

**MULTICRITERIA DECISION MODELLING FOR  
MANAGEMENT OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM IN THE  
PILIYANDALA – KESBEWA WATER SUPPLY  
SYSTEM, COLOMBO DISTRICT, SRI LANKA**

Thotamuna Kankanamalage Nirosha Kumudu Kumari

(148659D)

Degree of Master of Science in Water Resources Engineering and  
Management

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

October 2015

**MULTICRITERIA DECISION MODELLING FOR  
MANAGEMENT OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM IN THE  
PILYANDALA – KESBEWA WATER SUPPLY  
SYSTEM, COLOMBO DISTRICT, SRI LANKA**

Thotamuna Kankanamalage Nirosha Kumudu Kumari

(148659D)

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master of  
Science in Water Resources Engineering and Management

Supervised by  
Professor N.T.S. Wijesekera

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

October 2015

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that this is my own work and thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date:

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters thesis under my supervision.

Certified by

Supervisor:

Professor N.T.S Wijesekera

Signature of the supervisor:

Date:

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to the people who have contributed their valuable time, energy, ideas, experience and encouragement help me to complete this study. I am indebted to the National Water Supply and Drainage Board, UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Centre for South Asia Water Management (UMCSAWM) in University of Moratuwa and South Asia Foundation (SAF) for granting me a fulltime Madanjeet Singh Scholarship for Master of Science in Water Resources Engineering and Management.

Firstly, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the supervisor, Professor N.T.S Wijesekera, who offered excellent guidance, valuable advices, continuous support, encouragement and contribution throughout the study. Also I wish to extend my appreciation to Dr. R.L.H. Lalith Rajapakse, the course coordinator of UNESCO Madanjeet Singh Centre for South Asia Water Management for his continuous guidance, advice and support.

Secondly, I would like to thank to Eng. S.G.J Rajkumar (DGM – Development), Eng. B.U.J Perera (Chief Engineer – SP), Eng. V.P. Thiranagama (Chief Engineer – P&D), Eng. A.D.K.K Wijegunawardhana (Manager – Maharagama), Mrs. G.A. Pushpalatha (Area Engineer – Kesbewa), Mr.Pradeep Manatunga (System Administrator – Manager Office, Maharagama) and other staff members of National Water Supply and Drainage Board who supported for my research. I also wish to thank my colleagues and friends for their numerous supports.

Finally, I want to thank to my father, mother, two sisters and relations for their continuous support for my achievement. I would like to give my special thanks to my husband and children for their endless support and understanding.

# MULTICRITERIA DECISION MODELLING FOR MANAGEMENT OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM IN THE PILIYANDALA – KESBEWA WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM, COLOMBO DISTRICT, SRI LANKA

## ABSTRACT

Twenty Two management zones spatially distributed in the Piliyandala – Kesbewa Water Supply System (WSS) undergo problems such as frequent pipe bursting, scaling in old pipes, Non Revenue Water (NRW) issues and pressure drops. Importance of managing a water supply system is to provide sustainable water supply with acceptable quality at an affordable price in order to match stakeholder requirements. Managing a water supply system requires a careful consideration of organizational expectations, stakeholder requirements and system sustenance needs etc. Therefore a multicriteria decision support model is most appropriate to manage a water supply system. Piliyandala – Kesbewa WSS (32 km<sup>2</sup>) was selected as a case study to investigate the applicability of a multicriteria decision model. The Piliyandala – Kesbewa WSS has 24,309 connections for an approximate population of 106,960.

The present work identified management concerns, evaluated the present prioritisation techniques, and developed a Multicriteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) model framework in order to manage the Piliyandala – Kesbewa Water Supply System. A literature survey and a questionnaire survey among a sample of 78 water supply area management engineers enabled the identification of four main criteria and 15 sub criteria as the model components fulfilling water supply system management objectives.

Analytical Hierarchical Process (AHP) was selected because it provides measures of judgement consistency, derives priorities among criteria and alternatives, while simplifying the determination of preference ratings among decision criteria with the use of pairwise comparisons. Main water supply system management parameters were identified and refined using a survey among experienced water supply system managers.

