

Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	2.39	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	150	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	2.36	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	133	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	2.41	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	135	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	2.48	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	121	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	1.41	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	173	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	3.83	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	53	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	3.17	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	82	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	2.61	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	77	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	2.45	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	114	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	3.25	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	77	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	2.15	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	142	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	1.10	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	168	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	1.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	179	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	3.50	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	95	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	3.00	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	88	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	2.14	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	134	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	1.00	The aridity risk indicator is based on the Global Aridity Index (Global-Aridity) and Global Potential Evapo-Transpiration (Global-PET) Geospatial data sets by Trabucco and Zomer (2009). These data sets provide information about the potential availability of water in regions with low water demand, thus they are used in the Water Risk Filter 5.0 to better account for deserts and other arid areas in the risk assessment.	Trabucco, A., & Zomer, R. J. (2009). Global potential evapo-transpiration (Global-PET) and global aridity index (Global-Aridity) geodatabase. CGIAR consortium for spatial information.
1.0 - Aridity (rank)	158	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)	1.00	The water depletion risk indicator is based on annual average monthly net water depletion from Brauman et al. (2016). Their analysis is based on model outputs from the newest version of the integrated water resources model WaterGAP3 which measures water depletion as the ratio of water consumption-to-availability.	Brauman, K. A., Richter, B. D., Postel, S., Malsy, M., & Flörke, M. (2016). Water depletion: An improved metric for incorporating seasonal and dry-year water scarcity into water risk assessments. <i>Elem Sci Anth</i> , 4.
1.1 - Water Depletion (rank)	180	The water depletion risk indicator is based on annual average monthly net water depletion from Brauman et al. (2016). Their analysis is based on model outputs from the newest version of the integrated water resources model WaterGAP3 which measures water depletion as the ratio of water consumption-to-availability.	Brauman, K. A., Richter, B. D., Postel, S., Malsy, M., & Flörke, M. (2016). Water depletion: An improved metric for incorporating seasonal and dry-year water scarcity into water risk assessments. <i>Elem Sci Anth</i> , 4.
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (score)	1.41	World Resources Institute's Baseline Water Stress measures the ratio of total annual water withdrawals to total available annual renewable supply, accounting for upstream consumptive use. A higher percentage indicates more competition among users.	Hofste, R., Kuzma, S., Walker, S., ... & Sutanudjaja, E.H. (2019). <i>Aqueduct 3.0: Updated decision relevant global water risk indicators</i> . Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (rank)	122	World Resources Institute's Baseline Water Stress measures the ratio of total annual water withdrawals to total available annual renewable supply, accounting for upstream consumptive use. A higher percentage indicates more competition among users.	Hofste, R., Kuzma, S., Walker, S., ... & Sutanudjaja, E.H. (2019). Aqueduct 3.0: Updated decision relevant global water risk indicators. Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute.
1.3 - Blue Water Scarcity (score)	1.00	The blue water scarcity risk indicator is based on Mekonnen and Hoekstra (2016) global assessment of blue water scarcity on a monthly basis and at high spatial resolution (grid cells of 30 × 30 arc min resolution). Blue water scarcity is calculated as the ratio of the blue water footprint in a grid cell to the total blue water availability in the cell. The time period analyzed in this study ranges from 1996 to 2005.	Mekonnen, M. M., & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2016). Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. <i>Science advances</i> , 2(2), e1500323.
