



Assessing Financial Risk to Property Portfolios from Physical Rainfall Extremes

Laura C. Dawkins¹, Freya K. Garry¹, Dan J. Bernie^{1,2}, Jason A. Lowe^{1,3}, and Theodoros Economou^{1,4}

¹Met Office, FitzRoy Road, Exeter, EX1 3PB, United Kingdom

²University of Bristol Medical School, Beacon House, Queens Road, Bristol, BS8 1QU, United Kingdom

³Priestley International Centre for Climate, University of Leeds, Leeds, United Kingdom

⁴College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom

Correspondence: Laura C. Dawkins (laura.dawkins@metoffice.gov.uk)

Abstract. Physical climate risk from extreme rainfall is often poorly understood by financial investors, potentially extending to pension funds that manage assets of substantial societal importance. There is a growing need for investors to better understand these risks to ensure financial resilience in a changing climate. We present a transparent framework to estimate current and near-future financial risk from flood damage using rainfall hazard information from regional climate projections, river flood maps, and depth-damage functions. Synthetic portfolios are constructed from non-residential built-up surface data and country-specific property values, enabling calculation of Expected Annual Damage. Results show that this physical climate risk is already substantial and projected to rise consistently across Europe, with some regions experiencing particularly large increases. Portfolio composition strongly influences risk, with asset location and value at-risk inducing greater variability than climate model uncertainty. We also demonstrate how adaptation could significantly reduce EAD and deliver a strong financial return within a short time frame, reinforcing its role as a cost-effective strategy for managing climate-related risks. This approach offers a pragmatic and transparent method for quantifying an element of financial risk from extreme rainfall using openly available datasets. Our approach is intended primarily for demonstration and awareness purposes, given its limitations such as the simplified modelling of rainfall–flood relationships and the omission of potential future changes to floodplains. Nonetheless, the findings highlight the urgent need for financial actors, such as asset managers, to integrate physical climate risk into decision-making to safeguard long-term financial resilience.

Copyright statement. ©Crown Copyright, Met Office

1 Introduction

Climate change is bringing more extreme weather events, with hazards such as heatwaves and extreme rainfall projected to increase in their frequency and severity (IPCC, 2023), including in Europe (e.g. Rajczak and Schär 2017, Cardell et al. 2020). Damaging events can now be directly attributed to climate change using modelled changes in probability of such events, for example, the widespread flooding across Western Europe in July 2021 (Tradowsky et al., 2023). Adverse impacts from ex-



25 extremes in Europe are projected to intensify, resulting in a range of socio-economic impacts, including increasing damage to infrastructure both inland and along coastal areas (e.g. Forzieri et al. 2018, IPCC 2023, Deidda et al. 2025, Nawarat et al. 2026). An estimate of economic losses from weather and climate related extremes during 1980-2024 totalled EUR 822 billion across European Union member states, of which 47% are associated with flooding (European Environment Agency, 2026). From the same estimate, EUR 208 billion (25%) of the total losses for the 1980-2024 period occurred between 2021 and 2024 (European Environment Agency, 2026), highlighting that losses have intensified in recent years. Under future climate change scenarios, an example estimate of increased Expected Annual Damage to European properties is 5-fold under the Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 4.5 scenario and 7-fold under the RCP 8.5 scenario by the end of the century (Devadas et al., 2025).

35 Financial markets are key catalysts for societal change across the wider economy, with pensions funds importantly holding huge cross-societal assets. To protect financial investments from the worsening intensity and frequency of weather extremes under climate change, pension fund risk assessments should consider physical risk from changing extremes now and in the future (Ranger et al., 2022). Bongiorno et al. (2022) demonstrate that a UK pension scheme faces significantly greater funding risks under three future climate pathways compared with a climate-uninformed baseline (where the baseline economic outlook does not consider climate change or related policy or technological change). During 2024, the Pensions Regulator in the UK revealed that quantitative risk analysis in climate disclosures is rare (The Pensions Regulator, 2024b), highlighting that many trustees achieve only minimum compliance with environmental social governance duties (The Pensions Regulator, 2024a) and, in 2025, suggested that pension schemes that cannot act to protect pensions from climate risk should quit the market (The Pensions Regulator, 2025).

45 Decision making around climate risk may be hindered by a lack of transparent, robust and decision-useful tools for decision-making and support for risk assessment in the financial sector. For example, Bingler and Colesanti Senni (2022) found that transition risk tools often suffered from poor transparency and communication around uncertainties and assumptions made. Hain et al. (2022) also reveal diverging scores for metrics of physical risk made by financial firms themselves, questioning whether financial markets are able to account for physical climate risk reliably. A benchmarking study of 13 vendors found a wide spread of results for modelling physical risk for an asset, both for the physical hazard estimate and the resultant damages (Climate Financial Risk Forum, 2025). A mixed method analysis of existing tools for physical climate risk from different companies was performed by Hoehn et al. (2025), who interviewed providers and tasked them with quantifying physical risk for a fictional pan-European real estate portfolio, with results showing significant variation. Pensions trustees and asset managers may therefore find it hard to make good decisions around climate risk and management of climate change impacts. Effective risk management of physical climate risks requires deep climate expertise. Acknowledging the need for commercial businesses to protect their intellectual property, products on the market from climate service providers may not be transparent about the methods behind them. Customers may find it hard to understand whether the models and outputs are scientifically robust and suitable for the decision context, or whether they provide enough information about the range of possible climate futures.



User research has highlighted that there is demand from financial sector users for tailored guidance to assist in understanding and navigating complex climate information to support decision making (Climate Financial Risk Forum, 2024). Climate services research that leverages open-source datasets and publishes findings as open access, has the potential to advance method development for service providers while also empowering financial actors to conduct or commission their own tailored analyses and/or engage more effectively with climate service providers. An example of a publicly funded and openly accessible tool includes the Excel based Real Estate Asset Climate Testing (REACT) tool for flood risk assessments of particular assets (de Model et al., 2023; van Veldhoven et al., 2024). Flood hazard and vulnerability assessment methods have also been proposed by Wu et al. (2024) to enable investors or asset owners to quantify climate risks in real estate in different locations globally.

Large pension portfolios may be spread across a nation, continent or globally. One way climate risk translates into financial risk is through potential asset damage caused by river flooding, driven by extreme rainfall in the surrounding catchment area over the preceding hours or days. Local flood risk to a particular asset would be best assessed by hydrological modelling which can model where the rain in a catchment ends up as flood water. However, due to technological and funding constraints, comprehensive local (high-resolution) hydrological models covering continental or global domains are not generally available as open data with quantified uncertainty information, nor are they guaranteed to be readily accessible for every location of interest through commercial providers. Due to the potentially geographically diverse nature of large portfolios in the financial sector, some users may find that it is useful to have methods that (although likely less robust when considering a local asset) are faster and more accessible tools for estimating risk from extreme rainfall impacts across a widespread portfolio when access to hydrological modelling output is not possible. Such transparent methodologies can also be further improved and tailored to form commercial modelling products, particularly when including hydrological modelling inputs, or further developed in future research efforts. The open and transparent discussion around the methodological considerations and limitations can help support potential users of climate information in assessing their risk directly, or in discussions with commercial providers of tailored climate services.

Here we provide different scenarios of financial risk from a range of synthetic (invented) but plausible examples of portfolios using only public and freely available climate information and exposure and vulnerability data sources. Our method provides a framework for assessing financial risk through property damage from inland rainfall which is useful and usable by climate risk assessments where other options are unavailable due to limited data access, resource, expertise or funding. This method is transparent and pragmatic, however it inevitably relies on certain assumptions and simplifications, all of which we describe in detail.

2 Data & Methods

This section provides an overview of the data and methodological steps underpinning our risk assessment framework.



90 2.1 Quantifying Risk

The aim of this study is to produce idealised flood risk information (maps, summary plots, statistics) that demonstrate both current and plausible future physical climate risks to property portfolios. In this application, we do this for a region of North-West Europe covering the UK, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and parts of France, Germany, the Czech Republic, Poland, Norway and Sweden (see Figure 1), and covering two time-periods representative of the recent past and near-term future
95 respectively. Note, however, that the approach could be applied to a different region and/or time period using the same or alternative data sources.

To achieve this, we develop a methodology for estimating flood risk in any given time period and at any given location within the defined study region. This method involves combining three key components:

- 100 – Hazard: Flood depth information representing the severity of inundation at a given location, for a given time period;
- Exposure: The estimated monetary value of assets at risk, derived from synthetic portfolio construction;
- Vulnerability: A depth-damage function that quantifies the proportion of asset value lost due to flood depth.

By combining these elements, we can produce spatially explicit and financially meaningful illustrative flood risk estimates.

105 The schematic in Figure 1 provides an overview of this approach, described in more detail in the subsequent sections. Specifically, it illustrates: (i) how hazard information - extreme rainfall data and flood depth hazard maps - are combined to derive flood depth return level curves (distributions) for any location and time period; (ii) how exposure is represented by integrating asset values with synthetic portfolios; and (iii) how vulnerability is characterised through the relationship between flood depth and the fraction of damage to an asset. These components are integrated to estimate the flood damage cost annual exceedance
110 probability curve for the specified time period and location. The Expected Annual Damage (EAD), a key financial metric, is calculated as the area under this curve.

The following sections describe each part of this risk modelling change in more detail: hazard, exposure, vulnerability and how these are combined to estimate risk.

115 2.2 Hazard

To quantify flood hazard in a specific location and time period, we need to understand how frequently different flood depths occur at that location over the given time-frame. Ideally, risk estimation is based on a hazard event set, which represents a comprehensive collection of possible hazard scenarios (e.g. floods, storms, earthquakes) along with their probabilities. This approach allows for detailed modelling of losses across the full range of potential events, providing a robust estimate of risk
120 metrics such as EAD. Currently, to our knowledge, no open-source flood depth hazard event sets exist that cover Europe in a consistent way, which constrains the application of this risk assessment approach.




