

RELIABILITY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING STRUCTURES

Author :Er. Monika Dadhwal¹

¹MTech structure engineering and construction, Department of Civil Engineering, MRIEM, Rohtak, Haryana

Co-author :Abhishek Arya²

²Assistant Professor, Civil Engineering Department, MRIEM, Rohtak.

Abstract:

The structural reliability recommended in Eurocodes and other international documents vary within a broad range, while the regard to the failure consequences and style working life is mentioned only very vaguely. In some cases the target reliability indexes are indicated for one or two reference periods like 1 to 5-0 years, however no explicit link to the planning working life is typically provided. This text attempts to clarify the connection between the target reliability levels, failure consequences, the planning working life and therefore the discount rate. The theoretical study supported probabilistic optimization is supplemented by recommendations useful for code makers and required by practicing engineers. It appears that the optimum reliability indices depend totally on the ratio of the value of structural failure to the value per unit of structural parameter, and fewer significantly on the planning working life and on the discount rate.

1. Introduction

The target reliability levels recommended in various national and international documents for brand spanking new structures are inconsistent in terms of the values and therefore the criteria consistent with which the acceptable values are to be selected. Almost no recommendations are available for temporary structures. Generally, optimum reliability levels are often obtained by considering both the value of the structure and therefore the expected cost of failure over the planning working life.

The design working life is known as an assumed period of your time that a structure is to be used for its intended purpose with none major repair work being necessary. Indicative values of design working life (10 to 100 years for various sorts of new structures) are given in EN 1990 (2002) [2]. Recommended values of reliability indexes are given for 2 reference periods, 1 year and 50 years (see Table 1), with none explicit link to the planning working life that generally differs from the reference period, while no specific indicative values are available for temporary structures.

It should be emphasized that the reference period is known as a selected period of your time used as a basis for statistically assessing the time variant basic random variables, and therefore the corresponding probability of failure. The concept of reference period is therefore fundamentally different from the concept of design working life. Confusion is usually caused when the difference between these two concepts isn't recognized.

It should be recognized that the few β values (for 1 year and 50 years) given in Table 1 for every reliability class correspond to an equivalent reliability level. Application of those values, however, depends on the period of time considered within the verification, which can be linked to available probabilistic information concerning time variant basic variables (imposed load, wind, earthquake, etc.). It should be noted that the reference period of fifty years is additionally accepted because the design working life for common structures (see the discussion by Diamantidis (2009) [1]).

Table 1 : Reliability distribution according to EN1990(2002) [2].

Reliability classes	Consequences of structural failure	Reliability index β for reference period		Examples of buildings and civil engineering works
		1 year	50 years	
RC3-high	High	5.2	4.3	Bridges, public buildings
RC2-normal	Medium	4.7	3.8	Residences and offices
RC1-low	Low	4.2	3.3	Agricultural buildings

For example, considering a structure of reliability class 2 having a design working lifetime of 50 years, the reliability index $\beta = 3.8$ should be used, as long as probabilistic models of basic variables are available for this era. An equivalent reliability level is achieved when a reference period of 1 year, and a target of $\beta = 4.7$ are applied using the theoretical models for a reference period of 1 year. Thus, when designing a support, similar dimensions (reinforcement area) would be obtained considering $\beta = 4.7$ and basic variables associated with 1 year or $\beta = 3.8$ and basic variables associated with 50 years.

A more detailed recommendation concerning the target reliability is provided by ISO 2394 (1998), where the target reliability indexes are indicated for the entire design working life with none restriction concerning its length, and are related not only to the results, but also to the relative costs of safety measures (Table 2).

Table 2 : Life-time target reliability indexes β consistent with ISO 2394 (1998).

Relative costs of safety measures	Consequences of failure			
	small	some	moderate	great
High	0	1.5	2.3	3.1
Moderate	1.3	2.3	3.1	3.8
Low	2.3	3.1	3.8	4.3

Similar recommendations are provided in the JCSS (2001) [8] Probabilistic Model Code (Table 3) based on the previous study. The recommended target reliability indexes are also related to both the consequences and to the relative costs of safety measures, though for a reference period of 1 year. The consequence classes in JCSS (2001) [8] (similar to EN 1990, 2002[2]) are linked to the ratio ρ defined as the ratio $(C_{str} + C_f) / C_{str}$ of the total cost induced by a failure (cost of construction C_{str} plus direct failure costs C_f) to the construction cost C_{str} as follows:

- Class 1 Minor Consequences: ρ is less than approximately 2; risk to life, given a failure, is small to negligible and the economic consequences are small or negligible (e.g.

agricultural structures, silos, masts);

- Class 2 Moderate Consequences: ρ is between 2 and 5; risk to life, given a failure, is medium and the economic consequences are considerable (e.g. office buildings, industrial buildings, apartment buildings);
- Class 3 Large Consequences: ρ is between 5 and 10; risk to life, given a failure, is high, and the economic consequences are significant (e.g. main bridges, theatres, hospitals, high rise buildings).

