

BULETINUL INSTITUTULUI POLITEHNIC DIN IAȘI
Publicat de
Universitatea Tehnică „Gheorghe Asachi” din Iași
Tomul LVIII (LXII), Fasc. 2, 2012
Secția
CONSTRUCȚII. ARHITECTURĂ

PROBABILISTIC ASSESSMENT OF SEISMIC RISK OF BARCELONA, SPAIN, USING THE CAPRA PLATFORM

BY

M.C. MARULANDA², M.L. CARREÑO², O.D. CARDONA^{1,*}
and A.H. BARBAT²

¹National University of Colombia, Manizales, Colombia

²International Center for Numerical Methods – CIMNE,
Technical University of Catalonia, Spain

Received: February 24, 2012

Accepted for publication: March 30, 2012

Abstract. The Comprehensive Approach for Probabilistic Risk Assessment (CAPRA), is a robust methodology for modeling risk which allows identifying the most important aspects of catastrophes. CAPRA performs the evaluation of losses of the exposed elements using probabilistic metrics, such as the loss exceedance curve, the expected annual loss and the probable maximum loss, which are useful for multi-hazard risk analysis. The outcomes obtained with such a technical-scientific methodology are oriented to facilitate decision-making. They allow designing risk transfer instruments, evaluating the cost–benefit ratio, developing risk mitigation strategies and loss scenarios for emergency response, etc. The CAPRA platform is described in this paper by using as a testbed the city of Barcelona, Spain. Nevertheless, the results included for this urban area have not only a high scientific interest but also a practical one, because they are useful in taking risk reduction decision by the Municipality.

Key words: probabilistic seismic risk assessment; average annual loss; pure premium; loss exceedance curve.

*Corresponding author: *e-mail*: alex.barbat@upc.edu

1. Introduction

The frequency of catastrophic seismic events is particularly low and this is the reason why very limited historical data are available. Considering the possibility of future highly destructive events, risk estimation has to focus on probabilistic models that can use the limited available information to best predict future scenarios and consider the high uncertainty involved in the analysis. Therefore, risk assessments need to be prospective, anticipating scientifically credible events that might happen in the future. The earthquake prediction models use the seismological and engineering bases for its development, allowing the assessment of the risk of loss given a catastrophic event. Since large uncertainties related to the severity and frequency characteristics of the events are inherent in models, the earthquake risk models have to use probabilistic formulations that incorporate this uncertainty into the risk assessment. The probabilistic risk models built upon a sequence of modules (Woo, 1999; Grossi & Kunreuther, 2005; Cardona *et al.*, 2008 a, b, c, d), like that shown in Fig. 1, allow quantifying potential losses arising from earthquake events.




Fig. 1 – Probabilistic risk model.

In this sense, the probabilistic methodology Comprehensive Approach for Probabilistic Risk Assessment (CAPRA – Cardona *et al.*, 2010 a) lies on a robust model which identifies the most important aspects of catastrophe risk from the financial protection perspective according to the fiscal responsibility of the states. From the financial point of view, it is essential to estimate and quantify potential losses in a given exposure time given that the budget for both emergency response and recovery and reconstruction could mean a fiscal exposure and a non explicit contingent liability for governments at city and country levels (Pollner, 2001; Andersen, 2002). Estimation of contingent losses provides information and permits to set out strategies *ex ante* for reducing or financing them (Marulanda *et al.*, 2008 a, 2010 a; Cardona 2010 a, b). Assessment of potential losses allows budget allocation for structural retrofitting to reduce damages and implementation of effective financial

protection strategy to provide loss coverage of public infrastructure and private buildings to protect government resources and safeguard socio-economic development; in summary, to achieve the greater awareness, security culture and economic prosperity, the financial protection must be a permanent and long term policy (Freeman *et al.*, 2003).

A key strategic activities of disaster risk management is the assessment of the risk of disaster or of extreme events, which requires the use of reliable methodologies that allow an adequate calculation of probabilistic losses in exposed elements. The use of catastrophic risk models and the results obtained from risk analysis make feasible determining the potential deficit existing in case of the occurrence of an extreme event. Catastrophe risk models – based on metrics such as the Probabilistic Maximum Loss or the Average Annual Loss – are used to estimate, building by building, the probabilistic losses of different portfolios of exposed elements.

