

Heterodox Thinking on Water Economics, Values, and Governance

R. Quentin Grafton,¹ Edoardo Borgomeo,² Long Chu,¹
Peter Coombes,¹ Safa Fanaian,³
Darla Hatton MacDonald,⁴ Pamela Katic,⁵
Sheri Longboat,⁶ Ana Manero,⁷ William Nikolakis,⁸
Jesper Svensson,⁹ Sarah Ann Wheeler,¹⁰ Paul Wyrwoll,¹
Wiktor Adamowicz,¹¹ Sonia Akter,¹ Asit Biswas,¹²
Roy Brouwer,¹³ Luc Doyen,¹⁴ James Horne,¹⁵
Tom Kompas,¹⁶ Lien Le,¹ Rita Martins,¹⁷ Sarah Milne,¹
Nhat-Mai Nguyen,¹ Claudia Ringler,¹⁸
Julia Talbot-Jones,¹⁹ Djiby Thiam,²⁰ Cecilia Tortajada,²¹
and John Williams¹

ANNUAL REVIEWS **CONNECT**

www.annualreviews.org

- Download figures
- Navigate cited references
- Keyword search
- Explore related articles
- Share via email or social media

Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2026. 51:279–304

First published as a Review in Advance on
April 30, 2026

The *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* is
online at environ.annualreviews.org

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-112624-021419>

Copyright © 2026 by the author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution, and reproduction in any medium or format, provided the original author(s) and source are credited; this license does not permit sharing adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. Images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license unless indicated otherwise; see credit lines for license information.



¹Crawford School of Public Policy, Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia; email: quentin.grafton@anu.edu.au

²Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

³International Water Management Institute (Nepal Office), Kathmandu, Nepal

⁴Tasmanian School of Business and Economics, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

⁵Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich, London, United Kingdom

⁶Geography and Environmental Studies, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

⁷School of Agriculture and Environment, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

⁸Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

⁹Department of Political Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

¹⁰College of Business, Government and Law, Flinders University, Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

¹¹Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

¹²Water Management International Pte Ltd, Singapore

¹³Department of Economics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

¹⁴Center for Environmental Economics–Montpellier, Centre national de recherche scientifique (CNRS), Montpellier, France

¹⁵James Horne and Associates, Australia, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia

¹⁶Centre of Excellence for Biosecurity Risk Analysis, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

¹⁷Center for Business and Economics Research (CeBER), University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

¹⁸Natural Resources and Resilience, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, DC, USA

¹⁹School of Government, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand

²⁰School of Economics, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

²¹School of Social and Environmental Sustainability, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

Keywords

water crises, relationality, valuation, justice and well-being, water demand management, systems thinking

Abstract

Global water crises are, finally, near the top of the agendas at the United Nations and at multilateral initiatives and organizations. A social sciences– and humanities-informed emerging literature that we call Heterodox Thinking offers alternatives to much of the current decision-making on water. Rooted in water economics, values, and governance, Heterodox Thinking comprises developments in nonmarket valuation, systems thinking, risk assessments and mitigation, infrastructure investments, and understanding injustices and relationality. It is characterized by the Three Ps: People (e.g., who has voice and power and who does not), Place (e.g., locally informed and justice-based), and Planet (e.g., system interconnections, risks, and ecological and nonhuman considerations). At its best, Heterodox Thinking is informed by on-the-ground evidence and multiple disciplines and knowledge, and it seeks to value water, expose power imbalances, support human rights and well-being, and mitigate systemic risks. If effectively operationalized, it can deliver more equitable, risk-mitigated, and sustainable responses to the many different and localized water crises.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	281
2. VALUES AND VALUING WATER	282
2.1. Defining Values	283
2.2. Monetary Valuation of Water	283
2.3. Water Accounting	285
3. UNDERSTANDING SYSTEMS AND RESPONDING TO RISKS	285
3.1. Increasing Risks: Scarcity, Extreme Quantity, and Poor Quality	286
3.2. Responding to Water Security Risks	287
4. CONNECTING INFRASTRUCTURES TO SOCIOECONOMIC OUTCOMES	288
4.1. Different Approaches	289
4.2. Appraisal Frameworks to Value Water Infrastructure	289
5. PROMOTING JUSTICE AND WELL-BEING	290
5.1. Efficiency–Equity Trade-Offs in Resource Allocation	291
5.2. Cultural Drivers of Just, Inclusive Decision-Making	291
6. RETHINKING RELATIONALITY	292
6.1. Motivation: Should We Adopt Relational Thinking?	292
6.2. Operationalization: How Might Relational Thinking Be Put into Practice? ...	293

6.3. Reflection: Challenges and Possibilities of Relational Approaches	294
7. CONCLUSIONS	295

1. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations (UN) 2023 Water Conference and its successor, scheduled for December 2026, mark high points in terms of the attention paid to water by political leaders (1). According to the then-President of the UN General Assembly, Csaba Kőrösi, a key message of the 2023 Water Conference was that “the global water cycle is a global common good” (2, p.1), signifying that water is a shared resource that provides multiple benefits to many people. Treating water as a global common good originated in Interactive Dialogue 5 of the Water Conference, which highlighted that the global water cycle is currently out of balance; prioritized the benefits from mobilization of finance, especially for infrastructure; and emphasized the importance of pricing and valuing water correctly.

Commonly, water is characterized as a local public good, and as a global public good when in the atmosphere (3), because it is nonexclusive and nonrival. Water, however, can also be a private good (e.g., when captured in water storage or as bottled water) and a common-pool resource (e.g., in rivers and aquifers), where its use is rivalrous and exclusion difficult and/or costly. A growing literature emphasizes that a lack of safe access (4) and degradation of water sources (e.g., catchments) are primarily a result of relational and governance failures (5).

An emerging social sciences– and humanities-informed literature on water economics, values, and governance that we label Heterodox Thinking provides diagnoses and responses to “too much, too little and too dirty” water (6) that differ from much of the current practices and decision-making on water (7). Here, Heterodox Thinking does not mean heterodox approaches to economics (e.g., Marxian economics) or any other discipline. Instead, it refers to a diverse set of approaches to thinking about water informed by social justice, ecological economics, political ecology, Indigenous research, and systems thinking, among others, that collectively provide a heterodox alternative to mainstream thinking around water economics, values, and governance. We contend that Heterodox Thinking provides valuable insights into the causes and sustainable responses to the many water crises and supports pathways to help achieve the targets of UN Sustainable Development Goal 6 (SDG 6), including clean water and sanitation for all.

Heterodox Thinking highlights that there is no singular world water crisis (e.g., global water cycle out of balance). There are, in truth, multiple crises of different magnitudes with various causes that manifest in many ways across numerous places. That is, water crises play out primarily at the local scale (e.g., catchment level), with responses and feedbacks across multiple scales. When global considerations matter, at least for the present, they are dominated by virtual water, chiefly food trade (8).

We first review values and the valuation of water. This framing supports an understanding of the systems and risks around water as well as of how some risks can be managed with gray (built) infrastructure, such as urban drainage systems, desalination plants, and irrigation canals, and green (natural) infrastructure, such as floodplains and wetlands (9). Our review also focuses on two neglected but important areas of Heterodox Thinking: (a) justice and well-being and (b) relationality, or how we connect via relationships and diverse values with the Three Ps: People, Place, and Planet (**Table 1**). We conclude with key messages that highlight emerging insights into water economics, values, and governance.

Table 1 People, Place, and Planet: the “do” and the “do not” based on Heterodox Thinking on water economics, values, and governance

Themes	Do	Do not
Values	Recognize local-scale and place-based values and, wherever possible, measure cultural, spiritual, nonmaterial, and shared values	Assume values are always material, immutable, or individualistic
Valuation methods	Review and/or measure all values whenever possible, employ best practice methods (e.g., choice experiments) and triangulate across methods	Prioritize only market values and measures and/or ignore nonmarket values
Systems thinking	Adopt systems thinking (e.g., elements, functions, and interconnections) and actively adapt to actual and projected changes	Adopt single-goal missions to resolve systemic failures and/or use generalized and mean-based assessments
Risk assessments	Document boundaries, feedbacks, and dynamic behaviors; consider who bears the risks; consider systemic, cascading, and cumulative risks	Assume a business-as-usual trajectory and/or use risk methods inappropriate for complex, dynamic systems
Infrastructures	Ensure that infrastructures (gray and green) are fit for purpose, place, and people and evaluate spatial and temporal interconnections	Make the mobilization and amount of funds invested in infrastructure as the key performance indicator
Water justice	Document injustices (e.g., distributive, procedural, epistemic, restorative) and prioritize remedies to the disadvantaged and disempowered	Prioritize global and/or top-down approaches or focus on the documentation of injustice at the expense of practical responses to injustice (water, social, climate, environmental, etc.)
Rights of nature	Recognize Indigenous rights and effectively fund and support legal person guardianship	Implement tokenistic rights and/or ignore the power dynamics over who gets what water, when, and why
Relationality	Integrate relational values (e.g., integrity, respect, humility, reciprocity) into decision-making and adopt places, people, and relations thinking	Trivialize power relationships and/or fail to document historical failures and institutional weaknesses; ignore nonhuman considerations
Just, inclusive decision-making	Adopt and support inclusive decision-making processes (e.g., dialogues, deliberative processes) and ensure that all voices count	Prioritize economic efficiency at the expense of basic human rights and needs; ignore the institutional structures of who decides who gets what water and when
Water governance	Integrate local-scale and place-based knowledge, experiences, and priorities within existing or improved decision-making processes	Focus only on the financial return on investment and water-use efficiency and exclude, undermine, and/or ignore bottom-up decision-making processes

2. VALUES AND VALUING WATER

As water crises intensify globally—manifested through scarcity, pollution, and inequitable access, as well as extreme floods, storms, and droughts—more nuanced, transparent, and inclusive approaches are required to understand, measure, govern, manage, and communicate water’s diverse values (10, 11). Today’s water valuation methods were founded in economics—governed by concepts such as utility maximization—but have since broadened to multidisciplinary framings that put water values and water valuation at the intersection of economics, governance, and ethics (12). Recent practical developments in water valuation include more sophisticated stated and revealed preference methods, advanced spatial and temporal data analysis, the valuation of damages and losses, the growing use of natural capital accounting (NCA), and an alignment with the broader sustainable development agenda (13, 14, 15).

Heterodox Thinking highlights challenges in embedding plural values into policy, responding to inequities, and integrating valuation tools with the complex sociopolitical realities of water governance (16). Despite their perceived cost, time, and complexities of implementation, embedding pluralistic values within decision-making offers real benefit for practical decision-making (17, 18).

2.1. Defining Values

Debates around water values are central to the UN 2021 World Water Development Report (19), which built upon the Bellagio Principles for Valuing Water (20). These principles describe five distinct but interconnected aspects of valuing water: sources, infrastructure, services, productive inputs, and sociocultural attributes. Notwithstanding these principles, diverse views remain around water values—some of which are contested across different sociocultural and disciplinary contexts (11).

