### Structural Reliability Prof. Baidurya Bhattacharya Department of Civil Engineering Indian Institute of Technology-Kharagpur

### Lecture-230 Reliability Based Design Codes (Part-06)

(Refer Slide Time: 00:27)



So, after presenting this summary storyline, describing the high level expectations behind the structural Euro codes EN 1990, let us see in the next few slides how the code makers have expressed these expectations through codal provisions. And we are going to look only at the first few pages of EN 1990.

(Refer Slide Time: 00:57)



So, the very first set of requirements section 2.1 clearly lays down the context and the parameters behind the code. So, the code is reliability based we are very clear about that.

## (Refer Slide Time: 01:19)



We also see the issues related to the definition of reliability that we discussed early on in this course. They are all contained in this sentence; there is an intended service life.

## (Refer Slide Time: 01:35)



There are all service conditions and demands that are placed on the system. So, those are the loads and the structure should not fail under those loads.

## (Refer Slide Time: 01:47)



And the structure should also function. So, all the boxes are checked.

# (Refer Slide Time: 01:56)



And more specifically, so that there is no ambiguity the strength issue.

# (Refer Slide Time: 02:03)

Reliability based design	Structural Reliability Lecture 31 Reliability based design codes
Structs from BS EN 1990-2002+A1:2005 and EN 1990-2002+A1:2005 (E) incorporating contigends December 2008 and April 2010 E) E1 Treat attent to CEN Amendment A1 2000 to EN 1990-2002 E() E1 Treat attent to CEN Companies December 2008 E() E1 Treat attent to CEN Companies December 2008 E() E1 Treat attent to CEN Companies December 2008	
2.1 Basic requirements	
(1)P A structure shall be designed and executed in such a way that it will, during its intended life, with appropriate degrees of reliability and in an economical way – sustain all actions and influences likely to occur during execution and use, and – meet the specified serviceshility requirements for a structure or a structural element.	
(2)P A structure shall be designed to have adequate : - structural resistance, - ferriceability, and - datability.	
<ul> <li>(4)P A structure shall be designed and executifd in such a way that it will not be damaged by events such as : <ul> <li>explosion,</li> <li>import, and</li> <li>the consequences of human errors,</li> <li>to an extent disproportionate to the original cause.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Automat Restances of Designer www.honest-Maguet.in?"history of	

The functionalities issue.

(Refer Slide Time: 02:05)



And the longevity issue, the time dependent issues they are clearly spent out.

# (Refer Slide Time: 02:12)



Very early on it is interesting to see the code makers have been worried about and they have expressed the progressive collapse issue. So, this disproportionate collapse a progressive collapse has shown up quite early in the codal sentiments.

# (Refer Slide Time: 02:37)



And in the next few provisions also we see more details on how this sort of progressive collapse can be prevented.

## (Refer Slide Time: 02:53)



And then the code says that all of this should be done by appropriate design. So, the importance of design has been not left to any ambiguity.

### (Refer Slide Time: 03:08)



Now here we see the introduction of all the companion documents. So, EN 1990 shall be read with 91 through 99.

## (Refer Slide Time: 03:23)

-	Relia	bility based design	5	tructural Reliability Lecture 31 Reliability based design codes
stucts from BS EN 1990:20	62+A1:2005 and EN 1	990-2002+A1:2005 (E) incorporating corrigenda December 2008 and April 2010		
2.2 Reliabil	ity managemen	ıt		
(1)P The rel	ability required (	for structures within the scope of EN 1990 shall be		
achieved: a) by design	in accordance with	EN 1990 to EN 1999 and		
b) by				
<ul> <li>approp</li> <li>quality</li> </ul>	eiate execution an management mer	d nures.		
EN 1990	Eurocede :	Basis of Structural Design		
EN 1991	Eurocode 1	Actions on structures		
EN 1992	Eurocede 2	Design of concrete structures		
EN 1993	Eurocede 3	Design of steel structures		
EN 1994	Eurocede 4	Design of composite steel and concrete structures		
EN 1995	Eurocede 5	Design of tanber structures		
EN 1990	Eurocode 6:	Design of massing structures	_	in the second second
EN 1997	Enrocode 7	Contechnical design Dealers of atmeterate for authorsalis emistance	_	
EN 1999	Eurocode 9:	Design of sharenees or consequence Design of shareneess structures	_	
20.000				100
				And in street of the

