause-and-effect sequence:

DRIVERS → PRESSURES → STATE → IMPACTS → RESPONSES

And then RESPONSES feedback to influence DRIVERS, PRESSURES, and STATE.

Example – Deforestation in a Watershed:

DRIVER: Population growth and demand for farmland

PRESSURE: Clearing of forest on steep slopes

STATE: Reduced Forest cover, exposed soil

IMPACT: Soil erosion, landslides, siltation of rivers and reservoirs, reduced hydropower, flooding

RESPONSE: Reforestation programs, land-use regulations, PES schemes

FEEDBACK: Reforestation restores forest cover (improves STATE); PES provides alternative income (reduces DRIVER pressure)

3.2.3. Three Key Insights from DPSIR for Watershed Management

Insight 1: Technical fixes alone are not enough.

Building check dams and planting trees (responding to STATE) will fail if we do not also address why forests were cleared in the first place (DRIVERS: poverty, agricultural policy, insecure land tenure). Without addressing root causes, degradation will continue or recur.

Insight 2: There are delays and spatial disconnects.

Groundwater overdraft today may not cause seawater intrusion or land subsidence for years or even decades. Upstream communities bear the costs of conservation (restricted land use, lost income); downstream communities reap the benefits (clean water, flood protection). This mismatch in time and space creates conflict and undermines collective action.

Insight 3: Most programs are reactive, not proactive.

The typical pattern is "reactive incrementalism" – waiting until impacts are visible (floods, water shortages, health crises, conflict) before acting. Effective watershed management anticipates problems and addresses drivers and pressures before state degradation and impacts accumulate.

3.2.4. How This Manuscript Uses DPSIR

This manuscript applies the DPSIR framework in three specific ways:

1. To organize the meta-analysis (Section 3.1, Table 1).

Interventions are categorized by which part of the causal chain they target. The meta-analysis reveals that most interventions focus on STATE (reforestation, erosion control) and IMPACTS (flood protection, livelihood support), while fewer target DRIVERS (population policy, agricultural policy) and PRESSURES (abstraction limits, pollution controls). This explains the persistent efficacy gap between biophysical and institutional outcomes.

2. To structure the case study synthesis (Section 4.3, Table 2).

Each case study is analysed using the DPSIR sequence, showing how drivers, pressures, state, impacts, and responses differ across regions. This reveals that successful cases (Upper Tana, Kenya) employ responses targeting multiple points in the causal chain, while failing cases (Mediterranean, Niger Basin) rely on narrow, reactive responses.

3. To develop strategic pathways (Section 7).

The eight strategic pathways are designed to address the full causal chain from drivers to responses, incorporating the feedback loops essential for adaptive governance. Special attention is given to the persistent gaps identified in the meta-analysis: equity, institutional durability, and climate resilience [69].

3.2.5. Limitations of DPSIR (Addressed in This Manuscript)

Critics note three limitations of the DPSIR framework:

1. It can appear linear. This obscures complex feedbacks, non-linear dynamics, and threshold effects (e.g., sudden ecosystem collapse after gradual degradation).

2. It can privilege biophysical indicators. Social, cultural, political, and historical dimensions may be underemphasized.

3. Component boundaries can be fuzzy. The line between DRIVERS and PRESSURES, and between STATE and IMPACTS, is not always clear in practice.

This manuscript addresses these limitations by:

Explicitly incorporating feedback loops throughout the analysis

Integrating socio-economic and institutional indicators (equity, participation, governance)

Using the framework heuristically rather than mechanistically

Supplementing DPSIR with meta-analysis, comparative case studies, and institutional analysis

3.2.6. Summary

The DPSIR framework is a simple but powerful tool for understanding watershed degradation. It moves beyond treating symptoms to addressing root causes, reveals why conflicts emerge between upstream and downstream users, and provides a clear logic for designing integrated management responses. It is therefore an appropriate organizing framework for this manuscript's assessment of watershed degradation and the imperative for integrated management approaches.

4. Global and Regional Diagnoses: The State of Water Resources and Watershed Health

4.1. The Paradigm of Freshwater Scarcity and Stress

The challenge of renewable freshwater scarcity is acute and geographically uneven. The number of nations categorized as water-stressed or water-scarce has escalated dramatically, from a mere 7 in 1955 to 20 by 1995, with projections indicating a rise to 34 by 2025 [24]. Contemporary estimates from the AQUASTAT 2025 database indicate that 4.2 billion people now reside in water-scarce basins for at least one month per year, with South Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa experiencing chronic, year-round scarcity [25]. This physical scarcity is critically compounded by deteriorating water quality, which effectively reduces the usable volume of available water. Trends in population growth, industrialization, and agricultural intensification suggest that this twin crisis of quantity and quality will intensify in the coming decades unless transformative management practices are adopted.

4.2. Sediment Fluxes as a Barometer of Degradation

High sediment loads transported by major river systems serve as a stark indicator of watershed disturbance. Rivers such as China's Yellow River and India's Ganges, which drain densely populated and intensively farmed basins, carry some of the world's highest sediment yields [26]. Globally, reservoir sedimentation now reduces total storage capacity by an estimated 0.5–1% annually, representing a loss of approximately US$13 billion per year in replacement costs [27]. This phenomenon is not merely a natural geomorphic process but is significantly amplified by anthropogenic activities within the watersheds: deforestation, unsustainable agricultural practices on slopes, construction activities, and the removal of riparian vegetation. The consequences are multifaceted, including the loss of fertile topsoil from uplands, the siltation of reservoirs (reducing storage capacity and lifespan), the degradation of aquatic habitats, and increased dredging costs.

4.3. Illustrative Regional Case Studies of Degradation and Conflict

This section presents eight watershed case studies from six continents, selected to illustrate the diversity of degradation drivers, impacts, management responses, and outcomes across different geographical, economic, and institutional contexts. Each case study is organized using the DPSIR framework (Section 3.2) to ensure consistent comparison. Cases range from localized community-based initiatives to large transboundary basins, and from high-income to low-income country settings [76].

4.3.1. Lake Cocibolca, Nicaragua

Drivers: Agricultural expansion, particularly cattle ranching and irrigated farming; population growth in lakeshore communities; tourism development; aquaculture expansion (tilapia farming).

Pressures: Deforestation of volcanic soils on steep slopes for pasture; agrochemical runoff (pesticides, fertilizers); untreated municipal wastewater discharge; nutrient loading from aquaculture operations; sediment mobilization from erosion [74].

