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## Abstract

The Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD), Africa's largest hydropower project, is situated on the Blue Nile and is designed to generate 6,000 MW of electricity. However, its operation requires complex flow management, as it requires substantial water flow to meet its energy targets. Effective flow control is crucial for optimizing energy production, balancing reservoir levels, and ensuring consistent downstream releases to Sudan and Egypt. Spillage, a necessary process during high inflow periods, may reduce available water for power generation, limiting turbine output. This paper examines GERD's flow requirements for power generation and discusses the implications of flow regulation for sustainable water sharing and regional cooperation within the Nile Basin. It uses an integrated approach combining hydrologic modeling and observational data to explore whether higher regulated flows could address these risks and foster regional cooperation. References to foundational studies in Nile Basin hydrology, climate variability, and the GRACE satellite system enhance the analysis.

## 1. Introduction

The construction of GERD on the Blue Nile in Ethiopia represents a key step in Ethiopia's efforts to meet its energy needs and stimulate economic growth. With a projected power capacity of 6,000 MW, GERD is expected to supply electricity domestically and contribute to regional electrification through exports (Wheeler et al., 2020; Dumont, 2009). GERD’s reservoir, with a capacity of 74 BCM, is essential for regulating seasonal flow variations and managing sedimentation downstream. However, GERD’s operation raises concerns for downstream countries, particularly regarding the risks of reduced water availability, seepage, and spillage. Recent analyses of water flow using GRACE satellite data and terrestrial water storage observations have revealed significant seepage and groundwater flow risks (Abdelmohsen et al., 2023). These findings emphasize the need for balanced operational strategies to ensure GERD’s benefits without jeopardizing the water security of Sudan and Egypt. This paper builds upon existing research to address GERD’s flow requirements, spillage risks, and possible mitigation strategies.

## 2. Brief of GERD

The dam's hydropower generation capacity will provide reliable electricity for Ethiopia’s development, potentially reaching more than 60% of the population (Chen & Swain, 2014; Basheer et al., 2023). The additional electricity can also be exported to neighboring countries, creating economic opportunities and strengthening regional cooperation (Sterl et al., 2021).
In addition to energy production, The dam regulates the highly seasonal flow of the Blue Nile, mitigating flood risks in Sudan and preserving agricultural land (Melesse et al., 2007). By trapping sediment in its reservoir, GERD protects downstream dams, such as Egypt’s High Aswan Dam, from sediment buildup, which extends the lifespan of these infrastructures and sustains water storage capacity (Abotalib et al., 2023).The Dam must be utilized to generate electricity which will increase the amounts of water given to Egypt and Sudan as the following study and the balance Turbines when installed will allow around three times the Quota of Egypt and Sudan to be passed from the Dam.

## 3. Flow Requirements for Power Generation

The amount of water required to achieve different levels of power generation at GERD is a key factor in determining its impact on Nile hydrology. Table 1 below provides corrected flow calculations based on an efficiency of 0.9 and a head height of 147 meters.

Tabel1 Flow requirement at different Powers

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Power Output (MW) | Flow Required (m³/s) | Annual Flow (BCM) |
| 3,000 | 2,311.49 | 72.90 |
| 4,000 | 3,081.99 | 97.19 |
| 6,000 | 4,622.98 | 145.79 |

## 4. Seepage Risks and Groundwater Flow

The potential for seepage at GERD poses risks to both its storage efficiency and structural stability. Studies have shown that seepage losses are significant, estimated at approximately 19.8 6 BCM per year, which could reduce the reservoir’s effective storage capacity (Abdelmohsen et al., 2023). Seepage occurs through fault networks and fractured bedrock, creating pathways for groundwater flow that deplete reservoir levels and undermine dam stability (Liersch et al., 2017; Groen et al., 2020). Unmitigated seepage not only affects GERD’s ability to store water but also complicates hydrological modeling for the Nile Basin. Overlooking these losses could lead to inaccurate flow predictions and complicate regional water-sharing negotiations (Heggy et al., 2021; Digna et al., 2018). Therefore, addressing seepage through infrastructure reinforcements or additional grouting is critical to ensure the dam’s long-term sustainability.



