

## Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	1.96	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	185	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	2.10	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	157	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	1.40	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	176	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	2.12	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	177	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	1.14	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	195	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	3.39	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	83	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	3.26	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	76	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	2.21	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	110	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	1.35	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	161	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	1.50	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	183	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	1.32	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	183	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	1.45	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	125	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	3.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	88	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	3.50	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	97	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	1.55	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	192	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	1.96	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	163	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	1.00	The aridity risk indicator is based on the Global Aridity Index (Global-Aridity) and Global Potential Evapo-Transpiration (Global-PET) Geospatial data sets by Trabucco and Zomer (2009). These data sets provide information about the potential availability of water in regions with low water demand, thus they are used in the Water Risk Filter 5.0 to better account for deserts and other arid areas in the risk assessment.	Trabucco, A., & Zomer, R. J. (2009). Global potential evapo-transpiration (Global-PET) and global aridity index (Global-Aridity) geodatabase. CGIAR consortium for spatial information.
1.0 - Aridity (rank)	187	The aridity risk indicator is based on the Global Aridity Index (Global-Aridity) and Global Potential Evapo-Transpiration (Global-PET) Geospatial data sets by Trabucco and Zomer (2009). These data sets provide information about the potential availability of water in regions with low water demand, thus they are used in the Water Risk Filter 5.0 to better account for deserts and other arid areas in the risk assessment.	Trabucco, A., & Zomer, R. J. (2009). Global potential evapo-transpiration (Global-PET) and global aridity index (Global-Aridity) geodatabase. CGIAR consortium for spatial information.
1.1 - Water Depletion (score)	1.04	The water depletion risk indicator is based on annual average monthly net water depletion from Brauman et al. (2016). Their analysis is based on model outputs from the newest version of the integrated water resources model WaterGAP3 which measures water depletion as the ratio of water consumption-to-availability.	Brauman, K. A., Richter, B. D., Postel, S., Malsy, M., & Flörke, M. (2016). Water depletion: An improved metric for incorporating seasonal and dry-year water scarcity into water risk assessments. <i>Elem Sci Anth</i> , 4.
1.1 - Water Depletion (rank)	152	The water depletion risk indicator is based on annual average monthly net water depletion from Brauman et al. (2016). Their analysis is based on model outputs from the newest version of the integrated water resources model WaterGAP3 which measures water depletion as the ratio of water consumption-to-availability.	Brauman, K. A., Richter, B. D., Postel, S., Malsy, M., & Flörke, M. (2016). Water depletion: An improved metric for incorporating seasonal and dry-year water scarcity into water risk assessments. <i>Elem Sci Anth</i> , 4.
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (score)	1.15	World Resources Institute's Baseline Water Stress measures the ratio of total annual water withdrawals to total available annual renewable supply, accounting for upstream consumptive use. A higher percentage indicates more competition among users.	Hofste, R., Kuzma, S., Walker, S., ... & Sutanudjaja, E.H. (2019). Aqueduct 3.0: Updated decision relevant global water risk indicators. Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (rank)	138	World Resources Institute's Baseline Water Stress measures the ratio of total annual water withdrawals to total available annual renewable supply, accounting for upstream consumptive use. A higher percentage indicates more competition among users.	Hofste, R., Kuzma, S., Walker, S., ... & Sutanudjaja, E.H. (2019). Aqueduct 3.0: Updated decision relevant global water risk indicators. Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.
1.3 - Blue Water Scarcity (score)	1.00	The blue water scarcity risk indicator is based on Mekonnen and Hoekstra (2016) global assessment of blue water scarcity on a monthly basis and at high spatial resolution (grid cells of 30 × 30 arc min resolution). Blue water scarcity is calculated as the ratio of the blue water footprint in a grid cell to the total blue water availability in the cell. The time period analyzed in this study ranges from 1996 to 2005.	Mekonnen, M. M., & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2016). Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. <i>Science advances</i> , 2(2), e1500323.
1.3 - Blue Water Scarcity (rank)	190	The blue water scarcity risk indicator is based on Mekonnen and Hoekstra (2016) global assessment of blue water scarcity on a monthly basis and at high spatial resolution (grid cells of 30 × 30 arc min resolution). Blue water scarcity is calculated as the ratio of the blue water footprint in a grid cell to the total blue water availability in the cell. The time period analyzed in this study ranges from 1996 to 2005.	Mekonnen, M. M., & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2016). Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. <i>Science advances</i> , 2(2), e1500323.
1.4 - Projected Change in Water Discharge (by ~2050) (score)	1.01	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and hydrological models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). To estimate the change at 2°C of global warming above 1980-2010 levels, simulated annual water discharge was averaged over a 31-year period with 2°C mean warming. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between present day (1980-2010) conditions and 2°C scenarios by 2050.	Schewe, J., Heinke, J., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., ... & Gosling, S. N. (2014). Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 111(9), 3245-3250.
1.4 - Projected Change in Water Discharge (by ~2050) (rank)	167	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and hydrological models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). To estimate the change at 2°C of global warming above 1980-2010 levels, simulated annual water discharge was averaged over a 31-year period with 2°C mean warming. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between present day (1980-2010) conditions and 2°C scenarios by 2050.	Schewe, J., Heinke, J., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., ... & Gosling, S. N. (2014). Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 111(9), 3245-3250.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on the Standardized Precipitation and Evaporation Index (SPEI). Vicente-Serrano et al. (2010) developed this multi-scalar drought index applying both precipitation and temperature data to detect, monitor and analyze different drought types and impacts in the context of global warming. The mathematical calculations used for SPEI are similar to the Standard Precipitation Index (SPI), but it has the advantage to include the role of evapotranspiration.	Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Beguería, S., & López-Moreno, J. I. (2010). A multiscale drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index. <i>Journal of climate</i> , 23(7), 1696-1718.
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (rank)	194	This risk indicator is based on the Standardized Precipitation and Evaporation Index (SPEI). Vicente-Serrano et al. (2010) developed this multi-scalar drought index applying both precipitation and temperature data to detect, monitor and analyze different drought types and impacts in the context of global warming. The mathematical calculations used for SPEI are similar to the Standard Precipitation Index (SPI), but it has the advantage to include the role of evapotranspiration.	Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Beguería, S., & López-Moreno, J. I. (2010). A multiscale drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index. <i>Journal of climate</i> , 23(7), 1696-1718.
1.6 - Projected Change in Drought Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and drought models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP) . A drought threshold for pre-industrial conditions was calculated based on time-series averages. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between pre-industrial and 2°C scenarios.	Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., ... & Geiger, T. (2017). Assessing the impacts of 1.5 C global warming-simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). Geoscientific Model Development.
1.6 - Projected Change in Drought Occurrence (by ~2050) (rank)	152	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and drought models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP) . A drought threshold for pre-industrial conditions was calculated based on time-series averages. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between pre-industrial and 2°C scenarios.	Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., ... & Geiger, T. (2017). Assessing the impacts of 1.5 C global warming-simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). Geoscientific Model Development.
2.1 - Estimated Flood Occurrence (score)	3.37	This risk indicator is based on the recurrence of floods within the 34-year time frame period of 1985 to 2019. The occurrence of floods within a given location was estimated using data from Flood Observatory, University of Colorado. The Flood Observatory use data derived from a wide variety of news, governmental, instrumental, and remote sensing source.	Brakenridge, G. R. (2019). Global active archive of large flood events. Dartmouth Flood Observatory, University of Colorado.
2.1 - Estimated Flood Occurrence (rank)	90	This risk indicator is based on the recurrence of floods within the 34-year time frame period of 1985 to 2019. The occurrence of floods within a given location was estimated using data from Flood Observatory, University of Colorado. The Flood Observatory use data derived from a wide variety of news, governmental, instrumental, and remote sensing source.	Brakenridge, G. R. (2019). Global active archive of large flood events. Dartmouth Flood Observatory, University of Colorado.

