Structural Eurocodes

EN 1990 - Basis of Structural Design

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Rüdiger Höffer

Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Institute of Structural Engineering, Germany Registered Test Engineer for Structural Design, IRS Düsseldorf Member of TC 250 SC1 and the German Mirror Committee

Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Hans-Jürgen Niemann

Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany Niemann & Partner Consulting Engineers, Bochum

ECEC – European Council of Engineer's Chambers CPD-Lectures at 15th of May, 2015, Belgrade/SRB

Structural Eurocodes



Eurocode 1: Actions on Structures

- EN 1991-1-1 General actions Desities, self-weight, imposed loads for buildings : 2002 + Correction AC:2009
- EN 1991-1-2 General actions Actions due to fire : 2003
- EN 1991-1-3 General actions Snow loads : 2003 + AC:2009

EN 1991-1-4 General actions – Wind actions : 2005(E) Amendment A1:2010 Correction AC:2010

- EN 1991-1-5 General actions Thermal actions : 2003 Correction AC:2009
- EN 1991-1-6 General actions, Actions during execution : 2005 Correction AC:2008
- EN 1991-1-7 General actions Accidental actions : 2006 Correction AC:2010
- EN 1991-2 Traffic loads on Bridges : 2004
- EN 1991-3 Actions induced by cranes and machinery : 2006
- EN 1991-4 General actions Silos and tanks : 2006

Objectives of EN 1990

EN 1990 describes the Principles and requirements for safety, serviceability and durability of structures. It is based on the limit state concept used in conjunction with a partial factor method.

Overview

Risks in Civil Engineering

Measures of Reliability in a Probabilistic Concept

Reliability Verification in EN 1990

Partial Factor Concept in EN 1990

Limit States

Ultimate Limit State – ULS

Serviceability Limit State - SLS

Conclusions

Actions on Structures – EN 1991

Risks in Civil Engineering



Storm







Earthquake



Water

Risks in Civil Engineering

Failure Rate:

$$h_{t}(t) = \frac{P(T_{L} \leq t + \Delta t | T_{L} > t)}{\Delta t}$$

$$T_L$$
 – design life, t - time





safety zone:Z = R - Ewith mean m_Z , stand. dev. σ_Z survival:Z > 0; failure: $Z \le 0$



 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{safety zone:} & Z=R-E\\ \text{with mean }m_Z, \text{ stand. dev. }\sigma_Z\\ \\ \text{survival:} & Z>0; \text{ failure:} & Z\leq 0\\ \\ \text{probability of failure }P_f\\ & P_f=P(Z\leq 0) \end{array}$



A reliability index of $\beta = 0$ corresponds to a failure probability of $P_f = 0.5!$ safety zone: Z = R - Ewith mean m_Z , stand. dev. σ_Z survival: Z > 0; failure: $Z \le 0$ probability of failure P_f $P_f = P(Z \le 0)$ reliability index β $m_Z = \beta \cdot \sigma_Z$ $_{9/34}$



The reliability index β is applied in EN 1990 for reliability verifications. It is related to the probability of failure, P_f, by

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathsf{f}} = \Phi(\mathbf{-}\beta)$$

where Φ is the cumulative probability function of the Gaussian distribution

$P_{\rm f}$	10-1	10-2	10-3	10-4	10-5	10-6	10-7
β	1,28	2,32	3,09	3,72	4,27	4,75	5,20

Table C1 - Relation between β and $P_{\rm f}$

Design values of Action Effect, E_d and Resistance, R_d

Given are: target reliability index β

mean resistance m_R standard deviation σ_R

mean action effect m_E standard deviation σ_E

design requirement:

 $m_z = \beta \cdot \sigma_z$

```
 \begin{array}{l} \mbox{Replacing Z by E and R:} \\ m_R - m_E = \beta(\alpha_R \cdot \sigma_R - \alpha_E \cdot \sigma_E) \\ \mbox{where } \alpha \mbox{ are linear weight factors with ranges:} \\ -1 \leq \alpha_E < 0 \\ 0 \leq \alpha_R \leq 1 \end{array}
```