Fig 1 Flow with and without Seepage

## 5. Spillage: Risks and Benefits

Spillage refers to the intentional or unintentional release of excess water from the reservoir, often necessitated by heavy rainfall or inflow events. Spillage can offer certain benefits, such as flood risk reduction by lowering water levels in the reservoir (Abotalib et al., 2023). However, it also poses risks to downstream regions, particularly if spillage occurs during the rainy season, when river flows are already high.Controlled spillage can serve as a tool for sediment management, as it allows excess sediment to pass through the dam, preventing accumulation in the reservoir. Nonetheless, unregulated spillage may lead to flooding in downstream areas, damaging agricultural land and infrastructure in Sudan and Egypt (Mahmoud et al., 2022; Elganainy & Eldwer, 2018). Effective spillage management requires real-time monitoring and coordination with downstream reservoirs, such as Sudan’s Roseires Dam and Egypt’s High Aswan Dam. Developing coordinated spillage protocols can help mitigate the risks while maximizing GERD’s benefits (Elgib et al., 2021; Melesse et al., 2007).

## 6. Implications of Operating GERD at Full Capacity

Operating GERD at its maximum capacity to generate 6,000 MW necessitates a substantial water flow of 145.79 BCM annually, which could deplete the reservoir, especially in dry years. This high flow demand may hinder GERD’s capacity to buffer against droughts, leading to periods of limited water release to downstream nations (Eldardiry & Hossain, 2021). Consequently, Sudan and Egypt may experience water shortages during these times, impacting agriculture, municipal supplies, and ecological sustainability (Ali et al., 2023).The following table illustrates different operational scenarios and their implications for downstream water security.

Tabel 2 the Power scenarios and effects

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenario | Flow Release Pattern | Estimated Power Output (MW) | Implications for Downstream Flow |
| Full Capacity (6,000 MW) | Peak flow release in wet season, reduced in dry season | 6,000 | Potentially reduced downstream flow in dry years |
| Moderate Capacity (4,000 MW) | Consistent flow with seasonal adjustments | 4,000 | Stable downstream flow with reduced risk |
| Minimal Capacity (3,000 MW) | Conservative flow with drought buffer | 3,000 | Maintains reservoir capacity for dry years |

## 7. Sustainable Management of Spillage and Seepage

To mitigate the challenges associated with spillage and seepage, GERD’s operational strategy should incorporate sustainable management practices. Seepage could be minimized through structural reinforcements, such as additional grouting and sealing of fault lines within the dam’s foundation (Sultan et al., 2013; Wheeler et al., 2022). Furthermore, coordinated spillage protocols, developed in collaboration with downstream countries, could ensure that excess water releases are handled safely and equitably (Abou Samra & Ali, 2021). Improving spillage management is crucial, as it can help prevent unregulated flooding downstream while optimizing sediment control. By monitoring real-time flow data and adopting flexible spillage strategies, GERD can achieve greater resilience to seasonal variability and climate impacts (Funk et al., 2015; Scanlon et al., 2018).

## 8. Comparison of GERD and Egypt’s High Aswan Dam

The Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD) in Ethiopia and the High Aswan Dam in Egypt represent two critical hydropower and water management structures on the Nile River, serving distinct but interconnected roles within the Nile Basin. The GERD, with a capacity to generate 6,000 MW, relies heavily on high flow levels from the Blue Nile. Operating at full capacity, GERD requires approximately 145.79 BCM annually, which poses challenges for maintaining sufficient downstream flow, especially during dry years.In contrast, the High Aswan Dam, with a capacity of around 2,100 MW, is a multi-purpose dam primarily designed for both power generation and irrigation support for Egypt. Due to its location on the lower reaches of the Nile and its role in Egyptian water security, the High Aswan Dam operates under different flow dynamics. The average inflow at the High Aswan Dam is about 55.5 BCM annually, which is Egypt’s allocated quota of Nile water. This lower flow requirement compared to GERD highlights the differences in operational demands between the two dams.Given their shared reliance on Nile waters, coordination between GERD and the High Aswan Dam is essential to avoid potential risks of overflow in times of heavy rainfall and inflow, as well as drought impacts during dry years. Without coordinated flow management, unregulated releases from GERD could lead to spillage that not only reduces water available for GERD’s power generation but also risks causing downstream flooding. Conversely, holding excess water in GERD’s reservoir could exacerbate dryness downstream, impacting agriculture and water supply in Sudan and Egypt. Thus, structured agreements on seasonal flow releases, adaptive management strategies, and real-time monitoring are crucial to maximize the benefits of both dams while minimizing adverse impacts. Coordinated operation of GERD and the High Aswan Dam can facilitate sustainable water sharing, secure energy production, and provide resilience against climatic variations for all Nile Basin stakeholders.

