

Resourcefulness quantification approach for resilient communities and countries

Original

Resourcefulness quantification approach for resilient communities and countries / Zona, A.; Kammouh, O.; Cimellaro, G. P.. - In: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF DISASTER RISK REDUCTION. - ISSN 2212-4209. - ELETTRONICO. - 46:(2020), p. 101509. [10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101509]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2840575 since: 2020-07-17T12:27:47Z

Publisher:

Elsevier Ltd

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101509

Terms of use:

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2020. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101509>

(Article begins on next page)

Resourcefulness quantification approach for resilient communities and countries

Alessandro Zona^a, Omar Kammouh^b, Gian Paolo Cimellaro^c

^aDept. of Structural, Geotechnical and Building Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, Italy, Email: s243114@studenti.polito.it

^bDept. of Civil Engineering and Geosciences (CEG), Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands, E-mail: o.kammouh@tudelft.nl

^cDept. of Structural, Geotechnical and Building Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, Italy (Corresponding author), Email: gianpaolo.cimellaro@polito.it

Abstract: Availability of resources is one of the primary criteria for communities to attain a high resilience level during disaster events. This paper introduces a new approach to evaluate resourcefulness at the community and national scales. Resourcefulness is calculated using a proposed composite resourcefulness index, which is a combination of several resourcefulness indicators. To build the resourcefulness index, resourcefulness indicators representing the different aspects of resourcefulness are collected from renowned literary publications. Every indicator is assigned a measure to make it quantifiable. Time-history data for the measures are needed to perform the analysis. While these data could be obtained from different sources, acquiring a full set of data is quite challenging. Hence, to account for missing data, the Multiple Imputation (MI) and the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) data imputation methods are adopted. The data are then normalized, assigned weights, and aggregated to obtain the resourcefulness index. A case study is performed to demonstrate the applicability of the approach. The resourcefulness indexes of two countries, namely the United States and Italy, are evaluated. Results show that resourceful communities/countries are more resilient during disaster events as they have more tools to come up with solutions. It is also shown that knowing the current resourcefulness level helps in better identifying what aspects should be improved.

keywords: resilience, resourcefulness, recovery, natural hazards, disaster, community resilience.

1. Introduction

Research on disaster resilience has recently been fostered due to the noticeable increase in the number of natural hazards and human-caused disasters (Cimellaro et al. 2016a; Cimellaro et al. 2016b; Cimellaro et al. 2015; De Iuliis et al. 2019b; Kammouh et al. 2018b; Sarkis et al. 2018). During disasters, resilient communities tend to suffer fewer consequences and recover faster than non-resilient communities given the same hazard intensity (Kammouh et al. 2018a; Marasco et al. 2018). This highlights the importance of resilience quantification tools. Several methodologies and frameworks to evaluate and enhance the resilience of regions affected by extremely disruptive events have been proposed by numerous researchers (De Iuliis et al. 2019b; De Iuliis et al. under review; Kammouh et al. 2017; Kammouh et al. 2018f; Zamani Noori et al. 2017).

Figure 1 presents a conceptual definition of resilience, introduced by Bruneau et al. (2003). In the figure, the functionality (Q) of a system ranges from 0% to 100%, where 100% and 0% imply full availability and unavailability of services, respectively. A system can be defined as a group of components that jointly deliver a service or a group of services. Therefore, a community can be considered as a system of systems as it is composed of physical and social systems (Kammouh et al. 2018c). The occurrence of a disaster at time t_0 causes damage to the system, and this produces an instant drop in the system's functionality (ΔQ) (Kammouh et al. 2018e). Afterward, the system is restored to its initial state over the recovery period ($t_1 - t_0$) with a restoration rate R . Theoretically, resilience is defined as the ability to “prepare, absorb, recover from actual or potential adverse events” (NRC 2015). From the definition, resilience deals not only with already occurring disaster events but also with potential events that may occur in the future. Therefore, resilience quantification cannot be based solely on deterministic studies but should be expressed in a probabilistic manner. For example, as shown in Figure 1, every component of resilience (i.e., ΔQ , t_0 , t_1 , R) may have a certain probability distribution (Cimellaro et al. 2010b). The resilience function in the figure is, therefore, the function corresponding to the mean value of every resilience parameter.




Figure 1: Measuring the seismic resilience considering uncertainties

According to Bruneau et al. (2003), there are four characteristics of resilience (also called the 4-Rs):

- **Redundancy**: refers to the community's ability to provide alternative options for effective and efficient management of emergency situations;
- **Robustness**: refers to the system's ability to withstand a certain level of stress and consequently preserve its functionality;
- **Rapidity**: refers to the rate at which the community attain at least its pre-event functionality level;
- **Resourcefulness**: is the community's "capacity to identify problems, establish priorities, and mobilize resources when the existing conditions threaten to disrupt some elements, systems, or other units of analysis".

The resilience characteristics are graphically represented in Figure 2. For *redundancy*, the damage of one system does not prevent the functionality of the whole network if the network is redundant. For example, if one hospital is severely damaged, the functionality of another hospital can preserve the functionality of the whole hospital network as people can go to the functioning hospital (Cimellaro et al. 2017a; Cimellaro et al. 2018; Cimellaro et al. 2011). For *robustness*, robust systems can resist high damage using their inherent structural characteristics. For *rapidity*, rapidly restored systems are characterized by higher resilience because they return to their initial state quickly. Finally, for *resourcefulness*, more resources allow the damaged system to recover quickly given that efficient restoration plans are put in place.




Figure 2: Visual representation of the resilience characteristics

Resourcefulness assessment is deemed key for enhancing community resilience (Cimellaro et al. 2014; Drabek 2003; Kammouh et al. 2019a; Perrow 2011; Tierney 2008) (Cimellaro et al. 2016c) (De Iuliis et al. 2019a). For instance, if decision-makers are fully aware of the consequences of disaster events as well as the resources that they have to deal with such events, they would be more likely to know how to act and what types of resources to mobilize during the emergency and recovery phases. This, in turn, enhances the emergency response of the community, and thus its resilience. There have been very few studies tackling the concept of resourcefulness in the literature. None of these has attempted to assess the resourcefulness from a quantitative perspective. Thus, this paper introduces a new approach to quantify the resourcefulness of communities using an indicator-based approach. In the context of this work, a community is defined as a geographical area that includes all components needed to sustain life for a group of people (e.g., infrastructure, social systems, etc.). Examples of communities could be a city, a county, or a district. A country, for instance, can be considered as a community that is composed of several smaller communities. Therefore, there are no upper-bound limitations in terms of population number or geographical size.