A common misunderstanding is that price and value are equivalent. Price is what needs to be paid or exchanged to access water and/or water services where, all else equal, the higher the price is, the less will be demanded. Value, by comparison, is not about exchange but rather encompasses the intrinsic, not necessarily monetizable, water benefits and/or services embedded in multiple individual and societal values, both tangible and intangible (21). This important distinction is consistent with the view that the process of valuing water should be shaped by societal, historical, religious, aesthetic, and cultural values.

Decisions about water are influenced by water-related values, including underlying personal and governance-related convictions (22). Exploring these perceptions, a study (23) showed that people's engagement with water (e.g., through hydration, hygiene, comfort, and care) influences its "value" and that tension and trade-offs arise between functional (e.g., meeting one's needs) and ethical considerations (e.g., caring for others' needs and the environment).

Heterogeneities in water (24) across gender, class, and ethnicity underscore the need for representative justice and to value pluralism in water policy (25), especially with respect to long-standing Indigenous values. Relational values have become increasingly prominent in the published literature, although uptake by decision-makers has been low. Relationality recognizes connections that humans have with nature, and with one another, that are largely separate from instrumental value (not substitutable) and are embedded in ethical frameworks (26), history, lived experiences, place-based identities, Indigenous ontologies, and collective responsibilities (25, 27–29). Alongside relational value framings, environmental and water justice perspectives are becoming more prominent, highlighting how disparities in water distribution, processes, and recognition shape how water is considered as well as who and what are prioritized (5, 30). Without such thinking and approaches, water governance cannot deliver water for all.

2.2. Monetary Valuation of Water

The 1989 *Exxon Valdez* oil spill prompted the US National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to convene a blue-ribbon panel that provided guidelines about the practice of stated preference approaches (31). The stated preference literature investigates preferences for hypothetical changes in water access and/or environmental quality. A different body of research examines valuation using revealed preference methods, including averting behavior, and methods employed in damage assessment (32). Valuation methods include the public's willingness to pay to repair or avoid environmental damages (33). Damage estimates can also be framed as willingness to accept a certain payment to compensate for a reduction in utility from a given change, relative to the status quo (34). For example, a landmark study of the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico quantified the injuries to natural assets at US\$17.2 billion (35).

Key recent developments in water valuation include a focus on ensuring clean water access for human well-being. This includes a study of the preferences of Australian residents for a program to improve drinking water quality for up to 260,000 Australians in remote communities (36). This study found a willingness to pay of AU\$5.4 to 33.2 billion for better water quality over 10 years by the entire Australian population, highlighting strong public support for mitigating inequities in safe drinking water access among underprivileged and historically underserved communities. A different Australian study estimated that households would be willing to pay an aggregate of AU\$74.5 million for a modest (5%) reallocation of irrigation water to Aboriginal communities for environmental, cultural, and agribusiness purposes in the Murray–Darling Basin (37). Yet another study (38) estimated that more than three-quarters of households in the United States would be willing to pay upward of US\$22 per household to finance a water pipeline that would allow the Hopi Tribe to maintain their traditional culture and way of life. A positive willingness to pay for improved water services for the disadvantaged has also been estimated in Bangladesh (39), among other countries.

Valuation studies increasingly account for characteristics of service provision, especially aspects related to the reliability and performance of water delivery systems (40). These studies have found that residents in Canada would be willing to pay from CA\$46 to 71 annually to halve their risk of short-term water outages (41). In Guatemala, a study estimated (42) that rental prices decreased by 0.7% with every day of water supply interruption, while home units equipped with water storage infrastructure attracted a 10% higher rental price. Other hedonic price studies have found positive associations between real estate prices and quality of and access to freshwater bodies and aquifers (43–45).

In addition to drinking water access, water valuation is applied to water changes in the natural environment (e.g., rivers or lakes) for nonconsumptive purposes—recreation, cultural practices, or support for water-dependent ecosystems (46). As an example, the value of ecosystem services in the Yellow River Basin, China, was assessed to be approximately US\$266 billion in 2020, and an estimated US\$18 billion in ecological compensation could be allocated to upstream areas with high ecological values but lower economic capacity (47). In Jakarta, Indonesia, a study valued urban riparian (green) corridors for a river by using multiple approaches, including stated preference methods (48). This study found that low-income residents valued river services that were at risk of being lost from proposed policy changes around restricted access to green corridors.

Valuation studies can help identify public priorities for specific water body improvements. A recent study from Aotearoa New Zealand (49) used a choice experiment to assess preferences for improvements in nutrient levels, clarity, and bacterial contamination of river waters. This study found an overall value of NZ\$115 million annually for a national policy delivering moderate improvements in river water quality. Similarly, at a local scale, residents of Melbourne, Australia, were willing to pay up to AU\$37 million for a 10% reduction in the number of urban waterways in poor ecological and amenity conditions (50). In the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency supported a substantial body of research to estimate the benefits of the Clean Water Act. This research valued improved water quality using multiple methods, especially stated preference methods and benefit transfer approaches (51).

Estimation of losses and damages is crucial to support effective responses to floods, droughts, or infrastructure failures and to evaluate the value of adaptation strategies—such as insurance schemes—to reduce vulnerability and build resilience (52, 53). One study (54) found that wetland losses significantly increased property damages from flooding and a rise in claims to the US National Flood Insurance Program. The authors estimated the cost to society from 1 ha of lost wetland at US\$1,840 on average and up to US\$8,000 in high-density areas. Such assessments are important in the context of climate change and environmental degradation, including in cases

where long-term damages are incurred by future generations (55). Without them, water governance risks being short term, economically unviable, insufficiently risk focused, and inequitable because the least advantaged people are not prioritized.

2.3. Water Accounting

Growing interest in water and NCA reflects a recognition that sustainability, in part, requires an understanding of the links between environmental change and the market economy (56). Such links are formalized in the System of Environmental Economic Accounting–Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA-EA) framework, which provides standardized guidelines to connect environmental assets and services with economic activities (57). Many SEEA-EA applications involve water accounts. Water accounting, which seeks to represent the stocks and flows of water within and between the hydrological system and the economy (56), highlights the dependencies of economic activities on ecosystems (58).

The concept of water accounting was advanced in a study (59) that demonstrated how sustainable use of groundwater resources can increase the long-term wealth of a region through increased agricultural productivity. Building on this research, data from Panama were used to examine the complementarity between natural and produced capital, challenging the long-standing notion that the various forms of capital are substitutes for one another (60).

Water accounting is not without challenges, such as standardization of measures, and it suffers from limited integration of NCA into policy and decision-making (61). A practical limitation of water accounting lies in its handling of nonmarket values (56). Nevertheless, a proposed set of indicators has been developed to represent the spiritual and relational values that First Nations peoples associate with land and water (62)—values that cannot be integrated into standard national accounts but can be used alongside them.

Recent advances have sought to bridge the gap between accounting and valuation to support more robust water accounting (63). One study (64) used the zonal travel cost method to estimate the monetary value of nature-based recreation by linking potential visits to high-quality recreational areas with travel costs. Given that travel costs are observable, they can be used as a proxy for the exchange value of recreation and then be included in SEEA-EA tables of monetary flows as a replacement cost approach based on actual costs. New approaches show that stated preference techniques can be used to provide simulated exchange values (65). In summary, while water accounting and valuation serve different purposes, both offer practical ways to value water (66) and are critical to decision-making that supports systems thinking.

3. UNDERSTANDING SYSTEMS AND RESPONDING TO RISKS

Water resource systems, including stormwater management, flood protection, and water security measures, are connected components of surrounding complex systems, such as the biosphere, society, economy, climate, and geopolitics. Climate change and population growth are increasing the complexity of multiscale interactions and feedbacks between water resources and surrounding systems (67).

Key recent contributions to systems thinking highlight both the challenges and opportunities hitherto hidden by mainstream and, typically, siloed thinking. At their best, systems thinking and methods explicitly consider the cumulative spatial and temporal effects of current and alternative policy pathways. In this context, top-down and mean-focused analyses frequently misinform (68), while generalized, rather than fit-for-purpose, assessments constrain what is considered important and what may be excluded, thereby jeopardizing the effectiveness of proposed solutions (67). For instance, heuristic- and short-term-focused responses to flooding or droughts—based on

long-term historical experiences or data—may result in ineffective and less-than-robust adaptation to dynamic and system-wide changes (68).

Crucial risks that have been identified for water include governance challenges, hydro-political tensions, socioeconomic inequalities, and climatic changes, all of which can affect billions of people. One risk that needs effective mitigation is the decline in terrestrial water storage in multiple and important food-producing regions due to overextraction and, increasingly, climate change (69). This decline is expected to increase both the frequency and severity of water stress episodes (70). Another key risk is the intensification of extreme precipitation and floods within the seasonal cycle of water availability (71). Without understanding these risks and the embedding of systems thinking within water governance, there will be inadequate and/or inappropriate adaptation at multiple scales.

Global water demand continues to rise, driven primarily by agriculture and industrial consumption despite significant regional variations. Irrigated agricultural land has been expanding by nearly 1% each year, much of it in already water-stressed countries such as India and China, intensifying unsustainable freshwater use and food security risks (72). Increases in urban water demand are projected to result in more than a quarter of the world's major cities confronting water deficits, including so-called day zero events when water becomes severely rationed and/or unavailable from conventional sources, with hot spots in the Mediterranean, southern Africa, and western North America (73). Human interventions—including some land-use changes—can alleviate scarcity in particular upstream areas but potentially at the expense of exacerbating water shortages downstream (74). Overall, current trends, including the increasing use of water for cooling (e.g., in AI data centers), underscore the growing pressures on water systems (75) and the importance of regionally and community-tailored strategies to balance competing water demands.

3.1. Increasing Risks: Scarcity, Extreme Quantity, and Poor Quality

High-resolution monthly analyses have revealed that nearly two-thirds of the world's population—half located in China and India—experience severe water scarcity for at least 1 month each year, while approximately half a billion people face such scarcity year-round (76). Global water demand is increasing (77), and projections from multiple climate models suggest that by 2050 between 0.5 and 3.1 billion people could be newly exposed to water scarcity due to climate change, with uncertainties especially pronounced in South and East Asia (78). Probabilistic analyses also indicate that both the median severity of water scarcity and the range of uncertainty are increasing globally, posing serious threats to biodiversity, food security, and human well-being (79).

Changes in atmospheric moisture fluxes amplify both wet and dry events, intensifying precipitation extremes and increasing the risk of short-term water quantity crises (80). Drought, understood in mainstream thinking as primarily a deficit in precipitation, soil moisture, or water storage, must now be conceptualized as a multidimensional process embedded within coupled human–water systems (81). Heterodox Thinking on anthropogenic droughts emphasizes the interplay of natural variability, climate change, and water extraction on water management outcomes (82).

