2.3 The most recent view of vulnerability

Stefan Schneiderbauer, *Elisa Calliari, Unni Eidsvig*
Michael Hagenlocher

2.3.1 The importance of vulnerability for disaster risk assessment

2.3.1.1 Vulnerability: a key component to determine risks

Disaster risk is determined by the combination of physical hazards and the vulnerabilities of exposed elements. Vulnerability relates to the susceptibility of assets such as objects, systems (or part thereof) and populations exposed to disturbances, stressors or shocks as well as to the lack of capacity to cope with and to adapt to these adverse conditions. Vulnerability is dynamic, multifaceted and composed of various dimensions, all of which have to be considered within a holistic vulnerability assessment.

Vulnerability plays a fundamental role for understanding, assessing and reducing risks. When a hazardous event occurs — be it of natural, technological or man-made origin — the vulnerability of exposed people, objects (e.g. critical infrastructure, etc.) and systems (e.g. socioecological systems) at different scales is key to determine the severity of the impact. Though this fact has been widely accepted, the definition of vulnerability and the components it comprises varies between different authors and disciplines.

The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR Terminology, 2017) defines vulnerability as 'the characteristics and circumstances of a community, system or asset that make it susceptible to the damaging effects of a hazard. This definition reflects the last decades' shift in the understanding of vulnerability from a focused concept (for example limited to physical resistance of engineering structures) to a more holistic and systemic approach. At the same time, it does not provide reference to the political/institutional situation and does not account for power relations or the heterogeneity within communities, which are aspects considered as important and included in the definitions proposed by other authors (Cardona et al., 2012; Alexander, 2013; Birkmann et al., 2013; Wisner, 2016)

Vulnerability represents a fundamental component of risk. A proper understanding of vulnerability comprising its dimensions as well as its root causes is important for effective risk assessment and risk reduction.

The significance of vulnerability for assessing risk is emphasised by the fact that the consequences of a hazardous event largely depend on human factors. That is, the hazardous event itself may be predominantly an external phenomena out of the control of those affected; any devastating impact caused by this event, however, is mainly influenced by inherent societal conditions and processes.

The L'Aquila earthquake in April 2009 in Italy is an example of a medium-power seismic event that had a disproportionately large human impact. It caused 308 fatalities, most of which were the young and elderly, as well as women. The death toll is partially linked to the high vulnerability of building stock in the mountains of Abruzzo. It is in part explained by the risk perception among female victims, who tend to be more fatalistic than men and who perceived their homes as a refuge, instead of leaving it (Alexander, 2010; Alexander and Magni, 2013).

The degree of vulnerability within a society or a population group is usually not homogenously distributed; social class, ethnic origin, age and gender may determine a lower or higher probability of being affected. Evidence of this fact has been shown by the impact of Hurricane Katrina, which caused a disproportionately high number of victims amongst the poor black and elderly population in New Orleans in 2005 (Cutter et al., 2006).

Addressing vulnerability — together with exposure — represents the gateway for risk reduction measures. Consequently, the importance of vulnerability for DRM is underlined by the Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction, claiming that understanding disaster risk (Priority 1) and developing related policies and practices need to consider the various dimensions of vulnerability (UNISDR, 2015a).

BOX 2.1

Resilience and capacities

Besides the notion of 'vulnerability' there are other terms and concepts addressing the possibility of harm to a system, people or specific objects by certain events and processes. Vulnerability – understood as a holistic and systemic concept – is closely related to and partly overlaps, for example, with the concepts of resilience and of coping and adaptive capacity.

'Resilience' is a term that has been widely used over the last years to describe characteristics related to the ability to absorb stresses, to respond to changes and to recover from shocks. Some authors see resilience as the positive flipside of vulnerability. A broader understanding of resilience incorporates the ability and willingness to learn, to reorganise and to undertake critical self-reflection (Alexander 2013; Kelman et al., 2016). Climate resilience has emerged into a new doctrine under the umbrella of which communities define the activities to combat the impending implications of climate change.

There are numerous related activities within Europe, for example the RESIN project is investigating climate resilience in European cities, the European Commission's FP7 project emBRACE has focused on community resilience and developed a set of key indicators for assessing it, and the Commission's Horizon 2020 project 'resilens' is scrutinising the resilience of European critical infrastructure.

Just as the term 'resilience', the concept of capacities relates to the possibilities and abilities to reduce harm under hazardous conditions. Hereby, 'coping capacity' rather deals with the short-term conservation and protection of the current system and institutional settings, whilst 'adapting capacity' denotes a longer-term and constantly unfolding process of learning (Birkmann et al., 2013).

2.3.1.2 Conceptual issues and dimensions of vulnerability

Just as there are numerous definitions of the term 'vulnerability', there exist many models and concepts that describe vulnerability in its relation to other terms, such as resilience, exposure or capacities, and that elaborate on vulnerability's key dimensions. The European project 'Methods for the improvement of vulnerability assessment in Europe' (MOVE) developed such a concept, which attempts to represent the multifaceted nature of vulnerability (Figure 2.10). In its central part, it identifies six thematic dimensions of vulnerability: the physical, the ecological, the social, the economic, the cultural and the institutional dimension. All of these dimensions have to be considered within a holistic vulnerability study. The majority of assets and systems exposed to hazard will exhibit more than one dimension of vulnerability and hence these dimensions need to be addressed more in detail for any

FIGURE 2.10

The MOVE framework to conceptualise vulnerability
Source: Birkmann et al. (2013)



assessment (Birkmann et al., 2013). This framework is particularly useful within the context of disaster risk since it embeds vulnerability in the wider framework of risk governance/ management and emphasises the various intervention opportunities that may be taken to reduce risk.

A key initial question when scrutinising vulnerability is who or what is vulnerable to what type of threat or hazard. This leads to the question of how the interactions between hazards and vulnerabilities look like. In fact, there are significant differences in the way the various factors that determine vulnerability are linked or connected to different types of hazards. Typically, physical characteristics of elements at risk are directly linked to a particular hazard. For example, the degree to which a building withstands an earthquake is directly linked to the type of building material used. However, a great level of resistance related to earthquakes as a result of building material does not automatically imply that the ability to resist a flood event is similarly high. On the other hand, the predisposition to be adversely affected due to the economic, sociocultural or political-institutional susceptibilities is to a large degree hazard independent. A community, for instance, with a well-working emergency response system and a strong social network is better forearmed against any type of hazardous event than a community with corrupt public authorities and disrupted internal linkages (Brooks, 2003; Schneiderbauer and Ehrlich, 2006; Cardona et al., 2012).

Transferring these rather theoretical concepts into operational vulnerability assessments in practice results in a number of challenges. Most importantly, the majority of non-physical aspects of vulnerability are not measurable in the way in that we are able to determine temperature or people's income. Consequently, alternative methods for assessing vulnerability are applied. They can be quantitative or qualitative or a mix of both (see Chapter 2.3.4). Widely applied and accepted tools comprise vulnerability curves predominantly used for assessing physical vulnerabilities and the use of (proxy-) indicators, particularly to estimate the vulnerability of non-physical dimensions (for example social, economic or institutional vulnerabilities). Here, indicators are used to communicate simplified information about specific circumstances that are not directly measurable or can only be measured with great difficulty (Meyer, 2011). At local level, where spatial data and statistics often do not exist in sufficient resolution, expert opinions as well as participatory, community- based approaches play a major role in vulnerability assessments.

Power relations, cultural beliefs, the attitude towards risk- reduction efforts or the willingness and capacity to learn from previous events are essential for the degree of preparedness of a population. Related information can be found in story lines rather than in statistics. Another challenge lies in providing evidence about the degree of vulnerability and its causes. Vulnerability bears witness only in the aftermath of an event when damage and loss are realised. Loss and damage data, though strongly depending on the magnitude of the hazard itself, are therefore important data sources for vulnerability assessments and/or for the validation of assessment attempts (see Chapter 2.4).

Due to the conceptual complexity and methodological challenges connected with vulnerability, the uncertainties of vulnerability assessments and their results is a topic of ongoing discussion. The uncertainties are an aggregation of uncertainties from several sources. They include limitations in knowledge about the socioecological systems that the vulnerable elements are part of as well as inaccuracies of empirical data and limitations of models applied for vulnerability assessments.

Uncertainty can be classified in many different ways. One possibility is to subdivide it into 'aleatory uncertainty', which represents the variability of the properties of concern, and 'epistemic uncertainty', which stems from limited knowledge. A sophisticated estimation of uncertainties is usually a difficult and costly exercise. Hence, the level of complexity and sophistication and the effort and resources to be spent should be in line with the risk management issue and correspond to the level of detail needed.

2.3.1.3 State of the art and research gaps

The number of existing theoretical frameworks and concepts related to various aspects of vulnerability is striking. Future work should focus on the translation of these concepts into action, namely by developing easy-to-use tools to implement vulnerability studies that yield useful results for the stakeholder and user. At least within Europe, a set of standardised methods for defined purposes at certain scales would help to monitor changes over time and to compare vulnerability patterns spatially. The respective activities need to consider the developments of other relevant fields of action such as climate change adaptation or sustainable development.

The awareness of the significance of vulnerability for DRM has significantly increased over the last decades. Nevertheless, the importance of underlying triggering factors of vulnerability and not directly tangible aspects such as the cultural and institutional dimension requires further attention.

2.3.2 System and systemic vulnerability

In order to advance the understanding of vulnerability and its dynamics as well as to set appropriate policy agendas, it is crucial to look at how the vulnerability dimensions interact at different spatial, temporal and functional scales (Cardona et al., 2012).

The fact that our modern world is increasingly interconnected calls for systemic approaches when assessing vulnerabilities and risks, which take into account feedback loops and cascading chains of impacts

In particular, analysing vulnerability in the framework of sustainable development or climate change adaptation requires considering the interactions between human and natural systems.

2.3.2.1 System dynamics affecting vulnerability

Vulnerability is a dynamic concept (Cardona et al., 2012) and thus varies in space and time. Trends in exposure and vulnerability are influenced by changes in the demographic, economic, social, institutional, governance, cultural and environmental patterns of a system (Oppenheimer et al., 2014). Taking demography as an example, the current trend of an ageing population that characterises developed countries has considerably influenced people's vulnerability to heat stress, as shown by the high death toll paid by the elderly during the 2003 heatwave event in Europe (Robine et al., 2008).

Another example is the concentration of assets and settlements (and economic activities) in hazard-prone areas due to population growth and the lack of related spatial planning. At a first view this phenomena simply represents increased exposure values. At a closer look, it is strongly linked to vulnerability. Hazard-prone areas are in general characterised by lower land values and are thus occupied by low-income households. The scarcity or non-existence of infrastructure, services, social protection and security in these sites eventually leads to 'socially segregated' urban development, which in turn generates new patterns of vulnerability and risk (UNISDR, 2015b).

For instance, the most damaged areas during the 2010 floods in Bursa (Turkey) were those neighbourhoods characterised by the presence of informal settlements and occupied by low-income families (Tas et al., 2013).

Another aspect of systemic vulnerability is the dependence of human societies on ecosystem services, particularly those regulating climate, diseases and providing buffer zones (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). For example, coastal wetlands increase energy dissipation of storm surges, dampen wind-driven surface waves, modify wind fields and reduce the exposure of (and thus protect) people and physical assets in the hinterland. Moreover, provisioning services include food, raw materials, fresh water and medicinal resources, the availability of which determines well-being and thus can strongly influence the socioeconomic vulnerability profile of a community. Consequently, ecosystem-based adaptation approaches have been applied in DRM to address potentially hazardous processes such as flash floods, heat waves, sea level rise, increasing water scarcity, etc.

2.3.2.2 System criticality

Globalisation has made communities and nations interdependent in a number of realms, including politics, economy, culture and technology.
A systemic view postulates to consider those linkages within and without a socioecological system that may affect its vulnerability, thus drawing attention to wider human and environmental processes and phenomena (Turner et al., 2003). In concrete terms, this means that systems and their popula-

tions are not only affected by hazards to which they are physically exposed but also — by means of cascading effects — to those experienced elsewhere. Recent disasters such as the eruption of Eyjafjallajökull in Iceland (2010), the floods in Thailand (2011), the Great East Japan Earthquake (2011) and Hurricane Sandy in the United States (2013) called attention to the severe effects of such cascades of disasters.

Cascading disasters can be exemplified by the vulnerability of critical infrastructure (Pescaroli & Alexander, 2016). When in 2003 a tree fell on a Swiss power line, causing a fault in the transmission system, 56 million people in Italy suffered the effects of the worse blackout in the country's history. 30 000 people were trapped on trains and many commercial and residential users suffered disruption in their power supplies for up to 48 hours (Johnson, 2007). At a larger scale, failures in the global supply chain highlight how the vulnerability of one system may depend on the resilience of another system working in far spatial distance.

The Swedish company Ericsson experienced substantial loss due to the vulnerability of a subsupplier. A 10-minute fire at Philips' plant in New Mexico, caused by a lighting hitting the electric line, translated into a loss in phone sales of about EUR 375 million (Jansson, 2004).

This was mainly because Ericsson took no action after Philips' reassurance about production returning on track in a week — which was not the case. On the contrary, Nokia, another big Philips customer, promptly switched supplier and it even re-engineered some of its phones to accept both American and Japanese chips. By doing so, it raised its profits by 42 % that year and managed to acquire new market shares (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2009). The Ericsson–Nokia example underscores the fundamental role played by coping capacity in reducing the adverse effects of experienced hazards. Moreover, it calls for drawing attention not only to the triggering event when considering cascading disasters, but more importantly to how vulnerabilities of different system's components may align and thus amplify impacts (Pescaroli & Alexander, 2016).