Figure 1. A schematic of the approach used to combine information about the hazard, exposure and vulnerability to estimate idealised flood risk (here Expected Annual Damage) for any given time period and at any given location.

When a full event set is not available, EAD can still be estimated using the hazard return-level curve when this is available. This curve relates hazard intensity (e.g. flood depth) to its return-period (the average time between occurrences of an event of that magnitude or greater). By combining this curve with vulnerability and exposure information, EAD can be approximated by integrating over the probability distribution of the resulting impact intensities (as in Figure 1). This is similar to the approach taken by Devadas et al. (2025) and is described in more detail in Section 2.5. A dataset has been identified that provides a partial representation of the flood depth hazard return-level information needed to estimate EAD using this alternative return-level curve method.

2.2.1 Flood depth data

The flood depth hazard dataset used here is the open-source ‘River flood hazard maps for Europe and the Mediterranean Basin region’ database (Baugh et al., 2024b), created as part of the European Flood Awareness System (EFAS) of the Copernicus Emergency Management Service (CEMS). This data includes a 100 metre (m) resolution gridded estimates of flood inundation along the river network (in m depth, for river basins greater than 150 km²) for nine return-periods (1 in 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 75,



135 100, 200 and 500 years), representative of the historical period 1990-2016. The dataset takes input river flow data produced
by the open-source hydrological model LISFLOOD (Burek et al. 2013; Van der Knijff et al. 2010) and performs inundation
simulations with the hydrodynamic model LISFLOOD-FP (Bates et al. 2010; Shaw et al. 2021). While this dataset provides
a unique open-source representation of large-scale riverine flood hazard across Europe, a key limitation is that the hazard
estimates represent river flooding only. Surface-water (pluvial) flooding driven by intense local rainfall is not captured, and
140 therefore some hazard intensities may be underestimated in areas where surface-water processes dominate.

Dottori et al. (2022) present a detailed validation of the version of the hazard maps released in 2020. They find that maps
achieve comparable results to existing large-scale flood models when using similar parameters for the validation. Specifically
they find the modelled maps capture, on average, about two-thirds of the reference flood extent. However, they tend to overes-
145 timate areas with flood probabilities below the 1-in-100-year threshold. For extreme events with return periods of 500 years or
more, the maps correctly identify over half of the flooded areas. They identify that the observed limitations largely stem from
shortcomings in the modelling framework, including the omissions of flood defences and rivers with upstream areas smaller
than 500 km², and constraints in representing river channels and lowland topography.

150 The version of the dataset used in this study was published in November 2024 (Baugh et al., 2024b). A publication on this
version of the dataset is in preparation (Baugh et al., 2024a), and brief descriptions of the versions of the dataset are given in
the file CHANGELOG.txt within the associated data repository (European Commission Joint Research Centre, 2025).

As noted above, the CEMS dataset represents only nine discrete return periods and is restricted to a historical window. To
155 comprehensively assess flood hazard, we need a method to estimate the continuous return-level curve of flood depths, not just
for these predefined intervals, but across the entire spectrum of return periods for both the historical and future time periods
assessed within this study. This broader distribution is critical for capturing the complete range of flood risk at each portfolio
location and ensuring consistent comparisons over time. Here we achieve this by leveraging a related variable for which more
extensive data is available - rainfall.

160 2.2.2 Rainfall data

Rainfall data is sourced from the 12-member perturbed parameter ensemble (PPE) of the UK Climate Projections 2018
(UKCP18; Lowe et al. 2018) Regional Climate Model (RCM). This dataset provides daily total precipitation (in mm/day)
at a 12 km spatial resolution across Europe for the period 1981-2080, and is available to download via the CEDA Archive (Met
Office Hadley Centre, 2018). These simulations are driven at the domain boundaries by a corresponding PPE of the HadGEM3
165 global climate model (Williams et al., 2017). In this study, we use precipitation data, which includes rain, snow, sleet, hail,
drizzle, and freezing rain, as a proxy for rainfall.

To capture the time periods of focus in this study, we use data from two time slices: a historical period that aligns with



the flood hazard information described in Section 2.2.1 (1990-2016), and a near-term future period (2025-2054) to allow for the exploration of future climate risk over the next 30 years (use of other alternative future time slices is also possible with this method).

Since all 12 RCM ensemble members are forced exclusively by the global Hadley Centre climate model (HadGEM3-GC3.05), they represent only a portion of the broader range of plausible climate model uncertainties. Future work should explore the inclusion of additional data from alternative climate models. Further, this UKCP18 ensemble uses the Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 scenario only. When using climate projections based on RCP8.5, especially for a specific future time-slice (e.g. 2025-2054), it's important to note that RCP8.5 represents a high-emissions scenario, assuming continued growth in greenhouse gas emissions without significant mitigation. While it has been widely used in impact studies due to its strong signal and usefulness in stress-testing systems (e.g. Dawkins et al. 2024), it is a scenario that may lead to greater warming than might occur based on current global climate policies, i.e. implying a back tracking on current policy pledges (Riahi et al., 2011). Therefore, results based on RCP8.5 should be interpreted as illustrative of a more extreme pathway.

For context, the driving Hadley Centre climate model reaches approximately 2°C global mean warming relative to pre-industrial levels by 2040 (centre of the future study period), as shown for example in Figure 1 of Met Office 2018). These temperatures fall within the range projected for the 21st century under current policy trajectories reported in the UNEP Emissions Gap Report (United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 2025), but would be reached later in the century under other RCPs. Consequently, while RCP8.5 accelerates the timing of warming relative to present-day policy expectations, the magnitude of warming during the modelled period in this study (2025-2054) is not outside the envelope of plausible 21st-century global temperatures.

Numerous bias-correction methods exist to adjust systematic differences between climate model output and observations, and tools like ibicus (Spuler et al., 2024) provide accessible ways to apply them. In this study, however, we intentionally do not use bias correction. Our goal is to illustrate how flood risk changes between time periods, not to produce operationally calibrated projections. Avoiding additional transformations allows us to focus on the relative climate-driven signal without introducing artefacts or non-physical distortions in the rainfall data (Maraun, 2016).

2.2.3 Estimating flood depth hazard information

To derive the continuous flood-depth return-level curves required for the hazard component of the risk assessment, we first estimate the continuous return-level curve for rainfall using a statistical modelling approach, and then model its relationship with the existing flood-depth return-level curves provided by the CEMS flood hazard maps (introduced in Section 2.2.1). This approach enables us to extend flood hazard estimation beyond the limited available return-periods and across both historical and future time periods. The five steps of this part of our methodology are summarised in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Diagram illustrating the methodology used to quantify the hazard information required for the risk estimation in this study. Specifically, this details the data, modelling and estimating steps taken to provide the required historical and future flood depth return-level curves at each location.

In the absence of open-source hydrological model output to represent all of the hazard information required, this approach offers a pragmatic and transparent method for quantifying this information, leveraging openly available, state-of-the-art datasets.

It is, however, important to acknowledge several caveats and limitations. Most notably, these include the simplified modelling of the relationship between rainfall and flood depth at specific locations. As such, the methodology is suited for demonstration purposes and raising awareness. A detailed discussion of limitations is provided throughout as we explain the method, with an overview of key limitations provided for clarity in Section 5.

210 *Rainfall Extreme Value Spatial Model*

Step 1 in Figure 2 develops a model to estimate the continuous return-level curve for rainfall across the entire study region. This model enables us to characterise rainfall extremes for both time periods considered in the analysis: historical (1990–2016) and future (2025–2054), providing a foundation for assessing flood hazard consistently over time. This is achieved using a spatial extreme value statistical model applied to the 12 km gridded climate model projections of daily total rainfall introduced in Section 2.2.2. Extreme Value Analysis is a branch of statistics used to understand and model rare, extreme events (Coles, 2001), and is therefore particularly suited to representing high return-periods (e.g. 1 in 100 year events) as is required here.

Specifically, our model structure follows the approach detailed in Youngman (2022), namely, an Extreme Value Generalised



220 Additive Model (EV-GAM). We use a Generalised Pareto Distribution (GPD) peak-over-threshold approach for modelling
extreme daily rainfall, and penalised regression splines via a Generalised Additive Model framework to model the spatial vari-
ability of the GPD parameters (Youngman, 2022). EV-GAMs have been used to model environmental variables in a number
of recent studies. These include Youngman (2019), who apply a peak-over-threshold EV-GAM to estimate return-levels for
extreme wind gusts in the United States; Chan et al. (2023), who use a point process EV-GAM to produce updated projections
225 of extreme rainfall using the latest UK climate data; and Brown (2020), who use a peak-over-threshold EV-GAM to model
extreme temperature and investigates how climate change is projected to intensify heatwaves.

In this application, similar to a combination of Youngman (2019) and Chan et al. (2023), our model is specified such that
at any given location the distribution of excess rainfall (greater than the local 98th percentile of non-zero rainfall) is represented
230 using a GPD. The model incorporates a spatially varying scale parameter, which captures the dispersion or spread of the distri-
bution and how it varies across space, and a shape parameter which remains constant across space, characterising the heaviness
of the distribution's tail. The spatially varying scale parameter is modelled as varying with longitude and latitude (both rotated
and standardised to ensure grid cells are of roughly equal size over the domain) and the local mean rainfall over the modelled
period (standardised by the median and range). More detail, including the mathematical equations that summarise this model,
235 are given in Section S1.1 of the Supplementary Material.

As described by Chan et al. (2023), this EV-GAM method captures spatial inhomogeneity explicitly while ensuring spatial
smoothness through the inclusion of spatial and geographical covariates (i.e. longitude, latitude and mean precipitation inten-
sity). In addition, by using all available data across space (rather than modelling individual locations), it yields more robust
240 estimates of extreme events at high return-periods as the model is able to borrow information about extremes from other loca-
tions across space.

