

# **D1.3 Impact modelling** data requirements and methods to treat data gap filling and data uncertainty.





This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon<br>Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement<br>No. 101093806. The publication reflects only the authors' views and<br>the European Union is n information contained therein.





## **D1.3: Impact modelling data requirements and methods to treat data gap filling and data uncertainty**

## **Summary**

This document presents ICARIA's approach to identify and approach data gaps in climate resilience projects and to keep in line with the latest advances in data-driven and AI methodologies as applied in climate-related projects.















## **Table of contents**

























٦

т

# <span id="page-7-0"></span>**List of Figures**

 $\sqrt{ }$ 







## <span id="page-8-0"></span>**List of Tables**













## <span id="page-10-0"></span>**List of Acronyms and Abbreviations**











































## <span id="page-17-0"></span>**Executive summary**

and resultence, such a document aims to resevue as a scatibol tor lab tests within the projections and accelering an a scatibol contain the projection of various methodologies. Can offer a provide the computer in the contr This document presents the ICARIA cookbook and offers a set of alternative options and advanced methodological tools for identifying and optimizing the treatment data gaps, and a list of sources for collecting any further potentially available data of relevance to conducting climate risk and resilience assessment of critical assets. As ICARIA aims to establish a robust and efficient framework for climate adaptation and resilience, such a document aims for serving as a scaffold for lab tests within the project for application and extension of the currently applied methodologies. Nonetheless, selecting an optimal or combination of various methodologies can often prove perplexing. It is far from uncommon to encounter circumstances where data scarcity emerges as a consistent challenge, especially for assets and services sensitive to the initial amount of available data and bounded by restrictions in accessibility. Consequently, the role of the existing climate data in fully characterizing the overall risk/impact assessment methodology from a single or multi-hazard perspective, supporting the selection of optimal methodologies, identifying data gaps, and ultimately guiding and contributing to the formulation of effective decision-making policies amidst the exigency of climate change, remains critical. Further, when confronted with issues in climate adaptation and resilience, it is critical to consider that data gaps introduce substantial uncertainties in impact assessments, vulnerability analysis, and the design of adaptation strategies, thereby hindering the development of effective resilience measures capable of invariance to various contexts. To support addressing the critical challenge of data gaps, within ICARIA's goals, the design of a supplementary cookbook is included, aimed at assisting practitioners operating within ICARIA in identifuing alternative methodologies for data creation and augmentation in supporting the applied viable methodologies being employed in cases where the need to extend and support the currently chosen ones, remains necessary. In section 2, the cookbook attempts to include briefly some of the methodologies applied in ICARIA so far, a list of currently identified data gaps, and provide suggestions for downscaling techniques, hazard assessment, exposure analysis, vulnerability evaluation, and strategies to address data gaps, exploring alternative methods and concepts relevant to the application of climate-related methodologies in resilience and adaptation. To support any further lab tests within ICARIA, a template table for treating data gaps is proposed. Furthermore, it includes sets of additional data sources for assets and services, as examples for further application and reproduction in other areas of interest. While the cookbook covers different methodologies, the sequence is not paramount; rather, the relevance to the core resilience domains and compatibility with the ICARIA project are the primary considerations. In section 3, a domain user survey is conducted utilizing input from experts with diverse backgrounds, offering additional information on current data-driven methodologies related but not limited to climate change and adaptation, and additional resources for the practitioners of the ICARIA project. Finally, in section 4, a summary with reflections on treating data gaps is offered, summarizing in a condensed manner the current knowledge and state-of-the-art.

This deliverable is the first result of T1.3 with inputs from T1.1, T1.2, and T1.4, in WP1 and T2.1 in WP2.





## <span id="page-18-0"></span>**1 Introduction to project ICARIA**

The number of climate-related disasters has been progressively increasing in the last two decades and this trend could be drastically exacerbated in the medium- and long-term horizons according to climate change projections. It is estimated that, between 2000 and 2019, 7,348 natural hazard-related disasters have occurred worldwide, causing 2.97 trillion US\$ losses and affecting 4 billion people (UNDRR, 2020). These numbers represent a sharp increase of the number of recorded disaster events in comparison with the previous twenty years. Much of this increase is due to a significant rise in the number of climate-related disasters (heatwaves, droughts, flooding, etc.), including compound events, whose frequency is dramatically increasing because of the effects of climate change and the related global warming. In the future, by mid-century, the world stands to lose around 10% of total economic value from climate change if temperature increase stays on the current trajectory, and both the Paris Agreement and 2050 net-zero emissions targets are not met.

In this framework, **Project ICARIA** has the overall objective to promote the definition and the use of a comprehensive asset level modeling framework to achieve a better understanding about climate related impacts produced by complex, compound and cascading disasters and the possible risk reduction provided by suitable, sustainable and cost-effective adaptation solutions.

This project will be especially devoted to critical assets and infrastructures that are susceptible to climate change, in a sense that its local effects can result in significant increases in cost of potential losses for unplanned outages and failures, as well as maintenance – unless an effort is undertaken in making these assets more resilient. ICARIA aims to understand how future climate might affect life-cycle costs of these assets in the coming decades and to ensure that, where possible, investments in terms of adaptation measures are made up front to face these changes.

when that the detection at the detection and the detection and the detection and the section and the section and the detection and the detection of of different energies in the detection of the detection of the detection o To achieve this aim, ICARIA has identified 7 Strategic Subobjectives (SSO), each one related to one or several work packages. They have been classified according to different categories: scientific, corresponding to research activities for advances beyond the state of the art (SSO1, SSO2, SSO3, SSO4, SO5); technological, suggesting and/or developing novel solutions, integrating state-of-the art and digital advances (SSO6); societal, contributing to improved dialogue, awareness, cooperation and community engagement as highlighted by the European Climate Pact (SSO7); and related to dissemination and exploitation, aimed at sharing ICARIA results to a broader audience and number of regions and communities to maximize project impact (SSO7).

- SSO1.- Achievement of a comprehensive methodology to assess climate related risk produced by complex, cascading and compound disasters
- SSO2.- Obtaining tailored scenarios for the case studies regions
- SSO3.- Quantify uncertainty and manage data gaps through model input requirements and innovative methods





- SSO4.- Increase the knowledge on climate related disasters (including interactions between compound events and cascading effects) by developing and implementing advanced modeling for multi-hazard assessment
- SSO5.- Better assessment of holistic resilience and climate-related impacts for current and future scenarios
- SSO6.- Better decision taking for cost-efficient adaptation solutions by developing a Decision Support System (DSS) to compare adaptation solutions
- SSO7. Ensure the use and impact of the ICARIA outputs<br>
and the CARIA outputs<br>
and th ● SSO7.- Ensure the use and impact of the ICARIA outputs





## <span id="page-20-0"></span>**2 Objectives and context of Deliverable 1.3**

The document presents the creation of a complementary cookbook and the results of a domain user survey conducted within the ICARIA project as a contribution to the strategic sub objective SSO3. - Quantify uncertainty and manage data gaps through model input requirements and innovative methods (WP1, WP1 - Project framework, climate scenarios, and modelling inputs). Specifically, this document corresponds to Deliverable 1.3 and includes the results of Task 1.3 - modelling input requirements and methods to treat data gaps and uncertainties.

#### **The necessity for a cookbook and a domain survey**

ents and metriods to treat data gaps and uncertainties.<br>
Sestity for a cookbook and a domain survey<br>
change impacts are produced by complex interactions, and are often characterized by<br>
change impacts are produced by compl Climate change impacts are produced by complex interactions, and are often characterized by compound events and cascading effects that demand tailored-made, sustainable adaptation solutions. To support the ICARIA holistic asset-level modelling framework defined in D1.1 (ICARIA, (2023a)), this deliverable introduces a set of methodologies and tools to treat data gap and uncertainties with respect to modelling input requirements relevant for the case study areas, which has been designed as a "cookbook" potentially transferable to other contexts. Additionally, a dedicated domain user survey has been designed to specifically highlight critical data gaps recurring in the field of hazard and impact assessment. The necessity of both is preparatory, providing merely a scaffold for potential support and improvement of the current state-of-the-art methodologies already employed in ICARIA, which will be then tested in D1.4 (ICARIA, 2024c) for a number of selected data gaps in the case study areas, and further applied in WP4 to cover all relevant data gaps emerging from the Trial execution.

The main goals of D1.3 are summarized as follows:

- Identification of recurring data gaps in hazard/impact assessment: this ambitious task is achieved through a twofold approach. Firstly, ICARIA Case Study Facilitators focused on data gaps related to the implementation of Trials and Mini-Trials in the case-study areas. In parallel, experts were engaged via the domain survey, to provide feedback on data-driven techniques so that the practitioners can comprehensively understand the current limitations and prioritize which data gaps need to be addressed with priority.
- Creation of a list of alternative methods: to supplement the methodologies identified with respect to the key variables and datasets emerging from the impact assessment modelling architecture defined for the ICARIA case studies and based on the proposed holistic modelling framework (see D1.1, Section 3), and to investigate and identify the possibility for filling of data gaps via data augmentation/substitution techniques and/or expert knowledge collection.
- Improvement of data granularity supporting quantitative impact assessments: due to the observed lack of comprehensive datasets that can support assessments at local level (i.e., sub-regional, urban level), both concerning climate change and hazard assessment for complex events, both for exposure and vulnerability analyses, alternative routes need to be explored, including but not limited to the creation of synthetic data through statistical approaches, dynamical downscaling and/or expert elicitation methods. The latter, in particular, offers a unique opportunity to address recurring data gaps in multi-hazard





assessment (e.g., probability of occurrence of coincident compound events, probability of hazard transition in consecutive compound events and/or cascading effects scenarios), detailed quantitative exposure and/or vulnerability analysis (e.g., recurring construction typologies in a given area; health implication of different heat stress levels on specific age groups) that cannot be treated otherwise for the lack of data.

● Exploration of advanced data-driven methodologies: The enormously expanding production of data through remote sensing and research at global level, increasingly available through public data repository and open web platforms, suggests the effectiveness of approaches aimed at harnessing/handling information and addressing data gaps through data-driven methodologies supported by machine learning, AI and data fusion techniques. Similarly, consolidated statistical methods (including geospatial statistical methods) and dynamic downscaling approaches, help to expand the application potential of available data at global/EU level to produce quantitative impact assessments at local scale.

The specific objectives of D1.3 can be summarized as follows:

- to provide a list of possible data gaps in relation to Hazard (H), Exposure (E), and Vulnerability (V) as key elementary bricks of the ICARIA holistic impact assessment model
- to develop a cookbook providing a list of methodologies and technical specifications for filling data gaps in impact assessment, focusing on priorities emerging from the case studies modelling workflows identified in D1.1
- to provide templates to map data gap-filling and uncertainty treatment, including expert elicitation and user-provided data, in Trials and Mini-trials
- to conduct a domain survey about existing and emerging data-driven methodologies
- to provide the results of the domain survey as a form of recommendation for the practitioners.

