

Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	2.89	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	48	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	3.01	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	50	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	2.87	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	92	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	2.53	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	107	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	2.56	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	64	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	3.78	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	56	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	3.46	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	55	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	2.96	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	55	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	2.55	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	111	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	2.50	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	132	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	3.07	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	68	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	3.90	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	46	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	2.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	97	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	3.45	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	103	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	2.55	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	100	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	2.45	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	107	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	1.51	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)	80	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)	1.20	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. Elem Sci Anth, 4.
1.1 - Water Depletion (rank)	122	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. Elem Sci Anth, 4.
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (score)	1.55	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (rank)	114	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)	3.01	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. Science advances, 2(2), e1500323.
1.3 - Blue Water Scarcity (rank)	69	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. Science advances, 2(2), e1500323.
1.4 - Projected Change in Water Discharge (by ~2050) (score)	1.86	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. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(9), 3245-3250.
1.4 - Projected Change in Water Discharge (by ~2050) (rank)	107	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. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(9), 3245-3250.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (score)	4.82	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 multiscalar drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index. Journal of climate, 23(7), 1696-1718.
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (rank)	13	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 multiscalar drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index. Journal of climate, 23(7), 1696-1718.
1.6 - Projected Change in Drought Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	3.90	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)	19	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)	3.89	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)	56	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)	1.74	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)	158	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)	3.46	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). 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%).	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. Nature, 467(7315), 555.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
3.1 - Surface Water Contamination Index (rank)	55	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). 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%).	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. Nature, 467(7315), 555.
4.1 - Fragmentation Status of Rivers (score)	3.01	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.	Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M., Geenen, B., Tickner, D., Antonelli, F., & Macedo, H. E. (2019). Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Nature, 569(7755), 215.
4.1 - Fragmentation Status of Rivers (rank)	59	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.	Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M., Geenen, B., Tickner, D., Antonelli, F., & Macedo, H. E. (2019). Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Nature, 569(7755), 215.
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (score)	2.69	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.	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. science, 342(6160), 850-853.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (rank)	58	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.	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. science, 342(6160), 850-853.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (score)	3.56	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. Journal of Applied Ecology, 50(5), 1105-1115.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (rank)	50	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. Journal of Applied Ecology, 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)	121	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)	3.00	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. 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.	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)	63	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. 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.	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)	2.00	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. For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
		support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.	
5.3 - Implementation Status of Water Management Plans (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	136	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. 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.	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	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.	Transparency International (2019). Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. Berlin: Transparency International.
6.1 - Corruption Perceptions Index (rank)	102	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.	Transparency International (2019). Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. Berlin: Transparency International.
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (score)	1.00	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (rank)	136	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)	3.00	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)	64	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)	47	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (score)	4.00	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)	20	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)	2.46	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 1000km2 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)	143	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 1000km2 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)	3.00	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)	49	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)	5.00	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (rank)	19	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)	3.00	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)	87	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)	97	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)	2.91	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (rank)	143	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)	4.00	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)	54	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 Tecnoma (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 & Tecnoma (TYPSA Group)
11.1 - National Media Coverage (rank)	86	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnoma (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 & Tecnoma (TYPSA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (score)	2.00	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnoma (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 & Tecnoma (TYPSA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (rank)	92	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnoma (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 & Tecnoma (TYPSA Group)



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)	73	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)	1.91	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. Global environmental change, 52, 286-313.
12.2 - Hydro-political Risk (rank)	141	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. Global environmental change, 52, 286-313.
Population, total (#)	28206728	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US\$)	42689783734	GDP (current US\$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	49.66	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	40.00	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



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WGI -Political stability no violence (0-100)	67.49	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)	46.15	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)	45.67	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)	54.81	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)	50.96	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



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WRI BWS all industries (0-5)	0.11	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)	159	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)	133	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)	135	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)	135	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	129	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)	128	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)	132	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)	129	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)	125	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)	129	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.



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total water footprint of national consumption (m3/a/cap)	1206.87	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/Rep orts/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf
Ratio external / total water footprint (%)	7.70	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/Rep orts/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf
Area equipped for full control irrigation: total (1000 ha)	30.90	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)	30.90	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 (%)	90.32	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)	64.70	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10^9 m3/year)	30.30	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 m3/year)	25.90	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 m3/year)	30.30	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total renewable water resources (10^9 m3/year)	56.20	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	46.09	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 (m3/inhab/year)	2050.00	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]	4.66	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018



Country Aspects

1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

1.1.WATER RESOURCES

1.1.1.WATER RESOURCES

Three main river systems drain the country:

- -The Volta river system consists of the Oti and Daka rivers, the White and Black Volta rivers, and the Pru, Sene and Afram rivers. The basin covers 70 per cent of the country area;
- -The southwestern river system comprises the Bia, Tano, Ankobra and Pra rivers and covers 22 per cent of the country area; and
- -The coastal river system comprises the Ochi-Nakwa, Ochi Amissah, Ayensu, Densu and the Tordzie rivers, covering 8 per cent of the country area.