The proposed framework provides useful guidelines for policymakers to enhance the resilience of communities and countries by identifying the weaknesses in their current plans. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is dedicated to exploring the concept of resourcefulness and introducing its principles. Section 3

241
242
243 88 introduces a methodology to quantify the resourcefulness at the community and national levels. Section 4
244
245 89 presents a case study to illustrate the applicability of the methodology. Finally, conclusions are given in Section
246
247 90 5 together with the proposed future work.
248
249
250

251 91 **2. Resourcefulness definition and principles**

252 253 254 92 **2.1. Resourcefulness definition**

255
256
257 93 The concept of resourcefulness during disasters has been introduced in the field of emergency management
258
259 94 with a special emphasis on human factors (Cimellaro et al. 2019; Cimellaro et al. 2017b). Several case studies
260
261 95 on emergency management during natural hazards have revealed the importance of resourcefulness in dealing
262
263 96 with such incidents (Cimellaro et al. 2010a; Podolny and Page 1998; Rosenthal et al. 2001). Some researchers
264
265 97 consider resourcefulness as the only factor defining resilience (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013) while others
266
267 98 treat resourcefulness as one of several resilience dimensions (Bruneau et al. 2003; Kammouh et al. 2019a).

268
269 99 The term *resourcefulness* has been defined differently in the literature. The most dominant definitions are
270
271 100 summarized in Table 1. The existence of different definitions has made it essential to establish a universal
272
273 101 definition for resourcefulness. Thus, for this study, resourcefulness is defined as the capacity to identify
274
275 102 problems, establish priorities, allocate and mobilize resources before, during, and after an event that may
276
277 103 disrupt elements, systems, or other units of analysis taking into account human factors.
278

279 104 Table 1 Resourcefulness definitions
280
281

	Resilience dimensions	Definition of Resourcefulness
(Bruneau et al. 2003)	- Robustness - Rapidity - Redundancy - Resourcefulness	“Capacity to identify problems, establish priorities and mobilize resources when conditions exist that threaten to disrupt some element, system, or another unit of analysis.”
NIAC (2009)	- Robustness - Resourcefulness	“Ability to skillfully prepare for, respond to, and manage a crisis or disruption as it unfolds.”

241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300

301
302
303 - Rapid recovery
304
305

306
307 - Robustness “Ability to skillfully manage a disaster as it unfolds. It includes
308 identifying options, prioritizing what should be done both to
309 (Berkeley - Resourcefulness control damage and to begin mitigating it and communicating
310 et al. 2010) - Rapid recovery decisions to the people who will implement them. Resourcefulness
311 - Adaptability depends primarily on people, not technology.”
312
313
314
315

316
317 - Resistance “Resourcefulness encompasses the resources that people can draw
318 (Brown - Rootedness on, but also the capacity to use them at the right time, in the right
319 2015) - Resourcefulness way.”
320
321
322
323

324 105
325
326 106 **2.2. Resourcefulness principles**
327
328

329 107 The mathematical boundaries and conditions of resourcefulness are defined herein to ensure they represent the
330 conceptual definition of resourcefulness. The least possible value for Resourcefulness in this study is 0. This
331 108 implies that a community/country can never have less than the absolute absence of resources. On the other
332 hand, it is improper to set an upper limit for resourcefulness because it is always possible to increase the inflow
333 109 of resources. Therefore, resourcefulness (*RFS*) ranges from 0 to $+\infty$:
334
335 110
336
337 111

338
339 112
$$RFS \in [0, +\infty] \quad (1)$$

340
341

342 113 Generally, the response of a region in terms of recovery to hazardous events improves gradually. A region
343 with high resourcefulness would be able to respond better to a disaster. Therefore, adding resources means
344 114 enhancing *RFS*. Consequently, if we have a graph in which a resource *x* is plotted against resourcefulness, the
345 slope would be monotonically increasing:
346 115
347
348 116

349
350 117
$$RFS(x_2 > x_1) > RFS(x_1) \quad (2)$$

351
352

353 118 Finally, the resourcefulness of a region is independent of the resourcefulness of other regions. Therefore, The
354 sets of *RFC_c* are statistically independent:
355 119
356
357
358
359
360

$$RFS_c \neq f(RFS_{d+c}) \quad (3)$$

3. Methodology

Resourcefulness does not depend only on the “active” capacity of the people or skills that can be taught and learned, but also on their way of interacting. It is generally challenging to quantify the resourcefulness of a community/country as it involves several distinct characteristics (Kammouh et al. in press). In this work, a quantitative composite index accounting for these characteristics is formulated. The composite index is divided into dimensions and indicators to be able to consider more details in the analysis. Four dimensions are proposed by the authors to represent the different aspects of resourcefulness. Introducing these dimensions helps in structuring the methodology and make it more systematic. This categorization, however, has no effect on the data analysis that will be introduced later in the paper. The dimensions of resourcefulness are:

- **Political-economic**: support provided by the economic and political structure to the emergency management system;
- **Preparedness**: disaster preparedness of the individual citizens as well as the whole community/country;
- **Trust**: the ability of a community/country to cope with natural hazards as a cohesive unit, tapping into its trust resources;
- **Creativity**: the ability of a community/country to take smart and not obvious decisions during the emergency, which can mitigate losses.

Every dimension is divided into several indicators and every indicator is assigned a measure to make it quantifiable. The list of dimensions, indicators, and measures with their sources is shown in Table 2. The indicators and measures have been collected from renowned literary publications and then filtered for the purpose of obtaining mutually exclusive indicators. This has necessitated rejecting a number of indicators either because they are not relevant or because they overlapped with other indicators. In every source provided, the corresponding indicator was introduced as an important indicator for resourcefulness; thus, it has been adopted in this paper.

Table 2 Dimensions and indicators subdivision of the resourcefulness framework.

Dim.	Indicator	Symbol	Measure	Source
Political-economic	Economic Complexity	<i>ECI</i>	<i>Economic Complexity Index</i> ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Cutter et al. 2006)
	Bureaucracy Flexibility	<i>BF</i>	<i>Economic Freedom Index</i> ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Ballano 2017)
	Fragility	<i>FSI</i>	<i>(Fragile States Index)</i> ⁻¹ ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Nel and Righarts 2008)
	Mitigation Spending	<i>MS</i>	% <i>GDP allocated by the community to cope with disasters</i> ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Council 2005)
	Safety Rate/Crime rate	<i>SR</i>	<i>(Reported violent crime rate per 100,000 people)</i> ⁻¹ ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Yates and Mackenzie 2018)
	Participation in public life	<i>PPL</i>	% <i>turn-out at last presidential election</i>	(Organization 2002)
Preparedness	Smartphone penetration	<i>S</i>	% <i>population having and using a smartphone</i>	(Palen et al. 2010)
	Disaster Preparedness	<i>FDP</i>	% <i>population reporting having a family emergency plan</i>	(Paton and Johnston 2017)
	Emergency Kit Preparedness	<i>EKP</i>	% <i>population reporting having adequate emergency kits</i>	American Red Cross (2018)
Trust	Safety Perception	<i>SP</i>	% <i>population thinking crime is less than the previous year</i>	(Nogami 2015)
	Volunteering	<i>V</i>	<i>Average volunteering hours per week</i> ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Whittaker et al. 2015)
	Interpersonal Trust	<i>IT</i>	% <i>population thinking others can be trusted</i>	(Carlin et al. 2014)
	Trust in the political system	<i>TPS</i>	% <i>population thinking government can be trusted</i>	(Carlin et al. 2014)
	Trust in the police	<i>TP</i>	% <i>population thinking police can be trusted</i>	(Carlin et al. 2014)
	Patriotism	<i>P</i>	% <i>population proud to belong to the community</i>	(Lee and Loh 2003)
Creativity	Patent applications	<i>PAT</i>	<i>Patent applications per 1,000 people</i> ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Kreps 1990)
	Research and development expenditure	<i>RDE</i>	% <i>GDP invested in research and development</i> ÷ <i>TV</i>	(Kreps 1990)

