



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets for catastrophe risk modelling

R. Figueiredo^{1,2} and M. Martina^{1,2}

¹Institute for Advanced Study of Pavia, Pavia, Italy

²European Centre for Training and Research in Earthquake Engineering, Pavia, Italy

Received: 30 July 2015 – Accepted: 5 August 2015 – Published: 26 August 2015

Correspondence to: R. Figueiredo (rui.figueiredo@iusspavia.it)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Abstract

One of the necessary components to perform catastrophe risk modelling is information on the buildings at risk, such as their spatial location, geometry, height, occupancy type and other characteristics. This is commonly referred to as the exposure model or dataset. When modelling large areas, developing exposure datasets with the relevant information about every individual building is not practicable. Thus, census data at coarse spatial resolutions are often used as the starting point for the creation of such datasets, after which disaggregation to finer resolutions is carried out using different methods, based on proxies such as the population distribution. While these methods can produce acceptable results, they cannot be considered ideal. Nowadays, the availability of open data is increasing and it is possible to obtain information about buildings for some regions. Although this type of information is usually limited and, therefore, insufficient to generate an exposure dataset, it can still be very useful in its elaboration. In this paper, we focus on how open building data can be used to develop a gridded exposure model by disaggregating existing census data at coarser resolutions. Furthermore, we analyse how the selection of the level of spatial resolution can impact the accuracy and precision of the model, and compare the results in terms of affected residential building areas, due to a flood event, between different models.

1 Introduction

The estimation of potential losses that can occur due to natural hazards, commonly referred to as catastrophe risk modelling, is essential in supporting risk management decision-making processes, be it by governmental agencies or insurance and reinsurance companies (Grossi et al., 2005).

Risk is generally understood as the probability that a certain loss will occur, and is a function of three components: hazard, exposure and vulnerability (e.g. Kron, 2002; Stephenson, 2008). When analysing physical risk, the exposure component consists of

NHESSD

3, 5045–5084, 2015

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

the exposed physical assets, such as buildings and infrastructure. In order to perform catastrophe risk modelling for a set of buildings, the exposure dataset should include different information, such as their estimated value, spatial location, geometry, height, occupancy type as well as other characteristics that can vary depending on the hazard.

As an example, in the case of earthquake risk, having information on the buildings' structural system is essential, as this feature has a large influence on how the buildings will behave and, consequently, on how damaged they might be, given a certain level of ground shaking. Similarly, when analysing risk due to other types of perils, knowledge about different building characteristics may be required in order to correctly estimate damages.

When performing risk modelling on a large region, be it a country or even a large municipality, it is seldom possible to use exposure datasets with the necessary information about every single building in the area, as the development of such datasets entails difficulties related with limited resources or privacy issues, among others (Dell'Acqua et al., 2012). The information about buildings that is generally used as the starting point for the development of exposure datasets is typically available at relatively coarse resolutions, which can vary from municipality to district units, depending on the region or country. In the case of residential buildings, the source of this kind of information is usually census data; in Europe, for example, censuses are identified by UNECE as the main source of such information for dwellings and housing facilities (UNECE, 2007).

The low resolution at which the exposure data mentioned above is normally available is not compatible with the level of detail necessary to accurately model risk. Hazards are usually modelled with a high level of spatial resolution, meaning there is a spatial mismatch between hazard and exposure data. Disaggregating an exposure dataset to finer resolutions cannot be carried out by simply assuming that the assets in a coarse administrative unit are evenly distributed, since in reality people – and therefore, buildings – tend to be concentrated in settlements. Doing so would result in errors, the magnitude of which depends on the nature of the hazard itself – understandably, losses estimated for events with typically large, regularly shaped footprints, such as earth-

quakes, are less sensitive to the level of detail of the exposure dataset than events with narrower and more irregular footprints, such as hailstorms or floods (Chen et al., 2004).

It is thus important to perform the disaggregation of the exposed assets in a more sensible way. In order to do so, different techniques have been applied and are documented in the literature. For example, the disaggregation of the building stock at parish level performed by Silva et al. (2014) in the earthquake risk assessment for mainland Portugal is based on the population distribution on a 30 arc sec grid according to Land-Scan, which in turn is based on road proximity, slope, land cover and night-time lights (Dobson et al., 2000). Another instance is the disaggregation of municipal data carried out by Thieken et al. (2008) in the development of a flood loss estimation model for the private sector, based on CORINE land cover data with the help of a dasymetric mapping approach (Gallego and Peedell, 2001).