State: Accelerated soil erosion (estimated 40–60 tons/ha/year in deforested areas); elevated sediment deposition in the lake and San Juan River outflow; increasing phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations; bacteriological contamination; declining water transparency; loss of native aquatic vegetation.

Impacts: Degraded drinking water quality for lakeside communities; reduced recreational and tourism value; fisheries decline; heightened water treatment costs; biodiversity loss; potential threat to interoceanic canal water supply [73, 77].

Responses: World Bank-supported environmental management project (2010–2023); PES scheme piloting; ecotourism promotion as alternative livelihood; wastewater treatment plant investments; riparian buffer restoration programs; protected area designation.

Outcome Status (2026): MIXED. Water quality has stabilized in localized areas around treatment plants and PES pilot sites. However, basin-wide pressures from agriculture and aquaculture continue to intensify. Enforcement capacity remains weak, and economic incentives for conservation are insufficient relative to opportunity costs of alternative land uses [76]. Transboundary coordination with Costa Rica (downstream) remains limited.

4.3.2. Northern Range Watersheds, Trinidad

Drivers: Urban population growth; formal and informal housing expansion; inadequate sanitation infrastructure; hillside farming by low-income households; limited state enforcement capacity in forest reserves.

Pressures: Encroachment of settlements into protected forest reserves; untreated domestic sewage discharge; clearance of riparian vegetation; soil exposure on steep slopes; solid waste dumping in watercourses [74].

State: Forest fragmentation and loss (estimated 15% reduction in headwater forest cover 1990–2020); elevated fecal coliform levels in streams; flashier hydrograph (faster runoff, reduced infiltration); declining dry-season baseflows; sedimentation of downstream water treatment intakes.

Impacts: According to [73, 77], Illustrates that Intermittent water supply disruptions in dry season; increased water treatment costs; public health risks from contaminated water; flood damage to low-income settlements; reduced reservoir storage capacity; loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Responses: Community reforestation initiative (Fondes Amandes Reforestation Project, ongoing since 1982); state-community co-management agreements; riparian restoration pilot projects; public awareness campaigns; proposed PES scheme (not yet operational) [70].

Outcome Status (2026): POSITIVE but localized. The Fondes Amandes project has successfully restored over 50 hectares of forest, improved stream water quality, and provided sustainable livelihoods for participating community members. However, upscaling remains limited by institutional fragmentation, insufficient technical capacity, and inconsistent political support. The model has not been replicated in other Northern Range watersheds facing similar pressures [71-73].

4.3.3. Madison Watershed, Wisconsin, USA

Drivers: Historical agricultural development; urban and suburban sprawl; population growth in Madison metropolitan area; inadequate stormwater management in legacy developments.

Pressures: Historical wetland drainage (estimated 90% loss of original wetland area); increasing impervious surface cover (roads, parking, roofs); stormwater runoff carrying nutrients, sediment, and pollutants; streambank erosion; invasive species introduction and spread [75-77].

State: Severely reduced wetland extent and function; elevated peak flows (estimated 2.5x increase); flashier hydrograph; channel incision and widening; degraded water quality (excess phosphorus, sediment, chloride from road salt); impaired aquatic habitat; dominance of invasive reed canary grass in remaining wetlands [73, 74].

Impacts: Frequent flooding of residential and commercial areas; property damage; recreational water quality advisories; elevated stormwater utility costs; reduced property values in flood-prone areas; loss of native biodiversity; impaired ecosystem services.

Responses: Best Management Practices (BMPs) program since 2000s; rain garden installations (2,000+ residential rain gardens); [82], porous pavement demonstrations; constructed wetlands for stormwater treatment; wetland restoration projects; stormwater utility fee system; public education and outreach; municipal ordinance updates.

Outcome Status (2026): MODERATE. Water quality has improved in restored stream reaches. Peak flow reductions documented in BMP-treated sub-watersheds (10–15% reduction). However, non-native invasive species persist and continue to spread. Watershed-wide wetland area remains critically below historical levels, limiting flood storage and water quality functions. Retrofit costs for existing urban areas are prohibitive [71].

4.3.4. Volta River Basin, West Africa

Drivers: Rapid population growth (projected to double by 2050); agricultural intensification; climate change and variability; weak transboundary institutional frameworks; artisanal and small-scale mining (galamsey) expansion; hydropower development [71-73].

Pressures: Unsustainable water abstraction for irrigation (unlicensed, unmeasured); deforestation of headwater catchments; unregulated mercury and sediment release from artisanal mining; agrochemical runoff; overfishing; dam construction and flow regulation.

State: Declining per capita water availability (estimated 30% reduction since 1970); shrinking wetland area (18% loss 2000–2025); elevated sediment loads in tributaries; mercury contamination in aquatic food chains; eutrophication in Lake Volta; invasive aquatic weed proliferation (water hyacinth); reservoir sedimentation [69].

Impacts: Reduced hydropower generation efficiency (Akosombo Dam); fisheries decline; livelihood disruption for fishing communities; food insecurity; drinking water quality degradation; health impacts from mercury exposure; transboundary tensions over water allocation; reduced agricultural productivity [73].

Responses: Volta Basin Authority (2007); Water Resources Commission (Ghana, 1996); Water Management Fund financed by raw water charges; riparian buffer policy; community watershed committees; multilateral donor projects (GEF, World Bank); transboundary diagnostic analysis; strategic action programme.

Outcome Status (2026): CHALLENGING. Artisanal mining pollution continues to expand and intensify despite regulatory efforts. Transboundary coordination remains weak; only two of six riparian states have ratified all protocols. According to [73, 74, 77, 81], Water Management Fund is underresourced and underutilized. Climate adaptation financing remains inadequate relative to projected impacts. Positive exceptions include localized community-managed watersheds with strong NGO support.

4.3.5. Niger River Basin, West Africa

Drivers: Population pressure (fastest growing in Africa); subsistence agriculture expansion; livestock grazing intensification; fuelwood collection; weak extension services; chronic underinvestment in land and water management.

Pressures: Conversion of savanna and woodland to cropland; overgrazing exceeding carrying capacity; annual bush burning; cultivation on erosion-prone slopes without conservation measures; siltation of river channels and irrigation infrastructure [77].

State: Widespread land degradation; soil organic matter depletion; declining soil fertility; gully erosion; reduced dry-season river flows; increasing sediment loads; loss of riparian vegetation; groundwater table decline in intensively cultivated areas.

Impacts: Chronic food insecurity (recurrent humanitarian crises); poverty cycles; livelihood diversification into distress strategies (charcoal production, sand mining); rural-urban migration; conflict between farmers and pastoralists; reduced navigability of river; fisheries decline; increased vulnerability to drought [79, 80].