#### **Structure of the document**

nimed at harmessing/handling information and addressing data gaps through data-driven,<br>mehrodologies supported by mechine learning, Al and data fusion techniques, Similarly,<br>consolidated statistical methods (including geos The document is organized as follows: in Section 3, the main data gaps in relation to the ICARIA holistic modelling framework as emerged from Case Study Facilitators assessment and the results of the domain user survey are presented. In Section 4, the main methodologies used in ICARIA to treat data gaps and uncertainties are introduced, illustrating the "*cookbook*" structure and the Jupyter book. In section 5, dedicated tables list selected literature and reference studies with respect to the identified methodologies, including those preliminarily applied in Lab Task T1.4, for their potential adoption in WP4 for Trials implementation. In section 6, the domain user surveu, developed as a dedicated questionnaire for experts internal or external to the ICARIA consortium, is presented. The surveu is designed to include current and emerging trends in data-driven methodologies, and the section includes the results from the testing made by ten (10) selected experts. Finally, in the Conclusions, a reflection on the importance of treating data gaps and uncertainties even beyond the "*gap-filling*" issue, but rather in relation to the correct communication of hazard/impact modelling results to inform decision makers and practitioners is introduced, aimed at supporting the presentation of impact assessments and the identification of suitable resilience measures within CoP activities in WP5. The Appendix includes the main relevant open data repositories useful to support data-gap filling in ICARIA Trials.









## <span id="page-23-0"></span>**3 Recurring data gaps in impact assessment modelling**

ICARIA modelling framework (see D1.1) is aimed at quantifying impact from complex events, implying compound hazards and cascading effects conditions, with respect to multiple assets. Such multi-hazard and multi-receptor focus increase the complexity of assessing Hazard, Exposure and Vulnerability variables in time with the adequate spatial resolution to provide quantitative impact assessment information to support resilient planning and decision-making. Therefore, addressing data gaps implies their mapping across Trials and Mini-Trials, both to fill gaps and treating uncertainties, both to acknowledge in the assessment the assumptions and limitations related to data and their elaboration through modelling.

The templates provided in Annex (introduced in D1.1 to map for each Trial main data types expected input from T1.2, WP2 and WP3) have been developed to map the relevant data required the implement the hazard characterization, the exposure and vulnerability analysis and the risk/impact assessment in Case Study and followers' regions. They also include an "event tree scenario building tool", adapted from SNOWBALL project (Zuccaro et. al., 2018), intended to provide a visual representation of the specific modelling workflow(s) adopted in the studies and useful to support data-gap filling and uncertainties treatment (e.g., to i.e., determine hazards transition probabilities through expert elicitation procedures).

The ICARIA cookbook and the Jupyter platform introduced in Section 5 have been developed to provide references and technical specifications to address data gaps, including methods tested in T1.4.

Based on the analysis from domain user survey and contributions from Case Study Facilitators (CSFs), the main critical data gaps can be grouped in two main categories:

- and man mapping backs and the assumptions and limitations related to data and their<br>acknowledge in the assessment the assumptions and limitations related to data and their<br>information chrough modelling.<br>plates provided in • Climate Change and Hazard data, which determine the boundary conditions for hazard characterization in space and time, including aspects long term variation and seasonal trends of climate change patterns, extreme events frequency and intensity, local downscaling of hazards (i.e., with a spatial resolution higher than that derived by Regional Climate models (RCMs)), probability of occurrence of coincident compound events, probability of transition among natural hazards in consecutive compound events, probability of transition in cascading effects from a given triggering hazard impacting critical service networks (e.g., transport, energy, water distribution).
- Exposure, Vulnerability, and Impact data, which allow to determine expected impacts on exposed risk receptors based on specific vulnerability and impact assessment models input requirements. Even considering the diversity of data input required by different exposure, vulnerability, and impact models, recurring datasets can be identified with respect to the main hazard tupes.

#### **Climate change and Hazard data**





<span id="page-24-0"></span>

## **Table 1**: Climate change and Hazard data gaps' table.



























## **Exposure, Vulnerability, and Impact data**



<span id="page-29-0"></span>





## <span id="page-30-0"></span>**4 Methodologies for data-gap filling and uncertainties treatment**

#### **Main methodologies in ICARIA Cookbook**

The ICARIA Cookbook provides a series of "*recipes*" that include references and technical specifications to address data-gaps and uncertainties with respect to the ICARIA Holistic modelling framework. The main methods used in ICARIA, widely consolidated in literature, are summarized in the following.

#### **Statistical end dynamical methods**

**and end ugnamical methods**<br>Models (GCMs) are numerical models that represent the climate system with varying degrees<br>lexity and are based on the physical, chemical and biological properties of its components,<br>reactions an Climate Models (GCMs) are numerical models that represent the climate system with varying degrees of complexity and are based on the physical, chemical and biological properties of its components, their interactions and feedback processes. Each GCM represents all components of the earth system (atmosphere, cryosphere, biosphere, ocean, ice-sheets), as well as human impacts via greenhouse gas emissions and simulates possible future climate states. By representing all components, also their interactions are depicted (e.g., melting of sea ice changes the ocean's salinity and albedo, in turn affecting ocean's temperature, which then affects the atmospheric temperature). These models provide important information; however, their spatial resolution is relatively coarse (e.g., 100 km x 100 km, meaning 1 temperature, precipitation etc. value for a grid box of 10.000km<sup>2</sup>). To address this limitation, downscaling techniques are employed. In this sense, ICARIA has tried to tackle this uncertainty by not sticking to one but considering the two main sources of generation of information at the local scale available: dynamical and statistical downscaling. ICARIA has incorporated into its procedures these two downscaling methods.

**Statistical downscaling** obtains empirical relationships between large-scale variables from GCMs and high-resolution (surface) variables, allowing us to obtain very local results (like in a village) with less error than the dynamical one. The statistical downscaling methodology applied in ICARIA by FIC, named FICLIMA (Ribalaygua et. al., 2013), consists of a two-step analogue/regression statistical method which has been used in national and international projects with good verification results. The first step is common for all simulated climate variables and it is based on an analogue stratification. For the second step, the procedures applied depend on the variable of interest, ranging from multiple linear regression in temperature, clustering of rainfall most analogous days for precipitation, or transfer functions between probability distributions and parametric bias corrections for wind or RH. This methodology was applied in ICARIA for the three case studies using 10 GCMs and the 4 Tier 1 SSPs (1-2.6, 2-4.5, 3-7.0 and 5-8.5).

**Dynamical downscaling**, on the other hand, increases the resolution of the GCMs over the region of interest with RCMs, taking into account local characteristics and altering physical processes, allowing us to obtain results in areas (like watersheds) where there are no observed data as well as a better representation of atmospheric processes. For the so-called GCM to better represent local features such as topography or land use, the output of the general circulation models is used to drive regional climate models (ARSINOE Project, 2023; Nikulin et. Al., 2018). Regional climate models represent atmospheric processes at spatial resolutions of  $\sim$ 1 - 12 km. This so-called dynamical downscaling was





applied within ICARIA for 2 SSP scenarios (SSP126, SSP585), using two kinds of regional climate models (Weather Research and Forecasting Model (WRF) and Consortium for Small-scale modelling (COSMO) for Salzburg and South Aegean region.

wite useful unit and the first conduct and the presention and the first can be the measure of the first that within the simulated ranges (low to high emissions). The latter represents the fact that same emission scenario, On the other hand, there's the uncertainty problem about climate information. Efforts within the scientific community focus on addressing and quantifying uncertainties in climate simulations. Within climate projections two kinds of uncertainties are discussed, first the scenario uncertainty, and second the model uncertainty. The first one relates to the fact that we don't know which emission scenario will become reality until 2100, thus the temperature evolution until the end of the century is uncertain, but within the simulated ranges (low to high emissions). The latter represents the fact that for the same emission scenario, two models might yield opposing trends, which is the case for precipitation. As highly complex processes of different temporal and spatial scales are at play for precipitation, its correct representation within climate models is still subject of research. Even though we already know a lot, the approaches taken within two different models might cause opposing trends of precipitation amounts until 2100. Within ICARIA, each downscaling methodology assesses its own uncertainty with inner processes of verification through the use of different procedures and statistics, ensuring that the methodology introduces the least amount of uncertainty into the outcomes. As a result, both methods are then combined following the ensemble strategy, displaying the different outcomes and impacts for future climate states. Often the medians and quantiles are applied to gain a better knowledge and reduce uncertainty, enhancing the understanding of future climates for specific locations.

#### **Data-driven and data fusion methodologies**

Data-driven methodologies offer an additional tool for climate resilience and especially for defining, estimating, and treating data gaps (Harder et. al., 2022; Reichstein et. al., 2019; Andrychowicz et. al., 2023). While it finds application in a majority of fields, the ICARIA project and D1.3, include data-driven methods for studying data gaps for climate resilience. These methods guide us in filling data gaps in time series forecasting at large scales, in addressing weather data, in expanding hazard datasets by combining input from inventories (e.g., before and after an extreme event), in enhancing large-scale quantitative hazard assessments, etc... Further, the integration of public data with asset characteristics (e.g., buildings), helps to estimate and generate representative values for characteristics when data gaps appear, providing key input for improving critical response strategies and risk assessments from regional to national scales. Data-driven methodologies can play a key role as an auxiliary tool for data-gaps treatment while additionally providing complementary information to real-world experiments, filling geospatial data gaps about infrastructure, and expanding the output of climate models.

### **Expert elicitation methods**

Expert elicitation is a structured procedure for obtaining uncertainty judgments from experts, measuring their individual judgment capabilities with a performance-based metric, and then applying mathematical scoring rules to combine these individual judgments into a 'rational consensus' that can inform the deliberations of policy-makers. One of the most widely adopted elicitation methods is the





"*classical model*" formulated by Cooke (Cook et. al., 2018). The classical model has been developed to aggregate expert judgments based on performance measures, and is based on the scoring of expert judgment in terms of statistical accuracy and informativeness. The statistical accuracy, representing the "calibration" of expert's opinion, is tested through a number of questions for which the answer can be confronted with observed values and expressed by a probability index (the so called "seed variables", whose value is known to the analysts at the moment of the elicitation but are not known to the experts at the moment of the elicitation). Experts are thus scored according to their performance in assessing seed variables. A low value (near zero) expresses a high accuracy. The product of statistical accuracy and informativeness for each expert is their combined score, expressed as Performance Weighted (PW) combinations. Other assessment values can be derived from elicitation, such as Equally Weighted (EW) or Harmonically Weighted (HW) combinations, as well as individual expert assessments.



<span id="page-32-0"></span>**Figure 1**: Simplified volcanic eruptive scenario event tree, incorporating probabilities of occurrence of different eruptive events derived from successive expert elicitations (Mader, 2016). Probabilities of hazard transitions are derived from expert elicitation.

The application of expert elicitation methods is particularly appropriate to determine target variables characterized by significant level of uncertainty, which cannot be sufficiently described using current models or field data, but for which a rational consensus among experts can be reached. Based on the Cooke's classical model, several expert elicitation approaches and supporting tools have been developed, and are characterized by the following common features:

- 1. Scrutability: All data and processing tools are open to peer review and results must be reproducible by competent reviewers.
- 2. Empirical control: Quantitative expert assessments are subjected to quality controls.
- 3. Neutrality: The method for evaluating expert opinions should encourage experts to state their true opinions.
- 4. Fairness: Expert opinions are not judged, prior to processing the results of their assessments.





