INSIGHT · DISCOURSE · ACTION

CDRC Digest

October 2025 VOL.9 NO. 8

Contents

CDRC is a non-profit, independent Ethiopia-based policy institute engaged in research and analysis. The Centre looks at opportunities and key challenges in the Horn of Africa, and focuses on policy ideas on development, sustainable peace and security.

The CDRC Digest is the Centre's monthly publication, endeavoring to provide an African perspective on political, economic and social developments as well as mechanisms of sustaining peace and security in the Horn of Africa, the African continent and beyond. The publication is based on dialogue, rigorous research and analysis.

A monthly publication of the Centre for Dialogue, Research and Cooperation (CDRC), in partnership with the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Ethiopia

CDRC Digest Team:

Abdeta Dribssa Beyene, Ph.D (Executive Director)
Amb. Kasahun Dender (Deputy Executive Director)
Wegene Mengistu (Senior Researcher)
Yidnekachew Mitku Ph.D (Senior researcher)

Centre for Dialogue, Research and Cooperation
Ethio-China Friendship Avenue
Medina Tower 5th floor
Tel: +251 11 470 0370/73
Fax: +251 11 470 0359
Email: cdrc@cdrcethiopia.com
http://www.cdrcethiopia.org

The Nile's Crossroads: New Visions or Old Paradigms

Introduction

The inauguration of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD) on September 9, 2025, represents a watershed moment in the geopolitics of the Nile Basin, redefining both the regional balance of power and the prospects for cooperative development. More than a dam, the GERD symbolizes Ethiopia's long-awaited emergence as a regional powerhouse capable of transforming the hydropolitical architecture of Northeast Africa. Financed domestically at a cost exceeding $4 billion—without external aid or loans—the project stands as a testament to national pride, resilience, and self-reliance. For the over 400 million people living within the Nile Basin, the GERD forces a profound reckoning with long-standing water management practices, exposing old hierarchies while opening new possibilities for regional interdependence. Generating over 5,150 MW of electricity, the dam challenges Egypt's historical dominance over the Nile—a dominance rooted in the 1929 and 1959 colonial-era treaties that allocated the river's waters almost exclusively between Egypt and Sudan, excluding upstream states like Ethiopia, which contributes nearly 85% of the Nile's total flow through the Blue Nile.

The implications of this shift are immense. For Ethiopia, the GERD represents empowerment and development; for Egypt, it reveals the limits of a strategy built on preserving historical rights and control; for Sudan, it presents both an opportunity and a balancing act, as Khartoum navigates between hydropower cooperation and downstream sensitivities. Egypt's deeply entrenched perception of the Nile as an existential lifeline continues to define its strategic posture. However, adherence to outdated paradigms—rooted in unilateral control and zero-sum thinking—risks obstructing adaptation to a rapidly evolving regional and global context marked by climate variability, demographic expansion, and shifting geopolitical alliances.

In this context, Egypt's insistence on maintaining the natural flow of the Nile faces its greatest test. The completion of the GERD compels all riparian nations to choose between two divergent paths: one of confrontation and mistrust, and another of cooperation and shared prosperity. The Nile Basin Initiative (NBI), launched in 1999, provides an existing platform for such engagement, yet Egypt's selective participation and cautious diplomacy continue to hinder collective progress. Meanwhile, the basin's population—projected to reach 600 million by 2050—will drive unprecedented demand for both water and energy, making cooperative management not a matter of choice but of survival. Against this backdrop, the GERD serves as both a challenge and an opportunity: a catalyst for reimagining regional interdependence, or a trigger for renewed rivalry if old paradigms prevail.

The central challenge for the Nile Basin nations extends beyond water allocation—it is a test of strategic foresight and political leadership. The region faces a defining choice: to transcend historical grievances and build a framework for shared prosperity, or to remain captive to the inertia of past rivalries. As basin dynamics evolve, this decision will determine whether the Nile becomes a foundation for cooperation or a source of enduring discord. Comparative experience underscores the benefits of collaboration: the 1996 Ganges Treaty and the Senegal River Basin's joint management system illustrate how equitable institutional frameworks can transform potential conflict into a sustainable partnership. Ethiopia's emergence as a regional energy hub, exporting over $1 billion in electricity annually to Sudan, Kenya, Djibouti, and South Sudan, amplifies this opportunity for interdependence and shared growth. Yet, realizing this promise depends on robust governance and effective risk mitigation at home. Safeguarding transmission infrastructure—particularly across Oromia, Amhara, and Benishangul-Gumuz regions—is vital to ensuring the reliability of regional energy trade. Ultimately, Ethiopia's developmental vision and the stability of the broader Nile Basin are intertwined. A stable, resilient Ethiopia will not only secure its national transformation but also serve as the linchpin for a cooperative Nile order grounded in mutual progress and regional integration.

The Symbolism of the GERD

A Symbol of Self-Reliance, Renewal, and Resilience

The GERD's inauguration is far more than a technical or engineering milestone; it is a deeply symbolic moment in Africa's modern history. By timing the ceremony to coincide with the Ethiopian New Year and the Africa Climate Summit, Addis Ababa underscored themes of renewal, self-reliance, and continental agency. The dam was hailed as "the greatest achievement in the history of the Black race," reflecting a narrative of African resilience and ownership of development. Heads of State from Kenya, Djibouti, South Sudan, and Somalia, as well as dignitaries from the Caribbean, joined the celebration—an implicit recognition that Ethiopia's success carries broader continental and diasporic significance. The GERD stands as a model of how African nations can mobilize domestic resources to achieve transformative projects without reliance on external lenders, whose conditions often limit sovereignty and long-term policy independence.

The GERD stands as a powerful embodiment of Ethiopia's resilience and determination, having overcome formidable internal and external challenges throughout its conception and construction. Internally, Ethiopia faced a complex web of vulnerabilities—including resource constraints, political transitions, and governance challenges—that could have easily derailed such an ambitious national project. Yet, through collective mobilization and a strong sense of national purpose, Ethiopians transformed the GERD into a symbol of unity and self-reliance. Externally, the project confronted sustained opposition from Egypt, whose diplomatic, political, and covert tactics sought to halt or delay its progress. Cairo's attempts included funding proxy activities in the dam's surrounding regions to stir instability and exert pressure on Addis Ababa.

In addition, Egypt sought to internationalize the dispute, framing the GERD as a threat to regional and even global security in order to rally external powers and financial institutions to its side. Despite these efforts, Ethiopia's commitment to completing the project never wavered. The dam's inauguration thus represents not merely an infrastructural triumph but a profound assertion of sovereignty, agency, and developmental ambition in the face of adversity.

The project's local financing—through citizen bonds, payroll contributions, and public fundraising—has galvanized a sense of national unity around a collective endeavor. This approach directly challenges the post-colonial dependency model that has long defined infrastructure development across Africa. Beyond hydropower generation, the dam represents a moral and political victory: a declaration that African nations can take charge of their destinies, design solutions tailored to their needs, and confront global challenges such as climate change through indigenous effort and solidarity.

