

**THE IMPLICATIONS OF ADOPTING EUROCODES
FOR DESIGNING DISASTER RESILIENT BUILDINGS
IN SRI LANKA**

H.A. Pathirana

218113B

Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

June 2025

**THE IMPLICATIONS OF ADOPTING EUROCODES
FOR DESIGNING DISASTER RESILIENT BUILDINGS
IN SRI LANKA**

H.A. Pathirana

218113B

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

June 2025

DECLARATION OF THE CANDIDATE

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date: 17.06.2025

Hashini Ayeshika Pathirana

Department of Civil Engineering,

University of Moratuwa.

DECLARATION OF THE SUPERVISOR

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters thesis under our supervision. We confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 22.06.2025

Prof. M.T.R. Jayasinghe,
Senior Professor,
Department of Civil Engineering,
University of Moratuwa.

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 21.06.2025

Prof. C.S. Lewangamage,
Professor,
Department of Civil Engineering,
University of Moratuwa.

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 18.06.2025

Dr. A.U. Weerasuriya,
Senior Lecturer,
Department of Construction and Quality Management,
The Hong Kong Metropolitan University,
Hong Kong

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date: 17.06.2025

Dr. P.L.N. Fernando,
Senior Lecturer,
Department of Civil Engineering,
University of Moratuwa.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to the professional engineers in Sri Lanka, who endeavor to make sure safety, and disaster resilience in both new and existing built environments, benefiting the general public of Sri Lanka.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. M.T.R. Jayasinghe, Senior Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka, for granting me an incredible opportunity to conduct a research study in collaboration with the National Building Research Organization, Sri Lanka. He provided directions to initiate this research study and advice throughout the research study with constructive feedback during each milestone of the research study. His invaluable research vision made my research experience very effective in forming a strong foundation for my future professional career.

I sincerely thank my supervisor, Prof. C.S. Lewangamage, Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for providing directions during the critical stages of this research study as well as for providing valuable feedback during the milestones of the research study.

I gratefully acknowledge my supervisor, Dr. A.U. Weerasuriya, Senior Lecturer, Department of Construction and Quality Management, The Hong Kong Metropolitan University, Hong Kong, for his precious contribution to this research study through his invaluable guidance, encouragement, methodological advice, and critical feedback. His kind assistance has been incredibly helpful in shaping this research study with continuous progress throughout this research study, successfully attending to each milestone of this research study, effectively communicating research findings, and completing this research study on time. His research expertise and knowledge shared through a series of scholarly interactions and critical technical discussions greatly contributed to enhancing the research quality as well as my analytical thinking, research interests, communication skills, and professional growth. I am also thankful for his assistance in accessing important literature and permitting me to utilize remote computer facilities. I am genuinely appreciative of the valuable time he dedicated to supervising my research study, correcting and proofreading my research papers, presentations, and thesis for communicating the research findings in the best manner. His constant support and patience were instrumental in guiding this research in the right direction from its beginning to the end.

I express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. P.L.N. Fernando, Senior Lecturer, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for sharing research ideas, directions and providing feedback during the milestones of this research study.

I also extend my gratitude to the Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for offering this valuable opportunity to pursue a Master of Science degree with a major component of research.

I sincerely appreciate, Dr. Gobirahavan Rajeswaran, Senior Lecturer, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka, for supporting

me in conducting nonlinear analyses in this study, accessing key literature, and providing positive feedback on the research progress. I am also grateful to Prof. Priyan Dias, Emeritus Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa, for helping me to access research data and refine the research methods. My thanks also go to Dr. Isuru Nanayakkara, Department of Civil and Structural Engineering, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom, for his directions in shaping the research methodology.

I acknowledge with gratitude, Eng. (Dr.) Asiri Karunawardena, Director General, National Building Research Organization, for granting me this tremendous research opportunity and providing the necessary facilities to conduct this research study in collaboration with the National Building Research Organization (NBRO). I am genuinely appreciative of positive feedback and suggestions for improvements given to me during the milestones of this research study. I sincerely appreciate his recognition of my abilities and his encouragement to be involved in several key projects related to my research study. These opportunities I received throughout this research journey made me confident in facing new challenges at work. I truly appreciate all these opportunities, which laid a good start and a strong foundation for my professional career and made me confident in communicating research findings to technical audiences.

