Water resource utilization regimes at a basin scale: transition framework and development traps

Shuang Song

Shuai Wang

Bojie Fu

Xutong Wu

ater, at “the centre of the planetary drama of the Anthropocene”, is not only essential for myriad Earth system processes, but also supporting development of human societies in various aspects . At the same time, however, human’s modification has profoundly influenced the water cycle which may lead adverse changes to functions of human-water systems, resulting in various development traps . Facing major challenges in the Anthropocene, many of the world’s big river basins, also hot spots of economy and civilization, are urgently in need for integrated water resources management toward sustainability . Therefore, understanding the complex relationship between human societies and water resources utilization, and its evolution provides underlying supports to development in a coordinated way, at a basin scale.

Regime is a stable state of system’s structure and function, whose large and persistent changes may lead to substantive impacts on the outcomes of system with widespread cascading effects, defined as regime shifts . Within human-water systems, water have several key functions, the most important of which is supplying for human societies in sustainable development based on a complex structure of water utilization. However, inter-connected human interference, involving water withdrawal, dam constructions and water managements have significantly changed water functions and induced regime shifts in water utilization . These regime shifts, triggered by gradual or abrupt drivers, are likely to occur more often as societies’ development increasing their pressure or stuck in traps at a basin scale. As a result, many large river basins had gone through water utilization regimes of accelerated exploitation, over-exploitation, and integrated governance, as such it is a reasonable assumption that there is a transition pattern within regime shifts. Sketching the transition of water utilization regimes, therefore, can help to understand and predict development traps, which is crucial for integrated management and coordinated development towards sustainability at a basin scale. Despite pervasive and important, there is still lacking of effective method to define the water utilization regimes and detect regime shifts, with much fewer attempts to develop theoretical models to explain their transition phases as well.

Development of societies by using water resources has been going on for at least thousands of years. Although its regime shifts and transition phases are not fully understood yet, water utilization has been depicted and studied from different dimensions. Firstly, since water resources are scarce, the most widespread concern is the rising stresses on human societies to use water resources. Even though the stocks of water in artificial reservoirs are helpful to water resources availability, greater water utilization stresses had become a major constraint to development, because of significant increment in water withdrawals and larger shares of inflexible water utilization during the last century. Secondly, as the need of industrial and ecological developments, tendentiousness of water utilization changed with. Despite a major water utilization of agricultural irrigation dominating most river basins, there are noticeable growths and preferential tendentiousness in the economy profits and water consumption regarding industry or services, leading potential conflicts between different sectors. Thirdly, since water distribution and utilization are inherently basinal concerns, patterns of also play an important role. Although only 10% of available water is withdrawn on global average, about 30% of population live in highly water-stressed areas, where dominated sectors of water utilization are various as well. In addition, human activities are still changing this pattern, since positive impacts caused by human interventions mostly occur in upper regions whereas aggravated water resources downstream, in many basins around the world. Although existing researches have evaluated the aspects of water resource utilization from these different dimensions, we still cannot obtain a coherent understanding of regime shifts regard to social development and water utilization, without integrating them.

Here, by integrating three above mentioned dimensions of water utilization, we develop an Integrated Water Resources Utilization (IWRU) Index at a basin scale to give a sketch of relationships between human societies and their water utilization. Then, by applying this index to the Yellow River Basin, China, we analysed water utilization regimes and their shifts in this typical basin of anthropogenic impacts, with change points detection and contribution decomposition methods following. In addition, combining data analysis, we identify causes of the regime shifts. Finally, refer to the existing theories, we summarized a general transition framework of water utilization regimes, which can be a useful guideline for basins to predict development traps and to develop in a coordinated way.

# Results

## Detection of Water utilization regimes

With two significant points detected, the trend of IWRU index are split into three periods, whose slopes are various and mainly contributed by different dimensions (stress, tendentiousness or pattern of water utilization, see Methods) (Figure [[fig:IWRU]](#fig:IWRU)).

![Changes of the IWRU index. A, with two change points in 1978 and 1994, three periods were detected in trend of the IWRU. B, changes of IWRU in three periods have various slopes, while the second period have a negative growths rate. C, changes of the IWRU within three certain periods, which have different main contributors. ](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Changes of the IWRU index. **A,** with two change points in 1978 and 1994, three periods were detected in trend of the IWRU. **B,** changes of IWRU in three periods have various slopes, while the second period have a negative growths rate. **C,** changes of the IWRU within three certain periods, which have different main contributors.