#### **Uncertainty treatment methods**

evelywhere of the case of specifical actions, mixtually solution the comparation and the constrained constrained a parameter changes. Measurement errors arise from using imperfect observational tools, such gauges, and from The [Climate-ADAPT](https://climate-adapt.eea.europa.eu/en/knowledge/tools/uncertainty-guidance/topic1/index_html) uncertainty guidance (Zuccaro et. al., 2018) highlights the many levels of uncertainties associated to climate change impacts and adaptation: Future emissions trajectories of greenhouse gases and aerosols, which are influenced by demographic, economic, and technological developments and international climate agreements, will determine the scale and speed of future climate change. The impact of climate change on the environment and society will be shaped by the future development of non-climatic factors, including socio-economic, demographic, technological, and environmental changes. Measurement errors arise from using imperfect observational tools, such as rain gauges, and from data processing methods, like algorithms for estimating surface temperatures from satellite data. Aggregation errors occur due to incomplete temporal and spatial data coverage. Natural variability is driven by unpredictable processes within the climate system, such as atmospheric and oceanic changes, future volcanic eruptions, and dynamics within climate-sensitive environmental and social systems, like ecosystems. Model limitations in climate and impact models stem from their limited resolution, which affects the detailed representation of phenomena like cloud physics, and from an incomplete understanding of individual Earth system components, such as dynamic ice sheets, their interactions and feedbacks, like climate-carbon cycle feedbacks, and environmental or social systems under study, such as demographic changes in flood-prone areas or specific urban morphologies and features of building, open spaces and vegetative cover that affect soil drainage capacities and urban heat island conditions. Lastly, societal preferences and political priorities influence the significance placed on specific climate impacts, such as local or regional biodiversity loss







<span id="page-34-0"></span>**Figure 2**: Climate resilience & Decision-making uncertainty Typology based on knowledge uncertainty, system uncertainty, taxonomy uncertainty, and decision uncertainty (modified after Ascough II et al., 2008).

These types of uncertainties can be connected to various areas of "*Knowledge Uncertainty*", "*Variability Uncertainty*" and "*Decision Uncertainty*", as defined by Walker et al. (2003), which lead to the necessity of considering uncertainty as essential component of decision-making for climate resilience. According to Street and Nilsson (2014), recognizing and reflecting the nature and characteristics of uncertainty in the use of evidence leads to better-informed, more relevant, and robust decisions. By acknowledging uncertainties instead of expecting clear-cut outcomes, uncertainties become more manageable, enabling the formulation of coherent decisions and policies. Furthermore, the acknowledgment of uncertainties in hazard/impact assessments contribute to minimizing the risk of maladaptation and to a more effective risk management. In particular, the focus of ICARIA on probabilistic assessment of complex events (compound coincident, compound consecutive, cascading effects, see D1.1), which requires articulated event tree analysis, whose uncertainties in terms of hazard transition probabilities, and/or in terms of likelihood of cascading effects given a certain damage threshold on critical service assets and networks1, may lead to propagation of error in the impact assessment.





#### **Ensemble strategy for ICARIA climate information**

In the generation of climate information for ICARIA, one of the primary challenges faced by climate scientists and decision-makers is the inherent uncertainty in climate data (Camps-Valls et. al., 2023; Lenton et. al., 2019). Climate Models (CMs) are numerical models that represent the climate system with varying degrees of complexity, each simulating past and future climate states uniquely, thus introducing a degree of uncertainty based on the selected CM. The climate system itself has inherent variability due to the different time scales of its components (e.g., atmospheric processes occur over days, oceanic processes over years) and their impacts on weather patterns and phenomena like ENSO or AMO. While CMs effectively simulate broad atmospheric circulation, they lack the resolution (around 100 km) for capturing smaller-scale local phenomena, necessitating downscaling techniques that further add uncertainty. Additionally, the emission scenarios (SSPs) used to drive future climate projections introduce another layer of complexity and uncertainty in interpreting and communicating model results and their local impacts. The scientific community addresses and quantifies uncertainties in climate simulations primarily through the ensemble strategy (Zuccaro et. al., 2018), which involves using different models to compute the same SSP scenario. This approach displays various outcomes and impacts for future climate states, highlighting the spread within model simulations and enhancing the understanding of future climates for specific locations. Different procedures (Wilcke et al. 2016) can further reduce uncertainty from ensemble outcomes, such as selecting different ranges of change.

while one sensitively simulate broad antibophenic unitariality, inely lave the resultion<br>to the for capturing smaller-scale local phenomena, necessitating downscaling techniques<br>her add uncertainty. Additionally, the emiss ICARIA tackles this uncertainty not only through the ensemble approach but also by utilizing both dynamical and statistical downscaling methods. Each method assesses its own uncertainty through verification processes using different procedures and statistics, ensuring minimal uncertainty is introduced into the outcomes. By combining these two approaches, ICARIA gains a broader perspective, assessing uncertainties and their implications for future projections. This dual-method approach allows for a better representation of variability and possible future states while being time efficient. Consistent results from both methodologies at the same location enhance the reliability of ICARIA's climate outcomes, providing trustworthy information for case studies and other partners. Conversely, significant differences between the methodologies indicate high uncertainty in future states, dependent on the model used. Once the results from both downscaling methodologies were delivered in D1.2 (ICARIA, 2024a), ICARIA established its ensemble strategy for handling all climate information produced in WP1. This strategy addresses the primary type of uncertainty inherent in the project: the climate information itself.

The ensemble strategy used is derived from the RESCCUE (Velasco et. al., 2018) project. It goes beyond simply using SSPs for CMIP6 by incorporating an impact approach. This approach considers the expected changes for a variable from all potential future scenarios, thereby accounting for uncertainties from downscaling methods, unknown socioeconomic evolutions, and the inherent variability and divergence in climate models.

1. The first step involves analyzing projections related to main variables and hazard indicators for impact modelling. All scenarios (combinations of GCM + SSP) from both downscaling methodologies are considered as an ensemble, resulting in 48 total scenarios for SLZ and SAR (40 from statistical and 8 from dynamical), and 40 for AMB (only statistical).




- 2. These scenarios are ordered based on expected changes relative to the climate baseline (1981-2020) for future climate periods.
- 3. An impact approach is then used to identify the "*most probable scenario*" (P50, or median) and the "*worst-case scenario*" (P90). The scenarios in the ensemble strategy are traceable, allowing identification of the specific scenario selected (e.g., the most-probable scenario P50 for TMax corresponds to model MPI-ESM2-1-HR and projection SSP3-7.0).
- 4.

By proceeding in this manner, uncertainty in the evolution of socioeconomic scenarios is accounted for. Since it is unknown which SSP pathway humanity will follow, it is advisable not to rely on a single SSP. Instead, all SSPs are gathered, and the appropriate one is selected. This approach allows for flexibility, as humanity might not follow, for example, SSP 3-7.0 precisely, but another close scenario with similar results might be more accurate at some point. The selected scenarios will then be used for impact modelling, considering the expected evolution of changes in variables.

For compound events in ICARIA, joint probability in hazard modelling is resolved similarly. All scenarios for each variable in the compound event are considered. The same model + SSP combination for each variable is selected to maintain the inner dynamics of the climate model. Joint probabilities are obtained and sorted by their probability of occurrence, ultimately selecting the median (most likely scenario) and P90 (for uncertainty assessment).

### **Evaluation of uncertainty in ICARIA's compound events approach**

In ICARIA, two methods for the evaluation of the uncertainties connected to the compound events and cascading effects timelines are suggested: (1) Bayesian methods, and (2) Expert Elicitation methods (see also above).

## Bayesian methods in uncertainty treatment

eviding in this instinction that the evidential of the evidential of the conditional sections accurate is the surknown which SSP pathway humanity will follow, it is advisable not be rely on a single tead, all SSPs are gath Statistics comprises two main competing schools of thought: the frequentist (or classical) approach to statistical inference, which includes hypothesis testing and confidence intervals, and the Bayesian approach. The fundamental difference between these approaches lies in their definitions of probability. A frequentist sees probability as a long-run frequency. When a frequentist claims that the probability of a fair coin landing heads is 1/2, they mean that, over many tosses, the coin will land heads about half the time. On the other hand, a Bayesian, who would also state that the probability of a coin landing heads is 1/2, is expressing a belief about the likelihood of the coin landing heads, perhaps based on the symmetry of the coin suggesting no reason to favor one side over the other. This is known as subjective probability. In practice, frequentists use probability to describe the frequency of specific data types over repeated trials, whereas Bayesians use probability to represent the degree of belief in a statement about unknown quantities (Glickman et al., 2007).

At the core of Bayesian analysis lies Bayes' rule. For two events, A and B, with probabilities P(A) and  $P(B)$ , respectively, the conditional probability of A given B,  $P(A \mid B)$ , can be determined using Bayes' rule:

$$
P(A | B) = P(A) \cdot P(B | A) / P(B)
$$
\n
$$
(1)
$$





Bayes' rule allows us to convert a probability like  $P(B \mid A)$  into one like  $P(A \mid B)$ , meaning it translates the probability of B occurring given A has occurred into the probability of A occurring given B. In this context,  $P(A)$  is referred to as the prior probability,  $P(B \mid A)$  as the likelihood, and  $P(B)$  as the normalization factor. Bayes' rule can be straightforwardly extended to random variables and their distribution functions. It can be utilized to combine a prior distribution with a likelihood function to produce a posterior distribution, which can then serve as an input for risk analysis. Bayes' rule can be expressed as:

 $P(\theta | E) = P(\theta) P(E | \theta) / P(E)$  (2)

 $P(\theta | E) = P(\theta) P(E | \theta) / P(E)$  (2)<br>
denotes probability mass (or density),  $\theta$  is a value of the random variable in question (such as<br>
initude of a hazard), and E denotes the evidence considered (such as a triggering event).  $P$ where P denotes probability mass (or density),  $\theta$  is a value of the random variable in question (such as the magnitude of a hazard), and E denotes the evidence considered (such as a triggering event). P(θ) is the prior probability that the random variable takes on the value  $\theta$ , and its integral over  $\theta$  is one because it is a distribution. P(E  $\vert \theta \rangle$  is the conditional likelihood function, representing the probability of the evidence given a particular value of θ. Bayes' rule is applied to all values of θ to obtain P(θ | E), the posterior distribution of θ given the evidence. Both the prior and the likelihood are functions of θ, and Bayes' rule for distributions is essentially their product for each possible value of θ. The normalizing factor is a single value ensuring the resulting posterior distribution integrates to unity.

For most Bayesians, the prior distribution reflects the analyst's opinions or beliefs and represents subjective knowledge before considering specific evidence. It may stem from preconceptions, reasoning, hearsay, or a combination. The likelihood function represents a model, often based on the analyst's subjective knowledge, of what data suggests about the variable in question. The normalizing factor can be difficult to compute analytically, but using conjugate pairs can simplify the problem. If these shortcuts aren't feasible, modern software can handle the computation using intensive methods.

