METEOR: Draft Protocols on Hazard and Exposure Modelling Report Number: M6.3/P 30 November 2020



UK SPACE AGENCY

Authors:

A.Winson and K. Mee

Contributors:

C. Jordan







Document Verification

| Project | METEOR: Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines |
|-------------------|--|
| Report Title | Draft Protocols on Hazard and Exposure Modelling. |
| Related Milestone | M6.3 |
| Reference as | Winson, A. & Mee, K. (2020) METEOR: Draft Protocols on Hazard and Exposure Modelling. Report M6.3/P |
| Release Type | Public-/ Confidential / Confidential with Embargo Period |

| Prepared by: Contributors | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|--|
| Name(s): | Signature(s): | Date(s): | | |
| Annie Winson | | 30 November 2020 | | |
| Katy Mee | | | | |
| Approved by: Project Manager | | | | |
| Name: | Signature: | Date: | | |
| Kay Smith | | 14 December 2020 | | |
| | | | | |
| Approved by: UKSA IPP Project Officer | | | | |
| Name: | Signature: | Date: | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Date | Version | Alterations | Editor |
|------|---------|-------------|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |





Abbreviations

| Acronym | Description | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|
| BGS | British Geological Survey: An organisation providing expert advice in all areas of geoscience to the UK government and internationally | | | |
| DEM | Digital elevation model | | | |
| DMD | Disaster Management Department: Prime Minister's Office of Tanzania focused on disaster risk | | | |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction | | | |
| DRM | Disaster Risk Management | | | |
| EO | Earth Observation | | | |
| FATHOM | Provides innovative flood modelling and analytics, based on extensive flood risk research | | | |
| GCRF | Global Challenges Research Fund | | | |
| GEM | Global Earthquake Model: Non-profit organisation focused on the pursuit of earthquake resilience worldwide | | | |
| GIS | Geographic Information System | | | |
| нот | Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team: A global non-profit organisation the uses collaborative technology to create OSM maps for areas affected by disasters | | | |
| ImageCat | International risk management innovation company supporting the global risk and catastrophe management needs of the insurance industry, governments and NGOs | | | |
| IPP | International Partnership Programme | | | |
| METEOR | Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines | | | |
| NSET | National Society for Earthquake Technology: Non-governmental organisation working on reducing earthquake risk in Nepal and abroad | | | |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance | | | |





| Acronym | Description | | |
|---------|---|--|--|
| ОРМ | Oxford Policy Management: Organisation focused on sustainable project design and implementation for reducing social and economic disadvantage in low-income countries | | |
| OSM | OpenStreetMap | | |
| PDC | Pyroclastic density currents | | |
| PGA | Peak ground acceleration | | |
| SFDRR | Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction | | |
| UKSA | United Kingdom Space Agency | | |
| VEI | Volcanic explosivity index | | |
| WP | Work Package | | |





Contents

| DOCUME | | ERIFICATIONI | |
|---------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| ABBREVI | | NSII | |
| 1. MET | TEOR | PROJECT INTRODUCTION1 | |
| 1.1. | Proj | JECT SUMMARY | |
| 1.2. | Proj | JECT OVERVIEW1 | |
| 1.3. | Proj | JECT OBJECTIVES | |
| 1.4. | WOF | RK PACKAGES | |
| 1.5. | Mul | LTIPLE HAZARD IMPACT | |
| 2. MO | DELLI | ING APPROACHES4 | |
| 2.1. | Нув | rid multi-hazard model (METEOR model)5 | |
| 2.2. | Mot | DELLING MULTI-HAZARDS | |
| 2.3. | Haz | ARDS | |
| 2.3. | 1. | Earthquake | |
| 2.3. | 2. | Flood (Fluvial and Pluvial)13 | |
| 2.3. | 3. | Landslide14 | |
| 2.3. | 4. | Volcanic (Ash, Pf, Lahar)15 | |
| 2.4. | Ехро | OSURE | |
| 3. RES | ULTS | | |
| 4. FUR | RTHER | WORK – WORK PACKAGE 6 | |
| 4.1. | Sens | SITIVITY ANALYSIS | |
| 4.2. | 4.2. VALIDATION OF WEIGHTING VALUES27 | | |
| REFEREN | CES | | |
| ANNEX A | : NEP | PAL ARCGIS METHODOLOGY AND METADATA | |
| ANNEX B | : TAN | NZANIA ARCGIS METHODOLOGY AND METADATA | |





Figures

| Figure 1: Seismic hazard and vulnerability following the VI method by Kappes et al., 20125 |
|--|
| Figure 2: Integrated Risk Map following the Greiving (2006) methodology. Red square highlights risk in Dar es Salaam and Dodoma |
| Figure 3: Proposed model framework for the METEOR multi-hazard and exposure methodology7 |
| Figure 4: Schematic demonstrating the stages of the hazard component of the METEOR model. By the end of this process a 'relative' flood vulnerability map can be created |
| Figure 5: Schematic demonstrating combination of hazard vulnerability maps to produce multi-hazard risk map for Nepal9 |
| Figure 6: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a seismic hazard index for Nepal and Tanzania |
| Figure 7: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a flood hazard index for Nepal and Tanzania |
| Figure 8: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a landslide hazard index for Nepal |
| Figure 9: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a tephra fall index for Tanzania |
| Figure 10: Model builder tool identifying volcanic flow basins16 |
| Figure 11: Schematic of model builder tools developed to generate index for PDC and Lahar hazard in Tanzania |
| Figure 12: National multi-hazard and exposure map for Nepal. Inset box shows detail in Kathmandu. 23 |
| Figure 13: National multi-hazard and exposure map for Tanzania24 |
| Figure 14: Weighted multi-hazard and exposure maps for Dodoma (left) and Dar es Salaam (right). 26 |





Tables

| Table 1: METEOR Project Summary | 1 |
|---|----------|
| Table 2: Overview of METEOR Work Packages | 3 |
| Table 3: Overview of BGS multi-hazard impact deliverables | .3 |
| Table 4: Summary of different hazard data type, format and resolution for Nepal and Tanzania | 12 |
| Table 5: Weights applied to Nepalese exposure data. These weights are calculated by considering: t type of building materials, how many floors the building has and the type of hazard | he 18 |

Equations

| Equation 1: | Relative earthquake vulnerability map - Nepal | 19 |
|-------------|--|----|
| Equation 2: | Relative flood vulnerability map - Nepal | 19 |
| Equation 3: | Relative landslide vulnerability map - Nepal | 19 |
| Equation 4: | Relative earthquake vulnerability map - Tanzania | 21 |
| Equation 5: | Relative flood vulnerability map - Tanzania | 21 |
| Equation 6: | Relative volcanic vulnerability map - Tanzania | 21 |





1. METEOR Project Introduction

1.1. Project Summary

| Project Title | Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines (METEOR): EO-based Exposure, Nepal and Tanzania | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Starting Date | 08/02/2018 | | | | | |
| Duration | 36 months | | | | | |
| Partners | UK Partners: The British Geological Survey (BGS) (Lead), Oxford Policy Management Limited (OPM), SSBN Limited International Partners: The Disaster Management Department, Office of the Prime Minister – Tanzania (DMD), The Global Earthquake Model (GEM) Foundation, The Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT), ImageCat, National Society for Earthquake Technology (NSET) – Nepal | | | | | |
| Target Countries | Nepal and Tanzania for "level 2" results and all 47 Least Developed ODA countries for "level 1" data | | | | | |
| IPP Project | IPPC2_07_BGS_METEOR | | | | | |

Table 1: METEOR Project Summary

1.2. Project Overview

At present, there is a poor understanding of population exposure in some Official Development Assistance (ODA) countries, which causes major challenges when making Disaster Risk Management decisions. Modelling Exposure Through Earth Observation Routines (METEOR) takes a step-change in the application of Earth Observation exposure data by developing and delivering more accurate levels of population exposure to natural hazards. METEOR is delivering calibrated exposure data for Nepal and Tanzania, plus 'Level-1' exposure for the remaining Least developed Countries (LDCs) ODA countries. Moreover, we are: (i) developing and delivering national hazard footprints for Nepal and Tanzania; (ii) producing new vulnerability data for the impacts of hazards on exposure; and (iii) characterising how multi-hazards interact and impact upon exposure. The provision of METEOR's consistent data to governments, town planners and insurance providers will promote welfare and economic development and better enable them to respond to the hazards when they do occur.

METEOR is co-funded through the second iteration of the UK Space Agency's (UKSA) International Partnership Programme (IPP), which uses space expertise to develop and deliver innovative solutions to real world problems across the globe. The funding helps to build sustainable development while building effective partnerships that can lead to growth opportunities for British companies.





1.3. Project Objectives

METEOR aims to formulate an innovative methodology of creating exposure data through the use of EO-based imagery to identify development patterns throughout a country. Stratified sampling techniques harnessing traditional land use interpretation methods, modified to characterise building patterns, can be combined with EO and in-field building characteristics to capture the distribution of building types. The associated protocols and standards will be developed for broad application to ODA countries and will be tested and validated for both Nepal and Tanzania to assure they are fit-for-purpose.

Detailed building data collected on the ground for the cities of Kathmandu (Nepal) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) were used to compare and validate the EO generated exposure datasets. Objectives of the project look to: deliver exposure data for 47 of the least developed ODA countries, including Nepal and Tanzania; create hazard footprints for the specific countries; create open protocol; to develop critical exposure information from EO data; and capacity-building of local decision makers to apply data and assess hazard exposure. The eight work packages (WP) that make up the METEOR project are outlined below in section 1.4.

