

Recommendations on Excavations EAB

2nd Edition

Translation of the 4th German Edition

Published by

the German Geotechnical Society

(Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geotechnik e.V., DGGT)

Recommendations on Excavations EAB

Recommendations on Excavations

EAB

2nd Edition

Translation of the 4th German Edition

Published by

the German Geotechnical Society

(Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geotechnik e.V., DGGT)

Working Group on „Excavations“ of the German Geotechnical Society
Chairman: Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil. Dr.-Ing. E. h. Anton Weissenbach,
Am Gehölz 14, 22844 Norderstedt, Germany

The original 4th German edition was published under the title
Empfehlungen des Arbeitskreises „Baugruben“ EAB
by Ernst & Sohn, Berlin

Translator: Alan Johnson, Nordstemmen, Germany

Cover picture: IMAX Nuremberg, excavation (Photo: BAUER AG, Schrobenhausen, Germany)

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>

ISBN 978-3-433-01855-2

© 2008 Ernst & Sohn Verlag für Architektur und technische Wissenschaften GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin
All rights reserved (including those of translation into other languages). No part of this book may
be reproduced in any form – by photoprinting, microfilm, or any other means – nor transmitted or
translated into a machine language without written permission from the publishers.

Registered names, trademarks, etc. used in this book, even when not specifically marked as such,
are not to be considered unprotected by law.

Typesetting: Manuela Treindl, Laaber
Printing: Strauss GmbH, Mörlenbach
Binding: Litges & Dopf GmbH, Heppenheim
Printed in Germany

Members of the Working Group for Excavations

At the time of publication of these Recommendations the Working Group for Excavations consisted of the following members:

Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil Dr.-Ing E. h. A. Weißenbach, Norderstedt (Chairman)
Dipl.-Ing. U. Barth, Mannheim
Dipl.-Ing. I. Feddersen, Karlsruhe
Dipl.-Ing. P. Gollub, Schrobenhausen
Dipl.-Ing. W. Hackenbroch, Duisburg
Dipl.-Ing. E. Hanke, Eckental
Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. habil A. Hettler, Dortmund
Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. H. G. Kempfert, Kassel
Dr.-Ing. K. Langhagen, Dietzenbach
Dipl.-Ing. Ch. Sängler, Stuttgart
Dipl.-Ing. E. Schultz, Bad Vilbel
Dipl.-Ing. W. Vogel, Munich
Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. B. Walz, Wuppertal

Further members of the Working Group were:

o. Prof. em. Dr.-Ing. H. Breth (†), Darmstadt
Dipl.-Ing. R. Briske (†), Horrem
Dipl.-Ing. H. Bülow, Berlin
Dipl.-Ing. G. Ehl, Essen
Dipl.-Ing. E. Erler (†), Essen
Dipl.-Ing. H. Friesecke, Hamburg
Dipl.-Ing. F. Gantke, Dortmund
Dipl.-Ing. Th. Jahnke (†), Cologne
o. Prof. Dr.-Ing. H. L. Jessberger (†), Bochum
Dipl.-Ing. K. Kast (†), Munich
Dr.-Ing. H. Krimmer, Frankfurt
o. Prof. em. Dr.-Ing. E. h. E. Lackner (†), Bremen
Dipl.-Ing. K. Martinek, Munich
Dipl.-Ing. H. Ch. Müller Haude (†), Frankfurt/Main
o. Prof. Dr.-Ing. H. Nendza (†), Essen
Prof. Dr.-Ing. E. h. M. Nußbaumer, Stuttgart
Dipl.-Ing. E. Pirlet (†), Cologne
Dr.-Ing. H. Schmidt-Schleicher, Bochum
Prof. Dr.-Ing. H. Schulz, Karlsruhe
o. Prof. Dr.-Ing. H. Simons (†), Braunschweig
Dipl.-Ing. H. H. Sonder, Berlin
Dr.-Ing. J. Spang (†), Munich
Dr.-Ing. D. Stroh, Essen
Dipl.-Ing. U. Timm, Mannheim

Prof. Dr.-Ing. K. R. Ulrichs (†), Essen
Dipl.-Ing. K. Wedekind, Stuttgart
Prof. Dipl.-Ing. H. Wind, Frankfurt/Main

Preface*

In response to a clearly overwhelming requirement, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erd- und Grundbau e. V.* (German Society for Geotechnical and Foundation Engineering) called the Working Group for Tunnel Engineering into life in 1965 and transferred the chairmanship to the highly respected and now sadly missed Prof. *J. Schmidbauer*. The wide-ranging tasks of the Working Group were divided into three sub-groups “General”, “Open Cut Methods” and “Trenchless Technology”. The “Open Cut Methods” Working Group, under the chairmanship of the author, at first busied itself only with the urgent questions of analysis, design and construction of excavation enclosures. The German Society for Geotechnical and Foundation Engineering published the preliminary results of the Working Group as the “Recommendations for Calculation of Braced or Anchored Soldier Pile Walls with Free Earth Support for Excavation Structures, March 1968 Draft”.

During the course of work involving questions concerning analysis, design and construction of excavation enclosures, it was recognised that these matters were so comprehensive that the German Society for Geotechnical and Foundation Engineering decided to remove this area from the “Tunnel Engineering” Working Group and transfer it to a separate Working Group, that of “Excavations”; the personnel involved were almost completely identical with those of the previous “Open Cut Methods” Group. The first publication of the new Working group appeared with the title “Recommendations of the Working Group for Excavations” in the journal “*Die Bautechnik*” (Construction Technology) in 1970. It was based on a thorough reworking, restructuring and enhancement of the proposals published in 1968 and consisted of 24 numbered Recommendations, which primarily dealt with the basic principles of the analysis of excavation enclosures, analysis of soldier pile walls, sheet pile and in-situ concrete walls for excavations, and with the impact of buildings beside excavations.