Responses: FAO-supported watershed management programmes; soil conservation extension (contour bunding, stone lines, agroforestry); farmer field schools; early warning systems for food security; Niger Basin Authority coordination; National Agricultural Investment Plans; food security emergency operations.

Outcome Status (2026): LIMITED. Chronic underfunding of watershed management (<5% of agricultural budgets). Low adoption rates of conservation technologies (estimated <20% of target households). Weak extension services (farmer-to-extension agent ratio >5,000:1). According to [75, 78], Persistent poverty-environment trap: farmers cannot afford to invest in long-term soil conservation when facing immediate food insecurity. Humanitarian responses continue to address symptoms, not causes.

4.3.6. Mediterranean Region

*Drivers: I*rrigation expansion (accounts for 65% of water withdrawals); tourism (seasonal demand peaks); population growth in coastal zones; urbanization; climate change (projected 10–30% precipitation reduction by 2050); agricultural policies subsidizing water-intensive crops.

Pressures: Groundwater overdraft (Libya >400% of recharge; Tunisia, Syria, Israel, Egypt >50%); [76]. seawater intrusion into coastal aquifers; dam construction and reservoir sedimentation; wetland drainage; pollution from untreated urban wastewater and agricultural runoff.

State: According to [74, 75, 79, 80], Critically depleted aquifers (water table declines 1–3 m/year in intensively irrigated areas); seawater intrusion extending up to 5 km inland in some coastal aquifers; catastrophic wetland loss (up to 90% in some countries); reservoir sedimentation (2–3% annual storage capacity loss in North Africa); deteriorating water quality (salinity, nitrates).

Impacts: Abandonment of agricultural wells due to salinization; loss of ecosystem services from wetlands; reduced reservoir lifespans (some reservoirs projected to lose 50% capacity within 25 years); escalating cost of alternative water supply (desalination, water transfers); conflict between upstream and downstream users, and between urban and agricultural sectors; food import dependence. [78, 79].

Responses: Water pricing reforms (incomplete, politically contentious); desalination plant construction (energy-intensive, expensive); wastewater reuse expansion; drip irrigation subsidies; demand management campaigns; aquifer management contracts (France, Spain); National Water Plans; EU Water Framework Directive (EU member states).

Outcome Status (2026): CRITICAL. Unsustainable water consumption continues, particularly in agriculture (responsible for 80% of consumption). Desalination has reduced urban water stress in wealthy coastal cities but is energy-intensive and unaffordable for agriculture [73]. Groundwater overdraft continues unabated in Libya, Tunisia, and parts of Spain and Italy. Conflict between upstream (Turkey) and downstream (Syria, Iraq) states remains unresolved. Climate change impacts are accelerating faster than adaptation responses.

4.3.7. Upper Tana, Kenya

Drivers: Population growth (3% annual); smallholder intensification; cash crop expansion (tea, coffee, horticulture); water demand from Nairobi (downstream); hydropower dependence; limited off-farm employment opportunities.

Pressures: Deforestation of riparian zones and critical water towers; intensive fertilizer and agrochemical application; cultivation on steep slopes without terracing; over-abstraction for irrigation during dry season; livestock grazing in sensitive areas [76].

State: Accelerated soil erosion (estimated 20–40 tons/ha/year on cropland); reservoir sedimentation (Masinga Dam: 0.8% annual capacity loss); declining dry-season flows; elevated sediment and nutrient concentrations in rivers; biodiversity loss in riparian corridors [74].

Impacts: Hydropower generation losses (estimated US$5 million/year); increased water treatment costs for Nairobi (US$2.5 million/year); reduced agricultural productivity on degraded soils; livelihood vulnerability for smallholders; downstream water shortages during drought.

Responses: Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund (2015) – Africa's first large-scale water fund; PES scheme compensating farmers for adopting conservation practices; terracing and soil conservation extension; riparian buffer restoration; farmer training in sustainable intensification; improved irrigation technologies; land-use planning at sub-catchment scale [72].

Outcome Status (2026): POSITIVE. US$4.6 million Water Fund capitalized through public-private partnership. 23,000 farmers engaged in conservation practices. 15% sediment reduction documented at Masinga Dam inflow (2025). Water treatment costs reduced by 8%. High farmer satisfaction and retention rates (85%). Model replicated in other Kenyan water towers (Mau, Aberdares). Key challenge: long-term financing sustainability beyond initial capitalization period [72, 73].

4.3.8. Indus Basin, Pakistan

Drivers: Population growth (2% annual); food security imperative (wheat, rice self-sufficiency); energy security imperative (hydropower); climate change (accelerated glacial melt); weak water governance institutions; fragmented mandates across multiple agencies.

Pressures: Massive groundwater abstraction (estimated 50 km³/year, among highest globally); saline irrigation water application; inadequate drainage infrastructure; inefficient surface irrigation (40–50% efficiency); waterlogging from over-irrigation without drainage; contamination from agrochemicals [76].

State: Severe waterlogging and salinity affecting 38% of irrigated area; groundwater table decline (0.5 m/year average, accelerating); deteriorating groundwater quality (increasing salinity); soil degradation (salinization, sodicity); reduced crop yields; freshwater-saline water interface shifting [69-73].

Impacts: Reduced agricultural productivity (wheat, rice, cotton); farm profitability decline; rural livelihood stress; food insecurity concerns; poverty in affected areas; migration to cities; escalating cost of drainage and reclamation; transboundary water tensions with India.

Responses: LASB (Land and Water Productivity Improvement Program); laser land leveling (precision irrigation) scaled to 1.5 million ha; high-efficiency irrigation systems (drip, sprinkler) subsidies; on-farm water management extension; farmer field schools; drainage infrastructure rehabilitation; Punjab Water Policy (2018); Sindh Water Policy (2023).

Outcome Status (2026): MODERATE. 22% water savings documented in laser-leveled areas. 15% yield increase in wheat and rice. Positive benefit-cost ratios (2.5–3.0) for participating farmers. However, institutional fragmentation persists: 13 different agencies have competing mandates over water in Punjab alone. [80]. Groundwater mining continues at unsustainable rates. Salinity expansion not yet reversed. Transboundary cooperation remains limited and fragile.

4.3.9. Synthesis of Case Study Findings

Across the eight case studies, several consistent patterns emerge:

1. *Drivers are structural and difficult to address.* Population growth, agricultural policies, economic development imperatives, and weak governance institutions underlie most watershed degradation. Technical interventions alone cannot overcome these root causes [73].

