



This is a repository copy of *Development and field validation of a burst localisation methodology*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/83984/>

Version: Submitted Version

---

**Article:**

Farley, B., Mounce, S.R.M. and Boxall, J.B. (2012) Development and field validation of a burst localisation methodology. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 139 (6). 604 - 613. ISSN 0733-9496

[https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)WR.1943-5452.0000290](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000290)

---

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Development and field validation of a burst localisation methodology**

2

3

4 B. Farley<sup>1</sup>, S. R. Mounce<sup>2</sup> and J. B. Boxall<sup>3</sup>.

5 <sup>1</sup> Pennine Water Group, Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield,  
6 Sheffield S1 3JD, UK.

7 <sup>2</sup> Pennine Water Group, Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield,  
8 Sheffield S1 3JD, UK.

9 <sup>3</sup> Pennine Water Group, Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield,  
10 Sheffield S1 3JD, UK.

11 Corresponding Author: [S.R.Mounce@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:S.R.Mounce@sheffield.ac.uk)

12

13 **Abstract**

14 Reducing water loss through bursts is a major challenge throughout the developed and developing  
15 world. Currently burst lifetimes are often long because awareness and location of them is time and  
16 labour intensive. Advances that can reduce these periods will lead to improved leakage performance,  
17 customer service and reduce resource wastage. In water distribution systems the sensitivity of a pressure  
18 instrument to change, including burst events, is greatly influenced by its own location and that of the  
19 event within the network. A method is described here that utilises hydraulic model simulations to  
20 determine the sensitivity of potential pressure instrument locations by sequentially applying ‘leaks’ to all  
21 potential burst locations. The simulation results are used to populate a Jacobian matrix, quantifying the  
22 different sensitivities. This matrix may then be searched to identify different instrument locations to  
23 achieve required goals: maximising overall sensitivity to all potential events or selective sensitivity to  
24 events in different network areas. It is shown here that by searching this matrix to optimise such  
25 selective sensitivity, while minimising instrument numbers, it is possible to provide useful burst

1 localisation information. Results are presented from field studies that demonstrate the practical  
2 application of the method, showing that current standard network models can provide sufficiently  
3 accurate quantification of differential sensitivities and that, once combined with event detection  
4 techniques for data analysis, events can effectively be localised using a small number of instruments.

5

6 Subject headings: Water distribution systems; Water management; Leakage; Hydraulic models; Field  
7 tests; Data analysis

8

## 9 **INTRODUCTION**

10 According to the EIRIS report (2011), the world is facing climate, energy and food crises. However  
11 these cannot be fully discussed without understanding the impact of water scarcity. It is estimated that  
12 two-thirds of the world's population will live in water scarce areas by 2025 (EIRIS, 2011). Global  
13 demand for water is forecast to outstrip supply by 40% by 2030 due to factors such as population growth  
14 and climate change (Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 2011). Therefore it is critical to  
15 ensure that water resources are managed carefully and in particular that losses from pipe networks are  
16 tackled. Losses can occur from many sources; one of these is leakage or bursts arising from breaks or  
17 fractures in Water Distribution Systems (WDS). Globally the level of leakage varies tremendously, in  
18 the UK it is estimated that leakage from WDS accounts for around 25-30% of total water supply. Water  
19 is widely considered as abundant in the UK, however low rainfall in 2011 has led to concerns about  
20 crops and the potential for drought (Environment Agency, 2011). In recent years, ICT (Information and  
21 Communication Technologies), water system simulation and water modelling optimization technologies  
22 and improved leakage control have all been progressed to enable water engineers to effectively tackle  
23 and reduce water loss (Wu et al. 2011), however more is urgently needed.

24

1 This paper presents a methodology for locating low numbers of pressure instruments in WDS to  
2 effectively detect and localise leak/burst events. This is achieved through optimisation of the location of  
3 additional instrumentation, in combination with the existing instruments, to subdivide a system into  
4 smaller detection zones. The work utilises current UK industry standard hydraulic models and is  
5 demonstrated for WDS of differing size and complexity. Results are presented from field tests using  
6 hydrant flushing to simulate leak/burst events in real distribution systems. This field validation made use  
7 of an automated data analysis detection system, to identify events within time series data (Mounce et al.  
8 2010a).

9

## 10 **BACKGROUND**

11 The distribution of potable water to consumers in the developed world is via a complex network of  
12 pipes. The complexity of WDS varies tremendously from area to area. In the United Kingdom, and  
13 increasingly in other parts of the world (Brothers 2003), WDS are subdivided into district meter areas or  
14 distribution management areas (DMAs). To measure and assess the performance of these WDS  
15 instrumentation is installed measuring flow and pressure at certain locations. These flow and pressure  
16 instruments are generally located at pre-determined positions within each WDS. In the UK flow and  
17 pressure instruments are typically installed at the inlet (and any outlet) to each DMA and an additional  
18 pressure instrument (referred to as the DG2) is installed at the point of highest elevation or another  
19 critical point in the DMA. The highest elevation is selected to comply with regulations regard minimum  
20 pressure levels in WDS.

21

22 Understanding complex WDS has historically been hard because of the difficulty of collecting accurate  
23 data. Manual data collection meant that data was analysed as infrequently as every two months.

1 However in recent years developments in measuring and recording data have made data collection easier  
2 and the use of telemetry, like GPRS (General Packet Radio Service), has allowed for data collected from  
3 instrumentation to be accessed quickly, with data now available in near real time often at fifteen minute  
4 sampling interval. These advances together with the availability and ease of installation of pressure  
5 instrumentation, at any hydrant or other tapping point, provide significant potential for improving the  
6 understanding and management of WDS. It is proposed that by developing an understanding of the  
7 sensitivity of pressure responses across WDS potentially important information in regard to system  
8 performance could be gained from increasing the number of pressure instrumentation devices  
9 permanently installed. However, there are significant capital and operational expenditure costs,  
10 maintenance requirements and IT issues associated with any instrumentation deployment, hence their  
11 number and locations need to be optimised with demonstrable benefits accruing.