In what follows we describe the CAPRA platform and we illustrate all its modules with the seismic risk results of the city of Barcelona, Spain. The vulnerability and risk analysis of Barcelona were developed starting from the seismic hazard information available for the city and from the detailed cadastral information provided by the city administration, in order to obtain the probable maximum losses (loss exceedance curve) and the pure risk premiums (average annual loss) of each building of the city. Expected seismic risk scenarios have been obtained with the described model, which will be used by the Municipality of Barcelona to develop emergency response plans and to implement risk reduction measures.

2. Seismic Hazard Module

The hazard module of the probabilistic risk model defines the frequency and the severity of a hazard at a specific location. This is completed by analysing the historical event frequencies and reviewing scientific studies performed on the severity and frequencies in the region of interest. Once the hazard parameters are established, stochastic event sets are generated which define the frequency and severity of thousands of stochastic events. This module can analyse the intensity at a location, once an event of the stochastic set has occurred, by modelling the attenuation of the event between its location and the site under consideration, and evaluates the propensity of the local site conditions to either amplify or reduce the impact. The seismic hazard is quantified in terms of return periods (or exceedance rates) and the module provides the relevant seismic intensities necessary to evaluate the behaviour of the structures. Its calculation includes the contribution of the effects of all seismic sources located in a certain influence area.

The application to the city of Barcelona takes into account the seismic sources for the Catalonia region of Spain identified by Secanell *et al.* (2004).

Additionally, it considers the effects of the attenuation of the seismic waves by means of probabilistic spectral attenuation laws that include different source types (Ambraseys, 1996), as well as the local amplification effects based on microzonation studies. The site effects, considering the amplification of seismic hazard parameters according to the geological characterization of Barcelona, were established by Cid *et al.* (2001), where a transfer function and an amplification factor for the acceleration level at the rock level characterized each zone (see Fig. 2).




Fig. 2 – Seismic zonation based on local effects (Cid *et al.* 2001).

The seismic hazard was simulated by using the CRISIS 2007 code. The code allows estimating the hazard associated to all possible events that can occur, or to a group of selected events, or even to a single relevant event. Using the hazard module it is possible to calculate the probable maximum value of the intensity, characterized for different exceedance rates or return periods. An .ame file type is created in this module (amecomes from amenaza –hazard– in Spanish) which includes multiple grids on the area of study, of the different parameters of intensity of the considered phenomena. Each grid is a scenario of the intensity level obtained from historical or stochastic generated events, with their frequency of occurrence. For this case, the parameter of seismic intensity selected is the spectral acceleration.

Further, the desired risk parameters such as percentages of damage, economic losses, effects on people and other effects are evaluated, in a probabilistic framework, for each of the hazard scenarios and then these results are probabilistically integrated by using the occurrence frequencies of each earthquake scenario. For Barcelona, 2058 seismic hazard scenarios were generated.

3. Exposure Module

The *exposure* is mainly related to the infrastructure components or to the exposed population that can be affected by a particular event. The exposure module is based on files in *shape* format corresponding to the exposed infrastructure included in the risk analysis. To characterize the exposure, it is necessary to identify the individual components, including their location, their main physical, geometric and engineering characteristics, their vulnerability to hazardous events, their economic value and the level of human occupation that can have in a given analysis scenario. The exposure value of assets at risk is usually estimated from secondary sources such as available databases. The degree of precision of the results depends on the level of resolution and detail of exposure information.




Fig. 3 – Exposed value of Barcelona by AEBS.

The information used was compiled by Lantada (2007); the economic value of the exposed elements was supplied by the Cadastral Office of Barcelona, and 70,655 buildings were considered (Fig. 3). They are distributed in 10 municipal districts (Fig. 4), 73 neighborhoods, 233 Basic Statistical Areas (in Spanish AEB – Áreas Estadísticas Básicas) and 1,061 census sections. For each one of the buildings, the geographic location, economic value, year of construction, number of levels, structural type and human occupation, were defined. In order to proceed with the risk calculations, the results were

calculated building by buildings, but they can be presented by considering any geographical level according to the required resolution.




Fig. 4 – Administrative division of Barcelona.

In order to calculate the social impact, the general information related to building occupation is also estimated. Maximum occupancy and occupancy percentage at different hours of the day are also defined, allowing establishing different time scenarios of the event's occurrence. When no specific occupation information was available, an approximate occupation density by construction class was used to complete the information.

