

**Manuscript: nhess-2019-253 "Changes in flood damage with global warming in the east coast of Spain".**

Dear Dr. Sergio Martín Vicente Serrano,

In accordance with your instructions, we submit the revised version of the manuscript nhess-2019-253 for consideration for publication in Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences (NHESS), taking into account the reviewers' comments. We thank the reviewers and the editor for their thoughtful suggestions which have helped us to significantly improve how the analysis is presented.

The most evident changes applied to the manuscript are summarised below:

1. Taking into account the comments of reviewer #1, we have further deepened the important role of the vulnerability and exposure factors in flood risk, and the paper now includes a more in-depth description of these factors in the Introduction section.
2. Taking into account the comments of reviewer #1, we better explain our model strategy hoping to make it clearer that the main technical concerns of the reviewer do not apply in our statistical approach.
3. Taking into account the comments of reviewer #2, we have included the cross-validation method in our models using the leaving-one-out validation procedure.
4. Taking into account the comments of reviewer #2, we have explained better our methodology in the manuscript.

We are confident that these changes have improved the statistical significance of the analyses, and have improved the clarity of the presentation. Most importantly, the changes did not alter our conclusions and key findings. Instead, they strengthened the main message already reported in the previous version, giving even more confidence in the relevance and robustness of the results. We hope that in the revised manuscript, we have addressed all the comments and suggestions of the reviewers.

We enclose the revised version of the paper, a letter with detailed responses to all the editors and reviewers' comments, and a version of the article highlighting the differences between the original and the revised versions.

We hope that the revised manuscript now meets the criteria for publication in NHESS.

Sincerely,

Maria Cortès, on behalf of the co-authors

**Responses to reviewer #1 (Alfredo Perez):**

**Reviewer #1. GENERAL COMMENTS:**

In this article the authors carry out an assessment of the probability of future damaging events in two Western Mediterranean regions in Spain, considering both climate change and changes in exposure according to different socioeconomic scenarios. Although the results show a promising methodology for predicting flood damage, several suggestions should take into account before the work will be publish.

**Response:** We would like to thank the reviewer for his very constructive comments.

**Reviewer #1. A) Introduction:** "In Spain, the findings of Barredo et al. (2012) align with these results; they find no significant trend in adjusted insured flood losses between 1971 and 2008. These studies show the need to include exposure and vulnerability changes in future risk projections, which clearly contribute substantially to changing risks." I think that relevance given to social variables (exposure and vulnerability) in this work is very correct. In recent years, they have acquired as much or more importance than the physical ones within the risk formula. However, from my point of view, according to the results and the significance of these social variables in the models obtained, these social variables should be better explained. Therefore, I would like to see a paragraph in the introduction of the new version of the work that deepens in this regard.

**Response:** We found the bibliography provided by the reviewer very interesting, and we agree on including a paragraph in the introduction section that goes deeper in the role of exposure and vulnerability factors in flood risk. We have added this paragraph (line 26, page 2):

"Other studies such as López-Martínez et al. (2017) and Pérez-Morales et al. (2018) also mention the vulnerability and exposure components as possible drivers responsible for the increasing flood risk in Mediterranean regions of Spain. Specifically, these studies mention the institutional vulnerability (Raschky et al. 2008), which represents the sensitivity of public administrations to deal with hazards, as one of the main causes. Also, Pérez-Morales et al. (2018) demonstrated that the exposure in flood-prone areas in the south-east of Spain (part of the region of study) has increased in the last decades, due to a poor management of these areas by government institutions and the regulation adopted by them."

**Reviewer #1. B) Limitations and future research:** "Future research should focus on incorporating further variables into the model to reproduce the complexity of flood risk. flood damage caused by other types of flood events, such as those caused by heavy precipitation episodes (surface water floods), and also taking into account the changes in the population in the analysis". On the other hand, I suggest to the authors that, for the improvement of the models in future works, take into account those variables more related to building. Cadastre offers high-resolution temporal space data very useful in this regard. Although variables such as the number of inhabitants, population density per square kilometre, etc. can be significant, they are frankly improvable due to their level of temporal space aggregation. This implies an important generalization that does not

correctly represent the exposure, much less vulnerability. In the case of flooding hazard, cadastre and the variable "number of buildings per census tract" of the INE are much more precise. In fact, Cadastre is much more related to the database of damages registered by the insurance consortium, since these indemnities are associated with insurance policies connected to buildings or homes with cadastral references.

**Response:** We wish to thank the reviewer for this constructive comment and for the information provided. We agree on the improvement of the future works by considering more variables related to the exposure and vulnerability when analysing flood risk. In this work, we have chosen representative exposure variable to obtain in future projections in order to use the same model developed in the present climate for predicting future flood damage. In order to emphasise this, we have changed the following sentence in the manuscript (line 13, page 23):

"Future research should focus on incorporating further variables into the model to reproduce the complexity of flood risk, not only regarding hazard drivers but also considering more variables related to the exposure and vulnerability, as for example those related to the buildings present in the study region."

**Reviewer #1. C) Data. Line 21:** "The population data corresponds to the year when the flood event took place". According to this, the availability and source consulted year by year must be indicated. Municipal Register of inhabitants or Population Census.

**Response:** We agree with the reviewer and we have added this information in the manuscript. In addition, the reviewer's comment has helped us to realise that there was an error in the population data source of Catalonia. Population data of both regions (Catalonia and the Valencian Community) have been obtained from the same source (Spanish National Statistics Institute). We have changed the sentence as following (line 19, page 6):

"Population data for both regions were obtained from the municipal register of inhabitants provided by the Spanish National Statistics Institute..."

**Reviewer #1. D) Generalized Linear Mixed Model:** As far as my knowledge on the subject goes, it would be convenient to carry out a spatial autocorrelation test (Moran's I) to rule out the assumptions discussed in the text of the paper.

**Response:** The spatial autocorrelation is almost negligible in this case. The model includes a random effect associated with the geographical basin to reflect the autocorrelation for observations coming from the same basin, and the estimates for this component have a standard deviation that can be considered zero. This means that when considering the observations from the same basin, these observations can be considered independent. For analysing the case of spatial correlation as a function of the distance between basins, we have applied the suggested test (Moran's I) for three variables: Number of events, sum of damages and mean damage. The p-values for the test in each variable confirm that there is no need to consider spatial correlation in this case.

In order to clarify this point and to not create misunderstanding, we have changed the following sentence in the manuscript (page 8, line 16):

"This implies high correlations within the observations, not guaranteeing the independence requirement of the Generalized Linear Models (GLM)."

For:

“This implies that the observations are grouped by random factors, not guaranteeing the independence requirement of the Generalized Linear Models (GLM).”

**Reviewer #1. D) Generalized Linear Mixed Model:** Likewise, it would be convenient to compare the accuracy of the results with other models such as Geographically Weighted Logistic Regression (LGWR) since, as indicated in the work, there is very strong spatial autocorrelation that could reduce the accuracy of the results. The LGWR models are effective to solve spatial autocorrelation and non-stationarity, or regional variation, of some variables. Thus, the results of the GLMM models could be improved since it is possible to differentiate the local spatial variations of the parameters estimated by means of the implementation of a kernel function, that allows to make estimations adjusted to each observation giving greater influence on the closer observations.

**Response:** We agree with the reviewer that if there would have been significant the spatial autocorrelation, these kind of models could have been useful. But in this case, there are two random factors that are crossed: basin (spatial effect) and flood events (time effect). The model estimation indicates that the first is not significant but the second is. We have fitted the proposed models (LGWR) to evaluate the impact of spatial autocorrelation in the parameter estimation, but, to our knowledge, the implementation (<https://github.com/pysal/mgwr>) does not include the existence of random effects, so the time effect is not included in this model, which is clearly significant in our case. The results of the model obtained with LGWR are the same as the GLMM when the flood event effect is not considered.

**Reviewer #1. E) Future probability of damaging events. Regional rivalry (SSP3):** Population scenarios and, specifically SSP3, which represents a decrease in damage should be explained in greater detail by relating the comment within the context of the study area. In fact, this aspect is crucial, since it is a good find from which to establish these adaptation measures or strategies to climate change impacts.

**Response:** We agree with the reviewer's comment and we have included a paragraph in the results section (line 11, page 19):

“This scenario refers to a fragmented world with an emphasis on security at the expense of international development. In rich-OECD countries (defined by OECD membership and the World Bank category of high-income country), to which both regions of our study belong, the SSP3 scenario depicts a low fertility rate, high mortality and low immigration (Samir and Lutz, 2017). Therefore, population is assumed to decrease in these countries (see Figure 8). On the other hand, the largest increases in probability are found under SSP5, since this has the largest increase in population (see Figure 8). As mentioned before, this scenario refers to a world that emphasizes technological progress and where economic growth is fostered by the rapid development of human capital. In rich-OECD countries a low mortality rate, high immigration and a relatively high fertility rate are expected, due to a high technology and a very high standard of living that allows for easier combination of work and family (Samir and Lutz, 2017).”

**Reviewer #1. SPECIFIC ASPECTS:**

A) Figure 2. Map of both regions of study (put white lines of the provinces)

**Response:** We have followed the reviewer's suggestion and tried to include provinces lines in the map but for visual criteria we have decided to consider only basin borders.

B) “The solid line indicates the best estimate while the shaded blue bands indicate the 95 % confidence interval”. This phrase is repeated both in the body text and in the figures caption. Consider removing from the body text.

**Response:** We have removed from the body text following the reviewer’s suggestion.

## **Responses to reviewer #2:**

**Reviewer #2.** The paper presents an analysis of the expected change of flood damages under future climate scenarios for two regions on the North-East of the Iberian Peninsula. The authors present a model to estimate the probability of occurrence of damaging events based on daily precipitation and population. The model is calibrated for observed events in the two regions and then it is used to estimate changes in the probability of occurrence of damaging events with a global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 C and population estimates consistent with SSPs. The topic is relevant because the scientific community is currently addressing flood risk changes under climate change incorporating exposure. In my opinion, the main contributions of the paper are the application of the Generalized Linear Model to obtain the probability of a damaging event and the set of results obtained for the two regions under different scenarios. I also found interesting the discussion on the role of explanatory variables (precipitation and population) on determining the flood risk. These results are relevant for scientists working on climate risks and the methodology can be extended to other domains. Overall, the manuscript is correctly organized and well written, adequately illustrated with figures and tables. The topic fits well within the scope of Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, the objectives are clear and well identified and the conclusions are adequately supported by the results and discussion. Therefore, I think the paper deserves publication in NHESS. I am just offering a few suggestions for minor revisions that could improve the manuscript with a little further work.

**Response:** We wish to thank the anonymous referee for his/her useful and constructive comments. Each specific point has been addressed in the manuscript as explained in the following document.

**Reviewer #2.** In my opinion the presentation of the formulation and validation of the GLM model could be improved with some additional explanations. I found the problem formulation a bit confusing. The authors mention “the probability of large damaging events occurring given a certain precipitation amount”. The “large damaging event” is related to a certain quantile of the sample of insurance compensations. I understood that the “certain precipitation amount” is 40 mm in 24 h. Therefore, the model estimates the probability of having damages exceeding the threshold when mean precipitation exceeds 40 mm in 24 h. However, as shown in the appendix, basin populations are very different and damages should be evaluated according to the population. How do you account for the fact that basins are heterogeneous in size and have different population densities? Do you assume that the entire basin population is affected by the flood?

**Response:** As the reviewer correctly mentioned, the model estimates the probability of a damaging event, defined as the exceedance of different damage thresholds, when mean precipitation exceeds 40 mm in 24 h. In the model, we take into account the heterogeneities of the basin incorporating the population as explanatory variable. As the

reviewer commented, we assume that the entire population of the basin is affected by the flood event, since the smallest unit of study is the basin. We also considered the area of the basin as explanatory variable, but it didn't provide information on the response variable. We have added a new sentence in the following paragraph of the article to clarify this point (line 31-32, page 7):

"The minimum geographical unit of the study is the river-basin-scale and we only consider the flood cases that recorded a mean precipitation in the basin higher than 40 mm in 24 h. Therefore, the model estimates the probability of having economic damages exceeding different damage thresholds (percentiles) when mean precipitation in the basin exceeds 40 mm in 24 h."

