

Water Regulatory Authority of Albania

# Report on the Performance on the Water Supply and Sewerage Utilities

# 2017

(English short version)



Published by Water Regulatory Authority of Albania (WRA)  
St. "VIKTOR EFTIMIU" Bldg. 1, Administrative Unit No.5, 1001  
Tirana, Albania

E-mail: [public@erru.al](mailto:public@erru.al)  
Tel: +355 4 2258046  
Web: [www.erru.al](http://www.erru.al)

© The Water Regulatory Authority of Albania

June 2018

# Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	2
<b>Summary</b> .....	3
<b>1. Overall Performance Sector and Trend</b> .....	9
1.1 Reliability and Accuracy of Data .....	9
1.2 Analysis of Sector Key Performance Indicators .....	9
1.2.1 Water Supply and Wastewater Sewerage Services Coverage.....	10
1.2.2 Operation and Maintenance and Total Cost Coverage .....	10
1.2.3 Collection Efficiency.....	13
1.2.4 Staff Efficiency .....	13
1.2.5 Non-Revenue water (NRW) .....	14
1.2.6 Metering Coverage .....	15
1.2.7 Continuity of Water Supply .....	15
1.3 Sector Financial Results .....	16
1.3.1 Incomes from Activity and Subsidies.....	16
1.3.2 Capital Investments Needs and WSS Sector Finance .....	17
1.4 Aggregation .....	18
<b>2. Annex: Key Selected Data</b> .....	20

## Abbreviations

<b>WRA</b>	Regulatory Authority of the Sector of Water Supply and Wastewater Disposal and Treatment
<b>WSS</b>	Water Supply & Sewerage
<b>NRC</b>	National Regulatory Commission
<b>MIE</b>	Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy
<b>NWSSA</b>	National Water Supply and Sewerage Agency
<b>MBU</b>	Monitoring and Benchmarking Unit
<b>LGU</b>	Local Government Units
<b>KPI</b>	Key Performance Indicators
<b>WWTP</b>	Wastewater Treatment Plant
<b>O&amp;M</b>	Operation & Maintenance
<b>GCR</b>	General Collection Rate
<b>CCR</b>	Current Collection Rate
<b>TAR</b>	Territorial Administrative Reform

## Summary

### ***Performance Report as an instrument of analysis, information and transparency in the framework of WSS sector reform***

Drafting of the Annual Performance Report for the WSS Sector and for each licensed utility in the sector constitutes a legal obligation of WRA as an independent body.

The WSS Performance Report for 2017 drafted by WRA takes a particular importance taking into account the water sector reform undertaken by the Government at the end of October 2017. The information, analysis and conclusions that follow this report serve not only as a transparency mechanism for the public and all stakeholders, but also provides a general analysis for the whole sector including relevant recommendations to achieve their objectives.

WSS sector performance is analyzed in detail, its specificities along the reorganization phase, the main causes for the poor performance of utilities and recommendations in order to improve their technical and economic indicators.

The report is published on WRA official website to specifically inform consumers and increase their attention and the account toward the WSS utilities in order that provide services with justified tariffs and proper quality.

### ***Central Government Reform in the WSS Sector***

The government initiated in January 2016 the reform in the water sector with DCM no. 63, dated 27.01.2016. The main reason of the reform was the weak performance of the sector along the transition phase, either in financial sustainability or in the quality of the services provided to the customers. The WSS sector remained a heavy financial burden for the state budget subsidizing the O&M costs without mentioning financing the physical investment. The need for a reform in water sector became even more relevant in the framework of the Administrative Territorial Reform, which reduced the administrative organization of the country only in 61 municipalities instead of previously 345 administrative unit. WSS Sector Reform expected to be completed by the end of 2016 presupposes the reorganization of the WSS sector by the principle of 1 municipality-1 utility. The reform envisaged the direct involvement of Mayors in the responsibility and management of WSS utilities, including the increase of the utilities management staff capacities. The reform faced many difficulties regarding the issues for implementing reorganization of the utilities, as well as in fulfilling the staff capacities requirements. As a result, by the end of 2017, only 25 WSS utilities had completed their reorganization and the sector situation was not improve.

In this situation the central government re-launched the WSS sector reform at the end of October 2017. The reform consisted in an emergency phase within a duration of three months mainly to eliminate the illegal connections in the water supply systems by legalizing them based on self-declaration of the offenders without applying against them any legal punishment. After this gray period, every illegal connections discovered in the system would be subject of the penal consequences in accordance with the legislation in force. The expectation about the presence of the illegal connections in the water supply systems was for about 20% of the current total number of the customers.

The most important aspect of the reform was also that at the beginning of 2018 each Municipality (WSS utility) had to sign the Performance Contract with NWSSA on behalf of the Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy for a one-year period. The

contract based on performance indicators intended also incentives (funds) for the utilities with the destination as subsidies or physical investment in compliance with the rate of the performance achieved. Given the urgency to sign this contract form, it was impossible an immediate estimation of the current performance indicators value for each WSS utility serving as the base to compare the performance with the targets established to be reached by the utility in the end of the year 2018. It was foreseen that the targets setup in the contract should be subject of a further estimation about their consistency for each contract at the end of the year.

Although the report considers sector analysis and performance for the year 2017, in the framework of the reform it is important to mention the results of the illegal connections campaign beyond this period, i.e. up to May 2018. There were identified 14,366 new connections considered illegal, which represent only 1.7% of the current total number of consumers.

Given the expectation for increasing the number of customers and improving the financial situation of the utilities, obviously the reform during post-emergency phase should be addressed to improve the financial sustainability of the utilities subject of the permanent subsidies to cover their operation and maintenance costs. Financial performance analysis of the utilities highlights the need to carry out deep analysis of the poor performance, respectively for the utilities of Durrës, Vlorë, Patos, Lushnje, Kavajë and Kurbin, which represent about 67% of the subsidies allocated in the sector. The plan of measures must continue in the same directions as set out in the Water Sector Reform Document. Particularly important is maintaining the focus in drafting and monitoring the performance contracts between NWSSA and Municipalities.

NWSSA in cooperation with WRA should revise the form of Performance Contract between Municipalities and MIE (NWSSA) for determining the basic Performance Indicators of these contracts and the weight of each indicator case-by-case. The evaluation of the performance reached for the indicators should be done by WRA, as an independent body without any conflict of interest with the performance contract parties.

Although the central government intends to avoid subsidizing furthermore the sector for O&M costs, it is important to carefully consider the utilities whose the financial sustainability depend only by tariff increases. Small utilities have water supply system by pumping and in some cases to cover the operation costs it needs an increase of the tariffs far beyond consumer's affordability criteria. So for these utilities the subsidy policy of the central government has to be continued.

***WSS companies  
in the process of  
reorganization***

The sector performance assessment data of 2017 are based on reporting of all WSS utilities near to NWSSA. It appeared difficult for many WSS utilities to compare their performance and benchmarking with this one of the previous year because they were still in process of the reorganization in line with the reform. In these cases, performance data and performance indicators reported by the utilities for the new service area were not possible to comparison with those of the previous year.

**The new rural areas and their influence on the performance of reorganized WSS utilities**

The new rural areas included in service areas of the reorganized utilities constituted an additional financial burden since they bring additional operational costs and at the same time lower revenues from customers. In these rural areas before joining the utilities were applied very low tariffs and with a low collection rate. The Central Government has to take into account this fact by allocating additional funds in order to support the reorganized utilities.

**Small WSS utilities, lack of capacity**

The WSS utilities relatively small in remote areas are facing difficulties in hiring staff with appropriate qualifications in compliance with the requirements of that legislation provides for positions of their key management staff.

**WSS utilities should have a 5 Year Business Plan**

The reorganized utilities should consider priority drafting a 5-year Business Plan with relevant action plans to improve performance indicators, including among other the programs for the investments, against the illegal connections, water meter installation, increasing the collection rate etc.

**WSS Performance Sector**

The WSS sector performance is summarized in Table 1 based on the Key Performance Indicators that WRA uses to assess the performance of WSS utilities.

**Table 1. Key Performance Indicators of WSS Sector**

Key Performance Indicators	2016	2017	Performance Trend	WRA 'Good' Performance Benchmark
Non - revenue Water (%)	67.1	65	↗	30
O& M Cost Coverage (%)	117.9	109	↘	100
Total Cost Coverage (%)	89.8	85	↘	80
General Collection Rate (%)	91.03	92.76	↗	82
Current Collection Rate (%)	78.48	78.84	↗	82
Metering Ratio ( )	64.6	68.3	↗	85
Staff Efficiency (staff/1000 connections)	5.34	5.50	↘	4/6/10
Continuity of Water Supply (hours/day)	12.3	12	↘	18
Wastewater Sewerage Coverage (%)	50.7	50.2	↘	75
Water Supply Coverage (%)	79.4	78.3	↘	n/a

Source: NWSSA

**Sector in unsatisfactory performance**

WSS Sector Performance Indicators for 2017 show a tendency of slight worsening of its situation. The quality of services offered to customers in terms of water supply hours (average 12 hours/day) and the Non-Revenue Water (65%) indicator compared to 2016 remain still unacceptable. The current collection rate (78.84% from 78.48%) has a slight improvement, while the main financial performance indicator, O&M cost recovery is worsened by about 10%. In particular the Non-Revenue Water Indicator continues to remain in unacceptable level of 65%. This shows that most of the water produced is lost, which do not generate revenue, also the losses are increasing the costs of the service by energy factor. On the other hand, the improvement of this indicator is closely related to the quality service indicator. High level of losses reduce water supply hours of services provided to the customers and the pressure in the water distribution system. However, 2% improvement of NRW should be taken with the reserve because in its estimation might have a high level of inaccuracy of data reported by WSS utilities.

***The financial situation of WSS Sector***

The sector's financial situation in 2017 was not improved compared to 2016. In total, the deficit for covering the O&M costs of the sector is around 1,250 million ALL (about 10 million Euros), from which about 38% of this amount represent the deficit of the WSS Durrës and WSS Vlorë utilities, while 85% of the total belongs to 13 WSS utilities out of 58 in total. It is estimated that 37 out of 58 utilities continue to be subsidized by the state budget. The central government has allocated for subsidizing the sector an amount of 1,039 million ALL (about 8 million Euros). Meanwhile, regarding covering of the total cost of the utilities, the deficit is twice of the amount needed to cover the O&M cost deficit.

The main reason of this situation is the increase of the operating costs, mainly due to the increase of the staff number and the energy consumption. On the other hand, the increase in revenues in absolute value (in percentage is decreased) is result of the tariffs increase during the year of 2017 in some utilities. This financial result would be even more regressive if due to the reform impact many utilities have achieved a fairly good performance in collecting the old debts, which increased the indicator of the General Collection Rate at 92.76%. In fact the collection rate without debit (current collection rate) is 78.84%, or around 0.36% more than in 2016.