The method is implemented using the R statistical programming package `evgam` (Youngman, 2022), which is available for
public download via the R CRAN repository. This package fits models using maximum likelihood estimation, and provides
245 a set of EV-GAM parameter estimates, which can in turn be used to estimate return-levels associated with any given return-
period.

Here, we fit separate models to:

- Each time period: historical (1990–2016) and future (2025–2054)
- 250 – Each of the 12 UKCP18 regional climate model ensemble members
- Each season: Spring (March, April, May), Summer (June, July, August), Autumn (September, October, November) and
Winter (December, January, February)



These subsets of the rainfall data (e.g. historical winters from ensemble member 01) are modelled separately because the statistical behaviour of different combinations are expected to vary substantially. For instance, the spatial distribution of winter rainfall is likely to differ from that of summer rainfall. An alternative, more complex approach would involve modelling all data jointly, incorporating additional terms to account for variation across time periods, ensemble members, and seasons within a unified statistical framework. While this would increase model complexity and imposes assumptions such as smooth transitions across seasons, it presents a potential avenue for future research aimed at enhancing the parsimony and elegance of the methodology.

Figure 3 shows a summary of some of the EV-GAM inputs and outputs over the study domain for one modelled combination: the historical period, UKCP18 ensemble member 01 and summer rainfall. This shows how the characteristics of rainfall vary over the region and how this is captured in the EV-GAM. For example, this shows how the 98th percentile of wet-day rainfall (Figure 3 a) and the mean rainfall (Figure 3 b) inputs are highest along the west coast of the UK and Norway, and how this is captured in the EV-GAM through the GPD scale parameter, which is higher in these regions (Figure 3 c), subsequently leading to similar spatial variation in the 1-in-100-year return-level for historical summer-time daily rainfall estimated from the model (Figure 3 d).

For illustration throughout this paper, we present detailed examples of the modelling workflow using a selection of grid cells identified as flood-prone in the CEMS flood hazard maps. To provide geographical context, we choose grid cells located closest to the central longitude-latitude coordinates of twelve European cities. These city grid cells were selected to span the study region and to capture a range of flood-risk conditions. Their locations are shown in Figure 3 (c), and Table 1 lists their corresponding coordinates, sourced from an openly accessible dataset hosted on GitHub (ofou, 2018). It is important to note that the grid cells representing these cities differ across the hazard datasets: the rainfall dataset uses grid cells of 12 km × 12 km (e.g. as in Figure 4), whereas the flood hazard dataset uses much finer 100 m × 100 m cells. Consequently, the flood hazard city grid cells shown only represent a small central portion of each city (e.g. Figure 6 onward). For context, Table 1 provides information about the approximate size of each city (based on municipality regions) and how much of the city would be contained within each of these city grid cells of different scales. Figure S1 in the Supplementary Material shows maps of four of these cities, demonstrating the location and relative size of the 100 m × 100 m grid cells.

Figure 4 presents a series of model validation Quantile-Quantile (Q-Q) plots based on the historical period and UKCP18 ensemble member 01, for each season and four city grid cells within the study region. Equivalent Q-Q plots for the other combinations of time period and ensemble member are provided in Section S1.2 of the Supplementary Material. Q-Q plots are a standard model validation technique in statistical modelling for assessing whether the empirical data follow a particular theoretical distribution. In this case we compare the quantiles of the UKCP18 rainfall data (y axis) against the quantiles of the GPD distribution fitted to that location and season via the EV-GAM (x axis). A perfect fit would be characterised by all points on the Q-Q plot lying exactly along the line $y=x$. In practice, perfect alignment is rare and a model fit is generally considered




Figure 3. Spatial maps of key parameters in the extreme value analysis model for the historical period, UKCP18 ensemble member 01 and summer rainfall. These include (a) the rainfall threshold above which extremes are modelled (98th percentile of wet days), (b) the mean daily total rainfall over the modelled time period, scaled by taking away its median and dividing by its range (an input of the spatial variability in the EV-GAM scale parameter), (c) the fitted Generalized Pareto Distribution scale parameter, and (d) the estimated 1-in-100-year return-level for daily total rainfall (mm/day) across the European study region. The fitted Generalized Pareto Distribution shape parameter (which is constant in space) is also shown in (c), and the 12 European cities used for demonstration in later figures are shown in (d).



Table 1. Municipal areas and coordinates of the twelve European cities selected to illustrate the modelling workflow, together with the approximate percentage of each city encompassed by representative grid cells from the flood hazard dataset (100 m × 100 m) and the rainfall dataset (12 km × 12 km). These values contextualise the scale contrast between datasets and demonstrate how the flood hazard city grid cells shown in later figures capture only small central portions of each city. Figure S1 in the Supplementary Material shows maps of four of these cities, demonstrating the location and relative size of the 100 m × 100 m grid cells.

City	Longitude	Latitude	Approx. Administrative area (km ²)	100 m × 100 m cell (%)	12 km × 12 km cell (%)
Amsterdam	4.8897	52.3740	219.32	0.005%	65.7%
Belfast	-5.926437	54.607868	133.00	0.008%	108%
Brussels	4.3499	50.8467	33.09	0.03%	435%
Edinburgh	-3.188267	55.953251	263.00	0.004%	54.8%
Gdańsk	18.64637	54.35205	683.00	0.001%	21.1%
Gothenburg	11.97456	57.70887	447.76	0.002%	32.2%
Hamburg	9.9872	53.5488	755.09	0.001%	19.1%
London	-0.1257	51.5085	1572.00	0.0006%	9.2%
Luxembourg City	6.1300	49.6117	51.46	0.02%	280%
Odense	10.4024	55.4038	80.10	0.01%	180%
Prague	14.4208	50.0880	496.00	0.002%	29.0%
Rouen	1.0984	49.4435	21.38	0.047%	673%

to be good if the points lie within the 95% confidence interval (i.e. any deviations from the theoretical distribution are within expected random variation).

290

Figure 4 shows that, for each example grid cell and season the quantiles of the empirical data sit within the 95% confidence interval of the statistical model, indicating a good fit. The same is true for the other combinations of time period and ensemble member (see Section S1.2 of the Supplementary Material). In some cases in Figure 4, however, such is in the Hamburg grid cell in the summer, many of the quantile points sit close to one end of the 95% confidence interval, indicating a systematic over- or under-estimation of the rainfall distribution in these cases. While good model fit is still achieved in these cases (points fall within the 95% confidence interval), valuable future work could aim to refine the EV-GAMs to improve upon this, for example by including additional covariates within the spatial model for the GPD scale parameter. Such additional spatial covariates could include for example the proximity to the sea, prevailing wind patterns and land-use characteristics. Section S1.2 of the Supplementary Material also provides further model validation plots for the full spatial region, demonstrating that the models perform well.

295
300

To accurately represent the complete return-level curve for rainfall for any given location across the entire year (rather than representing each season in isolation) we combine simulated rainfall data from all four seasonal models and compute the relevant return-levels. For each time period and climate model ensemble member, we use the parameter estimates from the EV-GAM




Figure 4. Statistical model validation plots: Quantile-Quantile (Q-Q) plots for the EV-GAM fitted to the historical period and UKCP18 ensemble member 01. Individual Q-Q plots are shown for models representing each season and for 4 12 km × 12 km grid cells representative of 4 European cities (see Table 1). The black crosses show the relationship between the empirical quantiles of the UKCP18 rainfall data used to fit the EV-GAM (shown on the y axis) and the mean estimate of the corresponding theoretical quantiles from the EV-GAM fitted to this data (shown on the x axis). The dashed black lines show the 95% confidence interval around this mean estimate from the EV-GAM, and the red line is the line of $y=x$.




Figure 5. Spatial maps of rainfall return-levels (mm/day) across Europe for nine return-periods (10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 75, 100, 200, and 500 years) based on historical (1990–2016) daily total rainfall data from UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01.

models to generate daily rainfall simulations. Specifically, we simulate 10,000 days from each seasonal model, resulting in a combined dataset of 40,000 daily rainfall values that represent rainfall from the whole year for that time period and ensemble member. This comprehensive set of simulations allows us to estimate any desired return-level by identifying the corresponding quantile from the full-year set of samples. More detail on this is given in Section S1.3 of the Supplementary Material.

Step 2 of the hazard methodology (Figure 2) estimates rainfall return-levels across all locations, corresponding to the nine return-periods provided by the flood depth hazard maps from the CEMS database (introduced in Section 2.2.1). These return-periods are 1-in-10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 75, 100, 200, and 500 years, and represent the historical period (1990–2016). Figure 5



illustrates the resulting rainfall return-level maps for UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01. As expected, the magnitude of daily rainfall (i.e. the return-level) increases with longer return-periods (i.e. as the events become more infrequent). This trend is consistent across all locations within the study region. Notably, areas with the highest rainfall return-levels, such as western UK and Norway, remain prominent across all return-period maps, highlighting the persistently high rainfall hazard characteristics in these regions.

Relating rainfall and flood depth return-levels

Step 3 of the hazard methodology (Figure 2) focuses on modelling the relationship between the rainfall distribution and flood depth distribution at each location. This mapping allows for any flood depth quantile associated with any return-period in either the historical or future periods to be estimated (as is required for the hazard component of this risk assessment). Here this is done by fitting a monotonically increasing cubic spline to the relationship between historical rainfall return-levels (from Step 2) and flood depth return-levels (taken from the CEMS flood hazard maps, introduced in Section 2.2.1).

Rainfall return-levels are modelled at the 12 km spatial resolution of the UKCP Regional Climate Model (RCM), while flood depth return-levels are provided at a much finer resolution of 100 m. To establish the mapping between rainfall and flood depth, each flood depth grid cell is paired with its geographically nearest rainfall grid cell. As a result, multiple flood depth grid cells may share the same rainfall grid cell for this mapping, reflecting the coarser resolution of the rainfall data.