1.3 - Blue Water Scarcity (rank)	179	The blue water scarcity risk indicator is based on Mekonnen and Hoekstra (2016) global assessment of blue water scarcity on a monthly basis and at high spatial resolution (grid cells of 30 × 30 arc min resolution). Blue water scarcity is calculated as the ratio of the blue water footprint in a grid cell to the total blue water availability in the cell. The time period analyzed in this study ranges from 1996 to 2005.	Mekonnen, M. M., & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2016). Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. <i>Science advances</i> , 2(2), e1500323.
1.4 - Projected Change in Water Discharge (by ~2050) (score)	2.30	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and hydrological models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). To estimate the change at 2°C of global warming above 1980-2010 levels, simulated annual water discharge was averaged over a 31-year period with 2°C mean warming. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between present day (1980-2010) conditions and 2°C scenarios by 2050.	Schewe, J., Heinke, J., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., ... & Gosling, S. N. (2014). Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 111(9), 3245-3250.
1.4 - Projected Change in Water Discharge (by ~2050) (rank)	56	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and hydrological models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). To estimate the change at 2°C of global warming above 1980-2010 levels, simulated annual water discharge was averaged over a 31-year period with 2°C mean warming. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between present day (1980-2010) conditions and 2°C scenarios by 2050.	Schewe, J., Heinke, J., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., ... & Gosling, S. N. (2014). Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change. <i>Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences</i> , 111(9), 3245-3250.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (score)	1.71	This risk indicator is based on the Standardized Precipitation and Evaporation Index (SPEI). Vicente-Serrano et al. (2010) developed this multi-scalar drought index applying both precipitation and temperature data to detect, monitor and analyze different drought types and impacts in the context of global warming. The mathematical calculations used for SPEI are similar to the Standard Precipitation Index (SPI), but it has the advantage to include the role of evapotranspiration.	Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Beguería, S., & López-Moreno, J. I. (2010). A multiscale drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index. <i>Journal of climate</i> , 23(7), 1696-1718.
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (rank)	166	This risk indicator is based on the Standardized Precipitation and Evaporation Index (SPEI). Vicente-Serrano et al. (2010) developed this multi-scalar drought index applying both precipitation and temperature data to detect, monitor and analyze different drought types and impacts in the context of global warming. The mathematical calculations used for SPEI are similar to the Standard Precipitation Index (SPI), but it has the advantage to include the role of evapotranspiration.	Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Beguería, S., & López-Moreno, J. I. (2010). A multiscale drought index sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index. <i>Journal of climate</i> , 23(7), 1696-1718.
1.6 - Projected Change in Drought Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	3.47	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)	29	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and drought models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP) . A drought threshold for pre-industrial conditions was calculated based on time-series averages. Results are expressed in terms of relative change (%) in probability between pre-industrial and 2°C scenarios.	Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., ... & Geiger, T. (2017). Assessing the impacts of 1.5 C global warming-simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). Geoscientific Model Development.
2.1 - Estimated Flood Occurrence (score)	3.94	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)	53	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.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
2.2 - Projected Change in Flood Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	1.70	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)	160	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)	3.17	<p>The underlying data for this risk indicator is based on a broad suite of pollutants with well-documented direct or indirect negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity, compiled by Vörösmarty et al. (2010). The negative effects are specific to individual pollutants, ranging from impacts mediated by eutrophication such as algal blooms and oxygen depletion (e.g., caused by phosphorus and organic loading) to direct toxic effects (e.g., caused by pesticides, mercury).</p> <p>The overall Surface Water Contamination Index is calculated based on a range of key pollutants with different weightings according to the level of their negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity: soil salinization (8%), nitrogen (12%) and phosphorus (P, 13%) loading, mercury deposition (5%), pesticide loading (10%), sediment loading (17%), organic loading (as Biological Oxygen Demand, BOD; 15%), potential acidification (9%), and thermal alteration (11%).</p>	Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P., ... & Davies, P. M. (2010). Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity. <i>Nature</i> , 467(7315), 555.