Using population distribution to disaggregate building data available at coarser scales is a very reasonable approach, since there is an obvious correlation between the two. It is therefore not surprising that this method is frequently used in risk modelling. However, there are limitations. The distribution of the buildings according to their characteristics (such as structural type, age, etc.), which is known at the administrative unit resolution from census data, cannot accurately be disaggregated into a finer resolution grid by using solely the population at each of the grid cells, since without additional data, the shape of that distribution has to be kept, scaled by the percentage of population estimated for each cell, and this approach can lead to errors in the estimation of losses, especially if the hazard in question has a narrowly shaped footprint, as previously indicated. This issue is further described in the next chapter.

Ideally, building exposure datasets at the necessary resolutions would be based on actual building information, rather than relying on population distribution and/or other proxy variables to perform disaggregation. However, obtaining detailed information about every individual building in a large region is, as already mentioned, not practicable. Nevertheless, for some regions, building vector datasets are publicly available,

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and M. Martina

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



containing their spatial location as well as geometry in terms of footprint and height. These variables, while evidently insufficient to generate an exposure dataset on their own, can be very useful in its development, as explained further below.

The availability of this type of data is increasing. The best example can probably be found in OpenStreetMap (OSM) (<https://www.openstreetmap.org/>), which is a collaborative effort to create an editable map of the world, containing a large number of features, in which buildings are included. The number of mapped buildings in OSM has been continuously increasing in the last few years. At the same time, the interest in 3-D city models has been growing, both among the scientific community and the general public (Uden and Zipf, 2013). Thus, even though for the time being height information is not available for all the mapped buildings in OpenStreetMap, it can be expected that their number will continue increasing at a continuously faster pace, potentially making OSM the most interesting source of open data regarding building locations and geometries. Other possible sources of this sort of information are online public repositories maintained by national or regional authorities. In the case of Italy, for example, the Ministry of Environment (Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare) provides such a service, named Geoportale Nazionale (<http://www.pcn.minambiente.it/GN/>).

It is also worth noting that in terms of closed data, both Google and Microsoft have developed algorithms which are able to extract building footprints and heights from aerial imagery with very good results. An increasing number of cities and respective buildings in 3-D can now be viewed using these companies' software (Parikh, 2012; Bing Maps Team, 2014). Even if the data cannot currently be extracted and used for other purposes, the fact that these solutions are already being implemented can be seen as an indicator that this type of data will tend to become more widely available in the future. Furthermore, the development of tools, such as BREC (Built-up area recognition tool), that allow for the extraction of man-made structures, including shapes, from aerial or satellite high resolution images (Gamba et al., 2009), support this trend.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
⏪	⏩
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	

In the present work, we propose a methodology that takes advantage of the aforementioned type of data in the development of exposure datasets for physical risk modelling. The main advantage of this approach is that, instead of relying on proxies for the disaggregation of census data at coarser resolutions, it uses actual information about the buildings in a certain administrative unit, namely their locations, footprint areas and heights, which in this context are not simply variables used for disaggregating census data, but consist in themselves of additional data that is added to the process, resulting in more accurate results. Moreover, it enables the possibility of creating exposure datasets with higher levels of spatial resolution, although there are limitations, which are analysed. Finally, the results obtained using models with different resolutions are compared in terms of affected residential building areas due to a hypothetical flood event.

2 Methodology, input data and model development

In this chapter, the methodology developed for the production of building exposure datasets, taking advantage of information about building locations, footprint areas and heights, is described. The required input datasets are reported, and an exposure model that was developed for a selected test area is presented – in this study, the municipality of Pavia, capital of the province of Pavia, in the region of Lombardy, Italy, was chosen.

As previously mentioned, at country level, the most consistently available and reliable sources of information about residential buildings are national censuses. Thus, they are often the cornerstone of the development of exposure models for this type of building occupancy. In the present work, information on residential building areas for the municipality of Pavia were obtained from Istat, the Italian National Institute for Statistics (<http://www.istat.it/>). Since the required information is not yet available from the most recent 2011 census, 2001 data is used in this study, more specifically the residential building floor areas distributed by building construction type (unreinforced



masonry, reinforced concrete and others), number of storeys and year of construction. In Fig. 1, this data is illustrated in the form of two distributions.