Overcoming Historical Marginalization

Stretching more than a mile across the Blue Nile, the GERD also reinforces Ethiopia's enduring leadership in advocating for equitable and just utilization of the Nile waters—a principle long denied by the colonial-era legal order. The 1929 Nile Waters Agreement, concluded through an exchange of notes between the United Kingdom (representing its colonial territories, including Sudan, Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda) and Egypt, then a British protectorate, effectively institutionalized Egypt's dominance over the river. The agreement allocated 48 billion cubic meters of water annually to Egypt and 4 billion cubic meters to Sudan, while granting Cairo veto power over any upstream development projects that could alter the Nile's flow. This arrangement, later reinforced by the 1959 bilateral accord between Egypt and Sudan, entrenched a hydropolitical hierarchy that excluded Ethiopia—even though the Ethiopian highlands contribute roughly 85 percent of the Nile's total flow through the Blue Nile, Sobat, and Atbara rivers.

For decades, Ethiopia's calls for equitable and reasonable use were dismissed or treated as peripheral to the dominant narrative of Egyptian water security. The construction and completion of the GERD thus signify more than an engineering milestone; they represent a reversal of historical marginalization and a reassertion of Ethiopia's rightful place in shaping the governance of the Nile Basin. The dam's success underscores the shift from externally imposed constraints toward a new paradigm of African self-determination—where upstream and downstream

nations must negotiate as equals to secure shared prosperity.

The idea of harnessing the Blue Nile for national development remained dormant for decades due to geopolitical constraints, financial limitations, and external pressures. However, by the early 1990s, following the political transition in Ethiopia, the government began to revisit the question of how best to utilize the country's abundant water resources for economic transformation. In 1993, Ethiopia launched a series of exploratory initiatives aimed at systematically developing its river basins, beginning with the Gibe River, where successive hydropower projects were planned and executed. These efforts were not only about energy generation but also about building the institutional and technical capacity required to assert Ethiopia's rights as an upper riparian state.

In this process, Ethiopia sought strategic partnerships to strengthen its expertise in both water resource management and international river diplomacy. Cooperation with countries such as Turkey proved particularly valuable, especially in capacity building and in understanding how upper riparian states can negotiate to protect and advance their sovereign rights under international law. This experience significantly informed Ethiopia's proactive role in initiating the Cooperative Framework Agreement (CFA) negotiations, which sought to establish equitable principles for the utilization of Nile waters among all riparian countries. Ethiopia's engagement in the CFA process reflected a pragmatic strategy—balancing diplomacy with long-term preparation for independent development should negotiations fail.

When the Cooperative Framework Agreement (CFA) negotiations stalled in 2010—primarily due to Egypt's and Sudan's refusal to relinquish their exclusive historical "water security" claims over the Nile—Ethiopia made the decisive choice to proceed unilaterally. Several upstream states, including Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, and Tanzania, went on to sign the CFA, affirming their commitment to equitable and reasonable utilization of the Nile waters. During this period, Egypt was engulfed in the political upheaval of the Arab Spring, which limited its diplomatic bandwidth. Preoccupied with domestic instability, Cairo sought to buy time. An Egyptian delegation attending the African Union Summit in Malabo informally requested Ethiopia to postpone parliamentary ratification of the CFA concerned with an Ethiopian plan which was still referred to as "Project X"." Egypt was caught completely off guard by Ethiopia's announcement of Project X.

For decades, Egyptian policymakers had assumed that they possessed sufficient leverage to block any major upstream project by denying access to international financing and mobilizing diplomatic pressure. Cairo also believed it could exploit Ethiopia's internal political fragilities and regional vulnerabilities to prevent any sustained national effort toward large-scale hydropower development. Consequently, Egypt's leadership never imagined that Ethiopia would achieve the internal stability and political resolve necessary to mobilize domestic resources for such an ambitious undertaking. The launch of the GERD in 2011 shattered these long-held assumptions. Ethiopia's ability to self-finance the project—drawing on popular contributions, national pride, and political consensus—signaled a profound shift in the balance of agency within the Nile Basin, demonstrating that upstream states could act decisively to harness their natural resources despite external resistance.

Ethiopia, having long prepared for such a moment, continued its plans discreetly. The leadership was sympathetic to the challenges Egypt faced, but that did not distract itself from asserting its sovereign right to development while maintaining diplomatic engagement. In 2011, Ethiopia officially unveiled the long-conceived and closely guarded "Project X" as the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD)—a defining moment that reshaped the geopolitics of the Nile Basin. The decision marked Ethiopia's transition from rhetorical advocacy for equitable use to decisive action grounded in national capacity and regional vision. When the new Egyptian president, Mohamed Morsi, assumed office following the ouster of Hosni Mubarak, he initially adopted a conciliatory tone. During his encounters with Ethiopian leaders in Addis Ababa, Morsi acknowledged that the dam would not fundamentally harm Egypt's core interests, signaling a rare moment of pragmatic understanding between the two states. However, Egypt's deep state remained intent on undermining President Morsi's leadership. In a televised political parties' debate, political figures openly discussed ways to pressure Ethiopia—some

even suggesting exploiting the country's internal vulnerabilities to derail the dam project.

In the final report submitted in 2013, the International Panel of Experts (IPoE), composed of two representatives from Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan each, and four experts from Germany, France, United Kingdom, and South Africa, reviewed the project and concluded that the dam's phased filling—designed to reach a total reservoir capacity of 74 billion cubic meters—would cause minimal downstream harm. This finding effectively challenged Cairo's alarmist narratives and validated Ethiopia's long-standing position that the GERD could serve as a foundation for cooperation rather than conflict.

By late 2024, the GERD reached operational capacity, powering industrial zones, electrifying rural communities, and expanding irrigation in previously arid and food-insecure areas. It now stands at the core of Ethiopia's national development strategy, aligning with broader goals of industrialization, poverty reduction, and job creation for a population exceeding 120 million, of whom more than 70 million are youth. The dam's completion represents not only the realization of a decades-old vision but also Ethiopia's broader assertion of agency—transforming from a historically marginalized upstream state into an active architect of its development destiny and a key player in the reconfiguration of Nile Basin politics.

In the continental context, the GERD embodies a model for sustainable, African-led development. It offers inspiration for similar projects across the continent—such as the Inga Dam in the Congo Basin or large-scale irrigation schemes in the Sahel—highlighting how local initiative, when coupled with strategic vision, can redefine development pathways.

Resilience Through Stability: Safeguarding the GERD's Triumph

The completion of the GERD stands as a monumental achievement—an enduring symbol of Ethiopia's steadfastness against external pressures, particularly Egypt's persistent strategy of exploiting internal vulnerabilities to undermine Ethiopia's developmental progress. Historically, Egypt has sought to leverage Ethiopia's domestic fragilities—such as insurgencies, ethnic tensions, and economic challenges—to destabilize the country and obstruct major national projects like the GERD. Addressing these internal weaknesses is therefore essential not only for safeguarding Ethiopia's broader developmental aspirations but also for denying Egypt, or any other country for that matter, the leverage to continue such tactics.

To fully realize the GERD's transformative potential, Ethiopia must prioritize peace consolidation, institutional strengthening, and public trust-building across its diverse regions. Durable stability will neutralize external attempts to manipulate domestic fissures, ensuring that the dam's benefits are secured for future generations. The GERD's success thus transcends its engineering grandeur—it is a test of governance, unity, and foresight. If Ethiopia succeeds in stabilizing its internal environment and equitably distributing the dam's benefits, the GERD can become a catalyst for national reconciliation and regional cooperation, transforming Ethiopia's developmental trajectory and reinforcing its sovereignty against external pressures.

