



7th Framework Programme

FP7-SEC-2012.4.3-1

**Next Generation Damage and Post-Crisis Needs Assessment Tool for
Reconstruction and Recovery Planning
Capability Project**

Structural and non-structural damage evaluation of software modules incl. image-based monitoring

Deliverable No.	D7.2		
Workpackage No.	WP7	Workpackage Title	System Evaluation
Author(s)	Roger Berglund (FOI) Editorial		
Status	Final		
Version No.	V1.00		
File Name	RECONASS_D7.2_Structural_and_non_structural_Evaluation_of_software_modules_incl_image_based_monitoring_V1.00		
Delivery Date	31 05 2017		
Project First Start and Duration	Dec. 1, 2013; 42 months		



"This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no [312718]"

DOCUMENT CONTROL PAGE

Title	Structural and non-structural damage evaluation of software modules incl. image-based monitoring	
Authors	Name	Partner
	Roger Berglund (Editorial)	FOI
Contributors	Name	Partner
	Anand Vetrivel	ITC
	Evangelos Sdongos	ICCS
	Niko Joram	TUD
	Stephanos Camarinopoulos	RISA
	Emmanouil D. Bairaktaris	DBA
	Corrado Sanna	TECNIC
	Jonathan Naundrup	GS
	Sathish Nammi, Hassan Shirvani	ARU
	Michael Markus	THW
	Roger Berglund, Tobias Carlberg, Rickard Forsen, Björn Gregorsson	FOI
Peer Reviewers	Name	Partner
	Norman Kerle	ITC
	Stephanos Camarinopoulos	RISA
Format	Text-MS Word	
Language	en-UK	
Work Package	WP7	
Deliverable Number	D7.2	
Due Date of Delivery	31/05/2017	
Actual Date of Delivery	15/06/2017	
Dissemination Level	PP	
Rights	RECONASS Consortium	
Audience	<input type="checkbox"/> public <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> restricted <input type="checkbox"/> internal	
Revision	(none)	
Edited by		
Status	<input type="checkbox"/> draft <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consortium reviewed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> WP leader accepted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project coordinator accepted	

REVISION LOG

Version	Date	Reason	Name and Company
V 0.01	02/09/2016	First draft	Roger Berglund (FOI)
V 0.02	15/10/2016	Second draft	Björn Gregorsson (FOI)
V 0.03	03/05/2017	Third draft	Roger Berglund (FOI)
V 0.04	05/05/2017	Fourth draft	Roger Berglund, (FOI)
V 0.05	05/19/2017	Fifth draft	Roger Berglund, (FOI)
V 1.00	06/15/2017	Final version	Roger Berglund, (FOI) – Evangelos Sdongos, (ICCS)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOCUMENT CONTROL PAGE 2

REVISION LOG..... 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... 4

LIST OF FIGURES..... 6

LIST OF TABLES 11

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS 12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 13