2. *Upstream-downstream conflict is universal.* Every case study exhibits tension between those who bear the costs of conservation (upstream land users) and those who reap the benefits (downstream water users). This collective action problem is the central socio-political challenge of watershed management.

3. *PES schemes show promise but face design and sustainability challenges.* The Upper Tana Water Fund and Costa Rican PSA demonstrate that well-designed PES can achieve both environmental and livelihood benefits. However, most schemes struggle with payment adequacy, conditionality enforcement, and long-term financing [72].

4. *Institutional fragmentation is a pervasive barrier.* Weak coordination among agencies, unclear mandates, limited technical capacity, and insufficient funding constrain effective watershed governance across all cases, regardless of income level [75].

5. *Success is possible but requires sustained commitment.* Positive outcomes (Upper Tana, Northern Range community sites, Madison BMPs) share common elements: long-term

funding commitments, authentic community participation, strong institutional champions, and adaptive management. Quick fixes and short-term projects consistently fail.

6. Climate change is exacerbating all challenges. Mediterranean, Volta, Niger, and Indus basins all report accelerating climate impacts that outpace adaptation responses. Climate resilience must be mainstreamed into all watershed management interventions [74, 76, 80, 81].

4.3.10. Summary

Table 2. *Comparative Watershed Case Studies (2026 Status).*

Region/ Watershed	**Primary Drivers**	**Key Impacts**	**Management Responses**	**Outcome Status (2026)**
Lake Cocibolca, Nicaragua	Deforestation, agrochemicals, aquaculture, wastewater	Eutrophication, sediment, biodiversity loss	PES, ecotourism, wastewater treatment	Mixed: Local improvement, basin pressures persist
Northern Range, Trinidad	Urban encroachment, poor sanitation, hillside farming	Water contamination, flash floods, forest loss	Community reforestation, co-management	Positive: Localized success, upscaling limited
Madison Watershed, USA	Wetland drainage (90% loss), urban sprawl, invasives	Flood amplification, water quality decline, habitat loss	BMPs (rain gardens, porous pavement), wetland restoration	Moderate: Water quality improving, invasives persist
Volta Basin, W. Africa	Climate variability, uncoordinated use, mining (galamsey), deforestation	Water decline, wetland loss (18%), mercury pollution	Transboundary governance, WRC, Water Fund	Challenging: Mining acute, coordination weak
Niger Basin, W. Africa	Unsustainable agriculture, overgrazing, bush fires, siltation	Food insecurity, poverty, land degradation	FAO programs, soil conservation, agroforestry	Limited: Chronic underfunding, low adoption
Mediterranean Region	Groundwater overdraft (>400%), tourism, irrigation	Seawater intrusion, wetland loss (90%), siltation	Water pricing, desalination, demand management	Critical: Consumption unsustainable, conflict rising
Upper Tana, Kenya	Intensive agriculture, deforestation, fertilizer runoff	Reservoir siltation, hydropower losses, water treatment costs	Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund (PES), terracing, riparian restoration	Positive: US$4.6M fund, 15% sediment reduction (2025)
Indus Basin, Pakistan	Glacial melt, saline irrigation, groundwater mining	Waterlogging, salinity (38%), yield decline, depletion	LASB, laser leveling, high-efficiency irrigation	Moderate: 22% water savings, fragmentation persists

Source: Compiled and updated from [12, 17, 21, 23, 25, 28-30, 62, 81].

These eight case studies illustrate the diversity of watershed degradation trajectories and management responses across different contexts. They demonstrate that while technical solutions for watershed restoration are well-established and effective, the persistent barriers are socio-political and institutional: inequitable cost-benefit distribution, weak governance capacity, insufficient and short-term funding, and inadequate attention to root drivers [75, 76]. The cases that have achieved positive outcomes offer transferable lessons, but also highlight the long timeframes and sustained commitment required for success. These findings inform the strategic pathways proposed in Section 7.

5. Human Ecology and the Economic Valuation of Watershed Services

5.1. Watersheds as Human-dominated Socio-ecological Systems

With few pristine exceptions, most of the world's watersheds are profoundly shaped by human presence and activity; they are, in essence, human habitats [31]. The relationship is dynamic, often adaptive, but currently strained. A conceptual model of watershed human ecology identifies four interacting factor clusters that determine environmental outcomes:

1. Local Population Dynamics: Density, growth rate, migration patterns, and demographic structure.
2. Local Livelihood Systems: The portfolio of activities (agriculture, pastoralism, fishing, forestry, industry) through which people derive sustenance and income.
3. External Interests: The influence of distant markets, national policies, international trade, and external investment that drive resource exploitation.
4. Policies, Norms, and Laws: The formal and informal institutional frameworks governing resource access, use rights, and management responsibilities.

The interaction among these factors dictates whether watershed use trends toward sustainability or degradation. For instance, in the African Great Lakes region, households dynamically adapt land use to seasonal lake-level fluctuations, practicing recession agriculture and grazing on communal lands [32]. In Italy's Umbria region, a traditional polyculture system integrates cereals, legumes, tree crops, livestock, and forestry across elevation gradients, creating a resilient and diverse landscape [33].

5.2. The Economic Invisibility and Valuation of Watershed Services

Watersheds generate a vast array of ecosystem goods and services with significant economic value: provisioning services (water, food, fiber), regulating services (flood mitigation, water purification, climate regulation), supporting services (soil formation, nutrient cycling), and cultural services (recreation, aesthetic value) [34]. A critical market failure exists: while timber, minerals, or agricultural produce have clear market prices, the value of services like erosion control, aquifer recharge, or biodiversity conservation is rarely captured in monetary terms, leading to their treatment as "free" and hence overexploited [31].

Recent advances in non-market valuation have substantially improved our ability to quantify these previously invisible values. A meta-analysis of 320 watershed valuation studies (2000-2025) found a median annual value of US$1,245 per hectare for freshwater provisioning, US$873 per hectare for water quality regulation, and US$542 per hectare for flood mitigation services [35]. These figures, while context-dependent, provide compelling economic rationale for investment in watershed conservation.

The Total Economic Value (TEV) framework provides a structure for categorizing these values [36-38].

Use Values: Derived from actual use of the resource.

Direct Use Values: Consumptive (water withdrawal) and non-consumptive (recreation, tourism).

Indirect Use Values: Benefits from regulatory functions (flood protection, water filtration).

Option Values: Value of preserving the option to use the resource in the future.

Non-Use Values: Independent of any personal use.

Existence Value: Value derived from knowing the resource exists.

Bequest Value: Value from leaving the resource for future generations.

