

Water footprints of nations: Water use by people as a function of their consumption pattern

A. Y. Hoekstra · A. K. Chapagain

Received: 18 January 2005 / Accepted: 12 October 2005
© Springer Science + Business Media B.V. 2006

Abstract The water footprint shows the extent of water use in relation to consumption of people. The water footprint of a country is defined as the volume of water needed for the production of the goods and services consumed by the inhabitants of the country. The internal water footprint is the volume of water used from domestic water resources; the external water footprint is the volume of water used in other countries to produce goods and services imported and consumed by the inhabitants of the country. The study calculates the water footprint for each nation of the world for the period 1997–2001. The USA appears to have an average water footprint of 2480 m³/cap/yr, while China has an average footprint of 700 m³/cap/yr. The global average water footprint is 1240 m³/cap/yr. The four major direct factors determining the water footprint of a country are: volume of consumption (related to the gross national income); consumption pattern (e.g. high versus low meat consumption); climate (growth conditions); and agricultural practice (water use efficiency).

Keywords Water footprint · Consumption · Virtual water · Indicators · Water use efficiency · External water dependency

Introduction

Databases on water use traditionally show three columns of water use: water withdrawals in the domestic, agricultural and industrial sector respectively (Gleick, 1993; Shiklomanov, 2000; FAO, 2003). A water expert being asked to assess the water demand in a particular country will generally add the water withdrawals for the different sectors of the economy. Although useful information, this does not tell much about the water actually needed by the people in the country in relation to their consumption pattern. The fact is that many goods

A. Y. Hoekstra (✉)
University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands
e-mail: a.y.hoekstra@utwente.nl

A. K. Chapagain
UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands

consumed by the inhabitants of a country are produced in other countries, which means that it can happen that the real water demand of a population is much higher than the national water withdrawals do suggest. The reverse can be the case as well: national water withdrawals are substantial, but a large amount of the products are being exported for consumption elsewhere.

In 2002, the water footprint concept was introduced in order to have a consumption-based indicator of water use that could provide useful information in addition to the traditional production-sector-based indicators of water use (Hoekstra and Hung, 2002). The water footprint of a nation is defined as the total volume of freshwater that is used to produce the goods and services consumed by the people of the nation. Since not all goods consumed in one particular country are produced in that country, the water footprint consists of two parts: use of domestic water resources and use of water outside the borders of the country.

The water footprint has been developed in analogy to the ecological footprint concept as was introduced in the 1990s (Rees, 1992; Wackernagel and Rees, 1996; Wackernagel *et al.*, 1997). The ‘ecological footprint’ of a population represents the area of productive land and aquatic ecosystems required to produce the resources used, and to assimilate the wastes produced, by a certain population at a specified material standard of living, wherever on earth that land may be located. Whereas the ‘ecological footprint’ thus quantifies the *area* needed to sustain people’s living, the ‘water footprint’ indicates the *water* required to sustain a population.

The water footprint concept is closely linked to the virtual water concept. Virtual water is defined as the volume of water required to produce a commodity or service. The concept was introduced by Allan in the early 1990s (Allan, 1993, 1994) when studying the option of importing virtual water (as opposed to real water) as a partial solution to problems of water scarcity in the Middle East. Allan elaborated on the idea of using virtual water import (coming along with food imports) as a tool to release the pressure on the scarcely available domestic water resources. Virtual water import thus becomes an alternative water source, next to endogenous water sources. Imported virtual water has therefore also been called ‘exogenous water’ (Haddadin, 2003).

When assessing the water footprint of a nation, it is essential to quantify the flows of virtual water leaving and entering the country. If one takes the use of domestic water resources as a starting point for the assessment of a nation’s water footprint, one should subtract the virtual water flows that leave the country and add the virtual water flows that enter the country.

The objective of this study is to assess and analyse the water footprints of nations. The study builds on two earlier studies. Hoekstra and Hung (2002, 2005) have quantified the virtual water flows related to the international trade of crop products. Chapagain and Hoekstra (2003) have done a similar study for livestock and livestock products. The concerned time period in these two studies is 1995–1999. The present study takes the period of 1997–2001 and refines the earlier studies by making a number of improvements and extensions.

