

problematic cases

case	Characteristics	Results
example	Location	dominant variables (for individual WL)
gamma_char =	Geology	sensitivity SF to WL
beta =	data source	Uplift and at which WL
	Misc	Slip plane variation
1	<p><b>Pannerden_newkernel</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.29 beta = 4.05</p> <p>Characteristics Nederrijn mainly sand dike core on top of (antropogenic) clay based on default values due to absense reliable lab data drained behaviour dike body, modelled clay on clay</p>	<p>Results uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (mostly "Klei antropogeen") and to a lesser extend model uncertainty SF_char chages from 1.36 to 1.31 with WL varying from +12.8m to crest +16m, sharp lowering in SF above WL maybe strength reduction, sigma'v &gt; 0 slip plane mainly through "klei antropogeen" layer, smal slip plane slightly increasing (towards the crest) with WL</p>
2	<p><b>Lekdijk1_West</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 0.78 beta = 0.84</p> <p>Along the Lek (west), around Streefkerk (other side of the river) Clay dike on clay, with thick layer of clay from Tiel, over Hollandve based on default values due to absense reliable lab data</p>	<p>Uncertainty dominated by the model factor and some Su layers (e.g. "klei van tiel", "keli van gorkum") SF_char chages from 0.82 to 0.73 with WL varying from +1.2m to crest +5m no uplift deep and long slip plane, barely changes with WL and goes until the bottom of the blanket (Gorkum)</p>
3	<p><b>Lekdijk2_Streefkerk</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.34 beta = 5.51</p> <p>Along the Lek, on the west Clay on clay, with a thick peat layer in the middle of the thick clay- based on local measurements and some default (however, these</p>	<p>uncertainty dominated by the dike body (OB, OA=sand) and the model unc. SF_char chages from 1.32 to 1.15 with WL varying from +2.5m to crest +6m no uplift shallow slip plane for WL below +3m and deep slip plane for higher WL</p>
4	<p><b>Lekdijk3_East</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.72 beta = 6.01</p> <p>Along the Lek, mid way circa Lopik Clay on clay, with thick peat/clay layer (~12m), small sand layer ur parameters from Arcadis report (regional) except POP and Cov of no drained dike material and merged layers</p>	<p>uncertainty dominated by the model unc. and Su of layers "dijkmaterial", "klei_boven_veen" and "klei_onder_ve SF_char chages from 2.2 to 1.6 with WL varying from +2.5m to crest +6.5m no uplift deep slip plane ?</p>
5	<p><b>Lekdijk4_Eastcs3</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.51 beta = 5.70</p> <p>Along the Lek, on the west, circa the Honswijk fort Clay on clay, with thick intercalated peat/clay/sand layers (~9m) parameters from Arcadis report (regional) except POP and Cov of no</p>	<p>Uncertainty dominated by the model unc. and friction of layer "dijkmateriaal". Other relatively relevant Su layers: SF_char chages from 2.4 to 1.5 with WL varying from +4.2m to crest +8.2m no uplift deep slip plane for WL below ~ +6m and shallow slip plane for higher WL</p>