In the years following this, the Working Group for Excavations published new and reworked Recommendations in two-year periods. As a stage was reached at which no further revisions were envisaged, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erd- und Grundbau e. V.* decided to summarise the 57 Recommendations strewn throughout the “*Die Bautechnik*” journal, volumes 1970, 1972, 1974, 1976, 1978 and 1980, and to present them to the profession in one single volume.

In the 2nd (German) edition, published in 1988, the Recommendations were partly reworked and, in addition, supplemented by nine further Recommendations dealing with “Excavations in Water”, which were published in draft form in the 1984 volume of *Bautechnik*, and by two further Recommendations for “Pressure Diagrams for Braced Retaining Walls”, published in *Bautechnik* in 1987. Four further Recommendations resulted from partial restructuring and from endeavours

* The Preface refers to the 4th German Edition.

to make the Recommendations more easily understandable. The alterations and supplements are described in an article in the 1989 volume of *Bautechnik*.

In the 3rd (German) edition, published in 1994, a number of the Recommendations were reworked and three new Recommendations on “Excavations with Special Ground Plans” added. The modifications to the existing Recommendations are described in the 1995 volume of *Bautechnik*. In the same issue, the three new Recommendations were also presented to the professional public in draft form. Furthermore, an appendix was included, containing the principal construction supervision regulations, where they are relevant to stability analysis.

At the same time that the 3rd (German) edition of the EAB was being compiled, the Working Group for Excavations was deeply occupied with the implementation of the new partial safety factor approach in geotechnical and foundation engineering. On the one hand this was because several members of the Working Group for Excavations were also represented in the “Safety in Geotechnical and Foundation Engineering” Committee, which was compiling the DIN V 1054-100. On the other hand, it became increasingly obvious that excavation structures were affected by the new regulations to a far greater degree than other foundation engineering structures. In particular the specification in the new draft European regulations EN 1997-1, prescribing two analyses was unacceptable. This applied partial safety factors to the shear strength on one side and to the actions on the other. Compared to previously tried and tested practice it produced results that in part led to considerably greater dimensions but also to results that were too liberal. In contrast to this stood the draft DIN 1054 counter-model, in which the partial safety factors identified using the classical shear strength method were applied in the same manner to the external actions, and to the earth pressure and soil resistances. In the EAB-100, published in 1996 together with ENV 1997-1 and DIN 1054-100, the practical applications of both concepts were introduced and the differences illuminated. This was intended to make the decision in favour of the German proposals, which was still open, more straightforward for the profession.

Two important decisions were subsequently made: on the one hand the EN 1997-1 was published in a format that included the proposals of the new DIN 1054 as one of three allowable alternatives. On the other hand the DIN 1054-100 was modified such that the originally envisaged superpositioning of earth pressure design values and passive earth pressure design values was no longer permissible, because this route could not be reconciled with the principle of strict separation of actions and resistances. In addition, one now has characteristic internal forces and characteristic deformations when adopting characteristic actions for the given system, with the result that generally only one analysis is required for verification of both bearing capacity and serviceability. This 4th (German) edition of the EAB rests entirely upon these points, but also expands them by supplementary regulations, just as it has in the past. Moreover, all the Recommendations of the 3rd (German) edition have been subjected to thorough reworking. Recommendations

on the use of the modulus of subgrade reaction method and the finite element method (FEM), as well as a new chapter on excavations in soft soils, have been added. These had previously been presented to the profession for comments in the 2002 and 2003 volumes of the *Bautechnik* journal, based on the global safety factor approach. Much correspondence, some very extensive, has been taken into consideration in this issue.

By reworking existing Recommendations and publishing new ones the Working Group for Excavations aims to:

- a) simplify analysis of excavation enclosures;
- b) unify load approaches and analysis procedures;
- c) guarantee the stability of the excavation structure and its individual components and;
- d) guarantee the economic design of the excavation structures.

The Working Group for Excavations would like to express thanks to all who have supported the work of the Working Group in the past, in correspondence or by other means, and requests your further support for the future.

A. Weissenbach

Contents

Members of the Working Group for Excavations	V
Preface	VII
Notes for the user	XVI
1 General Recommendations	1
1.1 Engineering requirements for applying the Recommendations (R 1)...	1
1.2 Governing regulations (R 76)	1
1.3 New safety factor approach (R 77)	3
1.4 Limit states (R 78)	5
1.5 Support of retaining walls (R 67).....	6
1.6 Using the EAB in conjunction with Eurocode 7-1 (R 105, draft).....	7
2 Analysis principles	10
2.1 Actions (R 24)	10
2.2 Determination of soil properties (R 2).....	11
2.3 Earth pressure angle (R 89).....	13
2.4 Partial safety factors (R 79).....	15
2.5 General requirements for adopting live loads (R 3)	16
2.6 Live loads from road and rail traffic (R 55)	18
2.7 Live loads from site traffic and site operations (R 56).....	20
2.8 Live loads from excavators and lifting equipment (R 57)	22
3 Magnitude and distribution of earth pressure	25
3.1 Magnitude of earth pressure as a function of the selected construction method (R 8)	25
3.2 Magnitude of active earth pressure without surcharge loads (R 4) ...	26
3.3 Distribution of active earth pressure load without surcharges (R 5) ..	29
3.4 Magnitude of active earth pressure from live loads (R 6)	32
3.5 Distribution of active earth pressure from live loads (R 7)	34
3.6 Superimposing earth pressure components with surcharges (R 71)...	37
3.7 Determination of at-rest earth pressure (R 18).....	39
3.8 Earth pressure in retreating states (R 68)	41