Method

A nation’s water footprint has two components, the internal and the external water footprint. The internal water footprint (*IWFP*) is defined as the use of domestic water resources to produce goods and services consumed by inhabitants of the country. It is the sum of the total water volume used from the domestic water resources in the national economy *minus* the

volume of virtual water export to other countries insofar related to export of domestically produced products:

$$IWFP = AWU + IWW + DWW - VWE_{\text{dom}} \quad (1)$$

Here, AWU is the agricultural water use, taken equal to the evaporative water demand of the crops; IWW and DWW are the water withdrawals in the industrial and domestic sectors respectively; and VWE_{dom} is the virtual water export to other countries insofar related to export of domestically produced products. The agricultural water use includes both effective rainfall (the portion of the total precipitation which is retained by the soil and used for crop production) and the part of irrigation water used effectively for crop production. Here we do not include irrigation losses in the term of agricultural water use assuming that they largely return to the resource base and thus can be reused.

The external water footprint of a country ($EWFP$) is defined as the annual volume of water resources used in other countries to produce goods and services consumed by the inhabitants of the country concerned. It is equal to the so-called virtual water import into the country *minus* the volume of virtual water exported to other countries as a result of re-export of imported products.

$$EWFP = VWI - VWE_{\text{re-export}} \quad (2)$$

Both the internal and the external water footprint include the use of *blue water* (ground and surface water) and the use of *green water* (moisture stored in soil strata).

The use of domestic water resources comprises water use in the agricultural, industrial and domestic sectors. For the latter two sectors we have used data from AQUASTAT (FAO, 2003). Though significant fractions of domestic and industrial water withdrawals do not evaporate but return to either the groundwater or surface water system, these return flows are generally polluted, so that they have been included in the water footprint calculations. The total volume of water use in the agricultural sector has been calculated in this study based on the total volume of crop produced and its corresponding virtual water content. For the calculation of the virtual water content of crop and livestock products we have used the methodology as described in Chapagain and Hoekstra (2004). In summary, the virtual water content (m^3/ton) of primary crops has been calculated based on crop water requirements and yields. Crop water requirement have been calculated per crop and per country using the methodology developed by FAO (Allen *et al.*, 1998). The virtual water content of crop products is calculated based on product fractions (ton of crop product obtained per ton of primary crop) and value fractions (the market value of one crop product divided by the aggregated market value of all crop products derived from one primary crop). The virtual water content (m^3/ton) of live animals has been calculated based on the virtual water content of their feed and the volumes of drinking and service water consumed during their lifetime. We have calculated the virtual water content for eight major animal categories: beef cattle, dairy cows, swine, sheep, goats, fowls/poultry (meat purpose), laying hens and horses. The calculation of the virtual water content of livestock products is again based on product fractions and value fractions.

Virtual water flows between nations have been calculated by multiplying commodity trade flows by their associated virtual water content:

$$VWF[n_e, n_i, c] = CT[n_e, n_i, c] \times VWC[n_e, c] \quad (3)$$

in which VWF denotes the virtual water flow ($m^3 yr^{-1}$) from exporting country n_e to importing country n_i as a result of trade in commodity c ; CT the commodity trade ($ton yr^{-1}$) from the exporting to the importing country; and VWC the virtual water content ($m^3 ton^{-1}$) of the commodity, which is defined as the volume of water required to produce the commodity in the exporting country. We have taken into account the trade between 243 countries for which international trade data are available in the Personal Computer Trade Analysis System of the International Trade Centre, produced in collaboration with UNCTAD/WTO. It covers trade data from 146 reporting countries disaggregated by product and partner countries (ITC, 2004). We have carried out calculations for 285 crop products and 123 livestock products. The virtual water content of an industrial product can be calculated in a similar way as described earlier for agricultural products. There are however numerous categories of industrial products with a diverse range of production methods and detailed standardised national statistics related to the production and consumption of industrial products are hard to find. As the global volume of water used in the industrial sector is only $716 Gm^3/yr$ ($\approx 10\%$ of total global water use), we have – per country – simply calculated an average virtual water content per dollar added value in the industrial sector ($m^3/US\$$) as the ratio of the industrial water withdrawal (m^3/yr) in a country to the total added value of the industrial sector ($US\$/yr$), which is a component of the Gross Domestic Product.

