

Water Indicators

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Overall Basin Risk (score)	2.62	Overall Basin Risk (score)	
Overall Basin Risk (rank)	104	Overall Basin Risk (rank)	
Physical risk (score)	2.08	Physical risk (score)	
Physical risk (rank)	158	Physical risk (rank)	
Regulatory risk (score)	2.35	Regulatory risk (score)	
Regulatory risk (rank)	136	Regulatory risk (rank)	
Reputation risk (score)	4.51	Reputation risk (score)	
Reputation risk (rank)	2	Reputation risk (rank)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	1.76	1. Quantity - Scarcity (score)	
1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	137	1. Quantity - Scarcity (rank)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	2.59	2. Quantity - Flooding (score)	
2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	134	2. Quantity - Flooding (rank)	
3. Quality (score)	2.03	3. Quality (score)	
3. Quality (rank)	147	3. Quality (rank)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	2.54	4. Ecosystem Service Status (score)	
4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	90	4. Ecosystem Service Status (rank)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	2.10	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (score)	
5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	127	5. Enabling Environment (Policy & Laws) (rank)	
6. Institutions and Governance (score)	2.50	6. Institutions and Governance (score)	
6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	136	6. Institutions and Governance (rank)	
7. Management Instruments (score)	2.63	7. Management Instruments (score)	
7. Management Instruments (rank)	111	7. Management Instruments (rank)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	2.10	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (score)	
8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	97	8 - Infrastructure & Finance (rank)	
9. Cultural Diversity (score)	5.00	9. Cultural importance (score)	
9. Cultural Diversity (rank)	6	9. Cultural importance (rank)	
10. Biodiversity Importance (score)	4.66	10. Biodiversity importance (score)	

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10. Biodiversity Importance (rank)	10	10. Biodiversity importance (rank)	
11. Media Scrutiny (score)	5.00	11. Media Scrutiny (score)	
11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	2	11. Media Scrutiny (rank)	
12. Conflict (score)	3.49	12. Conflict (score)	
12. Conflict (rank)	17	12. Conflict (rank)	
1.0 - Aridity (score)	1.23	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)	98	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)	1.15	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)	127	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)	1.17	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.

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.2 - Baseline Water Stress (rank)	135	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)	1.32	The blue water scarcity risk indicator is based on Mekonnen and Hoekstra (2016) global assessment of blue water scarcity on a monthly basis and at high spatial resolution (grid cells of 30 × 30 arc min resolution). Blue water scarcity is calculated as the ratio of the blue water footprint in a grid cell to the total blue water availability in the cell. The time period analyzed in this study ranges from 1996 to 2005.	Mekonnen, M. M., & Hoekstra, A. Y. (2016). Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. <i>Science advances</i> , 2(2), e1500323.
1.3 - Blue Water Scarcity (rank)	148	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)	1.95	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)	98	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
1.5 - Drought Frequency Probability (score)	3.15	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)	59	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)	3.62	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)	27	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)	2.61	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)	134	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
2.2 - Projected Change in Flood Occurrence (by ~2050) (score)	2.13	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)	109	This risk indicator is based on multi-model simulation that applies both global climate and drought models from the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). The magnitude of the flood event was defined based on 100-year return period for pre-industrial conditions. Results are expressed in terms of change (%) in probability between pre-industrial and 2°C scenarios.	Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., ... & Geiger, T. (2017). Assessing the impacts of 1.5 C global warming-simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b). Geoscientific Model Development.
3.1 - Surface Water Contamination Index (score)	2.03	<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.

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
3.1 - Surface Water Contamination Index (rank)	147	<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)	2.33	<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)	98	<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)	3.18	<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.