12

13 To identify the optimal number and locations of instruments for any particular application (such as  
14 detection of water quality events (Berry et al. 2006), leakage hotspot identification (Wu and Sage, 2006)  
15 or hydraulic model calibration (Bush and Uber, 1998)), it is necessary to solve a complex optimisation  
16 problem. The problem is complex because there are many possibilities in terms of potential instrument  
17 locations and because the optimal number of instruments will differ from WDS to WDS. Optimal  
18 instrument placement using hydraulic simulation software has been studied for different purposes in  
19 WDS. Through the application of hydraulic mathematical models, simulations can be run in batches and  
20 multiple different events can be investigated. However, multiple simulations create a large amount of  
21 data that requires analysis. Once this data is analysed, the problem of where to situate instruments for  
22 different purposes can be solved. Work along these lines by Bush and Uber (1998) and Kapelan et al.  
23 (2003) demonstrated methods by which the optimal location of instrument(s) for calibration purposes

1 can be found. Another field in which optimal instrument/sensor placement has been widely studied is for  
2 the early detection of contamination events in WDS (Berry et al. 2006, Janke et al. 2006 and Watson et  
3 al. 2010). Despite trying to solve different problems, the principles behind these approaches are similar,  
4 namely utilising hydraulic models and running multiple simulations of different circumstances. Once  
5 simulations have been run it is important to search the resultant data in an efficient and well thought out  
6 fashion, to find the optimal location(s). A commonly used search approach in the field is the Genetic  
7 Algorithm (GA).

8

9 GAs are a search procedure based on the mechanics of natural selection and natural genetics (Goldberg,  
10 1989). They are highly parallel, mathematical algorithms that transform a set (population) of  
11 mathematical objects (typically strings of 1's and 0's and referred to as genes) into a new population.  
12 They work by combining survival of the fittest for individual genes; these are then passed on to the next  
13 generation. As the successful (fittest) genes 'breed' over generations they quickly converge to optimal  
14 solutions after examining only a small fraction of the search space. Mutations and crossover are also  
15 included in generations to ensure that a string of genes that may help provide an optimal solution are not  
16 lost too early. GAs and other evolutionary algorithms have been successfully applied to many complex  
17 engineering optimisation problems and extensively for water resources engineering and management  
18 (Nicklow et al. 2010). They have been widely applied to water distributions for calibration (Kapelán et  
19 al. 2003, Kapelán and Savic, 2009), existing leakage detection (Wu et al., 2010) and for contamination  
20 event detection (Ostfeld and Salomons, 2004). These applications have often led to resultant algorithmic  
21 advances.

22

1 Research has been conducted in the application of multiple hydraulic simulation and GA search  
2 approaches to burst event detection. A methodology for optimal placement of pressure instruments for  
3 improved detection was first proposed in Farley et al. (2008), and fully presented with field validation in  
4 a real water distribution system in Farley et al. (2010a). Perez et al. (2009) presented a similar method  
5 for identifying burst events, however the method was reliant on heavily instrumenting networks with  
6 more than fifteen sensors and has not been tested on in real WDS with simulated or real events. Romano  
7 et al. (2011) has used pressure instruments to localise leak/burst events using an ordinary cokriging  
8 technique (an interpolation technique utilising a cross-correlated secondary variable to reduce the  
9 variance of the estimation error) and other geostatistical approaches to successfully locate a series of  
10 flushing events. Thirteen pressure instruments were deployed in a single DMA and again this is far from  
11 normal practice for real WDS. Installation of the number of sensors in each WDS required by  
12 approaches such as Perez et al. (2009) and Romano et al. (2011) is not currently practical from a cost,  
13 management and IT perspective for water companies.

14

## 15 **METHOD**

16 The method presented here builds on and develops work by Farley et al. (2008, 2010a, and 2010b), to  
17 provide a technique which is able to both detect and localise burst events within WDS.

18

19 WDS usually have both flow and pressure instruments installed in them, but the instrument behaviour  
20 and approach to data collection are different. Flow data is averaged and then aggregated, leading to the  
21 data being smoothed (Mounce et al. 2012). Pressure values are instantaneous values; as a result some of  
22 the subtle variations in pressure may be missed. Flow measurements are usually taken at the inlet, and  
23 are sensitive to all down-stream changes. Pressure measurements however are sensitive to changes in

1 headloss along prescribed upstream flow routes only. They are therefore most sensitive to changes along  
2 certain routes and generally most sensitive to change local to the instruments position. Pressure  
3 instrumentation has been used (as opposed to flow) as pressure instruments are significantly cheaper and  
4 can readily be installed in any WDS using any readily available tapping point such as fire hydrants or  
5 wash outs, without the need for new fittings, excavations or decommissioning of pipes.  
6 Flow data has been effectively used for event detection, being more sensitive to leak/burst events than  
7 pressure data (Mounce et al. 2011). It is hypothesised that this detection via flow data can be augmented  
8 by pressure data: confirming detection and, if positioned intelligently, allowing location information to  
9 be inferred. This hypothesis is based on the differential and local sensitivity of the pressure  
10 instrumentation. Figure 1 shows conceptually how, for an extremely simple ideal network, differential  
11 sensitivity of instrumentation could be used to provide both detection and location information.

12  
13 {Figure 1 approximately here}

14  
15 To utilise this approach it is necessary to determine likely instrument behaviour at different locations  
16 with sufficient accuracy to identify differential sensitivity in real, complex networks. The work by  
17 Farley et al. (2008, 2010a, and 2010b) utilised a methodology that produces such a sensitivity matrix.  
18 This was achieved by sequentially modelling leak/burst events at all nodes in a model and simulating the  
19 pressure response at all possible instrumentation points. The main benefit of building on this work is that  
20 it has been subject to extensive validation, including fieldwork using flushing to simulate burst events.