4	General stipulations for analysis	43
4.1	Stability analysis (R 81).....	43
4.2	General information on analysis methods (R 11)	44
4.3	Determination and analysis of embedment depth (R 80).....	48
4.4	Determination of action effects (R 82)	51
4.5	Limit load design method (R 27)	53
4.6	Modulus of subgrade reaction method (R 102)	54
4.7	Finite-element method (R 103).....	60
4.8	Verification of the vertical component of the mobilised passive earth pressure (R 9).....	64
4.9	Verification of the transmission of vertical forces into the subsurface (R 84)	67
4.10	Stability analyses for braced excavations in special cases (R 10)	69
4.11	Verification of serviceability (R 83)	71
4.12	Allowable simplifications in the STR limit state (R 104, draft).....	74
5	Analysis approaches for soldier pile walls	77
5.1	Determination of load models for soldier pile walls (R 12)	77
5.2	Pressure diagrams for supported soldier pile walls (R 69)	78
5.3	Passive earth pressure for soldier pile walls with free earth supports (R 14)	81
5.4	Toe restraint for soldier pile walls (R 25).....	83
5.5	Equilibrium of horizontal forces for soldier pile walls (R 15)	86
6	Analysis approaches for sheet pile walls and in-situ concrete walls	90
6.1	Determination of load models for sheet pile walls and in-situ concrete walls (R 16)	90
6.2	Pressure diagrams for supported sheet pile walls and in-situ concrete walls (R 70)	92
6.3	Ground reactions and passive earth pressure for sheet pile walls and in-situ concrete walls (R 19)	94
6.4	Toe restraint for sheet pile walls and in-situ concrete walls (R 26) ...	96
7	Anchored retaining walls	101
7.1	Magnitude and distribution of earth pressure for anchored retaining walls (R 42).....	101
7.2	Analysis of force transmission from anchors to the ground (R 43)	102
7.3	Analysis of stability at low failure plane (R 44)	103
7.4	Analysis of global stability (R 45)	109
7.5	Measures to counteract displacements in anchored retaining walls (R 46)	112

8	Excavations with special ground plans	114
8.1	Excavations with circular plan (R 73)	114
8.2	Excavations with oval plan (R 74)	119
8.3	Excavations with rectangular plan (R 75) (11/05)	125
9	Excavations adjacent to structures	130
9.1	Engineering measures for excavations adjacent to structures (R 20)	130
9.2	Analysis of retaining walls with active earth pressure for excavations adjacent to structures (R 21)	132
9.3	Active earth pressure for large distances to structures (R 28)	134
9.4	Active earth pressure for small distances to structures (R 29)	137
9.5	Analysis of retaining walls with increased active earth pressure (R 22)	139
9.6	Analysis of retaining walls with at-rest earth pressure (R 23)	143
9.7	Mutual influence of opposing retaining walls for excavations adjacent to structures (R 30)	148
10	Excavations in water	151
10.1	General remarks for excavations in water (R 58)	151
10.2	Seepage pressure (R 59) (11/05)	153
10.3	Dewatered excavations (R 60)	154
10.4	Analysis of hydraulic heave safety (R 61)	156
10.5	Analysis of buoyancy safety (R 62)	160
10.6	Stability analysis of retaining walls in water (R 63)	167
10.7	Design and construction of excavations in water (R 64)	171
10.8	Water management (R 65)	174
10.9	Monitoring excavations in water (R 66)	175
11	Excavations in unstable rock	177
11.1	General recommendations for excavations in unstable rock (R 38)	177
11.2	Magnitude of rock pressure (R 39)	179
11.3	Distribution of rock pressure (R 40)	182
11.4	Bearing capacity of rock for support forces at the wall toe (R 41) ..	183
12	Excavations in soft soils	184
12.1	Scope of Recommendations R 91 to R 101 (R 90)	184
12.2	Slopes in soft soils (R 91)	185
12.3	Wall types in soft soils (R 92)	187
12.4	Construction procedure in soft soils (R 93)	190
12.5	Shear strength of soft soils (R 94)	194

