



Delft University of Technology

Document Version

Final published version

Citation (APA)

Hofman-Caris, R., Bertelkamp, C., de Waal, L., van den Brand, T., Hofman, J., van der Aa, R., & van der Hoek, J. P. (2019). Rainwater Harvesting for Drinking Water Production: A Sustainable and Cost-Effective Solution in The Netherlands? *Water*, 11(3), Article 511. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w11030511>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

In case the licence states "Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa)", this publication was made available Green Open Access via the TU Delft Institutional Repository pursuant to Dutch Copyright Act (Article 25fa, the Taverne amendment). This provision does not affect copyright ownership.
Unless copyright is transferred by contract or statute, it remains with the copyright holder.

Sharing and reuse

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This work is downloaded from Delft University of Technology.

Supplementary information

Table S.1: TCO calculations for six scenarios

Scenario 1

Process	Dimensions	Building costs [€]	investments [€]	Interest & depreciation [€/y]	Operation and maintenance [€/y]	energy [€/y]	chemicals [€/y]	Membrane replacement [€/y]	Filter [€/y]	Lamp [€/y]	[€/m ³]
Clean water buffer (2)	5000 m ³	983080	1356650	79019	33916						1.76
Raw water buffer (concrete pond)	14000 m ³	316967	437414	25477	10935						0.57
Self cleaning filters	10 m ³ /uur	9750	13455	784	336	77					0.02
RO membrane unit	400 m ²	40000	55200	3215	1380	47	13	1200			0.09
Conditioning / pH correction	1.25 m ²	13500	18630	1085	466	256			50		0.03
UV disinfection	10 m ³ /uur	3900	5382	313	135	256	0			32	0.01
Distribution pump	15 m ³ /uur	2659	3669	214	92	77					0.01
Absolute filter	0.73 m ²	759	1047	61	26						0.00
Building	50 m ²	10000	13800	804	345						0.02
Staff	6720 €/jaar										0.10
PLC	55000 €	55000	75900	4421	1898						0.10
Total		1435615	1981148	115393	49529	713	13	1200	50	32	2.71

Scenario 2

Process	Dimensions	Building costs [€]	investments [€]	Interest & depreciation [€/y]	Operation and maintenance [€/y]	energy [€/y]	chemicals [€/y]	Membrane replacement [€/y]	Filter [€/y]	Lamp [€/y]	[€/m ³]
Clean water buffer (2)	5000 m ³	983080	1356650	79019	33916						1.76
Raw water buffer (concrete pond)	14000 m ³	316967	437414	25477	10935						0.57
Booster pump	10 m ³ /uur	1500	2070	121	52						0.00
Rapid sand filter	1.25 m ²	13500	18630	1085	466	256			50		0.03
Peroxide dosing	0.3 L/uur	526	726	42	18	256	3394				0.06
UV / H ₂ O ₂ AOP	10 m ³ /uur	15300	21114	1230	528	38460	962			480	0.65
Activated carbon filter	1.65 m ²	15000	20700	1206	518	256			4950		0.11
pH correction	1.3 m ²	13500	18630	1085	466	256			50		0.03
Distribution pump	15 m ³ /uur	2659	3669	214	92	77					0.01
Absolute filter	0.73 m ²	759	1047	61	26						0.00
Building	50 m ²	10000	13800	804	345						0.02
Staff	6720 €/jaar										0.10
PLC	55000 €	55000 €	75900	4421	1898						0.10
Total		1427701	1970227	114757	49256	39563	4355	0	5050	480	3.43

Scenario 3

Process	Dimensions	Building costs [€]	investments [€]	Interest & depreciation [€/y]	Operation and maintenance [€/y]	energy [€/y]	chemicals [€/y]	Membrane replacement [€/y]	Filter [€/y]	Lamp [€/y]	[€/m ³]
Clean water buffer (2)	20 m ³	17291	23861	1390	597						19.86
Raw water buffer	12 m ³	4800	6624	386	166						5.51
Self cleaning filter	1.25 m ³ /uur	3500	4830	281	121	0					4.02
RO membrane unit	40 m ²	17500	24150	1407	604	1	0	160			21.71
Remineralisation / pH correction	1.25 m ²	1500	2070	121	52	1			5		1.78
UV disinfection	1 m ³ /uur	1900	2622	153	66	1	0			3	2.22
Distribution pump	1 m ³ /uur	931	1285	75	32	0					1.07
Absolute filter	0.73 m ²	759	1047	61	26						0.87
Building	10 m ²	2000	2760	161	69						2.30
Staff	1440 €/jaar										14.40
PLC	10000 €	10000	13800	804	345						11.49
Distribution pump		60181	83049	4837	2076	3	0	160	5	3	85.24