1.4. Work Packages

Outlined below are the eight work packages that make up the METEOR project (Table 2). These are led by various partners, with a brief description of what each of the work packages cover provided in Table 2. BGS is leading WP.6: Multiple Hazard impact, which focuses on the multiple hazard impacts on exposure and how they may be addressed in disaster risk management by a range of stakeholders.

| Work Package | Title | Lead | Overview |
|-----------------|--|----------|--|
| WP.1 | Project Management | BGS | Project management, meetings with UKSA, quarterly reporting and the provision of feedback on project deliverables and direction across primary stakeholders. |
| WP.2 | Monitoring and Evaluation | OPM | Monitoring and evaluation of the project and its impact, using a theory of change approach to assess whether the associated activities are leading to the desired outcome. |
| WP.3 | EO Data for Exposure Development | ImageCat | EO-based data for exposure development, methods and protocols of segmenting/classifying building patterns for stratified sampling of building characteristics. |
| WP.4 | Inputs and Validation | НОТ | Collect exposure data in Kathmandu and Dar es Salaam to help validate and calibrate the data derived from the |





| | | | classification of building patterns from EO-based imagery. |
|------|---|----------|---|
| WP.5 | Vulnerability and Uncertainty | GEM | Investigate how assumptions, limitations, scale and accuracy of exposure data, as well as decisions in data development process lead to modelled uncertainty. |
| WP.6 | Multiple Hazard Impact | BGS | Multiple hazard impacts on exposure and how they may be addressed in disaster risk management by a range of stakeholders. |
| WP.7 | Knowledge Sharing | GEM | Disseminate to the wider space and development sectors through dedicated web-portals and use of the Challenge Fund open databases. |
| WP.8 | Sustainability and Capacity-Building | ImageCat | Sustainability and capacity-building, with the launch of the databases for Nepal and Tanzania while working with in- country experts. |

Table 2: Overview of METEOR Work Packages

1.5. Multiple Hazard Impact

The multiple hazard impact work package (WP6) led by BGS includes four deliverables, which are focused on developing footprints of the hazards that have been designated as of most importance to our partner countries of Nepal (flooding, earthquake and landslide) and Tanzania (flooding, earthquake and volcanic activity) and modelling their potential impacts on exposure (Table 3).

The national scale hazard footprints were delivered in METEOR Report M6.1 (Winson et al., 2019).

| Deliverable | Title |
|-------------|---|
| M6.1 | Deliver national hazard footprints for Nepal and Tanzania |
| M6.2 | Develop models for analysing multi-hazards with exposure |
| M6.3 | Draft protocols on hazard and exposure modelling |
| M6.4 | Final report on multiple hazard impact |

Table 3: Overview of BGS multi-hazard impact deliverables





2. Modelling Approaches

The importance of multi-hazards has been long recognised, with statements about their importance appearing in both the 1992 UNEP technical report and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (SFDRR). Whilst it is accepted that there is a need for multi-hazard research that is coupled with both exposure and vulnerability, this is a complex problem to address. In practice, multi-hazard assessments are complicated by factors such as: hazard processes, variations in characteristics and methods of recording them, how they relate to each other, whether they can be cumulative or cascade and how different hazards impact elements at risk differently (and occasionally in opposing ways). Most crucially perhaps, to quantify some degree of multi-hazard risk it is necessary to develop techniques to compare various kinds of hazard data. These data are likely to vary in resolution both spatially and temporally, not only between the different hazards but also in some cases for a single hazard. For example, if the baseline of the data sets are long enough that there has been significant improvement in the methods of data collection then they may no longer be internally consistent. As a consequence, other authors have developed various contrasting approaches for modelling multi-hazards. These can be broadly described as 'qualitative', 'quantitative' and 'semi-quantitative'.

In order to create a robust model for analysing multi-hazards we reviewed c.20 different types of model. We tested some of these methods and determined that a semi-quantitative approach would be the most appropriate method for integrating these data. A brief outline of these tests can be seen in Section 2.1, with full details available in Winson & Jordan (2020). Previous multi-hazard work was predominantly focused on either small areas such as towns / catchments, at building scale resolution (e.g. Papathoma *et al.*, 2003; Bell & Glade, 2004; Kappes *et al.*, 2012 and others) or else regional to national scale assessments with county or national resolution (e.g. Grieving, 2006; Bartel & Muller, 2007; El Morjani *et al.*, 2007; Carpignano *et al.*, 2009). The aim of the multi-hazard modelling for the METEOR project is to create a nationally consistent approach to integrating hazard, exposure and vulnerability data at a resolution of c.90m (a similar resolution to studies by others focusing on the city / catchment scale assessments). This makes the approach developed for the METEOR project both novel and a significant step forward in modelling multi-hazards for the purpose of national scale policy making, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) planning and pre-positioning.





2.1. Hybrid multi-hazard model (METEOR model)

In METEOR Report M6.2 'Methods for analysing multi-hazards with exposure' (Winson & Jordan, 2020) we reviewed existing multi-hazard modelling approaches and tested several of them using the draft hazard and exposure data that the METEOR project had generated for Tanzania. Outputs of these tests can be seen in Figure 1 and Figure 2.



Figure 1: Seismic hazard and vulnerability following the VI method by Kappes et al., 2012.







Figure 2: Integrated Risk Map following the Greiving (2006) methodology. Red square highlights risk in Dar es Salaam and Dodoma.

Whilst the products from both are useful in their own ways, we found that the spatial resolution of the final outputs from the Greiving model were too coarse for our purposes. Comparatively the Kappes method allowed us to retain the spatial resolution of the input data, but it produced a collection of separate hazard outputs, rather than an integrated multi-hazard product. As a consequence of this review, we proposed a model that incorporated components of both of these approaches and created a hybrid version, which retained the full resolution at a pixel scale and generated a single multi-hazard output. The framework of this model can be seen in Figure 4.



Figure 3: Proposed model framework for the METEOR multi-hazard and exposure methodology

In this report we present the protocols that we have developed to apply the METEOR to the Level 3 exposure data and the national hazard footprints for Nepal and Tanzania produced by the METEOR project.





2.2. Modelling multi-hazards

As discussed in M6.2 (Winson & Jordan, 2020), each single hazard addressed in the METEOR project has a different standardised unit of measurement for magnitude, which can create complexity when combining these data to generate a multi-hazard product. To account for this, we have created a semi-quantitative (or index-based) approach that allows for the continuous standardisation of differing and therefore not directly comparable factors (based on approaches from Kappes et al., 2012 and Greiving, 2006 as tested in M6.2). In this approach we have developed indices that are weighted to reflect the more likely impact of the hazard or a buildings vulnerability to the hazard.



Figure 4: Schematic demonstrating the stages of the hazard component of the METEOR model. By the end of this process a 'relative' flood vulnerability map can be created.

The initial step in this model is to prepare a 'relative' hazard vulnerability map. For the purposes of this example, the steps necessary to produce a relative flood vulnerability map are shown (Figure 4). This process is broadly the same for each hazard.





Relative flood vulnerability mapping steps:

- 1) Each data point from the hazard assessment is normalised and then converted to a flood index value.
- 2) The Flood Index value per pixel is multiplied by the sum of the weighted percentage of each building type in that pixel (as a function of the total number of buildings per pixel). (Fluvial Flood Index * ((%Bld1 * BldW1) + (%Bld2* BldW2) + (%Bld3* BldW3) +.....))
- 3) If there is more than one output for a specific hazard (i.e. fluvial and pluvial flooding), these outputs are then weighted either through expert elicitation or, if necessary to reflect a frequency analysis of the hazard events and combined to produce a relative vulnerability map for that hazard, in this case flood.



Figure 5: Schematic demonstrating combination of hazard vulnerability maps to produce multi-hazard risk map for Nepal.

Once the individual hazard vulnerability maps have been produced they can be weighted independently, combined and normalised (i.e. values are set to between 0 and 1) to create a national scale multi-hazard 'risk' map.

The methodology for the treatment of the hazard and exposure data is described further in sections 3 and 4.





2.3. Hazards

In this study every effort was made to produce the hazard assessment using a single DEM dataset with fixed grid resolution projection and origin point of the other input data. Due to the variable nature of the input data this was not always possible. In some cases it was necessary to re-project or resample data to ensure that when the layers were combined they matched exactly. The variations in this input data (Table 4) are predominantly due to cell size and spatial projection. It is likely that anyone re-producing this study for other locations will also need to align varying datasets, and so it is perhaps fortuitous that we have encountered this issue during the development of this methodology and have been able to demonstrate that incorporating data from different providers is indeed possible.





| Country | Layer | Return Period | Туре | Format | Native Spatial Reference | Units | Cell Size | Data Type |
|----------|---|---|--------|---------|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Nepal | Flooding: Pluvial | 1 in 100 years | Raster | GeoTIFF | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | 0.00083333333, 0.00083333333 | 32 Bit Floating Point |
| | Flooding: Fluvial Defended | 1 in 100 years | Raster | GeoTIFF | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | 0.00083333333, 0.00083333333 | 32 Bit Floating Point |
| | Flooding: Fluvial Undefended | 1 in 100 years | Raster | GeoTIFF | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | 0.00083333333, 0.00083333333 | 32 Bit Floating Point |
| | Seismic: PGA 0.1 | 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years | ASCII | CSV | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | n/a | n/a |
| | Landslide: Rainfall Triggered Hazard | n/a | Raster | FGDBR | Projected: WGS84 UTM Zone 45N | Meters | 90 x 90 | 64-bit Double |
| | Landslide: Seismic Triggered Hazard | n/a | Raster | FGDBR | Projected: WGS84 UTM Zone 45N | Meters | 90 x 90 | 64-bit Double |
| Tanzania | Flooding: Pluvial | 1 in 100 years | Raster | GeoTIFF | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | 0.00083333333, 0.00083333333 | 32 Bit Floating Point |
| | Flooding: Fluvial Defended | 1 in 100 years | Raster | GeoTIFF | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | 0.00083333333, 0.00083333333 | 32 Bit Floating Point |
| | Flooding: Fluvial Undefended | 1 in 100 years | Raster | GeoTIFF | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | 0.00083333333, 0.00083333333 | 32 Bit Floating Point |





| Seismic: PGA 0.01 | 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years | Vector | Shapefile: point | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | n/a | n/a |
|---|---|--------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----|-----|
| Seismic: PGA 0.01 | 10% probabilityof exceedance in50 years | ASCII | CSV | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | n/a | n/a |
| Volcanic: Ash fall VEI2 @ 1km ² , 10km ² , 100km ² | n/a | Vector | Shapefile: point | Projected: WGS84 UTM Zone 36S | Metres | n/a | n/a |
| Volcanic: Ash fall VEI4 @ 1km ² , 10km ² , 100km ² | n/a | Vector | Shapefile: point | Projected: WGS84 UTM Zone 36S | Metres | n/a | n/a |
| Volcanic: PDC Basins | n/a | Vector | Shapefile: polygon | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | n/a | n/a |
| Volcanic: Lahar Basins | n/a | Vector | Shapefile: polygon | Geographic: WGS84 | Decimal Degree | n/a | n/a |

Table 4: Summary of different hazard data type, format and resolution for Nepal and Tanzania.