12.6	Earth pressure on retaining walls in soft soils (R 95)	199
12.7	Ground reactions for retaining walls in soft soils (R 96)	203
12.8	Water pressure in soft soils (R 97)	209
12.9	Determination of embedment depths and action effects for excavations in soft soils (R 98)	214
12.10	Further stability analyses for excavations in soft soils (R 99)	216
12.11	Drainage measures in excavations in soft soils (R 100)	220
12.12	Serviceability of excavation structures in soft soils (R 101)	221
13	Verification of bearing capacity of structural elements	224
13.1	Material parameters and partial safety factors for structural element resistances (R 88)	224
13.2	Bearing capacity of soldier pile infilling (R 47)	225
13.3	Bearing capacity of soldier piles (R 48)	229
13.4	Bearing capacity of sheet piles (R 49)	230
13.5	Bearing capacity of in-situ concrete walls (R 50)	233
13.6	Bearing capacity of waling (R 51)	235
13.7	Bearing capacity of struts (R 52)	236
13.8	Bearing capacity of trench sheeting and bracing (R 53)	239
13.9	Bearing capacity of provisional bridges and excavation covers (R 54)	239
13.10	External bearing capacity of soldier piles, sheet pile walls and cast in-situ concrete walls (R 85)	241
13.11	Bearing capacity of tension piles and ground anchors (R 86)	244
14	Measurements and monitoring of excavation structures	245
14.1	Purpose of measurements and monitoring (R 31)	245
14.2	Preparation, implementation and evaluation of measurements (R 32)	246
14.3	Measured variables (R 33)	248
14.4	Measurement methods and measurements systems (R 34)	249
14.5	Location of measurement points (R 35)	250
14.6	Measurement times (R 36)	251
14.7	Transfer and processing of measurement results (R 37)	252
Appendix	253
A 1:	Relative density of cohesionless soils (10/05)	253
A 2:	Consistency of cohesive soils (10/05)	254
A 3:	Properties of cohesionless soils (10/05)	255
A 4:	Soil properties of cohesive soils (10/05)	257
A 5:	Guide values for the modulus of subgrade reaction $k_{s,h}$ for wet soils	260
A 6:	Partial safety factors for geotechnical variables	261

A 7: Material properties and partial safety factors for concrete and reinforced concrete structural elements	263
A 8: Material properties and partial safety factors for steel structural elements	265
A 9: Material properties and partial safety factors for wooden structural elements	266
A 10: Empirical values for skin friction and base resistance of sheet pile walls and soldier piles	268
Bibliography	269
Terms and notation	278
Geometrical variables	278
Subsoil and soil parameters	278
Earth pressure and passive earth pressure	279
Further loads, forces and action effects	280
Analyses using the partial safety factor approach	280
Miscellany	281
Recommendations in numerical order	282

Notes for the user

1. The Recommendations of the Working Group for Excavations represent technical regulations. They are the result of voluntary efforts within the technical-scientific community, are based on valid and current professional principles, and have been tried and tested as “general best practice”.
2. The Recommendations of the Working Group for Excavations may be freely applied by anyone. They represent a yardstick for flawless technical performance; this yardstick is also of legal importance. A duty to apply the Recommendations may result from legislative or administrative provisions, contractual obligations or from further legal provisions.
3. Generally speaking, the Recommendations of the Working Group for Excavations are an important source of information for professional conduct in normal design cases. They cannot reproduce all possible special cases in which advanced or restrictive measures may be required. Note also that they can only reflect best practice at the time of publication of the respective edition.
4. Deviations from the suggested analysis approaches may prove necessary in individual cases, if founded on appropriate analyses, measurements or on empirical values.
5. Use of the Recommendations of the Working Group for Excavations does not release anybody from their own professional responsibility. In this respect, everybody works at his or her own risk.

1 General Recommendations

1.1 Engineering requirements for applying the Recommendations (R 1)

If no other stipulations are explicitly made in the individual Recommendations, they shall apply under the following engineering preconditions:

1. The complete height of the retaining wall is lined.
2. The soldier piles of soldier pile walls are installed so that intimate contact with the ground is ensured. The infilling or lining can consist of wood, concrete, steel, hardened cement-bentonite suspension or stabilised soil. It shall be installed so that the contact to the soil is as uniform as possible. Soil excavation should not advance considerably faster than piling advance.
3. Sheet pile walls and trench sheet piles are installed so that intimate contact with the ground is ensured. Toe reinforcement is permitted.
4. In-situ concrete walls are executed as diaphragm walls or as bored pile walls. See DIN 1538 for execution of diaphragm walls. For bored pile walls proceed according to DIN EN 1536. Accidental or planned spacing between the piles is generally lined according to Paragraph 2.
5. In the horizontal projection, struts or anchors are arranged perpendicular to the retaining wall. They are wedged or prestressed so that contact by traction with the retaining wall is guaranteed.
6. Braced excavations are lined in the same manner on both sides with vertical soldier pile walls, sheet pile walls or in-situ concrete walls. The struts are arranged horizontally. The ground on both sides of the braced excavation displays approximately the same height, similar surface features and similar subsurface properties.

If these preconditions are not fulfilled, or those in the individual Recommendations, and no Recommendations are available for such special cases, this does not exclude adoption of the remaining Recommendations. However, the consequences of any deviations shall be investigated and taken into consideration.

1.2 Governing regulations (R 76)

1. In the long term a considerable proportion of current German standards relating to structural engineering will be replaced by European standards. They were initiated in the shape of Eurocodes by what was then the Commission of the European Community and further developed under the support of the European Committee for Standardisation (Comité Européen de Normalisation, CEN). Although these Eurocodes, represented by the EN 1997 “Draft, Geotechnical Design” for geotechnical and foundation engineering, have

meanwhile achieved a considerable degree of maturity, their introduction as building regulations is not yet envisaged at the time of publication of the 4th German edition of the EAB.