Scenario 4

Process	Dimensions	Building costs [€]	investments [€]	Interest & depreciation [€/y]	Operation and maintenance [€/y]	energy [€/y]	chemicals [€/y]	Membrane replacement [€/y]	Filter [€/y]	Lamp [€/y]	[€/m ³]
Clean water buffer (2)	20 m ³	17291	23861	1390	597						19.86
Raw water buffer	12 m ³	4800	6624	386	166						5.51
Booster pump	1 m ³ /uur	500	690	40	17	0					0.57
Rapid sand filter	0.17 m ²	1500	2070	121	52	1			7		1.79
Peroxide dosing	0.1 L/uur	426	588	34	15	1	1188				12.37
UV / H ₂ O ₂ AOP	1 m ³ /uur	4300	5934	346	148	120	2				5.55
Activated carbon filter	0.17 m ²	1400	1932	113	48	1			495		6.56
pH correction	0.13 m ²	1500	2070	121	52	1			5		1.78
Distribution pump	1 m ³ /uur	931	1285	75	32	0					1.07
Absolute filter	0.73 m ²	759	1047	61	26						0.87
Building	10 m ²	2000	2760	161	69						2.30
Staff	1440 €/jaar										14.40
PLC	10000 €	10.000	13800	804	345						11.49
Distribution pump		45407	62661	3650	1567	123	1189	0	507	0	84.76

Scenario 5

Process	Dimensions	Building costs [€]	investments [€]	Interest & depreciation [€/y]	Operation and maintenance [€/y]	energy [€/y]	chemicals [€/y]	Membrane replacement [€/y]	Filter [€/y]	Lamp [€/y]	[€/m ³]
Clean water buffer	2 m ³	946	1305	76	33						1.09
Raw water buffer	20 m ³	2392	3302	192	83						2.75
Booster pump	0.01 m ³ /uur	931	1285	75	32	0					1.07
Bag filter 25 µm	0.19 m ²	568	784	46	20	0			17.6		0.83
RO. activated carbon filtration & UV disinfection	0.01 m ³ /uur	855	1222	71	31	1	0	210			3.12
Remineralisation / pH-correction	0.01 m ³ /uur	58	81	5	2	1			58		0.66
Distribution pump	0.01 m ³ /uur	931	1285	75	32	0					1.07
Absolute filter	0.73 m ²	759	1047	61	26						0.87
Building	4 m ²	800	1104	64	28						0.92
Staff	1440 €/jaar										14.40
PLC	10000 €	10000	13800	804	345						11.49
Distribution pump		18271	25214	1469	630	2	0	210	76	0	38.27

Scenario 6

Process	Dimensions	Building costs [€]	investments [€]	Interest & depreciation [€/y]	Operation and maintenance [€/y]	energy [€/y]	chemicals [€/y]	Membrane replacement [€/y]	Filter [€/y]	Lamp [€/y]	[€/m ³]
Clean water buffer	2 m ³	946	1305	76	33						1.09
Raw water buffer (concrete pond)	20 m ³	2392	3302	192	83						2.75
Booster pump	0.01 m ³ /uur	931	1285	75	32	0					1.07
Bag filter 25 µm	0.19 m ²	568	784	46	20	0			17.6		0.83
Cartridge filter 5 µm	onbekend	116	160	9	4	1			7		0.21
Peroxide dosing	0.01 m ³ /uur	500	690	40	17	1	32				0.90
UV / H ₂ O ₂ AOP	0.01 m ³ /uur	190	263	15	7	120	2				1.43
Activated carbon filter	onbekend	137	189	11	5	1			17		0.33
pH correction	onbekend	58	81	5	2	1			58		0.66
Distribution pump	0.01 m ³ /uur	931	1285	75	32	0					1.07
Absolute filter	0.73 m ²	759	1047	61	26						0.87
Building	4 m ²	800	1104	64	28						0.92
Staff	1440 €/jaar										14.40
PLC	10000 €	10000	13800	804	345						11.49
Distribution pump		18329	25294	1473	632	123	33	0	99	0	38.02