Earth system model simulations suggest that extreme droughts, more than mild or moderate events, will increasingly disrupt global vegetation productivity and the carbon cycle, with projections indicating a tripling of drought-related impacts on gross primary production by the late twenty-first century compared with historical baselines (83). Similarly, declines in terrestrial water storage will increase the land area and population exposed to exceptional drought conditions. These projections underscore the urgent need for a radical reassessment of climate change mitigation and the critical importance of adaptive water management (70).

Common responses to poor water quality events include substitution with alternative water sources, but that increases the risk of chemical and microbiological contamination (84). Water quality risks, however, are no longer limited to traditional pollutants but are increasingly attributed to modern pharmaceutical and lifestyle compounds. Fertilizers, pesticides, pharmaceutical residues, and industrial by-products have degraded water quality in many places (85) and are increasingly a global-scale concern. Contaminants, such as endocrine-disrupting chemicals like PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) (86) and microplastics, create new uncertainties and challenges whose associated health risks are only now emerging (87). These risks highlight the importance of whole-of-system approaches to water supply services.

3.2. Responding to Water Security Risks

Growing pressures from climate change, rapid urbanization, and environmental degradation are intensifying risks to water security, defined here as humans' need for sustainable and safe access to water to achieve their full potential. Thus, climate-smart and adaptive strategies are essential for ensuring safe and reliable drinking water. A review of more than 9,000 studies highlights that water security and resilience must be central to policy and practice (88). Adaptive measures—including stormwater management, wastewater reuse, water pricing, and public awareness campaigns—offer context-specific pathways to improve water management, augment supplies, and reduce demand. Wastewater reuse, including in agriculture (89) and when embedded within a circular economy, may expand the life cycle of water use and enhance water availability but needs strengthening with effective regulatory frameworks (90).

Heterodox Thinking about adaptation measures and further investments shows that risk rankings and the use of simple, purely financially motivated cost–benefit ratios across alternatives are inappropriate, by themselves, in an uncertain and dynamic world. Contrary to mainstream thinking, what matters is the mitigation of risks and increasing benefits from additional investments as well as who benefits, or who bears the costs—not a purely financial, static ranking of options based on the greatest bang for the buck (91).

Integrated, climate-smart approaches include multihazard frameworks and consider the interactions between different types of risks (e.g., integrating flood and disaster risks). They can support resilience and sustainable development while safeguarding public health and limiting the effects of climate change and water-related risks (92). Nature-based solutions (NbS)—also known as green infrastructure (e.g., wetlands, forests, and aquifers used for managed recharge)—complement and possibly substitute for gray infrastructure (e.g., levees) for flood risk management. For example, coastal wetlands, if given sufficient accommodation space and sediment supply, can mitigate some of the consequences of sea-level rise and safeguard ecosystem services (93). At their best, NbS foster synergies between nature, society, and the economy; support greener urban development; and enhance resilience (94, 95).

Effective management of irrigation water is essential to respond to water risks because this sector accounts for approximately 70% of global freshwater withdrawals (77). Increased irrigation efficiency is often promoted as a solution, yet a compilation of evidence from multiple studies (96) shows that higher efficiency rarely reduces overall water use unless it is paired with basin-scale water accounting, caps on extractions, and robust monitoring of irrigators' behavior (97). Without additional measures, water-use efficiency gains can, paradoxically, result in greater water consumption as return flows decline when beneficial crop transpiration increases. They may even cause rebound effects from substitution to more water-intensive crops as well as an increase in the irrigated areas (98) that can damage downstream communities and nonhuman entities.

By incorporating regulation, pricing mechanisms, and conservation measures alongside efficiency improvements, decision-makers can help ensure that limited freshwater resources are used

more productively, reallocated to urban and environmental needs, and managed in ways that enhance resilience to droughts and climate variability (99). Ultimately, integrated management approaches that recognize trade-offs, assess uncertainties, and account for irrigators' incentives are critical for mitigating water scarcity while seeking stable and profitable agricultural production systems (100).

While infrastructure (gray and green) investment is important for dealing with increased water risks, effectively responding to these challenges requires governance reform. Demand management through conservation, compliance, pricing, and behavioral change is essential to complement supply-side measures, and in many regions, formal and informal water markets can play a useful role (101). While some cities lack basic water and wastewater services and others have well-developed infrastructure with potable water and universal access, all require long-term, integrated planning and cooperative learning systems that strengthen governance (102) and raise public awareness. Ultimately, reframing urban water governance to emphasize both demand-side efficiency and supply-side resilience is critical to safeguarding freshwater, reducing environmental costs, and enhancing cities' adaptive capacity.

Responding to water risks must go well beyond prices and markets to include local-, regional-, and basin-level caps on water consumption, compliance enforcement, equitable allocation mechanisms for shared freshwater resources, and technological innovations (103). In this context, the reframing of water as a primarily financial risk is problematic because it reduces consideration of benefits from risk mitigation to prioritize quantitative monetary measures, especially return on investment. By contrast, Heterodox Thinking highlights the benefits of multiple approaches, including experiential knowledge, to inform a comprehensive consideration of risks across multiple communities of knowledge (104). In the infrastructure that supports water markets in many countries, further beneficial innovations, if supported by effective regulatory frameworks, may include forward and option contracts, online trading platforms, and blockchain development to track water trade (103).

Remote sensing has already transformed the monitoring of evapotranspiration, a critical component of the water cycle, enabling large-scale, cost-effective estimations of water use and consumption. Advances in data fusion, assimilation, and multisensor integration are further refining accuracy and reducing uncertainties (105). Global- and continental-scale flood forecasting has progressed through the coupling of meteorological and hydrological models, enhanced by ensemble prediction systems and early-warning soil moisture monitoring. When integrated into cloud-based platforms like Google Earth Engine, these innovations can provide cost-effective detection of soil moisture and improve the forecasting of hydrological risks (106). In summary, while mainstream approaches have helped mitigate specific risks, cumulative and systemic risks are increasing, especially for the poor and already disadvantaged, and addressing these issues requires Heterodox Thinking.

4. CONNECTING INFRASTRUCTURES TO SOCIOECONOMIC OUTCOMES

Debates around the value of gray (built) water infrastructure frequently focus on financing gaps. International agencies and financiers have developed estimates of this gap; the World Water Council and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (107) suggest that the financing needs of water-related infrastructure globally could reach US\$6.7 trillion by 2030 and US\$22.6 trillion by 2050. Yet a surprising proportion of allocated funds go unspent (108).

While financial gap analysis contributes to awareness of water-related challenges, it frames the value of infrastructure as a question of providing inputs (e.g., investment) to deliver outputs

(e.g., irrigation canals, water treatment plants). Such framing, however, misses the multiple outcomes that are enabled when infrastructure choices and investments are informed by Heterodox Thinking around water values (109).

4.1. Different Approaches

Water infrastructure has traditionally been viewed as consisting of built solutions—dams, pipelines, and other infrastructure systems to store, desalinate, clean, or distribute water. The last decade has witnessed a substantial increase in interest around NbS (110), which has encouraged stakeholders to broaden their view of water infrastructure, its benefits, and, therefore, its value.

Heterodox Thinking highlights the multiple freshwater ecosystem services that green infrastructure provides for water. An increasing number of economic studies have estimated the economic benefits of, and willingness to pay for, green/natural water infrastructure projects and NbS (e.g., 111–115).

Notwithstanding championed projects and programs, the enthusiasm of environmental organizations, multilateral development banks, and academics for NbS, natural/green infrastructure has not yet led to a commensurate increase in, for example, waterway naturalization and catchment rehabilitation globally. This may be explained by the characteristics of NbS: the diffuse, long-term, and public nature of benefits; missing markets and lack of economic valuation; knowledge gaps; governance challenges; and unequal power relations (9, 95). There are also important unanswered questions regarding the performance of NbS under increasing extreme climatic conditions (116).

Options for new gray and green water infrastructure emphasize funding innovations (117). The most feasible, lower-cost options, however, involve adapting and/or reinvesting in existing water infrastructure by readapting to meet evolving needs and climate challenges (118). These options include (a) reoperating to generate new benefits or meet new demands, adapt to climate change, or respond to hydro-ecological shocks; (b) rehabilitating to meet new, or to retain, desired water service requirements and reduce resource consumption; and (c) retrofitting to enable new uses of facilities or utilization of new technologies (e.g., wastewater treatment). Valuation of existing assets can also lead to their removal. While there is growing interest in removal of water infrastructure, notably dams, there is limited evidence to date on the social, environmental, and economic outcomes arising from such decisions (119).

Insufficient attention to the potential value of infrastructure upgrades or operational adjustments includes a failure to adequately consider the broader hydrological and ecological systems to which large water infrastructure projects are connected. This is surprising given the persistent popularity of approaches like Integrated Water Resources Management and nexus thinking. More importantly, a lack of systems thinking poses serious risks to water security, where investments in water-use efficiency or new water supply do not account for rebound effects (97, 98) in water demand, and where they lead to increased vulnerability from concentrating demands on a single water source (67, 120, 121).

4.2. Appraisal Frameworks to Value Water Infrastructure

Approaches connecting infrastructure to a broad range of socioeconomic outcomes have evolved in the last decade. From a focus on least-cost, single-objective planning of water infrastructure, improved analytical approaches include Heterodox Thinking on quantifying costs and benefits to different water users of alternative infrastructure options, and the robustness of infrastructure investments, under alternative scenarios (122). Over the past decade, water infrastructure evaluations have evolved to better encompass equity and ecological outcomes and to apply nonmarket valuation methods.

A focus on the disadvantaged in terms of access and affordability of water is increasingly being included in water system planning models—and is important for water infrastructure planning (123), as is ensuring free, prior, and informed consent—but is too often ignored with top-down decision-making. For example, a study (124) designed a water resource system model that fused information on the water infrastructure in Santa Cruz, California, with behavioral and regulatory features. This model has been used to assess the impacts of tariff rate design on household water affordability (124).

Ecological outcomes and services are increasingly being incorporated into a range of quantitative models. For instance, a new decision framework, called eco-engineering decision scaling, compares outcomes across traditional water infrastructure performance metrics (e.g., water supply reliability) and ecological outcomes (e.g., flow recession rates) under uncertainty (125). This practical approach connects infrastructure performance to broader societal outcomes.

A study (126) has shown how framing water management problems can impede decision-makers' capacity to evaluate trade-offs between environmental outcomes and economic benefits. The authors highlight the benefit of a multiple-objective robust optimization framework that allows for improved identification of trade-offs under uncertainty. Another study has developed computational frameworks to inform infrastructure selection under climate change (127) and deliver adaptive environmental flows—a form of green infrastructure investment—to prepare for and manage multiyear periods of water stress.