The main motivation behind the development of the methodology presented herein is the existence of shortcomings in the procedures typically used to disaggregate building census data to finer resolutions in the context of catastrophe risk modelling. When doing so using a proxy variable such as the population distribution, for example, there are three main limitations:

1. No additional information about the buildings themselves is taken into account. When using population as the proxy for disaggregation, the building distributions can be scaled according to the percentage of population of that municipality estimated to live in each grid cell, but it is not possible to accurately change, at each cell, the shape of the distribution for each building class. This is a considerable flaw, as in reality, the typology of buildings can change considerably between different parts of a municipality.
2. While there is an obvious correlation between the number of dwellings in a certain zone and the amount of population that lives there, disaggregating building areas using the population as a proxy is based on the assumption that the building floor area per inhabitant is the same everywhere in the municipality, which is not necessarily true.
3. The disaggregation is limited to the spatial resolution at which the proxy variable is available. However, this resolution can be suboptimal, especially in the case of hazards with smaller or more narrowly-shaped and irregular footprints, as explained in the previous chapter.

Thus, when information about buildings is available, namely their locations, footprints and heights, it can provide the grounds for a much more accurate distribution of census values into a finer resolution grid. This procedure can be considered as more than a mere disaggregation, since the building data used actually consists in another layer of information that is integrated. A conceptual representation is shown in Fig. 2.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



In the present work, for the municipality of Pavia, the building vector data was obtained from the Italian Ministry of Environment's Geoportale Nazionale, through the WFS service (Fig. 3).

In the census data, the total number of classes is 168, which corresponds to all the possible combinations between the classes in each of the three variables – construction type (3), number of storeys (8) and year of construction (7). On the other hand, from the dataset containing the building locations and geometries, it is only possible to divide the buildings into height classes (number of storeys), since there is no information on the two other variables. In this case, since the construction type and age of each individual building are not known, deriving a building-by-building exposure model in a deterministic way is not viable. Thus, a sensible approach is to develop a grid-based exposure model. The fact that actual geographic and geometric building information is used for disaggregating means that the resolution of the grid can be high, but there are limits past which the results are no longer meaningful, due to the fact that the area distributions of some of the required variables are only known at the resolution of the administrative unit. This issue is further discussed in Sect. 3.

The first step in the application of the methodology consists in assigning height classes, in terms of number of storeys, to different height intervals, in such a way that a correspondence can be established between information coming from the census and the vector datasets. The definition of such intervals, shown in Table 1, was carried out by combining data on the number of storeys of a large number of buildings in Pavia, gathered through a field survey, with height information for the same buildings, obtained from Geoportale Nazionale.

After this correspondence is set, the building footprint areas from the vector dataset for each height class can be calculated, both for the entire municipality (Vf_j) and for each grid cell ($vf_{j,k}$), by summing the footprint areas of the buildings inside those areas with heights within the range defined for each of the classes.

Ideally, when developing a residential exposure dataset, as in the case of this study, only residential buildings from the vector dataset should be considered. However, this

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

is almost always impossible, due to the fact that open datasets containing the occupancy type of every building in a region are not commonly available. This does not preclude the application of the methodology, since it is mass-preserving in terms of the census areas, meaning that the total areas for the municipality are equal to the sum of the census areas in each grid cell after disaggregation; nevertheless, the better the estimates of Vf_i and $vf_{i,k}$, the more accurate the exposure model, because of how these variables are used in the process, as presented further below.

In order to improve the accuracy in the estimation of residential building footprint areas from vector data, without knowledge about the occupancy type of each single building, while keeping the process automated enough that it can be applied to very large regions, a balanced approach, which was used in this study, is to consider all the buildings in the dataset except the ones that fall within certain criteria in terms of their area and location. Regarding the former, a footprint area limit of 3200 m^2 (calibrated using the building dataset of Pavia) is defined, above which buildings are considered not to be residential. With respect to the latter, CORINE land cover maps (Bossard et al., 2000) are used to exclude buildings located in areas classified as industrial or commercial (Fig. 4).

The estimated floor areas V_i and $v_{i,k}$, corresponding respectively to the footprint areas Vf_i and $vf_{i,k}$, are then determined by multiplying the footprint areas of each class by the respective number of storeys.

$$V_i = Vf_i \cdot s \quad (1)$$

On the side of the census dataset, the residential building floor areas for each height class C'_i are calculated by aggregating the other census variables, which in this case are the construction type and the year of construction.

$$C'_i = \sum_j C_{i,j} \quad (2)$$

For the present case, the total building floor areas of each height class from both sources are presented in Table 2. It can be observed that the areas obtained from

census data do not match the ones derived from the building vector dataset. This difference is expected and has three main explanations. First, the vector dataset contains all the buildings in the municipality; even after removing the ones located in industrial and commercial areas, many others of different occupancy types remain. Secondly, the floor areas from the vector dataset correspond to the gross areas of the buildings, while the census areas are internal. Lastly, there is a temporal mismatch between the two datasets, which were produced in different years.