And they are listed here that covers various materials, various loads and so on. (Refer Slide Time: 03:33)



Now we come to the point that different limit states, different types of expectations should have different levels of probability of exceedance or acceptable reliability.

## (Refer Slide Time: 04:00)



So, depending on the consequence these target liabilities should change or should be made different.

## (Refer Slide Time: 04:11)



So, that is also spelt out very clearly. So, far we have understood that the design has to be reliability based different consequences must have their respective acceptable reliabilities.

## (Refer Slide Time: 04:26)



And then we come to the point of how to do this safety check whether it should be done as the structure as a whole or on a component basis?

## (Refer Slide Time: 04:42)



Both options have been given and it so happens that we are still more tuned towards a component based design approach than whole systems based design approach.

## (Refer Slide Time: 04:57)

Reliability based design	Structural Reliability Lecture 31 Reliability based design codes
stucts from BS EN 1999-2092+A1:2005 and EN 1999-2092+A1:2005 (E) incorporating configenda December 2006 and April 2010	
<ul> <li>(4) The levels of reliability that apply to a particular structure may be specified in one or both of the following ways 1</li> <li>by the classification of the structure as a whole ;</li> <li>by the classification of its components.</li> </ul>	
(5) The levels of reliability relating to structural resistance and serviceability can be achieved by suitable combinations of :	
<ul> <li>a) preventative and protective measures (e.g. implementation of safety barriers, active and passive protective measures against fire, protection against risks of corrosion such as puinting or cathodic protection);</li> </ul>	
b) measures relating to design calculation ) - representative values of Britous ; - the choice of partial factors ;	1000
c) measures relating to quality management ;	6
	Add

Then these design calculations becoming more specific have to be based on representative actions.

## (Refer Slide Time: 05:06)



The sort of quantities that we saw in those partial safety factor based equations.

# (Refer Slide Time: 05:12)



And more specifically the choice of partial safety factors. So, the partial safety factors are also introduced very early on in the design document.

# (Refer Slide Time: 05:27)



Next we are reminded of the importance of inspection and maintenance because of all the time dependent issues related to aging and accumulating damage.