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
2.2 - Projected Change in Flood Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	3.87	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and drought models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). The magnitude of the flood event was defined based on 100-year return period for pre-industrial conditions. Results are expressed in terms of change (%) in probability between pre-industrial and 2°C scenarios.	Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., ... & Geiger, T. (2017). Assessing the impacts of 1.5 C global warming-simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). Geoscientific Model Development.
2.2 - Projected Change in Flood Occurrence (by ~2050) (rank)	7	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and drought models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). The magnitude of the flood event was defined based on 100-year return period for pre-industrial conditions. Results are expressed in terms of change (%) in probability between pre-industrial and 2°C scenarios.	Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., ... & Geiger, T. (2017). Assessing the impacts of 1.5 C global warming-simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). Geoscientific Model Development.
3.1 - Surface Water Contamination Index (score)	3.26	<p>The underlying data for this risk indicator is based on a broad suite of pollutants with well-documented direct or indirect negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity, compiled by Vörösmarty et al. (2010). The negative effects are specific to individual pollutants, ranging from impacts mediated by eutrophication such as algal blooms and oxygen depletion (e.g., caused by phosphorus and organic loading) to direct toxic effects (e.g., caused by pesticides, mercury).</p> <p>The overall Surface Water Contamination Index is calculated based on a range of key pollutants with different weightings according to the level of their negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity: soil salinization (8%), nitrogen (12%) and phosphorus (P, 13%) loading, mercury deposition (5%), pesticide loading (10%), sediment loading (17%), organic loading (as Biological Oxygen Demand, BOD; 15%), potential acidification (9%), and thermal alteration (11%).</p>	Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P., ... & Davies, P. M. (2010). Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity. <i>Nature</i> , 467(7315), 555.