4. Vulnerability Module

The vulnerability module quantifies the damage caused to each asset class by the intensity of a given event at a site (Miranda, 1999). The classification of the assets is based on a combination of construction material, construction type (*i.e.* wall & roof combination), building use, number of levels and age. Estimation of damage is performed in terms of the mean damage ratio (MDR), which is defined as the ratio of the expected repair cost to the replacement cost of the structure. A vulnerability curve is defined relating the MDR to the earthquake intensity that can be expressed in terms of maximum acceleration (*e.g.* useful for 1...2 story buildings), spectral acceleration, velocity, drift or displacement (*e.g.* useful for multi-story buildings) at each location.

Most part of the building stock of Barcelona was constructed when no seismic-resistant construction codes existed. The combination of very old

buildings constructed without seismic code with a highly populated and active produced a high vulnerability which can generate a significant risk even under the effects of a moderate earthquake. The vulnerability module of the ERN-CAPRA platform defines the vulnerability of the buildings in the city by using vulnerability functions. The assignment of the vulnerability function to each exposed element is carried out in the exposure module by means of a shape format file. There is a vulnerability function corresponding to each building typology; the most common structural system used in Barcelona is the unreinforced masonry, followed by the reinforced concrete, whose construction has increased rapidly in recent decades. Steel structures are less used and they are not usually used for residential buildings but for industrial buildings, markets, sports areas, among others. The used typologies were defined in RISK-UE (2004) and are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Building Typology Matrix for Barcelona (RISK-UE 2004)

Unreinforced masonry	M3.1	Unreinforced masonry bearing walls with wooden slabs.
	M3.2	Unreinforced masonry bearing walls with masonry vaults.
	M3.3	Unreinforced masonry bearing walls with composite steel and masonry slabs.
	M3.4	Reinforced concrete slabs.
Reinforced concrete	RC3.1	Concrete frames with unreinforced masonry infill walls with regularly infill frames.
	RC3.2	Concrete frames with unreinforced masonry infill walls with irregularly frames (<i>i.e.</i> irregular structural system, irregular infill, soft/weak storey).
Steel moment frames	S1	A frame of steel columns and beams.
Steel braced frames	S2	Vertical components of the lateral-force-resisting system are braced frames rather than moment frames.
Steel frames with unreinforced masonry infill walls	S3	The infill walls usually are offset from the exterior frame members, wrap around them, and present a smooth masonry exterior with no indication of the frame.
Steel and RC composite systems	S5	Moment resisting frame of composite steel and concrete columns and beams. Usually the structure is concealed on the outside by exterior non-structural walls.
Wood structures	W	Repetitive framing by wood rafters or joints on wood stud walls. Loads are light and spans are small.

Each structural type is subdivided into three classes according to the height

a) *Low (L)*: 1 to 2 floors for masonry and wood structures; and 1 to 3 floors for reinforced concrete and steel buildings.

b) *Medium (M)*: 3 to 5 floors for masonry and wood structures; and 4 to 7 floors for reinforced concrete and steel buildings.

c) *High (H)*: 6 or more floors for masonry and wood structures; and 8 or more floors for reinforced concrete and steel buildings.




Fig. 5 – Vulnerability functions for unreinforced masonry buildings.




Fig. 6 – Vulnerability functions for reinforced concrete, steel and wood buildings.

Fig. 5 shows the vulnerability functions used for unreinforced masonry buildings and Fig. 6 shows the functions for other building typologies, for low (*L*), medium (*M*) and high (*H*) buildings. These functions relate the severity of the event, represented by the spectral acceleration with the average damage in the building.

5. Risk Module

The physical seismic risk is evaluated by means of the convolution of the hazard with the vulnerability of the exposed elements; the results are the potential consequences. Risk can be expressed in terms of damage or physical effects, absolute or relative economic loss and/or effects on the population.

