

RISK ANALYSIS IN MAINTAINABILITY OF BUILDINGS
UNDER TROPICAL CONDITIONS

Egodage Nayanthara Darshananjali De Silva

B.Sc. (Engineering) Honors, University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.

M.Sc. (Building), National University of Singapore, Singapore.

(07/8031)

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

January 2012

DECLARATION

I declare that this my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except whether the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or in part in print, electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature:

Date:

The above candidate has carried out research for the PhD thesis under my supervision.

Signature of the supervisor:

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express my most sincere gratitude to Prof. Malik Ranasinghe, my supervisor, who has given valuable advices, guidance and support throughout the research, despite of his extremely busy schedule as the vice chancellor of the University of Moratuwa. This thesis would not exist without his patient efforts support, and encouragement.

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dayantha Wijesekara, Chairman, progress evaluation committee, Dr. Asoka Perera, member, progress evaluation committee, and Prof. Saman Bandara, research coordinator, Department of Civil Engineering for their constructive comments given at each progress review meeting.

My special thanks to Director post graduate studies; Faculty of Engineering, Head; Department of Civil Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering and my own department; Department of Building Economics for granting me the opportunity to carry out my post graduate studies.

To all the experts who have involved during data collection, many thanks for your enormous support, valuable time spent for truthful and important discussions and your patience and encouragement. This research would not conduct without your extremely special support even with your utterly busy schedules in your business.

Finally, to Chathura and Tharani, your patience and love extend to my work is most gratefully acknowledged. Without this kindheartedness support in all my endeavors, I would not able to complete this piece of work.

ABSTRACT

The cost of scheduled and unscheduled maintenance contributes to a significant portion of the whole life cost of high rise building. However, such maintenance is essential to maintain the expected performance of the building throughout its lifespan and the related costs arise from several factors, including the building's lifelong exposure to environmental factors as well as those due to design, construction and maintenance processes. The future maintenance requirements of buildings depend on the levels of risk associated with these factors as ignoring such risks results in high maintenance costs. As such, the analysis of such risks aimed at reducing future maintenance costs is of paramount importance from an early stage of a building project.

This study addresses the above research problem by a framework based on risk analysis to forecast the level of maintainability by (1) deriving and quantifying maintainability risk domain, (2) quantifying maintainability and (3) developing a model.

The derived maintainability risk domain consists of ten significant risk factors, extracted from 58 risk-causing variables/ issues. The significance and impact from these ten risk factors on maintainability were evaluated using data collected from thirty high-rise buildings which are of 10 or more storeyed high in Colombo metropolis. Field surveys and interviews were used for the collection of data which captured the existing maintainability issues in these high-rise buildings. The respective building managers, who are considered as substantive experts were interviewed to assess these risks factors.

Maintainability was quantified using an indicator, "*Maintenance Efficiency Indicator – MEP*" which is the ratio between equivalent value of maintenance cost and equivalent value of initial construction cost. Maintenance cost was established using the past maintenance records and present maintenance cost needed to improve the existing performance of the building when it falls below the required level. The required level of the performance is derived using five performance mandates such as stability, tightness requirements, durability, tactile requirements and safety in use.

An ensemble neural network architecture that combines small, individually trained networks into a larger network is used to develop the model for this framework. The ensemble architecture allows the individual expert networks to be representative of major components of the building. This facilitated the network to be trained with limited data samples. Furthermore, the structure is also capable of managing unforeseen correlations in input variables. The prototype used in this research uses four expert networks representing four building components; roof, façade, basement and internal areas. The final output of the ensemble network is used as an indicator of Maintenance Efficiency (*MEI*). Data collected from the sample of 30 high-rise buildings is used to train these neural networks. Low error margins (<0.005) and generalization error (<0.05) of these neural networks indicate high level of accuracy in their predictions.

The accuracy and validity of the proposed framework is tested using two case studies of high-rise buildings which were not used for training of the neural networks. A high-rise hospital building and a high-rise bank building are selected for these case studies. Validity of the proposed framework is tested under different risk scenarios as follows,

- Validation 1: Framework is used to forecast the *MEI*. These results are compared to the *MEI* computed based on actual cost data.
- Validation 2: Framework is used to estimate changes required in the Risk inputs for a general improvement of the maintenance efficiency (*MEI*). These changes are compared with expert's opinion on achieving the same goals.
- Validation 3: Using the framework, risk input levels corresponding to the best possible maintenance efficiency are determined. These values are compared with the belief elicited from experts.

Hence the proposed framework is suitable for forecasting the level of maintainability of high-rise buildings and the *MEI* established from whole life maintenance cost is an effective measure to quantify maintainability of high-rise buildings. Further, maintenance efficiency can be improved by controlling and

managing the maintainability risks described by the ten risk factors identified in this research study.