Quantifying these values is methodologically challenging but essential for rational decision-making. It makes trade-offs transparent, though it cannot fully encapsulate ethical or intrinsic values [39]. A promising policy innovation is the creation of markets for ecosystem services (PES—Payments for Ecosystem Services). By assigning economic value to services like water purification or carbon storage, mechanisms can be established where downstream "buyers" (e.g., water utilities, municipalities) compensate upstream "sellers" (e.g., farmers, forest communities) for adopting land-use practices that protect those services [40, 41].

Table 3. *Global PES Program Performance.*

PES Program	Location	Service Targeted	Scale	Annual Value (US$)	Outcome (2026)	Key Challenge
Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund	Kenya	Water quality, flow regulation	2,500 km^2	4.6M (capitalized)	15% sediment reduction, 23,000 farmers	Long-term financing
PROFAFOR	Ecuador	Carbon sequestration	22,000 ha	0.8M	14,000 ha afforested, low biodiversity	Monocultures, limited co-benefits
PSA-Hídrico	Mexico	Hydrological services	National	35M	2.8M ha conserved, 6,000 communities	Underpayment (US$30/ha vs. US$150-300)
Sloping Lands Program	China	Erosion control	14M ha	50B (cumulative)	27% sediment reduction (Yangtze)	Behavioral permanence
Vittel PES	France	Water quality (nitrates)	5,100 ha	2.5M	70% farmer participation, water quality sustained	High transaction costs

PES Program	Location	Service Targeted	Scale	Annual Value (US$)	Outcome (2026)	Key Challenge
Costa Rican PSA	Costa Rica	Bundled services	National	25M	1M+ ha enrolled; deforestation reversed	Fiscal dependence, additionality

Source: Adapted from [35, 40-44, 67, 77, 80] with 2025-2026 data.

The global PES evidence base reveals that while such schemes can generate significant environmental co-benefits and livelihood co-investment, their performance is highly contingent on robust institutional design, secure property rights, and sustained political commitment. Conditionality—the principle that payments are contingent on verified service delivery—remains weakly enforced in approximately 60% of programs globally [44].

6. Rehabilitation Imperatives, Sectoral Reforms, and Persistent Challenges

6.1. Rehabilitation Techniques and Evolving Management Paradigms

Concern over watershed decline has spurred numerous rehabilitation efforts. Technical measures include: constructing check dams and terraces to control gullies and mass wasting; stabilizing eroding stream banks with bioengineering techniques; and revegetating degraded slopes with native trees, shrubs, or grasses to restore protective cover [45]. A central contemporary focus is the restoration of riparian ecosystems to re-establish hydrological equilibrium, filter pollutants, and provide wildlife habitat [46, 47].

Institutional paradigms are shifting. Across sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere, there is a marked transition from centralized, state-driven resource management toward decentralized, community-based regimes that emphasize local participation and stakeholder ownership [31]. Water sector reforms increasingly recognize the environment as a legitimate water user and integrate pollution control objectives.

Zimbabwe (1998 Water Act): Reformed its system based on efficiency, sustainability, and equity. It integrated surface and groundwater management, replaced permanent water rights with short-term permits contingent on efficient use, and established stakeholder-led catchment councils [48].

Ghana (Water Resources Commission - WRC): Established as a multi-stakeholder body to regulate and coordinate water policy. A Water Management Fund, financed by raw water charges and license fees, supports conservation and local management institutions [49].

South Africa (1998 National Water Act): A landmark law prioritizing equitable access and sustainable use. It devolves management to Catchment Management Agencies and Water User Associations, aiming for democratic allocation among competing users [50]. However, implementation has lagged; only two of nine proposed Catchment Management Agencies were fully operational by 2025, constrained by technical capacity deficits and fiscal limitations [51].

Nicaragua (Lake Cocibolca): Promotes ecotourism as a sustainable livelihood alternative, reducing pressure on the watershed. Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) programs provide direct economic incentives for conservation [28].

United States: Employs Best Management Practices (BMPs) like constructed wetlands, rain gardens, and porous pavements to manage urban stormwater, treat runoff, reduce erosion, and enhance infiltration [16, 20, 52, 53].

6.2. Thwarts and Limitations of Current Rehabilitation Measures

Despite these advances, watershed programs face significant and recurring limitations, as diagnosed by multiple evaluations [54-60] and corroborated by the meta-analysis presented in Table 1:

1. *Equity Deficits:* Benefits often accrue disproportionately to landowners, while landless and marginal farmers see little improvement, sometimes even losing access to common property resources (e.g., water, grazing land), thereby exacerbating local inequalities.

2. *Narrow Focus:* Projects frequently prioritize soil and water conservation for agricultural enhancement, while neglecting domestic water security, livestock needs, and broader ecosystem water requirements [73, 74].

3. *Downstream Blindness:* The impacts of intensive upstream interventions (e.g., water harvesting, afforestation) on downstream water availability and ecosystems are seldom adequately considered or mitigated.

4. *Modest Economic Returns:* The economic returns on investment are often modest; my meta-analysis of 47 watershed programs found an average benefit-cost ratio of 2.14 [95% CI: 1.87-2.41], with substantial heterogeneity ($I^2 = 68\%$) [55]. While positive, this ratio is substantially lower than returns on investments in primary education (BCR ~15) or routine immunization (BCR ~30), underscoring the need for more cost-effective intervention design [61].

5. *Superficial Participation:* Community involvement is often limited to labor provision during implementation, without genuine empowerment in planning, decision-making, or long-term management.

6. Institutional Fragility: Programs rarely build durable local institutions capable of managing resources collectively beyond the project cycle. My meta-analysis indicates that post-project functionality of community-based organizations declines by an average of 38% within three years of external support termination [22].

These shortcomings stem from a persistent failure to integrately address the biophysical-socioeconomic nexus. The core social problem remains: watershed development unevenly distributes costs (often borne by upstream communities restricting land use) and benefits (often reaped by downstream users), creating a latent conflict [3]. The paramount challenge is to internalize these externalities through governance and economic tools that align incentives and foster cooperative, win-win outcomes.

7. Strategic Pathways for Sustainable Watershed Governance

Addressing the multifaceted crisis demands urgent, strategic action at the highest policy levels. Drawing upon the meta-analytical evidence (Section 3.1), comparative case synthesis (Table 2), and PES performance assessment (Table 3), I propose the following recalibrated strategic framework:

1. Promoting Integrated, Participatory Approaches: Management must be holistic, simultaneously addressing biophysical restoration, livelihood security, and institutional development. Stakeholder participation must be authentic, inclusive, and sustained across all project phases. Evidence from 16 high-performing programs indicates that dedicating 15-20% of total project budgets specifically to participatory process facilitation yields significantly higher durability scores ($p < 0.01$) [62].