6	<p><b>Gowa 1</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.20 beta = 5.64</p> <p>along the Waal, upstream of Biesbosch (Gorinchem) Clay on clay dike, with big portion of Venige klei and some clay un parameters from regional report, except POP, cov of the m value, no uplift</p>	<p>uncertainty dominated by Su of layers "Venige Klei", also "oud dijksmat", "Klei 14-16" and to some extend the m SF_char constant from WL +2.5m to +5.5m, drops from 1.31 to 1.18 with WL varying from +5.5m to crest +8.7m no uplift deep slip plane barely changes, it gets slightly longer with higher WL</p>
7	<p><b>Gowa2</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.49 beta = 6.18</p> <p>along the Waal, upstream of Biesbosch (Gorinchem) Clay on clay dike, with big portion of Venige klei and some clay un parameters from regional report, except POP, cov of the m value, no uplift</p>	<p>uncertainty dominated by Su of layers "Venige Klei", also "oud dijksmat", "Klei 14-16" and to some extend the m SF_char constant from WL +2.2m to +3.5m, drops from 1.73 to 1.50 with WL varying from +3.5m to crest +6.7m no uplift deep slip plane barely changes, it gets slightly longer (towards the crest) with higher WL</p>
8	<p><b>Gowa3_TG355</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.01 beta = 4.02</p> <p>along the Waal, upstream of Biesbosch (Brakel) clay on clay, Non-tidal Rhine, layers of "klei", "venige klei" and larg Based on regional GOWA triaxial and DSS for S; defaults for POF case computed also with one berm</p>	<p>uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layers "Venige klei" and "oude dijkmateriaal" ) and model factor; tc SF changes from 1.16 to 1 with WL varying from +3.5m to crest +7.7m; SF based on mean values much higher no uplift Slip plane hardly changes with WL, is relatively shallow and mainly goes through dike body and upper clay layer</p>
8a	<p><b>GoWa3_berm_4</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.17 beta = 5.45</p> <p>same as before 4 meter berm</p>	<p>uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layers "Venige klei" and "oude dijkmateriaal" ) and model factor; tc SF changes from 1.41 to 1.17 with WL varying from +3.5m to crest +7.7m no uplift Slip plane hardly changes with WL, it becomes longer with the WL, is relatively shallow and mainly goes through</p>
9	<p><b>Gowa4_TG401</b></p> <p>gamma_char = 1.30 beta = 7.21</p> <p>along the Waal, upstream of Biesbosch (Gorinchem) Non-tidal Rhine, sand core in dike body, modelled clay on clay and Based on regional GOWA triaxial and DSS for S; defaults for POF case computed also with one berm</p>	<p>dominant variables are friction angle, model and Su (mainly sand from dike core and two other layers) High SF_char, even higher for mean values of the strength parameters (1.72 to 1.47, with WL changing from no uplift Slip plane through sand core</p>