Egypt and Ethiopia's Approaches to the Nile

Ethiopia, as the primary source of the Nile River's waters—contributing roughly 85–86% of the river's annual flow through the Blue Nile and its tributaries—has long sought to harness this natural endowment for its own development. Yet its ambitions have consistently been constrained by both internal challenges and external resistance. Successive Ethiopian leaders have envisioned the Nile as a vehicle for national transformation, but progress has often been slowed by a combination of domestic instability, limited capacity, and the enduring influence of external actors opposed to any reconfiguration of the Nile's status quo.

Egypt, in contrast, has historically pursued a strategy aimed at preserving its hydro-hegemony and full dominance over the Nile's waters. This has included a mix of diplomatic obstruction, proxy conflicts, and exclusionary agreements designed to marginalize Ethiopia from basin-wide governance arrangements. From early efforts to extend military or political control over Ethiopia's highlands and headwaters to more recent attempts to exploit regional and ethnic tensions, Cairo has consistently sought to constrain

Addis Ababa's capacity to utilize the Nile for development. Although Ethiopia's steadfast defense of its sovereignty has prevented direct subjugation, these tactics have drained resources and diverted attention from long-term development objectives.

Egypt has also forged exclusive bilateral arrangements with other downstream riparian states to consolidate its "water security". The 1929 exchange of notes between Britain and Egypt, and the 1959 bilateral agreement between Egypt and Sudan, effectively entrenched Cairo's dominant allocation of the Nile—granting it 55.5 billion cubic meters of water annually, while excluding Ethiopia and other upstream nations. Ethiopia has consistently rejected these colonial-era frameworks, grounding its position in the principles of equitable and reasonable utilization and no significant harm, as enshrined in international water law.

Ethiopia's long-standing advocacy for inclusive, basin-wide frameworks eventually yielded results. In 1997, Addis Ababa successfully brought Egypt to the negotiating table for the D3 Project, supported by the UNDP and later the World Bank, which conditioned Egypt's access to a $750 million development fund on participation in joint discussions. This initiative paved the way for the establishment of the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) in 1999 as a transitional cooperative mechanism and set in motion the drafting of the Cooperative Framework Agreement (CFA). After thirteen years of negotiation, the CFA was adopted in 2009 at Sharm el-Sheikh and opened for signature in 2010 in Entebbe, Uganda. The agreement officially entered into force on October 13, 2024, following ratification by six Nile Basin states—a historic milestone in the evolution of Nile governance, despite Egypt and Sudan's refusal to sign due to their objections to Article 14(b).

Article 14(b) underscores the principle of collective water security, emphasizing cooperation among all riparian states to ensure equitable utilization without significantly harming any party. Egypt and Sudan, however, proposed alternative wording to protect their so-called "current uses and rights," effectively seeking to preserve the 1959 bilateral allocations that granted Egypt 55.5 billion cubic meters of the Nile's waters. The reference to "current uses" has remained contentious, as it perpetuates a colonial-era legacy that excludes upstream nations from rightful access and reinforces an outdated hydropolitical order.

The CFA's ratification represents a foundational step toward equitable and sustainable governance of the Nile waters, dismantling the legal barriers that long privileged downstream dominance. Yet, a comprehensive water allocation agreement based on the CFA's cooperative principles remains essential for ensuring durable peace, environmental sustainability, and shared prosperity across the basin. Egypt's continued reluctance to engage constructively risks isolating it from a regional framework that promises mutual benefit.

By rejecting outdated treaties and championing a principle-based approach, Ethiopia and its fellow upstream states have demonstrated a collective commitment to justice, sustainability, and African-led governance of shared resources. The future of the Nile, therefore, depends not on rigid adherence to historical entitlements but on a forward-looking framework of equity, partnership, and mutual resilience.

The Need for a Realist Slant in the Pursuit of an Amicable Solution to Nile Water Management

Addressing Inequities

The management of the Nile River remains one of Africa's most enduring geopolitical challenges, rooted in deep historical inequities and outdated frameworks. Principles of fairness—anchored in equity, reciprocity, and mutual benefit—must guide any meaningful attempt to resolve the competing interests of the eleven Nile Basin states. For decades, Egypt has exercised a de facto monopoly over the Nile waters, relying on the river for over 90 percent of its freshwater needs to sustain a population now exceeding 110 million people. This dependency has fueled a deeply entrenched sense of vulnerability in Cairo, shaping its foreign policy and regional posturing. Yet, the foundation of Egypt's dominance—the colonial-era Nile Waters Agreements of 1929, and the 1959 bilateral agreement—has become increasingly untenable in the face of demographic growth, climate pressures, and new development imperatives. The 1959 Agreement, in particular, which allocated 55.5 billion cubic meters of the Nile's annual

flow to Egypt and 18.5 billion to Sudan while completely excluding Ethiopia, was both inequitable and ahistorical. It ignored Ethiopia's status as the source of roughly 85 percent of the Nile waters reaching the Aswan Dam via the Blue Nile, Tekeze, and Baro rivers, effectively marginalizing its developmental rights.

Expecting Ethiopia to abide by treaties to which it was neither a party nor a beneficiary is incompatible with modern principles of sovereignty and equitable resource use. The construction of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD)—a project capable of generating 5,150 MW of electricity—symbolizes Ethiopia's assertion of its right to utilize its own resources to alleviate poverty, industrialize its economy, and expand energy access for its citizens. The GERD's potential to electrify millions, power industrial parks, and lift an estimated 20 million people out of poverty underscores its developmental necessity. Furthermore, it positions Ethiopia to become a regional energy exporter, earning valuable foreign currency through power sales to neighboring states.

Egypt's persistent diplomatic campaign to halt or slow the GERD's progress, even after signing the 2015 Declaration of Principles (DoP) in Khartoum—which explicitly recognized Ethiopia's right to construct the dam while negotiations continued—illustrates the limits of its traditional hegemonic strategy. Cairo's attempts to mobilize international allies, rally downstream sympathy, and exploit Sudan's military leadership have largely failed to yield tangible results. This resistance reflects a growing consensus among riparian states that Egypt's position seeks not equity, but the preservation of historical privilege. The fact that many African states have rejected Egypt's pressure tactics—including inducements and coercive diplomacy—demonstrates a regional shift toward fairness and self-determination.

Ethiopia's determination to proceed with the GERD, backed by popular support and national financing, thus represents not defiance but a rebalancing of an unjust order—an assertion that the Nile must be governed by contemporary realities, not colonial hierarchies.

Ethiopia's Push for Equitable Use

Ethiopia's rejection of the colonial Nile treaties and its leading role in drafting and ratifying the 2010 Cooperative Framework Agreement (CFA) signify a paradigm shift in the region, regarding transboundary water governance. Signed by six upstream nations—Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, Kenya, and later Burundi and South Sudan—the CFA articulates a vision based on "equitable and reasonable utilization" and the principle of "no significant harm." This framework offers a more inclusive and legally sound basis for cooperation, balancing sovereignty with shared responsibility. The successful filling of the GERD reservoir by late 2024, verified by technical and environmental assessments that found no significant downstream harm, demonstrates the feasibility of upstream development that respects ecological sustainability. Notably, the same period saw the Aswan High Dam in Egypt reach its highest levels, while Sudan experienced localized flooding due to exceptional rainfall rather than Ethiopian regulation—further discrediting alarmist claims about the dam's adverse impacts.