The difference between the values in absolute terms is not relevant, as the main objective behind the calculation of the footprint areas shown in Table 2 is to compute area ratios for each height class, using Eq. (3). Nevertheless, it is important to check whether the relative areas follow similar distributions; this is addressed further below.

$$R_i = \frac{C'_i}{V_i} \quad (3)$$

These ratios, obtained from the areas at municipality level, are then to be applied at grid cell level, in order to “scale” the areas obtained from the building geometries inside each of the cells, which are known from the vector dataset. The areas calculated in this way are thus coherent with the census dataset.

$$a'_{i,k} = v_{i,k} \cdot R_i \quad (4)$$

The assumption behind this step is that the area ratios R_i are the same within the municipality, irrespective of the adopted spatial resolution of the exposure model, which is, in our opinion, entirely reasonable.

As previously mentioned, before proceeding, it should be verified whether the data coming from the two sources – census and vector datasets – is in agreement. This can be done by comparing the distributions of the relative footprint areas of each height class, in relation to the total footprint area of the respective dataset. For the municipality of Pavia, the histogram illustrating those distributions is shown in Fig. 5.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and M. Martina

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

The fact that the distributions have similar shapes is a good indicator that the data from both sources is valid and can be confidently used as input for the methodology. It should be noted that even if there wasn't such a good agreement between the distributions, the methodology could still be applied due to its mass-preserving nature, but caution should be exercised in doing so, as that would indicate a likely problem with one or both of the datasets.

The final step of the methodology consists in disaggregating the building floor areas of each grid cell $a'_{i,k}$ into all the original census classes. In order to do so, it is necessary to calculate, for each height class, the fractions of the areas of the other variables, at municipality level (e.g. fraction of floor area of 3 storey masonry buildings built between 1946 and 1961, in relation to the total floor area of 3 storey buildings).

$$F_{i,j} = \frac{C_{i,j}}{C'_i} \quad (5)$$

Finally, the disaggregated floor areas can be calculated for each grid cell.

$$a_{i,j,k} = a'_{i,k} \cdot F_{i,j} \quad (6)$$

Applying the fractions $F_{i,j}$, which are calculated at municipality level, to the grid cell level, is based on the assumption that, for each height class, the distribution of the other variables is similar. This assumption has limitations, which ultimately limit the level of spatial resolution up to which the gridded exposure model can be taken. This issue is discussed more comprehensively in Sect. 3.

The methodology described in this chapter is summarized in Fig. 6, in the form of a flowchart.

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the methodology was applied in the development of a residential building exposure dataset for the municipality of Pavia. Additionally, a second model based on population distribution was elaborated, with the purpose of comparing results obtained using the two approaches. The population-based exposure model derives from the 2011 GEOSTAT population dataset, which is

can be draw from the analysis of the results for GC2. As in the case of GC1, the population-based model is unable to capture the area distribution per height class in the grid cell, where there are predominantly low-rise buildings. In this particular area, according to the building dataset, there are no buildings with heights of over 16.60 m (or 4 storeys according to the adopted correspondence, Table 1). However, since the population-based model does not take this information into account, the shape of the original distribution is kept, meaning that the results for this grid cell are, similarly to GC1, incorrect. Conversely, the vector-based model is able to capture the building areas and their height profile much more accurately.

3 Balance between model resolution and uncertainty

The application of the methodology presented in Sect. 2 enables the possibility of creating grid-based exposure models with a level of spatial resolution that isn't constrained by the resolution of the input dataset, since it consists of actual building footprints instead of gridded information, such as population or land use.

However, given the limited nature of the information that can be obtained from the building dataset, the maximum resolution that the gridded exposure model should have is limited as well. The dataset provides locations, footprints and heights of each of the buildings in the municipality, but information on the other variables (in this case, material type and year of construction) is only available at the resolution of the administrative unit. Thus, when performing the spatial disaggregation of census data, the distributions of those variables are kept regardless of the dimensions of the grid cells. This procedure, however, can only be considered valid up to a certain level of spatial resolution of the grid, which corresponds to the limit of the assumption of representativeness of the distributions. At higher resolutions, the grid cells become so small and therefore contain so few buildings, that the floor area distributions for each individual cell are meaningless.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

In this chapter, we analyse the relation between resolution and uncertainty in the development of a gridded exposure model. In order to enable this analysis, the first step consisted in generating grids with five different levels of spatial resolution, other than the 1 km × 1 km grid already shown in the previous chapter. The selected grid-cell sizes were 750 m × 750 m, 500 m × 500 m, 250 m × 250 m, 125 m × 125 m and 50 m × 50 m. Two of these grids are shown in Fig. 11.

For each of the six grids, at every grid cell, the fractions of residential footprint areas of each height class were calculated, in relation to the total residential footprint areas in the same cell. The results are plotted in Fig. 12, together with the census fractions at the level of the municipality.

The coefficients of variation of the root mean square deviations of the relative height class areas, for each grid resolution, in relation to the relative areas at municipality level, were quantified. For buildings with 1 and 2 storeys, the results are plotted in Fig. 13, together with power law fits to the data. In this figure, it is possible to observe that up to a certain level of resolution, the increase in CV(RMSD) is gradual and relatively constant, after which it becomes more abrupt, between 250 m × 250 m and 500 m × 500 m. The results are shown for 1 and 2 storey buildings as an example; a similar pattern is followed for all the eight height classes.

Understandably, decreasing the size of the cells increases the variability of the relative areas for each building class. In Fig. 13, this is shown in terms of height classes. For this variable, the distributions at each cell can be calculated regardless of the resolution of the grid, since this information is available from the building vector dataset. However, as mentioned above, the variables that are only known at municipality level cannot be disaggregated due to lack of information, meaning that the original distributions have to be kept. After a certain level of resolution, the dispersion in relative areas of each building class is so high that the assumption that class distributions have similar shapes at municipality and grid cell levels is no longer reasonable.

If on the one hand, adopting an exposure model with larger grid cell size results in lower uncertainties in the building class distributions on a cell-by-cell basis, on the

other, it can also lead to larger errors when calculating risk, especially in the case of perils with narrowly-shaped footprints. Thus, it is paramount to find a good balance between these two aspects. This issue is further analysed in Sect. 4, for a test case of a flood scenario.

4 Influence of the model resolution on the estimated impacts due to a flood scenario

In this chapter, we investigate the impact that the spatial resolution of the exposure datasets can have in the results of a risk model. In order to do so, a straightforward procedure was adopted, based on the estimation of affected footprint areas of each building class for a hypothetical flood event in the municipality of Pavia, using different exposure models.

In terms of hazard, the definition of the flood footprint was based on the flood hazard maps produced by the Po River Basin Authority (partially shown in Fig. 14), more specifically flood zone B (*fascia B*), which covers the areas at risk in case of floods with a return period of 200 years (Autorità di Bacino del fiume Po, 1999). Naturally, this does not mean that a 200 year flood would necessarily affect all the area simultaneously, but for the purpose at hand, it is reasonable to use it as an estimation of the flood footprint.

Assuming that the water depth of this hypothetical flood is insufficient to reach the second storey of the buildings in the flooded area, the affected floor areas for each of the 168 classes of buildings were calculated, which was done in two steps. Firstly, $a_{i,j,k}$ was divided by the number of storeys (s), in order to obtain the ground level floor areas corresponding to each of the classes. These areas were then multiplied by the fraction of the respective cells covered by the flood footprint, which is based on the premise that the assets assigned to each grid cell are uniformly distributed in space – an unavoidable procedure when using gridded models. However, that premise is not necessarily true, and this is the fundamental reason why results obtained using gridded exposure models with higher spatial resolutions contain smaller errors and

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



are closer to reality, especially when the hazard in question has a narrowly-shaped, irregular footprint, as is the case of floods.

The affected areas referred to in the previous paragraph are shown in Table 4 for the six vector-based gridded models mentioned in Sect. 3, as well as for a model based on a uniform spatial distribution of the assets in the municipality, without performing any kind of disaggregation. The best estimates of the total affected building areas for this case were also computed, which was done by applying the same methodology, considering the flood footprint itself as one cell. The relative differences of the results obtained using the aforementioned models with relation to the best estimate are shown as well.

As shown in Table 4, the estimation of the affected floor areas is highly dependent on the resolution of the adopted exposure model. Using models with lower resolutions lead to an overestimation of the areas when compared with the best estimates using the actual flood footprint. These results are coherent with what can be observed by overlapping the flood map, grid and building locations. As it can be observed in Fig. 14, in a majority of cases, buildings are located outside the parts of the grid cells covered by the flood extension, meaning that the consideration of a uniform spatial distribution of buildings inside each cell tends to lead to an overestimation of the affected floor areas and, therefore, damages. Understandably, this issue is exacerbated by using a coarser grid, as a higher fraction of cells contain the boundaries of the flood footprint. For other perils, this difference would expectably be lower. When modelling flood events in other areas using a gridded exposure model, a similar behaviour is generally to be expected, at least in the case of developed countries. This is due to the fact that usually, buildings tend to be more concentrated outside areas prone to flooding, either due to the existence of defences such as levees or as a result of urban planning.