2.3.2.3 State of the art and research gaps

Disaster risk research often remains fragmented in a number of disciplines and focused on single hazards (Cutter et al., 2015), with limited interaction with other relevant communities. Research adopting a coupled human-environmental system approach in framing vulnerability has contributed to the integration of separate domains (Cardona et al., 2012).

Namely, the approach of ecosystem-based adaptation has transferred this holistic view into practice. Yet, the level of trans- and interdisciplinarity that would be required to implement truly systemic approaches in vulnerability assessment is rarely achieved. Hence, future applied research should follow an approach of coproduction of knowledge and need to integrate relevant disciplines. Relevant university education and training programmes should prepare young scientists and practitioners accordingly.

2.3.3 Vulnerability within the context of changing climate conditions

Climate change is one of the most prominent examples of an external biophysical stressor putting coupled human-natural systems at risk and the vulnerabilities to changing climate conditions has been the focus of many assessment studies. Originally, the understanding of 'vulnerability' in the community of climate scientists differed from that of the disaster risk research by encompassing the hazard component itself. That is, the projected change of relevant climate parameters was seen as part of the system's vulnerability to climate change (IPCC, 2007).

Knowledge on climate change is growing fast, but standardised vulnerability assessment approaches are lacking. Vulnerability assessment must consider changing socioeconomic, political and organisational conditions that determine possible vulnerability pathways.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) special report, Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation (IPCC, 2012a), and later on its fifth assessment report (IPCC, 2013) have introduced the concept of 'climate risks' and have hence worked towards converging the concepts of both communities. The currently ongoing integration of climate change adaptation and disaster risk- reduction approaches leads to an increase of knowledge and has the potential to foster network building and to develop more efficient policies. A respective report is under preparation under the lead of the European Environment Agency (EEA).

The IPCC's fifth assessment report identifies several ways in which increasing warming and climate-related extremes can have an impact on a socioecological system and focuses in particular on those complex interactions between climate and such systems that increase vulnerability and risk synergistically (Oppenheimer et al., 2014). One of them is the negative effect of climate change on human health, which results from a number of direct and indirect pathways.

Direct biological consequences to human health can derive from heatwaves, extreme weather events and temperature-related concentrations of pollutants; yet most of the impacts will be indirectly triggered by warming-induced changes in environmental and social conditions (Mc Michael, 2013) and are hence in their extent determined by respective vulnerabilities. Moreover, climate change induced adverse impacts on crop yields' quantity and quality can exacerbate malnutrition (Met Office & WFP, 2014) and thus contribute to new or stronger vulnerabilities to a range of diseases.

The assessment of climate-related risks and the identification of respective key vulnerabilities needs to consider the variety of these possible direct and indirect impacts. Useful tools to tackle this challenge are so-called impact chains, which represent cascading cause-effect relationships and allow for structuring assessment processes and the prioritisation of fields of action (Schneiderbauer et al., 2013; Fritzsche et al., 2014). Impact chains have, for example, been developed and applied by the ci:grasp adaptation support platform (n.d.) and the latest German climate change vulnerability study (Buth et al., 2015).

2.3.3.1 Vulnerability and climate change in Europe

At European level, climate change is recognised as an important driver of risk due to both climate extremes (for example heavy precipitation events or storms) and slow onset events of long-term duration (for example sea

FIGURE 2.11

Global maps of vulnerability index calculated by INFORM (upper left) approaches and the identified sub-components of risk and vulnerability left and the WorldRiskIndex on the bottom right.
Source: BEH and UNU-EHS (2016), INFORM (n.d.)



level rise or glacier retreat) Climate change will also have positive impacts in Europe in specific sectors and in certain regions (for example agriculture and tourism in northern Europe). In this chapter we concentrate on potential adverse impacts that require actions to reduce related risks.. Though all the countries in the EU are exposed to climate change, the related impacts vary depending on differences in climate conditions but also in vulnerabilities and degree of exposure (EC, 2013). Many EU Member States have based their national adaptation strategies on studies about risks and vulnerabilities to climate change, for example the United Kingdom in 2016 (UK, 2016), Germany in 2015 (Buth et al., 2015) and the Netherlands (PBL, 2012). At European level, respective studies have been implemented by the European Observation Network, Territorial Development and Cohesion (ESPON) in 2011 (EPSON, 2011) and the EEA in 2012 (EEA, 2012) and 2016 (EEA, 2017), as well as the European Commission in 2014 (Ciscar et al., 2014). The EEA hosts the European climate adaptation platform website that represents the knowledge hub for climate change risks and adaptation in Europe (Climate-ADAPT, n.d.).

Some key vulnerabilities related to climate change identified by these reports are:

- demographic change / aging population;
- population growth in low- lying urban agglomerations;
- vulnerability of (critical) infrastructure to warming and floods;
- increasing dependency on electricity, particularly linked with the increasing internationalisation of power grids.

and WorldRiskIndex (upper right). The respective underlying conceptual are shown in the lower part representing the INFORM index on the bottom



2.3.3.2 State of the art and research gap

The knowledge about future climate conditions is vast and continues to increase. There are numerous studies scrutinising climate change impacts and vulnerabilities. However, most of them have been carried out in a static context and they have not considered future socioeconomic developments resulting in changes of land use, urbanisation or demography. Besides climate scenarios, climate risk studies should aim to integrate vulnerability pathways.

Europe-wide climate risk assessment should further be supported and coordinated with the results from national and subnational studies, where appropriate. A certain level of standardisation is desirable in order to allow for comparison in space and time.

2.3.4 Approaches to assess vulnerability

Researchers and practitioners apply quantitative, semi-quantitative, qualitative and increasingly mixed-methods approaches in order to assess vulnerability. Whether an approach is best suitable strongly depends on the objective and the scope of the assessment (e.g. understanding root causes, identification of hotspots, trend analysis or the selection of risk- reduction measures), as well as on the temporal and spatial scale; there is no 'one size fits all' approach.

Qualitative vulnerability analyses are based on experts' estimates. They are particularly useful if time and resources for the study are limited and if accessible data/information is not sufficient for quantitative analysis of complex phenomena. Qualitative assessment carried out with participatory techniques, such as interviews or focus group discussions, is particularly important for work at local/ community level and can reveal context-specific root causes for vulnerabilities. Quantitative assessments are often based on statistical analysis exploiting data about loss and damage related to certain hazards (see Chapter 2.3.4.1). The most widely employed alternative to this is the application of indicator-based approaches, which ideally allows assessing patterns and trends of vulnerability across space and time. The multifaceted nature of vulnerability cannot be adequately represented by a single variable (e.g. income per capita). Consequently, the generation of composite indicators has gained importance for grasping such complexities. It allows for combining various indicators into a vulnerability index and helps to translate complex issues into policy-relevant information.

At global level, there are a number of composite indicators to assess disaster risk, which represent vulnerability as one of the risk's dimensions next to hazard and exposure, for example the WorldRiskIndex (Welle and Birkmann, 2015; BEH and UNU-EHS, 2016) and the INFORM Index (De Groeve at al., 2014; INFORM, n.d.). Both are continuously updated multi-hazard risk indices aiming to support disaster risk reduction. The WorldRiskIndex is a means for understanding natural hazard related

FIGURE 2.12

Social vulnerability to floods in the Salzach river catchment, Austria. Source: Kienberger et al. (2014)



risks including the adverse effects of climate changes whilst INFORM is a tool for understanding risks to humanitarian crises and disasters. Conceptually, both indices are very similar. Their methodologies are presented in Figure 2.11. In the WorldRiskIndex, the vulnerability part comprises the components of susceptibility, coping capacity and adaptive capacity, which are represented by 23 indicators. In INFORM, vulnerability and lack of coping capacity are divided into two separate dimensions, which are described by 31 indicators. Figure 2.11 shows the countries' vulnerability scores based on data from 2016 calculated using the INFORM approach (left) and the WorldRiskIndex approach (right). Below these maps, the respective approaches and sub-components are visualised. Both indices started with an approach at nation-state resolution and global scale but strive for more sub-national applications of their methodology (Wannewitz et al., 2016).

In Europe, a range of assessments have used spatial approaches, such as spatial multicriteria analysis or composite indicators to create maps at subnational level that facilitate the identification of hotspots and offer information for place-based intervention planning. For instance, a number of studies have investigated vulnerability in the context of river floods at different spatial scales. Examples include assessments: (1) in Vila Nova de Gaia, a flood-prone municipality in northern Portugal (Fernandez et al., 2016); (2) along the rivers Rhine, Danube and Elbe in Germany (Fekete, 2009); or (3) in the Salzach catchment in Austria (Kienberger et al., 2014) (Figure 2.12). Using indicator-based approaches, the three case studies identify a set of social (e.g. age, education and gender), economic (e.g. income, employment and dependency), organisational and institutional (e.g. early warning systems (EWS), access to health services, proximity to first responders, etc.) indicators and aggregate them into a composite index of vulnerability.

Composite indicators have the advantage to represent complex phenomena in a single value. If necessary, the underlying indicators or subcomponents of the index can be visualised separately to support the understanding of which factors contribute most to a positive or negative situation in the aggregated result (Hagenlocher et al., 2013). On the other hand, composite indicators are always data driven and might conceal crucial aspects that are not or cannot be expressed in numbers and statistics.

In recent years, there is an increasing number of studies aiming to understand and analyse vulnerability in multihazard settings. For example, Welle et al. (2014) present an approach for the assessment of social vulnerability to heat waves and floods as well as institutional vulnerability to earthquakes in the city of Cologne, Germany. While different sets of vulnerability indicators are used and aggregated to assess vulnerability to heat waves (e.g. age, unemployment, place of origin, etc.) and floods (age and occupan-

FIGURE 2.13

Generic quantitative vulnerability functions showing vulnerability (i.e. degree of loss) as a function of hazard intensity. The red curve represents a more vulnerable element and the blue curve a less vulnerable element. Source: courtesy of authors



cy rates per household), institutional vulnerability was evaluated using qualitative information obtained from a series of stakeholder consultations. Acknowledging the fact that communities are often affected by multiple hazards — combined, sequentially or as a cascading effect —, these studies present an important step towards providing solutions for real-world challenges.

2.3.4.1 Quantitative vulnerability functions

Potential damage to physical assets and loss of human lives are often assessed using quantitative vulnerability functions. These functions take into account the intensity of the hazard and the properties of the exposed elements. The intensity expresses the damaging potential of the hazard. Properties represent the resistance of the exposed elements such as building material and maintenance level. Vulnerability functions are widely applied to illustrate the relationship between hazard characteristics and fatalities and damage. Generic vulnerability functions are shown in Figure 2.13 and refer to physical vulnerability, described as 'the degree of loss to a given element, or set of elements, within the area affected by a hazard. It is expressed on a scale of 0 (no loss) to 1 (total loss)' (UNDRO, 1984).

Vulnerability functions may be subdivided into fatality/mortality functions and damage functions (the latter denoted and formulated in different ways, e.g. loss functions, susceptibility functions and fragility functions). Damage functions are mainly based on empirical data collected in the aftermath of an event. Damage functions, in particular functions relating building damage to water depth, have a long tradition in the context of flood damage evaluation (Meyer et al., 2013). Physical vulnerability of buildings can also be assessed by physical models or by use of expert judgement. For some hazard types, fatality or mortality functions are developed to determine the death ratio for a single hazard parameter, e.g. water depth or earthquake magnitude. This allows the estimation of numbers of fatalities occurring at, for example, a certain water level. However, the development of fatality functions goes along with a high degree of uncertainty, which stems from the variety of physical and human parameters influencing the loss of life. For example, water depth may not be the only and most relevant intensity measure. Aspects such as flow rate, flood duration or sediment transport might be equally as important.

The most appropriate methodology to assess vulnerability strongly depends on the purpose and the context, as well as the temporal and spatial scales; there is no 'one size fits all' approach.

For quantitative physical vulnerability assessment, one can apply existing vulnerability curves, which are appropriate for the specific hazard and the exposed elements (e.g. building types) in study. Vulnerability curves have been developed for several types of natural hazards, such as wind storms, landslides, floods, tsunamis and earthquakes. There are curves expressing loss within the built environment as well as loss of human lives. Most of the curves are developed from empirical data and accordingly fit well with previous events in the area where the data was collected. For other locations a calibration or validation of the model is necessary prior to use. Validation is also needed for physical or analytical vulnerability functions.

Application of vulnerability functions is useful in several phases of the risk management, such as risk assessment and risk treatment. Risk analysts, scientists, stakeholders and decision-makers could be users of vulnerability functions with the purpose to provide input to:

- decisions about the question of whether risks need to be treated or about issues such as the prioritisation of risk treatment options of different areas and of different hazard types;

- identification of appropriate and optimal risk- reduction measures;

- financial appraisals during and immediately after a disaster as well as budgeting and coordination of compensation (Merz et al., 2010).

Alternatives to vulnerability curves are fragility curves, which also express the uncertainty in the physical vulnerability. Fragility curves have been widely applied in probabilistic risk and vulnerability assessment, in particular for earthquake risk (Hazus n.d.), but recently also for landslide risk assessment. These functions describe the probability of exceeding different damage states for various intensities. In a recent study on seismic risks in the city of Barcelona, Spain, a physical vulnerability assessment approach was first carried out based on vulnerability functions for different building types (e.g. unreinforced masonry or reinforced concrete, steel and wood buildings). In a second step this was combined with a probabilistic analysis of the seismic hazard into a seismic risk assessment for buildings across the city (Carreño et al., 2014). The authors also considered conditions related to social fragility and lack of resilience that favour second order effects when a city is hit by an earthquake. Factors such as population density, population with poor health or social disparity were used as proxies for social fragility. In addition, the operating capacity in case of an emergency, the state of development or the access to health services were used as indicators of lack of resilience and combined in an overall urban seismic risk index (Carreño et al., 2007). The results show that the population in the central parts of Barcelona lives at a considerably higher risk than those living on the outskirts of the city.