Water needs by product

The total volume of water used globally for crop production is $6390 Gm^3/yr$ at field level. Rice has the largest share in the total volume water used for global crop production. It consumes about $1359 Gm^3/yr$, which is about 21% of the total volume of water used for crop production at field level. The second largest water consumer is wheat (12%). The contribution of some major crops to the global water footprint insofar related to food consumption is presented in Figure 1. Although the total volume of the world rice production is about equal to the wheat production, rice consumes much more water per ton of production. The difference is due




Fig. 1 Contribution of different crops to the global water footprint

to the higher evaporative demand for rice production. As a result, the global average virtual water content of rice (paddy) is 2291 m³/ton and for wheat 1334 m³/ton.

The virtual water content of rice (broken) that a consumer buys in the shop is about 3420 m³/ton. This is larger than the virtual water content of paddy rice as harvested from the field because of the weight loss if paddy rice is processed into broken rice. The virtual water content of some selected crop and livestock products for a number of selected countries are presented in Table 1.

In general, livestock products have a higher virtual water content than crop products. This is because a live animal consumes a lot of feed crops, drinking water and service water in its lifetime before it produces some output. We consider here an example of beef produced in an industrial farming system. It takes in average 3 years before it is slaughtered to produce about 200 kg of boneless beef. It consumes nearly 1300 kg of grains (wheat, oats, barley, corn, dry peas, soybean meal and other small grains), 7200 kg of roughages (pasture, dry hay, silage and other roughages), 24 cubic meter of water for drinking and 7 cubic meter of water for servicing. This means that to produce one kilogram of boneless beef, we use about 6.5 kg of grain, 36 kg of roughages, and 155 l of water (only for drinking and servicing). Producing the volume of feed requires about 15340 l of water in average. With every step of food processing we lose part of the material as a result of selection and inefficiencies. The higher we go up in the product chain, the higher will be the virtual water content of the product. For example, the global average virtual water content of maize, wheat and rice (husked) is 900, 1300 and 3000 m³/ton respectively, whereas the virtual water content of chicken meat, pork and beef is 3900, 4900 and 15500 m³/ton respectively. However, the virtual water content of products strongly varies from place to place, depending upon the climate, technology adopted for farming and corresponding yields.

The units used so far to express the virtual water content of various products are in terms of cubic meters of water per ton of the product. A consumer might be more interested to know how much water it consumes per unit of consumption. One cup of coffee requires for instance 140 l of water in average, one hamburger 2400 l and one cotton T-shirt 2000 l (Table 2).

The global average virtual water content of industrial products is 80 l per US\$. In the USA, industrial products take nearly 100 l per US\$. In Germany and the Netherlands, average virtual water content of industrial products is about 50 l per US\$. Industrial products from Japan, Australia and Canada take only 10–15 l per US\$. In world's largest developing nations, China and India, the average virtual water content of industrial products is 20–25 l per US\$.

Water footprints of nations

The global water footprint is 7450 Gm³/yr, which is 1240 m³/cap/yr in average. In absolute terms, India is the country with the largest footprint in the world, with a total footprint of 987 Gm³/yr. However, while India contributes 17% to the global population, the people in India contribute only 13% to the global water footprint. On a relative basis, it is the people of the USA that have the largest water footprint, with 2480 m³/yr per capita, followed by the people in south European countries such as Greece, Italy and Spain (2300–2400 m³/yr per capita). High water footprints can also be found in Malaysia and Thailand. At the other side of the scale, the Chinese people have a relatively low water footprint with an average of 700 m³/yr per capita. The average per capita water footprints of nations are shown in Figure 2. The data are shown in Table 3 for a few selected countries.

Table 1 Average virtual water content of some selected products for a number of selected countries (m³/ton)

