Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	2.97	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	33	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	3.27	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	20	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	2.29	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	139	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	2.75	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	79	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	3.70	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	23	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	2.61	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	132	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	3.68	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	43	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	2.19	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	111	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	1.10	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	164	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	3.00	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	85	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	2.50	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	119	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	2.90	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	73	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	1.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	132	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	2.77	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	150	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	3.00	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	67	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	3.31	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	25	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	3.88	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) geo-database. CGIAR consortium for spatial information.
1.0 - Aridity (rank)	19	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) geo-database. CGIAR consortium for spatial information.
1.1 - Water Depletion (score)	3.20	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)	25	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)	3.24	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (rank)	48	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)	4.78	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)	17	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)	3.47	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)	5	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (score)	3.48	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)	47	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)	3.97	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)	18	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)	2.65	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)	132	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
2.2 - Projected Change in Flood Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	1.88	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)	154	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)	3.68	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)	43	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)	2.49	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)	92	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)	1.07	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (rank)	140	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)	3.66	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)	46	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)	1.00	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)	159	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "National Water Resources Policy" indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	144	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 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)	131	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)	98	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)	4.00	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (rank)	46	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)	2.00	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)	118	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)	2.00	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)	122	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.

Water Risk Filter

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)	47	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)	4.34	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)	29	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)	47	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)	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.

Country Overview - Morocco

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (rank)	74	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)	2.00	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)	148	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)	1.00	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)	132	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)	4.43	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (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. 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)	1.11	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)	183	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)	76	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)	27	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)

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
12.1 - Conflict News Events (RepRisk) (score)	4.00	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)	15	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)	2.61	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)	73	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 (#)	35276786	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US$)	103606321693	GDP (current US$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	63.47	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	35.71	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WGI -Political stability no violence (0-100)	29.06	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)	50.96	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
WGI - Regulatory Quality (0-100)	45.19	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)	49.04	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)	52.88	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

Water Risk Filter

Country Overview - Morocco

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WRI BWS all industries (0-5)	4.24	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)	33	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)	21	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)	18	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)	21	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.

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	18	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)	18	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)	18	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)	19	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)	19	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)	18	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.

Water Risk Filter

Country Overview - Morocco

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total water footprint of national consumption (m3/a/cap)	1724.77	WFN Water Footprint Data	Mekonnen, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y. (2011) National water footprint accounts: The green, blue and grey water footprint of production and consumption, Value of Water Research Report Series No. 50, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, the Netherlands.http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf
Ratio external / total water footprint (%)	29.17	WFN Water Footprint Data	Mekonnen, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y. (2011) National water footprint accounts: The green, blue and grey water footprint of production and consumption, Value of Water Research Report Series No. 50, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, the Netherlands.http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report50-NationalWaterFootprints-Vol1.pdf
Area equipped for full control irrigation: total (1000 ha)	1458.00	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)	1520.00	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 (%)	97.51	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)	5.69	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , hompage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10^9 m3/year)	29.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10^9 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)	29.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13

Water Risk Filter

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total renewable water resources (10^9 m3/year)	29.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	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)	843.60	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]	5.25	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018

Country Aspects

1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

1.1. WATER RESOURCES

1.1.1. WATER RESOURCES

The renewable water resources are estimated at 29 km3, 22 km3 of surface water and 10 km3 of groundwater, while the common part between surface water and groundwater is estimated at 3 km3 / year.

Surface resources are very unevenly distributed: the basins of Loukkos, Sebou and Oum Rbia meet 71.5 percent of national resources. However, groundwater resources are more evenly distributed over the territory. The average values of surface runoff mask important temporal irregularities. Indeed, the flow rates of ten across the country represent only 32 percent of normal.

Of the total renewable water resources, potential resources mobilized in the technical and economic conditions today are estimated to 20.7 km3/year nearly 3 km3 of groundwater.

