

Practitioner Input Form
Submitted: 15/02/2005

Input Record Number	002
Name	Stephen Merrett
Contact Information	Water Resource Economics and Management 43 Anson Road LONDON N7 0AR Tel: +44 (0)20 7 6091013 Fax: +44 (0)20 7 6098648 Email: steve@tufpark.demon.co.uk
Organisation(s) Involved	EBRD, IPA Energy, Arkhangelske Vodakanal.
Geographic Area	Russia, City of Arkhangelsk
Dates	June-September 2005
Communities Involved	Population of Arkhangelsk = 350,000 people
Duties and Responsibilities/ Purpose of Project	Project is to rehabilitate the water utility of the city, which is in a decrepit state. EBRD will finance part of the rehab costs and the Nordic Environment Programme the rest. Total cost approx. 30 million euros. 10 of this as grants.
Context of Intervention	As above

Practitioner Reflective Case Study

Input Record Number	002RCS Stephen Merrett
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="240 342 1300 416">1) The great majority of the population of Arkhangelsk are poor, so they would benefit if the project is successful. So it is financial and technological.<li data-bbox="240 454 1257 528">2) Movement is slow, but it is likely to be completed within two years if the loans/grants are spent effectively.<li data-bbox="240 566 1329 674">3) Success and failure will be judged in terms of reduction in water leakage and a very great improvement in water quality (currently carcinogenic!), plus improved service levels.<li data-bbox="240 712 1342 819">4) Availability of finance and the capacity of the borrower (the utility) to repay the loan at EBRD rates. This requires a huge % increase in the price of water from a tiny start level.	

Practitioner Input – Part II

Input Record Number	002II Stephen Merrett
9)	I cannot speak for EBRD and IPA Energy. For the former, the confirmation that water utilities in Russia, possibly with Oblast backing, can repay loans.
10)	Access is close to universal. But in a small survey we discovered that the very poorest households, probably less than 1% of the population, are off-network, and use standpipes. This water too will be improved.
11)	An ex-post survey would be extremely valuable if it showed how people's use of water changed (shifting from purchase of bottled and container water for cooking and drinking). As well, a comparison before and after of delivered water quality..
12)	None is necessary. For a networked population accessing poor water quality, the benefits to the poor of better water quality is evident.
13)	No.