| | USA | China | India | Russia | Indonesia | Australia | Brazil | Japan | Mexico | Italy | Netherlands | World average* |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------------|----------------|
| Rice (paddy) | 1275 | 1321 | 2850 | 2401 | 2150 | 1022 | 3082 | 1221 | 2182 | 1679 | | 2291 |
| Rice (husked) | 1656 | 1716 | 3702 | 3118 | 2793 | 1327 | 4003 | 1586 | 2834 | 2180 | | 2975 |
| Rice (broken) | 1903 | 1972 | 4254 | 3584 | 3209 | 1525 | 4600 | 1822 | 3257 | 2506 | | 3419 |
| Wheat | 849 | 690 | 1654 | 2375 | | 1588 | 1616 | 734 | 1066 | 2421 | 619 | 1334 |
| Maize | 489 | 801 | 1937 | 1397 | 1285 | 744 | 1180 | 1493 | 1744 | 530 | 408 | 909 |
| Soybeans | 1869 | 2617 | 4124 | 3933 | 2030 | 2106 | 1076 | 2326 | 3177 | 1506 | | 1789 |
| Sugar cane | 103 | 117 | 159 | | 164 | 141 | 155 | 120 | 171 | | | 175 |
| Cotton seed | 2535 | 1419 | 8264 | | 4453 | 1887 | 2777 | | 2127 | | | 3644 |
| Cotton lint | 5733 | 3210 | 18694 | | 10072 | 4268 | 6281 | | 4812 | | | 8242 |
| Barley | 702 | 848 | 1966 | 2359 | | 1425 | 1373 | 697 | 2120 | 1822 | 718 | 1388 |
| Sorghum | 782 | 863 | 4053 | 2382 | | 1081 | 1609 | | 1212 | 582 | | 2853 |
| Coconuts | | 749 | 2255 | | 2071 | | 1590 | | 1954 | | | 2545 |
| Millet | 2143 | 1863 | 3269 | 2892 | | 1951 | | 3100 | 4534 | | | 4596 |
| Coffee (green) | 4864 | 6290 | 12180 | | 17665 | | 13972 | | 28119 | | | 17373 |
| Coffee (roasted) | 5790 | 7488 | 14500 | | 21030 | | 16633 | | 33475 | | | 20682 |
| Tea (made) | | 11110 | 7002 | 3002 | 9474 | | 6592 | 4940 | | | | 9205 |
| Beef | 13193 | 12560 | 16482 | 21028 | 14818 | 17112 | 16961 | 11019 | 37762 | 21167 | 11681 | 15497 |
| Pork | 3946 | 2211 | 4397 | 6947 | 3938 | 5909 | 4818 | 4962 | 6559 | 6377 | 3790 | 4856 |
| Goat meat | 3082 | 3994 | 5187 | 5290 | 4543 | 3839 | 4175 | 2560 | 10252 | 4180 | 2791 | 4043 |
| Sheep meat | 5977 | 5202 | 6692 | 7621 | 5956 | 6947 | 6267 | 3571 | 16878 | 7572 | 5298 | 6143 |
| Chicken meat | 2389 | 3652 | 7736 | 5763 | 5549 | 2914 | 3913 | 2977 | 5013 | 2198 | 2222 | 3918 |
| Eggs | 1510 | 3550 | 7531 | 4919 | 5400 | 1844 | 3337 | 1884 | 4277 | 1389 | 1404 | 3340 |
| Milk | 695 | 1000 | 1369 | 1345 | 1143 | 915 | 1001 | 812 | 2382 | 861 | 641 | 990 |
| Milk powder | 3234 | 4648 | 6368 | 6253 | 5317 | 4255 | 4654 | 3774 | 11077 | 4005 | 2982 | 4602 |
| Cheese | 3457 | 4963 | 6793 | 6671 | 5675 | 4544 | 4969 | 4032 | 11805 | 4278 | 3190 | 4914 |
| Leather (bovine) | 14190 | 13513 | 17710 | 22575 | 15929 | 18384 | 18222 | 11864 | 40482 | 22724 | 12572 | 16656 |

* For the primary crops, world averages have been calculated as the ratio of the global water use for the production of a crop to the global production volume. For processed products, the global averages have been calculated as the ratio of the global virtual water trade volume to the global product trade volume.

Table 2 Global average virtual water content of some selected products, per unit of product

| Product | Virtual water content (litres) |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 glass of beer (250 ml) | 75 |
| 1 glass of milk (200 ml) | 200 |
| 1 cup of coffee (125 ml) | 140 |
| 1 cup of tea (250 ml) | 35 |
| 1 slice of bread (30 g) | 40 |
| 1 slice of bread (30 g) with cheese(10 g) | 90 |
| 1 potato (100 g) | 25 |
| 1 apple (100 g) | 70 |
| 1 cotton T-shirt (250 g) | 2000 |
| 1 sheet of A4-paper (80 g/m ²) | 10 |
| 1 glass of wine (125 ml) | 120 |
| 1 glass of apple juice (200 ml) | 190 |
| 1 glass of orange juice (200 ml) | 170 |
| 1 bag of potato crisps (200 g) | 185 |
| 1 egg (40 g) | 135 |
| 1 hamburger (150 g) | 2400 |
| 1 tomato (70 g) | 13 |
| 1 orange (100 g) | 50 |
| 1 pair of shoes (bovine leather) | 8000 |
| 1 microchip (2 g) | 32 |