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
3.1 - Surface Water Contamination Index (rank)	76	<p>The underlying data for this risk indicator is based on a broad suite of pollutants with well-documented direct or indirect negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity, compiled by Vörösmarty et al. (2010). The negative effects are specific to individual pollutants, ranging from impacts mediated by eutrophication such as algal blooms and oxygen depletion (e.g., caused by phosphorus and organic loading) to direct toxic effects (e.g., caused by pesticides, mercury).</p> <p>The overall Surface Water Contamination Index is calculated based on a range of key pollutants with different weightings according to the level of their negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity: soil salinization (8%), nitrogen (12%) and phosphorus (P, 13%) loading, mercury deposition (5%), pesticide loading (10%), sediment loading (17%), organic loading (as Biological Oxygen Demand, BOD; 15%), potential acidification (9%), and thermal alteration (11%).</p>	Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P., ... & Davies, P. M. (2010). Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity. <i>Nature</i> , 467(7315), 555.
4.1 - Fragmentation Status of Rivers (score)	2.12	<p>This risk indicator is based on the data set by Grill et al. (2019) mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Grill et al. (2019) compiled a geometric network of the global river system and associated attributes, such as hydro-geometric properties, as well as pressure indicators to calculate an integrated connectivity status index (CSI). While only rivers with high levels of connectivity in their entire length are classified as free-flowing, rivers of CSI &lt; 95% are considered as fragmented at a certain degree.</p>	Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M., Geenen, B., Tickner, D., Antonelli, F., ... & Macedo, H. E. (2019). Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. <i>Nature</i> , 569(7755), 215.
4.1 - Fragmentation Status of Rivers (rank)	110	<p>This risk indicator is based on the data set by Grill et al. (2019) mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Grill et al. (2019) compiled a geometric network of the global river system and associated attributes, such as hydro-geometric properties, as well as pressure indicators to calculate an integrated connectivity status index (CSI). While only rivers with high levels of connectivity in their entire length are classified as free-flowing, rivers of CSI &lt; 95% are considered as fragmented at a certain degree.</p>	Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M., Geenen, B., Tickner, D., Antonelli, F., ... & Macedo, H. E. (2019). Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. <i>Nature</i> , 569(7755), 215.
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (score)	2.72	<p>For this risk indicator, tree cover loss was applied as a proxy to represent catchment ecosystem services degradation since forests play an important role in terms of water regulation, supply and pollution control. The forest cover data is based on Hansen et al.'s global Landsat data at a 30-meter spatial resolution to characterize forest cover and change. The authors defined trees as vegetation taller than 5 meters in height, and forest cover loss as a stand-replacement disturbance, or a change from a forest to non-forest state, during the period 2000 – 2018.</p>	Hansen, M. C., Potapov, P. V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S. A. A., Tyukavina, A., ... & Kommareddy, A. (2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. <i>science</i> , 342(6160), 850-853.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (rank)	57	<p>For this risk indicator, tree cover loss was applied as a proxy to represent catchment ecosystem services degradation since forests play an important role in terms of water regulation, supply and pollution control.</p> <p>The forest cover data is based on Hansen et al.'s global Landsat data at a 30-meter spatial resolution to characterize forest cover and change. The authors defined trees as vegetation taller than 5 meters in height, and forest cover loss as a stand-replacement disturbance, or a change from a forest to non-forest state, during the period 2000 – 2018.</p>	Hansen, M. C., Potapov, P. V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S. A. A., Tyukavina, A., ... & Kommareddy, A. (2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. <i>science</i> , 342(6160), 850-853.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (score)	1.00	The study by Tedesco et al. (2013) to project changes [% increase or decrease] in extinction rate by ~2090 of freshwater fish due to water availability loss from climate change is used as a proxy to estimate the projected impacts on freshwater biodiversity.	Tedesco, P. A., Oberdorff, T., Cornu, J. F., Beauchard, O., Brosse, S., Dürr, H. H., ... & Hugueny, B. (2013). A scenario for impacts of water availability loss due to climate change on riverine fish extinction rates. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i> , 50(5), 1105-1115.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (rank)	193	The study by Tedesco et al. (2013) to project changes [% increase or decrease] in extinction rate by ~2090 of freshwater fish due to water availability loss from climate change is used as a proxy to estimate the projected impacts on freshwater biodiversity.	Tedesco, P. A., Oberdorff, T., Cornu, J. F., Beauchard, O., Brosse, S., Dürr, H. H., ... & Hugueny, B. (2013). A scenario for impacts of water availability loss due to climate change on riverine fish extinction rates. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i> , 50(5), 1105-1115.
5.1 - Freshwater Policy Status (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	2.00	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "National Water Resources Policy" indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.1 - Freshwater Policy Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	155	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "National Water Resources Policy" indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "National Water Resources Law(s)" indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	189	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation “National Water Resources Law(s)” indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.3 - Implementation Status of Water Management Plans (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation “National IWRM plans” indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.3 - Implementation Status of Water Management Plans (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	192	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation “National IWRM plans” indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
6.1 - Corruption Perceptions Index (score)	2.00	<p>This risk Indicator is based on the latest Transparency International's data: the Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. This index aggregates data from a number of different sources that provide perceptions of business people and country experts on the level of corruption in the public sector.</p>	Transparency International (2019). Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. Berlin: Transparency International.
6.1 - Corruption Perceptions Index (rank)	182	<p>This risk Indicator is based on the latest Transparency International's data: the Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. This index aggregates data from a number of different sources that provide perceptions of business people and country experts on the level of corruption in the public sector.</p>	Transparency International (2019). Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. Berlin: Transparency International.
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (score)	1.00	<p>This risk indicator is based on Freedom House (2019), an annual global report on political rights and civil liberties, composed of numerical ratings and descriptive texts for each country and a select group of territories. The 2019 edition involved more than 100 analysts and more than 30 advisers with global, regional, and issue-based expertise to covers developments in 195 countries and 14 territories from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.</p>	Freedom House (2019). Freedom in the world 2019. Washington, DC: Freedom House.



## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (rank)	189	This risk indicator is based on Freedom House (2019), an annual global report on political rights and civil liberties, composed of numerical ratings and descriptive texts for each country and a select group of territories. The 2019 edition involved more than 100 analysts and more than 30 advisers with global, regional, and issue-based expertise to covers developments in 195 countries and 14 territories from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.	Freedom House (2019). Freedom in the world 2019. Washington, DC: Freedom House.
6.3 - Business Participation in Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Business Participation in Water Resources Development, Management and Use" indicator, which corresponds to one of the six national level indicators under the Institutions and Participation category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
6.3 - Business Participation in Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	190	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Business Participation in Water Resources Development, Management and Use" indicator, which corresponds to one of the six national level indicators under the Institutions and Participation category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
7.1 - Management Instruments for Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Sustainable and efficient water use management" indicator, which corresponds to one of the five national level indicators under the Management Instruments category.  For SDG 6.5.1, management instruments refer to the tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
7.1 - Management Instruments for Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	190	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Sustainable and efficient water use management" indicator, which corresponds to one of the five national level indicators under the Management Instruments category.  For SDG 6.5.1, management instruments refer to the tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on the data set by UN IGRAC (2019) to determine the level of availability of groundwater monitoring data at country level as groundwater management decisions rely strongly on data availability. The level of groundwater monitoring data availability for groundwater management is determined according to a combination of three criteria developed by WWF and IGRAC: 1) Status of country groundwater monitoring programme, 2) groundwater data availability for NGOs and 3) Public access to processed groundwater monitoring data.	UN IGRAC (2019). Global Groundwater Monitoring Network GGMN Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (rank)	188	This risk indicator is based on the data set by UN IGRAC (2019) to determine the level of availability of groundwater monitoring data at country level as groundwater management decisions rely strongly on data availability. The level of groundwater monitoring data availability for groundwater management is determined according to a combination of three criteria developed by WWF and IGRAC: 1) Status of country groundwater monitoring programme, 2) groundwater data availability for NGOs and 3) Public access to processed groundwater monitoring data.	UN IGRAC (2019). Global Groundwater Monitoring Network GGMN Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.3 - Density of Runoff Monitoring Stations (score)	3.12	The density of monitoring stations for water quantity was applied as proxy to develop this risk indicator. The Global Runoff Data Base was used to estimate the number of monitoring stations per 1000km <sup>2</sup> of the main river system (data base access date: May 2018).	BfG (2019). Global Runoff Data Base. German Federal Institute of Hydrology (BfG).
7.3 - Density of Runoff Monitoring Stations (rank)	109	The density of monitoring stations for water quantity was applied as proxy to develop this risk indicator. The Global Runoff Data Base was used to estimate the number of monitoring stations per 1000km <sup>2</sup> of the main river system (data base access date: May 2018).	BfG (2019). Global Runoff Data Base. German Federal Institute of Hydrology (BfG).
8.1 - Access to Safe Drinking Water (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.
8.1 - Access to Safe Drinking Water (rank)	186	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (score)	2.00	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (rank)	115	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.
8.3 - Financing for Water Resource Development and Management (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on the average 'Financing' score of UN SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation database. UN SDG 6.5.1 database contains a category on financing which assesses different aspects related to budgeting and financing made available and used for water resources development and management from various sources.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
8.3 - Financing for Water Resource Development and Management (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	192	This risk indicator is based on the average 'Financing' score of UN SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation database. UN SDG 6.5.1 database contains a category on financing which assesses different aspects related to budgeting and financing made available and used for water resources development and management from various sources.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
9.1 - Cultural Diversity (score)	3.00	Water is a social and cultural good. The cultural diversity risk indicator was included in order to acknowledge that businesses face reputational risk due to the importance of freshwater for indigenous and traditional people in their daily life, religion and culture. This risk indicator is based on Oviedo and Larsen (2000) data set, which mapped the world's ethnolinguistic groups onto the WWF map of the world's ecoregions. This cross-mapping showed for the very first time the significant overlap that exists between the global geographic distribution of biodiversity and that of linguistic diversity.	Oviedo, G., Maffi, L., & Larsen, P. B. (2000). Indigenous and traditional peoples of the world and ecoregion conservation: An integrated approach to conserving the world's biological and cultural diversity. Gland: WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) International.
9.1 - Cultural Diversity (rank)	88	Water is a social and cultural good. The cultural diversity risk indicator was included in order to acknowledge that businesses face reputational risk due to the importance of freshwater for indigenous and traditional people in their daily life, religion and culture. This risk indicator is based on Oviedo and Larsen (2000) data set, which mapped the world's ethnolinguistic groups onto the WWF map of the world's ecoregions. This cross-mapping showed for the very first time the significant overlap that exists between the global geographic distribution of biodiversity and that of linguistic diversity.	Oviedo, G., Maffi, L., & Larsen, P. B. (2000). Indigenous and traditional peoples of the world and ecoregion conservation: An integrated approach to conserving the world's biological and cultural diversity. Gland: WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) International.
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (score)	5.00	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Companies operating in basins with higher number of endemic fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (rank)	24	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Companies operating in basins with higher number of endemic fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.
10.2 - Freshwater Biodiversity Richness (score)	2.00	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Count of fish species is used as a representation of freshwater biodiversity richness. Companies operating in basins with higher number of fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.
10.2 - Freshwater Biodiversity Richness (rank)	167	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Count of fish species is used as a representation of freshwater biodiversity richness. Companies operating in basins with higher number of fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.
11.1 - National Media Coverage (score)	2.00	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware local residents typically are of water-related issues due to national media coverage. The status of the river basin (e.g., scarcity and pollution) is taken into account, as well as the importance of water for livelihoods (e.g., food and shelter).	WWF & Tecnomia (TYPESA Group)
11.1 - National Media Coverage (rank)	191	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware local residents typically are of water-related issues due to national media coverage. The status of the river basin (e.g., scarcity and pollution) is taken into account, as well as the importance of water for livelihoods (e.g., food and shelter).	WWF & Tecnomia (TYPESA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware people are of water-related issues due to global media coverage. Familiarity to and media coverage of the region and regional water-related disasters are taken into account.	WWF & Tecnomia (TYPESA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (rank)	188	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware people are of water-related issues due to global media coverage. Familiarity to and media coverage of the region and regional water-related disasters are taken into account.	WWF & Tecnomia (TYPESA Group)