Note: *TV* (target value) represents the optimum value for the given indicator

According to the specifications set out by the OECD (Commission 2008), the construction of a composite index must follow the following steps:

1. Defining the index principles;

481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540

- 150 2. Data selection;
- 151 3. Imputation of missing data;
- 152 4. Normalization;
- 153 5. Weight allocation;
- 154 6. Aggregation;
- 155 7. Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis.

156 Since the index principles have been defined in the previous section, the next section deals with data selection
157 and imputation.

158 **3.1. Data selection and imputation**

159 The proposed approach uses time-history data for its execution. Practically, it is difficult to obtain a complete
160 statistical data set to perform a resourcefulness analysis. Thus, it is necessary to deal with the issue of missing
161 data. Missing data are data needed for the execution of the methodology but are not available in any of the
162 data sources. For this reason, data imputation has been implemented to account for the missing data. Before
163 choosing the imputation method, missing data patterns should first be analyzed. According to OECD
164 (Commission 2008), there are three main patterns for missing data:

- 165 - *Missing completely at random* (MCAR): the missingness on the variable is completely unsystematic.
166 For example, when data are missing for respondents for which their questionnaire was lost in the mail.
167 In this case, missing values do not depend on the observed variable or any other variables in the data
168 set;
- 169 - *Missing at random* (MAR): missing values do not depend on the observed variable but on other
170 variables;
- 171 - *Not missing at random* (NMAR): when the missing values on a variable are related to the values of that
172 variable itself, even after controlling for other variables.

173 The MCAR or MAR are the most common types of missing data patterns, and imputation methods can only
174 handle these types of missing data.

175 To minimize the influence of the data on the results, the following categories are excluded from the analysis:

1. Indicators with more than 75% of missing data over the time steps considered (e.g. years);
2. Time steps with more than 50% of missing data.

Missing data imputation is done as follows:

1. $x_i - x_j$ is plotted, where x_i and x_j are two variables.
2. R^2 of each plot is computed, where R is a unitless quantity ranging between 0 and 1 representing the reliability of a predicting model in modeling a set starting raw data:

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y})^2} \quad (4)$$

where y_i is the vertical coordinate of generic point i , \hat{y}_i is the vertical coordinate of the corresponding point in the prediction model (i.e. Regression line), \bar{y} is the mean value of all y_i .

3. If $R^2 \geq 0.5$, then x_j is considered a good regressor for x_i .
4. The Multiple Imputation (MI) technique is used for imputing missing data whose indicators have at least one good regressor while the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) imputation method is used for imputing missing data whose indicators have no good regressors.

3.2. Normalization

The measurement units differ among the indicators. Thus, it is important to normalize the data to transform their measurement units into pure and dimensionless numbers. Moreover, some indicators have a positive influence on the dimensions while others have negative effects. This needs to be considered in the approach.

To ensure a successful normalization of data, a potentially suitable approach is to choose an external value known as *Target Value* (Balbi et al. 2018; Cutter et al. 2010; Kammouh et al. 2018d). This value serves as a normalizing benchmark and is considered an optimum value for the given indicator. Every indicator must have an optimal value TV and that value must be properly chosen. The same normalization method has been adopted in the PEOPLES framework (Kammouh and Cimellaro 2018; Kammouh et al. 2019b), which is a hierarchical framework for assessing the resilience of communities at different scales. It comprises seven dimensions,

601
602
603 199 summarized by the acronym PEOPLES, which stands for population, environmental and ecosystem, organized
604
605 200 governmental services, physical infrastructures, lifestyle, economic development, and social capital. In their
606
607 201 case, however, each normalized indicator cannot be higher than 1. Therefore, 1 is used in place of x/TV
608
609 202 whenever the indicator x is higher than TV .

611
612 203 To ensure a successful implementation of the selected weighting method, it is necessary to perform the Z-
613
614 204 scores transformation. This technique transforms a data set with variance σ^2 and mean μ to a set with variance
615
616 205 1 and mean equal to 0. The Z-scores method transforms the data as follows:

$$x_y^* = \frac{x_y - \mu(x)}{\sigma(x)} \quad (5)$$

623 207 **3.3. Weights allocation**

625 208 A weight is assigned to each normalized indicator. It is a measure of the indicator's contribution to the overall
626
627 209 resourcefulness index. The PEOPLES framework allocates weights based on an interdependency matrix,
628
629 210 which is filled out by an expert (or a group of experts) (Kammouh et al. 2019b). The expert assigns 1 if he/she
630
631 211 thinks that the indicator in the row depends on the indicator in the column. Then, an interdependency factor
632
633 212 for every indicator is derived. The essence is to "prevent possible overlap among the indicators" (Kammouh
634
635 213 et al. 2019b). If this overlap is not removed, the final composite index may be affected. Nevertheless, the
636
637 214 expert-based method used in PEOPLES framework appears not to be suitable in our case due to the following
638
639 215 reasons:

- 641 216 1. Indicators in PEOPLES framework are mainly statistical data representing tangible dimensions. It is
642
643 217 possible to select one or more experts to evaluate the interdependency among indicators. For example,
644
645 218 an economist could have an authoritative opinion regarding the interdependency between *income* and
646
647 219 *occupation*, or an environmental scientist between *air quality* and *water quality*. For the resourcefulness
648
649 220 index, however, it is not possible to follow the same procedure as the indicators are not straightforward
650
651 221 in terms of quantification.
- 653 222 2. Resourcefulness is an inherent feature of communities and it must not change if people's opinions
654
655 223 change.

661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720

224 Due to the above reasons, a data-driven method was chosen for this study. The primary objective is to assign
225 low weights to indicators that correlate highly with others because they share information with other indicators
226 and high weights to indicators that do not correlate with others. The most suitable methodological approach
227 for this study is the Principal Components Analysis (PCA).