10	<b>Franeker_loc</b> gamma_char = beta =	Waddenzeedijk, north of Leeuwarden Sand dike on clay with thick cover layer (~7m) Local data (CPT for POP and lab for Su), except for m values	0.95 2.85	uncertainty dominated by Su of Klei.cal, followed by model unc. And also, to some extent, the friction angle of the SF_char changes from 1.02 to 0.82 with WL varying from +1.5m to crest +8.2m; becomes steeper after +7.1m <b>uplift for high WL ?</b> Slip plane hardly changes with WL, is relatively shallow and mainly goes through dike body and upper clay layer
10a	<b>Franeker_berm</b> gamma_char = beta =	same as before 10 meter berm	1.04 4.23	uncertainty dominated by Su of Klei.cal, followed by model unc. And also, to some extent, the friction angle of the SF_char changes from 1.12 to 0.88 with WL varying from +1.5m to crest +8.2m; becomes steeper after +7.1m <b>uplift for high WL ?</b> Slip plane hardly changes with WL, is a deep plane (to the bottom of the blanket layer)
11	<b>Ijsselmeerdijk</b> gamma_char = beta =	northern part of the Lake IJssel, west of Friesland simple schematization of a dike body of antropogene klei on top of based on default values	0.84 1.83	Su from the soil, model factor, leakage length becomes important with high WL SF_char changes from 0.85 to 0.59 with WL varying from +0.2m to crest +4.2m; becomes steeper after +3.1m no uplift Slip plane gets slightly longer (along the interface of blanket and aquifer) with higher WL
11a	<b>Ijsselmeerdijk_berm</b> gamma_char = beta =	same as before 15 meter berm (big hole filled)	0.99 3.56	Su from the soil, model factor, leakage length becomes important with high WL SF_char changes from 1.0 to 0.62 with WL varying from +0.2m to crest +4.2m; becomes steeper after +2.5m <b>uplift/reduction</b> Slip plane gets slightly longer (along the interface of blanket and aquifer) with higher WL
12	<b>Zuiderzeedijk</b> gamma_char = beta =	in the Katelmeer, north side Sand dike on clay, blanket of 4m of clay and humeous clay based on default values	1.09 3.67	uncertainties dominated by the Su from the humeous clay, the model unc. And the friction of the sand core SF_char changes from 1.25 to 0.82 with WL varying from -0.25m to crest +4.2m <b>strength reduction</b> Slip does not change with WL
12a	<b>Zuiderzeedijk_berm_20</b> gamma_char = beta =	same as before 20 meter berm	1.18 6.33	uncertainties dominated by the Su from the humeous clay, the model unc. and the yield stress point 387 SF_char changes from 1.47 to 1.07 with WL varying from -0.25m to crest +4.2m <b>strength reduction</b> Slip does not change with WL
13	<b>41_M_401</b> gamma_char = beta =	Along the Maas, downstream of Appeltern simple schematization of a dike body and blanket layer of clay (4 based on default values	0.99 4.45	uncertainties dominated by the Su from the clay layers, the model unc. and the to some extent the yield stress point SF_char changes from 1.12 to 0.4 with WL varying from +6.25m to crest +8.7m; becomes steeper after +7.9m <b>strength reduction</b> Slip does not change with WL
13a	<b>41_M_401_berm_10</b> gamma_char = beta =	same as before 10 meter berm	1.17 5.12	uncertainties dominated by the Su from the clay layers, the model unc. and the to some extent the yield stress point SF_char changes from 1.23 to 1.11 with WL varying from +6.25m to crest +8.7m <b>strength reduction</b> Slip does not change with WL
14	<b>Bergambacht</b> gamma_char = beta =	Along the Lek (west), around Streefkerk (other side of the river) Clay on clay, with a thick peat layer in the middle of the thick clay- Based on report on local data, except exponent m	0.90 3.13	uncertainty dominated by Su of dijkmaterial, model unc. and also Su of hollandveen and Gorkum licht onder dijk SF_char constant (0.91) from +1.5m to +3.0m, changes from 0.91 to 0.88 with WL varying from +3m to crest +5 no uplift medium deep slip does not change with WL
14a	<b>Bergambacht_berm</b> gamma_char = beta =	same as before 15 meter berm	1.03 4.65	uncertainty dominated by Su of dijkmaterial, model unc. and also Su of hollandveen and Rand geul zandige klei SF_char constant (1.04) from +1.5m to +3.0m, changes from 1.04 to 0.99 with WL varying from +3m to crest +5 no uplift deep slip does not change with WL
15	<b>Uitdam</b> gamma_char = beta =	In the west of the Markermeer Clay on clay with a 12 m blanket of mainly clay (body), humeous clay Based on report of regional data	0.83 2.79	<b>xxx</b> SF_char changes from 0.83 to 0.78 with WL varying from +0m to crest +3.1m no uplift relatively shallow slip plane for low WL and deep for high WL
15a	<b>Uitdam_berm</b> gamma_char = beta =	same as before 13 meter berm	1.08 5.39	<b>xxx</b> SF_char changes from 1.08 to 1.03 with WL varying from +0m to crest +3.1m no uplift deep slip plane changes slightly with the WL, it goes deeper (until the edge of het blanket/aquifer)