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
4.2 - Catchment Ecosystem Services Degradation Level (tree cover loss) (rank)	39	<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)	2.29	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)	102	The study by Tedesco et al. (2013) to project changes [% increase or decrease] in extinction rate by ~2090 of freshwater fish due to water availability loss from climate change is used as a proxy to estimate the projected impacts on freshwater biodiversity.	Tedesco, P. A., Oberdorff, T., Cornu, J. F., Beauchard, O., Brosse, S., Dürr, H. H., ... & Hugueny, B. (2013). A scenario for impacts of water availability loss due to climate change on riverine fish extinction rates. <i>Journal of Applied Ecology</i> , 50(5), 1105-1115.
5.1 - Freshwater Policy Status (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	2.00	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "National Water Resources Policy" indicator, which corresponds to one of the three national level indicators under the Enabling Environment category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
5.1 - Freshwater Policy Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	140	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
5.2 - Freshwater Law Status (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	128	<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)	83	<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)	68	This risk Indicator is based on the latest Transparency International's data: the Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. This index aggregates data from a number of different sources that provide perceptions of business people and country experts on the level of corruption in the public sector.	Transparency International (2019). Corruption Perceptions Index 2018. Berlin: Transparency International.
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on Freedom House (2019), an annual global report on political rights and civil liberties, composed of numerical ratings and descriptive texts for each country and a select group of territories. The 2019 edition involved more than 100 analysts and more than 30 advisers with global, regional, and issue-based expertise to covers developments in 195 countries and 14 territories from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.	Freedom House (2019). Freedom in the world 2019. Washington, DC: Freedom House.

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
6.2 - Freedom in the World Index (rank)	152	This risk indicator is based on Freedom House (2019), an annual global report on political rights and civil liberties, composed of numerical ratings and descriptive texts for each country and a select group of territories. The 2019 edition involved more than 100 analysts and more than 30 advisers with global, regional, and issue-based expertise to covers developments in 195 countries and 14 territories from January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.	Freedom House (2019). Freedom in the world 2019. Washington, DC: Freedom House.
6.3 - Business Participation in Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	1.00	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Business Participation in Water Resources Development, Management and Use" indicator, which corresponds to one of the six national level indicators under the Institutions and Participation category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
6.3 - Business Participation in Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	165	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Business Participation in Water Resources Development, Management and Use" indicator, which corresponds to one of the six national level indicators under the Institutions and Participation category.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
7.1 - Management Instruments for Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation "Sustainable and efficient water use management" indicator, which corresponds to one of the five national level indicators under the Management Instruments category. For SDG 6.5.1, management instruments refer to the tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
7.1 - Management Instruments for Water Management (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	74	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
7.2 - Groundwater Monitoring Data Availability and Management (score)	1.00	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)	167	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)	2.50	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)	140	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)	134	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
8.2 - Access to Sanitation (rank)	87	This risk indicator is based on the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene (UNICEF/WHO) 2019 data. It provides estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country for the period 2000-2017.	WHO & UNICEF (2019). Estimates on the use of water, sanitation and hygiene by country (2000-2017). Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.
8.3 - Financing for Water Resource Development and Management (SDG 6.5.1) (score)	3.00	This risk indicator is based on the average 'Financing' score of UN SDG 6.5.1. Degree of IWRM Implementation database. UN SDG 6.5.1 database contains a category on financing which assesses different aspects related to budgeting and financing made available and used for water resources development and management from various sources.	UN Environment (2018). Progress on integrated water resources management. Global baseline for SDG 6 Indicator 6.5.1: degree of IWRM implementation.
8.3 - Financing for Water Resource Development and Management (SDG 6.5.1) (rank)	111	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)	5.00	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)	6	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)	4.44	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
10.1 - Freshwater Endemism (rank)	53	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. Companies operating in basins with higher number of endemic fish species are exposed to higher reputational risks.	WWF & TNC (2015). Freshwater Ecoregions of the World.
10.2 - Freshwater Biodiversity Richness (score)	4.89	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)	31	The underlying data set for this risk indicator comes from the Freshwater Ecoregions of the World (FEOW) 2015 data developed by WWF and TNC. 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)	5.00	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 (TYPESA Group)
11.1 - National Media Coverage (rank)	3	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 (TYPESA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (score)	5.00	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 (TYPESA Group)
11.2 - Global Media Coverage (rank)	2	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 (TYPESA Group)

