

Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	2.58	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	113	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	2.36	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	131	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	2.86	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	96	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	2.96	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	58	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	2.72	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	52	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	1.67	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	176	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	2.71	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	121	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	1.64	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	165	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	2.10	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	128	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	3.00	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	98	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	2.97	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	84	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	3.90	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	48	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	2.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	113	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	2.79	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	



Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	149	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	3.55	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	39	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	2.68	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	76	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	3.17	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)	35	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)	1.97	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)	85	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)	3.33	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)	45	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)	3.32	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)	61	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)	1.15	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)	149	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)	2.32	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)	104	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)	3.17	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)	44	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)	1.64	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)	176	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)	2.19	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). 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)	103	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)	2.71	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)	121	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)	1.65	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)	150	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)	1.23	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)	131	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)	3.64	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. Journal of Applied Ecology, 50(5), 1105-1115.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (rank)	48	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)	144	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)	2.00	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)	130	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)	3.00	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 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) (rank)	88	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)	4.00	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)	72	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)	155	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)	82	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)	80	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)	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 GGMN Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (rank)	94	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)	2.78	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)	129	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)	60	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)	33	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)	115	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)	113	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)	3.74	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)	102	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)	1.84	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)	171	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)	4.00	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)	47	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)	3.00	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)	57	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)	89	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)	2.37	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)	92	This risk indicator is based on the assessment of hydro-political risk by Farinosi et al. (2018). More specifically, it is based on the results of spatial modelling by Farinosi et al. (2018) that determined the main parameters affecting water cross-border conflicts and calculated the likelihood of hydro-political issues.	Farinosi, F., Giupponi, C., Reynaud, A., Ceccherini, G., Carmona-Moreno, C., De Roo, A., & Bidoglio, G. (2018). An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues. Global environmental change, 52, 286-313.
Population, total (#)	3027398	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US\$)	11183458131	GDP (current US\$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	57.51	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	73.33	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)	60.10	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)	50.48	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)	52.40	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)	46.63	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)	35.58	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)	4.05	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)	34	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)	34	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)	25	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)	34	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)	34	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)	36	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)	36	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)	37	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)	38	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)	37	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)	3774.62	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 (%)	61.74	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)	57.30	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)	84.30	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 (%)	74.61	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)	0.00	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10^9 m3/year)	34.80	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)	0.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Water resources: total external renewable (10^9 m3/year)	34.80	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)	34.80	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	0.00	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)	11761.00	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]	5.12	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018



Country Aspects

1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

1.1.WATER RESOURCES

1.1.1.WATER RESOURCES

Mongolia is situated on three international river basins (Mongolian River Resources, 2010):

- -The Arctic Ocean Basin in northern and central Mongolia, also known as the Yenisei River Basin, drains in a northerly direction through the Russian Federation into the Arctic Ocean and covers 20 per cent of the country. It has many significant lakes and rivers fed by water from the northern Khangai mountains and the western slopes of the Khentii mountains. The total length of the rivers in the basin is 35,000km, which is about 50 per cent of the total length of all Mongolia's rivers. The basin's flow accounts for 51.4 per cent of the country's total annual runoff. Major rivers in the basin are the Selenge and its tributary the Orkhon, the Ider and the Delgermurun.
- -The Pacific Ocean Basin in eastern Mongolia, also known as the Amur River Basin, drains in an easterly direction through China, the Russian Federation and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea into the Pacific Ocean and covers 12 per cent of the country. It encompasses rivers in the eastern part of Mongolia, which have originated from the Khentii and Khyangan mountains. The basin's flow accounts for about 15 per cent of the country's total annual runoff. Major rivers in this basin are the Onon, Ulz, Khalkh and Kherlen.
- -The Central Asian Internal Drainage Basin in southern and western Mongolia covers 68 per cent of the country, does not drain into an ocean, occupies much of the arid Gobi Desert and hence has few rivers (Hovd, Zavkhan, Bulgan, Uyench, Bodonch and Buyant) and limited groundwater resources. It has a series of internal drainage systems: the Khar-Us Nuur, the Uvs Nuur, and the Pu-Lun-To. It is home to 78 per cent of Mongolia's wetlands.