16	<b>Afsluitdijk</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.04 4.87	In between the Wanden sea and the IJsselmeer simple schematization of a sand dike body and blanket layer of clay based on default values	model factor, Su of Klei_sand and klei_humeus_sand and some yield stress points SF_char changes from 1.22 to 0.90 with WL varying from +1.0m to crest +10m no uplift deep slip does not change with WL
17	<b>Livedike</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.32 8.45	along the Eems (delta), south of Eemshaven sand dike body and blanket layer of clay (12 m) Su based on regional data, rest based on default values	xxx xxx no uplift deep slip slightly changes with WL, becoming longer, towards the crest
18	<b>41_M_28</b> gamma_char = beta =	0.86 4.19	Near Nijmegen, along the Maas Non-tidal Maas, clay on clay dike, type of clay 'Ks', with a blanket Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI case computed also with one berm	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "Ks-dijklichaam", but also the rest of the clay layers), LL becomes SF_char changes from 1.03 to 0.85 with WL varying from +10m to crest +13.2m, there is an increased sensitivity for there is uplift for WL>12 m+NAP Slip plane does not change with WL, it goes until the bottom of the (relatively thin) blanket
18a	<b>41_M_28_berm_5</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.09 5.28	same as before 5 meter berm	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "Ks-dijklichaam", but also the rest of the clay layers), model uncertainty SF_char changes from 1.55 to 1.15 with WL varying from +10m to crest +13.2m, there is an increased sensitivity for there is uplift for WL>11.5 m+NAP Slip plane does not change with WL, it goes until the bottom of the (relatively thin) blanket
19	<b>41_W_237_ite_1</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.00 4.16	Between Tiel and Nijmegen, along the Waal Non-tidal Rhine, clay on clay dike, type of clay 'Ks', covered with a blanket Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI case computed also with one berm	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "dijklichaam", but also the rest of the clay layers) SF_char changes from 1.15 to 1.05 with WL varying from +6m to crest +13.2m, there is an increased sensitivity for there is uplift/reduction for WL>10.5m+NAP Slip plane barely changes with the WL, it goes until the bottom of the (relatively thin) blanket
19a	<b>41_W_237_ite_4</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.08 4.44	same as before 2.5 meter berm	<b>uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "dijklichaam", but also the rest of the clay layers)</b> SF_char changes from 1.32 to 1.07 with WL varying from +6m to crest +13.2m, there is an increased sensitivity for there seems to be uplift/reduction for WL>10m+NAP <b>Slip plane changes with the WL, due to uplift, it goes until the bottom of the (relatively thin) blanket and becomes longer</b>
20	<b>41_W_270_0</b> gamma_char = beta =	0.94 2.72	Between Tiel and Nijmegen, along the Waal Non-tidal Rhine, clay on clay dike, dike body from clay, and present Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI case computed also with one berm	<b>uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "onder dijk", "dijkmateriaal", but also the rest of the clay layers)</b> SF_char changes from 1.10 to 0.93 with WL varying from +4.5m to crest +12.5m reduction of strength, but no uplift ? <b>Slip plane slightly changes with the WL, it goes until aquifer border, and longer for higher WL</b>
20a	<b>41_W_270_25</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.24 4.53	same as before 25 meter berm	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "onder dijk", "dijkmateriaal", but also the rest of the clay layers) SF_char changes from 1.47 to 1.22 with WL varying from +4.5m to crest +12.5m reduction of strength, but no uplift ? Slip plane barely changes with the WL, it goes until "klei onder dijk" for lower WL, and deeper and longer for higher WL
21	<b>43001007_0</b> gamma_char = beta =	0.91 2.94	Along the river Waal, upstream of Vuren (near Gorkum) Non-tidal Rhine, clay on clay dike, dike body from clay, and present Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI case computed also with two berms	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "dijklichaam", but also some other clay layers) <b>and model</b> SF_char changes from 0.96 to 0.89 with WL varying from +2.7m to crest +7.5m no uplift Slip plane barely changes with WL, it goes in the bottom part of the blanket
21a	<b>43001007_15</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.11 5.54	same as before 15 meters berm	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "H_Ro_k&z onder", but also "dijklichaam") <b>and model</b> SF_char changes from 1.24 to 1.08 with WL varying from +2.7m to crest +7.5m no uplift Slip plane barely changes with WL, it goes in the bottom part of the blanket
21b	<b>43001007_25</b> gamma_char = beta =	1.28 7.54	same as before 30 meters berm	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "H_Ro_k&z onder", but also "dijklichaam") <b>and model</b> SF_char changes from 1.51 to 1.20 with WL varying from +2.7m to crest +7.5m no uplift Slip plane barely changes with WL, it goes in the bottom part of the blanket
22	<b>Dp_5_521_ite_steeper_1</b> gamma_char = beta =	0.84 1.92	Along the river IJssel, upstream of Veessen (between Deventer and Nijmegen) Non-tidal Rhine, clay on clay dike, dike body from clay, and present Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "Klei dijk b") SF_char changes from 0.93 to 0.84 with WL varying from +2.5m to crest +7m uplift potential & reduction