Table S.2: comparison of composition of harvested rainwater and Malaysian [1] and Dutch drinking water standards [40]

parameter	unit	rainwater		Drinking water standards	
		Min.	Max.	Malaysia	The Netherlands
pH		3.10	11.40	6.5-9.0	7.0 – 9.5
Alkalinity	mg/L	0.50	61.00		
Hardness	mg/L	0.00	270.00	500.0	> 1 (mmol/L)
conductivity 25° C	µS/cm	3.00	1017.00		1250
Turbidity	NTU	0.20	303.50	5	4
Color	Mg/L Pt-Co	0.40	310.50	15.0	20
Total dissolved solids (TDS)	mg/L	1.00	750.00	1000.0	
Total suspended solids (TSS)	mg/L	1.00	153.00	*)	*0
Total solids (TS)	mg/L	20.00	200.00		
BOD	mg/L	0.00	3.00		
COD	mg/L	8.74	23.83		
TOC	mg/L	0.00	0.00	**)	**)
N	mg/L	0.45	1.92		
P	mg/L	0.21	50.00		
NH ₃ -N	mg/L	0.00	0.00	1.5	
NO ₃ ⁻ - N	mg/L	0.00	72.40	10.0	50
NO ₂ ⁻ - N	mg/L	0.00	2.45		0.1
Totaal N Kjeldhl	mg/L	0.00	0.00		
Dissolved O ₂ (DO)	mg/L	4.41	6.79		>2000
Al	µg/L	80.20	336.00	200	200
NH ₄ ⁺	µg/L	0.00	35400.00		200
As	µg/L	0.00	27.10	10.0	10
B	µg/L	11.00	56.00		500
Ba	µg/L	0.00	11.20		
Cd	µg/L	0.00	0.40	3.0	5
Ca	µg/L	0.00	31150.00		
Cr	µg/L	0.00	4.80	50.0	50
Cl ⁻	µg/L	0.00	164000.00	250000.0	150000
Cu	µg/L	1.10	4500.00	1000.0	2000
F	µg/L	0.00	1000.00	600.0	1000
Fe	µg/L	0.00	1390.00	300.0	200
Pb	µg/L	2.00	271.00	10.0	10
Mg	µg/L	0.00	9350.00	150000	
Mn	µg/L	0.50	533.0	100.0	50
Hg	µg/L	0.00	0.00	1.0	1
Ni	µg/L	0.00	12.20	20.0	20
K	µg/L	0.00	8730.00		
PO ₄ ³⁻ - P	µg/L	0.00	620.00		
Na	µg/L	0.00	32320.00	200000.0	150000
Zn	µg/L	0.50	3200.00	3000.0	3000

Table S.3: inorganic parameters in directly harvested rainwater (min., max., median), (min-max), (mean ± std. dev.)