All modelling was undertaken in ArcGIS 10.3, which proved computationally intensive due to the size of the data sets (~3.5 million data points in Tanzania and ~1.5 million for Nepal). Where appropriate, models were built using the ArcGIS Model Builder tool allowing for a series of processes to be run at one time and to allow for data to be easily re-run if updated / for the different countries. The models are described below.

2.3.1. Earthquake

The seismic hazard assessment data produced by the Global Earthquake Model (GEM) was presented as a peak ground acceleration of 10% (PGA 0.1) or 2% (PGA 0.02) probability of exceedance in 50 years. For the purposes of developing this multi-hazard model, we used the PGA 0.1 layer. The model builder framework from ArcGIS can be seen in Figure 6. The first step in this model was to conduct a nearest neighbour interpolation, to convert the seismic data from point to raster data, so that it would be possible to incorporate it with the other hazard and exposure data later in the multi-hazard modelling process. After this interpolation was completed these data were normalised and reclassified to generate a seismic hazard index where: Low = 0 - 0.33, Medium = >0.33 - 0.66, High = >0.66 - 1.



Figure 6: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a seismic hazard index for Nepal and Tanzania.

2.3.2. Flood (Fluvial and Pluvial)

The data generated by FATHOM for the flood hazard assessment shows the modelled depth for flood events of different return periods i.e. 1 in 5 yrs – 1 in 1000yrs, with depths shown in meters. More detail on the 48 footprints and their return periods can be found in METEOR report M6.1 (Winson *et al.*2019). These return period simulations were prepared for fluvial and pluvial flooding. The fluvial models were generated to demonstrate the flooding potential of an event where all existing flood defences were effective (flood defended) and assuming that they all failed (flood undefended). Further details on this approach and its outputs can be found in M6.1 and in Sampson et al. (2015), Smith et al. (2015), Yamazaki et al. (2017) and Yamazaki et al. (2019).





For the purposes of developing the multi-hazard model we selected one each of the fluvial and pluvial outputs. After discussion we decided that the best layer to choose for this methodology testing would be the 1 in 100 year layer. This is because this return period is most commonly requested by decision makers. We also selected the flood undefended layer, as we felt that this would represent a worst-case scenario.

To begin, the flood hazard data was converted to an index so that it would be possible in later stages to compare flood data with that of other hazards. A representation of this model can be seen in Figure 7. The process first removed values associated with persistent water bodies, before the data layers were normalised. After this we assigned values as Low (0m), Medium (>0-0.5m) and High (>0.5m) reclassified as an index value between 1 (no data) and 4 (high).



Figure 7: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a flood hazard index for Nepal and Tanzania.

2.3.3. Landslide

The landslide susceptibility assessments prepared in M6.1 by the BGS landslide team (Winson et al., 2019) were modified to include a landslide trigger, of either of rainfall or earthquake. The subsequent landslide hazard maps were used in this model. Each of these layers was normalised, then reclassified to generate a landslide hazard index where: Low = 0 - 0.33, Medium = >0.33 - 0.66, High = >0.66 - 1.



Figure 8: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a landslide hazard index for Nepal.





2.3.4. Volcanic (Ash, Pyroclastic Density Currents, Lahar)

The primary volcanic hazards considered in the METEOR project are tephra fall (ash), pyroclastic density currents (PDCs) and lahars. Due to the sparsity of eruption history data available for Tanzania, it was not possible to produce tephra fall hazards for all of the volcanoes or to fully model the impact of PDC and lahars on the terrain surrounding the Tanzanian volcanoes. As a consequence of this, we have performed a tephra fall assessment for Rungwe (which has the most complete history) and a drainage basin analysis (after Aspinall et al., 2011) for all of the active volcanoes to assess potential PDC and lahar extent. More information about the approaches used by the BGS volcano group to generate this hazard assessment can be found in METEOR reports M6.1 and M6.2.

The model approach for incorporating the volcanic tephra data can be seen in Figure 9. Initially the tephra data were reclassified so that anything under 100kg/m^2 contour was given a value of 'High' (i.e. any point that fell between the 1kg/m^2 and the 100kg/m^2 contours), anything under the 1kg/m^2 contour was given a value of 'Medium' and everything else was valued as 'Low'.



Figure 9: Schematic of the model builder tool developed to generate a tephra fall index for Tanzania.

To assess the possible hazard from PDCs and lahars we performed a drainage basin analysis which identifies regions of the DEM that are potential inundation zones for these hazards. To generate an index the model needs to identify whether a pixel falls within a PDC or lahar basin (Figure 10). If the pixel is within a PDC basin that is 0 - 15km from the summit of the volcano then it is assigned a 'High' hazard value (index value 4), if it is within a PDC basin that is 15 - 30km from the summit of the volcano then it is assigned a value of 'Medium' hazard (3). If a pixel does not fall within a PDC basin but does fall within 50km of the summit then a 'Low' (2) value is assigned. The reasoning behind these values is that, whilst PDCs can travel more than 15km from the summit of a volcano, these are generally lower frequency events than PDCs that travel shorter distances. If a pixel does not fall within a PDC basin, but does fall within a lahar basin that is 0 - 50km of the summit then it is assigned a 'High' (4) value. The 'Medium' (3) hazard pixels fall in a lahar basin 50 - 100km from the summit. If a pixel does not fall within the lahar basin but does fall within 200km of the summit it is assigned a low (2) value. Figure 11 shows how these data for PDCs and lahars are populated to their own union layers with the correct hazard descriptions and scores.



Figure 10: Model builder tool identifying volcanic flow basins.



Figure 11: Schematic of model builder tools developed to generate index for PDC and Lahar hazard in Tanzania.





2.4. Exposure

The exposure data for the METEOR project has been produced by ImageCat and the Humanitarian OpenStreetMap Team (HOT) as part of WP3 and WP4 respectively. The details of these data acquisition methods have been described in METEOR deliverables: M3.1C: Classification of General Building Exposure Data; M3.2: Exposure Data Classification, Metadata Population and Confidence Assessment; M4.1: importing existing data into OSM; M4.2: METEOR EO Mapping of Exposure; and M4.3: Protocols for Crowd Sourcing Regional Exposure Data.

Very simply, the exposure data provided uses open source, freely available satellite data as a primary input. These data are then augmented with ground-based surveys of a sub-sample of buildings – conducted by Kathmandu Living Labs (Nepal) and Ramani Huria (Tanzania) for HOT.

These data show the total building count, the total building area and the total replacement cost value of the buildings per point. In this model the information from the total building counts has been used. For each pixel the number of different types of buildings was calculated as a percentage of the total number of buildings within that point. The way that a building responds to a specific hazard will be different, contingent on many factors. Weighting factors were defined in the model to account for this variation.

In many cases the approaches to model (multi) hazard with exposure have been developed for subnational level at high resolution (for example studies by: Bell & Glade, 2004; Kappes *et al.*, 2012; Papathoma *et al.*, 2003; Papathoma-Köhle *et al.*, 2007). Within METEOR, the inputs of the multihazard model are projected to a resolution of approximately 90m (or in some cases 3 arc seconds), it is therefore important to select building characteristics that can be identified at this scale and that are relevant for the hazards addressed in this study. The characteristics selected for this study were: building materials and number of floors. The ways in which these characteristics affect the vulnerability of a building will be specific to the hazard that they are subjected to, and so these must be weighted differently. For the purposes of this demonstration of the proposed methodology these weights have been taken, where possible, from existing literature or else derived by informal expert elicitation and review of the pertinent vulnerability curves (e.g. Auker et al., 2013; Blong et al., 2017; Kappes et al., 2012; Neri et al., 2000; Petrazzuoli & Zuccaro., 2004; Siebert et al., 2011; Silva & Pereira, 2014). The weights applied to the Nepal exposure data are shown in Table 5, for Tanzania see Table 6.





| | | | Landslide - | Landslide - | |
|--|---------|---------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Nepal | Pluvial | Fluvial | Rain | Eq | Earthquake |
| Hazard Weight | 0.165 | 0.165 | 0.165 | 0.165 | 0.33 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 - Reinforced concrete | | | | | |
| moment frame (1-3 stories) | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.12 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 - Reinforced concrete | | | | | |
| moment frame (4-7 stories) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.15 | 0.32 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 - Reinforced | | | | | |
| concrete moment frame (8-20 stories) | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.16 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 - Non-ductile | | | | | |
| reinforced concrete infilled frame (1-3 | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.18 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 - Non-ductile | | | | | |
| reinforced concrete infilled frame (4-7 | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.35 | 0.48 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 - Non-ductile | | | | | |
| reinforced concrete infilled frame (8-20 | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.24 |
| S - Steel | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 - Unreinforced | | | | | |
| concrete block masonry (1-3 stories) | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.09 |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7- Unreinforced | | | | | |
| concrete block masonry (4-7 stories) | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.24 |
| W - Wood | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.09 |
| MATO/LN - Informal constructions | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 - Unreinforced | | | | | |
| adobe masonry (1-3 stories) | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| MUR+CL99 - Unreinforced fired clay | | | | | |
| masonry | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| MUR+STRUB - Unreinforced rubble | | | | | |
| stone masonry | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| W+WWD - Wattle and Daub (Walls with | | | | | |
| bamboo/light timber log/reed mesh and | | | | | |
| post). | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |

Table 5: Weights applied to Nepalese exposure data. These weights are calculated by considering: the type of building materials, how many floors the building has and the type of hazard.