In summary, a typical Bayesian analysis involves the following steps (Glickman et. Al., 2007):

- 1. Formulate a probability model for the data
- 2. Decide on a prior distribution, representing the uncertainty in the unknown model parameters before observing the data
- 3. Observe the data and construct the likelihood function based on the data and the probability model from step 1. Combine the likelihood with the prior distribution from step 2 to determine the posterior distribution, which quantifies the uncertainty in the model parameters after observing the data
- 4. Summarize key features of the posterior distribution or calculate quantities of interest based on it. These constitute statistical outputs, such as point estimates and intervals.

The main goal of Bayesian statistical analysis is to obtain the posterior distribution of model parameters. The posterior distribution can be seen as a weighted average of knowledge about the parameters before data is observed (represented by the prior distribution) and the information contained in the observed data (represented by the likelihood function). From a Bayesian perspective, almost any inferential question can be addressed through an appropriate analysis of the posterior





distribution. Once obtained, the posterior distribution allows for computing point and interval estimates of parameters, prediction inference for future data, and probabilistic evaluation of hypotheses.

#### Elicitation methods in uncertainty treatment

Expert judgment is sought when significant scientific uncertainty impacts the decision-making process. Due to this uncertainty, experts may not agree. Informally soliciting expert advice is not new, but structured expert judgment aims to apply transparent methodological rules to treat expert judgments as scientific data in a formal decision process. The scientific method itself facilitates expert agreement (Cook et al., 2004). A valid goal of structured elicitation is to quantify, not eliminate, uncertainty in the decision process.

courd expert (solution and only distinguished and the experiment incordinate and the state scientific data in a formal decision process. The scientific method itself facilitates greenent (Cook et al., 2004). A valid goal o The "*classical model*" (Cook, 1991) used in Snowball methodology is a structured procedure for obtaining uncertainty judgments from experts, measuring their individual judgment capabilities with a performance-based metric, and using mathematical scoring rules to combine these judgments into a rational consensus that informs policy deliberations. The Classical Model method employs proper scoring rules to weight and combine expert judgments based on statistical accuracy and information scores, measured on calibration variables (see Cooke, 1991). It operationalizes rational consensus principles via a performance-based linear pooling or weighted averaging model. The weights are derived from experts' calibration and information scores, measured on seed item calibration variables. Calibration variables serve a threefold purpose (Aspinall et al., 2013):

- 1. to quantify experts' performance as subjective probability assessors
- 2. to enable performance-optimized combinations of expert distributions
- 3. to evaluate and hopefully validate the combination of expert judgments

The name "Classical Model" comes from an analogy between calibration measurement and classical statistical hypothesis testing. In the Classical Model, performance-based weights are determined using two quantitative measures of competency: calibration and information. Calibration assesses the statistical likelihood that a set of experimental results align with the expert's assessments, while information measures how concentrated an expert's uncertainty distribution is. The main steps of the Classical Model are as follows:

- 1. **Selection of Experts**: A group of experts is chosen.
- 2. **Assessment of Seed Items**: Experts express their views as elemental uncertainty distributions and assess a set of variables (seed items) whose true values are known or will become known later.
- 3. **Scoring Experts' Responses**: Experts' responses are scored based on the statistical likelihood that their distributions over the seed items match the observed or measured results. They are also scored on informativeness compared to a uniform background distribution.
- 4. **Combining Scores**: The calibration and information scores are combined to form a weight for each expert.





- 5. **Elicitation of Uncertainty Judgments**: Experts individually provide their uncertainty judgments on the questions of interest (target items).
- 6. **Weighted Pooling of Responses**: Performance-based or equal weight scores are applied to individual responses to obtain a weighted pooling of uncertainty distributions for each target item.





# **5 ICARIA cookbook: recipes for data gap filling**

This chapter is dedicated to gathering a series of methodologies for data gap filling and data uncertainty methods compiled in a cookbook. It outlines data gap groups, data requirements, data collection templates, and sources, emphasizing the potential replicability of any of the methodologies in case studies or during lab tests. A series of approaches are provided to address data gaps and uncertainty, including but not limited to automated data downscaling, extrapolation, synthetic data generation, etc. focusing on data-driven methodologies and their applicability for addressing data gaps and uncertainty. Additionally, a domain users' survey based on ICARIA's internal and external network is compiled, from experts with diverse backgrounds, collecting key feedback on the current and emerging functionalities of data-driven methodologies that the experts are already using or considered to use. The survey can be treated as a recommendation tool for the CFs, promoting replication of ICARIA results beyond the case studies within the project.

#### **Cookbook structure and general template in Jupyter book**

d uncertainty. Additionally, a domain users' survey based on ICARIA's internal and external<br>is compled, from experts with diverse backgrounds, collecting key feedback on the current<br>straing functionalities of data-driven m A Jupyter Book<sup>1</sup> is an open-source framework designed to serve as a generator of digital documents and books by integrating Jupyter Notebooks and Markdown files. It enables the seamless unification and presentation of data, code, and narrative text, making it highly suitable for interdisciplinary research and educational purposes. For combining climate resilience methodologies with data-driven techniques, the Jupyter Book will provide a structured environment for rendering extensive datasets, documenting analytical workflows, and coherently delivering results, ensuring replication, strengthening collaboration within the project, and fostering comprehensive dissemination of findings. In ICARIA, a supporting cookbook will be developed by collecting and compiling datasets and methodologies from the literature in a Jupyter notebook. This notebook will mirror the recipes listed in the initial D1.3 document, creating a scaffold for a more rigid understanding of the data gaps, which will later inform the implementation of Trials and Mini-Trials, prioritizing which gaps tend to appear, yielding fruitful results when addressed with representative methods. More specifically the Jupyter book will be organized as follows: each section of the D1.3 document will be systematically transferred to the Jupyter book, with each section receiving its dedicated chapter. For Chapter 3, which enumerates the cookbook's recipes, distinct categories—statistical methods, dynamical downscaling methods, data-driven methodologies, expert elicitation methods, and uncertainty treatment methods—will each be allocated a dedicated subsection containing a detailed list of recipes. Representative information for each recipe, as presented in their designed tables, will be transferred to the appropriate subsection. Furthermore, the domain survey data, including the questionnaire, responses, and a summary of results, will be thoroughly documented. Finally, the chapter referring to the reflections on data gaps and supplementary information from the appendix will be incorporated to ensure a comprehensive and scientific presentation. The Jupyter book will be hosted in a GitHub repository, freely accessible, allowing for continuous updates and extensions of the content, besides easy access and modifications by the case study facilitators. The link for the Jupyter book is the following:

 $^1$  For more information, see here: <u>[https://jupyterbook.org/en/stable/intro.html#](https://jupyterbook.org/en/stable/intro.html)</u>







## **Cookbook "***recipes***"**

The following sections contain the technical specifications and tools selected from literature, organized and taking into account the main underlying methodology with respect to those identified in Section 3. Although it is worth noting that the case studies implementing the suggested "recipes" often adopt hybrid approaches, combining multiple methodologies.

Description of Recipe and Identification:

DRAFT Due to the interdisciplinary character and diverse areas of application of the methodologies, attempting a totally rigid categorization would only add additional confusion, if not, being far from realistic. Thus, the categorization of the recipes within the cookbook was tailored to align with the project's objectives. As a result, a straightforward yet effective way to distinguish each recipe while providing a meaningful description was aimed. Each recipe is labeled using the following format:

## *Recipe - [Data gap category] [Recipe category numbered] [Secondary Category/Example] [Additional Characterization]*

An example: a recipe categorized under downscaling methodologies, listed second, focused on statistical downscaling methods and identified as a review paper The unique label would be the following:

Recipe CH-DD1-R, where:

- "*CH*" denotes Climate Charge and Hazard (or "*EV*" denotes Exposure and Vulnerability data),
- "*01*" represents the unique number,
- "*DD*" representing data-driven related methodologies ("*S*" representing Statistical downscaling related methodologies, "*D*" representing Dynamical downscaling related methodologies, "*EE*" representing Expert Elicitation related methodologies, "*U*" representing Uncertainty related methodologies, and "*HEV*" representing all Hazard, Exposure, and Vulnerability related methodologies), and
- "*R*" is appended to indicate it is a review paper.





Thus, all labels in recipes within the cookbook will follow the same manner, depending on the subsection and category they belong to.





## **Statistical methods**

S1. Long-term daily stream temperature record for Scotland reveals spatio-temporal patterns in warming of rivers in the past and further warming in the future











S2. Regional climate model emulator based on deep learning: concept and first evaluation of a novel hybrid downscaling approach **Table 4**: S2's recipe table.

















## S3. Bayesian analysis of high-frequency water temperature time series through Markov switching autoregressive models



**Table 5**: S3's recipe table.







S4. High-resolution downscaling with interpretable deep learning: Rainfall extremes over New Zealand



### **Table 6**: S4's recipe table.











S5. Dasymetric Mapping of Population Using Land Cover Data in JBNERR, Puerto Rico during 1990–2010



### **Table 7**: S5's recipe table.







S6. Climate change and energy performance of European residential building stocks – A comprehensive impact assessment using climate big data from the coordinated regional climate downscaling experiment



#### **Table 8:** S6's recipe table.













S7. Comparison of stochastic and machine learning methods for multi-step ahead forecasting of hydrological processes



#### **Table 9**: S7's recipe table.













S8. Downscaling probabilistic seasonal climate forecasts for decision support in agriculture: A comparison of parametric and nonparametric approach



### **Table 10**: S8's recipe table.







S9. An R package for daily precipitation climate series reconstruction

### **Table 11**: S9's recipe table.









S10. Description and validation of a two-step analogue/regression downscaling method

## **Table 12**: S10's recipe table.















S11. Weather Data Quality Control | Weather data temporal extension methodology



**Table 13**: S11's recipe table.













S12. A three-dimensional gap filling method for large geophysical datasets: Application to global satellite soil moisture observations



### **Table 14**: S12's recipe table.







## S13. Spatial interpolation techniques for climate data in the GAP region in Turkey

### **Table 15**: S13's recipe table.









# **Dynamical downscaling**

D1. A simple hybrid statistical–dynamical downscaling method for emulating regional climate models over Western Europe. Evaluation, application, and role of added value?