Location	pH	Cl ⁻ (mg/L)	SO ₄ ²⁻ (mg/L)	NO ₂ ⁻ (mg N/L)	NO ₃ ⁻ (mg N/L)	Na ⁺ (mg/L)	sampler material	reference
Paris, city center	No data	0 - 140 - 2.5	0.2 - 65 - 3	0.01 - 0.33 - 0.04	0.1 - 38 - 2	0.1 - 81.5 - 1.4	PVC	[2]
Denizly, Turkey	6.66 - 7.645	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	PE	[3]
Izmir. Turkey	5.6 - 6.5	2.8 - 4.1	1.5 - 2.7	No data	0.9 - 1.7	1.4 - 2.0	Polycarbonate and HDPE	[4]
Caatinga. Brazil	4.59 - 7.16	1.0- 15.3	0.2- 4.9	No data	0.1- 1.8	0.3 - 7.3	PE	[5]
Srinagar. India	5.06 - 7.69 - 6.53	0.0 - 4.4 - 1.5	0.8 - 6.4 - 12.2	No data	1.8 - 15.8 - 8.5	0.4 - 2.5 -1.0	PE	[6]
Mohan. India	4.21 - 6.93 - 5.25	0.2 - 1.6 - 0.6	0.0 - 3.4 - 1.3	No data	0.0 - 11.2 - 4.0	0.0 - 2.0 - 0.4	PE	[6]
Jodhpur. India	5.36 - 8.20 - 6.91	1.3 - 19.1 - 4.8	0.5 - 12.2 - 4.5	No data	0.2 - 16.3 - 6.7	0.9 - 9.3 - 3.1	PE	[6]
Allahabad	3.67 - 7.61 - 5.99	0.3 - 3.7 - 1.7	0.5 - 14.4 - 2.9	No data	2.7 - 19.1 - 7.6	0.6 - 5.1 - 1.9	PE	[6]
Nagpur	3.84 - 6.89 - 5.41	0.2 - 3.1 - 1.4	0.1 - 9.4 - 2.5	No data	0.2 - 13.5 - 4.7	0.3 - 1.9 - 0.9	PE	[6]
Pune	5.32 - 7.21 - 6.03	1.0 - 4.5 - 2.2	0.6 - 3.1 - 1.6	No data	1.0 - 8.8 - 3.1	0.1 - 2.7 - 1.3	PE	[6]
Visakhapatnan	4.01 - 6.94 - 5.28	0.6 - 10.5 - 4.7	0.0 - 10.9 - 3.5	No data	0.6 - 19.3 - 8.2	1.2 - 8.6 - 4.3	PE	[6]
Port Blair	4.46 - 6.47 - 5.77	1.2 - 4.8 - 2.7	0.2 - 2.6 - 1.0	No data	0.2 - 6.3 - 1.7	0.9 - 2.4 - 1.7	PE	[6]
Kodaikanal	4.66 - 6.60 - 5.64	0.3 - 1.2 - 0.7	0.1 - 2.5 - 0.8	No data	0.0 - 3.0 - 1.0	0.1 - 1.4 - 0.5	PE	[6]
Minicoy	4.66 - 7.42 - 6.27	1.5 - 8.2 - 4.8	0.2 - 4.3 - 1.4	No data	0.3 - 5.7 - 2.1	1.5 - 5.7 - 3.0	PE	[6]

Table S.4: heavy metals in directly harvested rainwater (min.. max.. median). (min-max). (mean \pm std. dev.)

Location	Al (mg/L)	Cu (mg/L)	Pb (mg/L)	Zn (mg/L)	Fe (mg/L)	Sampler material	reference
Paris. city center	No data	0.002 - 0.0 - 0.0054	0.005 - 0.008 - 0.008	0.005 - 0.49 - 0.04	0.005 - 0.18 - 0.005	PVC	[2]
Denizly. Turkey	0.039 \pm 0.008	0.021 \pm 0.004	0.010 \pm 0.002	0.090 \pm 0.017	0.024 \pm 0.006	PE	[3]
Izmir. Turkey	0.085 - 0.129	0.008 - 0.010	0.005 - 0.007	0.019 - 0.032	0.057 - 0.114	PE	[4]

Table S.5: physico-chemical parameters in harvested rainwater (min.. max.. median). (min-max). (mean ± std. dev.) after first flush