228 The Principal Components Analysis is a multivariate technique that is typically used “to explain the variance
229 of the observed data through a few linear combinations of the original data” (Commission 2008). It was first
230 proposed by Pearson (1901) and then developed by Hotelling (1933). This methodology requires a sufficient
231 number of events to be reliable. Different rules of thumb have been proposed in different studies and all of
232 them are based on the events/variables ratio: 10:1 (Commission 2008), 5:1 (Bryant and Yarnold 1995), *etc.*

233 In this method, the variations of the variables (indicators) x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N are explained by another set of variables
234 Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_N , called Principal Components, which are mutually uncorrelated (*i.e.* orthogonal) (Eq. (6)). These
235 two sets of variables are of linear combination but are not correlated (Eq. (7)), where a_{ij} are coefficients that
236 can be computed.

$$\text{cov}(Y_i, Y_j) = 0 \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \dots + a_{1N}x_N \\ Y_2 &= a_{21}x_1 + a_{22}x_2 + \dots + a_{2N}x_N \\ &\dots \\ Y_Q &= a_{Q1}x_1 + a_{Q2}x_2 + \dots + a_{QN}x_N \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

239 $Y_{Q+1}, Y_{Q+2}, \dots, Y_N$ do not offer any meaningful contribution to the cumulative variance and are therefore
240 ignored.

241 The aim of this method is to select Q and to compute the *component loadings* a_{ij} . The first step is to calculate
242 the covariance matrix S , where S is symmetric because $s_{ij} = s_{ji}$:

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} s_{11} & \dots & s_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ s_{N1} & \dots & s_{NN} \end{bmatrix} \quad (8)$$

244 where

$$s_{ij} = \text{cov}(x_i, x_j) \quad (9)$$

If the starting data x_N are standardized (*i.e.* normalized by means of z-scores method), then S should be considered equal to the Correlation Matrix (P), which is a matrix whose coefficients represent the correlation among the indicators (Pearson 1895). In this case, if the correlation between two indicators is high, then the indicators contain mutual information.

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{11} & \cdots & \rho_{1N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho_{N1} & \cdots & \rho_{NN} \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

where ρ_{ij} is the Pearson's correlation coefficient, computed as follows:

$$\rho_{ij} = \text{corr}(x_i, x_j) = \frac{\text{cov}(x_i, x_j)}{\sigma_{x_i} \sigma_{x_j}} \quad (11)$$

The eigenvalues λ and eigenvectors d are computed and organized in a vector $[\lambda]$ and matrix $[D]$, respectively. For each eigenvalue, the solution of $\det(P - \lambda I) = 0$ represents the percentage of variance (of the original data). The eigenvectors are arranged in decreasing order. Such an arrangement makes it possible to select a group whose cumulative variance is sufficient to represent the original data with no excessive information loss. Once selected, each eigenvector is multiplied by the square root of the corresponding eigenvalue to obtain the *Component Loadings Matrix A*.

Each of the principal components has a geometric meaning. For the sake of simplicity, let's assume that x_1 and x_2 , two variables in the R^2 space, are the only two variables involved in the statistical analysis. Under such an assumption, data involving all candidates (*i.e.* communities, countries, etc.) can be represented as depicted in Figure 3a. However, it is important to note that the same assumption must be extended to the R^n space. The vector, which is the first principal component, can be identified and consequently modified to minimize the sum of the squared distances points-vector. This will also result in the maximization of their variance (*i.e.* the eigenvalues of P). Since the space is 2-dimensional, it is necessary to include a second principal component, which is orthogonal to the first and explain the remaining variance. These principal components are indicated using vectors, representing the geometric meaning of eigenvectors of matrix P .

The higher is the variance explained by the first principal component, the lower is the information loss if the second component is neglected. For example, if the second principal component was neglected, the data distribution would be treated as the main available data, where every point is projected on the first principal component. A visual representation of this relationship is shown in Figure 3b. Finally, the weights w_i are evaluated using Eq. (12).

$$w_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^Q D_{ij}^2 \cdot \lambda_j}{\sum_{j=1}^Q D_{ij}^2 \cdot \lambda_j} \quad (12)$$

It is important to note that different communities/countries may obtain different weights to the same indicator (i.e., the principle of independence among communities/countries). In addition, the weight of the same indicator may change every year due to the refinement process. The greater is the number of events (i.e. years), the higher is the analysis' reliability.




Figure 3: (a) Hypothetical data distribution and principal components, (b) Selection of the first principal component.

3.4. Aggregating indicators

The last step of the methodology is the selection of an aggregation technique. There are two main methods that have been proposed in the literature: Additive aggregation and Geometric aggregation (Commission 2008). The additive aggregation method allows full compensability among indicators, whereas the geometric method partially prevents compensability. For example, Paton and Johnston (2017) investigated the contribution of the *Hakka spirit* to the response of the Taiwanese community in the aftermath of an earthquake

841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900

287 that took place in 1999. The term *Hakkas* refers to Han Chinese, who migrated to other countries including
288 Taiwan. The specific approach they usually adopt in response to natural hazards is termed “the spirit of the
289 sturdy neck”. This statement simply means holding on firmly in the face of extreme adversity. The term can
290 also mean “to keep on doing something without any regard to your strength”. According to the authors, this
291 mindset was instrumental to the quick recovery of Tung Shih town after the earthquake. On its part, the
292 government responded quickly, even though its progress was limited by the inadequacy of essential materials
293 and the city’s unpreparedness. Nevertheless, the *Hakka spirit* effectively mitigated the impacts of this lack of
294 preparedness, and this supports the additive aggregation since the absence of some resources did not prevent
295 responding to the disaster. Therefore, Additive aggregation is the most suitable aggregation method for
296 computing the resourcefulness composite index because it allows compensability among indicators.
297 Mathematically, the additive aggregation is represented as follows:

$$RFS_{c,y} = \sum_{i=1}^Q x_{yj} \cdot w_j \quad (13)$$

299 where $RFS_{c,y}$ is the resourcefulness index of region c in year y . The flow chart of the proposed methodology is
300 shown in Figure 4. The algorithm can be automated using any programming language or even spreadsheets.




Figure 4: Flow chart of the resourcefulness assessment methodology

4. Case study: resourcefulness index of the USA and Italy

In this section, the proposed methodology is applied to evaluate resourcefulness on the national scale. Countries for which enough data can be found are selected because data availability is essential for the analysis. The first country of choice for this study is the United States. A preliminary study on the country has revealed that it has the highest number of available and retrievable data. Analysis of a second case study is necessary for validation. In this case, Italy was chosen for this purpose. The list of sources used for the compilation of data is presented in the Appendix.