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
3.1 - Surface Water Contamination Index (rank)	82	<p>The underlying data for this risk indicator is based on a broad suite of pollutants with well-documented direct or indirect negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity, compiled by Vörösmarty et al. (2010). The negative effects are specific to individual pollutants, ranging from impacts mediated by eutrophication such as algal blooms and oxygen depletion (e.g., caused by phosphorus and organic loading) to direct toxic effects (e.g., caused by pesticides, mercury).</p> <p>The overall Surface Water Contamination Index is calculated based on a range of key pollutants with different weightings according to the level of their negative effects on water security for both humans and freshwater biodiversity: soil salinization (8%), nitrogen (12%) and phosphorus (P, 13%) loading, mercury deposition (5%), pesticide loading (10%), sediment loading (17%), organic loading (as Biological Oxygen Demand, BOD; 15%), potential acidification (9%), and thermal alteration (11%).</p>	Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P., ... & Davies, P. M. (2010). Global threats to human water security and river biodiversity. <i>Nature</i> , 467(7315), 555.
4.1 - Fragmentation Status of Rivers (score)	3.04	<p>This risk indicator is based on the data set by Grill et al. (2019) mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Grill et al. (2019) compiled a geometric network of the global river system and associated attributes, such as hydro-geometric properties, as well as pressure indicators to calculate an integrated connectivity status index (CSI). While only rivers with high levels of connectivity in their entire length are classified as free-flowing, rivers of CSI < 95% are considered as fragmented at a certain degree.</p>	Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M., Geenen, B., Tickner, D., Antonelli, F., ... & Macedo, H. E. (2019). Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. <i>Nature</i> , 569(7755), 215.
4.1 - Fragmentation Status of Rivers (rank)	58	<p>This risk indicator is based on the data set by Grill et al. (2019) mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Grill et al. (2019) compiled a geometric network of the global river system and associated attributes, such as hydro-geometric properties, as well as pressure indicators to calculate an integrated connectivity status index (CSI). While only rivers with high levels of connectivity in their entire length are classified as free-flowing, rivers of CSI < 95% are considered as fragmented at a certain degree.</p>	Grill, G., Lehner, B., Thieme, M., Geenen, B., Tickner, D., Antonelli, F., ... & Macedo, H. E. (2019). Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. <i>Nature</i> , 569(7755), 215.
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (score)	1.32	<p>For this risk indicator, tree cover loss was applied as a proxy to represent catchment ecosystem services degradation since forests play an important role in terms of water regulation, supply and pollution control. The forest cover data is based on Hansen et al.'s global Landsat data at a 30-meter spatial resolution to characterize forest cover and change. The authors defined trees as vegetation taller than 5 meters in height, and forest cover loss as a stand-replacement disturbance, or a change from a forest to non-forest state, during the period 2000 – 2018.</p>	Hansen, M. C., Potapov, P. V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S. A. A., Tyukavina, A., ... & Kommareddy, A. (2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. <i>science</i> , 342(6160), 850-853.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (rank)	126	<p>For this risk indicator, tree cover loss was applied as a proxy to represent catchment ecosystem services degradation since forests play an important role in terms of water regulation, supply and pollution control.</p> <p>The forest cover data is based on Hansen et al.'s global Landsat data at a 30-meter spatial resolution to characterize forest cover and change. The authors defined trees as vegetation taller than 5 meters in height, and forest cover loss as a stand-replacement disturbance, or a change from a forest to non-forest state, during the period 2000 – 2018.</p>	Hansen, M. C., Potapov, P. V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S. A. A., Tyukavina, A., ... & Kommareddy, A. (2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. <i>science</i> , 342(6160), 850-853.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (score)	3.02	The study by Tedesco et al. (2013) to project changes [% increase or decrease] in extinction rate by ~2090 of freshwater fish due to water availability loss from climate change is used as a proxy to estimate the projected impacts on freshwater biodiversity.	Tedesco, P. A., Oberdorff, T., Cornu, J. F., Beauchard, O., Brosse, S., Dürr, H. H., ... & Hugueny, B. (2013). A scenario for impacts of water availability loss due to climate change on riverine fish extinction rates. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i> , 50(5), 1105-1115.
4.3 - Projected Impacts on Freshwater Biodiversity (rank)	70	The study by Tedesco et al. (2013) to project changes [% increase or decrease] in extinction rate by ~2090 of freshwater fish due to water availability loss from climate change is used as a proxy to estimate the projected impacts on freshwater biodiversity.	Tedesco, P. A., Oberdorff, T., Cornu, J. F., Beauchard, O., Brosse, S., Dürr, H. H., ... & Hugueny, B. (2013). A scenario for impacts of water availability loss due to climate change on riverine fish extinction rates. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i> , 50(5), 1105-1115.
5.1 - Freshwater Policy Status (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	3.00	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)	90	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	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "National Water Resources Law(s)" indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	135	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation “National Water Resources Law(s)” indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.3 - Implementation Status of Water Management Plans (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	3.00	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation “National IWRM plans” indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.3 - Implementation Status of Water Management Plans (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	107	<p>This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation “National IWRM plans” indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.</p> <p>For SDG 6.5.1, enabling environment depicts the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.</p>	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
6.1 - Corruption Perceptions Index (score)	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)	85	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)	2.00	<p>This risk indicator is based on Freedom House (2019), an annual global report on political rights and civil liberties, composed of numerical ratings and descriptive texts for each country and a select group of territories. The 2019 edition involved more than 100 analysts and more than 30 advisers with global, regional, and issue-based expertise to covers developments in 195 countries and 14 territories from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.</p>	Freedom House (2019). Freedom in the world 2019. Washington, DC: Freedom House.

