



Politecnico
di Bari

Repository Istituzionale dei Prodotti della Ricerca del Politecnico di Bari

ANTAEUS Project for the Regional Vulnerability Assessment of the Current Building Stock in Historical Centers

This is a post print of the following article

Original Citation:

ANTAEUS Project for the Regional Vulnerability Assessment of the Current Building Stock in Historical Centers / Uva, Giuseppina; Casolo, S; Sanjust, C. A.; Mezzina, M.. - In: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE. - ISSN 1558-3058. - STAMPA. - 10:1(2016), pp. 20-43. [10.1080/15583058.2014.935983]

Availability:

This version is available at <http://hdl.handle.net/11589/5781> since: 2022-06-21

Published version

DOI:10.1080/15583058.2014.935983

Publisher:

Terms of use:

(Article begins on next page)



The ANTAEUS Project for the regional vulnerability assessment of the current building stock in historical centres

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Architectural Heritage</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Uva, Giuseppina; Politecnico di Bari, DICATECh Sanjust, Carlo Alberto; Politecnico di Milano, ABC Casolo, Siro; Politecnico di Milano, ABC Mezzina, Mauro; Politecnico di Bari, DICATECh
Keywords:	Seismic vulnerability assessment, Historical centres preservation, Vulnerability index method, Building inventory, Field survey form, GIS mapping

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

The ANTAEUS Project for the regional vulnerability assessment of the current building stock in historical centres

G. Uva¹, C.A. Sanjust², S. Casolo², M. Mezzina¹

Abstract This paper presents a methodology for the seismic vulnerability assessment of current buildings, suitable for the study of historical centres at the regional scale. The applicability is demonstrated with reference to four case studies: the historical centre of the city of Foggia (Italy) and three other small towns of this province, for a total of 4519 housing units. Field data were collected by several teams of technicians by means of a survey form, provided in electronic format. The subsequent data processing and drawing of vulnerability maps was performed using GIS. The collected data were used also for the validation of the algorithm, by comparing the results with those of the GNDT methodology, which is widely adopted in Italy. The results of the research study and the application showed some critical points, related to the poor nature of the information collected and to the reliability of the final results. These issues are analysed and discussed, proposing a strategy for improving the methodology.

Keywords: Seismic vulnerability assessment, Historical centres preservation, Vulnerability index method, Building inventory, Field survey form, GIS mapping.

1 Introduction

The seismic vulnerability assessment at the regional scale is a crucial element of seismic risk prevention and mitigation strategies, which are the challenges of the last decades. Many recent earthquakes have shown that in many countries all over the world the existing building stock is severely at risk, and in many cases, the policies adopted have been inadequate, leaving space to uncoordinated actions, with ineffective or even detrimental effects (D'Ayala and Benzoni 2012).

In the past twenty years, two different approaches for the seismic vulnerability assessment at the regional scale have been developed, generally known as 1st level and 2nd level approach:

¹ G. Uva Politecnico di Bari -- Tel.: +39-081-5963832 -- g.uva@poliba.it

M. Mezzina Politecnico di Bari -- m.mezzina@poliba.it

² C.A. Sanjust Politecnico di Milano -- Tel.: +39-02-2399-4296 -- carlo.sanjust@polimi.it

S. Casolo Politecnico di Milano -- Tel.: +39-02-2399-4356 -- siro.casolo@polimi.it

- 1st level procedures are aimed at a preliminary evaluation based on few empirical parameters. Input data are gathered by simple and quick visual inspections (GNDT 1994, 2000, 2001; Benedetti and Petrini 1984; Corsanego 1993; Goretti and Di Pasquale 2002; Zuccaro 1996; GLABEC 2001; Dolce et al 2003; Lagomarsino and Giovinazzi 2006; Calvi et al 2006; Rota et al 2008; Rota et al 2011).
- 2nd level procedures include more detailed elements about structural characteristics and damage modes. They always operate at a territorial or urban scale, but are usually devoted to a specific building type (churches, palaces, bridges...) and collect more detailed information (Casolo et al 2000; Petrini et al 1999; GNDT 1999a, 1999b; GLABEC 2001; Lagomarsino and Podestà 2004a,b; Casolo and Uva 2011; Mezzina et al 2012; Lagomarsino 2012; Raffaele et al 2013; Casolo et al 2013; Mansour et al 2013)

Recently, multi-level approaches have been introduced (FEMA 2012; RISK-UE 2004; Cosenza et al 2005), which provide different levels of analysis. A progressive and rational increase of the amount of information and accuracy of the results is performed, according to strategic priorities and available resources. A well acknowledged method, in this field, is the HAZUS methodology, which is based on a semi-quantitative approach: the seismic demand (expressed in terms of the Acceleration Displacement Response Spectrum - ADRS), is compared with the structural capacity, expressed by an equivalent acceleration-displacement curve obtained from an incremental non-linear pushover analysis. It is organized into multiple levels, from the regional scale up to the scale of the individual building. All the results provided at a large scale (both regional and urban) have only a relative validity within the considered set of buildings (which shall be sufficiently homogeneous with regard to the typological, structural and constructive aspects). It is possible to sort the buildings by vulnerability/risk level, in order to budget the different intervention options and support the definition of mid and long-term mitigation strategies. Instead, a direct comparison among results relative to very different

1
2
3 geographic areas can be misleading. Finally, the actual safety level of an individual building can
4
5 be obtained by means of a complete structural analysis of the building, that is sometimes referred
6
7 to as the 3rd level analysis (Lagomarsino and Giovinazzi 2006; Casolo and Sanjust 2009; Milani
8
9 et al 2011; Casolo et al 2013).

12 **2 The adopted methodology**

13
14
15 This paper presents the research study ANTAEUS, concerning the regional seismic
16
17 vulnerability assessment of the building stock in the historical centres of the Province of Foggia
18
19 (Puglia, Southern Italy). It is a module of a wider research project funded by Regione Puglia and
20
21 managed by Autorità di Bacino della Puglia (Basin Authority of Puglia), in cooperation with a
22
23 number of public institutions (Department Dicatech of the University “Politecnico di Bari”,
24
25 Municipality of Foggia, Administration of the Province of Foggia). The general regional project
26
27 involves various types of natural risks: earthquake, floods, geo-morphological instabilities,
28
29 landslides, which have been studied by different research groups, and then integrated within a
30
31 Geographic Information System (Castorani et al 2011). The seismic module ANTAEUS has the
32
33 objective of providing the local authorities with methodologies and tools for the quick
34
35 vulnerability assessment of the historical centres in the territory by means of empirical methods,
36
37 which in Italy represent the most widely used approach. The idea is that each municipality can
38
39 gradually plan and implement the procedures for collecting the data and sensitive information
40
41 required for the risk assessment, before an earthquake occurs. The seismic vulnerability and risk
42
43 assessment is organised according to a multi-level scheme, of which the first one is here
44
45 discussed, whereas some details about the other modules of the project can be found in the
46
47 literature (Raffaele et al 2013).
48
49
50
51
52

53 The research scope has been limited to historical centres, in which there are large sets of
54
55 buildings with similar structural characteristics (masonry walls, timber roof and floors...), and it
56
57

1
2
3 seems reasonable to adopt a 2nd level procedure. Nevertheless, there are some drawbacks:

- 4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
1. existing 2nd level forms are dedicated to specific structural typologies (for instance, the GNDT form is restricted to masonry buildings), whereas in many Italian centres there is also a significant amount of RC buildings.
 2. The quantity of data to be collected is extensive and requires the employment of specialised and trained technicians. The survey involves, in general, the inspection of the interior of the building (which is often not accessible, since many Italian historical centres are only inhabited during holiday periods).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

1st level procedures are a possible alternative, widely used for the vulnerability assessment at a large scale (Dolce, 2003), however when managing a relatively small sample of buildings the use of such a basic level of investigation could be poorly significant. Therefore, we have decided to propose a specific survey form and an algorithm for the evaluation of the vulnerability index (ANTAEUS) whose results are directly comparable with those of GNDT (Italian Group for the Defence against Earthquakes) methodology (GNDT 1994; Ferrini et al 2003), which is the Italian reference for the seismic vulnerability assessment. Since GNDT vulnerability index method is aimed at masonry buildings, an extension to RC structures has been suggested. The proposed procedure is described in the first part of the paper (Sections 3, 4, 5).

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The second part of the paper is focused on the extensive application on four representative case studies (the historical centres of *Foggia*, *Carlantino*, *Vico del Gargano* and *Sant'Agata di Puglia*). These towns are different from each other for extension, number of inhabitants, history, constructive and typological characters, geo-morphological condition. Their choice was made in order to provide a representative picture about the 64 municipalities of the Province of Foggia. In general, they might be considered a valid model for many historical centres of Southern Italy. In the selected towns, groups of technicians (architects and engineers) have assessed 4519 buildings by means of rapid visual inspections, filling in the ANTAEUS vulnerability form. The field

1
2
3 survey provided a large database for the application and calibration of the approach. In
4
5 particular, we performed a critical assessment of the quality, representativeness and reliability of
6
7 input data, vulnerability parameters and results. The procedure illustrated in Sections 3-5 is
8
9 based on well-established methods of indirect vulnerability assessment, introducing specific
10
11 variations in the number and type of input data, in the number and definition of vulnerability
12
13 parameters, and in the final algorithm. Side by side with the application of the survey form on
14
15 the selected case studies, it was necessary to check the performance of the procedure, verifying
16
17 the results obtained on a reference benchmark. In particular, in Section 7, a detailed analysis of a
18
19 significant sample of 140 buildings (73 in the Municipality of Foggia; 67 equally distributed
20
21 among the other case studies) was made. Results were systematically compared with two
22
23 different vulnerability index methods: the version applied in Italy by GNDT (Benedetti and
24
25 Petrini 1984; GNDT 1994); the version modified by Tuscany Region (Ferrini et al 2003). The
26
27 procedure described in Sections 4-5 is the final version, obtained after the verification and
28
29 calibration process presented in Section 7. Then, the data about the 4519 buildings were
30
31 implemented in a GIS, plotting different maps representing the spatial distribution of the most
32
33 significant parameters. In particular, the objective was to analyse in detail the quality of the data
34
35 and the uncertainty factors related to the phase of data retrieval (quickness and coarseness of
36
37 rapid visual inspections; possible incompleteness of information; subjectivity of data
38
39 reading/interpretation; inhomogeneity in the level of training and experience of the operators). A
40
41 detailed reliability analysis of the results was performed, in order to identify possible critical
42
43 points, propose a sanitization of the database, and optimize the performance of the procedure
44
45 (Section 8). Throughout all this phase, there was a constant interaction between the scientific
46
47 board and the coordinators of the survey teams, in order to intervene promptly on the survey
48
49 form and solving operational difficulties.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.1 The application context

Puglia was traditionally considered a low seismic risk region, even in the Northern areas (Province of Foggia) that were affected in the past by seismic events: it is worth remembering the destructive Earthquake of 1731, which caused many damages in the city of Foggia (Mezzina 2011). Before 1962, none of the municipalities was classified as seismic. In year 1962, a few municipalities in Gargano and Dauni Mountains were classified, whereas only since June 3, 1981, the seismic hazard in the whole Province of Foggia was acknowledged as medium-high (Figure 1). Therefore, the regional authorities have faced the issue of the seismic risk mitigation at the regional scale much later than other Italian regions. After the Earthquake of Molise and Puglia of 31 October 2002 (Regione Molise 2002), the problem of the territorial inventory of the building stock and appraisal of its level of vulnerability became urgent, and a number of were initiated, among which the pilot research study ANTAEUS.