I extend my sincere gratitude to Eng. (Ms.) K.M.D.N.K. Kahahengoda, Director, Structural Engineering Research and Project Management Division, NBRO, and its Engineering Staff; Eng. (Ms.) Ajantha Basnayake, Eng. (Ms.) Raneesha Gunathunga, Eng. Isuru Ramawickrama, Eng. Rakhitha Amarathunga, Eng. (Ms.) Nelum Perera, Eng. Dilantha Gunathunga, Eng. Tharuka Lakshan, Eng. (Ms.) Sathya Bandaranayake, and Eng. K. Raakulan for their constant support and motivation in completing this research study. I am thankful for the shared knowledge on civil engineering projects, and for creating a collegial and supportive workplace environment of learning and creativity, which provided an excellent opportunity to be involved in both research and official project works, broadening my research and learning experience. I am also grateful for the financial assistance provided by the NBRO, throughout my research studies.

I am also grateful to my friends who contributed ideas and perspectives that enriched this research study.

Last but not least, I am deeply thankful for my parents and my brother for their endless support, constant encouragement, patience, and understanding throughout this research journey.

ABSTRACT

Sri Lanka has prioritized designing disaster-resilient buildings and evaluating the degree of disaster-resilience of the existing buildings due to the challenges posed by natural and man-made hazards. This approach challenges the common practice of the Sri Lankan construction industry to use British Standards as its industrial standards. Since the British Standards had been replaced by Eurocodes, Sri Lanka has started using Eurocodes but without critically evaluating the effectiveness of Eurocodes and national annexes in designing buildings with disaster resilience features. Therefore, it is crucial to evaluate the structural vulnerability of buildings to gravity, wind, and seismic loads. To fulfill these timely needs, this study envisages to examine the effectiveness of Eurocodes and national annexes to design disaster-resilient buildings in Sri Lanka, assessing the degree of disaster resilience of the existing buildings, and examining cost implications. To this end, this study put forwards a novel framework to evaluate the structural resilience of code-compliant and non-code-compliant reinforced concrete buildings under extreme wind and seismic loads. The framework constitutes non-linear static pushover analysis for wind assessments, non-linear dynamic time-history analysis, incremental dynamic analysis, and fragility assessments for seismic evaluations. The framework was first applied to a typical office building before assessing a three-story school building, an eight-story university building, and a six-story hospital building, designed according to Eurocodes (EN1990. (2005), EN 1991-1-1. (2002), EN 1991-1-4. (2010), EN 1992-1-1. (2004), EN 1998-1. (2013)) and Sri Lankan national annexes, as well as a seven-story mixed-use defective building and its retrofitted version. The results showed that the Eurocode-based building designs have a significantly larger base shear capacity than the base shear force triggered by a wind with a 1700-year return period, the highest return period considered for the wind performance evaluation. Although these buildings have reasonable structural resilience against extreme seismic loading, they do not meet the more stringent performance requirements, such as Fully Operational and Operational, in the seismic performance objectives. Therefore, Eurocode-based designs can sometimes fail to meet the performance objectives for structural resilience, even though these objectives are assumed to be implicitly satisfied by the design codes and standards. The analysis of the defective building confirmed the building's inadequate capacity to carry gravity, wind, and seismic loads. The retrofitted building with structural jacketing had enhanced load carrying capacities, indicating the effectiveness of structural jacketing as a retrofitting measure for defective buildings in Sri Lanka. The comparison of material properties, partial safety factors, load combinations, and design methodologies of Eurocodes and British Standards for designing beams and columns revealed that British Standards generally require more reinforcement for a given section size, mainly due to more conservative partial safety factors in load combinations. However, the differences in section sizes and reinforcement requirements strongly depend on the building type and loading conditions, such as gravity loading alone or a combination of gravity and lateral loading.