Standard valuation methods applied to water infrastructure valuation (e.g., stated and revealed preference) (111) are increasingly accompanied by qualitative and narrative evidence on the relationship between humans—from the individual to the collective—and water. For example, Heterodox Thinking includes the use of water diaries (128), while experiential water insecurity scales (129) are being used in decision-making about water infrastructure investments (130). In summary, multiple approaches and Heterodox Thinking are required to ensure that investments in infrastructure (gray and green), both new and existing, appropriately meet the needs of the disadvantaged, effectively mitigate risks, and are fit for place and purpose.

5. PROMOTING JUSTICE AND WELL-BEING

Justice is a multidimensional concept that has evolved across cultural, historical, and institutional contexts. It concerns who gets water and who does not (e.g., distributive and redistributive justice) (131, 132) and who gets to participate in decisions and how (e.g., procedural and representation justice) (133, 134). It encompasses how past harms—particularly colonial and racialized exclusions—are acknowledged and responded to (e.g., recognition and restorative justice) (135, 136). Justice must also consider whose knowledge matters, how knowledge is included in water governance (e.g., epistemic and relational justice) (29, 137), and who is recognized (138).

Well-being is much more than a measure of absolute living standards. It depends on measures of relative affluence, material sufficiency (139), and what opportunities are available to the disadvantaged. Well-being also includes dignity, health, cultural integrity, and ecological viability for both human and nonhuman communities (29, 140, 141). These conceptions challenge mainstream thinking that typically has not used broad-based measures of well-being for water-related decision-making (136).

Justice and well-being are not abstract ideals but practical imperatives that shape how water is accessed, managed, and valued to position People and Place as key feasible priorities for water governance at scale. Three interrelated areas affect how justice and well-being are operationalized: (a) efficiency–equity trade-offs in resource allocation; (b) how social norms influence water-related practices; and (c) the existence, or not, of just and inclusive decision-making that respects and draws from diverse knowledge systems and effectively responds to historical exclusions.

5.1. Efficiency–Equity Trade-Offs in Resource Allocation

Efficiency is too often misconstrued as a neutral or apolitical principle. It is neither. Actions intended to optimize resource use—such as water markets and conservation pricing—can inadvertently deepen inequality when equity is not structurally embedded in the regulatory design; this oversight undermines the social license of these market and pricing tools. Equity, the operational logic of justice matters in decision-making valuation frameworks, requires evaluating what happens to whom, who benefits, and who loses from any decision. To illustrate, in many countries, formal and informal water markets play important roles in sharing water, increasing productivity and efficiency, aiding climate adaptation, and increasing access to water. Nevertheless, to deliver improved economic benefits, formal water markets require sophisticated governance structures and many preconditions to achieve societal goals. Consequently, without proper oversight, they may fail to achieve economic efficiency goals while also compromising equity or environmental sustainability (142).

Conservation pricing introduces another layer of complexity, especially when not implemented with lump-sum subsidies, progressive rebates, or a free basic water allowance to disadvantaged and impoverished stakeholders (103). That is, higher water prices reduce demand but, if not properly implemented, can easily reduce the well-being of the least well-off. For example, higher volumetric water tariffs have imposed a disproportionately greater burden on lower-income households and communities of color in Las Vegas, Nevada (143). In Barcelona, Spain, demand reduction policies curbed water use the most among the poorest households (144). This is not an argument against pricing water, but it highlights the necessity of water pricing that accounts for inequalities and mitigates social injustice (e.g., free basic water allowance, cross-subsidization, and/or concessions for low-income households).

Technological solutions to resolve water access are also not neutral in terms of supporting equitable outcomes for well-being. For instance, some technologies (e.g., solar-powered ground-water pumps), when embedded in unequal sociopolitical systems and without a systems perspective of land, water, and energy uses, risk discriminating against the impoverished and reinforcing structural inequalities (145).

5.2. Cultural Drivers of Just, Inclusive Decision-Making

Justice in water governance emerges not only through legal frameworks or policy instruments but also through culturally embedded logics of reciprocity, proportionality, and collective responsibility. In Italy, for example, Catholic engagement in social activism against privatization of water services reframes water as a moral right and a public good (141). In Namibia, proportional fairness became a legitimate basis for cost sharing, but only when supported by state institutions—revealing how moral norms and formal authority can support and coproduce legitimacy (146).

Multiple studies have emphasized that communities play an active role in maintaining justice by shaping water governance through moral economies—shared norms, expectations, and informal sanctions that regulate behaviors and influence how water is valued and accessed (141, 147). Such norms function both independently and in conjunction with established legal frameworks. They can be especially important where governmental systems are inconsistent or lack effectiveness.

Just, inclusive decision-making, including dialogues (148), allows for relational and negotiated processes that center equity, legitimacy, and plural worldviews. It can reveal how water governance needs to be redesigned to accommodate distributive outcomes and promote deliberative justice (136). An example from China suggests that equitable water allocation need not compromise future economic performance (149).

Similarly, equity-weighted approaches to tourism and conservation might reconfigure spatial priorities, mitigating the exclusion of rural and ecologically sensitive communities from water-intensive development (150). Furthermore, cooperative game theory can align with social justice principles to support cost-sharing mechanisms with stakeholder perceptions of fairness, such as with river basin adaptation planning (151). Such models show that justice and negotiated fairness are not only external constraints on efficiency but also necessary conditions for its legitimacy.

Heterodox Thinking emphasizes that dialogue and ontological pluralism are not procedural add-ons for governance but rather transformative practices. Relational ethics also offer prescriptive values for water justice grounded in humility, reciprocity, and respect (135). Embedding diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice into water dialogues requires spaces where marginalized voices shape decisions (148, 152), which can be nested into multiple levels of water governance, including within urban centers and at regional and national scales. In summary, to incorporate justice into water decision-making, decision-makers need to hold multiple understandings of water—as resource, relative, or sacred being—especially in settler colonial contexts (137) and where there is long-standing exclusion or discrimination against some groups.

6. RETHINKING RELATIONALITY

Heterodox Thinking on relationality asks what forms of human and nonhuman flourishing water governance should enable institutions to maintain “living” relationships over time. The relationality literature provides practical design guidance and seeks to pluralize law and knowledge and frame decision-making in terms of People (e.g., who has voice and power and who does not), Place (e.g., locally informed and justice-based decision-making), and Planet (e.g., interconnections, nonhuman considerations, and systemic risks).

6.1. Motivation: Should We Adopt Relational Thinking?

Worldviews that situate humans as separate from the world around them (e.g., economic growth as the policy priority) have undoubtedly contributed to improvements in average living standards. Yet they have also contributed to unsustainable trajectories (153). Heterodox Thinking, including water ecological economics perspectives grounded in complex coupled systems (5), seeks to conceptualize humans and nature as fundamentally interconnected, prioritizing multispecies-ecosystem justice (154) and operationalizing more just and sustainable outcomes.

Heterodox Thinking on relationality does not denote a singular framework but rather signals a broader intellectual shift spanning multiple disciplines. At its core, this shift reconceives objects, such as humans, waters, trees, and rocks, not as fixed substances or entities but as temporary events within ongoing flows of dynamic relationships that encompass what are conventionally distinguished as human and natural dimensions (155). That is, Heterodox Thinking on relationality inverts substantialist assumptions common in systems approaches: Entities do not precede relations but rather emerge through them (156).

Relationality literature draws from several overlapping traditions. An increasing body of evidence documents that the environmental ethical frameworks of Indigenous Peoples are critical to maintaining and restoring ecosystems. These ethical frameworks are grounded in a “relational accountability through the basis of four core relational values prominent across numerous cultural contexts: integrity, respect, humility and reciprocity” (26). Here, integrity refers to honoring Indigenous laws and ethics related to stewarding ecosystems across the spectrum of relationships. Respect involves a commitment to the health and well-being of those relationships—past, present, and future. Humility is rooted in an ontology where human welfare is not superior to that of

others. Reciprocity is an ethic of putting back what one takes out so as to ensure intergenerational sustainability for human and nonhuman communities.

Indigenous relational ontologies have long articulated water as kin, relative, or being. Relationality includes mutual caretaking among people through access to safe, sufficient, and culturally meaningful water (157) as well as reciprocity with land, waters, and all living beings, codified in governance norms, legal concepts, and ceremonies (158). Feminist and posthumanist scholars emphasize how water flows across and destabilizes boundaries (body/environment, human/nonhuman, material/spiritual). They highlight that water is not merely a substrate but a connective medium through which multispecies life is constituted (159).

Hydro-social scholarship advances the view that water is made and remade with infrastructures, laws, and power relations that affect who gets water, when, and where (160, 161, 162). Decolonial aspects of this literature insist that water governance must be responsive to place-specific ecologies and to Indigenous sovereignties, ontologies, and rights. As with multispecies justice claims, these approaches frequently collide with resource-extractive imperatives (163).

6.2. Operationalization: How Might Relational Thinking Be Put into Practice?

In Canada, the Anishinaabe *nibi inaakonigewin* asserts jurisdiction over water that goes far beyond colonial legal structures to revitalize ceremonial relationships, even as state recognition and resources remain limited (164). Colombia's Constitutional Court recognized the Atrato River as a rights-bearing entity and mandated cogovernance with Indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities complemented by a comprehensive restoration of the river. Nevertheless, implementation has been uneven, extractive industries persist, and river defenders face ongoing threats from nonstate actors (165). Furthermore, and in general, many current practices risk creating only a symbolic recognition of relationality in the absence of more distributed power governance (166).

Broader syntheses (167) suggest that more relational governance could be legally, socially, and ecologically transformative. That is, relational governance must be meaningfully implemented, resourced, and empowered if it is to reshape power and practices. While legal reform is vital, it is insufficient, by itself, to deliver relational governance. Statutory changes are often undercut when they are not embedded in supportive sociopolitical and institutional contexts (168). Operationalizing relationality, thus, requires aligning epistemologies, institutions, and power with relational values in four ways.

First, ontological and epistemological shifts are necessary (169). Governance arrangements that recognize multiple ontologies must value stories, oral histories, land-based knowledge, and ceremonies alongside dominant science. That involves much more than including local voices; it is about reshaping hierarchies of evidence and remaking what counts as authoritative knowledge in decision-making. Recent reviews highlight a growing discourse of water relationality that runs counter to, and may conflict with, rights-based and market-based framings (167). In practice, this can mean seating knowledge keepers and ceremonial authorities within decision fora, and treating practices, such as water walks, offerings, or seasonal rites, as legally and institutionally meaningful forms of governance (170).