Groundwater occurs mainly in the following formations:

- -The Voltaian formation has little or no primary porosity and thus groundwater occurrence is associated with the development of secondary porosity because of jointing, shearing, fracturing and weathering. In the wet forested southwestern part of the country, the weathered zone has an average thickness of 60m while it is thinnest in the semi-arid area in the extreme northeast where the mean thickness is about 10m. Yields rarely exceed 6m3/hr.
- -The Cenozoic and Mesozoic sediments occur mainly in the extreme southeastern and western part of the country. Three aquifers occur in this formation. The first aquifer is unconfined and occurs in the Recent Sand very close to the coast. It is between two and four metres deep and contains meteoric water. The intermediate aquifer is either semi-confined or confined and occurs mainly in the Red Continental Deposits of sand clay and gravel. The depth of this aquifer varies from 6m to 120m. The third aquifer occurs in the limestone and varies in depth between 120 and 300m. Groundwater in this aquifer occurs under artesian conditions and is fresh. The average yield in this limestone aguifer is about 184m3/hr.

Falling groundwater levels have been observed in the Upper Regions where over 2,000 boreholes have been drilled since the mid-1970s in the rural areas to provide potable water to communities. Wetlands constitute about 10 per cent of Ghana's total land area. The three main types of wetlands are: i) marine/coastal wetlands; ii) inland wetlands; and iii) human-made wetlands.

Wetlands in Ghana are very productive and their resources have been traditionally used by local populations as a source of the basic necessities of life, ranging from building materials and hunting and fishing areas, to sources of water for humans and livestock. Local populations have developed traditional knowledge systems and practices which govern the management of wetlands. Ghana is a signatory to the Ramsar Convention and there are five Ramsar sites of international importance in the country: i) Densu delta; ii) Songor; iii) Keta complex; iv) Muni-

Pomadze; v) Sakumo lagoons. All these are protected areas and they have been gazetted as such. Other wetlands located in the forest and wildlife reserves of the Mole National Park, and theBlack Volta, Sene, Bia and Owabi Wildlife Sanctuaries are protected too. Some wetlands, which fall outside the conserved wetland areas, are subject to traditional conservation practices such as the rivers Ankobra and Pra. The two most important lakes in the country are Lake Volta and Lake Bosomtwi in the Ashanti region.

Ghana's total actual renewable water resources are estimated to be 53.2km3/year, of which 30.3km3/year are internally produced. Internally produced surface water amounts to 29km3/year, while groundwater is estimated at 26.3km3/year. The overlap between surface water and groundwater is estimate/yr. Abo of surface water enter the country annually, of wh come from Burkina Fa from Côte d'Ivoir from Togo.

The Akosombo Dam was completed in the mid-1960s and impounds the Volta River to form Lake Volta, one of the largest artificial lakes. The hydropower capacity of the dam is 912 MW. Lake Volta has a surface area of 8502km2, a maximum depth of 91m and a capacity of 147.96km3. The total dam capacity of the country is 148.5km3.

1.1.2.WATER USE

The main consumptive water uses in Ghana are for municipal, industrial and irrigation purposes. In 2000, about 652 million m3 were withdrawn for irrigation (66 per cent), 235 million m3 for municipalities (24 per cent) and 95 million m3 for the industry (10 per cent), giving a total water withdrawal of 982 million m3. The combined withdrawal for municipalities and industry is 95 million m3 for rural and 235 million m3 for urban areas. Current water use for hydro-electricity generation (only at the Akosombo Dam), which is non-consumptive water use, is 37.843 km3/yr.

The sources of water supply in the country are surface water and groundwater. Groundwater is usually abstracted from boreholes for most rural areas. Some borehole supplies are also tapped to supplement urban water supplies. In 2000, 95 per cent of the withdrawal for urban supply was from surface water and the remaining 5 per cent from groundwater.