2.3.4.2 State of the art and research gaps

Indicator-based assessment methods have proved to support the drafting and prioritisation of disaster risk- reduction measures and strategies as well as the allocation of resources. Several challenges exist with respect to the dependency on data availability and quality, the validation of the applied methodology and related uncertainty analysis (Hinkel, 2011).

Vulnerability curves are widely applied for physical vulnerability assessment. Future activities should focus on the development of a repository of vulnerability curves with user guidelines for different hazard types and different types of assets. Research should work on the development and use of multiparameter vulnerability functions that are transferable, i.e. valid for different building types, and applicable for vulnerability changing over time and for multirisk scenarios.

In order to fill these gaps, more data are required for improving and calibrating existing models as well as for proposing new empirical vulnerability models (see Chapter 2.4). Data collection and analysis should be extended and streamlined through the use of remotely sensed data and geographic information system technology. The potential of Copernicus services and particularly of Sentinel data has not been fully exploited by the disaster risk community.

An additional challenge lies in the forward-looking nature of vulnerability. That is, vulnerability assessment needs to take into account those factors and processes that may not yet have become evident in past disaster situations. This is particularly valid in highly dynamic environments where both socio-natural hazards and vulnerability patterns might undergo rapid changes in the near- and mid-term future (Garschagen, 2014).

The importance to integrate uncertainty in vulnerability assessment has often been underlined but remains an issue of concern still today.

2.3.5 How vulnerability information is used in practice

The IPCC acknowledges DRM as a process that goes beyond DRR (IPCC, 2012b). Decisions to reduce disaster risk must be based on a sound understanding of the related vulnerabilities.

A requirement that has clearly been articulated in the SFDRR (UNISDR, 2015b) as one of four main priorities for action in the years to come.

2.3.5.1 Vulnerability in disaster risk management: from knowledge to action

Complementing hazard analysis, vulnerability studies generate information of relevance for various aspects of risk reduction and adaptation strategies, emergency management and sustainable territorial planning. They are of importance for all phases of the DRM cycle covering short-term response as well as long-term preparedness or recovery. Correspondingly large is the field of potential users of vulnerability information, including public administration staff who are responsible for civil protection or spatial planning, actors in the field of insurance, private companies running critical infrastructure, the civil society and, finally, any individual. One way of grouping the various purposes of vulnerability studies and their main users is to classify them according to

TABLE 2.1

Overview of vulnerability assessments, their main objectives and potential users at different spatial scales. Source: courtesy of authors

Scale	Main objective	Examples	Potential users
Global	Identification of spatial hot spots; allocation of resources; awareness raising	The vulnerability components of the following risk indices: INFORM index (De Groeve et al., 2015); World Risk Index (BEH & UNU-EHS, 2016); Disaster Risk Index (Peduzzi et al., 2009); Natural Disaster Hotspots index (Dilley et al., 2005)	International organisations (including donors); international non-governmental organisations (NGO); regional intergovernmental organisations
		Notre Dame Global Adaptation Index (ND-GAIN, n.d.)	
International/ regional	Identification of spatial hot spots; allocation of resources; awareness raising	The vulnerability component of the INFORM Subnational risk index for the Sahel and the Greater Horn of Africa (INFORM subnational models, n.d.)	International organisations (including donors); international NGOs; ROI
		Vulnerability to climate change in Europe (ESPON, 2011); climate change vulnerability mapping for Southeast Asia (Yusuf & Francisco, 2009)	
National / subnational	Identification of hot spots; development of risk reduction / adaptation strategies; allocation of resources; awareness raising; advocacy	The vulnerability component of the INFORM Subnational risk index (INFORM subnational models, n.d.) for Lebanon and Colombia, World Risk Index subnational for the Philippines (Wannewitz et al., 2016); Social Vulnerability Index for the USA (Cutter et al., 2003)	International organisations (incl. donors); international /national / local NGOs; national, subnational and local governments and public administration
		Numerous studies in Europe. For an overview of work related to climate change, see Prutsch et al., 2014	
Local	Identification of root causes; strengthening capacities of local actors; empowering communities	For an overview of vulnerability assessments in Europe with respect to natural hazards, see Birkmann et al., 2014;	International organisations (incl. donors); international / national/ local NGOs; national, subnational and local governments and public administration-affected communities
		A semi-quantitative assessment of regional climate change vulnerability by Kropp. et al., 2006	

spatial scale. Extending the examples presented above, Table 2.1 provides an illustrative overview of selected vulnerability assessments, their main purposes and potential users at different spatial scales.

Vulnerability assessment is used to support stakeholders and policymakers in prioritising various risks, in identifying root causes and spatial hotspots and in developing risk reduction strategies and measures.

The complexity of vulnerability and the wide range of possible applications of assessment studies require considerable effort to define the studies' scope (objective, target groups, spatial and temporal scale, spatial resolution of results, etc.). In practice, vulnerability studies have benefited from pursuing a process of co-production of knowledge. The integration of scientists, practitioners and potential users in the process of a vulnerability assessment right from the beginning usually results in a higher level of acceptance of their results. They are also more likely to be used in decision- and policymaking. An example is the latest vulnerability assessment for Germany within the scope of which a network of national authorities was created and which participated in all important decisions (Greiving et al., 2015).

2.3.5.2 Conclusions and key messages

Over the past decades, vulnerability research has made considerable progress in understanding some of the root causes and dynamic pressures that influence the progression of vulnerability and raised awareness that disasters are not natural but predominantly a product of social, economic and political conditions (Wisner et al., 2004).

Vulnerability assessments are a response to the call for evidence by decision-makers for use in pre-disaster risk assessment, prevention and reduction, as well as the development and implementation of appropriate preparedness and effective disaster response strategies by providing information on people, communities or regions at risk.

The following steps are proposed to further improve vulnerability research and related applications with the final aim to inform policymakers to most appropriately:

- co-produce knowledge in a transdisciplinary environment;
- evaluate and present inherent uncertainties;
- integrate intangible but crucial factors into quantitative assessments;
- develop and apply methods that allow for considering cascading and multirisks;
- combine vulnerability scenarios with (climate-) hazard scenarios when assessing future risks;
- empower communities to better understand and reduce their vulnerability in order to make them more resilient to identified hazards;
- design and facilitate multilevel and cross-sectoral feedback loops between public, practitioners and policymaking bodies (local, regional, national and European) and other stakeholders;
- standardise vulnerability assessment approaches in order to allow for more comparison (in space and time);
- work on improved evidence within vulnerability assessment — this requires continuous effort to improve loss and damage data.

Partnership

The comprehensive analysis and assessment of vulnerability requires an interdisciplinary approach involving both natural and social sciences. In addition, in order to foster sustainable and efficient vulnerability reduction strategies and measures, an approach to produce knowledge co-productively is desirable. This calls for a partnership with affected communities, practitioners and decision-makers. A stronger link and enhanced interaction with other relevant communities is desirable, namely climate change adaptation, natural resource management, public health, spatial planning and development.

Knowledge

The determination of risk often remains hazard centred and hazard specific and does not consider vulnerability appropriately. Vulnerability assessment has tended to be mostly quantitative in nature. Cultural aspects as well as formal (procedures, laws and regulations) and tacit informal (values, norms and traditions) institutions play a fundamental role as both enabling or limiting factors of resilience and have not gained sufficient attention. A challenge is the need to consider local data and information in order to account for small-scale specificities of vulnerability. Present databases on damage and loss caused by natural hazards should be standardised and extended to support evidence building in vulnerability assessment. Existing barriers in the co-production, exchange and use of knowledge have to be understood and minimised.

Innovation

In recent years, improved approaches to assess vulnerability by statistical analyses or indices have been established. Fostering the integration of Earth observation data and technology to detect changes would improve the possibility to represent some of the dynamic aspects of vulnerability. Further improvement requires enhanced event and damage databases and more sophisticated methods for potential future vulnerability pathways and their integration into risk scenarios. The challenge to integrate qualitative information, which often contains crucial facts, needs to be addressed. Observation data and technology to detect changes would improve the possibility to represent some of the dynamic aspects of vulnerability. Further improvements require enhanced event and damage databases and more sophisticated methods for potential future vulnerability pathways and their integration into risk scenarios. The challenge to integrate qualitative information, which often contains crucial facts, need to be addressed.

REFERENCES CHAPTER 2

Introduction

Klinke, A., Renn, O., 2002. A new approach to risk evaluation and management: risk-based, precaution-based, and discourse-based strategies. Risk Analysis 22(6), 1071-1094.

The Royal Society, 'Risk analysis, perception and management', 1992.

UNISDR Terminology, 2017.https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

Vetere Arellano, A. L., Cruz, A. M., Nordvik, P.. Pisano, F. (eds.). 2004. Analysis of Natech (natural hazard triggering technological disasters) disaster management. Nedies workshop proceedings, Italy, 2003. EUR 21054EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

2.1. Qualitative and quantitative approaches to risk assessment

Apostolakis, G. E., 2004. How useful is quantitative risk assessment? Risk Analysis 24(3),515-520.

Cox, T., 2008. What's wrong with risk matrices. Risk Analysis 28(2), 497-512.

Directive 2009/138/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 on the taking-up and pursuit of the business of Insurance and Reinsurance (Solvency II). Official Journal of the European Union L 335, 17.12.2009, pp 1–155.

Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 July 2012 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances, amending and subsequently repealing Council Directive 96/82/EC. Official Journal of the European Union L 197, 24.7.2012,pp.1-37.

Eurocode website, n.d. The EN Eurocodes. http://eurocodes.jrc.ec.europa.eu/, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

European Commission, 2014. Overview of natural and man-made disaster risks in the EU. Staff working document, SWD(2014) 134 final of 8.4.2014.

European Commission, 2010. Risk assessment and mapping guidelines for disaster management. Staff Working Paper, SEC(2010) 1626 final of 21.12.2010.

Friedman, D. G., 1984. Natural hazard risk assessment for an insurance programme. The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance, 9(3), 57-128.

Gowland, R., 2012. The work of the european process safety centre (EPSC) technical Steering committee working group: 'atypical scenarios'. Hazards XXIII, symposium series No 158, Institute of Chemical Engineers.

Grünthal, G., Thieken, A. H., Schwarz, J., Radtke, K. S., Smolka, A., Merz, B., 2006. Comparative risk assessments for the city of Cologne, Germany — storms, floods, earthquakes. Natural Hazards 38(1-2), 21-44.

Health and Safety Executive, 2001. Reducing risks, protecting eople — HSE's decision-making process, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, United Kingdom, www.hse.gov.uk/risk/theory/r2p2.pdf, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

Health and Safety Executive, 2009. Safety and environmental standards for fuel storage sites — Process Safety Leadership Group — Final report, United Kingdom, www.hse.gov.uk/comah/buncefield/fuel-storage-sites.pdf, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

Health and Safety Laboratory, 2005. Review of hazard identification techniques. Sheffield, United Kingdom, 2005, www.hse.gov.uk/research/hsl_pdf/2005/hsl0558.pdf

Hoogheemraadschap van Rijnland, 2009. Flood control in the Netherlands — A strategy for dike reinforcement and climate adaptation.

IAIS International Association of Insurance Supervisors, 2015. Insurance core principles. www.iaisweb.org/file/58067/insurance-core-principles-updated-november-2015, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

Simmons, D. C., 2016. How catastrophe and financial modelling revolutionised the insurance industry. Willis Towers Watson, https://understandrisk.org/wp-content/uploads/Simmons.pdf. [accessed 04 April, 2017].

Skjong, R., Wentworth, B. H., 2001. Expert judgment and risk perception. In Proceedings of the Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference. ISOPE IV, 17-22 June, Stavanger, pp. 537-544.

Stamatis, D. H., 2003. Failure mode and effect analysis: FMEA from theory to execution, ASQ Quality Press.

Tyler, B., Crawley, F., Preston, M., 2015. HAZOP: guide to best practice, 3rd ed., Institute of Chemical Engineers.

United Kingdom Cabinet Office, 2015. National risk register of civil emergencies. www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-risk-register-for-civil-emergencies-2015-edition

White, C. S. and Budde, P. E., 2001. Perfecting the storm: the evolution of hurricane models. www.contingencies.org/marapr01/perfecting.pdf, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

2.2. Current and innovative methods to define exposure

Arino, O., Ramos Perez, J.J., Kalogirou, V., Bontemps, S., Defourny, P., Van Bogaert, E., 2012. Global Land Cover Map for 2009 (GlobCover 2009). © Eur. Space Agency ESA Univ. Cathol. Louvain UCL.

Basher, R., Hayward, B., Lavell, A., Martinelli, A., Perez, O., Pulwarty, R., Sztein, E., Ismail-Zadeh, A.,

Batista e Silva, F., Lavalle, C., Koomen, E., 2013. A procedure to obtain a refined European land use/cover map. Journal of Land Use Science 8(3), 255–283.

Bouziani, M., Goïta, K., He, D.C., 2010. Automatic change detection of buildings in urban environment from very high spatial resolution images using existing geodatabase and prior knowledge. ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing 65(1), 143–153.

Cardona, O.D., Van Aalst, M., Birkmann, J., Fordham, M., McGregor, G., Perez, R., Pulwarty, R., Schipper, L., Sinh, B., 2012. Determinants of risk: exposure and vulnerability. In: Field, C.B., Barros, V., Stocker, T.F., Qin, D., Ebi, K.L., Mastrandrea, M.D., Mach, K.J., Plattner, G.-K., Allen, S.K., Tignor, M., Midgley, P.M. (Eds.), Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 65–108.

