

# An engine for social-ecological risk analysis and NBS recommendations for risk mitigation actions

Joy Ommer [a], Laura S. Leo [b], Sasa Vranic [a], Milan Kalas [a], Sisay E. Debele [c], Flavio Bertini [d], Danilo Montesi [d], Irina Pavlova [e], Prashant Kumar [c], Silvana Di Sabatino [b]

[a] KAJO s.r.o., Sladkovicova 228/8, 01401 Bytca, Slovakia

[b] Department of Physics and Astronomy (DIFA), Alma Mater Studiorum-University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

[c] Global Centre for Clean Air Research (GCARE), Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, United Kingdom

[d] Department of Computer Science and Engineering (DISI), Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

[e] Section on Earth Sciences and Geo-Hazards Risk Reduction, Natural Sciences Sector, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, Paris Headquarters, 75007 Paris, France

## Introduction

Nature-based solutions (NBS)

are gaining a central role in disaster risk reduction for socio-ecological systems (SES) in Europe but also globally. This trend can be reasoned by the numerous advantages that solutions inspired by nature have over grey solutions: sustainability, lower natural exploitation as well as a compound focus on SES and co-benefit estimation [1].

The selection of the most suitable NBS for a given location is a crucial part in NBS design considering possible negative impacts. Therefore, the suitability and effectiveness need careful examination. A few approaches are available: identifying the right location based on hydro-morphological characteristics [2]; a flood retention and catchment approach [3]; or a location assessment guidance for national level [4].

However, these approaches are lacking values such as integration of multiple hazards and multi-hazard; taking into consideration future changes in climate and society; Europe-wide applicability on small scale.

## Methods

The recommendation is given based on a geospatial analysis across multiple datasets. For each dataset, results are compared with a set of associated indicators which were selected based on literature review and were classified into several classes. For every indicator, a percentage is given which determines how suitable indicator is for a certain NBS.

## Future Challenges

- Integration of: Climate Change Projections; Risk Assessment; NBS in a Multi-hazard Context
- Effective Implementation in Decision-making
- Development of clear user workflows in co-design with NBS practitioners
- Strengthening end-users' engagement

## Approach

### HAZARD

Hazard & Risk Assessment

Identification of main drivers of the hazard

Climate Change and its impact on the hazard and main drivers

Linking NBS with main drivers and other local factors

### NBS

### RECOMMENDATION

Quantification of (co-)benefits and negative side effects

Explanation of NBS design steps and cautions for implementation

[1] J. Sahani et al., "Hydro-meteorological risk assessment methods and management by nature-based solutions," *Sci. Total Environ.*, vol. 696, p. 133936, Dec. 2019.

[2] P. Guerrero, D. Haase, and C. Albert, "Locating Spatial Opportunities for Nature-Based Solutions: A River Landscape Application," *Water*, vol. 10, no. 12, p. 1869, Dec. 2018.

[3] DGENV, "Natural Water Retention Measures," 2014.

[4] United Nations Development Programme, "Pathway for Increasing Nature-based Solutions in NDCs: A Seven-Step Approach for Enhancing Nationally Determined Contributions through Nature-based Solutions," New York, NY, 2019.

## Resources