The selection of the spatial resolution has an influence not only on the error in the estimation of flood risk, but also on the uncertainty in the exposure model, as previously explained in Sect. 3. In an attempt to graphically represent the balance that should exist between these two components, so as to make this notion more evident and clear,

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



5 firstly, a rescaling was performed to bring the values of CV(RMSD) of the eight height classes (Fig. 13) and the estimation errors of affected building areas (Table 4) into the range of [0, 1]. Regression models were then fitted to the data using the least squares approach, using a power law for the former and a second-order polynomial model for the latter. The results are shown in Fig. 16.

10 Conceptually, the obtained regression functions, shown in the above figure, intend to represent the cost of using different exposure models in relation to their spatial resolution, in terms of accuracy and precision of the building class distributions (represented by the grey curves) and of the errors in the estimation of affected assets (black curve). The lowest total cost – which should correspond to the optimal balance between these two aspects – is given by the intersection of the former with the latter. In this case, its range is represented by blue crosses in Fig. 15.

15 It should be highlighted that the main purpose behind carrying out this procedure was to conceptually demonstrate the balance that should exist between the two components, since their costs refer to different types of quantities and the adopted scaling procedure has limitations. The normalization performed in order to bring them into a common range of values is necessary, but ideally they should also be weighted so as to reflect the importance of each of them in the quality of the results of the risk model. This step is outside the scope of the present study, and would be an interesting topic for future research. Nevertheless, the adopted simplified approach can be useful in providing an indication about the range of grid resolutions that can in overall lead to the most reliable results. Following this line of thought, it can be assumed that for the case at hand – as well as in other cases with similar characteristics in terms of hazard and exposure – adopting a gridded model with a resolution between 250 m × 250 m and 500 m × 500 m would likely ensure a sensible balance between uncertainty in the exposure model and error in the estimation of affected assets.

25 As a final remark, the discussion presented above is based on the consideration that the exposure model is to be used within a typical risk calculation framework, in which it is defined beforehand, with a certain level of resolution and independently from the

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

spatial characteristics of the hazard. Even though this is the widely adopted procedure for risk calculation, in the case of floods, given the significance of errors that can derive from using coarse exposure models (as shown in Table 4), it is pertinent to suggest and briefly discuss a few potential alternatives, even if they are more complicated and would be more onerous to implement in practical applications. A possible approach would be to use a higher resolution grid that could capture the shape of the hazard more accurately, and then re-aggregate the results into a coarser grid, so that the number of buildings within each cell would be enough to ensure representativeness of the class distributions and, therefore, the accuracy of the cell-by-cell spatial distribution of damages. This procedure, however, could be less practical due to the need to post-process the results. Other potentially interesting approaches would be to develop exposure models using variable-resolution grids and/or irregularly-shaped cells, defined beforehand by taking the footprints of the hazard maps into account.

5 Conclusions

The building exposure component of risk models is frequently based on census data, which is often the most reliable source of building information, but unfortunately is usually only available at coarse resolutions. The disaggregation of census data to a higher resolution grid has often been based on proxies such as the population distribution; this approach, however, is not ideal. In this paper, a methodology was proposed to take advantage of open building data in order to disaggregate census data in a more sensible way. The building distributions obtained using this methodology were shown to better capture reality, when compared to models based on population distribution.

Given the incomplete nature of publicly available building information that can generally be obtained, the exposure dataset cannot be generated on a building by building basis, and thus using a grid is a sensible solution. While the resolution of the grid is not limited to the resolution of a proxy variable, there is another type of limitation related with the fact that only some of the building characteristics are known. After a certain

point, the uncertainty in the building distribution at each cell becomes too high and the results are no longer meaningful. This issue was investigated.

A flood event was then simulated, and the results in terms of affected building floor areas were compared, in order to assess the level of error that is introduced by using exposure models with different levels of resolution in the estimation of impacts for this type of hazard. It was concluded that, in the case of floods, lower resolutions of the exposure model will in general lead to an overestimation of the affected buildings.

