

Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	2.61	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	106	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	2.71	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	87	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	2.66	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	123	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	2.27	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	159	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	2.06	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	107	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	3.91	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	41	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	3.28	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	71	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	2.60	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	80	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	3.20	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	42	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	2.25	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	150	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	3.07	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	69	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	1.75	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	115	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	2.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	110	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	3.15	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	114	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	2.10	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	163	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	2.35	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	118	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	1.10	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)	107	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)	1.71	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)	95	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)	1.81	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). <i>Aqueduct 3.0: Updated decision relevant global water risk indicators</i> . Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (rank)	100	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)	1.44	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)	142	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)	2.80	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)	31	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 - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (score)	3.01	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)	64	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)	4.40	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)	12	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)	4.01	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)	32	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)	1.96	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)	146	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)	3.28	<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)	71	<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)	3.14	<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 < 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)	48	<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 < 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)	1.00	<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 - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (rank)	178	<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)	3.05	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)	64	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)	141	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)	4.00	<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.

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	23	<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)	3.00	<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)	84	<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)	3.00	<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)	129	<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)	2.00	<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.

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (rank)	115	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)	167	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)	3.00	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)	75	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 - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (score)	3.00	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 GGMM Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (rank)	90	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 GGMM Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.3 - Density of Runoff Monitoring Stations (score)	3.44	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 ² 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)	93	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 ² 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)	136	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 - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (rank)	110	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)	4.00	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)	40	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)	2.00	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)	110	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)	3.31	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 - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (rank)	118	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)	3.00	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)	107	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)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Tyspa 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)	123	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Tyspa 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 (Tyspa 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)	169	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Tyspa 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 - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
12.1 - Conflict News Events (RepRisk) (score)	3.00	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)	85	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)	1.69	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)	157	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 (#)	3719300	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US\$)	14378016729	GDP (current US\$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	55.69	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	35.24	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: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WGI -Political stability no violence (0-100)	53.69	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: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Government Effectiveness (0-100)	71.15	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: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Regulatory Quality (0-100)	81.25	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: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Rule of Law (0-100)	63.94	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: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Control of Corruption (0-100)	73.56	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: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WRI BWS all industries (0-5)	1.51	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 http://wri.org/publication/aqueduct-country-river-basin-rankings .
WRI BWS Ranking (1=very high)	95	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 http://wri.org/publication/aqueduct-country-river-basin-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 BAU (1=very high)	68	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	70	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	68	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	67	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	68	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	64	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	64	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	68	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	62	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 http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total water footprint of national consumption (m ³ /a/cap)	2267.49	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. http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf
Ratio external / total water footprint (%)	29.48	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. http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf
Area equipped for full control irrigation: total (1000 ha)	401.30	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)	432.80	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 (%)	63.00	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)	80.37	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	58.13	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 ⁹ m ³ /year)	5.20	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 ⁹ m ³ /year)	58.13	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13

Country Overview - Georgia

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total renewable water resources (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	63.33	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	8.21	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 ³ /inhab/year)	15832.00	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]	4.34	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018

Country Aspects

1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

1.1. WATER RESOURCES

1.1.1. WATER RESOURCES

Georgia can be divided into two main river basin groups:

-The Black Sea basin, in the west of the country. The internal renewable surface water resources (IRSWR) generated in this basin are estimated at 42.5km³/year. The main rivers are, from north to south, the Inguri, the Rioni and the Chorokhi. The main stream of the Chorokhi rises in Turkey (the Corub River) and the estimated inflow from Turkey is 6.3km³/year.

-The Caspian Sea basin, in the east of the country. The IRSWR generated in this basin are estimated at 14.4km³/year. The main rivers are, from north to south: the Terek and the Andiyskoye, which rise in the north of the country and flow northeast to the Russian Federation before entering the Caspian Sea; the Alazani, the Lori and the Kura, which rise in Georgia and flow into Azerbaijan in Lake Adzhinour, before flowing southeast in Azerbaijan and then entering the Caspian Sea. Two tributaries of the Kura River rise in Turkey: the Mtkvari, with an estimated inflow from Turkey of 0.91km³/year, and the Potskhovi, with an estimated inflow from Turkey of 0.25km³/year. The inflow of the Debet River, a southern tributary of the Kura River, is estimated at 0.89km³/year from Armenia.