As noted in Figure 4 the hazard index value per pixel is multiplied by the sum of the weighted percentage of each building type in that pixel to account for the differences in exposure and therefore vulnerability in each pixel. The equations to create each hazard vulnerability map output for the Nepalese data using the weights from Table 5 are shown in *Equation 1 - Equation 3*. The building codes in these equations are described in Table 5.





Equation 1: Relative earthquake vulnerability map - Nepal

Earthquake: ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.16) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.18) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.48) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.24) + (%S*0.2) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.24) + (%W*0.09) + (%MATO/LN * 0.3) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.3) + (%MUR+CL99*0.3) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.3) + (%W+WWD * 0.3))

Equation 2: Relative flood vulnerability map - Nepal

Fluvial: 0.5* ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.56) + (%MUR+CL99*0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.56) + (%W+WWD * 0.56))

+

Pluvial: 0.5*((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%MUR+CL99*0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.56) + (%W+WWD * 0.56))

Equation 3: Relative landslide vulnerability map - Nepal

Landslide - Rainfall: 0.5* ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.1) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.06) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.6) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.3) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.18) + (%S*0.3) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.2) + (%W*0.3) + (%MATO/LN * 0.6) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.6) + (%MUR+CL99*0.6) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.6) + (%W+WWD * 0.6))

+

Landslide - Eq: 0.5*((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.3) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 * 0.15) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.09) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.7) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.35) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.21) + (%S*0.3) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.5) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.3) + (%MATO/LN * 0.7) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.7) + (%MUR+CL99*0.7) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.7) + (%W+WWD * 0.7))





| Tanzania | Pluvial | Fluvial | Tephra | Lahar | Pyroclastic | Earthquake |
|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------------|------------|
| Hazard Weight | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.0525 | 0.0675 | 0.35 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 - Reinforced | | | | | | |
| concrete moment frame (1-3 | | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.3 | 0.06 | 0.56 | 0.12 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 - Reinforced | | | | | | |
| concrete moment frame (4-7 | | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.63 | 0.32 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 - Reinforced | | | | | | |
| concrete moment frame (8-20 | | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.7 | 0.16 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 - Non- | | | | | | |
| ductile reinforced concrete infilled | | | | | | |
| frame (1-3 stories) | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.64 | 0.18 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 - Non- | | | | | | |
| ductile reinforced concrete infilled | | | | | | |
| frame (4-7 stories) | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.72 | 0.48 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 - Non- | | | | | | |
| ductile reinforced concrete infilled | | | | | | |
| frame (8-20 stories) | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.8 | 0.24 |
| S - Steel | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 - | | | | | | |
| Unreinforced concrete block | | | | | | |
| masonry (1-3 stories) | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.72 | 0.09 |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7- | | | | | | |
| Unreinforced concrete block | | | | | | |
| masonry (4-7 stories) | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.81 | 0.24 |
| W - Wood | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.09 |
| MATO/LN - Informal constructions | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 - | | | | | | |
| Unreinforced adobe masonry (1-3 | | | | | | |
| stories) | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| MUR+CL99 - Unreinforced fired | | | | | | |
| clay masonry | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| MUR+STRUB - Unreinforced | | | | | | |
| rubble stone masonry | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| W+WWD - Wattle and Daub (Walls | | | | | | |
| with bamboo/light timber | | | | | | |
| log/reed mesh and post). | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |

Table 6: Weights applied to Tanzanian exposure data. These weights are calculated by considering: the type of building material, how many floors the building has and the type of hazard.





The equations to create each hazard vulnerability map output for Tanzania using the weights from Table 6 are shown in *Equation 4- Equation 6*. The building codes in these equations are described in Table 6.

Equation 4: Relative earthquake vulnerability map - Tanzania

((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.16) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.18) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.48) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.24) + (%S*0.2) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.24) + (%W*0.09) + (%MATO/LN * 0.3) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.3) + (%MUR+CL99*0.3) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.3) + (%W+WWD * 0.3))

Equation 5: Relative flood vulnerability map - Tanzania

Fluvial: 0.5* ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.56) + (%MUR+CL99*0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.56) + (%W+WWD * 0.56))

+

Pluvial: 0.5*((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%MUR+CL99*0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.56) + (%W+WWD * 0.56))

Equation 6: Relative volcanic vulnerability map - Tanzania

Tephra: 0.2 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.3) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.15) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.09) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.2) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.5) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.2) + (%MATO/LN * 0.6) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.6) + (%MUR+CL99*0.6) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.6) + (%W+WWD * 0.6))

+

Lahar: 0.35 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.06) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.1) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.06) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.6) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.3) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.18) + (%S*0.3) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.2) + (%W*1) + (%MATO/LN * 1) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *1) + (%MUR+CL99*1) + (%MUR+STRUB * 1) + (%W+WWD * 1))

+





Pf: 0.45 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.63) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.7) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.64) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.72) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.8) + (%S*0.9) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.72) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.81) + (%W*0.08) + (%MATO/LN * 0.8) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.8) + (%MUR+CL99*0.8) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.8) + (%W+WWD * 0.8))

3. Results

The aim of the work detailed in this report was to: test the METEOR multi-hazard methodology proposed in M6.2 (Winson *et al.*, 2020) using the national hazard and exposure data sets for both Nepal and Tanzania, to evaluate if it is computationally possible to run a model such as this at a resolution of c.90m and to analyse the model results to ensure that they are consistent. The very large data sets associated with both the hazard and exposure data have made working with these data challenging. This coupled with the restrictions imposed due to remote working in light of the COVID-19 pandemic has meant that preparing and running these models has taken considerably longer than expected. The process of developing ArcGIS model builder tools also took longer than expected, this was due to an under-estimation of the required time scales when handling a data set this large, as well as the time added by conducting these processes remotely. However, it is beneficial that now that the model builder tools have been created it will be possible to use them to re-run portions of this model (if necessary) or indeed to model data from other locations more rapidly. As a consequence of these limitations, the analysis of these outputs and their sensitivity will come later and will be reported in detail in METEOR report M6.4.

Example data results are shown for both Nepal (Figure 12) and Tanzania (Figure 13 and Figure 14). These maps have been created from the normalised vulnerability score for multi-hazards data. However, this is just a small component of the data that has been created in the modelling process. Appendix A and Appendix B show the full metadata available from the modelling of the Nepalese and Tanzanian data, respectively. These products could be analysed in a variety of ways in the future, some of which we are proposing in Section 4 of this report, to be detailed in deliverable M6.4. The full data sets have been delivered in in ESRI ArcGIS format alongside this report.







Figure 12: National multi-hazard and exposure map for Nepal. Inset box shows detail in Kathmandu.







Figure 13: National multi-hazard and exposure map for Tanzania.















Figure 14: Weighted multi-hazard and exposure maps for Dodoma (left) and Dar es Salaam (right).





4. Further Work – Work Package 6

In creating this model we aimed to develop a pragmatic approach to integrate data sets that differ widely from each other. Combining data, however, that has been generated by different processes, incorporates uncertainty into the model. As these data by their nature, are often incomplete this can mean that the uncertainty of the product is difficult to quantify. There can be several sources of uncertainty: we assume that when the hazard assessments were produced the physical processes that they represent were fully understood and free from data bias. However, we know that in reality it is very difficult to capture this in a model. We also know that some of the inventories we used to generate the hazard assessments were incomplete, this can be seen clearly in the eruption history data and is why the volcanology assessment is of a coarse resolution. Every effort has been made in this assessment to generate a model that is as accurate as the input data and the understanding of the physical systems allows, but it is likely that there is still an uncertainty in this that is so far, not quantified. It is therefore important to explore this using error analysis and determine which model parameters have the greatest influence on the modelled results by conducting a sensitivity analysis.

4.1. Sensitivity Analysis

Initially we proposed that the best way to assess this uncertainty would be through a Monte Carlo approach, as outlined in METEOR report M6.2 (Winson & Jordan, 2020). As stated, a Monte Carlo method would allow us to assess how the variables such as the weighting factors control each of the final outputs by applying an algorithm that computes solutions by performing iterations with different sets of random numbers. This would also help to identify areas where an increase in baseline knowledge would have the greatest impact on the overall understanding of risk. Given the computational time needed to prepare the model thus far, it may be that a Monte Carlo approach of the entire data set may not be possible in the time available. Instead we suggest a straight forward sensitivity analysis, which would examine the effects of varying model parameters on the final outputs of the model. Here we would vary one model parameter at a time in a systematic way and see if a small change in a parameter had a large change on the model outputs, by looking at residuals between the two final products. Assessing the difference in these outputs will allow us to infer the robustness of the current METEOR model and identify the inputs that have the greatest control on the final outputs. This approach would also allow us to explore which criteria, such as the weights assigned to the exposure data or the threshold values that were assigned when creating the index for the hazard assessment data, have a higher control on the final vulnerability.