Location	pH	Ec ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$)	Turbidity (NTU)	TOC (mg/L)	TH (mmol/L)	Sample	reference
Seine Maritime. France	6.9-8.9 7.1-8.7	117-188 119-197	0.8- 2.0 1.3	<0.0 3 <0.03	0.3-0.8 0.4-0.7	T PoU	[7]
Ain. France	4.5-6.5 4.2-6.4	10-32 18-31	0.7- 3.4 0.6-1.8	166- 8800 170- 3500	<0.08- 0.1 <0.05-0.1	T PoU	[7]
Île-de-France. France	1.2 1.2	32 24	1.7 1.2	1.5 0.1	0.04 0.04	T PoU	[7]
Rual Village. France (SW)	6.5 (5.6- 10.4)	56.2 (13.5- 235)	2.4(0.5- 6.1	2.3 (0.5- 5.1)	0.16 (<0.01- 0.58)	T	[8,9]
Sidney (4 sties). Australia	6.60±0.50	62.2±54. 5	2.96±6.1 6	No data	0.24±0.21	T	[10]
Seoul (3 tanks). Korea	7.04 (6.8-8.2) 8.71 (7.7-9.9) 8.56 (6.7- 9.7)	45 (42- 56) 88 (75- 109) 286 (152- 428)	3.4 (1.4- 10.8) 5.7 (0.41- 8.56) 4.90 (1.31-11)	No data	No data	T T T	[11]
Seoul. Korea	6.5 (6.3- 7.1) 7.3 (7.1- 7.6) 7.1 (6.7- 7.4) 6.0 (5.9- 6.3)	No data	No data	16 (13- 19) 10 (9- 12) 10 (8- 12) 2 (2-5)	No data	T.Wd T.Con T.Clay T.GSteel	[12]
Greece NE (6 sites)	6.75±0.4 6 6.64±0.5 8 6.99±0.5 7 6.65±0.5 1 6.63±0.4 9 6.76±0.63	63±31 68±20 143±2 5 37±10 46±22 31±13	No data	No data	0.26±0.0 9 0.36±0.1 3 0.48±0.1 1 0.21±0.1 0 0.27±0.1 2 0.27±0.11	T T T T T	[13]
Ballinabranna gh Ireland SE	7.21 (6.26- 8.21)	No data	1.11 (0.0- 4.60)	No data	0.35 (0.1- 0.6)	T	[14]
Exeter.UK	7.6-10.4	43.5-261	0.3-2.8	No data	0.16-0.27	T	[15]
UAB University Barcelona. Spain	7.59±0.07	85.0±10. 0	No data	11.6±1. 7	No data	T. 4 roofs	[16]

Austin. Texas USA	6.8	36.3	No data	11.7	No data	T.Asph	[17]
	6.5	25.5		4.8		T.AIZnS	
	7.6	74.5		6.1		tl	
	7.1	35.3		6.5		T.ConT	
	7.3	235.3		25.5		T.Bit T.Green	
Texas	8.7 - 9.3	No data	0.6 - 3	1 - 10	No data	1	[18]
	6.2 - 6.5		0.3 - 0.6	1.6 -		2	
	6.5 - 8.0		0.2 - 0.5	2.4		3	
	6.7		0.2 - 0.5	0.1 - 1		4	
	6.5 - 6.8		0.4 - 0.5	0.4 - 1		5	
	6.6 - 6.8		5 - 15	0 - 0.5 7 - 19		6	

¹T = Tank; PoU = Point of Use; T.Wd = Tank. water collected at wood tile roof. T.Con = Tank. water collected at Concrete roof; T.Clay = Tank. water collected at clay tile roof; T.GSteel = Tank. water collected at galvanised steel roof; T.Asph = Tank. water collected at asphalt shingle roof; T.AIZnStl = Tank. water collected at Aluminium-zinc coated steel. T.ConT = Tank. water collected at concrete tile roof; T.it = Tank. water collected from bituminous cool roof. T.Green = Tank. water collected at unfertilized green roof.

² All samples taken from water stored after first flush

- 1 Galvalume roof. aluminum gutter. cistern coated with fiberglass
- 2 Idem
- 3 Galvalume roof. PVC gutter. cistern coated with fiberglass
- 4 Galvalume roof. galvalume gutter. cistern coated with fiberglass
- 5 Galvalume roof. aluminum gutter. cistern coated with polyethylene
- 6 Asphalt fiberglass shingle. PVC gutter. cistern coated with fiberglass

Table S.6: inorganic parameters in harvested rainwater (min.. max.. median). (min-max). (mean \pm std. dev.) after first flush