## (Refer Slide Time: 05:43)

timete here BE EM 1990-2012/vA12005 and EM 1990-2002/vA12005 [4] incorporating compands December 2008 and April 2010 <b>2.3 Design working life</b> (1) The design working is should be specified. NOTE habitative categories are given in Table 2]. The values given in Table 2.1 may size be used for diverzing time-dependent performance (e.g. future-obtied ackations). See also Ameri A. <b>Fib</b> 2.1 - beficiative design working BF $\frac{1000}{1000} \frac{1000}{10000} \frac{1000}{10000} \frac{1000}{100000} \frac{1000}{100000} \frac{100000}{100000000000000000000000000000$		R	eliability	based design	Structural Reliability Lecture 31 Reliability based design codes
<b>2.3 Design working life</b> (1) The design working life should be specified. MOTE behavior categories are given as Table 2.1. In values given in Table 2.1 may size be used for thermal time-dependent performance (e.g. furgue-obtaid elacidation). See dio Ameri A. <b>Fit C 1-1 Indicative draign working life</b> <u>The obtained working life interpret working life</u> <u>A 10 Design working to furgue values lines are used in the second performance in the second perfor</u>	mants from BS EN	1990:2002+A1:2005 a	nd EN 1998:2002+A1:	2005 (E) incorporating corrigenda December 2008 and April 2018	
(1) The design working life should be specified. SDTE behavior estapones are given a Table 21.1 mer values given in Table 2.1 may size be used for discussing time-dependent performance (og forgas-ostated calculation). See also Annex A. $Fable 1.1 - believable designs working ibr \frac{\mathbf{bble calculative designs (treative designs ($	2.3	Design working	life		
(c) The weight Working the shown is given by: NOTE believe entropy and the given by: Bit category is a field of the shown of the sho	(1)	The during working	tife should be seen	- Feel	
SOTE Inductive component are given as Table 21. The values given in Table 21 may also be used for determining time-dependent performance (e.g. forgos-ordated calculations) free dio Jaune A.       Table 2.1 - Indicative design working life       Design working     Indicative design working life       1     Indicative design working life       2     100-02       2     100-02       3     Spaceful entrational parts, e.g. gastry gastry, bearing       4     50       1     Status       3     100       100     Nonamonto basing structure, bridge, and other configure entration of the transmit function.       (1) Structures or parts of structures for one bedges where the brang re-see in brand and other configure entration to the demantial within a view to brang re-see indicational databased	10	The design weeking	me awar oe de	cineve.	
Othermaning time-dependent performance (e.g. trained existination). See into Annex A       Table 2.1 - Indicative design working life       Design working the distance design working life       100 colspan="2">Temporary observations of the distance design working life distance design life distance destance design life distance design life distance design life distan	NOT	TI. Indicative categorie	are given in Table 2	1. The values given in Table 2.1 may also be used for	
Table 21 - Indicative design working life       Design working indicative design working life       Ide category     Indicative design working life       4     30       7     10 to 23       8     Paghaeolde structures for       3     15 has 24       4     50       9     Building thereares and other common structures       4     50       100     Monamula building structures briefly, and other common structures       11) Structures or parts of structures that one be demanded with a view to being en used thands and building structures.	deter	annis pas-pheroar	performance (e.g. fait	gue-criated calculations). See also Amera A.	
Design working life category         Instructive design working life (crear)         Examples           1         20         Temporery structures <sup>10</sup> 2         10 to 25         Registerolife structures [and parts, e.g. gastry garlers, berging           3         15 Ja, 31         Ageneration that function releases.           4         59         Building structures, bridger, and other 100           5         100         Structures to parts of structures that dig structures, bridger, and other and be considered a temporery.           (1) Structures or parts of structures that one be descanded with a view to being re used thands and be considered a temporery.         Instructure category and the structure of the structure of the considered temporery.			Table 2.1 - Indica	tive design working life	
totom         100         Temporery structures         10         2         10 to 23         Replaceded structures         10         10         2         10 to 23         Replaceded structures         4         10         11         11		Design working	Indicative design working life	Examples	
2     10 to 23     Replacedle structure pert, e.g. gastry gener, 10 to 23     Replacedle structure for energy of the structure 4     9     Replacedle structures and other common structure 5     100     Monamental building structures building     (1) Structures or parts of structures that the decauation of structures     (1) Structures to structures that one be decauated with a view to being re-soled structure     (1) Structures		ille category	(marr)		
1 (1) In 32 Agen denoted and sender the beams     4 90 Building thereares and effore construct structurery     5 100 Monamental building structures, building structures, building     (1) Structures that can be demantified with a view to being re-wood thruld     text be considered as temporary		ille category	(079473) 10	Temporary structures <sup>(0)</sup>	
4     59     Binkling thereares and other common structures     5     100     Monamental banking structures indexing     (1) Structures or parts of structures that there     (1) Structures or parts of structures that there is the target     (1) Structures or parts of structures that there is the target     (1) Structures or parts of structures that there is the target     (1) Structures or parts of structures that target		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	(099070) 10 10 to 25	Temporary structures <sup>(1)</sup> Reglacedele cracicani parte, e.g. gantry picture, benues	
100 Monamental building structures, bridges, and ether     (1) Structures of parts of structures that came be domanded with a view to being re-woold should include conducted as temporary.		ile category	0 yeart) 30 10 to 25	Temporary structures <sup>10</sup> Replacedlar structural parts, e.g. gastry pinlers, bearings Agracultural and structure structures	
(1) Structures of parts of interctures that came be demanded with a view to being re-woold thould not be considered as temporary.		1 7 3 4	0mm0 10 10 to 25 15 to 35 50	Temporary structures <sup>10</sup> Replace/olde structural parts, e.g. pastry prefers, bearings Agric charaft and structures. Building structures and other common structures	
(1) Structures or parts of structures that can be doctantified with a view to being re-wood should not be considered as temponey.		1 7 1 4 5	0/rw/0 10 10 to 25 15 to 81 50 100	Importery structures <sup>40</sup> Replacedule structural parts, e.g. gantry pieles, bearing: Argue channel start variale wirestress Boalding structures and other common structures Monamental banding structures, before, and other	-
		1 7 1 4 3	0 mart) 10 to 25 15 to 35 50 100	Temporary attestants <sup>10</sup> Replaceable structures <sup>10</sup> Appendents and sample structures Building structures and effort common structures <sup>10</sup> Monamental building structures, building, and other conditionants building structures, building	
		1 2 1 4 5 (1) Structures or pa not be considered a	(treart) 10 10 to 25 15 to 32 30 100 rts of structures that of temporary.	Importing distertions <sup>10</sup> Replaceable structures <sup>10</sup> digardinaria with structures <sup>10</sup> digardinaria with structures <sup>10</sup> distance the structures <sup>10</sup> Monumental building structures, bridges and edges real ensurement with the structures <sup>10</sup> and be demanded with a view to being re-used thousaid	

