

Olga Hałub-Kowalczyk

University of Wrocław (Poland)

ORCID: 0000-0003-2747-2625

e-mail: olga.halub@uwr.edu.pl

Human-Rights Approach to Water in the European Union on the 10th Anniversary of the ‘Right2Water’ Initiative

Abstract: The 20 principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights adopted by the EU in 2017 include the right to access such basic services as water, sanitation, energy or transport. In the face of the climate crisis, the first of these rights is becoming a service which, due to the progression of global warming, could lose its universal and easily accessible nature. It seems reasonable to ask about the chances of developing a ‘right to water’ within the framework of the EU’s system, which would unambiguously oblige the public authorities to ensure access to this right. The trigger for this research was the ‘Right2Water’ European citizens’ initiative addressed to the European Commission in 2013, which contained postulates to recognise access to water as a human right. Ten years after the launch of this procedure, it is reasonable to acknowledge the verification of the actions taken by the EU and whether the evolving EU water policy can be assessed as being oriented towards ensuring the right to water for all EU-inhabitants. The aim of this paper justifies the use of legal-dogmatic research methodology. Regarding the analysis of legal acts, the rules of legal hermeneutics were applied, esp. grammar and teleological interpretation.

Keywords: *access to water, right to water, Right2Water, Drinking Water Directive, Concession Directive*

Introduction

The 20 principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights adopted by the European Union (EU) in 2017 include the right to access such basic services as water, sanitation, energy, transport, financial services and digital communications (The 20 principles of the European Pillar of

Social Rights, 2017). In the face of the increasing climate crisis each year, the first of these rights is becoming a service which, due to the progression of global warming, could lose its universal and easily accessible nature. A challenge that the public authorities face in caring for both present and future generations is the state of hydrological poverty. Like E. Feitelson and J. Chenoweth (2002, p. 268), I understand this term to mean a “situation where a nation or region cannot afford the cost of sustainable clean water to all people at all times”. This general definition is a good reflection of the complexity of the problem we are experiencing. It is because we are being confronted with abstract formulations, such as ‘nation or region’ ‘cannot afford’, ‘all people’, and ‘at all times’, which may seem intangible and unquantifiable. Meanwhile, there are empirical studies addressing the problem of water scarcity in a way that makes it possible to infer some quantitative minimum availability of water for everyone to secure their minimum needs, such as the Water Poverty Index (Sullivan et al., 2003). Similarly, it is reasonable to ask about the chances of developing a ‘right to water’ (Winkler, 2012; Laskowski, 2010; Marszałek-Kawa, 2010; Thielbörger, 2014) within the framework of the EU’s system, which would unambiguously oblige the public authorities to ensure access to this right.

The trigger for this research was the ‘Right2Water’ European citizens’ initiative addressed to the European Commission in 2013, which contained postulates to recognise access to water as a human right. Ten years after the launch of this procedure, it is justified to acknowledge the verification of the actions taken by the EU in legislation in response to ‘Right2Water’ and whether the evolving EU water policy can be assessed as being oriented towards ensuring the right of access to water for all inhabitants of the EU. This research especially focuses on two projects undertaken as a result of the ‘Right2Water’ initiative – the amendment of the Drinking Water Directive (2021) and the Concession Directive (2014), which, according to the author, most fully implement the characteristics of a personal right to water, which include appropriate quality, physical availability and affordability (Communication of the European Commission, 2014).

The aim of this paper justifies the use of the legal-dogmatic research methodology and, to some limited extent, the legal-historic methodology. Regarding the analysis of legal acts, the rules of legal hermeneutics were applied, esp. the grammar and teleological interpretation.