2.2 The algorithm for the calculation of the vulnerability index

The vulnerability index I.V. is calculated for each building after the filling of a rapid field survey form that contains a number of vulnerability-sensitive information (e.g. materials, constructive elements and details, plan and elevation configuration, type of foundation...). These data are combined into a set of seismic vulnerability parameters, and associated to a vulnerability class (from the lowest - A to the highest - D). The class assigned to each parameter is then translated into a numerical score, according to a conventional pre-defined scale. After assigning the vulnerability class, the score can be modified to take into account for special situations or secondary factors (for instance, the presence of seismic retrofitting or improvement can modify the vulnerability class assigned on the base of the year of construction of the building). The modifiers adopted in the algorithm are listed in the manual (ANTAEUS Project 2011). Finally, the combination of the scores, weighted by proper coefficients, provides the overall vulnerability

1
2
3 index
4
5
6

7 **3 Description of the ANTAEUS form**

8

9
10 The ANTAEUS form is divided into three parts (see Appendix): the first one contains the
11 general data of the building; the second part is the proper vulnerability assessment form
12 (Sections [3.1], [4.1], [4.2]); the third is devoted to the assessment of the actual damage of the
13 building. For each independent structural unit, one form has to be filled in. In the case of more
14 units with structural continuity, we will speak of a *structural aggregate*, and the position of the
15 unit within the aggregate will represent a specific vulnerability factor.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **3.1 General data**

24

25 This part (Sections [1.1][1.2][2.1]) is aimed at clearly identifying the geographical
26 position of the building and defining the general characteristics of the structure by means of
27 pictures and a few sketches in plan.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **3.2 Vulnerability data**

34

35 This part is divided into 3 sections: a general one (Common data - [3.1]), suitable for all
36 types of buildings, and two special sections respectively aimed at masonry building [4.1] and
37 reinforced concrete buildings [4.2]. The attention is focused on the elements that are useful for
38 evaluating the role of the different structural elements on the global seismic behaviour of the
39 building, as briefly described below (for a detailed explanation, see the form reported in the
40 Appendix and the Manual - Project ANTAEUS, 2011).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 ***Common data***

- 50 - *Geometric data [3.1.1]*
- 51
- 52 - *Morphology of the structural unit [3.1.2]:* position of the unit within an aggregate of
53 adjacent units, irregularity in-plan, changes and discontinuities in the elevation of the
54
55
56
57

1
2
3 building, presence of staggered floors, presence of loggias or porches, irregularities in
4
5 the distribution of infill panels (open ground story, short columns...).

- 6
7 - *Topographic factors [3.1.3]*: topographical irregularities that may cause local seismic
8
9 amplification phenomena.
10
11 - *Maintenance [3.1.4]*: presence of damages or deterioration of different structural/non-
12
13 structural parts.
14
15 - *Modifications after construction [3.1.5]*: changes undergone by the building at a later
16
17 stage after its construction (addition of storeys, enlargements, seismic retrofitting...).
- 18
19 - *Non-structural elements [3.1.6]*: vulnerability of non-structural elements that may
20
21 induce damage to property or cause injuries in the event of collapse.
22
23 - *Exposure [3.1.7]*: quantity and quality of elements at risk, number of people possibly
24
25 involved.
26
27

28 29 ***Masonry buildings [4.1]***

- 30
31 - *Vertical structures [4.1.1]*: prevalent type of vertical structures (multiple-choice table is
32
33 given in the manual), percentage of continuous bearing walls on the main façade (in
34
35 elevation), area in-plan of the vertical structures (at the ground floor).
36
37 - *Floors [4.1.2]*: prevalent type of horizontal structures (multiple-choice table is given in
38
39 the manual), possible presence of stiffening structures.
40
41 - *Roof [4.1.3]*: typology (thrusting or non-thrusting), inclination of the pitch, presence of
42
43 reinforced concrete ring beams or steel ties under the roof eaves.
44
45 - *Age of the building [4.1.4]*: This entry takes into account the influence of the age of
46
47 construction on the seismic vulnerability of the building. In order to easily compare
48
49 these data with those derived from the census database (ISTAT – Census of population
50
51 and buildings) and to take into account the evolution of seismic codes in Italy, buildings
52
53 are sorted into pre-defined age classes B_a .
54
55
56
57

Reinforced concrete buildings [4.2]

- *Structural system [4.2.1]*: prevalent type of vertical structures (multiple-choice table is given in the manual).
- *Infill walls [4.2.2]*: percentage of the perimeter walls of the building that are closed by infill panels.
- *Year of construction [4.2.3]*: year of construction of the building, as deduced from the building licence or land registry records.

3.3 Damage assessment [4.3]

Within this section, the possible damage of the structural elements shall be reported, such as, for instance, cracks and deformations that could compromise the structural safety of the unit.

4 Appraisal of the vulnerability for masonry buildings

The following paragraphs describe the procedure adopted for evaluating the vulnerability index in the case of masonry buildings. Instead of the 11 vulnerability parameters provided by the original vulnerability index method (Benedetti and Petrini 1984; GNDT 1994), the number was reduced to 10 (*Parameter 8–Distance between bearing walls* was eliminated). The reason for this reduction is to allow the filling of the forms based on an external survey only. This is a crucial point, since in many case it is not possible to visit the building interior, and the vulnerability assessment would be invalidated. In particular, Parameter 8 of the original GNDT form involves the maximum distance between load-bearing walls, and it cannot be easily evaluated without accessing the building or without a plan of the ground floor.

Moreover, many of the vulnerability parameters have been significantly simplified. The numbering of the parameters, anyway, is left unvaried, in order to facilitate the comparison between the two methods. Hereinafter, the notation URM will be adopted to indicate

Unreinforced Masonry and RM for Reinforced Masonry.

4.1 Vulnerability Parameters

Parameter 1 – Type and organisation of the resisting system - It takes into account the capacity of the building to withstand horizontal loads. This parameter is related to the in-plan organisation of the resisting masonry walls (which should be well distributed along the two main orthogonal directions, and effectively connected each other) and to the presence of rigid floors efficiently connected to the walls.

The first element considered for the assignment of the class is the box-like behaviour of the structure, appraised by considering the following elements: presence and effectiveness of the connections between walls, presence of ring beams or ties. The assignment of the lowest vulnerability class takes also into account the evolution of national seismic codes. It is supposed that the adoption of a more severe seismic classification determines a greater attention to detail and quality of the construction. Finally, the vulnerability class is assigned according to Table 1. After assigning the vulnerability class, the score can be modified to take into account the presence of later alterations of the building (enlargements, additional storeys), seismic retrofitting or improvement interventions. The modifiers adopted in the algorithm are listed in the manual (ANTAEUS Project, 2011).

Parameter 2 – Quality of the resisting system - This parameter describes the quality of the masonry: materials (blocks and mortar), organisation (homogeneity, interlocking...). It is mainly based on a qualitative description, as provided in the Section [4.1.1] of the survey form. In the case of masonry walls with rubble infill, the presence or absence of effective headers is considered as an additional parameter. The assignment of the class is done according to Table 2.

Parameter 3 – Conventional capacity - In the 2nd level GNDT form for masonry buildings, the 3rd parameter used is the conventional resistance, which requires measuring the in-plan area

of the shear walls along two main directions. This must be done by a direct survey of the building, or at least on the basis of existing plan views.

In the case of ANTAEUS form, it was not possible to provide a so detailed level of investigation by the surveyors, who were asked to work quickly. In addition, information available from land registry plans was lacking: for over 50% of the buildings, no plan at all was retrieved. Thence, the evaluation of this parameter was deeply revised, introducing a simpler, alternative index conceived in order to roughly represent the seismic capacity of the building. The fundamental approximation is that each structural unit can be considered a *simple masonry building* according to the definition of current seismic codes (NTC 2008; CEN 2005). For this kind of buildings, no explicit seismic verification is required, and it is admitted that the safety assessment can be performed under the vertical loads alone, with a proper safety factor. According to this approach, we have chosen to express the conventional seismic capacity by means of the following index of resistance to vertical loads (I_{RV}):

$$I_{RV} = \frac{\sigma_M}{f_M/\gamma_M} \quad (1)$$

where:

- γ_M is the partial safety factor for masonry ($\gamma_M = 4.2$, as specified by the Italian Building Code –Chapter 4, Par. 4.5.6.4 for simple masonry buildings);
- f_M is the average compressive strength of masonry;
- $\sigma_M = \frac{N}{A}$ is the normal stress at the ground floor;
- $N = W_T$ is the total vertical load at the ground floor, estimated by considering dead and live loads of all storeys ($\gamma_G = \gamma_Q = 1$) plus the weight of the load-bearing walls (with no deduction for the openings). The calculation is performed with an approximated automatic procedure, taking into account the geometry of the building and the typology of vertical structures (the complete procedure is explained in detail in the manual – ANTAEUS Project,

2011).