#### **Table 16**: D1's recipe table.















D2. Dynamical and statistical downscaling of SSPs in AMB





### **Table 17**: D2's recipe table.









D3. Dynamical and statistical downscaling of seasonal temperature forecasts in Europe: Added value for user applications



#### **Table 18**: D3's recipe table.













# D4. Dynamical and statistical downscaling of a global seasonal hindcast in eastern Africa

#### **Table 19**:D4's recipe table.















# **Data-driven based methodologies and data fusion methods**

DD1. Developing novel machine-learning-based fire weather indices





### **Table 20**:DD1's recipe table.








DD2. PVS-GEN: Systematic Approach for Universal Synthetic Data Generation Involving Parameterization, Verification, and Segmentation





### **Table 21**: DD2's recipe table.









DD3. A single-building damage detection model based on multi-feature fusion: A case study in Yangbi



### **Table 22**: DD3's recipe table.







DD4. Assessing automated gap imputation of regional scale groundwater level data sets with typical gap patterns

## **Table 23**: DD4's recipe table.















DD5. From theory to practice: optimization of available information for landslide hazard assessment in Rome relying on official, fragmented data sources

### **Table 24**: DD5's recipe table.















DD6. Modelling national residential building exposure to flooding hazards



### **Table 25**: DD6's recipe table.







DD7. Deep Learning Regional Climate Model Emulators: A Comparison of Two Downscaling Training Frameworks

### **Table 26**: DD7's recipe table.















## DD8. Self-supervised learning for climate downscaling



#### **Table 27**: DD8's recipe table.







DD9. An Exploration of Interpolation - Machine Learning Model for Climate Model Downscaling Under the Limitation of Data Quantity

#### **Table 28**: DD9's recipe table.









DD10. A 'Total' Imputation Algorithm that Fills Gaps in Time Series Measurements for ADEV and Phase Noise Characterizations of Power-law Noise Models

### **Table 29**: DD10's table recipe.









## DD11. A data filling methodology for time series based on CNN and (Bi)LSTM neural networks

### **Table 30**: DD11's recipe table.









DD12. Increasing the detail of European land use/cover data by combining heterogeneous data sets





### **Table 31**: DD12's recipe table.









### DD13. Power Network Component Vulnerability Analysis: A Machine Learning Approach

### **Table 32**: DD13's recipe table.













# **Expert elicitation methods**

EE1. ELICIPY 1.0: A Python online tool for expert elicitation



**Table 33**: EE1's recipe table.







EE2. Using expert elicitation to strengthen future regional climate information for climate services



### **Table 34**: EE2's recipe table.







## EE3. Expert Elicitation: Using the Classical Model to Validate Experts' Judgments

### **Table 35**: EE3's recipe table.









# **Uncertainty treatment methods**

U1. How Certain is Good Enough? Managing Data Quality and Uncertainty in Ordinal Citizen Science Data Sets for Evidence-Based Policies on Fresh Water



**Table 36**: U1's recipe table.







U2. Where does scientific uncertainty come from, and from whom? Mapping perspectives of natural hazards science advice

### **Table 37**: U2's recipe table.















U3. A review of uncertainty quantification in deep learning: Techniques, applications and challenges

## **Table 38**: U3's recipe table.





















## U4. SHELF: The Sheffield Elicitation Framework

### **Table 39**: U4's recipe table.









U5. Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Measures of Uncertainty in Model-Based Environmental Assessment: The NUSAP System

**Table 40**: U5's recipe table.









# **Other methodologies related to hazard, exposure, and vulnerability**

HEV1. Urban pluvial flood modelling in the absence of sewer drainage network data: A physics-based approach





### **Table 41:** HEV1's recipe table.















HEV2. Storm damage beyond wind speed – Impacts of wind characteristics and other meteorological factors on tree fall along railway lines



### **Table 42**: HEV2's recipe table.













## HEV3. OpenStreetMap for multi-faceted climate risk assessments

#### **Table 43:** HEV3's recipe table.














HEV4. On the positioning of emergencies detection units based on geospatial data of urban response centres





## **Table 44**: HEV4's recipe table.













HEV5. Advancing building data models for the automation of high-fidelity regional loss estimations using open data



## **Table 45**: HEV5's recipe table.







HEV6. Estimating exposure of residential assets to natural hazards in Europe using open data

## **Table 46**: HEV6's recipe table.















# HEV7. Asset exposure data for global physical risk assessment

## **Table 47**: HEV7's recipe table.















# HEV8. Mapping Europe into local climate zones

# **Table 48**: HEV8's recipe table.















HEV9. CLIMADA v1: a global weather and climate risk assessment platform

# **Table 49**: HEV9's recipe table.









HEV10. Comparing an insurer's perspective on building damages with modelled damages from pan-European winter windstorm event sets: a case study from Zurich, Switzerland

## **Table 50**: HEV10's recipe table.

























# **6 ICARIA's domain user survey**

# **The main objective of the survey**

windy), covering complex, compound, and casceding events. However, accessing the<br>tity and capabilities of the holistic model remains the ultimate target. To achieve this, case<br>ass, namely the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, S The development of ICARIA's holistic model aligns with current SOTA methodologies, focusing on identifying risk/impact assessment strategies from a multi-hazard perspective and considering all climate-hazard categories, (including heatwaves, forest fires, droughts, floods, storm surges, and storm winds), covering complex, compound, and cascading events. However, accessing the replicability and capabilities of the holistic model remains the ultimate target. To achieve this, case study areas, namely the Barcelona Metropolitan Area, South Aegean Region, and Salzburg Region were subjected to combined climate-hazard events. This practical exposure allowed experts to concurrently assess and identify modelling gaps and uncertainties during the data collection phase. Subsequently, experts could unravel the correlations between impact/risk assessment methodologies, case study areas, and modelling requirements. While this approach provides a robust foundation for creating and applying the holistic model, the complementary input from experts regarding data gaps associated with data-driven methodologies remains crucial. This input is sought to address potential expansions and modifications of the chosen methodologies. The domain user survey serves exactly this complementary role, gathering answers from a panel of ten (10) experts (internally or externally to the consortium). Their expertise and experience in local and/or EU-funded projects guide an assessment of the latest state-of-the-art methodologies present in data-gaps treatment methodologies and data-driven techniques. The survey is structured following a systematic approach, commencing with the treatment of data gaps identified in previous projects where experts actively participated. This information is key, helping in recognizing recurring patterns of data gaps that may be shared across ICARIA and related projects, guiding case facilitators towards an extensive understanding of methodologies appropriate for addressing data gaps and uncertainties. Subsequently, as a second step, experts are prompted to identify potential knowledge gaps based on their practical experience. This aspect proves valuable in the analysis of both single and compound or cascading scenarios from local authorities and case facilitators, identifying vulnerabilities within specific risk categories. Further, an additional key point of the survey is the evaluation of the functionality and applicability of existing and emerging AI methodologies, specializing in utilizing AI to treat data gaps and address uncertainties within climate and CI datasets when modelling climate adaptation studies, mirroring the use cases of ICARIA. Lastly, experts are asked to provide references to milestone papers that may or may not play a crucial role in the integration of data gap treatment methodologies with AI techniques, potentially extending to areas such as climate data. This inclusion ensures that ICARIA remains aligned with the latest state-of-the-art approaches.

A brief list of the experts and a description of the range of the topics are covered based on their background and expertise. While climate resilience remains the main object in the ICARIA project, diverse backgrounds of experts create a whole picture of the current practices for data-driven/AI-based methodologies (when applied to climate data or otherwise). The following list of eight (8) experts including their backgrounds and specialties can be found in Table 1 below.







### **Table 51**: List of experts participated in ICARIA's domain user survey.

Experts' background spans a diverse pool of subjects, encompassing methodologies including but not limited to EO, RS, statistical and dynamical downscaling techniques, along with methodologies for DL, AI applied to climate resilience, and a range of other domains. Although the initial emphasis was placed on updating internal expertise, the participation of external specialists is equally indispensable in achieving the purpose of compiling lists of state-of-the-art emerging data-driven methodologies, particularly when integrated with insights from user studies. For the survey purposes, the EU Survey portal was used to initiate, create, publish, and collect the results of the survey. This portal offers a unique, user-friendly UI that intuitively guides the users through the creation of a survey, providing a plethora of options in terms of the structure of the survey. The link to the survey is provided in this link: https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/f96af3c2-67bc-11df-2c43-f5f6b97351cd. A figure of the survey as can be found in the EU survey's dedicated web interface can be find below:





#### **X EUSurvey**



**Figure 4**: Overview of the ICARIA's domain survey questionnaire.

# **Overview of the summary**

A summary of the results, and a brief description of the key methodologies proposed, as well as the output of the survey will be added below.





## **Table 52**: ICARIA's domain user survey list of questions.







#### **Answers**

matists, that after modelling climate change impacts; these assests are typically neglected,<br>revises must be used a.g., population distribution and road network as a proxy for increased<br>revises must be used a.g., populatio Data gap treatment methodologies used in previous EU-funded projects: (1) interpolation, (2) gap filling with a specific value, (3) Kolmogorov-Smirnov-based inhomogeneity test, (4) masked modelling, (5) availability of accurate, high resolution (~ 2km) meteorological forecasts (used for training ML models, Copernicus ERA-5 reanalysis data), (6) availability of meteo forecasts of different quality standards (this distribution shift results in forecasting models to underperform), (7) lack of human-related assets (as opposed to environmental monitoring variables, that affect modelling climate change impacts; these assets are tupically neglected, or proxies must be used e.g., population distribution and road network as a proxy for increased for example wildfire ignition risk), (8) simulations: atmospheric models to generate meteorological conditions in areas where observations at the desired frequency are missing. The generated data will have biases compared to the real data, and the quality will depend on the sophistication of the model simulation, (9) Multi-Stakeholder's forums, (10) Leverage crowdsourcing and social media platforms (data from heterogeneous sources), (11) – Semantically representation (the usage of Smart Data Models and standardize data formats, units and structures, enables the seamless fusion and harmonization of heterogeneous data ensuring compatibility, coherence and data sharing), (12) Specific domain ontologies ( in the context of climate and critical infrastructure (CI) datasets used for modeling climate change impacts or scenario building in climate adaptation case studies), and (13) FAIR principles, data provenance.

Knowledge gaps from practical experience: (1) inhomogeneities, (2) outliers, (3) physical inconsistencies, (4) uncertainty of past events. Historical meteorological observations with adequate geographical coverage date back just a few decades in the past. For example, observations of sea surface temperature over the oceans or precipitation over the ocean or remote areas are absent beyond 1950. This means that records of historical extremes are not available, which can compromise the simulation of future extreme events, (5) Temporal resolution, (6) Spatial resolution, (7) Socioeconomic data, (8) Incomplete datasets, (9) Incomplete event catalogues of natural disasters, (10) Real-time data and monitoring, (11) Lack of annotated datasets, (12) Limiting effectiveness of predictive models, (13) High uncertainty in climate models, and (14) Risk mapping (creation of accurate hazard and risk maps).

Existing AI functionalities: (1) temporal and spatial auto-correlation, (2) climate projections & simulations, (3) domain adaptation models, (4) non-stationarity (due to climate change are key aspects that should be taken into account, especially for the evaluation), (5) use of spatiotemporal masked autoencoders for pre-training on the available data (and make them more resilient to data-gaps), (6) missing data imputation (using data-driven algorithms), (7) anomaly detection, (8) synthetic data generation, (9) heterogeneous data integration (techniques like data fusion and ensemble learning can help combine different datasets effectively), (10) interoperability (harmonizing data forms and formats), (11) digital twin (AI can generate multiple scenarios for climate adaptation by simulating various climate and socio-economic conditions in a Digital Twin environment), (12) spatial downscaling (AI techniques like convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can downscale global climate model outputs to higher resolutions needed for local impact assessments), (13) temporal downscaling (AI can refine temporal granularity of climate data, making it suitable for short-term event analysis and adaptation planning, (14) uncertainty analysis (AI can be used to quantify uncertainties in climate projections and impact assessments. Bauesian neural networks and ensemble learning methods can provide probabilistic estimates and confidence intervals, (15)

1

2

3



4



sensitivity analysis (AI can perform sensitivity analysis, identifying the most influential variables and reducing uncertainty in model predictions), (16) trend Analysis (AI algorithms can identify long-term trends and patterns in climate and CI datasets, helping to detect gradual changes and emerging risks, (17) real-time monitoring (AI can process real-time data from sensors and IoT devices to provide immediate insights into current climate conditions and infrastructure status, and (18) dynamic adaptation (AI can be used to dynamically adjust models and scenarios based on real-time data, enhancing the responsiveness of climate adaptation strategies.