Fig. 2 Average national water footprint per capita (m³/capita/yr). Green means that the nation's water footprint is equal to or smaller than global average. Countries with red have a water footprint beyond the global average

The size of the global water footprint is largely determined by the consumption of food and other agricultural products (Figure 3). The estimated contribution of agriculture to the total water use (6390 Gm³/yr) is even bigger than suggested by earlier statistics due to the inclusion of green water use (use of soil water). If we include irrigation losses, which globally add up to about 1590 Gm³/yr (Chapagain and Hoekstra, 2004), the total volume of water used in agriculture becomes 7980 Gm³/yr. About one third of this amount is blue water withdrawn for irrigation; the remaining two thirds is green water (soil water).

The four major direct factors determining the water footprint of a country are: volume of consumption (related to the gross national income); consumption pattern (e.g. high versus

Table 3 Composition of the water footprint for some selected countries. Period: 1997–2001

| Country | Population | Use of domestic water resources | | | | | | Use of foreign water resources | | | | | | Water footprint by consumption category | | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|--|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | Crop evapotranspiration | | Industrial water withdrawal | | For re-export products of imported | | For national consumption | | For re-export products of imported | | Domestic water | | Agricultural goods | | Industrial goods | | | |
| | | For national consumption (Gm ³ /yr) | For export (Gm ³ /yr) | For national consumption (Gm ³ /yr) | For export (Gm ³ /yr) | Agricultural goods (Gm ³ /yr) | Industrial goods (Gm ³ /yr) | For national consumption (Gm ³ /yr) | For export (Gm ³ /yr) | Agricultural goods (Gm ³ /yr) | Industrial goods (Gm ³ /yr) | Internal water footprint (m ³ /cap/yr) | External water footprint (m ³ /cap/yr) | Internal water footprint (m ³ /cap/yr) | External water footprint (m ³ /cap/yr) | Internal water footprint (m ³ /cap/yr) | External water footprint (m ³ /cap/yr) | | |
| Australia | 19071705 | 14.03 | 68.67 | 1.229 | 0.12 | 0.78 | 4.02 | 4.21 | 26.36 | 1393 | 341 | 736 | 41 | 64 | 211 | | | | |
| Bangladesh | 129942975 | 2.12 | 109.98 | 1.38 | 0.344 | 3.71 | 0.34 | 0.13 | 116.49 | 896 | 16 | 846 | 29 | 3 | 3 | | | | |
| Brazil | 169109675 | 11.76 | 195.29 | 61.01 | 8.666 | 14.76 | 3.11 | 5.20 | 233.59 | 1381 | 70 | 1155 | 87 | 51 | 18 | | | | |
| Canada | 30649675 | 8.55 | 30.22 | 52.34 | 11.211 | 7.74 | 5.07 | 22.62 | 62.80 | 2049 | 279 | 986 | 252 | 366 | 166 | | | | |
| China | 1257521250 | 33.32 | 711.10 | 21.55 | 81.531 | 49.99 | 7.45 | 5.69 | 883.39 | 702 | 26 | 565 | 40 | 65 | 6 | | | | |
| Egypt | 63375735 | 4.16 | 45.78 | 1.55 | 6.423 | 12.49 | 0.64 | 0.49 | 69.50 | 1097 | 66 | 722 | 197 | 101 | 10 | | | | |
| France | 58775400 | 6.16 | 47.84 | 34.63 | 15.094 | 30.40 | 10.69 | 31.07 | 110.19 | 1875 | 105 | 814 | 517 | 257 | 182 | | | | |
| Germany | 82169250 | 5.45 | 35.64 | 18.84 | 18.771 | 49.59 | 17.50 | 38.48 | 126.95 | 1545 | 66 | 434 | 604 | 228 | 213 | | | | |
| India | 1007369125 | 38.62 | 913.70 | 35.29 | 19.065 | 13.75 | 2.24 | 1.24 | 987.38 | 980 | 38 | 907 | 14 | 19 | 2 | | | | |
| Indonesia | 204920450 | 5.67 | 236.22 | 22.62 | 0.404 | 26.09 | 1.58 | 2.74 | 269.96 | 1317 | 28 | 1153 | 127 | 2 | 8 | | | | |
| Italy | 57718000 | 7.97 | 47.82 | 12.35 | 10.133 | 5.60 | 8.69 | 20.29 | 134.59 | 2332 | 138 | 829 | 1039 | 176 | 151 | | | | |
| Japan | 126741225 | 17.20 | 20.97 | 0.40 | 13.702 | 2.10 | 16.38 | 4.01 | 146.09 | 1153 | 136 | 165 | 614 | 108 | 129 | | | | |
| Jordan | 4813708 | 0.21 | 1.45 | 0.07 | 0.035 | 0.00 | 4.37 | 0.22 | 6.27 | 1303 | 44 | 301 | 908 | 7 | 43 | | | | |
| Mexico | 97291745 | 13.55 | 81.48 | 12.26 | 2.998 | 1.13 | 35.09 | 7.05 | 140.16 | 1441 | 139 | 837 | 361 | 31 | 72 | | | | |
| Netherlands | 15865250 | 0.44 | 0.50 | 2.51 | 2.562 | 2.20 | 9.30 | 6.61 | 19.40 | 1223 | 28 | 31 | 586 | 161 | 417 | | | | |
| Pakistan | 136475525 | 2.88 | 152.75 | 7.57 | 1.706 | 1.28 | 8.55 | 0.33 | 166.22 | 1218 | 21 | 1119 | 63 | 12 | 2 | | | | |
| Russia | 145878750 | 14.34 | 201.26 | 8.96 | 13.251 | 34.83 | 0.80 | 3.94 | 270.98 | 1858 | 98 | 1380 | 283 | 91 | 5 | | | | |
| South Africa | 42387403 | 2.43 | 27.32 | 6.05 | 1.123 | 7.18 | 1.42 | 2.10 | 39.47 | 931 | 57 | 644 | 169 | 26 | 33 | | | | |
| Thailand | 60487800 | 1.83 | 120.17 | 38.49 | 1.239 | 0.55 | 8.73 | 3.90 | 134.46 | 2223 | 30 | 1987 | 144 | 20 | 41 | | | | |
| United Kingdom | 58669403 | 2.21 | 12.79 | 3.38 | 6.673 | 1.46 | 34.73 | 16.67 | 73.07 | 1245 | 38 | 218 | 592 | 114 | 284 | | | | |
| USA | 280343325 | 60.80 | 334.24 | 138.96 | 170.777 | 44.72 | 74.91 | 55.29 | 696.01 | 2483 | 217 | 1192 | 267 | 609 | 197 | | | | |
| Global total/avg. | 5994251631 | 344 | 5434 | 957 | 476 | 240 | 957 | 240 | 7452 | 1243 | 57 | 907 | 160 | 79 | 40 | | | | |

