

Solutions

2.1

: first UN Water Conference, 1977.: SDGs with dedicated SDG 6 for water and sanitation, 2015.

2.2

: the river.: upstream use or discharge may affect downstream supply or quality; both rely on it.

2.3

: a proposed upstream discharge might impose a downstream water-quality cost.: that cost may fall on B rather than only A.: no water-quality or discharge measurements are supplied; the permit is not approved.

2.4

each: the goal proves universal achievement; downstream location proves actual contamination; only B benefits from monitoring. Accept the associated precise correction for each.

3.1

each: A needs irrigation; B needs household supply/quality; consistent shared testing informs both; tests are needed before claiming contamination or success; monitoring funding is undecided; permit approval is outstanding. Accept a relevant consented sampling/reporting arrangement instead of repeating a stated interest.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, 8 ×: identify shared river; explain possible downstream effect; avoid claiming contamination; distinguish goal from achievement; recognise both interests; propose shared measurement; preserve funding uncertainty; preserve permission uncertainty; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The two fictional settlements depend on the same river for different purposes. An upstream discharge could affect downstream household water, so its possible costs deserve investigation. However, the supplied record contains no tests and does not establish contamination. International milestones in 1977 and 2015 show attention to water issues, not proof that every access problem is solved. Shared monitoring could inform both irrigation management and household protection. The settlements should agree on sampling, reporting and who pays before acting. They also need to decide on the proposed permit; the planning discussion is not an approval.”