1 INTRODUCTION 15

 1.1 GENERAL PROJECT OVERVIEW..... 15

 1.2 PILOT TEST..... 16

2 EXPERIMENTAL / PILOT SETUP 18

 2.1 THE PILOT STRUCTURE..... 18

 2.2 HIGH EXPLOSIVE CHARGES..... 22

 2.3 PILOT BUILDING INSTRUMENTATION - SENSORS AND RECORDINGS..... 23

 2.3.1 Local positioning tags 28

 2.3.2 Acceleration sensors..... 34

 2.3.3 Temperature sensors..... 40

 2.3.4 Strain sensors 43

 2.3.5 Communication gateway..... 45

 2.3.6 PCCDN tool 51

 2.4 ASSESSMENT MODULES..... 53

3 RECONASS COMPONENTS EVALUATION (RESULTS AND DISCUSSION) 57

 3.1 INTRODUCTION..... 57

 3.2 LOCAL POSITIONING TAGS 57

 3.2.1 External Detonation 57

 3.2.2 Internal Detonation..... 60

 3.3 ACCELERATION SENSORS..... 67

 3.3.1 External Detonation 67

 3.3.2 Internal Detonation..... 74

 3.4 TEMPERATURE SENSORS 85

 3.4.1 External Detonation 86

 3.4.2 Internal Detonation..... 88

 3.5 STRAIN SENSORS 88

 3.5.1 External Detonation 89

 3.5.2 Internal Detonation..... 92

 3.6 COMMUNICATION GATEWAY 92

3.6.1 External Detonation	94
3.6.2 Internal Detonation.....	104
3.7 PCCDN TOOL.....	126
3.7.1 External and Internal Detonation.....	127
4 EVALUATION OF DAMAGE ASSESSMENT MODULES (RESULTS AND DISCUSSION).....	151
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	151
4.1.1 VEBE	151
4.1.2 Structural Assessment Module	160
4.1.3 Non – Structural Assessment Module.....	163
4.2 COMPARISON OF RECONASS NON-STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT TO VEBE CODE	166
5 EVALUATION OF REMOTE SENSING MODULE (RESULTS AND DISCUSSION).....	168
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	168
5.2 DATA ACQUISITION AND PRE-PROCESSING:	168
5.2.1 Data acquisition using UAV:.....	168
5.2.2 Image orientation and 3D point cloud generation: generation of point cloud in local co-ordinate system.....	169
5.3 AUTOMATED DAMAGE DETECTION PROCESS	175
5.3.1 Damage assessment for the monitored building:	175
5.3.2 Damage assessment for the neighbouring building:	179
5.4 DATA SHARING TO PCCDN TOOL.....	182
5.5 FUNCTIONALITIES NOT TESTED	183
5.6 CONCLUSION	183
6 OTHER MEANS OF EVALUATION (RESULTS AND DISCUSSION).....	184
6.1 VISUAL INSPECTION RESULTS.....	184
6.1.1 Introduction	184
6.1.2 Visual inspection after the first blast.....	184
6.1.3 Visual inspection after the second blast.....	185
6.2 ADDITIONAL DEFORMATION MEASUREMENT	185
6.2.1 Measurement equipment and setup.....	185
6.2.2 Measurement of the initial situation.....	186
6.2.3 Measurement after the first blast.....	187
6.2.4 Measurement after the second blast.....	189
6.3 ADDITIONAL INSTRUMENTATION FOR NDEA AND FORTV	190
6.4 USER EVALUATION.....	192
7 CONCLUSIONS	193
8 REFERENCES	196
9 ANNEX/ES	197

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Construction site may 2016.....	16
Figure 2	Area view of the test site.....	17
Figure 3	Foundation level down view.....	18
Figure 4	Typical level down view.....	19
Figure 5	Cross-sections of columns & shear walls.....	19
Figure 6	Cross-sections of footing & connecting beams at foundation level.....	20
Figure 7	Cross-sections of beams for typical level.....	20
Figure 8	Exterior high explosive charge at 13 m standoff from the building wall (left), and predicted reflected pressure vs. impulse density at different distances from the building (right).....	22
Figure 9	Internal 15 kg high explosive charge in a backpack suspended in a rope (left), and predicted air blast pressure acting on the concrete wall (right).....	23
Figure 10	Strain Sensor Installation.....	24
Figure 11	Communication plan.....	25
Figure 12	Floor IDs (1F - 3F).....	26
Figure 13	1F floor plan.....	26
Figure 14	2F floor plan.....	27
Figure 15	3F floor plan.....	27
Figure 16	LPS System Management user interface.....	29
Figure 17	LPS Clustering software module with 10 configured clusters for the test building.....	29
Figure 18	Installed LPS tags on the ground floor.....	30
Figure 19	LPS tag deployment.....	33
Figure 20	GeoSIG AC-42 accelerometer.....	34
Figure 21	Technical overview of GeoSIG standard sensor housing.....	35
Figure 22	x,y alignment per floor.....	36
Figure 23	Room 1 accelerometer installation map.....	37
Figure 24	Room 4 accelerometer installation map.....	37
Figure 25	Room 5 accelerometer installation map.....	38
Figure 26	Room 8 accelerometer installation map.....	38
Figure 27	Room 9 accelerometer installation map.....	39
Figure 28	Room 12 accelerometer installation map.....	39
Figure 29	Accelerometer information flow.....	40
Figure 30	Csmicro Temperature sensor.....	41
Figure 31	Csmicro wiring diagram.....	41
Figure 32	Csmicro sensor with waspmote setup.....	42
Figure 33	Wireless sensor with Waspmote fitted to wall facing blast side.....	42
Figure 34	Illustration of temperature sensor directly connected to GS's datahub.....	43
Figure 35	Illustration of strain-gauges positions on the ground floor of pilot building.....	44
Figure 36	Illustration of wireless strain nodes (a) with and (b) without enclosure.....	44
Figure 37	Illustration of a set of 3 strain nodes.....	45
Figure 38	Managed network switch installation inside rack cabinet.....	46
Figure 39	Specialized UPS installation inside rack cabinet.....	46
Figure 40	Communication gateway installation inside rack cabinet.....	47
Figure 41	Network and communication gateway data flow.....	48
Figure 42	Communication equipment installation at first floor.....	50
Figure 43	Communication equipment installation at second floor.....	50
Figure 44	Communication equipment installation at third floor.....	51
Figure 45	Pilot setup for the PCCDN tool.....	52
Figure 46	Flow of information in case of an explosion.....	53
Figure 47	Input and Output in the L&NAM Module.....	54