European Citizens’ Initiative ‘Right2Water’

Water policy regulations appeared at the Community level as one of the first in the evolving EU environmental strategy (ScoCCA, 2019) in the mid-1970s through the Drinking Water Directive 75/440/EEC. Thus, managing water resources has become a core of European environmental law. Neither Drinking Water Directive nor the Framework Water Directive 2000/60/WE adopted in 2000 have raised the problem of water accessibility in terms of human rights. Meanwhile, since the 1990s, the problem of the double nature of water has been growing – on the one hand as a public good, and, on the other, as a commodity be-

ing a subject of market logic. However, the discussion of how to resolve the water impasse shall not be postponed for the next decades, because of the ongoing climate crisis and the lowering groundwater levels, as well as because currently around 1 million Europeans have no direct access to water (Deutsche Welle, 2018).

The EU's discussion on the right to water was initiated ten years ago by a European citizens' initiative (ECI) registered under the name 'Water and sanitation are a human right! Water is a public good, not a commodity!'. The European Public Services Union (EPSU) submitted it to the European Commission in December 2013 (della Porta & Parks, 2016). It's worth mentioning that a successful launching of the ECI was possible thanks to the collaboration of various groups and institutions united to promote the human right to water and prohibit water privatisation. Three years before the Right2Water was submitted, the EPSU established a special fund to promote the initiative in the Member States. The organisations participating in the project covered NGOs dealing with climate issues, public water companies, women's organisations, and even religious associations. (Forum Europejskiej Inicjatywy Obywatelskiej, 2021). The initiative was signed by almost 1.9 million people demanding that the right to water and sanitation be assured for the inhabitants of the EU and that steps be taken to block the possibility of privatising the water sector in the Member States. The 'Right2Water' initiative gained popularity not only because of the impressive amount of support, but primarily because it was the first European citizens' initiative to be submitted after the instrument was introduced into the system of EU law (Berge et al., 2018). The fact that it was submitted to the European Commission one week after the UN General Assembly once again confirmed that access to drinking water and sanitation is a human right must be considered symbolic (Resolution of the UNGA, 2013). The European Commission decided on March 19, 2014 to accept the initiative and to take it forward (Communication of the European Commission, 2014).

It should be noted that the postulate of acknowledging water as a human right is not new. It already has a tradition of more than twenty years in international law, both within the United Nations and in regional systems. However, it has not been included in any list of human rights under hard law as an autonomous right guaranteed to everyone without exception (Bakker, 2010). For this reason, in the face of the progressing environmental degradation and recurring periods of drought, the authors of the 'Right2Water' initiative have taken advantage of the momentum that is favourable for the citizens to join the discussion of this matter, which has been taking place to date behind the closed doors of the political circles. In particular, attention should be drawn to the efforts of the UN, which has been attempting to grasp the problem of sufficient access to water in terms of a human right since the late 1970s, starting with the UN-Water Conference in Mar del Plata in 1977 (Misiedjan & McKenzie, 2019; Harris et al., 2018). However, the analysis of UN documents leads to the conclusion that the decisive development of the right to water appeared in the 1990s and the early years of the 21st century (General Comment no. 15 CESCR 2002, Resolution of the UNGA 2010, HRC resolutions 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011).

Meanwhile, despite enacting extensive regulations regarding the water sector, the EU has not been treating access to water as an autonomous human right. Nor does the fact that environmental issues are addressed in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Article 37) change this state of affairs. There have also been no explicit declarations that the right to water is a fundamental right of the individual. The exception was C. Ashton's statement in 2010 made on behalf of the EU, declaring that access to water "is an individual human right (...), is a component element of the right to an adequate standard of living and is closely related to human dignity" (Declaration, 2010). The failure of the European Commission or the European Parliament to issue a binding position on the acknowledgement of water as being a human right can be interpreted as a sign that, for the EU decision-makers, water appears to be more of a commodity subject to the laws of the market than a common good. The 1992 Dublin Statement on Water and Sustainable Development introduced this approach in the discussion within international law. Moreover, it encouraged the supporters of water privatisation to struggle to shift water management from public entities to private companies. The Dublin Statement proclaimed that "water has an economic value in all its competing uses and should be recognised as an economic good". Moreover, since the 1990s, public institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have started to advocate for the privatisation movement and supported it in countries like Uruguay or Bolivia (Perera, 2012).

