Review Journal of Social Psychology & Social Works

http://socialworksreview.com

ISSN-E: 3006-4724 Volume: 3
ISSN-P: 3006-4716 Issue: 4 (October - December, 2025)

Climate Change, Institutional Fragmentation, and Transboundary Water Governance in Germany

Hifsa Aimen

Department of Political Science, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan
E-mail: aimenhifsa@gmail.com

Abstract

Climate change is increasingly reshaping the governance of transboundary water systems by intensifying hydrological variability, amplifying ecological stress, and challenging established institutional arrangements. In Germany, major shared river basins such as the Rhine, Danube, Elbe, and Oder are experiencing altered flow regimes, rising water temperatures, and more frequent extremes, placing pressure on long-standing cooperative frameworks. This article examines how climate change interacts with legal, institutional, and political structures to influence cooperation and conflict in German transboundary water governance. Drawing on a qualitative synthesis of academic literature, EU policy frameworks, and basin-level case studies, the analysis reveals that while Germany benefits from robust legal foundations and institutionalized cooperation, governance effectiveness is constrained by federal fragmentation, uneven adaptive capacity, and limited integration of climate risks into transboundary planning. The article argues that future cooperation will depend on strengthening adaptive, polycentric, and climate-responsive governance mechanisms capable of managing uncertainty and cross-border interdependencies.

Introduction

Transboundary water governance has entered a period of profound transformation as climate change disrupts long-standing hydrological patterns and governance assumptions. Rivers that were historically managed under relatively stable conditions are now subject to increasing variability, uncertainty, and extremes. These changes are particularly consequential in Europe, where most major river systems cross national borders and where water governance relies heavily on legal coordination, institutional cooperation, and shared norms. Germany occupies a strategic position within several major European river basins, acting simultaneously as an upstream, midstream, and downstream actor. Rivers such as the Rhine, Danube, Elbe, and Oder not only sustain ecosystems and economic activity but also link Germany politically and institutionally with its neighbors. While cooperation in these basins has historically been strong especially regarding pollution control and navigation, Rhine cooperation is a stark example in this regard. Climate change is introducing new governance challenges related to water scarcity, flood risk, ecological degradation, and competing sectoral demands. Although the European Union's Water Framework Directive (WFD) provides an ambitious framework for integrated river basin management, its

implementation under climate stress raises critical questions. Germany's federal governance structure, combined with the transboundary nature of its rivers, creates a complex multi-level system in which adaptation responsibilities are fragmented. This article investigates how climate change is testing the limits of existing transboundary water governance arrangements in Germany and explores whether current institutional frameworks are equipped to manage emerging risks.

Literature Review

European transboundary water governance is anchored in a dense legal and institutional architecture, with the WFD serving as its central pillar. The directive promotes river basin–based management, ecological objectives, and cross-border coordination, thereby reshaping national water governance systems (Moss, 2004; Richter et al., 2013). In Germany, the WFD has reinforced coordination across Länder and river basin districts, while also embedding EU norms into domestic water law (Albrecht, 2013). EU rules strongly emphasize water quality, while water quantity/allocation questions remain underdeveloped, which may become Problematic under changing hydrology (Baranyai, 2019; Suykens, 2018). However, scholars have highlighted persistent implementation challenges. These include bureaucratic complexity, procedural compliance without substantive ecological outcomes, and uneven coordination across borders (Keessen et al., 2010; Starke & Van Rijswick, 2020). Germany's federal structure adds further complexity, as Länder retain significant authority over water management, resulting in differentiated priorities and capacities (Theesfeld & Schleyer, 2013). Climate change literature increasingly emphasizes that hydrological non-stationarity undermines traditional planning approaches based on historical data (Renner & Hauffe, 2024). In Germany, modelling studies project declining summer runoff, increased winter flows, and higher evapotranspiration, particularly in eastern and southern river basins (Huang et al., 2010). These changes pose challenges not only for water availability but also for thermal pollution, ecosystem health, and navigation. Recent empirical research demonstrates that climate impacts are already observable, with prolonged low-flow periods and rising water temperatures affecting rivers such as the Elbe and Danube (Grosser & Schmalz, 2025). These trends intensify upstream–downstream interdependencies and increase the stakes of transboundary coordination. While Europe is often portrayed as a model of cooperative transboundary water governance, power asymmetries persist beneath formal cooperation. Upstream actors may benefit from greater control over infrastructure and abstraction, while downstream regions bear disproportionate ecological and economic costs. EU frameworks mitigate but do not eliminate these asymmetries, particularly when climate change introduces scarcity and competing claims (Kosow et al., 2024).