**Reviewer #2.** The second question is related to model validation through the ROC diagram. I got the impression that the same sample was used for model fitting and for model validation. Could the authors please clarify this point?

**Response:** In this case, the out-of-sample validation has not been included in the study, only the in-sample validation. So the reviewer is right: we use the whole data to estimate the model and validate the predictions.

When dealing with mixed models, the cross-validation can be a bit more complicated, because of the grouped structure of the data. In this study, there are two random effects (basin and flood event). The spatial effect is not significant, so this factor can be negligible for the cross-validation procedure. But the flood event is significant and the number of basins affected from a flood event is not balanced, ranging from 1 to 11, and the cross-validation procedure must take this configuration into account. One method to minimize the impact of such limitation is to use the leave-one-out procedure, where the model is fitted with all the observations except the one used for predicting. When the number of basins affected by one flood event is only 1 (in 32 cases) the random effect for this event is not well estimated, implying a worse prediction for these data.

We have used the in-sample validation in the main text of the article since the main objective for the development of the climate present model is to use it for prediction. However, we have added the results of the area under the ROC curve (RA) using the leave-one-out method in the tables and the ROC diagrams for the examples of the two regions in the Appendix section. We have clarified this in the methodology section adding a sentence in the Validation part (line 32, page 8):

"The model validation has been carried out using both in-sample and out-of-sample (i.e. leaving-one-out cross-validation) methods."

**Reviewer #2.** The third question is related to model application in climate scenarios. The results shown correspond to changes in the probability of damaging events. How are those changes computed? The GLM produces the probability of having a "damaging" event, given a precipitation amount  $P$  and a basin population  $R$ . Therefore, it produces one probability per event. Since the number and nature of events are different in the control and in the future periods, how are the changes in probability computed using the GLM? I would appreciate if the authors could elaborate on this, since the Methodology section ends abruptly after the presentation of precipitation and population projections.

**Response:** We have used the same relation between variables obtained in the development of the present climate model for the future model. Therefore, we assume that the relation is stationary, however, the values of the variables change, because we incorporate the projections values for precipitation and population. Any other change in

the model would involve collecting new data from future observations that we do not have. In the future, when we will have new data, this model can be estimated again by adding new observations to improve it and check its performance.

Regarding the random effects, the model used for the future prediction (considering precipitation and population projections data) is the average model, thus, it is based on the fixed effects and does not consider the random effects, which are assigned to zero, their expected value.

In order to clarify this point, we have followed the suggestions of the reviewer and add a sentence after the population projections in the Methodology section (line 15, page 11): "After both precipitation and population data for future scenarios have been corrected, the model developed for the present climate has been used to estimate probability of a damaging event in the future. Since the number of flood events and their nature in the future are unknown, the average model has been applied for the prediction."

**Reviewer #2.** Regarding the climate projections, the authors mention that they selected 30-year periods of EURO-CORDEX simulations starting from the year when the 20-year running mean exceeds the temperature thresholds. These periods are shown on Table 1. However, the SSP population projections are time dependent, but not temperature dependent. Where the analyses made with a different population for each model? Is this a methodological inconsistency? Could the authors provide a brief discussion on this?

**Response:** The SSP population projections are certainly year dependent, therefore, we have considered the population, regarding to each SSP, of the year of the observation. As each model has its 30-year period window per each level of global warming, we have considered the precipitation observation of these years as well as the population (for the 5 SSP) of the year of each precipitation observation.

**Reviewer #2.** Regarding data, the authors mention several data sources to identify flood events in the two regions (INUNGAMA, PRESSGAMA and FLOODHYMEX). They seem to use the events identified in these datasets to obtain the damage data provided by the Insurance Compensation Consortium, with a continuous record 1996-2015. Did you check if there are events with relevant damage data in the ICC dataset not included in the other data sources?

**Response:** As the reviewer mentioned, we have only considered the compensation produced in the basins affected by a flood event that is registered in the flood databases. The CCS database contain more claims than that we have considered, however they are not always are related with a real flood event. For this reason, we have only taken into account the days when we know that a flood event took place.

**Reviewer #2.** Apart from the above points, there are a few practical details that could improve the paper:

Pag 3, line 14, "summarises"... should be "summarise"?

**Response:** We have changed it in the manuscript.

Pag 13, lines 2-3, "which was affected by 69 flood events between 1996 and 2015, resulting in 171 flood cases". Which is the difference between a "flood event" and a "flood case"?

**Response:** A flood case is each basin affected by a flood event. Therefore, each observation of the sample. In the page 8 (lines 5-7) of the manuscript is explained in these words:

“For each event there can be more than one set of values, depending on the number of affected catchments. From now on we will use the expression "flood case" for each set of values corresponding to a basin affected by a flood event.”

Pag 16, line 15, “showed”... should be “shown”?

**Response:** We have changed it in the manuscript.

Pag 22, line 17, “capture”... should be “captured”?

**Response:** We have changed it in the manuscript.

Pag 26, Basin 130 is missing from the list in Table A2.

**Response:** We have corrected and added a new row in the table. Thank you very much for your observation.



# Changes in flood damage with global warming in the east coast of Spain

Maria Cortès<sup>1,2</sup>, Marco Turco<sup>3,\*</sup>, Philip Ward<sup>4</sup>, Josep A. Sánchez-Espigares<sup>5</sup>, Lorenzo Alfieri<sup>6</sup>, and Maria Carmen Llasat<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Applied Physics, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, 08028, Spain

<sup>2</sup>Water Research Institute (IdRA), University of Barcelona, Barcelona, 08001, Spain

<sup>3</sup>Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC), 08034 Barcelona, Spain

<sup>\*</sup>Now at: Regional Atmospheric Modeling (MAR) Group, Department of Physics, University of Murcia, 30100 Murcia, Spain

<sup>4</sup>Institute for Environmental Studies (IVM), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1081HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup>Department of Statistics and Operations Research, Technical University of Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain

<sup>6</sup>European Commission, Joint Research Centre (JRC), Ispra, Italy

**Correspondence:** Maria Cortès (mcortes@meteo.ub.edu)

**Abstract.** Flooding is one of the main natural hazard in the world and causes huge economic and human impacts. Assessing the flood damage in the Mediterranean region is of great importance, especially because its large vulnerability to climate change. Most past floods affecting the region were caused by intense precipitation events, thus the analysis of the links between precipitation and flood damage is crucial. The main objective of this paper is to estimate changes in the probability of damaging flood events with a global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C above preindustrial levels and taking into account different socioeconomic scenarios in two western Mediterranean regions, namely Catalonia and the Valencian Community. To do this, we analyse the relationship between heavy precipitation and flood damage estimates from insurance datasets in those two regions. We consider an ensemble of seven regional climate model simulations spanning the period 1976-2100 to evaluate precipitation changes and to drive a logistic model that links precipitation and flood damage estimates, and thus to derive statistics under present and future climates. Furthermore, we incorporate population projections based on 5 different socioeconomic scenarios. The results show a general increase in the probability of a damaging event for most of the cases and in both regions of study, with larger increments when higher warming is considered. Moreover, this increase is higher when both climate and population change are included. When population is considered, all the periods and models show a clearly higher increase in the probability of damaging events, which is statistically significant for most of the cases.

Our findings highlight the need for limiting the global warming as much as possible, as well as the importance of including variables that consider change in both climate and socioeconomic conditions in the analysis of flood damage.

*Copyright statement.* TEXT

## 1 Introduction

In the Mediterranean region, intense precipitation events constitute a real danger to the population. Heavy precipitation, sometimes associated with strong winds, can cause floods with dire consequences for people and the environment (Fourrie et al., 2016) particularly during the autumn season. Most of these events are a consequence of short and local heavy rains in small catchments, often near the coast in densely populated areas (Thiébaud, 2018). The relief surrounding the Mediterranean Sea forces the convergence of low-level atmospheric flows and the uplift of warm wet air masses that drift from the Mediterranean Sea to the coasts, thereby creating active convection. In addition, population growth is particularly high along the Mediterranean coasts, leading to a rapid increase in urban settlements and populations exposed to flooding (Gaume et al., 2016).

In the last few years, much research has focused on the study of climate change in the Mediterranean region, an area that is identified as highly vulnerable to climate change according to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Pachauri et al., 2014). Some studies have found an increase in precipitation extremes with global warming projections in the Mediterranean region (Colmet-Daage et al., 2018; Drobinski et al., 2018), although a general decrease in the annual precipitation is projected (Jacob et al., 2014; Cramer et al., 2018; Sillmann et al., 2013; Rajczak and Schär, 2017). Cramer et al. (2018) state that future warming in the Mediterranean region is expected to exceed the global mean rates by 25 %, with peaks of 40 % in summer. As a result, flood risk associated with extreme precipitation events is expected to increase due to climate change in this area, but also due to non-climatic factors such as increasingly sealed surfaces in urban areas and ill-conceived storm-water management systems (Cramer et al., 2018).

A large number of floods affecting the western Mediterranean region are surface water floods (Llasat et al., 2014; Cortès et al., 2018). This type of flood can be regarded as coming under the most general definition of rainfall-related floods (Bernet et al., 2017; Cortès et al., 2018). For this reason, precipitation is the main hazard driver of the damage caused by these events.

Nevertheless, flood disasters are the result of both societal and climatological factors, hence several other drivers other than climate must be considered for the assessment of flood-damage trends (Barredo, 2009). Bouwer (2011) analyses 22 disaster loss studies around the globe, showing that economic losses from various weather-related natural hazards have increased. However, most of these studies have not found a trend in disaster losses after normalization for changes in population and wealth, pointing towards increasing concentrations and values of assets as the principle cause of the increasing damages and losses from natural disasters. In Spain, the findings of Barredo et al. (2012) align with these results; they find no significant trend in adjusted insured flood losses between 1971 and 2008. Other studies such as López-Martínez et al. (2017) and Pérez-Morales et al. (2018) also mention the vulnerability and exposure components as possible drivers responsible for the increasing flood risk in Mediterranean regions of Spain. Specifically, these studies mention the institutional vulnerability (Raschky, 2008), which represents the sensitivity of public administrations to deal with hazards, as one of the main causes. Also, Pérez-Morales et al. (2018) demonstrated that the exposure in flood-prone areas in the south-east of Spain (part of the region of study) has increased in the last decades, due to a poor management of these areas by government institutions and the regulation adopted by them. These studies show the need to include exposure and vulnerability changes in future risk projections, which clearly contribute substantially to changing risks.


Insurance data may provide a good proxy for describing flood damage (Barredo et al., 2012), and several studies note its potential for describing economic damages caused by surface water and urban floods (Spekkers et al., 2013; Torgersen et al., 2015; Cortès et al., 2018). However, there are still few studies that relate flooding with insurance data, since these companies are reluctant to provide their databases and some of them are not even available due to confidentiality restrictions (André et al., 2013; Leal et al., 2019). Nevertheless, in the Mediterranean region, 20 years of flood-related insurance damage claims are available from the Spanish public reinsurer, the Insurance Compensation Consortium (Consortio de Compensación de Seguros, CCS), for the Spanish regions of Catalonia and the Valencian Community. CCS is a public institution that compensates homeowners for damage caused by floods, playing a role similar to that of a reinsurance company (Barredo et al., 2012). Therefore, in this study, insurance data is used as a proxy for flood damage.

The main objective of this paper is to estimate changes in the probability of damaging flood events with global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C above the preindustrial levels, taking into account different socioeconomic scenarios. To do this, we analyse the relationship between heavy precipitation and flood damage estimates from insurance datasets in two western Mediterranean regions, namely the Valencian Community and Catalonia regions of Spain. We use an ensemble of seven regional climate model simulations and 5 different socioeconomic scenarios to study future changes in these relationships.