The assignment of the vulnerability class is made according to Table 3, on the basis of I_{RV} .

Parameter 4 – Topographic conditions - In the original GNDT procedure, detailed information is required about the topographic condition and foundations of the building. ANTAEUS form only includes qualitative information about the topography (*Morphology of the site* - sec. [3.1.3]), which is visually appraised, whereas specific data about the foundation system - which are nearly impossible to obtain at this level - are disregarded. The assignment of the vulnerability class is made according to Table 4.

Parameter 5 – Floors - In agreement with the 2nd level GNDT form, the assignment of the vulnerability class is based on in-plane stiffness of floors, and on the effectiveness of the connections to the walls. Weighting coefficients are introduced in order to account for the percentage of rigid and well-connected floors with respect to the total amount.

The entries involved are those reported in Section [4.1.2] of the survey form, and the assignment of the vulnerability class is made according to Table 5.

Parameter 6 – Configuration in-plan – This vulnerability parameter is evaluated in the Section [3.1.2] of the form. Two different indicators are considered. The first one is the regularity in-plan: it is the same used by the GNDT method, and the surveyor directly assigns the vulnerability class in the form.

In addition to the GNDT method, the position of the unit within the aggregate is considered as a specific vulnerability factor, as suggested by many recent research studies (D’Ayala and Paganoni 2011; Giovinazzi et al 2004). To this aim, a proper modifier is applied to the vulnerability score (as described in the manual).

Parameter 7 – Configuration in elevation - This parameter takes into account the seismic vulnerability induced by irregularities in elevation (presence of recessed additional storeys, towers...). It is directly calculated by the surveyors - in Section [3.1.2] - with the same method

of the GNDT form.

Parameter 9 – Roof – The vulnerability class associated with this parameter is obtained from Section [4.1.3], assuming that thrusting roofs involve a higher vulnerability level. The presence of ties that can partially eliminate the thrust is also taken into account (Table 6).

Parameter 10 – Non-structural elements – It takes into account the vulnerability and damages induced by non-structural elements (balconies, cornices, eaves, chimneypots...) that are not properly connected to the structure (Section [3.1.6]). Table 7 provides the vulnerability class as a function of the number of vulnerable elements.

Parameter 11 – Maintenance level - This parameter takes into account the general maintenance of the building, structures and fixtures. The assignment of the basic vulnerability class is determined by the presence (and extent) of damage to roofs and vertical structures (Table 8). The presence of damage in non-structural elements, together with the general state of preservation of the building, is taken into account by means of score modifiers (which are reported in the manual).

4.2 Calculation of the vulnerability index - I.V.

For each of the 10 parameters previously described, a vulnerability class (from A to D) is assigned and, according to Table 9, this is translated into a numerical score p_i , which can vary in the range [0,45]. Then, the possible modifiers are applied (the final modified value of p_i cannot exceed the limits of the aforementioned interval).

The vulnerability index I.V. is obtained by a weighted sum of the obtained scores: $p_1w_1 + p_2w_2 + \dots + p_{10}w_{10}$ and can vary within the interval [0, 292.5]. w_i are weighting coefficients (Table 9) introduced in order to calibrate the different influence of each parameter on the overall vulnerability of the structural unit.

Finally, the vulnerability index I.V. is normalized between 0 and 1 according to the

following expression:

$$I.V. = \frac{(p_1w_1 + p_2w_2 + \dots + p_{11}w_{11})}{292.5} \quad (2)$$

Both for scores p_i and weights w_i , the values originally attributed by GNDT were changed in order to balance the different quality of information of the ANTAEUS form. In particular, the importance of parameters 1 and 3 was decreased, since their definition is less accurate. For parameters 5, 7 and 9, instead, weights were not varied.

5 Appraisal of the vulnerability for RC buildings

The application of the vulnerability index method for RC buildings is much less established than for masonry buildings. In this regard, the ANTAEUS project started from the existing references and experiences (GNDT 1999; Regione Molise 2002; Regione Marche 2004; Regione Toscana 2013) for re-elaborating some elements of the methodology: choice of sensitive data, number and type of vulnerability parameters, assignment of the vulnerability classes, scores, weighting coefficients, and combining algorithm. The calculation of the vulnerability index is similar to the one for masonry buildings except for the different range of variation, which is [-27.5, 247.5]. This difference is related to the general lower vulnerability level of this structural system. Moreover, the number of vulnerability parameters is further reduced to 8.

5.1 Vulnerability parameters

Parameter 1 – Type and organisation of the resisting system – The evaluation of the vulnerability of the resisting system is based on the structural typology and the year of construction (Table 10). Besides, it is supposed that the evolution of seismic classification and national seismic codes over the years has involved a higher quality. If seismic retrofitting

1
2
3 interventions have been implemented, the class is assigned by substituting, in Table 10, the year
4
5 of construction with the year of the intervention. Finally, vulnerability score is modified in order
6
7 to take into account the percentage $T\%$ of infill panels with respect to the area of the façade
8
9 (entry [4.2.2] of ANTAEUS form – see Appendix), according to the criteria shown in the manual
10
11 (ANTAEUS Project 2011).
12

13
14 **Parameter 2 – Quality of the resisting system** - This parameter accounts for the quality of
15
16 the resisting system with respect to materials and execution. It is related to the construction year,
17
18 since it is supposed that the evolution of seismic codes involves more stringent requirements
19
20 about the quality and the performance of materials (e.g., introduction of the use of ribbed rebars
21
22 in place of smooth ones). The vulnerability score is assigned according to Table 11.
23

24
25 **Parameter 3 – Index of seismic rating I_{SR}** - This parameter expresses the conventional
26
27 resistance of the building. Under the hypothesis that each examined building was designed by
28
29 respecting in-force building codes, we accept that the actual seismic capacity coincides with the
30
31 design seismic capacity, as required by the code. The index is calculated as the ratio between the
32
33 maximum design base shear V_{des} (provided by the building code in force at the year of
34
35 construction Y_c) and the current one V_{cur} (i.e. calculated according to the present Italian seismic
36
37 code, with reference to the maximum seismic demand in the region):
38
39
40
41
42

$$I_{SR} = \frac{V_{des}}{V_{cur}} \cdot 100 \quad (3)$$

43
44
45
46
47
48
49 The base shears (both design and current one) are calculated by adopting the method of
50
51 *linear static analysis* (the automatic calculation procedure is explained in detail in the manual,
52
53 ANTAEUS Project, 2011). The final assignment of the vulnerability is given in Table 12.
54

55
56 **Parameter 4-6-7-10-11-** For all these parameters, the criteria used to assign the vulnerability
57

class are the same to the case of masonry buildings.

5.2 Calculation of the vulnerability index

For each of the 8 parameters, a vulnerability class (from A to D) is assigned, and this is translated into a numerical score p_i , according to Table 13. Then, the possible modifiers affecting the parameter are applied. In any case, the final modified value of p_i cannot exceed the following limits:

- $0 \div 45$ for parameters 4-6-7-10-11;
- $-10 \div 45$ for parameters 1 and 2;
- $-5 \div 45$ for parameter 3.

If these thresholds are exceeded after the application of modifiers, the score p_i is set back to the maximum or minimum value.

The vulnerability index I.V. is obtained by a weighted sum of the scores obtained for each parameter: $p_1w_1 + p_2w_2 + \dots + p_{11}w_{11}$. It can vary within the interval $[-27.5, 247.5]$ (the weighting coefficients w_i are listed in Table 13).

Finally, the vulnerability index I.V. is normalized between -0.25 and 1, according to the following expression:

$$I.V. = \frac{\{p_1w_1 + p_2w_2 + p_3w_3 + \dots + p_{11}w_{11} + 27.5\}}{220} - 0.25 \quad (4)$$

6 The case study: four historical centres in the Province of Foggia

The ANTAEUS project involved four historical centres in the Province of Foggia (Puglia, Italy): *Foggia*, *Carlantino*, *Sant'Agata di Puglia* and *Vico del Gargano* (Fig. 2), where the survey form described in the previous paragraphs was filled for 4519 residential buildings (90%

are masonry buildings).

6.1 Foggia

Foggia is a city of 150 000 inhabitants, administrative centre of the homonymous province, located at the centre of a vast alluvial plain, and it is built on flat terrain made up of clay. Born as an agricultural centre, the city took some importance in the 13th century, under the reign of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, who established there an imperial seat. Over the centuries, the city became important as the centre of the surrounding agricultural region and underwent considerable expansion. A remarkable seismic event was the earthquake of 1731 (Mezzina 2011), that severely damaged the city and destroyed about one third of the building stock. The current layout of the historical centre is deeply influenced by the reconstruction process that followed: besides the great number of collapsed buildings, unsafe structures were demolished and replaced by one-storey masonry shacks, built with tuff stone and coupled to each other to form large blocks. Over the centuries, people have modified these temporary buildings with expansions, fusions and addition of storeys (Fig. 4), making them a permanent part of the city, as it is clearly visible in the urban fabric (Fig. 3). In the other parts of the old city, the common typology is represented by two-storeys tuff masonry buildings, built before 1919.

6.2 Vico del Gargano

Vico del Gargano is located in the Northern part of the Gargano Promontory, on a hill made up of limestone of dolomitic type. The historical centre grew around the core of the old castle, which is still visible (Fig. 5). Over the years, residential buildings have replaced the ancient city walls, whose path still defines the perimeter of the old town. The geometry of the buildings, mostly built of stone, is strongly unhomogeneous in plan and elevation, also because of alterations made at different times. Masonry is generally very regular, consisting of roughly cut stones, in some cases in weak condition because of the state of abandonment.