Located within these international basins are eight major regional basins, determined by their economic and environmental significance (Mongolian River Resources, 2010):

- -Arctic Ocean Basin:
- •The Selenge River Basin, located in semi-arid northern Mongolia, is the country's largest basin. It is composed of two main rivers, Selenge and its tributary Orkhon. Its major sub-basins are the Egiin, Ider, Orkhon and Tuul river basins
- •The Tuul River Basin covers almost 3.2 per cent of the country and is home to more than half of Mongolia's population. It has a catchment area of 49,840km2
- •The Khuvsgul Lake Basin in northern Mongolia is home to the second biggest freshwater lake in the world
- -Pacific Ocean Basin:
- •The Kherlen River Basin covers 116,455km2 in semi-arid eastern Mongolia

- •The rivers of the Onon, Ulz, and Khalkh basins are among the largest in eastern Mongolia and originate in the upper reaches of the Khentii and Khyangan mountains. They account for about 11 per cent of the country's total surface water runoff
- -Central Asia Internal Drainage Basin:
- •The Great Lakes Basin in western Mongolia contains Central Asia's most important wetlands. The basin is divided into four parts: the Uvs, Khyargas, Khar-Us and Sharga depressions. It features a series of large lakes: the Uvs, Khyargas, Khar-Us, Khar, Airag and Shargiin Tsagaan
- •The Northern Gobi river basins
- •The Southern Gobi river basins

There are about 4,113 rivers in Mongolia, with a total length of 67,000km. Large rivers originate in the mountainous areas in the north and west of the country – primarily in the Mongol Altai, Khangai-Khuvsgul and Khentii mountain ranges – where small rivers and mountain streams merge to create well-developed water networks. In contrast, the southern, central and southeastern parts of the country have few rivers and other water resources. In the interior drainage basins in the western and southern areas of Mongolia seasonal or intermittent streams end in salt lakes or disappear into the desert. The main water sources of the rivers are rainfall, groundwater, snow and glaciers, with melting snow accounting for 15-20 per cent of the annual runoff. From November to May, the rivers in the north are frozen. Waterways in the Gobi Desert are fed almost exclusively by groundwater. Sixty per cent of Mongolia's river runoff drains into the Russian Federation and China, while the remaining 40 per cent flows into the lakes of the Gobi Desert. The longest rivers within Mongolian territory are (Mongolian River Resources, 2010):

- -The Orkhon River (1,124km) originates in the Khangai Mountains. It initially flows eastward, before heading north and joining the Selenge River as its major tributary, which then continues northwards into the Russian Federation and Lake Baikal, volume-wise the world's largest freshwater lake. It has a drainage area of 132,855km2 and occupies 47 per cent of the Selenge River Basin. The Tuul and Kharaa rivers drain into the Orkhon River.
- -The Selenge River (1,024km) is Mongolia's principal waterway, accepting 30.6 per cent of the flow of all the rivers in Mongolia. It is formed by the confluence of the Delgermurun and Ider rivers. It flows north into the Russian Federation, eventually draining into Lake Baikal, of which it is the most substantial source of water. Its main tributaries are the Egiin, Orkhon and Uda rivers. It is also the headwater of the Yenisei-Angara River.
- -The Kherlen River (1,090km) has its source in the Khentii mountains. It flows to China, where it subsequently empties into Lake Hulun. Its main tributaries are the Iluur, Burkh, Baidrag, Terelj and Tenuun rivers.
- -The Zavkhan River (808km) starts at the confluence of the Buyant and Shar Us Rivers at the Khangai mountains. It empties into Lake Airag in the Great Lakes Basin, which then connects with Lake Khyargas. The river provides most of Lake Khyargas' tributary flow.