***WSS utilities are overstaffed***

The main elements of the operating costs of WSS utilities are the employee salaries and the energy costs. Staff Efficiency Indicator with an average of 5.5 staff/1000 connections is worsened, and the sector appears overstaffed. WSS utilities even during 2017 continued to increase the number of employees without any justifiable argument. In addition this indicator is artificially increase by the large number of people as guardianship of water storage facilities, as reservoirs, wells and pumping stations. In fact, this is a legal requirement to guarantee the safety of public health, but this element can be reconsidered because the public security guarantee for these facilities can be realized also by technical and logistic measures.

***A fragmented sector***

The sector continues to be highly fragmented with about 60 WSS utilities, where only large utilities, as Tirana and Durrës cover about half of the resident population of the country (2011 census). It is understood that in short and mid-term perspective in order to increase the financial performance of small and medium utilities is recommended the aggregation of the utilities, taking into advantage by the impact of the economy of scale. Aggregation should be conducted by the principles of the voluntary bases and the incentives from the central government.



## CONCLUSIONS

### **WSS Sector Reform**

- It is necessary to accelerate the sector reform. This requires greater engagement of municipalities and WSS utilities to finish the re-organization process of the utilities in line with the reform as well as setting deadlines and clauses for sanctions in case of non-compliance.
- As part of government action, were identified 14,366 new connections (October 2017-May 2018, considered illegal), which represent only 1.7% of the current total number of consumers. The expectation for illegal connections was 20% of the total number of consumers, so it appears necessary to review the plan of measures for sector reform in achieving the objectives for the year 2018 and those of the mid-term.
- It is estimated that 67% of the subsidies needs for the sector belongs to the utilities of Durrës (23%), Vlora (15%), Patos (14%), Lushnje (5%), Kavaja (4.5%) and Kurbin (4.5%). Taking into account this fact, the focus of the emergency phase reform needs to be reoriented in carrying out a more in-depth performance analysis of the above-mentioned utilities to determine the causes of their poor financial performance and the drafting of Action Plans for its improvement.
- Local and central actors in the WSS sector should intensify public awareness regarding the WSS sector reform through programs specifically organized on the matter in particular with visual media, as well as implementation the law in force against offenders and abusers.
- NWSSA in cooperation with WRA has to revise the form of Performance Contract between Municipalities and MIE (NWSSA) for determining the Core Performance Indicators to be part of these contracts, specifying the weight of each indicator case-by-case. The estimation of the performance indicators level accomplished in the end of each year of the of performance contract would be more reasonable to be carry out by the WRA, as an independent body out of any conflict of interest between the contract parties.
- Improve the mechanism of assessment planning allocation funds by central government through MIE for a transition period considering that the reorganized WSS utilities need additional costs by including in their service area some rural zones that before were managed by the ex-communes.

### **NWSSA and WRA**

- Strengthening the process of monitoring public investment funds from the central government and donors.
- The administration and verification of data process will be more efficient if it will be carry out directly by WRA (not through NWSSA) because the WRA has the required capacity and authority toward the WSS utilities to increase their accountability for reporting accurate technical and economic data.

- Evaluate needs to equip all water supply systems with bulk meters that enable the draft accurate water balance and water demand, as well as planning funds that the central government should contribute to utilities that do not have financial opportunities for procurement of the bulk meters.
- WRA is recommended to be involved in the process of determining investment priorities in the water supply and sewerage sector, as well as in their approval based on technical and economic criteria.
- WRA will strengthen the requirements toward utilities for justifying the number of staff and positions, as important part of operating costs having impact on the tariffs proposed.
- Due to the importance given to the 5-year Business Plans for WSS utilities, WRA will encourage utilities to draft a Business Plan as a legal prerequisite when they apply for new tariffs. NWSSA need to estimate the funds needed to draft the Business Plans by the utilities have limited financial opportunities. These funds have to be financed by the central government.
- Pursue a tariff policy revised in terms of affordability by consumers, as well as, assessing real financial capacity of the utilities to cover O&M costs. The final assessment has to identify the utilities that the financial sustainability can be reached either by implementing unaffordable tariffs for consumers, or subsidizing by the central or local government.
- The WSS utilities performance monitoring role has to be carry out mainly by WRAs.
- Revise the legal act concerning the qualification requirements for the key management staff of WSS utilities, which need to be not at the same level for the large, medium and small size of the utilities.
- Update the National Master Plan of WSS Sector to include the investment needs of new rural zones that before were not part of the utilities service area. The updates has to be reflected in the draft of the National Strategy of Financing the Water Supply and Sewerage Sector.
- The sector is highly fragmented and therefore it is necessary to be set as a close priority the aggregation process of the utilities starting with one or two pilots, respecting the principles of free willing of the owners (municipalities) joint with the incentives from the central government. The sector aggregation strategy should be focused mainly into the medium group of utilities, analyzing them case by case.

***Strategic  
Investments Level  
and Aggregation***

## 1. Overall Performance Sector and Trend

### 1.1 Reliability and Accuracy of Data

The source of data utilized for the performance analysis of WSS utilities is the Benchmarking Unit near NWSSA, as well as the 2017 financial balances that utilities submit to WRA. In some cases it is quite relevant the data contains significant inaccuracies. This fact is particularly evident in the water balances sheets the utilities submit to WRA, which are drafted based on estimated data regarding the flows because of lack of the bulk meters in the key points of water supply systems, wells, pumping stations, reservoirs etc. Therefore, the main performance indicator Non-Revenue Water is estimated with a high level of inaccuracy. There are made maximum efforts in data analysis to exclude the data that have "no sense" or high deviation level, in order to avoid a wrong estimation and conclusions about the sector performance in general, as well as for each utility. The same attentions is shown for other data, such as asset status, inventory, number of defects in total, or km pipeline, etc., which serve as a basis for calculating other indicators related to the performance assessment of the utility.

### 1.2 Analysis of Sector Key Performance Indicators

Table 2 shows the overall performance of the WSS sector for 2017 through 10 Key Performance Indicators. It also shows performance trends compared to the achievements of 2016, as well as the "Good Performance" objectives setup by the WRA.

**Table 2. WSS Sector Performance Indicators**

Key Performance Indicators	2016	2017	Performance Trend	WRA 'Good' Performance Benchmark
Non - revenue Water (%)	67.1	65	↗	30
O& M Cost Coverage (%)	117.9	109	↘	100
Total Cost Coverage (%)	89.8	85	↘	80
General Collection Rate (%)	91.03	92.76	↗	82
Current Collection Rate (%)	78.48	78.84	↗	82
Metering Ratio (%)	64.6	68.3	↗	85
Staff Efficiency (staff/1000 connections)	5.34	5.50	↘	4/6/10
Hours of Supply (hours/day)	12.3	12	↘	18
Wastewater Sewerage Coverage (%)	50.7	50.2	↘	75
Water Supply Service Coverage (%)	79.4	78.3	↘	n/a

Source: NWSSA

The table shows the levels of the sector key performance indicators for 2017 compared to 2016 that in general have a negative trend. The indicators "Non-revenue Water", "Current Collection Rate" and "Metering Ratio" have a slight improvement, while the General Collection Rate has improved by 1.73%. The quality of service offered to customers in terms of hours of water supply (average 12 hours/day) and the Non-Revenue Water (65%) indicator compared to 2016 remain still at unacceptable levels. WSS utilities continued to increase the number of employees unjustifiably, which is shown by the Staff Efficiency Indicator by a high average of 5.5 staff/1000 connections.

### 1.2.1 Water Supply and Wastewater Sewerage Services Coverage

Referring to the reporting WSS utilities for the “Water Supply Coverage”, in 2017 compared to 2016 this indicator is decreased from 79.4% to 78.3%, while the “Wastewater Coverage” remained almost at the same level. It is noted that the total number of population in the jurisdiction area (service area) for 2017 compared with 2016 is increased by about 96.000 inhabitants, while the population served by the utility (new customers) is increased with only 35.000 inhabitants. That means only about 36% of the increased population in the service area of WSS utilities has benefited from the water supply service.

For the Wastewater service the population in the jurisdiction has increased with about 96.000 inhabitants and only 25.000 inhabitants or 26% of the increased population in jurisdictions has benefited from sewerage service.

### 1.2.2 Operation and Maintenance and Total Cost Coverage

The year 2017 compared with 2016 has marked a decrease of O&M and Total Costs Coverage Indicators respectively by 9% and 4.8%. This decrease has been due to the fact that O&M and Total Costs have increased considerably in 2017 compared to 2016, respectively by 1,184 million ALL and 1,118 million ALL or in percentage respectively by 17% and 13.6%. Table 3 gives details of the O&M and Total Costs for the years 2016 and 2017 and the differences for each of them in absolute value in ALL and in percentage.

**Table 3. O&M cost & Total Cost for 2016 and 2017**

No	Expenditures/Costs	2016	2017	Differences (2017-2016)	Increased Costs Vs Total (%)
1	Labor costs	3,022,654	3,367,455	344,801	29%
2	Electricity costs	2,319,503	2,516,869	197,366	17%
3	Maintenance costs	447,020	705,816	258,796	22%
4	Subcontractors Services	359,656	638,394	278,738	23%
5	Materials and Chemicals Costs	144,723	162,998	18,275	2%
6	Other costs	317,564	337,400	19,836	2%
	<b>O&amp;M Cost</b>	<b>6,611,120</b>	<b>7,728,932</b>	<b>1,117,812</b>	<b>95%</b>
7	Depreciation cost	1,643,882	1,657,834	13,952	1%
8	Financial cost Taxes	410,722	462,613	51,891	4%
	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>8,665,724</b>	<b>9,849,379</b>	<b>1,183,655</b>	<b>100%</b>

The main reasons of increasing the O&M Direct Cost are the increase in the number of employees (Labor Costs) as well as the "Subcontracting Services ", which in total represent 52% of the increased costs.

From a detailed analysis of each item of cost in the table above, it is noted that:

**Labor Costs:** The utilities that have significantly increased the number of employees are Tirana with an increase of 475 people, Lushnjë with 85, Shkodra with 63, Vlorë with 62, Kavaja with 34 and Durrës with 30 people.

Utilities justify the increase of the number of the staff mainly by the reorganization process of the utilities with the staff coming from the new rural area which before the reform their water supply systems were managed the ex-communes themselves.