Once the expected physical damage is estimated (average value and its dispersion) as a percentage for each of the assets or infrastructure components included in the analysis, one can make estimates of various parameters useful for the proposed analysis. Risk metrics calculated by using the model provide risk managers and decision makers with essential information required to manage future risks. One measure is the Average Annual Loss and the other is the Loss Exceedance Curve. Other measures, such as the Pure Risk Premium and the Probable Maximum Loss, can be computed based on the former.

a) *Average Annual Loss* (AAL) is the expected loss per year. Computationally, AAL is the sum of products of event expected losses and event annual occurrence probabilities for all the stochastic events considered in the loss model. In probabilistic terms, AAL is the mathematical expectation of the annual loss.

b) *Pure Risk Premium* (PRP) is the AAL divided by the replacement value of the asset, usually expressed as a rate per mill of monetary value.

c) *Loss Exceedance Curve* (LEC) represents the annual frequency with which a loss of any specified monetary amount will be exceeded. This is the most important catastrophe risk metric for risk managers, since it estimates the amount of funds required to meet risk management objectives. The LEC can be calculated for the largest event in one year or for all (cumulative) events in one year. For risk management purposes, the latter estimate is preferred, since it includes the possibility of one or more severe events resulting from earthquakes.

d) *Probable Maximum Loss* (PML) represents the loss amount for a given annual exceedance frequency, or its inverse, the return period. Depending on the stakeholder's risk tolerance, the risk manager may decide to manage for losses up to a certain return period (*e.g.* 1 event in 300 years). For that stakeholders (*e.g.* a public or private agency), the PML is the 300-year loss. For others, it may be 150 years or 500 years. It is noteworthy that it is frequent that certain stakeholders set the insolvency criterion at return periods between 150 years and 200 years. However, other involved stakeholders (*e.g.* governments or regulation agencies) have chosen much longer return periods, such as the Mexican Insurance Commission, which uses a return period of 1500 years to fix solvency margins of insurance companies in Mexico.

As previously said, the probabilistic risk analysis is done based on a series of hazard scenarios that adequately represent the effects of any event of feasible magnitude that can occur in the area of influence. Each of these

scenarios has an associated specific frequency or probability of occurrence. The probabilistic calculation procedure comprises the assessment using appropriate metrics, in this case the economic loss, for each exposed asset considering each of the hazard scenarios with its frequency of occurrence, and the probabilistic integration of the obtained results.

Table 2
Physical Exposure

Exposed value, [€× 10 ⁶]	31,522.80	
Average Annual, [€× 10 ⁶]	72.14	
Loss, [%o]	2.29	
PML		
Return period, [years]	Loss	
	€× 10 ⁶	%
50	729.35	2.31
100	1,770.16	5.62
250	3,699.35	11.74
500	5,172.26	16.41
1,000	6,510.67	20.65
1,500	7,021.14	22.27

Table 3
Dead People

Exposed value, [Inhab.]	1,639,880.00	
Average Annual, [Inhab.]	28.27	
Loss, [%o]	0.017	
PML		
Return period, (Years)	Loss	
	Inhab.	%
50	101.41	0.01
100	654.30	0.04
250	2,069.97	0.13
500	3,380.29	0.21
1,000	4,898.39	0.30
1,500	5,799.44	0.35

The AAL for physical assets, fatalities and injuries are calculated for each building of the city. The probabilistic results for of Barcelona are shown in Tables 2,...,4. Fig. 7 shows the PML curve obtained for Barcelona. Fig. 8 shows the expected annual loss for each AEB of Barcelona. As it was previously mentioned, the expected annual economic loss was calculated building by building and Fig. 9 shows the obtained results at this resolution. Figs. 10 and 11 show the expected annual loss for injured and deaths by AEB in Barcelona.

Table 4
Injured People

Exposed value, [Inhab.]	1,639,880.00	
Average Annual, [Inhab.]	113.55	
Loss, [‰]	0.07	
PML		
Return period, [years]	Loss	
	Inhab.	%
50	101.41	0.01
100	654.30	0.04
250	2,069.97	0.13
500	3,380.29	0.21
1,000	4,898.39	0.30
1,500	5,799.44	0.35




Fig. 7 – PML curve for Barcelona.




Fig. 8 – Expected annual loss for the AEBs of Barcelona.




Fig. 9 – Expected annual loss for each building in the Eixample District of Barcelona.




Fig. 10 – Expected annual loss for deaths by AEB in Barcelona.




Fig. 11 – Expected annual loss for injured by AEB in Barcelona.

In addition to the probabilistic economic figures, it is also relevant for the emergency response plans of the city to count with critical earthquake loss scenarios. In the case of Barcelona, a critical scenario for a loss with a return period of approximately 1000 years was chosen, to estimate the people that could lose their job or their houses. Assessments of these figures are based on the percentage of damage of each structure (greater than or equal to 20%). Table 6 presents the information of the critical scenario for Barcelona.