This article is organised as follows. After an Introduction, the Methods section describes the study region, the data used and the methodology describing the model developed for the present climate as well as the treatment applied for the future precipitation and population projections. Then, the Results and discussion section presents the statistical models developed, the analysis of the future data, and the probability of flood damage with global warming, comparing our results with those obtained in other studies. Finally, a section describing the limitations of the study and possible future research is presented followed by the Conclusions, which ~~summarises~~ summarise the main findings of this study.

## 2 Methods

Figure 1 describes the overall methodology followed in this study and the data used. After selecting the flood events that have affected the region of study, we collected information on damage (insurance payments), hazard (precipitation) and exposure (population) for each basin affected by these events (Panel 1). These data have been used to develop Generalized Linear Mixed Models in order to assess the probability of damaging events for the present climate (Panel 2). Precipitation and population data from future projections were corrected (further information in Section 2.4) and aggregated at the river-basin scale (Panel 3). Finally, we assessed changes in the probability of a damaging event with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) with global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C above the preindustrial levels (Panel 4) using the relationships found in the present climate (Panel 2) and the data from future projections (Panel 3). In Section 2.2, the data and their sources are explained in detail.



**Figure 1.** Scheme of the overall methodology followed in the study


## 2.1 Region of study

The domain of this study is the eastern coast of Spain, and consists of Catalonia and the Valencian Community (Figure 2). The Mediterranean presents a complex orography and particular location - at the transition area between extra-tropical and subtropical influence (Giorgi and Lionello, 2008) - that leads to a great variety of climates with both Atlantic and Mediterranean influences. Thus, precipitation is characterised by a complex spatial pattern, with a strong seasonal cycle and large interannual

5

(Trigo and Palutikof, 2001) and spatial variability (Rodríguez-Puebla et al., 1998; Romero et al., 1998; Martín-Vide, 2004; Rodrigo and Trigo, 2007; Quintana-Seguí et al., 2016, 2017). Due to this strong variability, this region represents a challenging area for downscaling of precipitation studies (see e.g. Turco et al., 2011). Catalonia, situated in the north-east of the Iberian Peninsula has a surface of 32,108 km<sup>2</sup> and a population of more than 7.5 million people (IDEGCAT, 2018). The coastal zone is

a very vulnerable area since it is highly densely populated, with municipalities such as Barcelona that have a population density around 16,000 inhabitants km<sup>-2</sup>. Catalonia is characterised by three mountain ranges (Figure 2, N° 1): the Pyrenees in the north (maximum altitude above 3,000 m a.s.l.); a range parallel to the Mediterranean coast (SW-NE) named the Catalan Pre-Coastal Range (maximum altitude around 1,800 m a.s.l.); and the Catalan Coastal Range (maximum altitude around 600 m a.s.l.). This marked orography is one of the key reasons for producing floods, both from a hydrological point of view, since presents small torrential catchments, and from a meteorological point of view, as the orography forces wet air to rise from the Mediterranean (Llasat et al., 2016). The presence of the Pyrenees can also lead to remarkable effects in the mesoscale pressure distribution, giving place to processes such as convergence lines and orographic dipoles. For example, the flood event of October 1987, when more than 400 mm of rainfall were recorded in 24 h near Barcelona, was favoured by a mesohigh created at the south of the Pyrenees (Ramis et al., 1994). For the 1996-2015 period, a total of 166 flood events were recorded in Catalonia, 13 of them caused catastrophic impacts, 87 extraordinary impacts and 66 ordinary impacts (Cortès et al., 2018), following the methodology explained in Llasat et al. (2016) and Cortès et al. (2017).



**Figure 2.** Map of both regions of study (1: Catalonia; 2: Valencian Community), showing the aggregated basins (black lines), the main rivers (blue lines) and the pluviometric stations used (black points)

The second region of the study is the Valencian Community (Figure 2, N° 2), with a population around 5 million people and a total surface of 23,255 km<sup>2</sup> (INE, 2018). Similar to the Catalonia region, the coastal plains are crossed by torrential non-permanent streams, around which intense urbanization has taken place. In the South of the region, the mountains almost reach the coastline (maximum altitude around 1,560 m a.s.l.), favouring heavy precipitations that can exceed 700 mm in 24 h. This was the case in November 1987, when more than 800 mm of rainfall were recorded in 24 hours in Oliva (Valencia) (Ramis et al., 2013). The Valencian Community recorded a total of 69 flood events for the 1996-2015 period, 11 of which were catastrophic, 26 extraordinary and 32 ordinary (Cortès et al., 2018).

## 2.2 Data

We used three different databases to select the flood events that affected the regions of study (Catalonia and Valencian Community): INUNGAMA (Barnolas and Llasat, 2007; Llasat et al., 2016), PRESSGAMA (Llasat et al., 2009) and FLOODHYMEX (Llasat et al., 2013). INUNGAMA is a database of the GAMA (*Grup d'Anàlisi de situacions Meteorològiques Adverses*) group, which reports the flood events that have occurred in Catalonia from 1900 to 2015 on a municipal, county, and basin level. Information contained in the database includes hydrometeorological data, the impacts caused, and the affected areas for each of the events. The major part of this information is provided by PRESSGAMA, a database formed from press data, and other data sources such as official reports. This database, which includes more than 15,000 news items, systematically collects information on natural risks and climate change in the newspaper *La Vanguardia* from 1981 to 2015. Finally, for the flood events recorded in the Valencian Community, we used the FLOODHYMEX database, which contains both hydrometeorological and impacts information produced by flood events that have affected different Mediterranean regions for the period 1980-2015.

Population data for ~~Catalonia both regions~~ were obtained from the ~~Statistical Institute of Catalonia (Institut d'Estadística de Catalunya, IDESCAT, 2018). In the case of the Valencian Community, the data were~~ municipal register of inhabitants provided by the Spanish National Statistics Institute (*Instituto Nacional de Estadística*, INE, 2018). The population data corresponds to the year when the flood event took place.

We have used daily precipitation data provided by the Spanish State Meteorological Agency (*Agencia Estatal de Meteorología*, AEMET), which has an extensive network of automatic meteorological stations spread throughout the entire region of study collecting the accumulated daily precipitation between 7 UTC and 7 UTC of the following day. To ensure temporal homogeneity, we have only considered the stations with more than 90 % valid data over the 1996-2015 period (Figure 2).

Flood damage data were obtained from the insurance compensations due to floods paid by the Spanish Insurance Compensation Consortium (*Consortio de Compensación de Seguros*, CCS). The CCS compensates for damage caused to people and property by floods and other adverse weather events covered by an insurance policy. These data are provided at postcode level and with a daily temporal resolution. The CCS database includes around of 58,000 records of claims paid for floods in Catalonia and more than 100,000 in the Valencian Community for the 1996-2015 period (no previous information is available with this level of detail). To compare these data with other variables, we aggregated the damage in each postcode to the municipality level and then calculated the total amount per each flood event and basin affected. This process was carried out taking into account the claims made for the days on which the event occurred (according to INUNGAMA and FLOODHYMEX databases),

and the following seven days. We used this 7-day window as this is the period of time that the CCS allows insurance claims to be made. When the time difference between the two events is less than 7 days, damages are associated with the first event, if the date of the claim was before the first day of the second event. Finally, damage data were adjusted to 2015 values, following the methodology defined by the Spanish National Statistics Institute (INE, 2018). This consists of using the exchange rate in the consumer price index (CPI) between the two years to adjust the values shown in Euros.

Daily precipitation data for 7 climate projections were obtained from an ensemble of simulations developed within the EURO-CORDEX project (Jacob et al., 2014), which covers the whole of Europe with a spatial resolution of 0.11 degrees in latitude and longitude (around 12 km). Trambly et al. (2013) observed an improvement in the representation of precipitation and its extremes at this resolution compared with previous simulations at 25 and 50 km resolution. Overall, the seven climate projections are combinations of three different General Circulation Models (GCM), which were then downscaled with four RCMs as shown in Table 11. The models chosen are the ones that had the necessary variables at the moment of the design of our study, and they have been extensively validated in previous studies (see, e.g., Jacob et al., 2014; Alfieri et al., 2015b, 2018; Jerez et al., 2018) and used to study climate change impacts (Jerez et al., 2015). The Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 (RCP8.5) from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Pachauri et al., 2014) is the scenario used from 2006 to 2100 for the future projections. For the historical simulations (or reference period) the 1976-2005 period has been used.

The five Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSP) have been applied for the estimation of the population change in the future. The SSP projections (O'Neill et al., 2014) have been developed by the research community to facilitate integrated assessments of climate impacts, vulnerabilities, adaptation and mitigation. These socioeconomic pathways include projections for population, urbanization and Gross Domestic Product at global and national scales. In order to obtain this information at the spatial resolution required for the study (basin level), gridded data were used from the 2UP (Towards an Urban Preview) model, developed by the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. The core of the 2UP model and its primary objective is to disaggregate the scenario-based projected national-level urban population to 30 arcseconds (approximately 1 km near the equator) and simulate urban expansion for 194 countries and territories. This high spatial resolution grid has been used to calculate the future total population in each basin of the regions of study and for the different SSPs.

## **2.3 Modelling damage probabilities for the present climate**

### **2.3.1 Generalized Linear Mixed Model**

The aim of this section is to develop a model that is able to gauge the probability of large damaging events occurring given a certain precipitation amount and taking into account other variables related with the exposure of the territory. That is, our aim is not to estimate the precise amount of the monetary compensation, but to estimate when a 'large' damaging event will occur given a certain precipitation amount. Since there is not a standard definition of a large damaging event, we tested several cases, corresponding to insurance compensations exceeding the 10th, 20th, 30th, 40th, 50th, 60th, 70th, 80th and 90th percentile of the total sample. The minimum geographical unit of the study is the river-basin-scale and we only consider the flood cases that recorded a mean precipitation in the basin higher than 40 mm in 24 h. Therefore, the model estimates the probability of having

economic damages exceeding different damage thresholds (percentiles) when mean precipitation in the basin exceeds 40 mm in 24 h. Barbería et al. (2014) suggest that with a threshold of 40 mm 24 h<sup>-1</sup>, social impacts are expected for rain events in

urban areas of Catalonia, and Cortès et al. (2018) found a strong relationship between insurance data and precipitation when using this threshold for assessing the flood damage in the whole Catalan region. Population data was also taken into account, to model flood exposure in the region. Therefore, we sampled the response variable (i.e. the compensation series) and both explanatory variables (the mean 24 h precipitation recorded for each basin and the total population of the basin), and pooled them into one sample for each entire region (Catalonia and Valencian Community) to correlate them. For each event there can be more than one set of values, depending on the number of affected catchments. From now on we will use the expression "flood case" for each set of values corresponding to a basin affected by a flood event. This area is large enough to have a fairly large sample size for the analysis, yet small enough so that the causes of flood damage are related to the same weather pattern.

In order to accomplish this objective, a Generalized Linear Mixed Model (or GLMM) has been applied for both regions and all the percentiles of damage. The GLMMs are a powerful class of statistical models that combine the characteristics of linear mixed models (models that include both fixed and random predictor variables) and generalized linear models (which handle non-normal data by using link functions and exponential family distributions [e.g. Poisson or binomial]). Thus, GLMMs are the best tool for analysing non-normal data that involve random effects (Bolker et al., 2009). That is the case with the data used in this research, which is of binary type (event or non event) and there are random effects related to space and time: each of the basins can be affected by different flood events for the whole time period, and moreover each event can affect different basins at the same time. This implies ~~high correlations within the observations~~ that the observations are grouped by random factors, not guaranteeing the independence requirement of the Generalized Linear Models (GLM).