21  
22 The major challenge is then to search this matrix: to maximise overall sensitivity; to minimise the  
23 amount of instruments to be added to a given network (ideally complementing existing instrumentation);  
24 to provide a maximum number and even size of detection zones. The search methods previously used by



1 Farley et al. (2008, 2010b) focused on detection rather than localisation. Hence the methodological  
2 development presented here is for an approach to search the matrix to provide localisation information,  
3 requiring the integration of a GA search approach to improve efficiency. Whilst the approach has been  
4 developed for application to WDS with a DMA configuration, there is no reason why it could not be  
5 applied to different systems (whole networks or trunk mains). The hydraulic models used by the method  
6 are typical UK industry standard models supplied by a water company and with no additional calibration  
7 having being conducted.

### 8 9 **Assembling/Producing the Jacobian Sensitivity Matrix**

10 The steps in the process of generating the Jacobian sensitivity matrix via hydraulic model simulation are  
11 illustrated in a flow chart in Figure 2.

12  
13 {Figure 2 approximately here}

14  
15 New leak/burst events were simulated at every node (representing every possible leak/burst event  
16 location), and the change in pressure analysed using Equation (1).

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(P_{lc} - P_n)^2}{P_n} \quad (1)$$

17  
18 Where  $\chi^2$  = Chi squared value,  $P_{lc}$  = Pressure under leak conditions and  $P_n$  = Pressure under normal  
19 conditions. The pressure under normal conditions is the system modelled with no new leaks present. The  
20  $\chi^2$  method provides a good test of sensitivity as it compares the change in pressure from the system  
21 under normal conditions to when a leak/burst event has occurred. As it is normalised by the pressure  
22 under normal conditions ( $P_n$ ), this ensures that events that occur at high pressure are not determined as  
23

1 overly sensitive. The  $\chi^2$  values are calculated for every instrument response and then summated for a 24  
2 hour period and the values are then used to populate the Jacobian sensitivity matrix. In Farley et al.  
3 (2010b) it was shown that the dependence of the method on the diameter of leak size was minimal, and  
4 that results from a standard size leak were transferable. However, it should be noted that this requires a  
5 pressure dependant leak function and not simply the addition of a standard demand.

6

### 7 **Searching the Jacobian Matrix**

8 To extract relevant/useful data from the Jacobian matrix it is important to develop a search technique  
9 that is able to efficiently search large amounts of data. The first stage of this is to define whether  
10 leak/burst events would be detected by possible pressure instrument locations. This is achieved by  
11 applying a detection threshold to the data in the sensitivity matrix. The detection threshold is then used  
12 to create a binary matrix populated with 1 (indicating detection) and 0 (indicating no detection).

13

14 The threshold used to determine detection / non detection is derived from the hydraulic simulation  
15 results; there will be a degree of uncertainty in this value, as water distribution models are only  
16 representations of the real system (how close is dependent on model build quality and calibration  
17 accuracy) and therefore subject to uncertainty. To limit the impact of model uncertainty and try to ensure  
18 model error does not play a role in detection / non detection a model specific threshold is used. The  
19 threshold is selected as the average sensitivity (taken from the sensitivity matrix) resulting from the  
20 model in question. Assuming that the model has a degree of uncertainty, a sensitivity value that is close  
21 to the threshold response is more uncertain than an instrument which has no (or very minimal) or strong  
22 response. Therefore it is preferable to select instruments with very small or very large sensitivities to  
23 change in pressure, rather than a response close to the threshold. Consequently an uncertainty band was

1 applied either side of the threshold, the aim of this band was to penalise instruments that have a response  
2 close to the mean. The size of the band was explored to establish sensitivity, percentage uncertainties  
3 were explored as different +/- percentage values (5, 10, 20, 30 and 40%). Following extensive testing  
4 with a variety of DMA models, 10% was selected as the penalty function sufficiently accounting for  
5 model uncertainty, but not producing excessive penalty zones. Thus the matrix that is searched is no  
6 longer binary and is populated with 1 (indicating detection), -1 (indicating no detection) and 0 indicating  
7 a response in the uncertain or penalty zone.

8

9 Once detection and non-detection (or uncertainty) has been estimated, a method is required by which the  
10 location of an event can be inferred. Table 1 shows how theoretically 4 distinct zones can be identified  
11 with only 2 pressure instruments. This is based upon using two pressure instruments installed within the  
12 DMA and utilises the flow meter installed at the inlet (zone D detected only at the inlet flow instrument),  
13 which is consistent with Figure 1.

14 {Table 1 approximately here}

15

16 An important aim of the search is to find a combination of locations which subdivide the DMA into even  
17 sized zones. If all the zones are equal then the search areas are of equal size. Size may be quantified by  
18 number of nodes, not necessarily capturing geographical area rather some hybrid of geographical area  
19 and network complexity. This effectively provides a useful measure for the time it would take to  
20 pinpoint a leak within a given zone, and it is actually this that should be equalised. The target zone size  
21 for each DMA is calculated using Equation (2).

22

$$T_z = Nodes_{Total} / Z \quad (2)$$

1

2 Where  $T_z$  = target zone size,  $Nodes_{Total}$  = total number of nodes in the DMA and  $Z$  = number of possible  
3 zones (this is dependent on the number of instruments,  $n$ ). Theoretically the number of instruments per  
4 DMA is limited only by the number of potential instrument locations. Therefore, by increasing the  
5 number of instruments per DMA, the number of zones increases, as  $Z = 2^n$ . For a DMA of 100 nodes  
6 with two instruments  $T_z = 100 / 2^2 = 25$ . The target zone size is used in the ‘scoring’ of possible  
7 instrument combination. How close each zone is to the target will define how well the combination  
8 divides the DMA. Therefore for the example DMA (of 100 nodes), four zones of 25 nodes would  
9 represent a perfect division.