However, it is not quite clear what is meant in JCSS (2001) [8] by “the direct failure costs”. This term indicates that there may be some other “indirect costs” that may affect the total expected cost. Here it is assumed that the failure costs C_f cover all additional direct and indirect costs (except the structural costs C_{str}) induced by the failure. The structural costs are considered separately and related to the costs needed for an improvement of safety (costs per unit of decision parameter C_1).

Both the documents ISO 2394 (1998) [7] and JCSS (2001) [8] seem to recommend reliability indexes that are less than those given in EN 1990 (2002) [2] even for the “small relative costs” of safety measures. It should be noted that EN 1990 (2002) [2] gives the reliability indexes for 2 reference periods (1 and 50 years) which will be accepted because the design working life for common structures (see also the discussion provided by Diamantidis (2009) [1]). ISO 2394 (1998) [7] recommends indexes for “life-time, examples”, thus associated with the planning working life, with none restrictions, while Probabilistic Model Code by JCSS (2001) [8] provides reliability indexes for the reference period of 1 year.

Table 3 : Tentative target reliability indexes β and associated with one year reference period and supreme limit states consistent with JCSS (2001) [8].

Relative costs of safety measures	Minor consequences of failure	Moderate consequences of failure	Large consequences of failure
Large	$\beta=3.1(p\approx 10^{-3})$	$\beta=3.3(p\approx 5\times 10^{-4})$	$\beta=3.7(p\approx 10^{-4})$
Normal	$\beta=3.7(p\approx 10^{-4})$	$\beta=4.2(p\approx 10^{-5})$	$\beta=4.4(p\approx 5\times 10^{-6})$
Small	$\beta=4.2(p\approx 10^{-5})$	$\beta=4.4(p\approx 5\times 10^{-6})$	$\beta=4.7(p\approx 10^{-6})$

However, a transparent link between the planning working life and therefore the target reliability level isn't apparent from any of the above-mentioned documents. Thus, it's not clear which target reliability index should be used for a given design working life different from 50 years (say 10 years).

A new promising approach to specify the target reliability supported the concept of Life Quality Index (Fischer et al., 2012) [3] is taken into account in an on-going revision of the International Standard ISO 2394 (1998) [7].

The basic aim of this contribution is to clarify the link between the planning working life and therefore the reliability index, and to supply guidance for specification of the target reliability level for a given design working life. The submitted theoretical study supported probabilistic optimization is supplemented by

practical recommendations. This contribution is an extension of the previous study by Holicky and Retief (2011) [6], and Holicky [8].

2. General principles of probabilistic optimization

Probabilistic optimization may be based on a certain objective function adjusted to given condition of heritage structure. A simplified form (not covering monitoring and maintenance) may be expressed as the present value of the total expected cost $C_{tot}(x, o, q, n)$

$$C_{tot}(x, o, q, n) = C_{str} \sum_{i=1}^n P_f(x, i) Q(o, i) + C_f \sum_{i=1}^n P_f(x, i) Q(q, i) + C_0 + x C_1 \quad (1)$$

The cost of construction C_{str} including artistic value is discounted as it is paid in the future after number of years i . Here x denotes the decision parameter of the optimization (a parameter of structural resistance), o is the annual obsolescence (oldness) rate of heritage structure enhanced by annual discount rate q .

The cost of failure C_f including relevant artistic values is also discounted as it is paid after number of years i , q is the annual discount rate (without obsolescence rate o), e.g. 0.03, an average long run value of the real annual discount rate in European countries, n is the number of years to the failure, which may differ from the design working life (specified usually as 50 or 100 years).

Further, $P_f(x, i)$ is the failure probability in year i , $Q(o, i)$ is the discount factor dependent on the annual obsolescence rate o , $Q(q, i)$ is the discount factor dependent on the annual discount rate q and the number of years i , C_0 is the initial cost of intervention independent of the decision parameter x and failure (a quantity not affecting the optimization), and C_1 is the cost per unit of the decision parameter x (a structural parameter quantity affecting the structural resistance and optimization).

Note that the design working life may generally differ from the time to failure denoted by the number of years n and considered here as an independent variable affecting the probability of failure. Maintenance and possible repair of the structure is not included in the objective function (1), and these aspects are to be considered in further studies. Assuming independent failure events in subsequent years, the annual probability of failure $P_f(x, i)$ in year i may be approximated by the geometric sequence

$$P_f(x, i) = p(x)(1 - p(x))^{i-1} \quad (2)$$

The initial annual probability of failure $p(x)$ is dependent on the decision parameter x . Note that annual failure probabilities can be assumed to be independent when failure probabilities are chiefly influenced by time-variant loads (climatic actions, traffic loads, accidental loads). Then the failure probability $P_{fn}(x)$ during n years can be estimated by the sum of the sequence $P_f(x, i)$, that can be expressed as

$$P_{fn}(x, n) = 1 - (1 - p(x))^n \beta n p(x) \quad (3)$$

Note that the approximation indicated in equation (3) is fully acceptable for small annual probabilities $p(x) <$

10^{-3} .