Second, transforming governance means redesigning the institutions through which water is governed. Recent research on hydro-social territories underscores that authority over waterscapes is always claimed and contested; institutional design should, therefore, anticipate and respond to these contestations rather than depoliticize them (171). Moving from centralized decision-making to include local-based and expert-based actors, possibly within watershed councils and community guardianship, helps ground decision-making in place and relation within both rural and urban communities. Such relational bodies would include Elders, women, youth,

and knowledge keepers in decision-making roles and could promote more-than-human interests through appointed guardians. Emerging policy instruments and initiatives include cultural flow allocations as well as guardianship networks (e.g., the recently launched River Guardian Network across the Thames catchment in the United Kingdom) that provide the opportunity for relational governance to be implemented at a national scale. Furthermore, relational monitoring protocols tied to ceremony and seasonal indicators (172) as well as public-facing decision support tools enable communities to directly engage with dominant scientific model outputs (173).

Third, legal and institutional pluralism must entail a redistribution of powers and resources. Legal personhood for rivers or lakes can be an entry point, but without power sharing and enforcement powers it risks remaining symbolic. Recent comparative analyses document both opportunities and pitfalls: Where guardianship bodies have resources, clear mandates, and accountability to local communities, personhood provisions can recalibrate power and bolster restoration; where they do not, they can stall or be co-opted (174).

Fourth, in an increasingly urbanized world, scaling relational water governance to complex and urban settings is both possible and necessary. Urban design is being reconceptualized as a constellation of small-scale practices that catalyze socioecological processes that advance a just transition from extractive to regenerative economies, promoting the Rights of Nature. One example is the rapidly urbanizing territory of Chiang Mai, Thailand, where forest remnants, traditional villages, and emerging subdivisions coexist within a landscape mosaic structured around river-fed weirs, canals, and rice paddies (175). Crucially, and in general, water governance reform can do much more than add relationality to existing architectures; what is required is reconstituting governance structures around care, reciprocity, and place-based responsibility.

6.3. Reflection: Challenges and Possibilities of Relational Approaches

Relational approaches face large impediments in implementation. First, resistance from state and corporate actors can be very difficult to overcome, because relational governance unsettles entrenched political economies of extraction, decision-making, and infrastructure. Even where courts or legislatures adopt relational instruments, implementation frequently lags and struggles to align ministries, budgets, and enforcement with newly recognized obligations (165, 174). Second, tokenism emerges when symbolic recognition proceeds without a supportive institutional framework, which includes a redistribution of authority and resources. Personhood provisions that lack guardianship budgets, monitoring powers, or community accountability can entrench the status quo under the guise of innovation. Third, co-optation threatens nondominant knowledge systems and governance forms when they are translated into state categories without respect for sovereignty and self-determination. Recent syntheses caution that relational discourses can be mobilized rhetorically while decision-making remains technocratic and growth-oriented (167, 171).

Against these challenges, Heterodox Thinking shows that transformative change is possible. Empirical studies indicate that relational designs can help navigate nested conflicts by institutionalizing practices that maintain relationships amid disagreement (176). Climate–water scholarship demonstrates that relational, spatial, and political lenses produce more just and workable interventions than biophysically isolated fixes (162). Reviews of sustainability and environmental governance document a steady shift toward pluralist, place-based, and justice-centered paradigms, especially where Indigenous governance is upheld (172, 177). The jurisprudence and policy experimentation around the Rights of Nature and legal personhood for rivers highlight the importance of pairing legal recognition with guardianship bodies that have decision-making authority and restoration mandates (174).

The broader implication of Heterodox Thinking is that relational thinking is neither a new concept nor a buzzword. Rather, relationality is a coherent call for reorientation of water governance: from allocation to obligation, from efficiency to reciprocity, and from abstract universals to situated, place-based responsibilities. To this end, relational water governance must be led by communities, adequately resourced, and enabled to reshape power relations. To effect the required changes, as reviewed in Heterodox Thinking and especially in terms of relationality, the practices of high-level decision-making must change. Practical design guidance for such transformational change includes employing plural forms of law and knowledge, basing decision-making in place and relation, allocating resources to nature guardianship and restoration, and measuring success in terms of ecological-cultural integrity and distributional justice.

In summary, we contend that when and where these elements align, relational approaches can produce legally robust, socially legitimate, and ecologically (re)generative responses to the world's many local water crises. When and where they do not, relationality risks becoming a label for business as usual.

7. CONCLUSIONS

SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) provides priorities for actions and measures to assess whether or not targets are being achieved. While substantial progress has been made since 2015, none of the key SDG 6 targets will be close to being delivered by 2030, in part because of the scale of the challenges. We contend that additional key impediments are misplaced diagnoses, policies, and priorities that arise from inadequate attention to an emerging literature and heterodox evidence and frameworks about how to respond to the many local water crises.

Our review characterizes Heterodox Thinking in water economics, values, and governance by the Three Ps: People (e.g., who has voice and power and who does not), Place (e.g., locally informed and justice-based decision-making), and Planet (e.g., relationality and strengthening of global interconnections between People and Place in ways that integrate nonhuman considerations, systems thinking, and systemic risks). By contrast, more dominant policies and practices on water tend to prioritize single-issue and highly targeted interventions with quantifiable metrics and/or key performance indicators; promote water-use efficiency and pricing as the primary instruments to resolve water insecurity; and spotlight the mobilization of funds, such as through public-private partnerships, to invest in new gray infrastructure.

Both Heterodox Thinking and mainstream approaches can contribute (and have contributed) to positive water outcomes. Nevertheless, deficiencies in much current decision-making are impeding more effective, equitable, and sustainable responses to the world's many water crises. These deficiencies, in the extreme, include a focus on financial returns while either ignoring or deprioritizing social, environmental, and relational values that, typically, have the biggest impact on the well-being of the most disadvantaged; a framing of *the* global water crisis that fails to recognize that water insecurities are experienced primarily at the local scale and are determined principally by local drivers and conditions; a priority focus on building gray infrastructure that obscures the important interconnections across existing (gray and green) infrastructures that need to be fit for purpose, people, and place; single-goal missions that frequently fail to deliver systems solutions to systemic problems; and top-down governance that either misses or undervalues the insights and knowledge of local communities and ignores the power imbalances around who gets what water, when, how, and why.

A better water future informed by Heterodox Thinking includes both “do” and “do not” actions. An immediate change, at multiple scales, would be for decision-makers to not ignore the power dynamics over who gets what water, when, and why; use risk methods inappropriate for

complex, dynamic systems; prioritize top-down approaches of decision-making and evaluation at the expense of considerations and practical responses to water injustices; highlight efficiency at the expense of basic human rights and needs; give inadequate support for bottom-up decision-making; and deprioritize nonmarket value and the well-being of nonhumans. Heterodox Thinking would embed within water decision-making and governance actions to integrate systems thinking (e.g., elements, functions, interconnections) with planning that adapts to actual and projected changes; measure cultural, spiritual, nonmaterial, and shared values and triangulate across methods; consider who bears the risks and evaluate systemic and cumulative risks; integrate relational values (e.g., integrity, respect, humility, reciprocity) into decision-making and adopt places, people, and relations thinking; adopt inclusive decision-making processes (e.g., dialogues, deliberative processes); identify injustices (e.g., distributive, procedural, epistemic, restorative) and prioritize remedies to the disadvantaged and disempowered; and integrate local-scale and place-based knowledge, experiences, and priorities within existing or improved decision-making processes.

Heterodox Thinking in water economics, values, and governance that has emerged over the past decade offers an alternative vision and practices to business-as-usual decision-making. In our view, decision-making informed by Heterodox Thinking is essential if the world is to develop the sustainable and effective responses needed to overcome the systemic problems of “too much, too little and too dirty” (6) water.

SUMMARY POINTS

1. Global water crises of “too much, too little and too dirty” water are, essentially, local and require place- and context-based responses.
2. Mainstream priorities and solutions for water insecurity need to go beyond prices and markets, efficiency, and mobilization of finance to fully encompass considerations of People, Place, and Planet.
3. Multiple emerging and/or too often neglected or ignored approaches and methods are available to value water, identify injustices, understand power relationships and analyses, and mitigate risks.
4. On-the-ground evidence and Heterodox Thinking across multiple disciplines and knowledge, especially in the humanities and social sciences, offer justice-based and more equitable and sustainable solutions to the world’s many local water crises.

FUTURE ISSUES

1. Integration of standard methods of analysis with justice, place-based, and relational approaches supports more equitable and sustainable outcomes for water and people.
2. Relational thinking promotes the delivery of clean water and sanitation for all and, if it is to be implemented effectively, will need to be embedded within decision-making, especially around infrastructure, mitigation of risks, and remedies for injustices.
3. Systematic bottom-up and top-down collection and sharing of data, results and analyses, and sense-making, including lived experiences, are needed to better understand existing and emerging water risks as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of current and alternative responses to local water crises.

4. Valuing and respecting community, traditional, and ecological knowledge create opportunities to improve decision-making processes and to promote more equitable and sustainable outcomes for humans within nature.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

R.Q.G. conceived of the review. R.Q.G., E.B., L.C., P.C., S.F., D.H.M., P.K., S.L., A.M., W.N., J.S., S.W., and P.W. were the lead coauthors of key sections of the review (alphabetical by last name after the first author). R.Q.G., E.B., L.C., P.C., S.F., D.H.M., P.K., S.L., A.M., W.N., J.S., S.W., P.W., W.A., S.A., A.B., R.B., L.D., J.H., T.K., L.L., R.M., S.M., N.-M.N., C.R., J.T.-J., D.T., C.T., and J.W. wrote and reviewed the article (alphabetical by last name after the lead coauthors).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for the helpful insights of Dustin Garrick and thank the many authors and practitioners who have contributed to Heterodox Thinking in water economics, values, and governance. We thank Maurice Nevile for his exemplary editing. This research was supported, in part, by Australian Research Council grant FL190100164: “Water Justice: Indigenous Water Valuation and Resilient Decision-making.” This review was not created with assistance from AI. The content was entirely written, reviewed, and edited by the human coauthors.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Grafton RQ, Biswas AK, Bosch H, Fanaian S, Gupta J, et al. 2023. Goals, progress and priorities from Mar del Plata in 1977 to New York in 2023. *Nat. Water* 1:230–40
2. President of the United Nations General Assembly. 2023. *Summary of the proceedings by the President of the General Assembly: United Nations conference on the midterm comprehensive review of the implementation of the objectives of the International Decade for Action, “Water for Sustainable Development,” 2018–2028*. Summ. Doc., United Nations. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4012972>
3. Keys PM, Wang-Erlandsson L, Gordon LJ, Galaz V, Ebbesson J. 2017. Approaching moisture recycling governance. *Glob. Environ. Change* 45:15–23
4. Greenwood EE, Lauber T, van den Hoogen J, Donmez A, Bain RES, et al. 2024. Mapping safe drinking water use in low- and middle-income countries. *Science* 385(6710):784–90
5. Grafton RQ, Fanaian S, Horne J, Katic P, Nguyen N-M, et al. 2025. Rethinking responses to the world’s water crises. *Nat. Sustain.* 8:11–21
6. Grafton RQ, Fanaian S. 2023. Responding to the global challenges of ‘too much, too little and too dirty’ water: towards a safer and more just water future. *Notas Econ.* 56:65–90
7. World Bank Group. 1999. *Handbook for the Economic Analysis of Water Supply Projects*. World Bank. <https://ppp.worldbank.org/library/handbook-economic-analysis-water-supply-projects>
8. Kompas T, Che N, Grafton RQ. 2024. Global impacts of heat and water stress on food production and severe food security. *Sci. Rep.* 14:14398
9. Nelson DR, Bledsoe BP, Ferreira S, Nibbelink NP. 2020. Challenges to realizing the potential of nature-based solutions. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 45:49–55
10. Naddaf M. 2023. The world faces a water crisis—4 powerful charts show how. *Nature* 615(7954):774–75
11. Pascual U, Balvanera P, Anderson CB, Chaplin-Kramer R, Christie M, et al. 2023. Diverse values of nature for sustainability. *Nature* 620(7975):813–23

