



Workshop of the Belgian *fib* member group

23 January 2020 - Ghent



Design for Structural Robustness

dr. Wouter Botte

Department of Structural Engineering and Building Materials, Ghent University, Belgium



OUTLINE

1. Introduction
2. MC2020 developments related to robustness
3. Future activities



1 - Introduction

Dr. Wouter Botte

→ **Postdoctoral researcher** at the
Department of Structural Engineering and Building Materials (UGent)

→ PhD in Civil Engineering (2017)

“*Quantification of Structural Reliability and **Robustness of New and Existing Concrete Structures** Considering Membrane Action*”

Supervisors: Robby Caspeele – Luc Taerwe

→ Convenor AG10 Action Group: Robustness



1 - Introduction

MC2020 Action Groups established to focus on specific technical topics,
e.g. bond, durability and service life design, non-linear finite element modelling...

→ AG10 Action Group: Robustness

- Start: January 2018
- 25 members – 11 countries
- Several members are also part of:
CEN/TC250/WG6 and JRC report writing
- 6 meetings

Country	Delegates
Italy	9
Belgium	3
Portugal	3
UK	3
Spain	2
Germany	1
France	1
Denmark	1
Austria	1
Sweden	1
China	1

 → **Primary goal:** revise/update MC2010 sections related to robustness

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

Where to find structural robustness in MC2020?

PART II Basic principles

Chapter 5 – Performance-based approach

5.2 – Performance evaluation framework

5.2.1 – Structural performance

5.2.1.2 – Principles of limit state design

5.2.1.2.4.1 – Special considerations: robustness



Brief & general section

PART VI Design and assessment procedures

Chapter 27 – Evaluation of structural performance

27.9 – Design for robustness



Main section on structural robustness

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

Current status?

First draft of the chapter finalized and discussed in Action Group

→ Will be distributed to wider group for commenting end of January

→ Content subjected to changes

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

Table of content

27.9 Design for robustness

27.9.1 General

27.9.2 Design considerations

27.9.3 Design scenarios for robustness

27.9.4 Design actions

27.9.5 Design strategies

27.9.6 Robustness quantification

27.9.7 Robustness considerations for existing structures

(27.9.8 *Robustness criteria*)

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.1 General

→ **Definition:** no accidental and/or exceptional events or damage to structural components would result in **disproportional consequences** for the structural system or even **total collapse** of the whole structure during its **lifetime**.

→ **Design for robustness** can involve identification of:

- Hazards
- Direct damage
- Comprehensive damage
- Direct and indirect consequences

→ Several **strategies** can be adopted



2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.2 Design considerations

→ **When to do what?** Based on Consequence Class of the structure

→ **Design considerations:**

- Low risk group: no additional measures
- Medium-low risk group: indirect design methods (e.g. prescriptive rules/key element method)
- Medium-high risk group: medium-low + combination of indirect and direct design methods
- High risk group: direct design methods based on a systematic risk assessment
- Direct and indirect consequences

→ General **design recommendations**

- Shape of structure (simple/regular)
- Detailing rules
- Ductility
- Etc.

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.3 Design scenarios for robustness

→ Design for robustness should involve the **identification and assessment of design scenarios**, i.e. each design scenario relating to a **set of events/conditions occurring during the construction or lifetime of the structure** leading to a state of the system for which the **effect of disproportionate consequences** should be assessed.

→ Such design scenarios can be **identified based on**

- specified accidental actions → Design for identified hazards
 - notional damage
 - notional actions
- Design for threats that cannot be specified

To be discussed with the relevant stakeholders.

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.4.1 Design for accidental actions

Threat-specific design requires the **identification and quantification** of all abnormal events that could possibly affect the structure and the resulting actions on it.

→ In general cases, such input data is incomplete and/or imprecise [...] Therefore, the application of a direct design method [...] may [...] be **complemented by elements of threat-unspecific design** [...].

When structures are checked for specific accidental actions and/or to resist local damage, load **combination rules** should reflect the low probability of concurrence of the accidental action and the design live loads, i.e. **partial factors which are lower than for the case of ULS verifications**.

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.4.2 Design for notional actions

27.9.4.2.1 - Notional damage scenarios:

- Notional removal scenarios

[...] structural elements will be notionally removed and the structure will be checked for disproportionate consequences.

- Notional deterioration scenarios

[...] geometrical and/or material properties [...] will be notionally reduced and the structure will be checked for disproportionate consequences.

27.9.4.2.2 - Notional loads

Notional loads are **generally specified as a uniformly distributed equivalent static load.**

A value often referred to in standards for a notional load for buildings is 34 kN/m^2 [...] should be treated with caution in case the design scenario considered is considerably different, [...].

→ Consideration of load combination rules

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.5 Design strategies

The method to be applied depends on the design considerations [...]

→ Generally, design strategies for robustness can be divided into two types:

1) Indirect design methods

→ Focus not explicitly on the ability to sustain abnormal load effects

→ Prescriptive rules (e.g. horizontal/vertical ties)

2) Direct design methods

[...] aim to limit the effect of local failure. These design methods can start from one or more of the following design strategies:

→ Alternative load path strategy

→ Consequence reduction strategy

In case these do not lead to an adequate level of robustness:

→ Event control strategy

→ Key element design

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.6 Robustness quantification

Robustness quantification should be based on the **comparison of**:

- The amount and extent of **initial damage**
- The corresponding **follow-up consequences**

Robustness metrics can be divided into the following levels with decreasing complexity:

- **Risk-based quantification** based on a complete risk analysis [...];
- **Reliability-based quantification** based on e.g. probabilities of failure [...];
- **Deterministic quantification** based on structural measures [...]

→ Can be considered **in case of**:

- Comparison of design alternatives
- Follow-up of robustness during lifetime of the structure

2 - MC2020 developments related to robustness

27.9.7 Robustness considerations for existing structures

- Constraints may affect the level of robustness
- Two **design situations** are identified:
 - Change of use results in a significantly higher risk → adopt higher consequence class
 - Alterations/extensions should not reduce the level of robustness
- **Large unknowns** on structural properties → adopt high risk group
- **Some design strategies might be unfeasible** in some cases

3 – Future activities

- Reviewing chapters MC2020 based on comments by other groups
- Development of *fib* Bulletin on structural robustness

Dr. Wouter Botte

E Wouter.Botte@UGent.be

T +32 9 264 54 80

DEPARTMENT OF STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING AND BUILDING MATERIALS
MAGNEL LABORATORY FOR CONCRETE RESEARCH