Keywords: Eurocodes, Buildings, Disaster resilience, Wind loading, Seismic loading

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF THE CANDIDATE	i
DECLARATION OF THE SUPERVISOR	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xix
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. General	1
1.2. Research Problem	7
1.3. Aims and Objectives	8
1.4. Methodology	9
1.5. Significance of the Research	9
1.6. Arrangement of the report	10
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1. General	12
2.2. Wind and earthquake disaster profile in Sri Lanka	12
2.2.1. Documented wind disasters in Sri Lanka's history	12
2.2.2. Documented earthquake disasters in Sri Lanka's history	13
2.3. Sri Lankan practice of designing buildings to resist wind and earthquake hazards.....	13
2.3.1. Codes for designing buildings in Sri Lanka	13
2.3.2. Evolution of wind engineering practices in the Sri Lankan context	14
2.3.3. Evolution of earthquake engineering practices in the Sri Lankan context	15
2.4. The necessity of disaster resilience	16

2.5.	Role of building codes in disaster resilience	20
2.5.1.	Role of code-based building designs in disaster resilience.....	20
2.5.2.	Role of performance-based building designs in disaster resilience	21
2.5.3.	Role of resilience-based building designs in disaster resilience	22
2.6.	Structural resilience	23
2.6.1.	Intensity measures and engineering demand parameters	23
2.6.2.	Performance objectives and limit states	23
2.7.	Performance-based wind engineering (PBWE).....	25
2.7.1.	Current practice of wind engineering.....	25
2.7.2.	Limitations of the current practice of wind engineering.....	25
2.7.3.	Performance-based wind engineering (PBWE) frameworks	26
2.7.4.	Performance levels, performance objectives, acceptance criteria, and assessment methodologies	29
2.7.5.	Component-level performance evaluation of buildings subjected to extreme wind loads	30
2.7.6.	System-level performance evaluation of buildings subjected to extreme wind loads	32
2.8.	Performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE)	33
2.8.1.	Current practice of performance-oriented earthquake engineering	33
2.8.2.	Performance-based earthquake engineering (PBEE) frameworks.....	34
2.8.3.	Performance levels, performance objectives, acceptance criteria, and assessment methodologies	36
2.8.4.	Performance assessment of buildings under extreme earthquake loads 42	
2.9.	Summary	46
CHAPTER 3 : PLANNING, DESIGNING AND CONSTRUCTING SUBSTRUCTURES FOR BUILDING RESILIENCE		48
3.1.	General	48
3.2.	Philosophy of foundation design to seismic loading.....	48
3.2.1.	Fundamentals of soil-structure interaction for the evaluation of seismic loads 49	
3.3.	Foundation failure modes	51
3.4.	Lessons from past earthquake events	51
3.5.	New knowledge/findings from research.....	53

3.6. Good practice for the design and construction of foundations for seismic loads	53
3.7. Summary	55
CHAPTER 4 : LINEAR ELASTIC MODELING, ANALYSIS, DESIGN, AND DESIGN REVIEW.....	56
1.1. General	56
4.2. Case studies	56
4.3. Linear elastic modeling	58
4.3.1. Load schedule.....	64
4.4. Linear elastic analysis	67
4.5. Linear elastic design	68
4.6. Structural design review	68
4.7. Summary	70
CHAPTER 5 : NON-LINEAR INELASTIC MODELING OF BUILDINGS	71
5.1. General	71
5.2. Non-linear inelastic modeling of buildings	71
5.2.1. Structural ductility at the material level by stress-strain plot of materials	72
5.2.2. Structural ductility at the cross-sectional level by force-deformation curves (moment-curvature curves and P-M-M interaction curves)	78
5.2.3. Structural ductility at the member level by force-deformation (moment-rotation) curves.....	81
5.2.4. Assigning hinge properties.....	82
5.3. Summary	83
CHAPTER 6 : ANALYSIS OF BUILDINGS FOR EXTREME WIND LOADING	84
6.1. General	84
6.2. Non-linear static pushover analysis of the buildings.....	84
6.3. Summary	98
CHAPTER 7 : ANALYSIS OF BUILDINGS FOR EXTREME EARTHQUAKE LOADING	99
7.1. General	99
7.2. Ground motion selection	99
7.2.1. Spectrum model	100
7.2.2. Record characteristics	100