Figure 48	Non-structural elements in the Pilot Building	55
Figure 49	Detachment damage between the two circuit boards inside the LPS package.....	57
Figure 50	Lid of damaged LPS tag ripped off by the blast	58
Figure 51	Damaged rawplug mounting with intact LPS tag.....	59
Figure 52	Broken base plate on the wall facing the external explosion.....	59
Figure 53	Deployed LPS tags on the ground floor after second detonation.....	62
Figure 54	LPS tag deployment plan after second detonation.....	63
Figure 55	Comparison of tag coordinates before and after the second detonation, top-view and side-view (red triangles mark the measured new position)	64
Figure 56	3D view of the original and measured tag positions, the solid lines emphasize the ceiling boundaries before and after the explosion.....	64
Figure 57	Personnel tracking in 3 rd floor, setup and mobile station with prism.....	65
Figure 58	Results for personnel tracking experiment, walked track and positioning error	66
Figure 59	Accelerometer 55725 detach from wall after external explosion.....	68
Figure 60	Overview of sensors which recorded the external blast.....	69
Figure 61	AC07 55717, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	70
Figure 62	AC07 55717, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	70
Figure 63	AC08 55718, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	71
Figure 64	AC08 55718, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	71
Figure 65	AC10 55720, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	72
Figure 66	AC10 55720, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	72
Figure 67	AC11 55721, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	73
Figure 68	AC11 55721, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	73
Figure 69	Overview of sensors which recorded the internal blast.....	74
Figure 70	AC05 55715, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	75
Figure 71	AC05 55715, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	75
Figure 72	AC06 55716, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	76
Figure 73	AC06 55716, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	76
Figure 74	AC07 55717, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	77
Figure 75	AC07 55717, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	77
Figure 76	AC08 55718, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	78
Figure 77	AC08 55718, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	78
Figure 78	AC10 55720, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	79
Figure 79	AC10 55720, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	79
Figure 80	AC11 55721, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	80
Figure 81	AC11 55721, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	80
Figure 82	AC14 55724, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	81
Figure 83	AC14 55724, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	81
Figure 84	AC16 55726, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	82
Figure 85	AC16 55726, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	82
Figure 86	AC17 55727, plot of time series of acceleration at event.....	83
Figure 87	AC17 55727, plot of frequency domain of recorded event. On LOG-LOG scale.	83
Figure 88	Battery from datahub, displaying clear signs of pressure.....	84
Figure 89	Example of pressure applied to datahub from outside.....	85
Figure 90	Temperature sensor (No-001) facing the blast side.....	88
Figure 91	A damaged strain node due to first detonation	91
Figure 92	Partially damaged strain node with blown away due to first detonation	91
Figure 93	Accelerometer 1 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	94
Figure 94	Accelerometer 2 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	94
Figure 95	Accelerometer 3 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	95
Figure 96	Accelerometer 4 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	95
Figure 97	Accelerometer 5 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	96
Figure 98	Accelerometer 6 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	96