10

11 To search the Jacobian sensitivity matrix an objective or fitness function was developed, to find the  
12 optimal combination of instrument which subdivides the DMA into the most evenly sized zones. The  
13 consequence of applying an uncertainty band is that it acts to create an additional zone, a fifth zone in  
14 Table 1. This zone will be populated by responses that occur in the penalty zone for one or more of the  
15 pressure instruments. It is particularly desirable to keep this zone as small as possible; therefore a  
16 multiplier was applied to ensure that it is less favourable for a solution to have a large penalty zone. The  
17 fitness function equation used is shown in Equation (3). The decision variable for the GA was the  
18 locations of instruments.

$$FF = \sum_{i=1}^Z \sqrt{(N_i - T_z)^2} + P \times 1.25 \quad (3)$$

19

1  $P$  = number of event locations that are in the uncertainty band.  $N_i$  = total number of nodes (events)  
2 detected in zone  $i$ .  $N_i$  and  $P$  are evaluated by interrogating the binary (with uncertainty zone) Jacobian  
3 matrix for each set of instrument locations selected by the GA.

4

5 To solve Equation (3) a genetic algorithm search approach was used. The software developed for this  
6 application utilised the MATLAB Genetic Algorithm toolbox (Chipperfield et al. 1994). A function (the  
7 objective or fitness function) was written as a .m file which is then optimised (minimised) by the GA.  
8 Note that the number of instruments is not explicitly optimised as part of the fitness function.

9

10 By increasing the number of instruments within a DMA the number of zones that the DMA is divisible  
11 into also theoretically increases, as  $Z = 2^n$ . However, in practice it is extremely difficult to identify  
12 multiple (say 6) instrument locations that would allow for subdivision of a DMA into the theoretically  
13 possible number of (in this case 64) zones. There is a diminishing return on the number, size and  
14 usefulness of the zones established by adding instruments; the nature of this trade off is unique to every  
15 network. Experience has shown that larger DMAs (typically 800+ nodes) can usually accommodate the  
16 installation of 3 additional instruments but providing 5 to 7 useful zones rather than the theoretically  
17 possible 8. As the number of instruments and subdivision increases, the more reliant the method  
18 becomes on high model accuracy which can often be suspect in reality. Other constraints on heavily  
19 instrumenting DMAs are the cost, maintenance and IT overheads. Assigning multiple, say greater than 3  
20 additional, pressure instruments to every DMA in the system would be expensive and may not reduce  
21 the search time taken by leakage technicians to pinpoint leak/burst event (particularly when considering  
22 the inherent travel time and the like); therefore this is unlikely to be practical.

23

24

## 1    **APPLICATION AND VALIDATION**

2    The application and validation section is divided into two sections:

- 3       • Firstly the approach was applied to 14 DMA models to test application and explore how evenly  
4       these networks were subdivided.
- 5       • Additional pressure instruments were then deployed in a real-life WDS in the UK, based on  
6       application of the method, and bursts simulated by opening fire hydrants to validate the DMA  
7       sub-division approach.

8

### 9       **I. Ideal Application**

10    14 DMAs were analysed by the search technique (ignoring the current instrumentation) to show the  
11    application for a range of DMAs with the method evaluated for subdivision of the DMA into smaller  
12    burst event detection zones. The industrial partner advised restricting the addition of instruments to two  
13    as a practical limit since (potentially) four zones offer a pragmatic, cost effective solution with present  
14    technologies and practices. The method is extendable so that, for example, three instruments could  
15    render (potentially) eight subdivisions.

16

17    The characteristics of the DMA play an important role in the subdivision of the DMA. Generally it is  
18    easier for larger DMAs to be divided into four zones, as a result of the size. When the method was  
19    applied to some of the smaller DMAs it was not possible to achieve four zones. However, if the DMA is  
20    smaller, then the search area is smaller still, as a result it will not influence the search time (to find the  
21    leak/burst event) significantly. The number of zones for each of the 14 DMAs in the pilot is presented in  
22    Table 2, together with summary information to provide an impression of the range of DMA sizes and  
23    characteristics.

1 {Table 2 approximately here}

2  
3 Table 2 shows that for most of the DMAs used in this pilot it is not possible to subdivide them  
4 effectively into four suitably even sized zones. The characteristics of the DMA influence the number of  
5 zones it is possible to subdivide. Generally a DMA which is smaller in size divides in to a smaller  
6 numbers of zones. Table 2 also expresses the fitness function as a fraction of the number of nodes, this  
7 has been included to offer a comparison between two DMAs to assess the quality of the subdivision,  
8 with a low value indicating a good sub-division.

9  
10 Subdivision of smaller DMAs into 2 zones can be as beneficial as dividing a larger DMA into 4 zones.  
11 For example dividing a DMA which is 50% of the size of another into half the number of zones evenly  
12 produces the same size zones. Therefore the time taken to locate a leak/burst event will be similar.  
13 Consequently being unable to subdivide the DMA into 4 zones for smaller DMAs is not crucial. A  
14 potential benefit for the water utility company is that smaller DMAs will need fewer instruments, which  
15 will reduce instrumentation costs.

## 16 17 18 **II. Practical Constrained Application**

19 The water company that participated in this test wished to keep their existing instrumentation at the  
20 current locations within the DMA, as they provide important information about system performance for  
21 which continuous records are required. Using the method developed it is possible to include these  
22 instrumentation already situated in the DMA, as well as all other possible instrumentation points. The

1 matrix search was hence adapted to run searches with and without utilising the existing instrumentation  
2 locations as fixed points.