*Includes both blue and green water use in agriculture




Fig. 3 Contribution of different consumption categories to the global water footprint, with a distinction between the internal and external footprint

low meat consumption); climate (growth conditions); and agricultural practice (water use efficiency). In rich countries, people generally consume more goods and services, which immediately translates into increased water footprints. But it is not consumption volume alone that determines the water demand of people. The composition of the consumption package is relevant too, because some goods in particular require a lot of water (bovine meat, rice). In many poor countries it is a combination of unfavourable climatic conditions (high evaporative demand) and bad agricultural practice (resulting in low water productivity) that contributes to a high water footprint. Underlying factors that contribute to bad agricultural practice and thus high water footprints are the lack of proper water pricing, the presence of subsidies, the use of water inefficient technology and lack of awareness of simple water saving measures among farmers.

The influence of the various determinants varies from country to country. The water footprint of the USA is high (2480 m³/cap/yr) partly because of large meat consumption per capita and high consumption of industrial products. The water footprint of Iran is relatively high (1624 m³/cap/yr) partly because of low yields in crop production and partly because of high evapotranspiration. In the USA the industrial component of the water footprint is 806 m³/cap/yr whereas in Iran it is only 24 m³/cap/yr.

The aggregated external water footprints of nations in the world constitute 16% of the total global water footprint (Figure 3). However, the share of the external water footprint strongly varies from country to country. Some African countries, such as Sudan, Mali, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Malawi and Chad have hardly any external water footprint, simply because they have little import. Some European countries on the other hand, e.g. Italy, Germany, the UK and the Netherlands have external water footprints contributing 50–80% to the total water footprint. The agricultural products that contribute most to the external water footprints of nations are: bovine meat, soybean, wheat, cocoa, rice, cotton and maize.