Table 6
Information of the Critical Scenario for Barcelona

N°	Scenario		Loss	
	Source	Magnitude	€× 10 ⁶	%
600	Zone 4_SF2	6.56	6.78E+03	21

The Figs. 12 and 13 show the scenarios of homeless and jobless by AEB in Barcelona.




Fig. 12 – Homeless by AEB in Barcelona.




Fig. 13 – Jobless by AEB in Barcelona.

6. Conclusions

Catastrophic risks such as earthquake risk impose a dreadful threat not only for private insurers and reinsurers, but also for governments whom, in turn, are risk-takers for most of the uninsured and uninsurable risk. Therefore, seismic risk models become powerful tools for government officials in economic and financial planning institutions. The retention and transfer of risk should be a planned and somewhat controlled process, given that the magnitude of the catastrophic problem could represent a great governmental response and financial liabilities. For management purposes the risk assessment should improve the decision-making process in order to contribute to the effectiveness of risk management, identifying the weaknesses of the exposed elements and their evolution over time. It is expected that the application in Barcelona will be useful for the risk reduction and emergency preparedness plans in the city.

The performed study focuses on the risk assessment at urban level (by geographic units) due to the earthquake hazards, using as risk measure the Probable Maximum Loss (PML) for different return periods and the Average Annual Loss (AAL) or technical risk premium. The values of PML and AAL are the main results of this application. These measures are of particular importance for the future design of risk retention (financing) or risk transfer instruments, and therefore they will be a particularly valuable contribution to further studies to define a strategy for financial protection to cover the fiscal liability of the State.

REFERENCES

- Ambraseys N.N., Simpson K.A., Bommer J.J., *Prediction of Horizontal Response Spectra in Europe*. Earthquake Engng. a. Struct. Dyn., **25**, 375-400 (1996).
- Andersen T., *Innovative Financial Instruments for Natural Disaster Risk Management*. Inter-Amer. Develop. Bank. Sustain. Develop. Dept. Techn. Papers, 2002.
- Barbat A.H., Carreño M.L., Pujades L.G., Lantada N., Cardona O.D., Marulanda M.C., *Seismic Vulnerability and Risk Evaluation Methods for Urban Areas. A Review with Application to a Pilot Area*. Struct. A. Infrastruct. Engng., **6**, 1-2 (2010).
- Cardona O.D., Ordaz M.G., Marulanda M.C., Barbat A.H., *Fiscal Impact of Future Earthquakes and Country's Economic Resilience Evaluation Using the Disaster Deficit Index*. Innovation Practice Safety, Proc. 14th World Conf. on Earthquake Engng., Beijing, China, 2008 c.
- Cardona O.D., Marulanda M.C., *Mecanismos Financieros, Seguro y Reaseguro contra Desastres Naturales en América Latina y el Caribe: Experiencias Recientes*. Secretaría Permanente del Sistema Económico Latinoamericano y del Caribe, SELA, SP/SR-IPMFSRCDALC/DT N° 2-10, Caracas (2010 b). Available at: http://www.sela.org/attach/258/EDOCS/SRed/2010/11/T023600004489-0-TDR_Estudio_Seguro_contra_Desastres_ALC_2010_REV-ODC.pdf.