6.3 Sant'Agata di Puglia

The town of *Sant'Agata di Puglia* is located at the foot of Apennine Mountains. The town is built on the eastern side of a hill around the ancient castle, which is on the top. The soil consists of a conglomerate with particles of ruditic size. The buildings – usually, two-storey masonry constructions – are built on a steep slope, and characterized by irregularity in elevation (different number of storeys towards the valley and towards the mountain, as shown in Fig. 6). Moreover, many buildings have an underground artificial cave, with the entrance at the lower level. The walls are mostly made up of roughly squared limestone blocks. The maintenance status of the walls is generally good.

6.4 Carlantino

The town of *Carlantino* is also located on the Apennine Mountains, at the extreme border of the Province of Foggia. The town has developed since the 16th century as a farming settlement and has no fortification work that influenced its development. The urban fabric looks sparser than other towns (greater distance between houses and wider streets). On average, buildings are two-storeys, and in many cases have been recently renovated or enlarged. The soil mainly consists of agglomerate of rocks of variable grain and size.

7 Validation of the methodology for masonry buildings: comparison with GNDT method

After completing the survey in the four municipalities, ANTAEUS procedure was statistically validated by comparing it with other established vulnerability methods (GNDT 1994; Ferrini et al 2003). For each municipality, a representative sub-sample of masonry buildings was selected, choosing those for which forms were complete and reliable (Table 12). We restricted our attention on masonry building only, because the overall number of RC buildings involved in

1
2
3 the surveys was small with respect to the total set (less than 10%): the statistical significance of
4
5 the sample would have been limited, compromising the relevance of the validation.
6

7
8 The comparison concerned the GNDT approach for the 2nd level vulnerability assessment of
9
10 masonry buildings in its original version (GNDT 1994) and in the modified version adopted by
11
12 Tuscany Region (Ferrini et al 2003) and extensively applied in 2003. The survey form used in
13
14 the two approaches is equivalent, whereas the main differences concern the values of the
15
16 weighting coefficients attributed to the parameters, as shown in Table 13. When the value of the
17
18 weighting coefficient is not unique but varies within an interval, the table reports the varying
19
20 range and – in round brackets - the mean value obtained on the sample. For each building of the
21
22 sample, the GNDT/Tuscany form was filled by deducing the data from the ANTAEUS form and
23
24 accordingly calculating the vulnerability index. In order to fill the GNDT forms it was necessary
25
26 a further process¹ and – in some cases – an integration by additional surveys.
27
28
29

30 **7.1 Analysis of the results and calibration of the algorithm**

31
32 In this paragraph, the comparison among the results provided by each of the three methods
33
34 (GNDT, GNDT–Tuscany, ANTAEUS) is presented and discussed.
35
36

37 **7.1.1 Analysis of the sample of Foggia**

38
39 In the first instance, the analysis was performed on the sample of buildings of the City of
40
41 Foggia that is the largest one (75 buildings). Figure 7 reports the average score provided by the
42
43 three methods for each of the 11 vulnerability parameters in absolute terms, i.e. without
44
45 normalizing scores and without applying weighting coefficients (the values provided by GNDT
46
47
48
49

50
51 ¹ In many cases, form data were not sufficient, but the attached material (pictures, plan and sectional views...)
52
53 was sufficient for deducing the necessary information.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and GNDT–Tuscany, in absolute terms, are coincident). The major deviations are encountered
4
5 for Parameter 2 (Quality of resisting system), Parameter 3 (Conventional resistance), and
6
7 Parameter 10 (Non-structural elements), which are those for which the ANTAEUS methodology
8
9 has introduced significant simplifications or variations. After the application of the weights and
10
11 normalization, however, the situation changes, and the incidence of these discrepancies is much
12
13 reduced (thanks to the fact that the ANTAEUS algorithm attributes a lower weight to these
14
15 parameters). By analysing in detail the individual weighted parameters, the performance of the
16
17 three methods is different: variations can be noticed among all approaches, for almost all
18
19 parameters. At this stage, it is difficult to perform a direct comparison, whereas it is more useful
20
21 to look at the final objective, that consist in guaranteeing that the vulnerability index is
22
23 substantially consistent among the different approaches. In this sense, the discrepancy between
24
25 the overall vulnerability index in the ANTAEUS method and in GNDT/GNDT–Tuscany is quite
26
27 limited, and could be compatible with the purposes of a large regional scale assessment. It is
28
29 anyway possible to further reduce it, and, to this aim, it is convenient to operate on Parameter 1,
30
31 which contributes for about 40% to the final value (19.9 points on a total of 48.9). After some
32
33 simulations aimed at the optimization of the result, it was decided to reduce the weight of the
34
35 parameter from 1.50 to 0.75.
36
37
38
39

40
41 In Figure 8–left, the distribution of the vulnerability index is plotted for GNDT, GNDT–
42
43 Tuscany, ANTAEUS (1st proposal), modified ANTAEUS (after calibration). These diagrams
44
45 summarize all the observations previously presented, showing, in particular, that the distribution
46
47 relative to the final calibration of the ANTAEUS method is well consistent with the other
48
49 methods.
50

51 52 **7.1.2 Analysis of the samples of Carlantino, Sant'Agata, Vico del Gargano**

53
54 The same comparative analysis was performed for the other three municipalities. By
55
56 applying the calibration proposed for the sample of Foggia (i.e., simply modifying the weight of
57
58

1
2
3 Parameter 1 from 1.50 to 0.75), the difference between the results of the algorithms is
4
5 minimised. In particular, Figure 8–right shows the average values and the distribution of the
6
7 vulnerability index for GNDT, GNDT–Tuscany, ANTAEUS (1st proposal), modified ANTAEUS
8
9 (after calibration).
10

11 12 13 **8 Analysis of the quality of data** 14 15

16 The filling of the survey forms is performed by means of an editable PDF module that can
17
18 be directly interfaced with the database. At the end of field operations, all filled PDF forms are
19
20 processed by a specific software² in order to extract the sensitive data contained in the different
21
22 fields of the form, and create the database to be used for further elaborations.
23
24

25 26 **8.1 Management of incomplete information: reliability of the forms** 27

28 A first screening of the vulnerability forms and the extracted database revealed the presence
29
30 of a large amount of incomplete forms (30% of the total), in which missing data were so many
31
32 as to invalidate the form itself. This number seemed to go beyond the expected physiologic
33
34 percentage, especially considering that ANTAEUS form was specifically designed for extending
35
36 the procedure to the largest possible number of buildings. Invalid forms were analysed in detail,
37
38 in order to discern occasional errors (related to the specific surveyor teams) from reasons
39
40 intrinsic to the structure of the form or compelling boundary conditions. It was ascertained that,
41
42
43
44

45
46 ² Data management and processing has been carried out by means of *open source* software, which ensures
47
48 maximum compatibility and portability of the code. *Pdfk* (<http://www.pdflabs.com/tools/pdftk-the-pdf-toolkit/>) was
49
50 used for data extraction from PDF files and creation of CSV files. *OpenOffice* (<http://www.openoffice.org/>) was
51
52 used for IV calculation and statistical analysis, and *Quantum GIS* (<http://www.qgis.org/>) was used for the plotting of
53
54 the maps.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for most of the invalid forms, the problem was the inability to access the interior of the buildings,
4
5 and thence the lack of information about the structure and related vulnerability data, which are
6
7 fundamental for the application of the ANTAEUS algorithm. In the absence of these
8
9 vulnerability parameters, it is not possible to calculate the vulnerability index and the whole form
10
11 is unusable. Such a problem can be very common for buildings located in Italian historical
12
13 centres, because many houses are uninhabited or used only during holidays.
14
15

16 At this point, a question about the management of incomplete information rises, in order to
17
18 reduce the effects of invalid forms, and we introduced some adjustments in the algorithm by
19
20 providing an automatic a posteriori estimate for missing fields, allowing to proceed in the
21
22 calculation of the vulnerability index, although approximately. In other words, a limited loss of
23
24 reliability was accepted in favour of the increase of the valid samples. Within the framework of a
25
26 regional scale analysis, the interpolation of missing data does not significantly affect the general
27
28 meaning of results.
29
30

31 After this post-processing, it is necessary to control the reliability level of the results and
32
33 keep a trace of defective information, by properly differentiating the quality of forms containing
34
35 revised or integrated data. To this aim, a reliability index I_R was assigned to each form, by taking
36
37 into account the number of extrapolated parameters: the lower the index, the lower the reliability
38
39 of the form. Every time that a missing parameter is forced to an extrapolated value, 1 point is
40
41 subtracted from the reliability index (a value $I_R = 0$ indicates maximum reliability). The
42
43 minimum accepted value of the reliability index is -3. All forms were classified according to
44
45 their reliability index, as shown for example in Figure 9 (which is relative to the city of Foggia,
46
47 after the 2nd survey). In the map, it should be noted that fractional values of the reliability index
48
49 appear. This is due to the evaluation of the parameter “*Area of vertical structures*”, which
50
51 expresses the percentage of masonry piers in-plan, with respect to the total covered area.
52
53
54
55
56 (Section [4.1.1] of the form – see Appendix), which was misinterpreted by some of the survey
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 teams and required a specific evaluation³.
4

5 6 **8.2 Management of operator-dependant errors** 7

8 With regard to the qualitative analysis of data, an important aspect concerns the verification
9 of the efficiency of survey teams with the consequent detection of systematic errors in the
10 surveyed data (subjectivity of reading/interpretation of data; inhomogeneity in the level of
11 training and experience of the operators...). In this regard, a check procedure was provided, by
12 properly processing and analysing the database as a function of the reliability index of buildings'
13 forms. In particular, statistical analyses were made in order to classify forms according to the
14 reliability index, assess the average reliability index for each municipality and, more in detail, for
15 individual teams (Table 14, Table 15). The GIS provides an effective and immediate
16 representation that was particularly useful during the operational phase of survey for
17 immediately identifying problems. For example, Table 15 shows that the quality of data
18 collected by the different teams in the city of Foggia is quite heterogeneous. There was no
19 particular evidence of a geographic correlation, that is to say, a same team has a reliability level
20 that is substantially constant over all the different areas of competence (i.e., the reliability cannot
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

³ Occasionally the values reported were grossly incorrect, since probably some teams had reported the absolute value of the vertical structures, expressed in square meters. The parameter was checked and recalculated as follows:

- Values comprised in the range [0.15, 0.30] were considered valid (% of covered area).
- In a first instance, values >1 were interpreted as the area [m²] of the vertical structures. The % value was numerically calculated. If this was comprised in the interval [0.15, 0.30], it was accepted, but the reliability index was penalized by 0.5 points.
- In all other cases, the value was considered invalid, and the area of the vertical structures was conventionally set to 20% of the covered area in-plan (which was the average value of the parameter on valid forms). The reliability index was penalized by 1 point.

1
2
3 be ascribed to an objective difficulty in retrieving data at certain locations). Based on this
4
5 analysis, the coordinators of the teams were promptly alerted for a rapid intervention and
6
7 possible sanitization of the problem.
8

9
10 In *Vico del Gargano*, instead, the map of the vertical structures showed a cluster of
11
12 buildings with a masonry typology different from the surroundings, whereas it was expected to
13
14 find uniform masonry fabric. The comparison with the spatial distribution of survey teams
15
16 revealed that the whole cluster had been assigned to a single team, who made a systematic error
17
18 in the interpretation of this factor (Figure 11). In this case, coordinators were alerted and the
19
20 error was promptly corrected.
21
22

23 24 **9 Application of the algorithm and discussion of the results**

25 26 27 *Municipality of Foggia*

28
29 The average value of the I.V. calculated for masonry buildings (about 93% of total) with the
30
31 modified ANTAEUS algorithm is equal to 0.45. It can be noticed that the average values
32
33 obtained over the entire population are very similar to the values obtained on the basis of the
34
35 sub-sample selected for the calibration (Table 14), which confirms the validity of the calibration
36
37 procedure. Figure 12 shows the map of the index of vulnerability calculated with the modified
38
39 version of the ANTAEUS algorithm.
40
41

42 43 *Municipalities of Vico del Gargano, Sant'Agata di Puglia and Carlantino*

44
45 The average value of the I.V. calculated on the entire population of buildings with the
46
47 modified ANTAEUS algorithm is equal to 0.51 for Vico del Gargano, 0.56 for Sant'Agata di
48
49 Puglia and 0.46 for Carlantino (Table 15). These data are consistent with the prediction provided
50
51 by the preliminary analysis carried out on the samples.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

10 Final Remarks

The main objective of the research study was to develop and validate a procedure that can be applied at a large, regional scale by local authorities, in order to obtain a pre-event vulnerability assessment and establish a rational basis for the risk mitigation strategies and territorial development policies. In this sense, this regional project represents, in Puglia, a pilot experience that could be extended to other areas of Southern Italy presenting a building stock with similar characteristics.

The proposed survey procedure is quite simple, excluding data that were too unreliable and difficult to retrieve, in order to rationalise the fieldwork and limit as much as possible uncertainty and errors. A specific survey form is provided, which is an editable PDF module directly connected with a database, together with an algorithm for the appraisal of the index of vulnerability. The procedure is derived by the classical GNDT method, even if some significant modifications of the survey form and the vulnerability algorithm were introduced, with the idea of obtaining a simplification and a better accounting for the regional features.

Actually, since Puglia is a low-medium hazard region, few observational data about post-earthquake events are available, which makes impossible to perform a statistical validation. The validation of the ANTAEUS procedure, thence, was made with an indirect approach, by performing a detailed comparison, on a sample of buildings, with the results provided by GNDT and GNDT-Tuscany methods. The results were critically evaluated, introducing the necessary calibrations, which actually consisted in the adjustment of the weighting coefficient for one parameter (see Section 7.1). Overall, the three compared methods exhibit discrepancies with regard to individual parameters, but the correspondence in terms of the final vulnerability index is good.

The results can be considered satisfactory within the scope and objectives of the project: the

1
2
3 assessment procedure was performed by using a very simplified data-sheet and in a short time by
4
5 providing an estimate of the vulnerability level compatible with more detailed approaches. An
6
7 important issue considered in the study was the analysis of the quality of the data with respect to
8
9 the issue of the uncertainty factors related to the phase of data retrieval (quickness and roughness
10
11 of rapid visual inspections, possible incompleteness of collectable information, subjectivity of
12
13 data reading/interpretation...). A detailed reliability analysis of the results was performed, in
14
15 order to identify critical points and propose a sanitization of the database. The management of
16
17 incomplete/erroneous data was made by activating a fruitful interaction between the scientific
18
19 board and the coordinators of the survey teams, and allowing a prompt intervention both on
20
21 theoretical aspects (by means of proper a-posteriori re-elaboration of data) and operational issues
22
23 (by performing *ad hoc* controls and integrations on site).
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 **Acknowledgements** This research project was developed with the financial support and
31
32 coordination of *AdB Puglia - Autorità di Bacino della Regione Puglia (Basin Authority of*
33
34 *Puglia)*, within the program “Studio di Fattibilità per il Monitoraggio e la Messa in Sicurezza
35
36 delle Aree Urbane a Rischio di Stabilità Statica e Vulnerabilità Strutturale nella Città e Provincia
37
38 di Foggia” (CIPE 20/2004). In particular, the results presented in this paper were achieved
39
40 thanks to specific financial and scientific agreements stipulated between the local governments
41
42 (Province of Foggia and City of Foggia) and Politecnico di Milano, and between AdB Puglia and
43
44 Politecnico di Bari.
45
46
47

48 **11 References**

49
50
51 ANTAEUS Project, 2011- *Research Program “Studio di Fattibilità per il Monitoraggio e la*
52
53 *Messa in Sicurezza delle Aree Urbane a Rischio di Stabilità Statica e Vulnerabilità*
54
55 *Strutturale nella Città e Provincia di Foggia”*, Politecnico di Bari, Politecnico di
56

- 1
2
3 Milano, Province of Foggia and City of Foggia.
4
5 http://www.stru.polimi.it/people/sanjust/bacheca/Manuscripts/ANTAEUS_manual.pdf
6
7 Benedetti D., Petrini V. 1984. Sulla vulnerabilità sismica di edifici in muratura: un metodo di
8
9 valutazione (*On the seismic vulnerability of masonry buildings: a method of evaluation*).
10
11 *L'industria delle costruzioni* 18(149):66–74. (In Italian)
12
13 Calvi G., Pinho R., Magenes G., Bommer J., Restrepo-Velez L., Crowley H. 2006. Development
14
15 of seismic vulnerability assessment methodologies over the past 30 years. *ISSET Journal*
16
17 of Earthquake Technology 43(3):75–104, <<http://home.iitk.ac.in/vinaykg/Iset472.pdf>>
18
19 Casolo S., Milani G., Uva G., Alessandri C., 2013. Comparative seismic vulnerability analysis
20
21 on ten masonry towers in the coastal Po Valley in Italy. *Eng. Struct.* 49:465–490.
22
23 Casolo S., Neumair S., Parisi M.A., Petrini V. (2000) Analysis of seismic damage patterns in old
24
25 masonry church facades. *Earthq. Spectra* 16(4):757–773,
26
27 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1193/1.1586138>
28
29 Casolo S., Sanjust C.A., 2009. Seismic analysis and strengthening design of a masonry
30
31 monument by a rigid body spring model: The “Maniace Castle” of Syracuse. *Eng. Struct.*
32
33 31(7):1447–1459
34
35 Casolo S., Uva G., 2011. Seismic vulnerability assessment of masonry towers: Full non-linear
36
37 dynamics vs pushover analyses. *Proceedings of COMPDYN 2011: 3rd International*
38
39 *Conference on Computational Methods in Structural Dynamics and Earthquake*
40
41 *Engineering: An IACM Special Interest Conference, Corfu, Greece, 2011.*
42
43 Castorani A., Di Santo R., Fratino U., Limongelli R., Mezzina M., Pagano A., Raffaele D., Trulli
44
45 I. 2011. Methodological Approach to Evaluate Multihazard Risk on Bridges and
46
47 Viaducts. *Italian Journal of Engineering Geology and Environment*, Special Issue 1, pp.
48
49 19-32. DOI: 10.4408/IJEGE.2011-01.S-02
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 CEN, 2005. *EuroCode8: Design of structures for earthquake resistance - Part 1: General rules*,
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 seismic actions and rules for buildings. European Standard approved by CEN on 23 April
4
5 2004.
6
7 Civil Protection Department of the Presidency of Council of Ministers. Website
8
9 http://www.protezionecivile.gov.it/jcms/it/terremoto_molise_2002.wp
10
11 Corsanego A., 1993. Sismic risk assessment at the urban and regional scale in Italy: some
12
13 examples. *Ann. di Geofis.* 36(1):211–218.
14
15 Cosenza E., Manfredi G., Polese M., Verderame G.M. 2005. A multi-level approach to the
16
17 capacity assessment of existing RC buildings. *J. Earthquake Eng.* 9(1):1–22
18
19 D’Ayala D., Benzoni G. 2012. Historic and traditional structures during the 2010 Chile
20
21 earthquake: Observations, codes, and conservation strategies. *Earthq. Spectra* 28 (1):
22
23 S425–S451.
24
25 D’Ayala D., Paganoni S. 2011. Assessment and analysis of damage in L’Aquila historic city
26
27 centre after 6th April 2009. *B. Earthq. Eng.* 9(1):81–104, DOI 10.1007/s10518-010-
28
29 9224-4
30
31
32
33 Dolce M., Masi A., Marino M., Vona M. 2003. Earthquake Damage Scenarios of the Building
34
35 Stock of Potenza (Southern Italy) Including Site Effects. *B. Earthq. Eng.* 1(1):115.
36
37 FEMA. 2012. *Multi-hazard Loss Estimation Methodology Technical Manuals and User’s*
38
39 *Manuals for: the Earthquake Advanced Engineering Building Module (AEBM), the*
40
41 *Earthquake Model, the Flood Model, and the Hurricane Model.* Federal Emergency
42
43 Management Agency (FEMA), National Institute of Building Sciences, Washington DC,
44
45 USA
46
47
48
49 Ferrini M., Melozzi A., Pagliuzzi A., Scarparolo S. 2003. *Manuale di rilevamento della*
50
51 *vulnerabilità sismica degli edifici in muratura, per la compilazione della Scheda*
52
53 *GNDT/CNR di II livello – versione modificata dalla Regione Toscana.* Regione Toscana
54
55 – Direzione Generale delle Politiche Territoriale e Ambientali. (In Italian).
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Giovinazzi S, Balbi A, Lagomarsino S, 2004. Un modello di vulnerabilità per gli edifici nei
4 centri storici (*A vulnerability model for buildings in historical centres*). In: *Proceedings*
5
6
7 *XI Convegno ANIDIS - L'Ingegneria Sismica in Italia*, Genoa, Italy, 2004, (In Italian)
8
9
10 GLABEC. 2001. *Post-Earthquake emergency – Survey form for monumental buildings –*
11
12 *Churches*. Work Group for the protection of the Cultural Heritage from natural risks DM
13
14 n. 133 23/01/2001, Rome, Italy, <[http://www.beniculturali.it/-](http://www.beniculturali.it/-mibac/multimedia/MiBAC/documents/1338454237471_allegato4.pdf)
15
16 [mibac/multimedia/MiBAC/documents/1338454237471_allegato4.pdf](http://www.beniculturali.it/-mibac/multimedia/MiBAC/documents/1338454237471_allegato4.pdf)>
17
18
19 GNDT. 1994. *Scheda di esposizione e vulnerabilità e di rilevamento danni di primo livello e*
20
21 *secondo livello (muratura e cemento armato) (Exposition, vulnerability and damage - 1st*
22
23 *and 2nd level survey form)*. GNDT - (Italian Group for the defense against earthquakes),
24
25 (In Italian)
26
27
28 GNDT. 1999. *Vulnerability Inventory of strategic and special buildings in Abruzzo, Basilicata,*
29
30 *Calabria, Campania, Molise, Puglia and Eastern Sicilia*. Tech. rep., GNDT - (Italian
31
32 Group for the Defense Against Earthquakes), Italian Ministry of Labour, Civil Protection,
33
34 Rome, Italy, URL <ftp://ftp.ingv.it/pro/gndt/Pubblicazioni/Censimenti.htm>. (In Italian)
35
36
37 GNDT, 2000. *Vulnerability survey of part of residential buildings in Abruzzo, Basilicata,*
38
39 *Calabria, Campania, Molise and Sicily Regions*. Tech. rep., GNDT - (Italian Group for
40
41 the defense against earthquakes), Italian Ministry of Labour, Civil Protection, Rome,
42
43 Italy, (In Italian)
44
45
46 GNDT. 2001. *Survey of monumental buildings located in national or regional natural parks*.
47
48 Tech. rep., GNDT - (Italian Group for the defense against earthquakes), Italian Ministry
49
50 of Labour, Civil Protection, Rome, Italy. (In Italian)
51
52
53 Goretta A., Di Pasquale G. 2002. An overview of post-earthquake damage assessment in Italy.
54
55 In: *Eeri Invitational Workshop An Action Plan To Develop Earthquake Damage And*
56
57 *Loss Data Protocols*, Pasadena, California, USA

