The United States has the largest and most developed smart water infrastructure market in the world, and several trends point towards continued growth and development. Northeast Group conducted a survey of nearly 340 water utilities and found that the vast majority of respondents have completed or are interested in investing in smart water infrastructure. While automated metering reading (AMR) and advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) water metering is already well developed in the US, still only approximately 60% of water customers have communicating meters, leaving ample room for market growth. Additionally, within the smart meter segment, both utilities and vendors have shown that the country is trending quickly towards AMI – even at smaller utilities. There is also an overall trend towards investing in smart city infrastructure and increased awareness of water scarcity in some parts of the country. This is creating clear growth opportunities throughout the smart water value chain.

Northeast Group’s survey revealed several challenges that utilities have faced, and a number of lagging utilities that are still not interested in smart water infrastructure. Vendors will need to continue to work to improve the logistics, financing, and technical capability of smart water infrastructure to overcome these hurdles. Additionally, there are no binding regulatory or urgent economic drivers that are expected to encourage a large-scale spike in near-term investment. But with multiple avenues for growth and an industry that more now than ever is seeking to modernize, the US smart water infrastructure market will represent investment value of $8.3 billion cumulatively over the next ten years.

Key questions answered in this study:

- What are the views of 90 US water utilities on smart water infrastructure investment?
- How large will the smart water infrastructure market be in the US?
- How quickly will US water utilities switch to AMI metering?
- What are the main drivers and barriers of smart water projects in the US?
- Who are the leading vendors in the market and how do they stack up in the survey?
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