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (rank)	126	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)	95	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)	147	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Sustainable and efficient water use management" indicator, which corresponds to one of the five national level indicators under the Management Instruments category. For SDG 6.5.1, management instruments refer to the tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (score)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on the data set by UN IGRAC (2019) to determine the level of availability of groundwater monitoring data at country level as groundwater management decisions rely strongly on data availability. The level of groundwater monitoring data availability for groundwater management is determined according to a combination of three criteria developed by WWF and IGRAC: 1) Status of country groundwater monitoring programme, 2) groundwater data availability for NGOs and 3) Public access to processed groundwater monitoring data.	UN IGRAC (2019). Global Groundwater Monitoring Network GGMM Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (rank)	119	This risk indicator is based on the data set by UN IGRAC (2019) to determine the level of availability of groundwater monitoring data at country level as groundwater management decisions rely strongly on data availability. The level of groundwater monitoring data availability for groundwater management is determined according to a combination of three criteria developed by WWF and IGRAC: 1) Status of country groundwater monitoring programme, 2) groundwater data availability for NGOs and 3) Public access to processed groundwater monitoring data.	UN IGRAC (2019). Global Groundwater Monitoring Network GGMM Portal. UN International Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC).
7.3 - Density of Runoff Monitoring Stations (score)	2.01	The density of monitoring stations for water quantity was applied as proxy to develop this risk indicator. The Global Runoff Data Base was used to estimate the number of monitoring stations per 1000km ² of the main river system (data base access date: May 2018).	BfG (2019). Global Runoff Data Base. German Federal Institute of Hydrology (BfG).
7.3 - Density of Runoff Monitoring Stations (rank)	175	The density of monitoring stations for water quantity was applied as proxy to develop this risk indicator. The Global Runoff Data Base was used to estimate the number of monitoring stations per 1000km ² of the main river system (data base access date: May 2018).	BfG (2019). Global Runoff Data Base. German Federal Institute of Hydrology (BfG).
8.1 - Access to Safe Drinking Water (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.
8.1 - Access to Safe Drinking Water (rank)	161	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)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (rank)	171	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)	162	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)	179	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)	3.02	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Companies operating in basins with higher number of endemic fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (rank)	122	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Companies operating in basins with higher number of endemic fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.
10.2 - Freshwater Biodiversity Richness (score)	3.98	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)	68	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Count of fish species is used as a representation of freshwater biodiversity richness. Companies operating in basins with higher number of fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.
11.1 - National Media Coverage (score)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware local residents typically are of water-related issues due to national media coverage. The status of the river basin (e.g., scarcity and pollution) is taken into account, as well as the importance of water for livelihoods (e.g., food and shelter).	WWF & Tecnomia (TYP SA Group)
11.1 - National Media Coverage (rank)	157	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware local residents typically are of water-related issues due to national media coverage. The status of the river basin (e.g., scarcity and pollution) is taken into account, as well as the importance of water for livelihoods (e.g., food and shelter).	WWF & Tecnomia (TYP SA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (score)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware people are of water-related issues due to global media coverage. Familiarity to and media coverage of the region and regional water-related disasters are taken into account.	WWF & Tecnomia (TYP SA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (rank)	69	This risk indicator is based on joint qualitative research by WWF and Tecnomia (Typsa Group). It indicates how aware people are of water-related issues due to global media coverage. Familiarity to and media coverage of the region and regional water-related disasters are taken into account.	WWF & Tecnomia (TYP SA Group)