Keywords: Maintainability, Risk analysis, Buildings, Maintenance, Building defects.

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	II
ABSTRACT	III
TABLE OF CONTENT	VI
LIST OF FIGURES	X
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIV
LIST OF APPENDICES	XVI
CHAPTER ONE	1
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Research Problem	3
1.3 Research Objectives	4
1.4 Research Motivation	5
1.5 Main Findings.....	6
1.6 Structure of the Thesis	7
CHAPTER TWO	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Maintainability of Buildings.....	10
2.2.1 Definition.....	10
2.2.2 Maintainability Problems and their Causes	11
2.3 Common Maintainability Risks.....	13
2.3.1 Accessibility for Maintenance	14
2.3.2 Characteristics of Building Materials and Components	15
2.3.3 Design and Detailing	17
2.3.4 Environmental Conditions.....	18
2.3.5 Requirement for Maintenance	18
2.3.6 Constructability and Construction Quality	19
2.3.7 Maintenance Management Process	20
2.4 Addressing Maintainability Problems	24
2.4.1 Whole Life Cost Analysis	24
2.4.2 Cost Planning and Benchmarking	27
2.4.3 Maintenance Management (MM).....	28
2.5 Performance-Based Concepts and Performance Indicators.....	34
2.5.1 Performance Evaluation Using Defects.....	35
2.5.2 Performance Evaluation Using Deterioration Mechanism.....	37

2.5.3 Performance Evaluation Using Integrated Approaches.....	37
2.6 Risk Management	38
2.7 Risk Identification	39
2.8 Risk Analysis Techniques	40
2.8.1 Risk Matrix	40
2.8.2 Decision Tree Analysis.....	41
2.8.3 Risk Breakdown Structures (RBS).....	42
2.8.4 Failure Mode and Effect Analysis Techniques	43
2.8.5 Sensitivity Analysis	43
2.8.6 Probability Analysis	45
2.8.7 Knowledge-Based Risk Analysis Techniques.....	47
2.9 Risk Response Techniques and Management	52
2.10 Chapter Summary	54
CHAPTER THREE.....	56
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	56
3.1 Introduction	56
3.2 Research Process	56
3.2.1 General	56
3.2.2 Research Philosophy	57
3.2.3 Research Approach.....	59
3.2.4 Research Strategy	60
3.3 Performance Measurement of Buildings	61
3.4 Overview of the Survey Research	63
3.5 Goals of the Survey Research.....	63
3.6 Survey Sample	64
3.7 Data Collection Method.....	65
3.8 Development of the Survey Material.....	66
3.9 Preliminary Survey	66
3.10 Main Survey	67
3.10.1 General	67
3.10.2 Elicitation of Expert Knowledge	67
3.10.3 Maintenance Cost Data.....	73
3.11 Overview of the Modelling Process– Development of the Model	74
3.12 Quantification of Maintainability Risks – Model Inputs.....	76
3.12.1 General	76
3.12.2 Maintainability Risks Analysis.....	77
3.13 Maintenance Efficiency (<i>ME</i>) of Buildings– Model Output.....	78
3.14 Chapter Summary	82
CHAPTER FOUR	84
4 MAINTAINABILITY RISK FACTORS.....	84
4.1 Introduction	84
4.2 Maintainability Risk Factors	85
4.3 Factor 1: Architecture and Design Related Risks.....	85

4.4 Factor 2 - Structural and Detailing Related Risks	87
4.5 Factor 3: Services Integration Related Risk	91
4.6 Factor 4: Accessibility Related Risks	95
4.7 Factor 5: Maintenance Requirements Related Risks	97
4.8 Factor 6: Materials and Spare Parts Related Risks	100
4.9 Factor 7: Constructability and Construction/Installation Quality Related Risks	102
4.10 Factor 8: Maintenance Process Quality Related Risks	104
4.11 Factor 9: Characteristics, Environment and Exposure Related Risks	109
4.12 Factor 10: User Requirement and Changes Related Risks	110
4.13 Chapter Summary	112
CHAPTER FIVE	113
5 RISK ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK	113
5.1 Introduction	113
5.2 The Artificial Neural Network (ANN) Model	114
5.3 Modelling Building Maintainability	115
5.3.1 General	115
5.3.2 Expert Networks	116
5.3.3 Expert Network Computation Process	119
5.3.4 Ensemble Expert Networks	123
5.4 Neural Network Training Process	125
5.5 Chapter Summary	127
CHAPTER SIX	129
6 VALIDATIONS AND APPLICATIONS	129
6.1 Introduction	129
6.2 Case Studies Overview	129
6.3 Case 1- High-rise Private Hospital Building	130
6.3.1 Background	130
6.3.2 <i>ME</i> Using Ensemble NN Model	134
6.3.3 <i>ME</i> Under Best Performance Conditions	136
6.4 Case 2- High-rise Building of a Private Local Bank	137
6.4.1 Background	137
6.4.2 <i>ME</i> Using Ensemble NN Model	140
6.4.3 <i>ME</i> Under Best Performance Conditions	142
6.5 Chapter Summary	143
CHAPTER SEVEN	148
7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	148
7.1 Conclusions	148
7.2 Recommendations for Future Work	152
7.2.1 Maintainability Risks under Facilities Management (FM)	152
7.2.2 Maintainability Modelling under Neural Networks	153
REFERENCES	154

