



The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan  
Ministry of Water and Irrigation



Millennium Challenge Corporation

# PREPARATION OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR ZARQA GOVERNORATE WATER SYSTEM RESTRUCTURING AND REHABILITATION

## FEASIBILITY STUDY



May 2010



Nicholas O'Dwyer  
CONSULTING ENGINEERS



AMMAN CONSULTING  
Engineering and Planning Office

**THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN  
MINISTRY OF WATER AND IRRIGATION**

**WATER AUTHORITY OF JORDAN**

**PREPARATION OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL  
AND SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR ZARQA GOVERNORATE  
WATER SYSTEM RESTRUCTURING AND REHABILITATION**

**FEASIBILITY STUDY**

**Nicholas O'Dwyer Ltd.  
Consulting Engineers  
Nutgrove Office Park  
Nutgrove Avenue  
Dublin 14.  
(NOD)**

**Amman Consulting  
Engineering and Planning Office  
Abdullah Bin Abbas St  
Shmeisani  
Amman 11190  
(ACEPO)**

**May 2010**

<b>PROJECT NO. 20445</b>					
<b>Revision</b>	<b>Reason for Revision</b>	<b>Prepared by</b>	<b>Reviewed by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>	<b>Issue Date</b>
-	First Issue - Draft	T. Cuddy	M. McArdle	J. Cronin	04/03/10
A	Issue for Approval	T. Cuddy	M. McArdle	J. Cronin	20/05/10

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**1. INTRODUCTION ..... 1**  
**2. PROJECT COSTS ..... 2**  
    2.1 Capital Costs ..... 2  
    2.2 Operating and Maintenance Costs ..... 2  
    2.3 Beneficiaries and Unit Costs ..... 2  
**3. ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT..... 5**  
**4. SOCIO ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT AND BENEFICIARY ANALYSIS ..... 8**  
**5. ECONOMIC RATE OF RETURN (ERR) ..... 9**  
**6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 10**

**TABLES**

Table 2-1 - Summary IMP Cost Estimate ..... 3  
Table 2-2 – Beneficiary Populations of IMP and PIP project areas ..... 4

**APPENDICES**

- APPENDIX 1 – NOTICE TO PROCEED**
- APPENDIX 2 – ECONOMIC ANALYSIS**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

**1.1** On 13<sup>th</sup> October 2009, Nicholas O'Dwyer Ltd and ACEPO were appointed by the Ministry of Water and Irrigation to proceed with the Consultancy Services for the Preparation of the Feasibility Study and Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for Zarqa Governorate Water System Restructuring and Rehabilitation. A copy of the Notice to Proceed is contained in Appendix 1.

**1.2** The Terms of Reference for the project provide for the preparation of three linked reports on the restructuring and rehabilitation of the water supply system in the Zarqa Governorate. These are :

- 1. Investment Master Plan**
- 2. Priority Investment Programme**
- 3. Feasibility Study – this document**

In the preparation of this report – the **Feasibility Study** – a detailed examination of economic benefits of the proposed Restructuring and Rehabilitation project was undertaken. These benefits were then assessed against the schemes costs in order to derive an Economic Rate of Return for the overall project and for the prioritised projects on an individual basis in accordance with the MCC Guidelines for Economic and Beneficiary Analysis. The Investment Master Plan is submitted as a separate document.

The **Priority Investment Programme** which is compiled as a separate document contains details of the selection criteria for project prioritisation and set outs a list of the prioritised projects.

**1.3** This report contains a total of 6 sections. Section 2 provides details of project costs which were determined as part of the Investment Master Plan and the Priority Investment Programme. Section 3 contains the detailed Economic Analysis. The review of the Beneficiary Analysis is contained in Section 4 and Section 5 contains the Economic Rate of Return Assessment (ERR). Section 6 contains our Conclusion Statements and Recommendations.

## **2. PROJECT COSTS**

### **2.1 Capital Costs**

The cost estimates for the projects set out in the Investment Master Plan (IMP) Schedules of Works in Section 8 of the IMP document are set out in Table 2.1 overleaf. The cost estimates associated with the specific projects identified in the Priority Investment Programme (PIP) are also summarised in Table 2.1 as the Phase 1 (MCC) projects.

### **2.2 Operating and Maintenance Costs**

At the present time, as noted in Section 2.7 of the IMP document, the revenue obtained by Zarqa Water Affairs is unable to cover its operational costs. In the year 2007, there was a deficit of JD 3.75m or a recovery ratio of only 74%. In relation to water supply, a loss of JD 1.06m was recorded. The major areas of expenditure were water import and energy costs.

The proposed restructuring and rehabilitation project will significantly reduce the excessive quantity of unaccounted for and non-revenue water in the existing system, leading to significant reductions in the costs of water importation and pumping energy. Accordingly, for the purposes of the economic study we have assumed that, in the future, the Zarqa Governorate will be in a position to fully recover its operational costs through its revenue collection systems.

### **2.3 Beneficiaries and Unit Costs**

The current populations of the areas which will benefit from the IMP and PIP projects are set out in Table 2.2 overleaf, together with the unit cost per beneficiary of the project investment.

	Strategic Infra.	Water Supply Area (WSA)									Total Cost
		Azraq	Dulail	King Abdullah City	Tatweer	Zarqa	Awajan	Russaifah	North	West-NW	
<b>Phase 1 (MCC)</b>											
Primary Network	1,984,000	-	-	-	1,664,031	3,616,787	8,182,192	1,614,147	-	-	17,061,156
Secondary Network	-	-	-	-	1,412,292	7,152,275	8,026,195	5,197,827	-	-	21,788,589
Tertiary Network	-	-	-	-	1,038,827	16,268,506	12,983,065	6,340,053	-	-	36,630,451
<b>Sum</b>	<b>1,984,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>4,115,150</b>	<b>27,037,567</b>	<b>29,191,452</b>	<b>13,152,026</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>75,480,195</b>
<b>Phase 1 (TBD)</b>											
Primary Network	5,120,729	-	86,800	-	-	813,676	-	3,766,342	-	-	9,787,546
Secondary Network	-	-	2,326,919	-	-	-	-	12,128,262	7,843,329	5,085,722	27,384,232
Tertiary Network	-	125,121	5,481,260	-	-	-	-	14,793,456	4,161,569	4,442,093	29,003,500
<b>Sum</b>	<b>5,120,729</b>	<b>125,121</b>	<b>7,894,980</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>813,676</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>30,688,060</b>	<b>12,004,898</b>	<b>9,527,815</b>	<b>66,175,279</b>
<b>Phase 2.</b>											
Primary Network	29,811,513	876,516	6,862,552	3,145,012	-	5,319,600	8,622,030	11,926,148	3,028,248	4,427,274	74,018,893
Secondary Network	-	-	-	-	80,476	-	-	-	-	-	80,476
Tertiary Network	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sum</b>	<b>29,811,513</b>	<b>876,516</b>	<b>6,862,552</b>	<b>3,145,012</b>	<b>80,476</b>	<b>5,319,600</b>	<b>8,622,030</b>	<b>11,926,148</b>	<b>3,028,248</b>	<b>4,427,274</b>	<b>74,099,369</b>
<b>Phase 3.</b>											
Primary Network	32,725,932	-	334,476	-	-	740,652	-	-	1,337,972	1,844,364	36,983,397
Secondary Network	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tertiary Network	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sum</b>	<b>32,725,932</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>334,476</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>740,652</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,337,972</b>	<b>1,844,364</b>	<b>36,983,397</b>
<b>Total</b>											
Primary Network	69,642,174	876,516	7,283,829	3,145,012	1,664,031	10,490,714	16,804,222	17,306,636	4,366,220	6,271,638	137,850,992
Secondary Network	-	-	2,326,919	-	1,492,768	7,152,275	8,026,195	17,326,089	7,843,329	5,085,722	49,253,297
Tertiary Network	-	125,121	5,481,260	-	1,038,827	16,268,506	12,983,065	21,133,509	4,161,569	4,442,093	65,633,951
<b>Sum</b>	<b>69,642,174</b>	<b>1,001,637</b>	<b>15,092,008</b>	<b>3,145,012</b>	<b>4,195,626</b>	<b>33,911,495</b>	<b>37,813,482</b>	<b>55,766,234</b>	<b>16,371,118</b>	<b>15,799,454</b>	<b>252,738,240</b>

Phase 1 Works: Required for immediate upgrading of network. Will have immediate benefit, and will have structure and capacity for 2030 demand levels

Phase 2 Works: Required for improvement of network, Will be necessary for secure long term operation of the system with structure and capacity to 2030 demand levels even without additional inflows of water to the system.

Phase 3 Works: Additional works required to meet 2030 demands, as demand and flows grow with increasing population.

**Table 2-1 - Summary IMP Cost Estimate**

Population 2008 and 2030											
	Strategic Infrastructure	Water Supply Area (WSA)									Total
		Azraq	Dulail	King Abdullah City	Tatweer	Zarqa	Awajan	Russaifah	North	West-NW	
Population with Water Supply 2008		7,396	37,790	-	8,501	283,526	149,171	303,448	51,629	12,864	854,325
Projected Population with Water Supply 2030		10,154	55,329	436,008	16,888	399,586	225,680	450,472	76,008	19,874	1,690,000
Full Investment Master Plan (IMP) Projects											
Beneficiaries 2008	854,325	7,396	37,790	-	8,501	283,526	149,171	303,448	51,629	12,864	854,325
Unit cost per Beneficiary	82	135	399	-	494	120	253	184	317	1,228	296
Priority Investment Programme (PIP) Projects											
Beneficiaries 2008	854,325	-	-	-	8,501	226,821	149,171	91,034	-	-	475,527
Unit cost per Beneficiary	2	-	-	-	484	119	196	144	-	-	159

Table 2-2 – Beneficiary Populations of IMP and PIP project areas

### **3. ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT**

- 3.1** An economic model has been constructed in order to assess the costs and benefits of the proposed IMP and PIP projects. The structure of the model, including the determination of parameters and methods of calculation, has been developed in consultation with MCC economic advisors. The input data for the model has been obtained from the population, water demand, engineering and cost estimate analyses set out in the IMP, the prioritisation analysis set out in the PIP, the socio-economic and beneficiaries analysis set out in the MCA Beneficiaries Study (Ecoconsult April 2010), and the WAJ data records in relation to customer water use, water tariffs, billing revenue and expenditure.
- 3.2** To assess the economic rate of return (ERR) a cost benefit analysis (CBA) model has been developed on an excel spreadsheet. Two versions of the model have been prepared, one for the overall IMP projects, and one for the PIP, MCC priority projects. The model has 6 worksheets (Appendix 2).
- 3.3** In the "Soceon" worksheet, the socio-economic analysis is conducted using Household Expenditure and Income Survey (HEIS) (2006 and 2008) data. By using the purchasing power parity (PPP) exchange rate to convert dollars to JD and based on the HEIS data, it is estimated that in the Zarqa Governorate 5.60% of households (HHs) earn less than \$2 per day, 29.65% earn \$2-4 per day, and 64.76% earn > \$4 per day.
- 3.4** In the "wcon" worksheet, the current consumption patterns in terms of the following three types of water – network, tanker and shop water- are analysed (step 2) as a basis to develop a baseline model of water consumption and expenditure (step 3). This leads to the creation of 20 tables (without project) and 20 tables (with project) to assess water supply and consumption patterns in years 1-20 (2010-2029) of the project. This worksheet is central and electronically feeds into the worksheets "hsehold", "heli", and "prod", which in turn feeds into worksheet "CBA" which contains a summary of the cost benefit analysis.
- 3.5** Central to the model are the input variables. They relate to consumption patterns of the three different types of water (network, tanker and shop), average size of HH, price of different types of water, the size of the target population, annual growth rate, size of unaccounted for water (UFW) with and without the project , and the reduction in the consumption of shop water with project as a percentage.



It is assumed that consumers will switch away from tanker water if their needs are sufficiently satisfied with the additional network water generated by the reduction of UFW. The switching from shop water to the additional network water depends very much on the quality of the additional network water as shop water is usually devoted to drinking and cooking, and hence quality is a factor.

The forty tables of the "wcon" worksheet depend on the values of the above input variables. The tables monitor:

- <i> changes in water consumption patterns with and without the project for year 2010-2029;
- <ii> changes in population size,
- <iii> changes in the demand for water; and
- <iv> the extent to which WAJ will have to purchase additional water (see box "deficit") in order to main HHs at current levels of consumption in the "without project" scenario. In the "with project" context the figures in box "deficit" have a negative sign indicating consumption levels above current consumption level, in other words it is a measure of the quantity of the additional water.

**3.6** In the worksheet "hsehold", the total quantities of water (network, tanker and shop) are shown without and with project and over years 2010-2029. In addition the worksheet estimates the savings HHs gain from switching from tanker and shop water when faced when increased supply of network water over the twenty years of the life of the proposed project.

To proceed with the beneficiary analysis, it is necessary to reach an agreement on the quantities of water consumed across the three socio-economic categories and the three different water types.

**3.7** Worksheet "heli" analyses the unequal distribution of network water and water expenditure patterns. Worksheet "heli" also analyses the gains in health if those domestic consumers now consuming less than 50 lcd of network water are given access to 60 lcd of network water. The analysis depends on the Health and Environment Linkages Initiative (HELI): Jordan Pilot of June 2005. The "with project" scenario is analysed where water is more evenly distributed between group 1 (consumers formerly consuming less than 50 lcd) and group 2 (consumers formerly consuming more than 50lcd) as there are gains in a more equal distribution across HHs.

**3.8** In worksheet "prod" the unit costs of network water production are estimated in both the "without project" scenario (rows ) and "with project" as well as the opportunity cost to WAJ if there is no investment. WAJ will be faced with supplying increased demand due to population increase if current consumption patterns of water are to be maintained; and WAJ would forego the benefit of additional supplies above the increased demand generated by population growth at current consumption levels.

#### **4. SOCIO ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT AND BENEFICIARY ANALYSIS**

- 4.1** The analysis of the socio-economic breakdown is conducted in worksheet "socecon"; and the figures have been given above. Conservative assumptions are made about the water consumption apportionment across the three different water types and across the three socio-economic categories.

## **5. ECONOMIC RATE OF RETURN (ERR)**

- 5.1** The CBA model for the projects set out in the IMP generates an ERR of 20% if no allowance is made for WAJ investment costs which are likely to occur in any event to maintain the existing infrastructure in its current condition, and 26% if allowance is made for these costs. A sensitivity analysis is included in the model, which indicates that the ERR could be as low as 15% if no allowance is made for costs which are likely to occur in any event and if costs increase by 10% and benefits decrease by 10%.
- 5.2** The CBA model for the MCC priority projects set out in the PIP generates a higher ERR than for the full set of IMP projects. The ERR is 22% if no allowance is made for WAJ investment costs which are likely to occur in any event to maintain the existing infrastructure in its current condition, and 29% if allowance is made for these costs.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1** The CBA model for the Investment Master Plan generates an ERR of 20% - 26%, depending on whether allowance is made for WAJ investment costs which are likely to occur in any event to maintain the existing infrastructure in its current condition.
- 6.2** The CBA model for the MCC priority projects set out in the PIP generates a higher ERR of 22% - 29%.