Design verification using design values E_d and R_d :

$$\begin{split} m_{\mathsf{R}} - \beta \alpha_{\mathsf{R}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathsf{R}} &= m_{\mathsf{E}} - \beta \alpha_{\mathsf{E}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathsf{E}} \\ \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{d}} &= m_{\mathsf{R}} - \beta \alpha_{\mathsf{R}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathsf{R}} \geq \mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{d}} = m_{\mathsf{E}} - \beta \alpha_{\mathsf{E}} \cdot \sigma_{\mathsf{E}} \end{split}$$

Target values of Reliability

Table C2 - Target reliability index β for Class RC2 structural members ¹⁾

Limit state	Target reliability index			
	1 year	50 years		
Ultimate	4,7	3,8		
Fatigue		1,5 to 3,8 ²⁾		
Serviceability (irreversible)	2,9	1,5		
¹⁾ See Annex B				
²⁾ Depends on degree of inspectability, reparability and damage tolerance.				

(2) The actual frequency of failure is significantly dependent upon human error, which are not considered in partial factor design (See Annex B). Thus β does not necessarily provide an indication of the actual frequency of structural failure.

The target values of reliability are operational, indicative numbers

Reliability Differentiation in EN 1990

For the purpose of reliability differentiation, consequences classes (CC) may be established by considering the consequences of failure or malfunction of the structure as given in Table B1.

Consequences	Description	Examples of buildings and civil	
Class		engineering works	
CC3	High consequence for loss of human	Grandstands, public buildings where	
	life, or economic, social or	consequences of failure are high (e.g. a	
	environmental consequences very great	concert hall)	
CC2	Medium consequence for loss of human Residential and office building		
	life, economic, social or environmental	buildings where consequences of failure	
	consequences considerable	are medium (e.g. an office building)	
CC1	Low consequence for loss of human life,	Agricultural buildings where people do	
	and economic, social or environmental	not normally enter (e.g. storage	
	consequences small or negligible	buildings), greenhouses	

Table B1 - Definition of consequences classes

(2) Three reliability classes RC1, RC2 and RC3 may be associated with the three consequences classes CC1, CC2 and CC3.

Table B2 - Recommended minimum values for reliability index β (ultimate limit states)

Reliability Class	Minimum values for <i>β</i>		
	1 year reference period	50 years reference period	
RC3	5,2	4,3	
RC2	4,7	3,8	
RC1	4,2	3,3	

NOTE A design using EN 1990 with the partial factors given in annex A1 and EN 1991 to EN 1999 is considered generally to lead to a structure with a β value greater than 3,8 for a 50 year reference period. Reliability classes for members of the structure above RC3 are not further considered in this Annex, since these structures each require individual consideration.



Actions:self weight g, wind load wResistance:yield strength of the reinforcement $A_s \cdot \beta_s$

Global safety factor γ_{tot} applied to design the shell for tensile strength:

$$\gamma_{tot} \cdot (\mathbf{n}_{w} - \mathbf{n}_{g}) \leq \mathbf{A}_{s} \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}_{s}$$

Self-weight is compressive, it diminishes the tensile wind force: The shell cannot carry γ_{tot} when designed with a global factor.

Such a goal would be achieved by the following design equation:

$$\gamma_{tot} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{w} - \mathbf{n}_{g} \leq \mathbf{A}_{s} \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta}_{s}$$



5.11.1965

In a strong gale, three Cooling Towers at the Ferrybridge Power Station, UK, collapse due to tensile failure of the reinforcement at the windward side

Principal failure causes

(1) Small shell bending stiffness due to *Single layer reinforcement*, low natural frequencies, increase of resonant response to turbulence;

2) Load amplification due to flow Interference;

(3) Unified safety factor instead of partial concept



 $\begin{array}{l} \text{Concept of partial safety factors} \\ & \gamma_w \cdot n_w - \gamma_G \cdot n_g \leq \ A_s \cdot \beta_s / \gamma_M \\ \text{VGB-BTR 2005:} \quad 1,6 \cdot n_w - 1,0 \cdot n_g \leq \ A_s \cdot \beta_s / 1,15 \end{array}$

The shell is now designed to carry 1,6-times the nominal wind load against 1/1,15 times the nominal tensile strength.