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
12.1 - Conflict News Events (RepRisk) (score)	2.00	This risk indicator is based on 2018 data collected by RepRisk on counts and registers of documented negative incidents, criticism and controversies that can affect a company's reputational risk. These negative news events are labelled per country and industry class.	RepRisk & WWF (2019). Due diligence database on ESG and business conduct risks. RepRisk.
12.1 - Conflict News Events (RepRisk) (rank)	152	This risk indicator is based on 2018 data collected by RepRisk on counts and registers of documented negative incidents, criticism and controversies that can affect a company's reputational risk. These negative news events are labelled per country and industry class.	RepRisk & WWF (2019). Due diligence database on ESG and business conduct risks. RepRisk.
12.2 - Hydro-political Risk (score)	1.92	This risk indicator is based on the assessment of hydro-political risk by Farinosi et al. (2018). More specifically, it is based on the results of spatial modelling by Farinosi et al. (2018) that determined the main parameters affecting water cross-border conflicts and calculated the likelihood of hydro-political issues.	Farinosi, F., Giupponi, C., Reynaud, A., Ceccherini, G., Carmona-Moreno, C., De Roo, A., ... & Bidoglio, G. (2018). An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues. <i>Global environmental change</i> , 52, 286-313.
12.2 - Hydro-political Risk (rank)	140	This risk indicator is based on the assessment of hydro-political risk by Farinosi et al. (2018). More specifically, it is based on the results of spatial modelling by Farinosi et al. (2018) that determined the main parameters affecting water cross-border conflicts and calculated the likelihood of hydro-political issues.	Farinosi, F., Giupponi, C., Reynaud, A., Ceccherini, G., Carmona-Moreno, C., De Roo, A., ... & Bidoglio, G. (2018). An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues. <i>Global environmental change</i> , 52, 286-313.
Population, total (#)	4773095	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US\$)	304819020501	GDP (current US\$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	78.77	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	76.67	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, <i>The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues</i> (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: <a href="https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132">https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132</a>

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WGI -Political stability no violence (0-100)	93.60	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: <a href="https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132">https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132</a>
WGI - Government Effectiveness (0-100)	88.46	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: <a href="https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132">https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132</a>
WGI - Regulatory Quality (0-100)	94.71	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: <a href="https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132">https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132</a>
WGI - Rule of Law (0-100)	90.38	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: <a href="https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132">https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132</a>
WGI - Control of Corruption (0-100)	92.79	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: <a href="https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132">https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132</a>

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WRI BWS all industries (0-5)	2.92	WRI Baseline Water Stress (BWS)	Gassert, F., P. Reig, T. Luo, and A. Maddocks. 2013. "Aqueduct country and river basin rankings: a weighted aggregation of spatially distinct hydrological indicators." Working paper. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, December 2013. Available online at <a href="http://wri.org/publication/aqueduct-country-river-basin-rankings">http://wri.org/publication/aqueduct-country-river-basin-rankings</a> .
WRI BWS Ranking (1=very high)	70	WRI Baseline Water Stress (BWS)	Gassert, F., P. Reig, T. Luo, and A. Maddocks. 2013. "Aqueduct country and river basin rankings: a weighted aggregation of spatially distinct hydrological indicators." Working paper. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, December 2013. Available online at <a href="http://wri.org/publication/aqueduct-country-river-basin-rankings">http://wri.org/publication/aqueduct-country-river-basin-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 BAU (1=very high)	80	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	81	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	80	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	81	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	81	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	80	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	84	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	85	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	83	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at <a href="http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings">http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings</a> .



## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total water footprint of national consumption (m <sup>3</sup> /a/cap)	1301.41	WFN Water Footprint Data	Mekonnen, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y. (2011) National water footprint accounts: The green, blue and grey water footprint of production and consumption, Value of Water Research Report Series No. 50, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, the Netherlands. <a href="http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf">http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf</a>
Ratio external / total water footprint (%)	71.69	WFN Water Footprint Data	Mekonnen, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y. (2011) National water footprint accounts: The green, blue and grey water footprint of production and consumption, Value of Water Research Report Series No. 50, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, the Netherlands. <a href="http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf">http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf</a>
Area equipped for full control irrigation: total (1000 ha)	1.10	Aquastat - Irrigation	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Area equipped for irrigation: total (1000 ha)	1.10	Aquastat - Irrigation	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
% of the area equipped for irrigation actually irrigated (%)	100.00	Aquastat - Irrigation	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Electricity production from hydroelectric sources (% of total)	2.84	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10 <sup>9</sup> m <sup>3</sup> /year)	49.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10 <sup>9</sup> m <sup>3</sup> /year)	3.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Water resources: total external renewable (10 <sup>9</sup> m <sup>3</sup> /year)	49.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13

## Country Overview - Ireland

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total renewable water resources (10 <sup>9</sup> m <sup>3</sup> /year)	52.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	5.77	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Total renewable water resources per capita (m <sup>3</sup> /inhab/year)	11092.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
World happiness [0-8]	6.98	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018

## Country Aspects

### 1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

#### 1.1. WATER RESOURCES

##### 1.1.1. WATER RESOURCES

Ireland's climate is influenced by the relatively warm waters of the Gulf Stream and by the prevailing south-western winds from the Atlantic. Consequently, Ireland does not suffer from the extremes of temperature experienced by many other countries at similar latitude. January and February are the coldest months with mean daily air temperatures between 4°C and 6°C. July and August are the warmest, with mean daily air temperatures between 15°C and 16°C. Rainfall regime varies between about 800mm in low lying areas and up to 3,000mm in more mountainous areas. The long-term average annual precipitation is estimated at 1.118 mm/year.

Ireland has an abundant supply of water. The long-term average of annual renewable water resources is stated as 52,000 million m<sup>3</sup>/year of which 94 per cent are considered as internal water resources (49,000 million m<sup>3</sup>) and only 5 per cent are considered as external water resources (3,000 million m<sup>3</sup>). By the year 2009 the total dam (reservoir) capacity was stated as 869 million m<sup>3</sup>.

Ireland has seven river basin districts (RBDs), of which three are international RBDs and share water courses with Northern Ireland. The RBDs are the IRBD of Shannon, the south-eastern RBD, the western RBD, the eastern RBD, the south-western, the north-western IRBD and the Neagh Bann IRBD. The consultation process on the draft River Basin Management Plans for each RBD took place between December 22 2008 and June 22 2009. Finally, the 2009-2015 River Basin Management Plans were adopted in July 2010.

More generally water resources are likely to be impacted by the projected changes in climate over the coming decades. These impacts are expected to include summer water shortages in the east, the need for crop irrigation, potential deterioration in water quality, and an increased likelihood of flooding and coastal erosion.

##### 1.1.2. WATER USE

Because the rivers are mostly relatively short, when abnormal rainfall concentrates in short periods this causes rapid flows of water towards the sea, preventing storage in water courses, lakes and subsoil, and resulting in the loss of enormous quantities of water. Furthermore, the increased use of water by industry, agriculture and households is depleting groundwater reserves, emphasising the need to avoid resource pollution and wastage.

Water withdrawal in the country was estimated at a total of 850.2 million m<sup>3</sup>. A small portion of the water resources (0.2 million m<sup>3</sup>) were then produced by desalination processes. This water

abstraction can be itemised by user sector. By the year 2000, it was estimated that the water dedicated to agriculture only reached 0.2 million m<sup>3</sup>. However, almost 95 per cent of the water consumption (799 million m<sup>3</sup>) was dedicated to urban purposes, and for industrial uses the value was stated as 51 million m<sup>3</sup>.

##### 1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

The two main sources of pressure on water quality are from agricultural activities and municipal wastewaters. These activities can contribute to nutrient enrichment, organic pollution and siltation of water bodies. In fact, nutrient enrichment causing eutrophication is stated as the main threat to Ireland's aquatic systems. However, the implementation of the Nitrates Action Programme under the Nitrates Directive aims at strengthening the protection of waters against pollution from agricultural sources.

Agricultural activities associated with pollution include land spreading of artificial fertilisers and animal manures in unsuitable climatic and ground conditions, silage effluent discharges, farmyard runoff, and watering animals.

