

# **Report: Building Damage Assessment Expert System**

## **Introduction**

The assessment of damage to a building after a conflict or any other disaster is complex due to the variety of damage types and their interactions. Structural damage, fire damage, environmental factors, and safety hazards are all responsible for the overall condition of a building. Traditional damage assessment methods are based on manual site inspections, which are time-consuming, subjective, and error-prone.

These problems are addressed by proposing an expert system that combines fuzzy logic and probabilistic reasoning (Bayesian networks) to systematically analyze building damage. This system checks key factors such as crack width, slope angle, roof sagging, foundation cracks, and fire level to determine the severity of damage to a building. In addition to fuzzy logic that enables the system to handle inaccurate data and probabilistic reasoning that allows for modeling dependencies, the system also provides an automated and robust approach to damage assessment.

This report provides an in-depth survey of the development, implementation, and results of the expert system, as well as an analysis of its performance and potential applications.

## **Methodology**

The expert system consists of a combination of fuzzy logic and probabilistic reasoning as construction methods.

### **Implementation of Fuzzy Logic**

The system runs fuzzy logic that is capable of handling undefined inputs such as crack size or the angle at which an object is tilted. The system requires a specific set of functions for each input value (e.g. crack width,

tilt angle, roof) and classifies them into minor, moderate, and severe levels of damage. Fuzzy rules tell us the overall damage level. Here is an example of such rules:

Rule 1: If the crack width is minor and the tilt angle is minor, the damage is minor.

Rule 2: If the crack width is severe or the roof sag is severe, the damage is severe.

The damage severity is obtained as an output of the fuzzy logic system and ranges from 0 to 10. Thus, minor damage ranges from 0 to 4; The average damage ranges from 4 to 8 and finally, the severe damage ranges from 8 to 10.

## Implementation of Probabilistic Reasoning

A Bayesian network is used to create a model of the possible relationships that exist between the damage factors and to determine the probabilities of events and their dependencies. The network consists of nodes for crack width, slope angle, roof sagging, foundation cracks and fire level with their edges being referred to as their dependencies. The conditional probability distributions (CPDs) specified for each node are those that enable the calculation of the probabilities of events based on their states.

For example, the probability of structural damage is evaluated based on the original nodes (crack width, slope angle, roof sagging, etc.). The Bayesian network uses the variable elimination method for the inference process, and then the most probable damage level is revealed.

## Integration of Methods

The final result is achieved through fuzzy logic and probabilistic reasoning, both of which are used through weighted averaging. The result given by the fuzzy logic and the Bayesian network probabilities are combined equally (50% each) to produce the final damage score. This standardized method serves as a solution to deal with circumstances when qualitative and probabilistic effects that may arise during the evaluation process must be taken into account.

## Results

The expert system was tested with various input scenarios to evaluate its effectiveness. Below are the results for a sample case:

## Sample Inputs

Crack Width: 4 mm  
Leaning Angle: 1.5%  
Roof Sagging: 6 cm  
Foundation Cracks: 7 mm  
Fire Level: 50%

## Fuzzy Logic Results

Crack Width: Moderate  
Leaning Angle: Moderate  
Roof Sagging: Moderate  
Foundation Cracks: Moderate  
Fire Level: Moderate  
Fuzzy Damage Score: 5.53

## Probabilistic Reasoning Results

Damage Probabilities:  
Minor Damage: 10%  
Moderate Damage: 60%  
Severe Damage: 30%  
Most Likely Damage Level: Moderate

## Combined Results

Combined Damage Score: 6.77  
Final Damage Level: Moderate Damage

## Additional Test Cases

Input Scenario	Fuzzy Score	Probabilistic Result	Combined Score	Final Damage Level
Minor cracks, no leaning, no fire, no Sagging	1.69	Minor (80%)	1.84	Minor Damage
Severe cracks, severe leaning, no fire, no Sagging	8.51	Severe (60%)	8.26	Severe Damage

Input Scenario	Fuzzy Score	Probabilistic Result	Combined Score	Final Damage Level
Moderate cracks, moderate fire, no leaning, no Sagging	5	Moderate (60%)	6.5	Moderate Damage

## Comments

There are a number of obvious benefits to the expert system, some of which are detailed below.

- **Accuracy:** The system can handle imprecise inputs and complex dependencies using fuzzy logic and probabilistic reasoning.
- **Automation:** By its very nature, the system inherently involves a significant reduction in the need for physical inspections, in terms of time and resources.

However, there are some limitations:

- **Data requirements:** Not only does it require accurate input data, but also actual input data, which may not be available in the post-disaster scenario.
- **Simplified model:** The current model is highly limited; For example, not all possible factors are taken into consideration, including environmental or functional damage.

Besides adding more damage factors, the authors can also add system efficiency work on top and compare the model against real data for validation.

## Conclusion

The Building Damage Assessment Expert System represents a powerful and automated approach to the assessment of building damage after war or disasters. The system effectively handles imprecise inputs and complex dependencies using fuzzy logic integrated with probabilistic reasoning to come up with accurate damage assessments.

This system has a number of potential applications in post-war reconstruction, disaster recovery, and urban planning. Future improvements in the system's accuracy and scalability could make it an even more valuable tool for damage assessment and decision-making.

## References

- ❖ **FEMA P-154:**
  - ◊ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).
  
- ❖ **Eurocode 8**
  - ◊ European Committee for Standardization (CEN).