At that time, the supporters claimed that because water is essential for human beings, water management in underdeveloped, corruption-threatened countries should be shifted into independent private companies (Adamiak, Ośrodek Działań Ekologicznych "Źródła"). For this reason, the discussion on the human-rights approach to water cannot be conducted in isolation from a broader context that considers various interest groups perceiving the "human right to water" as an opportunity to develop the privatisation process. The complexity of this issue is visible in the lack of unambiguous actions and political decisions in the European Union. Moreover, the EU claims that "(...) the right to water does not fall within the Union's environment policy or the Union's social policy, which is limited and complementary in nature" (recital 34 of the Drinking Water Directive), and consequently, shifts the responsibility for the legal decisions to the Member States (the principle of subsidiarity). However, an evolution of the EU's position on this matter has been observed in recent years. Undoubtedly, the 'Right2water' initiative has become a catalyst of decisive changes in water availability in the EU and may influence further policy decisions on water management.

Drinking Water Quality

As mentioned, according to European Commission, effective access to water should be achieved through three elements: high quality, physical availability and affordability (Communication of the European Commission, 2014). It should be noted, that this approach presents a much narrower perspective, than the one previously presented in 2002 by the

CESCR in General Comment no. 15. The latter proclaims five elements of the right to water: availability, accessibility, affordability, access to information and high quality. The first requirement in both approaches is addressed in the EU legislation by the Drinking Water Directive. Its extensive revision should be considered one of the greatest successes of the 'Right2Water' initiative (Bieler, 2017; Council of the EU, Press release of October 23, 2020). As a consequence, the Commission launched a Union-wide public consultation and performed a Regulatory Fitness and Performance (REFIT) Evaluation of Directive 98/83/EC (recital 4 of the Directive) and identified areas, which require prompt improvement: the list of quality-based parametric values, the limited reliance on a risk-based approach, the imprecise provisions on consumer information, and the disparities between approval systems for materials that come into contact with water intended for human consumption and the implications such disparities have for human health (recital 4 of the Directive). This directive introduces higher standards for the requirements that drinking water must satisfy according to WHO guidelines. The result of accepting this organisation's demands has been the expansion of the list of requirements regarding the chemical composition, microbiological parameters, parameters of importance to risk assessment in internal water supply systems and indicator parameters indicating the presence of so-called aggressive or corrosive factors in water, in order for it to be acknowledged as drinking water. More stringent requirements regarding the presence of chemicals in water, such as chromium or lead, have been introduced. Furthermore, the list of chemical compounds has been supplemented with new ones (Bisphenol A, uranium, nitrite). Unfortunately, the regulations have been limited to the definition of the parameters mentioned, without attempting to link the standards for drinking water to the human-rights approach to water. Satisfying thirst through access to drinking water is a fundamental need of every human being arising from inherent dignity. Revising the Drinking Water Directive could be a good opportunity for the EU to declare its intention to build its water policy based on a human-rights approach.

Reliance on a Risk-Based Approach

According to the Directive, a holistic, risk-based approach to water security should be introduced. Its scope should encompass the whole supply chain from the catchment area through abstraction, treatment, storage and distribution to the point of compliance. The risk-based approach has three key elements: risk assessment and risk management of the catchment areas for water abstraction points intended for human consumption, risk assessment and management for the supply system, and risk assessment of the domestic distribution systems. The risk-based approach should ensure a continuous exchange of information between competent authorities and water suppliers (recital 15 of the Directive), as a result of which it is possible to increase the effectiveness of water safety protection and thereby the protection of public health and life. It also results in an easier means of redress, as they can be addressed to the public authorities in a broader scope. Similarly, the level of

legal protection of the individual against possible damage incited by any possible activities of such entities is significantly increased.