4.1 Imputation of missing data

Out of the total amount of data needed, only 29.4% and 18.3% of data were found for the United States and Italy, respectively. Some indicators were also excluded because no associated data was available. For instance, the analysis of the United States did not include the *Mitigation Spending* indicator. On the other hand, five indicators were excluded in the analysis of Italy, namely *Mitigation Spending*, *Safety Perception*, *Family Disaster Preparedness*, *Emergency Kit Preparedness*, and *Patriotism*. Excluded indicators are highlighted in the Appendix with the notion (n/a). Thus, the data set matrix $[X]$ is a 28×16 matrix for the USA and 18×12 matrix for Italy.

The next step involves the selection of good regressors for each indicator. Figure 5 shows an example of the R^2 results between an indicator (i.e., *ECI*) and the other indicators for Italy. In the analysis, we also consider the year as an indicator although it is not a resourcefulness indicator. Results show that *YEAR* is the best regressor for *ECI*, with $R^2 = 0.85$. To extend the analysis to all other indicators, Figure 6 shows the R^2 values between each indicator and the other indicators, of both the USA and Italy. Each symbol represents the R^2 value between the corresponding indicator on the x-axis the indicator represented by the symbol. If the symbol lies above the threshold line ($R^2 = 0.5$), the indicator represented by the symbol is considered a good regressor for the indicator on the x-axis; otherwise, it is not considered as a good regressor. Good regressors couldn't be obtained for some indicators, namely *Bureaucracy Flexibility* and *Fragile States Index* for USA and *Interpersonal Trus* for Italy. Consequently, MCMC simulations have been carried out by using the software SPSS (IBM-Corp) to impute missing data of these indicators. The software takes as input the initial data set and returns a complete set with no missing data.




Figure 5: Selection of regressors for the indicator *Economic Complexity ECI* for Italy




Figure 6: Selection of good regressors for each indicator for (a) the USA and (b) Italy

4.2 Results

4.2.1 Resourcefulness results

Following the imputation of data, data is normalized, weighted, and aggregated using the methodology introduced before. The outputs of the analysis for the US and Italy for the year 2017, which is the last year of the analysis, are given in Eqs. (14) and (15) respectively:

$$RFS_{USA,2017} = 0.4605 \quad (14)$$

$$RFS_{ITA,2017} = 0.3954 \quad (15)$$

Figure 7 illustrates the indicators values for both the USA and Italy. Real data are plotted in white whereas grey refers to the ideal values. The entire area (grey and white) is equal to 1 (i.e. 100%, ideal *RFS*), whereas the white-colored area is equal to 0.4605 for the USA (i.e. 46.05%, real $RFS_{USA,2017}$) and 0.3954 for Italy (i.e. 39.54%, real $RFS_{ITA,2017}$). It is important to note that the ideal value is not the maximum, but the value that corresponds to the perfect community/country whose indicators are equal to the *Target Values* multiplied by the corresponding weights. Therefore, perfect communities/countries would have a grey area equal to zero.




Figure 7: (a) USA's *RFS* and (b) Italy's *RFS*

It is possible to monitor the evolution of the indicators as well as the consistency between the *RFS*'s over the years. However, it is necessary to first determine the years that have enough and accurate data required for the successful computation of *RFS*. As already described above, the Principal Components Analysis should have at its disposal enough events (years) to return precise outputs. Nevertheless, none of the already defined criteria are satisfied as $[X]_{USA}$ matrix is 28×16 , with a events/variables ratio equal to 1.75 and $[X]_{ITA}$ is 18×12 , with an events/variables ratio equal to 1.50. Thus, the results in this study are certainly affected by the lack of data related to some years.

It is preferable to ignore the *RFS* of the USA and Italy for the years 2010 and 2011 respectively since data for these years are not available. Further analysis for the USA will be restricted to between 2010 and 2017, while that of Italy will be limited to between 2011 and 2017. The *RFS* of the USA between 2010 and 2017 and that of Italy between 2011 and 2017 are shown in Figure 8. In addition, the relationship between the *RFS* and the average data variation for the first year of analysis is shown in Figure 9.




Figure 8: Evolution of *RFS* over the years of the USA and Italy




Figure 9: *RFS* over the years vs percentage average data variation compared to the first year

4.2.2 Weights results

The most crucial step of the algorithm is the allocation of weights. Weights assignment is the most debatable topic when dealing with indicators. The weights generated by the analysis carried out for the year 2017 are shown in Figure 10. The fact that the weights change every year implies that they are subject to a process of refinement. It seems reasonable to expect a high weights variation in the first years, which then decreases progressively with time. This is confirmed in Figure 11 where the weight variation of both the US and Italy is decreasing. However, the decrease in weight variation in the case of Italy is very slow. This can be attributed to several reasons, for instance:

1. The criterion used to select the number of principal components for Italy resulted in four principal components in 2011 while only three principal components from 2013 on;
2. As observed above, none of the events/variables ratios suggested by OECD are satisfied. This is because the analysis may have been affected by the low number of events (*i.e.* years).
3. The initial data matrix for Italy was only 18.3% filled.




Figure 10: 2017 weights for Italy and the United States




Figure 11: Years vs average weights variation compared to the previous year

In this study, the weighting method was employed with the primary aim of preventing information overlap among indicators. Consequently, the methodology allocates lower weights to those indicators that show a high correlation coefficient with other indicators and higher weights to those who do not share information with other indicators.

Figure 12 illustrates the relationship between each of the indicator's average correlation coefficient (taken as absolute value) and the weight of each indicator, from 2010 to 2017. The figure shows a good relationship between the average correlation coefficients for all the years and the weights. Thus, a low weight is assigned whenever the indicator shows a high correlation coefficient with the other indicators while a high weight is assigned when the reverse is the case.

Based on this postulation, one can assume that the relationship between the correlation coefficients and the weights improves as the number of cases increases. To confirm this assumption, the graph shown in Figure 12 is repeated for all the years. The R^2 of each plot is obtained and then plotted against the years, as shown in

1381
 1382
 1383 395 Figure 13. The results obtained in Figure 13 confirm that the relationship between the correlation coefficients
 1384
 1385 396 and the weights improves with time.
 1386
 1387




Figure 12: Correlation coefficient of each indicator averaged over the years 2010-2017 vs weight of each indicator referred to the analysis carried out for the year 2017.




Figure 13: Years vs the R^2 of plot in Figure 12 repeated for every year

4.2.3 Sensitivity analysis

It can also be assumed that a good algorithm allocates the highest weights to the indicators whose absence can alter the results. Such allocation is presumed to be possible, irrespective of the methodology that is being employed for assigning weights. This assumption can also be confirmed by performing a sensitivity analysis, which is done by removing one variable at a time, then comparing the consequent RFS with the value obtained when all indicators are taken into consideration. The results shown in Figure 14 reveal a good relationship ($R^2 = 0.7878$) between the assigned weight and the variation of results when the indicator is not taken into consideration. This relationship appears to be stronger in the analysis carried out for the United States than Italy ($R^2 = 0.5542$). Nevertheless, such disparity is attributable to the lack of events (*i.e.* years).