Chen, J., Chen, J., Liao, A., Cao, X., Chen, L., Chen, X., He, C., Han, G., Peng, S., Lu, M., Zhang, W., Tong, X., Mills, J., 2015. Global land cover mapping at 30m resolution: A POK-based operational approach. ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, 103, 7–27.

Crowley, H., Ozcebe, S., Spence, R., Foulset-Piggott, R., Erdik, M., Alten, K., 2012. Development of a European Building Inventory Database. In: Proceedings of 12th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering.

World Bank 2014. Open Data for Resilience Field Guide. Washington, DC: World Bank.

De Bono, A., Chatenoux, B., 2015. A Global Exposure Model for GAR 2015, UNEP-GRID, GAR 2015 Background Papers for Global Risk Assessment, 20 p.

De Bono, A., Mora, M.G., 2014. A global exposure model for disaster risk assessment. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 10, 442–451.

Deichmann, U., Ehlrich, D., Small, C., Zeug, G., 2011. Using high resolution satellite data for the identification of urban natural disaster risk. World Bank and European Union Report.

Dell'Acqua, F., Gamba, P., Jaiswal, K., 2013. Spatial aspects of building and population exposure data and their implications for global earthquake exposure modeling. Natural Hazards 68(3), 1291–1309.

Dobson, J.E., Bright, E.A., Coleman, P.R., Durfee, R.C., Worley, B.A., 2000. LandScan: A global population database for estimating populations at risk. Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing. 66(7), 849–857.

Ehrlich, D., Tenerelli, P., 2013. Optical satellite imagery for quantifying spatio-temporal dimension of physical exposure in disaster risk assessments. Natural Hazards, 68(3), 1271–1289.

Erdik, M., Sesetyan, K., Demircioglu, M., Hancilar, U., Zulfikar, C., Cakti, E., Kamer, Y., Yenidogan, C., Tuzun, C., Cagnan, Z., Harmandar, E., 2010. Rapid earthquake hazard and loss assessment for Euro-Mediterranean region. Acta Geophysica 58.

Esch, T., Taubenböck, H., Roth, A., Heldens, W., Felbier, A., Thiel, M., Schmidt, M., Müller, A., Dech, S., 2012. TanDEM-X mission—new perspectives for the inventory and monitoring of global settlement patterns. Journal of Applied Remote Sensing 6(1), 061702–1.

Florczyk, A.J., Ferri, S., Syrris, V., Kemper, T., Halkia, M., Soille, P., Pesaresi, M., 2016. A New European Settlement Map From Optical Remotely Sensed Data. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing 9(5), 1978–1992.

Forzieri, G., Bianchi, A., Marin Herrera, M.A., Batista e Silva, F., Feyen, L., Lavalle, C., 2015. Resilience of large investments and critical infrastructures in Europe to climate change. EUR 27598 EN, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Freire, S., Halkia, M., Ehlrich, D., Pesaresi, M., 2015a. Production of a population grid in Europe. EUR 27482 EN, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Freire, S., Kemper, T., Pesaresi, M., Florczyk, A., Syrris, V., 2015b. Combining GHSL and GPW to improve global population mapping. IEEE International Geoscience & Remote Sensing Symposium, 2541-2543.

Friedl, M.A., Sulla-Menashe, D., Tan, B., Schneider, A., Ramankutty, N., Sibley, A., Huang, X., 2010. MODIS Collection 5 global land cover: Algorithm refinements and characterization of new datasets. Remote Sens. Environ. 114 (1), 168–182.

Fritz, S., See, L., Rembold, F., 2010. Comparison of global and regional land cover maps with statistical information for the agricultural domain in Africa. International Journal of Remote Sensing 31 (9), 2237–2256.

Gamba, P., Cavalca, D., Jaiswal, K., Huyck, C., Crowley, H., 2012. The GED4GEM project: development of a global exposure database for the global earthquake model initiative. In: 15th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Lisbon, Portugal.

Haque, U., Blum, P., da Silva, P.F., Andersen, P., Pilz, J., Chalov, S.R., Malet, J.-P., Auflič, M.J., Andres, N., Poyiadji, E., Lamas, P.C., Zhang, W., Peshevski, I., Pétursson, H.G., Kurt, T., Dobrev, N., García-Davalillo, J.C., Halkia, M., Ferri, S., Gaprindashvili, G., Engström, J., Keellings, D., 2016. Fatal landslides in Europe. Landslides.

Jaiswal, K., Wald, D., Porter, K., 2010. A Global Building Inventory for Earthquake Loss Estimation and Risk Management. Earthquake Spectra 26 (3), 731–748.

Latham, J., Cumani, R., Rosati, I., Bloise, M., 2014. Global Land Cover SHARE (GLC-SHARE) database Beta-Release Version 1.0.

Lloyd, C.T., Sorichetta, A., Tatem, A.J., 2017. High resolution global gridded data for use in population studies. Scientific Data 4, 170001.

Loveland, T.R., Reed, B.C., Brown, J.F., Ohlen, D.O., Zhu, Z., Yang, L., Merchant, J.W., 2000. Development of a global land cover characteristics database and IGBP DISCover from 1 km AVHRR data. International Journal of Remote Sensing 21(6-7), 1303–1330.

Lugeri, N., Kundzewicz, Z.W., Genovese, E., Hochrainer, S., Radziejewski, M., 2010. River flood risk and adaptation in Europe—assessment of the present status. Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change 15, 621–639.

Manakos, I., Braun, M. (Eds.), 2014. Land Use and Land Cover Mapping in Europe, Remote Sensing and Digital Image Processing. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.

Marin Herrera, M., Bianchi, A., Filipe Batista e Silva, F., Barranco, R., Lavalle, C., 2015. A geographical database of infrastructures in Europe: a contribution to the knowledge base of the LUISA modelling platform. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Michel-Kerjan, E., Hochrainer-Stigler, S., Kunreuther, H., Linnerooth-Bayer, J., Mechler, R., Muir-Wood, R., Ranger, N., Vaziri, P., Young, M., 2013. Catastrophe Risk Models for Evaluating Disaster Risk Reduction Investments in Developing Countries: Evaluating Disaster Risk Reduction Investments. Risk Analysis 33, 984–999.

Montero, E., Van Wolvelaer, J., Garzón, A., 2014. The European Urban Atlas, in: Manakos, I., Braun, M. (Eds.), Land Use and Land Cover Mapping in Europe. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 115–124.

Neumann, B., Vafeidis, A.T., Zimmermann, J., Nicholls, R.J., 2015. Future Coastal Population Growth and Exposure to Sea-Level Rise and Coastal Flooding — A Global Assessment. PLOS ONE 10, e0118571.

Peduzzi, P., Dao, H., Herold, C., Mouton, F., 2009. Assessing global exposure and vulnerability towards natural hazards: the Disaster Risk Index. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 9, 1149–1159.

Pesaresi, M., Ehrlich, D., Ferri, S., Florczyk, A., Freire, S., Haag, F., Halkia, M., Julea, A.M., Kemper, T., Soille, P., 2015. Global Human Settlement Analysis for Disaster Risk Reduction. In: The International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and

Spatial Information Sciences, XL-7/W3, 36th International Symposium on Remote Sensing of Environment, 11–15 May 2015, Berlin, German

Academic paper: Global Human Settlement Analysis for Disaster Risk Reduction. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277360201_Global_Human_Settlement_Analysis_for_Disaster_Risk_Reduction [accessed Apr 6, 2017]. ISPRS — Int. Arch. Photogramm. Remote Sens. Spat. Inf. Sci. XL-7/W3, 837–843.

Pesaresi, M., Guo Huadong, Blaes, X., Ehrlich, D., Ferri, S., Gueguen, L., Halkia, M., Kauffmann, M., Kemper, T., Linlin Lu, Marin-Herrera, M.A., Ouzounis, G.K., Scavazzon, M., Soille, P., Syrris, V., Zanchetta, L., 2013. A Global Human Settlement Layer From Optical HR/VHR RS Data: Concept and First Results. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 6(5), 2102–2131.

Pesaresi, M., Melchiorri, M., Siragusa, A., Kemper, T., 2016. Atlas of the Human Planet — Mapping Human Presence on Earth with the Global Human Settlement Layer. EUR 28116 EN. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Pittore, M., 2015. Focus maps: a means of prioritizing data collection for efficient geo-risk assessment. Annals of Geophysics 58(1).

Pittore, M., Wieland, M., 2013. Toward a rapid probabilistic seismic vulnerability assessment using satellite and ground-based remote sensing. Natural Hazards 68(1), 115–145.

Pittore, M., Wieland, M., Errize, M., Kariptas, C., Güngör, I., 2015. Improving Post-Earthquake Insurance Claim Management: A Novel Approach to Prioritize Geospatial Data Collection. ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information 4(4), 2401–2427.

Pittore, M., Wieland, M., Fleming, K., 2016. Perspectives on global dynamic exposure modelling for geo-risk assessment. Natural Hazards 86(1), 7-30.

Rose, A., Huyck, C.K., 2016. Improving Catastrophe Modeling for Business Interruption Insurance Needs: Improving Catastrophe Modeling for Business Interruption. Risk Analysis 36(10), 1896–1915.

UNISDR, 2015a. Making Development Sustainable: The Future of Disaster Risk Management. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, Geneva, Switzerland.

UNISDR, 2015b. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015–2030. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. http://www.wcdrr.org/uploads/Sendai_Framework_for_Disaster_Risk_Reduction_2015-2030.pdf, [accessed 04 April 2016].

GFDRR, 2014. Understanding risk in an evolving world, A policy Note. Global facility for disaster reduction and recovery. World Bank, Washington DC, USA, 16pp.

2.3. The most recent view of vulnerability

Alexander, D. and Magni, M., 2013. Mortality in the L ' Aquila (Central Italy) Earthquake of 6 April 2009. PLOS Current Disasters, (April 2009).

Alexander, D., 2010. The L'Aquila Earthquake of 6 April 2009 and Italian Government Policy on Disaster Response. Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research, 2(4), 325–342.

Alexander, D., 2013. Resilience and disaster risk reduction: An etymological journey. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 13 (11), 2707–2716.

BEH and UNU-EHS, 2016. WorldRiskReport 2016. Berlin and Bonn: Bündnis Entwicklung Hilft and United Nations University – EHS.

Birkmann, J., Cardona, O.D., Carreno, M.L., Barbat, A.H., Pelling, M., Schneiderbauer, S., Kienberger, S., M.Keiler, Alexander, D., Zeil, P., and T., W., 2013. Framing vulnerability, risk and societal responses : the MOVE framework. Nat Hazards, 67, 193–211.

Birkmann, J., Kienberger, S., and Alexander, D., 2014. Assessment of vulnerability to natural hazards : a European perspective. San Diego and Waltham, USA: Elsevier Inc.

Brooks, N., 2003. A conceptual framework Vulnerability , risk and adaptation : A conceptual framework. No. 3.

Buth, M., Kahlenborn, W., Savelsberg, J., Becker, N., Bubeck, P., Kabisch, S., Kind, C., Tempel, A., Tucci, F., Greiving, S., Fleischhauer, M., Lindner, C., Lückenkötter, J., Schonlau, M., Schmitt, H., Hurth, F., Othmer, F., Augustin, R., Becker, D., Abel, M., Bornemann, T., Steiner, H., Zebisch, M., Schneiderbauer, S., and Kofler, C., 2015. Germany's vulnerability to Climate Change. Summary. Dessau-Roßla.

Cardona, O.D., Aalst, M.K. van, Birkmann, J., Fordham, M., McGregor, G., Perez, R., Pulwarty, R.S., Schipper, E.L.F., and Sinh, B.T., 2012. Determinants of Risk : Exposure and Vulnerability. In: C. B. Field, V. Barros, T.F. Stocker, D. Qin, D.J. Dokken, K.L. Ebi, M.D. Mastrandrea, K.J. Mach, G.-K. Plattner, S.K. Allen, M. Tignor, and P.M. Midgley, eds. Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA, 65–108.

Carreño, M.L., Barbat, A.H., Cardona, O.D., and Marulanda, M.C., 2014. Holistic Evaluation of Seismic Risk in Barcelona. In: Assessment of Vulnerability to Natural Hazards. 21–52.

Carreño, M.-L., Cardona, O.D., and Barbat, A.H., 2007. Urban Seismic Risk Evaluation: A Holistic Approach. Natural Hazards, 40(1), 137–172.

CI:GRASP, n.d. The Climate Impacts: Global and Regional Adaptation Support Platform. http://www.pik-potsdam.de/cigrasp-2/index.html, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

Ciscar, J.C., Feyen, L., Soria, A., Lavalle, C., Raes, F., Perry, M., Nemry, F., Demirel, H., Rozsai, M., Dosio, A., Donatelli, M., Srivastava, A., Fumagalli, D., Niemeyer, S., Shrestha, S., Ciaian, P., Himics, M., Van Doorslaer, B., Barrios, S., Ibáñez, N., Forzieri, G., Rojas, R., Bianchi, A., Dowling, P., Camia, A., Libertà, G., San Miguel, J., de Rigo, D., Caudullo, G., Barredo, J., Paci, D., Pycroft, J., Saveyn, B., Van Regemorter, D., Revesz, T., Vandyck, T., Vrontisi, Z., Baranzelli, C., Vandecasteele, I., Batista e Silva, F., and Ibarreta, D., 2014. Climate Impacts in Europe: The JRC PESETA II Project. JRC Scientific and Policy Reports. Seville, Spain: Joint Research Centre, Institute for Prospective Technological Studies.