Therefore, Kavaja has significantly increased the number of employees due to needs to operate the systems specifically implemented during 2017 by the Projects, "Water Supply Project for the Kavaja area, Golem, Mali i Robit from the drilling wells of Çermë Lot I and II" and " Extension Project of IPUN Qerret, Loti II".

Durrës utility is justifying their additional staff needed to carry out the new assets inventory coming from reorganization process of the utility. The reorganization process required a huge need for additional staff for adjournment of the connections and provision with required form of the customer contract by the rural areas of ex-communes of Manëz, Ishëm, Sukth etc. Additional staff was needed also for the installation of 20,000 new individual and collective meters for existing and new customers financed by World Bank in 2017.

However, the sector is overloaded with unjustified staff, which requires an analysis of each utility regarding the number of employees in the organizational structure and job description for each job position. Another factor of increasing labor costs is the raise by the government of the eve for the minimum level of the salaries under the DCM no. 399 date 03.05.2017. This brings additional costs and has given their effect on increasing labor costs. In total, the reported increase in staff numbers and minimum wage has led to an increase in Labor Costs of around 345 million ALL.

**Subcontracted Services Costs** As mentioned above, the other factor that has led to significant costs increases are subcontracted services with third parties. Utilities justify these costs by the increase of guardianship employee due to the additional of water supply components (depots, pumping stations, wells etc.) from reorganization process of the utilities. The legislation needs to be revised on this matter in order that the security with particular importance objects for the reasons of healthy safety of the population can be guaranteed also by technical or logistical alternative solutions. The increase in costs for services contracted with third parties compared to 2016 was 279 million ALL.

Labor and subcontracted services costs together are estimated to have increased compared to 2016 in the amount of 624 million ALL. About 65% of these increased costs belong to the Tirana utility with an increase of 403 million ALL, Lushnjë with 44.6 million ALL, Shkodër with 25.4 million ALL, Vlora with 25.3 million ALL and many other utilities with lower amounts.

It is a very positive fact that in the sector there are also utilities that have reduced the number of employees and consequently the labor costs, such as Fier utility that has reduced these costs by 41.3 million ALL. Same performance trend had also Malësi e Madhe utility reducing these costs by 27 million ALL, Pogradec with ALL 11.6 million, as well other utilities: Peqin, Poliçan and Kurbin with lower absolute amount than above mentioned utilities.

The human resources has to be based by recruiting qualified staff ensuring that increase rate of the respected costs should be associated with revenue increase in order to recover the reasonable related costs.

**Energy Cost:** The utilities for the year 2017 reported higher energy costs compared to those of 2016 although the energy price remained the same. Total energy consumption for 2017 for the whole sector was increased by about 16 million KWH compared to 2016. The biggest consumers of the energy are respectively, Vlorë with ALL 46.7 million, Durrës with ALL 45.6 million, Lushnje with 43.4 million ALL, Fier with ALL 30.2 million and Tirana with 13.6 million ALL. In general about 42 utilities has increased their energy consumption comparing with the previous year.

Reasons of increasing energy consumption are generally justified by utilities due to their reorganization with additions to water supply systems from rural areas that are mostly with pumping stations. Another reason utilities they claims about the worsening of pump efficiency by further amortization.

In particular, the Durrës utility claims to have increased electricity consumption mainly due to over-billing by the electricity distribution operator (OSHEE) about 3.6 million kwh, which this utility considers abusive and has made the relevant complaint according the law.

In terms of costs, it is noticed that 16 utilities have reported lower energy costs compared to 2016, respectively, Malësi e Madhe with 23.8 million ALL by the reorganization of its service area because some pumping stations of the former Shkodër Fshat utility are no longer in its jurisdiction but belong to the Shkodra utility. Kavaja utility has reduced energy costs by 7.4 million ALL, because after the reorganization have been removed from its service area the pumping stations of Lekaj and Kryevindh ex-communes, which are transferred to Rogozhina utility.

Lezhë utility has reduced energy costs by 20.1 million ALL, due to the improvement by replacing of higher performance pumps at pumping stations, as well as the reduction of working hours due to lower water losses in water supply system. There are improvements in energy performance also for some other utilities but relatively with small amounts.

Conclusion, for this item of operation and maintenance costs, the improvements for most of the utilities have come from transferring (removing) some pumping station from their service area as a result of reorganization from Administrative Reform and Water Reform.

Lezha utility can be considered as a positive example where improvements in energy consumption have been result of technical reasons and better water loss management by the utility staff.

**Repairing Costs** During 2017 the repairing costs compared to 2016 have increased considerably by 259 million ALL. Network bursts (pipe breaks) for 2017 are reported about 42,700 from 35,793 during 2016. In terms of money the most significant part of the repairing costs increase belongs to Tirana with about 173.8 million ALL, to proceed further with Durrës with 65.7 million ALL and Saranda with 11 million ALL, or about 50% of the value belongs to Tirana utility.

The increase in the number pipe breaks is justified mainly by the additional assets coming from the water supply systems from rural areas due to reorganization, assets are in a very bad situation.

Another reason pretended by the utilities for that increase is further amortization of the existing assets in the service area.

Positive is the fact that 17 utilities reported decrease of these costs. The highest decrease was recorded by Malësi e Madhe with 13.4 million ALL and lower values belong to utilities of Kavajë, Gjirokastër, Kruja and Delvina, but these utilities had difficulties to explain the sound reasons regarding this performance improvement.

### 1.2.3 Collection Efficiency

Collection Efficiency is one of the main performance indicators of the utilities because it is directly related to the financial sustainability of the utility and cash flow situation. The report has considered two indicators regarding the Collection Efficiency, the General Collection Efficiency (GCE) and the Current Collection Efficiency (CCE). GCE represents the total revenues collection made by the utility, including the old debts, while CCE included only the collection by the billing made by the utility during the current year, i.e. without old debts.

Table no. 33, Annex 2, provides for each utility the indicators of GCE and CCE in 2017, compared with those of 2016. Take into account the sector organization, for some utilities the table gives the interpolated value of the indicators.

The re-processing data (for 2016 and 2017) of calculation of GCE and CCE indicate that both indicators are improved respectively by 1.73% and 0.36%. In absolute value, from the old debts are collected 1,040 million ALL. The improvement was due to a better engagement of the utilities in fulfilling the tasks setup by Government's actions in water sector reform regarding the old debts collection. However, the unpaid amount of the old debts remain still very high by about 12,618 million ALL, out of which about 10,000 million ALL belongs to the category of households customers.

In the other hand the utilities themselves are debtor to third parties in the value of about 10,000 million ALL, which 50% are unpaid energy bills to OSHEE, while the rest are obligation to suppliers, or unpaid staff social insurances. The collection of the old debts could counterbalance the capacity of the utilities to pay the debts to third parties.

The Current Collection Rate of the sector for the year 2017 was at the level of 78.84%, with an improvement by 0.36% compared to 2016, but still remaining in unacceptable level. The Utilities should reinforce their commitment in order to increase the level of collection rate, as the most important element of financial sustainability of the utility.

Among the positive examples that have a high level of current collection rate can be mentioned utilities of Maliq, Erseka, Berat-Kuçova and Gramsh, while the utilities with very low collection current rate are Rrogozhina, Tropoja, Kukës, Vlora and Peshkopi.

### 1.2.4 Staff Efficiency

Staff Efficiency expresses the number of utility staff per 1000 connections, and it is an important indicator taking into consideration that the personnel and energy costs are the main categories of the utility operation and maintenance (O&M) costs. On the other hand, this indicator shows how effective is the management of human resources in the utility.

Staff efficiency Indicator for the year of 2017 with an average of 5.5 staff/1000 connections is worsened comparing with the previous year, and overall the sector appears overstaffed. WSS utilities even during 2017 continued to increase the number of employees by 947 people without any justifiable argument.

Despite the number of customers are increased by 134,712 connections or customers in 2017 compared to 2016, this indicator has worsened to 0.17 employees per 1,000 WSS connections compared to the previous year. Referring to this indicator from international and the region experience, utilities usually operate with a high number of employees.



Korça utility is one of few utilities in the country operating with a staff efficiency level complying with international levels.

The enlargement of the service area mainly by the small water supply systems from the rural areas has given its negative impact in this indicator. In fact, the legal requirement to guarantee the safety of public health, with physical guardianship for all water storage facilities, as reservoirs, wells and pumping stations, is increasing artificially this indicator. The small additional water supply systems demand a large number of people hired as guardianship of those premises, but this element can be reconsidered because the public security guarantee for these facilities can be realized also by technical and logistic measures. On the other hand, it should be recognized the problem of hiring personnel from utilities not based on real needs and according to the appropriate qualifications.

WRA should provide a contribution in improving employment policies in terms of the number of employees by analyzing in detail the organizational structure, i.e. the number of employees and positions. When the utilities apply for the new tariffs to WRA, the salaries staff are part of the costs to be considered in the tariffs proposed.

### **1.2.5 Non-Revenue water (NRW)**

"Non-revenue water" indicator for 2017 at the sector level was 65%, or improved by 2% compared to 2016, but it remains in an unacceptable level. In the absolute value, in 2017 in the whole sector was produced about 286 million m<sup>3</sup> of water, i.e. about 11.5 million m<sup>3</sup> of water less than in 2016. Meanwhile another positive aspect is the fact that the amount of billed water has increased by 3.4 million m<sup>3</sup> water compared to the previous year.

The utilities since 2013 are reporting to WRA the Water Balance sheets, which is supposed to be an important instrument for identifying and assessing technical and administrative losses. The fact is that the quality of the data utilized for drafting the water balance are far from being confident. The first problem on drafting the water balance is that often the volume of the water produced on the source is estimated (not measured), due to the lack of water meters installed in the wells, pumping stations, reservoirs and in the rings of the distribution networks. On the other hand, the drafting of an accurate water balance is limited by the lack of installation of 100% of water meters in all customers. Installation of bulk meters in all main components of water supply systems should be a priority of utilities. The central government has to finance them for the utilities which do not have financial capacities to afford these investments.

The staff of the utilities have to do maximum efforts to find ad-hoc assessment methods to define the breakdown elements of technical and administrative losses in the water balance, for example the overbilling factors, illegal connections for administrative losses etc. The accuracy in their determination leads in drafting effective action plan for reducing losses, especially administrative losses which do not need excessive cost, but only staff engagement.

Also, is necessary to be considered the fact that the water supply systems in general operate in an intermittent water supply regime (many of them under 8 hours/ day) which makes the assessment of the NRW indicator inaccurate and unreliable. Referring to the above, it should be taken with reserve the findings regarding the NRW in the sector and the improvement of this indicator in 2017 by 2% compared to 2016.



