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# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCLM</td>
<td>COSMO Climate Limited-area Modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Corine Land Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVA</td>
<td>Dynamic and interactive vulnerability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA&amp;D</td>
<td>European Climate Assessment and Dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>European Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFIS</td>
<td>European Forest Fire Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>Effective temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWI</td>
<td>Fire Weather Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMES</td>
<td>Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (Copernicus programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPCC</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRC</td>
<td>Joint Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDVI</td>
<td>Normalized Difference Vegetation Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET</td>
<td>Physiologically equivalent temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMV</td>
<td>Predicted mean vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Rapid damage assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAR</td>
<td>Third Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHI</td>
<td>Urban Heat Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMZ</td>
<td>Urban morphological zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTCI</td>
<td>Universal thermal comfort index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBGT</td>
<td>Wet bulb globe temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEI</td>
<td>Water Exploitation Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

The objective of this map book is to provide a scientific and technical background to the EEA website’s maps (1). The explanatory texts accompanying the maps in the digital map book have been derived directly from the more elaborate fact sheets in this report. In 2012, the EEA published the report *Urban adaptation to climate change in Europe - Challenges and opportunities for cities together with supportive national and European policies* (EEA, 2012). As a follow-up to this report, a technical paper on urban vulnerability indicators (Swart et al., 2012) explored the availability of information on exposure, sensitivity and response to a variety of urban climate threats, and the feasibility of developing vulnerability indicators that could be mapped. The current map book is based on the findings of these earlier reports and adds more detailed assessments on the various indicators.

**Political background**

The European Commission acknowledges that the average global temperature is rising and will continue to do so. This will affect natural phenomena like precipitation patterns, glacier mass changes and sea level rise. Mitigation efforts are needed to limit global warming. However, even if these efforts are successful, the temperature rise and related changes will continue to manifest for several decades or even centuries. To avert the most serious effects on society as well as nature, adaptation efforts on all levels (from international to local) are needed. The EU strategy on adaptation (EC, 2013a) provides a general direction on how to adapt in Europe, while underlining the particular importance of adaptation action in European urban areas (EC, 2013c). Such action builds on, but does not replace, earlier EU policies. These include directives on a framework for Community action in the field of water policy (EC, 2000) and on the assessment and management of flood risks (EC, 2007b), the communication addressing the challenge of water scarcity and droughts in the European Union (EC, 2007a), and the recommendation concerning the implementation of Integrated Coastal Zone Management in Europe (EC, 2002).

Because cities are home to a major section of the European population and its economic activities, they are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts: actions taken for their adaptation are important for Europe. The European Commission encourages city action via the Mayors Adapt initiative (2), through which cities can commit to adopt local adaptation strategies and awareness-raising activities.

In order to support actions at national level, the European Commission will develop indicators to support evaluation of adaptation efforts and vulnerabilities. The urban vulnerability indicators in this map book and the short guidance on how to use them can aid this joint effort between the European Commission and city governments.

**Approach**

Selection of the indicators follows a simple system. They are grouped according to exposure, sensitivity and response capacity in relation to certain climatic threats: heatwaves, water scarcity and droughts, flooding and forest fire (see Tables 2.1 to 2.4). In this way, indicators can serve different categories: green urban areas are relevant to our understanding of exposure to heatwaves and pluvial flooding, while themselves being sensitive to droughts; their increase over time can be viewed as a positive response activity. This system builds on an EEA practice that is in turn based on Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) definitions. It has been amended slightly, in two ways. Firstly, coping capacity and adaptive capacity are subsumed under the term response capacity, which is further categorised into awareness, ability and action. Secondly, it is acknowledged that exposure is not influenced by climatic factors alone, but also by morphological factors (e.g. topography influencing wind speed and direction, for heat), hydrological factors

---

(river basin characteristics, for floods) and human factors (e.g. soil sealing for both heat and floods). For further information on the system, see the technical paper on urban vulnerability indicators (Swart et al., 2012).

The selection of indicators is further driven by data availability. Only a limited set of relevant urban data of sufficient quality are available Europe-wide.

The main data sources for city data are:

- the Urban Audit database including the Urban Audit perception surveys (Eurostat) (1);
- the Urban Atlas (EEA) (4);
- the EEA Fast Track Service Precursor on Land Monitoring - Degree of soil sealing (EEA) (5).

The indicators provide an initial indication of cities’ vulnerability that needs to be further analysed, by using data and indicators on other factors not yet considered here (see Tables 2.1 to 2.4) as well as local data.