More specific things now, so the design working life depending on the type of structure that is Ranna needs to choose the service life, the intended life. And that is typically for the kind of structures that we undertake formal designs are of the order of 50 to 100 years.

## (Refer Slide Time: 06:09)



And then the issue of durability once again comes up and the designer is cautioned that all issues related to aging and environmental degradation have to be anticipated and considered.

# (Refer Slide Time: 06:31)

Reliability based design	Structural Reliability Lecture 31 Reliability based design codes
Sortion 3 Principles of limit states dosine	
3.1 General	
(1)P A distinction shall be made between altimate limit states and serviceability limit) states.	
NOTE. In some cases, additional verifications may be speeded, for example to ensure traffic unless	
(2) Verification of one of the two categories of limit states may be omitted provided that sufficient information is available to prove that it is satisfied by the other:	
(3)P Limit states shall be related to design situations, see 3.2.	
(4) Design situations should be classified as persistent, transient or accidental, see 3.2.	
(5) Verification of limit states that are concerned with time dependent effects (e.g. fatigue) should be related to the design working life of the construction.	6
wa Batabay IT Durgan www.anii.ihga.a.in?heitaya/	ASK

Finally more details on the type of limit states to be considered are spelt out. So, we see specifically that ultimate limit states and serviceability limit states have to be considered.

# (Refer Slide Time: 06:53)



Not only that, the designer also needs to worry about not only the operating condition but transient situations and accidental situations as well. So, that presumably includes the construction phase as well.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:11)



Once more time dependent issues are again brought out and the designer is reminded of that. (Refer Slide Time: 07:20)



Now the design situations, the normal and abnormal and the transient etcetera, so more details are given now. So, the persistent design situation.

## (Refer Slide Time: 07:34)



The transient design situation.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:36)



The accidental design situation.

## (Refer Slide Time: 07:39)



And the seismic design situation. So, special place of mention has been there for the seismic loads.

## (Refer Slide Time: 07:51)



And then the designer is again reminded that he or she has to take care of all likely scenarios, so nothing should be left out of consideration at the design stage.