- -The Tuul River (704km) originates at the confluence of the Namiya and Nergui streams. It flows in a southwesterly direction, passing through the southern part of the Mongolian capital, Ulaanbaatar, before joining the Orkhon River.
- -The Hovd River (593km) has its source on the northern side of the Mongol Altai Mountains, rising from the permanent snows of Tavan Bogd Mountain. It flows into Lake Khar-Us in Hovd province in western Mongolia. Its main tributaries are the Tsagaan and Sagsai rivers.
- -The Eruu River (323km) starts in the Khentii Mountains at the confluence of the Khongiin and Sharluun rivers. It flows into the Orkhon River and has a drainage area of 11,860km2.
- -The Onon River (298km) originates in the Khentii Mountains, from where it flows in northeasterly direction, eventually converging with the Ingoda River in the Russian Federation to produce the Shilka River. At the border with China, the Shilka joins the Argun River to form the Amur River, which eventually drains into the Pacific Ocean. The Onon River has a drainage area of 94,010km2. Its main tributaries are the Barkh, Balzh and Khurkh rivers.
- -The Kharaa River (291km) originates in the mountains north of Ulaanbaatar and passes through Selenge and Darkhan-Uul provinces before emptying into the Orkhon River.

Mongolia's long-term average annual renewable water resources include 32.7km3 of surface water and 6.1km3 of groundwater. Part of the groundwater flow, estimated at 4km3/year, returns to the river system as base flow and is called overlap. This gives a total of 34.8km3/year (32.7+6.1 – 4.0) for internal renewable water resources (IRWR). It is estimated that no water enters the country from neighbouring countries, but that 25km3/year flows into the Russian Fedration and $1.401 \, \text{km3/year}$ into China.

There are some 3,060 natural lakes with a surface area larger than 0.1km2. The biggest lake in terms of surface area is Lake Uvs (3,518km2), which is a saline lake without an outlet. Considering volume (384km3) and depth (139m) Lake Khuvsgul is the biggest. It contains 74 per cent of the total freshwater resources of Mongolia, and is fed by 46 rivers and other large lakes. In the higher mountainous regions the potential evaporation is lower than the annual precipitation and therefore the lakes never dry up and persist against periods of drought. However, in areas such as the Valley of Lakes it is the opposite and therefore the lakes there can become quite shallow in very dry areas; and most of the medium lakes such as Orog, Taatsyin Tsagaan, Adgiin Tsagaan and Ulaan in the Valley of Lakes dry up 1-2 times per 11-12 years, which can lead to an ecological crisis when millions of fishes, aquatic plants and animals die in isolated spots of concentrated saline mud left by drying lakes (Davaa et al, 2007).

In 1999, about 27 earth dams stored water for sprinkler irrigation systems. A small part (55km2) of the catchment drained by the Boroo River is intercepted by the Shariin Am dam and storage reservoir facility. The Shariin River is a narrow and shallow river with a small dam about 4m high, capable of impounding a small storage reservoir with a regulating capacity of about 250,000 m3. In 1999, the theoretical hydropower potential was estimated at 5,500-6,000 MW. There is a 528 kW mini-hydroplant in operation (the Kharakhoum scheme) on an irrigation canal which diverts water from the Orkhon River.

1.1.2.WATER USE

In 1996, total water withdrawal from groundwater (80 per cent) and surface water (20 per cent) was equal to 400 million m3, of which 138 million m3 (34.6 per cent) were for livestock including irrigated fodder production, 32 million m3 (7.9 per cent) for irrigation of other crops, 101 million m3 (25.2 per cent) for municipalities, 103 million m3 (25.8 per cent) for industry, and 26 million m3 (6.5 per cent) for other needs (Myagmarjav and Davaa, 1999).