A total of 12 urban vulnerability indicators were developed, relating to 4 climatic threats that have been found to have particular urban relevance (heatwaves, water scarcity and droughts, floods and forest fires):

- green urban areas
- soil sealing
- thermal comfort
- water consumption
- river flooding
- coastal flooding
- forest fires
- elderly people
- socio-economic status
- education
- trust
- city commitment.
- cities engaged in initiatives

(1) See http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview online.
2. Exposure, sensitivity and response to climatic threats

Multiple factors influence exposure to heat, flooding, water scarcity and droughts, and forest fires, as well as sensitivity to these threats and the capacity to respond to them. The following tables 2.1-2.4 provide some indication of the situation. Dark green cells represent indicator maps presented in the digital map book and described in the following factsheets, while light green cells represent information included in background layers originally developed for other purposes (while it has made available for the map book, it is not described further in this report). White cells indicate factors that are not available at European level and require local quantitative or qualitative information. The single factors interact with each other, and thus need to be considered from a comprehensive perspective.

Table 2.1. Heatwaves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors that tend to increase vulnerability to heatwaves...</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Response capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High thermal discomfort values</td>
<td>High share of elderly people</td>
<td>Increasing the share of green urban areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of green urban areas</td>
<td>High share of low-income households – socio-economic status</td>
<td>Decreasing soil sealing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of soil sealing</td>
<td>High population number</td>
<td>Commitment to fight climate change — awareness of and trust in city governance; Cities engaged in initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased background heat and heatwaves</td>
<td>High share of very young population</td>
<td>Trust in other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>High share of lonely pensioner households</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less ventilation</td>
<td>Abundance of many assets</td>
<td>Socio-economic status — financial resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little shadowing</td>
<td>Abundance of key services for the city and for other regions</td>
<td>Awareness of business and citizens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient building insulation</td>
<td>Low cooling water availability</td>
<td>Well-functioning institutional structures and processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat generation by production, transport, etc.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity in administrations to act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific geographical location and topography</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Sufficient number of hospital beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
### Table 2.2 Water scarcity and droughts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Response capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low precipitation</td>
<td>High water consumption</td>
<td>Commitment to fight climate change — trust in city governance; Cities engaged in initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water stress in the region</td>
<td>High share of elderly population</td>
<td>Trust in other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High population number</td>
<td>High share of low-income households – socio-economic status</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought situations</td>
<td>High share of green urban areas</td>
<td>Socio-economic status — financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High abstraction in relation to available resources</td>
<td>High share of lonely pensioner households</td>
<td>Awareness of business and citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low water availability (surface and underground)</td>
<td>High share of very young population</td>
<td>Well-functioning institutional structures and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwater intrusion</td>
<td>Inefficient water supply infrastructure and management</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity in administrations to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Availability of technical measures like reservoirs, water recycling, rainwater harvesting, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-intensive industry, tourism, agriculture in the region</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Availability of organisational measures like water use restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of soil sealing in the region</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 Flooding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Response capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High share of low-lying urban areas, potentially prone to flooding</td>
<td>High share of low-income households — socio-economic status</td>
<td>Decreasing soil sealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High and increasing degree of soil sealing</td>
<td>High share of elderly population</td>
<td>Increasing the share of green urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of green urban areas</td>
<td>High share assets (commercial, residential areas) in potentially flood prone areas</td>
<td>Commitment to fight climate change — awareness of and trust in the city governance; Cities engaged in initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea level rise in combination with storm surges</td>
<td>Key services like transport and energy infrastructure in potentially flood-prone areas</td>
<td>Trust in other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of frequency and levels of river floods</td>
<td>High population number in potentially flood prone areas</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of frequency and intensity of heavy precipitation</td>
<td>High share of very young population</td>
<td>Socio-economic status — financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical location (at coasts or rivers) and topography (low-lying)</td>
<td>High share of lonely pensioner households</td>
<td>Awareness of business and citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmelt</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Well-functioning institutional structures and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High soil moisture levels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficient capacity in administrations to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of flood defences and retention areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective sewage system and storage systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors that tend to increase the vulnerability to forest fires</td>
<td>Response capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sensitivity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response capacity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High share of urban areas in forest fire risk zones</td>
<td>High share of elderly population</td>
<td>Commitment to fight climate change — trust in city governance; Cities engaged in initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High share of population in forest fire risk zones</td>
<td>High share of low-income households — socio-economic status</td>
<td>Trust in other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest fire probability</td>
<td>High share of residential areas in high-risk zones</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought situations</td>
<td>High share of commercial areas in high-risk zones</td>
<td>Socio-economic status — financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing temperature</td>
<td>High share of transport infrastructure in high-risk zones</td>
<td>Accessibility of urban areas for firefighting and evacuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased wind speeds</td>
<td>Proximity to forests and high number of vegetated areas at the edge of cities</td>
<td>Awareness of business and citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human behaviour increasing ignition probability</td>
<td>High share of very young population</td>
<td>Financial resources of the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>High share of lonely pensioner households</td>
<td>Well-functioning institutional structures and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High share of other service infrastructure in high-risk zones</td>
<td>Sufficient capacity in administrations to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Availability of effective forest-fire risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Factsheets of indicator maps