2. The new generation of national standards based on the partial safety factor approach serves as a temporary solution for all fields of structural engineering until the introduction of the Eurocodes. All standards mentioned refer to the latest version using the partial safety factor approach. Year and month data are not provided here. The following codes in particular are the governing standards for excavation structures:

DIN 1055-100 “Basis of design”
DIN 1054 “Verification of the safety of earthworks and foundations”
DIN 18 800 “Steel structures” including the steel structure adaptation directive
DIN 1045 “Concrete, reinforced and prestressed concrete structures”
DIN 1052 “Timber structures”
DIN 1055-2 “Soil properties”

3. DIN 1054 only regulates fundamental questions of geotechnical and foundation engineering. It is supplemented by the analysis standards which, where necessary, have been adapted to the partial safety factor approach. The following codes in particular represent the governing standards for excavation structures:

DIN 4084 “Calculation of embankment failure and overall stability of retaining structures”
DIN 4085 “Calculation of earth-pressure”
DIN 4126 “Stability analysis of diaphragm walls”

4. The existing standards covering the exploration, investigation and description of ground are not affected by the adaptation to partial safety factors and therefore remain valid in their respective latest editions:

DIN 4020: Geotechnical investigations for civil engineering purposes
DIN 4021: Exploration by excavation and borings
DIN 4022: Designation and description of soil and rock
DIN 4023: Graphical presentation of logs and boreholes
DIN 4094: Investigation by soundings
(Part 3 replaced by EN ISO 22 476-2:2005)
DIN 18 121 to
DIN 18 137: Soil investigation and testing
DIN 18 196: Soil classification for civil engineering purposes

5. DIN 1054 only replaces the analysis section of the previous standards DIN 4014 “Bored piles”, DIN 4026 “Driven piles”, DIN 4125 “Ground anchorages, temporary and permanent anchorages” and DIN 4128 “Injection

piles (in-situ concrete and composite piles)” with small diameter. The new European standards from the “Execution of special geotechnical works” series now take the place of the execution sections of these standards:

- DIN EN 1536: Bored piles
- DIN EN 1537: Ground anchors
- DIN EN 1538: Diaphragm walls
- DIN EN 12 063: Sheet pile walls
- DIN EN 12 699: Displacement piles
- DIN EN 12 715: Grouting
- DIN EN 12 716: Jet grouting
- DIN EN 12 794: Precast concrete foundation piles
- DIN EN 14 199: Micropiles

6. The following execution standards are not affected by the adaptation to European standards and therefore continue to be valid for excavation structures:

- DIN 4095: Drainage for the protection of structures
- DIN 4123: Excavations, foundations and underpinnings
in the range of existing buildings
- DIN 4124: Excavations and trenches

7. Until all relevant technical building regulations, standards and recommendations are adapted to the partial safety factor approach, the transitional regulations given in DIN 1054, Appendices F and G, apply.

1.3 New safety factor approach (R 77)

1. In contrast to the original probabilistic safety factor approach, the new safety factor approach, upon which both the new European standards generation and the new national standards generation are based, no longer rests on probability theory investigations, e.g. the beta-method, but on a pragmatic splitting of the previously utilised global safety factors into partial safety factors for actions or effects and partial safety factors for resistances.
2. The foundation for stability analyses is represented by the characteristic values for actions and resistances. The characteristic value is a value with an assumed probability which is not exceeded or fallen short of during the reference period, taking the lifetime or the corresponding design situation of the civil engineering structure into consideration; characterised by the index “k”. Characteristic values are generally specified based on testing, measurements, analyses or empiricism.
3. If the bearing capacity in a given cross-section of the retaining wall or in an interface between the retaining wall and the ground needs to be analysed, the effects in these sections are required:

- as action effects, e.g. axial force, shear force, bending moment;
- as stresses, e.g. compression, tension, bending stress, shear stress or equivalent stress.

In addition further effects of actions may occur:

- as oscillation effects or vibrations;
- as changes to the structural element, e.g. strain, deformation or crack width;
- as changes in the position of the retaining wall, e.g. displacement, settlement, rotation.

4. Two types of ground resistances are differentiated:

- a) The shear strength of the soil is the decisive basic resistance parameter. For consolidated soils or soils drained for testing these are the shear parameters ϕ' and c' ; for unconsolidated soils or soils not drained for testing the shear parameters ϕ_u and c_u . These variables are defined as cautious estimates of the mean values, because the shear strength at a single point of the slip surface is not the decisive value but the average shear strength in the slip surface.
- b) The soil resistances are derived from the shear strength, directly:
 - the sliding resistance;
 - the bearing capacity;
 - the passive earth pressure;
 and indirectly via load tests or empirical values:
 - the toe resistance of soldier piles, sheet pile walls and in-situ concrete walls;
 - the skin resistance of soldier piles, sheet pile walls, in-situ concrete walls and of ground anchors, and soil and rock nails.

The term “resistance” is only used for the failure state of the soil. As long as the failure state of the soil is not achieved by effects, the term “soil reaction” is used.

5. The cross-section and internal resistance of the material are the decisive factors in the design of individual components. The detailed specification standards continue to be the governing standards here.
6. The characteristic values for effects are multiplied by partial safety factors; the characteristic values for resistances are divided by partial safety factors. The variables acquired in this way are known as the design values of effects or resistances respectively and are characterised by the index “d”. Three limit states are differentiated for stability analyses, according to R 78 (Section 1.4).

1.4 Limit states (R 78)

1. The term “limit state” is used with two different meanings:
 - a) In soil mechanics, the state in the soil in which the displacement of the individual soil particles against each other is so great that the mobilisable shear strength achieves its greatest values in either the entire soil mass, or at least in the region of a failure plane, is known as the “limit state of plastic flow”. It cannot become greater even if more movement occurs, but may become smaller. The limit state of plastic flow characterises the active earth pressure, passive earth pressure, bearing capacity, embankment stability and overall stability of retaining structures.
 - b) A limit state in the sense of the new safety factor approach is a state of the load-bearing structure where, if exceeded, the design requirements are no longer fulfilled.
2. The following limit states are differentiated using the new safety factor approach:
 - a) The ultimate limit state is a condition of the structure which, if exceeded, immediately leads to a mathematical collapse or other form of failure. It is known as the ultimate limit state (ULS) in DIN 1054. Three cases of ULS are differentiated, see Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.
 - b) The serviceability limit state (SLS) is a condition of the structure which, if exceeded, no longer fulfils the conditions specified for its use. It is known as the serviceability limit state (SLS) in DIN 1054.
3. The EQU limit state describes the loss of static equilibrium. These include:
 - analysis of safety against failure by toppling;
 - analysis of safety against hydraulic failure by uplift (buoyancy);
 - analysis of safety against hydraulic failure by heave.