Access to Water for Vulnerable Groups

From the perspective of the individual's right to water, providing access to water for marginalised groups requires special attention. It implements the second element of the right to water in the meaning of EU law, namely physical availability. States must apply all necessary measures to improve or maintain water access, particularly for those at risk of social exclusion 'for various reasons', such as refugees or indigenous people (Jackson, 2016). The national authorities will therefore be responsible for defining the group of beneficiaries of this right. Importantly, states should also establish why specific groups have limited access to water. Therefore, the state should independently adopt criteria to define the reasons for this state of affairs. Consequently, it cannot be ruled out that states will have to adjust their own decisions and actions in public water management if it transpires that excessive abstraction prices are one of the reasons for limited access to water. States should also assess the opportunities and possibilities of improving access to water and apply the necessary measures to achieve this objective. Therefore, water management can serve as an excellent instrument in states' equality and anti-discrimination policies by ensuring equality of opportunities for access to water. However, exercising the right to water will be progressive (Ssenyonjo, 2016; Sepúlveda & Magdalena, 2003; Schutter, 2019), depending on the state's financial capabilities.

Providing water abstraction devices by Member States in public spaces outside and inside buildings is also important for universal access to this right. This solution can increase water availability and may become a tool for making access to water common for vulnerable groups and every natural person. However, the proposal to provide water free of charge can encounter resistance from some interest groups. It is especially true in countries that base their water management system on a privatised model but also in those based on public-private partnerships, where profits from the sale of water mainly end up in the hands of private companies.

Access to Information on Water

As a result of the 'Right2Water' initiative, a new instrument has been introduced into EU law which, according to the author, establishes one of the fundamental elements of the future right to water in the EU's system, i.e., access to information on its status, which corresponds with the requirements dedicated to the right to water, specified by the CESCR in General Comment no 15. This right has operated to date as an element of the procedural right to information on the environment (Dupuy & Viñuales, 2017), commonly recognised, among other things, in the Aarhus Convention (1998). However, according to the author, the role

and significance of water in the lives of individuals and entire societies fully justifies an approach that gives the right to information on the water an autonomous nature. It is because its implementation protects fundamental personal values, such as dignity, life, health, equality and freedom from suffering hunger. Therefore, the EU legislator's introduction of a framework of information obligations regarding the right to water into the legal order should be appreciated. On the other hand, the Directive leaves a certain amount of dissatisfaction. It is because it does not create a 'right of access to information on water' *expressis verbis*. It approaches the subject exclusively from the point of view of the information obligations of states. However, this was another opportunity to consolidate the discussion on water regarding a human-rights approach *expressis verbis*, which the EU has missed.

The Water Sector in the Internal Market

The European citizens' initiative 'Right2Water' contained postulates calling on the EU to take a clear stance against privatising water by removing the supply of water and water management from the domestic market rules. Water is a special good and should not be treated completely as a market product. The experience of such cities as Grenoble, Paris and Berlin, where re-municipalisation took place years after the introduction of the privatisation of water, confirms that this is a process that threatens the availability of water and its low prices (Berge et al., 2022). Therefore, if the water sector is not transferred into private hands, this significantly facilitates the achievement of the third constitutive element of the right to water, i.e., affordability. From the point of view of the amendments introduced in this respect after the 'Right2Water' campaign, special attention should be paid to enacting the Concession Directive in February 2014. The objective of this act of law was to provide an adequate, balanced and flexible legal framework for the award of concessions, ensuring effective and non-discriminatory access to the market to all economic operators in the EU and legal certainty favouring public investment in infrastructures and strategic services to citizens (recital 1 of the Directive). Importantly, the water sector was excluded from the provisions of the Directive. This move was especially significant for the anti-privatisation movement. It is a significant step towards 'de-commercialising' water and making it once again a good that is not of an exclusively commercial nature (Bakker, 2016). Critics of the current form of the Concessions Directive point out that excluding the water sector from its provisions is a double-edged sword. The organisations representing the private water sector argue that the essence of the EU's solutions is not only to guarantee equal access to the market of services for all economic operators from the EU, but also to introduce standards to ensure transparency of the procedure for awarding concessions and equal treatment of all candidates and bidders (AquaFed, 2013). These regulations aim to combat fraud, favouritism and corruption and prevent conflicts of interest (recital 61 of the Directive). On the other hand, the European Parliament, which is explicitly critical of the privatisation process, stated in its response to 'Right2Water' that 'Treaty rules require the EU to remain neutral