The GERD's completion opens a critical diplomatic window. Egypt must now reconcile its legitimate concern for water security with Ethiopia's equally legitimate right to development, and Sudan's growing ambitions for agricultural expansion and energy access. Sudan stands to gain substantially from regulated water flows that reduce destructive flooding by nearly 30%, facilitate irrigation, and enhance its electricity supply through potential imports from Ethiopia, and a sustained water flow that helps generate electricity from existing infrastructures. Yet, Khartoum continues to navigate a delicate balance, influenced by Egypt's historical dominance and the lingering inertia of Nile politics. The challenge, therefore, is not technical but political—how to harmonize divergent national priorities: Egypt's fear of stable flows, Ethiopia's pursuit of industrial transformation, and Sudan's quest for agricultural modernization.

A forward-looking approach requires all riparian states to move beyond grievance-driven diplomacy and instead operationalize the principles already enshrined in the CFA and the Declaration of Principles. This means institutionalizing mechanisms for data sharing,

coordinated drought management, and joint investments aimed at ensuring mutual gains. In this respect, Ethiopia's call for equitable utilization should be viewed not as an act of confrontation but as an invitation to redefine regional cooperation on the Nile through a 21st-century lens—anchored in realism, interdependence, and shared prosperity.

A Realist Approach to State Agency and Shared Resource Management

The path toward an amicable and sustainable Nile water management regime demands a realist understanding of state behavior—one that acknowledges power asymmetries, enlightened national interests, and the imperative of reciprocity. Realism does not negate cooperation; rather, it grounds it in pragmatic recognition of each state's strategic calculations and resource imperatives. Egypt's existential anxieties—rooted in the potential for a 5–15% reduction in Nile flows during prolonged droughts—must be understood and addressed through confidence-building and adaptive management mechanisms. At the same time, Ethiopia's sovereign right to harness its natural endowments for its growing population of over 120 million people cannot be curtailed by unequal and antiquated treaties. Sudan's position, situated between dependency and opportunity, illustrates the necessity of aligning economic benefits with cooperative governance. The 2022 Ethiopia–Sudan agreement on data exchange and operational coordination provides a promising precedent for pragmatic engagement grounded in mutual benefit rather than coercion.

For the Nile Basin, adopting such a realist yet cooperative approach is imperative in light of contemporary challenges: population growth projected to reach 600 million by 2050, accelerating climate variability, and mounting economic interdependencies. A purely legalistic or moral appeal for "fairness" will not suffice; what is required is a strategic recalibration that aligns national interests with collective sustainability. Realism, in this sense, means recognizing that Ethiopia's stability and development contribute to regional energy security; that Egypt's water security depends on upstream coordination; and that Sudan's agricultural ambitions are best served through predictable, managed flows.

Ultimately, the future of Nile governance will hinge on whether riparian states can balance their competing imperatives within a cooperative security framework—one that treats water not as a zero-sum commodity but as a shared foundation for regional peace, integration, and prosperity. The realist slant thus becomes a bridge between principle and pragmatism: it compels states to negotiate not from fear or sentiment but from a recognition of interdependence—a sober understanding that cooperation, not control, is the surest path to enduring security on the Nile.

Lessons to Draw from Other River Basins

River basins are complex systems shaped by diverse factors, including the number of countries involved, climatic and hydrological conditions, governance frameworks, and cultural dynamics. Each basin is unique, reflecting distinct historical, political, and social contexts. For example, the Senegal River Basin benefits from cultural and historical cohesion among its riparian states, united by a shared history of French colonization and liberation struggles. In contrast, the Nile River Basin is characterized by significant diversity, with its countries displaying varied cultures, histories of statehood, and conflicting perspectives on the Nile's role and resource management. These differences drive the Nile's intricate dynamics, shaping cooperative efforts and disputes over water allocation. Despite these distinctions, lessons from one basin can inform solutions for another. The Senegal River Basin's success with cooperative frameworks, equitable resource sharing, and inclusive dialogue offers valuable insights for the Nile, despite its unique challenges. By adopting similar principles, Nile Basin countries can address their diverse needs and perspectives, fostering sustainable management and equitable collaboration to ensure the river's resources benefit all riparian states, even amidst competing claims and historical complexities.

Comparative experiences from other transboundary river systems underscore that equitable outcomes emerge not from dominance but from structured collaboration. The 1996 Ganges Treaty between India and Bangladesh established joint monitoring and flood-control systems that balanced competing needs despite persistent mistrust. Similarly, the 2002 Incomati–Maputo Agreement among South Africa,

Mozambique, and Eswatini prioritized benefit-sharing through shared infrastructure development and data transparency. These models highlight how shared governance frameworks—anchored in realism and reciprocity—can transform historically contentious water relations into engines of regional integration.

Overcoming Diplomatic Setbacks

The 2015 *Declaration of Principles* (DoP), signed by Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan, was intended to mark a new chapter in the shared management of the Nile waters. It sought to promote cooperation, transparency, and mutual understanding, providing a framework for building trust and developing technical arrangements that could balance national interests. However, despite its promise, the DoP soon faced significant setbacks—chiefly because Egypt struggled to detach itself from a deeply entrenched domestic narrative that framed the Nile as an exclusive lifeline under threat. Egypt's long-standing "scarcity and threat" narrative—carefully cultivated for political legitimacy—has left little room for an honest national dialogue about the country's real alternatives or the changing dynamics of transboundary water governance. This narrative, deeply woven into state policy and public discourse, presents the Nile as Egypt's sole lifeline and externalizes the blame for domestic water management challenges. Over decades, it has evolved into a self-reinforcing system that channels political capital, public sympathy, and financial resources toward maintaining a perception of perpetual vulnerability.

Institutions of the state—ministries, research centers, and security agencies—have budgeted vast resources to sustain this narrative, creating powerful constituencies and beneficiaries who are reluctant to relinquish their influence. Framing water management as a matter of national security has allowed these actors to justify continued funding and avoid the scrutiny that would accompany genuine policy reform or efficiency measures. As a result, the "water threat" has become not only a political tool but also an economic ecosystem within Egypt's bureaucracy.

Maintaining this narrative also serves broader strategic and diplomatic functions. It legitimizes calls for international aid and technical support, ensuring a steady inflow of external resources from global partners concerned about stability in the Arab world's most populous nation. Western governments, multilateral lenders, and regional allies are thus continuously prompted to contribute to Egypt's "water security" agenda, often without critically assessing its underlying assumptions. In this way, the scare narrative performs multiple roles: domestically, it consolidates political control and sustains institutional rents; externally, it mobilizes sympathy, secures financial inflows, and positions Egypt as a perpetual victim in need of international reinforcement. The result is a policy environment that privileges rhetoric over reform—one that hinders the pursuit of genuine cooperation, innovation, and efficiency in managing shared Nile resources.

While Egypt possesses viable options such as desalination from the Mediterranean and Red Sea, extensive underground water reserves, and potential water recycling and efficiency measures, successive governments have instead perpetuated a discourse of scarcity and external threat. This approach served short-term political ends but constrained strategic flexibility. Moreover, Egypt's reliance on external financial support—often tied to the narrative of existential water insecurity—has reinforced this rigidity. Western donors, multilateral lenders, and regional allies have been drawn into the discourse, channeling billions in assistance to mitigate a crisis that could, in fact, be addressed through regional cooperation and technological innovation.