Climate-ADAPT, n.d. European climate adaptation platform. http://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

Cutter, S., Emrich, C.T., Mitchell, J.T., Boruff, B.J., Gall, M., Schmidtlein, M.C., and Burton, G.C., 2006. The Long Road Home: Race, Class, and Recovery from Hurricane Katrina. Environment, 48(2), 8–20.

Cutter, S.L., Boruff, B.J., and Shirley, W.L., 2003. Social Vulnerability to Environmental Hazards. Social Science Quarterly, 84(2), 242–261.

Cutter, S.L., Ismail-Zadeh, A., Alcántara-Ayala, I., Altan, O., Baker, D.N., Briceño, S., Gupta, H., Holloway, A., Johnston, D., McBean, G.A., Ogawa, Y., Paton, D., Porio, E., Silbereisen, R.K., Takeuchi, K., Valsecchi, G.B., Vogel, C., and Wu, G., 2015. Pool knowledge to stem losses from disasters. Nature, (55), 277–279.

De Groeve, T., Poljansek, K., Vernaccini, L., 2015. Index for Risk Management - INFORM. Concept and Methodology. EUR 26528EN, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.

Dilley, M., Chen, R.S., Deichmann, U., Lerner-Lam, A.L., Arnold, M., Agwe, J., Buys, P., Kjekstad, O., Lyon, B., and Gregory, Y., 2005. Natural Disaster Hotspots A Global Risk. Disaster Risk Management Series. Washington DC, USA.

EC, 2013. EU Strategy on adaptation to climate change.

Economist Intelligence Unit, 2009. Managing supply-chain risk for reward. London. New York, Hong Kong.

EEA, 2012. Climate change, impacts and vulnerability in Europe: An indicator-based report. Copenhagen, Denmark: European Environment Agency.

EEA, 2017. Climate change, impacts and vulnerability in Europe: An indicator-based report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

ESPON, 2011. ESPON CLIMATE-Climate Change and Territorial Effects on Regions and Local Economies. Luxembourg.

Fekete, A., 2009. Validation of a social vulnerability index in context to river-floods in Germany. Natural Hazards and Earth System Science, 9 (2), 393–403.

Fernandez, P., Mourato, S., and Moreira, M., 2016. Social vulnerability assessment of flood risk using GIS-based multicriteria decision analysis. A case study of Vila Nova de Gaia (Portugal). Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk, 7 (4), 1367–1389.

Fritzsche, K., Schneiderbauer, S., Bubeck, P., Kienberger, S., Buth, M., Zebisch, M., and Kahlenborn, W., 2014. The Vulnerability Sourcebook: Concept and guidelines for standardised vulnerability assessments. Bonn and Eschborn.

Garschagen, M., 2014. Risky Change? Vulnerability and adaptation between climate change and transformation dynamics in Can Tho City, Vietnam. Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Greiving, S., Zebisch, M., Schneiderbauer, S., Fleischhauer, M., Lindner, C., Lückenkötter, J., Buth, M., Kahlenborn, W., and Schauser, I., 2015. A consensus based vulnerability assessment to climate change in Germany. International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management, 7(3), 306–326.

Hagenlocher, M., Delmelle, E., Casas, I., Kienberger, S., 2013. Assessing socioeconomic vulnerability to dengue fever in Cali, Colombia: statistical vs expert-based modeling. International Journal of Health Geographics, 12- 36.

Hazus, n.d. Hazus: FEMA's Methodology for Estimating Potential Losses from Disasters. https://www.fema.gov/hazus, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

Hinkel, J., 2011. 'Indicators of vulnerability and adaptive capacity': Towards a clarification of the science–policy interface. Global Environmental Change, 21(1), 198–208.

INFORM subnational models, n.d. INFORM Subnational risk index. http://www.inform-index.org/Subnational, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

INFORM, n.d. Index For Risk Management. http://www.inform-index.org/, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

IPCC, 2007. Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007.

IPCC, 2012a. Managing the Risks of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

IPCC, 2012b. Summary for policymakers - Special report on managing the risk of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation (SREX). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

IPCC, 2013. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Summary for Policymakers.

Jansson, N.A.U., 2004. Ericsson's proactive supply chain risk management approach after a serious sub-supplier accident. International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 34, 434–456.

Johnson, C.W., 2007. Analysing the Causes of the Italian and Swiss Blackout, 28th September 2003. In: Tony Cant, ed. 12th Australian Conference on Safety Critical Systems and Software Conference. Adelaide, Australia: Australian Computer Society.

Kelman, I., Gaillard, J.C., Lewis, J., and Mercer, J., 2016. Learning from the history of disaster vulnerability and resilience research and practice for climate change. Natural Hazards, 82(1), 129–143.

Kienberger, S., Contreras, D., and Zeil, P., 2014. Spatial and Holisitc Assessment of Social, Economic, and Environmental Vulnerability to Floods – Lessons from the Salzach River Basin, Austria. In: J. Birkmann, S. Kienberger, and D. E. Alexander, eds. Assessment of Vulnerability to Natural Hazards: A European Perspective. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, 53–73.

Kropp, J. p., Block, A., Reusswig, F., Zickfeld, K., and Schellnhuber, H.J., 2006. Semiquantitative Assessment of Regional Climate Vulnerability: The North-Rhine Westphalia Study. Climatic Change, 76 (3-4), 265–290.

Mc Michael, A.J., 2013. Globalization, Climate Change, and Human Health. The New England Journal of Medicine, 368, 1335–1343.

Merz, B., Kreibich, H., Schwarze, R., and Thieken, A., 2010. Assessment of economic flood damage. Natural Hazards And Earth System Sciences, 10(8), 1697–1724.

Met Office and WFP, 2014. Climate impacts on food security and nutrition. A review of existing knowledge. Rome, Italy.

Meyer, V., Becker, N., Markantonis, V., Schwarze, R., van den Bergh, J.C.J.M., Bouwer, L.M., Bubeck, P., Ciavola, P., Genovese, E., Green, C., Hallegatte, S., Kreibich, H., Lequeux, Q., Logar, I., Papyrakis, E., Pfurtscheller, C., Poussin, J., Przylusky, V., Thieken, A.H., and Viavattene, C., 2013. Review article : Assessing the costs of natural hazards – state of the art and knowledge gaps, 13, 1351–1373.

Meyer, W., 2011. Measurement: Indicators – Scales – Indices – Interpretations. In: R. Stockmann, ed. A Practitioner Handbook on Evaluation. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing, 189–219.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis. Washington, DC.

ND-GAIN , n.d. Notre Dame Global Adaptation Initiative (ND-GAIN). http://index.gain.org, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

Oppenheimer, M., Campos, M., R.Warren, Birkmann, J., Luber, G., O'Neill, B., and Takahashi, K., 2014. Emergent Risks and Key Vulnerabilities. In: C. B. Field, V.R. Barros, D.J. Dokken, K.J. Mach, M.D. Mastrandrea, T.E. Bilir, M. Chatterjee, K.L. Ebi, Y.O. Estrada, R.C. Genova, B. Girma, E.S. Kissel, A.N. Levy, S. MacCracken, P.R. Mastrandrea, and L.L.White, eds. Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA,: Cambridge University Press, 1039–1099.

PBL, 2012. Effect of climate changes on waterborne disease in The Netherlands. The Hague.

Peduzzi, P., Dao, H., Herold, C., and Mouton, F., 2009. Assessing global exposure and vulnerability towards natural hazards: the Disaster Risk Index. Natural Hazards and Earth System Science, 9 (4), 1149–1159.

Pescaroli, G. and Alexander, D., 2016. Critical infrastructure, panarchies and the vulnerability paths of cascading disasters. Natural Hazards, 82(1), 175–192.

Prutsch, A., Torsten Grothmann, Sabine McCallum, Inke Schauser, and Rob Swart, 2014. Climate change adaptation manual : lessons learned from European and other industrialised countries. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Robine, J.-M., Cheung, S.L.K., Le Roy, S., Van Oyen, H., Griffiths, C., Michel, J.-P., and Herrmann, F.R., 2008. Death toll exceeded 70,000 in Europe during the summer of 2003. Comptes rendus biologies, 331 (2), 171–8.

Schneiderbauer, S. and Ehrlich, D., 2006. Social Levels and Hazard (in)-Dependence. In: J. Birkmann, ed. Measuring Vulnerability to Natural Hazards: Towards Disaster Resilient Societies. Tokyo, Japan: United Nations University Press, 78–102.

Schneiderbauer, S., Zebisch, M., Kass, S., and Pedoth, L., 2013. Assessment of vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change in mountain environments. In: J. Birkmann, ed. Measuring Vulnerability to Natural Hazards: Towards Disaster Resilient Societies. Tokyo, Japan: United Nations University Press, 349 – 380.

Tas, M., Tas, N., Durak, S., and Atanur, G., 2013. Flood disaster vulnerability in informal settlements in Bursa, Turkey. Environment and Urbanization, 25(2), 443–463.

Turner, B.L., Kasperson, R.E., Matson, P.A., Mccarthy, J.J., Corell, R.W., Christensen, L., Eckley, N., Kasperson, J.X., Luers, A., Martello, M.L., Polsky, C., Pulsipher, A., and Schiller, A., 2003. A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 100(14), 8074–8079.

UK, 2016. UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2017. Synthesis Report. London, UK.

UNDRO, 1984. Disaster Prevention and Mitigation: a Compendium of Current Knowledge. Volume 11. Geneva: United Nations, Office of the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator.

UNISDR, 2015a. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015–2030. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. http://www.wcdrr.org/uploads/Sendai_Framework_for_Disaster_Risk_Reduction_2015-2030.pdf, [accessed 04 April 2016].

UNISDR Terminology, 2017.https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology, [accessed 04 April, 2017].

UNISDR, 2015b. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction.

Wannewitz, S., Hagenlocher, M., Garschagen, M., 2016. Development and validation of a sub-national multi-hazard risk index for the Philippines. GI_Forum – Journal for Geographic Information Science, 1, 133-140.

Welle, T. and Birkmann, J., 2015. The World Risk Index – An Approach to Assess Risk and Vulnerability on a Global Scale. Journal of Extreme Events, 02 (01), 1550003.

Welle, T., Depietri, Y., Angignard, M., Birkmann, J., Renaud, F., and Greiving, S., 2014. Vulnerability Assessment to Heat Waves, Floods, and Earthquakes Using the MOVE Framework: Test Case Cologne, Germany. In: J. Birkmann, S. Kienberger, and D. E. Alexander, eds. Assessment of Vulnerability to Natural Hazards: A European Perspective. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier, 91–124.

Wisner, B., 2016. Vulnerability as Concept , Model , Metric , and Tool. In: Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science. Oxford University Press, 1–58.

Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., and Davis, I., 2004. At risk: natural hazards, people's vulnerability, and disasters. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Yusuf, A.A. and Francisco, H., 2009. Climate Change Vulnerability Mapping for Southeast Asia. Singapore.

2.4. Recording disaster losses for improving risk modelling

Amadio, M., Mysiak, J., CarreraL., Koks, E., 2015. Improvements in Flood Risk Assessment: Evidence from Northern Italy. Review of Environment, Energy and Economics (Re3).

Barbat, A., Carrenoa, M., Pujadesb, L., Lantadab, N., Cardona, O., Marulanda, M., 2010. Seismic vulnerability and risk evaluation methods for urban areas. A review with application to a pilot area. Structure and Infrastructure Engineering 6(1–2), 17–38.

Barredo, J., 2009. Normalised flood losses in Europe: 1970–2006. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 9, 97–104.

Benedetti, D., Benzoni, G., Parisi, M.A., 1988. Seismic vulnerability and risk evaluation for old urban nuclei, Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics 16(2), 183–201.

Biass, S, Bonadonna, C, Di Traglia, F, Pistolesi, M, Rosi, M, Lestuzzi, P., 2016. Probabilistic evaluation of the physical impact of future tephra fallout events for the Island of Vulcano, Italy. Bulletin of Volcanology 78, 37.

Cochrane, H. 1997. Indirect economic losses. In Development of Standardized Earthquake Loss Estimation Methodology. Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Building Sciences.

Boisevert, R., 1992. Indirect losses from a catastrophic earthquake and the local, regional, and national interest. In Indirect Economic Consequences of a Catastrophic Earthquake. Washington, D.C.: FEMA, National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program.

Bolton, N. and L. Kimbell. 1995. The Economic and Demographic Impact of the Northridge Earthquake. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America.

Brémond, P., Grelot, F., Agenais, A.L., 2013. Review Article: economic evaluation of flood damage to agriculture — review and analysis of existing methods. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, European Geosciences Union, 13, 2493 — 2512.

Brookshire, D.S. and M. McKee. 1992. Other indirect costs and losses from earthquakes: issues and estimation. In Indirect Economic Consequences of a Catastrophic Earthquake. Washington, D.C.: FEMA, National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

Bruneau, M., Chang, S., Eguchi, R., Lee, G., O'Rourke, T., Reinhorn, A., Shinozuka, M., Tierney, K., Wallace, W., Von Winterfeldt, D., 2003. A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities. Earthquake Spectra 19(4), 733–752.

Cepal NU, 2014. Handbook for disaster assessment, ECLAC.

Comerio, M., 1996. Disaster Hits Home. New Policy for Urban Housing Recovery. University of California Press.