In 2005, total water withdrawal was estimated at about 511 million m3, of which about 227 million m3 (44 per cent) were for agriculture, 122 million m3 (24 per cent) for municipalities and 162 million m3 (32 per cent) for industries. About 82 per cent, or 419 million m3, was contributed by groundwater resources.

1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

Freshwater ecosystems of Mongolia are subject to increasing and multiplying threats, including overgrazing, dams and irrigation systems, growing urbanization, mining and gravel extraction, climate change and lack of water management policies and institutional frameworks (Batnasan, 2003).

The Asia Foundation's Securing Our Future (SOF) programme is a three-year initiative designed to promote the sustainable use of Mongolia's natural resources that is focused on responsible mining and land-use practices. It is being jointly implemented by the Asia Foundation, the Netherlands, and a coalition of non-governmental, public and private sector partners. The overall purpose of the programme is to ensure that future mining activities in Mongolia generate long-term benefits for the people of Mongolia without compromising the nation's ecological and social heritage. SOF involves seven programme areas that seek to ensure maximum community participation in decision-making processes, and in the long-term collective management and use of the country's vast natural resources. One of the seven areas consists in the development of a Mongolian river water quality monitoring network, which enlists citizens and students to work in partnership with Mongolian and expatriate scientific experts in the collection and dissemination of data on the quality of river water across the nation, which will lead to the compilation of a complete ecological inventory of Mongolian waterways (Asia Foundation, 2010).

Overuse of groundwater resources and climate change has led to a lowering of the groundwater table, which has consequently caused some springs, lakes and their associated ecosystems to dry up.

Since the systematic observation period, from 1940 onwards, serious floods have been observed on Mongolian rivers, which caused severe property damage and loss of life. About 18 flood events were observed from 1996 to 1999 and resulted in 54 lives lost and a lot of property damage (Davaa et al, 2007).

Out of 10,000 cases of diarrhoea every year in Mongolia, almost 70 per cent occur in the capital Ulaanbaatar. Dysentery and hepatitis are also common. These infections stem from a lack of access to safe water and sanitation infrastructure (UN, 2006a).



2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

2.1.WATER INSTITUTIONS

The main institutions dealing with agriculture and water resources development are the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Light Industry (MOFALI) and the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). MOFALI is responsible for rural water supply and contains the Department of Strategic Planning and Policy, which is the Water Policy and Regulation Unit (Batnasan, 2003). MOE is responsible for water conservation. This ministry has the Agency of Meteorology, Hydrology and Environment Monitoring, and the Agency for Nature, Forest and Water Resources, which contains the Centre for Water Research.

At present, no fully developed integrated institutional infrastructures dealing with river basin management issues exist in Mongolia.

In 2000, the National Water Committee (NWC) was established with the purpose of coordinating and monitoring the National Water Programme's implementation (Batsukh et al, after 2005). In addition to the MOFALI and the MOE other ministries are involved in the NWC, such as the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Infrastructure (Batnasan, 2003).

2.2.WATER MANAGEMENT

The management of the country's water resources is detailed in the Law on Water, enacted in 1995 to regulate the protection, effective use and restoration of water. It also focuses on capacity-building in the water sector and the decentralization of water management (Asia Foundation, 2010).

Dutch engineering companies, in close collaboration with UNESCO-IHE, plan to support the Mongolian Ministry of Environment in its mission to modernize water management in Mongolia. The project entitled 'Strengthening integrated water resources management (IWRM) in Mongolia' aims to introduce the concept of IWRM in the country as well as expand the knowledge and skills in the Mongolian water sector. The project initiators aim to transfer their know-how onto the local community by providing training for the project partners. Meanwhile, two university courses on water management will be set up in Mongolia. The Mongolian water sector is currently facing a variety of challenges. There is a lack of safe drinking water. There is insufficient sanitation for the entire population (MDGs). The project started in January 2009 and is set to finish in four years. The total budget estimated for the project is €6.5 million (UNESCO-IHE, 2009).