Figure 14: Sensitivity analysis of indicators showing the variation in the value of RFS if the indicator is removed from the analysis, plotted against the weight value of the indicator.

5. Conclusions and discussion

This paper proposes a new approach to compute resourcefulness at the community and national scales. Resourcefulness is deemed one of the main components of disaster resilience. The methodology involves normalizing, weighting, and aggregating data of selected resourcefulness indicators to obtain a resourcefulness index. The problem of missing data has been tackled in the paper using the Multiples Imputation and the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods.

As a case study, the proposed methodology has been applied to two countries, namely the USA and Italy. Results show that the two main issues in the methodology are the size of the data sample and the type of data collected. The former can affect the reliability of the analysis in the case of data paucity while the latter can prevent any comparison between different communities/countries if the data structure is not the same. Comparability among regions may be achieved by defining fixed and consistent criteria for the data collection process. Therefore, there is a need for a standard data collection methodology to be implemented by all regions so the outputs can be compared.

1561
1562
1563 429 The reliability of the Principal Components Analysis can be improved by decreasing the number of indicators
1564
1565 430 (*i.e.* increasing ratio cases/variables). To do so, a more concise set of indicators can be derived out of the
1566
1567 431 existing ones. Further discussion on the selection of indicators is therefore needed to identify which to keep
1568
1569 432 and which to remove. Data availability is also an important issue since the methodology is data-driven. The
1570
1571 433 amount and quality of data are what determines the trustability of results. Data sources can vary according to
1572
1573 434 the case study. The sources used for the case study presented in the paper are not valid for another case study.
1574
1575 435 Ideally, the competent authorities who are interested in applying this methodology to their case, whether it is
1576
1577 436 a community or a country, should have access to the data that can feed the methodology. Therefore, data
1578
1579 437 availability would not be an issue for them.
1580
1581 438 The proposed approach will help decision-makers specialized in the resource and funds allocation sectors to
1582
1583 439 assess their resourcefulness level and, hence, improve their response to natural hazards and manmade disasters.
1584
1585 440 Future work will focus on solving the issue of data availability and collection by proposing a procedure that
1586
1587 441 does not rely entirely on hard data but on also expert judgment, such as the Bayesian Network.
1588
1589 442
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620

1621
1622
1623
1624 **443 Appendix.** Summary of indicators used for the case study of the United States and Italy with data sources
1625
1626

Dim.	Indicator	Symb.	Sources for the USA	Sources for Italy
Political-economic	Economic Complexity	<i>ECI</i>	https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/	https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/
	Bureaucracy	<i>BF</i>	https://www.heritage.org/index/	https://www.heritage.org/index/
	Flexibility			
	Fragility	<i>FSI</i>	http://fundforpeace.org/fsi/data/	http://fundforpeace.org/fsi/data/
	Mitigation Spending	<i>MS</i>	n/a	n/a
	Safety Rate	<i>SR</i>	https://www.statista.com/statistics/191219/reported-violent-crime-rate-in-the-usa-since-1990/	https://www.statista.com/statistics/91219/reported-violent-crime-rate-in-the-usa-since-1990/
	Participation in public life	<i>PPL</i>	https://www.fairvote.org/voter_turnout#voter_turnout_101	https://www.tgcom24.mediaset.it/politica/infografica/l-andamento-storico-dell-affluenza-alle-urne_1001472-2018.shtml
Preparedness	Smartphone penetration	<i>S</i>	https://www.statista.com/statistics/201183/forecast-of-smartphone-penetration-in-the-us/	https://www.statista.com/statistics/201183/forecast-of-smartphone-penetration-in-the-us/
	Disaster Preparedness	<i>FDP</i>	https://ncdp.columbia.edu/	n/a
	Emergency Kit Preparedness	<i>EKP</i>	https://ncdp.columbia.edu/	n/a
Trust	Safety Perception	<i>SP</i>	https://www.statista.com/statistics/205525/public-perception-of-trend-in-crime-problem-in-the-usa/	https://www.istat.it/it/files//2018/06/EN_Fear_of_crime.pdf
	Volunteering	<i>V</i>	https://www.statista.com/statistics/189295/percentage-of-population-volunteering-in-the-united-states-since-2003/	https://www.lastampa.it/2012/12/04/blogs/datablog/il-volontariato-in-italia-

1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680

1681
 1682
 1683
 1684
 1685
 1686
 1687
 1688
 1689
 1690
 1691
 1692
 1693
 1694
 1695
 1696
 1697
 1698
 1699
 1700
 1701
 1702
 1703
 1704
 1705
 1706
 1707
 1708
 1709
 1710
 1711
 1712
 1713
 1714
 1715
 1716
 1717
 1718
 1719
 1720
 1721
 1722
 1723
 1724
 1725
 1726
 1727
 1728
 1729
 1730
 1731
 1732
 1733
 1734
 1735
 1736
 1737
 1738
 1739
 1740

basWoxRZc2U9svassRt6TO/pagina.html

Interpersonal Trust	<i>IT</i>	https://gssdataexplorer.norc.org/variables/441/vshow	https://www.statista.com/statistics/641012/level-of-interpersonal-trust-italy/
---------------------	-----------	---	---

Trust in the political system	<i>TPS</i>	http://www.peoplepress.org/2017/12/14/public-trust-in-government-1958-2017/	http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano_en/contenido?WC_M_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_es/zonas_es/europa/ari39-2018-toygur-guide-to-understanding-italy-2018-elections-and-beyond
-------------------------------	------------	---	---

Trust in the police	<i>TP</i>	https://news.gallup.com/poll/213869/confidence-police-back-historical-average.aspx	https://www.statista.com/statistics/579685/public-trust-in-state-police-italy/
---------------------	-----------	---	---

Patriotism	<i>P</i>	https://news.gallup.com/poll/236420/record-low-extremely-proud-americans.aspx?utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=twitter&utm_campaign=sharing	n/a
------------	----------	---	-----

Creativity

Patent applications	<i>PAT</i>	https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IP.PAT.NRES?locations=US&view=chart	https://www.statista.com/statistics/412674/european-patent-applications-from-italy/
---------------------	------------	---	---

Research and development expenditure	<i>RDE</i>	https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/GB.XPD.RSDV.GD.ZS?display=graph	https://www.statista.com/statistics/420976/gross-domestic-expenditure-on-research-and-development-gdp-italy/
--------------------------------------	------------	---	---

444
 445

Acknowledgments

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the Grant Agreement n° ERC_IDEAL RESCUE_637842 of the project IDEAL RESCUE—Integrated Design and Control of Sustainable Communities during Emergencies.