### 1.2.6 Metering Coverage

The metering coverage indicator for the year 2017 was 68.3%, which has to be considered relatively low. Consider the reorganization of utilities with the new administrative reform, currently none of utilities has 100% metering coverage to consumers because of the new rural zones included in their service area. Some utilities have this indicator even below than 10%. In fact the customers should pay for the real volume of water consuming. It is not correct that the consumers to pay in flat rate basis by 150 liters/day/inhabitant, because some of them are consuming much lower than this figure (the apartments), and contrarily some of them (private houses) using drinking water for irrigation of their yards. In some cases, for the utilities is more convenient financially to apply flat rate to the households, but this often stimulates during the summer season over-consumption mainly by the first customers in the distribution network with a negative impact for the other customers in the system reducing hours of supply and pressure.

Utilities reported for the year 2017 installation of 63.820 meters more than in 2016, but still the sector is far from the target of 100% of metering coverage.

Within the framework of the Water Reform Program undertaken by the Government, the installation of meters is one of its priorities. The installation of meters in the whole water supply system should be one of the main objectives of utilities for water preservation policy to avoid the abuses and overconsumption in the systems.

### 1.2.7 Continuity of Water Supply

This indicator for the year 2017 remains for the whole sector on the average of 12 hours/day. Such a performance on the quality of the service is considered poor, for not mentioning the utilities that have this indicator on the values of 2-3 hours a day, which is really unacceptable. This indicator does not only represent only the quality of the service, but it closely linked with the rate of the risk for the public health because of the highly possibility for contamination of the drinking water by the insertion inside of the pipes the wastewater when they are empty, even under negative pressure.

Referring to the data of 2017, the population in the service area of the reorganized utilities is increased by about 35% with the customers coming from rural areas. The continuity of the service in these areas usually was lower than in urban areas, giving so a negative impact on this indicator in the reorganized utilities. Currently, by the reorganization impact the utilities in the country do not provide 24 hours a day water supply for all the customers in the service area. That's why even utility as Korça, Librazhd, Pogradec and Devoll that before supplied water 24/per day in whole the service area, can not currently have the same level of performance for this indicator.

Therefore, we can say that this is an indicator that is generally calculated from the emptying time of the main reservoirs, which do not reflect the real time of the water supply service of the customers in the distribution network.

## 1.3 Sector Financial Results

### 1.3.1 Incomes from Activity and Subsidies

The Table 34 in Annex 3 gives the water billed revenues for each utility comparing with the O&M and Total Costs in ALL and in percentage and the respective annual financial result by loss or profit. In addition, in the table is included the real needs for subsidies to cover O&M costs. The table also gives the balance of revenue for 2017 compared those of the year 2016.

In details, the largest increase of revenues related to activity of the utilities was performed by the big utilities, namely, Tirana with 296 million ALL, Durrës with 74 million ALL, Shkodra with 32.4 million ALL and Korça with 24.6 million ALL. The main reason for improvement in revenue performance of the utilities is by the strengthening of commitment for their collection.

Fier, although has good results in improving performance indicators in general, has significantly reduced revenue by 70.7 million in 2017, because one of its most important client (customer) in terms of volume of water consumed, the Oil Processing Plant (ARMO) is not anymore the client of Fier utility.

The analysis also finds that the levels of cost recovery in small and medium utilities have improved compared to 2016, but their influence in the sector in absolute value is not significant. The small utilities fails to create a positive financial balance of their operation and consequently they will continue to be subject of the subsidies from the central government.

The Table 34 shows also than in whole sector only 18 utilities out of 58 manage to cover O&M costs, and 3 of them manage to cover even the total costs.

In details, the financial situation for each utility for 2017 in terms of expenditures, revenues and needs for subsidies are given in Table 34 in Annex 3.

Referring to this table, it is concluded that the real need for subsidies to cover O&M costs for the entire sector is 1,251,324 ALL (about 9.6 million euros). On the other hand, 67% of the total need for subsidies belongs to the utilities as *Durrës (23%), Vlora (15%), Patos (14%), Lushnje (5%), Kavaja (4.5%) and Kurbin (4.5%)*. *That means the financial improvement of the sector has to be focused on these utilities. In particular Durrës, Vlora and Patos utilities should be subject of a deep analysis of the performance to determine the causes of the poor financial performance, as well as to draft or recommend the required action plans for improving the performance.*

Table 35 in Annex 4 provides detailed information about the subsidies needs for the year 2017, as well as the allocation (distribution) for each utility. The table show that during the 2017 the sector is subsidized with a total amount of 1.039 million ALL (about 8 million euros), 1,000 million from the state budget, of which 800 million allocated to cover the difference between the costs and the tariffs for the O&M, and 200 million ALL to incentivize the good performance of the utilities. There are allocated to the utilities funds as subsidies form the municipalities budget in total for the amount of 39 million.

The tables shows also for some utilities are allocated more subsidies than the needs to cover the O&M costs. There are not known the reasons and criteria used for allocating the subsidies shown in the table above, however is required more transparency about the distribution of the subsidies in the future.

### 1.3.2 Capital Investments Needs and WSS Sector Finance

This Report does not undertake a detailed investment analysis in the WSS sector. Capital investments continue to play an important role in improving the sector's situation. In 2017 the main sources of funding were the state budget and foreign donors, approximately in equal proportions. The investments were focused on rehabilitation of Water Supply, Wastewater Sewerage Systems and in the construction of wastewater treatment plants.

Table 4 shows investments that have been carry out during 2016 and 2017, divided by amounts, source of funding and destinations, respectively, into water supply systems, wastewater sewage systems, and wastewater treatment plants.

**Table 4. Investments in Sector, Year 2016 and 2017 by Source and Destination**

		000/ALL	
Description/Years		2016	2017
<b>Funding Source</b>	Foreign Funds	8,504,013	6,435,508
	Budget State Fund	4,108,555	4,194,097
<b>Total</b>		<b>12,612,568</b>	<b>10,629,605</b>
<b>Destination</b>	Water Supply	4,950,000	5,000,000
	Sewerage	4,712,568	2,900,000
	WWTP	2,950,000	2,729,605

*Source: Monitoring unit (NWSSA)*

The needs for investments in the WSS sector are presented in details in the National Water Supply and Sewerage Master Plan for the period 2011-2040. The Master Plan estimates the investment needs until 2040 in the sector at the amount of 6 billion Euros, respectively 4 billion Euros for the WWS and WWTP, 1 billion Euros for the water supply and the rest for engineering services. or in average for about 270 million Euros per year. The value of funding is very high in relation with the actual financing possibilities, which during the last 10 years has been in the order of 50-60 million Euros per year including both sources, i.e. the state budget and donors.

The Master Plan actually assessed the investment needs only on the territory within the WSS service area before the territorial administrative reform. There are not included the investment needs for the so-called "gray areas" of the territory of 131 former municipalities where water supply services and WWS were managed by themselves, also the "white areas" in which did not exist at all water supply engineering systems and WWS. For these reasons it is necessary to revise this study in order to estimate and include the investment needs for "gray" and " white areas " up to 2040.

In May 2016, a draft of the National Strategy for Financing the Water Supply and Sewerage Sector in Albania was drafted, which includes a model for sector financing, but still it is not approved by Council of Ministers. The model has identified a formula of 3Ts of financing the sector needs by various funding sources with the main objective to reach the financial sustainability of the sector, and with the tariffs affordable for consumers. Financing the sector by 3Ts formula the model intend the financing from internal sources of the utility generated by its activity (Tariffs), central government funding (Taxes), and finally by donors (Transfers).

According to this model, the new element regarding the validity of the financing scheme for the investment needs in the sector is by covering part of the funding from the utilities themselves. The analysis of affordability possibility by consumers based on their monthly average income showed that there is a large margin which the tariff can be increased in order to generate revenue to cover part of their funding needs.

However, depending on the investment needs to be determined by the National Master Plan, the data of the Strategy should be updated and finally approved by the CoM.

## 1.4 Aggregation

Water supply and sewerage services in the sector are provided by about 58 WSS utilities. Only 2 utilities, respectively from Tirana and Durrës municipalities cover about half of the country population. *A highly fragmented sector with about 58 WSS utilities suffers from lack of economies of scale and is operating with very high costs.*

Our country is close to the process of opening the accession negotiations with the European Union. Once the negotiations are opened, the European Union is expected to allocate substantial funds to the water sector in order to meet the standards requirements of the EC Water Directive. A fragmented sector has very limited capacities to absorb these funds. From the previous experience of the countries recently joined the European Union as Bulgaria and Romania, the absorption of these funds from a fragmented sector was very difficult, and in the end, the small systems constructed had very high operating costs.

Aggregation of utilities, as a typical advantage of the economy of scale, is proposed as an approach that enables not only an effective absorption of the funds, but also the works, or systems constructed will have relatively low operation costs.

The financial situation of the sector shows that about 45% of subsidy needs are addressed to the medium utilities with 3,000-15,000 connections or clients. These utilities represent 30 out of 58 utilities in the sector, and in general they have a poor performance, where about 20 of them do not cover even the O&M costs.

For the above reasons, the sector aggregation strategy has to be focused on the mid-size group of utilities. The small utilities (around 14) do not represent a significant weight in the sector could have the good opportunity to aggregate with the first ones.

In our country throughout the transition phase, only the aggregation of the Berat-Kuçova utility has been realized, which, however, has problems of its performance and management. Aggregation itself is a complex and delicate process comprising a complex factors, political, economic, geographical, social, etc. The feasibility study carried out in 2009 for aggregation of the sector in our country recommend that in order to have a successful *aggregation process, it should be carried out on voluntary basis and with incentives from the central government.*

In the current situation the aggregation should be proceeded by a study succeeding by implementing by *a successful pilot sample of two or more utilities in the sector.* The successful implementation of the pilot will serve as an example to follow for the whole the sector in the medium term. For this purpose, it needs financing *a feasibility study for the aggregation pilot case to be implemented in voluntary*

commitment of the local units involved, and supported by incentives (financing) with investment by the central government through its budget or donors contribution.

On the other hand, the consultancy services hired on this purpose should take care in drafting the Aggregation Agreements between municipalities. It has to be based on equal rights and obligations, for ex. one of the important clause should be the weight of votes, which shall be adjustment for important utility decisions in order to avoid arbitrary decisions of municipalities that may have over 50% of shares in the aggregate utilities. The Regulator has to play an important role in the process.