---

**APPENDIX 1 – NOTICE TO PROCEED**

---



MINISTRY OF WATER AND IRRIGATION  
Water Authority

Ref: 7/2/12639  
Date: 12/10/2009

Nicholas O'Dwyer Consulting Engineers Ltd.  
And Amman Consulting Engineering and  
Planning Office

Project : Consultancy Services for preparation of the feasibility study and  
environmental and social impact assessment for Zarqa Governate  
Water System Restructuring and rehabilitation .

Subject : Central Tender No. 67/2009 "Notice to Proceed , "

Dear Mr. Richard Crowe ,

Reference to the awarding decision, please be informed that the notice to proceed for  
contract No. 67/2009 will be 13<sup>th</sup>.October 2009 .

Minister of Water and Irrigation /WAJ

Eng. Raed Abu Soud

Cc : MCA / Jordan

Cc : Secretary General / WAJ

Cc : Project Manager for P1-B

Cc : File No. (13/1)

h/h/notice to proceed/l

THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN  
TEL: +962 6 5680100/5683100 - FAX : +962 6 5679143 - P.O.Box:5012 AMMAN 11181 JORDAN - WWW.WAJ.GOV.JO

---

**APPENDIX 2 – ECONOMIC ANALYSIS**

---



## Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Full List of IMP Projects. Work-sheet "Socecon"

### Step 1

Step 1 ascertains the percentage of households that belong to the key socio-economic groupings of the TOR, namely, <\$ 2, \$2 - \$4, and >\$4. PPP exchange rates for the USA \$1 (2005) are used (see the Global Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditure: 2005 International Comparison Program, IBRD World Bank 2008)

Income per capita per day (\$)	Income per capita per day (JOD)	Annual income per capita (JOD)	Mean nr per household	Annual income per household (JOD)	Monthly income per household (JOD)																	
2	0.7600	365	277	6	1,664	139																
4	1.5200	365	555	6	3,329	277																
PPP exchange rate US\$ 1= .38 JOD		1																				
Income per capita per day (\$)	Annual income per household (JOD)	Zarqa Governorate.....		Zarqa sub-district.....		Ruseifa sub-district.....		Berein sub-district.....		Hashameer sub-district.....		Dhilail sub-district.....		Ashraq sub-district.....								
< 2	<1664	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)							
Between 2-4	Between 1664-3329	32.3%	38.5%	27.0%	32.1%	40.6%	48.5%	37.2%	41.0%	22.4%	26.5%	39.3%	47.3%	38.0%	52.7%							
> 4	>3329	61.5%	100.0%	67.9%	100.0%	51.5%	100.0%	59.0%	100.0%	73.5%	100.0%	52.7%	100.0%	47.3%	100.0%							
		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%								
Income Groups 2006 (JOD per annum)		Zarqa Governorate .....		Zarqa sub-district.....		Ruseifa sub-district.....		Berein sub-district.....		Hashameer sub-district.....		Dhilail sub-district.....		Ashraq sub-district.....								
		Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households							
		(cumulative)		(cumulative)		(cumulative)		(cumulative)		(cumulative)		(cumulative)		(cumulative)								
<u>Low income group</u>	<	1,800	9,786	6.7%	4,208	5.5%	5.5%	4,492	8.5%	8.5%	88	4.1%	4.1%	382	4.4%	4.4%	382	8.6%	8.6%	235	15.9%	15.9%
64.4%	1,800	2,400	14,742	10.1%	16,880	7.5%	12.9%	7,563	14.3%	22.8%	280	13.0%	17.1%	545	6.3%	10.7%	822	8.6%	17.3%	236	15.9%	31.8%
	2,400	3,000	21,634	14.8%	31,500	12.1%	25.0%	9,865	18.7%	41.5%	281	13.0%	30.1%	1,168	13.5%	24.3%	822	18.5%	35.8%	238	16.1%	47.9%
	3,000	3,600	18,549	12.7%	44,200	12.9%	37.9%	6,770	12.8%	54.3%	427	19.8%	49.9%	352	4.1%	28.3%	927	20.9%	56.7%	130	8.8%	56.7%
	3,600	4,200	16,389	11.2%	55,400	10.8%	48.7%	6,572	12.4%	66.7%	426	19.8%	69.7%	541	6.3%	34.6%	475	10.7%	67.4%	98	6.6%	63.3%
	4,200	4,800	13,228	9.0%	64,400	9.8%	58.5%	3,863	7.3%	74.0%	238	11.0%	80.7%	1,177	13.6%	48.2%	278	6.3%	73.7%	93	6.3%	69.6%
<u>Midle income group</u>	4,800	5,400	11,578	7.9%	72,300	9.0%	67.5%	3,265	6.2%	80.2%	139	6.5%	87.2%	741	8.6%	56.8%	463	10.4%	84.1%	58	3.9%	73.5%
28.4%	5,400	6,000	7,386	5.0%	77,400	5.6%	73.1%	2,083	3.9%	84.2%	44	2.0%	89.2%	569	6.6%	63.4%	288	6.5%	90.6%	96	6.5%	80.0%
	6,000	7,000	11,141	7.6%	85,000	8.2%	81.3%	3,220	6.1%	90.3%	0	0.0%	89.2%	1,315	15.2%	78.6%	201	4.5%	95.2%	134	9.1%	89.1%
	7,000	8,000	6,365	4.3%	89,300	4.3%	86.8%	1,674	3.2%	93.4%	45	2.1%	91.3%	178	2.1%	80.7%	108	2.4%	97.6%	95	6.4%	95.5%
	8,000	9,000	5,140	3.5%	92,800	4.8%	91.6%	771	1.5%	94.9%	46	2.1%	93.5%	565	6.5%	87.2%	0	0.0%	97.6%	67	4.5%	100.0%
<u>High income group</u>	9,000	10,000	3,025	2.1%	94,900	2.3%	93.9%	1,116	2.1%	97.0%	51	2.4%	95.8%	0	0.0%	87.2%	106	2.4%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
7.2%	10,000	12,000	3,007	2.1%	97,000	1.9%	95.8%	965	1.8%	98.8%	45	2.1%	97.9%	565	6.5%	93.7%	0	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	12,000	14,000	2,093	1.4%	98,400	2.1%	97.9%	299	0.6%	99.4%	0	0.0%	97.9%	180	2.1%	95.8%	0	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	>14000	2,369	1.6%	100.0%	1,642	2.1%	100.0%	322	0.6%	100.0%	45	2.1%	100.0%	360	4.2%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
		146,432	100.0%		76,898			52,840			2,155			8,638			4,433			1,480		

Source: HEIS 2006, Department of Statistics

Adjustments at the income boundaries		Zarqa Governorate.....		Zarqa sub-district.....		Ruseifa sub-district.....		Berein sub-district.....		Hashameer sub-district.....		Dhilail sub-district.....		Ashraq sub-district.....	
		Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households
<	1,800	9,786	6.7%	4,208	5.5%	4,492	8.5%	88	4.1%	382	4.4%	382	8.6%	235	15.9%
<	1,664	9,049	6.2%	3,891	5.1%	4,154	7.9%	81	3.8%	353	4.1%	353	8.0%	217	14.7%
1,664	1,800	737	0.5%	317	0.4%	338	0.6%	7	0.3%	29	0.3%	29	0.6%	18	1.2%
3,000	3,600	18,549	12.7%	9,942	12.9%	6,770	12.8%	427	19.8%	352	4.1%	927	20.9%	130	8.8%
3,000	3,329	10,165	6.9%	5,448	7.1%	3,710	7.0%	234	10.9%	193	2.2%	508	11.5%	71	4.8%
3,329	3,600	8,384	5.7%	4,494	5.8%	3,060	5.8%	193	9.0%	159	1.8%	419	9.5%	59	4.0%

### Analysis of socio-economic breakdown of population of MCC priority areas

WSA	Population connected (NOD/ACEPO)	Population (host)	Zarqa sub-district (host) population	Zarqa sub-district <\$2	Zarqa sub-district between \$2-\$4	Zarqa sub-district >\$4	Russaifah (host population) <\$2	Russaifah between \$2-\$4	Russaifah >\$4	Host Population of MCC priority areas <\$2	\$2-\$4	>\$4	
Tatweer	8,501	8,673	8,673	439	2,345	5,889							
Zarqa	226,821	231,407	231,407	11,709	62,579	157,120							
Awajan	149,171	152,187	152,187	7,701	41,155	103,331							
Russaifah	91,034	92,875					92,875	7,301	37,748	47,826			
Total	475,527	485,142	392,268	19,849	106,079	266,340	92,875	7,301	37,748	47,826	27,149	143,828	314,166 in real numbers
											5.60%	29.65%	64.76% percentage terms

Connection rate 98.02%







<b>Step 4</b>									
Step 4 consists in assessing annual models of water consumption over the 20 years of the life of the project (2010-2029) taking into account population growth and "without project" and "with project" scenarios.									
The following additional assumptions are made:									
<b>Population and connectivity parameters</b>									
Annual population growth rate:			3.25%		Generated by the CBA model				
Population (2008)			871,600		Source: Department of Statistics				
Population (2029)			1,705,876		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Baseline data (2010)			929,162		Generated by the CBA model				
Percentage of population connected (2008)			98.02%		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Percentage of population connected (2029)			99.07%		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual increase in population connected			0.05%		Generated by the CBA model				
Percentage of population connected (2010)			98.12%		Generated by the CBA model				
<b>UFW parameters</b>									
UFW physical as % of total system input, without project (2008)			63.60%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
UFW physical as % of total system input, without project (2010)			63.9%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW physical as % of total system input, without project (2029)			66.4%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW physical without project (2010-2029)			0.2%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, without project (2008)			5.2%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, without project (2010)			5.2%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, without project (2029)			5.0%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW administrative without project (2010 - 2029)			-0.2%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW physical as % of total system input, with project (2008)			13.8%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers	The 2008 & 2010 UFW figures with project are hypothetical for the sake of the engineering calculations. In reality UFW with project is only realised in year 3 of the life of the project.			
UFW physical as % of total system input, with project (2010)			13.7%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW physical as % of total system input, with project (2029)			12.4%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW physical with project (2010-2030)			-0.5%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, with project (2008)			6.7%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, with project (2010)			6.7%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, with project (2029)			6.9%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW administrative with project			0.1%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
Percentage of HHHs affected adversely by UFW administrative			89.0%		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Consumption of shop water is reduced "with project" by 50%			50%	(Conjecture that can be modified with evidence)					
Currently, this is conjecture. But it is not foreseen that all HHHs particularly the richer ones will not totally give up the use of shop water as it is used for drinking and cooking. However, the quality of the additional network water would be significant in this decision.									
On the other hand, tanker water will be easily substituted for additional network water on a one to one basis when available, as it is mainly relied upon when network water is not available and usually not for drinking and cooking (unless treated) but for more general domestic uses. This has been borne out by the ECO Consult draft report.									
The model assumes that benefits of the proposed project only are realised in year 3 of the life of the project. Up till then the network operates in accordance with UFW figures "without project" as outlined above.									



Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water							2011		
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year				
18,709,586	693,174	929,162	941,774	21,404,700	1	without project			
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue / hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	18,709,586	141	54	132,963	4,118,245	31	0.22		
<\$2	1,156,162	141	54	8,216	0	0	0.00		
\$2-\$4	6,040,708	141	54	42,929	0	0	0.00		
>\$4	11,512,716	141	54	81,817	0	0	0.00		
	Shop water								
Total	202,260	2	1	132,963	10,684,586	80	53		
<\$2	5,225								
\$2-\$4	40,949								
>\$4	156,086								
	Tanker water								
Total	1,799,680	14	5	132,963	7,198,721	54	4		
<\$2	68,847								
\$2-\$4	359,713								
>\$4	1,371,120								
	Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	21,404,700	161	62	132,963	22,001,553	165			
<\$2									
\$2-\$4									
>\$4									
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water							2011		
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year				
18,709,586	693,174	929,162	941,774	21,404,700	1	with project			
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue / hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	18,709,586	141	54	132,963	4,118,245	31	0.22		
<\$2	1,156,162	141	54	8,216	0	0	0.00		
\$2-\$4	6,040,708	141	54	42,929	0	0	0.00		
>\$4	11,512,716	141	54	81,817	0	0	0.00		
	Shop water								
Total	202,260	2	1	132,963	10,684,586	80	53		
<\$2	5,225								
\$2-\$4	40,949								
>\$4	156,086								
	Tanker water								
Total	1,799,680	14	5	132,963	7,198,721	54	4		
<\$2	68,847								
\$2-\$4	359,713								
>\$4	1,371,120								
	Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	21,404,700	161	62	132,963	22,001,553	165			
<\$2									
\$2-\$4									
>\$4									







Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2014
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year		5	
18,489,538	2,899,304	929,162	1,038,175	23,595,703	4		without project	
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3	
Total	18,489,538	126	49	146,573	4,069,810	28	0.22	
<\$2	1,142,564	126	49	9,057	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	5,969,662	126	49	47,324	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	11,377,312	126	49	90,192	0	0	0.00	
	Shop water							
Total	222,963	2	1	146,573	11,778,270	80	53	
<\$2	5,760							
\$2-\$4	45,141							
>\$4	172,063							
	Tanker water							
Total	1,983,897	14	5	146,573	7,935,589	54	4	
<\$2	75,894							
\$2-\$4	396,533							
>\$4	1,511,470							
	Network, shop & tanker water							
Total	23,595,703	161	62	146,573	23,783,668	162		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2014
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		5
36,663,575	-14,017,505	929,162	1,038,175	23,595,703	60%	4	with project	
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3	
Total	36,663,575	250	97	146,573	8,070,173	55	0.22	
<\$2	2,265,631	250	97	9,057	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	11,837,459	250	97	47,324	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	22,560,485	250	97	90,192	0	0	0.00	
	Shop water							
Total	156,074	1	0	146,573	8,244,789	56	53	
<\$2	4,032							
\$2-\$4	31,598							
>\$4	120,444							
	Tanker water							
Total	793,559	5	2	146,573	3,174,235	22	4	
<\$2	30,358							
\$2-\$4	158,613							
>\$4	604,588							
	Network, shop & tanker water							
Total	37,613,209	257	99	146,573	19,489,198	133		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								

Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2015
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year		6	
18,415,848	3,679,214	929,162	1,072,454	24,374,789	5		without project	
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	18,415,848	122	47	151,412	4,053,589	27	0.22	
<\$2	1,138,010	122	47	9,357	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	5,945,870	122	47	48,886	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	11,331,968	122	47	93,170	0	0	0.00	
Shop water								
Total	230,325	2	1	151,412	12,167,166	80	53	
<\$2	5,950							
\$2-\$4	46,631							
>\$4	177,744							
Tanker water								
Total	2,049,402	14	5	151,412	8,197,607	54	4	
<\$2	78,400							
\$2-\$4	409,626							
>\$4	1,561,375							
Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	24,374,789	161	62	151,412	24,418,362	161		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		2015
45,951,476	-21,908,307	929,162	1,072,454	24,374,789	90%	5	with project	6
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	45,951,476	303	117	151,412	10,114,572	67	0.22	
<\$2	2,839,579	303	117	9,357	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	14,836,216	303	117	48,886	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	28,275,681	303	117	93,170	0	0	0.00	
Shop water								
Total	126,679	1	0	151,412	6,691,941	44	53	
<\$2	3,272							
\$2-\$4	25,647							
>\$4	97,759							
Tanker water								
Total	204,940	1	1	151,412	819,761	5	4	
<\$2	7,840							
\$2-\$4	40,963							
>\$4	156,138							
Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	46,283,095	306	118	151,412	17,626,274	116		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								





Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water							2018		
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year		without project		
18,193,747	6,162,984	929,162	1,182,231	26,869,813	8	9			
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	18,193,747	109	42	166,911	4,004,702	24	0.22		
<\$2	1,124,285	109	42	10,314	0	0	0.00		
\$2-\$4	5,874,161	109	42	53,890	0	0	0.00		
>\$4	11,195,301	109	42	102,707	0	0	0.00		
<b>Shop water</b>									
Total	253,902	2	1	166,911	13,412,607	80	53		
<\$2	6,559								
\$2-\$4	51,404								
>\$4	195,938								
<b>Tanker water</b>									
Total	2,259,180	14	5	166,911	9,036,721	54	4		
<\$2	86,426								
\$2-\$4	451,556								
>\$4	1,721,199								
<b>Network, shop &amp; tanker water</b>									
Total	26,869,813	161	62	166,911	26,454,030	158			
<\$2									
\$2-\$4									
>\$4									
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water							2018		
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		with project	
48,456,940	-21,809,523	929,162	1,182,231	26,869,813	96%	8	9		
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	48,456,940	290	112	166,911	10,666,060	64	0.22		
<\$2	2,994,404	290	112	10,314	0	0	0.00		
\$2-\$4	15,645,148	290	112	53,890	0	0	0.00		
>\$4	29,817,388	290	112	102,707	0	0	0.00		
<b>Shop water</b>									
Total	132,029	1	0	166,911	6,974,556	42	53		
<\$2	3,411								
\$2-\$4	26,730								
>\$4	101,888								
<b>Tanker water</b>									
Total	90,367	1	0	166,911	361,469	2	4		
<\$2	3,457								
\$2-\$4	18,062								
>\$4	68,848								
<b>Network, shop &amp; tanker water</b>									
Total	48,679,336	292	113	166,911	18,002,085	108			
<\$2									
\$2-\$4									
>\$4									







Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water										2021	
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year			12			
17,970,097	8,879,811	929,162	1,303,245	29,620,230	11			without project			
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3				
Total	17,970,097	98	38	183,996	3,955,473	21	0.22				
<\$2	1,110,465	98	38	11,370	0	0	0.00				
\$2-\$4	5,801,952	98	38	59,406	0	0	0.00				
>\$4	11,057,680	98	38	113,220	0	0	0.00				
	Shop water										
Total	279,891	2	1	183,996	14,785,533	80	53				
<\$2	7,230										
\$2-\$4	56,666										
>\$4	215,995										
	Tanker water										
Total	2,490,432	14	5	183,996	9,961,727	54	4				
<\$2	95,272										
\$2-\$4	497,777										
>\$4	1,897,383										
	Network, shop & tanker water										
Total	29,620,230	161	62	183,996	28,702,734	156					
<\$2											
\$2-\$4											
>\$4											
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water										2021	
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year			12			
50,444,671	-20,964,387	929,162	1,303,245	29,620,230	11			with project			
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3				
Total	50,444,671	274	106	183,996	11,103,588	60	0.22				
<\$2	3,117,236	274	106	11,370	0	0	0.00				
\$2-\$4	16,286,921	274	106	59,406	0	0	0.00				
>\$4	31,040,514	274	106	113,220	0	0	0.00				
	Shop water										
Total	139,946	1	0	183,996	7,392,767	40	53				
<\$2	3,615										
\$2-\$4	28,333										
>\$4	107,997										
	Tanker water										
Total	0	0	0	183,996	0	0	4				
<\$2	0										
\$2-\$4	0										
>\$4	0										
	Network, shop & tanker water										
Total	50,584,617	275	106	183,996	18,496,355	101					
<\$2											
\$2-\$4											
>\$4											



















**Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Full List of IMP Projects. Work-sheet "Hsehold"**

Table 4: Household water consumption analysis across 20 years																					
water prices per m <sup>3</sup> :		network		shop		pop growth: 3.25%		tanker		annual connectivity growth: 0.05%											
2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029		
Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
<b>Target population (all HHs)</b>	929,162	959,354	990,526	1,022,711	1,055,942	1,090,253	1,125,679	1,162,255	1,200,021	1,239,013	1,279,273	1,320,840	1,363,758	1,408,071	1,453,824	1,501,063	1,549,837	1,600,196	1,652,191	1,705,876	
<b>Target population (connected HHs)</b>	911,673	941,774	972,870	1,004,992	1,038,175	1,072,454	1,107,864	1,144,444	1,182,231	1,221,266	1,261,590	1,303,245	1,346,276	1,390,728	1,436,647	1,484,082	1,533,084	1,583,703	1,635,994	1,690,011	
<b>Without project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	18,782,594	18,709,586	18,636,407	18,563,058	18,489,538	18,415,848	18,341,986	18,267,953	18,193,747	18,119,370	18,044,819	17,970,097	17,895,200	17,820,131	17,744,887	17,669,470	17,593,878	17,518,111	17,442,169	17,366,051	
Total shop water consumed	195,795	202,260	208,938	215,837	222,963	230,325	237,930	245,786	253,902	262,285	270,945	279,891	289,133	298,679	308,541	318,729	329,252	340,124	351,354	362,955	
Total tanker water consumed	1,742,158	1,799,680	1,859,102	1,920,486	1,983,897	2,049,402	2,117,069	2,186,971	2,259,180	2,333,774	2,410,831	2,490,432	2,572,661	2,657,605	2,745,355	2,836,001	2,929,640	3,026,371	3,126,296	3,229,521	
<b>With project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	18,782,594	18,709,586	18,636,407	27,559,224	36,663,575	45,951,476	46,772,283	47,607,380	48,456,940	49,321,137	50,200,151	50,444,671	50,691,508	50,940,698	51,192,282	51,446,298	51,702,788	51,961,794	52,223,359	52,487,524	
Total shop water consumed	195,795	202,260	208,938	183,461	156,074	126,679	128,482	130,267	132,029	133,765	135,473	139,946	144,566	149,340	154,271	159,364	164,626	170,062	175,677	181,477	
Total tanker water consumed	1,742,158	1,799,680	1,859,102	1,344,340	793,559	204,940	169,366	131,218	90,367	46,675	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Savings from switching from shop water to network water</b>				0	1,703,144	3,518,758	5,452,411	5,757,604	6,077,007	6,411,226	6,760,889	7,126,654	7,361,963	7,605,041	7,856,145	8,115,540	8,383,499	8,660,306	8,946,253	9,241,641	9,546,783
<b>Savings from switching from tanker water to network water</b>				0	2,177,766	4,499,343	6,971,854	7,362,097	7,770,509	8,197,865	8,644,971	9,112,665	9,413,548	9,724,365	10,045,445	10,377,127	10,719,760	11,073,706	11,439,338	11,817,043	12,207,220
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water</b>				0	3,880,910	8,018,100	12,424,264	13,119,701	13,847,516	14,609,091	15,405,861	16,239,319	16,775,510	17,329,406	17,901,590	18,492,666	19,103,259	19,734,012	20,385,592	21,058,685	21,754,003
<b>Poorest socio-economic group (&lt;\$2 per person per day)</b>																					
<b>Target population (all HHs)</b>	57,418	59,283	61,210	63,199	65,252	67,372	69,561	71,822	74,155	76,565	79,053	81,622	84,274	87,012	89,839	92,758	95,772	98,884	102,097	105,415	
<b>Target population (connected HHs)</b>	56,337	58,197	60,119	62,104	64,154	66,272	68,461	70,721	73,056	75,468	77,960	80,534	83,193	85,940	88,778	91,709	94,737	97,865	101,096	104,435	
<b>Without project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	1,160,673	1,156,162	1,151,640	1,147,107	1,142,564	1,138,010	1,133,446	1,128,871	1,124,285	1,119,689	1,115,082	1,110,465	1,105,837	1,101,198	1,096,548	1,091,888	1,087,216	1,082,534	1,077,842	1,073,138	
Total shop water consumed	5,058	5,225	5,397	5,576	5,760	5,950	6,146	6,349	6,559	6,776	6,999	7,230	7,469	7,716	7,971	8,234	8,506	8,786	9,076	9,376	
Total tanker water consumed	66,647	68,847	71,120	73,469	75,894	78,400	80,989	83,663	86,426	89,279	92,227	95,272	98,418	101,667	105,024	108,492	112,074	115,775	119,597	123,546	
<b>With project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	1,160,673	1,156,162	1,151,640	1,703,026	2,265,631	2,839,579	2,890,300	2,941,905	2,994,404	3,047,807	3,102,126	3,117,236	3,132,490	3,147,888	3,163,435	3,179,132	3,194,982	3,210,987	3,227,150	3,243,475	
Total shop water consumed	5,058	5,225	5,397	4,739	4,032	3,272	3,319	3,365	3,411	3,456	3,500	3,615	3,735	3,858	3,985	4,117	4,253	4,393	4,538	4,688	
Total tanker water consumed	66,647	68,847	71,120	51,428	30,358	7,840	6,479	5,020	3,457	1,786	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Savings from switching from shop water to network water</b>				0	43,997	90,900	140,852	148,736	156,987	165,621	174,653	184,102	190,181	196,460	202,947	209,648	216,570	223,721	231,108	238,739	246,621
<b>Savings from switching from tanker water to network water</b>				0	83,311	172,123	266,710	281,639	297,263	313,611	330,716	348,607	360,118	372,008	384,291	396,980	410,087	423,627	437,615	452,064	466,990
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water</b>				0	127,308	263,023	407,562	430,375	454,250	479,232	505,369	532,710	550,299	568,468	587,238	606,628	626,657	647,348	668,723	690,803	713,611
<b>Medium poor socio-economic group (\$2 - \$4 per person per day)</b>																					
<b>Target population (all HHs)</b>	299,996	309,744	319,808	330,200	340,929	352,007	363,445	375,254	387,447	400,036	413,035	426,456	440,313	454,620	469,392	484,644	500,391	516,650	533,438	550,771	
<b>Target population (connected HHs)</b>	294,349	304,068	314,108	324,479	335,193	346,260	357,693	369,503	381,703	394,307	407,326	420,775	434,668	449,020	463,846	479,161	494,982	511,326	528,208	545,649	
<b>Without project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	6,064,280	6,040,708	6,017,081	5,993,399	5,969,662	5,945,870	5,922,022	5,898,119	5,874,161	5,850,147	5,826,077	5,801,952	5,777,770	5,753,533	5,729,239	5,704,889	5,680,483	5,656,020	5,631,501	5,606,925	
Total shop water consumed	39,640	40,949	42,301	43,698	45,141	46,631	48,171	49,761	51,404	53,102	54,855	56,666	58,537	60,470	62,466	64,529	66,660	68,861	71,134	73,483	
Total tanker water consumed	348,215	359,713	371,590	383,859	396,533	409,626	423,151	437,123	451,556	466,465	481,867	497,777	514,213	531,191	548,730	566,848	585,564	604,899	624,871	645,503	
<b>With project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	6,064,280	6,040,708	6,017,081	8,897,965	11,837,459	14,836,216	15,101,228	15,370,853	15,645,148	15,924,169	16,207,973	16,286,921	16,366,616	16,447,072	16,528,300	16,610,313	16,693,125	16,776,750	16,861,200	16,946,491	
Total shop water consumed	39,640	40,949	42,301	37,143	31,598	25,647	26,012	26,373	26,730	27,082	27,427	28,333	29,269	30,235	31,233	32,265	33,330	34,430	35,567	36,741	
Total tanker water consumed	348,215	359,713	371,590	268,701	158,613	40,963	33,852	26,227	18,062	9,329	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Savings from switching from shop water to network water</b>				0	344,814	712,399	1,103,882	1,165,670	1,230,336	1,298,001	1,368,793	1,442,845	1,490,485	1,539,698	1,590,536	1,643,052	1,697,303	1,753,344	1,811,236	1,871,040	1,932,818
<b>Savings from switching from tanker water to network water</b>				0	435,283	899,310	1,393,505	1,471,505	1,553,137	1,638,555	1,727,921	1,821,402	1,881,541	1,943,666	2,007,842	2,074,137	2,142,621	2,213,366	2,286,447	2,361,942	2,439,928
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water</b>				0	780,097	1,611,709	2,497,387	2,637,176	2,783,473	2,936,556	3,096,714	3,264,247	3,372,026	3,483,364	3,598,378	3,717,189	3,839,924	3,966,711	4,097,684	4,232,982	4,372,747
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water (both socio-economic categories)</b>				0	907,405	1,874,732	2,904,949	3,067,550	3,237,723	3,415,788	3,602,083	3,796,956	3,922,324	4,051,832	4,185,616	4,323,817	4,466,581	4,614,059	4,766,406	4,923,784	5,086,358
<b>Target Population (all HHs) of both socio-economic categories</b>	357,414	369,027	381,018	393,398	406,181	419,379	433,006	447,076	461,603	476,601	492,088	508,077	524,586	541,632	559,231	577,402	596,164	615,535	635,535	656,186	
Table 4 feeds off the worksheet "Wcon" electronically.																					
Health benefits for those consuming < 50 lcd																					
Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALY)																					
Avoided health-related costs																					
The health impact of the proposed project is analysed in section (d), of the worksheet "Heli"																					

## Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Full List of IMP Projects. Work-sheet "Heli"

### (a) Analysing the 2008 billing data: a story of inequality in distribution between network water-poor and network water-rich HHs

Tables 1 & 3 are derived from the 2008 billing data and provide the following findings:

<i>-> total quantities of network water and nr HHs across 11 different consumption bands (table H1)

<i>-> average annual consumption per HH, average HH bill and total revenue across consumption bands (table H3)

**Table H1: Water consumption across consumption ranges**

Consumption bands (con band)	Water quantities per con band (m³)	Water quantities per con band in % terms	Cumulative in % terms increasing	Cumulative in % terms declining	nr HHs per con band	nr HHs per con band	nr HHs per con band in % terms	Cumulative in % terms increasing	Cumulative in % terms declining
<50lcd	4,635,648	26.34%	26.34%	100.00%	62,044	62,044	51.44%	51.44%	100.00%
50lcd-65lcd	2,709,956	15.40%	41.74%	73.66%	18,291	18,291	15.17%	66.61%	48.56%
65lcd-80lcd	2,522,226	14.33%	56.07%	58.26%	13,528	13,528	11.22%	77.82%	33.39%
80lcd-120lcd	4,793,678	27.24%	83.30%	43.93%	19,259	19,259	15.97%	93.79%	22.18%
120lcd-145lcd	1,389,365	7.89%	91.20%	16.70%	4,104	4,104	3.40%	97.19%	6.21%
145lcd-165lcd	624,570	3.55%	94.75%	8.80%	1,570	1,570	1.30%	98.49%	2.81%
165lcd-185lcd	349,621	1.99%	96.73%	5.25%	777	777	0.64%	99.14%	1.51%
185lcd-205lcd	230,410	1.31%	98.04%	3.27%	460	460	0.38%	99.52%	0.86%
205lcd-225lcd	136,962	0.78%	98.82%	1.96%	248	248	0.21%	99.72%	0.48%
225lcd-245lcd	125,671	0.71%	99.53%	1.18%	207	207	0.17%	99.90%	0.28%
245lcd	82,220	0.47%	100.00%	0.47%	125	125	0.10%	100.00%	0.10%
<b>Total water consumption (2008)</b>	<b>17,600,327</b>					<b>120,613</b>			

The above table speaks for itself with respect to the unequal distribution of network water. This is indicated by a number of observations:

62,044 HHs or in % terms	51.44% of all Zarqa HHs consume <50lcd of network water and	26.34% of Zarqa network water
58,569 HHs or in % terms	48.56% of all Zarqa HHs consume between 50-265 lcd of water and	73.66% of Zarqa network water

Since the ECO Consult report indicates no correlation between income and water consumption levels, the inequality is based on unequal distribution generated by poor quality piping in certain areas which disadvantages households across all income groups.