4.2. Validation of Weighting Values

The weighting values displayed in Table 5 and Table 6 were derived through a combination of expert elicitation, harvesting from existing literature and reviewing available vulnerability curves. They form what we propose is a best estimate of the weights that should be attached to different building criteria and different types of hazard. It is clear, however, that effort should be made to validate these figures, as they have the potential to strongly affect the outcome of the overall model.

To that end we propose the following assessment: a small area of each study country will be selected, ideally where the exposure data is augmented by the ground surveys (i.e. in Kathmandu and Dar es Salaam). In this area we will select the vulnerability curves that are most representative of the various building types in those points. These vulnerability curves will be translated into look up tables, so that when a specific hazard value (i.e. PGA) is reported it can be matched to the exact exceedance probability for that building type and this value used to weight that specific building in that specific point. Due to the way that the hazard data is generated this model approach will be taken to address the earthquake and flooding hazards. This process will be conducted for all building types in all of the points in the subset. The outputs of this approach can then be compared to the outputs from the original model format and analysed for variance. It is likely that this approach will be computationally expensive, which is why the test will be limited to a small area.

We also plan to assess the impact of varying the hazard assessments and their subsequent weights. To do this we will explore the differences in outputs when the 1 in 10 year and 1 in 1000 year flood hazard data are included (instead of the 1 in 100 year return period). This will provide a sense of what the difference between a 'worst' case and 'best' case outputs are. We could also explore the vulnerability of specific building classes to single and multi-hazards independently to try to identify the types of interventions that might have the greatest impacts in decreasing the vulnerability of certain types of buildings.





References

Aspinall, W., Auker, M., Hincks, T.K., Mahony, S., Nadim, F., Pooley, J., Sparks, R.S.J. and Syre, E. (2011) Volcano hazard and exposure in GDRFF priority countries and risk mitigation measures-GFDRR Volcano Risk Study. *Bristol University Cabot Institute and NGI Norway for the World Bank, Washington DC, NGI Report, 20100806*.

Auker, M.R., Sparks, R.S.J., Siebert, L., Crosweller, H.S. and Ewert, J. (2013) A statistical analysis of the global historical volcanic fatalities record. *Journal of Applied Volcanology*, 2(1), p.2.

Bartel, P. & Muller, J. (2007) Horn of Africa natural hazard probability and risk analysis. Tech. rep, *USAID*. <u>https://reliefweb.int/report/djibouti/horn-africa-natural-hazard-probability-and-risk-analysis</u> Accessed: 01/03/2019.

Bell, R. & Glade, T. (2004). Quantitative risk analysis for landslides–Examples from Bíldudalur, NW-Iceland. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 4(1), pp.117-131.

Blong, R.J., Grasso, P., Jenkins, S.F., Magill, C.R., Wilson, T.M., McMullan, K. and Kandlbauer, J. (2017) Estimating building vulnerability to volcanic ash fall for insurance and other purposes. *Journal of Applied Volcanology*, *6*(1), pp.1-13.

Carpignano, A., Golia, E., Di Mauro, C., Bouchon, S. & Nordvik, J.P. (2009) A methodological approach for the definition of multi-risk maps at regional level: first application. *Journal of Risk Research*, *12*(3-4), pp.513-534.

El Morjani, Z.E.A., Ebener, S., Boos, J., Ghaffar, E.A. & Musani, A. (2007) Modelling the spatial distribution of five natural hazards in the context of the WHO/EMRO Atlas of Disaster Risk as a step towards the reduction of the health impact related to disasters. *International Journal of Health Geographics*, *6*(1), pp.8.

Greiving, S. (2006). Integrated risk assessment of multi-hazards: a new methodology. *Special Paper-Geological Survey of Finland*, 42, p.75-82.

Kappes, M.S., Papathoma-Koehle, M. & Keiler, M. (2012) Assessing physical vulnerability for multihazards using an indicator-based methodology. *Applied Geography*, *32*(2), pp.577-590.

Neri, A., Esposito Ongaro, T., Todesco, M., Macedonio, G., Papale, P., Santacroce, R., Longo, A. and Del Seppia, D. (2000) Numerical simulation of pyroclastic flows at Vesuvius aimed at hazard assessment. *Human and Structural Vulnerability Assessment for Emergency Planning in a Future Eruption of Vesuvius using Volcanic Simulation and Casualty Modelling. Final Report EC Project ENV4-CT98-0699.*

Papathoma, M., Dominey-Howes, D., Zong, Y. & Smith, D. (2003) Assessing tsunami vulnerability, an example from Herakleio, Crete. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 3(5), pp.377-389.

Papathoma-Köhle, M., Neuhäuser, B., Ratzinger, K., Wenzel, H., Dominey-Howes, D. (2007) Elements at risk as a framework for assessing the vulnerability of communities to landslides. Natural Hazards and Earth System Science, Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union, 7 (6), pp.765-779





Petrazzuoli, S.M. and Zuccaro, G. (2004) Structural resistance of reinforced concrete buildings under pyroclastic flows: a study of the Vesuvian area. *Journal of volcanology and geothermal research*, *133*(1-4), pp.353-367.

Sampson, C.C., Smith, A.M., Bates, P.D., Neal, J.C., Alfieri, L. & Freer, J.E. (2015) A high-resolution global flood hazard model. *Water Resources Research*, *51*(9), pp.7358-7381.

Siebert, L., Simkin, T. and Kimberly, P. (2011) Volcanoes of the World. Univ of California Press.

Silva, M. and Pereira, S. (2014) Assessment of physical vulnerability and potential losses of buildings due to shallow slides. *Natural hazards*, 72(2), pp.1029-1050.

Smith, A., Sampson, C. & Bates, P. (2015) Regional flood frequency analysis at the global scale. *Water Resources Research*, *51*(1), pp.539-553.

UNEP (1992). Agenda 21. *Technical report, United Nations environment programme*. [UN-ISDR2005] UN-ISDR (2005). Hyogo framework for action 2005 – 2015: building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. In *World conference on disaster reduction, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan*.

Winson, A., Crummy, J., Mee, K., Boon, D., Ciurean, R., Dashwood, C., Garcia Bajo, M., Sampson, C. & Silva, V. (2019) METEOR Hazard footprints for Nepal and Tanzania. Report M6.1/P

Winson, A. & Jordan, C. (2020) METEOR: Methods for Analysing Multi-hazards with Exposure. WP6.2/C

Yamazaki, D., Ikeshima, D., Tawatari, R., Yamaguchi, T., O'Loughlin, F., Neal, J.C., Sampson, C.C., Kanae, S. & Bates, P.D. (2017) A high-accuracy map of global terrain elevations. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *44*(11), pp.5844-5853.

Yamazaki, D., Ikeshima, D., Sosa, J., Bates, P.D., Allen, G. & Pavelsky, T. (2019) MERIT Hydro: A highresolution global hydrography map based on latest topography datasets. *Water Resources Research*, 55, pp.5053-5073.





Annex A: Nepal ArcGIS Methodology and Metadata

This document briefly outlines the methodology used in converting hazard scores and calculating exposure and vulnerability. All processing was done in ArcGIS 10.3. The final hazard-exposure-vulnerability output (ESRI ArcGIS format) and ArcGIS.mxd can be found in this folder, along with these notes:

https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo894890-d0ab-4b08-89e3-d35692a8f0b1

Data sources

Seismic: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo351d4b-d801-4af0-bf1f-027eb8ff8b08 Flooding: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo0e6efd-71c1-4cce-81c9-3632fba036f1 Landslide: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo3c8743-bd66-4321-bd0c-76a82e357a44 Exposure: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo234cad-8f91-4682-b2b6-6033a6ff17b4

Hazard map conversions

The original hazard maps were converted to low-medium-high scores (2, 3, 4, respectively). This was done by extracting the original hazard scores from the original hazard maps, using the 'Extract Values to Points' tool (ArcToolbox > Spatial Analyst > Extraction). This takes the hazard map value of each point in the exposure dataset and adds it to the attribute table. The resulting shapefile contained the attributes from the exposure dataset, along with all of the original hazard scores for the input hazard maps: seismic, flooding (fluvial and pluvial 1 in 100 years) and landslide (rainfall and earthquake induced).

Hazard scores were normalised and then converted into 2-3-4 scores using the following thresholds:

Seismic and landslides:

4 = High: > 0.66-1 3 = Med: > 0.33-0.66

2 = Low: 0-0.33

Flooding (fluvial and pluvial):

4 = High: > 0.5 3 = Med: > 0 - <= 0.5 2 = Low: 0

No data values





No data values were represented by -9999 in all datasets. For landslides and seismic, these no data values occurred where exposure points occurred outside of the modelled extents of the hazard maps. These were given 0 values in the converted hazard score fields and therefore would not generate an overall vulnerability score. For flooding, the -9999 values were areas not included in the flood modelling. These values were converted to 1 to ensure they did generate a vulnerability score.

Calculating percentage of building type

The Nepal building exposure shapefile (NPL_buildings_exposure_20200214.shp) contains points, each of which can represent numerous buildings of different types. This shapefile contains a field with the number of buildings per point (TOT_CNT field). The Nepal building exposure breakdown table (NPL_buildings_exposure_breakdown_20200214.dbf) contains the breakdown of the number of each building type per point (also TOT_CNT field).