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

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)	99	This risk indicator is based on 2018 data collected by RepRisk on counts and registers of documented negative incidents, criticism and controversies that can affect a company's reputational risk. These negative news events are labelled per country and industry class.	RepRisk & WWF (2019). Due diligence database on ESG and business conduct risks. RepRisk.
12.2 - Hydro-political Risk (score)	1.29	This risk indicator is based on the assessment of hydro-political risk by Farinosi et al. (2018). More specifically, it is based on the results of spatial modelling by Farinosi et al. (2018) that determined the main parameters affecting water cross-border conflicts and calculated the likelihood of hydro-political issues.	Farinosi, F., Giupponi, C., Reynaud, A., Ceccherini, G., Carmona-Moreno, C., De Roo, A., ... & Bidoglio, G. (2018). An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues. <i>Global environmental change</i> , 52, 286-313.
12.2 - Hydro-political Risk (rank)	177	This risk indicator is based on the assessment of hydro-political risk by Farinosi et al. (2018). More specifically, it is based on the results of spatial modelling by Farinosi et al. (2018) that determined the main parameters affecting water cross-border conflicts and calculated the likelihood of hydro-political issues.	Farinosi, F., Giupponi, C., Reynaud, A., Ceccherini, G., Carmona-Moreno, C., De Roo, A., ... & Bidoglio, G. (2018). An innovative approach to the assessment of hydro-political risk: A spatially explicit, data driven indicator of hydro-political issues. <i>Global environmental change</i> , 52, 286-313.
Population, total (#)	3516816	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US\$)	16910277134	GDP (current US\$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	41.84	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	32.86	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, <i>The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues</i> (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WGI -Political stability no violence (0-100)	40.89	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)	37.98	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)	48.56	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Rule of Law (0-100)	43.75	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)	37.02	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WRI BWS all industries (0-5)	0.02	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)	168	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)	132	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	133	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2020 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	133	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	128	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	127	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)	130	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)	128	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 Optimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	129	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2040 Pessimistic (increasing rank describes lower risk)	127	WRI country ranking	Luo, T., R. Young, and P. Reig. 2015. "Aqueduct projected water stress rankings." Technical note. Washington, DC: World Resources Institute, August 215. Available online at http://www.wri.org/publication/aqueduct-projected-water-stress-country-rankings .

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total water footprint of national consumption (m ³ /a/cap)	1256.15	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 (%)	44.52	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)	3.00	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)	3.00	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 (%)	0.00	Aquastat - Irrigation	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Electricity production from hydroelectric sources (% of total)	36.73	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	35.50	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	2.00	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 m ³ /year)	35.50	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13

Country Overview - Bosnia and Herzegovina

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total renewable water resources (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	37.50	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	5.33	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Total renewable water resources per capita (m ³ /inhab/year)	9843.00	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]	5.13	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018

Country Aspects

1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

1.1. WATER RESOURCES

1.1.1. WATER RESOURCES

Waters in Bosnia and Herzegovina hydrographically belong to the Black Sea Basin (39,000km², or 75.7 per cent of the country's total surface area) and to the Adriatic Sea Basin (12,000km², or 24.3 per cent), although the precise lines of separation between these two basins have not yet been determined in certain areas because of the hydrologically complex nature of the karst.

The Sava river is a recipient of water streams from the northern part of BiH, which belong to the Black Sea basin, while the Neretva river is the only direct tributary of the Adriatic basin.

The river basins of the Black and Adriatic seas supply Bosnia and Herzegovina with most of its fresh water. The country receives some 1,000mm of precipitation annually.