## (Refer Slide Time: 08:10)



Now more details about the ultimate limit state and now we are getting more specifics that this limit state has to do with life safety or safety of very important assets.

## (Refer Slide Time: 08:24)



And more details about what sort of definition of this sort of failure? This ultimate limit state collapse should be considered.

### (Refer Slide Time: 08:40)



So, loss of equilibrium, creation of a mechanism, loss of stability, rupture etcetera, would all come under this sort of ultimate or collapse limit state.

## (Refer Slide Time: 08:56)



Time dependent effects should also not be forgotten. So, we are seeing again and again that the code makers want to remind the designer that time dependent effects have to be kept in mind. And then serviceability limit state is next.

### (Refer Slide Time: 09:15)

Reliability based design	Structural Reliabili Lecture 3 Reliability base design code
Entricit: from BS EN 1960-2002-A1:2005 and EN 1980-2002-A1:2005 (E) incorporating compands December 2008 and April 2010	
3.4 Serviceability limit states	
(1)P The limit states that concern : - the functioning of the structure or structured members under normal use ; - the constant oppopter; - the appenenties of the construction works, shall be classified as serviceability limit states.	
(2)P A distinction shall be made between reversible and irreversible serviceability limit states.	

So, there the designer is reminded that everything to do with the proper functioning even though it does not interfere with safety, life safety, asset safety or any loss of stability but still the structure has to function. So, the designer is reminded of that and we see that the details.

### (Refer Slide Time: 09:45)



And 1 interesting distinction is drawn here between the reversible and irreversible service within limit states. And if you remember this would somewhat come under the consideration of whether we are talking about reliability or availability. So, if something is reversible then you remember that we said the term availability is more appropriate. So, here we see a broadening of the definition of reliability in certain situations.

### (Refer Slide Time: 10:20)



Then we go a little deeper into this concept of limit state design. So, the limit states are more firmly defined and again the designer is reminded.

### (Refer Slide Time: 10:34)



That all relevant design situations must be considered.

## (Refer Slide Time: 10:40)



And the preference for partial safety factors is clearly stated.

# (Refer Slide Time: 10:49)



But the designer is also given the option of doing a direct reliability based analysis.

## (Refer Slide Time: 10:59)



We have talked about models. So, here the code makers emphasize the importance of good modeling and this could be a combination of physical and mathematical models.

# (Refer Slide Time: 11:17)



Then details about the consequences. So, we have been told about limit states, we have been told about target reliabilities and now these target reliabilities have to be tied to consequence classes. So, 3 consequence classes have been defined early on and the designer has to decide which class their structure comes under.

### (Refer Slide Time: 11:46)



And again this note is actually very important, this tells the designer that so far all these requirements in terms of acceptable failure probability are to be applied to structural members or they are component based. So, these targets that we are going to see next, they are going to pertain to structural elements, components and not the entire structure. And that is actually consistent with the fact that I said that still most design verification is done at a component level.

#### (Refer Slide Time: 12:25)

Reliability Class         Minimum values for β           1 year reference period         50 year ref           RC3         5.2	fernier period
1 year reference period 50 years re	ference period
RC3 5.2	
	43
RC2 4,7 RC1 4,2	3.8
RC1         4.2           B3.2 Differentiation by β values         (1) The reliability classes (RC) may be defined by the β reliability indi           (2) Three reliability classes (RC), RC2 and RC3 may be associated         (2) Three reliability classes (RC), RC2 and RC3	es concept.

Next comes the corresponding reliability classes. So, each consequence class gives rise to it is corresponding reliability class. And here we see finally the explicit stating of the target beta values, the target reliability indexes. And it is given for 1 year reference period and 50 year reference period for each of the 3 consequence classes or reliability classes. So, this brings an end to our high level discussion and investigation of the philosophy behind the structural Euro codes. And now we will take up more details about reliability based design and what this partial safety factors are? How they come and how they are derived?