1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

Major environmental problems are: recurrent drought in the north which severely affects agricultural activities; deforestation; overgrazing; soil erosion; poaching and habitat destruction which threatens wildlife populations; water pollution; and inadequate supplies of potable water. Water quality in the country is generally good, especially for irrigation purposes, and the impact of irrigation on water quality is not significant, probably because of the limited extent of irrigation. However, there are isolated problems associated with pollution not necessarily related to irrigation directly, but from general agricultural practice. In the Akomadan area, where irrigated tomato farming is practised, there are reports of pesticides in the water and in the soil in the vicinity of the



irrigation site because of the application of pesticides. Many of the water sources used for periurban irrigation, at least in the Kumasi area, are heavily polluted. Use of water with levels of microbiological pollution well above WHO guidelines for irrigation is commonplace and therefore both growers and consumers are at risk from bacterial and helminth infections. The increasing use of seasonally flooded flat valley bottoms poses problems of water pollution for municipal use downstream.

Groundwater pollution is not widespread and is limited to some agricultural sites which are not necessarily irrigation sites. However, cases of high levels of nitrate and phosphate concentrations have been reported, especially near agricultural sites. In some areas, the occurrence of salt in groundwater is a major problem and this limits its utilization for irrigation purposes.

Mining is predominant in the southwestern river system and in this area pollution of surface water and groundwater has been observed because of the use of cyanide and other poisonous chemicals.

Siltation is a cause for concern in most dams and reservoirs. However, very few studies have been carried out to establish what percentages of the various dams have been silted up. In the case of Lake Volta it is not known how much of the dead storage has been lost to siltation. The siltation volume in the Weija reservoir is not known either, but initial studies carried out prior to its construction concluded that after 50 years of operation less than one per cent of the volume of the dam would be lost to siltation.

The positive impact of irrigation includes improved access to food and hence better nutrition to some extent, though this effect is limited since irrigation contributes less than three per cent of the country's food production. Some families have higher incomes because of the use of irrigation facilities. On the other hand, the incidence of waterborne, water-based and water-related diseases increases in areas where irrigation projects are sited. No specific studies have been conducted to establish the percentage of the population affected.

2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

2.1.WATER INSTITUTIONS

The ministries dealing with water and irrigation include: the Ministry of Food and Agriculture; the Ministry of Works and Housing; and the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology.

In the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA), the Ghana Irrigation Development Authority (GIDA) is the main institution in charge of irrigation. It started in the early 1960s as a Land Planning Unit of MoFA, was upgraded in 1964 to become the Irrigation, Reclamation and Drainage Department (IRDD), and became the Irrigation Department in 1974. Finally, in 1977, GIDA was established by the SMC (Supreme Military Council) Decree No. 85. It is entrusted with irrigation development, provides all agricultural inputs and extension services, delivers water to the farmers and secures the repayment of credits. It is also expected to exercise management control over its irrigation dams and the associated catchment areas, and over the drainage of irrigated areas and general water quality, especially within its project areas. Due to its vast terms of reference together with

scarce available resources, GIDA offers poor services and its irrigation projects are often unsuccessful because of the lack of technical support.

Institutions involved in water management within the Ministry of Works and Housing (MWH) are:

-The Water Resources Commission (WRC), which is the leading institution involved in water resources management in the country. This new institution came into being in 1996 following the execution of the Water Resources Management (WARM) studies supported by CIDA, DANIDA, DFID, CfD, GTZ, UNDP and the World Bank. Prior to this date, the management of the country's water resources was fragmented among various institutions with no clear policy on who was in control.

-The Ghana Water Company Limited (GWCL), which exercises management functions over water sources that it abstracts for treatment and subsequent distribution to consumers. In some cases, it builds dams on which water supply schemes for big cities are based. It has the mandate to manage such water sources, including the relevant catchment areas, for the benefit of the Ghanaian public.

-The Community Water and Sanitation Agency (CWSA), which is responsible for water supply to rural communities, including small towns. It also deals with household sanitation and hygiene promotion and has offices in all regions of Ghana.

Within the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology (MEST), the following institutions are involved in water management:

-The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by virtue of its mandate and functions is one of the institutions that are involved in some aspects of water resources management. It maintains and enforces standards for wastewater discharge into water bodies. It also ensures, through the concept of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), that the negative impact of development projects are reduced through the monitoring of the companies' mitigation plans.

-The Water Research Institute (WRI) was formed in 1996 from the merger of the Institute of Aquatic Biology and the Water Resources Research Institute, all part of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). It has a mandate to conduct research into water and related resources. In pursuance of this mandate, it generates and provides scientific information, strategies and services towards the rational development, utilization and management of Ghana's water resources in support of the socio-economic advancement of the country, especially in the agriculture, health, industry, energy, transportation, education and tourism sectors. It engages, amongst other things, in research on groundwater resources (availability, quality, quantity), on hydro-meteorological and hydrological data for planning and research, on irrigation technology, rainwater harvesting, sawah eco-technology for rice production, water management in valley bottoms for rice production and the production of bio-insecticides for the control of malaria and bilharzia vectors.