The generalized linear mixed model follows the equation 1:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 P + \beta_2 R + b_i + b_j \quad (1)$$

Where  $\pi$  is the response variable (the probability to exceed a specific threshold of damage),  $P$  and  $R$  are the predictors (precipitation recorded in 24 h and total population of the basin in our case), and  $b_i$  and  $b_j$  are the random effects related to the basins and the events. The value of the  $\beta$  coefficient is determined using Generalized Linear Models (GLMs). The Wald  $\chi^2$  statistic is used to assess the statistical significance of individual regression coefficients (Harrell Jr, 2015).

### 2.3.2 Validation method

We plotted the relative operating characteristic (ROC) diagram, a commonly used logistic prediction diagnostic, showing the hit rate (i.e. the relative number of times a forecasted event actually occurred) against the false alarm rate (i.e. the relative number of times an event had been forecasted but did not actually happen) for different potential decision thresholds (Mason and Graham, 2002). Thus, for each insurance compensation percentile, we first calculated the forecast probabilities for that event, and then grouped the probability forecasts into batches (here 100 with a width of 0.01) to count the observed occurrences/non-occurrences. That is, we converted the observed and forecasted series, expressed as continuous amounts, into



exceedance categories (yes/no statements indicating whether the data equal or exceed a selected probability). We then plotted the resulting elements on a standard contingency table (see Table 12). The [model validation has been carried out using both in-sample and out-of-sample \(i.e. leaving-one-out cross-validation\) methods.](#) The ROC diagram shows the hit rate (H) against the false alarm rate (F). These indices are defined as

$$H = \frac{a}{a + c}; 0 \leq H \leq 1 \quad (2)$$

$$F = \frac{b}{b + d}; 0 \leq F \leq 1 \quad (3)$$

## 2.4 Future probability of flood damage

### 2.4.1 Precipitation extremes in future climate change scenarios


10 In this study, we analysed changes in daily precipitation data from the EURO-CORDEX simulations assuming global warming scenarios of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C above preindustrial levels (1881-1910) (Vautard et al., 2014). For each simulation, the year when a 20-year running mean of global average temperature exceeds 1.5, 2, and 3 °C in the RCP8.5 dataset is identified and then a 30-year time window applied for each warming period and model. Therefore, for each simulation we have 3 periods of 30 years, described in Table 11, as well as the reference period 1976-2005. This method is based on the guidelines of the HELIX  
15 project (Betts et al., 2018).

To select the precipitation data to be used in the analysis, we first aggregate all the time-series to the river-basin level, calculating the mean of the grid cells belonging to each of the basin polygons. Then, we applied a bias correction to smooth the differences between observations and simulations. To this end, we selected the common period 1996-2005. The data from the simulations comes from the historical data series of each model, while the data from the observations is the daily precipitation  
20 data from the AEMET weather stations with an effectiveness higher than 90 %. Both datasets are aggregated to the river-basin-scale, using the mean value. Once the two pairs of comparable series are available for each model, the differences between them are estimated by applying a quantile mapping bias correction method, specifically with a non-parametric quantile mapping using the robust empirical quantiles method (Gudmundsson et al., 2012). This method estimates the values of the quantile-quantile relation of observed and modelled time series for regularly spaced quantiles using local linear least square regression.

25 In order to check the suitability of the method chosen, the differences between the observations and simulations for the period 1996-2005 have been compared with and without the correction applied. This was done for the cases that recorded a mean precipitation in the basin higher than 40 mm, since is the same sample used in the development of the model for the present climate.

Figure 3 shows an example for the Valencian Community, with a comparison between the simulations and observed precipi-  
30 itation for the common period 1996-2005 for the flood cases that exceeded the 40 mm 24 h<sup>-1</sup> precipitation threshold without

(top panel) and with (bottom) the correction applied. The homogenization achieved with the bias correction process is clearly reflected in the bottom panel of the Figure 3.



**Figure 3.** Comparison of the mean precipitation value (cases with average daily precipitation exceeding 40 mm) for each basin of the Valencian Community between the observations and the different models with (bottom) and without (top) correction for the common period 1996-2005. M1 to M7 refer to the 7 EURO-CORDEX simulations used (Table 11). The numbers on the x-axis indicate the code of each basin (see Table A2, Appendix section)

The same bias correction method has been applied for the three future periods (1.5 °C, 2 °C and 3 °C), using the specific correction of each basin and model. Finally, only the cases that recorded a mean precipitation in the basin higher than 40 mm 24 h<sup>-1</sup> were selected, in order to use the same data as those that were introduced to build the damage model for the present climate (Section 2.3).

### 2.4.2 Population projections

The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs), together with the 2UP model (van Huijstee et al., 2018), have been used to estimate the total population of each of the basins of the study for the future projections. The main objective of the 2UP model is to disaggregate scenario-based projected national-level urban population to 30 arcseconds data and simulate urban expansion

for 194 countries and territories. In order to incorporate this data in the damage model, three main processes have been applied:

(i) temporal downscaling from 10 years resolution to yearly; (ii) river-basin-level aggregation; and (iii) bias correction.

For the temporal downscaling, simple linear regression has been applied in order to obtain yearly population data for each of the SSPs. The 2UP model estimates the population every 10 years, from 2010 to 2080. When climate projections for the + 3 °C scenario exceed the year 2080, the same population change coefficient for the last ten years period (2070-2080) has been applied.

After obtaining the yearly population data for all SSPs, the data were aggregated to the river-basin-level by summation. Therefore, each basin will have 5 different yearly population series (corresponding to each SSP) from 2010 to 2084 (the last year of the precipitation simulations).

Finally, a bias correction process is also required for the population data. The year 2010 was chosen for carrying out the comparison between the population data from the observations and those from the 2UP model. Figures A1 and A2 from the Appendix section show the 2010 population aggregated at basin and region level for Catalonia and the Valencian Community, respectively. As can be observed in both cases, differences between the projections are negligible, though there exists a significant disagreement with the observations. For this reason we used a scaling bias correction method to correct the population projection data. This means that the ratio for each basin and SSP between the observed and simulated population for the 2010 year was applied to the future population projections.

Therefore, after these processes, each basin has a yearly population series corrected from 2010 to 2084 for the 5 SSP.

After both precipitation and population data for future scenarios have been corrected, the model developed for the present climate has been used to estimate the probability of a damaging event in the future. Since the number of flood events and their nature in the future are unknown, the average model has been applied for the prediction.

### 3 Results and discussion

#### 3.1 Present climate

##### 3.1.1 Catalonia

We applied the Generalized Linear Mixed Model to all the flood events that affected Catalonia basins within 1996-2015, which resulted in a total of 596 flood cases, 177 of which recorded an average precipitation in the basin higher than 40 mm.


The regression coefficients for all the percentiles of damage obtained by applying the GLMM are given in Table 13. In all cases both of the predictors have positive values, showing that the probability of a damaging event increases not only with precipitation recorded in 24 h but also with the population of the basin.

The formula considering the 70th percentile of damage is shown as an example in Equation 4:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = -20.92 + 2.98\log(P) + 0.57\log(R) + b_i + b_j \quad (4)$$

Where  $\pi$  is the probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage (in this case),  $P$  the mean precipitation accumulated in the basin in 24 h,  $R$  the total population of the basin and  $b_i$  and  $b_j$  are the random effects related to the basin and the flood event.

Both precipitation and population are statistically significant, meaning that they are useful variables to explain the probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage (0.38 M Euro). This can be observed in the examples in Figure 4, which show the effect of each explanatory variable in the case of probability exceeding the 70th percentile of damage. ~~The solid line indicates the best estimate while the shaded blue bands show the 95 % confidence interval.~~ For both variables, this probability increases rapidly. However, in the case of population a break point can be observed around 0.5 million people, above which the rate of increase is much lower.



**Figure 4.** Effect of the explanatory variables (left: mean precipitation recorded in 24 h; right: total population of the basin) on the probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage in Catalonia. The solid line indicates the best estimate while the shaded blue bands indicate the 95 % confidence interval. The black marks at the bottom of each graph represent the values of the independent variable for each flood case

The area under the ROC curve (RA) has been used to validate the model, since it is a useful measure for summarising the skill of a model. RA ranges from 0 for a forecast with no hits and only false alarms, to 1 for a perfect forecast. Models with an RA above 0.5 have more skill than random forecasts. Figure B1 (Appendix section) shows the ROC ~~diagram~~ diagrams for the example shown in Equation 4. ~~The RA value (, when using both in and out-of-sample validation. RA values (RA<sub>IN</sub>=0.95 )indicates and RA<sub>OUT</sub>=0.89) indicate~~ that our model has good fit to simulate the probability of a damaging event (defined as the 70th percentile of damage in this case). In this example with respect to in-sample validation, if the user wants to maximise

the difference between the hit rate (0.94) and the false alarm rate (0.17), a probability value of 0.22 is needed (which we called best threshold). The RA ~~indicator~~ indicators for the different damage percentiles used ~~is~~ are presented in Table 13, with values close to 1 for all the cases.

### 3.1.2 Valencian Community


- 5 The same analysis has been carried out for the Valencian Community region, which was affected by 69 flood events between 1996 and 2015, resulting in 171 flood cases (72 if we take into account only the cases where the mean precipitation accumulated in 24h in the basin exceeded the threshold of 40 mm 24 h<sup>-1</sup>).

Table 14 shows the regression coefficients for all the damage percentiles used. As in the case of Catalonia (Section 3.1.1), both mean precipitation accumulated in 24h and total population of the basin are statistically significant predictors and have  
10 positive regression coefficients for all the cases.

As an example, the model follows Equation 5 when the damaging event is defined using the 70th percentile of damage:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = -40.96 + 2.33\log(P) + 2.32\log(R) + b_i + b_j \quad (5)$$

- Figure 5 corroborates these results, showing the effect of precipitation (left graph) and population (right graph) on the probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage. In both cases this relationship is described by a concave curve, indicating  
15 that the increase in the probability per unit of increase of the predictor is larger when considering lower predictor values.



**Figure 5.** Effect of the explanatory variables (left: mean precipitation recorded in 24 h; right: total population of the basin) on the probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage in the Valencian Community. The solid line indicates the best estimate while the shaded blue bands indicate the 95 % confidence interval. The black marks at the bottom of each graph represent the values of the independent variable for each flood case

The shaded blue bands of Figure 5 show the confidence level of the prediction at 95 %. In this case, these bands are narrower than in the Catalonia case (see Figure 4), showing that the model estimation is more precise for the Valencian Community region. Figure B2 (Appendix section) displays the ROC ~~diagram~~ diagrams for the example of Equation 5, demonstrating that the model has a significant goodness of fit with ~~a RA value of~~ high RA values for both validation methods used ( $RA_{IN}=0.9$  and  $RA_{OUT}=0.85$ ). As shown in Table 14, the model has a good performance for all the damage percentiles, with RA values close to 1 in all cases.

In this section we have shown that precipitation is a key factor in explaining the damage caused by flood events in regions in which water surface floods are the main type of flood, as is the case in the Mediterranean region of study. Studies like Zhou et al. (2013) and Torgersen et al. (2015) also apply regression models to observe the relationship between different precipitation observation measures and the compensations paid by insurance companies. In both studies, a good correlation is observed between these two variables in the case of surface water floods, and it is shown that it is feasible to build models that explain the costs of damage as a simple function of precipitation (Zhou et al., 2013). Moreover, the incorporation of population data in the model, with statistically significant and positive relationships with damages, has shown the importance of considering the exposure of the territory in flood risk analysis. Saint Martin et al. (2016) has also shown the benefits of

including indicators that explain the exposure to assess the risk of flood-related damage in real time in French Mediterranean basins.

Our findings also align with the results of previous studies (Spekkers et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2013; Wobus et al., 2014; Torgersen et al., 2015) and further indicate that insurance databases are a promising source for flood damage assessment at local (Garrote et al., 2016; Bihan et al., 2017; Zischg et al., 2018; Zhou et al., 2013) and regional scale (Barredo et al., 2012; Kim et al., 2012; Wobus et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2017). However, using insurance data as a unique source for defining flood damage leads to only considering the direct and tangible damages. Indirect damages are more difficult to calculate and few studies take them into account (Elmer et al., 2010), especially at the regional scale (Przyluski and Hallegatte, 2011). In spite of this, some exhaustive studies can be found in the literature that incorporate indirect damage indicators such as, for example, the loss of working hours (Petrucci and Llasat, 2013) or the number of fire service operations done in flooded properties (Papagiannaki et al., 2015).


### 3.2 Future model

The results presented in this section are divided into three parts. In the first and second part, the data obtained from the precipitation projections (Section 3.2.1) and population scenarios (Section 3.2.2) are analysed. Then, the last part (Section 3.2.3) shows the results obtained by applying the models developed in Section 3.1 using the data from the projections. Therefore, in this last part, the probability of a damaging event is estimated for a global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C and taking into account different socio-economic scenarios.

#### 3.2.1 Extreme precipitation projections

Figure 6 shows the ensemble mean of the relative changes in the total annual precipitation (top) and the number of days with daily precipitation higher than 40 mm (bottom) for the entire Iberian Peninsula and for a global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C above preindustrial levels.

Results show a general decrease of the total annual precipitation in most of the Iberian Peninsula, especially in the central and southern part. The decrease becomes larger with higher levels of global warming. This pattern is also observable in other studies of the Mediterranean region (Jacob et al., 2014; Cramer et al., 2018; Sillmann et al., 2013; Rajczak and Schär, 2017; Turco et al., 2017). For example, Kjellström et al. (2018) found an increase in mean precipitation in the north of Europe, but a reduction in the south, especially during summer months. In addition, they found a likely decrease in the mean precipitation with global warming in mountain regions, such as the Pyrenees and Cantabrian Mountains. In terms of extremes, our results show projected increases in the number of days with daily precipitation exceeding 40 mm in the centre, north and north-west of the region (bottom panel Figure 6). This is also in line with other studies on projections of extreme precipitation in the region (Drobinski et al., 2018; Colmet-Daage et al., 2018; Trambly and Somot, 2018; Cramer et al., 2018), which show a likely increase in the extreme precipitation events in Europe and the Mediterranean area with increasing global temperature, mostly during the winter months (Kjellström et al., 2018; Vautard et al., 2014; Rajczak and Schär, 2017; Jacob et al., 2014).




**Figure 6.** Ensemble mean of the relative changes of total annual precipitation (top) and number of days with daily precipitation > 40 mm (bottom) for 1.5, 2 and 3 °C global warming (columns) at annual scale. Dotted areas indicate where at least 50 % of the simulations show a statistically significant change and more than 66 % agree on the direction of the change. Coloured areas (without dots) indicate that changes are small compared to natural variations, and white regions (if any) indicate that no agreement between the simulations is found (similar to Tebaldi et al., 2011)

Figure 7 shows the change (in %) of the mean 24 h precipitation, averaged across all basins, in the future simulations compared to the reference period (1976-2005), when taking into account the cases that overpassed the 40 mm 24 h<sup>-1</sup> precipitation threshold for the different models and warming periods (global warming at 1.5 °C, 2 °C and 3 °C). In the case of Catalonia (left panel), most of the models and warming periods show an increase of the mean daily precipitation with the exception of

5 Model 3 (EC-EARTH-RCA4), which projects a decrease for the 2 °C global warming level. Most of the models (4 out of 7) indicate greater precipitation values when the highest warming level is taken into account (3 °C), agreeing with several studies that point to an increase of precipitation extremes with global warming (Drobinski et al., 2018; Colmet-Daage et al., 2018; Trambly and Somot, 2018; Cramer et al., 2018).





**Figure 7.** Change in the mean daily precipitation compared to the reference period (1976-2005) for cases exceeding the 40 mm 24 h<sup>-1</sup> threshold for the 7 models and the 3 levels of warming in Catalonia (left) and the Valencian Community (right). Dashed hatchings around bars indicate significant changes (p value < 0.05; Mann-Whitney Test) with respect to the reference period

In the case of the Valencian Community region, the change in the mean daily precipitation for the future periods is lower (Figure 7, right panel). However, apart from one case which is non-significant (3 °C, Model 5: MPI-ESM-LR-CCLM4-8-17), all the models and periods show an increase of the mean precipitation of the basin when the events with daily precipitation exceeding the 40 mm are taken into account. In this case, there is no clear pattern of larger increases in extreme precipitation with higher warming levels.

The greater positive changes in precipitation values in the case of Catalonia was expected if we take into account the results showed-shown in Figure 6. The east of the Iberian Peninsula (where the Valencian Community is placed) presents a greater decrease in both annual precipitation and in the number of days with daily precipitation higher than 40 mm in comparison to the north-east part (Catalonia). Nevertheless, from these results we can conclude that heavy daily precipitation is likely to increase with global warming in both regions of study.

### 3.2.2 Population projections


The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs) describe plausible alternative changes in aspects of society such as demographic, economic, technological, social, governance and environmental factors (O'Neill et al., 2017). The SSPs are based on five narratives describing alternative socio-economic developments, including sustainable development (SSP1), middle-of-the-road development (SSP2), regional rivalry (SSP3), inequality (SSP4) and fossil-fueled development (SSP5) (Riahi et al., 2017).

Figure 8 shows the projections in the population in each entire region of study (left: Catalonia, right: Valencian Community) after applying the data treatment processes explained in Section 2.4.2.

For both regions, the largest increase in population is in SSP5, with population growth around 50 % for Catalonia and 62 % for the Valencian Community by the end of the 21st century with respect to 2010. SSP5 is defined by the push for economic and social development coupled with the exploitation of abundant fossil fuel resources and the adoption of resource and energy

intensive lifestyles around the world (O'Neill et al., 2017). Though fertility declines rapidly in developing countries, fertility levels in high income countries are relatively high. For this reason, despite being the scenario that projects the second lowest population by the end of the 21st century in terms of global population (Samir and Lutz, 2017), in our region of study it projects the highest increase (high-income economy).

- 5 On the other hand, SPP3 depicts the largest decrease in the total population in Catalonia and the Valencian Community, with a reduction of 25 % and 30 %, respectively. In this scenario a low population growth is expected in industrialized countries, while a high increase can be found in developing countries (O'Neill et al., 2017). This explains the difference between the results found in studies such as Samir and Lutz (2017) in which the highest global population expected growth is found for this scenario.




**Figure 8.** Future population projections for the different SSP's in Catalonia (left) and the Valencian Community (right)

- 10 SSP5 assumes a society that keeps relying heavily on fossil fuels. This implies that we may expect high emissions, and therefore the combination with RCP8.5 (the only RCP used in this study) is very plausible. For this reason, the main results of this study will focus on the RCP8.5/SSP5 combination. However, some analysis will also be performed considering all the SSPs in order to show the differences between the socioeconomic projections (see Section 3.2.3).

### 3.2.3 Future probability of damaging events

- 15 Finally, changes in the probability of damaging events for both regions have been assessed when considering a global warming of 1.5, 2 and 3 °C. In this case, only three damage percentiles (50th, 60th, 70th) were selected for defining a "large damaging event". Figure 9 shows the change in this probability for Catalonia, for all the three percentiles of damage and taking into account the mean precipitation recorded in 24 h and the population considering the SSP5 socioeconomic scenario. As can be observed, this probability increases with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) for all the models and warming periods.
- 20 The increase is higher when greater warming is considered in most of the cases (the increase is usually larger with 3 °C than with 1.5 and 2 °C), which emphasizes the importance of limiting global warming as much as possible. Furthermore, the increase in probability is greater for higher percentiles of damage.




**Figure 9.** Change in the probability of a damaging event in Catalonia with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) for the 50, 60 and 70th damage percentiles and for all models when using the SSP5 socioeconomic scenario. Different hatchings around bars show the different percentiles of damage

The results presented above show the change in probability of damaging events due to both climate change and increasing exposure (i.e. increasing population), both of which have been shown to have a significant relationship with flood damage in Section 3.1.1. In Table 15, the change in the probability of damaging events is shown for the 70th damage percentile, when keeping population constant at today's levels (left) compared to when using the SSP5 population data (right). The results show that the increase in probability is higher when both climate and population change are included. When population is considered, all the periods and models clearly show a higher increase in the probability of a damaging event, which is statistically significant for all cases. Nevertheless, when mean precipitation accumulated in 24 h is used as the sole independent variable of the model, not all the models show an increase in the probability of damaging events. These results point out the importance of including variables that represent change in both the climate and socioeconomic conditions.

Finally, in order to see the differences between the socioeconomic scenarios (SSPs), the probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage in Catalonia for all the periods, models and SSPs is plotted in Figure 10. Results show an increase in the probability of a damaging event in almost all cases, pointing out that even with lower exposure than in the SSP5 scenario, increases in flood damage are evident. The only exception is for Model 3 in combination with the 2 °C warming period and the SSP3 scenario; ~~this SSP shows a marked reduction in population~~. This scenario refers to a fragmented world with an emphasis on security at the expense of international development. In rich-OECD countries (defined by OECD membership


and the World Bank category of high-income country), to which both regions of our study belong, the SSP3 scenario depicts a low fertility rate, high mortality and low immigration (Samir and Lutz, 2017). Therefore, population is assumed to decrease in these countries (see Figure 8). On the other hand, the largest increases in probability are found under SSP5, since this has the largest increase in population (see Figure 8). As mentioned before, this scenario refers to a world that emphasizes technological progress and where economic growth is fostered by the rapid development of human capital. In rich-OECD countries a low mortality rate, high immigration and a relatively high fertility rate are expected, due to a high technology and a very high standard of living that allows for easier combination of work and family (Samir and Lutz, 2017).




**Figure 10.** Change with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage in Catalonia for all the models, warming periods and socioeconomic scenarios (SSP). Different hatchings around bars show different warming levels

The same analysis has been carried out for the Valencian Community, based on the relationships found for the present climate for this region (see Section 3.1.2). Figure 11 shows the change in the probability of a damaging event (defined by the 3 percentiles of damage) based on the mean precipitation recorded in 24 h and the population (SSP5 scenario). As can be observed, all models and periods show an increase in this probability with respect to the reference period. Therefore, an increase in the probability of a damaging event occurrence is likely to happen with global warming and with the expected growth of the population, becoming higher when greater warming is considered. Actually, with a global temperature of 3 °C above preindustrial conditions, the change in probability is considerably higher than the other two warming periods (1.5 °C and 2 °C) in most cases, becoming twice as high in some of them. Furthermore, this probability becomes larger for higher percentiles of damages.

The change in the probability of a damaging event when considering the 70th percentile of damage is shown in Table 16. When population is considered constant at today's levels (left), the range of values goes from -4 to 26 %, but only the positive and highest ones are statistically significant. However, when the change in population according to SSP5 is also taken into account (right), all values become positive, greater and most of them statistically significant, highlighting the importance of considering the population while analysing flood damages.



**Figure 11.** Change in the probability of a damaging event in the Valencian Community with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) for the 50, 60 and 70th damage percentiles and for all models when using the SSP5 socioeconomic scenario. Different hatchings around bars show the different percentiles of damage



**Figure 12.** Change with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage in the Valencian Community for all the models, warming periods and socioeconomic scenarios (SSP). Different hatchings around bars show different warming levels

The probability of exceeding the 70th percentile of damage for the Valencian Community for all the periods, models, and SSPs is shown in Figure 12. Although most of the cases show an increase in the probability of a damaging event, this increase is not as clear as that of the Catalonia region. When the SSP3 socioeconomic scenario is taken into account, substantial decreases can be found in most models. As in the case of Catalonia, the largest increases are found under the SSP5 scenario, when higher population growth rates are expected (see Figure 8). These results once again underline the importance of considering socioeconomic changes in flood risk analysis.

Overall, results show a general and marked increase in the probability of a damaging event with global warming with respect to the reference period when considering the RCP 8.5 climate change scenario and the SSP5 socioeconomic scenario. Other studies, such as Wobus et al. (2014), also show an increase in monetary damages from flooding in nearly all regions of the United States and a total increase in damages by the end of the 21st century of approximately 30 %, although without taking into account other factors involved such as changes in demographics or infrastructure. In the Mediterranean area, other authors found an increase in flood risk associated with extreme precipitation events due to climate change (Cramer et al., 2018; Alfieri et al., 2015a), however the projections in flood hazards in Europe vary a lot regionally (Kundzewicz et al., 2017). Most of the studies of future flood projections refer to river floods (Alfieri et al., 2015a; Roudier et al., 2016; Rojas et al., 2012), without taking into account other types of floods. Therefore, this study ends with a substantial contribution towards assessing the future

flood damage caused by other types of flood events, such as those caused by heavy precipitation episodes (surface water floods), and also taking into account the changes in the population in the analysis.

#### 4 Limitations and future research

The main contribution of this study is the assessment of the probability of future damaging events in two Western Mediterranean regions, considering both climate change and changes in exposure according to different socioeconomic scenarios. Although the results show a promising methodology for predicting flood damage, several limitations should be taken into account.

Firstly, it should be noted that flood risk analysis is very complex and needs to be treated from a holistic perspective using techniques that take into account all the factors involved, both those related to the hazard of the phenomenon and those related to exposure of the territory. In this study only precipitation and population were taken into account, and although the results show a good performance of the model for simulating the probability of a damaging event, other variables such as soil physical conditions or preventive measures should be considered. For instance, in Garrote et al. (2016) different simulation scenarios were defined considering the modifications to the terrain due to the construction of fluvial defence structures in the area. Future research should focus on incorporating further variables into the model to reproduce the complexity of flood risk, not only regarding hazard drivers but also considering more variables related to the exposure and vulnerability, as for example those related to the buildings present in the study region. Furthermore, the present study only focuses on daily precipitation data, while several studies point out the possible better relationship found between sub-daily data and insurance data in the case of surface water floods (Spekkers et al., 2013; Torgersen et al., 2015; Cortès et al., 2018). Nevertheless, the analysis of sub-daily extremes would require convection-permitting regional climate models (Tramblay and Somot, 2018), and studies such as Beranová et al. (2018) have shown that convection is not ~~capture~~-captured realistically. Therefore, projected changes of sub-daily precipitation extremes in climate change scenarios based on RCMs not resolving convection need to be interpreted with caution (Beranová et al., 2018). Finally, an effort has to be made to incorporate indirect and non-tangible damages in flood damage analysis, as these are crucial for evaluating the full impacts caused by natural hazards (Petrucchi and Llasat, 2013).

Despite these limitations, this work has provided a first assessment of the link between precipitation and flood damage in a Mediterranean region, also considering the exposure of the territory with the incorporation of the population in the model and the impacts of climate change projections.

#### 5 Conclusions

The NW Mediterranean region experiences heavy precipitation every year and flash floods that occasionally produce catastrophic damages (Llasat et al., 2013). Both of the western Mediterranean regions covered in this study (Catalonia and the Valencian Community) are prone to these events, most of them caused by local heavy precipitation events (Llasat et al., 2016).

In this study, the relationship between heavy precipitation and flood damage for both regions has been analysed. Generalized Linear Mixed Models have been used in order to estimate the probability of damaging events taking into account both hazard

and exposure. The results show that the probability of a damaging event increases with precipitation and population of the basin. For both regions of study the values under the ROC curve (RA) indicate that our model has a good performance, with values close to 1 in all cases. These results improve those obtained by using a simple logistic model with precipitation recorded in 24 h as the only explanatory variable (see Cortès et al., 2018), pointing out the need of incorporating variables such as population that give information about the exposure of the territory for explaining flood damage.

Using the models developed in this study, we also assessed the future probability of damaging flood events under scenarios of climate and population change. We show that this probability increases with respect to the reference period (1976-2005) for most models and warming periods in both regions when considering the RCP8.5/SSP5 combination, being higher in the case of Catalonia. Furthermore, a remarkable result found in both areas is that this change is usually larger when greater warming is considered. This points out the importance of limiting the global warming to the lowest possible levels with mitigation actions. A reduction in the probability of damaging events is only found when considering SSP3 (and in some cases SSP4 for the Valencian Community), since this scenario shows a marked decrease in the population by the end of 21st century in both areas. Furthermore, in both regions the results show that the increase in probability is higher when both climate and population change are included, highlighting the importance of considering variables that take into account the exposure of the territory in flood damage analysis.

To summarise, we have estimated the changes in the probability that a flood event causing large damage will occur, based on the changes in precipitation expected with global warming, and also considering the expected changes in demographics. The general increase found in the probability of damaging event should be taken into account in flood management strategies. Therefore, our results suggest the urgency to develop and apply adaptation and mitigation strategies, also considering that many areas in Spain already suffer from problems related to climate change (Quiroga et al., 2011; Turco and Llasat, 2011).

*Code availability.* TEXT

*Data availability.* TEXT

*Code and data availability.* TEXT

*Sample availability.* TEXT


25 *Video supplement.* TEXT



Appendix A: Methods

A1 Future probability of flood damage


A1.1 Population projections



**Figure A1.** Population (year 2010) for each basin of Catalonia (left) and for the whole region (right) for the different databases. The numbers on the x-axis indicate the code of each basin (see Table A1)

| Code | Name of the basin                             |
|------|---|
| 6    | El Daró                                       |
| 19   | Riera de Riudecanyes                          |
| 50   | La Tordera                                    |
| 60   | El Besòs                                      |
| 70   | El Foix                                       |
| 80   | El Francolí                                   |
| 90   | Eth Garona                                    |
| 100  | El Ter  |
| 200  | El Llobregat                                  |
| 300  | El Segre                                      |
| 400  | L'Ebre  |
| 500  | Rieres Costa Brava Nord                       |
| 600  | Rieres Costa Brava Centre                     |
| 618  | Rieres Costa Brava Sud                        |
| 700  | Rieres del Maresme                            |
| 774  | Torrents de l'Àrea Metropolitana de Barcelona |
| 789  | Rieres litorals Llobregat                     |
| 800  | Rieres del Garraf                             |
| 833  | Rieres Tarragona Nord                         |
| 900  | Rieres Tarragona Sud                          |
| 913  | Rieres Meridionals de Tarragona               |
| 944  | Rieres litorals Ebre Nord                     |
| 1001 | El Tec; Rieres litorals Muga; La Muga         |
| 1002 | Rieres litorals Fluvià; El Fluvià             |
| 1003 | El Gaià; Rieres Tarragona Centre              |
| 1004 | La Sénia; Rieres litorals Ebre Sud            |

**Table A1.** Corresponding names of the codes of the basins of Catalonia region



**Figure A2.** Population (year 2010) for each basin of the Valencian Community (left) and for the whole region (right) for the different databases. The numbers on the x-axis indicate the code of each basin (see Table A2)


| Code       | Name of the basin         |
|------------|---------------------------|
| 10         | Vinalop-Alacant           |
| 15         | Marina Baixa              |
| 20         | Ebre                      |
| 22         | Marina Alta               |
| 30         | Segura                    |
| 32         | Serpis                    |
| 128        | Jucar                     |
| <u>130</u> | <u>Túria</u>              |
| 168        | Palancia-Los Valles       |
| 170        | Mijares-Plana de Castelló |
| 204        | Cenia-Maestrazgo          |

**Table A2.** Corresponding names of the codes of the basins of the Valencian Community region

## Appendix B: Results


### B1 Present climate

#### B1.1 Catalonia



**Figure B1.** Relative operating characteristic (ROC) ~~diagram~~ diagrams (left: in-sample validation, right: out-of-sample validation) for above 70th percentile of damage predictions using Eq. 4 for Catalonia ( $P_0=40$  mm/24 h). Each value of the ROC ~~curve~~ curves indicates a set of probability forecasts by stepping a decision threshold with 1 % probability through the modelling results. The numbers inside the ~~plot~~ plots are the ROC area (RA) and the best threshold (BT), here defined as the threshold that maximises the difference between the hit rate (H) and the false alarm rate (F)

## B1.2 Valencian Community



**Figure B2.** Relative operating characteristic (ROC) diagram-diagrams (left: in-sample validation, right: out-of-sample validation) for above 70th percentile of damage predictions using Eq. 5 for the Valencian Community ( $P_0=40$  mm/24 h). Each value of the ROC curve-curves indicates a set of probability forecasts by stepping a decision threshold with 1 % probability through the modelling results. The numbers inside the plot-plots are the ROC area (RA) and the best threshold (BT), here defined as the threshold that maximises the difference between the hit rate (H) and the false alarm rate (F)

*Author contributions.* TEXT

*Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

*Disclaimer.* TEXT

- Acknowledgements.* This work has been supported by the Spanish project M-COSTADAPT (CTM2017-83655-C2-R) of the FEDER/Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities - AEI, for the project EFA210/16/ PIRAGUA, INTERREG POCTEFA 2014-2020 and for the

Water Research Institute (IdRA) of the University of Barcelona. It was conducted under the framework of the HyMeX Programme (HYdrological cycle in the Mediterranean EXperiment) and the Panta Rhei WG Changes in Flood Risk. P.J.Ward received funding from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NOW) in the form of VIDI grant 016.161.324. M.Turco has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 740073 (CLIM4CROP project) [and from the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities through the project PREDFIRE \(RTI2018-099711-J-I00\)](#).

## References

- Alfieri, L., Burek, P., Feyen, L., and Forzieri, G.: Global warming increases the frequency of river floods in Europe, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19, 2247–2260, 2015a.
- Alfieri, L., Feyen, L., Dottori, F., and Bianchi, A.: Ensemble flood risk assessment in Europe under high end climate scenarios, *Global Environmental Change*, 35, 199–212, 2015b.
- Alfieri, L., Dottori, F., Betts, R., Salamon, P., and Feyen, L.: Multi-model projections of river flood risk in Europe under global warming, *Climate*, 6, 6, 2018.
- André, C., Monfort, D., Bouzit, M., and Vinchon, C.: Contribution of insurance data to cost assessment of coastal flood damage to residential buildings: insights gained from Johanna (2008) and Xynthia (2010) storm events, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 13, 2003–2012, 2013.
- Barbería, L., Amaro, J., Aran, M., and Llasat, M. C.: The role of different factors related to social impact of heavy rain events: considerations about the intensity thresholds in densely populated areas, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 14, 1843–1852, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-14-1843-2014>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/14/1843/2014/>, 2014.
- Barnolas, M. and Llasat, M.: Metodología para el estudio de inundaciones históricas en España e implementación de un SIG en las cuencas del Ter, Segre y Llobregat, CEH-CEDEX, Monografías M-90, Ministerio de Fomento, Madrid, 2007.
- Barredo, J. I.: Normalised flood losses in Europe: 1970–2006, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 9, 97–104, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-9-97-2009>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/9/97/2009/>, 2009.
- Barredo, J. I., Saurí, D., and Llasat, M. C.: Assessing trends in insured losses from floods in Spain 1971–2008, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 12, 1723–1729, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-12-1723-2012>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/12/1723/2012/>, 2012.
- Beranová, R., Kyselý, J., and Hanel, M.: Characteristics of sub-daily precipitation extremes in observed data and regional climate model simulations, *Theoretical and applied climatology*, 132, 515–527, 2018.
- Bernet, D. B., Prasuhn, V., and Weingartner, R.: Surface water floods in Switzerland: what insurance claim records tell us about the caused damages in space and time, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions*, pp. 1–38, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-136>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2017-136/>, 2017.
- Betts, R., Alfieri, L., Bradshaw, C., Caesar, J., Feyen, L., Friedlingstein, P., Gohar, L., Koutroulis, A., Lewis, K., Morfopoulos, Catherine Papadimitriou, L., Richardson, K. J., Tsanis, I., and Wyser, K.: Changes in climate extremes, fresh water availability and vulnerability to food insecurity projected at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming with a higher-resolution global climate model, *Earth’s Future*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017EF000714>, 2018.
- Bihan, G. L., Payrastre, O., Gaume, E., Moncoulon, D., and Pons, F.: The challenge of forecasting impacts of flash floods : test of a simplified hydraulic approach and validation based on insurance claim data, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, pp. 1–27, 2017.
- Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., and White, J.-S. S.: Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution, *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 24, 127–135, 2009.
- Bouwer, L. M.: Have disaster losses increased due to anthropogenic climate change?, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 92, 39–46, 2011.