Conhaz project, 2016. https://www.ufz.de/index.php?en=35939, [accessed 06 April, 2017].
Corsanego, A., 1991. Seismic vulnerability evaluation for risk assessment in Europe. Fourth International Conference on Seismic Zonation, Standford.
Cozzani, V., Campedel, M., Renni, E., Krausmann, E., 2010. Industrial accidents triggered by flood events: Analysis of past accidents. Journal of Hazardous Materials 175(1-3), 501–509.
Craig, H., Wilson, T., Stewart, C., Outes, V., Villarosa, G., Baxter, P., 2016. Impacts to agriculture and critical infrastructure in Argentina after ashfall from the 2011 eruption of the Cordón Caulle volcanic complex: an assessment of published damage and function thresholds, Journal of Applied Volcanology, 5(1), 7.
De Groeve, T., Poljansek, K., Ehrlich, D., 2013. Recording Disasters Losses: Recommendation for a European Approach. EUR 26111 EN, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/29296/1/lbna26111enn.pdf, [accessed 06, April].
Direction Territoriale Méditerranée du Cerema, 2014. Retour d'expérience sur les inondations du département du Var les 18 et 19 janvier 2014 Volet 2 — Conséquences et examen des dommages. http://observatoire-regional-risques-paca.fr/sites/default/files/rapport_rex83_2014_dommages_sept14_0.pdf, [accessed: 14 May 2015]
Elissondo, M., Baumann, V., Bonadonna, C., Pistolesi, M., Cioni, R., Bertagnini, A., Biass, S., Herrero, JC., Gonzalez, R., 2016. Chronology and impact of the 2011 Cordón Caulle eruption, Chile. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 16, 675–704.
Ellison, R., J.W. Milliman, and R.B. Roberts. 1984. Measuring the regional economic effects of earthquakes and earthquake predictions. Journal of Regional Science 24, 559–579.
EU expert working group on disaster damage and loss data, 2015. Guidance for recording and sharing disaster damage and loss data. Towards the development of operational indicators to translate the Sendai Framework into action, EUR 27192 EN, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
FAO, 2015. The impact of disasters on agriculture and food security. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
Gautak, K., Van der Hoek, E., 2003. Literature study on environmental impact of floods, GeoDelft internal publication. http://repository.tudelft.nl/islandora/object/uuid%3A4080519e-a46d-4e96-8524-62ee8fd93712?collection=research, [accessed 03 January, 2017].
GFDRR, 2013. Post-disaster needs assessment, Volume A, Guidelines, https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/gfdrr/files/PDNA-Volume-A.pdf, [accessed 12 January, 2017].
Grandjean. P., 2014. Science for precautionary decision-making, In: EEA, Some emerging issues, Late lessons from early warnings: science, precaution, innovation.
Green, C., Viavattene, C., and Thompson, P.: Guidance for assessing flood losses, CONHAZ Report, http://conhaz.org/ CONHAZ %20 REPORT %20WP06 1.pdf, 2011, [accessed 12 January, 2017].
Guéguen P., Michel C., LeCorre L., 2007. A simplified approach for vulnerability assessment in moderate-to-low seismic hazard regions: application to Grenoble (France). Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 5(3), 467–490.
Guimares, P., Hefner, F.L., Woodward, D.P., 1993. Wealth and income effects of natural disasters: an econometric analysis of Hurricane Hugo. Review of Regional Studies 23, 97–114.
Hallegatte, S. 2008. An adaptive regional input-output model and its application to the assessment of the economic cost of Katrina. Risk Analysis 28(3), 779–799.
Hallegatte, S., Hourcade, J.-C., Dumas, P. 2007. Why economic dynamics matter in assessing climate change damages: illustration on extreme events, Ecological Economics 62(2), 330-340.
Hubert, G., Ledoux, B., 1999. Le coût du risque... L'évaluation des impacts socio-économiques des inondations, Presses de l'Ecole nationale Ponts et Chaussées, Paris [in French].
Idea, 2015. www.ideaproject.polimi.it, [accessed 06 April, 2017].
Jongman, B., Kreibich, H., Apel, H., Barredo, J.I., Bates, P.D., Feyen, L., Gericke, A., Neal, J., Aerts, C.J.H., Ward, P.J., 2012. Comparative flood damage model assessment: towards a European approach. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 12, 3733–3752.
Kimbell, L., Bolton, N., 1994. The impact of the Northridge Earthquake on the economies of California and Los Angeles. Paper presented to the Seismic Safety Commission of the State of California, Burbank.
Krausmann, E., Cruz, A.M., Affeltranger, B., 2010. The impact of the 12 May 2008 Wenchuan earthquake on industrial facilities, Loss Prevention in the Process Industry.
Lagomarsino, S. and Giovinazzi, S., 2006. Macroseismic and mechanical models for the vulnerability and damage assessment of current buildings. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 4, 415-443.
Magill, C., Wilson, T.M., Okada, T., 2013. Observations of tephra fall impacts from the 2011 Shinmoedake eruption, Japan. The Earth, Planets and Space 65, 677–698.
Marrero, J. M., García, A., Llinares, A., De la Cruz-Reyna, S., Ramos, S., Ortiz, R., 2013. Virtual tools for volcanic crisis management, and evacuation decision support: applications to El Chichón volcano (Chiapas, México). Natural hazards, 68(2), 955-980.
Marsh, A., 2015. Decade of Advances In Catastrophe Modeling and Risk Financing, Insights. http://www.oliverwyman.com/content/dam/marsh/Documents/PDF/US-en/A %20Decade %20of %20Advances %20In %20Catastrophe %20Modeling %20and %20 Risk %20Financing-10-2015.pdf, [accessed 17 February, 2017].
MATRIX project, 2013. http://matrix.gpi.kit.edu/, [accessed 06 April, 2017].
McEntire, D., 2005. Why vulnerability matters: Exploring the merit of an inclusive disaster reduction concept. Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal 14(2), 206 — 222.
Mei, E., Lavigne, F., Picquout, A., de Bélizal, E., Brunstein, D., Grancher, D., Sartohadi, J., Cholik, N., Vidal, C., 2013. Lessons learned from the 2010 evacuations at Merapi volcano. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research 261, 348–365.
Menoni, S., Atun, F., Molinari, D., Minucci, G., Berni, N., 2017. Defining complete post flood scenarios to support risk mitigation strategies. In Molinari, D., Ballio, F., Menoni, S. (Eds.). Flood Damage Survey and Assessment: New Insights from Research and Practice. Wiley, AGU (American Geophysical Union) series.
Menoni, S., Pergalani, F., Boni, M. P., Petrini, V., 2007. Lifelines earthquake vulnerability assessment: a systemic approach, In: Linkov, I., Wenning, R., Kiker, G. (Eds). Risk Management Tools For Port Security, Critical Infrastructure, and Sustainability, pp. 111-132.

Merz, B., Kreibich, H., Schwarze, R., Thieken, A., 2010. Assessment of economic flood damage, Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 10, 1697–1724.

Meyer, V., Schwarze, R., Becker, N., Markantonis, V., van den Bergh, J.C.J.M., Bouwer, L.M., Bubeck, P., Ciavola, P., Genovese, E., Green, C., Hallegatte, S., Kreibich, H., Lequeux, Q., Logar, I., Papyrakis, E., Pfurtscheller, C., Poussin, J., Przyluski, V., Thieken, A., Viavattene, C., 2015. Assessing the Costs of Natural Hazards — State of the Art and the Way Forward. Wiley&Sons.

Miavita project, n.d. http://miavita.brgm.fr/default.aspx, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

Ministère chargé de l'environnement-DPPR / SEI / BARPI, 2005. Inspection des installations classées, L'impact des inondations sur des établissements SEVESO, Séries d'événements de 1993 à 2003 Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, Languedoc-Roussillon, France.

Ministére de l'Ecologie et du Développement Durable, 2005. Réduire la vulnérabilité des reseaux urbains aux inondations, Rapport, Novembre.

Nanto, D., Cooper, W., Donnelly, M., Johnson, R. (2011). Japan's 2011 Earthquake and Tsunami: Economic Effects and Implications for the United States. CRS Report for Congress, Congressional Research Service, 7-5700 -www.crs.gov-R41702.

Newhall, C.G. and Punongbayan R.S. (Eds.), 1997. Fire and Mud. Eruptions and Lahars of Mount Pinatubo, Philippines, University of Washington Press.

OECD, 2012. Global Modelling of Natural Hazard Risks. Enhancing Existing Capabilities to Address New Challenges. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Park, J., Seager, T. P., Rao, P.S.C., Convertino, M., Linkov, I., 2013. Integrating Risk and Resilience Approaches to Catastrophe Management in Engineering Systems, Risk Analysis 33(3).

Pesaro, G., 2007. Prevention and mitigation of the territorial impacts of natural hazards: The contribution of economic and public-private cooperation instruments. In: Aven, T., Vinnem, E., (Eds.). Risk, Reliability and Societal Safety, Chapter: Volume 1 — Specialisation Topics. Publisher: Taylor&Francis, pp.603-612.

Petrini, V., 1996. Overview report in vulnerability assessment. In: Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Seismic Zonation, Nice, France, October 1995, Edition Ouést, Paris.

Pitilakis, K.P., Franchin,B., Khazai, H., Wenzel, H., (Eds.), 2014. SYNER-G: Systemic Seismic Vulnerability and Risk Assessment of Complex Urban, Utility, Lifeline systems, and critical facilities. Methdologies and Applications. Springer.

Pitt, M., 2008. The Pitt review: learning lessons from the 2007 floods. http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/pittreview/thepittreview/final_report.html, [accessed 05 May 2015].

Rose, A. and J. Benavides. 1997. Inter-industry models for analyzing the economic impact of earthquakes and recovery policies: Illustrative examples [7/93; revised 11/93]. In Advances in Social Science Analysis of Earthquakes, B. Jones, ed. Buffalo, N.Y.: National Center for Earthquake Engineering Research.

Scawthorn, C., 2008. A Brief History of Seismic Risk Assessment. In: Bostrom, A., French, S., Gottlieb, S., (Eds.), Risk Assessment, Modeling, and Decision Support, Strategic Directions. Springer.

Senouci, A., Bard, Y., Naboussi Farsi, M., Beck, E., Cartier, S., 2013. Robustness and uncertainties of seismic damage estimates at urban scale: a methodological comparison on the example of the city of Oran (Algeria). Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 11, 1191–1215.

Spence, R., Kelman, I., Baxter, P., Zuccaro, G., Petrazzuoli, S., 2005. Residential building and occupant vulnerability to tephra fall. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 5:4, 477-494

Spence, R., Pomonis, A., Baxter, P.J., Coburn, A., White, M., Dayrit, M., and Field Epidemiology Training Program Team, 1997. Building Damage Caused by the Mount Pinatubo Eruption of June 15, 1991, In: Newhall, C.G. and Punongbayan R.S. (Eds.), 1997. Fire and Mud. Eruptions and Lahars of Mount Pinatubo, Philippines. University of Washington Press.

Suzuki, K., 2008. Earthquake damage to industrial facilities and development of seismic and vibration control technology. Journal of System design and dynamics 2(1), 2-11.

Syner-G project, 2014. http://www.vce.at/SYNER-G/, [accessed 06 April, 2017].

Theocharidou, M., Giannopoulos, G., 2015. Risk assessment methodologies for critical infrastructure protection. Part II: A new approach. EUR 27332 EN. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Thieken, A. H., Olschewski, A., Kreibich, H., Kobsch, S., Merz, B., 2008. Development and evaluation of FLEMOps — a new Flood Loss Estimation Model for the private sector. In: Proverbs, D., Brebbia, C. A., Penning-Rowsell E., (Eds.) Flood recovery, innovation and response, WIT Press, Southampton, UK.

Turner, B.L., Kasperson, R.E., Matson, P.A., McCarthy, J.J., Corell, R.W., Christensen, L., Eckley, N. Kasperson, J.X., Luers, A., Martello, M.L., Polsky, C., Pulsipher, A., Schiller A., 2003. A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainable science. PNAS, 100(14), 8074-8079.

Van der Veen, A., Logtmeijer, C. 2005. Economic hotspots: visualizing vulnerability to flooding. Natural hazards 36 (1-2), 65-80.

Van der Veen, A., Vetere Arellano, L., Nordvik, J.P., (Eds.), 2003. In search of a common methodology on damage estimation, EUR 20997 EN, European Communities, Italy

West, C.T., 1996. Indirect economic impacts of natural disasters: policy implications of recent research and experience. In: Proceedings of Analyzing Economic Impacts and Recovery from Urban Earthquakes: Issues for Policy Makers. Conference presented by Earthquake Engineering Research Institute and Federal Emergency Management Agency, Pasadena, Calif.

West, C.T., and D.C. Lenze. 1994. Modeling the regional impact of natural disaster and recovery: a general framework and an application to Hurricane Andrew. International Regional Science Review 17,121–150

Wilson, G., Wilson, T.M., Deligne, N.I., Cole, J.W., 2014. Volcanic hazard impacts to critical infrastructure: A review, Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research, 286, 148-182.

Wilson, T., Cole, J., Johnston, D., Cronin, S., Stewart C., Dantas A., 2012. Short- and long-term evacuation of people and livestock during a volcanic crisis: lessons from the 1991 eruption of Volcán Hudson, Chile. Journal of Applied Volcanology Society and Volcanoes 1(2).

Wilson, T., Stewart, C., Bickerton, H., Baxter, P., Outes, V., Villarosa, G., Rovere, E., 2013. Impacts of the June 2011 Puyehue-Cordón Caulle volcanic complex eruption on urban infrastruc-ture, agriculture and public health, GNS Science, New Zealand, GNS Science Report 2012/20, 88 pp.