3.1 Green urban areas

Indicator definition

The green urban areas indicator comprises three sub-indicators, as explained below.

1. The share of green areas is defined
   a. in cities: as the share of urban area within the city boundaries [%];
   b. around cities: as the share of a 5 km buffer zone around the urban area of the city [%].
2. The distribution of green urban areas expressed with the proxy of edge density per hectare of edges/boundaries [m/ha] between vegetated and built-up areas of the urban area of the city.
3. The change of the share of green urban areas [%] not yet developed. From 2015/2016, once the Urban Atlas update 2012 is finalised, a change indicator will become available that shows the change in the share of green urban areas for both reference units.

Justification of the indicator

The indicator relates to:

- heatwaves
- flooding
- water scarcity
- forest fires.

Heatwaves have been the most prominent hazard causing human fatalities over past decades (EEA, 2012). The 2003 summer heatwave alone caused up to 70 000 excess deaths over 4 months in central and western Europe. Increased mortality is the most drastic impact of heatwaves; however, exposure to hot weather can have other effects on human health and well-being, including ‘bad moods’, feeling discomfort and getting sick.

The impact of heatwaves is felt particularly intensely in cities and towns. The term ‘Urban Heat Island’ (UHI) is used to describe the increased temperature of urban air compared to its rural surroundings. The temperature difference can be up to 10 °C, or even more (Oke, 1982). The difference is particularly high at night-time, when high temperatures are generally most problematic (Grize et al., 2005).

Green areas inside the warm urban microclimate of densely populated cities can improve the thermal comfort (Steeneveld et al., 2011) as well as the overall health and living conditions of inhabitants (Bowler et al., 2010a). The effect of green infrastructure on UHIs is primarily due to shading and evapotranspiration (Bowler et al., 2010b). Consequently, the more green urban areas a city contains (including at the fringes), and the better distributed these green spaces are, the lesser the impact of the UHI effect. Apart from this effect at city scale on neighbourhoods, green may provide considerable relief from heat and thermal comfort locally by providing local shade to individual residents (Armson et al., 2013).

The status information of the share and the distribution of urban green in a city can be used as an overall exposure indicator for the potential UHI of a city, while information on the change of green urban area surface would be contained in the response capacity indicators.

Regarding a city’s exposure to pluvial and other floods, unsealed (6) and green areas can help to maintain the infiltration capacity and provide water storage capacity. By contrast, sealed surfaces decrease natural drainage and hamper infiltration into soils, which leads to increased run-off and a

---

(6) See also indicator ‘soil sealing’.
faster passing on of rainwater into the sewage system. Due to the often weak rainwater management systems, urban drainage infrastructures are not capable of dealing with the events of heavy rainfall expected to occur more frequently in future in several regions of Europe. Thus, green is to some extent also an indicator of a city’s sensitivity to such events (EEA, 2012).

The amount and type of vegetation close to the urban fringe is also relevant to sensitivity to forest fires, as it can provide favourable conditions for the spread of fire into the city.

In drought and water-scarcity situations and depending on the chosen vegetation type, green areas may themselves suffer and may no longer be able to provide some of the benefits described above. Furthermore, droughts and water scarcity are caused and aggravated partly by the prevailing land cover and its changes in a region (i.e., loss of vegetated areas in favour of extension of sealed artificial areas). Land use changes which lead to further urbanisation alter the existing run-off and underlying groundwater level; furthermore, areas important for groundwater generation might be occupied, and hence lost.