12. Hanemann M, Whittington D. 2024. The economic value of water. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Environmental Science*. Oxford University Press
13. Dupont DP, Adamowicz WL. 2017. Water valuation. In *Water Policy and Governance in Canada*, ed. S Renzetti, DP Dupont. Springer International Publishing
14. Garrick DE, Hall JW, Dobson A, Damania R, Grafton RQ, et al. 2017. Valuing water for sustainable development. *Science* 358(6366):1003–5
15. Pascual U, Balvanera P, Anderson CB, Chaplin-Kramer R, Christie M, et al. 2023. Diverse values of nature for sustainability. *Nature* 620(7975):813–23
16. Moggridge BJ, Thompson RM. 2021. Cultural value of water and Western water management: an Australian Indigenous perspective. *Australas. J. Water Resour.* 25:4–14
17. Pannell DJ, Johnston RJ, Burton MP, Iftekhhar MS, Rogers AA, Day C. 2025. The value of a value: the benefits of improved decision making informed by non-market valuation. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag.* 131:103148
18. Manero A, Nikolakis W, Woods K, Grafton RQ. 2024. Non-market valuation and Indigenous Peoples' values: researcher constraints and policy impacts. *Environ. Sci. Politics* 153:103679
19. United Nations. 2021. *The United Nations World Water Development Report 2021: valuing water*. Rep., United Nations. <https://www.unwater.org/publications/un-world-water-development-report-2021>
20. High-Level Panel on Water. 2017. *Bellagio Principles on Valuing Water*. Rep., United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/documents/bellagio-principles-valuing-water-22818>
21. Grafton RQ, Manero A, Chu L, Wyrwoll P. 2023. The price and value of water: an economic review. *Cambridge Prisms Water* 1:e3
22. Schulz C, Wolf LJ, Martin-Ortega J, Glenk K, Gischler M. 2024. Valuing water: a global survey of the values that underpin water decisions. *Environ. Sci. Politics* 153:103685
23. Dieleman L, Geerts R, Vandermoere F, Brouwer S. 2024. Water value ambivalence: a qualitative exploration of the multitude of water values. *Water* 16(9):1236
24. Davenport MA, Keeler BL, Roth S, Kreiter A, Pradhananga A, Green E. 2024. Social and cultural values and representation justice: implications for water. *Soc. Nat. Resour.* 37(2):288–304
25. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). 2022. *Methodological assessment report on the diverse values and valuation of nature of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*. Rep., IPBES Secretariat. <https://www.ipbes.net/the-values-assessment>
26. David-Chavez D, Gavin M, Ortiz N, Valdez S, Carroll S. 2024. A values-centered relational science model: supporting Indigenous rights and reconciliation in research. *Ecol. Soc.* 29(2):11
27. Bates WB, Chu L, Claire H, Colloff MJ, Cotton R, et al. 2023. A tale of two rivers—Baaka and Martuwarra, Australia: shared voices and art towards water justice. *Anthrop. Rev.* 11(1):228–61
28. West S, Haider LJ, Stålhammar S, Woroniecki S. 2020. A relational turn for sustainability science? Relational thinking, leverage points and transformations. *Ecosyst. People* 16(1):304–25
29. Jackson S, Anderson EP, Piland NC, Carriere S, Java L, Jardine TD. 2022. River rhythmicity: a conceptual means of understanding and leveraging the relational values of rivers. *People Nat.* 4(4):949–62
30. Haefner M, Cantor A, Cowal J, Bryant A, Mani Yaw D, et al. 2025. Plural water narratives: an environmental justice lens on a systematic review of Q-methodology water research. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 12(2):e70024
31. Lipton D, Lew DK, Wallmo K, Wiley P, Dvarskas A. 2014. The evolution of non-market valuation of U.S. coastal and marine resources. *J. Ocean Coast. Econ.* 2014(1):6
32. Young RA, Loomis J. 2014. *Determining the Economic Value of Water: Concepts and Methods*. Routledge. 2nd ed.
33. English E, von Haefen RH, Herriges J, Leggett C, Lupi F, et al. 2018. Estimating the value of lost recreation days from the *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill. *J. Environ. Econ. Manag.* 91:26–45
34. Whittington D, Adamowicz W, Lloyd-Smith P. 2017. Asking willingness-to-accept questions in stated preference surveys: a review and research agenda. *Annu. Rev. Resour. Econ.* 9:317–36
35. Bishop RC, Boyle KJ, Carson RT, Chapman D, Hanemann WM, et al. 2017. Putting a value on injuries to natural assets: the BP oil spill. *Science* 356(6335):253–54

36. Manero A, Adamowicz W, Akter S, Spencer-Cotton A, Coombes PJ, et al. 2024. Benefits, costs and enabling conditions to achieve 'water for all' in rural and remote Australia. *Nat. Water* 2:31–40
37. Jackson S, Hatton MacDonald D, Bark RH. 2019. Public attitudes to inequality in water distribution: insights from preferences for water reallocation from irrigators to Aboriginal Australians. *Water Resour. Res.* 55:6033–48
38. Carson RT, Hanemann WM, Whittington D. 2020. The existence value of a distinctive Native American culture: survival of the Hopi Reservation. *Environ. Resour. Econ.* 75:931–51
39. Brouwer R, Sharmin DF, Elliott S, Liu J, Khan MR. 2023. Costs and benefits of improving water and sanitation in slums and non-slum neighborhoods in Dhaka, a fast-growing mega-city. *Ecol. Econ.* 207:107763
40. Van Houtven G, Pattanayak SK, Usmani F, Yang J-C. 2017. What are households willing to pay for improved water access? Results from a meta-analysis. *Ecol. Econ.* 136:126–35
41. Appiah A, Adamowicz W, Lloyd-Smith P, Dupont D. 2019. Reliability of drinking water: risk perceptions and economic value. *Water Econ. Politics* 5(2):1850020
42. Leiva B, Van Houtven G, Vásquez WF, Nájera A. 2023. Valuing water service reliability and in-home water storage: a hedonic price model from Guatemala. *Util. Policy* 82:101526
43. Edwards EC, Hendricks NP, Sampson GS. 2025. The capitalization of property rights to groundwater. *Am. J. Agric. Econ.* 107(2):390–410
44. Ge R, Huang J, Shi X. 2025. Cleaner water and higher housing prices: evidence from China. *J. Public Econ.* 245:105374
45. Mannaf M, Wheeler S, Zuo A. 2025. Comparing the value of natural capital in South Australian farmland using market sales and assessed valuation. *Aust. J. Agric. Res. Econ.* 69:540–55
46. Akter S, Grafton RQ, Merritt W. 2014. Integrated hydro-ecological and economic modelling of environmental flows: Macquarie Marshes, Australia. *Agric. Water Manag.* 145:98–109
47. Zhou Z, Sun X, Zhang X, Wang Y. 2022. Inter-regional ecological compensation in the Yellow River Basin based on the value of ecosystem services. *J. Environ. Manag.* 322:116073
48. Vollmer D, Prescott MF, Padawangi R, Girot C, Grêt-Regamey A. 2015. Understanding the value of urban riparian corridors: considerations in planning for cultural services along an Indonesian river. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 138:144–54
49. Walsh PJ, Guignet D, Booth P. 2023. Eliciting policy-relevant stated preference values for water quality: an application to New Zealand. *Agric. Res. Econ. Rev.* 52(2):347–78
50. Cooper B, Crase L, Burton M. 2023. Measuring and managing ecological and amenity outcomes in urban waterways. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 236:104777
51. Moore CM, Corona J, Griffiths C, Heberling MT, Hewitt JA, et al. 2023. Measuring the social benefits of water quality improvements to support regulatory objectives: progress and future directions. *PNAS* 120(18):e2120247120
52. Akter S. 2020. Social cohesion and willingness to pay for cyclone risk reduction: the case for the Coastal Embankment Improvement Project in Bangladesh. *Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct.* 48:101579
53. Brouwer R, Liu H, Alcon F, Robinson P, Botzen W. 2025. The role of probability information and choice complexity in demand for crop insurance under climate change. *Econ. Disasters Clim. Change* 9:519–46
54. Taylor CA, Druckenmiller H. 2022. Wetlands, flooding, and the Clean Water Act. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 112(4):1334–63
55. Loomis J, Kent P, Strange L, Fausch K, Covich A. 2000. Measuring the total economic value of restoring ecosystem services in an impaired river basin: results from a contingent valuation survey. *Ecol. Econ.* 33(1):103–17
56. Vardon T, Le HL, Martinez-Lagunes R, Pule OB, Schenau S, et al. 2024. Accounting for water: a global review and indicators of best practice for improved water governance. *Ecol. Econ.* 227:108396
57. United Nations. 2021. *System of Environmental-Economic Accounting—Ecosystem Accounting (SEEA EA)*. White Pap., United Nations. <https://seea.un.org/ecosystem-accounting>
58. Chen Y, Vardon M. 2024. Accounting for water-related ecosystem services to provide information for water policy and management: an Australian case study. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 69:101658
59. Fenichel EP, Abbott JK, Bayham J, Boone W, Haacker EM, Pfeiffer L. 2016. Measuring the value of groundwater and other forms of natural capital. *PNAS* 113(9):2382–87