There are about 30 water reservoirs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, primarily on the Neretva and Trebisnjica basin and the Drin. Most are designed for hydropower and all are important for flood control, drinking water and irrigation. Ninety per cent of drinking water comes from groundwater resources.

1.1.2. WATER USE

The biggest cities in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FB&H) account for 61 per cent of total water consumption. Sarajevo consumes 36 per cent, Mostar 10 per cent, Tuzla 9 per cent, and Zenica 6 per cent. Water consumption by industry is very significant. Part of the industrial water demand is met by drinking water from the water utilities, but the biggest industrial consumers typically also have their own water supply sources. Today, industrial technologies are working towards reducing consumption of all resources used during production, and introducing water recycling wherever possible, as they are obliged to pay fees for water abstraction and wastewater discharge. The total water used by industry from its own water sources amounts to 5,914,770 x 10³ m³, a mere 17 per cent of pre-war consumption.

Agricultural land covers 11,367km² (43.5 per cent), of which 7,184km² is arable. It is estimated that the total area in need of irrigation represents 808km² (11.2 per cent) of total arable land, but present estimates suggest that only 16km² (0.2 per cent) of arable land is irrigated in reality.

In the Republika Srpska (RS), the five biggest cities account for 50 per cent of total water consumption; Banja Luka (25 per cent), Bijeljina (10 per cent), Prijedor (7 per cent), Doboj (4 per cent) and Zvornik (4 per cent). As in FB&H, a small amount of the industrial water demand (18 million m³) is covered by drinking water from water utilities, while most is derived from industry's own sources (150 million m³/year). Small quantities of water are used for irrigation.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina there is a large system of hydro-energy utilization named HET (Hydro power plants on the Trebišnjica river). There are four hydro power plants, three in Bosnia and Herzegovina and one in Croatia, which have a capacity of 820MW, and there are plans for new hydropower plants with the aim of gaining an additional 200MW.

1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

Major environmental problems include air pollution from metallurgical plants, the scarcity of sites for disposing of urban waste, deforestation, and water shortages and destruction of infrastructure resulting from the 1992-95 civil strife.

Today, none of Bosnia and Herzegovina's large settlements has a treatment facility for wastewater, which means that all settlements of this size are also significant sources of pollution.

All watercourses should reach 'good' ecological status by 2015, with the exception of the four water bodies on the Bosna River. All bodies under pressure were classified as 'exposed to risk in the first approximation'.

Of 22 groundwater bodies, six are considered to be 'at risk' due to human intervention, four are 'at risk' in terms of both quantity (due to over extraction) and quality, and the rest are threatened with quality risk only. Four groundwater bodies have insufficient data to estimate status.

2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

2.1. WATER INSTITUTIONS

The institutional structure in Bosnia and Herzegovina is complex, with two entities (FB&H and RS), 10 cantons within FB&H, and municipalities. As a result, responsibilities for water management and policies exist at numerous government levels (entity, canton and municipality), which imposes operational and planning constraints. The two entities (RS and FB&H) are each responsible for elaborating their respective Water Laws and Water Management Strategies, but these need to be harmonized further. Great progress has been made in cooperation between entity Ministries and Water Agencies in the fields of water sector reform and water quality and quantity monitoring, especially in the last seven years or so, but there remains room for improvement.

2.2. WATER MANAGEMENT

Flood management, water pollution control and water quality monitoring are all important water resource management challenges in Bosnia and Herzegovina and all require transboundary approaches.

The institutions and organizational structure of Bosnia and Herzegovina's water resource sector are different from those of its neighbours. Effective international ties may have been hindered by internal policy disputes regarding water management resulting from the existence of two different

water laws and water protection approaches.

The harmonization of the new water laws in each entity and the application of a river-basin approach to water resource management is expected to improve the internal problems with water resource management. The proposed state-level body (the Committee on Sustainable Development) dealing with water will hopefully provide a means for Bosnia and Herzegovina to participate in transnational water initiatives such as the Danube Basin Commission.