Tabel 3 the Comparison between GERD and High Dam

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **GERD** | **High Aswan Dam** |
| Location | Blue Nile, Ethiopia | Nile River, Egypt |
| Primary Purpose | Hydropower | Hydropower, Irrigation |
| Capacity (MW) | 6,000 | 2,100 |
| Required Annual Flow (BCM) | 145.79 | 55.5 |
| Average Inflow Requirement | High, due to power demands | Moderate, meets quota |
| Downstream Impact | High, affects Sudan/Egypt | Primarily impacts Egypt |
| Risk Management | Requires seasonal coordination with High Aswan Dam | Seasonal adjustments |

## 9. Conclusion

The Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam has the potential to transform the energy landscape in East Africa, but its operations must be managed carefully to address both technical and geopolitical challenges. With a flow requirement of 145.79 BCM per year to generate 6,000 MW, GERD’s impact on Nile Basin hydrology is substantial, raising critical questions about water availability for Egypt and Sudan. Seepage and spillage present significant challenges to GERD’s sustainability, and overlooking these factors could compromise both the dam’s effectiveness and regional water security. Implementing adaptive flow management strategies, establishing coordinated spillage protocols, and addressing seepage risks are essential steps toward ensuring that GERD contributes positively to regional stability.
Future research should continue to refine hydrological models and integrate satellite observations, such as GRACE and GRACE-FO, to monitor GERD’s impact over time. With collaborative management, GERD can fulfill its role as a cornerstone of sustainable development in the Nile Basin.

Coordinated flow management between GERD and the High Aswan Dam is essential to balance Ethiopia’s energy needs with the water security of Sudan and Egypt. This coordination can prevent flooding and manage drought impacts effectively, ensuring sustainable water sharing across the Nile Basin.

## References

1. Abdelmohsen K., Sultan M., Yan E., et al. (2023). Watching the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam from a distance: Implications for sustainable water management of the Nile water. PNAS Nexus.

2. Dumont HJ. (2009). The Nile: Monographiae Biologicae. Dordrecht: Springer.

3. Melesse AM, Weng Q, Thenkabail PS, Senay GB. (2007). Remote sensing sensors and applications in environmental resources mapping and modeling. Sensors, 7:3209–3241.

4. Chen H, Swain A. (2014). The Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam: Evaluating its sustainability standard and geopolitical significance. Energy Dev Front, 3:11–19.

5. Wheeler KG, Jeuland M, Hall JW, et al. (2020). Understanding and managing new risks on the Nile with the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam. Nat Commun, 11(1):5222.

6. Malede DA, Agumassie TA, Kosgei JR, et al. (2022). Analysis of rainfall and streamflow trend and variability over Birr River watershed, Abbay basin, Ethiopia. Environ Challenges, 7:100528.

7. Basheer M, et al. (2023). Negotiating Nile infrastructure management should consider climate change uncertainties. Nat Clim Chang, 13:17–19.

8. Abotalib AZ, et al. (2023). Irreversible and large-scale heavy metal pollution arising from increased damming and untreated water reuse in the Nile Delta. Earth’s Futur. 11:e2022EF002987.

9. Eldardiry H, Hossain F. (2021). A blueprint for adapting high Aswan dam operation in Egypt to challenges of filling and operation of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam. J Hydrol, 598:125708.

10. Ali AM, Melsen LA, Teuling AJ. (2023). Inferring reservoir filling strategies under limited data availability: the case of GERD. Hydrol Earth Syst Sci.

11. Liersch S, Koch H, Hattermann FF. (2017). Management scenarios of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam and their impacts under recent and future climates. Water (Basel), 9:728–729.

12. Groen J, et al. (2020). Groundwater mapping for climate resilient WASH in arid and semi-arid areas of Ethiopia. GW4E Project Summary Report.

13. Heggy E, Sharkawy Z, Abotalib AZ. (2021). Egypt's water budget deficit and suggested mitigation policies for the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam filling scenarios. Environ Res Lett, 16:074022.

14. Digna RF, et al. (2018). Impact of water resources development on water availability for hydropower production and irrigated agriculture of the eastern Nile Basin. J Water Resour Plan Manag, 144:05018007.

15. Sultan M, et al. (2013). Assessment of the vulnerabilities of the Nubian Sandstone Fossil Aquifer, North Africa. Climate Vulnerability. 5:311–333.