

SAGHIR

Jan 21/14.

- Shawraa Fouad Jordan Steingass Luiz Lima
- Gary Musson Colin McMillan Caitlin Cunningham
- Vassandrai Sauras-Madden Max Janssens.

Water Privatization

opening statements

- ① Not necessarily for profit, it's about better management
- + equitable access to people of all social & economic standings

Main Points

- Navy Coast, France, Johannesburg, Ghana, Casablanca
- ↳ to South Africa
- ↳ give δ to poorest areas for free
- ↳ significant \uparrow in water accessibility \rightarrow safe water.

Benefits

- ① Resource Management
 - ↳ companies have a vested interest in the ^{re.} source so they want to maintain it
 - ↳ healthy competition b/w companies & water quality

- ② Accountability
 - ↳ governments + public structures can be \uparrow in some cases already one corrupt in developing countries
 - ↳

Water Privatization will benefit the resource overall & will help companies be more accountable to ^{the} people. It is also noted that many places that have privatization are not solely private, they incorporate public aspects

Testing process is more competitive and leads to contractual accountability

Sarah Moreth; Michael Zagrodney; Jessica Wilson;
Lauren Elvish; Scott McGill

Antoine Frérot

- ★ ① Being for-profit means that there is incentive to do the job well, without other priorities getting in the way
- ② Competition keeps prices low
- ③ Private companies have expertise
- ★ ④ Water is publicly owned; water services are provided by private companies. Infrastructure is owned by the government
- ⑤ ~~Costs~~ ~~still~~ Rates still determined by gov't
- ⑥ Publicly managed water (politicians) may result in short-term decision making to appease voters or the public (e.g. Cochabamba)

Opening statements

Sachs - negative

- priorities are profits for shareholders, not consumers, esp. those who are disadvantaged
- elected officials better represent the people

Saghir - about effectiveness & providing services to everyone

- it works!
- privatization does not necessarily charge the poor for water

Barlow - available to everyone; human right

- should not have a price
- privatization does not promote conservation

- Frérot - profit \Rightarrow effective business practices
- water is always publicly owned

Counter arguments

- ③ - elected officials only focus on their term (other priorities)
- ① - making water public does not ensure access
- child mortality fell 25% after privatization in Argentina
- development of cost-effective practices
- ~~the~~ private companies are ~~better~~ more easily held to high standards
- ② - Prices charged by companies based on necessary improvements; consumer rates det. by public

DARLOW

Erica Tropea, Robert Baidoc, Antonio Trogrlic,
Evelyn Vegas, James Slater, Justine Tessier
Roxanne Piche, Klinger Soares Ferreira

Statement: ^{we disagree} Water is a fundamental right & should be available to all people. Public interests ~~should~~ should be represented by the public sector - those who really care.

Arguments → People in 3rd world countries are not given accessibility to water. Water should not have a price on it - it is a common good.

→

→

↙ Privatization gives a false ~~misleads~~ misleads the public by making it seem as though water will be more accessible to all when in reality, it is at people's doorstep but they cannot access it.

→ Ecological effects - Privatization doesn't promote conservation of water - ^{fresh} water is quickly disappearing, and private companies do not ~~see~~ focus on long-term goals for the betterment of the community & infrastructure.

↳ long-term viability of private sector's infrastructure.

- does try to sell water to those who cant afford it
x selling services - is selling water

first world infrastructure will not work in a 3rd world country. You can install the ~~infrastructure~~ systems
* but people cannot afford it regardless, ~~because they~~ ~~are making~~ so it fails.
↳ private sectors installed water pump in 3rd world - heard the

- said private companies provide free water to those who cant afford it

↳ this is a public system?

→ Bolivia case → ~~is~~ made collecting water from rain illegal

→ competition drives lower prices & better quality?
only if they dont have a monopoly which usually isnt the case.

public

~~does~~ does not ensure access.

- more \$ to get delivery than install systems.

- standards used by private companies for quality

- prices are controlled by outside forces

- benefits resources overall

- PPP ~~etc~~

- wont leave scene

Robyn, James, Mike, Steven, Taylor, Andrew, Michelle,

Jeffrey Sachs: opposed

Statement: We disagree with the statement that water privatization is essential to ensure global security to receive safe water due to the fact that private markets have a legal obligation to produce ~~so~~ profits for shareholders, and that we believe that the local governments are obligated to provide water to its people, its a human right.

ultimate solution: must combine private company installs infrastructure, not owning rights, public, pays for installation.

- #1 - profits for shareholders
- not local focused
- soul purpose legal obligation

- #2 - local governments know needs.
- overpopulation - ganges.

Other groups:

- foreign capital → public → more well rounded world view.
- Cultural differences
- ↳ not all are private / public culture

opposed pro:

- no compo.
- first world infrastructure not going to work in 3rd world, systems aren't set up the same

social hub
 { small water flows to be clean } poor
 ◦ increased challenges for
 ◦ 3rd parties? - ~~not~~ better than nothing? ↳ putting a bandaid

examples. opposed:

- water public - no ensured access, cheaper? hiking
- quality will maintained contract ↳ up to the public, build compo.
- ↳ prices are determined by external factors.
- focus on elected term, focus on profit? what is the difference? more effective?

Contracts clearly out lined.
 more decreases corruption or allows for more?
 Stakeholders - society - accountable? - visible interests of officials.
 • not sally private
 • Bolivia - corrupt government
 • Don't want to deplete resource... no more profit.

Tues. Jan 21/14

Hugh Briggs - importance in maintaining campus
 - consultant being paid, realistic sol'n

- Water privatization is essential step to reduce water crisis - ensure global pop'n receive safe & reliable water.

- Main Arguments ^{- statement (1 min)}
 - 2 Key Arguments Supporting
 - no re-bundles.

- WHO - infrastructure - jobs
- 1% of annual income (25 billion out of 25 trillion).
- in favour of companies coming to help
- opposed private.
- not business of market to provide something that can't be afforded
- World Bank ^{wants} market only sol'n however no evidence
- proper implementation.
- Bolivia - collected rain water. no legal infrastructure



social purpose, legal obligation.
 • profits for shareholders, not focused local needs. -- the role of private companies.

private companies.

CLOTHING SWAP
 Clothing Swap

positives:

- increased in accessibility & safe water.
- France
- effective business practices.
- private companies sell infrastructure ^{service not commodity} not actual water, contracts.

- ve - not given, no price, misleads → not actually accessible.
- no conservation, no long term goals for ecology. --- is it even considered.

Rebuttals:

- Canada & USA. trying to buy water, you can't afford it too bad, ^{and withdrawing from agreement is costly as corporations are supported by NAFTA.}
- there is no competition, once you have the contract you're in, expensive to switch.
- Bolivia, is an example where the citizens had water available but not able to access it because was too costly, and illegal to collect ^{rain water.}
- In Africa, privatized areas are not any better.
- not as sanitary tested less
- ~~the~~ question to ask you what competition exists in 3rd world countries, who lack money? what companies are running to set up shop?