MCDA models were developed for Overall Management objectives. Model calibration identified weights of 0.64, 0.20, 0.07 and 0.09 respectively for the main criteria namely, Income Generation, System Sustainability, System Losses and System Reliability. Entire set of sub criteria supporting the main set were identified as New Connections, Bill Collection, Operation & Maintenance, Salaries & Overtime, Transport, Non Revenue Water, Low Pressure, No water, Water Quality, Defective Meters, Leaks of Mains, Leaks of Water Connections, Leaks near Meter, Night Time Leaks, and Stop Valve Leaks. Respective sub parameter weights were 0.317, 0.326, 0.142, 0.046, 0.012, 0.064, 0.016, 0.020, 0.024, 0.009, 0.011, 0.004, 0.003, 0.004, and 0.002.

MCDA model with main and sub criteria together with 22 management zones, provided a priority order for overall management. Model verification compared the MCDA priority order with the management priority at field level. The trend line showing the spatial variability of priority from MCDA model closely matched with the Area Engineer's prioritisation exhibiting the satisfactory level of model verification. The AHP model incorporating stakeholder pairwise combinations revealed that average of stakeholder preferences would be a satisfactory starting indicator of the success of MCDA model development.

Priority order of overall management is obtained for management zones. Field identified priority indicators of each management zone differed from the AHP model indicators demonstrating a lack of guidelines for the management at field level and the lack of a clear link of objectives at various levels of management. Very low priority for System Losses and System Reliability reflects a deficiency in System Management.

MCDA model hierarchy and weights provide a clear indication for water supply organisations to evaluate whether management objectives are suitably achieved during system operations. This research clearly demonstrated the suitability and method of development of a AHP Multicriteria Decision Model for Water Supply System Management. However it is recommended to carryout similar studies at other systems while addressing the weaknesses with respect to the guidelines and stakeholder assessments.

**Key Words:**

Water Management Options, Water Supply System, MCDA, AHP, Multicriteria Model, Stakeholder Assessment, Criteria

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Figures.....	viii
List of Abbreviations.....	xii
List of Appendices.....	xiii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 General.....	1
1.2 Water Supply Systems in Sri Lanka.....	1
1.3 Management Concern.....	3
2. OBJECTIVES.....	5
2.1 Overall Objective.....	5
2.2 Specific Objectives.....	5
3. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
3.1 Water Management in Water Supply Schemes.....	6
3.2 Critical Management Factors.....	7
3.3 Model Selection.....	8
3.4 MCDA Modelling.....	8
3.5 Water Supply System Management in Sri Lanka.....	9
3.6 Summary of Management Criteria.....	10
4. METHODOLOGY.....	12
4.1 General.....	12
5. DATA COLLECTION AND CHECKING.....	14
5.1 Data Collection.....	14
5.1.1 Study area.....	14
5.1.2 Water supply system data.....	16
5.1.3 Area Engineer's priority.....	20
5.1.4 Stakeholder survey.....	22
5.2 Data Checking.....	25
5.2.1 Missing data, pattern and trends.....	25
5.2.2 Comparison with Annual Report.....	27

5.2.3	Stakeholder responses .....	31
6.	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	32
6.1	MCDA Conceptualisation.....	32
6.2	Criteria Identification.....	35
6.2.1	Stakeholder responses .....	35
6.3	MCDA Model Framework.....	38
6.3.1	Main criteria.....	38
6.3.2	Priority combinations.....	39
6.4	Alternatives.....	41
6.4.1	Management zones.....	41
6.4.2	Income Generation.....	43
6.4.3	System Sustainability.....	45
6.4.4	System Losses.....	46
6.4.5	System Reliability.....	47
6.4.6	Sub Criteria Normalized .....	49
6.5	Model Development .....	51
6.5.1	Main criteria preferences.....	51
6.5.2	Sub criteria preferences.....	55
6.5.3	Preference of alternatives.....	59
6.6	Consistency Estimations .....	79
6.6.1	Main criteria.....	79
6.6.2	Sub criteria.....	79
6.6.3	Alternatives.....	80
6.7	Model Calibration Results – MCDA Weights .....	81
6.7.1	Introduction .....	81
6.7.2	Comparison.....	83
6.8	Model Verification.....	84
6.8.1	Priority order in practice .....	84
6.8.2	Verification of priority.....	85
7.	DISCUSSION.....	89
7.1	Model Conceptualisation .....	89
7.2	Main Criteria Prioritization.....	89
7.3	Sub Criteria Prioritization.....	90