7.2.3. Search parameters	101
7.2.4. Additional characteristics	103
7.3. Ground motion matching	103
7.3.1. Target response spectrum of Sri Lanka	104
7.3.2. Original Accelerograms and Matched Accelerograms	106
7.4. Non-linear dynamic time-history analysis, incremental dynamic analysis, and fragility assessment of buildings	107
7.5. Summary	127
CHAPTER 8 : COST IMPLICATIONS OF ADOPTING EUROCODES OVER BRITISH STANDARDS FOR A BUILDING SUBJECTED TO GRAVITY LOADING	128
8.1. General	128
8.2. Design data of the typical building	128
8.3. Preliminary design of the typical building	129
8.4. Structural analysis of the typical building	130
8.4.1. Load combinations	130
8.4.2. Structural analysis results	130
8.5. Structural design of the beams and columns	137
8.5.1. Structural design of the beams for flexure and shear	137
8.5.2. Structural design of the columns for axial loading and flexure	140
8.6. Summary	142
CHAPTER 9 : CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND FUTURE WORK	144
9.1. General conclusion	144
9.2. Recommendations	148
9.3. Future work	149
REFERENCES	152

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Description	Page
Figure 1.1:	Average annual natural hazard occurrence between 1980 – 2020 (World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal)	1
Figure 2.1:	Measure of seismic resilience - conceptual definition (Reproduced from Bruneau et al., 2003)	19
Figure 2.2:	Performance-based wind engineering framework. Adapted from (Griffis et al., 2013).....	28
Figure 2.3:	Performance objective matrix. Adapted from (Griffis et al., 2013)	30
Figure 2.4:	Component deformation acceptance criteria – deformation controlled actions. Adapted from (Griffis et al., 2013)	31
Figure 2.5:	Component deformation acceptance criteria – force-controlled actions. Adapted from (Griffis et al., 2013)	31
Figure 2.6:	Component acceptance criteria – steel beam and column elements. Reproduced from (Mohammadi et al., 2019).....	32
Figure 2.7:	Vision 2000 recommended seismic performance objectives for buildings (after SEAOC, 1995).....	37
Figure 2.8:	Qualitative performance levels of FEMA 273/274/356	38
Figure 2.9:	Performance assessment procedure of FEMA 273/274/356 (after Comartin)	39
Figure 2.10:	PEER analysis methodology (Porter, 2003).....	40
Figure 2.11:	ATC-58 performance prediction flowchart	41
Figure 3.1:	Sketch of the soil-structure interaction problem	50
Figure 3.2:	Collapsed an apartment building after reaching the ultimate limit state of the sub-soil, Taiwan 2018.	52
Figure 3.3:	Typical examples of bearing capacity failure in the city of Adapazari during the 1999 Kocaeli earthquake. Adapted from (Yilmaz et al., 2004).....	52
Figure 4.1:	Finite element model of the typical office building in SAP2000 software (a) 3D view, (b) plan view, (c) a sectional view	58
Figure 4.2:	Finite element model of the school building in SAP2000 software (a) 3D view, (b) plan view, (c) a sectional view	59
Figure 4.3:	Finite element model of the university building in SAP2000 software (a) 3D view, (b) plan view, (c) a sectional view.....	59

Figure 4.4: Finite element model of the hospital building in SAP2000 software (a) 3D view, (b) plan view, (c) a sectional view	60
Figure 4.5: Section sizes and reinforcement details (a) defective column, (b) retrofitted column.....	62
Figure 4.6: Section sizes and reinforcement details (a) defective beam, (b) retrofitted beam	62
Figure 4.7: Finite element model of the defective building in SAP2000 software (a) 3D view, (b) plan view, (c) a sectional view.....	63
Figure 4.8: Finite element model of the retrofitted building in SAP2000 software (a) 3D view, (b) plan view, (c) a sectional view.....	64
Figure 5.1: Stress-strain curve for unconfined concrete	73
Figure 5.2: Stress-strain plots for concrete in the basic structural elements of the typical building	75
Figure 5.3: Stress-strain plots for concrete in the basic structural elements of the school building.....	75
Figure 5.4: Stress-strain plots for concrete in the basic structural elements of the university building	76
Figure 5.5: Stress-strain plots for concrete in the basic structural elements of the hospital building.....	76
Figure 5.6: Stress-strain curve for the high-strength and mild steel reinforcement bars	78
Figure 5.7: Moment-curvature curve for beams and columns of the typical building	79
Figure 5.8: P-M-M interaction curve for columns of the typical building	80
Figure 5.9: PERFORM-3D action deformation relationship.....	81
Figure 5.10: Moment-rotation curve for beams and columns of the typical building	82
Figure 5.11: Structure of a typical compound beam.....	83
Figure 6.1: Principal directions of the buildings a) typical building, b) school building, c) university building, d) hospital building, e) defective building, f) retrofitted building	85
Figure 6.2: Wind load application in the X-direction a) 3D view, b) plan view, c) elevation view	88
Figure 6.3: Wind load application in the y-direction a) 3d view, b) plan view, c) elevation view	88
Figure 6.4: Pushover capacity curves in principal directions of the typical building.....	90