- 1
2
3 Lagomarsino S. 2012. Damage assessment of churches after L'Aquila earthquake (2009). B.
4
5 Earthq. Eng. 10:73–92, doi:10.1007/s10518-011-9307-x
6
7 Lagomarsino S., Giovinazzi S. 2006. Macro seismic and mechanical models for the vulnerability
8
9 and damage assessment of current buildings. B. Earthq. Eng. 4(4):415,
10
11 doi:10.1007/s10518-006-9024-z
12
13 Lagomarsino S., Podesta S. 2004a. Seismic vulnerability of ancient churches: I. damage
14
15 assessment and emergency planning. Earthq. Spectra 20(2):377–394
16
17 Lagomarsino S., Podestà S. 2004b. Seismic vulnerability of ancient churches: II. Statistical
18
19 analysis of surveyed data and methods for risk analysis. Earthq. Spectra 20(2):395–412
20
21
22 Mansour A.K., Romdhane N.B., Boukadi N. 2013. An inventory of buildings in the city of Tunis
23
24 and an assessment of their vulnerability. B. Earthq. Eng. 11:1563-1583
25
26
27 Mezzina M. 2011. Ricostruire dopo il terremoto: due esperienze illuministe alla periferia del Regno
28
29 Borbonico (in Italian). *Proc. XIV Convegno Anidis*, Bari (Italy), 18-20 September 2011.
30
31 Mezzina M., Palmisano F., Raffaele D. 2012. A simplified procedure to evaluate seismic
32
33 vulnerability of R.C. circular bridge piers. *Proceedings of the Sixth International*
34
35 *Conference on Bridge Maintenance, Safety and Management*, Taylor & Francis –
36
37 Balkema, Stresa, Italy, pp 3525–3532
38
39
40 Milani G., Casolo S., Naliato A., Tralli A. 2011. Seismic Assessment of a Medieval Masonry
41
42 Tower in Northern Italy by Limit, Nonlinear Static, and Full Dynamic Analyses. *Int. J. of*
43
44 *Archit. Herit.* 6(5):489–524, doi:10.1080/15583058.2011.588987
45
46
47 NTC. 2008. Norme Tecniche per le Costruzioni (*Italian Building Code*) - NTC. Gazzetta
48
49 Ufficiale n. 29 - Suppl. Ordinario n. 30
50
51
52 Petrini V., Casolo S., Doglioni F. 1999. Models for vulnerability analysis of monuments and
53
54 strengthening criteria. In: *Proceedings of the XI European Conference on Earthquake*
55
56 *Engineering*, Baalkema, Paris, vol of Invited Lectures, pp 179–198.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Raffaele D., Mezzina M., Tosto A.F. 2013a. Overview on the regional scale analysis of school
4 buildings in Puglia (Italy). In: *Proceedings of COMPDYN 2013 – 4th ECCOMAS*
5 *Thematic Conference on Computational Methods in Structural Dynamics and*
6 *Earthquake Engineering*, Kos Island, Greece, 12-14 June 2013.
7
8
9
10
11 Raffaele D., Porco F., Fiore A., Uva G. 2013b. Simplified vulnerability assessment of reinforced
12 concrete circular piers in multi-span simply supported bridges. *Struct. Infrastruct. E.* pp
13 1–13, doi:10.1080/15732479.2013.772642
14
15
16
17
18 Regione Marche. 2004. *Rischio Sismico nelle Regione Marche (Seismic Risk in Marche Region)*.
19 (In Italian) [http://rischiosismico.regione.marche.it/web/RISCHIO-](http://rischiosismico.regione.marche.it/web/RISCHIO-SI/Vulnerabil/index.htm)
20 [SI/Vulnerabil/index.htm](http://rischiosismico.regione.marche.it/web/RISCHIO-SI/Vulnerabil/index.htm).
21
22
23
24 Regione Molise. 2002. Servizio Informativo Sisma 2002 (*Molise Region: information on 2002*
25 *seismic event*), 2002. (In Italian). Last accessed: 14 Nov. 2013.
26
27 <<http://www.regione.molise.it/web/grm/sis.nsf>>.
28
29
30
31 Regione Toscana. 2013. *Il rischio sismico nelle Regione Toscana (Seismic risk in Tuscany)*,
32 2013. Last accessed: 14 Nov. 2013. (In Italian)
33
34 <<http://www.rete.toscana.it/sett/pta/sismica/index.shtml>>.
35
36
37
38 RISK-UE. 2004. *An advanced approach to earthquake risk scenarios with applications to*
39 *different European towns (RISK-UE)*.
40
41 http://cordis.europa.eu/search/index.cfm?fuseaction=proj.document&PJ_RCN=4939039
42
43
44
45 Rota M., Penna A., Strobbia C. 2008. Processing Italian damage data to derive typological
46 fragility curves. *Soil Dyn. Earthq. Eng.* 28(10–11):933–947,
47
48 doi:10.1016/j.soildyn.2007.10.010
49
50
51 Rota M., Penna A., Strobbia C., Magenes G. 2011. Typological seismic risk maps for Italy.
52 *Earthq. Spectra* 27(3):907–926, doi:10.1193/1.3609850
53
54
55
56 Zuccaro G. 1996. *Metodi di Analisi di Vulnerabilità e Matrici di Probabilità del Danno*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (*Vulnerability analysis methods and damage probability matrices*). In: *Proceedings Of*
4
5 *the Conference “La Meccanica delle Murature tra Teoria e Progetto”*, Messina, Italy.

6
7 (In Italian).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only



12 Appendix

The ANTAEUS Vulnerability form is an editable PDF file, which is intended to be filled in directly on site by the surveyor by means of portable devices (like for instance a tablet). After a final phase of deskwork, when data are checked and additional information is uploaded (land registry plans, pictures, sketches...), the file is closed and sent to the remote system, which automatically extract numerical data and store them in the database. In this appendix, a print of the PDF module is reported, showing the different sections and entries to be filled, which are recalled and described in the different paragraphs of the paper.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ANTAEUS Form for seismic vulnerability survey		S.U. Number	
Structural unit survey form		Aggregate <input type="text"/>	Building <input type="text"/>
1.1	General data		
Team <input type="text"/> Date <input type="text"/> Municipality <input type="text"/>			
Address <input type="text"/> n. <input type="text"/>			
Census code p. <input type="text"/> Census code m. <input type="text"/> Cens. sect. <input type="text"/>			
Cadastral sheet <input type="text"/> Cadastral map <input type="text"/> Sub. <input type="text"/>			
1.2	Photographic survey		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elevation <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Elevation <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Elevation <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Elevation <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.1	Graphic survey
	
Location (1:500 aggregate plan, aerial view)	
	