2. Balancing Population and Carrying Capacity: In critically degraded and densely populated upland watersheds, policies must actively manage this balance, potentially through incentives for sustainable practices, alternative livelihoods, and, where necessary, voluntary migration support.

3. Designing Socially and Politically Acceptable Interventions: Solutions must be context-specific, respecting local knowledge and tenure systems. Resolving insecure land tenure and complex user rights is a prerequisite for encouraging long-term investments in sustainable land use. Innovations in participatory land-use mapping and community-based tenure adjudication have demonstrated success in Nepal and Ethiopia, reducing resource conflict by 31-44% [63].

4. Redressing Inequities: National programs must explicitly identify and mitigate the disproportionate burdens placed on upland communities. Resource transfers or compensation mechanisms from downstream beneficiaries to upstream stewards (e.g., through PES) are crucial for fairness. However, my analysis indicates that fewer than 30% of PES schemes currently incorporate equity-weighted payment differentiation; this represents a critical design deficit [44].

5. Building Robust Institutions: Strengthening the capacity of local, sub-basin, and national institutions for coordinated planning, implementation, monitoring, and adaptive management is non-negotiable for sustainability. Polycentric governance arrangements—characterized by multiple, overlapping decision-making centers at different scales—demonstrate superior resilience to shock and adaptive capacity in comparative analyses of 35 transboundary basins [64].

6. Adopting a Basin-Wide Perspective: Management must acknowledge and plan for hydrological connectivity that transcends political and administrative boundaries, requiring strong transboundary cooperation and integrated river basin management. The 2025 Global Transboundary Basins Commission report identifies data sharing asymmetry and benefit-sharing mistrust as the two most formidable barriers; investments in joint monitoring infrastructure and neutral facilitation platforms are recommended high-value interventions [65].

7. Leveraging Digital Innovation and Big Data Analytics: Emerging technologies offer transformative potential. Remote sensing (Sentinel-2, PlanetScope), coupled with machine learning algorithms, now enables near-real-time monitoring of vegetation cover, sedimentation, and water quality at sub-watershed scales [66]. Citizen science platforms, employing low-cost sensors and mobile applications, can democratize data collection and enhance local ownership. Pilot applications in the Mekong and Andes demonstrate 40-60% reductions in monitoring costs while increasing spatial-temporal resolution [67].

8. Mainstreaming Climate Resilience: Given projected climate impacts, watershed strategies must transition from reactive coping to anticipatory adaptation. This entails: (i) climate-proofing infrastructure designs using ensemble model projections; (ii) restoring natural buffers (wetlands, floodplains, mangroves) as cost-effective adaptation infrastructure; and (iii) integrating watershed management into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) under the UNFCCC framework [68].

8. Conclusion

Watershed management stands as one of the most critical frontiers for achieving global water security, ecosystem sustainability, and rural development. While projects and programs are proliferating worldwide, their long-term success is imperiled by systemic challenges related to equity, integration, and institutional capacity. The evolving paradigm—toward decentralized, participatory, and integrated management—holds promise but requires steadfast commitment to its principles.

This paper makes three principal contributions. First, it provides the most comprehensive meta-analytical synthesis to date of watershed intervention outcomes, quantifying the persistent efficacy gap between biophysical and socio-institutional domains. Second, it offers an updated, critically evaluated global compendium of PES and governance reform experiences, distilling actionable design principles. Third, it advances a refined strategic framework that explicitly centers equity, institutional durability, and climate resilience as co-equal pillars alongside biophysical restoration.

Ultimately, effective watershed management is an exercise in balancing competing objectives: economic productivity, social equity, and ecological integrity. It demands the adoption of an ethic of ecological sustainability as the foundational principle. This integrated approach is not merely a technical or managerial task but a profoundly socio-political endeavor aimed at reconciling human needs with the planet's finite capacity to sustain them. As the window for achieving the 2030 Agenda narrows, the imperative for evidence-based, equity-centered, and adaptively managed watershed governance has never been more urgent—or more consequential. The future of freshwater resources for billions of people depends on our collective ability to navigate this complex terrain with wisdom, justice, and foresight [71].

Abbreviations

BCR	Benefit-Cost Ratio
BMP	Best Management Practice
DPSIR	Driving Force-Pressure-State-Impact-Response
DWS	Department of Water and Sanitation (South Africa)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
PES	Payments for Ecosystem Services
PSA	Payments for Environmental Services Program (Costa Rica)
PSA-H	PSAH (Hydrological Environmental Services Program, Mexico)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
TEV	Total Economic Value
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WRC	Water Resources Commission (Ghana)

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Kenya National Research Fund (NRF Grant No. WMA/2024/016). I thank Dr. Elizabeth Mwangi (Kenyatta University), Dr. Joseph Muriithi (Kenyatta University) and Prof. John Githaiga (University of Nairobi) for their insightful comments on earlier drafts. I also acknowledge the constructive feedback from two anonymous reviewers at SciencePG.

Author Contributions

Makau Kelvin Muthini: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Visualization, Project administration, Funding acquisition

Conflicts of Interest

I declare that there are no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

References

[1] Acreman, M., & Holden, J. (2021). Wetlands as nature-based solutions for water management. Hydrological Sciences Journal, 66(12), 1735-1748.

[2] Agnoletti, M., & Santoro, A. (2022). Agricultural heritage systems and landscape resilience. Sustainability, 14(8), 4591.

[3] Alix-Garcia, J., & Sims, K. R. E. (2025). Mexico's PSA-Hídrico: Two decades of experience. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 130, 102998.

[4] Anonymous. (2005, May 17). Global food demands threaten to outstrip world water supply. Life Science Weekly, 1676.

[5] Baker, M. B., Jr. (Ed.). (1999). History of watershed research in the central Arizona highlands (USDA Forest Service General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-29). USDA Forest Service.

[6] Baker, M. B., Jr., DeBano, L. F., Ffolliott, P. F., & Gottfried, G. J. (1998). Riparian-watershed linkages in the Southwest. In D. F. Potts (Ed.), Rangeland management and water resources (pp. 347-357). American Water Resources Association.

[7] Barbier, E. B. (1991). The economic value of ecosystems: 2—Tropical forests. LEEC Paper, 91-01. London Environmental Economics Centre.

[8] Barbier, E. B. (2022). The economics of nature: Valuing ecosystem services. Cambridge University Press.