60. Rouhi Rad M, Adamowicz W, Entem A, Fenichel EP, Lloyd-Smith P. 2021. Complementarity (not substitution) between natural and produced capital: evidence from the Panama Canal expansion. *J. Assoc. Environ. Resour. Econ.* 8(6):1115–46
61. Bagstad KJ, Ingram JC, Shapiro CD, La Notte A, Maes J, et al. 2021. Lessons learned from development of natural capital accounts in the United States and European Union. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 52:101359
62. Jarvis D, Stoeckl N, Douglas M, Grainger D, Larson S, et al. 2022. *Valuing Indigenous cultural connections*. Final Rep., Northern Australia Environmental Resources Hub. <https://nesplandscapes.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Valuing-Indigenous-cultural-connections-final-report.pdf>
63. Manero A, Normyle A, Vardon M, Grafton RQ. 2024. “Two sides of the same coin”? Bridging water accounting and valuation for better decision-making. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 19:091003
64. Vallecillo S, La Notte A, Zulian G, Ferrini S, Maes J. 2019. Ecosystem services accounts: valuing the actual flow of nature-based recreation from ecosystems to people. *Ecol. Model.* 392:196–211
65. Grilli G, Ferrini S, Luisetti T, Turner KR. 2022. The role of choice experiments in natural capital accounting approaches: fast track versus simulated exchange value in the Deben Estuary saltmarshes. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.* 65(7):1281–300
66. Chen Y, Burnett P, Wyrwoll P, Grafton RQ, Vardon M. 2025. Valuing and accounting for water-related ecosystem services for water pricing and management: an Australian case study. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 75:101771
67. Coombes PJ, Smit M, MacDonald G. 2016. Resolving boundary conditions in economic analysis of distributed solutions for water cycle management. *Australas. J. Water Res.* 20(1):11–29
68. Barry ME, Coombes PJ. 2018. Planning resilient water resources and communities: the need for a bottom-up systems approach. *Australas. J. Water Res.* 22(2):113–36
69. Scanlon BR, Fakhreddine S, Rateb A, de Graaf I, Famigletti J, et al. 2023. Global water resources and the role of groundwater in a resilient water future. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* 4:87–101
70. Pokhrel Y, Felfelani F, Satoh Y, Boulange J, Burek P, et al. 2021. Global terrestrial water storage and drought severity under climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* 11:226–33
71. Wasko C, Nathan R, Stein L, O’Shea D. 2021. Evidence of shorter more extreme rainfalls and increased flood variability under climate change. *J. Hydrol.* 603(B):126994
72. Mehta P, Siebert S, Kumm M, Deng Q, Ali T, et al. 2024. Half of twenty-first century global irrigation expansion has been in water-stressed regions. *Nat. Water* 2:254–61
73. Ravinadrasana V, Franzke CLE. 2025. The first emergence of unprecedented global water scarcity in the Anthropocene. *Nat. Commun.* 16:8281
74. Veldkamp TIE, Wada Y, Aerts JCJH, Döll P, Gosling SN, et al. 2017. Water scarcity hotspots travel downstream due to human interventions in the 20th and 21st century. *Nat. Commun.* 8:15697
75. World Meteorological Organization (WMO). 2025. *State of global water resources 2024*. Rep. 380, WMO. <https://doi.org/10.59327/WMO/WATER/2024>
76. Mekonnen MM, Hoekstra AY. 2016. Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. *Sci. Adv.* 2(2):e1500323
77. Boretti A, Rosa L. 2019. Reassessing the projections of the World Water Development Report. *npj Clean Water* 2:15
78. Gosling SN, Arnell NW. 2016. A global assessment of the impact of climate change on water scarcity. *Clim. Change* 134:371–85
79. Greve P, Kahil T, Mochizuki J, Schinko T, Satoh Y, et al. 2018. Global assessment of water challenges under uncertainty in water scarcity projections. *Nat. Sustain.* 1:486–94
80. Allan RP, Barlow M, Byrne MP, Cherchi A, Douville H, et al. 2020. Advances in understanding large-scale responses of the water cycle to climate change. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* 1472:49–75
81. AghaKouchak A, Mirchi A, Madani K, Di Baldassarre G, Nazemi A, et al. 2021. Anthropogenic drought: definition, challenges, and opportunities. *Rev. Geophys.* 59(2):e2019RG000683
82. Chu L, Williams J, Manero A, Grafton RQ. 2025. Effects of long-term meteorological trends on streamflow in the northern Murray–Darling Basin (MDB), Australia, 1981–2020. *J. Hydrol. Reg. Stud.* 58:102232
83. Xu C, McDowell NG, Fisher RA, Wei L, Sevanto S, et al. 2019. Increasing impacts of extreme droughts on vegetation productivity under climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* 9:948–53

84. Salehi M. 2022. Global water shortage and potable water safety: today's concern and tomorrow's crisis. *Environ. Int.* 158:106936
85. Wilkinson JL, Boxall ABA, Kolpin DW, Leung KMY, Lai RWS, et al. 2022. Pharmaceutical pollution of the world's rivers. *PNAS* 19(8):e2113947119
86. Alsadik A, Akintunde OO, Habibi HR, Achari G. 2025. PFAS in water environments: recent progress and challenges in monitoring, toxicity, treatment technologies, and post-treatment toxicity. *Environ. Syst. Res.* 14:18
87. Burri NM, Weatherl R, Moeck C, Schirmer M. 2019. A review of threats to groundwater quality in the anthropocene. *Sci. Total Environ.* 684:136–54
88. Lebu S, Lee A, Salzberg A, Bauza V. 2024. Adaptive strategies to enhance water security and resilience in low- and middle-income countries: a critical review. *Sci. Total Environ.* 925:171520
89. Christou A, Beretsou VG, Iakovides IC, Karaolia P, Michael C, et al. 2024. Sustainable wastewater reuse for agriculture. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.* 5(7):504–21
90. Tortajada C, Radcliffe JC, van Rensburg P, González-Gómez F. 2025. Sustainable water reuse for water security. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 20:021003
91. Kompas T, Chu L, Ha PV, Spring D. 2019. Budgeting and portfolio allocation for biosecurity measures. *Aust. J. Agric. Res. Econ.* 63:412–38
92. Rey D, Holman IP, Knox JW. 2017. Developing drought resilience in irrigated agriculture in the face of increasing water scarcity. *Reg. Environ. Change* 17:1527–40
93. Schuerch M, Spencer T, Temmerman S, Kirwan ML, Wolff C, et al. 2018. Future response of global coastal wetlands to sea-level rise. *Nature* 561(7722):231–34
94. Faivre N, Fritz M, Freitas T, de Boissezon B, Vandewoestijne S. 2017. Nature-based solutions in the EU: innovating with nature to address social, economic and environmental challenges. *Environ. Res.* 159:509–18
95. Seidl C, Wheeler S, Page D. 2024. Understanding the global success criteria for managed aquifer recharge schemes. *J. Hydrol.* 628:130469
96. Perez-Blanco CD, Hrast-Essenfelder A, Perry C. 2020. Irrigation technology and water conservation: a review of the theory and evidence. *Rev. Environ. Econ. Politics* 14:216–39
97. Wheeler S, Carmody E, Grafton RQ, Kingsford R, Zuo A. 2020. The rebound effect on water extraction from subsidising irrigation infrastructure in Australia. *Res. Conserv. Recycl.* 159:104755
98. Grafton RQ, Williams J, Perry CJ, Molle F, Ringler C, et al. 2018. The paradox of irrigation efficiency. *Science* 361(6404):748–50
99. Grafton RQ, Chu L, Kingsford RT, Bina G, Williams J. 2022. Resilience to hydrological droughts in the northern Murray–Darling Basin. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A* 380:20210296
100. Owens K, Carmody E, Grafton RQ, O'Donnell E, Wheeler S, et al. 2022. Delivering global water security: embedding water justice as a response to increased irrigation efficiency. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 9(6):e1608
101. Wheeler S. 2023. Informal and formal markets in meeting water needs. *Nat. Sustain.* 6:1291–92
102. Koop SHA, van Leeuwen CJ. 2017. The challenges of water, waste and climate change in cities. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* 19:385–418
103. Wheeler S, Nauges C, Grafton RQ. 2025. Water pricing and markets: principles, practices and proposals. *Appl. Econ. Perspect. Politics* 47:487–514
104. Rudebeck T. 2022. Framing water as a financial risk: reviewing the processes shaping a narrative. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 9(4):e1596
105. Zhang K, Kimball JS, Running SW. 2016. A review of remote sensing based actual evapotranspiration estimation. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 3:834–53
106. Sazib N, Mladenova I, Bolten J. 2018. Leveraging the Google Earth Engine for drought assessment using global soil moisture data. *Remote Sens.* 10(8):1265
107. World Water Council, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2015. *Water: fit to finance? Catalyzing national growth through investment in water security. Report of the High Level Panel on Financing Infrastructure for a Water-Secure World.* Rep., OECD. <https://www.publicfinanceforwash.org/resources/water-fit-finance-catalyzing-national-growth-through-investment-water-security>

108. George J, Hoo YR, Wang Q, Bahuguna A, Andres L. 2024. *Funding a water-secure future: an assessment of global public spending*. Rep., World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/water/publication/funding-a-water-secure-future>
109. Rozenberg J, Fay M. 2019. *Beyond the gap: how countries can afford the infrastructure they need while protecting the planet*. Rep., World Bank. <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/189471550755819133>
110. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). 2018. *The United Nations World Water Development Report 2018: nature-based solutions for water*. Rep., UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/wwap/wwdr/2018>
111. Polyakov M, Iftekhhar MS, Fogarty J, Buurman J. 2022. Renewal of waterways in a dense city creates value for residents. *Ecol. Econ.* 199:107468
112. Dai D, Brouwer R, Lei K. 2021. Measuring the economic value of urban river restoration. *Ecol. Econ.* 190:107186
113. Cooper B, Crase L, Burton M. 2023. Households' willingness to pay for water for the environment in an urban setting. *J. Environ. Manag.* 348:119263
114. Kompas T, Che TN, Grafton RQ. 2024. Non-market value losses to coastal ecosystem services and wetlands from sea-level rise and storm surge, 2050 to 2100: the Kimberley region, Western Australia. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* 255:107215
115. Strain B, Kompas T, Boxshall A, Kevin J, Swearer S, et al. 2022. Assessing the coastal protection services of natural mangrove forests and artificial rock revetments. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 55:101429
116. Temmerman S, Horstman EM, Krauss KW, Mullarney JC, Pelckmans I, Schoutens K. 2023. Marshes and mangroves as nature-based coastal storm buffers. *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.* 15:95–118
117. Brand MW, Seipp KQ, Saksa P, Ulibarri N, Bomblies A, et al. 2021. Environmental impact bonds: a common framework and looking ahead. *Environ. Res. Infrastr. Sustain.* 1:023001
118. Scott CA, Shrestha PP, Lutz-Ley AN. 2020. The re-adaptation challenge: limits and opportunities of existing infrastructure and institutions in adaptive water governance. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 44:104–12
119. Bellmore J, Duda JJ, Craig LS, Greene SL, Torgersen CE, et al. 2017. Status and trends of dam removal research in the United States. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 4(2):e1164
120. Coombes PJ. 2024. The influence of regulation on preference for utility infrastructure investment to generate income for Australian water corporations. *Australas. J. Water Res.* 28(2):151–72
121. Di Baldassarre G, Wanders N, AghaKouchak A, Kuil L, Rangelcroft S, et al. 2018. Water shortages worsened by reservoir effects. *Nat. Sustain.* 1:617–22
122. Borgomeo E, Mortazavi-Naeini M, Hall JW, Guillod BP. 2018. Risk, robustness and water resources planning under uncertainty. *Earth's Future* 6(3):468–87
123. Fletcher S, Hadjimichael A, Quinn J, Osman K, Giuliani M, et al. 2022. Equity in water resources planning: a path forward for decision support modelers. *J. Water Res. Plan. Manag.* 148(7):02522005
124. Nayak A, Rachunok B, Thompson B, Fletcher S. 2023. Socio-hydrological impacts of rate design on water affordability during drought. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 18:124027
125. Poff NL, Brown CM, Grantham TE, Matthews JH, Palmer MA, et al. 2016. Sustainable water management under future uncertainty with eco-engineering decision scaling. *Nat. Clim. Change* 6(1):25–34
126. Singh R, Reed PM, Keller K. 2015. Many-objective robust decision making for managing an ecosystem with a deeply uncertain threshold response. *Ecol. Soc.* 20(3):12
127. Herman JD, Quinn JD, Steinschneider S, Giuliani M, Fletcher S. 2020. Climate adaptation as a control problem: review and perspectives on dynamic water resources planning under uncertainty. *Water Resour. Res.* 56(2):e24389
128. Hoque SF, Hope R. 2025. *The Water Diaries: Living with the Global Water Crisis in Bangladesh and Kenya*. Cambridge University Press
129. Jepson WE, Wutich A, Collins SM, Boateng GO, Young SL. 2017. Progress in household water insecurity metrics: a cross-disciplinary approach. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 4(3):e1214
130. Young SL, Miller JD, Bose I. 2024. Measuring human experiences to advance safe water for all. Work. Pap., Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University. <https://doi.org/10.21985/n2-xvrr-7693>