In terms of non-conventional water resources, the potential of wastewater was estimated at nearly 500 million m3 in 2000 and should reach 1 500 million m3 in 2020. The wastewater reuse in Morocco, particularly for irrigation of agricultural land and green space above is experimental. Currently, the use of desalination of seawater and brackish groundwater demineralization for drinking water supply of cities and centers loss is limited to the Saharan areas of southern Morocco. It was about 7 million m3 in 2000, with a forecast of 51.4 million m3 in 2020.

Mobilization of water resources is done with an important heritage hydraulic

-104 large dams with a total capacity of 16 904 million m3 regulate 10 600 million m3 if taken individually and 9 billion m3 if considered in the hydraulic systems of their watersheds, is regulated by volume heard the guaranteed volume of 10 eight years. At these large dams, add 17 small and medium dams and 67 dams and small lakes with a total capacity of 9.9 million m3;

-13 works of water transfers between river basins can deliver more than 2 700 million m3;

-An extensive network of boreholes, wells and catchment sources agrees to mobilize 3 billion m3 of groundwater which 2.5 billion from the groundwater and 500 million from the deep aquifers.

The exploitation of groundwater, currently identified and assessed, can raise 3166 million m3 per year, including 82.6 percent from groundwater and 17.4 percent from deep aquifers. Although there is overexploitation of global renewable groundwater, the level of exploitation differ widely between types of ground and between watersheds. On average, the rate of exploitation of groundwater is 114.1 percent and it ranges from 75.4 percent in the basin of Bouregreg to 179.6 percent in the Souss basin. The rate of exploitation of deep aquifers is 80.4 percent and 48.2 percent goes into the basin of Loukkos to 130.1 percent in the Tensift basin. Basin by the rate of exploitation of groundwater ranges from 63.7 percent in the basin of the Sebu and 179.6 percent

in the Souss Massa. This tendency to over-exploitation of groundwater will only get worse and it is estimated that by 2020 the rate of exploitation of groundwater projected to reach 120.1 percent and 89.5 deep groundwater percent.

1.1.2. WATER USE

Water demands for 2000 were $ 12 607 million m3, of which 11 010 million m3 for irrigation more than 87 percent of total demand, 1 237 million m3 for communities and 360 million m3 for industry. Of the total 12 607 million m³, 7 million were desalted water, 3,166 million ground water and 9434 million surface water. By 2020 these claims will amount to 15 690 million m3, of which 13 038 million m3 for irrigation or 83 percent of the total demand. The confrontation between the mobilized water resources and water demand of different sectors shows that the needs are being met and will also be in 2020. However, this overall assessment conceals wide disparities between watersheds, only basins Loukkos and Sebou be surplus and the other accusing structural deficits.

The satisfaction of the demand for irrigation water consists of 76 percent of surface water and 24 percent groundwater. The use of groundwater is mainly practiced by the private irrigation sector, which accounts for over 66.7 percent of the total demand for irrigation groundwater or 84.9 percent of demand in this sector.

1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

The greatest concern about the quality of water used or released by irrigation salinity. Of the 29 billion m3 of renewable water resources, 1.1 billion or 3.8 per cent have a salinity between 1 and 2 g/liter and 1 billion m3 or 3.4 per cent a rate greater than 2 g/liter.

The salinity or alkalinity, sodium or magnesium, soil surveys want more than 150 000 ha of irrigated land and are usually the result of unsafe practices such as over-exploitation of groundwater, including coastal aquifers, the rise of the water resulting abuse of irrigation water, poor drainage due to lack of maintenance of sewerage and drainage, and non-controlling irrigation techniques, including surface irrigation.

Various actual and potential negative effects on the environment are linked to irrigated agriculture. First spreading sometimes excessive nitrogen fertilizer, mainly in irrigated areas, leading to pollution of some aquifers: one considers that 10 percent of the nitrogen applied are driven out of the soil profile. In addition, withdrawals of water needed for irrigation, pollution resulting from the massive use of fertilizers and pesticides, and increasing the salinity of the medium are threats to fragile environments such as plans freshwater or brackish water, the bottom of rivers and oases. Also play an important role overexploitation of some aquifers, and the silting up of dams, which determined the loss since inception more than 10 percent of their total capacity.

In terms of health, diseases such as malaria and schistosomiasis are still rampant in irrigated

areas, despite the checks and preventive and curative measures implemented.

The rapid growth of urban population causes an important phenomenon of urbanization poorly controlled in the peripheral areas of medium and large urban centers and at the expense of agricultural land generally more productive and easier to urbanize. This phenomenon irrigation schemes on the periphery of urban centers including the perimeters of large hydraulic Gharb, Tadla and Haouz market gardens and small and medium hydraulic located around the cities of Fez, Rabat, Salé, Meknes, Tetouan, Marrakesh and Casablanca. Just within the perimeter of Gharb estimated losses of irrigated land to more than 6000 ha equipped.

2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

2.1. WATER INSTITUTIONS

Policy development and water management, the State is omnipresent. It lays down general rules and establishes the mechanisms of solidarity between regions and users. It provides, without developing the necessary resources, water policy and ensures the guarantee of food safety and public safety. It performs the inventory, planning and use of water resources, decides to build structures to mobilize, implement the various types of development for water use and is involved in the management of these resources mobilized in the case of large-scale irrigation. This policy has limitations and the state has set other strategic directions for a new water policy, based on demand management and user participation, and arrested other objectives and tasks for its different services.

The Administration of hydraulics, assisted by the Regional Directorates of Water, was responsible for the identification and monitoring of surface water and groundwater, both quantitatively and qualitatively. It also ensures the tasks of planning and management of water resources and supervised their mobilization. However, under the new structure of government and the creation of the Ministry of Planning, Environment and Water, which is attached to the Secretariat of State for water allocations Administration of hydraulics have been limited to the completion of the works of mobilization, and missions of research and planning have been linked to land use.

The basin agencies have been established by the new water law (Law No. 10-95) published in 1995. They are the result of the decentralization of management and administration of water resources. They are therefore called upon to handle some of the missions undertaken by the Administration of Water Resources and its regional offices, but they are now under the Ministry of Planning. Six water agencies have been in place since June 2002, also the lead agency of the basin of the Oum Rbia established in 1996. The basin agencies are public institutions, endowed with legal personality and administrative autonomy, and administered by a board of directors. The latter includes all the actors involved in water issues.

The regional agricultural developments (ORMVA), created in 1966, are public institutions, endowed with legal personality and administrative autonomy, and are responsible for planning and agricultural development perimeters irrigated delineated in the program of large hydro or large-scale irrigation. These offices provide three basic tasks: planning, agricultural development and

water service.

The Provincial Directorates of Agriculture (CCA) are representative governments at the provincial level the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. They are responsible, based on central planning at the Administration of Agricultural Engineering, design, implementation and monitoring of perimeters of small and medium hydropower. They intervene in the management of irrigation systems to ensure that heavy maintenance work.

The Higher Council for Water and Climate is an advisory body under the authority of the King which meets in annual sessions. It brings together the various stakeholders in the water sector, including policy makers, users and elected officials and public and private stakeholders and fundamental mission is to develop and handle all issues and policies in the planning, management, protection and water use, and advise on these issues, including master plans for integrated management of water resources in different watersheds and the national water.

The missions of monitoring, evaluating, planning, mobilizing and managing the water resources in quantity and quality are the responsibility of the State Secretariat of Water and Environment (SEEE) for the Ministry of Energy, Mines, Water and Environment (MEMEE), established in October 2007. Drinking water supply in rural areas is mainly provided by the National Office for Drinking Water (ONEP) under the supervision of MEMEE (over 80%). In urban areas, drinking water and sanitation are the responsibility of local authorities that decide management way. Irrigation is managed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAPM) mainly through the Administration of Agricultural Engineering (AGR) at the central level (SEMIDE EMWIS, 2008).

2.2. WATER MANAGEMENT

Associations of agricultural water users (WUAs) were created by law 2 / 84 passed in 1992, establishing the legal basis of user participation in construction works of the irrigation network and its accountability for its maintenance.