7.4	Project Management Alternatives.....	90
7.5	Field Level Prioritization.....	91
7.6	Model Calibration and Verification.....	91
7.7	MCDA Model for WSS Management.....	92
7.8	Criteria Weights.....	92
8.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	93
	REFERENCES.....	94
	APPENDIX A – DATA CHECKING.....	97
	APPENDIX B – STAKEHOLDER SURVEY.....	109
	APPENDIX C – ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	145

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 : Study Area Map.....	4
Figure 4.1: Methodology Flow Chart.....	13
Figure 5.1 : Existing Water Supply Network of Study Area.....	15
Figure 5.2: Piliyandala Kesbewa WSS – Spatial Variability of Dockets.....	18
Figure 5.3: Piliyandala Kesbewa WSS - Management zone Distribution.....	19
Figure 5.4: Area Engineer’s Priority Order.....	21
Figure 5.5 : Water Consumption and Water Supply Connections.....	26
Figure 5.6a :Monthly Variation of Water Inflows to the Piliyandala Water Tower (2005 – 2014).....	26
Figure 5.6b : Annual Variation of Water Inflows to the Piliyandala Water Tower (2005 – 2014).....	27
Figure 5.7: Monthly Distribution of Water Consumption.....	28
Figure 5.8: Anually Distribution of Water Consumption.....	28
Figure 5.9: Water Inflows to the Piliyandala Water Tower.....	28
Figure 5.10: Water Consumption in Piliyandala – Kesbewa WSS.....	29
Figure 5.11: Comparison of Water Inflows with the Water Consumption.....	29
Figure 5.12: Water Inflows per Connection and Consumption per Connection.....	30
Figure 6.1: MCDA Model Framework for Main and Sub Criteria.....	33
Figure 6.2: Conceptual MCDA for Questionnaire Development.....	34
Figure 6.3a : Comparison of Stakeholder Responses for Main Criteria.....	36
Figure 6.3b : Comparison of Stakeholder Responses for Sub Criteria.....	37
Figure 6.4: Main Criteria Response Groupings and Representative Combinations.....	40
Figure 6.5: Variation of Sub Criteria for System Reliability.....	48
Figure 6.6: Preference of Alternatives – New Connections and Bill Collection.....	75
Figure 6.7: Preference of Alternatives – Operation & Maintenance, Salaries & Overtime and Transport.....	76
Figure 6.8: Preference of Alternatives – Non Revenue Water.....	77
Figure 6.9: Preference of Alternatives for Sub Criteria of System Reliability.....	78
Figure 6.10: Combinations of MCDA Model Weights.....	82
Figure 6.11: Alternative Weights for Three Options.....	83
Figure 6.12: Comparison of Priority Order during Model Verification.....	88

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Main and Sub Criteria for WSS Management from Literature.....	10
Table 5.1 : Water Supply System Data.....	16
Table 5.2 : Characteristics of Management Zones.....	17
Table 5.3 : Area Engineer’s Priority Order.....	20
Table 5.4 : Stakeholder Group for Preliminary Discussions.....	22
Table 5.5 : Preliminary List of Main and Sub Parameters.....	23
Table 5.6 : Summary of Stakeholder Survey Responses.....	24
Table 5.7 : Inflow and the Consumption Data.....	25
Table 5.8 : NRW Percentage of the Piliyandala - Kesbewa WSS.....	30
Table 6.1: Stakeholder Sample used for Parameter Identification.....	35
Table 6.2: Work Experience of the Sample used for Parameter Identification.....	35
Table 6.3: Classification of Stakeholder Responses for Main Criteria.....	37
Table 6.4a: Classification of Stakeholder Responses for Sub Criteria.....	38
Table 6.4b: Classification of Stakeholder Responses for Sub Criteria.....	38
Table 6.5: Possible Priority Score Groups for Main Criteria.....	38
Table 6.6: Main Criteria Score Combinations from Stakeholder Survey.....	41
Table 6.7: Details of Management Zones in Piliyandala – Kesbewa WSS.....	42
Table 6.8: Total Population per Water Supply Connections.....	43
Table 6.9: Average Consumption.....	44
Table 6.10: Water Supply System Management Costs.....	46
Table 6.11: Zonal Distribution of NRW.....	47
Table 6.12: Complaints Distribution in the Online Database of NWSDB.....	48
Table 6.13: Alternative Weights for Sub Criteria.....	50
Table 6.14: Pairwise Comparison of Main Criteria with respect to Stakeholder Views.....	51
Table 6.15: Pairwise Comparison of Main Criteria Combinations in Saaty Scale of 1 – 9.....	52
Table 6.16: Pairwise Preferences of Main Criteria for Combination 1.....	52
Table 6.17: Pairwise Preferences of Main Criteria for Combination 2.....	53
Table 6.18: Pairwise Preferences of Main Criteria for Combination 3.....	53
Table 6.19: Pairwise Preferences of Main Criteria for Combination 4.....	53
Table 6.20: Relative Importance of Main Criteria.....	54
Table 6.21: AHP Priority for each Main Criteria Combinations.....	54