The DoP faltered precisely because Egypt was unable to make a paradigm shift from this entrenched zero-sum mindset toward a cooperative, benefit-sharing model. Cairo accused Ethiopia of *unilateral* filling of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD)—a process that, in fact, adhered to the DoP's principles and was conducted transparently and gradually. In January 2024, Egypt withdrew from trilateral negotiations, citing water security concerns, after its efforts to link Ethiopia's future development ambitions to the operational parameters of the GERD failed. The Egyptian delegation sought to tie any agreement to restrictions that would prevent Ethiopia from pursuing further upstream projects, particularly under conditions of sustained drought—an approach Ethiopia understandably viewed as an infringement on its sovereign right to equitable development.

Sudan's position, meanwhile, was more nuanced. While wary of potential Egyptian dominance in the negotiations, Khartoum was also concerned that any externally brokered compromise might compel Ethiopia to accept a skewed water release regime, particularly during the rainy season, that could threaten Sudan's downstream infrastructure and agricultural systems. Sudan's 2022 bilateral agreement with Ethiopia on GERD operations—signed despite Khartoum's $90 million electricity debt—signaled a pragmatic recognition of the dam's benefits. The agreement underscored the importance of transparency, technical coordination, and joint monitoring mechanisms to manage the Nile's complex hydrology.

Looking ahead, neutral mediators can play a constructive role in rebuilding trust and reinvigorating the stalled trilateral dialogue. The African Union (AU), as the custodian of *Agenda 2063* and a champion of "African solutions to African problems," offers a legitimate and inclusive platform for continued engagement. Similarly, Gulf states such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, both of which have invested heavily in Egypt's and potentially in Sudan's agricultural sector, could serve as credible facilitators with both leverage and interest in a stable Nile Basin. Their agricultural investments in wheat, sorghum, and livestock forage provide shared incentives for sustainable water management. Harnessing these regional and international partnerships can transform the GERD from a point of contention into a foundation for regional integration, where the principles of equity, cooperation, and shared prosperity guide future engagement.

The critical question, therefore, is whether Egypt is prepared to undertake a paradigm shift—one that embraces the realities of equitably managed Nile Basin—or whether it will continue to cling to a status quo that is increasingly untenable. The completion of the GERD has already altered the hydropolitical balance, signaling that unilateral control over the Nile is no longer viable. Egypt now faces a historic crossroads: it can adapt to the emerging regional order by engaging in cooperative frameworks grounded in equity and mutual prosperity, or it can resist change and risk being sidelined by the very transformations reshaping the basin. Future developments—ranging from Ethiopia's growing energy diplomacy, attainable future developments upstream, and Sudan's agricultural modernization to the rising influence of new global actors like China, the Gulf states, and the African Union—are redefining power relations along the Nile. These shifts, once consolidated, will make a return to the old order impossible. For Egypt, the choice is stark: to lead in shaping this new reality through cooperation and innovation, or to live with the consequences of change imposed from without.

Imagining Possibilities: A Shared Future for the Nile

Aligning with Agenda 2063

The African Union's *Agenda 2063* envisions a continent defined by prosperity, integration, and self-reliance—where Africa's natural resources are harnessed to drive industrialization, ensure food security, and promote social transformation. The Nile River, stretching over 6,650 kilometers and shared by eleven countries, epitomizes this vision. With an average annual flow of 84 billion cubic meters, the Nile sustains livelihoods for more than 400 million people. The GERD—Africa's largest hydropower project—generates 5,150 megawatts of electricity and produces 15.76 terawatt-hours annually, representing not only an engineering achievement but also a symbol of Africa's capacity for self-financed, transformative development.

Harnessing the Nile's full potential requires moving beyond zero-sum competition toward a paradigm of *collective abundance*. Coordinated resource management could enable the cultivation of over 6.6 million hectares of irrigable land across the basin, with projections rising to 8–10 million hectares by 2050. This could generate over $100 billion in cumulative economic activity through expanded agricultural production, cross-border energy trade, and industrial development. Such an approach aligns directly with Agenda 2063's pillars of inclusive growth, sustainable development, and regional integration.

Economic Opportunities Across the Basin

The economic dividends of cooperation are substantial and measurable. In Sudan, the fertile savannas currently irrigate approximately 1.8 million hectares,

with the capacity to expand to 2.5 million hectares. The GERD's regulated flow reduces flooding by an estimated 30%, stabilizing crop yields and protecting rural communities from catastrophic losses such as the devastating 2020 floods that displaced more than 500,000 people. Access to affordable Ethiopian electricity—estimated at 2 gigawatts—could enhance agro-processing, boost crop values by 15–20%, and strengthen Sudan's role as a breadbasket for both Africa and the Gulf states, where demand for cereals and animal feed continues to grow.

For Ethiopia, the GERD represents a decisive step toward industrialization and energy sovereignty. With its 5,150 MW capacity, the dam anchors a national strategy to power factories, small enterprises, and rural communities. Electricity access, now reaching more households than ever before, allows for modern food storage, dairy processing, and small-scale manufacturing—improving livelihoods and strengthening market access for rural producers. This transformation directly contributes to the objectives of Agenda 2063: inclusive growth, self-reliance, and connectivity, particularly by generating employment for Ethiopia's youth and gradually reducing the poverty rate that has become a source of fragility.

In South Sudan, the Sudd wetlands—one of the world's largest freshwater ecosystems—hold immense agricultural potential. Sustainable irrigation could enable the cultivation of over 500,000 hectares, creating 10,000 jobs through maize, rice, and oilseed processing, while preserving the region's ecological balance. Similarly, Egypt's Nile Delta, which irrigates roughly 3.8 million hectares, will ultimately benefit from stabilized water availability during dry seasons. This regulation can mitigate the impacts of climate variability and improve predictability for agricultural planning.

Cross-border initiatives—such as integrated irrigation schemes, joint power grids, and regional commodity corridors—can further enhance mutual benefits. Such ventures could increase vegetable and high-value crop exports by 15–25%, diversify rural incomes, and stimulate industrial linkages across the basin. If pursued within a framework of mutual respect and shared gains, the Nile could evolve from a source of contention into an engine of continental transformation—anchoring regional cooperation, sustainable development, and peace in the Horn of Africa and beyond.

Catalyzing Regional Development

The GERD stands not merely as an energy project but as a catalyst for regional transformation and economic integration**.** Its projected energy exports—valued at over $1 billion annually—have the potential to power agro-processing zones, industrial parks, and manufacturing corridors across the Nile Basin. Reliable and affordable electricity can dramatically reduce post-harvest losses, currently estimated at 20–30%**,** by enabling cold storage, processing, and transport networks for perishable goods. The multiplier effects are immense: tens of thousands of direct jobs and millions of indirect employment opportunities can be created across the basin, stimulating rural economies and reinforcing industrial value chains. These structural shifts can collectively raise national GDPs, enhance regional food security, and contribute to Agenda 2063's ambition of increasing intra-African trade to 50% through the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA)**.**

By moving beyond the zero-sum rivalries that have long defined Nile politics, riparian states have the chance to recast the river as an engine of shared prosperity. A cooperative development framework would position the Nile Basin as a global hub for value-added agriculture and light industry, attracting investments from Europe, Asia, and the Gulf. This vision promotes a shift from primary commodity dependence to an industrial model that enhances competitiveness and environmental sustainability. If effectively managed, the GERD's benefits could ripple across East and Northeast Africa, creating a self-reinforcing cycle of energy, production, and trade integration—one that aligns with continental efforts to reduce poverty and strengthen resilience to climate shocks.