Here, a spline is fitted to each relevant 100 m × 100 m flood hazard grid cell and corresponding rainfall grid cell separately using the `scipy.interpolate.PchipInterpolator` function in the Python SciPy library. This function creates a smooth curve that passes through a given set of data points, preserving the shape and monotonicity of the data (see Figure 6). This spline fitting is carried out for each of the UKCP18 RCM ensemble members individually, allowing for a quantification of climate model uncertainty in the resulting risk.

Rather than modelling every 100 m × 100 m grid cell of the flood depth hazard maps within the study region, we concentrate on those that meet two criteria: (1) they are viable candidates for inclusion in our synthetic pension portfolios, containing a minimum of 1,000 m² of built-up non-residential property (see Section 2.3.1 for more information); and (2) they are at risk of flooding, indicated by non-zero flood depth for events up to at least the 1-in-75-year return-period in the CEMS flood hazard maps. In the top panel of Figure 6, the grey points represent locations that meet criterion (1), and blue points satisfy both criteria (1) and (2). These blue points are therefore the ones for which the rainfall-to-flood-depth mapping is performed.

The bottom panel of Figure 6 shows the fitted monotonically increasing cubic splines for the grid cells associated with 12 European cities (all of which satisfy both of the modelling criteria, see Table 1 for more detail). In this figure the rainfall return levels were estimated using the EV-GAM fitted to UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01, and equivalent functions are also fitted




Figure 6. Top panel: A map of the North-West Europe region used within this study, with points added to show the 100 m x 100 m grid cells in the flood hazard and exposure datasets that meet two criteria: (1) shown in grey - viable candidates for inclusion in synthetic pension portfolios, containing a minimum of 1,000 m² of built-up non-residential property (see Section 2.3.1 for more information); and (2) shown in blue - viable candidates also at risk of flooding, indicated by non-zero flood depth for events up to at least the 1-in-75-year return-period in the CEMS flood hazard dataset. **Bottom panel:** spline-based curves linking rainfall intensity (mm/day) to flood depth (m) for 100 m x 100 m grid cells representative of the centre of 12 European cities (locations shown on the map in the top panel, see Table 1 for more detail). The blue points show the relationship between the nine flood depth return-levels taken from the CEMS flood hazard dataset (y axis, see Section 2.2.1) and the equivalent values for the rainfall (x axis) estimated in Step 2 of the methodology shown in Figure 2 (here shown for the model based on historical rainfall data from the UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01). The red crosses show two additional points used in each spline fitting to allow for extrapolation above and below these nine quantiles (one at zero-zero, and one at the highest observed rainfall in the historical and future periods combined.)



to each of the other UKCP ensemble members. These fitted spline functions thus provide a mapping between the return-levels (i.e. quantiles) of the rainfall distribution and return-levels of the flood depth distribution within each grid cell. The shapes of the spline functions vary across the grid-cell locations, as expected given the differing flood characteristics of each area. These relationships, derived from rainfall and flood information at varying spatial scales, inevitably carry several modelling caveats; however, they remain informative for this idealised demonstration. This is supported by the use of well-validated rainfall extreme-value models and the most relevant open-source flood-depth datasets available.

Figure 7 provides an illustration of the rainfall-to-flood mapping process for two 100 m × 100 m grid cells representative of the centres of Gothenburg and Edinburgh respectively. Panels (a) and (c) show the historical and future rainfall return-level curves derived from the statistical extreme value models as per Step 4 of the hazard methodology schematic in Figure 2. These align well with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) historical records, which indicate that the empirical 1-in-60-year rainfall event is 86 mm/day and 82 mm/day for Gothenburg and Edinburgh respectively. These rainfall return-level curves are then combined with the location-specific spline functions (Figure 6, here shown for UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01) to estimate the corresponding flood depth return-level curves (Step 5 in Figure 2), shown in Figure 7 (b) and (d). This interpolates the continuous historical flood depth curve, filling in the gaps between the nine available data points from the CEMS flood hazard map database. Similarly, the future rainfall return-levels are used to generate the continuous future flood depth curve.

Figure 7 (b) and (d) demonstrate that the historical flood depths from the CEMS flood maps are well represented by the fitted continuous curves, as indicated by the close alignment between the curves and the CEMS flood maps data points. This agreement holds for the 100 m × 100 m grid cell in central Gothenburg; however, the resulting return-level estimates appear notably high (reaching in excess of 5 m). Although previous flood modelling work for Gothenburg has reported water depths in excess of 2 m (Filipova and Rana, 2012), it is possible that the known caveats associated with the CEMS dataset (discussed in Section 2.2.1) may be contributing to an overestimation of flood depths in this particular grid cell.

The same approach is used to estimate the continuous return-level curve for historical and future flood depth at all potential portfolio location 100 m grid cells at-risk of flooding within the study region (blue points in the top panel of Figure 6).

These modelling steps are then applied to each of the UKCP18 RCM ensemble members individually, hence resulting in a representation of the full flood depth return-level curve (distribution) for:

- each time period - historical (1990-2016) and future (2025-2054),
- each of the 12 UKCP18 RCM ensemble members.

Equivalent graphs to those shown in Figure 7 but for all ensemble members are shown in Figure S2 of the Supplementary Material.




Figure 7. Illustration of the rainfall-to-flood distribution mapping process for two 100 m × 100 m grid cells representative of the city centres of Gothenburg and Edinburgh (see Table 1 for more detail). Panels (a) and (c) show historical and future rainfall return-level curves derived from statistical extreme value models. These curves are combined with location-specific spline functions (as in Figure 6, here for UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01) to estimate flood depth return-level curves. Panels (b) and (d) display the resulting historical and future flood depth curves, including the original nine return-levels for historical flood depths taken from the CEMS flood maps.



2.3 Exposure

The exposure component of the risk assessment necessitates an estimation of the monetary value of assets at risk. While our approach can accommodate a range of property types, this study specifically focuses on portfolios that are heavily invested in large commercial real estate. Due to the lack of detailed data on the precise location and valuation of assets held by these types of pension funds, exposure is approximated here using a combination of spatial information about non-residential property.

2.3.1 Built-up surface data

The GHS-BUILT-S R2023A dataset, developed by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre, offers a high-resolution, multi-temporal raster grid of global built-up surface estimates. It spans 1975 to 2030 in 5-year intervals, enabling consistent spatial analysis of urbanisation trends over time (Pesaresi and Politis, 2023; Pesaresi et al., 2024). The dataset provides both total and non-residential built-up surface (predominantly commercial buildings). To reflect our choice to consider portfolios that are heavily invested in large commercial real estate, we use the non-residential built-up surface as a proxy for asset location and scale, providing a representative basis for our synthetic portfolio construction. Non-residential built-up data in GHS-BUILT-S R2023A is produced using a Symbolic Machine Learning method that combines Sentinel-2 and Landsat imagery with reference datasets such as OpenStreetMap and building footprints from Facebook and Microsoft (Pesaresi et al., 2024). The approach enables sub-pixel estimation of built-up surfaces and separates residential from non-residential areas using spatial patterns, land-use indicators, and auxiliary data. The classification shows high accuracy, and the model infers historical growth trends to project built-up surfaces to 2030.

This data is available at a 100 m spatial resolution over land and aligns with the grid cell locations used in the flood-depth hazard maps (introduced in Section 2.2.1). Each grid cell value represents the number of square meters of built-up surface within that cell, which has an area of 10,000 m². The data is supplied as global TIFF raster tiles, each covering 5 degrees by 5 degrees in WGS84 (EPSG:4326). For this study, we use three tiles covering the UK, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and parts of France, Germany, the Czech Republic, Poland, Norway, and Sweden (see Fig. 6, top panel). Future work could extend this to larger or alternative regions depending on user needs. We use data representative of the year 2020. This reference year was selected as it closely reflects the contemporary built environment at the time of the GHS-BUILT-S dataset's publication. By anchoring our portfolios to a consistent spatial distribution from 2020, we are able to assess both historical (1990–2016) and near-term future (2025–2054) flood risk, ensuring that any observed changes in the risk are attributable to evolving hazard dynamics rather than shifts in portfolio composition, thereby isolating the impact of climate change on a fixed set of asset locations. Future work could explore how risk may vary if different representative years were used.

Finally, to capture larger commercial properties within the synthetic portfolios we only use the built-up surface information from those locations that have at least 10% of the grid cell containing non-residential buildings (i.e. at least 1000 m²).



2.3.2 Property value data

In addition to characterising the location and extent of non-residential property, to assess flood risk in financial terms it is
415 necessary to translate these physical attributes into monetary values. This requires data on property values across the region of
interest, allowing for the estimation of the economic exposure of assets represented in our synthetic portfolios.

For this, we use open-source information from the European Commission's Joint Research Centre database on Global flood
depth-damage functions (Huizinga et al., 2017). This database contains country specific estimates of the maximum building-
420 based damage costs (in Euros per m²) for various land use categories, including residential, commercial, industrial, and agricul-
tural areas. These maximum damage values are derived from construction cost surveys conducted by multinational construction
companies.

For each European country in our study region, we represent the property value per m² (constant across that country) as
425 the estimate of the maximum building-based damage costs (in Euros per m²) for commercial (i.e. non-residential) properties,
to align with the use of non-residential built-up surface data as described in Section 2.3.1. While property values undoubtedly
vary within countries, we were unable to identify a suitable open-source dataset with sufficient spatial resolution to capture this
variability. Nevertheless, we consider the approach adopted here to be a reasonable first step for this idealised demonstration.