- Colmet-Daage, A., Sanchez-Gomez, E., Ricci, S., Llovel, C., Borrell Estupina, V., Quintana-Seguí, P., Llasat Botija, M. d. C., and Servat, E.: Evaluation of uncertainties in mean and extreme precipitation under climate change for northwestern Mediterranean watersheds from high-resolution Med and Euro-CORDEX ensembles, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 2018, vol. 22, num. 1, p. 673-687, 2018.
- Cortès, M., Llasat, M. C., Gilabert, J., Llasat-Botija, M., Turco, M., Marcos, R., Martín Vide, J. P., and Falcón, L.: Towards a better understanding of the evolution of the flood risk in Mediterranean urban areas: the case of Barcelona, *Natural Hazards*, pp. 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-017-3014-0>, 2017.
- Cortès, M., Turco, M., Llasat, M., and Llasat, M. d. C.: Estimación de los daños por inundaciones en el mediterráneo español a partir de la lluvia, in: *EL CLIMA: AIRE, AGUA, TIERRA Y FUEGO*, Asociación Española de Climatología, 2018.
- Cortès, M., Turco, M., Llasat-Botija, M., and Llasat Botija, M. d. C.: The relationship between precipitation and insurance data for floods in a Mediterranean region (northeast Spain), *Natural Hazards And Earth System Sciences*, 2018, vol. 18, p. 857-868, 2018.
- Cramer, W., Guiot, J., Fader, M., Garrabou, J., Gattuso, J.-P., Iglesias, A., Lange, M. A., Lionello, P., Llasat, M. C., Paz, S., et al.: Climate change and interconnected risks to sustainable development in the Mediterranean, *Nature Climate Change*, p. 1, 2018.
- Drobinski, P., Da Silva, N., Panthou, G., Bastin, S., Muller, C., Ahrens, B., Borga, M., Conte, D., Fosser, G., Giorgi, F., et al.: Scaling precipitation extremes with temperature in the Mediterranean: past climate assessment and projection in anthropogenic scenarios, *Climate dynamics*, 51, 1237–1257, 2018.
- Elmer, F., Thielen, a. H., Pech, I., and Kreibich, H.: Influence of flood frequency on residential building losses, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 10, 2145–2159, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-10-2145-2010>, 2010.
- Fourrie, N., Haddouch, H., Brousseau, P., Wattrelot, E., and Fisher, C.: Forecast of heavy precipitation events, in: *The Mediterranean Region under Climate Change. A scientific update*, edited by editions, I., chap. 3, pp. 577–585, IRD editions, 2016.
- Garrote, J., Alvarenga, F., and Díez-Herrero, A.: Quantification of flash flood economic risk using ultra-detailed stage–damage functions and 2-D hydraulic models, *Journal of Hydrology*, 541, 611–625, 2016.
- Gaume, E., Borga, M., Llassat, M. C., Maouche, S., Lang, M., and Diakakis, M.: Mediterranean extreme floods and flash floods, in: *The Mediterranean Region under Climate Change. A scientific update*, edited by editions, I., chap. 1, pp. 133–144, IRD editions, 2016.
- Giorgi, F. and Lionello, P.: Climate change projections for the Mediterranean region, *Global and planetary change*, 63, 90–104, 2008.
- Gudmundsson, L., Bremnes, J. B., Haugen, J. E., and Engen-Skaugen, T.: Technical Note: Downscaling RCM precipitation to the station scale using statistical transformations - a comparison of methods, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 16, 3383–3390, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-16-3383-2012>, 2012.
- Harrell Jr, F. E.: *Regression modeling strategies: with applications to linear models, logistic and ordinal regression, and survival analysis*, Springer, 2015.
- IDESCAT: Institut d’Estadística de Catalunya, <https://www.idescat.cat>, 2018.
- INE: Instituto Nacional de Estadística, <https://www.ine.es>, 2018.
- Jacob, D., Petersen, J., Eggert, B., Alias, A., Bøssing, O., Bouwer, L. M., Braun, A., Colette, A., Georgopoulou, E., Gobiet, A., Menut, L., Nikulin, G., Haensler, A., Kriegsmann, A., Martin, E., Meijgaard, E. V., Moseley, C., and Pfeifer, S.: EURO-CORDEX: new high-resolution climate change projections for European impact research, *Regional Environmental Change*, pp. 563–578, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-013-0499-2>, 2014.
- Jerez, S., Tobin, I., Vautard, R., Montávez, J. P., López-Romero, J. M., Thais, F., Bartok, B., Christensen, O. B., Colette, A., Déqué, M., et al.: The impact of climate change on photovoltaic power generation in Europe, *Nature communications*, 6, 10014, 2015.



- Jerez, S., López-Romero, J., Turco, M., Jiménez-Guerrero, P., Vautard, R., and Montávez, J.: Impact of evolving greenhouse gas forcing on the warming signal in regional climate model experiments, *Nature communications*, 9, 1304, 2018.
- Kim, Y.-O., Seo, S. B., and Jang, O.-J.: Flood risk assessment using regional regression analysis, *Natural hazards*, 63, 1203–1217, 2012.
- Kjellström, E., Nikulin, G., Strandberg, G., Christensen, O. B., Jacob, D., Keuler, K., Lenderink, G., Meijgaard, E. V., Schär, C., and Somot, S.: European climate change at global mean temperature increases of 1.5 and 2 °C above pre-industrial conditions as simulated by the EURO-CORDEX regional climate models, *Earth System Dynamics*, pp. 459–478, 2018.
- Kundzewicz, Z. W., Krysanova, V., Dankers, R., Hirabayashi, Y., Kanae, S., Hattermann, F., Huang, S., Milly, P. C., Stoffel, M., Driessen, P., et al.: Differences in flood hazard projections in Europe—their causes and consequences for decision making, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 62, 1–14, 2017.
- 10 Leal, M., Boavida-Portugal, I., Fragoso, M., and Ramos, C.: How much does an extreme rainfall event cost? Material damages and relationships between insurance, rainfall, land cover and urban flooding, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 2019.
- Llasat, M. C., Llasat-Botija, M., and López, L.: A press database on natural risks and its application in the study of floods in Northeastern Spain, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 9, 2049–2061, 2009.
- Llasat, M. C., Llasat-Botija, M., Petrucci, O., Pasqua, a. a., Rosselló, J., Vinet, F., and Boissier, L.: Towards a database on societal impact of Mediterranean floods within the framework of the HYMEX project, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 13, 1337–1350, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-13-1337-2013>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/13/1337/2013/>, 2013.
- 15 Llasat, M. C., Marcos, R., Llasat-Botija, M., Gilabert, J., Turco, M., and Quintana-Seguí, P.: Flash flood evolution in north-western Mediterranean, *Atmospheric Research*, 149, 230–243, 2014.
- Llasat, M. C., Marcos, R., Turco, M., Gilabert, J., and Llasat-Botija, M.: Trends in flash flood events versus convective precipitation in the Mediterranean region: The case of Catalonia, *Journal of Hydrology*, 541, 24–37, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.05.040>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.05.040>, 2016.
- 20 López-Martínez, F., Gil-Guirado, S., and Pérez-Morales, A.: Who can you trust? Implications of institutional vulnerability in flood exposure along the Spanish Mediterranean coast, *Environmental Science & Policy*, 76, 29–39, 2017.
- Martin-Vide, J.: Spatial distribution of a daily precipitation concentration index in peninsular Spain, *International Journal of Climatology*, 24, 959–971, 2004.
- 25 Mason, S. J. and Graham, N. E.: Areas beneath the relative operating characteristics (ROC) and relative operating levels (ROL) curves: Statistical significance and interpretation, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 128, 2145–2166, 2002.
- O'Neill, B. C., Kriegler, E., Riahi, K., Ebi, K. L., Hallegatte, S., Carter, T. R., Mathur, R., and van Vuuren, D. P.: A new scenario framework for climate change research: the concept of shared socioeconomic pathways, *Climatic change*, 122, 387–400, 2014.
- 30 O'Neill, B. C., Kriegler, E., Ebi, K. L., Kemp-Benedict, E., Riahi, K., Rothman, D. S., van Ruijven, B. J., van Vuuren, D. P., Birkmann, J., Kok, K., et al.: The roads ahead: Narratives for shared socioeconomic pathways describing world futures in the 21st century, *Global Environmental Change*, 42, 169–180, 2017.
- Pachauri, R. K., Allen, M. R., Barros, V. R., Broome, J., Cramer, W., Christ, R., Church, J. A., Clarke, L., Dahe, Q., Dasgupta, P., et al.: Climate change 2014: synthesis report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC, 2014.
- 35 Papagiannaki, K., Lagouvardos, K., Kotroni, V., and Bezes, a.: Flash flood occurrence and relation to the rainfall hazard in a highly urbanized area, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions*, 3, 3119–3149, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhessd-3-3119-2015>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/3119/2015/>, 2015.

- Pérez-Morales, A., Gil-Guirado, S., and Olcina-Cantos, J.: Housing bubbles and the increase of flood exposure. Failures in flood risk management on the Spanish south-eastern coast (1975–2013), *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 11, S302–S313, 2018.
- Petrucci, O. and Llasat, M. C.: Impact of disasters in mediterranean regions: An overview in the framework of the HYMEX project, in: *Landslide Science and Practice: Social and Economic Impact and Policies*, vol. 7, pp. 137–143, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-31313-4-18>, 2013.
- Przyluski, V. and Hallegatte, S.: Indirect costs of natural hazards, CONHAZ report WP02, 2, 383–398, 2011.
- Quintana-Seguí, P., Peral, C., Turco, M., Llasat, M. d. C., and Martin, E.: Meteorological analysis systems in North-East Spain: validation of SAFRAN and SPAN, *Journal of Environmental Informatics*, 2016.
- Quintana-Seguí, P., Turco, M., Herrera García, S., Míguez-Macho, G., et al.: Validation of a new SAFRAN-based gridded precipitation product for Spain and comparisons to Spain02 and ERA-Interim, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 2017.
- Quiroga, S., Garrote, L., Iglesias, A., Fernández-Haddad, Z., Schlickenrieder, J., Lama, B. d., Mosso, C., and Sánchez-Arcilla, A.: The economic value of drought information for water management under climate change: a case study in the Ebro basin, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 11, 643–657, 2011.
- Rajczak, J. and Schär, C.: Projections of Future Precipitation Extremes Over Europe: A Multimodel Assessment of Climate Simulations, *Journal of Geophysical Research : Atmospheres*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027176>, 2017.
- Ramis, C., Llasat, M. C., Genovés, A., and Jansà, A.: The October-1987 floods in Catalonia: Synoptic and mesoscale mechanisms, *Meteorological Applications*, 1, 337–350, 1994.
- Ramis, C., Homar, V., Amengual, A., Romero, R., and Alonso, S.: Daily precipitation records over mainland Spain and the Balearic Islands, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 13, 2483–2491, 2013.
- Raschky, P. A.: Institutions and the losses from natural disasters, *Natural hazards and earth system sciences*, 8, 627–634, 2008.
- Riahi, K., Van Vuuren, D. P., Kriegler, E., Edmonds, J., O’neill, B. C., Fujimori, S., Bauer, N., Calvin, K., Dellink, R., Fricko, O., et al.: The shared socioeconomic pathways and their energy, land use, and greenhouse gas emissions implications: an overview, *Global Environmental Change*, 42, 153–168, 2017.
- Rodrigo, F. and Trigo, R. M.: Trends in daily rainfall in the Iberian Peninsula from 1951 to 2002, *International Journal of Climatology: A Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 27, 513–529, 2007.
- Rodriguez-Puebla, C., Encinas, A., Nieto, S., and Garmendia, J.: Spatial and temporal patterns of annual precipitation variability over the Iberian Peninsula, *International Journal of Climatology*, 18, 299–316, 1998.
- Rojas, R., Feyen, L., Bianchi, A., and Dosio, A.: Assessment of future flood hazard in Europe using a large ensemble of bias-corrected regional climate simulations, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 117, 2012.
- Romero, R., Guijarro, J., Ramis, C., and Alonso, S.: A 30-year (1964–1993) daily rainfall data base for the Spanish Mediterranean regions: First exploratory study, *International Journal of Climatology*, 18, 541–560, 1998.
- Roudier, P., Andersson, J. C., Donnelly, C., Feyen, L., Greuell, W., and Ludwig, F.: Projections of future floods and hydrological droughts in Europe under a +2 C global warming, *Climatic Change*, 135, 341–355, 2016.
- Saint Martin, C., Fouchier, C., Javelle, P., Douvinet, J., and Vinet, F.: Assessing the exposure to floods to estimate the risk of flood-related damage in French Mediterranean basins, in: *3rd European Conference on Flood Risk Management (FLOODrisk 2016)*, vol. 7, p. 04013, 2016.
- Samir, K. and Lutz, W.: The human core of the shared socioeconomic pathways: Population scenarios by age, sex and level of education for all countries to 2100, *Global Environmental Change*, 42, 181–192, 2017.