Regionally, the GERD provides the foundation for cross-border energy grids and economic corridors, linking Ethiopia's hydropower capacity with Sudan's agricultural potential and South Sudan's land and water resources. The establishment of joint agro-industrial hubs could stimulate cross-border grain and textile production, strengthening trade links between the three countries. In addition, the creation of "Nile

Innovation Hubs"—centers bringing together engineers, hydrologists, and policymakers—could advance smart irrigation systems and water-efficient technologies, potentially optimizing water use by up to 30%. These initiatives would help transform the GERD into a platform for regional creativity, knowledge exchange, and collaborative governance**,** reframing it not as a source of contention but as a shared engine for sustainable development.

Finally, the dam's broader impact extends to corridorization and regional connectivity. Coordinated investment in transport infrastructure—roads, railways, and port linkages—can turn energy access into a tangible driver of trade and integration. Such corridors would connect Ethiopia's industrial centers with Sudan's farmlands, Djibouti's ports, and Kenya's manufacturing zones, embedding the Nile Basin within the AfCFTA's continental supply chains. In this vision, the GERD becomes not only a hydropower project but a strategic linchpin for regional integration**,** symbolizing Africa's capacity to translate its natural endowments into collective advancement and resilience.

The Shift in Regional Power Dynamics: Downstream Concerns and Upstream Ascendancy

Ethiopia's Rising Influence

The completion and operation of the GERD have irreversibly altered the geopolitical and developmental landscape of the African continent. For decades, the distribution of power over the Nile waters was dictated by colonial-era treaties that excluded upstream states and entrenched Egypt's dominance. Today, the GERD has created a paradigm shift—one that places energy sovereignty, regional integration, and sustainable development at the center of African political discourse. By generating 5,150 MW of electricity, Ethiopia is not only addressing its domestic power deficit—where nearly 60% of its 120 million citizens remain without reliable electricity—but is also emerging as a regional energy hub capable of exporting power to neighboring countries.

This transformation has triggered a profound change in how African states perceive their own development trajectories. The success of the GERD has emboldened other African governments to explore options for energy independence, cross-border interconnection, and the equitable utilization of shared natural resources. It represents a symbolic and practical assertion of African agency—a continental movement toward self-reliance and resource justice. The dam also compels a rethinking of Egypt's historical posture. For much of the last century, Egypt has treated the Nile as an exclusive lifeline—its "constitutional right"—protected by colonial-era agreements that granted it veto power over upstream projects. The GERD's operational reality, however, underscores that such monopoly claims are untenable in the 21st century.

Ethiopia views the GERD not as an instrument of domination but as a catalyst for equitable and sustainable resource sharing—one that encourages constructive behavior and fosters a culture of collaboration among riparian states. The dam embodies a vision of mutual benefit, where predictable water flows, flood control, and shared access to affordable energy can underpin regional stability and collective prosperity. Historically, Egypt's engagement in the Horn of Africa has often been viewed as counterproductive, driven more by efforts to preserve influence than to promote peace and development. Policies centered on fragmentation, proxy alignments, and zero-sum competition have deepened regional insecurity and hindered cooperation. The GERD represents an opportunity—and indeed a necessity—for behavioral change in how Egypt relates to its southern neighbors.

For this potential to materialize, Cairo must fundamentally reassess its posture toward the Horn. Rather than perceiving the GERD as an existential threat, Egypt could approach it as a gateway to deeper economic partnership, cross-border trade, and shared growth. The Horn of Africa holds vast potential: it is not only a source of renewable energy and an emerging market for Egyptian products but also a region capable of contributing to continental water security through reforestation and sustainable watershed management. Embracing collaboration, rather than confrontation, would position Egypt as a constructive regional actor and ensure a more secure and prosperous future for all states along the Nile Basin.

Sustained peace and economic integration in the Horn could, in fact, serve Egypt's long-term interests far better than proxy wars or destabilization campaigns. A cooperative approach—anchored in energy interdependence, investment in regional industrialization, and environmental preservation—could transform the Horn into a dynamic growth corridor beneficial to Egypt's food security and trade ambitions. Egypt's continued pursuit of short-term advantage through divisive politics, particularly in Sudan, risks perpetuating instability that ultimately undermines its own strategic depth. A recalibration toward constructive engagement—especially in the agricultural and energy sectors—would mark a decisive break from a century of zero-sum thinking.

Sudan's Strategic Position

Sudan occupies a pivotal, though increasingly precarious, position in this evolving regional equation. Despite being one of the greatest potential beneficiaries of the GERD, Sudan's internal fragmentation and protracted civil conflict have denied its people the developmental dividends of regional integration. The ongoing war between the Sudan Armed Forces (SAF) and the Rapid Support Forces (RSF) has devastated the country's social and economic infrastructure, displaced millions, and eroded central authority. The conflict has become self-sustaining—driven by competing patronage networks, resource capture, and external manipulation. For some actors, war has become a profitable enterprise; for others, an instrument for preserving influence. The result is a state teetering on the edge of permanent fragmentation.

In a regional and global context marked by great power competition and the erosion of the multilateral order, Sudan risks being trapped in a prolonged crisis that serves external interests rather than national recovery. Yet paradoxically, the GERD offers Sudan a tangible pathway out of its cycle of instability. Through regulated water flows, the dam can drastically reduce flooding risks, improve sediment management for the Roseires and Merowe dams, and enhance irrigation reliability. These benefits could revive Sudan's long-neglected agricultural potential, especially in the Gezira and Nile Valley regions. The 2020 floods that destroyed 100,000 hectares of farmland underscored the vulnerability of Sudan's agricultural base; under a stable GERD regime, such disasters could be mitigated.

Moreover, Ethiopia's surplus electricity—potentially supplying Sudan with up to 2 GW of affordable power—could stimulate industrial recovery, create jobs, and attract Gulf investments in agribusiness and manufacturing. The 2022 Ethiopia–Sudan agreement on GERD operations and information sharing, despite Khartoum's $90 million energy debt, demonstrated Sudan's pragmatic acceptance of the dam's inevitability and its potential benefits. If peace returns, Sudan could transform itself into a breadbasket for both Africa and the Gulf, with agricultural exports projected to reach $5 billion annually by 2030. However, realizing this vision requires not only internal reconciliation but also robust regional cooperation—particularly with Egypt and Ethiopia—to establish a shared framework that supports Sudan's efforts to resolve its internal crisis and to create favorable conditions for effective water and energy management.

Egypt's Dilemma and Regional Implications

Egypt now finds itself confronting a strategic dilemma of historic proportions. The GERD challenges the legal and political architecture that has underpinned Cairo's dominance since the 1959 Nile Waters Agreement, which allocated 75% of the Nile's flow to Egypt and treated Sudan as a junior partner. The dam's stabilization of the Nile's flow enables Sudan to utilize its full share—18 billion cubic meters—for the first time, and possibly to demand more as agricultural expansion accelerates. This development strikes at the heart of Egypt's hydropolitical supremacy. A self-sufficient and industrializing Sudan, empowered by reliable water and energy supplies, could emerge as both competitor and equal partner on the Nile.

Sudan's vast arable land has attracted Gulf states, particularly Saudi Arabia and the UAE, whose combined agricultural investments exceed $10 billion. These external stakeholders view Sudan's stability and agricultural resurgence as vital to their own food security. Consequently, any Egyptian effort to manipulate Sudan's internal conflict risks alienating these influential partners and fracturing long-standing Arab alliances. Cairo's traditional strategy of supporting one faction—typically the SAF—against

another in order to maintain leverage over Khartoum is increasingly counterproductive. It perpetuates a cycle of instability that undermines regional security and fuels extremist networks, arms trafficking, and humanitarian crises that no state in the Horn or the Nile Basin can afford.