**Methodology**

The selection of classes contained in the green urban areas is based on their relevance to the UHI effect. In general, green areas are made up of Urban Atlas classes that contain substantial amounts of green vegetation. These classes are the two least-sealed discontinuous urban areas (sealing degree < 30 %), urban green spaces (such as parks, allotment gardens, sport and leisure facilities), and agricultural areas as well as forest and semi-natural areas.

The basic reference unit for processing is the urban area inside the city, which functions as a representation of the city defined by its administrative boundaries (see annex). In addition, to account for the urban fringe, a buffer of 5 km is computed around the city’s urban area. Consequently, two strata are created: ‘green’ and ‘red’.

1. **Sub-indicator: share of green urban areas**

Green urban areas are extracted from the Urban Atlas product (reference year 2006) for the city’s urban area (Map 3.1) and the surrounding buffer (Map 3.22), i.e. values are available for 369 cities. All listed classes were considered components of the green urban areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Urban Atlas classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11230</td>
<td>Discontinuous Low Density Urban Fabric (S.L. : 10 %–30 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11240</td>
<td>Discontinuous Very Low Density Urban Fabric (S.L. &lt; 10 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14100</td>
<td>Green urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14200</td>
<td>Sports and leisure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000</td>
<td>Agricultural areas, semi-natural areas and wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30000</td>
<td>Forests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extracted polygons are grouped to create a ‘green’ class.

Afterwards, the area of all ‘green’ patches is summed and the share of this total is calculated:

a) in relation to the total area of the city’s urban area;

b) in relation to the buffer of 5 km around the city’s urban area (excluding the city’s urban area).
2. **Sub-indicator: distribution of green urban areas**

Intra-urban edges are the boundaries between green areas as defined in the sub-indicator ‘Share of green urban areas’, and all other areas that are not included in the green urban areas (which are called red areas for the sake of simplicity). They are computed within the City’s urban area between these two classes, i.e. the green and the red areas, and their lengths are summed to produce a total edge length value per city. Afterwards, the total length is considered in relation to the city’s urban area by calculating an average length per square kilometre.

The edge density provides an indication of the distribution of green urban areas such that one may interpret that a high edge density in a city indicates a relatively high number of green patches with borders to the sealed parts of the urban fabric, made up of residential and commercial/industrial/public buildings. The edge lengths and derived density are calculated for the red–green edges within the city’s urban area (Map 3.3).

3. **Sub-indicator: change of share of green urban areas**

Changes in the share of green urban areas are computed by calculating the difference between the 2006 and the 2012 values (that will be created using the same methodology as for the 2006 values) for urban area of a city. The values will be either positive or negative, and provide a first picture on development within the cities.

**Data specifications**

**EEA data references**

The Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES) Urban Atlas is used to extract the relevant classes and produce the maps of green urban areas from which the statistics can be computed. Data are available for download from the EEA data service (7).

The UMZ as a reference unit for city morphology (as the best approximation of the ‘real’ city form, which often does not correspond to the administrative delineation) is available from the EEA data service (8).

NB: In the current processing, all UMZ patches located within the city’s boundaries are used (see annex).

**External data references**

Eurostat Urban Audit city/greater city (9).

**Uncertainties**

Together with local temperature measurements, an overview of the coverage of the green areas, the distribution of these areas and the trends in coverage will help assess whether smaller patches of green areas or larger parks are more effective in reducing the UHI effect, thus further clarifying the link between green space and heat, or thermal comfort. For this to be achieved, further research is needed in different cities. Policies can be developed using the outcomes of such research.

Whether water areas (the ‘blue’ class) are to be included or excluded from the analysis remains an issue to be resolved. The physical processes that lead to cooling by green structures are clearly different from the processes that connect water temperature to air temperature. For example, water may enhance

---


(9) See [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview) online
the UHI. While literature from the Netherlands proposes excluding blue areas, some researchers prefer to include them. This may depend on the context, but it is certainly an issue to be further explored and agreed in the future.

**Indicator assessment**

Key question: What is the share of green areas in European cities and their surrounding areas, and how are these areas distributed within the cities?