WMO, 2007. Conducting flood loss assessment. A tool for integrated flood management. APFM Technical Document n.7, Flood Management Tools Series, World Meteorological Organisation.
Yamano, N., Kajitani, Y., Shumuta, Y., 2007. Modeling the Regional Economic Loss of Natural Disasters: The Search for Economic Hotspots, Economic Systems Research 19(2), 163-181.
Zonno, G., Cella, F., Luzi L., Menoni, S., Meroni, F., Ober, G., Pergalani, F., Petrini, V., Tomasoni, R., Carrara, P., Musella, D., García-Fernández, M., Jiménez, M.J., Canas, J.A., Alfaro, A.J., Barbat, A.H., Mena, U., Pujades, L.G., Soeters, R., Terlien, M.T.J., Cherubini, A., Angeletti, P., Di Benedetto, A., Caleffi, M., Wagner, J.J. and Rosset, P., 1998. Assesing seismic risk at different geographical scales: concepts, tools and procedures. In: Bisch, Ph., Labbé, P., Pecker, A. (eds). Proc. of the XI Conference on Earthquake Engineering, CD-ROM, Balkema, Rotterdam.

2.5. Where are we with multihazards and multirisks assessment capacities?

Abad, J.,2013. Fragility of pre-damaged elements: realisation of fragility functions of elements pre-damaged by other past events and demonstration on a scenario. European Commission project MATRIX (New methodologies for multi-hazard and multi-risk assessment methods for Europe), Project No 265138, D4.2.
Aubrecht, C., Freire, S., Neuhold, C., Curtis, A., Steinnocher, K., 2012. Introducing a temporal component in spatial vulnerability analysis. Disaster Advances, 5(2), 48-53.
Balica, S.F., Douben, N., Wright, N.G., 2009. Flood vulnerability indices at varying spatial scales. Water Science and Technology 60(10), 2571-2580.
Barroca, B., Bernardara, P., Mouchel, J.M., Hubert, G., 2006. Indicators for identification of urban flooding vulnerability. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 6, 553-561.
Bazzurro, P., Cornell, C.A., Menun, C.Motahari, M. 2004. Guidelines for seismic assessment of damaged buildings. 13th World Conference on Earthquake Engineering, Vancouver, BC, Canada, Paper 1708.
Birkmann, J., Cardona, O. D., Carreno, M. L., Barbat, A. H., Pelling, M., Schneiderbauer, S., Kienberger, S., Keiler, M., Alexander, D., Zeil, P. Welle, T. 2013. Framing vulnerability, risk and societal responses: the MOVE framework. Natural Hazards 67(2), 193-211.
Bucchignani, E., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Montesarchio, M. 2014. Climate-related extreme events with high-resolution regional simulations: assessing the effects of climate change scenarios in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. Vulnerability, Uncertainty, and Risk, 1351-1362.
Cannon, A., 2010. A flexible nonlinear modelling framework for nonstationary generalised extreme value analysis in hydroclimatology. Hydrological Processes 24(6), 673-685.
Cannon, S., De Graff, J., 2009. The increasing wildfire and post-fire debris-flow threat in western USA, and implications for consequences of climate change. In: Sassa, K., Canuti, P.(eds). Landslides — disaster risk reduction, Springer, 177-190.
Cardona, O. D., Van Aalst, M.M., Birkmann, J., Fordham, M., McGregor, G., Perez, R., Puhwarty, R.S., Schipper, E.L.F., Sinh, B.T., 2012. Determinants of risk: exposure and vulnerability. In: Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation. Field, C.B., Barros, V., Stocker, T.F., Qin, D., Dokken, D.J., Ebi, K.L., Mastrandrea, M.D., Mach, K.J., Plattner, G.-K., Allen, S.K., Tignor, M.,Midgley, P.M. (eds.).A Special Report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, and New York, NY, USA, 65-108.
Cariam, 2006. Plans de prévention des risques naturels prévisibles (ppr) — Cahier de recommandations sur le contenu des ppr. Tech. rep., Ministère de l'Écologie et du Développement Durable (in French).
Carpignano, A., Golia, E., Di Mauro, C., Bouchon, S., Nordvik, J.-P. 2009. A methodological approach for the definition of multi-risk maps at regional level: first application. Journal of Risk Research 12(3-4), 513.
Chester, D.K. 1993. Volcanoes and society, E. Arnold, London, United Kingdom.
Choe, D.E., Gardoni, P., Rosowski, D., 2010. Fragility increment functions for deteriorating reinforced concrete bridge columns. Journal of Engineering Mechanics 136(8), 969.
Choine, M.N., O'Connor, A., Gehl, P., D'Ayala, D., Garcia-Fernández, M., Jiménez, M., Gavin, K., Van Gelder, P., Salceda, T., Power, R., 2015. A multihazard risk assessment methodology accounting for cascading hazard events. 12th International Conference on Applications of Statistics and Probability in Civil Engineering, ICASP12, Vancouver, Canada.
Coburn, A.W., Bowman, G., Ruffle, S.J., Foulser-Piggott, R., Ralph, D., Tuveson, M., 2014. A taxonomy of threats for complex risk management. Cambridge Risk Framework series, Centre for Risk Studies, University of Cambridge, United Kingdom.
Coles, S., 2001. An introduction to statistical modelling of extreme values. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, London, United Kingdom, limited.
Collins, T., Grinseki, S., Romo Aguilar, M. 2009. Vulnerability to environmental hazards in the Ciudad Juárez (Mexico) — El Paso (USA) metropolis: a model for spatial risk assessment in transnational context. Applied Geography 29, 448.
De Groeve, T., Poljansek, K., Vernaccini, L., 2015. Index for risk management — INFORM: concept and methodology, Version 2016. EUR 27521 EN. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
Del Monaco, G., Margottini, C., Serafini, S., 1999. Multi-hazard risk assessment and zoning: an integrated approach for incorporating natural disaster reduction into sustainable development. TIGRA project (ENV4-CT96-0262) summary report.
Del Monaco, G., Margottini, C., Spizzichino, D., 2007. Armonia methodology for multi-risk assessment and the harmonisation of different natural risk maps. In: Armonia: applied multi-risk mapping of natural hazards for impact assessment, European Commission project, Contract 511208.
De Pippo, T., Donadio, C., Pennetta, M., Petrosino, C., Terizzi, F., Valente, A., 2008. Coastal hazard assessment and mapping in northern Campania, Italy. Geomorphology 97(3-4), 451-466.
Dessai, S., Hulme, M., Lempert, R. Pielke, R., 2009. Climate prediction: a limit to adaptation. In: Adger, N., Lorenzoni, I. and O'Brien, K.(Eds.). Adapting to climate change: thresholds, values, governance. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
Dilley, M., Chen, U., Deichmann, R.S., Lerner-Lam, A. Arnold, M., 2005. Natural disaster hotspots: global risk analysis. Disaster Risk Management Series 5, The World Bank.
El Adlouni, S., Ouarda, T., Zhang, X., Roy, R., Bobée, B. 2007. Generalised maximum likelihood estimators for the nonstationary gen-

eralized extreme value model. Water Resources Research 43(3), 410.
European Commission, 2000. Temrap: the European multi-hazard risk assessment project. DG XII, Environment and Climate Programme, contract ENV4-CT97-0589.
European Commission, 2010. Risk assessment and mapping guidelines for disaster management. Staff Working Paper, SEC(2010) 1626 final.
FEMA, 2011. Getting started with HAZUS-MH 2.1. Tech. rep. United States Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
Fleming, K., Parolai, S., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Tyagunov S., Vorogushyn, S., Kreibich, H., Mahlke, H., 2016. Harmonising and comparing single-type natural hazard risk estimations. Annals of Geophysics 59(2), So216.
Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Almeida, M., Aubrecht, C., Polese, M., Ribeiro, L.M., Viegas D. Zuccaro, G. 2014. Assessment and management of cascading effects triggering forest fires. In: Viegas, D. Advances in forest fire research, 1073.
Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Bucchignani, E., Manzi, M. 2016. Patterns in climate-related parameters as proxy for rain-fall deficiency and aridity: application to Burkina Faso. ASCE-ASME Journal of Risk and Uncertainty in Engineering Systems, Part A: Civil Engineering 3(1).
Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Bucchignani, E., Palazzi, E., D'Onofrio, D., Gasparini, P., Marzocchi, W., 2015b. Analysis of non-stationary climate-related extreme events considering climate change scenarios: an application for multi-hazard assessment in the Dar Es Salaam region, Tanzania. Natural Hazards 75(1), 289-320.
Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Di Ruocco, A., Marzocchi, W., 2013. Naples test case. European Commission project MATRIX, Project No. 265138, D7.3.
Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Gasparini, P., Uhinga, G. 2015a. Multi-risk assessment as a tool for decision-making. In: Pauleit et al. (Eds). Urban vulnerability and climate change in Africa: a multidisciplinary approach. Future City 4(7), Springer, 229-258.
Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Marzocchi, W., 2013. Software for multi-hazard assessment. European Commission project MATRIX, Project No. 265138, D 3.5.
Gasparini, P., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., 2014. Seismic risk assessment, cascading effects. In: Beer, M., Patelli, E., Kougioumtzoglou, I., Au, I. (Eds.).Encyclopedia of earthquake engineering, Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg, 1-20.
Gencer, E. A. 2013. The impact of globalisation on disaster risk trends: macro- and urban-scale analysis. Background paper prepared for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2013, UNISDR, Geneva.
Ghosh, J., Padgett, J.E., 2010. Aging considerations in the development of time-dependent seismic fragility curves. Journal of Structural Engineering 136(12), 1497.
Gill, J.C., Malamud, B.D., 2014. Reviewing and visualising the interactions of natural hazards. Reviews of Geophysics 52, 680.
Gill, J.C., Malamud, B.D., 2016. Hazard Interactions and interaction networks (cascades) within multi-hazard methodologies, Earth System Dynamics 7, 659.
Giorgio, M., Guida, M. Pulcini, G., 2011. An age- and state-dependent Markov model for degradation processes. IIE Transaction 43(9), 621.
Greiving, S., 2006. Integrated risk assessment of multi-hazards: a new methodology. In: Schmidt-Thomé, P. (Ed.). Natural and Technological Hazards and Risks Affecting the Spatial Development of European Regions. Geological Survey of Finland 42, 75.
Grünthal, G., 1998. European macroseismic scale. Cahiers du Centre Europeén de Géodynamique et de Séismologie 15, Luxembourg.
Grünthal, G., Thieken, A., Schwarz, J., Radtke, K., Smolka, A. Merz, B. 2006. Comparative risk assessment for the city of Cologne — Storms, floods, earthquakes. Natural Hazards 38(1-2), 21-44.
Haasnoot, M., Middelkoop, H., Offermans, A., van Beek, E., Van Deursen, W.P.A., 2012. Exploring pathways for sustainable water management in river deltas in a changing environment. Climate Change 115(3), 795-819.
Iervolino, I., Giorgio, M., Chioccarelli, E., 2013. Gamma degradation models for earthquake-resistant structures. Structural . Safety 45, 48-58.
Iervolino, I., Giorgio, M., Chioccarelli, E., 2015a. Age- and state-dependent seismic reliability of structures. 12th International Conference on Applications of Statistics and Probability in Civil Engineering. ICASP12, Vancouver, Canada.
Iervolino, I., Giorgio, M., Polidoro, B., 2015b. Reliability of structures to earthquake clusters. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 13, 983-1002.
IPCC, 2012. Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation. A special report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Field, C.B., Barros, V., Stocker, T.F., Qin, D., Dokken, D.J., Ebi, K.L., Mastrandrea, M.D., Mach, K.J., Plattner, G.-K., Allen, S.K., Tignor, M., Midgley, P.M. (Eds.).Cambridge University Press.
IPCC, 2014. Climate change 2014: mitigation of climate change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press.
Jenkins, K., Hall, J., Glenis, V., Kilsby, C., McCarthy, M., Goodess, C., Smith, D., Malleson, N., Birkin, M., 2014. Probabilistic spatial risk assessment of heat impacts and adaptations for London. Climate Change 124(1), 105-117.
Jurgilevich, A., Räsänen, A., Groundstroem F., Juhola, S., 2017. A systematic review of dynamics in climate risk and vulnerability assessments. Environmental Research Letters 12(1), 013002.
Kappes, S.M., Keiler, M., Von Elverfeldt, K. Glade, T., 2012. Challenges of analysing multi-hazard risk: a review. Natural Hazards 64(2), 1925-1958.
Kappes, S.M., Keiler, M., Glade, T., 2010. From single- to multi-hazard risk analyses: a concept addressing emerging challenges. In:Malet, J.P., Glade, T., Casagli, N., (Eds.). Mountain risks: bringing science to society. CERG Editions, Strasbourg, France, p.351.
Kappes, S.M., Papathoma-Köhle, M., Keiler, M., 2011. Assessing physical vulnerability for multi-hazards using an indicator- based methodology. Applied Geography 32(2), 577-590.
Karapetrou, S.T., Filippa, A.M., Fotopoulou, S.D., Pitilakis, 2013. Time-dependent vulnerability assessment of rc-buildings considering ssi and aging effects. In Papadrakis, M., Papadopoulos, V. and Plevris V., (Eds.). 4th Eccomas Thematic Conference on Computational Methods in Structural Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering.
Komendantova, N., Mrzyglocki, R., Mignan, A., Khazai, B., Wenzel, F., Patt, A., Fleming, K., 2014. Multi-hazard and multi-risk deci-