A balance should be achieved between, on the one hand, the exposure model's accuracy and precision, and on other, the errors in the estimation of affected buildings. In order to graphically represent this notion, functions were fitted to each of the components, normalized and intersected; conceptually, these functions can be understood as cost functions, and in this context, their intersections represent the lowest total costs, which correspond to the optimal resolutions. Even if the procedure was carried out in a simplified manner, it provided a useful indication about the range of grid resolutions to be adopted when applying the proposed methodology in the development of exposure datasets for flood risk modelling.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the ECOSTRESS project (Ecological COastal Strategies and Tools for Resilient European Societies), funded by the European Commission, DG ECHO (ECHO/SUB/2013/671461).

References

Autorità di Bacino del fiume Po.: Piano stralcio per l'Assetto Idrogeologico (PAI) – 7.II, Allegato 3 – Metodo di delimitazione delle fasce fluviali, Parma, 1999.

Bing Maps Team: Over 100 New Streetside and 3D Cities Go Live on Bing Maps (Blog post), available at: <http://blogs.bing.com/maps/2014/08/20/over-100-new-streetside-and-3d-cities-go-live-on-bing-maps/> (last access: 18 March 2015), 2014.

Bossard, M., Feranec, J., and Otahel, J.: CORINE land cover technical guide – Addendum 2000, European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, 2000.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Chen, K., McAneney, J., Blong, R., Leigh, R., Hunter, L., and Magill, C.: Defining area at risk and its effect in catastrophe loss estimation: a dasymetric mapping approach, *Appl. Geogr.*, 24, 97–117, doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2004.03.005, 2004.

Dell'Acqua, F., Gamba, P., and Jaiswal, K.: Spatial aspects of building and population exposure data and their implications for global earthquake exposure modeling, *Nat. Hazards*, 68, 1291–1309, doi:10.1007/s11069-012-0241-2, 2012.

Dobson, J. E., Bright, E. A., Coleman, P. R., Durfee, R. C., and Worley, B. A.: LandScan: a global population database for estimating populations at risk, *Photogramm. Eng. Rem. S.*, 66, 849–857, 2000.

Gallego, J. and Peedell, S.: Using CORINE Land Cover to map population density, Towards Agri-Environmental Indicators, Topic Report 6/2001, European Environment Agency, Copenhagen, 92–103, 2001.

Gamba, P., Dell'Acqua, F., and Lisini, G.: BREC: the built-up area RECOgnition tool, in: 2009 Joint Urban Remote Sensing Event, IEEE, 1–5, doi:10.1109/URS.2009.5137593, 2009.

Grossi, P., Kunreuther, H., and Windeler, D.: An introduction to catastrophe models and insurance, in: *Catastrophe Modeling: A New Approach to Managing Risk*, Springer, USA, 23–42, 2005.

Kron, W.: Keynote lecture: Flood risk = hazard × exposure × vulnerability, in: *Flood Defence '2002*, edited by: Wu, B., Wang, Z.-Y., Wang, G., Huang, G. G. H., Fang, H., and Huang, J., Science Press, New York, 82–97, 2002.

Parikh, B.: Expanded coverage of building footprints in Google Maps (Blog post), available at: <http://google-latlong.blogspot.com/2012/10/expanded-coverage-of-building.html> (last access: 18 March 2015), 2012.

Silva, V., Crowley, H., Varum, H., and Pinho, R.: Seismic risk assessment for mainland Portugal, *B. Earthq. Engin.*, 13, 429–457, doi:10.1007/s10518-014-9630-0, 2014.

Stephenson, D.: *Definition, diagnosis and origin of extreme weather and climate events*, in: *Climate Extremes and Society*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 11–23, 2008.

Thieken, A. H., Olschewski, A., Kreibich, H., Kobsch, S., and Merz, B.: Development and evaluation of FLEMOps – a new Flood Loss Estimation MOdel for the private sector, *Wit. Trans. Ecol. Envir.*, 1, 315–324, doi:10.2495/FRIAR080301, 2008.

Uden, M., and Zipf, A.: OpenBuildingModels – towards a platform for crowdsourcing virtual 3D cities, in: *Progress and New Trends in 3D Geoinformation Sciences*, edited by: Pouliot, J.,

Daniel, S., Hubert, F., and Zamyadi, A., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-29793-9, 299–314, 2013.

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe: Measuring Population and Housing – Practices of UNECE countries in the 2000 round of censuses, New York, Geneva, 2007.

NHESSD

3, 5045–5084, 2015

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[|◀](#)

[▶|](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[▶⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

Table 1. Correspondence between height classes (census) and height intervals (building vector data).

Nr. of storeys	Height (m)
1	$h \leq 4.80$
2	$4.80 < h \leq 8.60$
3	$8.60 < h \leq 12.45$
4	$12.45 < h \leq 16.60$
5	$16.60 < h \leq 20.75$
6	$20.75 < h \leq 24.90$
7	$24.90 < h \leq 28.70$
8+	$h > 28.70$

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

Table 2. Estimated floor areas of the buildings of each height class.