Figure 99	Accelerometer 7 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	97
Figure 100	Accelerometer 8 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	97
Figure 101	Accelerometer 9 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	98
Figure 102	Accelerometer 10 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	98
Figure 103	Accelerometer 11 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	99
Figure 104	Accelerometer 12 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	99
Figure 105	Accelerometer 13 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	100
Figure 106	Accelerometer 14 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	100
Figure 107	Accelerometer 15 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	101
Figure 108	Accelerometer 16 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	101
Figure 109	Strain 14 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	102
Figure 110	Strain 16 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	102
Figure 111	Temp 5 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	103
Figure 112	Temp 6 measurements plot for the 1st explosion	103
Figure 113	Accelerometer 1 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	104
Figure 114	Accelerometer 2 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	104
Figure 115	Accelerometer 3 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	105
Figure 116	Accelerometer 4 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	105
Figure 117	Accelerometer 5 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	106
Figure 118	Accelerometer 6 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	106
Figure 119	Accelerometer 7 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	107
Figure 120	Accelerometer 8 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	107
Figure 121	Accelerometer 9 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	108
Figure 122	Accelerometer 10 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	108
Figure 123	Accelerometer 11 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	109
Figure 124	Accelerometer 12 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	109
Figure 125	Accelerometer 13 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	110
Figure 126	Accelerometer 14 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	110
Figure 127	Accelerometer 15 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	111
Figure 128	Accelerometer 16 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	111
Figure 129	Strain 37 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	112
Figure 130	Strain 38 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	112
Figure 131	Temp 5 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	113
Figure 132	Temp 6 measurements plot for the 2nd explosion	113
Figure 133	Top view of the space where the network was established	114
Figure 134	Network topology of scenario 1	116
Figure 135	Network topology of scenario 2	118
Figure 136	Accelerometer ACC_VS01-External explosion	127
Figure 137	Accelerometer ACC_VS03-External explosion	128
Figure 138	Accelerometer ACC_VS15-External explosion	129
Figure 139	Accelerometer ACC_VS16-External explosion	130
Figure 140	Accelerometer ACC_VS01-Internal explosion	131
Figure 141	Accelerometer ACC_VS02-Internal explosion	132
Figure 142	Accelerometer ACC_VS03-Internal explosion	133
Figure 143	Accelerometer ACC_VS04-Internal explosion	134
Figure 144	Accelerometer ACC_VS05-Internal explosion	135
Figure 145	Accelerometer ACC_VS06-Internal explosion	136
Figure 146	Accelerometer ACC_VS07-Internal explosion	137
Figure 147	Accelerometer ACC_VS15-Internal explosion	138
Figure 148	Accelerometer ACC_VS16-Internal explosion	139
Figure 149	Local position sensor LPS_001-Internal explosion	140
Figure 150	Local position sensor LPS_003-Internal explosion	141
Figure 151	Local position sensor LPS_004-Internal explosion	142

Figure 152	Local position sensor LPS_008-Internal explosion	143
Figure 153	Local position sensor LPS_015-Internal explosion	144
Figure 154	Temperature sensor temp_002-External explosion	145
Figure 155	Temperature sensor temp_003-External explosion	145
Figure 156	Temperature sensor temp_007-External explosion	146
Figure 157	Temperature sensor temp_008-External explosion	147
Figure 158	Temperature sensor temp_009-External explosion	148
Figure 159	Point cloud of the scene after the first explosion.....	148
Figure 160	Calculated debris after the external explosion	149
Figure 161	Point cloud of the scene after the second blast	149
Figure 162	Calculated debris after the internal explosion	150
Figure 163	Sketch illustrating the different damage zones used in VEBE.	152
Figure 164	The aiming point of the attack (magenta) and the hit points of the missiles. The blue marked building (type B3MN) has been hit by two missiles.	153
Figure 165	Craters in the ground (green dots) for the two missiles not hitting a building.....	153
Figure 166	Building debris after detonation of the missiles.....	154
Figure 167	To the left in the image a plan and a section is displayed (for the green marked building in the map) with different damage zones indicated.	154
Figure 168	One of the final results of the VEBE simulated attack is a calculation of the size of the different damage zones.	155
Figure 169	Extent of debris after explosion.....	156
Figure 170	To the left in the image is the plan and section displayed with different damage zones indicated.....	156
Figure 171	Size of different damage zones after the internal explosion.....	157
Figure 172	Calculated damaged (collapsed) walls (red hatching) and wall collapse zone (red hatching) from exterior charge.	158
Figure 173	Calculated damage zones from interior charge. Floor collapse (solid red), wall collapse (red hatching), crack zone (yellow hatching), shake zone (green hatching).....	159
Figure 174	Formation of Plastic Hinges and the corresponding Damage Indices.....	161
Figure 175	Modified Structural Model due to the Internal Explosion	161
Figure 176	Side-by-side comparison of Observed Damages against the calculated Plastic Hinge Pattern and the corresponding Damage Indices at every Hinge	162
Figure 177	NE and SE 3D view of the pilot building.....	163
Figure 178	Output of the Loss and Needs Assessment Module for the considered SE and NE view.....	166
Figure 179	Aibotix Aibot X6 V2	168
Figure 180	Circular layout of images, also indicating the ground control points (green circles).....	169
Figure 181	Processes employed to co-register the images with the BIM-Model.....	170
Figure 182	Statistics of point-to-plane measures - per reference plane the mean orthogonal distance and the corresponding standard deviation (both in cm) is shown	172
Figure 183	Examples - UAV image, UAV-based PC and point-to-plane distances.....	173
Figure 184	Wall facing the TNT charge after the detonation. UAV-based image.....	174
Figure 185	Eigen-value derived geometric features: curvature (top) and standard deviation of normal-Z-component (bottom), UAV-based (left), TLS-based (right).....	175
Figure 186	The automatically classified point cloud of CAD model depicting the element-wise damage information (left-top and left bottom) of blast-1 identified and the corresponding images (right-top and right bottom) f. The damaged regions are annotated using alphabets A-H.....	177
Figure 187	The automatically classified point cloud of CAD model depicting the element-wise damage information (left-top and left bottom) of blast-2 and the corresponding images (right-top and right bottom). The damaged regions are annotated using alphabets A-H.....	178
Figure 188	The detected missing element by comparison of pre- and post-event point cloud are highlighted (A-E) in the point cloud of CAD model for reference (left-top). The corresponding elements are highlighted in pre-event image (right-top) and post-event images (left- and right-bottom).....	179