APPENDIX A:	189
APPENDIX B:	196
APPENDIX C:	200
APPENDIX D:	202

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Decreasing of performance level. (Source: Hermans, 1995).....	15
Figure 2.2: Example of a risk matrix used to filter maintenance decisions of a machine (Source: Manufacturing Technology Committee (Online Guide) - http://www.pqri.org/pdfs/MTC/Risk_Rank_Filter_Training_Guide.pdf).....	41
Figure 2.3 : Decision tree analysis (Source: Flanagan and Norman, 1993)	42
Figure 2.4: A typical risk breakdown structure	43
Figure 2.5: A typical spider diagram for an oil field development	44
Figure 2.6: Risk management phases and their effectiveness	54
Figure 3.1: “Onion” research process.....	57
Figure 3.2: Building decomposition	59
Figure 3.3: Research strategies.....	61
Figure 3.4: A typical performance curve under periodic maintenance actions	61
Figure 3.5: Expert knowledge elicitation process	74
Figure 3.6: Overview of the framework	76
Figure 4.1: Damp patches and fungus growth due to rain water penetration through window frame of flushed windows	86
Figure 4.2: Water ponding along a open corridor	86
Figure 4.3: Fungus/algae growth under moist conditions	87
Figure 4.4: Wet wall due to lack of provisions for run-off rain water	87
Figure 4.5: Damp ceiling boards due to condensation	87
Figure 4.6: Structural cracks - (a) Settlement crack in a slab, (b) Diagonal crack on a wall, (c) Horizontal crack on a wall, (d) Vertical crack on a wall, (e) Expansion crack on floor and (f) Crack and corrosion of re-bar.....	89
Figure 4.7 : Plaster cracks - (a) Expansion cracks (b) Thermal cracks	89
Figure 4.8 : Water leakages - (a) Basement wall joint leakage, (b) Basement slab leakage, (c) Wall leakage, (d) Roof slab leakage	90
Figure 4.9 : Water-ponding due to lack of detailing for ground water – (a) Machine room is flooded, (b) Shooting of ground water	90
Figure 4.10: Damages in finishes - (a) Paint failures due to seepage of water, (b) Damage to the ceiling board from seepage of water, (c) : Damage of tile floor by	

pigeons, (d) Damage of paint film by termites, (e) Corroded stainless steel doors due to chloride/salts, (f) Efflorescence due to water seepage	91
Figure 4.11: Separate service ducts are provided for each service for easy maintenance - (a) M&E wiring, (b) Gas lines, (c) Plumbing	92
Figure 4.12: Sufficient space and accessibility for service ducts for easy maintenance - (a) Sufficient space, (b) Bigger access door	92
Figure 4.13: Separate machine rooms for individual services - (a) Electrical switch boards, (b) Water pumps	93
Figure 4.14 :Removable panels are used in suspended ceiling to access the service runs	93
Figure 4.15: Special platforms are provided for machineries to absorb the vibration	93
Figure 4.16: Lack of provisions for maintenance work in service ducts - (a) Small access door, (b) Insufficient space.....	94
Figure 4.17.: Lack of accessibility for plumbing work	94
Figure 4.18: Water-ponding at the roof slab under the cooling tower	94
Figure 4.19 : Deterioration of the slab due to drainage water of the outdoor unit	95
Figure 4.20: Difficult and unsafe access areas - (a) Lack of provisions for safe access system to the roof fixture in a 15 storey building, (b) Lack of provisions for gondolas due to external fixtures.....	96
Figure 4.21: Insufficient space, light and ventilation at the basement for maintenance	96
Figure 4.22: Severely damaged tiled floors and sealant.....	97
Figure 4.23: Permanent stains on façade panels.....	98
Figure 4.24: Severe leakage through the basement slab.....	99
Figure 4.26 The lamp mounted on the parapet wall was abandoned due to frequent breakdown under water seepage.....	99
Figure 4.25 : External chains are used to fix the bulbs due to non-practicality for frequent access for easy replacement	99
Figure 4.27: Sealant cracks.....	101
Figure 4.28: Damage of the surfaces of poor quality of tiles	101
Figure 4.29: Cracks in the repaired waterproofing.....	101
Figure 4.30: Corroded cast iron drainage pipe	102
Figure 4.31: Water-ponding due to insufficient drainage towards the outlet.....	103