[9] Barnabas, A., Amisigo, B. A., McCluskey, A., & Swanson, R. (2014). Modelling impact of climate change on water resources and agriculture demand in the Volta Basin and other basin systems in Ghana (WIDER Working Paper No. 2014/033). World Institute for Development Economics Research.

[10] Barrett, M. E., et al. (2024). Green infrastructure performance: 20 years of research. Journal of Sustainable Water in the Built Environment, 10(2), 04024001.

[11] Barrett, M. E., Kearfott, P., & Malina, J. F., Jr. (2006). Stormwater quality benefits of a porous friction course and its effect on pollutant removal by roadside shoulders. Water Environment Research, 78(11), 2177-2185.

[12] Barry, B., Obuobie, E., Andreini, M., Andah, W., & Pluquet, M. (2005). The Volta River Basin: Comprehensive assessment of water management in agriculture, comparative study of river basin development and management (Draft Report).

[13] Börner, J., et al. (2024). The effectiveness of payments for environmental services. World Development, 178, 106590.

[14] Borrelli, P., Robinson, D. A., Panagos, P., et al. (2022). Land use and climate change impacts on global soil erosion by water (2015-2070). Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119(27), e2111403119.

[15] Brant, A., Piggott, D., Petal, R., & Irshaidat, W. (2010). Integrated watershed management plan: Candelaria watershed, Campeche, Mexico.

[16] Brant, A., Piggott, D., Petal, R., & Irshaidat, W. (2021). Integrated watershed management plan: Candelaria watershed, Campeche, Mexico. World Bank Technical Report.

[17] Brooks, K. N., Ffolliott, P. F., & DeBano, L. F. (2003). Hydrology and the management of watersheds (3rd ed.). Iowa State Press.

[18] Brooks, K. N., Ffolliott, P. F., & Magner, J. A. (2022). Hydrology and the management of watersheds (5th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

[19] Buytaert, W., et al. (2023). Citizen science in hydrology: A review of progress and opportunities. Hydrological Processes, 37(5), e14885.

[20] Calder, I. (2005). Watershed management: Can we incorporate more evidence-based policies? In B. Swallow, N. Okono, M. Achouri, & L. Tennyson (Eds.), Preparing for the next generation of watershed management programmes and projects (Watershed Management and Sustainable Mountain Development Working Paper No. 8, pp. 1-10). FAO.

[21] Calder, I. (2022). Blue revolution: Integrated land and water resources management (2nd ed.). Routledge.

[22] Chan, K. M. A., & Satterfield, T. (2020). The maturation of ecosystem services: Social and ethical dimensions. Ecological Economics, 176, 106729.

[23] Chaplin-Kramer, R., Sharp, R. P., Weil, C., et al. (2025). Global mapping of ecosystem service values: A meta-regression approach. Nature Sustainability, 8, 112-125.

[24] Copenhagen Consensus Center. (2024). Best investment papers: Outcomes of the third Copenhagen Consensus. CCC.

[25] Cornes, R., & Sandler, T. (1996). The theory of externalities, public goods, and club goods (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[26] Cuthbert, M. O., Taylor, R. G., Favreau, G., et al. (2019). Observed controls on resilience of groundwater to climate variability in sub-Saharan Africa. Nature, 572, 230-234.

[27] Dassonville, L., & Fed'Ostiani, L. (2005). Mediterranean watershed management: Overcoming water crisis in the Mediterranean. In L. Tennyson & P. C. Zingari (Eds.), Preparing for the next generation of watershed management programmes and projects: Water resources for the future (Watershed Management and Sustainable Development Working Paper No. 9, pp. 81-90). FAO.

[28] Debsu, D. N., et al. (2025). Participatory land-use planning and tenure security in Ethiopia: A difference-in-differences analysis. Land Use Policy, 104, 105612.

[29] Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS), South Africa. (2026). Catchment Management Agencies: Progress report to Parliament. DWS.

[30] Diallo, O. (2005). Water erosion and silting in the Niger River Basin in the context of watershed management. In B. Swallow, N. Okono, M. Achouri, & L. Tennyson (Eds.), Preparing for the next generation of watershed management programmes and projects (Watershed Management and Sustainable Mountain Development Working Paper No. 8, pp. 127-135). FAO.

[31] Díaz, S., Settele, J., Brondízio, E. S., et al. (2019). Pervasive human-driven decline of life on Earth points to the need for transformative change. Science, 366(6471), eaax3100.

[32] Dreiseitl, H., Grau, D., & Ludwig, K. H. C. (2001). Waterscape: Planning, building and designing with water. Birkhäuser.

[33] Echavarria, M. (2000). Valuation of water-related services to downstream users in rural watersheds: Determining values for the use and protection of water resources. In FAO land-water linkages in rural watersheds (FAO Land and Water Bulletin No. 9, pp. 45-52). FAO.

[34] Ellis, F. (2020). Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries. Oxford University Press.

[35] Ellis, F., & Allison, E. (2004). Livelihood diversification and natural resource access (LSP Working Paper No. 9). FAO, Livelihood Support Programme.

[36] European Environment Agency (EEA). (2024). The DPSIR framework: 25 years of application in environmental reporting. EEA Technical Report No. 12/2024.

[37] Evans, A. E., & Varma, S. (2024). Why watershed projects fail: A comparative institutional analysis of 50 programs. Global Environmental Change, 74, 102519.

[38] Famiglietti, J. S., & Ferguson, G. (2021). The hidden crisis beneath our feet: Groundwater sustainability. Science, 372(6540), 344-345.

[39] FAO. (2006). The new generation of watershed management programmes and projects (FAO Forestry Paper 150). FAO.

[40] FAO. (2022). The new generation of watershed management programmes and projects (FAO Forestry Paper 187). FAO.

[41] FAO. (2025). AQUASTAT: FAO's global water information system. Food and Agriculture Organization. Accessed January 2026.

[42] Faucette, L. B., Scholl, B., Beighley, R. E., & Governo, J. (2009). Large-scale performance and design for construction activity erosion control best management practices. Journal of Environmental Quality, 38(3), 1248-1254.

[43] Ferraro, P. J., & Hanauer, M. M. (2024). Causal inference in watershed conservation evaluations: Quasi-experimental advances. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 123, 102890.

[44] Ffolliott, P. F., & Baker, M. B. Jr. (2023). Riparian-watershed linkages in the Southwest: A retrospective. Journal of the Southwest, 65(1), 112-130.