Building exposure layer with one point representing 4 buildings

Building breakdown table detailing the types and number of buildings represented by that point

To calculate percentage of building types per point, the buildings exposure attribute table was joined to the breakdown table (using the OBJECTID field) and percentage calculated as follows:

(TOT_CNT (breakdown) / TOT_CNT (exposure)) * 100

Transferring building percentage to building exposure shapefile





For the final vulnerability calculations, the building percentage per building type needed to be transferred to the building exposure shapefile. This required pivoting the joined breakdown-exposure table (containing the building percentages) so that the percentage of each building type was represented by a separate column in the buildings exposure table (since each of these building types is weighted differently in the final vulnerability calculations).

The first table below shows the joined exposure and breakdown tables with building percentage calculated in a single field. The 'TYPE_CODE' field was created to provide a 'GIS-friendly' field heading in the resulting attribute table since field headings are limited to 10 alphanumeric characters, and the CONTYPE codes don't comply with this. The second table shows an example of the resulting pivoted table with each building type represented by a separate column containing the percentage of building type for that point in the building exposure shapefile. The third table gives the building types (CONTYPE) and their equivalent field heading in the pivoted table (TYPE_CODE).

| OBJECTID | CONTYPE* | BUILD PCENT | TYPE_CODE* |
|----------|------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 | MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 | 0.5 | B1_PCENT |
| 1 | MATO/LN | 0.5 | B5_PCENT |
| 2 | S/LFINF | 1 | B7_PCENT |
| 3 | S/LFINF | 0.3333 | B7_PCENT |
| 3 | W+WWD | 0.6666 | B13_PCENT |

| OBJECTID | B1_PCENT | B5_PCENT | B7_PCENT | B13_PCENT |
|----------|------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 | MATO/LN | S/LFINF | W+WWD |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.6666 | 0 | 0 | 0.3333 |

| Nepal | TYPE CODE |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 | B1_PCENT |
| C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 | B2_PCENT |
| C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 | B3_PCENT |
| C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 | B4_PCENT |
| MATO/LN | B5_PCENT |
| S | B6_PCENT |
| S/LFINF | B7_PCENT |
| MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 | B8_PCENT |
| MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 | B9_PCENT |





| MUR+CL99+MOM | B10_PCENT |
|---------------|-----------|
| MUR+CL99+MOC | B11_PCENT |
| W | B12_PCENT |
| W+WWD | B13_PCENT |
| MUR+STRUB+MOL | B14_PCENT |
| MUR+STRUB+MOM | B15_PCENT |

Vulnerability calculations

The pivoted table containing building percentages was joined back to the building exposure shapefile (using OBJECTID). New fields were created for each of the separate hazard vulnerability calculations (including normalised scores) and overall multi-hazard vulnerability calculations. The Field Calculator was used to calculate these scores using the following weights and expressions.

| Nepal | TYPE CODE | Pluvial | Fluvial | LS (rain) | LS (Eq) | EQ |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|------|
| Hazard Weight | | 0.165 | 0.165 | 0.165 | 0.165 | 0.33 |
| MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 | B1_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 | B2_PCENT | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.18 |
| C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 | B3_PCENT | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.35 | 0.48 |
| C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 | B4_PCENT | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.24 |
| MATO/LN | B5_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| S | B6_PCENT | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| S/LFINF | B7_PCENT | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 |
| MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 | B8_PCENT | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.09 |
| MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 | B9_PCENT | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.24 |
| MUR+CL99+MOM | B10_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| MUR+CL99+MOC | B11_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| W | B12_PCENT | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.09 |
| W+WWD | B13_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| MUR+STRUB+MOL | B14_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| MUR+STRUB+MOM | B15_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 |

Flooding hazard

Fluvial: (0.165 * ((%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 *0.4) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%S * 0.09) + (%S/LFINF * 0.09) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%MUR+CL99+MOM * 0.56) + (%MUR+CL99+MOC * 0.56) + (%W *0.8) + (%W+WWD * 0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOL * 0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOM * 0.56))) * hazard score





Field Calculator expression:

VULN_FD100 = (0.165 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.15) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.56))) * [FD1_100_HZ]

+

Pluvial: (0.165 * ((%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 *0.4) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%S * 0.09) + (%S/LFINF * 0.09) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%MUR+CL99+MOM * 0.56) + (%MUR+CL99+MOC * 0.56) + (%W *0.8) + (%W+WWD * 0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOL * 0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOM * 0.56))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

```
VULN_P100 = (0.165 * (( [B1_PCENT] * 0.56 ) + ( [B2_PCENT] * 0.4) + ( [B3_PCENT] * 0.25) + (
[B4_PCENT] * 0.15) + ( [B5_PCENT] * 0.56) + ( [B6_PCENT] * 0.09) + ( [B7_PCENT] * 0.09) + (
[B8_PCENT] * 0.4) + ( [B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ( [B10_PCENT] * 0.56) + ( [B11_PCENT] * 0.56) + (
[B12_PCENT] * 0.8) + ( [B13_PCENT] * 0.56) + ( [B14_PCENT] * 0.56) + ( [B15_PCENT] * 0.56))) *
[P1_100_HZ]
```

VULN_FLOOD = [VULN_FD100] + [VULN_P100] = Relative flooding vulnerability map

Earthquake hazard

Earthquake: (0.33 * ((%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.3) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.18) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.48) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.24) + (%MATO/LN * 0.3) + (%S * 0.2) + (%S/LFINF * 0.2) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 * 0.09) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 * 0.24) + (%MUR+CL99+MOM * 0.3) + (%MUR+CL99+MOC * 0.3) + (%W * 0.09) + (%W+WWD * 0.3) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOL * 0.3) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOM * 0.3))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

VULN_SEIS = (0.33 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.18) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.48) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.24) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.24) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.3))) * [SEIS_HZ]

= Relative earthquake vulnerability map

Landslide hazard

Landslide - Rainfall: (0.165 * ((%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.6) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.6) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.3) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.18) + (%MATO/LN * 0.6) + (%S * 0.3) + (%S/LFINF * 0.3) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 * 0.2) +





(%MUR+CL99+MOM * 0.6) + (%MUR+CL99+MOC * 0.6) + (%W *0.3) + (%W+WWD * 0.6) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOL * 0.6) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOM * 0.6))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

VULN_LS_R = (0.165 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.18) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.6))) * [HazR_HZ]

+

Landslide - Eq: (0.165 * ((%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.7) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 *0.7) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.35) + (%C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.21) + (%MATO/LN * 0.7) + (%S * 0.3) + (%S/LFINF * 0.3) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3 * 0.5) + (%MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%MUR+CL99+MOM * 0.7) + (%MUR+CL99+MOC * 0.7) + (%W * 0.3) + (%W+WWD * 0.7) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOL * 0.7) + (%MUR+STRUB+MOM * 0.7))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

VULN_LS_EQ = (0.165 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.35) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.21) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.5) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.7)) * [HazEQ_HZ]

VULN_LS = [VULN_LS_R] + [VULN_LS_EQ] = Relative landslide vulnerability map

Weight vulnerability map outputs

(Relative Flood vulnerability * 0.333) + (Relative Earthquake Vulnerability * 0.3333) + (Relative Landslide Vulnerability * 0.333)

Field Calculator expression:

MULTI_HAZ = ([VULN_FLOOD] * 0.333) + ([VULN_SEIS] * 0.333) + ([VULN_LS] * 0.333)





METADATA

The final shapefile containing original, normalised and converted hazard scores, building percentages and vulnerability calculations is **NPL_hazard_exposure_vulnerability_FINAL.shp**. The following table lists the fields in the attribute table and gives a brief description of what they represent:

| Field name | Description |
|------------|--|
| FID | ArcGIS' Feature ID (default field that cannot be deleted) |
| Shape | Type of feature (e.g. shapefile – default field that cannot be deleted) |
| OBJECTID | ArcGIS OBJECTID field – default field used for filtering, searching etc. |
| POINT_X | Longitude of grid centroid (from building exposure shapefile) |
| POINT_Y | Latitude of grid centroid (from building exposure shapefile) |
| ZONE | Name of Zone (from building exposure shapefile) |
| DISTRICT | Name of District (from building exposure shapefile) |
| VDC_NAME | Name of Village Development Committee (from building exposure shapefile) |
| VDC_CODE | Code of Village Development Committee (from building exposure shapefile) |
| TOT_CNT | Total building count estimate (from building exposure shapefile) |
| TOT_SIZE_M | Total building floor area in square metres (from building exposure shapefile) |
| TOT_VAL | Total estimate of building value in USD (from building exposure shapefile) |
| OBJECTID_1 | Unique Identifier, 64-bit. This links to detailed exposure breakdown table. (from building exposure shapefile) |
| FD1_100_HZ | Converted hazard score for fluvial defended 1 in 100 year flood |
| P1_100_HZ | Converted hazard score for pluvial defended 1 in 100 year flood |
| SEIS_HZ | Converted hazard score for seismic |
| HazR_HZ | Converted hazard score for landslide (rainfall) susceptibility |
| HazEQ_HZ | Converted hazard score for landslide (Earthquake) susceptibility |
| B10_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+CL99+MOM' |
| B11_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+CL99+MOC' |
| B12_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'W' |
| B13_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'W+WWD' |
| B14_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+STRUB+MOL' |
| B15_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+STRUB+MOM' |
| B1_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3' |