Nr. of storeys	Census data		Vector data		Ratio R_i
	Area (m ²)	Relative area	Area (m ²)	Relative area	
1	91 059.0	0.029	340 766.1	0.050	0.267
2	654 282.0	0.209	1 527 360.2	0.222	0.428
3	797 247.0	0.254	1 968 133.2	0.286	0.405
4	732 016.0	0.233	1 700 485.7	0.247	0.430
5	402 393.0	0.128	726 374.9	0.106	0.554
6	214 509.0	0.068	511 209.3	0.074	0.420
7	154 826.0	0.049	53 968.3	0.008	2.869
8+	88 856.0	0.028	45 427.4	0.007	1.956

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[|◀](#)

[▶|](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Table 3. Total residential RC building floor areas for cells GC1 and GC2.

Grid cell	Total RC floor areas (m ²)	
	Vector-based model	Population-based model
GC1	123 033.2	59 059.8
GC2	19 964.6	34 197.5

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Table 4. Estimated flooded floor areas using different exposure models.

Model	Resolution (m ²)	Affected floor area (m ²)	Ratio
Best estimate	–	29 522.5	–
Proposed methodology at different grid resolutions	50 × 50	31 917.4	1.08
	125 × 125	38 009.6	1.29
	250 × 250	48 018.0	1.63
	500 × 500	69 506.4	2.35
	750 × 750	90 692.9	3.07
	1000 × 1000	112 085.8	3.80
No disaggregation (buildings uniformly distributed within municipality)	–	131 797.4	4.46

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 1. Distribution of residential building footprint areas in the municipality of Pavia, according to material type, number of storeys and year of construction.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)



[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)






Figure 2. Conceptual representation of the methodology.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#) | [Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#) | [References](#)

[Tables](#) | [Figures](#)

[⏪](#) | [⏩](#)

[◀](#) | [▶](#)

[Back](#) | [Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 3. Left: building footprints for the municipality of Pavia; right: highlight of a part of the municipality, with buildings classified by height, from lower (light orange) to higher (dark orange).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)




Figure 4. Municipality of Pavia – building footprints, 1 km² grid and CORINE areas of land cover class “Industrial or commercial units” (in red). Buildings in blue are considered non-residential.

NHESSD

3, 5045–5084, 2015

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 5. Comparison of relative building footprint areas of each height class between census and vector datasets.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)






Figure 6. Flowchart of the methodology.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#) [Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#) [References](#)

[Tables](#) [Figures](#)

[⏪](#) [⏩](#)

[◀](#) [▶](#)

[Back](#) [Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina


[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Figure 7. 1 km² grid adopted in the vector- and population-based exposure models. Cells highlighted in red are used to illustrate the differences between the two models.



Figure 8. Bird's eye images of two areas of the municipality of Pavia with different predominant building typologies. Top panel: GC1, mainly high-rise buildings; bottom panel: GC2, Mainly low-rise buildings. Source: Bing Maps.

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 9. Residential reinforced concrete building floor areas per height class, from the vector- and population- based exposure models, for cell GC1.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 10. Residential reinforced concrete building floor areas per height class, from the vector- and population- based exposure models, for cell GC2.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina


[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Figure 11. Grids with resolutions of 500 m × 500 m (left panel) and 125 m × 125 m (right panel).

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 12. Relative footprint areas of buildings of each height class in every grid cell, for grids with six different spatial resolutions. Red rhombuses represent fractions at municipality level.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

[⏪](#)

[⏩](#)

[◀](#)

[▶](#)

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 13. CV(RMSD) of the relative areas of 1 (left panel) and 2 (right panel) storey buildings, for six different levels of resolution of the grid (50 m × 50 m, 125 m × 125 m, 250 m × 250 m, 500 m × 500 m, 750 m × 750 m and 1000 m × 1000 m), in relation to the relative areas at municipality level, together with power law fits to the data.

[Title Page](#)

[Abstract](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Conclusions](#)

[References](#)

[Tables](#)

[Figures](#)

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

[Back](#)

[Close](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)



Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 14. Flood zones A (green) and B (yellow) in the municipality of Pavia, according to the Po River Basin Authority map.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Using open building data in the development of exposure datasets

R. Figueiredo and
M. Martina




Figure 15. Regression models fitted to the normalized CV(RMSD) of the eight height classes (grey curves) and estimation errors of affected building areas (black curve).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)