Municipal pollution sources include sewage, waterworks effluent, on-site wastewater treatment systems and diffuse urban inputs. Sewage discharges comprise the main municipal pollution source. Pollution from municipal wastewater treatment plants arises where there is inadequate treatment, combined with storm overflows and direct untreated discharges. In most rural areas the majority of the population uses individual septic tanks that, if poorly sited and/or not properly maintained, can pollute groundwater, surface water and drinking water supplies.

Other activities which may impact on water bodies include forestry, industrial activities, quarrying, dredging, fish farming, bog development, civil works and housing development.

Given these pressures on water quality, many water bodies will require remedial measures to meet the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD, Directive 2000/60/EC). Protection and restoration of high quality waters will also be a significant challenge.

Regarding groundwater resources, elevated nitrate concentration in groundwater bodies is an issue, particularly in the southeast and south of the country. It may contribute to eutrophication of surface waters and affect drinking waters. Diffuse agricultural pollution is considered the most significant source. In addition, elevated groundwater phosphate concentrations, particularly in karst limestone areas such as Galway, Mayo and Roscommon, may be contributing to eutrophication in rivers and lakes.

Regarding the river system, it is stated that 49 per cent of the river water bodies are classified as having good or better ecological status (i.e. satisfactory), based on the WFD Interim Biological Classification for river water quality in 2008. Given this classification, 28 per cent of river water bodies are classified as having moderate ecological status, 21 per cent poor and 2 per cent have a bad ecological status. In the case of nitrate pollution the majority of sites with elevated nitrate

concentrations occur in the southeast. The contrast between the western and eastern rivers is not as immediately apparent for phosphate as nitrate pollution; however half of the surveillance monitoring sites in the South-Eastern River Basin District (SERBD) would not achieve good status in 2008 based on phosphate levels.

High ecological quality at river sites is an indicator of largely undisturbed conditions and reflects the natural background status or only minor distortion by anthropogenic influences. Such sites are used as reference sites from which deviation in quality is measured. These sites play an important part in conserving individual species and overall catchment biodiversity and must be protected under the WFD. The percentage of high quality sites has almost halved in the last 21 years from almost 30 per cent of the total sampled in the 1987-1990 period to less than 17 per cent in 2006-2008. These sites now comprise less than 2 per cent of the total surveyed.

Of the 271 lakes in Ireland, assessed for WFD Interim Biological Status in 2008, over 55 per cent had at least good status. Only very modest nitrogen loading was recorded in 2008 for the 75 lakes on the surveillance monitoring programme, and 81 per cent of surveillance lakes sampled in 2008 were of good or better status for phosphorus concentrations.

Although freshwater is abundant, it is not limitless in quantity, and is not evenly distributed across the country; it is not of good quality status everywhere either. However, demand for wastewater treatment also increased substantially and significant investment has been made in treatment capacity. For example, in 2000-01 only 29 per cent of wastewater arising received secondary treatment, which had risen to 92 per cent by 2007-08. The dispersed nature of settlement poses a particular challenge for the provision of affordable environmental services.

## 2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

The most recent environment assessment prepared by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) concluded that the quality of Ireland's environment is relatively good but that there are some key environmental challenges facing Ireland resulting from the major economic, social and demographic changes that have occurred in recent years. Four priority challenges for the environment are:

- Limiting and adapting to climate change
- Reversing environmental degradation – particularly in relation to water pollution and the conservation of natural habitats and species
- Mainstreaming environmental considerations
- Complying with environmental legislation and agreements

### 2.1. WATER INSTITUTIONS

The Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DEHLG) has primary responsibility for environmental policy; it is the main public body from the state government responsible for environmental issues. In some areas, such as in climate change, responsibility rests across a number of departments including the DEHLG, Department of Transport, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, and the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural

Resources.

The implementation of national policy often falls under the remit of local government (i.e. Local Authorities). Local Authorities have responsibility for local development and waste management planning, as well as the enforcement of environmental regulations in their functional area. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is a statutory body responsible for protecting the environment, including the licensing and enforcement of activities with the potential to cause serious pollution.

### 2.2. WATER MANAGEMENT

In line with elsewhere in Europe a series of river basin management plans has been developed under the Water Framework Directive. The challenge for water resources management in Ireland will be the successful development and rollout of effective programmes of measures, which aim to address water related issues as they arise within individual river basin districts. Eight water management issues have been identified as being of national importance:

- Wastewater and industrial discharges
- Landfills, quarries, mines and contaminated lands
- Agriculture
- Waste from unsewered properties
- Forestry
- Usage and discharge of dangerous substances
- Physical modifications to surface waters
- Abstractions

In this regard, the priorities for government water services investment over the coming years include measures to improve drinking water conservation (e.g. leakage control); to meet drinking water and wastewater treatment standards and ensure compliance with the WFD; and to meet forecasted increases in demand. In fact, significant investment has already gone into improving the water services infrastructure (for drinking water and urban wastewater).