Emerging AI functionalities: (1) domain adaptation models, extrapolation (2) AI methods: GANs, Diffusion models, (3) self-supervised learning, (4) physics-aware models, (5) self-supervised pre-training, creation of ML-based emulators of physical purposes, (6) Reinforcement Learning

- (RL), (7) Spatial-Temporal Graph Neural Networks (ST-GNNs), Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) Networks, (8) Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE).
- 5 Reference(s) for three (3) milestone research papers: Source for Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test, (1) Example of a physics-aware model, (2) Example of DL application for Earth system science, (3) Example of causal relations from data, (4) Example of DL forecasts from sparse observations, (5) Artificial intelligence reconstructs missing climate information.

**Table 53**: ICARIA's domain user survey answers table.

## **Summary of the survey**

merging Alt tunctionalities: (1) domain adaptation models, extrapolation (2) Alt methods: Using the starting, (4) physics-aware models, (5) saft-supervised<br>Ursion models, (3) saft-supervised teaming, (4) physics-aware mode The summary of the domain user survey for data gap treatment methodologies, knowledge gaps from practical experience, and AI functionalities can be organized in three lines: (1) Data gap treatment, (2) Existing AI functionalities, and (3) Emerging AI functionalities. The list of the experts who participated in the survey shared their extensive experience in participating in previous and current EU-funded projects and highlighted data inhomogeneity and inconsistency as the main issues to be addressed. For that reason, methodologies such as interpolation, value data gap filling, and inhomogeneity tests were proposed. Additionally, it was underlined that high-resolution meteorological forecasts and Copernicus ERA-5 reanalysis data are critical for training machine learning models, though varying quality standards can impact forecasting accuracy. This is only an example of the utilization of machine learning and AI methodologies for climate change. In terms of AI functionalities, current AI capabilities include temporal and spatial auto-correlation, climate projections and simulations, domain adaptation models, non-stationarity, and the use of spatiotemporal masked autoencoders as key candidate methodologies to improve resilience to data gaps. This is reflected in the ICARIA project and has the potential to be linked with the climate change and hazard data for cases where weather data are in scarcity (e.g., not fully covering the studied area or when weather observations are not reaching the minimum years necessary for providing accurate and robust output). Further, improving climate change methodologies using AI tools, should include a list of emerging methods including, domain adaptation models, extrapolation AI methods such as GANs, Diffusion models, self-supervised learning, physics-aware models, and self-supervised pre-training, creation of machine learning-based emulators of physical purposes. These methodologies allow for further investigation and application through ICARIA's lab tests and trials and mini-trials, allowing for inclusion of the suggestions from experts, utilizing concrete tools developed in previous EU-funded and other various related projects.





The diversity of the experts allows for creating a more complete idea of the applicability of AI tools, and how realistic such tools would be for ICARIA's purposes.





# **7 Conclusions**

.

The issue of data gaps and uncertainties treatment in quantitative hazard/impact assessment is crucial to guarantee reliability of results. A variety of methods and tools can be found in literature, with robust approaches that can increasingly rely on the ever-growing availability of high-resolution information from remote sensing, in-situ monitoring networks and citizen-science tools, as well as of computing capacity enhanced by machine learning and AI. Nevertheless, the identification and communication of data gaps and uncertainties related to specific hazard/impact modelling results is important beyond the "*data gap filling problem*", to acknowledge uncertainties and limitations in risk assessments and simulations derived by the implementation of the ICARIA Holistic modelling framework in any s case study area.

It beyond the "drat gap filling problem", to acknowledge uncertainties and limitations in risk<br>theyond the "drat gap filling problem", to acknowledge uncertainties and limitations in risk<br>ents and simulations derived by th This is even more crucial in the context of assessments encompassing the impacts on multiple assets determined by complex multi-hazard events (compound coincident, compound consecutive, cascading effects, see D1.1) which, compared to single-hazard assessments, highlight even more the complexity for decision makers and planners to make choices and take science-informed decisions aimed at increasing resilience. These uncertainties are related not only to the missing data concerning specific Hazard-Exposure-Vulnerability (H-E-V) variables used as input in a given impact assessment model, but intrinsic to the dynamics of compound events and cascading effects (Zuccaro et al., 2018), in which uncertainties such as the probability of transition among hazards, and the probability of triggering cascading effects following a given threshold of damage on a critical service asset or network component contribute to propagate errors in the quantitative assessment of the final scenario.

Therefore, considering how uncertainties related to climate change itself depend on a variety of aleatory factors and tipping points (Lenton et al., 2019) it is of extreme importance that the results of ICARIA probabilistic impact assessment models, while improving their reliability through data gap filling, data refinement (and associated uncertainties) with respect to the space-time variables and to H-E-V parameters involved in the areas object of the analysis, always acknowledge all data sources used as input, existing data gaps or low-resolution data used e.g., as a proxy of a missing variable This will be achieved by mapping in the Trials and Mini-Trials modelling framework the key variables and datasets (see D1.1 section 3.2) used, the data sources and the application (already implemented in ICARIA Lab Tasks or potential within WP4 Trial implementation) of the ICARIA cookbook. This will allow decision-makers to develop climate adaptation and resilience plans adequately informed by scientific evidence and existing limitations in knowledge, pursuing the achievement of encountering hazard events with robust and informative models and frameworks.





# **References**

Abdar, M.; Pourpanah, F.; Hussain, S.; Rezazadegan, D.; Liu, L.; Ghavamzadeh, M.; Fieguth, P.; Cao, X.; Khosravi, A.; Acharya, U. R.; Makarenkov, V.; Nahavandi, S. A Review of Uncertainty Quantification in Deep Learning: Techniques, Applications and Challenges. Information Fusion 2021, 76, 243–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2021.05.008>.

Anand, H.; Darayi, M. Power Network Component Vulnerability Analysis: A Machine Learning Approach. Procedia Computer Science 2021, 185, 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.05.008>.

Computer Science 2021, 185, 73-80. https://doi.org/10.1018/1 procs.2021.05.008.<br>wicz, M.; Espehit, L.; Li, [D](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2023.129424).; Merchant, S.; Merose, A.; Zyda, F.; Agrawal, S.; Kalchbrenner, N.<br>Learning for Day Forecasts from Sparse Observ Andrychowicz, M.; Espeholt, L.; Li, D.; Merchant, S.; Merose, A.; Zyda, F.; Agrawal, S.; Kalchbrenner, N. Deep Learning for Day Forecasts from Sparse Observations. arXiv 2023. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.06079>.

Angeles, K.; Kijewski-Correa, T. Advancing Building Data Models for the Automation of High-Fidelity Regional Loss Estimations Using Open Data. Automation in Construction 2022, 140, 104382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2022.104382>.

Apaydin, H.; Sonmez, F.; Yildirim, Y. Spatial Interpolation Techniques for Climate Data in the GAP Region in Turkey. Clim. Res. 2004, 28, 31–40. https://doi.org/10.3354/cr028031.

ARSINOE Project. ARSINOE Project: Climate-Resilient Regions through Systemic Solutions and Innovations. 2023, https://doi.org/10.3030/101037424.

Ascough, J. C.; Maier, H. R.; Ravalico, J. K.; Strudley, M. W. Future Research Challenges for Incorporation of Uncertainty in Environmental and Ecological Decision-Making. Ecological Modelling 2008, 219 (3–4), 383–399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2008.07.015.

Aspinall, W. P.; Cooke, R. M. Quantifying Scientific Uncertainty from Expert Judgement Elicitation. In Risk and Uncertainty Assessment for Natural Hazards; Rougier, J., Sparks, S., Hill, L. J., Eds.; Cambridge University Press, 2013; pp 64–99. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139047562.005.

Aznar-Siguan, G.; Bresch, D. N. CLIMADA v1: A Global Weather and Climate Risk Assessment Platform. Geosci. Model Dev. 2019, 12 (7), 3085–3097. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-3085-2019.

Bikše, J.; Retike, I.; Haaf, E.; Kalvāns, A. Assessing Automated Gap Imputation of Regional Scale Groundwater Level Data Sets with Typical Gap Patterns. Journal of Hydrology 2023, 620, 129424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2023.129424.

Boé, J.; Mass, A.; Deman, J. A Simple Hybrid Statistical–Dynamical Downscaling Method for Emulating Regional Climate Models over Western Europe. Evaluation, Application, and Role of Added Value? Clim Dyn 2023, 61 (1–2), 271–294. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06552-2.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06552-2)

Camps-Valls, G.; Gerhardus, A.; Ninad, U.; Varando, G.; Martius, G.; Balaguer-Ballester, E.; Vinuesa, R.; Diaz, E.; Zanna, L.; Runge, J. Discovering Causal Relations and Equations from Data. arXiv 2023. [https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.13341.](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.13341)





Cartagena-Colón, M.; Mattei, H.; Wang, C. Dasymetric Mapping of Population Using Land Cover Data in JBNERR, Puerto Rico during 1990–2010. Land 2022, 11 (12), 2301. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11122301>.

Colson, A. R.; Cooke, R. M. Expert Elicitation: Using the Classical Model to Validate Experts' Judgments. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy 2018, 12 (1), 113–132. [https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rex022.](https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rex022)

Cooke, R. M. Experts in Uncertainty: Opinion and Subjective Probability in Science; Environmental ethics and science policy series; Oxford University Press: New York, 1991.

Cooke, R. M.; Goossens, L. H. J. Expert Judgement Elicitation for Risk Assessments of Critical Infrastructures. Journal of Risk Research 2004, 7 (6), 643–656. [https://doi.org/10.1080/1366987042000192237.](https://doi.org/10.1080/1366987042000192237)

De' Michieli Vitturi, M.; Bevilacqua, A.; Tadini, A.; Neri, A. ELICIPY 1.0: A Puthon Online Tool for Expert Elicitation. SoftwareX 2024, 25, 101641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2024.101641.

Demuzere, M.; Bechtel, B.; Middel, A.; Mills, G. Mapping Europe into Local Climate Zones. PLoS ONE 2019, 14 (4), e0214474, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214474.

Doury, A.; Somot, S.; Gadat, S.; Ribes, A.; Corre, L. Regional Climate Model Emulator Based on Deep Learning: Concept and First Evaluation of a Novel Hybrid Downscaling Approach. Clim Dyn 2023, 60 (5–6), 1751–1779. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-022-06343-9.

M; Goossens, L. H. J. Expert Judgement Elicitation for Risk [A](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214474)ssessments of Critical<br>
2. M; Goossens, L. H. J. Expert Judgement Elicitation for Risk Assessments of Critical<br>
the Witter, C. Journal of Risk Research 2004, 7 ( Doyle, E. E. H.; Thompson, J.; Hill, S.; Williams, M.; Paton, D.; Harrison, S.; Bostrom, A.; Becker, J. Where Does Scientific Uncertainty Come from, and from Whom? Mapping Perspectives of Natural Hazards Science Advice. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 2023, 96, 103948. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jidrr.2023.103948.