Figure 189	Point cloud of the building after blast-2 The openings detected as damage by the developed method are highlighted and annotated (top). The i. The detected debris is highlighted using red polygons in the images (bottom)T	181
Figure 190	Automated 3D reconstruction of building based on the point cloud depicted in Figure 189.....	182
Figure 191	Visual inspection after the first blast.....	184
Figure 192	The four main total station positions and the reference points	186
Figure 193	Reference point (left) and THW members working with total station (right)	186
Figure 194	The six initial 3D scans merged together	187
Figure 195	Façade facing first blast with crater (left) and point X8 with a deformation of 10 mm away from the detonation centre	188
Figure 196	Histogram showing the number of measurements in N-direction and the measurement intervals in meters after the first blast.....	188
Figure 197	Point cloud of the scans after the first detonation (left). comparison to the initial scan, red indicates 10 mm displacement (right).....	189
Figure 198	Situation after second blast with collapsed floors and girders (from the west).....	189
Figure 199	Situation after second blast with bent wall compared to situation before (from east).....	190
Figure 200	Location of pressure gauges and accelerometers for the pilot test, 3D views and section	191
Figure 201	Free field pressure from the 400 kg charge at 13 m (ground level), and reflected pressure at location P1	192
Figure 202	Schematic workflow of the Reconass system. More detailed in Figure 11.....	193

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Initial LPS coordinates as measured by the total station.....	31
Table 2	Assignment of LPS nodes to clusters	32
Table 3	Pilot goals regarding the communication gateway and network nodes/interfaces	47
Table 4	Clustering of LPS tags after first detonation (empty clusters due to damage)	60
Table 5	LPS tag coordinates before the second detonation as measured by total station.....	61
Table 6	LPS tag coordinates after second detonation	63
Table 7	Temperature sensor (No-006) reading showing a data gap due to datahub reset.....	86
Table 8	Temperature sensor (No-007) reading showing temperature variation on the top floor.....	87
Table 9	Data gaps and recorded data files after initial detonation	90
Table 10	Estimated Strain after first detonation through measurements across BCM-1.....	90
Table 11	The aggregate of captured sensor measurements during the periods of the two explosions (phenomenon peak time)	93
Table 12	Summary of measurements received during the execution of scenario 1.....	117
Table 13	Summary of measurements received during the execution of scenario 2.....	119
Table 14	Summary of measurements received during the execution of scenario 3.....	121
Table 15	Summary of measurements received during the execution of scenario 4.....	123
Table 16	Summary of measurements received during the execution of scenario 5.....	125
Table 17	VEBE results for the external explosion of 400 kg TNT.	158
Table 18	A compilation of damage zones for the internal detonation.	159
Table 19	Calculated Displacements at the locations of the Accelerometers.....	160
Table 20	Damage States calculated by the Module and comparison with the surveyed damages – View SE	164
Table 21	Damage States calculated by the Module and comparison with the surveyed damages – View NE	165
Table 22	Comparison between the two methods of calculation and the results of the pilot test.	167