Figure 6.5: Pushover capacity curves in principal directions of the school building	91
Figure 6.6: Pushover capacity curves in principal directions of the university building	91
Figure 6.7: Pushover capacity curves in principal directions of the hospital building	92
Figure 6.8: Pushover capacity curves in principal directions of the defective building	92
Figure 6.9: Pushover capacity curves in principal directions of the retrofitted building	93
Figure 6.10: Comparison of pushover capacity curves of defective and retrofitted buildings – X-direction	97
Figure 6.11: Comparison of pushover capacity curves of defective and retrofitted buildings – Y-direction	98
Figure 7.1: Comparison of code response spectra for hard soil	104
Figure 7.2: Comparison of code response spectra for medium soil	105
Figure 7.3: Comparison of code response spectra for soft soil	105
Figure 7.4: Comparison of response spectrum in Indian seismic code for hard rock with response spectrum for Colombo rock site. Adapted from (Uduweriya et al., 2013)	106
Figure 7.5: Ground motion 1 a) original accelerogram b) matched accelerogram c) response spectra	107
Figure 7.6: Peak spectral accelerations at the fundamental period of the buildings	109
Figure 7.7: Interstorey drift (X3) of the typical building under the seismic excitation of ground motion 1 with 0.1g peak spectral acceleration	110
Figure 7.8: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the X-directional response of the typical building	111
Figure 7.9: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the Y-directional response of the typical building	111
Figure 7.10: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the X-directional response of the school building	112
Figure 7.11: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the Y-directional response of the school building	112
Figure 7.12: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the X-directional response of the university building	113
Figure 7.13: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the Y-directional response of the university building	113

Figure 7.14: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the X-directional response of the defective building	114
Figure 7.15: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the Y-directional response of the defective building	114
Figure 7.16: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the X-directional response of the retrofitted building	115
Figure 7.17: Incremental dynamic analysis curves for the maximum interstorey drift in the Y-directional response of the retrofitted building	115
Figure 7.18: Fragility curves for the X-directional response of the typical building	117
Figure 7.19: Fragility curves for the Y-directional response of the typical building	117
Figure 7.20: Fragility curves for the X-directional response of the school building	118
Figure 7.21: Fragility curves for the Y-directional response of the school building	118
Figure 7.22: Fragility curves for the X-directional response of the university building	119
Figure 7.23: Fragility curves for the Y-directional response of the university building	119
Figure 7.24: Fragility curves for the X-directional response of the defective building	120
Figure 7.25: Fragility curves for the Y-directional response of the defective building	120
Figure 7.26: Fragility curves for the X-directional response of the retrofitted building	121
Figure 7.27: Fragility curves for the Y-directional response of the retrofitted building	121
Figure 7.28: Comparison of fragility curves for X-directional response of defective and retrofitted buildings	123
Figure 7.29: Comparison of fragility curves for Y-directional response of defective and retrofitted buildings	123
Figure 7.30: Comparison of “Fully Operational” fragility curves for X-directional response of the buildings	124
Figure 7.31: Comparison of “Life Safe” fragility curves for X-directional response of the buildings	125

Figure 7.32: Comparison of “Operational” fragility curves for X-directional response of the buildings.....	125
Figure 7.33: Comparison of “Near Collapse” fragility curves for X-directional response of the buildings.....	126
Figure 8.1: Frame identification.....	130
Figure 8.2: Column identification.....	131
Figure 8.3: Axial force diagrams - Eurocode-based typical building.....	132
Figure 8.4: Axial force diagrams – British Standard-based typical building.....	132
Figure 8.5: Bending moment diagrams (M22) - Eurocode-based typical building	133
Figure 8.6: Bending moment diagrams (M22) - British Standard-based typical building	134
Figure 8.7: Bending moment diagrams (M33) - Eurocode-based typical building	135
Figure 8.8: Bending moment diagrams (M33) - British Standard-based typical building	135
Figure 8.9: Shear force diagrams - Eurocode-based typical building.....	136
Figure 8.10: Shear force diagrams – British Standard-based typical building	137
Figure 9.1: Framework to evaluate the degree of structural resilience of new building designs.....	146
Figure 9.2: Framework to evaluate the degree of vulnerability in existing buildings	147