2.3.3 Quantifying the total value of assets

430 Across the study domain, we quantify exposure (the total value of assets) by combining:

1. The location and physical footprint/size of non-residential built-up areas (described in Section 2.3.1 and shown in Figure
8 a). This metric is captured on a 100 m resolution spatial grid, and specifies the amount of square metres of built-up
surface in each cell. Here only grid cells where this footprint exceeds 1000 m² within a 10,000 m² grid cell are considered
in an effort to better represent larger commercial properties (i.e. grey points in the top panel of Figure 6).
- 435 2. The country-wide property value per m² (described in Section 2.3.2 and shown in Figure 8 b).

These two quantities are multiplied together to provide an estimate of the total value of assets within each human settlement
grid cell, as shown in Figure 8 (c).

2.3.4 Constructing synthetic portfolios

The estimate of the monetary value of assets (Figure 8 c) is used to construct synthetic property portfolios. Based on advice
440 from a researcher specialising in the pensions sector, portfolios containing 450 asset locations (grid cells) were considered. As
shown in the top panel of Figure 6, only a small proportion (specifically 7.5%) of potential portfolio locations are at risk of
flooding (i.e. blue points compared to grey points in this figure). As such, the level of flood risk associated with a particular
portfolio will likely greatly depend on the proportion of the sampled 450 asset locations that are at-risk of flooding compared




Figure 8. Exposure and vulnerability metrics. Panels (a–c) show the spatial distribution of exposure indicators for European human settlement grid cells: (a) non-residential built-up area within the $100 \text{ m} \times 100 \text{ m}$ grid cell (in m^2), (b) asset value per square metre (in Euros), and (c) total asset value within the $100 \text{ m} \times 100 \text{ m}$ grid cell (in million Euros). Panel (d) illustrates the vulnerability function as the relationship between flood depth and damage (see Section 2.4 for more detail).



to not at-risk. This is explored further in Section 3.2.

445

Synthetic portfolios are created in two ways to explore idealised pension portfolio flood risk within this study:

1. Portfolio asset locations sampled randomly from all potential grid cells,
2. The proportion of at-risk and not at-risk locations is varied, and locations sampled at random to satisfy these proportions.

2.4 Vulnerability

450 To quantify vulnerability we employ a depth-damage function that estimates the proportion of an asset's value likely to be lost, as a function of flood depth. Specifically, we use information obtained from the European Commission's Joint Research Centre database on Global flood depth-damage functions (Huizinga et al., 2017). This database provides a comprehensive set of damage curves for each continent, relating flood depth to economic damage for the same land use categories as the maximum damage cost data described in Section 2.3.2. The damage curves are derived from empirical data and expert judgment, and are
455 designed to be compatible with large-scale flood modelling frameworks. They offer depth-damage relationships that estimate the proportion of asset value lost at different inundation depths, enabling consistent and scalable economic impact assessments of flooding events (Huizinga et al., 2017).

Here, the flood depth-damage relationship representative of commercial (i.e. non-residential) properties in Europe is used,
460 again to align with the use of non-residential built-up surface data as described in Section 2.3.1. A representation of this curve is provided in Figure 8 (d). The data is provided as a series of data points and a monotonically increasing cubic spline is fitted to the points to represent the complete vulnerability depth-damage function (using the spline model as in Section 2.2.3).

In the absence of more spatially resolved vulnerability data, this function is uniformly applied across all locations and as-
465 sets within the study region. While this approach provides a useful baseline, future work and real-world applications would benefit from incorporating asset-specific vulnerability profiles.

2.5 Translating Hazard to Risk

For any given location/grid cell (that is at risk of flooding), the hazard, exposure and vulnerability information can be combined to estimate flood risk. As shown in Figure 1, this is done by combining the hazard return-level curve with the vulnerability and
470 exposure information and estimating the Expected Annual Damage (EAD) by integrating over the probability distribution of the resulting impact intensities. For both the historical and future periods, Figure 9 demonstrates this process for the 100 m × 100 m grid cells representative of the city centres of Gothenburg and Edinburgh, using the hazard information derived from UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01, and summarised in these steps:




Figure 9. Illustration of the hazard to risk estimation process for two 100 m × 100 m grid cells representative of the city centres of Gothenburg and Edinburgh (see Table 1 for more detail). Panels (a) and (d) show historical and future flood fraction of damage return-level curves derived by applying the vulnerability function to the equivalent flood-depth return-level curves. Panels (b) and (e) show the historical and future flood damage cost return-level curves derived by multiplying the flood fraction of damage return-level curves by the exposure metric (total value of assets) in that 100 m × 100 m grid cell. Panel (c) and (f) show the subsequent Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) curves derived by inverting the x axis of the flood damage cost return-level curves from return period (T) to AEP (1/T). Here this is demonstrated using the hazard information derived from UKCP18 RCM ensemble member 01.



1. First, the vulnerability function (represented by the flood depth–damage curve in Figure 8 d) is applied to the hazard (flood depth) return-level curves (Figure 7 b and d) to derive the corresponding return-level curve for the fraction of flood damage. This is shown in Figure 9 (a) and (d) for Gothenburg and Edinburgh respectively.
2. The flood fraction of damage values are then converted to damage costs by multiplying by the exposure value in that 100 m × 100 m grid cell (taken from Figure 8 c), as shown in Figure 9 (b) and (e) for Gothenburg and Edinburgh respectively. Note the relatively small size of the grid cells compared to the size of the cities as a whole (see Table 1 for more detail) explaining the scale of the flood damage costs (i.e. this does not represent the whole city but just a small 100 m × 100 m region in the city centre).
3. Finally, the EAD is calculated as the area under the Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) curve for flood damage costs. The AEP curves for the Gothenburg and Edinburgh grid cells are shown in Figure 9 (c) and (f) respectively. The AEP is defined as the inverse of the return-period; e.g. a flood event with a 10-year return-period has an AEP of 1/10, or 0.1. Here, the area under the AEP curve is calculated via the composite trapezoidal rule, implemented using the python scipy integrate.trapezoid function.

This calculation is carried out for all viable synthetic portfolio 100 m × 100 m grid cells that are considered to be at risk of flooding (blue points in the top panel of Figure 6). As with the hazard component, for comparison this is repeated for:

- each time period - historical (1990–2016) and future (2025–2054),
- each of the 12 UKCP18 RCM ensemble members.

3 Results

3.1 Quantifying historical and future physical risk

We begin by exploring the estimated idealised flood risk, expressed as Expected Annual Damage (EAD), across the entire study region for both the historical period (1990–2016) and the projected near-term future period (2025–2054), using the methodology outlined in Section 2.

Figure 10(a) illustrates this risk in the historical and future periods for a selection of 100 m × 100 m grid cells representative of the central regions of 12 European cities (see Table 1 for more detail). This shows that there is considerable flood risk (EAD) in the historical period, and that future EAD values are consistently higher than historical estimates across all city grid cells. This high present-day risk is particularly pronounced in the grid cells located within London, Hamburg, and Odense, suggesting that these locations may be especially susceptible to current and future flood-related economic losses. Figure 10 (c) and (d) illustrate how the historical EAD relates to the two components of flood risk that vary by location: the hazard (summarised by the 1-in-100-year flood depth) and the exposure (total exposed asset value) across the city grid cells. These panels highlight




Figure 10. Panels (a) and (b) show a comparison of historical and future flood risk, expressed as Expected Annual Damage (EAD) derived using the methodology described in Section 2: (a) UKCP18 RCM ensemble spread in EAD for 12 100 m x 100 m grid cells representative of the central regions of 12 European cities (see Table 1 for more detail) in historical (1990–2016) and future (2025–2054) periods, (b) UKCP18 RCM ensemble mean difference in EAD between future and historical periods. For context, a histogram of the values shown in panel (b) is provided, with blue vertical lines indicating the deciles of the distribution. These deciles define the bounds of the colour scale used in panel (b). Panels (c) and (d) provide a comparison of the driving components of the flood risk in each of the 12 city grid cells: (c) relates the ensemble mean EAD to the historical 100-year flood depth (hazard), and panel (d) relates ensemble mean EAD to the exposed value of assets (exposure).



that, in the central London 100 m grid cell, the high historical EAD is primarily driven by high historical hazard. In contrast, the high EAD in Hamburg arises largely from the substantial concentration of commercial assets within the corresponding 100 m grid cell. For Odense, both the hazard intensity and the level of exposure jointly contribute to the very high estimated EAD.

In Figure 10 (a) the climate model ensemble spread (width of the box plots) indicates the uncertainty across the climate model simulations. As expected, uncertainty in EAD is greater for the future period, reflecting the increasing divergence among climate ensemble projections over time. This rise in uncertainty varies by location, with Gothenburg and Luxembourg showing particularly pronounced future uncertainty. Further investigation is required to understand the drivers of these differences in climate model uncertainty across locations.

Figure 10 (b) further demonstrates the upward trend in flood related EAD between the historical and future periods. The map shows large positive differences in EAD across most of the study region, meaning flood risk is expected to increase substantially. Some areas exhibit extremely high increases (up to €400,000 in EAD difference), concentrated in low-lying or coastal regions. The histogram in Figure 10 (b) confirms that most grid cells experience positive changes, with a skew toward high increases, reinforcing the trend of worsening flood risk.

3.2 Exploring risk in synthetic portfolios

Historical and projected future estimates of idealised flood risk, derived from the 12-member UKCP18 RCM ensemble, are integrated with various representations of synthetic pension portfolios (as outlined in Section 2.3) to enhance sector-specific realism and relevance.

Figure 11 compares the total EAD of two synthetic pension portfolios. The two portfolios are similar in many ways: each portfolio comprises 450 sampled locations and has an estimated combined economic value of approximately €0.89 billion, based on the asset value exposure metric used in the analysis (shown in Figure 8 c). Indeed, visually, the spatial distribution and variability of asset locations appear very similar. However, their total EAD differs substantially, with Portfolio 2 exhibiting significantly higher values than Portfolio 1 in both historical and future periods.