Slip plane barely changes with WL, it goes in the bottom part of the blanket

22a	<b>Dp_5_521_noberm</b>	same as before	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "Klei dijk b")
	gamma_char =	1.02 original talude	SF_char chages from 1.19 to 1.06 with WL varying from +2.5m to crest +4.7m
	beta =	3.49	uplift potential & reduction
			Slip plane barely changes with WL, it goes in the bottom part of the blanket and then into the aquifer!
23	<b>dp_190+000_basissom_0</b>	Along the Lek, on the west, downstream of Streefkerk	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "dijksmateriaal oud")
	gamma_char =	0.55 Tidal Rhine, clay on clay, multi layer cross section, mainly composed of	SF_char chages from 0.65 to 0.55 with WL varying from +1m to crest +4.5m
	beta =	-2.22 Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI	Uplift for high water levels
		case computed also with one berm	Slip plane does not change with WL, it goes until the bottom of the blanket (deep and long)
23a	<b>dp_190+000m_basissom_30</b>	same as before	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "gorkum zwaar" (bottom of the blanket))
	gamma_char =	0.88 30 meters berm	SF_char chages from 0.94 to 0.88 with WL varying from +1m to crest +4.5m
	beta =	3.00	Uplift for high water levels
			Slip plane does not change with WL, it goes until the bottom of the blanket (deep and long)
24	<b>DP92_0</b>	Along the river IJssel, upstream of Zutphen	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "klei dijk" and "klei zandig")
	gamma_char =	0.82 Non-tidal Rhine, clay on clay dike, dike body from clay, and presence of	SF_char chages from 1.03 to 0.84 with WL varying from +8.2m to crest +11.3m
	beta =	2.27 Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI	uplift/reduction for WL>10.2m+NAP
		case computed also with one berm	Slip plane does not change with WL
24a	<b>Dp92_5</b>	same as before	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "klei dijk" and "klei zandig")
	gamma_char =	1.04 5 meters berm	SF_char chages from 1.18 to 1.04 with WL varying from +8.2m to crest +11.3m
	beta =	4.21	uplift/reduction for WL>10.2m+NAP
			Slip plane does not change with WL
25	<b>DV13_0</b>	In the west of the IJsselmeer, south of Den Oever	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "klei cal" and "klei dyk") <b>and model</b>
	gamma_char =	1.22 IJssel lake area, clay dike on clay, old dike in clay, hightened with ;	SF_char chages from 1.22 to 1.02 with WL varying from +1.75m to crest +3.7m (constant from -0.6 to 1.75)
	beta =	5.08 Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI	no uplift
		case computed also with one berm	Slip plane barely changes with WL, goes to the bottom of "KLEI_cal"
25a	<b>DV13_3</b>	same as before	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "klei cal" and "klei dyk") <b>and model</b>
	gamma_char =	1.55 15 meters berm	SF_char chages from 1.55 to 1.36 with WL varying from -0.6m to crest +3.7m (constant from -0.6 to 1.75)
	beta =	7.24	no uplift
			Slip plane barely changes with WL, goes to the bottom of "KLEI_cal"
26	<b>dwp0_lte_0</b>	Along the Oude Maas, south of Rotterdam, near Barendrecht	uncertainty dominated by model factor and slightly Su ratio of the layer "Gorkum licht"
	gamma_char =	0.96 Tidal Rhine, clay on clay, mix of Hollandveen and Gotkum licht un	SF_char chages from 1.08 to 0.96 with WL varying from +3.1m to crest +4.4m (constant from 1.8 to 3.1)
	beta =	4.97 Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI	no uplift
			Slip plane does not change with WL
27	<b>wsno_0161_0</b>	Western Scheldt near Kruidinigen, east of Goes	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "Calais Klei") and model
	gamma_char =	1.07 Western Scheldt area, sand on clay, blanket ~ 6m of Duinkerke kl	SF_char chages from 1.15 to 0.85 with WL varying from +2.9m to crest +9m
	beta =	4.19 Based on default data from the schematization guidelines of STBI	no uplift
		case computed also with one berm	Slip plane barely changes with WL, goes to the bottom of "Calais klei" (blanket)
27a	<b>wsno_0161_20</b>	same as before	uncertainty dominated by Su ratio (especially layer "Calais Klei") and model. after meta model the uncertainty is
	gamma_char =	1.11 20 meters berm	SF_char chages from 1.33 to 0.95 with WL varying from +2.9m to crest +9m
	beta =	5.74	no uplift
			Slip plane barely changes with WL, goes to the bottom of "Calais klei" (blanket)

beta = reliability index  
Fp = fragility curve point  
WL = Water Level  
FC = Fragility curve (beta vs WL)

Check level 1

Comments on check level 1

I miss the dsx at various WL  
FC not always decreasing

See 2nd computation (beta 1st = 4.05, beta 2nd = 3.93)

SF\_char does zig-zag

very sensitive to grid settings, in the end the beta curve is decreasing (iterations converge to the correct slip plane)

I miss the dsx at various WL

The toe location should be moved to make the PL1 more realistic

recalculation

I miss the dsx at various WL

I miss the dsx for design point

design point of the WL higher than the crest

MHW and norm do not match

corrected for SF

MHW and norm do not match

design point of the WL higher than the crest

corrected for SF

MHW and norm do not match

(1.6 for +7.7m WL)

corrected for SF

MHW and norm do not match

corrected for SF

dike body and upper clay layer

MHW and norm do not match

corrected for SF

Design point water level higher than crest; high influence water level and high beta explain this

the sand and  $S_u$  of other clay layers

the sand and  $S_u$  of other clay layers

slip plane going through the sand for high water levels!!

slip plane going through the sand for high water levels!!