## 2. Annex: Key Selected Data

**Table 32, Annex 1. Sector Reorganization situation for all WSS utilities**

No.	Utilities licensed by WRA under reform till 31 December 2017	Unlicensed utilities by WRA under reform		
		Report data as reorganized	Report data as unorganized	Newly formed reform utilities that did not report data for 2017
1	WSS Kukës	WSS Tiranë	WS Bulqizë	WSS Shijak
2	WSS Kurbin	WSS Durrës	WSS Këlcyrë	WSS Dropull
3	WSS Vorë	WSS Kamëz	WSS Kolonjë	WSS Finiq
4	WSS Belsh	WSS Ura Vajgurore	WSS Has	Klos Municipality
5	WSS Malësi e Madhe	WSS Peshkopi	Pukë Municipality	
6	WSS Gjirokastrë	WSS Mat	WSS Fushë Arrëz	
7	WS Gramsh	WSS Elbasan	WSS Rrogozhinë	
8	WSS Korçë	WSS Peqin		
9	WSS Krujë	WSS Fier		
10	WSS Mirditë	WSS Lushnje		
11	WS Poliçan	WSS Divjakë		
12	WSS Berat Kuçovë	WSS Mallakastër		
13	WSS Devoll	WSS Libohovë		
14	WSS Maliq	WS Përmet		
15	WSS Patos	WSS Pustec		
16	WSS Skrapar	WSS Tropojë		
17	WSS Vau Dejës	WSS Vlorë		
18	WSS Tepelenë	WSS Selenicë		
19	WSS Delvinë	WSS Himarë		
20	WSS Lezhë	WSS Sarandë		
21	WSS Pogradec	WSS Konispol		
22	WSS Shkodër	WSS Kavajë		
23	WSS Cërrik			
24	WSS Roskovec			
25	WSS Librazhd-Prrenjas			

**Table 33, Annex 2. Current and General Collection Rates for every utility, Year 2016-2017**

No	Utility	Current Collection Rate		General Collection Rate WRA	
		Year 2016	Year 2017	Year 2016	Year 2017
1	Shkodër WSS	62.51%	65.10%	73.81%	76.28%
2	Fushë Arrëz WSS	68.33%	57.72%	70.58%	57.72%
3	Pukë WSS	88.21%	89.27%	102.33%	102.84%
4	Vau Dejës WSS	87.63%	81.36%	87.63%	103.67%
5	Malësi e Madhe WS	76.77%	54.85%		56.30%
6	Lezhë WSS	79.69%	79.63%	80.76%	85.07%
7	Mirditë WSS	77.69%	69.38%	113.23%	96.24%
8	Kurbin WS	93.40%	80.52%	96.56%	83.03%
9	Kukës WSS	69.40%	60.09%	77.39%	62.12%
10	Tropojë WS	56.35%	50.62%	66.23%	56.72%
11	Has WS	71.06%	76.14%	79.52%	83.31%
12	Tiranë WSS	86.11%	86.24%	98.46%	97.91%
13	Kamëz WSS	78.04%	78.94%	90.42%	88.16%
14	Kavajë WSS	79.02%	82.98%	79.02%	101.31%
15	Rrogozhinë WSS	76.41%	58.89%	78.08%	62.22%
16	Vorë WSS		64.31%		64.31%
17	Durrës WSS	76.60%	67.77%	85.64%	85.69%
18	Krujë WSS	65.63%	72.82%	65.74%	79.03%
19	Bashkia Shijak				
20	Peshkopi WSS	68.88%	57.32%	79.34%	84.74%
21	Bulqizë WS	74.75%	77.60%	85.81%	89.30%
22	Mat WSS	82.82%	77.53%	110.54%	109.27%
23	Bashkia Klos				
24	Elbasan WSS	74.36%	60.08%	103.14%	92.19%
25	Librazhd WSS	97.07%	97.65%	97.74%	97.65%
26	Gramsh WS	84.99%	82.61%	92.27%	87.52%
27	Cërrik WSS		89.41%		96.19%
28	Belsh WSS	80.00%	72.80%	85.00%	102.08%
29	Peqin WSS	77.28%	71.42%	105.38%	98.04%
30	Korçë WSS	79.00%	79.93%	95.00%	96.80%
31	Pogradec WSS	84.80%	85.63%	95.49%	99.69%
32	Maliq WSS	81.77%	96.40%		118.49%
33	Pustec WSS		46.52%		50.15%
34	Devoll WSS	80.49%	82.84%	96.01%	103.01%
35	Kolonjë WSS	91.06%	92.43%	92.11%	99.41%
36	Berat Kuçovë WSS	83.32%	85.86%	85.92%	104.48%
37	Ura-Vajgurore WS	87.14%	71.99%	95.45%	77.27%
38	Poličan WS	75.33%	79.34%	97.06%	91.69%
39	Skrapar WSS	78.96%	82.42%	110.36%	98.63%
40	Fier WSS	62.02%	77.02%	90.69%	98.49%
41	Lushnje WSS	57.17%	70.28%	101.83%	102.08%
42	Divjakë WS	89.55%	86.82%	92.02%	86.82%
43	Patos WS	77.15%	80.34%	82.43%	91.91%
44	Roskovec WSS		43.20%		100.67%
45	Mallakastër WSS	79.86%	78.17%	93.04%	90.65%
46	Vlorë WS	66.19%	64.48%	75.90%	76.20%
47	Selenicë WS	91.41%	71.73%	94.26%	71.73%
48	Himarë WSS	63.26%	75.34%	68.01%	89.67%
49	Delvinë WSS	61.99%	72.07%	74.04%	80.86%
50	Sarandë WSS	62.13%	74.42%	76.60%	87.67%
51	Finiq WSS				
52	Konispol WS		94.77%		94.77%
53	Gjirokastër WSS	93.83%	87.40%	98.71%	103.94%
54	Tepelenë WSS	75.05%	75.93%	75.05%	75.93%
55	Kelcyrë WS	76.42%	60.19%	90.84%	85.98%
56	Përmet WS	89.56%	86.48%	92.59%	97.30%
57	Libohovë WSS	65.08%	65.11%	71.07%	70.13%
58	Dropull WSS				
	<b>Total</b>	<b>78.48</b>	<b>78.84%</b>	<b>91.03%</b>	<b>92.76%</b>

**Table 34, Annex 3. Financial Results 2017 for WSS Operators (000 ALL)**

NO	Activity	Utility	Billed Amounts	O&M Costs	Total Costs	Year 2017				Annual Financial Results		
						Subsidy Need (000 ALL)	In % to the Total	Subsidies received	Difference	Losses	Profit	Loss in % to Total
			1	2	3	4		5	(4)-(5)			
1	WSS	Tiranë	2,784,087	2,241,683	2,766,756			-	-		17,332	
2	WSS	Durrës	852,613	1,135,272	1,249,052	282,659	23%	99,044	(183,615)	-396,439		18%
3	WSS	Vlorë	305,887	496,763	677,956	190,876	15%	104,900	(85,976)	-372,069		15%
4	WSS	Fier	372,628	363,815	424,451			9,000	9,000	-51,823		
5	WSS	Elbasan	333,190	353,120	498,447	19,930	2%	33,000	13,070	-165,257		6.50%
6	WSS	Korçë	318,356	194,872	343,985			9,500	9,500	-25,629		
7	WSS	Berat-Kuçovë	224,845	173,244	240,224			10,500	10,500	-15,379		
8	WSS	Shkodër	290,357	302,480	410,862	12,123		24,000	11,877	-120,505		5%
9	WSS	Kavajë	92,105	147,723	240,316	55,618	4.50%	41,500	(14,118)	-148,211		6%
10	WSS	Sarandë	159,466	133,839	177,899			22,500	22,500	-18,434		
11	WSS	Lushnjë	136,736	197,711	281,861	60,975	5%	30,500	(30,475)	-145,124		6%
12	WSS	Kamëz	216,820	124,383	125,192			-	-		91,629	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>6,087,090</b>	<b>5,864,905</b>	<b>7,437,001</b>	<b>622,181</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>384,444</b>		<b>-1,458,870</b>	<b>108,961</b>	<b>58%</b>
13	WSS	Pogradec	142,577	120,513	256,841			31,500	31,500	-114,264		4.50%
14	WSS	Lezhë	165,935	112,554	220,302			30,000	30,000	-54,367		2%
15	WSS	Gjirokastrër	95,555	94,685	102,720			4,500	4,500	-7,165		
16	WSS	Peshkopi	47,091	50,491	55,542	3,400		-	(3,400)	-8,451		
17	WS	Kurbin	49,046	104,404	116,221	55,358	4.50%	31,500	(23,858)	-67,175		3%
18	WSS	Cërrik	45,415	56,028	58,890	10,613		4,500	(6,113)	-13,476		
19	WSS	Belsh	42,163	62,492	66,537	20,329	2%	16,400	(3,929)	-24,374		
20	WSS	Maliq	23,672	40,754	47,725	17,082		19,500	2,418	-24,053		
21	WSS	Himarë	25,285	31,436	35,752	23,233	2%	-	(23,233)	-10,467		
22	WSS	Krujë	46,183	78,695	110,674	32,512	2.60%	40,000	7,488	-64,491		3%
23	WSS	Kukës	42,540	34,439	45,949			12,500	12,500	-3,409		
24	WS	Patos	38,296	208,692	218,045	170,396	14%	87,500	(82,896)	-179,749		7%
25	WS	Gramsh	32,492	32,357	38,213			10,000	10,000	-5,721		
26	WSS	Devoll	33,048	23,213	35,243			4,500	4,500	-2,195		
27	WSS	Librazhd	37,392	36,256	46,818			9,000	9,000	-9,426		
28	WSS	Mallakastër	40,443	100,526	110,545	60,083	5%	38,000	(22,083)	-70,102		3%
29	WSS	Mat	35,324	28,930	43,180			5,500	5,500	-7,856		
30	WSS	Tepelenë	27,257	46,640	59,750	19,383		15,000	(4,383)	-32,493		
31	WSS	Rrogozhinë	16,351	31,607	35,175	15,256		13,500	(1,756)	-18,824		
32	WS	Ura-Vajgurore	32,373	43,926	49,866	11,553		17,500	5,947	-17,493		
33	WS	Malësi e Madhe	30,223	27,249	36,456			14,000	14,000	-6,233		
34	WS	Përmet	23,342	33,233	34,805	9,891		8,900	(991)	-11,462		
35	WS	Selenicë	22,847	35,713	43,476	12,866		13,600	734	-20,629		
36	WSS	Peqin	34,496	67,419	72,536	32,923	2.6 %	27,000	(5,923)	-38,040		
37	WS	Divjakë	15,995	30,946	34,306	14,950		17,937	2,987	-18,311		
38	WSS	Vau Dejës	13,766	28,586	45,595	14,820		33,500	18,680	-31,829		
39	WSS	Skrapar	16,047	41,729	50,528	25,682	2%	23,500	(2,182)	-34,481		
40	WSS	Roskovec	19,536	27,862	40,060	8,326		2,000	(6,326)	-20,524		
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>1,194,690</b>	<b>1,631,375</b>	<b>2,111,750</b>	<b>558,656</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>531,337</b>		<b>-917,060</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36%</b>
41	WS	Tropojë	21,446	20,623	27,104			3,100	3,100	-5,658		
42	WSS	Delvinë	21,348	26,730	37,765	5,382		15,500	10,118	-16,417		
43	WS	Bulqizë	21,142	28,723	29,250	7,581		9,000	1,419	-8,108		
44	WSS	Mirditë	20,485	31,330	59,234	10,845		35,800	24,955	-38,749		
45	WS	Polican	17,543	28,773	31,115	11,230		15,500	4,270	-13,572		
46	WSS	Konispol	4,016	9,813	9,813	5,797		4,500	(1,297)	-5,796		
47	WSS	Kolonjë	14,126	9,894	11,090			-	-		3,037	
48	WS	Kelcyrë	9,086	14,326	15,780	5,240		3,700	(1,540)	-6,694		
49	WS	Has	9,887	16,769	20,443	6,882		9,500	2,618	-10,556		
50	WSS	Libohovë	7,666	15,961	16,154	8,295		7,500	(795)	-8,489		
51	WSS	Vorë	19,951	22,794	39,265	2,843		8,000	5,157	-19,314		
52	WSS	Pukë	9,759	12,797	15,918	3,038		5,500	2,462	-6,159		
53	WSS	Pustec	3,302	4,053	5,064	751		1,000	249	-1,762		
54	WSS	Fush Arrëz	4,438	7,041	8,922	2,603		4,700	2,097	-4,485		
55		Bashkia Shijak	0		0			-	-	0		
56		Bashkia Klos	0		0			-	-	0		
57		Finiq	0		0			-	-	0		
58		Dropull	0		0			-	-	0		
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>184,195</b>	<b>249,627</b>	<b>326,917</b>	<b>70,487</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>123,300</b>		<b>-145,759</b>	<b>3,037</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>7,465,975</b>	<b>7,745,907</b>	<b>9,875,668</b>	<b>1,251,324</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,039,081</b>		<b>-2,521,689</b>	<b>111,998</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Table 35, Annex 4. Needs for Subsidies in 2017 and their Allocation (in 000 ALL)**