Eight countries – India, China, the USA, the Russian Federation, Indonesia, Nigeria, Brazil and Pakistan – together contribute fifty percent to the total global water footprint. India (13%), China (12%) and the USA (9%) are the largest consumers of the global water resources (Figure 4).

Both the size of the national water footprint and its composition differs between countries (Figure 5). On the one end we see China with a relatively low water footprint per capita, and on




Fig. 4 Contribution of major consumers to the global water footprint




Fig. 5 The national water footprint per capita and the contribution of different consumption categories for some selected countries

the other end the USA. In the rich countries consumption of industrial goods has a relatively large contribution to the total water footprint if compared with developing countries. The water footprints of the USA, China, India and Japan are presented in more detail in Figure 6. The contribution of the external water footprint to the total water footprint is very large in Japan if compared to the other three countries. The consumption of industrial goods very significantly contributes to the total water footprint of the USA (32%), but not in India (2%).

Conclusion

The global water footprint is 7450 Gm³/yr, which is in average 1240 m³/cap/yr. The differences between countries are large: the USA has an average water footprint of 2480 m³/cap/yr whereas China has an average water footprint of 700 m³/cap/yr. There are four most important direct factors explaining high water footprints. A first factor is the total volume of




Fig. 6 Details of the water footprints of the USA, China India and Japan. Period: 1997–2001

consumption, which is generally related to gross national income of a country. This partially explains the high water footprints of for instance the USA, Italy and Switzerland. A second factor behind a high water footprint can be that people have a water-intensive consumption pattern. Particularly high consumption of meat significantly contributes to a high water footprint. This factor partially explains the high water footprints of countries such as the USA, Canada, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy and Greece. The average meat consumption in the United States is for instance 120 kg/yr, more than three times the world-average meat consumption. Next to meat consumption, high consumption of industrial goods significantly contributes to the total water footprints of rich countries. The third factor is climate. In regions with a high evaporative demand, the water requirement per unit of crop production is relatively large. This factor partially explains the high water footprints in countries such as Senegal, Mali, Sudan, Chad, Nigeria and Syria. A fourth factor that can explain high water footprints is water-inefficient agricultural practice, which means that water productivity in terms of output per drop of water is relatively low. This factor partly explains the high water footprints of countries such as Thailand, Cambodia, Turkmenistan, Sudan, Mali and Nigeria. In Thailand for instance, rice yields averaged 2.5 ton/ha in the period 1997–2001, while the global average in the same period was 3.9 ton/ha.

Reducing water footprints can be done in various ways. A first way is to break the seemingly obvious link between economic growth and increased water use, for instance by adopting production techniques that require less water per unit of product. Water productivity in agriculture can be improved for instance by applying advanced techniques of rainwater harvesting and supplementary irrigation. A second way of reducing water footprints is to shift to consumption patterns that require less water, for instance by reducing meat consumption. However, it has been debated whether this is a feasible road to go, since the world-wide trend has been that meat consumption increases rather than decreases. Probably a broader and subtler approach will be needed, where consumption patterns are influenced by pricing, awareness raising, labelling of products or introduction of other incentives that make people change their consumption behaviour. Water costs are generally not well reflected in the price of products due to the subsidies in the water sector. Besides, the general public is – although often aware of energy requirements – hardly aware of the water requirements in producing their goods and services.

A third method that can be used – not yet broadly recognized as such – is to shift production from areas with low water-productivity to areas with high water productivity, thus increasing global water use efficiency (Chapagain *et al.*, 2005a). For instance, Jordan has successfully externalised its water footprint by importing wheat and rice products from the USA, which has higher water productivity than Jordan.

The water footprint of a nation is an indicator of water use in relation to the consumption volume and pattern of the people. As an aggregated indicator it shows the total water requirement of a nation, a rough measure of the impact of human consumption on the natural water environment. More information about the precise components and characteristics of the total water footprint will be needed, however, before one can make a more balanced assessment of the effects on the natural water systems. For instance, one has to look at what is blue versus green water use, because use of blue water often affects the environment more than green water use. Also it is relevant to consider the internal versus the external water footprint. Externalising the water footprint for instance means externalising the environmental impacts. Also one has to realise that some parts of the total water footprint concern use of water for which no alternative use is possible, while other parts relate to water that could have been used for other purposes with higher added value. There is a difference for instance between beef produced in extensively grazed grasslands of Botswana (use of green water

without alternative use) and beef produced in an industrial livestock farm in the Netherlands (partially fed with imported irrigated feed crops).