The EQU limit state incorporates actions, but no resistances. The decisive limit state condition is:

$$F_d = F_k \cdot \gamma_{dst} \leq G_k \cdot \gamma_{stb} = G_d$$

i.e. the destabilising action F_k , multiplied by the partial safety factor $\gamma_{dst} \geq 1$, may only become as large as the stabilising action G_k , multiplied by the partial safety factor $\gamma_{stb} < 1$.

4. The STR limit state describes the failure of structures and structural elements or failure of the ground. These include:
 - analysis of the bearing capacity of structures and structural elements subject to soil loads or supported by the soil;
 - verification that the bearing capacity of the soil is not exceeded, e.g. by passive earth pressure, bearing capacity or sliding resistance.

Verification that the bearing capacity of the soil is not exceeded is performed exactly as for any other construction material. The limit state condition is always the decisive condition:

$$E_d = E_k \cdot \gamma_F \leq R_k / \gamma_R = R_d$$

i.e. the characteristic action effect E_k , multiplied by the partial safety factor γ_F for actions or loads, may only become as large as the characteristic resistance R_k , divided by the partial safety factor γ_R .

5. The GEO limit state is peculiar to geotechnical engineering. It describes the loss of overall stability. These include:
 - analysis of safety against embankment failure;
 - analysis of overall stability of retaining structures.

The limit state condition is always the decisive condition:

$$E_d \leq R_d$$

i.e. the load design value E_d may only become as large as the design value of the resistance R_d . The geotechnical actions and resistances are determined using the design values for shear strength:

$$\begin{aligned} \tan \varphi'_d &= \tan \varphi'_k / \gamma_\varphi & \text{and} & & c'_d &= c'_k / \gamma_c & \text{or} \\ \tan \varphi_{u,d} &= \tan \varphi_{u,k} / \gamma_\varphi & \text{and} & & c_{u,d} &= c_{u,k} / \gamma_c \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the friction $\tan \varphi$ and the cohesion c are reduced at the beginning using the partial safety factors γ_φ and γ_c .

6. The serviceability limit state SLS describes the state of a structure at which the conditions specified for its use are no longer fulfilled, without a loss of bearing capacity. It is based on verification that the anticipated displacements and deformations are compatible with the purpose of the structure. For excavations, the SLS includes the serviceability of neighbouring buildings or structures.

1.5 Support of retaining walls (R 67)

1. Retaining walls are called unsupported if they are neither braced nor anchored and their stability is based solely on their restraint in the ground.
2. Retaining walls are called yieldingly supported if the wall support points can yield with increasing load, e.g. in cases where the supports are heavily inclined and when using non-prestressed or only slightly prestressed anchors.
3. Retaining wall supports are called slightly yielding in the following cases:
 - a) Struts are at least tightly connected by frictional contact (e.g. by wedges).
 - b) Ground anchors are tested according to EN 1537, Method 1, and are prestressed to at least 80% of the computed force required for the next construction stage.

- c) A tight connection via frictional contact is established with displacement piles (previously “driven piles”), bored piles or micropiles (previously “grouted piles”), which verifiably display only small head deflection under load.
4. Retaining wall supports are known as nearly inflexible if designed according to R 22, Paragraph 1 (Section 9.5), utilising increased active earth pressure, and the struts and anchors are according to R 22, Paragraph 10.
5. Retaining wall supports are defined as inflexible only if they are designed either for reduced or for the full at-rest earth pressure according to R 23 (Section 9.6) and the supports are prestressed accordingly. Furthermore, the anchors of anchored retaining walls shall reach into non-yielding rock strata or be designed substantially longer than required by calculations.

If the requirements of Paragraphs 4 or 5 are fulfilled and, in addition:

- a rigid retaining wall is installed and;
- excessive toe deflections are avoided;

an excavation structure may be regarded as a low-deflection and low-deformation structure.

1.6 Using the EAB in conjunction with Eurocode 7-1 (R 105, draft)

1. This edition of the EAB is based on the specifications provided in DIN 1054 (2005). This publication in turn was closely harmonized with EN 1997-1 – Eurocode EC7-1. DIN 1054 is not identical in every detail with Eurocode EC7-1, but neither does it contradict it. As soon as Eurocode EC7-1 can be adopted, with the permission of the responsible authorities, DIN 1054 must at least be formally adapted to the specifications of Eurocode EC-7. The consequences associated with this for applying this edition of the Recommendations are related below as well as a preview will allow.
2. The following stipulations have been agreed upon in terms of the validity of the regulations:
 - a) Once the DIN 1054 (2005) has been included in the model list of the Acknowledged Technical Rules for Works (*Technische Baubestimmungen*), it can be introduced by the responsible authorities of the federal states during 2005 and 2006. The end of the validity period of DIN 1054 (1976) is given as the end of 2007 in the model list.
 - b) A two-year transition period began at the end of 2004; during this period a national annex to the Eurocode EC7-1 was to be compiled and published jointly with the Eurocode, and approved for use on the basis of European agreements.
 - c) In addition, at the end of 2004 a five-year transition period began, at the end of which Eurocode EC7-1 was to be introduced by the responsible authorities and all contradictory national regulations be withdrawn.

