

Results of the W-SMART contingency management questionnaire 2011

Sabine Gielens Vewin

12 May 2011



Objective & Response

 Objective: get a picture of present contingency management practice in the water sector

- Response: 17 water utilities
 - -8 out of 18 from US
 - 8 out of 10 from The Netherlands
 - 1 from France



Summary

Question	% Yes
1. Overarching contingency plan	76
2. Risk assessment	94
3. Measures to reduce identified risks	94
4. General emergency response planCoordinated with response authorities	100 94
5. Alternative drinking water supply	88
6. Emergency exercises	94

Most common identified risks

	Europe	US
All	 Technical failure Cyberattack Telecommunications failure Deliberate disturbance (terrorism) Power failure 	 Drought Fire Deliberate disturbance (terrorism) Power failure Severe weather (storm, hurricane) Pandemic Influenza Chemical contamination
Most	Biological & chemical contaminationFloodingPandemic influenza	CyberattackExplosionTechnical failureTelecommunications failure
Many	• Fire	FloodingBiological contamination
Other	Public transportation strikeScarcity of diesel	• Tsunami

Remarkable differences / similarities

Question	Europe % yes	US % yes
1. Acces to national database for water security incidents	22	100
2. Mutual aid agreements for emergency response	78	100
- Emergency power services- Emergency water supply equipment- Logistical support- Staff support	33 78 89 22	50 75 100 100
 3. Alternative drinking water supply Connection with neighbour Alternative supply by trucks Distribute bottled water Other 	100 56 78 44 Stocks in dunes Tap connection to fire hydrant	75 63 75 50 Raw water
4. Arrangements regarding national / regional terrorism threat alert system	78	50



Questions?

Identification and prioritisation of the issues that need further action
 (in three groups – 20 min)

 Conclusions presented by the Chairs in a plenary forum (15)