EN 1990 does not apply directly the *design values* but utilises the *partial factor design* consisting of the following steps:

(1) **Characteristic values** of the basic variables actions F_k , and of the material properties X_k are introduced.

- Characteristic values are typically:
- for variable actions Q: Q_k is the 0,98-quantile of the yearly extremes;
- for permanent actions G: G_k is the mean value;
- for accidental actions A: A_d is a nominal value used as design value;
- for strength of materials X: X_k is the 5%-quantile.

(2) **Design values of actions F** are specified by using partial load factors γ_F :

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{d}} = \gamma_{\mathsf{F}}\mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{k}} & \text{for a leading action, or} \\ \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{d}} = \gamma_{\mathsf{F}}\cdot\psi\cdot\mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{k}} & \text{for an accompanying action;} \end{array}$

Design values of material properties X are specified by partial material factors γ_m : $X_d = X_k / \gamma_m$

(3) The design values of action effect and resistance are calculated as

$$\mathsf{E}_{\mathsf{d}} = \mathsf{E}\{\gamma_{\mathsf{F}} \cdot \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{k}}; \gamma_{\mathsf{F}} \cdot \psi \cdot \mathsf{F}_{\mathsf{k}}\} \leq \mathsf{R}_{\mathsf{d}} = \mathsf{R}\{\mathsf{X}_{\mathsf{k}}/\gamma_{\mathsf{m}}\}$$

Summary of Verification Procedure



19/34

If several variable actions have to be considered, the combination of actions consists of the leading action Q_{k1} and the accompanying actions $\psi \cdot Q_{kj}$, where ψ is the factor for accompanying actions, $\psi \leq 1$



The factor ψ , covers the following situations:

- the combination value of a variable action
- the frequent value of a variable action
- the quasi-permanent value of a variable action

 $\begin{array}{l} \psi_0 {\cdot} Q_k \\ \psi_1 {\cdot} Q_k \\ \psi_2 {\cdot} Q_k \end{array}$

Variable loads and	Action	ψ_0	ψ_1	ψ_2
related ψ-factors	Imposed loads in buildings, category (see EN 1991-1.1)			
	Category A: domestic, residential areas	0.7	0.5	0.3
	Category B: office areas	0.7	0.5	0.3
	Category C: congregation areas	0.7	0.7	0,6
	Category D: shopping areas	0.7	0.7	0,6
	Category E: storage areas	1,0	0,9	0,8
	Category F: traffic area,	-	-	~
	vehicle weight ≤ 30 kN	0,7	0,7	0,6
	Category G: traffic area,			
	30kN < vehicle weight ≤ 160kN	0,7	0,5	0,3
	Category H: roofs	0	0	0
	Snow loads on buildings (see EN 1991-			
	1-3)			
	 Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden 	0,70	0,50	0,20
	- Remainder of CEN Member States,	0,70	0,50	0,20
	for sites located at altitude $H > 1000$			
	m a.s.l.			
	- Remainder of CEN Member States,	0,50	0,20	0
	for sites located at altitude $H \le 1000$			
	m a.s.l.			
	Wind loads on buildings (see EN 1991-	0,6	0,2	0
	1-4)			
	Temperature (non-fire) in buildings (see	0,6	0,5	0
	EN 1991-1-5)			
	Note: The ψ values may set by the National annex.			



source unknown

Limit States

Ultimate Limit State – ULS

states associated with collapse or with other similar forms of structural failure

(1)P The limit states that concern :

- the safety of people, and/or
- the safety of the structure

shall be classified as ultimate limit states.