**Web link to maps**

http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=18ba829030e5420d99b117f1d0d21ee5

Map 3.1 Share of green urban areas of the urban area in cities, 2006
Map 3.2 Share of green areas in the buffer around the urban area of cities, 2006
Based on the data for 2006, cities in the south would benefit most from green infrastructure for improvement of thermal comfort (see Section 3.3), while cities with the most green cover are found in the north, notably in Scandinavian countries. This may be related to the greater water availability to sustain green areas in northern cities, and the lack of water in southern cities during the summer period. Cities having a relatively small green share are found all over Europe (except in Scandinavia). There is a concentration of such cities in the densely populated areas of the Netherlands and the German Ruhr area. In addition, the share of green in the buffer area of the cities in this region tends to be somewhat lower than that of cities in other parts of Europe. Although the present climate does not yet lead to frequent conditions of thermal discomfort in cities in the north-western part of Europe, their UHIs could be as large as in other regions (Steeneveld et al., 2011), and climate change is expected to increase the frequency of thermal discomfort occasions in the near future (see Section 3.3). Thus, increasing the share of green might be beneficial in these areas as well.

Most of the cities (94 %) in Europe analysed here have a share of green areas of between 10 % and 38 %, with a median value of 24.3 %. In the buffer area, most cities (92 %) have a share of green areas of between 63 % and 95 %, with the median value being 81.7 %. The cities’ green areas are mostly concentrated in larger areas; the edge density is mostly between 4 m/ha and 24 m/ha, while some 20 % of the cities’ edge densities range from 25 m/ha to 34 m/ha.

In further assessing the indicators, the extremes of two sub-indicators are of particular interest. The ‘share of urban green’ and ‘edge density’ inside the city’s urban area is considered. Both indicators are classified using the 10 and 90 percentiles, respectively, using +/- 1 standard deviation.
Table 3.2 Extremes of share of urban green and edge density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class 1 (10% lowest)</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3 (10% highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of urban green [%]</td>
<td>&lt; 17.5</td>
<td>17.5–34.5</td>
<td>&gt; 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge density [m/ha]</td>
<td>&lt; 9.4</td>
<td>9.4–30.5</td>
<td>&gt; 30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then the classifications were used to construct the following matrix, showing the number of cities in each pair of classes.

Table 3.3 Pairing the share of urban green with edge density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of city</th>
<th>Share of urban green</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this analysis, the following cities showed extreme values (i.e. located in the corner boxes of the matrix, highlighted using bold gridlines).

- **Low share of green urban areas and low edge density (uneven distribution) (1/1):** Valencia, Nyiregyháza, Pécs, Kecskemét, Reggio di Calabria and Haarlemmermeer (10). In such cities, exposure to heat at local and neighbourhood scale is expected to be relatively large, since the share of green is low. On average, citizens’ access to green areas is limited as these areas are relatively far away from their homes. Furthermore, in these cities, there is little mitigation of the effects of extreme precipitation events thanks to green structures.

- **Low share of green urban areas and high edge density (even distribution) (1/3):** unsurprisingly, this is an unusual combination. If there is little green, the edge density is expected to be relatively low as well. Only one city is found in this class: the city of Porto. At larger scales, in this type of city one might expect a relatively high exposure to heat, and sensitivity to strong precipitation events. However, the large edge density suggests the green structures are quite well distributed: there will be more places inside these cities benefitting locally from city green.

- **High share of green urban areas and low edge density (uneven distribution) (3/1):** Badajoz, Sassari, Jönköping, Uppsala, Linköping, Örebro and Warwick. In these cities, exposure to heat at city to neighbourhood scale is expected to be reduced because of the large share of green. However, the green is distributed in relatively large patches, so a relatively small number of favourable local effects are expected, partly due to the fact that the green is probably relatively far away. The cities will be less sensitive to strong precipitation events than cities with less green. However, to optimally sustain the favourable effect of green on thermal comfort, water will be required, making these cities somewhat sensitive to drought.

- **High share of green urban areas and high edge density (even distribution) (3/3):** Graz, Namur, Alcobendas, Helsinki, Palermo, Monza, Gozo, Ruda, Slaska, Vila Nova de Gaia and Malmö. In principle, this is the most favourable condition for prevention of thermal discomfort and adverse

---

(10) The edge density of the Haarlemmermeer is reduced by the highly geometric and straight structure of the settlements (and the city’s airport), while the share of green urban areas is reduced by the use of the city’s urban area.
effects of strong precipitation events. Thermal comfort is optimally improved from local to city scale, and green will generally be within a relatively close distance to residents’ homes. However, as with the previous class, water will be required to sustain the vegetation, making these cities somewhat sensitive to drought.

It must be stressed that the assessment is based on the present sub-indicator combination only. Other conditions may be more or less favourable. For heat, for example, the lack of green may be balanced out by a favourable building style and other elements that provide shade locally; likewise, the lack of water storage capacity diagnosed from the low share of green may be offset by the presence of surface waterbodies.