Utility	Subsidies from CG for O&M	Subsidies from CG for Performance	Subsidies from LG and Others	Total Subsidies Received	The Real Need for Subsidies for O&M	Difference (over subsidize)	Difference (Under subsidize)
	1	2	3	4 (1+2+3)	5	6 (5-4)	7 (5-4)
1 Tiranë WSS	0	0	0	0			
2 Durrës WSS	48,000	28,000	23,044	99,044	282,659		183,615
3 Vlorë WS	55,000	40,000	9,900	104,900	190,876		85,976
4 Fier WSS	9,000	0	0	9,000		9,000	
5 Elbasan WSS	33,000	0	0	33,000	19,930	13,070	
6 Krocë WSS	9,500	0	0	9,500		9,500	
7 Berat-Kuçove WSS	5,500	5,000	0	10,500		10,500	
8 Shkodër WSS	18,500	5,500	0	24,000	12,123	11,877	
9 Kavajë WSS	41,500	0	0	41,500	55,618		14,118
10 Sarandë WSS	12,500	10,000	0	22,500		22,500	
11 Lushnjë WSS	30,500	0	0	30,500	60,975		30,475
12 Kamëz WSS	0	0	0	0			-
13 Pogradec	20,500	11,000	0	31,500		31,500	
14 Lezhë WSS	30,000	0	0	30,000		30,000	
15 Gjirokastër WSS	3,500	1,000	0	4,500		4,500	
16 Peshkopi WSS	0	0	0	0	3,400		3,400
17 Kurbin WS	22,500	9,000	0	31,500	55,358		23,858
18 Cërrik WSS	3,000	1,500	0	4,500	10,613		6,113
19 Belsh WSS	13,400	3,000	0	16,400	20,329		3,929
20 Maliq WSS	14,500	5,000	0	19,500	17,082	2,418	
21 Himarë WSS	0	0	0	0	23,233		23,233
22 Krujë WSS	25,000	15,000	0	40,000	32,512	7,488	
23 Kukës WSS	12,500	0	0	12,500		12,500	
24 Patos WS	80,500	7,000	0	87,500	170,396		82,896
25 Gramsh WS	8,000	0	2,000	10,000		10,000	
26 Devoll WSS	3,500	1,000	0	4,500		4,500	
27 Librazhd WSS	4,000	5,000	0	9,000		9,000	
28 Mallakastër WSS	34,000	4,000	0	38,000	60,083		22,083
29 Mat WSS	5,500	0	0	5,500		5,500	
30 Tepelenë WSS	10,500	4,500	0	15,000	19,383		4,383
31 Rrogozhinë WSS	13,500	0	0	13,500	15,256		1,756
32 Ura-Vajgurore WS	14,000	3,500	0	17,500	11,553	5,947	
33 Malësi e Madhe WS	14,000	0	0	14,000		14,000	
34 Përmet WS	8,400	500	0	8,900	9,891		991
35 Selenicë WS	11,000	2,600	0	13,600	12,866	734	
36 Peqin WS	27,000	0	0	27,000	32,923		5,923
37 Divjakë WS	14,500	2,000	1,437	17,937	14,950	2,987	
38 Vau Dejës WS	19,500	14,000	0	33,500	14,820	18,680	
39 Çorovodë WSS	23,500	0	0	23,500	25,682		2,182
40 Roskovec WSS	500	1,500	0	2,000	8,326		6,326
41 Tropojë WS	2,500	600	0	3,100		3,100	
42 Delvinë WSS	14,500	1,000	0	15,500	5,382	10,118	
43 Bulqizë WS	5,500	1,000	2,500	9,000	7,581	1,419	
44 Mirditë WSS	19,500	16,300	0	35,800	10,845	24,955	
45 Poliçan WS	15,500	0	0	15,500	11,230	4,270	
46 Konispol	4,500	0	0	4,500	5,797		1,297
47 Kolonjë WSS	0	0	0	0			-
48 Këlcyrë WS	3,700	0	0	3,700	5,240		1,540
49 Has WS	9,500	0	0	9,500	6,882	2,618	
50 Libohovë WSS	7,500	0	0	7,500	8,295		795
51 Vorë WSS	7,000	1,000	0	8,000	2,843	5,157	
52 Pukë WSS	5,500	0	0	5,500	3,038	2,462	
53 Pustec WSS	1,000	0	0	1,000	751	249	
54 Fushë Arrëz WSS	4,000	500	200	4,700	2,603	2,097	
55 Bashkia Shijak	0	0	0	0			-
56 Bashkia Klos	0	0	0	0			-
57 Finiq WSS	0	0	0	0			-
58 Dropull WSS	0	0	0	0			-
<b>TOTAL (000/ ALL)</b>	<b>800,000</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>39,081</b>	<b>1,039,081</b>	<b>1,251,324</b>	<b>292,646</b>	<b>504,889</b>
			<b>TOTAL (in Euro)</b>		<b>10.000.000</b>		

**Table 36, Annex 5. Actual Tariffs of Water Supply and Wastewater Services**

No	Service	Utility	2017-2018									Monthly bill (12 m <sup>3</sup> )
			Drinking water supply service						Wastewater Sewerage service			
			Variable tariff			Fixed tariff			Variable tariff			
			Households	Institutions	Private	Households	Institutions	Private	Households	Institutions	Private	
1	WSS	Belsh	35			120			5			720
2	WSS	Berat-Kuçovë	48	130	130	100	200	200	13	22	22	998
	Administrative unit	Otlak, Velabisht, Sinjë, Kozarë, Lumas	50	150	150	100	200	200	14	24	24	1,042
	Administrative unit	Roshnik	40	150	150	100	200	200	14	24	24	898
3	WSS	Devoll	38	100	110	50	50	50				607
4	WS	Bulqizë	17	55	75	100	100	100				365
5	WS	Cërrik	35			79						599
6	WSS	Delvinë	48	100	100							691
7	WS	Divjakë	53			113						899
8	WSS	Durrës	70	120	130	150	150	150	50	60	60	1,908
9	WSS	Elbasan	38	115	130				8	25	30	662
10	WS	Elbasan Fshat	38	120	120	120	120	120				691
11	WSS	Ersekë (Kolonjë)	38	100	110	100	100	100	10	13	18	811
12	WSS	Fier	52	105	125	200	200	200	13	18	20	1,176
13	WSS	Fushë Arrëz	20						7.5			396
14	WSS	Fushë Krujë	28	60	80				6	10	12	490
15	WS	Gramsh	32	90	90	60	180	150				533
16	WSS	Gjirokastrë	43	125	130	80	80	80	10	16	16	859
	Administrative unit	Cepo, Antigonë, Lazarat, Lunxhëri, Odrin, Picar	25	60	60							360
17	WS	Has	25									360
18	WSS	Himarë	50									720
19	WSS	Kavajë	38	80	100				15	20	20	763
20	WS	Këlcyrë	37			100						653
21	WSS	Korçë	72	117	140	140	140	140	42	64	64	1,810
	Administrative unit	Mollaj, Bulgarec	38	110	100	100	100	100				667
	Administrative unit	Voskop, Komuna Vitkuq, Bulgarec (etc.)	28	110	100	100	100	100				523
	Administrative unit	Drenovë	28	110	100	100	100	100				523
	Administrative unit	Voskopojë	28	110	100	100	100	100				523
22	WSS	Krastë	30	80	100				7	10	15	533
23	WSS	Krujë	33	80	80				8	12	12	590
24	WSS	Kukës	25						7			461
25	WS	Kurbin	30	80	120	50	50	50				492
26	WSS	Lezhë	58	135	145	200	200	200	18	22	27	1,334
27		Libohovë	18									259
28	WSS	Librazhd	38	100	100				13	22	23	734
29	WSS	Lushnjë	58	130	140	100	200	200	17	21	24	1,200
30	WSS	Maliq										-
	Administrative unit	Maliq, Libonik, Pojan, Vreshtas, Përg (Zona Fushore)	45	100	105	54/50 *	54/50 *	54/50 *				773
	Administrative unit	Maliq, Libonik, Përg, Gore, Moglicë (Mountain areas)	22.5	100	105	27	54	54				356
31	WS	Malsia e Madhe	50	120	120	167	167	167				767
32		Mallakastër	50			100			10			820
33	WSS	Mat	23	60	80				2	4	6	300
34	WSS	Mirditë	30	100	115				10	15	15	480
35	WS	Novoselë	33	50	70							396
36	WS	Orikum	25	70	75	100	100	100				400
37	WS	Patos	20			200						440
38	WSS	Peqin	30	90	100	50	50	50				410
39	WS	Përmet	40	110	120	100	100	200				580
40	WSS	Peshkopi (Dibër)	27	65	85							324
41	WSS	Pogradec	22/62	37/111	37/111	200/100*	400/100*	400/150*	11/33	12/36	12/36	1,19
42	WS	Polican	37	80	95							533
44	WSS	Pukë	35	130	140	100	100	100	8	16	16	739
45	WSS	Roskovec	60			200			50			1,824
46	WSS	Rubik	30	70	100				7	10	15	533
47	WSS	Rrogozhinë	48	90	100	50	100	100	10	12	12	895
48	WSS	Sarandë	52	138	138	150	150	150	20	31	31	1,217
49	WS	Selenicë	30	80	100							432
50	WSS	Skrapar	27	80	95							389
51	WSS	Shkodër	40	110	110	100	100	100	15	20	20	912
52	WSS	Tepelenë	33	100	120	90	400	250	12	20	20	756
53	WSS	Tiranë	65	140	155	200	200	200	11	30	35	1,334
54	WS	Tropojë	19	60	80							274
55	WS	Ura Vajgurore	40	90	100							576
56	WSS	Vau i Dejës										-
57	WSS	Vlorë	30	60	80				11	13	13	590
58	WSS	Vorë	45			100			11			926