Serviceability Limit State - SLS

states that correspond to conditions beyond which specified service requirements for a structure or structural member are no longer met

(1)P The limit states that concern :

- the functioning of the structure or structural members under normal use;
- the comfort of people ;
- the appearance of the construction works,

shall be classified as serviceability limit states.

Limit States: Ultimate Limit States

ULS in EN 1990

EQU : Loss of static equilibrium of the structure or any part of it considered as a rigid body, where :

- minor variations in the value or the spatial distribution of actions from a single source are significant, and
- the strengths of construction materials or ground are generally not governing;

STR : Internal failure or excessive deformation of the structure or structural members, including footings, piles, basement walls, etc., where the strength of construction materials of the structure governs ;

GEO : Failure or excessive deformation of the ground where the strengths of soil or rock are significant in providing resistance ;

FAT : Fatigue failure of the structure or structural members.

FAT load combinations are given in the design codes EN1992 – EN1996

Ultimate Limit States: Static Equilibrium

Verifications of static equilibrium

 $E_{\rm d,dst} \le E_{\rm d,stb}$

where :

 $E_{d,dst}$ is the design value of the effect of destabilising actions ;

 $E_{d,stb}$ is the design value of the effect of stabilising actions.



Static Equilibrium Limit States

 $E_{\rm d,dst} \leq E_{\rm d,stb}$

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} \gamma_{G,j} G_{\mathbf{k},j} "+" \gamma_{\mathbf{P}} P "+" \gamma_{\mathbf{Q},1} Q_{\mathbf{k},1} "+" \sum_{i\geq 1} \gamma_{\mathbf{Q},i} \psi_{\mathbf{0},i} Q_{\mathbf{k},i}$$

Persistent and transient design situations	Permanent actions		Leading variable action (*)	Accompanying variable actions	
	Unfavourable	Favourable		Main (if any)	Others
(Eq. 6.10)	$\gamma_{\rm Gj,sup}G_{\rm kj,sup}$	$\gamma_{\rm Gj,inf}G_{\rm kj,inf}$	$\gamma_{Q,1} Q_{k,1}$		$\gamma_{Q,i}\psi_{0,i}Q_{k,i}$
	1,10	0,90	1,5070		1,50 / 0
(*) Variable actions are those considered in Table A1.1					
NOTE 1 The γ values may be set by the National annex. The recommended set of values for γ are :					

$$\begin{split} \gamma_{\rm Gj,sup} &= 1,10\\ \gamma_{\rm Gj,inf} &= 0,90\\ \gamma_{\rm Q,1} &= 1,50 \text{ where unfavourable (0 where favourable)}\\ \gamma_{\rm Q,i} &= 1,50 \text{ where unfavourable (0 where favourable)} \end{split}$$

Structural Failure Limit States



Persistent and transient design situations	Permanent actions		Leading variable action	Accom variable a	panying actions (*)
	Unfavourable	Favourable		Main (if any)	Others
(Eq. 6.10)	$\gamma_{ m Gj,sup}G_{ m kj,sup}$ 1,35	$\gamma_{\rm Gj,inf}G_{\rm kj,inf}$ 1,00	γ _{Q,1} Q _{k,1} 1,50		$\frac{\gamma_{Q,i}\psi_{0,i}Q_{k,i}}{1,50}$

(*) Variable actions are those considered in Table A1.1

Note regarding permanent actions resulting from **one** source:

The partial factor 1,35 applies for all actions originating from **self-weight** if the resulting total effect is unfavourable. Similarly, $\gamma_{inf} = 1.00$ is valid if the resulting total effect is favourable. This also applies if different materials are involved.