3

4 Hence three additional search strategies that include the current instrumentation already in the DMA to  
5 varying degrees were applied to the 14 DMAs as follows:

6 I. The optimal combination of two instruments determined by applying the search technique defined  
7 above, ignoring the current instrumentation (results presented in Table 2)

8 II. The current instrumentation only (i.e. the pressure instruments at inlet and at the point of highest  
9 elevation), no additional instrumentation

10 III. One of the current industry instruments and one optimally placed instrument

11 IV. One of the current industry instruments (i.e. the pressure instrument at the inlet or the point of  
12 highest elevation) and two optimally placed instruments.

13

14 Strategy I effectively provides the ‘benchmark’ against which to judge the ‘best’ solution from strategy

15 II, III or IV. A selection of four DMAs are presented below to illustrate the results obtained from the  
16 application of these strategies, these are the four DMAs that were then used in the live field trials.

17

18

19

20

21

{ Figure 3 approximately here }

22 By supplementing the DG2, critical instrument with an additional instrument, DMA A is divided into

23 two distinct zones, with a small penalty zone (as shown in Figure 3) – strategy III. The fitness function

24 and fraction obtained are identical to those achieved by strategy I, showing that the current DG2, critical

25 instrument location is actually only sensitive to a defined area of the DMA rather than the majority of



1 the DMA as might be the aspiration for a DG2, crucial instrument. For DMA B, one additional  
2 instrument (using strategy III) provides a good division of the DMA into 2 large zones (and one very  
3 small one). However, in this case the DG2, critical instrument did not provide any value to the  
4 subdivision of the DMA and the fitness function and fraction were worse than those reported in Table 2  
5 for strategy I. However, this drop in fitness function versus the small zone obtained by the application of  
6 strategy IV was deemed of insufficient benefit when discussed with the water utility company. For  
7 DMA C, the optimal combination was selected as being obtained by using strategy IV. This is one of  
8 the few situations where the current DG2 instrument location provides some benefit for leak sub-division,  
9 but the drop in fitness function and fraction when only adding one instrument is significant. For this  
10 DMA using 3 instruments (1 DG2 and 2 optimally placed) the fitness function and fraction are actually  
11 improved enough over strategy I to provide sufficient benefit (as evaluated qualitatively by the water  
12 company personnel). For DMA D, the addition of a single optimally located instrument (using strategy  
13 III) enables division into two distinct zones, obtaining the same fitness function and fraction as the  
14 bench mark strategy I. This is despite the DG2 instrument location not contributing a zone of detection.  
15 This shows that the strategy I solution can actually be achieved with only one instrument.

16

17 The division of the DMAs shown in Figure 3 offer some interesting insight into the strategies. Strategy  
18 II is generally very poor for both overall sensitivity, as found in previous work (Farley et al. 2008), and  
19 shows little effective sub-division, as expected. The division of DMAs A and C offer a lower fitness  
20 function as a fraction of the total nodes score than the division of DMAs B and D. This is because in  
21 both the former DMAs the DG2 instrument is used, however it does not contribute (in terms of creating  
22 a detection zone). As a result, the fitness function relative to the number of nodes is higher (1.0 in both  
23 cases compared to 0.81 for A and 0.62 for C). DMA A benefited from having its DG2 instrument

1 situated at a sensitive point and was therefore able to offer some subdivision of the DMA. However the  
2 DG2 instrument is not always situated in a sensitive location and some benefit (in terms of leak/burst  
3 event detection) may be achieved by moving it (Farley et al. 2010b). In general the location of the DG2  
4 point has been shown to be ineffective for leak/burst event location and detection, however it can  
5 provide other useful WDS data. Strategy III has been used for both DMAs B and D, however the DG2  
6 point contributes very little in terms of detection and location in these particular DMAs. Strategy III is a  
7 viable strategy, however it generally depends on the DG2 being situated in a sensitive area.

8

### 9 **Field validation**

10 Once the instrumentation had been installed in the DMAs it was important to test the methodology to see  
11 if the actual location of the real leak/burst events was obtained. Previous work by Farley et al. (2008,  
12 2010b) and Mounce et al. (2010b) have used hydrant flushing to simulate the effect of a leak/burst  
13 events within a DMA, to provide certainty of test conditions and a reasonable timeframe of event. A  
14 mixture of pre-determined and blind hydrant flushings was used to evaluate the methodology in this  
15 paper. In all 8 events were conducted, these 8 events were created by a water company technician  
16 opening a hydrant at a location within one of the four DMAs (see Figure 4). Once the hydrant was open  
17 a volume of water was allowed to flow from the hydrant (the flow from the hydrant flushing was  
18 unknown). The first set of flushing locations were determined by the research team and therefore placed  
19 in known locations. The second set of flushing tests were conducted solely by the water company,  
20 therefore the location of the flush was not disclosed until after the detection/non detection and location  
21 had been evaluated.. The field trials events ran for a period of at least 12 hours, with some running for  
22 up to 24 hours. The following events were conducted in the four DMAs:

- 23 • DMA A – One blind flushing conducted

- 1 • DMA B - One blind flushing conducted
- 2 • DMA C – Two blind flushing tests and three events specified by the research team were
- 3 conducted
- 4 • DMA D – One blind flushing conducted