| B2_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3' |
|-------------|---|
| B3_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7' |
| B4_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'C99/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20' |
| B5_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MATO/LN' |
| B6_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'S' |
| B7_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'S/LFINF' |
| B8_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+CL99/HBET:1,3' |
| B9_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type 'MUR+CL99/HBET:4,7' |
| VULN_FD100 | Vulnerability score for fluvial 1 in 100 year flood |
| VULN_P100 | Vulnerability score for pluvial 1 in 100 year flood |
| VULN_SEIS | Vulnerability score for seismic |
| VULN_LS_R | Vulnerability score for landslide (rainfall) susceptibility |
| VULNE_LS_EQ | Vulnerability score for landslide (earthquake) susceptibility |
| VULN_FLOOD | Vulnerability score for combined fluvial and pluvial 1 in 100 year floods |
| VULN_LS | Vulnerability score for combined landslide (rainfall and earthquake) floods |
| MULTI_HAZ | Vulnerability score for combined seismic, flood and landslide hazards |
| VNORM_F100 | Vulnerability score for fluvial 1 in 100 year flood – normalised |
| VNORM_P100 | Vulnerability score for pluvial 1 in 100 year flood – normalised |
| VNORM_LSr | Vulnerability score for landslide (rainfall) susceptibility – normalised |
| VNORM_LSeq | Vulnerability score for landslide (earthquake) susceptibility – normalised |
| VNORM_SEIS | Vulnerability score for landslide (earthquake) susceptibility – normalised |
| FD1_100_OR | Original hazard value for fluvial 1 in 100 year flood |
| FD1_100_NO | Normalised hazard value for fluvial 1 in 100 year flood |
| P1_100_OR | Original hazard value for pluvial 1 in 100 year flood |
| P1_100_NOR | Normalised hazard value for pluvial 1 in 100 year flood |
| Hazard_R | Original landslide (rainfall) susceptibility score |
| Haz_EQ90m | Original landslide (earthquake) susceptibility score |
| SEIS_NORM | Normalised seismic hazard score |
| HazR_NORM | Normalised landslide (rainfall) susceptibility score |
| HazEQ_NORM | Normalised landslide (earthquake) susceptibility score |





Annex B: Tanzania ArcGIS Methodology and Metadata

This document briefly outlines the methodology used in converting hazard scores and calculating exposure and vulnerability. All processing was done in ArcGIS 10.3. The final hazard-exposure-vulnerability output (ESRI shapefile) and ArcGIS.mxd can be found in this folder, along with these notes:

https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo4396b3-10f9-4a29-95fb-38168c3fa53b

Data sources

Seismic: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fobc00af-fc52-47a5-b1c5-6dae5a804e68

Flooding: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo918680-95ec-4108-90b1-98007ca88b8d

Volcanic flows (PDC and Lahars): <u>https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fodc3c09-930e-45b6-b083-1f4b49a62dce</u>

Tephra: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/fo8d331a-f8e1-42a6-a92c-c3c2479bc0d0

Exposure: https://bgs.sharefile.eu/home/shared/focacb6e-d419-4a2c-9c1d-52cb7c35e44c

Hazard map conversions

The original hazard maps were normalised, where necessary (seismic and flooding), then converted to low-medium-high scores (2, 3, 4, respectively). Some scores of 1 were applied to no data values which fell outside of modelled areas but where the hazard could still possibly occur. This was done using ArcGIS Model Builder to convert the maps to 2, 3, 4 scores based on the thresholds below:

Flood (fluvial and pluvial):

```
4 = High: > 0.5
3 = Med: > 0 - <= 0.5
2 = Low: 0
1 = -9999: No data values – areas outside of modelled flood areas
```

Seismic:

```
4 = High: > 0.66-1
3 = Med: > 0.33-0.66
2 = Low: 0-0.33
```

PDC:

4 = High: Any pixel in a PDC basin falling 0-15 km from the summit





- 3 = Med: Any pixel in a PDC basin falling 15-30 km from the summit
- 2 = Low: Any pixel not in a PDC basin but within 50 km of the summit
- 1 = -9999: No data values areas outside of modelled PDC basins

Lahar:

- 4 = High: Any pixel in a lahar basin falling 0-50 km from the summit
- 3 = Med: Any pixel in a lahar basin falling 50-100 km from the summit
- 2 = Low: Any pixel not in a lahar basin but within 200 km of the summit
- 1 = -9999: No data values areas outside of modelled ash fall areas

These converted hazard scores were then transferred to the building exposure dataset using the 'Extract Values to Points' tool (ArcToolbox > Spatial Analyst > Extraction). This takes the hazard map value of each point in the exposure dataset and adds it to the attribute table. Values from the original hazard maps were also transferred to the building exposure dataset using the same method. The resulting shapefile contained the attributes from the exposure dataset, along with all of the original hazard scores for the input hazard maps: seismic, flooding (fluvial and pluvial 1 in 100 years), PDC, lahar and tephra.

Calculating percentage of building type

The Tanzania building exposure shapefile (TZA_buildings_exposure_20200731.shp) contains points, each of which can represent numerous buildings of different types. This shapefile contains a field with the number of buildings per point (TOT_CNT field). The Tanzania building exposure breakdown table (TZA_buildings_exposure_breakdown_20200731.dbf) contains the breakdown of the number of each building type per point (also TOT_CNT field). Refer to Nepal example for table structure.

To calculate percentage of building types per point, the buildings exposure attribute table was joined to the breakdown table (using the OBJECTID field) and percentage calculated as follows:

(TOT_CNT (breakdown) / TOT_CNT (exposure)) * 100

Transferring building percentage to building exposure shapefile

For the final vulnerability calculations, the building percentage per building type needed to be transferred to the building exposure shapefile. This required pivoting the joined breakdown-exposure table (containing the building percentages) so that the percentage of each building type was represented by a separate column in the buildings exposure table (since each of these building types is weighted differently in the final vulnerability calculations).

The first table below shows the joined exposure and breakdown tables with building percentage calculated in a single field. The 'TYPE_CODE' field was created to provide a 'GIS-friendly' field heading in the resulting attribute table since field headings are limited to 10 alphanumeric characters, and the





CONTYPE codes don't comply with this. The second table shows an example of the resulting pivoted table with each building type represented by a separate column containing the percentage of building type for that point in the building exposure shapefile. The third table gives the building types (CONTYPE) and their equivalent field heading in the pivoted table (TYPE_CODE).

| OBJECTID | CONTYPE* | BUILD PCENT | TYPE_CODE* |
|----------|-----------------------|-------------|------------|
| 1 | CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 | 0.5 | B1_PCENT |
| 1 | CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 | 0.5 | B5_PCENT |
| 2 | S | 1 | B7_PCENT |
| 3 | S | 0.3333 | B7_PCENT |
| 3 | MUR+CL99 | 0.6666 | B13_PCENT |

| OBJECTID | B1_PCENT | B5_PCENT | B7_PCENT | B13_PCENT |
|----------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|
| | CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 | CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 | S | MUR+CL99 |
| 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.6666 | 0 | 0 | 0.3333 |

| Tanzania | TYPE CODE |
|------------------------|-----------|
| CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 | B1_PCENT |
| CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 | B2_PCENT |
| CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 | B3_PCENT |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 | B4_PCENT |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 | B5_PCENT |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 | B6_PCENT |
| S | B7_PCENT |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 | B8_PCENT |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 | B9_PCENT |
| W | B10_PCENT |
| MATO/LN | B11_PCENT |
| MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 | B12_PCENT |
| MUR+CL99 | B13_PCENT |
| MUR+STRUB | B14_PCENT |
| W+WWD | B15_PCENT |





Vulnerability calculations

The pivoted table containing building percentages was joined back to the building exposure shapefile (using OBJECTID). New fields were created for each of the separate hazard vulnerability calculations (including normalised scores) and overall multi-hazard vulnerability calculations. The Field Calculator was used to calculate these scores using the following weights and expressions (these include the exact GIS syntax used).

| Tanzania | TYPE CODE | Pluvial | Fluvial | Tephra | Lahar | PDC | EQ |
|------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| Hazard Weight | | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.03 | 0.0525 | 0.0675 | 0.35 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 | B1_PCENT | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.3 | 0.06 | 0.56 | 0.12 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 | B2_PCENT | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.63 | 0.32 |
| CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 | B3_PCENT | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.7 | 0.16 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 | B4_PCENT | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.64 | 0.18 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 | B5_PCENT | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.72 | 0.48 |
| CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 | B6_PCENT | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.8 | 0.24 |
| S | B7_PCENT | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 | B8_PCENT | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.72 | 0.09 |
| MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 | B9_PCENT | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.2 | 0.81 | 0.24 |
| W | B10_PCENT | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.09 |
| MATO/LN | B11_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 | B12_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| MUR+CL99 | B13_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| MUR+STRUB | B14_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |
| W+WWD | B15_PCENT | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.6 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.3 |

Flooding -

Fluvial: (0.5* ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.56) + (%MUR+CL99*0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.56) + (%W+WWD * 0.56))) * hazard score

+

Pluvial: 0.5*((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.2) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.15) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.56) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%MUR+CL99*0.56) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.56) + (%W+WWD * 0.56))





Field Calculator expression:

V_FLUV = (0.25 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.32) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.12) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.15) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.56))) * [FU1_100_HZ]

Field Calculator expression:

V_PLUV = (0.25 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.32) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.12) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.15) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.56))) * [PU1_100_HZ]

Combined fluvial and pluvial [V_FLOOD] = [V_FLUV] + [V_PLUV] = Relative flooding vulnerability map

Earthquake -

Earthquake: (0.35 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.12) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 * 0.32) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.16) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.18) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.48) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.24) + (%S*0.2) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.24) + (%W*0.09) + (%MATO/LN * 0.3) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.3) + (%MUR+CL99*0.3) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.3) + (%W+WWD * 0.3))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

```
V_SEIS = (0.12 * (( [B1_PCENT] * 0.12) + ( [B2_PCENT] * 0.32) + ( [B3_PCENT] * 0.16) + ( [B4_PCENT] * 0.18) + ( [B5_PCENT] * 0.48) + ( [B6_PCENT] * 0.24) + ( [B7_PCENT] * 0.2) + ( [B8_PCENT] * 0.09) + ( [B9_PCENT] * 0.24) + ( [B10_PCENT] * 0.09) + ( [B11_PCENT] * 0.3) + ( [B12_PCENT] * 0.3) + ( [B13_PCENT] * 0.3) + ( [B14_PCENT] * 0.3) + ( [B15_PCENT] * 0.3))) * [SEIS_HAZ]
```