In the first period (P1, 1965-1978), the IWRU index had a rapidly increasing and the lightening of water stresses made the most striking contribution (+0.722), while tendentiousness and pattern of the water utilization had slight negative contribution (-0.048 and -0.09 respectively). In the second period (P2, 1979-1994), the IWRU index experienced a slight drop, despite positive contributions of tendentiousness and pattern of water utilization (+0.352 and +0.279 respectively), because of increasing stresses on water resource playing a larger negative role (-0.636). However, as the further increasing of positive contributions of water utilization tendentiousness (+0.485) and pattern (+0.515), and decelerations of water stresses (-0.344, 46% less than P2) in the third period (P3, 1995-2013), a positive growth of the IWRU returned. As a result, each period has a different most striking positive contributor to IWRU: P1 is stress; P2 is tendentiousness; and P3 is pattern.

Combining these three dimensions’ net contribution to IWRU further, ratios of the contributions of the three dimensions clustered clearly by different time periods, indicating three regimes (Figure [[fig:phases]](#fig:phases)).

![Combination of three dimensions (S: stresses; T: tendentiousness; P: pattern) in different periods. Size of the points denoting values of the IWRU: the mean of the P1 phase is 0.10, while 0.14, 0.19 in P2 and P3. The red indicator line in this ternary plot denotes 1:1 contributions between tendentiousness (T) and patterns (P). Two key change points (1978, 1994), along with the beginning (1965) and the ending (2013) of research period, are labelled.](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Combination of three dimensions (S: stresses; T: tendentiousness; P: pattern) in different periods. Size of the points denoting values of the IWRU: the mean of the P1 phase is 0.10, while 0.14, 0.19 in P2 and P3. The red indicator line in this ternary plot denotes 1:1 contributions between tendentiousness (T) and patterns (P). Two key change points (1978, 1994), along with the beginning (1965) and the ending (2013) of research period, are labelled.

At the very beginning (1965) and throughout the whole P1, water utilization regime dominated by high stress. After then, it experienced a shift to low stress since 1978, with a change in the proportion of contributions between tendentiousness and pattern, too. Finally, the three dimensions’ contribution were much similar in P3, making the points highly concentrated at the centre of the ternary diagram for that period.

## Differences between water utilization regimes

The differences between the water utilization regimes are reflected in changes of all three dimensions.

![image](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Moving from the regime in P1 to P2, the most striking change is the reversal of the trend in water utilization stress, which is determined by a combination of scarcity, flexibility and variability (Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)A and Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)D). In the P1, natural surface water resources were rather abundant with lesser water consumptions (supplementary Fig. S1 and S3) and most of which were flexible water utilization (supplementary Fig. S4). During the P1 and even P2, however, water consumption increases rapidly and natural surface water resources decreases at the same time, making water increasingly scarce. Opposite effect to that, numerous reservoirs built reduced the variability of water resources by boosting storage capacities, but most of which built in P1 (supplementary Fig. S5 and supplementary Table S1). As a result, water utilization stress decreases during P1, but begins to rise rapidly in P2.

On the other hand, as the most positive contributors to the IWRU index in P2 and P3 separately, tendentiousness and patterns of water utilization were keeping to enlarge their impacts (Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)B and Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)C). Representing tendentiousness of water utilization, increasing non-provisioning share of water utilization were mainly contributed by larger industrial water consumptions and minor total water uses, while the influence of both are weakening (Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)E). However, patterns of water utilization, whose contributions to the IWRU are increasing, were mainly benefited from decreasing disparities in the amount of water resources used, both intersectoral and regional (Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)F).

## Causes of water utilization regime changes

![ Causes of water utilization regime shifts: economy growths, efficiency changes, and managements. A. Changes of total irrigated area and water consumption per unit of irrigated area. B. Changes of gross values added (GVA) of industry and services, and their water use density (WUI) respectively (see supplementary: Methods. S2 for details). C. Constructions’ finished time of each new reservoir and their located regions’ water use percentages in basin’s total water use, at that time. Red ones denote hub reservoirs in the basin, which plays a role in integrated water management. Size of the points indicates their magnitude of water storage capacities. Some important or special reservoirs’ name are denoted: (1) Xiaolangdi reservoir and Sanmen Reservoir were constructed mainly responsible for managing sediments of the Yellow River. (2) Liujia Gorge, Longyang Gorge, were constructed mainly responsible for managing water flood discharge and storage. Therefore, these marked reservoirs are significant for the entire basin, far crucial than regional development. ](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Causes of water utilization regime shifts: economy growths, efficiency changes, and managements. **A.** Changes of total irrigated area and water consumption per unit of irrigated area. **B.** Changes of gross values added (GVA) of industry and services, and their water use density (WUI) respectively (see supplementary: Methods. S2 for details). **C.** Constructions’ finished time of each new reservoir and their located regions’ water use percentages in basin’s total water use, at that time. Red ones denote hub reservoirs in the basin, which plays a role in integrated water management. Size of the points indicates their magnitude of water storage capacities. Some important or special reservoirs’ name are denoted: (1) Xiaolangdi reservoir and Sanmen Reservoir were constructed mainly responsible for managing sediments of the Yellow River. (2) Liujia Gorge, Longyang Gorge, were constructed mainly responsible for managing water flood discharge and storage. Therefore, these marked reservoirs are significant for the entire basin, far crucial than regional development.