0.2m

(deeper and under the dike)

0.2m

parameters not correct (wrong standard deviation)

parameters not correct (wrong standard deviation)

seems to be giving quite high beta!! check norm beta

parameters under review!!

nes slightly important after 12 m +NAP  
or WL > 12m+NAP

curve corrected, checked with auto calculation for 13 water levels

ic. And to some extend the yield stress points  
or WL > 11.5m+NAP

sudden fall ?  
check other intermediate files saved?

sudden fall is caused by uplift for fragility points 4 and 5  
looks all OK, the SF in all the intermediate files are almost equal.  
the slip plane also changes from the point that uplift occurs: from shallow to deep

sudden fall ?  
SF last WL = 1001

sudden fall is not caused by multiplication factor for uplift for fragility points 4 and 5  
the long slip circle does look strange  
Additionally, there is a horizontal split in the layers below and next to the dike, so  
the bottom of hydrostatic zone is wrongly place. Needs recalculation

Tried all these optimizations, but did not succeed to get a proper  
Result is unreliable.  
--> schematisering behoeft mogelijk nog aanpassing

s longer

Su dijkmaterial is not consistent with other cases, 0.25 instead

Su dijkmaterial is not consistent with other cases, 0.25 instead of 0.31  
A large part of the slip circle is actually through this material. The beta could be higher

Su dijkmaterial is not consistent with other cases, 0.25 instead of 0.31  
A large part of the slip circle is actually through this material. The beta could be higher

her WL

check slip circle: SF in design point is 1.03. Equals the model factor so should be OK  
curve corrected: 2nd point is lower than the rest. 3rd, 4th, 5th have each a lower slip circle.  
The first iteration in the inner loop for the 2nd water level resulted beta 2.95 so OK to delete

dsx file of the design point gives a slip plane through the berm

This was due to bad grid settings. The minimum safety curve is at a different position and has SF equal to the model factor  
Moreover, all fragility points are calculated with the slip circle through the crest

zig-zag > corrected curve, check if it is good choice or if it needs SF-wl-curve (mean and char) shows exactly the same behaviour with decreasing and increasing curve  
1st and 2nd water level shallow slip circle, 3rd 4th 5th deep slip circles + increasing beta  
Needs review and recalculation

Tried all these optimizations, but did not succeed to get a proper result.  
Result is unreliable.

zig-zag > corrected curve, check last design point CRASHES!  
so, possibly it is a good thing to remove the last point from the curve!

Highest water level can not be calculated, because PL1 exceeds geometry.  
Deleting is the best solution, since the design point is at a lower water level.

corrected curve, check

It looks like bad convergence for the FORM iteration of the 4th water level, since the Leakage length outwards is very important in that specific calculation and the SF is not equal to the model factor design point m 1.04 vs SF 1.05.  
It looks like deleting is the best solution, rather than recalculating with more FORM iterations

corrected curve, check

The prob calculation for the 4th water level did not converge in the inner loop. It resulted an endless loop.  
Deleting is the best solution, since the design point is at a lower water level.

needs recomputation MM with 4 Fp to acquire final beta  
corrected curve, check

It is not clear which of the fragility points has to be deleted. Anyway it does not (yet) influence the final result.  
advised to check the case with an automatic calculation for more water levels and a refined grid  
Additionally: the soils below and next to the dike should be separate materials to prevent averaging.

Tried all these optimizations, but did not succeed to get a proper result.  
Result is unreliable.

strange value @ SF\_char (dip)  
used recalculated SF

The strange dip for the 2nd waterlevel in the SF-wl for characteristic values is caused by an error in the kernel which is probably fixed now. For the calib, use the recalculated SF (1.55)

sophia, check + note  
multiplication factor is present!!!!  
2aquifers?  
GHW missing!!

Calculation of the case should be redone with the following amendments  
multiplication should not be input  
just a sandy layer, no 2 aquifers  
GHW should be input

Curve goes a bit up first, but then decreases. Deleted the 1st aquifer

WNC parameters  
multiplication factor is present!!!!

Calculation of the case should be redone with the following amendments  
No multiplication factor, no traffic load, WNC PL1 defaults, Ringtoets WTI, Sand dike on clay

Case finished and approved,

sophia, check + note  
WNC ok!

Not enough tangent lines used.  
The SF in the designpoint (1.08) is not equal to the model factor in the design point (1.12)

recalculating on wcp0003