Location	Cl ⁻ (mg/L)	SO ₄ ²⁻ (mg/L)	NO ₂ ⁻ (mg N/L)	NO ₃ ⁻ (mg N/L)	Na ⁺ (mg/L)	Sample	reference
Texas	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	1 2 3 4 5 6	[18]
Seoul. Korea	No data	0.1-1.5 0.1-0.8 0.1-0.5 0.0-0.1	No data	0.06 0.06 0.02 0.00	No data	T.Wd T.Co n T.Cla y T.GSteel	[12]
Greece NE (6 sites)	7.29 \pm 3.9 7 5.05 \pm 2.9 3 4.16 \pm 2.8 1 3.54 \pm 2.2 5 3.48 \pm 3.2 8 3.61 \pm 2.2 8	10.65 \pm 3.1 4 13.56 \pm 4.3 4 15.70 \pm 6.4 3 8.28 \pm 2.69 8.84 \pm 5.31 10.25 \pm 3.9 8	0.08 \pm 0.10 0.05 \pm 0.12 0.05 \pm 0.10 0.03 \pm 0.07 0.04 \pm 0.10 0.01 \pm 0.02	0.83 \pm 0.71 0.84 \pm 0.71 0.58 \pm 0.52 0.71 \pm 0.57 0.66 \pm 0.51 0.58 \pm 0.55	5.15 \pm 2.0 8 4.42 \pm 1.5 7 6.91 \pm 1.9 0 3.26 \pm 1.8 9 3.78 \pm 2.1 4 4.15 \pm 1.7 7	T T T T T T	[13]
Ballinabrannagh Ireland SE	5.06 (1.50- 22.49)	7.50 (0.0- 31.7)	0.01 (0.0- 0.15)	0.33 (0.0- 0.64)	4.60 (0.0- 8.6)	T	[14]
Exeter.UK	3-28	No data	<0.01-0.22	1.32-17.74	2.8-4.3	T	[15]
UAB University Barcelona. Spain	8.86 \pm 2.3 8	3.54 \pm 0.39	0.040 \pm 0.01 5	0.395 \pm 0.05 9	No data	T. 4 roofs	[16]
Austin. Texas USA	No data	No data	0.03 0.02 0.03 0.02 0.03	1.0 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.5	No data	T.Asph T.AIZnSt l T.ConT T.Bit T.Green	[17]

¹T = Tank; PoU = Point of Use; T.Wd = Tank. water collected at wood tile roof. T.Con = Tank. water collected at Concrete roof; T.Clay = Tank. water collected at clay tile roof; T.GSteel = Tank. water collected at galvanised steel roof; T.Asph = Tank. water collected at asphalt shingle roof; T.AIZnStl = Tank. water collected at Aluminium-zinc coated steel. T.ConT = Tank. water collected at concrete tile roof; T.it = Tank. water collected from bituminous cool roof. T.Green = Tank. water collected at unfertilized green roof.

² All samples taken from water stored after first flush

Table S.7: heavy metals in harvested rainwater (min.. max.. median). (min-max). (mean \pm std. dev.) after first flush

Location	Al (mg/L)	Cu (mg/L)	Pb (mg/L)	Zn (mg/L)	Fe (mg/L)	Sample	reference
Texas	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	1 2 3 4 5 6	[18]
Sidney (4 sties). Australia	0.115 \pm 0.14 3	0.221 \pm 0.29 4	0.011 \pm 0.01 3	2.63 \pm 2. 2	No data	T	[10]
Seoul. Korea	0.043 0.099 0.036 0.033	0.009 0.012 0.015 0.016	0.003 0.005 0.003 0.003	0.018 0.038 0.019 0.074	0.023 0.048 0.024 0.027	T.Wd T.Co n T.Cla y T.GSteel	[12]
Ballinabrannagh Ireland SE	No data	No data	0.002(0.0- 0.025)	No data	0.022(0.0 -0.095)	T	[14]
Exeter.UK	0.080-0.108	0.218-0.290	0.026-0.064	0.193- 0.480	0.009- 0.027	T	[15]
Austin. Texas USA	0.36 0.31 0.48 0.46 0.21	0.035 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	0.001 0.001 0.003 0.001 0.004	0.045 0.186 0.135 0.105 0.345	0.262 0.244 0.349 0.349 0.070	T.Asph T.ALZnSt l T.ConT T.Bit T.Green	[17]

¹T = Tank; PoU = Point of Use; T.Wd = Tank. water collected at wood tile roof. T.Con = Tank. water collected at Concrete roof; T.Clay = Tank. water collected at clay tile roof; T.GSteel = Tank. water collected at galvanised steel roof; T.Asph = Tank. water collected at asphalt shingle roof; T.ALZnStl = Tank. water collected at Aluminium-zinc coated steel. T.ConT = Tank. water collected at concrete tile roof; T.it = Tank. water collected from bituminous cool roof. T.Green = Tank. water collected at unfertilized green roof.