Some main drivers caused the above changes of water utilization regime. (1) The expansion of irrigated area and the economic growth of industry and services are keys to the changes in the tendentiousness of water utilization between P1 and P2 (Figure[[fig:Causes]](#fig:Causes) A). During the P1, irrigated agricultural area in the Yellow River basin expanded rapidly at a rate of , and irrigation water was the dominant utilization way ( of the total water use in 1965, and in 1978). Entering P2, however, while the expansion of irrigated area stalled, industry and services gradually took off and took up more water resources (Figure[[fig:Causes]](#fig:Causes) B), leading to reduction of proportion of irrigation water.

(2) During the P3, irrigation, whose water consumptions were still dominating, have noticeable changes in its efficiency, however. Although irrigated agricultural area resumed expansion, and both industry, urban services were boosting their gross added values (GVA), water use density (WUI) experienced significant declines and reached the lowest points (Figure[[fig:Causes]](#fig:Causes) A and B). It means, water utilization ways have changed, along with technological solutions and a range of water conservation practices (supplementary Fig. S6). As a result, the proportions of water use between the different sectors tend to average out while the total water consumption remains stable, after the P3 (supplementary Fig. S7).

(3) Changing water management practice contributed throughout all three periods. In the P1, most of the reservoirs are built in regions with high water demands, as ratio of regional water use and basinal water use for each new reservoir are significantly higher (Figure [[fig:Causes]](#fig:Causes)C). In the P2, on the other hand, the number of new reservoirs decreases significantly with little increment of total storage capacities (supplementary Fig. S5). Entering the P3, however, the number of new reservoirs are even much higher than that in the P1, and most of them were built in regions with lower ratio of regional water use and basinal water use (Figure [[fig:Causes]](#fig:Causes)C and supplementary Fig. S5).

# Discussion

## Transition Framework

image


Widespread regime shifts in a human-water system can be triggered by accumulation of gradual changes, where increasing anthropogenic pressure are among the most important drivers . At the same time, human society has become more and more dependent on water utilization as it further develops, modifying natural water cycles by socio-economic processes . This social water cycle has linked to the natural water cycle through water withdraw, water utilization and drainage, forming a closed chain of interdependence, interconnection and mutual influence, which is consistent with nature-society dualistic water cycle theory . According to our results, regime shifts of water utilization as transitional phases induced by developing, similar in social-ecological system, is one of the most important characteristics towards natural-social dualistic structure . As such, we summarized a transition framework of the water utilization regimes here, which conceptualizes a general trajectory towards a natural-social dualistic water cycle (Figure [[fig:framework]](#fig:framework)).

Throughout the above transition phases towards dualistic water cycle, three dimensions of water utilization regime are various in discipline of evolution, corresponding to typical changes within the Yellow River Basins as an example (Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)). (1) Firstly, although stresses on water resources increases by economic expansion boosting water demands, socio-economic progress responding to resource scarcity by better management and efficiency. Water resources were becoming more scarce in the Yellow River Basin from P1 to P3, but the expansion of farmland, the construction of reservoirs, and the increase in water use efficiency became responses to different water utilization stresses in aspects (Figure [[fig:Causes]](#fig:Causes)). Since the scarcity of water resources is directly perceptible and sensitive for utilization, its stresses on societies is one of the most striking drivers to regime shifts within human-water systems . (2) Secondly, the non-provisioning part of water demands growths with secondary and tertiary industries developing, leading tendentiousness of water utilization continually tilted to the socio-economic part. As original region of Ancient Chinese Civilization, the Yellow River Basin used to be dominated by agricultural but in its way to an energy industry zone now . As a result, saving water consumption in agriculture and making concessions for industry and energy is widely recognized as solutions for the competing . Anyhow, this changes of tendentiousness reflect a truth that growing socio-economic parts are throwing feedbacks to scarcity of water resources and contributing to regime shifts. (3) Thirdly, with closer socio-economic ties and stiffer competition between regions and sectors, the geographic scope of water resource supply and demand allocation is expanding, leading to changing patterns of water utilization. In the Yellow River Basin, the gap in water consumptions between regions and sectors are narrowing, as the result of a carefully designed allocation . However, the allocation of water utilization is determined on the basis of regional and sectoral economic contexts and development trajectories. The changes in water utilization patterns along with regime shifts, therefore, are the outcomes of feedback loops within complex human-water systems.