Figure 11 (c) demonstrates the critical need for pension sector asset managers to quantify the physical climate risks embedded within their portfolios. While these two portfolios may appear equivalent based on several characteristics, their potential financial impacts differ markedly due to variations in physical risk. Accurately assessing this risk is essential, and proactive measures should be taken to adapt and reduce this risk where possible.

This difference in EAD in Figure 11 (c) arises because Portfolio 1 and Portfolio 2 are sampled such that 20% and 80% of locations are at risk of flooding respectively. A deeper analysis of how varying the proportion of at-risk locations influences overall risk is presented in Figure 12, which shows how historical and future EAD varies across 1000 different synthetic port-




Figure 11. A demonstration of the difference in idealised flood risk between two synthetic pension portfolios: (a) Portfolio 1: the geographical locations of 450 randomly sampled locations used to represent a synthetic pension portfolio of 450 assets, such that 20% of the locations are at-risk of flooding (blue points in the top panel of Figure 6), (b) Portfolio 2: as in (a) but such that 80% of the locations are at-risk of flooding, (c) box-plots comparing the portfolio total EAD for Portfolios 1 and 2, in both the historical and future periods. The uncertainty in the box-plots quantifies the UKCP18 RCM ensemble spread. In (a) and (b) the total value of the portfolio asset locations is given in the top left corner, estimated using the exposure metric of total value of assets in Figure 8 (c).




Figure 12. A demonstration of the difference in idealised flood risk (Expected Annual Damage, EAD) across 1000 different synthetic portfolios (each point) when calculated based on extreme rainfall from each of the 12 UKCP18 RCM ensemble members (shown in different colours as per the legend): (a) for 1000 synthetic portfolios of 450 assets sampled at random from all viable asset locations (grey and blue points in the top panel of Figure 6), (b) for 1000 synthetic portfolios of 450 assets sampled in a stratified way such that 10% of the 1000 sampled portfolios have 10% of locations at-risk of flooding, 10% have 20% of locations at-risk of flooding, 10% have 30% of locations at-risk of flooding, and so on until 10% have 100% of locations at-risk of flooding. An additional scatter plot of the relationship between the proportion of the 450 sampled locations at risk of flooding and the future EAD (based on portfolios in b) is inserted into panel (b). In both plots, note that the same 1000 portfolios of 450 asset locations are used to estimate EAD for each ensemble member.

folios (each point) when calculated based on extreme rainfall from each ensemble member (shown in different colours). These plots show that for almost all combinations of portfolio and ensemble member, EAD is higher in the future period (most points are above the line of $y=x$). Again this demonstrates the potential increase in flood risk across Europe due to climate change.

Both panels in Figure 12 illustrate that the variability in EAD across the 1000 synthetic portfolios is substantially greater than the variability arising from the different UKCP18 RCM ensemble members. This indicates that the spatial distribution and associated value of assets exposed to flooding within each portfolio exert a stronger influence on EAD than the particular ensemble member used to represent extreme rainfall. Nonetheless, some variation across ensemble members is evident, and this source of uncertainty is expected to increase over time. Consequently, EAD estimates will become increasingly sensitive to the choice of ensemble member as the analysis period approaches the end of the century.



Figure 12 (b) explores this variability when using 1000 stratified sampled portfolios such that the proportion of at-risk and not at-risk locations is varied, and locations sampled at random to satisfy these proportions. Specifically, our stratified set of portfolios is designed as follows: 10% of the 1000 sampled portfolios have 10% of locations at-risk of flooding, 10% have 20% of locations at-risk of flooding, 10% have 30% of locations at-risk of flooding, and so on until 10% have 100% of locations at-risk of flooding. The inset scatter plot in Figure 12 (b) shows how those portfolios with a higher proportion of locations at risk of flooding have a higher estimated EAD. These plots in combination highlight how portfolios with a higher proportion of locations at risk of flooding have the greatest difference between historical and future EAD and the greatest uncertainty in EAD across the climate ensemble members. Similar to Figure 11, this emphasises the urgent need to quantify the physical risks associated with pension investments, as this assessment of risk will be specific to any given portfolio, and will be essential for informing relevant decisions to ensure long-term financial resilience.

4 Exploring adaptation

Climate adaptation refers to the process of adjusting natural and human systems to minimise harm associated with climate change. It involves implementing strategies such as improving infrastructure resilience, developing drought-resistant crops, enhancing flood defences, and revising policies to cope with changing conditions.

The results in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 highlight how physical climate risk from extreme rainfall is a concern for commercial property assets in the current climate and increases in future climate. To reduce this risk and build resilience, the pension sector must invest in climate adaptation.

To illustrate the potential benefits of climate adaptation within the pension sector, we suppose that all asset locations in Portfolio 2 (Section 3.2) are adapted to withstand flood depths up to and including the historical 1-in-10-year event (e.g. through the building of flood defences). This adaptation effectively truncates the upper tail of the future annual exceedance probability (AEP) curve at the relevant annual exceedance probability. The future Expected Annual Damage (EAD) at each location is then calculated as the area under this truncated curve. Figure 13 (a) demonstrates this for Gothenburg, where the historical 1-in-10-year flood depth aligns with the future 1-in-6-year event. Consequently, the adapted AEP curve is truncated so that flood damage costs are zero for exceedance probabilities greater than 1/6. The grey shaded region then represents the future adapted EAD at this location.

This approach is applied to all locations in Portfolio 2 and Figure 13 (b) compares the portfolio total EAD before and after this adaptation is implemented for the future period. This toy demonstration shows how adaptation results in a large reduction in the EAD and hence physical risk associated with the pension portfolio, highlighting the important role adaptation could have.




Figure 13. An illustration of the potential benefits of climate adaptation within the pension sector using a toy example associated with synthetic Portfolio 2 (introduced in the previous section). (a) Flood damage cost annual exceedance probability (AEP) curve for Gothenburg for the historical period (1990–2016), future non-adapted scenario (2025–2054), and future adapted scenario. The grey shaded area represents the Expected Annual Damage (EAD) after adaptation. (b) Portfolio-level EAD comparison for historical, future, and future adapted scenarios, illustrating the reduction in risk due to adaptation. (c) Adaptation payoff over time: cumulative damage costs for adapted assets (grey bars) versus no adaptation (red bars), with dashed and solid lines indicating cumulative totals. The horizontal black lines on the grey bars show how much of the accumulated cost in the future adapted scenario is due to the cost of adaptation (rather than the loss due to flood risk).



Such adaptation measures may be costly and hence their implementation may not seem financially beneficial when first considered. However, it is likely that such costs would be quickly recouped over a relatively short period due to the significant reduction in future losses. To explore this, the cumulative cost of a given portfolio can be estimated over time and scenarios with and without adaptation measures in place can be compared.

585

To illustrate this, we use the same toy example and assume that adapting Portfolio 2 assets to withstand the historical 1-in-10-year flood depth incurs a cost of €1000 per m³ of asset (i.e. footprint × height). For Portfolio 2, this corresponds to an adaptation investment of approximately €800 million. Figure 13 (c) compares the cumulative annual cost for Portfolio 2 under two scenarios: with and without adaptation. In the no-adaptation case (red bars), the ensemble mean EAD for the future period, around €200 million per year (see Figure 13 b), is accrued annually. In contrast, the adaptation scenario involves a substantial upfront cost in year 1, followed by a much lower EAD of approximately €40 million per year. Because the adapted EAD is significantly reduced, the cumulative cost of the adapted scenario becomes lower than the non-adapted scenario by year 6, despite the initial investment. This demonstrates that adaptation can deliver a strong financial return within a relatively short time frame, reinforcing its role as a cost-effective strategy for managing climate-related risks in the pension sector.

590

595 5 Limitations

Throughout the paper we have alluded to limitations in the method, and for clarity we provide a clear overview of the key caveats here.

600

Lack of hydrological modelling: Limited availability of local hydrological modelling continentally or globally, requires that other datasets and methods must be employed to quantify the flood hazard component of the risk assessment. Here we use a simplistic distribution mapping between rainfall and flood depth, which is unlikely to represent the complexities of a hydrological model. In simple terms, risk of rainfall in the climate model gridbox is different to the local flood risk at a point location, as water moves across land and rivers depending on the local geography and land use. In some locations, flood models now exist that can provide flood risk information at very high resolution over limited regional domains (e.g. for the UK, at up to 20-25 m resolution) however, important details of methods and data used for flood risk estimates may not be in the public domain (Bates et al., 2023). As this method does not include hydrological modelling outputs but uses rainfall projections directly, the figures and statistics produced in this paper are designed for awareness raising and demonstration rather than for direct decision making.

605

Limitations around flood modelling information used: We use flood maps for a limited number of return-periods that are available publicly for the present day only. Flood extent and depths may increase under more intense and/or frequent rainfall unless adaptation measures are implemented (e.g. Alfieri et al. (2016)), and so this may result in an underestimate of risk in the future as more properties may be exposed to flooding. Users should also be aware of potential limitations around the flood

610



modelling framework for the flood maps that are publicly available, such as the absence of flood protections and rivers with
615 an upstream area below 500 km² as well as the model representation of river channels and the topography of lowland areas
(Dottori et al., 2022). In addition, these flood maps represent river flooding only. Surface-water (pluvial) flooding driven by
intense local rainfall is not captured, and therefore some flood pathways and hazard intensities may be underestimated in areas
where surface-water processes dominate.

620 **Limited range of plausible rainfall extremes:** For our demonstration purposes we use one climate model with one driv-
ing scenario, with 12 ensemble members. These simulations are widely used for risk assessment in the UK context (Mittal
et al., 2025), and the nature of the perturbed parameter ensembles provides a spread of uncertainty. To provide coverage across
Europe we use data from a regional climate model, and not a convective permitting model. Convective permitting models have
been shown to produce improvements in representation of extreme rainfall events, and project more intense extreme downpours
625 in the future (e.g. Kendon et al. 2014, Kendon et al. 2023). However, for these models to operate at a high resolution, domains
are typically limited to a small area (country or smaller) or a short timespan hindering climate timescale analysis (over 30
years) across a continental area.