in relation to national decisions governing the ownership regime of water undertakings' (The European Parliament Resolution, 2015). Meanwhile, the Commission has exercised far-reaching restraint in expressing an unambiguously critical position on the privatisation of the water sector. Furthermore, in the past, the opposite trends could be observed encouraging the privatisation of the water sector (Liotard & McGiffen, 2009). However, it should be accepted that the exclusion of the water sector is an important sign of the change in the EU's position towards being against the process of water privatisation, but it cannot be perceived as a fundamental step towards the human right to water.

Conclusions

The tenth anniversary of the submission of the European citizens' initiative 'Right2Water' sees the development of EU policies to increase water availability as a public good. The extensive amendment of the Drinking Water Directive and the adoption of the Concessions Directive enable the conclusion that the EU recognises the need to develop a human-rights approach to water, but it does not directly impose the proclamation of new human right in the EU legislation. The response to 'Right2Water' is still far from expected, but it proves that the EU is taking the need to seriously address the postulates of universal access to water. The author agrees with EPSU's point of view, that the revision of the Drinking Water Directive may be perceived as a success of the "Right2Water" movement (EPSU, 2020). The subsequent steps taken within the EU confirmed that the discussion on water rights became a part of the EU agenda. The expansion of the legislation intended to satisfy the needs of people with limited access to water, who may be at risk of social exclusion is particularly noteworthy. Nevertheless, the EU is not speaking in unison on the right to water. While the European Parliament calls for the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights extension to include this right, the European Commission appears to represent a much more restrained position and shifts the entire responsibility for the water strategy to national legislation. It is probably trying to face the challenge of reconciling enterprises' interests with the population's needs regarding the availability of this good. Some scholars even argue that the position of the European Commission is disappointing and supportive of the neoliberal agenda (della Porta & Parks, 2016; Bieler, 2017). This implicit ambiguity confirms the lack of development of a uniform water availability strategy, which constitutes a kind of 'bridge' between human rights and environmental law (Dupuy & Viñuales, 2017), and sustainable development. Certainly, the exclusion of the water sector from the Concessions Directive is a breakthrough step, albeit not yet a milestone, with regard to limiting the privatisation process of the water sector in the EU. Additionally, the European Parliament is going further and calling on the Commission and the Member States to promote water management solutions based on the public-public partnership model.

The overall conduct of the EU regarding the right to water ten years after the formulation of the 'Right2Water' initiative enables to formulate a thesis that the human-rights approach to

water in the EU will be constantly gaining importance over the coming years, if the pressure on political circles from social movements will be continued. Simultaneously, we should not lose sight of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the SDGs, which proclaims inter alia availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all (goal no. 6). In this context, it is worth mentioning the pressure on the European Commission, which is constantly put from the European Parliament. In the latest resolution “On access to water as a human right – the external dimension” from October 2022, it was stipulated that “water is not a mere commodity but a public good, (...) vital to human life and dignity” (Resolution 2021/2187 INI). Moreover, the necessity to undertake integrated economic and social action towards equal access to the WASH sector (Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene) was highlighted. Despite the non-binding character of this resolution, its role shouldn’t be underestimated, as it confirms that the right to water is established in the EU agenda. At the same time, it leads to the conclusion that the Parliament still finds the adoption of the mentioned guarantees insufficient for providing equitable access to water.