By combining the above three dimensions, water utilization regimes reflect a tendency of transitional evolution thoroughly. In addition to the Yellow River Basin, which is the focus of this study, human-water relations in major river basins around the world can be explained by the framework. For examples, Indus River, Mississippi River, and Danube River, whose water utilizations have all gone through a relatively natural phases, rapid developments and integrated management regimes. . In summary, our proposed transitional framework for the nature-society dualistic water cycle is universal, for identify regime shifts of water utilization.

## Development Traps

At different transition phases, basins may face to various development traps in water utilization, leading an unsustainable trajectory (Figure [[fig:traps]](#fig:traps)). Like social-ecological systems and other complex systems, coupled human-water system may collapse under the gradual pressure on resources or because of structural mismatches . A number of studies have identified transformation as an important way out of unsustainable trajectory, and different types of transformation are required according to dominating phases and traps of systems . Thus, our transition framework can identify regime shifts of water utilization, which can help to predict possible development traps.



**Transition phases of water resources utilization regime and development traps.** Green arrows indicate the trajectory without falling into any development trap, IWRU roughly follows a non-linear upward trend at the same time. However, overexploitation of water resources will leave the system in a resource trap, without moving to regional coordinated cycle. And even if one enters a regional cycle, it can still fall into a structural trap when water utilization fails to adapt to the complex changes within human-water systems.

According to case studies around the world, big river basins often face resource traps at the beginning of their developments, while highly developed ones often face structural traps. During P1 and P2 (refers from natural cycle to the regional cycle) in the Yellow River Basin, after the successive exploitation of agriculture, industry and services, the Water resource extraction rate has reached , far exceeding the internationally recognized warning threshold of . Although water management practices in P1 (construction of numerous reservoirs) mitigated the stress on water resources from accelerated development, it became scarce rapidly throughout and water utilization stresses rebounded in the P2 along with a regime shift. The resource trap is revealed at this point, with severe runoff outages and groundwater depletion of the Yellow River from P2 onwards (supplementary Fig. S8). Since similar phenomena occurred in Mississippi and Indus River Basins, the fact that the accelerated development has been followed by water scarcity and a series of ecological problems shows that the resource traps is pervasive in the transition trajectory, especially from natural cycle to regional cycle .

To get rid of the resource trap, a clear transformation towards integrated basin management was proposed, with several management practices (supplementary Methods S4 and Fig. S9). The most important of these is the “87 Water Allocation Scheme”, which adopts a top-down approach in allocating water resources to all regions and sectors . Since then, the scheme has been revised and refined, and a comprehensive water resources utilization system has gradually been formed that takes the basin scale into account . These integrated management practices made the utilization of water resources into a regime of unified scheduling since the P3 in the Yellow River Basin, to escape from the “resource trap”. Similarly, many of the world’s major river basins have eventually moved towards a system of integrated governance, especially for trans-boundary rivers (e.g. Danube and Mekong River), where water resources are in need of collaborative governance .

However, in the regional cycle regime of water utilization, the Yellow River Basins still faces structural traps and require further transformation according to changes within the human-water system. Firstly, in line with paradox of irrigation efficiency, significant improvement in agricultural irrigation efficiency (i.e. decline in water use intensity) has been accompanied by a resurgence in irrigated area, resulting in an unabated and weak upward trend in water stress . Secondly, the changing tendentiousness between non-provisioning (i.e. industry and urban services) and provisioning (i.e. domestic and irrigation water use) is stagnating (see Figure [[fig:dimensions]](#fig:dimensions)E) because of rigidify in the industrial structure. At the same time, the flexibility of water use is declining since domestic water use and thermal water use growth rapidly (supplementary Fig. S4). Typically, these may lead to a reduction in resilience of basins and leave highly coupled human-water systems facing greater vulnerability to collapse –as a structural trap . Therefore, based on the identification of current phases and development traps by the transition framework, further transformative governance is still needed to achieve a high-quality sustainable development of the basin .