The combination of urban share in the city’s urban area and the amount of green in the buffer area are also of interest. Adverse effects of the lack of green in the city’s urban area may be counterbalanced somewhat by green in the buffer zone. For example, air flowing over green areas in the buffer zone may provide cool air for densely built areas. For smaller cities in particular, the influence of the green buffer might reach quite far into the city. However, it is difficult to quantify such effects at present, and the type of green in the surroundings is also important. For example, while forested areas provide relatively little cooling in the first phase of a heatwave as compared to grassland, they may provide such cooling for a much longer time, thereby mitigating temperature in the later phase of a heatwave (Teuling et al., 2010).

Again, both indicators are classified with the 10 and 90 percentiles using +/- 1 standard deviation, respectively.

Table 3.4 Extremes of the share of urban green and green in the buffer zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of urban green [%]</th>
<th>Class 1 (10 % lowest)</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3 (10 % highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 17.5</td>
<td>17.5–34.5</td>
<td>&gt; 34.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green in buffer zone [%]</td>
<td>&lt; 54.0</td>
<td>54.0–90.7</td>
<td>&gt; 90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, for the vast majority of cities, the share of green in their buffer zones is well over 50 %. This classification results in the following matrix, showing the number of cities in each pair of classes.

Table 3.5 Pairing the share of urban green and green in the buffer zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of city</th>
<th>Share of urban green</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of green urban areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 17.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5–34.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 34.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green in buffer zone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We identify cities in the extreme classes (i.e. located in the corner boxes of the matrix, highlighted with the bold gridlines), while noting that there is hardly any overlap with the previous classification.

- Low share of green urban areas and share of green in the buffer area (1/1): Copenhagen, L’Hospitalet de Llobregat, Badalona, Paris, Milan, Naples, Rotterdam, Schiedam, Portsmouth, Southend-on-Sea. In these cities, lack of green inside the UMZ is apparently not counterbalanced by a relatively large
share of green in the buffer zone. It should be noted, however that there may be other compensating factors, such as relatively deep water in the city or its surroundings (e.g. Rotterdam, Copenhagen).

- **Low share of green urban areas and green share in the buffer zone (1/3):** again, this is an unusual combination: if there is little green inside the UMZ, there is apparently a tendency to have little green in the surroundings as well. The only city with a possibly relatively large compensating mechanism is Debrecen. However, for the vast majority of cities, the share of green in their buffer zones is well over 50%.

- **High share of green urban areas and low green cover in the buffer zone (3/1):** Leganés and Monza. This is apparently a relatively rare combination as well, indicating that cities with a high share of urban green tend not to be located in areas with relatively little green.

- **High share of green urban areas and amount of green in the buffer zone (3/3):** Namur, Weimar, Badajoz, Córdoba, Oulu, Perugia, Catanzaro, Sassari, Uppsala, Lund. In principle, this is the most favourable condition for prevention of thermal discomfort.

Again, we caution that the assessment is based on the present sub-indicator combination only. Other conditions may be more or less favourable. For example, relatively deep water in the city or its surroundings may be present, allowing ventilation and cooling, in particular during daytime.
3.2 Soil sealing

**Indicator definition**

This indicator comprises two sub-indicators, showing:

1. the average degree of sealed surfaces within the city's urban area [%];
2. the net change of the degree of sealed surfaces within the city's urban area [%] over time.

**Justification of the indicator**

Soil sealing is the covering the soil surface with impervious materials as a result of urban development or infrastructure construction. It was identified as one of the main soil degradation processes in the Soil Thematic Strategy (COM (2006) 231) of the European Commission and in the latest EEA report on the status of the European environment (EEA, 2010). Depending on its density and extent, soil sealing reduces or completely disrupts natural soil functions and the related delivery of ecosystem services in the area concerned, e.g. water absorption, filtering and buffering (EC-DGENV, 2012; EEA, 2014; JRC, 2014; Prokop et al., 2011).

Soil sealing plays a major role in pluvial floods and the generation of heat. In the case of pluvial floods, soil sealing decreases the water infiltration potential of the soil, thus increasing the risk of run-off and flooding. Conversely, the infiltration of storm water into soils would significantly increase the time needed for water to reach rivers, thus reducing the amount of peak flow and therefore the risk of flooding (EC-DGENV, 2012). In the event of heavy rainfalls in cities with high soil sealing, the sewage system might no longer be able to cope with the high amount of run-off water, and thus cause pluvial flooding.