sion-support tools as a part of participatory risk governance: feedback from civil protection stakeholders. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 8, 50-67.
Komendantova, N., Scolobig, A., Vinchon, C., 2013a. Multi-risk approach in centralized and decentralized risk governance systems: case studies of Naples, Italy and Guadeloupe, France. International Relations and Diplomacy 1(3), 224-239.
Komendantova, N., Scolobig, A., Monfort, D., Fleming, K., 2016. Multi-risk approach and urban resilience Multi-risk approach and urban resilience. International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment 7(2), 114-132.
Komendantova, N., van Erp, N., van Gelder, P., Patt, A., 2013 b. Individual and cognitive barriers to effective multi-hazard and multi-risk decision-making governance. European Commission project MATRIX, Project N 265138, D 6.2.
Kunz, M., Hurni, L., 2008. Hazard maps in Switzerland: state-of-the-art and potential improvements. In: Proceedings of the 6th ICA Mountain Cartography Workshop. Lenk, Switzerland.
Lazarus, N., 2011. Coping capacities and rural livelihoods: challenges to community risk management in southern Sri Lanka. Applied Geography 31(1), 20-34.
Lee, K., Rosowsky, D., 2006. Fragility analysis of woodframe buildings considering combined snow and earthquake loading. Structural Safety 28(3), 289-303.
Liu, B., Siu, Y.L., Mitchell, G., 2016. Hazard interaction analysis for multi-hazard risk assessment: a systematic classification based on hazard-forming environment. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 16, 629-642.
Liu, Z., Nadim, F., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Mignan, A., Fleming, K., Luna, B., 2015. A three-level framework for multi-risk assessment. Georisk: Assessment and Management of Risk for Engineered Systems and Geohazards 9(2), 59-74.
Loat, R., 2010. Risk management of natural hazards in Switzerland. Tech. rep. Federal Office for the Environment FOEN.
Luino, F., 2005. Sequence of instability processes triggered by heavy rainfall in the northern Italy. Geomorphology 66(1-4), 13-39.
Marulanda, M.C., Tibaduiza, M.L.C., Cardona, O.D., Barbat, A.H., 2013. Probabilistic earthquake risk assessment using CAPRA: application to the city of Barcelona, Spain. Natural Hazards, 69(1), 59-84.
Marzocchi, W., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Gasparini, P., Mastellone, M. L., Di Ruocco, A., 2012. Basic principles of multi-risk assessment: a case study in Italy. Natural Hazards 62(2), 551-573.
Marzocchi, W., Mastellone, M., Di Ruocco, A., Novelli, P., Romeo, E., Gasparini, P., 2009. Principles of multi-risk assessment: interactions amongst natural and man-induced risks. Tech. rep. European Commission, Directorate-General for Research, Environment Directorate.
Marzocchi, W., Sandri, L, Gasparini, P., Newhall, C., Boschi, E., 2004. Quantifying probabilities of volcanic events: the example of volcanic hazard at Mount Vesuvius. Journal of Geophysical Research 109, B11201.
Marzocchi, W., Sandri, L., Selva, J., 2008. BET_EF: a probabilistic tool for long- and short-term eruption forecasting. Bulletin of Volcanology Bulletin of Volcanology 70, 623.
Marzocchi, W., Sandri, L., Selva, J., 2010. BET_VH: a probabilistic tool for long-term volcanic hazard assessment. Bulletin of Volcanology 72, 717.
Middelmann, M., Granger, K., 2000. Community Risk in Mackay: a multi-hazard risk assessment. Tech. rep., Australian Geological Survey Organisation (AGSO).
Mignan, A., 2013. MATRIX -CITY user manual. European Commission project MATRIX, Project No 265138, D 7.2.
Mignan, A., Wiemer, S., Giardini, D., 2014. The quantification of low-probability-high-consequences events: Part 1, a generic multi-risk approach. Natural Hazards 73(3), 1999-2022.
Müller, A., Reiter, J., Weiland, U., 2011. Assessment of urban vulnerability towards floods using an indicator-based approach - a case study for Santiago de Chile. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, 11, 2107.
Münzberg, T., Wiens, M., Schultmann, F., 2014. Dynamic-spatial vulnerability assessments: a methodical review for decision support in emergency planning for power outages. Procedia Engineering 78, 78-87.
Neri, M., Aspinall, W., Bertagnini, A., Baxter, P.J., Zuccaro, G., Andronico, D., Barsotti, S., D Cole, P., Ongaro, T.E., Hincks, T., Macedonio, G., Papale, P. Rosi, M., Santacroce, R., Woo, G., 2008. Developing an event tree for probabilistic hazard and risk assessment at Vesuvius. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research 178(3), 397-415.
Neri, M., Le Cozannet, G., Thierry, P., Bignami, C., Ruch, J., 2013. A method for multi-hazard mapping in poorly known volcanic areas: an example from Kanlaon (Philippines). Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 13,1929-2013.
Newhall, C., Hoblitt, R., 2002. Constructing event trees for volcanic crises. A method for multi-hazard mapping in poorly known volcanic areas: an example from Kanlaon (Philippines). Bulletin of Volcanology 64, 3.
Nicholls, R. J., Cazenave, A., 2010. Sea-level rise and its impact on coastal zones. Science 328 (5985), 1517-1520.
O ´Neill, B.C., Kriegler, E., Riahi, K., Ebi, K.L., Hallegatte, S., Carter, T.R., Mathur, R., 2014. A new scenario framework for climate change research: the concept of shared socioeconomic pathways. Climate Change, 122(3), 387-400.
Oppenheimer, M., Campos, M., Warren, R., Birkmann, J., Luber, G., O ´Neill, B., Takahashi, K., 2014. Emergent risks and key vulnerabilities. In Climate change 2014: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part A. global and sectoral aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Field, C.B., Barros, V.R., Dokken, D.J., Mach, K.J., Mastrandrea, M.D., Bilir, T.E., Chatterjee, M., Ebi, K.L., Estrada, Y.O., Genova, R.C., Girma, B., Kissel, E.S., Levy, A.H., MacCracken, S., Mastrandrea, P.R., White, L.L., (Eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, New York, United States, pp1039.
Ouarda, T., El Adlouni, S., 2011. Bayesian nonstationary frequency analysis of hydrological variables. Journal of the American Water Resources Association 47(3), 496-505.
Papathoma, M., Dominey-Howes, D., 2003. Tsunami vulnerability assessment and its implications for coastal hazard analysis and disaster management planning, Gulf of Corinth, Greece. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 3, 733-747.
Papathoma, M., Dominey-Howes, D., Zong, Y., Smith, D., 2003. Assessing tsunami vulnerability, an example from Herakleio, Crete. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 3, 377-389.
Papathoma-Köhle, M., 2016. Vulnerability curves vs. vulnerability indicators: application of an indicator-based methodology for debris-flow hazards. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 16, 1771-1790.
Papathoma-Köhle, M., Neuhäuser, B., Ratzinger, K., Wenzel, H., Dominey-Howes, D., 2007. Elements at risk as a framework for as-

sessing the vulnerability of communities to landslides. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 7, 765-779.

Pescaroli, G., Alexander, D., 2015. A definition of cascading disasters and cascading effects: going beyond the ' toppling dominos' metaphor. Planet@Risk 3(1), 58.

Petitta, M., Calmanti, S., Cucchi, M., 2016. The extreme climate index: a novel and multi-hazard index for extreme wheather events. Geophysical Research Abstracts 18, EGU2016 — 13861, EGU General Assembly 2016.

Polese, M., Di Ludovico, M., Prota, A., Manfredi, G., 2012. Damage-dependent vulnerability curves for existing buildings. Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics 42(6), 853–870.

Polese, M., Marcolini, M., Zuccaro, G., Cacace F., 2015. Mechanism based assessment of damage-dependent fragility curves for rc building classes. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering 13(5), 1323–1345.

Sanchez-Silva, M., Klutke, G.A., Rosowsky, D.V., 2011. Life-Cycle Performance of Structures Subject to Multiple Deterioration Mechanisms. Structural Safety 33(3), 206–217.

Schmidt, J., Matcham, I., Reese, S., King, A., Bell, R., Smart, G., Cousins, J., Smith, W., Heron, D., 2011. Quantitative Multi-Risk Analysis for Natural Hazards: A Framework for Multi-Risk Modelling. Natural Hazards 58, 1169.

Schmidt-Thomé, P., (Ed.), 2005. The Spatial Effects of Management of Natural and Technological Hazards in Europe — Final Report of the European Spatial Planning and Observation Network (ESPON) Project 1.3.1. Geological Survey of Finland.

Scolobig, A., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Komendantova, N., Patt, A., Di Ruocco, A., Gasparini, P., Monfort, D., Vinchon, C., Bengoubou-Valerius, M., Mrzyglocki, R., Fleming, K., 2013. From Multi-Risk Assessment to Multi-Risk Governance: Recommendations for Future Directions. Chapter prepared for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015, UNISDR.

Scolobig, A., Garcia-Aristizabal, A., Komendantova, N., Patt, A., Di Ruocco, A., Gasparini, P., Monfort, D., Vinchon, C., Bengoubou-Valerius, M., Mrzyglocki, R., Fleming, K., 2014a. From Multi-Risk Assessment to Multi-Risk Governance: Recommendations for Future Directions. In: Understanding Risk: The Evolution of Disaster Risk Assessment. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington DC, Chapter 3-20, pp163.

Scolobig, A., Komendantova, N., Patt, A., Vinchon, C., Monfort-Climent, D., Begoubou-Valerius, M., Gasparini, P., Di Ruocco, A., 2014b. Multi-Risk Governance for Natural Hazards in Naples and Guadeloupe. Natural Hazards 73(3), 1523-1545.

Seidou, O., Ramsay, A., Nistor, I., 2011. Climate Change Impacts on Extreme Floods II: Improving Flood Future Peaks Simulation Using Non-Stationary Frequency Analysis. Natural Hazards 60(2), 715–726.

Seidou, O., Ramsay, A., Nistor, I., 2012. Climate Change Impacts on Extreme Floods I: Combining Imperfect Deterministic Simulations and Non-Stationary Frequency Analysis. Natural Hazards, 61(2), 647-659.

Self, S., 2006. The Effects and Consequences of Very Large Explosive Volcanic Eruptions. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences 364(1845), 2073.

Selva, J., 2013. Long-Term Multi-Risk Assessment: Statistical Treatment of Interaction among Risks. Natural Hazards 67(2), 701-722.

Selva, J., Marzocchi, W., Papale, P., Sandri, L., 2012. Operational Eruption Forecasting at High-Risk Volcanoes: The Case of Campi Flegrei, Naples. Journal of Applied Volcanology, Society and Volcanoes, 1, 5.

Siliverstovs, B., Ötsch, R., Kemfert, C., Jaeger, C.C., Haas, A., Kremers, H., 2010. Climate Change and Modelling of Extreme Temperatures in Switzerland. Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment 24(2), 311-326.

Silva, M., Pareira, S., 2014. Assessment of Physical Vulnerability and Potential Losses of Buildings due to Shallow Slides. Natural Hazards 72(2), 1029-1050.

Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., Tignor, M., Miller, H.L., (Eds.), 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Sperling, M., Berger, E., Mair, V., Bussadori, V., Weber, F., 2007. Richtlinien zur Erstellung der Gefahrenzonenpläne (GZP) und zur Klassifizierung des spezifischen Risikos (KSR). Tech. rep., Autonome Provinz Bozen, (in German).

Sterlacchini, S., Frigerio, S., Giacomelli, P., Brambilla, M., 2007. Landslide Risk Analysis: A Multi-Disciplinary Methodological Approach. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 7, 657-675.

Tarvainen, T., Jarva, J., Greiving, S., 2006. Spatial Pattern of Hazards and Hazard Interactions in Europe. In: Natural and Technological Hazards and Risks Affecting the Spatial Development of European Regions. Schmidt-Thomé, P. (Ed.), Geological Survey of Finland, Special Paper 42, 83.

Tyagunov, S., Grünthal, G., Wahlström, R., Stempniewski, L., Zschau, J., 2006. Seismic Risk Mapping for Germany. Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 6, 573-586.

UN, 2002, Johannesburg Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Tech. rep. United Nations.

UNEP, 1992. Agenda 21. Tech. rep. United Nations Environment Programme.

UNISDR, 2005. Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. http://www.unisdr.org/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf, [accessed 04 April 2016].

UNISDR, 2015. Sendai framework for disaster risk reduction 2015–2030. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. http://www.wcdrr.org/uploads/Sendai_Framework_for_Disaster_Risk_Reduction_2015-2030.pdf, [accessed 04 April 2016].

Van Westen, C., Montoya, A., Boerboom, L., Badilla Coto, E., 2002. Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment Using GIS in Urban Areas: A Case Study for the City of Turrialba, Costa Rica. In:Regional Workshop on Best Practices in Disaster Mitigation: Lessons Learned from the Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program and other Initiatives. Proceedings, Bali, Indonesia, pp120.

Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., Davis, I., 2004. At Risk: Natural Hazards, People`s Vulnerability and Disasters. New York, Routledge.

Xu, L., Meng, X., Xu, X., 2014. Natural Hazard Chain Research in China: A Review. Natural Hazards 70(2), 1631-1659.

Yalciner, H., Sensoy, S., Eren, O., 2012. Time-Dependent Seismic Performance Assessment of a Single-Degree-of-Freedom Frame Subject to Corrosion. Engineering Failure Analysis, 19, 109.

Zentel, K.-O., Glade, T., 2013. International Strategies for Disaster Reduction (IDNDR and ISDR). In:Encyclopedia of Natural Hazards. Bobrowsky, P.T., (Ed.), pp552.

Zschau, J., Fleming, K., (2012). Natural Hazards: Meeting the Challenges of Risk Dynamics and Globalisation, in ' Improving the Assessment of Disaster Risks to Strengthen Financial Resilience', World Bank and Government of Mexico, Editors, Chapter 9, Germany, 'Experiences in Disaster Risk Management within the German Development Cooperation', Neutze F., Lutz, W., (Eds.),

pp163.
Zuccaro, G., Gacace, F., Spence, R., Baxter, P., 2008. Impact of Explosive Eruption Scenarios at Vesuvius. Journal of Volcanology and Geothermal Research 178(3), 416-453.
Zuccaro, G., Leone, M., 2011. Volcanic Crisis Management and Mitigation Strategies: A Multi-Risk Framework Case Study. Earthzine 4.