2.3. WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Bosnia and Herzegovina's strategic goal is to join the European Union. A number of measures have been implemented in preparation for accession, including the signing of the Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU in June 2008. While presently not a member of the European Union and thus having no formal obligation to implement EU regulations, Bosnia and Herzegovina, with its two entities, intends to implement the European Union Water Framework Directive (WFD). This intention was made explicit in Memorandum of Understanding within the national CARDS project Institutional Strengthening of Water Sector in Bosnia and Herzegovina, signed by the Delegation of the European Commission in Sarajevo, the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and entity governments, with the objective being to "harmonize, finalize and approve the reform of water sector in Bosnia and Herzegovina, based on principles and goals of the WFD (2000/60/EC)".

Within this project, new Water Laws (2006) for both entities were elaborated, incorporating basic principles of the WFD. The differences in entity Water Laws mean that the extent of WFD transposition into these laws similarly differs, with 83 per cent having been transposed into FB&H water law and 97 per cent into RS water law. The goals of EU accession and implementation of integrated water resources management (IWRM) are thus well-accepted by both entities.

Implementation of legislation remains a big issue, and the legislation itself is lagging far behind needs and plans. Both entities' water ministries are currently working on creating secondary water legislation, and it is anticipated that an EC Water Policy project will be implemented soon, which will present a crucial step towards the development of secondary legislation. Moreover, no overarching water policy exists in Bosnia and Herzegovina at present, and water management strategies at the entity level and river basin management plans (e.g. for the Sava and Adriatic basins) have not been sufficiently elaborated. However, FB&H expected to adopt a Water Governance Strategy by the end of 2009, and RS elaborated a Framework Plan for Development of Water Management in 2006, a crucial step towards developing a Water Management Strategy in RS.

The Bosnia and Herzegovina constitution includes most of the principles of the human rights conventions and guarantees that they supersede national legislation. As it stands, the legal framework for ensuring the right to water appears sufficient on paper; the challenge lies in improving its implementation in reality. Improvement is needed in the implementation of rulings and international human rights conventions, largely because the institutional and administrative bodies needed to ensure that the legislation is adequately enforced are embedded in a complex

politico-administrative system lacking harmonization and clearly defined responsibilities.

At present, Bosnia and Herzegovina is neither a signatory nor party to:

-UNECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (1992);

-Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (1992);

-UNECE Protocol on Water and Health (1992).

Bosnia and Herzegovina is preparing for the ratification of the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes (1992) and the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (1992), in which cooperation with neighbouring countries (the Republic of Serbia, the Republic of Montenegro and the Republic of Croatia) will be important.

3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Bosnia and Herzegovina is a member of or contractor to the following conventions and agreements related to transboundary water:

•Danube River Protection Convention (1994): since 1996, Bosnia and Herzegovina has been actively involved in the work of the expert teams of the Danube River Protection Convention (representatives in the ICPDR and the expert groups AEW, MLIM, EMIS, and ECO etc.). Bosnia and Herzegovina ratified the convention in January 2005 (Official Gazette B&H 1/05);

•Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean Sea against Pollution (1976) (Official Gazette B&H, No 26/98) and its Protocols:

a. Protocol for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution from land-based sources (1980) (took effect on 17 June, 1983);

b. Protocol concerning Mediterranean Specially Protected Areas (1982) (took effect on 23 March, 1986);

c. Protocol for the prevention of pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by dumping from ships and aircraft (1976) (took effect on: 12 February, 1978);

d. Protocol concerning co-operation in combating pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by oil and other harmful substances in cases of emergency (1976) (took effect on 12 February, 1978).

Bosnia and Herzegovina hopes to improve transboundary cooperation with neighbouring countries, especially in terms of pollution of transboundary waters. In 1996, the country signed a bilateral agreement with Croatia on Water Management Cooperation, but its implementation in practice remains a challenge. With serious threats to many regional water supply catchments and pollution of transboundary water courses, dialogue and collaborative action with neighbouring country representatives needs to intensify. The lack of qualified staff in government and local institutions is an additional problem, and improvement in this regard is vital for bringing about comprehensive and sustained improvements in the water sector.