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
12.1 - Conflict News Events (RepRisk) (score)	5.00	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)	5	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)	1.99	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)	134	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 (#)	207652865	Population, total	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
GDP (current US\$)	1796186586414	GDP (current US\$)	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
EPI 2018 score (0-100)	60.70	Environmental Performance Index	
WGI -Voice and Accountability (0-100)	30.00	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WGI -Political stability no violence (0-100)	61.58	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Government Effectiveness (0-100)	47.60	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)	46.63	Water Governance Indicator	Kaufmann, Daniel and Kraay, Aart and Mastruzzi, Massimo, The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=1682132
WGI - Rule of Law (0-100)	51.92	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)	38.46	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
WRI BWS all industries (0-5)	0.91	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)	118	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)	100	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)	100	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)	100	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Baseline Water Stress (BWS) - 2030 BAU (increasing rank describes lower risk)	105	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)	102	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)	102	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)	113	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)	113	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)	108	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 - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total water footprint of national consumption (m ³ /a/cap)	2027.14	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 (%)	9.23	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)	5400.00	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)	5400.00	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 (%)	96.81	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)	63.23	World Development Indicators	The World Bank 2018, Data , homepage accessed 20/04/2018
Total internal renewable water resources (IRWR) (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	5661.00	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 m ³ /year)	2986.00	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)	5661.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13

Country Overview - Brazil

Indicator	Value	Description	Source
Total renewable water resources (10 ⁹ m ³ /year)	8647.00	Aquastat - Water Ressources	FAO. 2016. AQUASTAT website. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Website accessed on 2018/04/13
Dependency ratio (%)	34.53	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)	41603.00	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]	6.42	WorldHappinessReport.org	World Happiness Report, homepage accessed 20/04/2018

Country Aspects

1. PHYSICAL ASPECTS

1.1. WATER RESOURCES

1.1.1. WATER RESOURCES

Brazil has always been considered a country rich in water. It is estimated that about 12 per cent of the world's surface water resources are located in the country. In 2007, per capita water availability reached 43,027m³ per year, more than the world average of 8,209m³ per capita in the same year. However, this impressive average masks an extremely uneven distribution of water resources among regions.

The Amazon river basin alone, which covers 48 per cent of the country's territory, accounts for 68 per cent of Brazil's freshwater resources but has almost 12 per cent of its population. The most dramatic departure from abundance can be found in the northeast region, which includes most of the country's semi-arid region. Accounting for 18 per cent of Brazil's territory and about 28 per cent of its population, the northeast region has only 3 per cent of the country's water resources and is subject to recurrent severe droughts, harvest failures, and food shortages. The southeast, with 73 per cent of the country's population, 11 per cent of its territory and about 7 per cent of its water resources, is the heart of Brazil's industrial economy and also has the highest agricultural production.

Brazil has 12 hydrographical regions (included the Amazon, Tocantins, São Francisco) the Plata river, which has three Brazilian sub-basins: Paraná, Upper Paraguay, and Uruguay and the remaining rivers flowing into the Atlantic, which are divided into several basins. The Amazon and the Tocantins-Araguaia basins in the north account for 56 per cent of Brazil's total drainage area. The Amazon River, the world's largest river by volume of water and second longest after the Nile, is navigable by ocean steamers as far as Iquitos in Peru. The São Francisco River is the largest river entirely within Brazil, flowing for over 1,609km northward before it turns eastward into the Atlantic. The last 277km of the lower river is navigable for ocean-going ships. The Paraná-Paraguay river system drains the southwestern portion of the state of Minas Gerais. Brazil's two southernmost states partially drain into the Uruguay river, which flows into the Plata river. The inflow of the Amazon to Brazil is 1.9BCM per year, so that the total surface water resources in the country reach, on average, 8.2BCM per year.

The stored groundwater in Brazil is less than 1,000m deep; the groundwater that is of sufficient quality for human use is estimated at 112,000km³, with highly variable extraction rates. In Brazil, groundwater is used in rural areas for domestic water supply and irrigation on a moderate scale. Estimates suggest that approximately 300,000 wells are being used, and over 10,000 more are drilled every year. Groundwater is beginning to be used on a large scale in areas where surface

water sources are scarce, where they are heavily used, or where their use is problematic due to heavy water pollution (as in central and southern Brazil).

1.1.2. WATER USE

About 61 per cent of all water withdrawal in Brazil is used for irrigation, which is lower than the average water withdrawal for irrigation in Latin America of 71 per cent. The irrigated area in 1998 was 28,000km³, which represents 5.7 per cent of the cultivated area. The irrigation potential of Brazil is estimated at 293,000km³, including only areas where irrigation can be developed and excluding areas of high ecological value in the northern region (such as the Amazonas and Tocantins basins). Ineffective irrigation has generated salinization and drainage problems in 150km³, mostly in the northeast (of a total irrigated area of 7,360km³), jeopardizing these lands' productivity.