Structural Failure Limit States

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} \gamma_{G,j} G_{k,j} + \gamma_{P} P' + \gamma_{Q,1} Q_{k,1} + \sum_{i\geq 1} \gamma_{Q,i} \psi_{0,i} Q_{k,i}$$
(6.10)

or, alternatively for STR and GEO limit states, the less favourable of the two following expressions:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j\geq 1} \gamma_{G,j} G_{k,j} "+" \gamma_P P "+" \gamma_{Q,1} \psi_{0,1} Q_{k,1} "+" \sum_{i>1} \gamma_{Q,i} \psi_{0,i} Q_{k,i} \\ \sum_{j\geq 1} \xi_j \gamma_{G,j} G_{k,j} "+" \gamma_P P "+" \gamma_{Q,1} Q_{k,1} "+" \sum_{i>1} \gamma_{Q,i} \psi_{0,i} Q_{k,i} \\ \end{cases}$$
(6.10a) (6.10b)

Where :

- implies "to be combined with" "+ "
- implies "the combined effect of"
- Σ ξ is a reduction factor for unfavourable permanent actions G

Structural Failure Limit States

$$\sum_{j\geq 1} \gamma_{G,j} G_{k,j} + \gamma_{P} P' + \gamma_{Q,1} Q_{k,1} + \sum_{i\geq 1} \gamma_{Q,i} \psi_{0,i} Q_{k,i}$$
(6.10)

or, alternatively for STR and GEO limit states, the less favourable of the two following expressions:

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j\geq 1} \gamma_{G,j} G_{k,j} "+" \gamma_P P "+" \gamma_{Q,1} \psi_{0,1} Q_{k,1} "+" \sum_{i>1} \gamma_{Q,i} \psi_{0,i} Q_{k,i} \\ \sum_{j\geq 1} \xi_j \gamma_{G,j} G_{k,j} "+" \gamma_P P "+" \gamma_{Q,1} Q_{k,1} "+" \sum_{i>1} \gamma_{Q,i} \psi_{0,i} Q_{k,i} \\ \end{cases}$$
(6.10a) (6.10b)

Where :

- implies "to be combined with" "+ "
- implies "the combined effect of"
- Σ ξ is a reduction factor for unfavourable permanent actions G

Serviceability Limit States

(1) Serviceability limit states in buildings should take into account criteria related, for example, to floor stiffness, differential floor levels, storey sway or/and building sway and roof stiffness. Stiffness criteria may be expressed in terms of limits for vertical deflections and for vibrations. Sway criteria may be expressed in terms of limits for horizontal displacements.

(2) The serviceability criteria should be specified for each project and agreed with the client.



Horizontal Displacements

Serviceability Limit States

	Irreversible effects of		ects of Actions
	Actions		
Serviceability	Characteristic	Frequent	Quasi-permanent
requirements	Combination	Combination	Combination
	w_{tot} or w_{max}	$w_{ m max}$	$w_{\rm max}$
Function and damage			
to non-structural			
members (e.g.			
partition walls,			
claddings, etc) ⁽³⁾			
• Brittle	$\leq L/500$ to $L/360$		
• Non-brittle	$\leq L/300$ to $L/200$		
Function and damage	$\leq L/300$ to $L/200$		
to structural members			
To avoid ponding of			
water.		$\leq L/250^{(4)}$	
Roof covered with			
waterproof membrane			
Comfort of user or			
functioning of		$\leq L/300$	
machinery			
Crane gantry girders,			
deflection due to		$\leq L/600$	
static wheel loads			
Appearance			$\leq L/250$

31/34

Design working life

Definition in EN 1990

assumed period for which a structure or part of it is to be used for its intended purpose with anticipated maintenance but without major repair being necessary



Design working life

(1) The design working life should be specified.

NOTE Indicative categories are given in Table 2.1. The values given in Table 2.1 may also be used for determining time-dependent performance (*e.g.* fatigue-related calculations). See also Annex A.

Design working	Indicative design	Examples		
life category	working life			
	(years)			
1	10	Temporary structures ⁽¹⁾		
2	10 to 25	Replaceable structural parts, e.g. gantry girders,		
		bearings		
3	15 to 30	Agricultural and similar structures		
4	50	Building structures and other common structures		
5	100	Monumental building structures, bridges, and other		
		civil engineering structures		
(1) Structures or parts of structures that can be dismantled with a view to being re-used should				
not be considered as temporary.				

Table 2.1 - Indicative design working life

Design working life