5  
6 {Figure 4 approximately here}

7  
8 Regular automated data analysis allows the identification of new leaks as they occur (including smaller  
9 events not displaying obvious surface signs of their presence). Such data analysis can be as simple as  
10 flat-line alarm levels, or use automated profiling for alarm limits. A more sophisticated way it can be  
11 achieved is through intelligent ‘smart alarms’. Recent developments in the field of computational  
12 intelligence variously called soft computing, machine learning, or data-driven modelling are helping to  
13 solve various problems in the water resources domain. Evora and Coulibaly (2009) presented a review  
14 of recent advances in artificial neural network modelling of remote sensing applications in hydrology.  
15 In order for the optimal siting methodology to be assessed, some form of automated, online system for  
16 analysing the flow and pressure data was required i.e. to determine when a leak/burst event had occurred  
17 within a DMA and evaluate any change at the pressure instrumentation. Mounce et al. (2010a) describe  
18 an online system pilot implemented with a UK water company using an ANN (Artificial Neural  
19 Network) and FIS (Fuzzy Inference System) system for detection of leaks/bursts at DMA level. This  
20 event detection system is not reliant on any special hardware or network configuration and produces  
21 intelligent alerts. The automated analysis system is data driven starting from the logger units which  
22 initiate calls to the telemetry software every thirty minutes, GPRS signal permitting. The system is  
23 designed to provide detection of bursts and leaks as they occur but not existing leaks or background

1 leakage. The system provides 'sensitive' detection of abnormal flow and pressure events and due to the  
2 ANN/FIS system developed provides a confidence estimate, in the form of a percentage, of how unusual  
3 the event is together with an estimate of the burst flow rate that can be very effectively used to prioritise  
4 events and response. This system was operating on the flows and pressures logged in the case study area  
5 for the three month period of the pilot (January to March 2010) which included the blind flushing  
6 described above, hence online data was used as verification for event detection.

7

## 8 **RESULTS**

9

10 Where the ANN/FIS system was operating and data sources were available, the near real-time system  
11 detected all events providing a robust confirmation of its ability to detect abnormal flow level. A more in  
12 depth investigation of both flow and pressure alerts now follows to assess how the model methodology  
13 for division of DMAs into zones performed.

14

15 {Table 3 approximately here}

16

17 Table 3 shows that for the three events conducted in DMA C (event 1, 2 and 3) all successfully correctly  
18 identified the zone in which the leak/burst event had occurred. There was full agreement between the  
19 model-analysed response and the ANN/FIS system determined response for all instruments. Table 3 also  
20 shows that no event in this DMA was detected by the DG2 instrument, this suggests that this instrument  
21 is not optimally placed to detect low pressure events.

22

## 23 **Blind testing field validation**

1 The 5 blind tests of the method were conducted in four DMAs in two phases in a one month period and  
2 provided a robust test, as the location and size of the event was dependent on the technician at the water  
3 company. The aim was to make the simulated leak/burst events as ‘real’ as possible.

4

5 The subdivision of DMA A was previously shown in Figure 3. A blind flush occurring in DMA A is  
6 now used to illustrate results obtained. The DMA is divided into 3 zones, in Figure 5 events that occur in  
7 the yellow area should be detected by the optimal pressure instrument. Events that occur in the blue zone  
8 will be detected by the second optimal/DG2 instrument. Events in the rest of the DMA will only be  
9 detected by the flow meter at the inlet. The blind test was conducted in the blue zone (in Figure 5), as a  
10 result it should be detected by the optimal/DG2 instrument. The response of the instruments is shown in  
11 Figure 5a.

12

13 {Figure 5 approximately here}

14

15 Figure 5a shows that the event can be successfully located in the DMA since there is complete  
16 agreement between the ANN/FIS detection and model analysed detection. In this case, automated alerts  
17 for the flow sensor (estimated flush size 6.9 l/s) and DG2 pressure instrument/sensor were generated.  
18 The optimal pressure instrument has not responded, this rules out this zone as a potential location for the  
19 event. The flow meter has responded as has the optimal/DG2 instrument. Therefore the event occurred  
20 in the small zone close to the DG2 instrument from the optimal division of DMA using two pressure  
21 instruments. Therefore the correct zone of the leak/burst event was identified. Table 4 summarises all 5  
22 blind tests.

23

{Table 4 approximately here}

1

2 Table 4 shows that there was complete agreement between the model analysed detection and ANN/FIS  
3 detection for event 4 in DMA A, event 5 in DMA B and event 7 in DMA C. In the case of event 5, the  
4 event was conducted close to the inlet. Throughout the use of the modelling methodology adopted such  
5 events have proved difficult to detect and, as a result, the zone close to the inlet are generally flow only  
6 zones. In the case of event 6, three of the instruments used in this field work do have agreement between  
7 the model-analysed and actual response for DMA C. However for the methodology to be successful, all  
8 instruments need to agree. Consequently the location of this event was incorrectly attributed to the  
9 wrong zone in this DMA. For event 8, the correct zone was not identified. As predicted in Table 4 the  
10 DG2 location did not detect the engineered leak/burst event. This shows that the DG2 location is not the  
11 most sensitive for detection of leak/burst events.

12

13

#### 14 **DISCUSSION OF FLUSHING TEST RESULTS**

15

16 The results from the flushing tests conducted in the five DMAs were generally positive. There was total  
17 agreement between the researcher defined test conducted in DMA C (Table 3), with the correct zone  
18 being identified each time. Three out of the five blind tests produced exact agreement between the model  
19 analysed and actual response, and therefore the correct zone of the leak/burst event could be identified.  
20 In the other two events, factors beyond the control of this methodology led to the incorrect zone being  
21 identified. There was a large difference between the normal (non-event) modelled and actual normal  
22 (non-event) pressures in DMA D; this reflects common issues with reliability of models. Tests in DMA  
23 D were further hampered, as two instruments were not working during the period of the blind tests. One

1 instrument was the flow meter and therefore it was not possible to determine the size of the event. For  
2 event 7 conducted in DMA C, the pressure instruments failed to detect this event, when the model  
3 predicted they should do so. This is likely to be down to the small size of the leak/burst event, thus  
4 making the pressure change difficult to determine. Farley et al (2010b) showed that smaller leak/burst  
5 events (typically less than 1.5 l/s) are more difficult to detect.