References

- Balbi, A., Kammouh, O., Pia Repetto, M., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2018). "Resilience framework for seaport infrastructure: theory and application." *9th International Conference on Bridge Maintenance, Safety (IABMAS 2018)*, Nigel Powers, Dan M. Frangopol, Riadh Al-Mahaidi, and C. Caprani, eds., CRC Press, Melbourne, Australia, 588.
- Ballano, V. O. (2017). *Law, Normative Pluralism, and Post-Disaster Recovery*, Springer.
- Berkeley, A., Wallace, M., and COO, C. (2010). "A framework for establishing critical infrastructure resilience goals." *Final Report and Recommendations by the Council, National Infrastructure Advisory Council*.
- Brown, K. (2015). *Resilience, development and global change*, Routledge.
- Bruneau, M., Chang, S. E., Eguchi, R. T., Lee, G. C., O'Rourke, T. D., Reinhorn, A. M., Shinozuka, M., Tierney, K., Wallace, W. A., and Von Winterfeldt, D. (2003). "A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities." *Earthquake spectra*, 19(4), 733-752.
- Bryant, F. B., and Yarnold, P. R. (1995). "Principal-components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis."
- Carlin, R. E., Love, G. J., and Zechmeister, E. J. (2014). "Trust shaken: Earthquake damage, state capacity, and interpersonal trust in comparative perspective." *Comparative Politics*, 46(4), 419-453.
- Cimellaro, G. P., Mahin, S., and Domaneschi, M. (2019). "Integrating a Human Behavior Model within an Agent-Based Approach for Blasting Evacuation." *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 34(1), 3-20.
- Cimellaro, G. P., Malavisi, M., and Mahin, S. (2017a). "Using Discrete Event Simulation Models to Evaluate Resilience of an Emergency Department." *Journal of Earthquake Engineering*, 21(2), 203-226
- Cimellaro, G. P., Malavisi, M., and Mahin, S. (2018). "Factor analysis to evaluate hospital resilience." *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering*, 4(1), March 2018
- Cimellaro, G. P., Ozzello, F., Vallero, A., Mahin, S., and Shao, B. (2017b). "Simulating earthquake evacuation using human behavior models." *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics*, 46(6), 985-1002.
- Cimellaro, G. P., Reinhorn, A. M., and Bruneau, M. (2010a). "Framework for analytical quantification of disaster resilience." *Engineering Structures*, 32(11), 3639-3649.
- Cimellaro, G. P., Reinhorn, A. M., and Bruneau, M. (2010b). "Seismic resilience of a hospital system." *Structure and Infrastructure Engineering*, 6(1-2), 127-144.

1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860

485 Cimellaro, G. P., Reinhorn, A. M., and Bruneau, M. (2011). "Performance-based metamodel for health care facilities." *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics*, 40 (11), 1197–1217.

486 Cimellaro, G. P., Renschler, C., Reinhorn, A. M., and Arendt, L. (2016a). "PEOPLES: a framework for evaluating resilience." *Journal of Structural Engineering*, ASCE, 142(10), 1-13 DOI: 10.1061/(ASCE)ST.1943-1541X.0001514.

489 Cimellaro, G. P., Solari, D., and Bruneau, M. (2014). "Physical infrastructure Interdependency and regional resilience index after the 2011 Tohoku earthquake in Japan." *Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics*, 43(12), 1763-1784.

493 Cimellaro, G. P., Tinebra, A., Renschler, C., and Fragiadakis, M. (2016b). "New Resilience Index for Urban Water Distribution Networks." *Journal of Structural Engineering*, ASCE, 142(8), C4015014.

496 Cimellaro, G. P., Villa, O., and Bruneau, M. (2015). "Resilience-Based Design of Natural gas distribution networks." *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, ASCE, 21(1), March 2015.

498 Cimellaro, G. P., Zamani-Noori, A., Kammouh, O., Terzic, V., and Mahin, S. A. (2016c). "Resilience of Critical Structures, Infrastructure, and Communities." Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER), Berkeley, California, pp. 318.

501 Commission, J. R. C.-E. (2008). *Handbook on constructing composite indicators: Methodology and User guide*, OECD publishing.

503 Council, M. M. (2005). "Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves: An Independent Study to Assess the Future Savings from Mitigation Activities, Volumes 1 and 2, Report to US Congress on behalf of the National Institute of Building Sciences." Washington, DC.

506 Cutter, S. L., Burton, C. G., and Emrich, C. T. (2010). "Disaster resilience indicators for benchmarking baseline conditions." *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 7(1).

508 Cutter, S. L., Emrich, C. T., Mitchell, J. T., Boruff, B. J., Gall, M., Schmidtlein, M. C., Burton, C. G., and Melton, G. (2006). "The long road home: Race, class, and recovery from Hurricane Katrina." *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 48(2), 8-20.

511 De Iuliis, M., Kammouh, O., Cimellaro, G., and Tesfamariam, S. (2019a). "Resilience of the Built Environment: A Methodology to Estimate the Downtime of Building Structures Using Fuzzy Logic." *Resilient Structures and Infrastructure*, Springer, 47-76.

515 De Iuliis, M., Kammouh, O., Cimellaro, G. P., and Tesfamariam, S. (2019b). "Downtime estimation of building structures using fuzzy logic." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 34, 196-208.

517 De Iuliis, M., Kammouh, O., Cimellaro, G. P., and Tesfamariam, S. (under review). "Quantifying restoration time of power and telecommunication lifelines after earthquakes using Bayesian belief network model." *Journal of Management in Engineering*.

520 Drabek, T. E. (2003). *Strategies for coordinating disaster responses*, Institute of Behavior Sciences Boulder, CO.

522 Hotelling, H. (1933). "Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principal components." *Journal of educational psychology*, 24(6), 417.


524 IBM-Corp. Released 2017. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

525 Kammouh, O., Cardoni, A., Marasco, S., Cimellaro, G. P., and Mahin, S. (2018a). "Resilience assessment of city-scale transportation networks subject to earthquakes using the Monte Carlo approach." *9th International Conference on Bridge Maintenance, Safety (IABMAS 2018)*, Nigel Powers, Dan M. Frangopol, Riadh Al-Mahaidi, and C. Caprani, eds., CRC Press, Melbourne, Australia, 588.



530 Kammouh, O., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2018). "PEOPLES: a tool to measure community resilience." *Proceedings of 2018 Structures Congress (SEI2018)*, J. G. Soules, ed., ASCE- American Society of Civil Engineering, Fort Worth, Texas. April 19–21, 2018, 161 - 171.