Access to electricity has increased from fewer than 500 kilowatt hours (kWh) per capita in 1970 to more than 2,000kWh per capita in 2000. These results have been achieved mainly through the development of hydropower, which currently accounts for 81 per cent of Brazil's installed capacity (69 gigawatts out of a total of 79).

Brazil also has the largest hydroelectric power plant in operation in the world, the Itaipú Dam, which was built between 1975 and 1991 in a joint development on the Paraná River. Its 18 generating units add up to a total production capacity of 12,600MW (megawatts) and a reliable output of 75 million MWh a year, providing 25 per cent of the energy supply in Brazil and 78 per cent of that in Paraguay (in 1995).

1.2. WATER QUALITY, ECOSYSTEMS AND HUMAN HEALTH

The major environmental problems are: deforestation in the Amazon Basin that destroys habitat and endangers a multitude of plant and animal species indigenous to the area; the lucrative illegal wildlife trade; air and water pollution in Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo and several other large cities; land degradation and water pollution caused by improper mining activities; wetland degradation; and severe oil spills.

Sewage is a major cause of water pollution in Brazil, a significant problem that undermines quality of life, health, and economic development in large metropolitan areas and has a disproportionate impact on the poor in the slums surrounding Brazil's largest cities. Water quality management is also undertaken by the states, although the quality of their water monitoring systems and surveys varies widely. In 2006, only nine Brazilian states had water quality monitoring systems that were rated as excellent or very good; five had good or fair systems, and thirteen had weak systems.

The southeastern state of São Paulo, with a monitoring system considered very good, registered in its latest study high microbiological indexes indicative of pollution from domestic sewage both upstream and downstream in the Bairro da Serra river, and even higher indexes from its two main

tributary streams.

2. GOVERNANCE ASPECTS

2.1. WATER INSTITUTIONS

The National Water Resources Management System is a combination of public organizations, private entities and civil society representatives that makes the implementation of water resources management instruments possible, in accordance with the principles established in the law. The institutional framework consists of the following:

-The National Council on Water Resources (NCWR) is the highest organization in the system's hierarchy. It aims at promoting the integration of water resources planning at national, regional and state levels and between user sectors. The NCWR consists of representatives of the Federal Government ministries, representatives designated by the State Councils on Water Resources, and representatives of water users and civil organizations concerned with water resources management. The Chairman of the National Water Resources Council is the Minister of the Environment.

-The National Water Authority (Autoridade Nacional da Água – ANA) is in charge of implementing the National Plan for Water Resources formulated by the NCWR. The ANA consists of ten functional superintendencies with implementation and administrative functions, headed by a president and four directors. The ANA is under the Ministry of the Environment but has administrative and financial independence.

-The River Basin Committees (RBCs) are connected organizations that bring together stakeholders to discuss and make decisions regarding problems relating to the protection of water resources in the river basin region. Under Brazilian law, they do not have legal status. RBCs include representatives of the Federal Government, the states or Federal Districts in which they are located (even if only partially), the municipalities, water users, and water resources civil organizations that have a demonstrated record of action in the basin. The number of representatives from each sector and the criteria for their appointment are defined in the regulations of the Committees.

-The River Basin Water Agencies act as the executive secretariats of the River Basin Committees. Although there is a close relationship between the committees and the agencies, the latter are very different from the former. The main difference is in their nature and organization: while the Committees act as what in Brazil are called “water parliaments”, the Water Agencies operate more like executive organizations.

-The Water Resources Civil Organizations (CWOs) should be represented on the National Water Resources Council and should participate in the decision-making process. CWOs can be any of the following: inter-municipal consortia; river basin associations; regional, local, or sectoral associations of water users; technical, academic, and research organizations; nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

2.2. WATER MANAGEMENT

As in many other countries, water resources management in Brazil has historically relied upon heavy investment in hydraulic infrastructure. From the building of the first hydropower facility in 1901 until the mid-1970s, hydropower was the main focus of water resources management. In 1934, after several modifications had been made to the first draft of 1907, the Water Code was approved. The Water Code was the first legislation for water resources management in Brazil, and was applied for more than 60 years. The Water Code ensured the free use of any water for basic life necessities and permitted everyone to use any public water while complying with administrative regulations. Some of its provisions, such as the ‘polluter pays’ principle, were introduced long before they became globally recognized as good practice.

Plans to reform Brazil's water resources management system began to take shape during the 1970s when other water users challenged the priority given to hydropower. Different initiatives and institutions for water management were established by the Federal government and states such as São Paulo and Ceara. The Constitutional reform of 1988 was the first step in the creation of a National Water Law, responsibility for which was given to the federal government. The reformed Constitution also established a distinction between federally controlled water, for rivers across state boundaries, and state-controlled water, for rivers and groundwater that remained completely within state boundaries. Based on this new responsibility, the states began to implement their own water resources management systems. São Paulo pioneered this process in 1991 (see ‘Water management in the Metropolitan Region of São Paulo’). Today, 26 Brazil's states and the Federal District have adopted legislation to modernize water resource management (see ‘States of Brazil’).

After six years of negotiation, the federal government approved the 1997 National Water Law (No. 9433), which was aimed at incorporating modern water resources management principles and instruments into Brazil's water resources management system. A National Water Authority was created in 2000 and tasked with implementing the National Water Law. Numerous local, regional, and national initiatives, public and private bodies, and technical, scientific and professional associations also play a role in Brazil's water resources management system. The first National Water Plan was created in 2006, the first in Latin America. Today in Brazil has more than 180 River Basin Committees advanced in water management resources.

2.3. WATER POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK

The National Water Resources Policy was approved by Federal Law No. 9433/97. The National Water Resources Policy can be divided into three main sections:

1. Sector Principles. These are: (i) the river basin is the territorial unit for the implementation of the National Water Resources Policy; (ii) management of water resources should allow for multiple uses of water; (iii) water is a limited resource with economic value; (iv) the management of water resources should be decentralized and should involve participation by the government, users, and the community; and (v) when there is a shortage of water, priority is given to human consumption

and the watering of animals.

2. Management instruments affecting water users directly, such as water permits and water tariffs, and decision-making, such as water resources planning at river basin, state and national levels, water resources information systems, and classification of bodies of water according to main uses.

3. The institutional framework for the operation of the principles and implementation of the instruments, including the National Water Resources Council, the water resources councils of the states and the Federal District, the river basin committees, the government agencies with functions related to water, and the river basin water agencies.

In addition, Brazil's government is undertaking a number of water resources management initiatives, such as:

-PROAGUA (Programa Nacional de Desenvolvimento dos Recursos Hídricos – Federal Water Resources Management Project), which aims at bettering the population's quality of life, especially that of the poor, by combining integrated water resources management with the expansion and optimization of hydraulic infrastructure, promoting rational, integrated and sustainable use and participatory management of water resources in Brazil.

-PRODES (Programa Despoluição de Bacias Hidrográficas – Basin Restoration Program), an innovative programme introduced by the Brazilian federal government to finance wastewater treatment plants while providing financial incentives to properly operate and maintain the plants. It is a type of output-based aid, as opposed to aid programmes aimed only at inputs.

The National Water Law (No. 9433) adopted by Congress in January 1997 incorporates most modern water resources management principles and instruments.

The legal framework is completed by the water resources management laws created by the states since 1991. Although implemented at different times over the last 20 years, most of these state laws are structurally very similar to each other and to National Water Law No. 9433.

3. GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Brazil has signed numerous treaties with neighbouring countries aimed at promoting sustainable use of shared water resources. The Treaty of the Rio de la Plata entered into force in 1977 and acts as a political interconnection among the countries of the Southern Cone (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Uruguay). Its main objectives are the sustainable use of water resources, regional development with preservation of flora and fauna, physical, fluvial, and terrestrial integration, and promotion of greater knowledge of the basin and its resources and potential.

The Amazon Cooperation Treaty (TCA) was signed in 1978 by Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Surinam, and Venezuela and entered into force for Brazil in 1980. The basic scope of the TCA is to promote the harmonious development of the Amazon in order to allow an equitable distribution of its benefits, improve the quality of life of its peoples, and achieve the full incorporation of each signatory's Amazon territories in its respective domestic economies.

Other treaties include the Cooperation Agreement for the Use of Natural Resources and Development of the Quaraí River Basin and the Treaty for the Use of Shared Natural Resources of the Bordering Stretches of the Uruguay River and its tributary, the Pepiri-Guaçú River, between

Brazil and Argentina.