The renewable groundwater resources are estimated at 17.23km³/year, of which 16km³/year are drained by the surface water network (overlap). This gives a total of 58.13km³/year for internal renewable water resources (IRWR). The total actual renewable water resources (ARWR) are 63.33km³/year.

In 1990, the total water abstraction was estimated at 3km³/year from some 1,700 tube-wells. According to a recent assessment a further 7km³/year could be abstracted in the future. Groundwater use was not greatly developed during the Soviet period, due to the emphasis on large-scale state-run surface irrigation schemes.

Georgia has 25,075 rivers exist with a total length of 54,768 km; 99.4 per cent of them are small rivers with a total length of less than 25km. Hydrological studies have been made of 555 rivers of the Black Sea Basin and 528 rivers of the Caspian Sea Basin. More than 17,000 rivers (total length 32,574 km) belong to the Black Sea Basin. There are about 43 dams in Georgia, 35 of which are in the east and 8 in the west; their total reservoir capacity is estimated at about 3.4km³. The water is primarily used for irrigation and hydropower generation and less for water supply. The largest dam, for hydropower, is the Inguri dam, with a reservoir capacity of 1.092km³. In 1995, hydropower supplied 89 per cent of electricity. Some 31 dams have been built for irrigation purposes; they have a total reservoir capacity of 1km³, of which 782 million m³ are active. The

three largest irrigation reservoirs are: the Sioni reservoir (325 million m³) on the Lori River, the Tbilisi reservoir (308 million m³) on the Kura River and the Dalimta reservoir (180 million m³) on the Lori River.

In 2005, the total treated wastewater was estimated at 9 million m³. There is no tradition of treated wastewater reuse in Georgia.

Some wetlands have a primary environmental importance such as:

-Central Kolkheti (337.1km²), on both sides of the Rioni river mouth along the central part of the eastern Black Sea coast, in the regions Guria and Samegrelo near the city of Poti. The site contains many relicts and endemic species of flora and fauna. The area is a coastal alluvial plain, composed of quaternary deposits. The average water flow rate (over a long period) of the Rioni River (the largest river in the site) is 399m³/second. Kolkheti State Reserve (500km²) was established in 1947.

-Spani (5.13km²) in the autonomous Republic of Adjara, one kilometre from the Black Sea coast, near the city of Kobuleti. The area supports rare mammal species and migratory waterbirds of international importance. The area is a coastal alluvial plain, composed of quaternary, lake-riverine and additional lake deposits, which have developed to a depth of 9 -14 m.

1.1.2. WATER USE

Between 1985 and 1990, the total water withdrawal decreased from 4,600 to 3,500 million m³ because of the industrial decline since the end of the Soviet Union. During 2005 the total water withdrawal was 1,621 million m³, 66 per cent of which came from surface water and 34 per cent from groundwater. Agricultural water withdrawal accounted for 1,055 million m³ and water withdrawal for municipal purposes for 358 million m³. Industrial water withdrawal was estimated at 208 million m³.

Potable water supplies are mainly abstracted from groundwater and at such relatively low volumes that they do not substantially affect the river flows. Tbilisi city is the only large user of surface water for municipal supplies but two thirds of the city supplies are also abstracted from groundwater. Thus, contamination of potable water mainly occurs during transmission in pipes from source to customer and is not a water resource management issue.

Hydro-electric power generation is an important user of river water and the hydro-power reservoirs modify the flow patterns of rivers throughout the year. Most hydropower generation is needed during winter while the biggest irrigation releases from multi-purpose (hydropower and irrigation) reservoirs are needed during July and August.

