

Ganga from places like Kedarnath in Uttarakhand and extending into central India in Madhya Pradesh. Being on different limbs of the Ganga, population in one sub-basin is not affected by hydrologic events in other sub-basins, viz. whether there is drought or flood in Chambal Basin makes no difference to people in Bhagirathi or Alaknanda basins. And whether the glaciers aggregate or melt away has no impact on people in the sub-basins of Chambal, Ken, Betawa, Son, etc. Even on the main Ganga, impact of any significant change in glaciers will be felt may be up to Haridwar, very little at Kanpur, and may not even be perceptible by the time the river enters Bihar.

(3) Secrecy of data of Ganga Basin is a favourite excuse for Indian hydrologists for their inability to produce any significant work in hydrologic modelling. Data on Narmada, Tapi, Sabarmati, Krishna, Godavari, Cauvery, Mahanadi, Subernarekha, Bramhani and Baitarni, .... are no secret. Have the Indian hydrologists community produced many research papers and hydrologic models on these basins? The flood-forecasting package most commonly used in India, a model-cum-software called Mike 11 and its next version System 21, has been developed by DHL, a Denmark based R&D group, which also did not have access to the Ganga Basin data. This proves that it is possible to develop flood-forecasting packages without Ganga Basin data.

(4) Dave Petley of Durham University, UK has been quoted as being amazed about secrecy of data from Ganga Basin, while there are good data available from other poor countries, most notably the Philippines. But if Petley were to look up in a map which are the countries adjacent to and downstream of the Philippines and the political relationship it has with downstream countries, he might appreciate why there is no secrecy of data in the Philippines.

1. Jain, S. K., *Curr. Sci.*, 2013, **105**, 885.

CHETAN PANDIT

Formerly at Central Water Commission,  
New Delhi, India  
e-mail: [cmpandit@yahoo.com](mailto:cmpandit@yahoo.com)

### Response:

Chetan Pandit writes that the arguments in my letter are untenable on several counts. However, he has not advanced any scientific reasons to counter my opinion. Although the points mentioned by him are not focused on the underlying theme of my letter, I am addressing them here to further buttress my arguments.

First, the comment about the hydrological data networks. According to the recommendations of the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO 2008)<sup>1</sup> which are followed all over the world, minimum suggested density of a stream-flow network in the mountains is one river gauging station per 1000 sq. km area. For precipitation measurement in mountains, WMO recommends at least one non-recording station per 250 sq. km area and one-recording stations for 2500 sq. km area. The recommended minimum density of stations is necessary to correctly estimate precipitation and river flows and their variabilities. Now for illustration, the catchment area of the Ganga Basin up to Devprayag is 19,600 sq. km. There are 10 river gauging stations in this catchment operated by the Central Water Commission, where long-term data series are available. Clearly, the number is just half of the WMO recommendations. Out of these, two stations, namely Joshimath and Uttarkashi are located at 1375 and 1096 m respectively, and Badrinath at 3107 m. All other stations are at altitudes below 850 m. Thus, we have only one station at elevation exceeding 1500 m. Likewise, the long-term and recent rainfall data are available at about 10 stations operated by India Meteorological Department (IMD) and none of these is located at altitudes greater than 1500 m. Further, there is no long-term observed snowfall data series for this basin, although the area receives considerable snow. The situation in other mountains is also nearly the same. While analysing the rainfall data of the Himalayas, Nandargi and Dhar<sup>2</sup> noted that there is significant decline in the number of rainfall measuring stations, particularly after the year 2000. Clearly, we need to urgently strengthen the hydrometeorological observation network in the mountain areas in our country.

The reasons given by Pandit while questioning the statement 'Ganga Basin is home to nearly 40% of the Indian

population' do not contain anything new and in fact support my arguments. Any large basin will have variations in water availability and demands – both spatially and temporally. I believe that integrated river basin management by addressing the supply and demand issues would be necessary for sustainable water use in India and to give protection against floods and droughts.