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
Table 2.1:	Common criteria for performance levels	39
Table 4.1:	Schedule of loads on the case study buildings	66
Table 5.1:	Design parameters for unconfined concrete.....	72
Table 5.2:	Confinement details of the main structural elements in the typical building	73
Table 5.3:	Confinement details of the main structural elements in the school building	74
Table 5.4:	Confinement details of the main structural elements in the university building	74
Table 5.5:	Confinement details of the main structural elements in the hospital building	74
Table 5.6:	Design parameters for steel reinforcement bars.....	77
Table 5.7:	Coordinates of the 24th P-M-M interaction curve for the columns of the typical building	80
Table 5.8:	Explanation of PERFORM-3D action-deformation relationship.....	81
Table 8.1:	Basic details of the typical building.....	128
Table 8.2:	Unit weights of materials for the typical building	128
Table 8.3:	Superimposed dead loads on the typical building.....	129
Table 8.4:	Imposed loads on the typical building	129
Table 8.5:	A summary of the preliminary design.....	129
Table 8.6:	Design of beams in the X-direction of the typical building for flexure and shear	138
Table 8.7:	Design of beams in the Y-direction of the typical building for flexure and shear	139
Table 8.8:	Design of columns of the typical building with the maximum axial force	140
Table 8.9:	Design of columns of the typical building with the critical combination of axial force and uniaxial bending moment	141
Table 8.10:	Design of columns of the typical building with the critical combination of axial force and biaxial bending moments.....	141

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
AEL	Annual Expected Loss
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
ATC	Applied Technology Council
BSI	British Standards Institution
BSSC	Building Seismic Safety Council
CIDA	Construction Industry Development Authority
COV	Coefficient of Variation
CPT	Cone Penetration Test
CTBUH	Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat
DDI	Deformation Damage Index
DM	Damage Measure
DOL	Duration of Load
DV	Decision Variable
EC	Eurocode
EDP	Engineering Demand Parameter
EN	Euro Norms
EU	European Union
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FO	Fully Operational
FPHLM	Florida Public Hurricane Loss Model
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IBC	International Building Code
IDA	Incremental Dynamic Analysis
IM	Intensity Measure
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
LRFD	Load and Resistance Factor Design
LS	Life Safe
MEP	Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing

MRI	Mean Recurrence Interval
MWFRS	Main Wind Force Resisting System
NBRO	National Building Research Organization
NC	Near Collapse
NDTHA	Non-linear Dynamic Time-History Analysis
NEHRP	National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program
NSPA	Non-linear Static Pushover Analysis
O	Operational
OMRF	Ordinary Moment Resisting Frame
PBD	Performance-Based Design
PBEE	Performance-Based Earthquake Engineering
PBWE	Performance-Based Wind Engineering
PEER	Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research
QST	Quenched and Self-Tempered
RB	Reinforcement Bar
RC	Reinforced Concrete
RMS	Root of Mean Squares
SDOF	Single Degree of Freedom
SEAOC	Structural Engineers Association of California
SL	Sri Lanka
SMRF	Special Moment Resisting Frame
SPT	Standard Penetration Test
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UDA	Urban Development Authority
UK	United Kingdom
UNDRR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
US	United States Dollar

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Page
	APPENDIX A – GENERAL ARRANGEMENT DRAWINGS OF BUILDINGS.	157
	APPENDIX B – SUMMARY OF WIND LOADS ON BUILDINGS	163
	APPENDIX C – SUMMARY OF SEISMIC LOADS ON BUILDINGS	165
	APPENDIX D – SUMMARY OF STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF BUILDINGS	167
	APPENDIX E – SUMMARY OF STRUCTURAL DESIGN OF BUILDINGS	169
	APPENDIX F – SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS FOR COMPARISON OF STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND DESIGN OF A GRAVITY-LOADED TYPICAL BUILDING BASED ON EUROCODES AND BRITISH STANDARDS	171