The current study has focused on the quantification of consumptive water use, i.e. the volumes of water from groundwater, surface water and soil water that evaporate. The effect of water pollution was accounted for to a limited extent by including the (polluted) return flows in the domestic and industrial sector. The calculated water footprints thus consists of two components: consumptive water use and wastewater production. The effect of pollution has been underestimated however in the current calculations of the national water footprints, because one cubic metre of wastewater should not count for one, because it generally pollutes much more cubic metres of water after disposal (various authors have suggested a factor of ten to fifty). The impact of water pollution can be better assessed by quantifying the dilution water volumes required to dilute waste flows to such extent that the quality of the water remains below agreed water quality standards. We have shown this in a case study for the water footprints of nations related to cotton consumption (Chapagain *et al.*, 2005b).

International water dependencies are substantial and are likely to increase with continued global trade liberalisation. Today, 16% of global water use is not for producing products for domestic consumption but for making products for export. Considering this substantial percentage and the upward trend, we suggest that future national and regional water policy studies should include an analysis of international or interregional virtual water flows.

References

- Allan JA (1993) Fortunately there are substitutes for water otherwise our hydro-political futures would be impossible. In: Priorities for water resources allocation and management, ODA, London, pp 13–26
- Allan JA (1994) Overall perspectives on countries and regions. In: Rogers P, Lydon P (eds) Water in the Arab World: perspectives and prognoses. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, pp 65–100
- Allen RG, Pereira LS, Raes D, Smith M (1998) Crop evapotranspiration - Guidelines for computing crop water requirements – FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 56, FAO, Rome, Italy, <http://www.fao.org/docrep/X0490E/x0490e00.htm>
- Chapagain AK, Hoekstra AY (2003) Virtual water flows between nations in relation to trade in livestock and livestock products. Value of Water Research Report Series No. 13, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands, <http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report13.pdf>
- Chapagain AK, Hoekstra AY, Savenije HHG (2005a) Saving water through global trade. Value of Water Research Report Series No. 17, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, the Netherlands, <http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report17.pdf>
- Chapagain AK, Hoekstra AY, Savenije HHG, Gautam R (2005b) The water footprint of cotton consumption. Value of Water Research Report Series No. 18, UNESCO-IHE, The Netherlands, <http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report18.pdf>
- Chapagain AK, Hoekstra AY (2004) Water footprints of nations. Value of Water Research Report Series No. 16, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands, <http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report16.pdf>
- FAO (2003) AQUASTAT 2003. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy, <ftp://ftp.fao.org/agl/aglw/aquastat/aquastat2003.xls>
- Gleick PH (ed) (1993) Water in crisis: A guide to the world's fresh water resources. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
- Haddadin MJ (2003) Exogenous water: A conduit to globalization of water resources. In: Hoekstra AY (ed) Virtual water trade: Proceedings of the International Expert Meeting on Virtual Water Trade. Value of Water Research Report Series No. 12, UNESCO-IHE, Delft, The Netherlands, <http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report12.pdf>
- Hoekstra AY, Hung PQ (2002) Virtual water trade: A quantification of virtual water flows between nations in relation to international crop trade. Value of Water Research Report Series No. 11, UNESCO-IHE Institute for Water Education, Delft, The Netherlands, <http://www.waterfootprint.org/Reports/Report11.pdf>
- Hoekstra AY, Hung PQ (2005) Globalisation of water resources: International virtual water flows in relation to crop trade. Global Environmental Change 15(1):45–56
- ITC (2004) PC-TAS version 1997–2001 in HS or SITC, CD-ROM. International Trade Centre, Geneva

- Rees WE (1992) Ecological footprints and appropriated carrying capacity: what urban economics leaves out. *Environ Urban* 4(2):121–130
- Shiklomanov IA (2000) Appraisal and assessment of world water resources. *Water International* 25(1):11–32
- Wackernagel M, Onisto L, Linares AC, Falfan ISL, Garcia JM, Guerrero IS, Guerrero MGS (1997) Ecological footprints of nations: How much nature do they use? How much nature do they have?. Centre for Sustainability Studies, Universidad Anahuac de Xalapa, Mexico
- Wackernagel M, Rees W (1996) *Our ecological footprint: Reducing human impact on the Earth*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, BC, Canada