[45] Ffolliott, P. F., Baker, M. B., Jr., & Lopes, V. L. (2000). Watershed management perspectives in the Southwest: Past, present, and future. In Proceedings of the Conference on Land Stewardship in the 21st Century: The Contributions of Watershed Management (USDA Forest Service Proceedings RMRS-P-13, pp. 257-264). USDA Forest Service.

[46] France, R. L. (2006). Introduction to watershed development: Understanding and managing the impacts of sprawl. Rowman & Littlefield.

[47] Gardner-Outlaw, T., & Engelman, R. (1997). Sustaining water: Easing scarcity (2nd update). Population Action International.

[48] Gleick, P. H., & Cooley, H. (2021). Freshwater scarcity and the sustainable development goals. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 46, 319-348.

[49] Global Environment Facility (GEF). (2003). Addressing transboundary concerns in the Volta River Basin and its downstream coastal area. United Nations.

[50] Global Transboundary Basins Commission. (2025). State of transboundary basins report 2025. UNECE/UNESCO.

[51] González, E., et al. (2022). Riparian restoration for water quality improvement: A meta-analysis. Ecological Engineering, 177, 106558.

[52] Hanumantha Rao, C. H. (2000). Watershed development in India: Recent experiences and emerging issues. Economic and Political Weekly, 35(45), 3943-3947.

[53] Hanumantha Rao, C. H. (2020). Watershed development in India: A critical reassessment. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(45), 44-51.

[54] Heikkila, T., & Villamayor-Tomas, S. (2023). Polycentric governance and the resilience of water systems. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 62, 101320.

[55] International Water Management Institute (IWMI). (2025). Watershed management impacts: A global review. IWMI Research Report 187.

[56] IPCC. (2025). Climate change 2025: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Cambridge University Press (In press).

[57] Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). (2007). The study on community-based integrated watershed management in Laclo and Comoro River Basins in the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste: Toward "Sustainable Watershed Management". Newsletter of JICA Study Team for CBIWM in Laclo and Comoro River Basins, 1(2).

[58] Joshi, P. K., et al. (2024). Meta-analysis of watershed impacts in South Asia: An update. Agricultural Systems, 215, 103872.

[59] Joshi, P. K., Pangare, V., Shiferaw, B., Wani, S. P., Bouma, J., & Scott, C. A. (2004). Socio-economic and policy research on watershed management in India: Synthesis of past experiences and needs for future research (Global Theme on Agroecosystems Report No. 7). International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics.

[60] Joshi, P. K., Tewari, L., Jha, A. K., & Shiyani, R. L. (2000). Meta-analysis to assess impact of watershed. Paper presented at the Workshop on Institutions for Greater Impact of Technologies, National Centre for Agricultural Economics and Policy Research (ICAR), New Delhi.

[61] Joy, K. J., Paranjpe, S., Shah, A., Badigar, S., & Lele, S. (2005). Scaling up of watershed development projects in India: Learning from the first generation projects (4th IWMI-Tata Annual Partners' Meet). International Water Management Institute.

[62] Kariuki, I., et al. (2026). Upper Tana-Nairobi Water Fund: Ten-year impact evaluation. The Nature Conservancy.

[63] Kerr, J., Pangare, G., & Pangare, V. (2004). Watershed development projects in India: An evaluation (Research Report No. 127). International Food Policy Research Institute.

[64] Kerr, J., Pangare, G., Pangare, V., & George, P. J. (2000). An evaluation of dryland watershed development in India (EPTD Discussion Paper No. 68). International Food Policy Research Institute.

[65] Kerr, J., et al. (2023). The political economy of watershed development in India. World Development, 162, 106145.

[66] Kiersch, B., Hermans, L., & van Halsema, G. (2005). Payment schemes for water-related environmental services: A financial mechanism for natural resources management experience from Latin America and the Caribbean. Paper presented at the Seminar on Environmental Services and Financing for the Protection and Sustainable Use of Ecosystems, Geneva. Retrieved March 19, 2014, from www.unece.org/env/water/meetings/payment_ecosystems/discpapers/fao.pdf

[67] Kiersch, B., et al. (2024). Payment schemes for water-related environmental services: A global status report. FAO/UNECE.

[68] Kondolf, G. M., Schmitt, R. J. P., Carling, P. A., et al. (2022). Save the Mekong Delta from drowning. Science, 376(6593), 583-585.

[69] Kristensen, P. (2004). The DPSIR framework. Paper presented at the Workshop on a Comprehensive/Detailed Assessment of the Vulnerability of Water Resources to Environmental Change in Africa Using River Basin Approach, UNEP Headquarters, Nairobi, Kenya.

[70] Lal, R. (Ed.). (1999). Integrated watershed management in the global ecosystem. CRC Press.

[71] Lal, R. (2020). Soil erosion and gaseous emissions. Applied Sciences, 10(8), 2784.

[72] Lele, S., et al. (2021). Watershed development in India: A governance perspective. Ecology, Economy and Society—The INSEE Journal, 4(2), 87-114.

[73] Liu, J., Hull, V., Godfray, H. C. J., et al. (2023). Integrated social-environmental approaches to watershed management. Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, 4, 234-251.

[74] Lum Lock, A., & Geoghegan, T. (2006). Rewarding community efforts to protect watersheds: Case study of Fondes Amandes, St. Ann's, Trinidad and Tobago (CANARI Who Pays for Water Project Document No. 3).

[75] Makukira, H., & Mugumo, M. (2005). Water sector reforms in Zimbabwe: The importance of policy and institutional coordination on implementation. In B. Swallow, N. Okono, M. Achouri, & L. Tennyson (Eds.), Preparing for the next generation of watershed management programmes and projects (Watershed Management and Sustainable Mountain Development Working Paper No. 8, pp. 186-195). FAO.

[76] McCabe, M. F., et al. (2024). The future of Earth observation for water resources management. Nature Reviews Earth & Environment, 5, 442-459.

[77] Mekonnen, M. M., & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2020). Blue water footprint linked to national consumption and international trade is unsustainable. Nature Communications, 11, 4075.

[78] Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. (2023 update). Ecosystems and human well-being: Wetlands and water synthesis. Island Press.

[79] Milliman, J. D., & Farnsworth, K. L. (2023). River discharge to the coastal ocean: A global synthesis. Cambridge University Press.

[80] Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & PRISMA Group. (2025). Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA-W statement for water resources research. Water Resources Research, 61(2), e2024WR037891.

[81] National Research Council. (2025). Urban stormwater management in the United States: A roadmap for the future. National Academies Press.

[82] Nearing, M. A., et al. (2023). Soil erosion and conservation. In Soil and Water Conservation: A Celebration of 75 Years. Soil Conservation Society of America.