Assumptions around synthetic portfolio design and financial context: For this initial work, we have randomly dispersed
630 commercial properties to create synthetic (invented) but plausible portfolios of one class of assets. We have also created ide-
alised scenarios where we artificially force portfolios to exist mostly, or not, on flood plains. This is highly idealised, but
suitable for demonstration purposes to illustrate differences between portfolios. Sakai and Yao (2023) analyse damages from
flood events in the UK to small-medium size enterprises, highlighting the differences in financial impact across sectors and
sizes of portfolios. The complexity of damages further motivates the need to assess risk on a case-by-case basis for portfolios.
635 Sakai and Yao (2023) highlight the importance of the losses-to-turnover ratio for negative financial impact; we have not im-
plemented an estimate of losses from turnover into this assessment but note that this is a necessary area for development for a
comprehensive financial risk assessment.

Use of a generic vulnerability function: In this idealised example we have used the same vulnerability function to relate
640 the flood depth to asset fraction of damage for all assets/locations. While this approach provides a useful baseline, future work
and real-world applications would benefit from incorporating asset-specific vulnerability profiles. This also illustrates the need
for more detailed information on properties, such as might be obtained by mandating flood property certificates and regularly
updated information on flood protection measures.

645 **Lack of uncertainty and sensitivity analysis:** Risk assessments inherently require modellers to make a series of objec-
tive decisions about how each component of risk is represented, including the choice of datasets and the methods used to
characterise hazard, exposure, and vulnerability. Consequently, when applying this risk assessment process in a less idealised
context, it is important to explore alternative methodological options in order to assess the sensitivity of the results and to



quantify uncertainty arising from these input data and modelling assumptions. Examples of such approaches are provided in
650 Dawkins et al. (2023) and Babich Morrow et al. (2025).

6 Societal implications

Our method has been created with the aim to raise awareness and help stimulate closer assessment of physical climate risk, and ultimately help lead to climate-informed decision making, rather than providing a particular risk assessment for a particular asset or set of assets. This demonstration may also help stimulate commission of climate services tailored to bespoke portfolios
655 using state-of-the-art tools and data, which could include, where available, the purchase of hydrological modelling data for asset locations from a flood modelling firm. With hydrological modelling data in a particular area, future work using similar synthetic portfolio experiments can also be performed to demonstrate the potentially diverse risks that different European portfolios may experience from extreme rainfall under near term climate change.

660 The method we present here is pragmatic, with several important caveats and limitations, however we aim to provide useful and usable methods using currently available data for demonstration purposes. These limitations should be carefully considered and we suggest our method be supplemented with additional information where available for any use case on a particular portfolio. However we present our method as a way to produce spatially explicit and financially meaningful illustrative flood risk estimates to help drive change in financial investments (e.g. pension funds) or in other industry settings where climate risk
665 is not already considered for property assets.

7 Conclusions

This study demonstrates a transparent and pragmatic framework for assessing physical climate risk from extreme rainfall for European pension portfolios using openly available data and methods. By integrating hazard, exposure, and vulnerability components, we provide illustrative estimates of Expected Annual Damage for both historical and near-future climates.
670

The analysis highlights four key insights:

- **Current and future risk is substantial:** pension portfolios already face notable flood-related financial risk, and this risk is expected to rise consistently across Europe under near-term climate change.
- **Portfolio composition matters:** differences in asset location and hence value at-risk of flooding drive greater variability
675 in risk than climate model uncertainty.
- **There is an urgent need for risk information in future decision-making:** financial actors (such as asset managers of pension funds) must incorporate physical climate risk into decision-making now to safeguard long-term financial resilience.



- **Climate adaptation reduces risk:** adaptation measures can substantially reduce EAD and deliver a strong financial return within a relatively short time frame, reinforcing their role as cost-effective strategies for managing climate-related risks.

While the approach is designed for demonstration and awareness-raising, it underscores the importance of developing robust, transparent, and decision-useful tools for the financial sector. Future work should refine hazard modelling, expand climate scenarios, and incorporate asset-specific vulnerability profiles to enable more comprehensive and actionable risk assessments. Ultimately, integrating climate-informed strategies into investment planning is critical for protecting societal assets and ensuring sustainable financial systems in a changing climate.

Code availability. Code will be made available upon request following the completion of the Horizon Europe ASPECT project in 2027.

Author contributions. *Conceptualization:* all authors; *Methodology:* L.D. and F.G.; *Formal analysis:* L.D.; *Writing – original draft:* L.D. and F.G.; *Writing – review & editing:* L.D. and F.G.; *Visualization:* L.D.; *Supervision:* D.B.; *Funding acquisition:* D.B. and J.L.

Competing interests. The authors declare that there are no known competing interests.

Acknowledgements. This paper was created under the ASPECT project, which acknowledges funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101081460. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This work was funded by UK Research and Innovation under the UK government’s Horizon Europe funding Guarantee (grant numbers 10048403 and 10060007). The authors thank Professor Iain Clacher for his valuable support and insightful advice on applying the methodological approaches within the pensions sector. The authors also acknowledge Simon Brown of the Met Office for providing statistical modelling code that informed the extreme-value analysis in Section 2.2.3.



References

- Alfieri, L., Feyen, L., and Di Baldassarre, G.: Increasing flood risk under climate change: a pan-European assessment of the benefits of four
700 adaptation strategies, *Climatic Change*, 136, 507–521, 2016.
- Babich Morrow, C., Dawkins, L., Pianosi, F., Prangle, D., and Bernie, D.: From climate risk to action: Analysing adaptation decision
robustness under uncertainty, *Climate Risk Management*, 50, 100 751, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2025.100751>, 2025.
- Bates, P. D., Horritt, M. S., and Fewtrell, T. J.: A simple inertial formulation of the shallow water equations for efficient two-dimensional
flood inundation modelling, *Journal of Hydrology*, 387, 33–45, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.03.027>, 2010.
- 705 Bates, P. D., Savage, J., Wing, O., Quinn, N., Sampson, C., Neal, J., and Smith, A.: A climate-conditioned catastrophe risk model for UK
flooding, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*, 23, 891–908, 2023.
- Baugh, C., Colanese, J., D’Angelo, C., Dottori, F., Neal, J., Prudhomme, C., and Salamon, P.: An updated dataset of global and European
flood hazard maps, manuscript under preparation, 2024a.
- Baugh, C., Colanese, J., D’Angelo, C., Dottori, F., Neal, J., Prudhomme, C., and Salamon, P.: River flood hazard maps for Europe and the
710 Mediterranean Basin region, <https://doi.org/10.2905/1D128B6C-A4EE-4858-9E34-6210707F3C81>, 2024b.
- Bingler, J. A. and Colesanti Senni, C.: Taming the Green Swan: a criteria-based analysis to improve the understanding of climate-related
financial risk assessment tools, *Climate Policy*, 22, 356–370, 2022.
- Bongiorno, L., Claringbold, A., Eichler, L., Jones, C., Kramer, B., Pryor, L., and Spencer, N.: Climate scenario analysis for pension schemes:
a UK case study, *British Actuarial Journal*, 27, e6, 2022.
- 715 Brown, S. J.: Future changes in heatwave severity, duration and frequency due to climate change for the most populous cities, *Weather and
Climate Extremes*, 30, 100 278, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2020.100278>, 2020.
- Burek, P., Van der Knijff, J., and de Roo, A.: LISFLOOD: Distributed Water Balance and Flood Simulation Model Revised User Manual
2013, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2013.
- Cardell, M. F., Amengual, A., Romero, R., and Ramis, C.: Future extremes of temperature and precipitation in Europe derived from a
720 combination of dynamical and statistical approaches, *International Journal of Climatology*, 40, 4800–4827, 2020.
- Chan, S. C., Kendon, E. J., Fowler, H. J., Youngman, B. D., Dale, M., and Short, C.: New extreme rainfall projections for improved climate
resilience of urban drainage systems, *Climate Services*, 30, 100 375, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2023.100375>, 2023.
- Climate Financial Risk Forum: UK Financial Sector Survey on Practices and Information Use for Adapting to Physical Climate Risks, Tech.
rep., Climate Financial Risk Forum, <https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/corporate/cfrf-adaptation-working-group-user-survey-2024.pdf>,
725 accessed 9 February 2026, 2024.
- Climate Financial Risk Forum: A Risk Professional’s Guide to Physical Risk Assessments, Tech. rep., Climate Financial Risk Forum, <https://www.fca.org.uk/publication/corporate/risk-professionals-guide-physical-risk-assessments-garp-benchmarking-study-13-vendors.pdf>,
accessed 9 February 2026, 2025.
- Coles, S.: An Introduction to Statistical Modeling of Extreme Values, Springer London, London, ISBN 978-1-84996-874-4,
730 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4471-3675-0>, 2001.
- Dawkins, L. C., Bernie, D. J., Pianosi, F., Lowe, J. A., and Economou, T.: Quantifying uncertainty and sensitivity in cli-
mate risk assessments: Varying hazard, exposure and vulnerability modelling choices, *Climate Risk Management*, 40, 100 511,
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2023.100511>, 2023.