The largest consumer of water by far is irrigated agriculture, though consumption has fallen to less than half of previous levels because of the economic downturn, the deterioration of infrastructure and the fact that electricity charges for pumping are now commercially priced.

Industrial water usage is low, currently only about 10 per cent of the usage in 1980, because the change to open markets for produced goods has resulted in the collapse of many industries.

Process water in the mining industry, which has also declined, is mainly recirculated and the industry does not therefore abstract or discharge large quantities. [EUWI-EECCA, 2005]

1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

Regardless of the fact that Georgia is a country with abundant fresh water resources, the current situation of the water supply is extremely complicated. This is largely due to anthropogenic contamination, deficit of drinking water and low sanitary standards of the water supply system. About 60 per cent of existing water pipelines are depreciated. Their sanitary and technical conditions are unsatisfactory, resulting in frequent accidents and this, in turn, leads to water contamination. Due to water network damages, large quantities of water are lost. According to data for 1999, such losses amounted to 40 per cent of the overall quantity of water supplied to households.

Due to the degradation of the water supply and sewerage infrastructure, the quality of drinking water often does not comply with human health and safety standards. Some 38 per cent of the water pipeline system of the cities and regions belongs in the high-risk water pipeline category, in which the microbiological contamination index is high. The poor quality of water has resulted in several outbreaks of infectious intestinal diseases and epidemics [Government of Georgia, 2002].

In eastern Georgia there is a salinization problem relating to irrigation. Currently, 592.2km² are severely salinized and 543.4km² are moderately salinized. The poor quality of management and infrastructure of the irrigation systems has added to these problems during the past decade [UNECE, 2003].

The main sources of risk from pollution are municipal sewage effluent and some hot-spots of industrial and mining pollution. Municipal wastewater is mostly not treated at all but is discharged directly to the rivers or to the Black Sea. Only the Tbilisi wastewater treatment plant provides mechanical treatment of effluent. Although mine process water is recirculated, it can spill accidentally, especially during heavy rain, carrying metal pollution to the rivers. As most industry of the USSR era has declined, the main pollution risk will come from newly emerging or revived industries if they are established without proper planning controls. River pollution from municipal waste landfills that are poorly designed is also important in that it reduces the recreational amenity value of the river [EUWI-EECCA, 2005].

2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

2.1. WATER INSTITUTIONS

Although several legislative acts about water management have been passed by the Georgian Parliament since independence, and some institutional restructuring has taken place, the basic structures remain similar to the previous Soviet water management system. Agencies involved in water management are:

- Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection (includes the Hydrometric Service);
- Ministry of Agriculture (irrigation abstractions and drainage return flows);

- Ministry of Labour, Health and Social Affairs (drinking and bathing water quality);
 - Ministry of Geology (control of groundwater);
 - Ministry of Economic Development (responsible for municipal water supply and sewage disposal);
- and
- Local government (manages water supply and sanitation systems).

Consequent disadvantages of the institutional structure include: lack of cross-sector coordination; use of administrative boundaries instead of hydraulic or geographic boundaries; lack of financial clarity; conflict between policy, laws and management; and lack of or poor distribution of information.

Although the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection is officially responsible for issuing effluent disposal licences, this mechanism is ineffective because the sanctions on water users are inadequate or cannot be applied. The root cause is the lack of funds in the municipalities and state enterprises to adequately treat effluents before disposal. These state entities are thus unable to comply with the environmental legislation [EUWI-EECCA, 2005].

2.2. WATER MANAGEMENT

During the Soviet period, many administrative units were involved in the management of the same irrigation scheme. With the institutional changes, every scheme is directly managed by one of the 48 administrative units of the Department of Melioration and Water Resources.