The organization of the distribution of irrigation water varies depending on the scope:

-Private irrigation systems, mobilizing an independent water resource, program management independently;

-Within the perimeters of small and medium hydraulics, programming and organization of irrigation are following the water tower imposed by the WUAs. This association is also responsible for maintenance and equipment maintenance;

-In the case of large hydro schemes, it is the management departments of irrigation and drainage ORMVA that provide water service to the head of the farms.

To supervise the farmers in the irrigation sector, it was established a national network of research and development led by the Service experimentation, testing and standardization, under the Administration of Agricultural Engineering, and the Department of Agricultural Engineering of the Agronomic and Veterinary Institute Hassan II. The network carries out testing and research to determine the parameters of irrigation, and the characterization and certification of irrigation equipment and provides training for counselors and CCA ORMVA irrigation and farmers in the form of outreach sessions and thematic courses.

To control the volume of water withdrawn, the perimeters of large hydro schemes and modern small and medium hydraulics are fitted with regulators and flow measurement and volume of water delivered at the top of the plots. In the traditional boundaries of small and medium hydraulic flow rates and volumes are controlled by means of dividers and thresholds are equipped with traditional séguias serving farms and plots. In the case of private irrigation, the fixed public water volumes and flow rates can be taken, and the procedures for measuring these volumes that are controlled by the police officers providing water.

One of the main issues concerns wastewater treatment with a National Sanitation Program, which aims to connect 80% of the urban population to sanitation networks and to reduce the pollution by 60% in 2020. In addition, due to the limited surface water resources and growing demand, most of the country groundwater resources have been overexploited. The performance of supply networks and water uses is still low, new tariffs could improve this situation (SEMIDE EMWIS, 2008).

2.3. WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

In terms of water legislation, the main initiative was the promulgation of Law No. 10-95, adopted in July 1995. This law allowed reorganizing the previous texts and asking a number of principles, including the wide management of watersheds, recognizing the economic value of water and the national and regional solidarity. The decrees are not all enacted, making it difficult to comment now on the concrete results of the law.

One of the key points of the latter is the creation of basin agencies. As part of the mandate of these agencies, the elements that should have the greatest impact on the future development of irrigation development and periodic updating of the master plan for integrated management of water resources at the basin scale, and the possibility of granting financial aid for investment in resource mobilization.

With regard particularly agricultural water, the essential reference is the Agricultural Investment Code of 1969. This set of texts defined the basic principles governing the major irrigation schemes: land consolidation and development of a framework hydraulic and development ("frame") which sets out the equipment, methods of irrigation, crop rotations and tillage practices. Legal provisions can prevent the fragmentation of holdings from legacies, sales or rental of housing, and to impose effective development of the land. This obligation to achieve results is the need to develop the heavy investment in irrigation made by the community.

It should be noted however, that it is true that this approach was justified by the former objective socioeconomic conditions in rural areas and the options chosen by the state in economic development and social development, it is now outdated by the changing national and international economic and everyday practices of users of large irrigation schemes.

The withdrawal of state provision of services to agriculture, deregulation of the production chain, decreasing the protection of agricultural production and the prospects of opening the domestic market to international competition are the obligation of rotations a provision obsolete. This requirement obsolete, who met with long opposition from farmers, has been virtually abandoned since the early 1980s.

3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Water resources in Morocco are totally internal and do not receive any cross-border, however, it exports an average annual volume of 230 million m3 from the basin of the river Guir, which forms the eastern border of river South Atlases, to Algeria. No water resources are shared with Mauritania.

Morocco ratified on 13 April 2011 the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses (UNTC).

4. SOURCES

Aquastat - FAO. (2005). URL: http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/main/index.stm, accessed 27 October 2011.

SEMIDE EMWIS (2008). URL: http://www.emwis.org, accessed 14 November 2011

United Nations Treaty Collection (UNTC), Ratification Status UN Watercourse Convention. http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XXVII-12&chapter=27&lang=en. Accessed 16 November 2011.