Operators who apply tariffs not approved by the WRA, but setup by utility itself

\* Fixed tariff for water and Sewerage services

**Table 37, Annex 6. Licensing Situation of WSS Utilities, till 13 June 2018**

No.	Utility	Licensing deadline	Licensing Situation	Notes
1	Këlcyrë WS		Non licensed	
2	Pukë Fshat WS Pukë Municipality WSS	13.07.2018	Non licensed Licensed	United according to the reform
3	Mallakastër WSS	01.09.2000	Non licensed	
4	Fushë Arrëz WSS	06.05.2009	In process	
5	Peqin WSS	02.02.2013	Non licensed	
6	Has WS	02.11.2013	Non licensed	
7	Bulqizë WS Kraštë WS	17.07.2018 24.11.2014	In process Non licensed	United according to the reform
8	Himarë WSS	18.01.2019	Licensed	
9	Kolonjë WSS	14.12.2021	Licensed	
10	Selenicë WS	30.04.2016	In process	
11	Tropojë WS	31.05.2022	Licensed	
12	Sarandë WSS	13.06.2016	Non licensed	
13	Dibër WSS	12.06.2022	Licensed	
14	Rrogozhinë WSS	29.03.2022	Licensed	
15	Përmet WS	13.01.2017	In process	
16	Libohovë WSS	01.03.2022	Licensed	
17	Mirditë WSS	22.11.2019	Licensed	
18	Kavajë WSS	15.03.2017	Non licensed	
19	Divjakë WS	02.04.2017	Non licensed	
20	Shkodër WSS	28.12.2021	Licensed	
21	Tiranë WSS	05.10.2018	Licensed	
22	Lezhë WSS	05.10.2021	Licensed	
23	Fier WSS	21.01.2018	In process	
24	Gramsh WS	05.10.2021	Licensed	
25	Elbasan Fshat WS	20.02.2017	Non licensed	
26	Elbasan WSS	25.11.2018	Licensed	
27	Devoll WSS	21.11.2021	Licensed	
28	Vau i Dejës WSS	20.03.2019	Licensed	
29	Kukës WSS	22.09.2020	Licensed	
30	Kurbin WS	22.09.2020	Licensed	
31	Ura Vajgurore WS	22.09.2020	Licensed	
32	Lushnjë WSS	22.09.2020	Licensed	
33	Vorë WSS	13.10.2020	Licensed	
34	Malësi e Madhe WS	01.12.2020	Licensed	
35	Patos WSS	02.02.2021	Licensed	
36	Pogradec WSS	02.02.2021	Licensed	
37	Gjirokastër WSS	02.02.2021	Licensed	
38	Poliçan WSS	02.02.2021	Licensed	
39	Korçë Qytet WSS	27.02.2021	Licensed	
40	Vlorë WSS	29.03.2022	Licensed	
41	Delvinë WSS	27.04.2021	Licensed	
42	Tepelenë WSS	27.04.2021	Licensed	
43	Krujë WSS	04.05.2021	Licensed	
44	Librazhd WSS	10.05.2021	Licensed	
45	Mat WSS	06.06.2021	Licensed	
46	Skrapar WSS	06.06.2021	Licensed	
47	Durrës WSS	17.07.2021	Licensed	
48	Berat - Kuçovë WSS	17.07.2021	Licensed	
49	Belsh WSS	01.12.2020	Licensed	New utility created under reform
50	Maliq WSS	05.09.2021	Licensed	New utility created under reform
51	Cërrik WSS	05.09.2021	Licensed	New utility created under reform
52	Roskovec WSS	22.11.2021	Licensed	New utility created under reform
53	Pustec WSS		In process	New utility created under reform
54	Finiq WSS	31.05.2022	Licensed	New utility created under reform
55	Konispol WSS	31.05.2022	Licensed	New utility created under reform
56	Kamëz WSS			New utility created under reform
57	Klos WSS			New utility created under reform
58	Dropull WSS		In process	New utility created under reform

**Table 38, Annex 7. Number of New Connections, November 2017 - May 2018**

No	Utility	Illegal connections (November-December) 2017		Illegal connections (January - May) 2018		Total no. illegal connections 2017-2018	New contracts assigned as a result of the action against illegal connection November 2017 - May 2018	
		Households	Institutions	Households	Institutions		Households	Institutions
1	Tiranë WSS					309		
2	Durrës WSS				15	1886	3309	501
3	Vlorë WS						1576	
4	Elbasan WSS	0	0	0	0			
5	Fier WSS						1429	
6	Berat-Kucove WSS					27	447	
7	Korçë WSS				4			
8	Shkodër WSS					1986		
9	Kavajë WSS						506	
10	Lushnje WSS			2			932	
11	Sarandë WSS	308	29	79	21			
12	Kamëz WSS			62	3		828	263
13	Pogradec WSS	69		8			78	
14	Lezhë WSS	112		46			1737	
15	Gjirokastrë WSS	189		2				
16	Peshkopi WSS						9	
17	Kurbin WS			35	2			
18	Cerrik WSS						41	46
19	Belsh WSS					37	152	
20	Maliq WSS			24				
21	Himarë WSS						1144	
22	Krujë WSS					21		
23	Bilisht WS					0		
24	Gramsh WS						34	
25	Kukës WSS					88	108	
26	Patos WS						72	34
27	Librazhd WSS				3		0	
28	Mallakastër WSS	506						
29	Tepelenë WSS			5			75	
30	Burrel WSS	65					83	
31	Rrogozhinë WSS					15		
32	Përmet WS					0		
33	Ura-Vajgurore WS						33	32
34	Malësi e Madhe WS					23		
35	Divjakë WS						160	
36	Selenicë WS	0	0	0	0			
37	Peqin WS					29	39	33
38	Vau Dejës WS						27	6
39	Skrapar WSS					150	44	68
40	Roskovec WSS						77	
41	Tropojë WS						15	
42	Bulqizë WS			34			83	
43	Delvinë WSS			105			70	
44	Mirditë WSS			48			137	
45	Poliçan WS			3			53	
46	Konispol WSS					5		
47	Kolonjë WSS			3				
48	Vorë WSS						39	19
49	Këlcyrë WS						20	
50	Has WS						4	3
51	Libohovë WSS			100				
52	Pukë Municipality WSS			35	15			
53	Pustec WSS			13				
54	Fushë Arrëz WSS			4				
<b>Total</b>		<b>1249</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>4576</b>	<b>13361</b>	<b>1005</b>