In order to establish the content of a possible ‘right to water’, one must consider universally recognised pillars (both by the UN and the EU), i.e., high quality of water, physical availability and affordability. Each of these elements has initially found its place in the regulations under review in this paper. However, the assurance of a right for the individual, on the one hand, and the obligation to use water sparingly on the other, prevents basing the EU’s policy strategy on this solely on a single water management instrument (Faure, 2012).

According to the author, to further develop the ‘right to water’ concept, it would be necessary to oblige the Member States to enact a document, which might be called National Support Programme in Access to Water (NSPAW). It would be based on a human-rights approach to water. According to the author, the key elements of the NSPAW should include reporting on the progress made in assuring individuals of high-quality water, physical accessibility and affordability of water sector services. Furthermore, it should also be considered reasonable to specify the vulnerable groups with limited access to water and the resources available to the given administrative unit (e.g., the municipality) for building or expanding the water infrastructure to eliminate these deficits.

The European citizens’ initiative ‘Right2Water’ was a key trigger for discussing securing the right to water in the EU system. Similarly, political circles had to address not only an abstract vision of a problem to be faced in the future, but a real voice of the population of the EU calling for immediate action. Although the extent to which Member States will be willing to implement these solutions is unknown, it should be expected that the coming years will support the further development of the concept of the ‘right to water’, especially through the mechanisms of participatory democracy and the developing movements of the citizens.

References:

- Adamiak, J. (n.d.). *Woda – doskonały pomysł na biznes*. https://www.woda.edu.pl/artykuly/prywatyzacja_wody
- AquaFed. (2013). *Call for the European Union to include the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation in the European Charter on Fundamental Rights*. <https://pr.euractiv.com/pr/call-european-union-include-human-right-safe-drinking-water-and-sanitation-european-charter-94495>
- Bakker, K. (2010). *Privatizing Water: Governance Failure and the World's Urban Water Crisis*. Cornell University Press.
- Bakker, K. (2012). Dobra wspólne kontra towary. Rozważania nad prawem człowieka do wody. In F. Sultana, & A. Loftus (Eds.), *Prawo do wody w perspektywie politycznej, gospodarczej i społecznej* (pp. 47–73). PAH.
- Bakker, K. (2016). The business of water. In K. Conca, & E. Weinthal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of water politics and policy* (pp. 407–429). Oxford University Press.
- Bieler, A. (2017). Fighting for public water: the first successful European Citizens' Initiative "Water and Sanitation are a Human Right". *Interface: a journal for and about social movements*, 9(1), 300–326.
- Communication of the European Commission (press release) setting out the actions it intends to take in response to the European Citizens' initiative 'Right2water. (2014, March 19). https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_14_277
- Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters*. Aarhus, Denmark, June 25, 1998.
- Council of the EU. (2020, October 23) *Press release*. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2020/10/23/safe-and-clean-drinking-water-council-adopts-strict-minimum-quality-standards>
- Declaration by the High Representative, Catherine Ashton. (2010, March 22). https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/PESC_10_12
- De Schutter, O. (2019). *International human rights law: cases, materials, commentary*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deutsche Welle. (2018). <https://www.dw.com/pl/milion-ludzi-w-europie-nie-ma-dost%C4%99pu-do-wody-pitnej/a-46019524>
- della Porta, D., & Parks, L. (2018). Social movements, the European crisis, and EU political opportunities. *Comparative European Politics*, 16(1), 85–102.
- Directive (EU) 2020/2184 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2020 on the quality of water intended for human consumption.
- Directive 2014/23/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on the award of concession contracts Text with EEA relevance.
- Dupuy, P. M., & Viñuales, J. E. (2017). *International environmental law*. Cambridge University Press.
- EPSU. (2020). <https://www.epsu.org/article/epsu-welcomes-vote-drinking-water-directive-and-step-realise-right2water-eu-legislation>
- EU Human Rights Guidelines on Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation 2019 no. 9784/19. <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/39776/st10145-en19.pdf>
- European Parliament resolution* of October 5, 2022 on access to water as a human right – the external dimension (2021/2187(INI)).
- European Parliament resolution* of September 8, 2015 on the follow-up to the European Citizens' Initiative *Right2Water* (2014/2239(INI)).