6  
7 The instrumentation was installed in the DMA for a considerably longer period of time (approximately 3  
8 months). During this period the ANN/FIS online system was analysing pressure and flow at all  
9 instrument points (where instrumentation operation and communications allowed). In this period a  
10 number of ghost detections were recorded at pressure instruments. Ghost detections are more common  
11 when using pressure time series values for detection as pressure fluctuates much more than the flow in  
12 the system. If the pressure instruments were to be used solely to detect leak/burst events, this would be  
13 of concern and potentially lead to the revision of the detection bands (parameter settings) of the analysis  
14 system. During the period of the pilot only 5% of ghost alerts were encountered for flow analysis  
15 compared to 38% for pressure analysis demonstrating that the flow signal is much more reliable for  
16 event detection (see also Mounce et al. 2011). However, when flow is used first to determine detection,  
17 the pressure instruments can then potentially be used to determine location. For 6 of the 8 events the  
18 correct zone in which the leak/burst event had occurred was identified when both flow and pressure  
19 instruments were used.

20  
21 The first set of known events were all conducted in areas where a response from the optimal placed  
22 instrument would occur, and as a result were successfully located. As the locations of the blind tests  
23 were not preselected for research purposes a number of the events were conducted close to the inlet at

1 low flow rates. From a water company's perspective this is ideal as it will cause a minimum impact on  
2 the pressures in the system. However it meant that the majority of events were conducted in flow-only  
3 detection zones. Therefore the pressure instruments' ability to detect was not comprehensively tested.  
4 Only two of the blind events were conducted in zones that would be expected to achieve pressure  
5 detection. Of these two events, one was successful. The failure to detect the other event can be attributed  
6 to the low flow rate of the event, which did not cause a large change in pressure at the optimally placed  
7 pressure instrument/sensors as anticipated. The hydrant flushing was useful to allow for further testing  
8 of the methodology in a real world environment and to develop an understanding of how data analysis  
9 systems and optimal methodology (for detection and location) can operate together.

10

## 11 **CONCLUSIONS**

12

- 13 • A method, based on GA optimisation of a Jacobian sensitivity matrix derived from hydraulic  
14 model simulation results, that is able to detect and reduce the search time for finding a leak/burst  
15 event(s) by subdividing a DMA has been presented with the following features:
  - 16 ○ Practicality, having been developed and tested with input from the water industry
  - 17 ○ Requiring only a low number of instruments
  - 18 ○ Utilising current industry standard hydraulic models with a pressure dependant leak  
19 function and with previous validation having demonstrated independence of leak size  
20 diameter
  - 21 ○ Allowing integration with an appropriate event detection system (an automated ANN/FIS  
22 system was used in this study) enabling the potential for further development as an online  
23 sub-DMA location system.



- 1 • The methodology has been successfully applied to a number of DMAs as part of a verification  
2 and validation scheme in a real WDS in the UK using pressure and flow data:
  - 3 ○ Verification was conducted on 14 DMA models illustrating sub-division for a range of  
4 DMA characteristics
  - 5 ○ Validation was carried out with a total of 8 events (hydrant openings) conducted in 4  
6 DMAs. Three of these were in known locations (selected by the research team) and five  
7 in blind locations (selected by a water technician)
    - 8 § 6 events were correctly localised to sub-DMA areas of the DMA
    - 9 § 1 event was inaccurate due to an error in the model
    - 10 § 1 event was inaccurately predicted, this is likely to be due to the small size of the  
11 event
- 12 • A field verified and validated methodology has been presented in this work offering a practicable  
13 method to greatly reducing the time taken for leak/burst events to be located. Such advances are  
14 essential to the urgent need for water loss reduction.

## 16 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

17 This work was supported by the EPSRC (grant EP/E003192/1) and Industrial Collaborators. The authors  
18 would like to thank Yorkshire Water Services for their assistance with models and data. In addition the  
19 authors wish to acknowledge 7Technologies for provision and support of the hydraulic modelling  
20 software. Particular thanks are due to Mr. R. Patel, Mr. L. Soady and Dr. J. Machell for their help and  
21 support in conducting field work.

1   **REFERENCES**

2

3   Berry, J., Hart, W. E., Phillips, C. A., Uber, J. G. and Watson, J. P. (2006). “Sensor Placement in  
4   Municipal Water Networks with Temporal Integer Programming Models”. *Journal of Water Resources*  
5   *Planning and Management*, 132(4), 218-224.

6

7   Brothers, K. J. (2003). “A practical approach to Water Loss Reduction”. *Water 21*, 54-55.

8

9   Bush, C. A. and Uber, J. G. (1998). “Sampling design methods for water distribution model calibration”.  
10   *Journal of Water Resource Planning and Management*, 124(6), 334–344.

11

12   Chipperfield, A. J., Fleming, P. J. and Fonseca, C. M. (1994). “Genetic Algorithm Tools for Control  
13   Systems Engineering”. *Proc. Adaptive Computing in Engineering Design and Control*, Plymouth  
14   Engineering Design Centre, 21-22 September, 128-133.

15

16   EIRIS report (2011). “A drought in your portfolio: Are global companies responding to water scarcity?”  
17   [www.eiris.org](http://www.eiris.org).

18

19   Environment Agency (2011). “Environment Agency, UK” <[http://www.environment-  
21   agency.gov.uk/news/130645.aspx](http://www.environment-<br/>20   agency.gov.uk/news/130645.aspx)>. (3/7/2011).

21

22   Evora, N. D and Coulibaly, P. (2009). “Recent advances in data-driven modeling of remote sensing  
23   applications in hydrology”. *Journal of Hydroinformatics*, 11(3–4), 194–201.

1

2 Farley, B., Boxall, J.B. and Mounce, S.R., (2008). “Optimal locations of pressure meter for burst  
3 detection”. *Proceedings of the 10th Water Distribution System Analysis Symposium*, South Africa, 17–20  
4 August (ASCE online).