Water management in the southeast, and particularly in Georgia, has become increasingly more complex due to rapid population growth, dwindling water supplies, water quality and instream flow concerns, and allocation disputes with neighbouring states. The Georgia state legislature responded with two key initiatives: SB 130, passed in 2001, which formed the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD); and HB 237, passed in 2004, which requires the development of a Comprehensive Statewide Water Plan (CSWP). In 2003, the MNGWPD adopted wastewater management, watershed protection, and water supply and conservation plans that will guide water resources in metropolitan Atlanta for the next 30 years. [Sample & Bocarro].

The recent start of the National Policy Dialogue on integrated water resources management (IWRM) as an instrument for the intersectoral dialogue on water management is therefore crucial: it allows contacts and cooperation to be established between the agencies and ministries sharing responsibilities for water in Georgia. An important task under the National Policy Dialogue on IWRM is evaluation of the existing water policies and their revision to ensure they reflect better the changing institutional context of water management in Georgia [UNECE, 2011].

The main water management activities are the operation of reservoirs for irrigation and diversions for irrigation. Both these activities are managed by the Department of Melioration within the Ministry of Agriculture. One major reservoir (Khrami) is managed for hydro-electric energy production and the Department agrees with the hydro-power plant operator on summer releases from the reservoir before the season begins and then liaises with the plant operator on detailed release schedules throughout the season. The main water quantity issue is that of flows passing to Azerbaijan [EUWI-EECCA, 2005].

2.3. WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The policy document “Concept of agrarian policy in Georgia” was adopted by presidential decree in 1997; it covers the following issues relating to irrigation:

- The main irrigation infrastructure will remain in the hands of the State, while the inter-farm distribution will be included in the privatization programme;
- There should be an increase in state investment in irrigation, soil protection, research, selection, breeding information and plant protection services, and development of environmental protection for rural infrastructure.

While there is no separate policy document that directly spells out Georgian policy for protecting and managing water availability and quality, the Law on Water does outline a number of key principles that comprise a policy framework [UNECE, 2003]. Some of these are:

- water protection is a major element of environmental protection for Georgian citizens, in view of both current and future needs;
- drinking water for the population is the highest priority of all uses;
- both groundwater and surface water are under state control;
- management of water varies according to hydrologic importance;
- a system of “user-polluter pays” is key; and
- pollution is not allowed, although a definition of what constitutes pollution is lacking.

There are more than 10 major laws in Georgia that have a significant influence on the protection and management of water resources and associated environmental concerns. The most comprehensive is the above Law on Water, which has been in force since October 1997 and was last amended in June 2000. The 96 separate articles of this Law cover a very wide and comprehensive set of issues, such as pollution control policies, protection of drinking water sources, licensing of water use and discharge, categorization and protection of resources, particular measures for the Black Sea, flood control, and many others. All surface water, groundwater and near-coastal water are deemed to be under the control of the national government. Many of the provisions of the Law are supplemented by legislative orders and decrees, as well as by regulations of the Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources, which specify necessary actions in greater detail. The Ministry holds overarching responsibility for implementing the Law on Water, although other ministries are key players on specific topics. The Law is implemented by personnel at a regional or municipal level. The Law on Water does provide for the licensing of water use and the discharge of pollutants, an approach that has been in place since 1999.

The government has prepared a national programme of harmonization of Georgian legislation (including water legislation) with EU legislation [Tsiklauri, 2004].

In December 2008, the Water Governance project was informed of a renewed interest in the drafting of a new law on water resources reflecting EU requirements and principles within the framework of the EU-Georgia Neighbourhood Policy Action Plan. At present legal assistance to the government is being provided under the Environmental Collaboration for the Black Sea project

(ECBSea), which is helping the government prepare a plan for convergence of water-sector legislation with the EU water acquis (selected priority directives), a draft policy document and a draft concept paper relating to the water law [Water Governance Project, 2008].