131. Wutich A, Brewis A, York AM, Stotts R. 2013. Rules, norms, and injustice: a cross-cultural study of perceptions of justice in water institutions. *Soc. Nat. Res.* 26:795–809
132. Nigra AE, Cazacu-De Luca A, Navas-Acien A. 2022. Socioeconomic vulnerability and public water arsenic concentrations across the US. *Environ. Pollut.* 313:120113
133. Nastiti A, Sudradjat A, Geerling GW, Smits AJM, Roosmini D, Muntalif BS. 2017. The effect of physical accessibility and service level of water supply on economic accessibility: a case study of Bandung City, Indonesia. *Water Int.* 42(7):831–51
134. Hartwig LD, Jackson S, Markham F, Osborne N. 2022. Water colonialism and Indigenous water justice in south-eastern Australia. *Int. J. Water Res. Dev.* 38(1):30–63
135. Longboat S. 2015. First Nations water security: security for Mother Earth. *Can. Woman Stud./Cab. Femme* 30(2/3):6–13
136. Prieto M. 2021. Equity versus efficiency and the human right to water. *Water* 13(3):278
137. Yates JS, Harris LM, Wilson NJ. 2017. Multiple ontologies of water: politics, conflict and implications for governance. *Environ. Plan. D* 35(5):797–815
138. Enciso SE, Bulot NJ. 2026. The right of the river to be known: epistemic reparations, environmental justice, and Indigenous truth-telling about custodial group agents. *Philos. Stud.* 183:1157–78
139. Grafton RQ, Chu L, Kompas T, Fanaian S. 2026. Is global human well-being peaking? *World Dev. Sustain.* 8:100265
140. Celermajer D, Schlosberg D, Rickards L, Stewart-Harawira M, Thaler M, et al. 2020. Multi-species justice: theories, challenges, and a research agenda for environmental politics. *Environ. Politics* 30(1/2):119–40
141. Fantini E. 2014. Catholics in the making of the Italian water movement—a moral economy. *Particip. Confl.* 7(1):35–57
142. Wheeler S. 2021. Lessons from water markets around the world. In *Water Markets: A Global Assessment*, ed. S Wheeler. Edward Elgar Publishing
143. Azizi K, Barnes JL, Anderies JM, Garcia M. 2024. Equity implications of efficient water conservation programs. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 19:094015
144. March H, Sauri D. 2017. When sustainable may not mean just: a critical interpretation of urban water consumption decline in Barcelona. *Local Environ.* 22(5):523–35
145. Balasubramanya S, Garrick D, Brozović N, Ringler C, Zaveri E, Rodella A-S, et al. 2024. Risks from solar-powered groundwater irrigation. *Science* 383(6680):256–58
146. Schnegg M, Bollig M, Linke T. 2016. Moral equality and success of common-pool water governance in Namibia. *Ambio* 45:581–90
147. Beresford M, Wutich A, Garrick D, Drew G. 2022. Moral economies for water: a framework for analyzing norms of justice, economic behavior, and social enforcement in the contexts of water inequality. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 10(2):e1627
148. Davis R. 2025. The role of Indigenous forums in environmental policy: a deliberative systems approach. *Soc. Nat. Res.* 38(7):663–82
149. Zhang J, Dong Z, Chen T. 2020. Multi-objective optimal allocation of water resources based on the NSGA-2 algorithm while considering intergenerational equity: a case study of the middle and upper reaches of Huaihe River Basin, China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* 17(24):9289
150. Sinha A, Driha O, Balsalobre-Lorente D. 2020. Tourism and inequality in per capita water availability: Is the linkage sustainable? *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* 27:10129–34
151. Girard C, Rinaudo JD, Pulido-Velazquez M. 2016. Sharing the cost of river basin adaptation portfolios to climate change: insights from social justice and cooperative game theory. *Water Resour. Res.* 52(10):7945–62
152. Williams J, Colloff MC, Grafton RQ, Khan S, Paydar Z, Wyrwoll P. 2022. The three-infrastructures framework and water risks in the Murray–Darling Basin, Australia. *Australas. J. Water Res.* 27(1):47–67
153. Raudsepp-Hearne C, Peterson GD, Tengö M, Bennett EM, Holland T, et al. 2010. Untangling the environmentalist's paradox: Why is human well-being increasing as ecosystem services degrade? *BioScience* 60(8):576–89
154. Moon K, Marsh D, Cooke B, Kingsford R. 2025. Relational commons: an ontological and governance framework beyond protected areas and the boundaries of conservation. *Conserv. Lett.* 18:e13137

155. Debaise D. 2017. *Nature as Event: The Lure of the Possible*. Duke University Press
156. Muraca B. 2016. Relational values: a Whiteheadian alternative for environmental philosophy and global environmental justice. *Balkan J. Philos.* 8(1):19–38
157. Whyte KP. 2021. Time as kinship. In *The Cambridge Companion to Environmental Humanities*, ed. J Cohen, S Foote. Cambridge University Press
158. Whyte KP. 2020. Too late for Indigenous climate justice: ecological and relational tipping points. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change* 11(1):e603
159. Viaene L. 2021. Indigenous water ontologies, hydro-development and the human/more-than-human right to water: a call for critical engagement with plurilegal water realities. *Water* 13(12):1660
160. Budds J, O'Reilly K. 2023. Reforming water governance in Chile: a hydrosocial relations perspective. *J. Lat. Am. Geog.* 22(3):151–59
161. Escate LR, Hoogesteger J, Boelens R. 2022. Water assemblages in hydrosocial territories: connecting place, space, and time through the cultural–material signification of water in coastal Peru. *Geoforum* 135:61–70
162. Wilson N, Shah S, Montoya T, Grasham C, Korzenevica M, et al. 2024. Climate–water crises: critically engaging relational, spatial, and temporal dimensions. *Ecol. Soc.* 29(4):13
163. Houart C, Hoogesteger J, Boelens R. 2025. Power and politics across species boundaries: towards multispecies justice in riverine hydrosocial territories. *Environ. Politics* 34(1):49–69
164. Craft A, McGregor D, Seymour-Hourie R, Chiblow S. 2021. Decolonizing Anishinabe *nibi in-aakonigewin* and *gikendaasowin* research. In *Decolonizing Law: Indigenous, Third World and Settler Perspectives*, ed. S Xavier, B Jacobs, V Waboose, JG Hewitt, A Bhatia. Routledge
165. Mosquera-Guerrero L, Krueger T. 2024. Struggling for the recognition of river rights: a case of hydrosocial territorialization of the Atrato River in Colombia. *Geoforum* 151:104000
166. Immovilli M, Reitsma S, Roncucci R, Rasch ED, Roth D. 2022. Exploring contestation in rights of river approaches: comparing Colombia, India and New Zealand. *Water Altern.* 15(3):574–91
167. O'Donnell E, Clark C, Killeen R. 2024. Rights and relationality: a review of the role of law in the human/water relationship. *Water Altern.* 17(2):207–38
168. Nikolakis W, Grafton RQ. 2022. Law versus justice: the Strategic Aboriginal Water Reserve in the Northern Territory, Australia. *Int. J. Water Res. Dev.* 38(1):11–29
169. Fisher K, Makey L, Macpherson E, Paul A, Rennie H, et al. 2022. Broadening environmental governance ontologies to enhance ecosystem-based management in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Marit. Stud.* 21:609–29
170. Datta R, Chapola J, Lewis K. 2025. Rethinking indigenous community-led water sustainability: decolonial and relational approaches in Western Canada. *Water* 17(3):334
171. Boelens R, Hommes L, Hoogesteger J, Swyngedouw E, Vos J, Wester P. 2025. Hydrosocial territories: imaginaries, materialities, and struggles over knowledge, order and meaning. *Water Int.* 50(5):426–62
172. Kobluk HM, Salomon AK, Ford AT, Kadykalo AN, Hessami MA, et al. 2024. Relational place-based solutions for environmental policy misalignments. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 39(3):217–20
173. Landström C, Peters H, Hughes AG, Jackson CR, McKenzie AA, et al. 2025. The Wetland Explorer: a digital tool for improved community engagement with water quality modelling for decision-making. *Environ. Sci. Politics* 173:104226
174. Kanyama MC. 2025. Ecological restoration in rights-of-nature laws and restoration as a substantive right of nature: challenges and opportunities. *Restor. Ecol.* 34(S1):e70100
175. McGrath B, Thaitakoo D, Chaemchuen N, Yang T. 2023. Urban designs as social-natural resolutions. In *Nature-Based Solutions for Cities*, ed. T McPhearson, N Kabisch, N Frantzekaki. Edward Elgar Publishing
176. Agramont A. 2025. A relational approach to nested conflicts in the Katari River Basin. *Ecol. Soc.* 30(2):15
177. Macpherson E, Cuppari RI, Kagawa-Viviani A, Brause H, Brewer WA, et al. 2024. Setting a pluralist agenda for water governance: why power and scale matter. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Water* 11(5):e1734