- Cardona O.D., Ordaz M.G., Marulanda M.C., Barbat A.H., *Estimation of Probabilistic Seismic Losses and the Public Economic Resilience—An Approach for a Macroeconomic Impact Evaluation*. J. of Earthquake Engng., **12**, S2, 60-70 (2008 a).
- Cardona O.D., Ordaz M.G., Reinoso E., Yamín L.E., Barbat A.H., *Comprehensive Approach for Probabilistic Risk Assessment (CAPRA): International Initiative for Disaster Risk Management Effectiveness*. Proc. of 14th Europ. Conf. on Earthquake Engng., Ohrid, Macedonia, August 2010 a.
- Cardona O.D., Ordaz M.G., Yamín L.E., Arámbula S., Marulanda M.C., Barbat A.H., *Probabilistic Seismic Risk Assessment for Comprehensive Risk Management: Modeling for Innovative Risk Transfer and Loss Financing Mechanisms*. Innovation Practice Safety, Proc. 14th World Conf. on Earthquake Engng., Beijing, China, 2008 d.
- Cardona O.D., Ordaz M.G., Yamín L.E., Marulanda M.C., Barbat A.H., *Earthquake Loss Assessment for Integrated Disaster Risk Management*. J. of Earthquake Engng., **12**, S2, 48-59 (2008 b).
- Cid J., Susagna T., Goula X., Chavarria L., Figueras S., Fleta J., Casas, A. y Roca A., *Seismic Zonation of Barcelona Based on Numerical Simulation of Site Effects*. Pure Appl. Geophys., **158**, 2559-2577 (2001).
- Cid J., *Zonación sísmica de la ciudad de Barcelona basada en métodos de simulación numérica de efectos locales*. Tesis doctoral, Dpto. Ingeniería del Terreno, Cartográfica y Geofísica, Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña, Barcelona, 1998.
- Freeman P., Keen M., Muthukumara M., *Dealing with Increased Risk of Natural Disasters: Challenges and Options*. International Monetary Fund (IMF), Working Paper 03/197, 2003.
- Grossi P., Kunreuther H., *Catastrophe Modeling: A New Approach to Managing Risk*. Springer Science, 2005.
- Lantada N., *Evaluación del riesgo sísmico mediante métodos avanzados y técnicas GIS. Aplicación a la ciudad de Barcelona*. Tesis doctoral, Univ. Politécnica de Cataluña, Barcelona, Spain, 2007.
- Marulanda M.C., Cardona O.D., Barbat A.H., *Revealing the Socio-Economic Impact of Small Disasters in Colombia Using Desinventar database*. Disasters, **34**, 2, 552-570 (2010).
- Marulanda M.C., Cardona O.D., Ordaz M.G., Barbat A.H., *La gestión financiera del riesgo desde la perspectiva de los desastres: Evaluación de la exposición fiscal de los Estados y alternativas de instrumentos financieros de retención y transferencia del riesgo*. Monografía CIMNE IS-61, Univ. Politécnica de Cataluña, Barcelona, 2008.
- Miranda E., *Approximate Seismic Lateral Deformation Demands on Multistory Buildings*. J. of Struct. Engng., **125**, 4, 417-425 (1999).
- Pollner J., *Managing Catastrophic Disaster Risks Using Alternative Risk Financing and Pooled Insurance Structures*. World Bank Techn. Paper, 495, 2001.
- Secanell R., Goula X., Susagna T., Fleta J. y Roca A., *Seismic Hazard Zonation of Catalonia, Spain, Integrating Uncertainties*. J. of Seism., **8**, 1, 24-40 (2004).

- Woo G., *The Mathematics of Natural Catastrophes*. In Yamin L.E., Gallego M., Cardona O.D., Phillips C.A. *Recent Advances in Seismic Microzonation Studies, The Manizales-Colombia Case*, 13th World Conf. on Earthquake Engng., Vancouver, 2004.
- * * * *An Advanced Approach to Earthquake Risk Scenarios with Applications to Different European Towns*. Project of the European Commission, Contract number: EVK4-CT-2000-00014, RISK-UE, 2004.

EVALUAREA PROBABILISTĂ A RISCULUI SEISMIC AL ORAȘULUI BARCELONA, SPANIA, UTILIZÂND PLATFORMA CAPRA

(Rezumat)

Procedeeul de evaluare probabilistă integrală a riscului, CAPRA, este bazat pe o metodă robustă de modelare a riscului, care permite identificarea celor mai importante aspecte ale catastrofelor. CAPRA evaluează pierderile ce se produc în elementele expuse utilizând mărimi probabiliste, cum ar fi curba de depășire a pierderii, pierderea medie anuală și pierderea maximă probabilă, care sunt foarte utile în analiza riscului. Rezultatele care se obțin cu o astfel de metodă tehnico-științifică au ca obiectiv facilitarea luării de decizii. Ele permit proiectarea instrumentelor de transfer al riscului, evaluarea relației cost-beneficiu, dezvoltarea de strategii de reducere a riscului și calculul de scenarii de pierderi necesare pentru managementul situațiilor de urgență. Platforma CAPRA este descrisă în lucrare utilizând orașul Barcelona din Spania pentru a ilustra toate aspectele de calcul. Rezultatele care se prezintă pentru zona urbană studiată nu au doar un interes științific ci și unul practic, deoarece ele vor fi utilizate de primăria orașului pentru luarea de decizii de reducere a riscului.