3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

In 1925, an agreement with Turkey was reached on the use of water from the Chorokhi River, allocating half of the average surface water flow to each country. This agreement dealt only with water flow and did not consider the sediment flow, estimated at 5 million m³/year. About 46 per cent of these sediments form the sand beaches found along the Georgian shore and are an important resource, as tourism is of prime importance to Georgia’s earnings. Turkey plans to construct a cascade of 11 dams on the Chorokhi River, which will affect the sediment flow and thus the beaches on the Georgian shore. Georgia is pressing for a reconsideration of the agreement, which should not only deal with the allocation of water but also address the issue of sediment flow.

In 1997, Georgia ratified the agreement between the governments of Georgia and Azerbaijan on environmental protection. In 1998, Georgia ratified a similar agreement with Armenia. According to both agreements, the governments will cooperate in creating specifically protected areas within the transboundary ecosystems.

The implementation of the “Eco-regional Nature Protection Programme for Southern Caucasus” is part of the Caucasus Initiative, launched by the German Ministry of Cooperation and Development. The programme covers the three Caucasus countries, Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia, and will facilitate the protection and sustainable use of water resources in the region.

Measures are already being taken to support the development of protected areas in Georgia. Within the Black Sea Integrated Management Programme, supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the World Bank, implementation of the system of protected wetland areas in the coastal zone of Georgia is in progress [Tsiklauri, 2004].

The project, Reducing Transboundary Degradation in the Kura-Araks River Basin, currently being implemented by the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre in collaboration with the GEF, has involved four of the basin countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and the Islamic Republic of Iran. Efforts are being made to involve Turkey in the project, which is co-funded by Sweden. The project preparation phase is 18 months and began in July 2005. The project aims to ensure that the quality and quantity of water throughout the Kura-Araks river system meets the short and long-term needs of the ecosystem and the communities relying upon it. The project will achieve its objectives by fostering regional cooperation, increasing the capacity to address water quality and quantity problems, demonstrating water quality/quantity improvements, initiating required policy and legal reforms, identifying and preparing priority investments, and developing sustainable management and financial arrangements.

Azerbaijan signed and ratified the UN Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Water Courses and International Lakes, while the upstream countries Armenia and Georgia did not [Kerres, 2010].

4. SOURCES

- FAO. 2008. Aquastat. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/main/index.stm> [accessed 26 February 2012]
- Government of Georgia. 2002. National assessment report for sustainable development.
- Sample, D. & Bocarro, R. Integrated Water Resources Management in North Georgia: Implications of Wastewater Management Policy. Available at: www.uga.edu/water/publication/uploads/SampleD%20water%20alloc%20septic%20April13.pdf
- UNECE. 2011. Launch of National Policy Dialogue on Integrated Water Resource Management in Georgia. Available at: http://www.unece.org/press/pr2011/11env_p11e.htm [accessed 26 February 2012]
- EUWI-EECCA. 2005. EUWI – EECCA Component. Country Situation and Priorities – Georgia (October 2005).
- Water Governance Project. 2008. www.google.es/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=georgia%20water%20legislation%20eu&source=web&cd=10&ved=0CHkQFjAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.wgw.org.ua%2Fpublications%2FGeorgia%2520Country%20www.google.es/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=georgia%20%20legislation%20eu&source=web&cd=10&ved=0CHkQFjAJ&ur
- Kerres, M. 2010. Adaptation to Climate Change in the Kura-Aras River Basin. Report for KfW Entwicklungsbank. Available at: www.kfw-entwicklungsbank.de/DE_Home/Sektoren/Wasser/Klimawandel/Kura-Aras.pdf
- Tsiklauri, I. 2004. National report on the role of ecosystems as water suppliers, Georgia. Convention on protection and use of transboundary watercourses and international lakes. Geneva.
- United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP). 2002. Caucasus Environment Outlook (CEO).
- United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). 2003. Environmental performance review Georgia.
- USAID. 2006. South Caucasus Water Program. <http://www.scaucasuswater.org>
- World Bank. 1996. Georgia: reform in the food and agriculture sector: a World Bank country study. Washington, D.C., 170 p.