2.2. WATER MANAGEMENT

Since irrigated agriculture is relatively new in Ghana, the management of the schemes had hitherto been entrusted to the staff of GIDA, and the relatively larger projects to reputable consultancy firms during the first few years after completion. A few irrigation projects in the



country are operated by private companies. In the case of the Tono and Vea schemes, they were initially fully funded by the government. In an attempt to stop continuous public funding of the schemes, the Irrigation Company of the Upper East Region (ICOUR) was established as a commercial entity. The idea was to start reducing the funding to ICOUR until it can stand on its own. Currently there is only a loose connection between ICOUR and GIDA, and ICOUR does not report to GIDA. However, it is reported that ICOUR still relies on the central government to provide it with funds to meet some of its recurrent expenditure, like maintenance of infrastructure, including housing. Another such company is Weija Irrigation Company (WEICO), which also operates as a commercial entity with a loose connection with GIDA. The government intended to make WEICO operate on its own but there are financial problems. Apart from the abovementioned schemes, some other private irrigation schemes exist that have been financed by private companies.

Farmer participation in the management of irrigation projects commenced in 1987 with the passing of a legislative instrument, LI 1350, which legalized and streamlined the GIDA staff management role and incorporated farmer participation in project management.

2.3.WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Ghana's agricultural policy is driven by five key objectives: i) ensuring food security and adequate nutrition for the population; ii) promoting the supply of raw materials for other sectors of the economy; iii) contributing to export earnings; iv) increasing the employment opportunities and incomes of the rural population; v) generating resources for general economic development. The importance of water in the realization of these objectives is well known. The key issue in the development and utilization of the water resources of the country is to ensure sustainability while giving preference to municipal water requirements if there are competing uses of the resource.

The policy reform strategy within the irrigation sub-sector is to increase agricultural production through the development of water resources for irrigation. This is being done by: i) limiting the cost of irrigation projects to not more than US\$600/ha; ii) recovery of at least operation and maintenance costs; iii) handing over the management of projects to farmers' associations; iv) involving farmers from the inception and selection of technologies through to the decision-making stages of irrigation projects; and v) a contribution of between 10 and 25 per cent of project costs by beneficiary communities or associations for small-scale projects.

The draft water policy identifies the availability and ease of access to water in sufficient quantities for cultivation of food crops, watering of livestock and sustainable freshwater fisheries as a major precondition for the achievement of food security and self-sufficiency in food production to meet the nutritional needs of the population. Towards achieving this, the government promises to:

- -Support the establishment of micro-irrigation and valley bottom irrigation schemes among rural communities.
- -Strengthen district assemblies to assume a central role in supporting community operation and maintenance of small-scale irrigation and other food production facilities.
- -Promote partnerships between the public and private sector in the provision of large commercial

irrigation infrastructure.

- -Encourage the efficient use of fertilizers to reduce pollution of water bodies, as well as highyielding crop species and agricultural extension services to ensure conservation of water.
- -Promote and encourage water use efficiency techniques in agriculture and reduce transmission losses of irrigation water in irrigation schemes.
- -Manage land use and control land degradation, including bush fires, to reduce soil loss and siltation of water bodies.
- -Develop a pricing system and a mechanism for delivering irrigation water that is affordable for farmers and also ensure cost recovery on investments made in infrastructure.
- -Utilize data and information on water cycles, land cover/use, soils and socio-economic elements for the planning, design and development of agricultural schemes.

3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Ghana shares three international rivers:

- -The Volta River is shared by six countries: Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire, Togo, Burkina Faso, Benin and Mali. There is no mechanism to develop the Volta River together, but a permanent joint commission has been set up to discuss ways of sharing benefits and increasing cooperation for better management of the Volta river basin. Developments in the White Volta basin by Burkina Faso affect Ghana since it is downstream. This is creating insecurity and conflict, as it is perceived to be the cause of the drop in water level in Lake Volta below the minimum operating level of the Akosombo hydropower plant. Ghana shares hydropower created at Akosombo and Kpong hydropower plants with all the riparian countries except Burkina Faso and Mali.
- -The Bia River originates in the Ashanti Uplands and flows into Côte d'Ivoire.
- -The Tano River, flowing parallel with the Bia River to the southeast of the latter, also has its headwaters in the Ashanti Uplands and enters the Atlantic Ocean through the Tano lagoon located in Côte d'Ivoire.