This has resulted in a dramatic improvement in the level of treatment of urban wastewater. 92 per cent of urban wastewaters now receive at least secondary treatment compared to 25 per cent at the start of 2000. In addition, a system for EPA licensing or certification of wastewater discharges from areas served by local authority sewer networks was brought into effect in September 2007. This aims to reduce the input of nutrients and other dangerous substances to receiving waters. In 2009 the EPA revised its code of practice establishing a framework of best practice in relation to the development of wastewater treatment and disposal systems in unsewered rural areas. This investment has also resulted in increased treatment capacity for drinking water by a level equivalent to the needs of a population of 855,000 and storage capacity has increased by a level equivalent to the needs of a population of 1,510,000.

The implementation and enforcement of the Nitrates Action Plan under the EU Nitrates Directive is the most important measure to address diffuse agricultural pollution of freshwaters.

## 2.3. WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The main Directives and related legislation on the European level regarding the domain of water resources management are:

- Directive 80/68/EEC of 17 December, 1979 on the protection of groundwater against pollution caused by certain dangerous substances;
- Directive 82/176/EEC of 22 March, 1982 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry; covers inland surface water, territorial waters and internal coastal waters;
- Directive 83/513/EEC of 26 September, 1983 on limit values and quality objectives for cadmium discharges; sets limit values and quality objectives for cadmium discharges in the aquatic environment;
- Directive 84/156/EEC of 8 March, 1984 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by sectors other than the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry; sets limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges in sectors other than the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry;
- Directive 84/491/EEC of 9 October, 1984 on limit values and quality objectives for discharges of hexachlorocyclohexane;
- Directive 91/271/EEC of 21 May, 1991 concerning urban waste water treatment;
- Directive 91/676/EEC of 12 December, 1991 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources (known as the Nitrates Directive);
- Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November, 1998 on the quality of water;
- Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy;
- Regulation (EC) No 648/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March, 2004 on detergents;
- Decision 2006/507/EC of 14 October, 2004 concerning the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs);
- Directive 2006/7/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 February, 2006 concerning the management of bathing water quality and repealing Directive 76/160/EEC (with effect from 31 December, 2014);
- Directive 2006/44/EC of 6 September, 2006 on the quality of fresh waters needing protection or improvement in order to support fish life (this Directive will be repealed by the Framework Directive on water as of the end of 2013);
- Directive 2006/11/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 February, 2006 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community the European Union (this Directive will be repealed by the Framework Directive on water as of the end of 2013);
- Proposal for a European Parliament and Council Directive of 22 September, 2006 setting out a framework for soil protection and amending Council Directive 2004/35/EC [COM (2006) 231 final – not published in the Official Journal];

- Directive 2006/118/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December, 2006 on the protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration;
- Directive 2007/2/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March, 2007 establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE);
- Commission Communication of 18 July, 2007: “Addressing the challenge of water scarcity and droughts in the European Union” [COM (2007) 414 final – not published in the Official Journal];
- Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October, 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks; aims to manage and reduce the risk of floods, particularly along rivers and in coastal areas;
- Directive 2008/1/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 January 2008 concerning integrated pollution prevention and control (the IPPC Directive);
- Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC.

As a Member State of the European Union, Ireland has to implement this legislation in its own legal framework, defining specific laws for the implementation of the different directives and the common legislative principles. This is a responsibility of the Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DEHLG) and further information on this local legislation can be found on its web page.

## 3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Ireland's population has grown since the mid-1960s and continues to grow at a high rate relative to other EU countries (e.g. over the 10-year period 1996-2006, Ireland's population growth has been five times the EU average). The population is still increasing and by 2009 it was estimated at almost 4.5 million. Immigration since the mid-1990s and relatively high birth rates are contributing to this trend. Nevertheless, even today Ireland remains relatively sparsely populated compared to most other European countries (63.7 persons/km<sup>2</sup>).

The growth in population, incomes and economic activity, especially over the past decade, and the general trend towards increased urbanisation and suburbanisation has impacted on the environment in a variety of ways. These include changes in land use, increased traffic flows, and the need for increased infrastructure such as housing, water supply, sewerage and waste management facilities.

By European standards, Ireland has experienced a relatively high rate of land use change in the last decade. While agriculture is the main land use, ‘artificial’ land (i.e. lands used for residential, industrial, commercial purposes, etc) has increased by 14.5 per cent in the period 2000 to 2006. Land use change is predominantly from agricultural uses into residential and to a lesser extent commercial development. Over 60 per cent of the land in Ireland is devoted to agricultural activities, with an additional 10 per cent currently devoted to forestry. Irish agriculture is predominantly extensive and grass-based. Tillage occupies some 10 per cent of the utilisable agricultural area, while most of the remainder is devoted to dairy cattle and sheep farming. Sheep numbers have declined in recent years. There has been significant destocking of commonages

which were being heavily overgrazed.

#### **4. SOURCES**

FAO. 1997. Aquastat. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/main/index.stm> [accessed February 28 2012]

(EEA) European Environmental Agency. 2011. The European Environment – State and Outlook 2010. Available at: <http://www.eea.europa.eu/soer/> [accessed February 28 2012]