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, literature-based research design. It synthesizes peer-reviewed academic studies, policy analyses, and documented case studies on German and European transboundary water governance. A thematic analytical approach is used to examine how climate change affects governance performance across legal, institutional, and political dimensions.

Discussion

Climate-Induced Stress on Cooperative Frameworks

The analysis reveals that climate change is not merely an environmental challenge but a structural governance stressor. Reduced summer flows, prolonged droughts, and higher water temperatures intensify competition among sectors such as agriculture, energy production, industry, and environmental protection (Huang et al., 2010; Grosser & Schmalz, 2025). These pressures strain cooperative arrangements that were primarily designed to manage pollution control and average flow conditions. Comparative analysis of WFD basins finds that low transaction costs plus strong incentives (high problem pressure or legal/domestic Incentives) are key for cooperative planning (Jager, 2016). In transboundary basins, climate-induced variability complicates coordination by increasing uncertainty and shortening decision-making timeframes. Floods and droughts demand rapid responses, yet governance structures are often slow and consensus-driven, limiting their adaptive capacity (Moss, 2004).

Institutional Fragmentation and Federal Constraints

Germany's federal system significantly shapes its adaptive capacity. German water management is federal and fragmented, with powers split across federal, Länder, and local levels, historically organized by administrative, not basin, boundaries (Hüesker & Moss, 2015). Local participatory work in Wesermarsch and Lower Saxony shows stakeholders recognize climate risks but Often prefer rigid, technical fixes (dikes, pumps, irrigation) and underinvest in flexible or land-use based Adaptation, limiting long-term resilience (Bormann et al., 2012). Studies of European regions, including German cases, identify high governmental fragmentation in water governance as a core weakness: responsibilities overlap, some sub-domains (irrigation, groundwater) are under-regulated, and climate-related roles remain unclear, as a result, adaptation still focuses on historical risks rather than emerging climate threats, and coordinative efforts are hampered (Bergsma et al.,2018). This fragmentation becomes more problematic in transboundary contexts, where coordination must occur not only across Länder but also across national borders. In eastern basins such as the Elbe and Oder, climate change exacerbates existing coordination challenges with neighboring states, particularly where institutional capacities and policy priorities diverge

The Water Framework Directive under Climate Pressure

Although the WFD provides a robust procedural framework, its ability to address climate change remains limited. The directive emphasizes ecological objectives and planning cycles but offers limited guidance on managing scarcity, allocation conflicts, and extreme events (Baranyai, 2019). Studies indicate that climate scenarios are not systematically integrated into river basin management plans, leading to reactive rather than anticipatory governance (Arndt & Heiland, 2024). As climate impacts intensify, this gap risks undermining the effectiveness of transboundary cooperation. Without explicit mechanisms for adaptive allocation and risk-sharing, existing agreements may struggle to remain relevant under future conditions. Transboundary river basins require coordination across different legal and administrative systems. In the Dutch–German Rhine delta, institutional mismatches (more fragmented German structures vs. Dutch waterboards)

Complicate cross-border climate adaptation; cross-border networks are needed to bridge these differences (Renner& Meijerink, 2017). Climate change is also reshaping the nature of water-related conflicts in Germany. While earlier disputes focused on pollution and industrial impacts, emerging tensions increasingly revolve around scarcity, thermal stress, and ecosystem protection (Kosow et al., 2024). These conflicts are often subtle and administrative rather than overtly political, but they nevertheless challenge cooperative norms and trust among riparian actors.