Egypt is thus at a critical policy crossroads. It can continue to cling to outdated claims of hydro-hegemony and destabilize Sudan to maintain leverage, or it can embrace a cooperative model of basin management inspired by examples such as the Senegal River Basin Development Organization (OMVS). The latter approach—emphasizing shared infrastructure, benefit-sharing, and joint agricultural development—could generate mutual prosperity while reducing the risks of conflict. The OMVS model, which increased regional GDP by 15% through coordinated river management, illustrates what is possible when riparian states act as partners rather than adversaries.

If Egypt chooses cooperation, the GERD could become a cornerstone of regional stability—a symbol of modern African statecraft balancing development and diplomacy. However, if Cairo persists in treating the dam and Sudan's transformation as existential threats, it risks embroiling itself in endless proxy conflicts. This isolates Egypt from its Gulf allies and undermines its own long-term water security. The GERD's completion and its successful filling phase—achieved without the disasters once predicted by Egypt—provide a window for renewed dialogue. The path forward lies not in contesting Ethiopia's upstream ascendancy but in redefining interdependence across the Nile Basin, transforming an age-old contest over control into a partnership for shared prosperity.

The GERD's Tumultuous Journey: Leadership Transitions, Institutional Challenges, and External Pressures

The GERD has traversed a difficult and complex path since its inception. Following the death of Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, a leader who conceived and mobilized national support for the project, Ethiopia's new leadership faced internal and institutional challenges that severely tested the dam's progress. While national support and mobilization for the dam have largely remained consistent, the political transition of 2012 created uncertainty, and key decision-makers lacked both the cohesion and technical readiness to manage the intricate issues surrounding the dam's construction. While the civil engineering component—particularly the physical structure of the dam—advanced steadily, the electromechanical works and energy systems lagged far behind due to the severe incapacity of the Metals and Engineering Corporation (METEC), the military-run enterprise initially tasked with installing turbines, generators, and related systems.

By 2017–2018, the situation had reached a critical stage. Executives of the Italian construction firm Salini Impregilo, which was responsible for the main civil works, became increasingly alarmed by the growing delays and mismanagement within METEC. They raised their concerns directly with senior Ethiopian figures, warning that without urgent intervention, the dam's technical integrity and completion timeline were at grave risk. The problems extended beyond inefficiency—serious contractual irregularities and allegations of corruption surfaced, including claims that certain companies were pressured to pay substantial bribes in connection with turbine procurement and engine installations. Salini's leadership, in a rare act of candor, informed Ethiopian officials that the military-led management of the dam had become a major obstacle to progress.

Prime Minister Hailemariam Desalegn, despite recognizing the seriousness of the situation, was constrained by political realities and could do little to alter the entrenched power dynamics around the project. As a result, when Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed assumed office in 2018, he inherited a project in deep crisis—technically stalled, financially strained, and politically entangled. There were credible fears at the time that the GERD, once the flagship of Ethiopia's developmental state, could end up as an incomplete and costly failure.

However, decisive leadership and institutional reforms helped avert disaster. The government restructured key contracts, removed METEC from the project, and brought in more competent entities to take over the electromechanical works. All the metallic components in sections of the dam, including the turbine housings, had to be replaced to ensure quality and reconstructed following the design modifications

introduced in 2017. This intervention, combined with renewed political determination, restored momentum and eventually set the GERD back on track toward completion. The turnaround demonstrated Ethiopia's resilience and the leadership's commitment to seeing through what had become not only a national development project but also a powerful symbol of sovereignty and self-reliance.

Externally, Ethiopia faced enormous pressure from Egypt and other regional actors. Cairo launched an intensive diplomatic campaign to isolate Ethiopia and frame the GERD as a threat to downstream water security. At various points, Ethiopia was urged—often by powerful Middle Eastern and Western interlocutors—to make concessions that would have undermined its sovereign right to equitable water use. Some external actors even sought to link Ethiopia's Nile policies with broader geopolitical calculations in the Middle East, effectively asking Addis Ababa to "sacrifice" its national interests to serve regional political alignments. Yet Ethiopia remained steadfast, maintaining that the GERD was a project of regional benefit designed to promote shared prosperity through clean energy and equitable development. The tripartite negotiations between Ethiopia, Sudan, and Egypt over the GERD proved to be exceptionally difficult and complex. Balancing the continued construction of the dam while simultaneously managing its filling and future operation placed Ethiopia in an intricate diplomatic and technical dilemma. Egypt, portraying the dam as a strategic threat to its historical control over Nile waters, deployed extensive diplomatic, legal, and political efforts to influence or even obstruct the process. Cairo sought to frame the issue in international forums as a matter of existential security, lobbying external powers and regional actors to pressure Ethiopia into accepting arrangements that would effectively preserve Egypt's downstream dominance over the Nile's flow—including through framing lies about the Dam and Ethiopia's intentions as well as realities of electricity in Ethiopia, where more than 50% of Ethiopians lacked access to electricity.

In the midst of this pressure, Ethiopia's technical experts and negotiators demonstrated remarkable discipline and resilience. They worked diligently to uphold the principle of equitable and reasonable utilization, ensuring that Ethiopia's sovereign right to use its natural resources for development remained non-negotiable. Despite repeated attempts to derail the process, Ethiopia maintained its commitment to the Declaration of Principles (2015) and to African-led dialogue under the auspices of the African Union. This approach enabled the country to continue construction and implement the dam's initial fillings in stages that balanced developmental needs with the avoidance of significant harm to downstream nations.

The negotiations also revealed Ethiopia's growing institutional maturity—its capacity to combine scientific expertise, legal reasoning, and diplomatic tact to navigate one of Africa's most consequential transboundary resource disputes. By staying the course despite intense pressure, Ethiopia not only safeguarded its national interests but also reinforced the precedent that African disputes can and should be resolved through negotiation, technical dialogue, and regional frameworks rather than coercion or external imposition.

In the end, the combination of political resolve, institutional correction, and diplomatic patience allowed Ethiopia to overcome both internal dysfunction and external pressure. The GERD's survival—and eventual success—stands as a testament to national perseverance in the face of formidable challenges and as a reminder that developmental sovereignty must be safeguarded through competent governance and regional cooperation.

Lessons for State Capacity and Regional Diplomacy

The GERD's tumultuous experience has profoundly shaped Ethiopia's statecraft, institutional learning, and regional diplomacy. Domestically, it revealed the dangers of over-centralized decision-making and the risks of politicizing major national projects through military-industrial structures like METEC. The subsequent reforms—replacing military-led enterprises with professional civilian oversight and reasserting transparency in contract management—became a turning point in Ethiopia's governance trajectory. It demonstrated that effective state capacity depends not only on ambition but also on institutional competence, accountability, and merit-based leadership. The GERD thus became a crucible

through which Ethiopia began redefining the relationship between political authority, technical expertise, and public trust in national development.