The discount factor of the present value of the expected future costs in year i is considered in the usual form as

$$Q(q,i) = 1 / (1+q)^i \quad (4)$$

Thus, the cost of malfunctioning C_f is discounted by the factor $Q(q,i)$ depending on the discount rate q and the point in time (year number defined as i) when the loss of structural utility occurs.

Considering equations (2) and (4) the total costs $C_{tot}(x,q,n)$ described by equation (1) may be written in a simplified form as

$$C_{tot}(x,o,q,n) = C_{str} P Q(x,o,n) + C_f p(x) P Q(x,q,n) + C_0 + x C_1 \quad (5)$$

3. Failure probability of a generic structural member

Consider a generic structural member described by the limit state function $Z(x)$ as

$$Z(x) = x f - (G + Q) \quad (10)$$

Here x denotes a deterministic structural parameter (e.g. the cross-section area), f the strength of the material, G the load effect due to permanent load and Q the load effect due to variable load. Theoretical models of the random quantities f , G and Q considered in the following example are given in Table 4 (adopted from the probability model code described in JCSS (2001) and Holicky (2009)[4]).

Table 4 : Theoretical models of the random variables f , G and Q (annual extremes).

Variables	Distribution	Mean	Standard deviation	Coefficient of variation
f	Lognormal	100	10	0.10
G	Normal	35	3,5	0.10
Q	Gumbel	10	5	0.50

Considering the theoretical models given in Table 4, the reliability margin $Z(x)$ may be well approximated by the three parameter lognormal distribution $\beta Z(x)$ that provides sufficient accuracy.

The annual failure probability $p(x)$ is then given as

$$p(x) = \beta Z(x) (Z(x) = 0) \quad (11)$$

The annual failure probability $p(x)$ in equation (11) is evaluated for the reliability margin $Z(x) = 0$ using three parameter for $Z(x)$; then for $x = 1$ and $n = 50$ the failure probability is $P_{fn}(1) \beta 6.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ and corresponding reliability index is $\beta 3.8$ (common value indicated in EN1990(2002)[2]).

4. Conclusion

The target reliability levels recommended in various national and international documents are inconsistent in terms of the values and the criteria according to which the appropriate values are to be selected. It is shown that the target reliability of structures can be derived from theoretical principles of probabilistic optimization considering the objective function as the total costs expressed as a sum of the initial costs C_0 , the marginal costs $x C_1$ (where x denotes the decision parameter and C_1 the incremental cost of decision parameter x), and the failure consequences consisting of the construction costs C_{str} and failure costs C_f (the loss of structural utility at the time of failure), these being taken into account by the relevant cost ratios C_{str}/C_1 and C_f/C_1 . The construction costs C_{str} is discounted considering an annual obsolescence (oldness) rate q and the time to failure (number of years) n , the failure costs C_f is discounted considering an annual discount rate q and the time to failure (number of years) n . In such a way the total cost is affected (reduced) by the obsolescence rate o and discount rate q , and the number of years n .

References:

1. Diamantidis D 2009 "Reliability differentiation", In.: Holický et al.: Guidebook 1, Load effects on Buildings, CTU in Prague, Klokner Institute, ISBN 978-80-01-04468-1, pp. 48-61, 2009
2. EN 1990 2002 Eurocode / Basis of structural design, CEN
3. Fischer K, Barnardo-Viljoen C, and Faber, M, H 2012. Deriving target reliabilities from the LQI, LQI Symposium in Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark
4. Holický M and Schneider J (2001). "Structural Design and Reliability Benchmark Study", In.: Safety, Risk and Reliability – Trends in Engineering c/o IABSE, ETH Zürich, International Conference in Malta, ISBN 3-85748-102-4, pp. 929-938
5. Holický M 2009 Reliability analysis for structural design, SUN MeDIA Stellenbosch, ZA, ISBN 978-1-920338-11-4, 199 pages
6. Holický M and Retief J 2011 Theoretical Basis of the Target Reliability. In: 9th International Probabilistic Workshop. Braunschweig Technische Universität, pp. 91-101. ISBN 978-3- 89288-201-5
7. Rackwitz R 2000 *Optimization — the basis of code-making and reliability verification*. Structural Safety, **22**(1), p. 27-60.
8. Holický M 2013 Introduction to Probability and Statistics for Engineers, Springer, Heidelberg, New York, London