5

6 Farley, B., Mounce, S. R. and Boxall, J. B. (2010a). “Field validation of ‘optimal’ instrumentation  
7 methodology for burst/leak detection and location”. *Proceedings of 11<sup>th</sup> Water Distribution System  
8 Analysis Symposium*, Tucson, Arizona, Sep 2010 (ASCE online).

9

10 Farley, B., Mounce, S. R. and Boxall, J. B. (2010b). “Field Testing of an Optimal Sensor Placement  
11 Methodology in an Urban Water Distribution Network for Event Detection”. *Urban Water Journal*, 7  
12 (6), 345-356.

13

14 Goldberg D E (1989). “Genetic Algorithms in Search Optimization and Machine Learning”. Addison  
15 Wesley.

16

17 Janke, R., Murray, R., Uber, J. and Taxon, T. (2006). “Comparison of Physical Sampling and Real-Time  
18 Monitoring Strategies for Designing a Contamination Warning System in a Drinking Water Distribution  
19 System”. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 132(4), 310-313.

20

21 Kapelan, Z., Savic, D. A. and Walters, G. A. (2003). “Multi-objective Sampling Design for Water  
22 Distribution Model Calibration”. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 129(6), 466-  
23 479.

1

2 Kapelan, Z. and Savic, D. (2009). "Editorial: Special Issue on WDS Model Calibration". *Urban Water*  
3 *Journal*, 6(1), 1-2.

4

5 Mounce, S. R., Boxall, J. and Machell, J. (2010a). Development and Verification of an Online Artificial  
6 Intelligence System for Burst Detection in Water Distribution Systems. *Journal of Water Resources*  
7 *Planning and Management*, 136(3), 309-318.

8

9 Mounce, S. R., Farley, B., Mounce, R. B & Boxall, J. B. (2010b). "Field Testing of Optimal Sensor  
10 Placement and Data Analysis Methodologies for Burst Detection and Location in an Urban Water  
11 Network." *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Hydroinformatics*, Chemical Industry  
12 Press, 2, 1258-1265.

13

14 Mounce, S. R., Mounce, R. B. and Boxall, J. (2012). "Identifying sampling interval for event detection  
15 in water distribution networks." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 138(2), 187-  
16 191.

17

18 Mounce, S. R., Mounce, R. B. and Boxall, J. B. (2011). "Novelty detection for time series data analysis  
19 in water distribution systems using Support Vector Machines." *Journal of Hydroinformatics*, 13(4), 672-  
20 686.

21

22 Nicklow, J., Reed, P., Savic, D., Dessalegne, T., Harrell, L., Chan-Hilton, A., Karamouz, M., Minsker,  
23 B., Ostfeld, A. Singh, A. and Zechman, E. (2010). "State of the Art for Genetic Algorithms and Beyond

1 in Water Resources Planning and Management”. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and*  
2 *Management*, 136(4), 412-432.

3

4 Ostfeld, A. and Salomons, E. (2004). “A Stochastic Early Warning Detection System Model for  
5 Drinking Water Distribution Systems Security”. *Proceedings of the EWRI ASCE Conference*, Salt Lake  
6 City, Utah, USA.

7

8 Perez, R., Puig, V., Pascual, J., Peralta, A., Landeros, E. and Jordanas, L. (2009). “Pressure sensor  
9 distribution for leak detection in Barcelona water distribution network.” *Water Science & Technology:*  
10 *Water Supply*, 9(6), 716-721.

11

12 Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (2011). “Water in Production and Products.”  
13 POSTnote 345.

14

15 Romano, M., Savic, D. and Kapelan, Z. (2011). “Geostatistical techniques for approximate location of  
16 bursts in water distribution systems.” *Proceedings of CCWI 2011*, Exeter, UK, 695-700.

17

18 Watson, J. P., Hart, W. E., Woodruff, D. L. and Murray, R. (2010). “Formulating and analyzing multi-  
19 stage sensor placement problems.” *Proceedings of 11<sup>th</sup> Water Distribution System Analysis Symposium*,  
20 Tucson, Arizona, Sep 2010.

21

1 Wu, Z. Y. and Sage, P. (2006). “Water Loss Detection via Genetic Algorithm Optimization-based  
2 Model Calibration.” *ASCE 8th Annual International Symposium on Water Distribution Systems  
3 Analysis*, August 27-30, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA.

4  
5 Wu, Z.Y., Sage, P. and Turtle, D. (2010). “Pressure-Dependent Leak Detection Model and Its  
6 Application to a District Water System.” *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*,  
7 136(1), 116-128.

8  
9 Wu, Z. Y., Farley, M., Turtle, D., Kapelan, Z., Boxall, J. B., Mounce, S. R., Dahasahasra, S., Mulay, M.  
10 and Kleiner, Y. (2011). “Water Loss Reduction”, Bentley Systems, ed. Zheng Wu. ISBN: 978-1-  
11 934493-08-3.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

1 **Figure captions:**

2

3 Figure 1a: Simplified differential response of instrument locations

4 Figure 1b: Differential detection resulting from selected instrument locations

5 Figure 2: Flow chart of methodology (after Farley et al. 2008)

6 Figure 3: Division of sample DMAs

7 Figure 4: Hydrant flushing to simulate burst and detected pressure drop in online data

8 Figure 5: Example of how the method can be used to subdivide a DMA

9

10 **Table captions:**

11 Table 1: Combination of responses for two instruments

12 Table 2: Number of subdivision areas achieved for DMAs used in the pilot, based on using the optimal  
13 combination

14 Table 3: Comparison of the model-analysed and ANN/FIS system detection for the non blind test in  
15 DMA C (After Farley et al. 2010a)

16 Table 4: Comparison of model predicted and ANN/FIS detection for blind test events

17

18

19

20

21

22

23