² All samples taken from water stored after first flush

Table S.8: microbiological parameters in harvested rainwater (min.. max.. median). (min-max). (mean ± std. dev.) after first flush

Location	Total/faecal coliforms (N/100 ml)	E. coli (N/100 ml)	Enterococci (N/100 ml)	PC22°/PC37°C N/ml	Sample	reference
Texas*)	<1	<1	<1	<1 - 300	1	[18]
	400 - 2000	<1 - 25	<1 - 500	3.1E5 - 1E7	2	
	<1 - 3	<1	1 - 13	6300 - 31600	3	
	2- 400	<1	<1 - 30	10.000 - 100.000	4	
	30 - 130	<1 - 1	<1 - 40	10.000 - 60.000	5	
	6 - 630	<1 - 125	3 - 500	1E5 - 3 E6	6	
Seine Maritime. France	30-1.800/— and illegilble results	No data	No data	56-480/40-450 and illegilble results	T PoU	[7]
Ain. France	<30-230/— 12-92/—	No data	No data	133-8.800/3-10.400 170-3.500/6-5.000	T PoU	[7]
Île-de-France. France	1200/— 1200/—	No data	No data	>100/400 >100/250	T PoU	[7]
Rual Village. France (SW)	40 (<10- >10.000)	2 (<10- 5.500)	45(<10- >10.000)	10-632.000/25-368.000	T	[8,9]
Sidney (4 sites). Australia	426/77	11	12	No data	T	[10]
Seoul. Korea	12/—	1	Not detected	No data	T.Wd	[12]
	12/—	2	detected		T.Con	
	2/—	<1	Not detected		T.Clay	
	<1/—	0	detected		T.GSteel	
Greece NE (6 sites)	0-7750/—	5-200	No data	103-104/103-104	T	[13]
	0-3250/—	0-3		30-100/240-104	T	
	0-2800/—	0-2		20-30/8-60	T	
	0-2050/—	—		—	T	
	0-1600/—	—		—	T	
	0-4700/—	—		—	T	
Austin. Texas USA	540/28.1	No data	No data	No data	T.Asph	[17]
	440/1.9				T.AlZnStl	
	780/4.7				T.ConT	
	530/10.8				T.Bit	
	50/4.7				T.Green	

¹T = Tank; PoU = Point of Use; T.Wd = Tank. water collected at wood tile roof. T.Con = Tank. water collected at Concrete roof; T.Clay = Tank. water collected at clay tile roof; T.GSteel = Tank. water collected at galvanised steel roof; T.Asph = Tank. water collected at asphalt shingle roof; T.AlZnStl = Tank. water collected at Aluminium-zinc coated steel. T.ConT = Tank. water collected at concrete tile roof; T.it = Tank. water collected from bituminous cool roof. T.Green = Tank. water collected at unfertilized green roof.

² All samples taken from water stored after first flush

Table S.9: use of drinking water in the Netherlands in L/person/day in 2016 [19]

Bath	1.9
Shower	49.2
Sink	5.2
Toilet flushing	34.6
Laundry	15.4
Dish washing	6.0
Food	1.2
Drinks	1.3
other	4.5