Mongolia's pricing policy is decentralized and local authorities are entitled to set up and revise water tariffs (UN, 2006a). Mongolia's Law on Water covers pricing policies intended to ensure cost recovery and the equitable allocation of water resources. In 2008, however, only approximately 65 per cent of water costs were recovered through pricing, partly because of the country's present economic conditions. For example, although the regulation states that all water used for industrial purposes will be charged for, industries are not making enough profit to pay for the real costs of

water. Water use for agriculture is free, although every user must establish a contract for the use of water, while household users pay small fees for their use (ADB, 2008).

2.3. WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A Water Law has been in force since June 1995 and was amended in 2004 to integrate river basin management practices with the goal of better utilizing water resources while protecting ecosystems. The Water Law also recognizes the economic value of water, requires capacity-building in the water sector, focuses on the decentralization of water management, puts forward the need for environmental impact assessments and sets new penalties for violating water legislation (Batsukh et al, after 2005).

In 1995, the Law on Water and Mineral Water Use Fees was also enacted, establishing fees for the use of water by citizens, companies and other organizations. Other laws related to water are the Environmental Protection Law, enacted in 1995, and the Environmental Impact Assessment Law, enacted in 1998 (Asia Foundation, 2010).

The Mongolian Action Programme for the 21st century, the National Water Programme and the National Action Programme on climate change were approved in 1998, 1999 and 2000 respectively (Batnasan, 2003).

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands were ratified by the Mongolian parliament in 1993 and 1997 respectively, and entered into force in 1994 and 1997 (Batnasan, 2003).

3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

There are about 210 rivers flowing through Mongolia into the Russian Federation and China. The first international agreement on transboundary water resources was between the governments of Mongolia and the USSR in 1974 on the use of water and protection of the Selenge River Basin, which plays an important role for the economic and industrial development of both countries. The agreement made between the governments of Mongolia and the Russian Federation in 1995 on the protection of transboundary water resources focuses on over 100 small rivers and streams located in the western part of the country. The drainage basins of transboundary rivers between Mongolia and the Russian Federation cover almost one-third of Mongolia's territory. In 1994, an agreement was signed between China and Mongolia on the protection of transboundary water resources concerning Lake Buir, the Kherlen, Bulgan and Khalkh rivers, and 87 small lakes and rivers located near the border. Transboundary water resources shared with China include surface water bodies in Dornod, Hovd, and Bayan-Olgiy provinces and groundwater resources in Govi-Altay, Omnogovi, Bayanhongor, Suhbaatar and Dornogovi provinces (UN, 2006b).

4. SOURCES

ADB (Asian Development Bank). 2008. Country water action: Mongolia. Socializing water tariffs for cost recovery. Web Writer: Tigno C.

Aquastat - FAO. 2010. Available at: http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/main/index.stm



[accessed 27 February 2011]

Batnasan, N. 2003. Freshwater issues in Mongolia. Proceeding of the National Seminar on IRBM in Mongolia, 24-25 Sept. 2003, Ulaanbaatar, p.53-61

Batsukh, N., Buyankhishig, N., Ouyn, D., Boldbaatar, Ya. After 2005. Sustainable development and groundwater resources of Mongolia.

Davaa, G., Oyunbaatar, D., Sugita, M. 2007. Surface water of Mongolia.

Mongolian River Resources. 2010. Mongolian river resources website. www.mongolianriverresources.mn/index.php?option=com_frontpage&Itemid=1 [accessed 27 February 2012]

Myagmarjav, D.B. and Davaa, G. 1999. Surface water of Mongolia. Interpress, Ulaanbaatar, 345 p. UN. 2006a. The 2nd United Nations World Water Development Report: 'Water, a shared responsibility'.

UN. 2006b. The 2nd United Nations World Water Development Report: Case Study: Mongolia with special reference to the Tuul River Basin.

UNESCO-IHE. 2009. Dutch assistance to improve water management in Mongolia.