- Sillmann, J., Kharin, V. V., Zwiers, F. W., Zhang, X., and Bronaugh, D.: Climate extremes indices in the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble : Part 2 . Future climate projections, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 118, 2473–2493, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrd.50188>, 2013.
- Spekkers, M. H., Kok, M., Clemens, F. H., and Ten Veldhuis, J. A.: A statistical analysis of insurance damage claims related to rainfall extremes, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17, 913–922, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-17-913-2013>, 2013.
- 5 Tebaldi, C., Arblaster, J. M., and Knutti, R.: Mapping model agreement on future climate projections, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, 1–5, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL049863>, 2011.
- Thiébaud, S.: The Mediterranean Region under Climate Change. A scientific update: Abridged English/French Version, IRD editions, 2018.
- Torgersen, G., Bjerkholt, J. T., Kvaal, K., and Lindholm, O. G.: Correlation between extreme rainfall and insurance claims due to urban flooding – case study Fredrikstad, Norway, *Journal of Urban and Environmental Engineering*, 9, 127–138, 2015.
- 10 Trambly, Y. and Somot, S.: Future evolution of extreme precipitation in the Mediterranean, *Climatic Change*, 2018.
- Trambly, Y., Ruelland, D., Somot, S., Bouaicha, R., and Servat, E.: High-resolution Med-CORDEX regional climate model simulations for hydrological impact studies: A first evaluation of the ALADIN-Climate model in Morocco, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17, 3721–3739, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-17-3721-2013>, 2013.
- Trigo, R. M. and Palutikof, J. P.: Precipitation scenarios over Iberia: a comparison between direct GCM output and different downscaling techniques, *Journal of Climate*, 14, 4422–4446, 2001.
- 15 Turco, M. and Llasat, M. C.: Trends in indices of daily precipitation extremes in Catalonia (NE Spain), 1951–2003, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 11, 3213–3226, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-3213-2011>, <http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci.net/11/3213/2011/>, 2011.
- Turco, M., Quintana-Seguí, P., Llasat, M., Herrera, S., and Gutiérrez, J. M.: Testing MOS precipitation downscaling for ENSEMBLES regional climate models over Spain, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116, 2011.
- 20 Turco, M., Llasat, M. C., Herrera, S., and Gutiérrez, J. M.: Bias correction and downscaling of future RCM precipitation projections using a MOS-Analog technique, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122, 2631–2648, 2017.
- van Huijstee, J., van Bommel, B., Bouwman, A., and van Rijn, F.: Towards an Urban Preview: Modelling future urban growth with 2UP, Tech. rep., PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, The Hague, 2018.
- 25 Vautard, R., Gobiet, A., Sobolowski, S., and Kjellström, E.: The European climate under a °2C global warming, *Environmental Research Letters*, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/034006>, 2014.
- Wobus, C., Lawson, M., Jones, R., Smith, J., and Martinich, J.: Estimating monetary damages from flooding in the United States under a changing climate, *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 7, 217–229, 2014.
- Zhou, Q., Panduro, T. E., Thorsen, B. J., and Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K.: Verification of flood damage modelling using insurance data, *Water Science and Technology*, 68, 425–432, <https://doi.org/10.2166/wst.2013.268>, 2013.
- 30 Zhou, Q., Leng, G., and Feng, L.: Predictability of state-level flood damage in the conterminous United States: the role of hazard, exposure and vulnerability, *Scientific Reports*, 7, 5354, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-05773-4>, <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-05773-4>, 2017.
- Zischg, A. P., Mosimann, M., Bernet, D. B., and Röthlisberger, V.: Validation of 2D flood models with insurance claims, *Journal of Hydrology*, 357, 350–361, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.12.042>, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.12.042>, 2018.

| Model | Institute | GCM        | RCM        | 1.5 °C    | 2 °C      | 3 °C      |
|-------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1     | KNMI      | EC-EARTH   | RACMO22E   | 2017–2046 | 2032–2061 | 2055–2084 |
| 2     | SMHI      | HadGEM2-ES | RCA4       | 2011–2040 | 2023–2052 | 2041–2070 |
| 3     | SMHI      | EC-EARTH   | RCA4       | 2014–2043 | 2028–2057 | 2053–2082 |
| 4     | MPI-CSC   | MPI-ESM-LR | REMO2009   | 2017–2046 | 2031–2060 | 2054–2083 |
| 5     | CLMcom    | MPI-ESM-LR | CCLM4-8-17 | 2017–2046 | 2031–2060 | 2054–2083 |
| 6     | SMHI      | MPI-ESM-LR | RCA4       | 2017–2046 | 2031–2060 | 2054–2083 |
| 7     | CLMcom    | EC-EARTH   | CCLM4-8-17 | 2014–2043 | 2028–2057 | 2053–2082 |

**Table 11.** EURO-CORDEX climate models used, their characteristics and the periods of each GCM for the three warming levels considered in this study

|          |     | Observed |    |
|----------|-----|----------|----|
|          |     | Yes      | No |
| Forecast | Yes | a        | b  |
|          | No  | c        | d  |

**Table 12.** Contingency table to support Eq.2 and Eq.3

| Percentile | $\beta_0$ | $\beta_1$ | $\beta_2$ | RA <sub>IN</sub> | RA <sub>OUT</sub> |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| 10         | -14.74    | 3.05      | 0.94      | 0.98             | <u>0.89</u>       |
| 20         | -12.98    | 1.60 *    | 0.72      | 0.94             | <u>0.88</u>       |
| 30         | -14.73    | 2.16      | 0.64      | 0.95             | <u>0.89</u>       |
| 40         | -24.87    | 3.12      | 1.11      | 0.97             | <u>0.91</u>       |
| 50         | -18.46    | 2.17      | 0.81      | 0.96             | <u>0.91</u>       |
| 60         | -17.74    | 2.10      | 0.69      | 0.95             | <u>0.90</u>       |
| 70         | -20.92    | 2.98      | 0.57      | 0.95             | <u>0.89</u>       |
| 80         | -27.22    | 4.19      | 0.54      | 0.96             | <u>0.90</u>       |
| 90         | -21.46    | 3.28      | 0.31 *    | 0.95             | <u>0.84</u>       |

**Table 13.** Parameters of the Generalized Linear Mixed Model and the area under the ROC curve (RA<sub>IN</sub>: in-sample validation; RA<sub>OUT</sub>: out-of-sample validation) values for all the percentiles of damage for Catalonia.  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  represent the regression coefficients of the model (intercept, precipitation, and population respectively). \* shows the non-significant regression coefficients (p value > 0.05)

| Percentile | $\beta_0$ | $\beta_1$ | $\beta_2$ | RA <sub>IN</sub> | RA <sub>OUT</sub> |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|-------------------|
| 10         | -183.57   | 34.47     | 4.95      | 1.00             | <u>0.96</u>       |
| 20         | -188.88   | 32.58     | 5.53      | 1.00             | <u>0.98</u>       |
| 30         | -43.83    | 4.59      | 1.99      | 1.00             | <u>0.98</u>       |
| 40         | -42.40    | 3.14      | 2.31      | 0.96             | <u>0.89</u>       |
| 50         | -42.85    | 3.06      | 2.32      | 0.90             | <u>0.85</u>       |
| 60         | -60.63    | 4.46      | 3.16      | 0.95             | <u>0.91</u>       |
| 70         | -40.96    | 2.33      | 2.32      | 0.90             | <u>0.85</u>       |
| 80         | -49.60    | 3.80      | 2.41      | 0.89             | <u>0.86</u>       |
| 90         | -50.97    | 4.05      | 2.34      | 0.94             | <u>0.83</u>       |

**Table 14.** Parameters of the Generalized Linear Mixed Model and the area under the ROC curve (RA<sub>IN</sub>: in-sample validation; RA<sub>OUT</sub>: out-of-sample validation) values for all the percentiles of damage for the Valencian Community.  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  represent the regression coefficients of the model (intercept, precipitation, and population respectively). In this case, all the regression coefficients are statistically significant (p value < 0.05)

| Model | Precipitation |      |      | Precipitation + population |      |      |
|-------|---------------|------|------|----------------------------|------|------|
|       | 1.5 °C        | 2 °C | 3 °C | 1.5 °C                     | 2 °C | 3 °C |
| 1     | 13 %          | 15 % | 12 % | 31 %                       | 39 % | 41 % |
| 2     | 11 %          | 10 % | 12 % | 42 %                       | 42 % | 63 % |
| 3     | 6 %           | -2 % | 17 % | 20 %                       | 15 % | 61 % |
| 4     | 11 %          | 16 % | 9 %  | 25 %                       | 44 % | 40 % |
| 5     | 3 %           | 10 % | 10 % | 15 %                       | 36 % | 48 % |
| 6     | 1 %           | 8 %  | 14 % | 15 %                       | 34 % | 56 % |
| 7     | 6 %           | 5 %  | 4 %  | 19 %                       | 28 % | 41 % |

**Table 15.** Change in the probability of a damaging event in Catalonia for the 70th damage percentile and the three warming periods with the mean 24 h precipitation as explanatory variable (left) and mean 24 h precipitation and population (SSP5) as explanatory variables (right). The gray cells show statically significant (p value < 0.05) increases (light) and decreases (dark) in relation to the reference period (1976-2005)



| Model | Precipitation |      |      | Precipitation + population |      |      |
|-------|---------------|------|------|----------------------------|------|------|
|       | 1.5 °C        | 2 °C | 3 °C | 1.5 °C                     | 2 °C | 3 °C |
| 1     | 12 %          | 12 % | 16 % | 23 %                       | 50 % | 86 % |
| 2     | 4 %           | 2 %  | 8 %  | 11 %                       | 28 % | 71 % |
| 3     | 13 %          | 19 % | 14 % | 36 %                       | 50 % | 61 % |
| 4     | 2 %           | 1 %  | 3 %  | 21 %                       | 35 % | 47 % |
| 5     | -4 %          | -2 % | -4 % | 28 %                       | 42 % | 56 % |
| 6     | 16 %          | 7 %  | 26 % | 41 %                       | 50 % | 94 % |
| 7     | 10 %          | 20 % | 9 %  | 24 %                       | 47 % | 54 % |

**Table 16.** Change in the probability of a damaging event in the Valencian Community for the 70th damage percentile and the three warming periods with the mean 24 h precipitation as explanatory variable (left) and mean 24 h precipitation and population (SSP5) as explanatory variables (right). The gray cells show statically significant (p value < 0.05) increases (light) and decreases (dark) in relation to the reference period (1976-2005)