It is surprising that Pandit with wide experience in water sector is raising doubts about the studies and publications by Indian hydrologists on Narmada, Tapi, Sabarmati, Krishna, Godavari basins, etc. These basins have been the subject of numerous hydrological studies. An internet search using the keywords, e.g. 'Mahanadi hydrological modeling' yields more than 85,000 results. Agreed that most of the sites/pages will not be related to hydrologic modelling, but even if, say 3% of the pages are about some hydrologic study, it points to nearly 2500 works. Moreover, numerous past and even current Ph D/Master's theses, reports of government organizations, papers from Indian journals and conference papers are not available on the internet. So, put together the number of hydrological studies on these basins is quite large, commensurate with our scientific and technical manpower and resources. Coincidentally, as I write this rebuttal, the 25 January issue of *Current Science*<sup>3</sup> has a paper on modelling of the Godavari Basin!

Hydrologic data secrecy was the subject matter of a note in *Current Science* by Harsha<sup>4</sup>, who forcefully argued that 'what neutralizes the argument behind data secrecy is the availability of the very same hydrological data of Region I (Indus basin) to Pakistan under Article VI of the Indus Water Treaty of 1960 and perhaps international users; also the lean season data of River Ganges at Farakka are available for all international users for easy download from the website of Bangladesh Joint Rivers Commission. What the policy-makers have failed to realize is that the adverse impact of data secrecy is felt more by the Regions I and II (Ganga, Brahmaputra and Barak basin), in respect of ability to model and predict likely climate change, plan, design and operate water resources projects, adaptation to climate change scenario, flood-risk management, river morphological studies and sustainable development as part of Integrated Water

Resources Management – probably more than the impact felt by any individual researcher due to data secrecy.’

Pandit is correct in saying that it is possible to develop a flood-forecasting package without Ganga Basin or any basin data. But in my opinion, if a forecasting package is to be applied to the Ganga Basin or a part of it, then it has to be first calibrated and validated with the Ganga Basin data. It will be a highly unscientific practice, if this is not done. This means that in the absence of data, our people are not able to test their hypotheses and models on the rivers of the Ganga Basin. A related information is

that some past studies by government organizations had implemented the packages referred to by Pandit and other software to a few tributaries of the Ganga. However, it is not known as to how these packages have performed and whether these are being applied for real decision-making at present.

Finally, Narasimhan<sup>5</sup> had noted that ‘mobilizing science in the service of society is beset with challenges of human attitude’.

1. WMO, Guide to Hydrological Practices. Volume I: Hydrology – From Measurement to Hydrological Information. WMO

No. 168. World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, 2008.

2. Nandargi, S. and Dhar, O. N., *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, 2011, **55**(6), 930–945.
3. Durga Rao, K. H. V. *et al.*, *Curr. Sci.*, 2014, **106**, 293–299.
4. Harsha, J., *Curr. Sci.*, 2013, **105**(9), 1207–1208.
5. Narasimhan, T. N., *Curr. Sci.*, 2010, **98**(4), 470.

SHARAD KUMAR JAIN

*National Institute of Hydrology,  
Roorkee 247 667, India  
e-mail: s\_k\_jain@yahoo.com*

#### FORM IV

Particulars of *Current Science*—as per Form IV under the Rule 8 of the Registration of Newspapers (Central) 1956.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Place of Publication: Bangalore  | 4. Publisher's Name, Nationality and Address:<br>G. Madhavan<br>Indian<br>Current Science Association, Bangalore 560 080 |
| 2. Periodicity of Publication: Fortnightly  | 5. Editor's Name, Nationality and Address:<br>R. Srinivasan<br>Indian<br>Current Science Association, Bangalore 560 080  |
| 3. Printer's Name and Address:<br>G. Madhavan<br>Current Science Association, Bangalore 560 080 | 6. Name and Address of the owner:<br>Current Science Association<br>Bangalore 560 080                                    |

I, G. Madhavan, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge.

Bangalore  
1 March 2014

(Sd/-)  
G. Madhavan  
Publisher, *Current Science*