Du, H.; Lin, X.; Jiang, J.; Lu, Y.; Du, H.; Zhang, F.; Yu, F.; Feng, T.; Wu, X.; Peng, G.; Deng, S.; He, S.; Bai, X. A Single-Building Damage Detection Model Based on Multi-Feature Fusion: A Case Study in Yangbi. iScience 2024, 27 (1), 108586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.108586.

Eberenz, S.; Stocker, D.; Röösli, T.; Bresch, D. N. Asset Exposure Data for Global Physical Risk Assessment. Earth Syst. Sci. Data 2020, 12 (2), 817–833. https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-12-817-2020.

Esposito, C.; Mastrantoni, G.; Marmoni, G. M.; Antonielli, B.; Caprari, P.; Pica, A.; Schilirò, L.; Mazzanti, P.; Bozzano, F. From Theory to Practice: Optimisation of Available Information for Landslide Hazard Assessment in Rome Relying on Official, Fragmented Data Sources. Landslides 2023. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-023-02095-7.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10346-023-02095-7)

Faroux, S.; Kaptué Tchuenté, A. T.; Roujean, J.-L.; Masson, V.; Martin, E.; Le Moigne, P. ECOCLIMAP-II/Europe: A Twofold Database of Ecosystems and Surface Parameters at 1 Km Resolution Based on Satellite Information for Use in Land Surface, Meteorological and Climate Models. Geosci. Model Dev. 2013, 6 (2), 563–582. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-563-2013>.





Glickman, M. E.; Dyk, D. A. Basic Bayesian Methods. In Topics in Biostatistics; Ambrosius, W. T., Ed.; Walker, J. M., Series Ed.; Methods in Molecular BiologyTM; Humana Press: Totowa, NJ, 2007; Vol. 404, pp 319–338. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-59745-530-5\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-59745-530-5_16).

Gosling, J. P. SHELF: The Sheffield Elicitation Framework. In Elicitation; Dias, L. C., Morton, A., Quigley, J., Eds.; International Series in Operations Research & Management Science; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2018; Vol. 261, pp 61-93. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65052-4\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65052-4_4).

Grainger, S.; Dessai, S.; Daron, J.; Taylor, A.; Siu, Y. L. Using Expert Elicitation to Strengthen Future Regional Climate Information for Climate Services. Climate Services 2022, 26, 100278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2021.100278.

Gudmundsson, L.; Bremnes, J. B.; Haugen, J. E.; Engen-Skaugen, T. Technical Note: Downscaling RCM Precipitation to the Station Scale Using Statistical Transformations – a Comparison of Methods. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 2012, 16 (9), 3383–3390. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-3383-2012.

Han, E.; Ines, A. V. M. Downscaling Probabilistic Seasonal Climate Forecasts for Decision Support in Agriculture: A Comparison of Parametric and Non-Parametric Approach. Climate Risk Management 2017, 18, 51–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2017.09.003.

Harder, P.; Hernandez-Garcia, A.; Ramesh, V.; Yang, Q.; Sattigeri, P.; Szwarcman, D.; Watson, C.; Rolnick, D. Hard-Constrained Deep Learning for Climate Downscaling. arXiv 2022. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.05424.

Climate Information for Climate Services. Climate Services 2022, 26, 100278.<br>
26. 26. 100278.<br>
26. 26. 100278.<br>
26. 26. 11. Bermans, J. B.; Haugen, J. E.; Engen-Skaugen, T. Technical Note: [D](https://www.icaria-project.eu/downloads/%23deliverables.)ownscaling [R](https://doi.org/10.1109/EFTF/IFCS54560.2022.9850921)CM<br>
26. 10016. 26. 2 Howe, D. A.; Champagne, C.; Schlossberger, N. A 'Total' Imputation Algorithm That Fills Gaps in Time Series Measurements for ADEV and Phase Noise Characterizations of Power-Law Noise Models. In 2022 Joint Conference of the European Frequency and Time Forum and IEEE International Frequency Control Symposium (EFTF/IFCS); IEEE: Paris, France, 2022; pp 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1109/EFTF/IFCS54560.2022.9850921.

ICARIA (2023a). Deliverable 1.1 – CARIA holistic modelling framework. Available at: https://www.icaria-project.eu/downloads/#deliverables.

ICARIA (2024a). Deliverable 1.2 – Climate projections and hazard scenarios. Available at: https://www.icaria-project.eu/downloads/#deliverables.

ICARIA (2024b). Deliverable 1.3 – Impact modelling data requirements and methods to treat data gap filling and data uncertainty. Available at: https://www.icaria-project.eu/downloads/#deliverables.

ICARIA (2024c). Deliverable 1.4 – WP1 Testing results. Available at: [https://www.icaria-project.eu/downloads/#deliverables.](https://www.icaria-project.eu/downloads/%23deliverables)

Kim, K.-M.; Kwak, J. W. PVS-GEN: Systematic Approach for Universal Synthetic Data Generation Involving Parameterization, Verification, and Segmentation. Sensors 2024, 24 (1), 266. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s24010266>.





Lenton, T. M.; Rockström, J.; Gaffney, O.; Rahmstorf, S.; Richardson, K.; Steffen, W.; Schellnhuber, H. J. Climate Tipping Points — Too Risky to Bet Against. Nature 2019, 575 (7784), 592–595. [https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0.](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0)

Loerke, E.; Pohle, I.; Wilkinson, M. E.; Rivington, M.; Wardell-Johnson, D.; Geris, J. Long-Term Daily Stream Temperature Record for Scotland Reveals Spatio-Temporal Patterns in Warming of Rivers in the Past and Further Warming in the Future. Science of The Total Environment 2023, 890, 164194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.164194>.

Lorenz, R.; Becker, N.; Gardiner, B.; Ulbrich, U.; Hanewinkel, M.; Benjamin, S. Storm Damage beyond Wind Speed – Impacts of Wind Characteristics and Other Meteorological Factors on Tree Fall along Railway Lines. February 23, 2024. https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-120.

Mader, H. M., Statistics in Volcanology; International Association of Volcanology and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior, Geological Society of London, Eds.; Special publications of the International Association of Volcanology and Chemistry of the Earth's Interior; Geological Society: London, 2006.

Manzanas, R.; Gutiérrez, J. M.; Fernández, J.; Van Meijgaard, E.; Calmanti, S.; Magariño, M. E.; Cofiño, A. S.; Herrera, S. Dynamical and Statistical Downscaling of Seasonal Temperature Forecasts in Europe: Added Value for User Applications. Climate Services 2018, 9, 44–56. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2017.06.004.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2017.06.004)

Monjo, R.; Pórtoles, J.; Ribalaygia, J. Detection of Inhomogeneities in Daily Data: A Test Based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness-of-Fit Test. 2013. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.5089753.

Montalvo, C.; Reyes-Silva, J. D.; Sañudo, E.; Cea, L.; Puertas, J. Urban Pluvial Flood Modelling in the Absence of Sewer Drainage Network Data: A Physics-Based Approach. Journal of Hydrology 2024, 634, 131043. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2024.131043.

Mühlhofer, E.; Kropf, C. M.; Riedel, L.; Bresch, D. N.; Koks, E. E. OpenStreetMap for Multi-Faceted Climate Risk Assessments. Environ. Res. Commun. 2024, 6 (1), 015005. https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/ad15ab.

t; Becker, N; Gardiner, B; Ulbrich, U; Hanewinkel, M; Benjamin, S. Storm [D](https://doi.org/10.1088/2515-7620/ad15ab)amage beyond Wind<br>
Impacts of Wind Characteristics and Other Meteorological Factors on Tree Fall along [R](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2024.131043)ailway<br>
bruary 23, 2024. https://doi.org/10. Nikulin, G.; Asharaf, S.; Magariño, M. E.; Calmanti, S.; Cardoso, R. M.; Bhend, J.; Fernández, J.; Frías, M. D.; Fröhlich, K.; Früh, B.; García, S. H.; Manzanas, R.; Gutiérrez, J. M.; Hansson, U.; Kolax, M.; Liniger, M. A.; Soares, P. M. M.; Spirig, C.; Tome, R.; Wyser, K. Dynamical and Statistical Downscaling of a Global Seasonal Hindcast in Eastern Africa. Climate Services 2018, 9, 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2017.11.003>.

Papacharalampous, G.; Tyralis, H.; Koutsoyiannis, D. Comparison of Stochastic and Machine Learning Methods for Multi-Step Ahead Forecasting of Hydrological Processes. Stoch Environ Res Risk Assess 2019, 33 (2), 481–514. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-018-1638-6.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00477-018-1638-6)

Paprotny, D.; Kreibich, H.; Morales-Nápoles, O.; Terefenko, P.; Schröter, K. Estimating Exposure of Residential Assets to Natural Hazards in Europe Using Open Data. Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. 2020, 20 (1), 323–343. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-20-323-2020>.





Paulik, R.; Zorn, C.; Wotherspoon, L.; Sturman, J. Modelling National Residential Building Exposure to Flooding Hazards. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 2023, 94, 103826. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jidrr.2023.103826.

Peixoto, J. P. J.; Costa, D. G.; Franca Rocha, W. D. J. S. D.; Portugal, P.; Vasques, F. On the Positioning of Emergencies Detection Units Based on Geospatial Data of Urban Response Centres. Sustainable Cities and Society 2023, 97, 104713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2023.104713>.

Prathom, C.; Champrasert, P. An Exploration of Interpolation - Machine Learning Model for Climate Model Downscaling Under the Limitation of Data Quantity. In 2023 International Technical Conference on Circuits/Systems, Computers, and Communications (ITC-CSCC); IEEE: Jeju, Korea, Republic of, 2023; pp 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/ITC-CSCC58803.2023.10212662.

Rampal, N.; Gibson, P. B.; Sood, A.; Stuart, S.; Fauchereau, N. C.; Brandolino, C.; Noll, B.; Meyers, T. High-Resolution Downscaling with Interpretable Deep Learning: Rainfall Extremes over New Zealand. Weather and Climate Extremes 2022, 38, 100525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2022.100525.

Reichstein, M.; Camps-Valls, G.; Stevens, B.; Jung, M.; Denzler, J.; Carvalhais, N.; Prabhat. Deep Learning and Process Understanding for Data-Driven Earth System Science. Nature 2019, 566 (7743), 195–204. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0912-1.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0912-1)

Ribalaygua, J.; Torres, L.; Pórtoles, J.; Monjo, R.; Gaitán, E.; Pino, M. R. Description and Validation of a Two-Step Analogue/Regression Downscaling Method. Theor Appl Climatol 2013, 114 (1–2), 253–269. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-013-0836-x.](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-013-0836-x)

by mescling Under the Limitation of Data Quantity. In 2023 International Technical Conference<br>
11-6. <u>https://dol.org/10.1109/ITC-CSCCSB803.2023.1021266</u>2; IEEE: Jeju, Korea, Republic of,<br>
11-6. https://dol.org/10.1109/ITC Rosina, K.; Batista E Silva, F.; Vizcaino, P.; Marín Herrera, M.; Freire, S.; Schiavina, M. Increasing the Detail of European Land Use/Cover Data by Combining Heterogeneous Data Sets. International Journal of Digital Earth 2020, 13 (5), 602–626. https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2018.1550119.