- Faure, M. (2012). Instruments for environmental governance: what works? In P. Martin, Z. Li, T. Qin, et al. (Eds.), *Environmental Governance and Sustainability* (p. 11). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Feitelson, E., & Chenoweth, J. (2002). Water poverty: towards a meaningful indicator. *Water Policy* 4, 263–268. DOI: 10.1016/S1366-7017(02)00029-6
- Forum Europejskiej Inicjatywy Obywatelskiej. (2021). <https://europa.eu/citizens-initiative-forum/sites/default/files/2021-03/Right2Water%20PL.pdf>
- General Comment no. 15 of 2002 to CESCR.
- Harris, S., Bartel, R., Williams, J., et al. (2018). Water Policy and the Anthropocene. In S. Harris, R. Bartel, J. Williams, & L. Noble (Eds.) *Water Policy, Imagination and Innovation* (pp. 1–21). Routledge.
- Jackson, S. E. (2016). Indigenous Peoples and Water Justice in a Globalizing World. In K. Conca, & E. Weinthal, *The Oxford Handbook of water politics and policy* (pp. 120–141). Oxford University Press.
- Laskowski, S. R. (2010). *Das Menschenrecht auf Wasser*. Mohr Siebeck Verlag.
- Liotard, K., & McGiffen, S. P. (2009). *Poisoned Spring: The EU and Water Privatisation*. London Pluto Press.
- Marszałek-Kawa, J. (2010). Relations between European Parliament with the national parliaments Member States of the European Union. *Polish Political Science Yearbook*, 39, 45–71.
- Misiedjan, D., & McKenzie, S. (2019). The human right to water. In M. Faure (Ed.), *Human Rights and the Environment. Legality, Indivisibility, Dignity and Geography* (p. 338). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Resolution of the Human Rights Council no. 12/8 of 2009, October 1.
- Resolution of the Human Rights Council no. 15/9 of 2010, September 30.
- Resolution of the Human Rights Council no. 16/2 of 2011, March 24.
- Resolution of the Human Rights Council no. 7/22 of 2008, March 28.
- Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, 2010, 64/292.
- Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, 2013, A/RES/68/157.
- Riedel, E., & Rothen, P. (Eds.) (2006). *The Human Right to Water*. Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag.
- Scooca, G. (2019). Strengthening International Water Security: The European Proposal. *World Water Policy*, 5, 192–206. DOI: 10.1002/wwp2.12014
- Sepúlveda Carmona, M. M. (2003). *The nature of the obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. Intersentia.
- Ssenyonjo, M. (2016). *Economic, social and cultural rights in international law*. Oxford University Press.
- Sullivan, C. (2003). The Water Poverty Index: Development and application at the community scale. *Natural Resources Forum*, 27, 189–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1477-8947.00054>
- The 20 Principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights. (2017). https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/priorities-2019-2024/economy-works-people/jobs-growth-and-investment/european-pillar-social-rights/european-pillar-social-rights-20-principles_en
- Thielbörger, P. (2014). *The Right(s) to Water. The Multi-level Governance of a Unique Human Right*. Springer.
- van den Berge, J., Vos, J., & Boelens, R. (2018). Uniting Diversity to Build Europe's Right2Water Movement. In R. Boelens, T. Perreault, & J. Vos (Eds.), *Water justice* (pp. 226–227). Cambridge University Press.
- van den Berge, J., Vos, J., & Boelens, R. (2022). Water justice and Europe's Right2Water movement. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 38(1), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07900627.2021.1898347>
- Winkler, I. T. (2012). *The Human Right to Water. Significance, Legal Status and Implications for Water Allocation*. Oxford Hart Publishing.