1861
1862
1863 533 Kammouh, O., Cimellaro, G. P., and Mahin, S. (2018b). "Downtime estimation and analysis of
1864 534 lifelines after Earthquakes." *Engineering Structures*, 173(2018), 393-403.
1865 535 Kammouh, O., Dervishaj, G., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2017). "A New Resilience Rating System for
1866 536 Countries and States." *Procedia Engineering*, 198(Supplement C), 985-998.
1867 537 Kammouh, O., Dervishaj, G., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2018c). "Quantitative Framework to Assess
1868 538 Resilience and Risk at the Country Level." *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in
1869 539 Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering*, 4(1), 04017033.
1870 540 Kammouh, O., Gardoni, P., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2019a). "Resilience assessment of dynamic
1871 541 engineering systems." *MATEC Web Conf.*, 281, 01008.
1872 542 Kammouh, O., Gardoni, P., and Cimellaro, G. P. (in press). "Probabilistic Framework to Evaluate the
1873 543 Resilience of Engineering Systems Using Bayesian and Dynamic Bayesian Networks."
1874 544 *Reliability Engineering and System Safety*.
1875 545 Kammouh, O., Noori, A. Z., Cimellaro, G. P., and Mahin, S. A. (2019b). "Resilience Assessment of
1876 546 Urban Communities." *ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems,
1877 547 Part A: Civil Engineering*, 5(1), 04019002.
1878 548 Kammouh, O., Noori, A. Z., Taurino, V., Mahin, S. A., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2018d). "Deterministic and
1879 549 fuzzy-based methods to evaluate community resilience." *Earthquake Engineering and
1880 550 Engineering Vibration*, 17(2), 261-275.
1881 551 Kammouh, O., Silvestri, S., Palermo, M., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2018e). "Performance-based seismic
1882 552 design of multistory frame structures equipped with crescent-shaped brace." *Structural
1883 553 Control and Health Monitoring*, 25(2), e2079.
1884 554 Kammouh, O., Zamani Noori, A., Domaneschi, M., Cimellaro, G. P., and Mahin, S. (2018f). "A fuzzy
1885 555 based tool to measure the resilience of communities." *9th International Conference on
1886 556 Bridge Maintenance, Safety (IABMAS 2018)*, Nigel Powers, Dan M. Frangopol, Riadh Al-
1887 557 Mahaidi, and C. Caprani, eds., CRC Press, Melbourne, Australia, 588.
1888 558 Kreps, G. (1990). "Organizing for Emergency Management." *Emergency Management: Principles
1889 559 and Practices for Local Government*, 86-99.
1890 560 Lee, G., and Loh, C.-H. (2003). "Human and Institutional Perspective of the 921 Earthquake in
1891 561 Taiwan: Lessons Learned."
1892 562 MacKinnon, D., and Derickson, K. D. (2013). "From resilience to resourcefulness: A critique of
1893 563 resilience policy and activism." *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(2), 253-270.
1894 564 Marasco, S., Zamani Noori, A., Kammouh, O., Domaneschi, M., Vallero, A., Scutiero, G., and
1895 565 Cimellaro, G. P. (2018). "Seismic Damage Assessment of a Virtual Large-Scale City Model."
1896 566 *9th International Conference on Bridge Maintenance, Safety (IABMAS 2018)*, Nigel Powers,
1897 567 Dan M. Frangopol, Riadh Al-Mahaidi, and C. Caprani, eds., CRC Press, Melbourne, Australia,
1898 568 588.
1899 569 Nel, P., and Righarts, M. (2008). "Natural disasters and the risk of violent civil conflict." *International
1900 570 Studies Quarterly*, 52(1), 159-185.
1901 571 Nogami, T. (2015). "The myth of increased crime in Japan: a false perception of crime frequency in
1902 572 post-disaster situations." *International journal of disaster risk reduction*, 13, 301-306.
1903 573 NRC (2015). *Developing a framework for measuring community resilience: summary of a workshop*,
1904 574 National Academies Press.
1905 575 Organization, W. H. (2002). "Community participation in local health and sustainable development:
1906 576 Approaches and techniques."
1907 577 Palen, L., Anderson, K. M., Mark, G., Martin, J., Sicker, D., Palmer, M., and Grunwald, D. "A vision for
1908 578 technology-mediated support for public participation & assistance in mass emergencies &
1909 579 disasters." *Proc., Proceedings of the 2010 ACM-BCS visions of computer science conference*,
1910 580 British Computer Society, 8.
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920


1921
1922
1923 581 Paton, D., and Johnston, D. (2017). *Disaster resilience: an integrated approach*, Charles C Thomas
1924 582 Publisher.
1925 583 Pearson, K. (1895). "Note on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents." *Proceedings of*
1926 584 *the Royal Society of London*, 58, 240-242.
1927 585 Pearson, K. (1901). "LIII. On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space." *The London,*
1928 586 *Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 2(11), 559-572.
1930 587 Perrow, C. (2011). *The next catastrophe: Reducing our vulnerabilities to natural, industrial, and*
1931 588 *terrorist disasters*, Princeton University Press.
1932 589 Podolny, J. M., and Page, K. L. (1998). "Network forms of organization." *Annual review of sociology*,
1933 590 24(1), 57-76.
1934 591 Rosenthal, U., Boin, A., and Comfort, L. K. (2001). *Managing crises: Threats, dilemmas,*
1935 592 *opportunities*, Charles C Thomas Publisher.
1936 593 Sarkis, A. I., Palermo, A., Kammouh, O., and Cimellaro, G. P. (2018). "Seismic resilience of road
1938 594 bridges: lessons learned from the 14 November 2016 Kaikoura Earthquake." *9th*
1939 595 *International Conference on Bridge Maintenance, Safety (IABMAS 2018)*, Nigel Powers, Dan
1940 596 M. Frangopol, Riadh Al-Mahaidi, and C. Caprani, eds., CRC Press, Melbourne, Australia, 588.
1941 597 Tierney, K. "Structure and process in the study of disaster resilience." *Proc., 14th world conference*
1942 598 *on earthquake engineering, Beijing, China*.
1943 599 Whittaker, J., McLennan, B., and Handmer, J. (2015). "A review of informal volunteerism in
1944 600 emergencies and disasters: Definition, opportunities and challenges." *International journal*
1945 601 *of disaster risk reduction*, 13, 358-368.
1947 602 Yates, D., and Mackenzie, S. (2018). "Heritage, Crisis, and Community Crime Prevention in Nepal."
1948 603 *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 25(2), 203-221.
1949 604 Zamani Noori, A., Marasco, S., Kammouh, O., Domaneschi, M., and Cimellaro, G. (2017). "Smart
1950 605 cities to improve resilience of communities." *8th International Conference on Structural*
1951 606 *Health Monitoring of Intelligent Infrastructure, SHMII 2017* Brisbane; Australia, 1112-1121.
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957 608
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980




Redundancy



Robustness



Rapidity



Resourcefulness