The HELI (2005) report highlights the health benefit accruing from raising network water consumption from <50 lcd to 60 lcd and higher.

In the context of Zarqa Governorate the following statistics are of interest in the HELI framework:

**Table H2: Water consumption across groups 1 (HHs consuming <50 lcd) & 2 (HHs consuming between 50 - 265 lcd) with project**

Year	Total water	Group 1 water	Group 2 water	Total HHS connect	Group 1 HHs	Group 2 HHs	Group 1 m³/HH/annum	Group 2 m³/HH/annum	Group 1 lcd	Group 2 lcd	Group 1 =>60lcd (m³)	Group 2 after transf to Group 1 (m³)	Group 2 after transf to Group 1 (lcd)
2,010	18,782,594	4,947,038	13,835,556	128,713	66,211	62,502	75	221	29	86			
2,011	18,709,586	4,927,809	13,781,776	132,963	68,397	64,566	72	213	28	83			
2,012	18,636,407	4,908,535	13,727,872	137,353	70,655	66,698	69	206	27	80			
2,013	27,559,224	7,258,664	20,300,560	141,888	72,988	68,900	99	295	38	114			
2,014	36,663,575	9,656,606	27,006,969	146,573	75,398	71,175	128	379	50	147			
2,015	45,951,476	12,102,893	33,848,584	151,412	77,887	73,525	155	460	60	178			
2,016	46,772,283	12,319,080	34,453,203	156,412	80,459	75,953	153	454	59	175	12,480,625	34,291,658	175
2,017	47,607,380	12,539,032	35,068,348	161,576	83,116	78,460	151	447	58	173	12,892,711	34,714,669	171
2,018	48,456,940	12,762,792	35,694,148	166,911	85,860	81,051	149	440	57	170	13,318,404	35,138,536	168
2,019	49,321,137	12,990,408	36,330,729	172,422	88,695	83,727	146	434	57	168	13,758,152	35,562,985	164
2,020	50,200,151	13,221,926	36,978,224	178,115	91,623	86,492	144	428	56	165	14,212,420	35,987,730	161
2,021	50,444,671	13,286,329	37,158,342	183,996	94,649	89,348	140	416	54	161	14,681,687	35,762,984	155
2,022	50,691,508	13,351,342	37,340,166	190,071	97,774	92,298	137	405	53	156	15,166,449	35,525,059	149
2,023	50,940,698	13,416,975	37,523,723	196,347	101,002	95,345	133	394	51	152	15,667,216	35,273,482	143
2,024	51,192,282	13,483,238	37,709,044	202,830	104,337	98,493	129	383	50	148	16,184,518	35,007,764	137
2,025	51,446,298	13,550,142	37,896,156	209,527	107,782	101,745	126	372	49	144	16,718,900	34,727,398	132
2,026	51,702,788	13,617,697	38,085,091	216,446	111,341	105,105	122	362	47	140	17,270,926	34,431,863	127
2,027	51,961,794	13,685,916	38,275,879	223,592	115,017	108,575	119	353	46	136	17,841,179	34,120,615	122
2,028	52,223,359	13,754,807	38,468,551	230,975	118,815	112,160	116	343	45	133	18,430,261	33,793,098	117
2,029	52,487,524	13,824,384	38,663,140	238,601	122,738	115,863	113	334	44	129	19,038,793	33,448,732	112

This table shows that in year 6 group 1 achieves average consumption level of 60 lcd. However to maintain this beyond year 6 redistribution of water from group 2 to group 1 is necessary. It is doable as it only requires modest reduction in the average water consumption level of group 2. In year 7 there is no reduction involved but in year 8 there is a reduction from 173 lcd to 171 lcd and in year 20 from 129 lcd to 119 lcd.

There are a number of reasons why network water poor HHs receive inadequate supplies. These include the following:

<i>-> unequal storage capacity

GFA 2008: 100 show that 1% of HHs have no storage; 13% have 1 m³ storage capacity, 48% have 2 m³ and 38% have more than 2.7 m³ (mean size) storage capacity.

#### Impact of storage capacity on benefiting from network water

Where tanks are only filled once a week this would generate the following consumption rates (lcd):-

storage:1m³	storage:2m³	storage:2.73m³
20	40	55
61	121	165

<i>-> Altitude

Where the household lives in high altitude areas pressure is weak and supply erratic as others at lower altitudes are at the front of the queue and hence supplied first.

<i>-> Tariff structure

Given the large gap between the m³ price of network water (varying between JD 0.18 - JD 0.64), and that of tanker water (JD 4) and shop water (JD 52.83)

(in the context of water scarcity) those who have the influence, storage capacity and appropriate altitude are able to harvest a disproportionate share of the network water as illustrated by table H1 above. In addition, EC Consult points out that the sharing of meters by poor HHs pushes up the price of network water for the poor.

One resolution is to ensure that poor HHs have access to one meter per HH as recommended by ECO Consult.

Another resolution to this situation is to raise tariff rates much closer to commercial rates of tanker water, so that when HHs consume more than 165 lcd, the price of network water is > JD 4, so that the network water-rich HHs are forced to purchase tanker water when their consumption is >165 lcd.

Network water-poor HHs are willing to pay higher tariffs at the lower consumption band rates (see GFA 2008:163-173)

In summary, constraints <i>-> and <i>-> require an engineering resolution, while constraint <i>-> faces the challenge of reform of the tariff structure.

Both sets of resolutions will be required to address the plight of network water-poor HHs, of which there are 62,044 HHs representing

51.44% of all HHs of Zarqa.

#### <c> Economic and financial analysis of the 2008 billing data

Table H 3 below analyses annual HH expenditure on water, average prices per m³ and revenue across the consumption bands

**Table H3: HH network water consumption, water bills and revenue**

Consumption bands (con band)	av HH con/annum per con band (m³)	av HH con/annum per con band (m³)	tariff (JD)	av HH annual bill (JD)	av price per m³ per con band (JD)	revenue created per con band (JD)	Cumulative in % terms increasing	Cumulative in % terms declining	
<50lcd	75	19		3,750	15	0.20	930,660	22.32%	100.00%
50lcd-65lcd	148	37		6,450	26	0.17	471,908	11.32%	77.68%
65lcd-80lcd	186	47		9,341	37	0.20	505,460	12.12%	66.36%
80lcd-120lcd	249	62		14,870	59	0.24	1,145,525	27.47%	54.24%
120lcd-145lcd	339	85		26,657	107	0.31	437,601	10.50%	26.76%
145lcd-165lcd	398	99		36,483	146	0.37	229,113	5.50%	16.27%
165lcd-185lcd	450	112		47,097	188	0.42	146,377	3.51%	10.77%
185lcd-205lcd	501	125		58,296	233	0.47	107,265	2.57%	7.26%
205lcd-225lcd	552	138		71,896	288	0.52	71,321	1.71%	4.69%
225lcd-245lcd	607	152		88,250	353	0.58	73,071	1.75%	2.98%
245lcd	658	164		102,341	409	0.62	51,171	1.23%	1.23%
							<b>4,169,472</b>		

There are some minor inequalities in billing before average price per m³ begins to rise from 80 lcd onwards.

#### (d) Planning and implementing the HELI-desired outcome

It is now assumed that engineering and policy steps relating to tariff reform will take place so that the necessary quantities of additional water created by the proposed project will be channelled to HHs with <50 lcd so that their consumption rate is raised to 60 lcd; and this continues even in the face of population growth from year 9 onwards.

The details of the re-distribution of water between groups 1 & 2 in order to lift HHs of group 1 to 60 lcd and to maintain these HHs at this level are worked out above (table H2).

Hence, I move on to calculate the health benefits. I assume that the diarrhoea incidence/ person / year for those consuming < 50 lcd is .61

This is a conservative figure given Figure 6, HELI (2005) report, page 40. I also assume that the diarrhoea incidence/person/year is .27 for those consuming 60 lcd (ibid.)

Applying Table 10 (HELI 2005:43) to the metered population the health gains for raising consumption of group 1 to 60 lcd, health gains are estimated in Table H4 below.

**Table H4 Estimating the health benefits in lifting group 1 to consumption level of 60 lcd**

Diarrhoea incidence (JD)	Total health cost	population size
0.61	56,323,128	5,100,396 (HELI 2005:43)
0.27	24,929,909	5,100,396 (HELI 2005:43)
<b>Health gain (JD)</b>	<b>31,393,219</b>	<b>5,100,396</b>

  

Year of the project	All socio-economic categories		Socio-economic categories (poor & medium poor)	
	Target population	Health gain (JD)	Target population	Health gain (JD)
1	929,162	0	357,414	0
2	959,354	0	369,027	0
3	990,526		381,018	0
4	1,022,711		393,398	0
5	1,055,942		406,181	0
6	1,090,253	6,710,568	419,379	2,581,302
7	1,125,679	6,928,615	433,006	2,665,176
8	1,162,255	7,153,747	447,076	2,751,776
9	1,200,021	7,386,194	461,603	2,841,189
10	1,239,013	7,626,194	476,601	2,933,509
11	1,279,273	7,873,993	492,088	3,028,827
12	1,320,840	8,129,843	508,077	3,127,243
13	1,363,758	8,394,007	524,586	3,228,857
14	1,408,071	8,666,754	541,632	3,333,773
15	1,453,824	8,948,364	559,231	3,442,097
16	1,501,063	9,239,124	577,402	3,553,942
17	1,549,837	9,539,332	596,164	3,669,420
18	1,600,196	9,849,294	615,535	3,788,651
19	1,652,191	10,169,328	635,535	3,911,756
20	1,705,876	10,499,761	656,186	4,038,861

Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study, Full List of IMP Projects, Work-sheet "Prod"																				
Step 5																				
Step 5 consists of an analysis of production costs in order to ascertain costs per m3 of water produced and water delivered to consumers																				
This analysis is based on WAJ 2009, Zarqa Water Administration Profit and Loss Statement for 2008																				
Table 5a: Water production analysis Zarqa Governorate (2008)		Years																		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Without project																				
Water production	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804
Internal water sources (wells and springs)	39,074,642																			
Water imports	13,060,162																			
Authorised consumption	25,606,380	25,506,847	25,407,082	25,307,086	25,206,856	25,106,393	25,005,697	24,904,767	24,803,603	24,702,204	24,600,569	24,498,699	24,396,593	24,294,250	24,191,670	24,088,853	23,985,798	23,882,505	23,778,973	23,675,202
Billed metered consumption (billing system, tankers, exports)	24,184,161																			
Unbilled metered consumption (free water in arid areas)	490,706																			
Flushing of network	931,513																			
Water production costs	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700
Salaries and wages (minus Sewerage Directorate & Irrigation Division)	1,743,119																			
Electricity expenses (Water Directorate total minus water treatment)	4,973,336																			
Spare parts and maintenance (Water Directorate & Desert Wells)	803,256																			
Vehicle expenses (Water Directorate/ water tankers/ desert wells)	306,998																			
General and Admin Expenses devoted to water-related staff & activities	358,614																			
Fuel expenses (minus Sewerage Directorate but plus 81% of Admin Dir)	212,854																			
Water imports	4,086,524																			
**Water related salaries & wages as percentage of total salary and wage bill (JOD 2,156,313)	81%																			
Average cost per m3 of water produced (internal plus imports)	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239
Average cost per m3 of water delivered to consumer (authorised consumption)	0.488	0.489	0.491	0.493	0.495	0.497	0.499	0.501	0.503	0.505	0.507	0.510	0.512	0.514	0.516	0.518	0.521	0.523	0.525	0.527
Step 6																				
Step 6 ascertains what happens production costs (with project) given																				
percentage UFW "without project".....	68.5%	68.6%	68.7%	68.8%	69.0%	69.1%	69.2%	69.3%	69.5%	69.6%	69.7%	69.8%	70.0%	70.1%	70.2%	70.3%	70.5%	70.6%	70.7%	70.8%
but percentage UFW "with project".....	68.5%	68.6%	68.7%	19.5%	19.4%	19.3%	19.3%	19.2%	19.2%	19.1%	19.0%	19.0%	18.9%	18.9%	18.8%	18.8%	18.7%	18.7%	18.6%	18.5%
For the sake of the calculations it is assumed that the whole Zarqa water system is being rehabilitated and restructured. The key factors between the "without project" and "with project" scenario is the difference between the UFW of without & with project																				
Making this wider assumption does not alter the calculation of unit costs of water production & delivery																				
With project																				
Percentage of connected consumers reached				30%	60%	90%	92%	94%	96%	98%	100%									
Water production	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804	52,134,804
Internal water sources (wells and springs)	39,074,642																			
Water imports	13,060,162																			
Authorised consumption	25,606,380	25,506,847	25,407,082	37,339,502	49,361,034	61,471,626	62,315,937	63,165,915	64,021,556	64,882,860	65,749,825	65,796,493	65,842,879	65,888,985	65,934,811	65,980,360	66,025,632	66,070,630	66,115,353	66,159,804
The quantity of water delivered to consumers with project																				
We do not expect any energy saving of note due to the project works. At present the water is pumped from low-level pumping stations up to high-level reservoirs, and from there by gravity into the distribution network for customers' supply. There will in fact be more water pumped to higher elevations than at present, but there will be a trade-off in that the pumping to a reservoir can be done with steady state pumping which is more energy efficient. In overall terms no energy saving of note is envisaged. (NOD/ACEPO engineers 2010)																				
Water production costs	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700	12,484,700
Salaries and wages (minus Sewerage Directorate & Irrigation Division)	1,743,119																			
Electricity expenses (Water Directorate total minus water treatment)	4,973,336																			
Spare parts and maintenance (Water Directorate & Desert Wells)	803,256																			
Vehicle expenses (Water Directorate/ water tankers/ desert wells)	306,998																			
General and Admin Expenses devoted to water-related staff & activities	358,614																			
Fuel expenses (minus Sewerage Directorate but plus 81% of Admin Dir)	212,854																			
Water imports	4,086,524																			
**Water related salaries & wages as percentage of total salary and wage bill (JOD 2,156,313)	81%																			
Average cost per m3 of water produced (internal plus imports)	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239	0.239
Average cost per m3 of water delivered to consumer (authorised consumption)	0.488	0.489	0.491	0.334	0.253	0.203	0.200	0.198	0.195	0.192	0.190	0.190	0.190	0.189	0.189	0.189	0.189	0.189	0.189	0.189
Water production & delivery savings per m3 (years 1-20 (Year 3))	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.158972	0.242364	0.294175	0.298929	0.303648	0.308334	0.312989	0.317615	0.319859	0.322126	0.324414	0.326725	0.329059	0.331415	0.333795	0.336199	0.338627
Table 5b Opportunity cost to WAJ for not investing: cost of additional water required (without project) and loss of surplus (with project)																				
Without project																				
Quantities of water (mf)	0	693,174	1,406,995	2,142,139	2,899,304	3,679,214	4,482,613	5,310,271	6,162,984	7,041,575	7,946,891	8,879,811	9,841,240	10,832,114	11,853,400	12,906,097	13,991,236	15,109,883	16,263,139	17,452,141
Cost (JD)	0	337,965	685,997	1,044,426	1,413,591	1,793,845	2,185,552	2,589,087	3,004,837	3,433,205	3,874,603	4,329,459	4,798,215	5,281,328	5,779,268	6,292,523	6,821,596	7,367,006	7,929,290	8,509,002
With project																				
Quantities of water (mf)	0	693,174	1,406,995	-6,245,506	-14,017,505	-21,908,307	-21,890,533	-21,857,885	-21,809,523	-21,744,575	-21,662,137	-20,964,387	-20,237,840	-19,481,508	-18,694,369	-17,875,367	-17,023,409	-16,137,368	-15,216,078	-14,258,334
Cost (JD)	0	337,965	685,997	-3,045,072	-6,834,404	-10,681,660	-10,672,994	-10,657,076	-10,633,496	-10,601,830	-10,561,637	-10,221,440	-9,867,204	-9,498,445	-9,114,666	-8,715,351	-8,299,969	-7,867,969	-7,418,783	-6,951,823
Opportunity cost to WAJ for not investing	0	0	0	4,089,497	8,247,995	12,475,505	12,858,546	13,246,163	13,638,334	14,035,035	14,436,240	14,850,899	14,665,419	14,779,773	14,893,934	15,007,875	15,121,565	15,234,975	15,348,073	15,460,825

The analysis only includes costs relating to the provision of network water both for residents and non-residents. Hence it excludes costs relating to the sewerage directorate, and waste water treatment. The figures for cost reduction "with project" are provisional and will be updated by data from the work of the engineers.

The analysis in this worksheet is conducted for the Zarqa Governorate as a whole, since the data provided (WAJ 2009) are governorate-wide and for that reason it is assumed for the sake of the analysis that the reduction in water leakage "with project" is applicable to the whole governorate.

The ultimate goal of the analysis is to ascertain savings in the production & delivery of network water "with project" for the whole governorate (see cell b 80 below).

The findings of this work sheet feed into the "CBA" worksheet.

There is an adjustment for the fact that pumping at wells is subsidized at JD0.043 per Kw instead of the industrial rate of JD0.050

Source: NOD/ACEPO engineers  
Source: NOD/ACEPO engineers



## Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Selected List of PIP MCC Priority Projects. Work-sheet "Socecon"

### Step 1

Step 1 ascertains the percentage of households that belong to the key socio-economic groupings of the TOR, namely, <\$ 2, \$2 - \$4, and >\$4. PPP exchange rates for the USA \$1 (2005) are used (see the Global Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditure: 2005 International Comparison Program, IBRD World Bank 2008)

Income per capita per day (\$)	Income per capita per day (JOD)	Annual income per capita (JOD)	Mean nr per household	Annual income per household (JOD)	Monthly income per household (JOD)	Zarqa sub-district.....		Ruseifa sub-district.....		Berein sub-district.....		Hashameer sub-district.....		Dhilail sub-district.....		Ashraq sub-district.....				
						% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households	% of households (cumulative)	% of house%	% of households (cumulative)	% of house%	% of households (cumulative)	% of house%	% of households (cumulative)	% of house%	% of households (cumulative)			
2	0.7600	365	277	6	1,664	6.2%	6.2%	5.1%	5.1%	7.9%	7.9%	3.8%	3.8%	4.1%	4.1%	8.0%	8.0%	14.7%	14.7%	
4	1.5200	365	555	6	3,329	32.3%	38.5%	27.0%	32.1%	40.6%	48.5%	37.2%	41.0%	22.4%	26.5%	39.3%	47.3%	38.0%	52.7%	
PPP exchange rate US\$ 1= .38 JOD		1																		
< 2	<1664					6.2%	6.2%	5.1%	5.1%	7.9%	7.9%	3.8%	3.8%	4.1%	4.1%	8.0%	8.0%	14.7%	14.7%	
Between 2-4	Between 1664-3329					32.3%	38.5%	27.0%	32.1%	40.6%	48.5%	37.2%	41.0%	22.4%	26.5%	39.3%	47.3%	38.0%	52.7%	
> 4	>3329					61.5%	100.0%	67.9%	100.0%	51.5%	100.0%	59.0%	100.0%	73.5%	100.0%	52.7%	100.0%	47.3%	100.0%	
						100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%

  

Income Groups 2006 (JOD per annum)	Zarqa sub-district.....		Ruseifa sub-district.....		Berein sub-district.....		Hashameer sub-district.....		Dhilail sub-district.....		Ashraq sub-district.....												
	Nr households	% of households (cumulative)	% of households (cumulative)	% of households (cumulative)	% of households (cumulative)	% of households (cumulative)	% of households (cumulative)	Nr households	% of households (cumulative)	Nr households	% of households (cumulative)	Nr households	% of households (cumulative)										
<b>Low income group</b>	<	1,800	9,786	6.7%	6.7%	4,208	5.5%	5.5%	4,492	8.5%	8.5%	88	4.1%	4.1%	382	4.4%	4.4%	382	8.6%	8.6%	235	15.9%	15.9%
64.4%	1,800	2,400	14,742	10.1%	16.8%	5,749	7.5%	12.9%	7,563	14.3%	22.8%	280	13.0%	17.1%	545	6.3%	10.7%	383	8.6%	17.3%	236	15.9%	31.8%
	2,400	3,000	21,634	14.8%	31.5%	9,281	12.1%	25.0%	9,865	18.7%	41.5%	281	13.0%	30.1%	1,168	13.5%	24.3%	822	18.5%	35.8%	238	16.1%	47.9%
	3,000	3,600	18,549	12.7%	44.2%	9,942	12.9%	37.9%	6,770	12.8%	54.3%	427	19.8%	49.9%	352	4.1%	28.3%	927	20.9%	56.7%	130	8.8%	56.7%
	3,600	4,200	16,389	11.2%	55.4%	8,276	10.8%	48.7%	6,572	12.4%	66.7%	426	19.8%	69.7%	541	6.3%	34.6%	475	10.7%	67.4%	98	6.6%	63.3%
	4,200	4,800	13,228	9.0%	64.4%	7,566	9.8%	58.5%	3,863	7.3%	74.0%	238	11.0%	80.7%	1,177	13.6%	48.2%	278	6.3%	73.7%	93	6.3%	69.6%
<b>Midle income group</b>	4,800	5,400	11,578	7.9%	72.3%	6,900	9.0%	67.5%	3,265	6.2%	80.2%	139	6.5%	87.2%	741	8.6%	56.8%	463	10.4%	84.1%	58	3.9%	73.5%
28.4%	5,400	6,000	7,386	5.0%	77.4%	4,306	5.6%	73.1%	2,083	3.9%	84.2%	44	2.0%	89.2%	569	6.6%	63.4%	288	6.5%	90.6%	96	6.5%	80.0%
	6,000	7,000	11,141	7.6%	85.0%	6,272	8.2%	81.3%	3,220	6.1%	90.3%	0	0.0%	89.2%	1,315	15.2%	78.6%	201	4.5%	95.2%	134	9.1%	89.1%
	7,000	8,000	6,365	4.3%	89.3%	4,265	5.5%	86.8%	1,674	3.2%	93.4%	45	2.1%	91.3%	178	2.1%	80.7%	108	2.4%	97.6%	95	6.4%	95.5%
	8,000	9,000	5,140	3.5%	92.8%	3,691	4.8%	91.6%	771	1.5%	94.9%	46	2.1%	93.5%	565	6.5%	87.2%	0	0.0%	97.6%	67	4.5%	100.0%
<b>High income group</b>	9,000	10,000	3,025	2.1%	94.9%	1,755	2.3%	93.9%	1,116	2.1%	97.0%	51	2.4%	95.8%	0	0.0%	87.2%	106	2.4%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
7.2%	10,000	12,000	3,007	2.1%	97.0%	1,431	1.9%	95.8%	965	1.8%	98.8%	45	2.1%	97.9%	565	6.5%	93.7%	0	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	12,000	14,000	2,093	1.4%	98.4%	1,614	2.1%	97.9%	299	0.6%	99.4%	0	0.0%	97.9%	180	2.1%	95.8%	0	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	>14000	2,369	1.6%	100.0%	1,642	2.1%	100.0%	322	0.6%	100.0%	45	2.1%	100.0%	360	4.2%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%	
		146,432	100.0%		76,898			52,840			2,155			8,638			4,433			1,480			

Source: HEIS 2006, Department of Statistics

Adjustments at the income boundaries	Zarqa sub-district.....		Ruseifa sub-district.....		Berein sub-district.....		Hashameer sub-district.....		Dhilail sub-district.....		Ashraq sub-district.....		
	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	Nr households	% of households	
<	1,800	9,786	6.7%	4,208	5.5%	88	4.1%	382	4.4%	382	8.6%	235	15.9%
<	1,664	9,049	6.2%	3,891	5.1%	81	3.8%	353	4.1%	353	8.0%	217	14.7%
1,664	1,800	737	0.5%	317	0.4%	7	0.3%	29	0.3%	29	0.6%	18	1.2%
3,000	3,600	18,549	12.7%	9,942	12.9%	427	19.8%	352	4.1%	927	20.9%	130	8.8%
3,000	3,329	10,165	6.9%	5,448	7.1%	234	10.9%	193	2.2%	508	11.5%	71	4.8%
3,329	3,600	8,384	5.7%	4,494	5.8%	193	9.0%	159	1.8%	419	9.5%	59	4.0%

### Analysis of socio-economic breakdown of population of MCC priority areas

WSA	Population connected (NOD/ACEPO)	Population (host)	Zarqa sub-district (host) population	Zarqa sub-district <\$2	Zarqa sub-district between \$2-\$4	Zarqa sub-district >\$4	Russaifah (host population)	Russaifah <\$2	Russaifah between \$2-\$4	Russaifah >\$4	Host Population of MCC priority areas	<\$2	\$2-\$4	>\$4
Tatweer	8,501	8,673	8,673	439	2,345	5,889								
Zarqa	226,821	231,407	231,407	11,709	62,579	157,120								
Awajan	149,171	152,187	152,187	7,701	41,155	103,331								
Russaifah	91,034	92,875					92,875	7,301	37,748	47,826				
Total	475,527	485,142	392,268	19,849	106,079	266,340	92,875	7,301	37,748	47,826	27,149	143,828	314,166	in real numbers
											5.60%	29.65%	64.76%	percentage terms

Connection rate 98.02%

Please note Tatweer, Zarqa and Awajan WSA lie within the Zarqa sub-district and obviously Russaifa WSA lies within Russaifa sub-district  
The North WSA belongs to Hashmeer sub-district and West-NW WSA lies within Berein sub-district

**Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Selected List of PIP MCC Priority Projects. Work-sheet "Wcon"**

Step 2 is to assess the structure of water distribution across the three socio-economic groups outlined in the TOR

From the analysis conducted in step 1 it is shown that the percentage of the population in each socio-economic group in the MCC priority areas is as follows:

<\$2	5.6%
\$2-\$4	29.6%
>\$4	64.8%

(for details of the analysis see worksheet "Socecon")

Proportionate shares across socio-economic categories (assumptions)

	<\$2	\$2 - \$4	>\$4
Shop water shares	1	1.5	3
Tanker water	1	1	2

Percentage water shares across water type and socio-economic category

	network water (percentage)	tanker water (share)	tanker water (percentage)	shop water (share)	shop water (percentage)
<\$2	5.6%	1	3.4%	1	2.3%
\$2-\$4	29.6%	7	18.0%	8	18.2%
>\$4	64.8%	32	78.6%	35	79.5%
	100%		100%		100%

These figures represent the distribution of network water across the three main socio-economic groupings based on the 2008 billing data. The ECO Consult draft report indicates that there is no relationship between income and the quantity of network water received. However, the distribution of shop and tanker water across socio-economic categories remains unknown. In the absence of data assumptions are made; and these assumptions apply only to the beneficiary analysis

Values of key independent (or input) variables are outlined here, appropriately referenced:

Average annual tanker water consumption per household (m <sup>3</sup> /hse/a)	13.535	(ECO Consult 2010:calculated from raw data and adjusted to HH size) This is an under-estimate as ECO Consult figures are based on one quarter.
Average annual shop water consumption per household (m <sup>3</sup> /hse/a)	1.521	(GFA Aug 2008 raw data analysed)
Price of shop water (JOD/m <sup>3</sup> )	52.826	NOD/ACEPO engineers
Price of tanker water (JOD/m <sup>3</sup> ) (conservative)	4	(GFA Aug 2008:107)
Average size of household (HH)	7.083	Based on DOS Zarqa population 2008, 98.02% connection rate.
<b>N.B. HH size in demographic data refers to person sharing the same roof. Here in the context of the water sector, HH refers to multiple HHs that share the same water meter.</b>		

	lcd	m <sup>3</sup> /HH / annum
The model below (table 1:last row) shows average consumption of all types of water is	62	161
The model also shows (table 1:first row) average consumption of network water only is	56	146

The findings are only shown here but the analysis is conducted on the excel file of the 2008 billing data and based on the certain assumptions which were necessary as the 2008 billing data (in contrast to the 2006 billing data) does not distinguish between domestic and non-domestic consumers.

Hence, in order to distinguish between domestic and non-domestic consumption the following assumptions were used:

<i> the quantities of water consumed by domestic HHs and non-domestic units are based on the 2006 billing data as 85% and 15% respectively;

<ii> units that did not consume any water in 2008 are excluded from the analysis. Some of them were only registered in 2009.

<iii> units that consume quantities >265 lcd are assumed to be non-domestic.

The relevant conclusions of the analysis is outline in Table 1 below under network water in terms of HHs and quantities of water consumed.

The breakdown of domestic consumers in terms of eleven consumption bands is shown in worksheet "Heli". More specifically 51.44%

of HHs consume less than 50 lcd which is a figure close to the findings of the EC Consult survey of 49.5%.







Step 4									
Step 4 consists in assessing annual models of water consumption over the 20 years of the life of the project (2010-2029) taking into account population growth and "without project" and "with project" scenarios.									
The following additional assumptions are made:									
<b>Population and connectivity parameters</b>									
Annual population growth rate:			3.25%		Generated by the masterplan CBA model				
Population (2008)			485,142		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Population (2029)			949,643		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Baseline data (2010)			517,189		Generated by the CBA model				
Percentage of population connected (2008)			98.02%		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Percentage of population connected (2029)			99.07%		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual increase in population connected			0.05%		Generated by the CBA model				
Percentage of population connected (2010)			98.12%		Generated by the CBA model				
<b>UFW parameters</b>									
UFW physical as % of total system input, without project (2008)			63.60%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
UFW physical as % of total system input, without project (2010)			63.9%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW physical as % of total system input, without project (2029)			66.4%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW physical without project (2010-2029)			0.2%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, without project (2008)			5.2%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, without project (2010)			5.2%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, without project (2029)			5.0%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW administrative without project (2010 -			-0.2%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW physical as % of total system input, with project (2008)			13.8%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers	The 2008 & 2010 UFW figures with project			
UFW physical as % of total system input, with project (2010)			13.7%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model	are hypothetical for the sake of the			
UFW physical as % of total system input, with project (2029)			12.4%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers	engineering calculations. In reality UFW			
Average annual % change to UFW physical with project (2010-2030)			-0.5%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model	with project is only realised in year 3 of the			
UFW administrative as % of total system input, with project (2008)			6.7%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers	life of the project.			
UFW administrative as % of total system input, with project (2010)			6.7%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
UFW administrative as % of total system input, with project (2029)			6.9%	70hrs/wk	Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Average annual % change to UFW administrative with project			0.1%	70hrs/wk	Generated by the CBA model				
Percentage of HHs affected adversely by UFW administrative			89.0%		Source: NOD/ ACEPO engineers				
Consumption of shop water is reduced "with project" by 50%			50%		(Conjecture that can be modified with evidence				
(Currently, this is conjecture. But it is not foreseen that all HHs particularly the richer ones will not totally give up the use of shop water as it is used for drinking and cooking. However, the quality of the additional network water would be significant in this decision.									
On the other hand, tanker water will be easily substituted for additional network water on a one to one basis when available, as it is mainly relied upon when network water is not available and usually not for drinking and cooking (unless treated) but for more general domestic uses. This has been borne out by the ECO Consult draft report.									
The model assumes that benefits of the proposed project only are realised in year 3 of the life of the project. Up till then the network operates in accordance with UFW figures "without project" as outlined above.									

Table 3: Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water										2010
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year			without project		
10,454,745	0	517,189	507,454	11,533,446	0					
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3			
Total	10,454,745	146	56	71,644	2,301,238	32	0.22			
<\$2	585,060	146	56	4,009	0	0	0.00			
\$2-\$4	3,099,461	146	56	21,240	0	0	0.00			
>\$4	6,770,224	146	56	46,395	0	0	0.00			
	Shop water									
Total	108,983	2	1	71,644	5,757,151	80	53			
<\$2	2,496									
\$2-\$4	19,835									
>\$4	86,652									
	Tanker water									
Total	969,718	14	5	71,644	3,878,871	54	4			
<\$2	32,937									
\$2-\$4	174,491									
>\$4	762,289									
	Network, shop & tanker water									
Total	11,533,446	161	62	71,644	11,937,260	167				
<\$2										
\$2-\$4										
>\$4										
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water										2010
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year			with project		
10,454,745	0	517,189	507,454	11,533,446	0					
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3			
Total	10,454,745	146	56	71,644	2,301,238	32	0.22			
<\$2	585,060	146	56	4,009	0	0	0.00			
\$2-\$4	3,099,461	146	56	21,240	0	0	0.00			
>\$4	6,770,224	146	56	46,395	0	0	0.00			
	Shop water									
Total	108,983	2	1	71,644	5,757,151	80	53			
<\$2	2,496									
\$2-\$4	19,835									
>\$4	86,652									
	Tanker water									
Total	969,718	14	5	71,644	3,878,871	54	4			
<\$2	32,937									
\$2-\$4	174,491									
>\$4	762,289									
	Network, shop & tanker water									
Total	11,533,446	161	62	71,644	11,937,260	167				
<\$2										
\$2-\$4										
>\$4										

Given the variety of variables it was thought necessary to devote separate "without project" and "with project" tables for each of the 20 years of the life of the project. However, the 40 tables feed off variables that are identified at the top of the worksheet, such as the size of population, population growth years, quantities of water used, water prices etc. These can be changed at the top of the worksheet, and the changes will be fed electronically and automatically to all the 40 tables for those who wish to explore different scenarios, and onward to the summary CBA worksheet where the ERR is decided.

The data generated by these 40 tables is fed into the more traditional worksheets "hsehold", "prod" and "CBA".







Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water									2014	
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year			without project	5	
10,291,625	1,614,126	517,189	577,883	13,134,164	4					
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3				
Total	10,291,625	126	49	81,587	2,265,333	28	0.22			
<\$2	575,932	126	49	4,566	0	0	0.00			
\$2-\$4	3,051,102	126	49	24,188	0	0	0.00			
>\$4	6,664,592	126	49	52,834	0	0	0.00			
Shop water										
Total	124,109	2	1	81,587	6,556,182	80	53			
<\$2	2,842									
\$2-\$4	22,588									
>\$4	98,679									
Tanker water										
Total	1,104,304	14	5	81,587	4,417,216	54	4			
<\$2	37,509									
\$2-\$4	198,708									
>\$4	868,087									
Network, shop & tanker water										
Total	13,134,164	161	62	81,587	13,238,731	162				
<\$2										
\$2-\$4										
>\$4										
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water									2014	
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year			with project	5
20,407,636	-7,802,070	517,189	577,883	13,134,164	60%	4				
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3				
Total	20,407,636	250	97	81,587	4,492,010	55	0.22			
<\$2	1,142,036	250	97	4,566	0	0	0.00			
\$2-\$4	6,050,140	250	97	24,188	0	0	0.00			
>\$4	13,215,460	250	97	52,834	0	0	0.00			
Shop water										
Total	86,876	1	0	81,587	4,589,327	56	53			
<\$2	1,990									
\$2-\$4	15,812									
>\$4	69,075									
Tanker water										
Total	441,722	5	2	81,587	1,766,886	22	4			
<\$2	15,003									
\$2-\$4	79,483									
>\$4	347,235									
Network, shop & tanker water										
Total	20,936,234	257	99	81,587	10,848,224	133				
<\$2										
\$2-\$4										
>\$4										

Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2015
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year		without project	
10,250,607	2,048,331	517,189	596,968	13,567,920	5		6	
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3	
Total	10,250,607	122	47	84,282	2,256,304	27	0.22	
<\$2	573,636	122	47	4,717	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	3,038,941	122	47	24,987	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	6,638,030	122	47	54,579	0	0	0.00	
	Shop water							
Total	128,208	2	1	84,282	6,772,700	80	53	
<\$2	2,936							
\$2-\$4	23,334							
>\$4	101,937							
	Tanker water							
Total	1,140,774	14	5	84,282	4,563,095	54	4	
<\$2	38,747							
\$2-\$4	205,271							
>\$4	896,756							
	Network, shop & tanker water							
Total	13,567,920	161	62	84,282	13,592,099	161		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2015
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		
25,577,456	-12,194,128	517,189	596,968	13,567,920	90%	5	with project	
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3	
Total	25,577,456	303	117	84,282	5,629,961	67	0.22	
<\$2	1,431,345	303	117	4,717	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	7,582,808	303	117	24,987	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	16,563,303	303	117	54,579	0	0	0.00	
	Shop water							
Total	70,514	1	0	84,282	3,724,985	44	53	
<\$2	1,615							
\$2-\$4	12,834							
>\$4	56,066							
	Tanker water							
Total	114,077	1	1	84,282	456,309	5	4	
<\$2	3,875							
\$2-\$4	20,527							
>\$4	89,676							
	Network, shop & tanker water							
Total	25,762,048	306	118	84,282	9,811,256	116		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								





Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2017
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year		8	
10,168,286	2,956,411	517,189	637,049	14,478,879	7		without project	
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	10,168,286	113	44	89,941	2,238,184	25	0.22	
<\$2	569,030	113	44	5,033	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	3,014,536	113	44	26,664	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	6,584,721	113	44	58,243	0	0	0.00	
Shop water								
Total	136,816	2	1	89,941	7,227,423	80	53	
<\$2	3,134							
\$2-\$4	24,901							
>\$4	108,782							
Tanker water								
Total	1,217,366	14	5	89,941	4,869,464	54	4	
<\$2	41,349							
\$2-\$4	219,053							
>\$4	956,964							
Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	14,478,879	161	62	89,941	14,335,071	159		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2017
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		8
26,499,163	-12,165,838	517,189	637,049	14,478,879	94%	7	with project	
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	26,499,163	295	114	89,941	5,832,842	65	0.22	
<\$2	1,482,925	295	114	5,033	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	7,856,061	295	114	26,664	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	17,160,177	295	114	58,243	0	0	0.00	
Shop water								
Total	72,512	1	0	89,941	3,830,534	43	53	
<\$2	1,661							
\$2-\$4	13,197							
>\$4	57,654							
Tanker water								
Total	73,042	1	0	89,941	292,168	3	4	
<\$2	2,481							
\$2-\$4	13,143							
>\$4	57,418							
Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	26,644,717	296	115	89,941	9,955,544	111		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								

Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2018
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)		Year		
10,126,982	3,431,159	517,189	658,087	14,957,044	8		9	
							without project	
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3	
Total	10,126,982	109	42	92,911	2,229,092	24	0.22	
<\$2	566,718	109	42	5,199	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	3,002,291	109	42	27,545	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	6,557,973	109	42	60,167	0	0	0.00	
	Shop water							
Total	141,334	2	1	92,911	7,466,109	80	53	
<\$2	3,237							
\$2-\$4	25,723							
>\$4	112,374							
	Tanker water							
Total	1,257,569	14	5	92,911	5,030,278	54	4	
<\$2	42,714							
\$2-\$4	226,287							
>\$4	988,568							
	Network, shop & tanker water							
Total	14,957,044	161	62	92,911	14,725,480	158		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2018
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		
26,972,044	-12,138,796	517,189	658,087	14,957,044	96%	8	9	
							with project	
	Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3	
Total	26,972,044	290	112	92,911	5,936,930	64	0.22	
<\$2	1,509,388	290	112	5,199	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	7,996,254	290	112	27,545	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	17,466,402	290	112	60,167	0	0	0.00	
	Shop water							
Total	73,494	1	0	92,911	3,882,377	42	53	
<\$2	1,683							
\$2-\$4	13,376							
>\$4	58,435							
	Tanker water							
Total	50,303	1	0	92,911	201,211	2	4	
<\$2	1,709							
\$2-\$4	9,051							
>\$4	39,543							
	Network, shop & tanker water							
Total	27,095,841	292	113	92,911	10,020,518	108		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								

Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2019
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	Year		10	
10,085,582	3,920,316	517,189	679,821	15,451,001	9		without project	
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	10,085,582	105	41	95,979	2,219,980	23	0.22	
<\$2	564,401	105	41	5,371	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	2,990,017	105	41	28,454	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	6,531,163	105	41	62,154	0	0	0.00	
Shop water								
Total	146,002	2	1	95,979	7,712,678	80	53	
<\$2	3,344							
\$2-\$4	26,572							
>\$4	116,085							
Tanker water								
Total	1,299,101	14	5	95,979	5,196,403	54	4	
<\$2	44,125							
\$2-\$4	233,760							
>\$4	1,021,216							
Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	15,451,001	161	62	95,979	15,129,060	158		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								
Supplies of water to targeted households: network, shop and tanker water								2019
network water (m3)	Deficit (m³)	baseline pop	pop connect	water demand (m3)	% HHs reached	Year		10
27,453,073	-12,102,515	517,189	679,821	15,451,001	98%	9	with project	
Network water	m3/hse/a	lcd	nr hse	water revenue	water revenue/hse	water prices/ m3		
Total	27,453,073	286	111	95,979	6,042,811	63	0.22	
<\$2	1,536,307	286	111	5,371	0	0	0.00	
\$2-\$4	8,138,862	286	111	28,454	0	0	0.00	
>\$4	17,777,904	286	111	62,154	0	0	0.00	
Shop water								
Total	74,461	1	0	95,979	3,933,466	41	53	
<\$2	1,705							
\$2-\$4	13,552							
>\$4	59,203							
Tanker water								
Total	25,982	0	0	95,979	103,928	1	4	
<\$2	883							
\$2-\$4	4,675							
>\$4	20,424							
Network, shop & tanker water								
Total	27,553,515	287	111	95,979	10,080,205	105		
<\$2								
\$2-\$4								
>\$4								























**Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Selected List of PIP MCC Priority Projects. Work-sheet "Hsehold"**

Table 4: Household water consumption analysis across 20 years																					
water prices per m <sup>3</sup> :		network		shop		pop growth: 3.25%		tanker		annual connectivity growth: 0.05%											
2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029		
Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	Year	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
<b>Target population (all HHs)</b>	517,189	533,998	551,353	569,272	587,773	606,876	626,599	646,964	667,990	689,700	712,115	735,259	759,154	783,827	809,301	835,604	862,761	890,800	919,751	949,643	
<b>Target population (connected HHs)</b>	507,454	524,213	541,525	559,409	577,883	596,968	616,683	637,049	658,087	679,821	702,272	725,464	749,423	774,172	799,739	826,151	853,435	881,619	910,735	940,812	
<b>Without project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	10,454,745	10,414,107	10,373,375	10,332,547	10,291,625	10,250,607	10,209,494	10,168,286	10,126,982	10,085,582	10,044,086	10,002,494	9,960,805	9,919,020	9,877,138	9,835,159	9,793,083	9,750,910	9,708,639	9,666,271	
Total shop water consumed	108,983	112,582	116,301	120,141	124,109	128,208	132,442	136,816	141,334	146,002	150,823	155,804	160,950	166,265	171,756	177,428	183,288	189,341	195,594	202,053	
Total tanker water consumed	969,718	1,001,743	1,034,825	1,069,000	1,104,304	1,140,774	1,178,448	1,217,366	1,257,569	1,299,101	1,342,004	1,386,323	1,432,107	1,479,402	1,528,259	1,578,730	1,630,867	1,684,727	1,740,365	1,797,841	
<b>With project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	10,454,745	10,414,107	10,373,375	15,339,982	20,407,636	25,577,456	26,034,332	26,499,163	26,972,044	27,453,073	27,942,348	28,078,453	28,215,847	28,354,551	28,494,587	28,635,977	28,778,745	28,922,912	29,068,504	29,215,543	
Total shop water consumed	108,983	112,582	116,301	102,120	86,876	70,514	71,519	72,512	73,494	74,461	75,412	77,902	80,475	83,132	85,878	88,714	91,644	94,670	97,797	101,027	
Total tanker water consumed	969,718	1,001,743	1,034,825	748,300	441,722	114,077	94,276	73,042	50,303	25,982	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Savings from switching from shop water to network water</b>				0	948,021	1,958,659	3,035,016	3,204,919	3,382,735	3,568,800	3,763,465	3,967,095	4,098,109	4,233,449	4,373,258	4,517,685	4,666,882	4,821,006	4,980,219	5,144,691	5,314,595
<b>Savings from switching from tanker water to network water</b>				0	1,212,210	2,504,486	3,880,795	4,098,046	4,325,414	4,563,330	4,812,243	5,072,620	5,240,143	5,413,199	5,591,970	5,776,645	5,967,419	6,164,493	6,368,075	6,578,381	6,795,632
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water</b>				0	2,160,231	4,463,145	6,915,811	7,302,965	7,708,149	8,132,130	8,575,708	9,039,715	9,338,252	9,646,648	9,965,228	10,294,330	10,634,301	10,985,498	11,348,295	11,723,072	12,110,227
<b>Poorest socio-economic group (&lt;\$2 per person per day)</b>																					
<b>Target population (all HHs)</b>	28,943	29,883	30,854	31,857	32,892	33,961	35,065	36,205	37,382	38,596	39,851	41,146	42,483	43,864	45,289	46,761	48,281	49,850	51,470	53,143	
<b>Target population (connected HHs)</b>	28,398	29,336	30,304	31,305	32,339	33,407	34,510	35,650	36,827	38,044	39,300	40,598	41,939	43,324	44,754	46,232	47,759	49,336	50,966	52,649	
<b>Without project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	585,060	582,786	580,507	578,222	575,932	573,636	571,336	569,030	566,718	564,401	562,079	559,752	557,419	555,080	552,737	550,387	548,033	545,673	543,307	540,936	
Total shop water consumed	2,496	2,578	2,664	2,752	2,842	2,936	3,033	3,134	3,237	3,344	3,454	3,568	3,686	3,808	3,934	4,064	4,198	4,337	4,480	4,628	
Total tanker water consumed	32,937	34,025	35,149	36,309	37,509	38,747	40,027	41,349	42,714	44,125	45,582	47,088	48,643	50,249	51,909	53,623	55,394	57,223	59,113	61,065	
<b>With project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	585,060	582,786	580,507	858,444	1,142,036	1,431,345	1,456,913	1,482,925	1,509,388	1,536,307	1,563,687	1,571,304	1,578,993	1,586,755	1,594,591	1,602,504	1,610,493	1,618,561	1,626,708	1,634,937	
Total shop water consumed	2,496	2,578	2,664	2,339	1,990	1,615	1,638	1,661	1,683	1,705	1,727	1,784	1,843	1,904	1,967	2,032	2,099	2,168	2,240	2,314	
Total tanker water consumed	32,937	34,025	35,149	25,417	15,003	3,875	3,202	2,481	1,709	883	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Savings from switching from shop water to network water</b>				0	21,713	44,860	69,512	73,403	77,475	81,737	86,195	90,859	93,860	96,959	100,162	103,469	106,886	110,416	114,063	117,830	121,721
<b>Savings from switching from tanker water to network water</b>				0	41,174	85,067	131,814	139,193	146,916	154,997	163,452	172,296	177,986	183,864	189,936	196,208	202,688	209,382	216,297	223,440	230,819
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water</b>				0	62,886	129,926	201,326	212,596	224,392	236,734	249,647	263,155	271,845	280,823	290,097	299,678	309,575	319,798	330,360	341,270	352,540
<b>Medium poor socio-economic group (\$2 - \$4 per person per day)</b>																					
<b>Target population (all HHs)</b>	153,328	158,311	163,457	168,769	174,254	179,917	185,764	191,802	198,035	204,471	211,117	217,978	225,062	232,377	239,929	247,727	255,778	264,091	272,674	281,536	
<b>Target population (connected HHs)</b>	150,442	155,411	160,543	165,845	171,322	176,980	182,825	188,862	195,100	201,543	208,199	215,074	222,177	229,515	237,094	244,924	253,013	261,369	270,001	278,917	
<b>Without project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	3,099,461	3,087,413	3,075,337	3,063,234	3,051,102	3,038,941	3,026,753	3,014,536	3,002,291	2,990,017	2,977,715	2,965,384	2,953,025	2,940,637	2,928,221	2,915,776	2,903,302	2,890,799	2,878,267	2,865,706	
Total shop water consumed	19,835	20,490	21,167	21,866	22,588	23,334	24,104	24,901	25,723	26,572	27,450	28,356	29,293	30,260	31,260	32,292	33,358	34,460	35,598	36,774	
Total tanker water consumed	174,491	180,254	186,206	192,356	198,708	205,271	212,050	219,053	226,287	233,760	241,480	249,455	257,693	266,204	274,995	284,077	293,458	303,150	313,161	323,503	
<b>With project</b>																					
Total network water consumed	3,099,461	3,087,413	3,075,337	4,547,760	6,050,140	7,582,808	7,718,256	7,856,061	7,996,254	8,138,862	8,283,915	8,324,265	8,364,997	8,406,118	8,447,634	8,489,551	8,531,876	8,574,617	8,617,780	8,661,372	
Total shop water consumed	19,835	20,490	21,167	18,586	15,812	12,834	13,016	13,197	13,376	13,552	13,725	14,178	14,646	15,130	15,630	16,146	16,679	17,230	17,799	18,387	
Total tanker water consumed	174,491	180,254	186,206	134,649	79,483	20,527	16,964	13,143	9,051	4,675	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Savings from switching from shop water to network water</b>				0	172,540	356,477	552,375	583,297	615,660	649,524	684,953	722,014	745,858	770,490	795,936	822,221	849,375	877,426	906,403	936,337	967,259
<b>Savings from switching from tanker water to network water</b>				0	218,125	450,657	698,310	737,402	778,315	821,126	865,915	912,767	942,911	974,051	1,006,219	1,039,449	1,073,777	1,109,239	1,145,871	1,183,714	1,222,806
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water</b>				0	390,665	807,134	1,250,685	1,320,700	1,393,975	1,470,649	1,550,868	1,634,781	1,688,770	1,744,541	1,802,155	1,861,671	1,923,153	1,986,665	2,052,274	2,120,051	2,190,065
<b>Total savings from switching from shop and tanker water (both socio-economic categories)</b>				0	453,552	937,061	1,452,011	1,533,296	1,618,366	1,707,383	1,800,515	1,897,936	1,960,615	2,025,364	2,092,252	2,161,349	2,232,727	2,306,463	2,382,634	2,461,321	2,542,606
<b>Target Population (all HHs) of both socio-economic categories</b>	182,271	188,195	194,311	200,626	207,146	213,879	220,830	228,007	235,417	243,068	250,968	259,124	267,546	276,241	285,219	294,488	304,059	313,941	324,144	334,679	
Table 4 feeds off the worksheet "Wcon" electronically.																					
<b>Health benefits for those consuming &lt; 50 lcd</b>																					
Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALY)																					
Avoided health-related costs																					
The health impact of the proposed project is analysed in section (d), of the worksheet "Heli"																					

## Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Selected List of PIP MCC Priority Projects. Work-sheet "Heli"

### (a) Analysing the 2008 billing data: a story of inequality in distribution between network water-poor and network water-rich HHs

Tables 1 & 3 are derived from the 2008 billing data and provide the following findings:

<i>-> total quantities of network water and nr HHs across 11 different consumption bands (table H1)

<i>-> average annual consumption per HH, average HH bill and total revenue across consumption bands (table H3)

**Table H1: Water consumption across consumption ranges**

Consumption bands (con band)	Water quantities per con band (m³)	Water quantities per con band in % terms	Cumulative in % terms increasing	Cumulative in % terms declining	nr HHs per con band	nr HHs per con range in % terms	Cumulative in % terms increasing	Cumulative in % terms declining
<50lcd	4,635,648	26.34%	26.34%	100.00%	62,044	51.44%	51.44%	100.00%
50lcd-65lcd	2,709,956	15.40%	41.74%	73.66%	18,291	15.17%	66.61%	48.56%
65lcd-80lcd	2,522,226	14.33%	56.07%	58.26%	13,528	11.22%	77.82%	33.39%
80lcd-120lcd	4,793,678	27.24%	83.30%	43.93%	19,259	15.97%	93.79%	22.18%
120lcd-145lcd	1,389,365	7.89%	91.20%	16.70%	4,104	3.40%	97.19%	6.21%
145lcd-165lcd	624,570	3.55%	94.75%	8.80%	1,570	1.30%	98.49%	2.81%
165lcd-185lcd	349,621	1.99%	96.73%	5.25%	777	0.64%	99.14%	1.51%
185lcd-205lcd	230,410	1.31%	98.04%	3.27%	460	0.38%	99.52%	0.86%
205lcd-225lcd	136,962	0.78%	98.82%	1.96%	248	0.21%	99.72%	0.48%
225lcd-245lcd	125,671	0.71%	99.53%	1.18%	207	0.17%	99.90%	0.28%
245lcd-265lcd	82,220	0.47%	100.00%	0.47%	125	0.10%	100.00%	0.10%
<b>Total water consumption (2008)</b>	<b>17,600,327</b>				<b>120,613</b>			

The above table speaks for itself with respect to the unequal distribution of network water. This is indicated by a number of observations:

62,044 HHs or in % terms	51.44% of all Zarqa HHs consume <50lcd of network water and	26.34% of Zarqa network water
58,569 HHs or in % terms	48.56% of all Zarqa HHs consume between 50-265 lcd of water and	73.66% of Zarqa network water

Since the ECO Consult report indicates no correlation between income and water consumption levels, the inequality is based on unequal distribution generated by poor quality piping in certain areas which disadvantages households across all income groups.

The HELI (2005) report highlights the health benefit accruing from raising network water consumption from <50 lcd to 60 lcd and higher.

In the context of Zarqa Governorate the following statistics are of interest in the HELI framework:

**Table H2: Water consumption across groups 1 (HHs consuming <50 lcd) & 2 (HHs consuming between 50 - 265 lcd) with project**

Year	Total water	Group 1 water	Group 2 water	Total HHS connect	Group 1 HHs	Group 2 HHs	Group 1 m³/HH/annum	Group 2 m³/HH/annum	Group 1 lcd	Group 2 lcd	Group 1 =>60lcd (m³)	Group 2 after transf to Group 1 (m³)	Group 2 after transf to Group 1 (lcd)
2,010	10,454,745	2,753,615	7,701,131	71,644	36,854	34,790	75	221	29	86			
2,011	10,414,107	2,742,911	7,671,196	74,010	38,071	35,939	72	213	28	83			
2,012	10,373,375	2,732,183	7,641,192	76,454	39,328	37,126	69	206	27	80			
2,013	15,339,982	4,040,309	11,299,673	78,979	40,627	38,352	99	295	38	114			
2,014	20,407,636	5,375,049	15,032,587	81,587	41,969	39,618	128	379	50	147			
2,015	25,577,456	6,736,698	18,840,758	84,282	43,355	40,927	155	460	60	178			
2,016	26,034,332	6,857,032	19,177,301	87,065	44,787	42,278	153	454	59	175	6,947,229	19,087,103	175
2,017	26,499,163	6,979,461	19,519,702	89,941	46,266	43,675	151	447	58	173	7,176,662	19,322,501	171
2,018	26,972,044	7,104,010	19,868,034	92,911	47,794	45,117	149	440	57	170	7,413,671	19,558,373	168
2,019	27,453,073	7,230,705	20,222,367	95,979	49,372	46,607	146	434	57	168	7,658,508	19,794,565	164
2,020	27,942,348	7,359,573	20,582,775	99,149	51,003	48,146	144	428	56	165	7,911,430	20,030,918	161
2,021	28,078,453	7,395,421	20,683,032	102,423	52,687	49,736	140	416	54	161	8,172,705	19,905,748	155
2,022	28,215,847	7,431,608	20,784,239	105,806	54,427	51,379	137	405	53	156	8,442,609	19,773,238	149
2,023	28,354,551	7,468,141	20,886,410	109,300	56,225	53,076	133	394	51	152	8,721,426	19,633,125	143
2,024	28,494,587	7,505,024	20,989,563	112,910	58,081	54,828	129	383	50	148	9,009,451	19,485,136	137
2,025	28,635,977	7,542,264	21,093,713	116,639	60,000	56,639	126	372	49	144	9,306,988	19,328,989	132
2,026	28,778,745	7,579,867	21,198,878	120,491	61,981	58,510	122	362	47	140	9,614,352	19,164,393	127
2,027	28,922,912	7,617,838	21,305,074	124,470	64,028	60,442	119	352	46	136	9,931,866	18,991,047	122
2,028	29,068,504	7,656,185	21,412,319	128,580	66,142	62,438	116	343	45	133	10,259,865	18,808,638	117
2,029	29,215,543	7,694,912	21,520,631	132,827	68,327	64,500	113	334	44	129	10,598,698	18,616,846	112

This table shows that in year 6 group 1 achieves average consumption level of 60 lcd. However to maintain this beyond year 6 redistribution of water from group 2 to group 1 is necessary. It is doable as it only requires modest reduction in the average water consumption level of group 2. In year 7 there is no reduction involved but in year 8 there is a reduction from 173 lcd to 171 lcd and in year 20 from 129 lcd to 119 lcd.

There are a number of reasons why network water poor HHs receive inadequate supplies. These include the following:

#### <i>-> unequal storage capacity

GFA 2008: 100 show that 1% of HHs have no storage; 13% have 1 m³ storage capacity, 48% have 2 m³ and 38% have more than 2.7 m³ (mean size) storage capacity.

#### Impact of storage capacity on benefiting from network water

Where tanks are only filled once a week this would generate the following consumption rates (lcd):-	storage:1m³	storage:2m³	storage:2.73m³
It means that those HHs with the smaller tanks obtain <50 lcd	20	40	55
The situation can be improved with 3 fillings per week giving the following lcd:-	61	121	165

#### <i>-> Altitude

Where the household lives in high altitude areas pressure is weak and supply erratic as others at lower altitudes are at the front of the queue and hence supplied first.

#### <i>-> Tariff structure

Given the large gap between the m³ price of network water (varying between JD 0.18 - JD 0.64), and that of tanker water (JD 4) and shop water (JD 52.83)

(in the context of water scarcity) those who have the influence, storage capacity and appropriate altitude are able to harvest a disproportionate share of the network water as illustrated by table H1 above. In addition, EC Consult points out that the sharing of meters by poor HHs pushes up the price of network water for the poor.

One resolution is to ensure that poor HHs have access to one meter per HH as recommended by ECO Consult.

Another resolution to this situation is to raise tariff rates much closer to commercial rates of tanker water, so that when HHs consume more than 165 lcd, the price of network water is > JD 4, so that the network water-rich HHs are forced to purchase tanker water when their consumption is >165 lcd.

Network water-poor HHs are willing to pay higher tariffs at the lower consumption band rates (see GFA 2008:163-173)

In summary, constraints <i>-> and <i>-> require an engineering resolution, while constraint <i>-> faces the challenge of reform of the tariff structure.

Both sets of resolutions will be required to address the plight of network water-poor HHs, of which there are 62,044 HHs representing

51.44% of all HHs of Zarqa.

#### <c> Economic and financial analysis of the 2008 billing data

Table H 3 below analyses annual HH expenditure on water, average prices per m³ and revenue across the consumption bands

**Table H3: HH network water consumption, water bills and revenue**

Consumption bands (con band)	av HH con/annum per con band (m³)	av HH con/annum per con band (m³)	tariff (JD)	av HH annual bill (JD)	av price per m³ per con band (JD)	revenue created per con band (JD)	Cumulative in % terms increasing	Cumulative in % terms declining
<50lcd	75	19	3.750	15	0.20	930,660	22.32%	100.00%
50lcd-65lcd	148	37	6.450	26	0.17	471,908	11.32%	77.68%
65lcd-80lcd	186	47	9.341	37	0.20	505,460	12.12%	66.36%
80lcd-120lcd	249	62	14.870	59	0.24	1,145,525	27.47%	54.24%
120lcd-145lcd	339	85	26.657	107	0.31	437,601	10.50%	26.76%
145lcd-165lcd	398	99	36.483	146	0.37	229,113	5.50%	16.27%
165lcd-185lcd	450	112	47.097	188	0.42	146,377	3.51%	10.77%
185lcd-205lcd	501	125	58.296	233	0.47	107,265	2.57%	7.26%
205lcd-225lcd	552	138	71.896	288	0.52	71,321	1.71%	4.69%
225lcd-245lcd	607	152	88.250	353	0.58	73,071	1.75%	2.98%
245lcd-265lcd	658	164	102.341	409	0.62	51,171	1.23%	1.23%
						<b>4,169,472</b>		

There are some minor inequalities in billing before average price per m³ begins to rise from 80 lcd onwards.

#### (d) Planning and implementing the HELI-desired outcome

It is now assumed that engineering and policy steps relating to tariff reform will take place so that the necessary quantities of additional water created by the proposed project will be channelled to HHs with <50 lcd so that their consumption rate is raised to 60 lcd; and this continues even in the face of population growth from year 9 onwards.

The details of the re-distribution of water between groups 1 & 2 in order to lift HHs of group 1 to 60 lcd and to maintain these HHs at this level are worked out above (table H2).

Hence, I move on to calculate the health benefits. I assume that the diarrhoea incidence/ person / year for those consuming < 50 lcd is .61

This is a conservative figure given Figure 6, HELI (2005) report, page 40. I also assume that the diarrhoea incidence/person/year is .27 for those consuming 60 lcd (ibid.)

Applying Table 10 (HELI 2005:43) to the metered population the health gains for raising consumption of group 1 to 60 lcd, health gains are estimated in Table H4 below.

**Table H4 Estimating the health benefits in lifting group 1 to consumption level of 60 lcd**

Diarrhoea incidence (JD)	Total health cost	population size	All socio-economic categories		Socio-economic categories (poor & medium poor)	
			Target population	Heath gain (JD)	Target population	Heath gain (JD)
0.61	56,323,128	5,100,396 (HELI 2005:43)	517,189	0	182,271	0
0.27	24,929,909	5,100,396 (HELI 2005:43)	533,998	0	188,195	0
	31,393,219	5,100,396	551,353	0	194,311	0
			569,272	0	200,626	0
			587,773	0	207,146	0
			606,876	3,735,353	213,879	1,316,434
			626,599	3,856,752	220,830	1,359,219
			646,964	3,982,097	228,007	1,403,393
			667,990	4,111,515	235,417	1,449,003
			689,700	4,245,139	243,068	1,496,096
			712,115	4,383,106	250,968	1,544,719
			735,259	4,525,557	259,124	1,594,923
			759,154	4,672,637	267,546	1,646,758
			783,827	4,824,498	276,241	1,700,277
			809,301	4,981,294	285,219	1,755,536
			835,604	5,143,186	294,488	1,812,591
			862,761	5,310,340	304,059	1,871,500
			890,800	5,482,926	313,941	1,932,324
			919,751	5,661,121	324,144	1,995,125
			949,643	5,845,108	334,679	2,059,966



**Zarqa Water Supply Feasibility Study. Selected List of PIP MCC Priority Projects. Work-sheet "Prod"**

Step 5																				
Step 5 consists of an analysis of production costs in order to ascertain costs per m3 of water produced and water delivered to consumers																				
This analysis is based on WAJ 2009, Zarqa Water Administration Profit and Loss Statement for 2008																				
Table 5a: Water production analysis Zarqa Governorate (2008)		Years																		
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Without project	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
<b>Water production</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>
Internal water sources (wells and springs)	39,074,642																			
Water imports	13,060,162																			
<b>Authorised consumption</b>	<b>25,606,380</b>	<b>25,506,847</b>	<b>25,407,082</b>	<b>25,307,086</b>	<b>25,206,856</b>	<b>25,106,393</b>	<b>25,005,697</b>	<b>24,904,767</b>	<b>24,803,603</b>	<b>24,702,204</b>	<b>24,600,569</b>	<b>24,498,699</b>	<b>24,396,593</b>	<b>24,294,250</b>	<b>24,191,670</b>	<b>24,088,853</b>	<b>23,985,798</b>	<b>23,882,505</b>	<b>23,778,973</b>	<b>23,675,202</b>
Billed metered consumption (billing system, tankers, exports)	24,184,161																			
Unbilled metered consumption (free water in arid areas)	490,706																			
Flushing of network	931,513																			
<b>Water production costs</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>
Salaries and wages (minus Sewerage Directorate & Irrigation Division)	1,743,119																			
Electricity expenses (Water Directorate total minus water treatment)	4,973,336																			
Spare parts and maintenance (Water Directorate & Desert Wells)	803,256																			
Vehicle expenses (Water Directorate/ water tankers/ desert wells)	306,998																			
General and Admin Expenses devoted to water-related staff & activities	358,614																			
Fuel expenses (minus Sewerage Directorate but plus 81% of Admin Dir)	212,854																			
Water imports	4,086,524																			
**Water related salaries & wages as percentage of total salary and wage bill (JOD 2,156,313)	81%																			
<b>Average cost per m3 of water produced (internal plus imports)</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>
<b>Average cost per m3 of water delivered to consumer (authorised consumption)</b>	<b>0.488</b>	<b>0.489</b>	<b>0.491</b>	<b>0.493</b>	<b>0.495</b>	<b>0.497</b>	<b>0.499</b>	<b>0.501</b>	<b>0.503</b>	<b>0.505</b>	<b>0.507</b>	<b>0.510</b>	<b>0.512</b>	<b>0.514</b>	<b>0.516</b>	<b>0.518</b>	<b>0.521</b>	<b>0.523</b>	<b>0.525</b>	<b>0.527</b>
<b>Step 6</b>																				
Step 6 ascertains what happens production costs (with project) given																				
percentage UFW "without project".....	68.5%	68.6%	68.7%	68.8%	69.0%	69.1%	69.2%	69.3%	69.5%	69.6%	69.7%	69.8%	70.0%	70.1%	70.2%	70.3%	70.5%	70.6%	70.7%	70.8%
but percentage UFW "with project".....	68.5%	68.6%	68.7%	19.5%	19.4%	19.3%	19.3%	19.2%	19.2%	19.1%	19.0%	19.0%	18.9%	18.9%	18.8%	18.8%	18.7%	18.7%	18.6%	18.5%
For the sake of the calculations it is assumed that the whole Zarqa water system is being rehabilitated and restructured. The key factors between the "without project" and "with project" scenarios is the difference between the UFW of without & with project																				
Making this wider assumption does not alter the calculation of unit costs of water production & delivery																				
<b>With project</b>																				
Percentage of connected consumers reached				30%	60%	90%	92%	94%	96%	98%	100%									
<b>Water production</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>	<b>52,134,804</b>
Internal water sources (wells and springs)	39,074,642																			
Water imports	13,060,162																			
<b>Authorised consumption</b>	<b>25,606,380</b>	<b>25,506,847</b>	<b>25,407,082</b>	<b>37,339,502</b>	<b>49,361,034</b>	<b>61,471,626</b>	<b>62,315,937</b>	<b>63,165,915</b>	<b>64,021,556</b>	<b>64,882,860</b>	<b>65,749,825</b>	<b>65,796,493</b>	<b>65,842,879</b>	<b>65,888,985</b>	<b>65,934,811</b>	<b>65,980,360</b>	<b>66,025,632</b>	<b>66,070,630</b>	<b>66,115,353</b>	<b>66,159,804</b>
The quantity of water delivered to consumers with project																				
We do not expect any energy saving of note due to the project works. At present the water is pumped from low-level pumping stations up to high-level reservoirs, and from there by gravity into the distribution network for customers' supply. There will in fact be more water pumped to higher elevations than at present, but there will be a trade-off in that the pumping to a reservoir can be done with steady state pumping which is more energy efficient. In overall terms no energy saving of note is envisaged. (NOD/ACEPO engineers 2010)																				
<b>Water production costs</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>	<b>12,484,700</b>
Salaries and wages (minus Sewerage Directorate & Irrigation Division)	1,743,119																			
Electricity expenses (Water Directorate total minus water treatment)	4,973,336																			
Spare parts and maintenance (Water Directorate & Desert Wells)	803,256																			
Vehicle expenses (Water Directorate/ water tankers/ desert wells)	306,998																			
General and Admin Expenses devoted to water-related staff & activities	358,614																			
Fuel expenses (minus Sewerage Directorate but plus 81% of Admin Dir)	212,854																			
Water imports	4,086,524																			
**Water related salaries & wages as percentage of total salary and wage bill (JOD 2,156,313)	81%																			
<b>Average cost per m3 of water produced (internal plus imports)</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.239</b>
<b>Average cost per m3 of water delivered to consumer (authorised consumption)</b>	<b>0.488</b>	<b>0.489</b>	<b>0.491</b>	<b>0.334</b>	<b>0.253</b>	<b>0.203</b>	<b>0.200</b>	<b>0.198</b>	<b>0.195</b>	<b>0.192</b>	<b>0.190</b>	<b>0.190</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.189</b>
<b>Water production &amp; delivery savings per m3 (years 1-20)</b>	<b>0.000000</b>	<b>0.000000</b>	<b>0.000000</b>	<b>0.158972</b>	<b>0.242364</b>	<b>0.294175</b>	<b>0.298929</b>	<b>0.303648</b>	<b>0.308334</b>	<b>0.312989</b>	<b>0.317615</b>	<b>0.319859</b>	<b>0.322126</b>	<b>0.324414</b>	<b>0.326725</b>	<b>0.329059</b>	<b>0.331415</b>	<b>0.333795</b>	<b>0.336199</b>	<b>0.338627</b>
(Year 3)																				
<b>Table 5b Opportunity cost to WAJ for not investing: cost of additional water required (without project) and loss of surplus (with project)</b>																				
<b>Without project</b>																				
Quantities of water (mf)	0	385,906	783,309	1,192,586	1,614,126	2,048,331	2,495,617	2,956,411	3,431,159	3,920,316	4,424,357	4,943,770	5,479,059	6,030,746	6,599,369	7,185,484	7,789,667	8,412,511	9,054,629	9,716,654
Cost (JD)	0	188,153	381,912	581,460	786,987	998,689	1,216,768	1,441,434	1,672,903	1,911,398	2,157,149	2,410,395	2,671,381	2,940,363	3,217,602	3,503,370	3,797,946	4,101,621	4,414,694	4,737,472
<b>With project</b>																				
Quantities of water (mf)	0	385,906	783,309	-3,476,128	-7,802,070	-12,194,128	-12,184,126	-12,165,838	-12,138,796	-12,102,515	-12,056,490	-11,667,964	-11,263,401	-10,842,251	-10,403,943	-9,947,890	-9,473,483	-8,980,094	-8,467,074	-7,933,751
Cost (JD)	0	188,153	381,912	-1,694,828	-3,803,993	-5,945,394	-5,940,518	-5,931,602	-5,918,417	-5,900,727	-5,878,287	-5,688,857	-5,491,607	-5,286,270	-5,072,568	-4,850,214	-4,618,911	-4,378,353	-4,128,224	-3,868,196
Opportunity cost to WAJ for not investing	0	0	0	2,276,288	4,590,980	6,944,083	7,157,286	7,373,036	7,591,320	7,812,125	8,035,436	8,099,252	8,162,989	8,226,633	8,290,170	8,353,584	8,416,858	8,479,975	8,542,918	8,605,669

The analysis only includes costs relating to the provision of network water both for residents and non-residents. Hence it excludes costs relating to the sewerage directorate, and waste water treatment. The figures for cost reduction "with project" are provisional and will be updated by data from the work of the engineers.

The analysis in this worksheet is conducted for the Zarqa Governorate as a whole, since the data provided (WAJ 2009) are governorate-wide and for that reason it is assumed for the sake of the analysis that the reduction in water leakage "with project" is applicable to the whole governorate.

The ultimate goal of the analysis is to ascertain savings in the production & delivery of network water "with project" for the whole governorate (see cell b 80 below).

The findings of this work sheet feed into the "CBA" worksheet.

There is an adjustment for the fact that pumping at wells is subsidized at JOD.043 per Kw instead of the industrial rate of JOD.050

Source: NOD/ACEPO engineers

Source: NOD/ACEPO engineers