Soil sealing or imperviousness is known to enhance the UHI, while urban vegetation tends to reduce it (Heusinkveld et al., 2014). Generation of the UHI effect depends largely on the surface material, the degree and area of soil sealing and the share of green (vegetated) urban areas. Compared to vegetated areas, sealed surfaces absorb more solar radiation and emit less energy through radiation from the surface. Thus, the urban fabric becomes relatively warm and releases the heat more slowly, which is one of the causes of the UHI effect. Moreover, as more surfaces are sealed, evapotranspiration of the vegetation that is present is reduced, which further increases air and surface temperatures (EC-DGENV, 2012).

Since there is some correlation between the urban green share and the degree of soil sealing (not all unsealed area is vegetated), increasing soil sealing at the cost of urban green will strongly enhance exposure to heat via the UHI. Thus, cities with extremely high soil sealing are not only exposed to a higher risk of urban drainage flooding, but also to the UHI. Considering that the mean temperature in Europe is rising and the number of heatwaves is expected to increase, large areas with sealed surfaces combined with limited areas covered with vegetation will further exacerbate the heat island effect of cities (EEA, 2014).

The changes shown here of the soil sealing degree over time contain processes of new sealing as well as densification due to urbanisation processes. Both developments have a negative impact on the flood and temperature regulation potential of soils.

**Methodology**

The soil sealing values (sometimes also described as the degree of imperviousness) are derived from satellite images with a spatial resolution of 20 m. Proxy parameters quantify the cover of green vegetation considered as inversely correlated with the degree of soil sealing. More detailed information
about the data set and its production workflow can be retrieved from the delivery report (Gangkofner et al., 2010; Kopecky and Kahabka, 2009).

The basic reference unit for the processing is the city's urban area (city/greater city as defined in the Urban Atlas/Urban Audit), which functions as a representation of the morphological city (see annex).

The area of soil sealing is taken from the pan-European soil-sealing layers 2006 and 2009, which contain the fraction of sealed soil per 1 ha cell. To compute the mean soil-sealing degree of city’s urban area by means of zonal statistics, the soil-sealing mosaic of Europe was overlaid with these reference unit objects. Subsequently, these continuous values were classified into five discrete classes and presented as coloured dots.

To obtain better estimates of changes of soil sealing over time, a wider delineation was chosen. The reference unit for this sub-indicator comprises the city boundaries. Note that this delineation is different from that used to compute the other sub-indicator and that for the green urban area indicators, which only use the urban area inside city. This inconsistency is acceptable, since the change indicator can be regarded as a policy indicator for which a wider urban delineation is appropriate.

In order to capture the change in soil sealing, the imperviousness density change layer was employed. These values were also classified into five classes (from very low to a very high increase), and were represented as coloured dots.

Note that the changes are net changes, since the increase of soil sealing integrates two different processes:

- sealing of areas that were previously unsealed;
- increase in the degree of sealing of areas that were already sealed (densification).

Mean per cent soil sealing per city and change in annual mean number of days with extreme precipitation (> 20 mm/day) between the COSMO Climate Limited-area Modelling (CCLM) scenarios were run (2071–2100) and the reference was run (1961–1990) for IPCC scenario A1B. The city's urban area is defined by its morphological form (UMZ) inside the city boundaries derived from Urban Audit (Eurostat, 2012).

Data specifications

EEA data references

Degree of sealed surfaces: can be most easily calculated via the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) from satellite images. In the frame of GMES (Copernicus) precursor activities, the high-resolution soil sealing layer for the whole of Europe for the year 2006 (based on the same satellite pictures as used for CORINE land cover data) and the ‘imperviousness 2009’ data were produced under the FP7 Geoland2 project. Both status layers as well as the change layer are now distributed by the EEA and are available for download via the Copernicus Land Monitoring Services portal (11). A licence agreement is required.

The UMZ as a reference unit for city morphology (as the best approximation of the ‘real’ city form, which often does not correspond to the administrative delineation) is available from the EEA data service (12).

NB: In the current processing, all UMZ patches located within the city’s boundaries are used (see annex).

---

External data references

Eurostat Urban Audit city/greater city \(^{(13)}\).

Uncertainties

Despite the attempt to achieve cloud-free coverage of Europe (e.g. by using multiple overlapping image information sets to substitute clouds), the underlying satellite images for both imperviousness status maps (2006 and 2009) still show some amount of cloud cover over certain regions. Those areas have been excluded by applying a cloud mask. Moreover, ‘no data’ areas of 2006 (clouds) that are cloud-free in 2009 are predominantly visually mapped and subsequently integrated during the post-editing step, to reduce the unclassifiable area of the 2006 coverage.