Regionally, the GERD transformed Ethiopia's diplomatic posture from one of defensive justification to strategic confidence. The government learned to combine technical credibility with diplomatic resilience—anchoring its arguments in principles of equitable utilization, mutual benefit, and the sovereign right to development. Ethiopia's approach shifted from passive response to proactive narrative framing, engaging the African Union and neighboring states based on shared regional development rather than zero-sum hydro politics. The GERD also became a tool for reimagining the Horn of Africa's interdependence—where electricity trade, flood control, and climate adaptation could replace historical suspicion and coercive politics.

Ultimately, the GERD saga underscored a key insight: national projects of transformative scale require both internal coherence and regional diplomacy that aligns national ambitions with collective gains. Ethiopia's success in steering the project through crisis not only reaffirmed its developmental resolve but also offered a blueprint for how African states can assert agency, strengthen governance, and transform contentious resources into instruments of peace and cooperation.

Risks of Militarization: Rivers as Strategic Fault Lines

The Threat of Escalation

The Nile Basin is increasingly emblematic of a global pattern in which shared rivers evolve from sources of cooperation into potential frontiers of militarization. The Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD), the largest hydropower project in Africa, sits at the heart of this shifting dynamic. While designed as an engine of regional integration, the GERD's fixed and highly visible infrastructure also represents a strategic vulnerability—exposed to both sabotage and the broader impacts of climate-induced drought. Ethiopia's upstream position and capacity to regulate the river's flow have heightened Egyptian anxieties, with Cairo repeatedly signaling that significant reductions in downstream water could invite a forceful response. These fears are amplified by Egypt's renewed security alignments with Somalia and Eritrea—relationships that echo the proxy dynamics of the 1960s–1990s succession wars, when Nile politics intertwined with regional conflict and fragmentation.

Egypt's strategy risks deepening the region's militarization rather than promoting stability. Instead of adapting to the new hydrological and geopolitical realities created by the GERD, Cairo could double down on its historic pattern of sponsoring divisions and supporting non-state actors as instruments of pressure. Such a course would exacerbate existing conflicts in the Horn of Africa, entrench mistrust, and undermine prospects for sustainable peace. Sudan, caught between these rivalries, remains particularly vulnerable. While Khartoum advocates for joint monitoring of the GERD to safeguard its dams from flooding, its internal instability risks allowing external actors to instrumentalize its position. Ethiopia's parallel ambition to secure maritime access to the Red Sea—coupled with its growing investments in drone and defense technology—further broadens the strategic scope of the Nile dispute, linking water security to military modernization and regional rivalries along the Red Sea corridor.

Historical precedents, such as the Indus River tensions between India and Pakistan that periodically escalated to nuclear brinkmanship, underscore the grave risks of militarizing water disputes. The Horn of Africa could face similar destabilization if the logic of deterrence supplants the ethos of cooperation. The central question, therefore, is whether Egypt can recalibrate its approach—shifting from coercive posturing and alarmism toward constructive engagement. If Cairo embraces collaboration rather than confrontation, it could help avert a regional catastrophe. The path forward demands behavioral change: one grounded in mutual recognition, trust-building, and the pursuit of shared benefit rather than zero-sum competition.

Pathways to De-escalation

Despite the mounting tensions, direct confrontation is not inevitable. The 2015 *Declaration of Principles*—jointly signed by Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan—commits all parties to the principle of "no significant harm," providing a framework for cooperative water

governance. Building on this foundation, the African Union (AU) could play a pivotal role in revitalizing dialogue. While past mediation efforts have faltered due to competing national priorities and weak institutional coordination, the GERD's completion offers a moment to reset. A renewed tripartite mechanism, supported by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), could develop joint water management protocols and confidence-building measures, including shared hydrological data, coordinated dam operations, and transparent impact assessments.

Security cooperation could also serve as a bridge to de-escalation. Rather than viewing the GERD through a militarized lens, the riparian states could transform it into a platform for joint security exercises focused on infrastructure protection and climate resilience. Shared initiatives in afforestation, flood forecasting, and early warning systems would reduce the impact of erratic rainfall—which has already decreased Nile flows by nearly 10% in recent decades—and foster a sense of collective stewardship. Importantly, Gulf states such as Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Qatar—whose agricultural investments in Sudan depend heavily on Nile stability—can use their financial leverage to incentivize cooperation and discourage escalation. Framing security as a shared investment, rather than a contest of dominance, could turn potential fault lines into cooperative defense lines for the preservation of the Nile ecosystem and the promotion of regional stability.

Conclusion: A Strategic Choice for the Nile's Cooperative Future

The Nile Basin, sustaining over 400 million people across eleven nations, has reached a decisive juncture. The choice before its riparian states is clear: to persist in the zero-sum politics of control or to embrace a cooperative framework anchored in shared prosperity, sustainability, and mutual security. The completion of the GERD on September 9, 2025, symbolizes a new hydropolitical era. With an installed capacity of over 5,150 megawatts and the potential to generate $1 billion annually in electricity exports, the GERD repositions Ethiopia as a pivotal energy hub and a key driver of regional development. Its benefits extend beyond national borders—Sudan stands to gain from regulated river flows that reduce flooding by 30%, enable irrigation of up to 2.5 million hectares, and attract foreign investment into agro-industrial ventures. For Egypt, however, the GERD introduces a structural challenge: it necessitates long-delayed reforms in water utilization, crop selection, and irrigation efficiency, and demands a diplomatic recalibration toward cooperative rather than confrontational engagement.

Strategically, the GERD represents more than an engineering triumph—it is a test of governance, regional foresight, and institutional maturity. Egypt's continued pursuit of confrontation and securitization risks deepening mistrust and regional instability, undermining its own long-term interests. A cooperative path—grounded in equitable water sharing, transparent data exchange, and joint management mechanisms—offers a far more sustainable and beneficial alternative. Such an approach would transform the Nile into a shared regional asset for growth rather than a contested frontier of sovereignty.

The confluence of three transformative developments—the GERD's completion, the exposure of historical water inequities rooted in colonial-era treaties, and the entry into force of the Cooperative Framework Agreement (CFA) in 2024—creates a unique policy window to realign the Basin's governance. Yet, realizing this opportunity requires overcoming entrenched interests, particularly within Egypt's bureaucratic and political elite, who benefit from maintaining the status quo of "current water usage rights." This internal resistance, coupled with Cairo's reliance on external aid flows tied to its water security narrative, constrains Egypt's capacity for genuine policy reform. If unaddressed, it will encourage unilateral actions by upstream states and accelerate fragmentation of the Basin's cooperative potential.

To prevent this outcome, a multi-tiered policy framework is required:

1. Institutionalizing the CFA through an empowered Nile Basin Commission to oversee data sharing, compliance, and dispute resolution.

2. Operationalizing regional power interconnections linking Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, and Egypt,

ensuring that hydropower benefits translate into basin-wide development.

3. Strengthening AU-led mediation and involving credible partners—such as the Gulf states, whose agricultural investments depend on Nile stability—to create balanced incentives for cooperation.

4. Establishing a joint basin research and innovation fund to enhance efficiency in irrigation, climate adaptation, and water-saving technologies across the region.

Ultimately, the Nile's future depends on visionary leadership capable of transcending inherited rivalries. By adopting a cooperative paradigm underpinned by mutual benefit, sustainability, and shared accountability, the riparian states can convert a century of contention into a model of African integration. With the African Union and trusted international partners acting as guarantors, the Nile can evolve from a symbol of division into a unifying artery of continental renaissance. If Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan seize this moment, the river's flow will no longer represent contested sovereignty—but the lifeblood of Africa's shared prosperity, security, and enduring peace.