**Total number of illegal connection: 6525**

**Total number of new contracts assigned as a result of the action against illegal connection: 14366**

**Table 39, Annex 8. WSS Utility Data, Year 2017**

	Utility	Total water connections	Total sewerage connections	Total of employees	Total volume of water produced	Total volume of water billed	Total amount of water billed	Total amount of wastewater billed	Total amount of wastewater billed	Other revenues from wastewater	Total revenues from Activities
		no	no	no	000/m3	000/m3	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL
Group 1	Tiranë WSS	233,946	216,433	1,764	99,958	34,747	2,320,868	463,219	2,784,087	773,587	3,557,675
	Durrës WSS	79,917	46,702	675	26,472	7,733	676,944	175,669	852,613	59,702	912,315
	Vlorë WS	52,076	37,683	395	27,442	5,984	261,625	44,262	305,887	0	305,887
	Elbasan WSS	40,598	31,613	341	17,075	4,237	297,573	35,617	333,190	1,958	335,148
	Fier WSS	35,265	26,004	402	12,779	4,449	329,607	43,021	372,628	1,083	373,711
	Berat_Kuçovë WSS	28,056	21,892	248	13,969	2,786	192,958	31,887	224,845	1,728	226,573
	Korçë WSS	28,053	22,352	112	4,126	2,952	228,769	89,587	318,356	18,270	336,627
	Shkodër WSS	27,327	22,363	333	10,177	4,070	238,607	51,750	290,357	6,350	296,707
	Kavajë WSS	24,190	6,107	241	3,216	1,475	86,445	7,020	93,465	0	93,465
	Lushnjë WSS	21,444	8,779	197	7,362	1,681	122,617	14,120	136,736	1,644	138,380
Group 2	Sarandë WSS	18,674	12,232	159	5,566	1,661	138,365	21,101	159,466	3,790	163,256
	Kamëz WSS	15,976	28,706	124	2,365	2,331	177,535	39,285	216,820	7,200	224,020
	Pogradec WSS	14,741	11,931	147	1,831	1,254	103,419	39,158	142,577	5,236	147,814
	Lezhë WSS	12,795	10,519	124	2,782	1,696	139,840	26,095	165,935	16,446	182,381
	Gjirrokastër WSS	10,123	6,894	156	3,856	1,330	85,539	10,016	95,555	3,147	98,702
	Peshkopi WSS	8,824	3,942	89	1,871	1,243	40,952	6,139	47,091	41	47,132
	Kurbin WS	7,543	0	109	3,705	1,202	49,046	0	49,046	104	49,150
	Cërrik WSS	6,872	3,419	79	1,866	798	45,415	0	45,415	0	45,415
	Belsh WSS	6,508	820	67	1,114	763	41,422	741	42,163	3,564	45,727
	Maliq WSS	6,337	0	54	716	492	23,672	0	23,672	479	24,151
	Himarë WSS	6,296	1,004	45	1,131	736	26,831	3,793	30,624	75	30,699
	Krujë WSS	6,126	5,762	69	2,008	777	40,854	5,329	46,183	756	46,939
	Devoll WSS	6,099	0	34	803	709	33,048	0	33,048	300	33,348
	Gramsh WS	5,831	0	45	1,226	715	32,103	0	32,103	109	32,212
	Kukës WSS	5,774	3,709	76	1,857	1,052	35,765	6,774	42,540	0	42,540
	Patos WSS	5,723	5,597	149	3,246	1,413	38,296	0	38,296	447	38,743
	Librazhd WSS	5,461	4,989	67	2,217	590	29,294	8,098	37,392	4,237	41,629
	Mallakastër WSS	5,056	1,605	108	62	584	38,088	2,355	40,443	1,904	42,347
	Tepelenë WSS	4,414	3,449	75	2,178	432	23,361	3,896	27,257	0	27,257
	Mat WSS	4,400	3,637	46	1,274	772	33,713	1,611	35,324	358	35,682
	Rrogozhinë WSS	4,385	1,531	45	724	254	16,108	526	16,634	2,354	18,988
	Përmet WS	4,182	0	60	743	413	23,342	0	23,342	1,034	24,376
	Ura-Vajgurore WS	4,161	0	58	1,819	1,011	32,373	0	32,373	836	33,209
	Malësi e Madhe WSS	4,068	0	62	1,422	558	30,223	0	30,223	0	30,223
	Divjakë WS	4,019	0	56	549	255	15,995	0	15,995	528	16,523
	Selenicë WS	3,867	0	48	1,330	534	22,847	0	22,847	398	23,244
	Peqin WSS	3,750	0	89	1,348	651	34,496	0	34,496	659	35,155
	Vau Dejës WSS	3,418	0	35	844	378	13,766	0	13,766	52	13,818
	Skrapar WSS	3,294	2,938	52	839	373	14,002	2,146	16,148	33	16,181
	Roskovec WSS	3,267	264	57	898	356	19,298	238	19,536	88	19,624
Group 3	Tropojë WS	2,944	0	44	1,844	693	21,446	0	21,446	238	21,684
	Bulqizë WS	2,845	0	38	1,225	583	21,510	0	21,510	195	21,705
	Delvinë WSS	2,842	1,660	30	637	214	19,349	1,999	21,348	85	21,433
	Mirditë WSS	2,692	2,165	58	809	387	17,260	3,225	20,485	950	21,435
	Poliçan WS	2,500	0	42	717	314	17,543	0	17,543	75	17,618
	Konispol WS	2,184	0	19	83	57	4,016	0	4,016	0	4,016
	Kolonjë WSS	2,088	2,088	26	425	203	12,098	2,028	14,126	111	14,237
	Vorë WSS	1,835	979	25	428	291	18,579	1,371	19,951	0	19,951
	Këlcyrë WS	1,554	0	27	856	169	9,086	0	9,086	0	9,086
	Has WSS	1,429	0	28	620	309	9,887	0	9,887	562	10,449
	Libohovë WSS	1,301	0	20	2,770	1,103	7,666	0	7,666	0	7,666
	Pukë WSS	1,121	1,105	26	613	144	8,712	1,047	9,759	52	9,811
	Pustec WSS	739	359	7	181	48	2,743	177	2,920	0	2,920
	Fush Arrëz WSS	600	566	11	373	118	3,752	686	4,438	0	4,438
	Bashkia Shijak	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Bashkia Klos WSS	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Finiq WSS	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dropull WSS	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Total</b>		<b>799,530</b>	<b>561,798</b>	<b>7,493</b>	<b>286,345</b>	<b>100,081</b>	<b>6,328,667</b>	<b>1,143,988</b>	<b>7,472,654</b>	<b>920,764</b>	<b>8,393,419</b>

Source NWSSA

**Table 40, Annex 9. WSS Utility Data, Year 2017**

	Utility	Total Revenues from wastewater activity	Direct Operational Cost (DOC) Waste	Direct Operational Cost (DOC) Wastewater	Direct Operational Cost (DOC) WWTP	Direct Operational Cost (DOC) Wastewater & WWTP	Total Operational cost (TOC) Water	Total Operational cost (TOC) Wastewater	Total Operational cost (TOC) WWTP	Total cost (TC) Wastewater & WWTP	
		000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	000/ALL	
Group 1	Tiranë WSS	2,725,984	2,203,862	37,821	0	2,241,683	2,704,935	61,821	0	2,766,756	
	Durrës WSS	649,222	958,630	91,825	84,817	1,135,272	1,049,794	113,435	85,823	1,249,052	
	Vlorë WS	197,237	417,654	73,317	5,792	496,763	589,331	80,691	7,934	677,956	
	Elbasan WSS	200,196	348,553	4,567	0	353,120	452,930	45,517	0	498,447	
	Fier WSS	388,031	349,890	13,925	0	363,815	407,958	16,493	0	424,451	
	Berat_Kuçovë WSS	234,926	159,175	14,069	0	173,244	221,474	18,750	0	240,224	
	Korçë WSS	233,461	114,841	46,408	33,624	194,872	169,696	110,998	63,291	343,985	
	Shkodër WSS	189,014	237,133	53,218	12,128	302,480	309,478	84,721	16,662	410,862	
	Kavajë WSS	77,558	124,762	11,343	9,557	145,660	183,108	12,733	24,263	220,104	
	Lushnje WSS	96,098	189,223	8,488	0	197,711	270,327	11,534	0	281,861	
	Sarandë WSS	118,678	119,411	8,738	5,690	133,839	156,601	15,608	5,690	177,899	
	Kamëz WSS	191,151	94,750	29,633	0	124,383	95,559	29,633	0	125,192	
	Group 2	Pogradec WSS	122,089	86,927	22,244	11,342	120,513	135,657	96,691	24,494	256,841
Lezhë WSS		141,162	93,955	10,455	8,144	112,554	128,611	43,791	47,900	220,302	
Gjirokastër WSS		91,418	86,556	8,129	0	94,685	93,786	8,934	0	102,720	
Peshkopi WSS		26,991	47,157	3,334	0	50,491	51,031	4,511	0	55,542	
Kurbini WS		39,491	104,404	0	0	104,404	116,221	0	0	116,221	
Cërrik WSS		40,605	54,942	1,086	0	56,028	57,804	1,086	0	58,890	
Belsh WSS		30,697	62,204	288	0	62,492	65,928	609	0	66,537	
Maliq WSS		22,820	40,754	0	0	40,754	47,725	0	0	47,725	
Himarë WSS		23,072	26,132	1,701	0	27,833	27,632	1,713	0	29,345	
Krujë WSS		33,631	75,485	3,209	0	78,695	101,814	8,860	0	110,674	
Devoll WSS		27,376	23,213	0	0	23,213	35,243	0	0	35,243	
Gramsh WS		28,095	30,850	0	0	30,850	40,886	0	0	40,886	
Kukës WSS		25,563	30,302	4,137	0	34,439	40,612	5,337	0	45,949	
Patos WSS		30,767	208,692	0	0	208,692	218,045	0	0	218,045	
Librazhd WSS		36,515	28,702	7,554	0	36,256	37,536	9,282	0	46,818	
Mallakastër WSS		31,615	99,074	1,452	0	100,526	108,230	2,315	0	110,545	
Tepelenë WSS		20,697	44,490	2,150	0	46,640	55,230	4,520	0	59,750	
Mat WSS		27,386	26,369	2,561	0	28,930	39,592	3,588	0	43,180	
Rrogozhinë WSS		9,796	26,911	2,433	0	29,344	31,577	3,122	0	34,699	
Përmet WS		20,186	33,233	0	0	33,233	34,805	0	0	34,805	
Ura-Vajgurore WS		23,306	43,926	0	0	43,926	49,866	0	0	49,866	
Malësi e Madhe WSS		16,578	27,249	0	0	27,249	36,456	0	0	36,456	
Divjakë WS		13,887	30,946	0	0	30,946	34,306	0	0	34,306	
Selenicë WS		16,388	35,713	0	0	35,713	43,476	0	0	43,476	
Peqin WSS		24,639	67,419	0	0	67,419	72,536	0	0	72,536	
Vau Dejës WSS		12,272	28,586	0	0	28,586	45,595	0	0	45,595	
Skrapar WSS		13,309	34,924	2,836	0	37,760	43,179	4,772	0	47,951	
Roskovec WSS		8,440	25,959	1,903	0	27,862	36,838	3,222	0	40,060	
Group 3		Tropojë WS	10,857	20,623	0	0	20,623	27,104	0	0	27,104
		Bulqizë WS	16,692	25,078	0	0	25,078	30,680	0	0	30,680
	Delvinë WSS	17,261	25,094	1,636	0	26,730	33,991	3,774	0	37,765	
	Mirditë WSS	14,212	26,588	4,742	0	31,330	52,248	6,986	0	59,234	
	Poliçan WS	13,919	28,773	0	0	28,773	31,115	0	0	31,115	
	Konispol WS	3,806	9,813	0	0	9,813	9,813	0	0	9,813	
	Kolonjë WSS	13,057	8,041	1,853	0	9,894	9,015	2,075	0	11,090	
	Vorë WSS	12,830	20,902	1,892	0	22,794	35,813	3,452	0	39,265	
	Këlcyrë WS	5,469	14,326	0	0	14,326	15,780	0	0	15,780	
	Has WSS	7,528	16,769	0	0	16,769	20,443	0	0	20,443	
	Libohovë WSS	4,991	15,961	0	0	15,961	16,154	0	0	16,154	
	Pukë WSS	8,712	11,434	1,363	0	12,797	13,326	2,592	0	15,918	
	Pustec WSS	1,358	4,119	13	0	4,132	4,335	13	0	4,348	
	Fush Arrëz WSS	2,562	6,075	966	0	7,041	7,866	1,056	0	8,922	
	Bashkia Shijak	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Bashkia Klos WSS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Finiq WSS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dropull WSS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
<b>Total</b>		<b>6,393,601</b>	<b>7,076,549</b>	<b>481,290</b>	<b>171,093</b>	<b>7,728,932</b>	<b>8,749,087</b>	<b>824,235</b>	<b>276,057</b>	<b>9,849,379</b>	

Source NWSSA

To ensure for all Albanians  
That water and sewerage  
service producers deliver  
the highest achievable quality  
at a fair price and in a financially  
sustainable manner