- d) The end of the validity period of DIN 1054 (2005) is fixed at the end of 2009 by the stipulations of Paragraph c).

The competent responsible authorities are:

- the higher building control authorities of the federal states for building measures subject to the respective state building code;
 - the departments of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs (*Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau- und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS)*) responsible for inland waterways, for federal roads and road bridges, and the Federal Railway Authority (*Eisenbahn-Bundesamt*) responsible for rail traffic.
3. In terms of the STR limit state safety analyses according to R 78, Paragraph 4 (Section 1.4), Eurocode EC7-1 provides three options. DIN 1054 (2005) is based on analysis procedure 2 inasmuch as the partial safety factors are applied to the loads and to the resistances. To differentiate between this and the other scenario, in which the partial safety factors are not applied to the loads but to the actions, this procedure is designated as analysis method 2* in the Commentary to Eurocode EC7-1 [134]. DIN 1054 also utilises a number of gaps that are not specifically codified, e.g. using load cases according to R 79, Paragraph 1 (Section 2.4).
4. The National Annex represents a formal link between Eurocode EC7-1 and national standards. This National Annex states which of the possible analysis methods and partial safety factors are applicable in the respective national domains. Remarks, clarifications or supplements to Eurocode EC7-1 are not permitted. However, the applicable, complementary national codes may be given. The complementary national codes may not contradict Eurocode EC7-1. Moreover, the National Annex may not repeat information already given in Eurocode EC7-1.
5. The reworked DIN 1054 will be paramount in the complementary national code; it has the working title “DIN 1054 (2007)” and is the application rule to Eurocode EC7-1. It is likely that the following points will differ from the DIN 1054 (2005) edition:
- where feasible it will be shortened to avoid the problem of repetitions;
 - from a formal point of view it will be more closely adapted to Eurocode EC7-1;
 - it will include supplements, improvements and modifications.

The supplements, improvements and modifications shall be adhered to inasmuch as they affect the regulations of the EAB, if the respective excavation structure is designed to Eurocode EC7-1. However, they may also be accordingly utilised if the design is based on DIN 1054 (2005).

6. In the governing version, Eurocode 7-1 defines the following limit states in place of the GZ 1A, GZ 1B and GZ 1C limit states:

- a) EQU: loss of equilibrium of the structure, regarded as rigid, without the influence of soil resistances. The designation is derived from “equilibrium”.
 - b) STR: inner failure or very large deformation of the structure or its components, whereby the strength of the materials is decisive for resistance. The designation is derived from “structure”.
 - c) GEO: failure or very large deformation of the ground, whereby the strength of the soil or rock is decisive for resistance. The designation is derived from “geotechnical”.
 - d) UPL: loss of equilibrium of the structure or ground due to uplift (buoyancy) or water pressure. The designation is derived from “uplift”.
 - e) HYD: hydraulic failure by heave, inner erosion or piping in the ground, caused by a flow gradient. The designation is derived from “hydraulic”.
7. In order to transfer the GZ 1B and GZ 1C limit states to the terminology used in EC7-1 the GEO limit state is divided into GEO B and GEO C:
- a) GEO B: failure or very large deformation of the ground in conjunction with identification of the action effects and dimensions; i.e. when utilising the shear strength for passive earth pressure, for sliding resistance and bearing capacity and when analysing stability in the low failure plane.
 - b) GEO C: failure or very large deformation of the ground in conjunction with analysis of overall stability, i.e. when utilising the shear strength for analysis of the safety against embankment failure and overall stability of retaining structures, generally, when analysing the stability of engineered slope stabilisation measures.
8. The previous limit states are now replaced as follows:
- a) The previous limit state GZ 1A now corresponds without restrictions to the EQU, UPL and HYD limit states.
 - b) The previous limit state GZ 1B corresponds without restrictions to the STR limit state. In addition, the GEO B limit state applies in conjunction with external design, i.e. when utilising the shear strength for passive earth pressure, sliding resistance and bearing capacity and when analysing stability in the low failure plane.
 - c) The previous limit state GZ 1C corresponds to the GEO C limit state in conjunction with analysis of overall stability, i.e. when utilising the shear strength for analysis of safety against embankment failure and overall stability of retaining structures.

Analysis of the stability of engineered slope stabilisation measures is always allocated to the GEO limit state. Depending on the specific design and function they may be dealt with:

- either in the sense of the previous limit state GZ 1B using the regulations of the GEO B limit state;
- or in the sense of the previous limit state GZ 1C using the regulations of the GEO C limit state.

2 Analysis principles

2.1 Actions (R 24)

1. DIN 1055-100 and DIN 1054 differentiate between permanent and variable actions. In excavation structures the permanent actions include:
 - weight density of the excavation structure, if necessary taking provisional bridges and excavation covers into consideration;
 - earth pressure as a result of the weight density of the soil, if necessary taking cohesion into consideration;
 - earth pressure as a result of the permanent weight density of neighbouring structures;
 - horizontal shear forces created by vaults, and shear forces from retaining walls and frame-like structures;
 - water pressure as a result of the contractually agreed upon reference water level of groundwater or open water.

DIN 1054 also stipulates that, simplified, the earth pressure resulting from a variable, unbounded distributed load $p_k \leq 10 \text{ kN/m}^2$ can be adopted as a permanent action. Also see Paragraph 2.