Figure 4.32 : Water-ponding due to poorly constructed drainage outlet.....	103
Figure 4.33: Water seepage due to poorly constructed wall adjacent to a wet area	103
Figure 4.34: water seepage through a poorly finished scaffolding hole.....	104
Figure 4.35: Poorly finished touch-up work: uneven surface	104
Figure 4.36: Wetting of the edge of the concrete slab due to a damaged gutter	107
Figure 4.37: Cracked and detached grille.....	107
Figure 4.38: Severely deteriorated concrete slabs	107
Figure 4.39 : Case 1- More cleaning cycles are required to remove frequent dirt stains on façade surfaces, close to busy roads	110
Figure 4.40: Case 2- A paint coating is applied over a granite tile column to prevent further falling of granite particles due to carbonation caused by the sea breath	110
Figure 4.41: Case 3- Frequent inspections are needed to detect corroded fixtures of the façade when the building is located closer to the sea	110
Figure 4.42: Flower pots and cloth hangers are hung along the parapet wall	112
Figure 5.1: A typical feed-forward multi-layer NN	117
Figure 5.2 : Architecture of the ensemble network	124
Figure 5.3 : Network performance. (a) Performance of trained roof expert network. (b) Performance of trained façade expert network. (c) Performance of trained basement expert network (d) Performance of trained internal area expert network (e) Performance of trained ensemble network	127
Figure 6.1: <i>MEs</i> under existing, improved and best performance conditions – high-rise private hospital.....	136
Figure 6.2: <i>MEs</i> under existing, improved and best performance conditions – High-rise building of a private local bank	142

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Common defects in buildings.....	11
Table 3.1: Research strategies	60
Table 3.2: Performance mandates and assessment terms	62
Table 3.3: Types of building	64
Table 3.4: Description of the 7-point Likert scale.....	73
Table 4.1: Risk variables related to architecture and design.....	85
Table 4.2: Risk variables related to structural and detailing	87
Table 4.3: Risk variables related to service integration	91
Table 4.4: Risk variables related to accessibility	95
Table 4.5: Risk variables related to maintenance requirements	97
Table 4.6: Risk variables related to materials and spare parts	100
Table 4.7: Risk variables related to constructability and construction quality.....	102
Table 4.8: Risk variables related to maintenance process quality.....	105
Table 4.9: Risk variables related to building characteristics, environment and exposure.....	109
Table 4.10: Risk variables related to user requirement and changes	111
Table 5.1: <i>ME</i> classes	119
Table 5.2: Performance of the networks.....	125
Table 6.1 Maintainability risk performance – Case study1.....	131
Table 6.3: Performances of risk factors for three scenarios – Case study 1.....	134
Table 6.4: Maintainability risk performance – Case study 2.....	137
Table 6.5: Calculation process for case study 2	139
Table 6.6: Performances of risks factors for three scenarios – Case study 2	140
Table 6.7: Modified risk input used during the forecasting of improved risk - Validation case -1	144
Table 6.8: Improvement of risk factors proposed for expected minimum maintenance requirements - Validation case – 1	145
Table 6.9: Modified risk input used during the forecasting of improved risk - Validation case -2.....	145
Table 6.10: Improvement of risk factors proposed for expected minimum maintenance requirements - Validation case - 2.....	146

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
AHP	Analytic Hierarchy Process
ANN	Artificial Neural Networks
BMI	Building Maintenance Information
BMS	Building Management System
BOI	Board of Investment
BOO	Build Operate and Own
BOT	Build Operate and Transfer
BPG	Building Performance Group
CAFM	Computer Aided Facilities Management
CAS	Constructability Appraisal System
CIBSE	Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers
CMA	Condominium Management Authority
CMC	Colombo Municipal Council
CMMS	Computerized Maintenance Management Systems
CONQUAS	Construction Quality Assessment System
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
HAPM	Housing Association Property Mutual Limited

IRR	Internal Rate of Return
MC	Management Corporation
M&E	Mechanical and Engineering
MSE	Mean Squared Error
NPV	Net Present Value
PeBBu	Performance Based Building Thematic Network
RICS	Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors
RBS	Risk Breakdown Structures

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Description	Page
Appendix A	Details of Buildings in the Survey Sample	189
Appendix B	Maintainability Risk Variables	196
Appendix C	Details of Substantive Experts	200
Appendix D	Risk Assessment using 7-Point Likert Scale	202