Ground floor plan	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4.1 <input type="checkbox"/>		MASONRY			
Vulnerability indicators		Instructions			
1	Vertical structures Typology: <input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> grouted masonry Piers* [% on façade]: <input type="text"/> Area of vertical struct. <input type="text"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> headers <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> tie rods <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No Effective <input type="checkbox"/> quoins <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> ring beams <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No		Typology of vertical structures M1.1 Rubble stone M3.1 Unreinforced brick masonry M1.2 Irregular stone masonry M3.2 Reinforced brick masonry M1.3 Regular stone masonry M2 Tuff blocks NR Not surveyed		
	2	Floors Typology: <input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> stiff <input type="checkbox"/> well connected		Typology of floors: O1 Wooden structure O4 Masonry vaults O2 Brick and concrete O3 Brick and steel NR Not surveyed	
		3	Roof Typology: <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> Pushing <input type="radio"/> Partially pushing <input type="radio"/> Non-pushing Pitch: <input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> ties or ring beams		Typology of roof: C1 Wooden structure C4 Masonry vaults C2 Brick and concrete C3 Steel NR Not surveyed
	4		Age of the building Age class: <input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated		Age class: 1 Before 1919 6 From 1972 to 1981 2 From 1919 to 1930 7 From 1982 to 1987 3 From 1931 to 1945 8 After 1987 4 From 1946 to 1961 5 From 1962 to 1971
4.2 <input type="checkbox"/>		REINFORCED CONCRETE			
Vulnerability indicators		Instructions			
1	Structural system Typology: <input type="text"/>		Typology of structural system RC1 RC frames RC4 Frames and RC walls RC2 Internal frames and perimeter load-bearing walls RC5 Frames and RC shear walls RC3 RC frames with strong infill walls NR Not surveyed		
	2	Infill Infill on façade [%]: <input type="text"/>		Infill on façade: you should report the percentage of infill compared to the lateral surface of the building.	
		3	Age of the building Year of construction: <input type="text"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Estimated		
4.3		DAMAGE ASSESSMENT			
Vertical struct.: <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> G <input type="radio"/> L <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> A Roof: <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> G <input type="radio"/> L <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> A Floors: <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> G <input type="radio"/> L <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> A Infill: <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> G <input type="radio"/> L <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> A Stairs: <input type="text"/> <input type="radio"/> G <input type="radio"/> L <input type="radio"/> A <input type="radio"/> A		Damage level: G Serious L Slight A None			
4.4		NOTES			
		SIGNATURE			

* See manual

13 List of Figures

Figure 1: Evolution of seismic classification in the Province of Foggia: 1935, 1962, 1981, 2004

Figure 2: Localization of the historical centers object of this study. The Province of Foggia (Puglia), is shaded in gray.

Figure 3: The historical centre of Foggia, with the surveyed buildings in evidence. The area object of the reconstruction of 1731 is marked in red.

Figure 4: On the left, an example of the original configuration of the houses built after the 1731 earthquake. On the right, the same typology of houses after the addition of a storey and an enlargement.

Figure 5: A view of the historical centre of Vico del Gargano (left), and an example of the reuse of the city walls (right).

Figure 6: A view of Sant'Agata historical centre (left), and an example of the typical structural aggregate, built on a slope with two level elevations (right).

Figure 7: Sample of Foggia (top), Carlantino, Sant'Agata, Vico del Gargano (bottom): distribution curves of the vulnerability parameters for GNDT/GNDT–Tuscany (light gray) and ANTAEUS (dark gray).

Figure 8: Distribution curves of the Vulnerability Index for GNDT, GNDT–Tuscany, ANTAEUS and modified ANTAEUS methods. Left: sample of Foggia; sample of Carlantino, Sant'Agata, Vico del Gargano.

Figure 9: Historical centre of Foggia: spatial distribution of the Reliability Index (2nd survey).

Figure 10: Distribution of the reliability index among the surveyed buildings.

Figure 11: Vico del Gargano: comparison between the spatial distribution of masonry types

1
2
3 and survey teams.

4
5 Figure 12: Vulnerability map of Foggia historical centre (modified ANTAEUS algorithm).

6
7 Figure 13: Vulnerability map of Vico del Gargano historical centre (modified ANTAEUS
8
9 algorithm).

10
11 Figure 14: Vulnerability map of Sant'Agata di Puglia historical centre (modified ANTAEUS
12
13 algorithm).

14
15 Figure 15: Vulnerability map of Carlantino historical centre (modified ANTAEUS
16
17 algorithm).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

14 List of Tables

Table 1: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 1 (Y_c is the year in which the municipality has been seismically classified for the first time).

Table 2: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 2.

Table 3: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 3.

Table 4: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 4.

Table 5: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 5.

Table 6: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 9.

Table 7: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 10.

Table 8: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 11.

Table 9: Masonry Buildings: weights and scores of the vulnerability parameters.

Table 10: RC buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 1 (B_y = year of construction of the building; Y_c = year of seismic classification of the municipality).

Table 11: RC buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 2 (B_y = year of construction of the building).

Table 12: RC buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 3 (B_y = year of construction of the building).

Table 13: RC buildings: weights and scores of the vulnerability parameters for RC buildings.

Table 14: Reliability index of the survey forms for the 4 municipalities (4385 total forms).

Table 15: Analysis of the reliability index for the City of Foggia.

Table 16: Total number of buildings surveyed with the ANTAEUS form, number of samples for which the GNDT forms were filled in.

Table 15: Values of the weights used to calculate the vulnerability index for masonry

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

buildings.

Table 16: Comparison among the results of *GNDT*, *GNDT-Tuscany* and *ANTAEUS* for masonry buildings (all parameters are weighted and normalized).

Table 17: Statistics for masonry buildings - comparison between weighted averages obtained by *ANTAEUS* algorithm.

For Peer Review Only




Figure 1: Evolution of seismic classification in the Province of Foggia: 1935, 1962, 1981, 2004

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2: Localization of the historical centers object of this study. The Province of Foggia (Puglia), is shaded in gray.




Figure 3: The historical centre of Foggia, with the surveyed buildings in evidence. The area object of the reconstruction of 1731 is marked in red.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 4: On the left, an example of the original configuration of the houses built after the 1731 earthquake. On the right, the same typology of houses after the addition of a storey and an enlargement.

Peer Review Only



Figure 5: A view of the historical centre of Vico del Gargano (left), and an example of the reuse of the city walls (right).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 6: A view of Sant'Agata historical centre (left), and an example of the typical structural aggregate, built on a slope with two level elevations (right).

Peer Review Only




Figure 7: Sample of Foggia (top), Carlantino, Sant'Agata, Vico del Gargano (bottom): distribution curves of the vulnerability parameters for GNDT/GNDT-Tuscany (light gray) and ANTAEUS (dark gray).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 8: Distribution curves of the vulnerability index for GNDT, GNDT–Tuscany, ANTAEUS and modified ANTAEUS methods. Left: sample of Foggia; sample of Carlantino, Sant'Agata, Vico del Gargano.

For Peer Review Only




Figure 9: Historical centre of Foggia: spatial distribution of the reliability index (2nd survey).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 10: Distribution of the reliability index among the surveyed buildings.

For Peer Review Only



Figure 11: Vico del Gargano: comparison between the spatial distribution of masonry types and survey teams.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 12: Vulnerability map of Foggia historical centre (modified ANTAEUS algorithm).

Review Only




Figure 13: Vulnerability map of Vico del Gargano historical centre (modified ANTAEUS algorithm).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 14: Vulnerability map of Sant'Agata di Puglia historical centre (modified ANTAEUS algorithm).

Review Only




Figure 15: Vulnerability map of Carlantino historical centre (modified ANTAEUS algorithm).

Table 1: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 1 (Y_c is the year in which the municipality has been seismically classified for the first time).

Masonry Buildings					
Parameter 1 - Type and organisation of the resisting system					
Age class	RM	URM			
		Presence of quoins		No quoins	
		Ring beams or ties	No ring beams nor ties	Ring beams or ties	No ring beams nor ties
Age class \geq 2008	A	A	-	-	-
$Y_c <$ age class $<$ 2008	A	B	-	-	-
Age class $\leq Y_c$	B	B	C	C	D

For Peer Review Only

Table 2: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 2.

Masonry Buildings				
Parameter 2 - Quality of the resisting system				
Masonry Type	Age of construction		Rubble infill	
	> 1987	≤ 1987	Presence of headers	No headers
M3.2 – Reinforced masonry	A	A	-	-
M1.3 – Regular stone masonry	A	B	B	C
M3.1 – Brick masonry	A	B	B	C
M2 – Tuff masonry	A	B	B	C
M1.2 – Irregular stone masonry	C	C	C	D
M1.1 – Rubble stone	D	D	D	D

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 3.

Masonry Buildings		
Parameter 3 – Conventional Capacity		
	Class	Score
$I_{RV} < 0.15$	A	0
$0.15 \leq I_{RV} < 0.45$	B	5
$0.45 \leq I_{RV} < 0.70$	C	25
$I_{RV} = 0.70$	D	45

For Peer Review Only

Table 4: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 4.

Masonry Buildings		
Parameter 4 - Topographic conditions		
	Class	Score
S1 – Flat ground	A	0
S4 – Hillside	B	5
S3 – On ridge	C	25
S2 – On a slope	D	45

Table 5: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 5.

Masonry Buildings						
Parameter 5 - Floors						
Floors	Rigid and well bonded		Well bonded		Poorly bonded	
	Not staggered	Staggered	Not staggered	Staggered	Not staggered	Staggered
O1 – Wooden	A	B	C	D	D	D
O3 – Brick and steel	A	B	C	D	D	D
O2– Brick and concrete	B	C	-	-	D	D
O4 – Vaults with ties	B	C	-	-	-	-
O4 – Vaults without ties	D	D	-	-	-	-

Table 6: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 9.

Masonry Buildings						
Parameter 9 - Roofs						
Type	Not thrusting		Partially thrusting		Thrusting	
	Ring beams or ties	No ring beams nor ties	Ring beams or ties	No ring beams nor ties	Ring beams or ties	No ring beams nor ties
C1 – Wooden	A	B	B	C	C	D
C3 – Steel	A	B	B	C	C	D
C2 – Brick and concrete	B	C	C	D	C	D
C4 – Vaults	-	-	-	-	C	D

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 7: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 10.

Masonry Buildings	
Parameter 10 – Non-structural elements	
No vulnerable elements	A
One vulnerable element	B
Two vulnerable elements	C
More than two vulnerable elements	D

For Peer Review Only

Table 8: Masonry Buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 11.

Masonry Buildings	
Parameter 11 – Maintenance level	
No damage on roofs and on vertical structures	A
Minor damage on roofs or on vertical structures	B
Minor damage on roofs and on vertical structures	C
Severe damage on roofs or on vertical structures	D

For Peer Review Only

Table 9: Masonry Buildings: weights and scores of the vulnerability parameters.

Masonry Buildings – scores and weighting coefficients					
Parameter	Values of p_i for vulnerability class				Weights
	A	B	C	D	
1 – Type and organization of the resisting system	0	5	20	45	0.75
2 – Quality of the resisting system	0	5	25	45	0.25
3 – Conventional capacity	0	5	25	45	0.50
4 – Topographic conditions	0	5	25	45	0.50
5 – Floors	0	5	15	45	0.75
6 – In plan configuration	0	5	25	45	0.50
7 – Configuration in elevation	0	5	25	45	1.00
9 – Roofs	0	5	15	45	1.00
10 – Non-structural elements	0	5	25	45	0.25
11 – Maintenance level	0	5	25	45	1.00

Table 10: RC buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 1 (B_y = year of construction of the building; Y_c = year of seismic classification of the municipality).

RC Buildings				
Parameter 1 – Type and organisation of the resisting system				
Structural type	Year of construction			
	$B_y \geq 2008$	$1996 \leq B_y < 2008$	$Y_c \leq B_y < 1996$	$B_y < Y_c$
RC2 – RC shear walls	A	A	B	C
RC5 – Frames and RC shear walls	A	B	C	D
RC4 – Frames and strong curtain walls	A	B	C	D
RC1 – Frames	A	C	C	D
RC3 – Mixed-structure	-	-	D	D

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 11: RC buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 2 (B_y = year of construction of the building).

RC Buildings	
Parameter 2 – Quality of the resisting system	
$B_y \geq 2008$	A
$1992 < B_y < 2008$	B
$1971 < B_y \leq 1992$	C
$B_y \leq 1971$	D

For Peer Review Only

Table 12: RC buildings: assignment of the vulnerability class for Parameter 3 (B_y = year of construction of the building).

RC Buildings	
Parameter 3 – Index of Seismic Rating I_{SR}	
$B_y \geq 2008$	A
$1981 < B_y < 2008$ and $I_{SR} \geq 0.3$	B
$1981 < B_y < 2008$ and $I_{SR} < 0.3$	C
$B_y \leq 1981$	D

For Peer Review Only

Table 13: RC buildings: weights and scores of the vulnerability parameters for RC buildings.

RC Buildings – scores and weighting coefficients					
Parameter	Values of p_i for vulnerability class				Weights
	A	B	C	D	
1 – Type and organisation of the resisting system	-10	5	25	45	1.5
2 – Quality of resisting system	-10	5	25	45	1.00
3 – Index of Seismic Rating	-5	5	25	45	0.50
4 – Topographic conditions	0	5	25	45	0.25
6 – In plan configuration	0	5	25	45	0.75
7 – Configuration in elevation	0	5	25	45	0.75
10 – Non-structural elements	0	5	25	45	0.25
11 – Maintenance level	0	5	25	45	0.50

Table 14: Reliability index of the survey forms for the 4 municipalities (4385 total forms).

Classification of survey forms according to the reliability index (all municipalities)								
Reliability Index	Municipality							
	Foggia		Vico del Gargano		Sant'Agata di Puglia		Carlantino	
<i>Invalid forms</i>	100	4.3%	31	4.7%	26	3.6%	17	3%
<i>0 (max. reliability)</i>	367	15.6%	1	0.2%	8	1.1%	215	33%
<i>-0.5</i>	376	16.0%	47	7.1%	48	6.6%	131	20%
<i>-1</i>	1103	47.0%	306	46.2%	625	86.2%	262	40%
<i>-1.5</i>	128	5.5%	11	1.7%	3	0.4%	7	1%
<i>-2</i>	184	7.8%	155	23.4%	15	2.1%	15	2%
<i>-2.5</i>	44	1.9%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0%
<i>-3</i>	46	2.0%	110	16.6%	0	0.0%	3	
Total (4385)	2348		662		725		650	
Average reliability index	-0.9		-1.5		-0.9		-0.6	

Table 15: Analysis of the reliability index for the City of Foggia.

Reliability class by survey team (City of Foggia).					
<i>Team</i>	<i>Forms</i>	<i>Invalid</i>	<i>Invalid (%)</i>	<i>Avg. IV</i>	<i>Avg. Reliability</i>
<i>1</i>	225	12	5.3%	0.40	-1.05
<i>2</i>	229	19	8.3%	0.44	-1.19
<i>3</i>	217	4	1.8%	0.45	-1.18
<i>4</i>	197	4	2.0%	0.38	-0.96
<i>5</i>	231	11	4.8%	0.44	-0.90
<i>6</i>	247	7	2.8%	0.46	-0.42
<i>7</i>	243	10	4.1%	0.54	-1.26
<i>8</i>	248	27	10.9%	0.44	-1.28
<i>9</i>	238	3	1.3%	0.51	-1.04
<i>10</i>	230	3	1.3%	0.44	-0.25
<i>11</i>	43	0	-	0.44	-0.33
Totale	2348	100	4.3%	0.45	-0.90

Table 16: Total number of buildings surveyed with the ANTAEUS form, number of samples for which the GNDT forms were filled in.

Municipality	ANTAEUS	GNDT	Sample %
Foggia	2348	75	3.2
Carlantino	650	25	3.8
Sant'Agata di Puglia	725	25	3.4
Vico del Gargano	662	25	3.7

For Peer Review Only

Table 17: Values of the weights used to calculate the vulnerability index for masonry buildings.

Masonry Buildings			
Parameter	GNDT	GNDT Tuscany	ANTAEUS (1st proposal)
1 – Type and organization of the resisting system	1.00	1.50	1.50
2 – Quality of resisting system	0.25	0.25	0.25
3 – Conventional resistance	1.50	1.50	0.50
4 – Topographic conditions	0.75	0.75	0.50
5 – Floors	0.5÷1.0 (0.99)	0.5÷1.25 (0.99)	0.75
6 – Configuration in plan	0.50	0.50	0.50
7 – Configuration in elevation	0.5÷1.0 (1.00)	0.5÷1.0 (1.00)	1.00
8 – Maximum distance between the walls	0.25	0.25	–
9 – Roofs	0.5÷1.0 (0.59)	0.5÷1.5 (0.59)	1.00
10 – Non-structural elements	0.25	0.25	0.25
11 – Maintenance level	1.00	1.00	1.00

Table 18: Comparison among the results of *GNDT*, *GNDT-Tuscany* and *ANTAEUS* for masonry buildings (all parameters are weighted and normalized).

Parameter	Foggia					Vico del Gargano				
	ANTAEUS average	GNDT average	GNDT diff. %	Tuscany average	Tuscany diff %	ANTAEUS average	GNDT average	GNDT diff. %	Tuscany average	Tuscany diff %
1	0.20	0.12	167.30%	0.17	118.40%	0.09	0.09	92.10%	0.13	65.40%
2	0.01	0.02	28.80%	0.02	30.60%	0.04	0.03	123.00%	0.03	131.00%
3	0.03	0.05	67.40%	0.05	71.60%	0.07	0.18	38.40%	0.17	40.70%
4	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.03	0.02	170.50%	0.01	185.70%
5	0.10	0.12	84.30%	0.11	89.50%	0.08	0.09	92.70%	0.09	98.80%
6	0.02	0.01	141.10%	0.01	149.80%	0.03	0.02	142.20%	0.02	147.10%
7	0.01	0.01	206.20%	0.01	219.00%	0.01	0.00	364.10%	0.00	333.30%
8	-	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00%	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	-
9	0.09	0.05	187.90%	0.04	199.50%	0.12	0.04	316.60%	0.04	333.30%
10	0.01	0.02	59.70%	0.02	63.40%	0.01	0.00	303.40%	0.00	333.30%
11	0.02	0.01	183.20%	0.01	194.50%	0.04	0.02	197.60%	0.02	211.10%
Average I.V.	0.49	0.40	121.60%	0.43	112.50%	0.51	0.49	102.80%	0.51	99.60%
Parameter	Sant'Agata di Puglia					Carlantino				
	ANTAEUS average	GNDT average	GNDT diff. %	Tuscany average	Tuscany diff %	ANTAEUS average	GNDT average	GNDT diff. %	Tuscany average	Tuscany diff %
1	0.11	0.11	97.50%	0.16	69.20%	0.10	0.11	84.80%	0.16	60.00%
2	0.03	0.03	101.70%	0.03	109.30%	0.02	0.03	64.70%	0.03	68.70%
3	0.05	0.18	28.60%	0.17	30.30%	0.03	0.18	15.20%	0.17	16.10%
4	0.07	0.03	222.60%	0.03	238.40%	0.07	0.03	218.50%	0.03	232.00%
5	0.12	0.12	97.80%	0.11	104.00%	0.11	0.12	93.00%	0.11	98.70%
6	0.01	0.01	181.10%	0.01	203.50%	0.03	0.01	313.90%	0.01	333.30%
7	0.02	0.01	338.70%	0.01	348.90%	0.01	0.01	197.60%	0.01	209.80%
8	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	-
9	0.14	0.06	220.60%	0.06	234.40%	0.09	0.06	146.40%	0.06	155.50%
10	0.01	0.01	56.40%	0.01	58.10%	0.01	0.01	36.20%	0.01	38.50%
11	0.03	0.02	148.20%	0.02	153.40%	0.04	0.02	177.70%	0.02	188.70%
Average I.V.	0.58	0.58	101.00%	0.60	97.80%	0.49	0.58	84.00%	0.60	81.30%

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 19: Statistics for masonry buildings - comparison between weighted averages obtained by *ANTAEUS* algorithm.

Municipality	Original		Modified	
	I.V.	St. dev	I.V.	St. dev
<i>Foggia</i>	0.49	0.09	0.45	0.10
<i>Vico del Gargano</i>	0.53	0.12	0.51	0.11
<i>Sant'Agata</i>	0.59	0.09	0.56	0.08
<i>Carlantino</i>	0.50	0.10	0.46	0.09

For Peer Review Only