Serrano-Notivoli, R.; De Luis, M.; Beguería, S. An R Package for Daily Precipitation Climate Series Reconstruction. Environmental Modelling & Software 2017, 89, 190–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.11.005.

Shmuel, A.; Heifetz, E. Developing Novel Machine-Learning-Based Fire Weather Indices. Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol. 2023, 4 (1), 015029. https://doi.org/10.1088/2632-2153/acc008.

Singh, K.; Jeong, C.; Park, S.; Babur, A. N.; Zeller, E.; Cha, M. Self-Supervised Learning for Climate Downscaling. In 2023 IEEE International Conference on Big Data and Smart Computing (BigComp); IEEE: Jeju, Korea, Republic of, 2023; pp 13–17. [https://doi.org/10.1109/BigComp57234.2023.00012.](https://doi.org/10.1109/BigComp57234.2023.00012)

Spezia, L.; Gibbs, S.; Glendell, M.; Helliwell, R.; Paroli, R.; Pohle, I. Bayesian Analysis of High-Frequency Water Temperature Time Series through Markov Switching Autoregressive Models. Environmental Modelling & Software 2023, 167, 105751. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2023.105751.

Stankiewicz, J.; König, A.; Pickar, K.; Weiss, S. How Certain Is Good Enough? Managing Data Quality and Uncertainty in Ordinal Citizen Science Data Sets for Evidence-Based Policies on Fresh Water. Citizen Science: Theory and Practice 2023, 8 (1), 39. <https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.592>.





Street, R. B.; Nilsson, C. Introduction to the Use of Uncertainties to Inform Adaptation Decisions. In Adapting to an Uncertain Climate; Capela Lourenço, T., Rovisco, A., Groot, A., Nilsson, C., Füssel, H.-M., Van Bree, L., Street, R. B., Eds.; Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2014; pp 1–16. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04876-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-04876-5_1).

Tzoumpas, K.; Estrada, A.; Miraglio, P.; Zambelli, P. A Data Filling Methodology for Time Series Based on CNN and (Bi)LSTM Neural Networks. arXiv 2022. [https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.09994.](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.09994)

Van Der Meer, M.; De Roda Husman, S.; Lhermitte, S. Deep Learning Regional Climate Model Emulators: A Comparison of Two Downscaling Training Frameworks. J Adv Model Earth Sust 2023, 15 (6), e2022MS003593. https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003593.

Van Der Sluijs, J. P.; Craye, M.; Funtowicz, S.; Kloprogge, P.; Ravetz, J.; Risbey, J. Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Measures of Uncertainty in Model–Based Environmental Assessment: The NUSAP System. Risk Analysis 2005, 25 (2), 481–492. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1539-6924.2005.00604.x.

Velasco, M.; Russo, B.; Martínez, M.; Malgrat, P.; Monjo, R.; Djordjevic, S.; Fontanals, I.; Vela, S.; Cardoso, M.A.; Buskute, A., Water 2018 10: 1356-1366. https://doi.org/10.3390/w10101356.

Walker, W. E.; Harremoës, P.; Rotmans, J.; Van Der Sluijs, J. P.; Van Asselt, M. B. A.; Janssen, P.; Krayer Von Krauss, M. P. Defining Uncertainty: A Conceptual Basis for Uncertainty Management in Model-Based Decision Support. Integrated Assessment 2003, 4 (1), 5–17. https://doi.org/10.1076/iaij.4.1.5.16466.

Wang, G.; Garcia, D.; Liu, Y.; De Jeu, R.; Johannes Dolman, A. A Three-Dimensional Gap Filling Method for Large Geophysical Datasets: Application to Global Satellite Soil Moisture Observations. Environmental Modelling & Software 2012, 30, 139–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2011.10.015.

arison of Two Downscaling Training Frameworks. J [A](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2011.10.015)dv Model Earth Syst 2023, 15 (6),<br>
S003593. https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003593.<br>
Sluips, J. P.; Craye, M.; Funtowicz, S.; Kloproge, P.; Ravetz, J.; Risbey, J. Combining Q Welker, C.; Röösli, T.; Bresch, D. N. Comparing an Insurer's Perspective on Building Damages with Modelled Damages from Pan-European Winter Windstorm Event Sets: A Case Study from Zurich, Switzerland. Nat. Hazards Earth Sust. Sci. 2021. 21 (1). 279–299. https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-21-279-2021.

Wilcke, R.A.I. and Bärring, L., 2016: Selecting regional climate scenarios for impact modelling studies. Environmental Modelling & Software 78, 191-201 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.01.002.

Yang, Y.; Javanroodi, K.; Nik, V. M. Climate Change and Energy Performance of European Residential Building Stocks – A Comprehensive Impact Assessment Using Climate Big Data from the Coordinated Regional Climate Downscaling Experiment. Applied Energy 2021, 298, 117246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.117246>.

Zuccaro, G.; De Gregorio, D.; Leone, M. F. Theoretical Model for Cascading Effects Analyses. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction 2018, 30, 199–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.04.019>.





# **Annex A: Main sources of open data repositories for local hazard downscaling and exposure/vulnerabilities classification and analyses**

<b>Hazard /Feature</b>	<b>Relevant Parameters /</b> <b>Indicators</b>	<b>Dataset</b>	<b>Source</b>
<b>Urban Climate</b>	<b>Local Climate Zones</b>	<b>World Urban Database</b>	https://www.wudapt.org /lcz-maps/
	<b>Land Surface Temperature</b>	GoogleEarthEngine	https://earthengine.goo gle.com/
<b>Extreme Events</b>	<b>European Severe Weather</b> <b>Database</b>	<b>ESWD</b>	https://eswd.eu/
Hazard, Exposure, Vulnerability, Losses	<b>Risk Data Library</b>	<b>Global Facility for</b> <b>Disaster Reduction and</b> Recovery (GFDRR) World <b>Bank</b>	https://riskdatalibrary.o rq/ https://www.gfdrr.org/e $\underline{n}$
Land characterization	<b>Digital Surface Model</b>	<b>EU-DEM</b>	https://spacedata.coper nicus.eu/collections/co pernicus-digital-elevatio n-model
	Land cover classification Coastal zones classification Land use Imperviousness	<b>Copernicus Land</b> <b>Monitoring Service</b>	https://land.copernicus. eu/
	High resolution(100m) maps of land cover/use, population, GDP, and fixed assets for 42 countries from 1870 to 2020	HANZE v2.0 exposure model	https://zenodo.org/reco rds/6826536
	A dual database at 1 km resolution that includes an ecosystem classification and a coherent set of land surface parameters (Faroux et. al., 2015)	<b>ECOCLIMAM</b>	https://opensource.umr -cnrm.fr/projects/ecocli map/wiki
Population	Population distribution (regional level) Domestic product (regional) Employment (regional) Labour (regional) Households (regional)	<b>ARDECO</b>	https://urban.jrc.ec.euro pa.eu/ardeco/explorer?l $nq = en$

**Table** *A 1: List of open data repositories.*























# **Annex B: Templates to map data gap filling and uncertainty treatment**



# **Table B 1**: Key input/output of the hazard assessment models - CS NAME.

**Table B 2**: Key input/output of the vulnerability assessment models for the Trials - CS NAME.









# **Table B 3**: Key input/output of the risk/impact assessment models for the Trial - CS NAME.











**Figure 5**: Event tree scenario building tool, adapted from SNOWBALL (Zuccaro et. al., 2018).




## **Annex C: EU Projects**

- 1. [BINGO](http://www.projectbingo.eu/output) Bringing INnovation to onGOing water management A better future under climate change [CORDIS](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/641739/reporting).
- 2. [BRIGAID](https://brigaid.eu/) BRIdging the GAp for Innovations in Disaster Resilience, [CORDIS](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/700699).
- 3. [CLARITY](http://v/) Integrated Climate Adaptation Service Tools for Improving Resilience Measure Efficiency, [CORDIS](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/730355), [GitHub,](https://github.com/clarity-h2020) [Zenodo](https://zenodo.org/communities/clarity?page=1&size=20).
- 4. ClimateAdapt Testing the limits and potential of evolution in response to climate change[,](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/332138) CORDIS.
- 5. ClimateFarmDemo a European-wide network of pilot farmers implementing and demonstrating climate-smart solutions for a carbon-neutral Europe, CORDIS.
- 6. ClimEMPOWER Climate resilience in regional development, CORDIS.
- 7. CRISIS-ADAPT II Climate Risk Information for SupportIng ADAptation Planning and operaTion.
- 8. CRISTAL Project Climate resilient and environmentally sustainable transport infrastructure, with a focus on inland waterways, CORDIS.
- 9. DRIVER+ DRiving InnoVation in crisis management for European Resilience: CORDIS.
- 10. ESPRESSO Enhancing Synergies for disaster PRevention in the EurOpean Union, [CORDIS.](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/700342)
- 11. EU-CIRCLE A panEuropean framework for strengthening Critical Infrastructure resilience to climate change, CORDIS.
- 12. FireLogue Cross-section dialogue for Wildfire Risk Management, CORDIS.
- ClimateAdapt Testing the limits and potential of evolution in response to climate change,<br>COE[D](https://networknature.eu/)IS.<br>
ClimateFarmDemn a European-wide network of pilot farmers implementing and<br>
climateFarmDemn a European-wide network of 13. KNOWING: Framework for defining Climate Mitigation Pathways based on Understanding and Integrated Assessment of Climate Impacts, Adaptation Strategies and Social Transformation, CORDIS.
- 14. MAGICA Maximizing the synergy of European research Governance and Innovation for Climate Action, CORDIS.
- 15. MAIA Mapping and Assessment for Integrated Ecosystem Accounting, CORDIS.
- 16. NetworkNature Advancing nature-based solutions together, CORDIS.
- 17. PLACARD: PLAtform for Climate Adaptation and Risk reDuction, CORDIS.
- 18. RAIN: RAIN will quantify the complex interactions between weather events and land-based infrastructure systems, CORDIS.
- 19. RECONECT Regenarating ECOsystems with Nature-based solutions for hydro-meteorological risk rEduCTion, CORDIS.
- 20. RESCCUE Resilient cities facing climate change, CORDIS.
- 21. [Snowball](http://snowball.meteoromania.ro/) Modelling framework and tools supporting impact assessment from cascading effects, [CORDIS](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/606742).
- 22. [SOCLIMPAC](https://soclimpact.net/)T DownScaling CLImate ImPACTs and decarbonization pathways in EU islands, and enhancing socioeconomic and non-market evaluation of Climate Change for Europe, for 2050 and Beyond, [CORDIS.](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/776661)
- 23. [weADAPT](https://weadapt.org/) a dynamic, collaborative space for knowledge exchange on climate change adaptation issues.





# **Annex D: Data Management Statement**

### **Table D 1:** Data used in preparation of ICARIA Deliverable 1.3.



### **Table D 2**:. Data produced in preparation of ICARIA Deliverable 1.3.









This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 101093806. The publication reflects only the authors' views and the European Union is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.