Table 6.22: Pairwise Preferences of Sub Criteria – Conversion to Saaty Scale.....	56
Table 6.23: Pairwise Preferences for Sub Criteria under Main Criteria – Income Generation.....	57
Table 6.24: Pairwise Preferences for Sub Criteria under Main Criteria – System Sustainability.....	57
Table 6.25: Pairwise Preferences for Sub Criteria under Main Criteria – System Reliability.....	57
Table 6.23a: Relative Importance of Sub Criteria – Income Generation.....	58
Table 6.24a: Relative Importance of Sub Criteria – System Sustainability.....	58
Table 6.25a: Relative Importance of Sub Criteria – System Reliability.....	58
Table 6.22b: Sub Criteria in the Order of Priority.....	59
Table 6.26.1: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – New Connections.....	60
Table 6.26.2: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Bill Collection.....	61
Table 6.26.3: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Operation & Maintenance Cost.....	62
Table 6.26.4: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Salaries & Overtime Cost.....	63
Table 6.26.5: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Transport Cost.....	64
Table 6.26.6: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – NRW.....	65
Table 6.26.7: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Low Pressure.....	66
Table 6.26.8: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – No Water.....	67
Table 6.26.9: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Water Quality.....	68
Table 6.26.10: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Defective Meters.....	69
Table 6.26.11: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Leaks of Mains.....	70

Table 6.26.12: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Leak of Water Connections.....	71
Table 6.26.13: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Leak near Meter.....	72
Table 6.26.14: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion – Night Time Leaks.....	73
Table 6.26.15: Pairwise Preferences converted to Saaty’s Scale for Alternatives for Sub Criterion –Stop Valve Leaks.....	74
Table 6.27: Consistency Ratios – Main Criteria.....	79
Table 6.28: Consistency Ratios – Sub Criteria.....	79
Table 6.29: Consistency Ratios – Sub Criteria.....	80
Table 6.30: Consistency Ratios – Sub Criteria.....	80
Table 6.31: Consistency Ratios for Alternatives.....	80
Table 6.32: Alternative Weights of MCDA Model.....	81
Table 6.33: Comparison of Consistent Weight Combinations .....	84
Table 6.34: Field Level Priority for Overall Management.....	85
Table 6.35: Priority Comparion – Model & Field.....;	86
Table 6.36: Management Zone Priority Order Comparison (Re ordered).....	87

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

Abbreviation	Description
AE	Area Engineer
AHP	Analytical Hierarchy Process
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CKD	Chronic Kidney Disease
CP	Compromise Programming
CPIV	Composite Performance Index Value
CR	Consistency Ratio
CWS	Community Water Systems
DOCS	Department of Census and Statistics
EA	Engineering Assistant
EPANET MSX	EPANET Multi – Species Extension
GA	Genetic Algorithms
LAs	Local Authorities
MAE	Mean Absolute Error
MCDA	Multicriteria Decision Analysis
MCDM	Multicriteria Decision Making Technique
NRW	Non Revenue Water
NWSDB	National Water Supply & Drainage Board
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
R&D	Research & Development
SCE	Shuffled Complex Evolution
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UWOT	Urban Water Optioneering Tool
WSS	Water Supply System

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>Appendix Page</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page</b>
Appendix - A	Data Checking	97
Appendix – B	Stakeholder Survey	109
Appendix – C	Analysis and Results	145