References Supplementary Information

- Dallman, S.; Chaudhry, A.M.; Muleta, M.K.; Lee, J. The Value of Rain: Benefit-Cost Analysis of Rainwater Harvesting Systems. *Water Resources Management* **2016**, *30*, 4415-4428, doi:10.1007/s11269-016-1429-0.
- Beysens, D.; Mongruel, A.; Acker, K. Urban dew and rain in Paris, France: Occurrence and physico-chemical characteristics. *Atmospheric Research* **2017**, *189*, 152-161, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2017.01.013.
- Cukurluoglu, S. Sources of trace elements in wet deposition in Pamukkale, Denizli, western Turkey. *Environmental Forensics* **2017**, *18*, 83-99, doi:10.1080/15275922.2016.1263899.
- Yatkin, S.; Adali, M.; Bayram, A. A study on the precipitation in Izmir, Turkey: chemical composition and source apportionment by receptor models. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* **2016**, *73*, 241-259, doi:10.1007/s10874-015-9325-1.
- Deusdará, K.R.L.; Forti, M.C.; Borma, L.S.; Menezes, R.S.C.; Lima, J.R.S.; Ometto, J.P.H.B. Rainwater chemistry and bulk atmospheric deposition in a tropical semiarid ecosystem: the Brazilian Caatinga. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* **2017**, *74*, 71-85, doi:10.1007/s10874-016-9341-9.
- Bhaskar, V.V.; Rao, P.S.P. Annual and decadal variation in chemical composition of rain water at all the ten GAW stations in India. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* **2017**, *74*, 23-53, doi:10.1007/s10874-016-9339-3.
- De Gouvello, B.; Nguyen-Deroche, N.; Lucas, F.; Gromaire, M.C. A methodological strategy to analyze and improve the French rainwater harvesting regulation in relation to quality. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2013**, *67*, 1043-1050, doi:10.2166/wst.2013.664.
- Vialle, C.; Sablayrolles, C.; Lovera, M.; Huau, M.C.; Jacob, S.; Montrejaud-Vignoles, M. Water Quality Monitoring and Hydraulic Evaluation of a Household Roof Runoff Harvesting System in France. *Water Resources Management* **2012**, *26*, 2233-2241, doi:10.1007/s11269-012-0012-6.
- Vialle, C.; Sablayrolles, C.; Lovera, M.; Jacob, S.; Huau, M.C.; Montrejaud-Vignoles, M. Monitoring of water quality from roof runoff: Interpretation using multivariate analysis. *Water Res.* **2011**, *45*, 3765-3775, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2011.04.029.
- Van Der Sterren, M.; Rahman, A.; Dennis, G.R. Quality and quantity monitoring of five rainwater tanks in Western Sydney, Australia. *J. Environ. Eng.* **2013**, *139*, 332-340, doi:10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0000614.
- Amin, T.; Han, M.Y. Microbial quality variation within a rainwater storage tank and the effects of first flush in Rainwater Harvesting (RWH) system. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences* **2011**, *5*, 1804-1813.
- Lee, J.Y.; Bak, G.; Han, M. Quality of roof-harvested rainwater – Comparison of different roofing materials. *Environ. Pollut.* **2012**, *162*, 422-429, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2011.12.005.
- Gikas, G.D.; Tsihrintzis, V.A. Assessment of water quality of first-flush roof runoff and harvested rainwater. *Journal of Hydrology* **2012**, *466-467*, 115-126, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.08.020.
- O'Hogain, S.; McCarton, L.; McIntyre, N.; Pender, J.; Reid, A. Physicochemical and microbiological quality of water from a pilot domestic rainwater harvesting facility in Ireland. *Water and Environment Journal* **2011**, *25*, 489-494, doi:10.1111/j.1747-6593.2010.00244.x.
- Ward, S.; Memon, F.A.; Butler, D. Harvested rainwater quality: The importance of appropriate design. *Water Sci. Technol.* **2010**, *61*, 1707-1714, doi:10.2166/wst.2010.102.

16. Farreny, R.; Morales-Pinzón, T.; Guisasola, A.; Tayà, C.; Rieradevall, J.; Gabarrell, X. Roof selection for rainwater harvesting: Quantity and quality assessments in Spain. *Water Res.* **2011**, *45*, 3245-3254, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2011.03.036.
17. Mendez, C.B.; Klenzendorf, J.B.; Afshar, B.R.; Simmons, M.T.; Barrett, M.E.; Kinney, K.A.; Kirisits, M.J. The effect of roofing material on the quality of harvested rainwater. *Water Res.* **2011**, *45*, 2049-2059, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2010.12.015.
18. Kim, T.; Lye, D.; Donohue, M.; Mistry, J.H.; Pfaller, S.; Vesper, S.; Kirisits, M.J. Harvested rainwater quality before and after treatment and distribution in residential systems. *J Am Water Works Assoc* **2016**, *108*, E571-E584, doi:10.5942/jawwa.2016.108.0182.
19. Vewin. Water supply statistics 2017 (in Dutch: Drinkwaterstatistieken 2017). Available online: <http://www.vewin.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/Publicaties/Cijfers/Drinkwaterstatistieken-2017-NL.pdf> (accessed on 8 August 2018).