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ABBREVIATION	DESCRIPTION
ARU	Anglia Ruskin University
FOI	Swedish Defence Research Agency
FORTV	Swedish Fortifications Agency
GS	GeoSIG Ltd
HBM	Hottinger Baldwin Messtechnik GmbH
ICP	Integrated Circuit Piezoelectric
LPS	Local positioning system
NDEA	Norwegian Defence Estates Agency
PCB	PCB Piezotronics, manufacturer of piezoelectric sensors
PETN	Pentaerythritol Tetranitrate
RDX	Research Department Formula X (i.e. Cyclotrimetylenetrinitramine))
TNT	Trinitrotoluene
TUD	Technische Universität Dresden

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

D7.2 shall include reporting of efforts for T7.3.2, T7.4 and T.5. The entire consortium is expected to contribute with regards to the evaluation of the components they develop.

D7.2 shall provide evaluation of the RECONASS components (sensors, comms, PCCDN and modules) from a technical perspective. This should be performed in accordance to the technical requirements/specifications (and/or functional requirements/specifications) delivered in WP1 (D1.3 and D1.4).

The descriptions from the DoW of T7.3.2, T7.4 and T.5 follow:

Sub Task 7.3.2 Structural Testing (Task Leader: FOI)

A multi-storey building in scale (initial estimates indicate ½ scale) where high explosive is detonated in two steps. First step is an explosion outside the building resulting in part damage of one side of the building. Second step is a small blast inside one room of the building. Local positioning of tags will be recorded before and after blast event. Data from the experiments will be correlated with assessment of structural condition before and after event. This part of work will be in cooperation with DBA. The finite element model of the building will be made by DBA. Some façade elements will be included in the building. Moreover, the whole RECONASS system (including the communication system and the PCCDN) will be used to provide the base station and stakeholders (THW, members of the User Group, associate partners, regular partners in this work) with data and information on the monitored building under blast loading so that it can be evaluated.

Partners' Roles:

ICCS will install and test the communication gateway into the test site building in Sweden.

TUD will support the test design and the evaluation of the local positioning data

FOI, the task leader, will design the test, build the building on the test site and perform the experiment. Moreover, it will write a report on the evaluation of the integrated system that will include a summary of the feedback of the end users that will be involved.

RISA will provide the PCCDN Tool and use information from this task to evaluate it in terms of interoperability, allowance for collaborative work, fusion of external data, functionality, etc.

DBA will produce the finite element model of the building and will use data from the experiments to evaluate the Module on Structural Assessment.

GS will provide the acceleration sensors of the monitoring system and use data from the tests to evaluate it.

THW will evaluate the input it will receive from the test.

ARU will provide the strain and temperature sensors of the monitoring system and use data from the tests to evaluate it. ARU will also install the monitoring system (including the tags) for the tests, including activities that are not specific to GS's expertise.

Task 7.4 Evaluation of Non-Structural Damage Assessment Sub-Module (Task Leader: FOI)

FOI will use the VEBE code to evaluate the non-structural damage assessment sub-module. Also data from testing under 7.3.2 will be used by **TECNIC** to evaluate the same module.

Task 7.5 Evaluation of the detailed image-based monitoring of the building exterior and structural changes (Task Leader: ITC)

UAV-based oblique images will be acquired of the test building (simulating data from established commercial services such as Pictometry), and used to (i) test how well damage assessed at the building exterior based on measurements from the monitoring system can be detected in 3D image-based assessment, (ii) to determine level of detail and accuracy façade changes (shifting, tilting, loss of façade elements) automatic mapping using oblique data, (iii) determine how damage mapping of the area surrounding the monitored building based on oblique aerial imagery can be calibrated/improved based on sensor information, (iv) determine how accurately external debris piles can be mapped and their volume quantified, and (v) to what extent Pictometry-like oblique image-data obtained with an inexpensive UAV solution may be suitable to replace commercial services such as Pictometry, at least for localised monitoring of a sensor-equipped building and its environs.

Partners' Roles:

ITC, the task leader, will use test data to determine if oblique airborne data provide the detailed exterior building damage information needed, to calibrate/improve standard satellite-based damage maps, and to assess how the data integrate to the PCCDN.