2. According to Recommendations R 55 to R 57 (Sections 2.6 to 2.8), the variable actions are differentiated into a component adopted as an unbounded distributed load $p_k = 10 \text{ kN/m}^2$ and a component adopted either as a distributed load q_k in excess of this or as a strip load, line load or point load on a small contact area. While the unbounded distributed load $p_k = 10 \text{ kN/m}^2$ according to Paragraph 1 is treated as a permanent load, the other variable actions are differentiated for the cases described below as a function of the duration and frequency of the action based on DIN 1054.
3. Beside the permanent actions it is generally sufficient to base the stability analysis on the following, regularly occurring variable actions:
 - live loads acting directly on provisional bridges and excavation covers according to R 3, Paragraph 1 (Section 2.5);
 - earth pressure from live loads according to R 3, Paragraph 1 (Section 2.5);
 - earth pressure from live loads in conjunction with structures adjacent to the excavation.
4. In special cases it may be necessary to consider the following actions, beside the typical case loads:
 - centrifugal, brake and nosing forces, e.g. for excavations beside or below railway or tram lines;
 - exceptional loads and improbable or rarely occurring combinations of loads or points of application of loads;

- water pressure resulting from water levels that may exceed the agreed design water levels, e.g. water levels that will flood the excavation if they occur or at which the excavation shall be flooded;
- the influence of temperature on struts, e.g. steel H-section struts without buckling protection devices or struts in narrow excavations with frost-sensitive ground.

The impact of temperature changes on the remaining excavation structure need not be investigated for flexible walls.

5. In unusual cases it may be necessary to consider exceptional loads, beside the loads of the typical case, e.g.:
 - impact of construction machinery against the supports of provisional bridges or excavation covers or against the intermediate supports of buckling protection devices;
 - loads caused by the failure of operating or stabilising installations, if the effects cannot be countered by appropriate measures;
 - loads caused by the failure of particularly susceptible bearing members, e.g. struts or anchors;
 - loads due to scouring in front of the retaining wall.

Short-term exceptional loads, e.g. such as those occurring when testing, over-stressing, or loosening anchors or struts, may be treated as exceptional loads.

6. The actions specified in Paragraphs 3 to 5 are allocated to load cases corresponding to the different safety requirements. Also see R 79 (Section 2.4).

2.2 Determination of soil properties (R 2)

1. In principle, the soil properties required for stability analyses are the immediate result of geotechnical investigations based on DIN 4020 “Geotechnical Investigations for Civil Engineering Purposes”. To take the heterogeneity of the ground and the inaccuracy of sampling and testing into due consideration, surcharges and allowances shall be applied to the values identified during testing before they are adopted as characteristic values in an analysis. This applies particularly to the shear strength. Also see Paragraph 3.
2. Two cases are differentiated when specifying characteristic values for the unit weight:
 - a) For stability analyses in the STR and GEO limit states, i.e. in particular when analysing the embedment depth, when determining the action effects and when analysing the safety against global failure, the mean value may be adopted as the characteristic value.
 - b) When analysing safety against uplift (buoyancy), safety against hydraulic heave and safety against lift-off, which are all incorporated in the EQU limit state, the lower characteristic values are the decisive values.

3. Characteristic values for shear strength should be selected as conservative estimates of the statistical mean value. Minor deviation from the mean value may be acceptable if the available samples are sufficiently representative of the soil in the region of the excavation structure to be analysed. A larger deviation shall be assumed for a small data pool and heterogeneous ground.
4. The capillary cohesion of cohesionless soil, in particular of sand, may be taken into consideration if it cannot be lost by drying or flooding or due to rising groundwater or water ingress from above during construction work.
5. The cohesion of a cohesive soil may only be considered if the soil does not become pulpy when kneaded and if it is certain that the soil state will not change unfavourably compared to its original condition, e.g. when thawing following a period of frost.
6. The following restrictions shall be considered when transferring the shear strength determined by testing laboratory samples to the behaviour of the in-situ ground:
 - a) The shear strength of cohesive and rock-like ground can be greatly reduced by hair cracks, slickensides or intercalations of slightly cohesive or cohesionless soils.
 - b) Certain slip surfaces may be predetermined by faulting and inclined bedding planes. For example, Opalinus Clay (*Opalinuston*, a Middle-Jurassic (Dogger alpha, Aalenium) clay (*Al (I) Clay*)), Nodular Marl (*Knollenmergel*, a marly claystone containing carbonate nodules; Upper Triassic, Carvian) and *Tarras* (a type of Puzzolan) are all considered especially prone to sliding.
 - c) In fine-grained soils, e.g. kaolin clay, and in soils with a decisive proportion of montmorillonite, the residual shear strength may be the decisive factor.
7. If the results of appropriate soil mechanics laboratory tests are not available, the characteristic soil properties may be specified as follows:
 - a) As far as it is sufficiently known from local experience that similar subsurface conditions are prevalent, the soil properties from previous investigations carried out in the immediate vicinity may be adopted. This requires expertise and experience in the geotechnical field.
 - b) If the type and quality of in-situ soils can be assigned to the soil groups specified in DIN 18 196 based on drilling or soundings, and further laboratory and manual testing, analysis may be based on the soil properties given in Appendices A 3 and A 4, taking the respective restrictions into consideration.
8. The empirical values for cohesionless soils given in:
 - Table 3.1 for the unit weight based on Appendix A 3 or;
 - Table 3.2 for the shear strength based on Appendix A 3;may be adopted, if the following requirements are met: