

Document Viewer

# Turnitin Originality Report

Processed on: 07-Apr-2023 14:54 WIB  
ID: 2058258371  
Word Count: 2890  
Submitted: 1

ICCIM-1 By Henny Wiyanto

Similarity Index <h2 style="margin: 0;">12%</h2>	<b>Similarity by Source</b> Internet Sources: 11% Publications: 8% Student Papers: 0%
---	--

mode:

5% match (Internet from 18-Mar-2022)

[https://www.arpnjournals.org/jeas/research\\_papers/rp\\_2021/jeas\\_1221\\_8805.pdf](https://www.arpnjournals.org/jeas/research_papers/rp_2021/jeas_1221_8805.pdf)

2% match (Internet from 01-Mar-2023)

<https://www.mdpi.com/2075-5309/12/6/776>

1% match (Internet from 15-Jan-2023)

[https://mdpi-res.com/d\\_attachment/buildings/buildings-12-00776/article\\_deploy/buildings-12-00776-v2.pdf?version=1654668074](https://mdpi-res.com/d_attachment/buildings/buildings-12-00776/article_deploy/buildings-12-00776-v2.pdf?version=1654668074)

1% match (Henny Wiyanto, David Lie, James Kurniawan. "Critical Index Determination Method on Visual Assessment of Concrete Damage for Buildings", IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 2019)  
[Henny Wiyanto, David Lie, James Kurniawan. "Critical Index Determination Method on Visual Assessment of Concrete Damage for Buildings", IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 2019](#)

1% match (Internet from 12-Oct-2022)

<http://repository.untar.ac.id>

1% match (Internet from 19-Mar-2023)

<https://ici2016.org/how-do-we-assess-the-consequences-of-a-risk/>

<1% match (Internet from 18-Mar-2023)

<https://revues.imist.ma/index.php/JOMODS/article/download/35390/18255>

<1% match (Internet from 25-Nov-2022)

[https://www.scilit.net/articles/search?q=reference\\_ids%3A%28112250473%29&sort=Newest](https://www.scilit.net/articles/search?q=reference_ids%3A%28112250473%29&sort=Newest)

<1% match (Internet from 22-May-2022)

<https://www.kansaiuniversityreports.com/?page=84>

<1% match (Internet from 03-Nov-2019)

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15732479.2016.1263673>

<1% match (Henny Wiyanto, Chaidir Anwar Makarim, Onnyxiforus Gondokusumo, Januar Parlaungan Siregar et al. "Determining Concrete Structure Condition Rating Based on Concrete Compressive Strength", Buildings, 2022)

[Henny Wiyanto, Chaidir Anwar Makarim, Onnyxiforus Gondokusumo, Januar Parlaungan Siregar et al. "Determining Concrete Structure Condition Rating Based on Concrete Compressive Strength", Buildings, 2022](#) ✕

<1% match (Henny Wiyanto, Joshua Chang, Yohanes Dennis. "Concrete Structure Condition Rating in Buildings with Non-Destructive Testing", IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 2020)

[Henny Wiyanto, Joshua Chang, Yohanes Dennis. "Concrete Structure Condition Rating in Buildings with Non-Destructive Testing", IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 2020](#) ✕

Concrete Damage Risk Rating Examination to Existing Buildings Henny Wiyanto, Reagen Yocom, and Glen Thenaka Abstract Building assessment is a measure that has to be taken by building management to the existing building or operational building because it is very critical to the safety and comfort of the building's users. One of the commonly used building assessment methods is visual assessment. Visual assessment is a non-destructive concrete assessment that is done to identify and define different concrete conditions, which can be seen during its' lifetime. Concrete damage assessment is done to estimate the risk rating of concrete damage against the existing building structures. The risk assessment process is done in three steps: risk identification, risk analysis, and risk evaluation. There are three risk ratings: low, medium, and high. Risk rating examination of the existing building is determined based on the concrete damage type and condition rating value on the building structure element, concrete damage frequency on the building, and critical weight of the building structure element. Risk rating examination results of concrete damage are used to determine priorities building structure element repair. Keywords Concrete damage Risk rating Visual assessment An existing building 1 Introduction Concrete damage on reinforced concrete structures cannot be avoided. This is caused by a lot of factors, one of which is poor construction implementation and low material quality. As time goes on, existing building usage also predominantly affects H. Wiyanto (&) R. Yocom G. Thenaka Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta 11440, Indonesia e-mail: [hennyw@ft.untar.ac.id](mailto:hennyw@ft.untar.ac.id) © The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2022 523 H. A. Lie et al. (eds.), Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Construction, Infrastructure, and Materials, Lecture Notes in Civil Engineering 216, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7949-0> 47 the building's condition. Improper building usage will cause physical damage to the building itself. Building usage is the act of using a building according to its' intended function [1, 2]. Oftentimes, building management or owners neglect the building's condition and do not perform proper building assessments because of cost factors. Even though building condition assessment can lower the risk of further building damage, which severely endangers the building's users, that is very risky towards the safety and comfort of building users. Building condition assessment is done with assessment towards concrete damage condition, which is done to estimate the risk of structural and non-structural damage in order to perform building reparation. According to ISO 31000:2009 [3], the risk assessment process is done with three steps: risk identification, risk analysis, and risk evaluation. The search for references about building condition rating has

been performed from multiple sources, which are [4–21]. Based on that problem, the risk assessment needs to be done towards concrete damage to the existing building structure.

**2 Method Concrete damage risk rating examination to the existing building is performed in the following steps.**

**2.1 Risk Identification** Concrete damage risk identification is a step to identify the amount and location of concrete damage on a building structure that can lower a building's functionality. Concrete damage location is divided into four structure elements: shear wall, column, beam, and slab. Concrete damage identification is made using visual assessment.

**2.2 Risk Analysis** Concrete damage risk analysis is a step done to assess risk towards the concrete damage types that have already been identified according to the damage amount and location. Damage location affects the structure element critical weight. The amount of concrete damage describes the damage frequency of a damage type on the building. Concrete damage risk assessment is done with the following steps: Determining Concrete Damage Type and Condition Rating. Based on concrete damage type and condition rating, search results for building from multiple Table 1 Concrete damage type and condition rating [20]

No.	Damage type	Condition rating
1	Craze crack	2.54
2	Mapping crack	3.00
3	Random cracks	3.36
4	Delamination	3.25
5	Pop-outs (small)	2.75
6	Pop-outs (medium)	2.93
7	Pop-outs (large)	3.36
8	Scaling (light)	2.53
9	Scaling (medium)	2.88
10	Scaling (severe)	3.13
11	Scaling (very severe)	3.47
12	Spall (small)	2.86
13	Spall (large)	3.40

references, namely [4–18, 22–24], concrete damage type and condition rating are determined for existing buildings in Indonesia by Wiyanto et al. in [19, 20] as in Table 1. Criteria and measures for each concrete damage condition rating are as shown in Table 2.

**Determining Concrete Damage Frequency** Concrete damage frequency is determined based on the amount of damage done to the building. Damage frequency is determined using three criteria based on Table 3.

**Determining Concrete Damage Risk Rating** The concrete damage risk rating is determined based on concrete damage condition rating and concrete damage frequency using Eq. 1.

Condition rating	Description	Criteria	Measure
1	Very good	No damage	No repairs are needed, but still needs maintenance
2	Good	Light damage	Needs reparation in the field of routine maintenance
3	Medium	Medium damage	Immediately needs further assessment or testing and or reparation
4	Bad	Heavy damage	Needs structure strengthening or weight reduction
5	Very bad	Very heavy/ critical damage	It cannot be maintained or demolished

**Table 3** Damage concrete frequency Rating. Frequency 1 Rare (R) 2 Moderate (M) 3 Common (C)

$$P_{RRse} = \frac{1}{4} CI fcd \delta_{1P} ncd$$

RRse is the concrete damage risk level of each structure element, CI is the concrete damage condition rating, fcd is the concrete damage frequency, and ncd is the amount of damage done.

**Determining Building Damage Risk Rating** Building damage risk rating is determined based on concrete damage risk rating and damage location. Concrete damage location is divided into four structure elements, each with its own critical weight. Based on structure element critical weight search results for buildings from multiple references, namely [9–13, 21], structure element critical weight for existing buildings is determined by Wiyanto et al. in [19, 20], such as in Table 4.

Building damage risk rating is determined using Eq. 2.

$$P_{SR} = \frac{1}{4} RPRse wse \delta_{2P} SR$$

SR is the building's damage risk rating, and wse is the structure element critical weight, as shown in Table 4. Based on the building's damage risk rating value, concrete damage risk rating can be described by referring to Table 5.

**2.3 Risk Evaluation** Concrete damage risk evaluation is a step used to determine priority towards risk on a building so that further measures can be taken according to the risk rating. This is done in order to maintain and repair a building to increase safety and comfort for the building's users.

Structure element	Critical weight
Shear wall (SW)	1
Column (C)	1
Beam (B)	0.7
Slab (S)	0.5

**Table 5** Concrete damage risk

rating. Rating Risk Criteria 1 Low S < 5 2 Medium 5 S < 10 3 High 10 S 15

3 Results and Discussion Assessment is applied to an existing high-rise building. Concrete damage risk rating assessment is done based on visual assessment on a 13-year-old 13-story parking building. Assessment is initiated with damage type examination, which is done on each building structure element, and condition rating of each damage. The results of concrete damage examination and condition rating assessment can be seen in Table 6. Table 6 Parking building concrete damage type and condition rating. No. Damage type Element Condition rating 1 Craze crack C 2.54 2 Mapping crack S 3.00 3 Scaling (very severe) B 3.47 4 Spall (small) B 2.86 5 Spall (small) SW 2.86 6 Random Cracks S 3.36 7 Scaling (light) S 2.53 8 Scaling (severe) S 3.13 9 Scaling (light) S 2.53 10 Random cracks C 3.36 11 Spall (large) C 3.40 12 Pop-outs (medium) B 2.93 13 Scaling (medium) B 2.88 14 Spall (small) C 2.86 15 Spall (small) S 2.86 16 Spall (small) B 2.86 17 Spall (small) B 2.86 18 Scaling (very severe) B 3.47 19 Scaling (light) C 2.53 20 Spall (small) C 2.86 21 Spall (small) B 2.86 22 Scaling (severe) B 3.13 23 Random cracks S 3.36 24 Spall (small) B 2.86 25 Spall (small) B 2.86 26 Delamination C 3.25 27 Scaling (very severe) C 3.47 28 Random cracks B 3.36

Table 7 Parking building concrete damage frequency No. Damage type Frequency Rating 1 Craze crack R 1 2 Mapping crack R 1 3 Scaling (very severe) R 1 4 Spall (small) C 3 5 Random cracks R 1 6 Scaling (severe) R 1 7 Scaling (light) R 1 8 Spall (large) R 1 9 Pop-outs (medium) R 1 10 Scaling (medium) R 1 11 Delamination R 1

Based on the damage types that are identified in the visual assessment, concrete damage frequency on that building is determined. Damage frequency from each damage can be seen in Table 7. Concrete damage risk rating of each structural element is determined based on concrete condition rating assessment results and the concrete damage frequency on the building. The risk rating assessment of each structural element can be seen in Table 8. The parking building's structural damage risk rating is determined based on the concrete damage risk rating of each structure element, with the structure element's critical weight. Parking building structure damage risk rating assessment can be seen in Table 9. Building damage risk rating is determined referring to Table 5. A risk rating of 5.95 shows that the parking building's concrete damage risk rating is 2, which is the medium rating. Medium risk means that further examination and reparation measures need to be done on the building. From the risk rating, it can be shown that the shear wall and beam elements are the highest priority for examination and reparation measures.

Table 8 Parking building concrete damage risk rating No. Damage type Condition rating Frequency rating Risk rating Shear wall 1 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 RRsw 8.58 Column 1 Craze crack 2.54 1 2.54 2 Random cracks 3.36 1 3.36 3 Spall (large) 3.40 1 3.40 4 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 5 Scaling (light) 2.53 1 2.53 6 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 7 Delamination 3.25 1 3.25 8 Scaling (very severe) 3.47 1 RRcl 3.47 4.46 Beam 1 Scaling (very severe) 3.47 1 3.47 2 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 3 Pop-outs (medium) 2.93 1 2.93 4 Scaling (medium) 2.88 1 2.88 5 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 6 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 7 Scaling (very severe) 3.47 1 3.47 8 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 9 Scaling (severe) 3.13 1 3.13 10 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 11 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 12 Random cracks 3.36 1 RRbm 3.36 5.89 Slab 1 Mapping crack 3.00 1 3.00 2 Random cracks 3.36 1 3.36 3 Scaling (light) 2.53 1 2.53 4 Scaling (severe) 3.13 1 3.13 5 Scaling (light) 2.53 1 2.53 6 Spall (small) 2.86 3 8.58 7 Random cracks 3.36 1 RRsl 3.36 3.78

Table 9 Parking building damage risk rating No. Structure element Risk rating Critical weight RRse wse 1 Shear Wall 8.58 1 8.58 2 Column 4.46 1 4.46 3 Beam 5.89 0.7 4.12 4 Slab P3.78 0.5 1.89 3.2 19.05 SR 5.95 4

Conclusion The building damage risk rating resulted from damage type assessment based on visual to existing buildings can be used to describe risk criteria. The risk rating value can describe concrete damage risk towards building structure, so it can be used to determine priorities for the measures that will be done to the

building. These measures can be in the form of building maintenance, destructive testing, and building repair. This risk [rating assessment method can be](#) applied to [existing buildings](#) in order to determine building structure element repair priority. References

1. Republik Indonesia (2002) Undang-undang Republik Indonesia nomor 28 tahun 2002 tentang bangunan gedung. Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi, Jakarta
2. Republik Indonesia (2005) Peraturan pemerintah Republik Indonesia nomor 36 tahun 2005 tentang peraturan pelaksanaan undang-undang nomor 28 tahun 2002 tentang bangunan gedung. Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi, Jakarta
3. ISO/TC 262 Risk management (2009) ISO 31000:2009 Risk management—principle and guidelines. International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland
4. Aparicio AC, Casas JR, Cruz PJS (2003) Deterioration and structural performance of reinforced concrete beams. In: The 3rd international workshop LCC03/IABMAS, Lausanne, Switzerland, 24–26 March 2003
5. Shohet IM (2003) Building evaluation methodology for setting maintenance priorities in hospital buildings. *Constr Manage Econ* 21(7):681–692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144619032000115562>
6. Znidaric J, Perus I (1998) Condition rating methods for concrete structures. In: CEB bulletin No. 243: strategies for testing and assessment of concrete structure affected by reinforcement corrosion, p 155–168
7. Coronelli D (2007) Condition rating of RC structures: a case study. *J Build Apprais* 3(1):29–51. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jba.2950057>
8. Pedro JACBO, Paiva JAVP, Vilhena AJDSM (2008) Portuguese method for building condition assessment. *Struct Surv* 26(4):322–335. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02630800810906566>
9. Mitra G, Jain KK, Bhattacharjee B (2010) Condition assessment of corrosion-distressed reinforced concrete buildings using fuzzy logic. *J Perform Constr Facil* 24(6):562–570. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)cf.1943-5509.0000137](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)cf.1943-5509.0000137)
10. Jain KK, Bhattacharjee B (2012) Visual inspection and condition assessment of structures (VICAS): an innovative tool for structural condition assessment. *Int J 3R's* 3(1):349–357
11. Jain KK, Bhattacharjee B (2012) Application of fuzzy concepts to the visual assessment of deterioration reinforced concrete structure. *J Constr Eng Manage* 138(3):399–408. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000430](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000430)
12. Tirpude NP, Jain KK, Bhattacharjee B (2014) Decision model for repair prioritization of reinforced-concrete structures. *J Perform Constr Facil* 28(2):250–256. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CF.1943-5509.0000427](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CF.1943-5509.0000427)
13. Pragalath H, Seshathiri S, Rathod H, Esakki B, Gupta R (2018) Deterioration assessment of infrastructure using fuzzy logic and image processing algorithm. *J Perform Constr Facil* 32 (2):1–13. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)cf.1943-5509.0001151](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)cf.1943-5509.0001151)
14. Wijaya MGW, Wahyuni E, Iranata D (2014) Assessment kerentanan bangunan beton bertulang pasca gempa. *Jurnal Teknik Pomits* 1(1):1–6
15. Hamdia KM, Arafa M, Alqedra M (2018) Structural damage assessment criteria for reinforced concrete buildings by using a fuzzy analytic hierarchy process. *Underground Space* 3(3):243–249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.undsp.2018.04.002>
16. Leite FM, Volsse RA, Roman HR, Saffaro FA (2020) Building condition assessment: adjustments of the building performance indicator (BPI) for university buildings in Brazil. *Ambiente Construído* 20(1):215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s1678-86212020000100370>
17. American Society of Civil Engineers, Agency FEM (2000) FEMA 356/November 2000: prestandard and commentary for the seismic rehabilitation of buildings. American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia
18. Wiyanto H, Chang J, Dennis J (2020) Concrete structure condition rating in Buildings with non-destructive testing. *IOP Conf Ser: Mater Sci Eng* 852:012058; In: The 2nd Tarumanagara international conference on the applications of technology and engineering 2019, Jakarta, Indonesia, 21–22 Nov 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/852/1/012058>
19. Wiyanto H, Lie D, Kurniawan J (2019) Critical index determination method on visual

assessment of concrete damage for buildings. IOP Conf Ser: Mater Sci Eng 508:012003; In: Tarumanagara international conference on the applications of technology and engineering, Jakarta, Indonesia, 22–23 Nov 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/508/1/012003> 20. Wiyanto H, Makarim CA, Gondokusumo O (2020) Condition rating examination based on visual assessment of concrete damage caused by poor implementation. Tech Rep Kansai Univ 62(09):5861–5870 21. Pushpakumara BHJ, Silva S, Silva GHMJS (2017) Visual inspection and non-destructive tests-based rating method for concrete bridges. Int J Struct Eng 8(1):74–91. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijstructe.2017.081672> 22. American Society of Civil Engineers (2000) Guideline for structural condition assessment of existing buildings. American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, Virginia, United State 23. American Concrete Institute Committee 201 (2008) Guide for conducting a visual inspection of concrete in service. American Concrete Institute, Farmington Hills, U.S.A. 24. Wiyanto H (2020) Penerapan soft system methodology pada metode penilaian kerusakan beton secara visual. Jurnal Media Komunikasi Teknik Sipil 26(1):52–60 524 H. Wiyanto et al. Concrete Damage Risk Rating Examination to Existing Buildings 525 526 H. Wiyanto et al. Concrete Damage Risk Rating Examination to Existing Buildings 527 528 H. Wiyanto et al. Concrete Damage Risk Rating Examination to Existing Buildings 529 530 H. Wiyanto et al. Concrete Damage Risk Rating Examination to Existing Buildings 531