= Relative earthquake vulnerability map

Volcanic –

Tephra: (0.03 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.3) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.15) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.09) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.2) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.12) + (%S*0.09) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.5) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.25) + (%W*0.2) + (%MATO/LN * 0.6) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.6) + (%MUR+CL99*0.6) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.6) + (%W+WWD * 0.6))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

```
V_VEI2_APR = (0.03 * (( [B1_PCENT] * 0.3) + ( [B2_PCENT] * 0.15) + ( [B3_PCENT] * 0.09) + (
[B4_PCENT] * 0.4) + ( [B5_PCENT] * 0.2) + ( [B6_PCENT] * 0.12) + ( [B7_PCENT] * 0.09) + ( [B8_PCENT]
* 0.5) + ( [B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ( [B10_PCENT] * 0.2) + ( [B11_PCENT] * 0.6) + ( [B12_PCENT] * 0.6) + (
[B13_PCENT] * 0.6) + ( [B14_PCENT] * 0.6) + ( [B15_PCENT] * 0.6))) * [VEI2_APR_]
```





V VEI2 DEC = (0.03 * (([B1 PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B2 PCENT] * 0.15) + ([B3 PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B4 PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B5 PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B6 PCENT] * 0.12) + ([B7 PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B8 PCENT] * 0.5) + ([B9 PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10 PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B11 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B12 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.6))) * [VEI2_DEC]

V_VEI4_APR = (0.03 * (([B1_PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B2_PCENT] * 0.15) + ([B3_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B4_PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B5_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B6_PCENT] * 0.12) + ([B7_PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B8_PCENT] * 0.5) + ([B9_PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10_PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B11_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B12_PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B13 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B14 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B15 PCENT] * 0.6))) * [VEI4 APR]

V VEI4 DEC = (0.03 * (([B1 PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B2 PCENT] * 0.15) + ([B3 PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B4 PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B5 PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B6 PCENT] * 0.12) + ([B7 PCENT] * 0.09) + ([B8 PCENT] * 0.5) + ([B9 PCENT] * 0.25) + ([B10 PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B11 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B12 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B13 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B14 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B15 PCENT] * 0.6))) * [VEI4 DEC]

+

Lahar: (0.0525 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.06) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.1) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.06) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.6) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.3) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.18) + (%S*0.3) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.4) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.2) + (%W*1) + (%MATO/LN * 1) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *1) + (%MUR+CL99*1) + (%MUR+STRUB * 1) + (%W+WWD * 1))) * hazard score

Field Calculator expression:

V LAHAR = (0.0525 * (([B1 PCENT] * 0.06) + ([B2 PCENT] * 0.1) + ([B3 PCENT] * 0.06) + ([B4 PCENT] * 0.6) + ([B5 PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B6 PCENT] * 0.18) + ([B7 PCENT] * 0.3) + ([B8 PCENT] * 0.4) + ([B9 PCENT] * 0.2) + ([B10 PCENT] * 1) + ([B11 PCENT] * 1) + ([B12 PCENT] * 1) + ([B13 PCENT] * 1) + ([B14 PCENT] * 1) + ([B15 PCENT] * 1))) * [LAHAR HAZ]

+

Pyroclastic Density Current: (0.0675 * ((%CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 * 0.56) + (%CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 *0.63) +

Field Calculator expression:

(%CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 * 0.7) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 * 0.64) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 * 0.72) + (%CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 * 0.8) + (%S*0.9) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 * 0.72) + (%MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 * 0.81) + (%W*0.8) + (%MATO/LN * 0.8) + (%MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 *0.8) + (%MUR+CL99*0.8) + (%MUR+STRUB * 0.8) + (%W+WWD * 0.8))) * hazard score

V PDC = (0.0675 * (([B1 PCENT] * 0.56) + ([B2 PCENT] * 0.63) + ([B3 PCENT] * 0.7) + ([B4 PCENT]

* 0.64) + ([B5 PCENT] * 0.72) + ([B6 PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B7 PCENT] * 0.9) + ([B8 PCENT] * 0.72) + ([B9 PCENT] * 0.81) + ([B10 PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B11 PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B12 PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B13_PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B14_PCENT] * 0.8) + ([B15_PCENT] * 0.8))) * [PDC_HAZ]

Combined volcanic hazard map (with VEI4 Dec scenario) [V VOLC]:

[V_PDC] + [V_LAHAR] + [V_VEI4_DEC] = Relative volcanic vulnerability map





Weight vulnerability map outputs

(Relative Flood vulnerability * 0.5) + (Relative Earthquake Vulnerability * 0.35) + (Relative Volcanic Vulnerability * 0.15)

Field Calculator expression:

V_MULTI = ([V_FLOOD] *0.333) + ([V_SEIS] *0.333) + ([V_VOLC] * 0.333)

METADATA

The final shapefile containing original, normalised and converted hazard scores, building percentages and vulnerability calculations is **TZA_hazard_exposure_vulnerability_FINAL**. The following table lists the fields in the attribute table and gives a brief description of what they represent:

| Field name | Description |
|-------------|--|
| OBJECTID | ArcGIS OBJECTID field – default field used for filtering, searching etc. |
| Shape | Type of feature (e.g. shapefile – default field that cannot be deleted) |
| POINT_X | Longitude of grid centroid (from building exposure shapefile) |
| POINT_Y | Latitude of grid centroid (from building exposure shapefile) |
| REGION | Name of Region (level 1 administrative unit) |
| DISTRICT | Name of District (level 2 administrative unit) |
| WARD | Name of Ward |
| WARD_CODE | Unique code for Ward |
| TOT_CNT | Total building count estimate (from building exposure shapefile) |
| TOT_SIZE_M | Total building floor area in square metres (from building exposure shapefile) |
| TOT_VAL | Total estimate of building value in USD (from building exposure shapefile) |
| OBJECTID_1 | Unique Identifier, 64-bit. This links to detailed exposure breakdown table. (from building exposure shapefile) |
| FU1_100_HZ | Converted hazard score for fluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood |
| FU_1_100_OR | Original hazard score for fluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood |
| FU100_norm | Original hazard score for fluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood – normalised |
| PGA01_ORIG | Original seismic hazard value (PGA 0.1) |
| PU1_100_OR | Original hazard score for pluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood |





| PU1_100norm | Original hazard score for pluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood – normalised |
|--------------|---|
| PU1_100_HZ | Converted hazard score for pluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood |
| PGA01_NORM_1 | Original seismic hazard value (PGA 0.1) – normalised |
| SEIS_HAZ | Converted seismic hazard score |
| PDC_HAZ | Converted pyroclastic density current hazard score |
| LAHAR_HAZ | Converted lahar hazard score |
| VEI2_APR_ | Converted tephra (ash) fall hazard score – VEI2 April to November |
| VEI2_DEC | Converted tephra (ash) fall hazard score – VEI2 December to March |
| VEI4_APR | Converted tephra (ash) fall hazard score – VEI4 April to November |
| VEI4_DEC | Converted tephra (ash) fall hazard score – VEI4 December to March |
| B1_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type CR/LFM/HBET:1,3 |
| B2_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type CR/LFM/HBET:4,7 |
| B3_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type CR/LFM/HBET:8,20 |
| B4_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:1,3 |
| B5_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:4,7 |
| B6_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type CR/LFINF+DNO/HBET:8,20 |
| B7_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type S |
| B8_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type MUR+CB99/HBET:1,3 |
| B9_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type MUR+CB99/HBET:4,7 |
| B190_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type W |
| B11_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type MATO/LN |
| B12_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type MUR+ADO/HBET:1,3 |
| B13_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type MUR+CL99 |
| B14_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type MUR+STRUB |
| B15_PCENT | Percentage of buildings of type W+WWD |
| V_FLUV | Vulnerability score for fluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood |
| V_PLUV | Vulnerability score for pluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood |
| V_SEIS | Vulnerability score for seismic hazard |
| V_PDC | Vulnerability score for pyroclastic density current hazard |
| V_LAHAR | Vulnerability score for lahar hazard |
| V_VEI2_DEC | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI2 December to March |





| V_VEI2_APR | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI2 April to November |
|------------|--|
| V_VEI4_APR | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI4 April to November |
| V_VEI4_DEC | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI4 December to March |
| V_MULTI | Vulnerability score for multihazards |
| V_FLOOD | Vulnerability score for fluvial and pluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood combined |
| V_VOLC | Vulnerability score for volcanic hazards (PDC, lahar, tephra) combined |
| VNORM_MHAZ | Vulnerability score for multihazards - normalised |
| VNORM_FLD | Vulnerability score for fluvial and pluvial flood combined - normalised |
| VNORM_SEIS | Vulnerability score for seismic hazard – normalised |
| VNORM_VOLC | Vulnerability score for volcanic hazards (PDC, lahar, tephra) combined – normalised |
| VNORM_FLUV | Vulnerability score for fluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood – normalised |
| VNORM_PLUV | Vulnerability score for pluvial undefended 1 in 100 year flood – normalised |
| VNORM_PDC | Vulnerability score for pyroclastic density current hazard – normalised |
| VNORM_LAH | Vulnerability score for lahar hazard – normalised |
| VNORM_V2A | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI2 April to November – normalised |
| VNORM_V2D | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI2 December to March – normalised |
| VNORM_V4A | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI4 April to November – normalised |
| VNORM_V4D | Vulnerability score for tephra (ash) fall hazard – VEI4 December to March – normalised |