Conclusion

This article demonstrates that climate change is fundamentally altering the governance landscape of transboundary waters in Germany. Although Germany benefits from strong legal frameworks and a tradition of cooperation, climate-induced hydrological change exposes structural weaknesses related to institutional fragmentation, limited adaptive capacity, and insufficient integration of climate science into governance processes. The findings suggest that sustaining cooperation under climate stress will require a shift from static, compliance-oriented governance toward adaptive, learning-based, and polycentric approaches. Embedding climate scenarios into river basin planning, strengthening cross-border data-sharing, and developing flexible mechanisms for managing scarcity are critical steps. Germany's experience highlights broader lessons for transboundary water governance in an era of accelerating environmental change.

References

Arndt, S., & Heiland, S. (2024). Current status of water-related planning for climate change adaptation in the Spree river basin, Germany. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences. https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-24-4369-2024

Albrecht, H. (2013). Water governance implementation under the EU Water Framework Directive in Germany. Environmental Policy and Governance.

Baranyai, G. (2019). European water law and hydropolitics: An inquiry into the resilience of transboundary water governance in the European Union. Springer.

Bergsma, E., Alphen, H., Bruggeman, A., Giannakis, E., Koti, J., Kristvik, E., Loza, P., Martinez, M., Muthanna, T., Rocha, F., Viseu, T., & Zoumides, C. (2018). Strengths and weaknesses for climate change adaptation in water governance: A comparison across six European regions. Achievements and Challenges of Integrated River Basin Management. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.74401

Bormann, H., Ahlhorn, F., & Klenke, T. (2012). Adaptation of water management to regional climate change in a coastal region: Hydrological change vs. community perception and strategies. Journal of Hydrology, 454, 64–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.05.063

Grosser, P., & Schmalz, B. (2025). Assessing the impacts of climate change on hydrological processes in a German low mountain range basin: Modelling future water availability, low flows and water temperatures using SWAT+. Environments. https://doi.org/10.3390/environments12050151

Huang, S., Krysanova, V., Österle, H., & Hattermann, F. (2010). Simulation of spatiotemporal dynamics of water fluxes in Germany under climate change. Hydrological Processes, 24. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.7753

Hüesker, F., & Moss, T. (2015). The politics of multi-scalar action in river basin management: Implementing the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). Land Use Policy, 42, 38–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.07.003

Jager, N. (2016). Transboundary cooperation in European water governance: A set-theoretic analysis of international river basins. Environmental Policy and Governance, 26, 278–291. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1717

Keessen, A. M., van Rijswick, H. F. M. W., & Jonk, M. (2010). European freshwater law and river basin management. Water International, 35(5), 565–573.

Kosow, H., Brauner, S., Brumme, A., Hauser, W., Hölzlberger, F., Moschner, J., Rübbelke, D., Vögele, S., & Weimer-Jehle, W. (2024). Uncharted water conflicts ahead: Mapping the scenario space for Germany in the year 2050. Frontiers in Water. https://doi.org/10.3389/frwa.2024.1492336

Moss, T. (2004). The governance of land use and water management: Multi-scalar action in river basin management. Land Use Policy, 21(1), 85–96.

Renner, T., & Meijerink, S. (2017). Policy entrepreneurs in international river basins—Getting climate adaptation on the cross-border water policy agenda. Regional Environmental Change, 18, 1287–1298. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-017-1178

Starke, A., & Van Rijswick, H. F. M. W. (2020). Challenges in implementing the EU Water Framework Directive: Legal and institutional perspectives. Journal of Environmental Law, 32(2), 245–270.

Suykens, C. (2018). Critical success factors in transboundary water management: A US–EU comparison. European Energy and Environmental Law Review. https://doi.org/10.54648/eelr2018001

Theesfeld, I., & Schleyer, C. (2013). Germany's light version of integrated water resources management. Environmental Policy and Governance, 23(2), 130–144. https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1602