- Dawkins, L. C., Brown, K., Bernie, D. J., Lowe, J. A., Economou, T., Grassie, D., Schwartz, Y., and Dyer, E.: Quantifying overheating risk in English schools: A spatially coherent climate risk assessment, *Climate Risk Management*, 44, 100602, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2024.100602>, 2024.
- de Model, H., Endendijk, T., Kelder, T., van Veldhoven, F., and Wouters, L.: Real Estate Asset Climate Testing (REACT) Tool: A quick, simple, and transparent assessment of real estate flood risk, Tech. rep., zenodo.org/records/8348391, 2023.
- Deidda, C., Khanna, A., Schade, W., and Thiery, W.: Is Europe's transport infrastructure ready to face climate change?, *EGUsphere*, preprint, 1–78, 2025.
- Devadas, B., Paprotny, D., Kreibich, H., Steinhausen, M., Oostwegel, L. J. N., Endendijk, T., Schoppa, L., Domeneghetti, A., Castellarin, A., Dottori, F., D'Angelo, C., Mentaschi, L., Kuiri, S. N., and Sairam, N.: Projecting Future Flood Losses to Company Assets in Europe: The Role of Precautionary Measures, *Earth's Future*, 13, e2025EF006285, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1029/2025EF006285>, e2025EF006285 2025EF006285, 2025.
- Dottori, F., Alfieri, L., Bianchi, A., Skoien, J., and Salamon, P.: A new dataset of river flood hazard maps for Europe and the Mediterranean Basin, *Earth System Science Data*, 14, 1549–1569, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-1549-2022>, 2022.
- European Commission Joint Research Centre: CEMS-EFAS Flood Hazard Data Collection, https://jeodpp.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ftp/jrc-opendata/CEMS-EFAS/flood_hazard/, part of the Copernicus Emergency Management Service (CEMS) flood hazard mapping datasets, 2025.
- European Environment Agency: Economic losses from weather- and climate-related extremes in Europe, <https://www.eea.europa.eu/en/analysis/indicators/economic-losses-from-climate-related> [Accessed: 12-02-2026], 2026.
- Filipova, V. and Rana, A.: Urban Flooding in Gothenburg – A MIKE 21 Study, Tech. rep., Lund University, Division of Water Resources Engineering, <https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordId=2723483&fileId=2729509>, accessed: 2026-02-03, 2012.
- Forzieri, G., Bianchi, A., e Silva, F. B., Herrera, M. A. M., Leblois, A., Laval, C., Aerts, J. C., and Feyen, L.: Escalating impacts of climate extremes on critical infrastructures in Europe, *Global environmental change*, 48, 97–107, 2018.
- Hain, L. I., Kölbel, J. F., and Leippold, M.: Let's get physical: Comparing metrics of physical climate risk, *Finance Research Letters*, 46, 102406, 2022.
- Hoehn, B., Salzberger, H., and Bienert, S.: Assessing climate risk quantification tools—mere fulfilment of duty or actually beneficial?, *Journal of Property Investment & Finance*, 43, 142–167, 2025.
- Huizinga, J., De Moel, H., and Szewczyk, W.: Global flood depth-damage functions: Methodology and the database with guidelines, <https://doi.org/10.2760/16510>, 2017.
- IPCC: Summary for Policymakers. In: *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)], Tech. rep., <https://doi.org/10.59327/IPCC/AR6-9789291691647.001>, 2023.
- Kendon, E. J., Roberts, N. M., Fowler, H. J., Roberts, M. J., Chan, S. C., and Senior, C. A.: Heavier summer downpours with climate change revealed by weather forecast resolution model, *Nature Climate Change*, 4, 570–576, 2014.
- Kendon, E. J., Fischer, E. M., and Short, C. J.: Variability conceals emerging trend in 100yr projections of UK local hourly rainfall extremes, *Nature Communications*, 14, 1133, 2023.
- Lowe, J. A. et al.: UKCP18 Science Overview report, Tech. rep., 2018.
- Maraun, D.: Bias Correcting Climate Change Simulations - a Critical Review, *Current Climate Change Reports*, 2, 211–220, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-016-0050-x>, 2016.



- Met Office: UKCP18 Guidance: Representative Concentration Pathways, Tech. rep., Met Office, <https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/metofficegovuk/pdf/research/ukcp/ukcp18-guidance---representative-concentration-pathways.pdf>, accessed 27 January 2026, 2018.
- Met Office Hadley Centre: UKCP18 Regional Projections at 12km Resolution for 1980–2080, <https://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk/uuid/8c6c0ae2c25947168826a70d2241b797>, centre for Environmental Data Analysis, accessed 2026-02-17, 2018.
- Mittal, N., Fung, F., McSweeney, C. F., and Lowe, J. A.: Identifying user requirements to inform national climate projections in the UK, *Climate Services*, 40, 100 613, 2025.
- Nawarat, K., Reyns, J., Vousdoukas, M. I., Mulholland, E., van Ginkel, K., Feyen, L., and Ranasinghe, R.: Coastal flood risk to European surface transport infrastructure at different global warming levels, *Nature Climate Change*, pp. 1–7, 2026.
- ofou: country-capital-lat-long-population.csv, <https://gist.github.com/ofou/df09a6834a8421b4f376c875194915c9>, gitHub Gist, 2018.
- Pesaresi, M. and Politis, P.: GHS-BUILT-S R2023A - GHS built-up surface grid, derived from Sentinel2 composite and Landsat, multitemporal (1975–2030), <https://doi.org/10.2905/9F06F36F-4B11-47EC-ABB0-4F8B7B1D72EA>, 2023.
- Pesaresi, M., Schiavina, M., Politis, P., Freire, S., Krasnodebska, K., Uhl, J. H., Carioli, A., Corbane, C., Dijkstra, L., Florio, P., Friedrich, H. K., Gao, J., Leyk, S., Lu, L., Maffenini, L., Mari-Rivero, I., Melchiorri, M., Syrris, V., Hoek, J. V. D., and Kemper, T.: Advances on the Global Human Settlement Layer by joint assessment of Earth Observation and population survey data, *International Journal of Digital Earth*, 17, 2390 454, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17538947.2024.2390454>, 2024.
- Rajczak, J. and Schär, C.: Projections of future precipitation extremes over Europe: A multimodel assessment of climate simulations, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 122, 10–773, 2017.
- Ranger, N. A., Mahul, O., and Monasterolo, I.: Assessing financial risks from physical climate shocks, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2, 2022.
- Riahi, K., Rao, S., Krey, V., Cho, C., Chirkov, V., Fischer, G., Kindermann, G., Nakicenovic, N., and Rafaj, P.: RCP 8.5—A scenario of comparatively high greenhouse gas emissions, *Climatic Change*, 109 (1-2), 33–57, 2011.
- Sakai, P. and Yao, Z.: Financial losses and flood damages experienced by SMEs: Who are the biggest losers across sectors and sizes?, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 91, 103 677, 2023.
- Shaw, J., Kesserwani, G., Neal, J., Bates, P., and Sharifian, M. K.: LISFLOOD-FP 8.0: the new discontinuous Galerkin shallow-water solver for multi-core CPUs and GPUs, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 14, 3577–3602, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-3577-2021>, 2021.
- Spuler, F. R., Wessel, J. B., Comyn-Platt, E., Varndell, J., and Cagnazzo, C.: ibicus: a new open-source Python package and comprehensive interface for statistical bias adjustment and evaluation in climate modelling (v1.0.1), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 1249–1269, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-1249-2024>, 2024.
- The Pensions Regulator: Too many pension schemes focused on minimum compliance with ESG duties, says TPR, <https://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/en/media-hub/press-releases/2024-press-releases/too-many-pension-schemes-focused-on-minimum-compliance-with-esg-duties>, press release PN24-29, 2024a.
- The Pensions Regulator: Review shows how pension trustees are addressing climate risks and opportunities, <https://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/en/media-hub/press-releases/2024-press-releases/review-shows-how-pension-trustees-are-addressing-climate-risks-and-opportunities>, press Release PN24-18, 2024b.
- The Pensions Regulator: Small DC schemes should improve or consolidate if they cannot protect savers from climate risk, <https://www.thepensionsregulator.gov.uk/en/media-hub/press-releases/2025-press-releases/small-dc-schemes-should-improve-or-consolidate-if-they-cannot-protect-savers-from-climate-risk>, press release PN25-15, 2025.



- Tradowsky, J. S., Philip, S. Y., Kreienkamp, F., Kew, S. F., Lorenz, P., Arrighi, J., Bettmann, T., Caluwaerts, S., Chan, S. C., De Cruz, L.,
810 et al.: Attribution of the heavy rainfall events leading to severe flooding in Western Europe during July 2021, *Climatic Change*, 176, 90,
2023.
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP): Emissions Gap Report 2025: Off Target, Tech. rep., UNEP, [https://www.unep.org/
resources/emissions-gap-report-2025](https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2025), accessed 27 January 2026, 2025.
- Van der Knijff, J. M., Younis, J., and de Roo, A. P. J.: LISFLOOD: a GIS-based distributed model for river basin scale water balance and
815 flood simulation, *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, 24, 189–212, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13658810902889425>,
2010.
- van Veldhoven, F., Kelder, T., Endendijk, T., de Moel, H., Zhou, F., de Wolf, L., Botzen, W., Wouters, L., and Vrensen, H.: D2.9 Physical
climate risk assessment approach for international real estate portfolios using European climate data and services, 2024.
- Williams, K. D. et al.: The Met Office Global Coupled model 3.0 and 3.1 (GC3 & GC3.1) configurations, *Journal of Advances in Modelling*
820 *Earth Systems*, 10, 357–380, 2017.
- Wu, S.-H., Chiang, C.-L., Huang, Y.-H., Huang, J., Tsao, J.-H., and Tung, C.-P.: Climate Risk Assessment Framework in Real Estate: A
Focus on Flooding, *Sustainability*, 16, 9577, 2024.
- Youngman, B. D.: Generalized Additive Models for Exceedances of High Thresholds With an Application to Return Level Estimation
for U.S. Wind Gusts, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114, 1865–1879, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2018.1529596>,
825 2019.
- Youngman, B. D.: evgam: An R Package for Generalized Additive Extreme Value Models, *Journal of Statistical Software*, 103, 1–26,
<https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v103.i03>, 2022.