In general, the appearance of cloud cover on one of the images leads to an exclusion of this area from the computation of the average soil sealing degree, that is, the average was computed based on the cloud-free area of a city. For the computation of changes, this leads to an incomparability of the 2 years, as the total area for which the change is computed varies across years for the respective city. Therefore, the sealing density change layer has been produced separately, applying correction measures to account for such issues and create a reliable change layer.

The NDVI distinguishes between vegetation and other surfaces. The index may not always correctly distinguish between vegetated and bare surfaces; generally, the type of soil sealing cannot be distinguished. And not all unsealed areas are vegetated, and vice versa; (dense) vegetation overhanging sealed soil cannot be distinguished from (dense) vegetation over other vegetation or bare soil.

Indicator assessment

Key question: What is the current degree of soil sealing in cities and the trend indicating vulnerability to flood risks and heatwaves?

Web link to maps

http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=75e71bd8f54246b0be3a4ddded724343

\(^{(13)}\) See http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview online
Map 3.4 Mean per cent soil sealing (2006) combined with the change in annual mean number of days with extreme precipitation in cities’ urban area
Cities with high soil sealing and an increasing number of intensive rainfall events facing a higher risk of urban drainage flooding are found particularly in north-western and northern Europe. Cities in areas with a decreasing number of such events but with high soil sealing still face a flood risk, but will do so less often in the future. Cities of high and low soil sealing can be found in all regions, and do not cluster in a particular region. This finding is confirmed by Prokop et al. (2011) who report that ‘individual regions with high sealing rates exist all over the EU’. The cities with low sealing levels in Finland, Norway, Slovenia and Sweden are exceptional. However, it should be stressed that a city’s weakness does not depend on soil sealing alone, but also on rainwater management (EEA, 2012).

Cities with an extremely high degree of soil sealing and a low share of urban green are exposed to a relatively strong UHI (Heusinkveld et al., 2014) and therefore to heat, to which the UHI contributes. Examples are L’Hospitalet de Llobregat and Badalona in Spain, and Bucharest in Romania. Here, the share of impervious surfaces in the UMZ amounts to around 80 %, while the share of urban green is only between 10 % and 16 %. At the other end of the spectrum, Gozo in Malta has only 7 % soil sealing and a share of urban green areas of 80 %.

(14) See http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview online.
Figure 3.1 Distribution of cities over classes of degree of soil sealing (2006)

Figure 3.1 shows the distribution of cities over various classes of the degree of soil sealing in the city’s urban area. Cities in the classes with between 40% and 60% of sealing are most common. However, in the short period of 3 years, a rapid increase in a large number of the cities is observed (Figure 3.1): in 245 cities, the increase was more than 0.5% over 3 years. Most of the extremely strong increases of over 2% per 3 years (17 cities) occurred in cities of southern European countries, where exposure to heat is already strong. Only one city, Helsinki, showed a considerable decrease in soil sealing, of $-1.4\%$ in 3 years. Furthermore, hardly any change ($<0.2\%$) was detected in 120 cities in the database. This category includes about half of the United Kingdom’s cities (54 of 106) and one-quarter of the German cities (22 of 85). Thus, the trend seems to be less favourable in regions where cooling would probably be most desired.

It is also of interest to note which cities with a high soil-sealing degree tend to have a slower rate of increase, and also the reverse. We therefore consider extremes of the two sub-indicators. Both indicators are classified using the 10 and 90 percentiles, respectively, as shown below.

**Table 3.6 Extremes of soil sealing and change of soil sealing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1 (10% lowest)</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 3 (10% highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil sealing [%]</td>
<td>&lt; 37.4</td>
<td>37.4–61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of soil sealing [%]</td>
<td>&lt; 0.101</td>
<td>0.101–0.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classifications were used to construct the following matrix, showing the number of cities in each pair of classes.

**Table 3.7 Pairing soil sealing and change of soil sealing**
The matrix reveals that many cities with a relatively low degree of soil sealing also have a low or slightly negative tendency in the change of soil sealing. This is a trend that mainly occurs in north and north-western Europe, notably in the United Kingdom, where we find 12 of the 21 cities in the class indicated by the upper left (1/1) box. There are only three southern European cities in this (1/1) category: Aix-en-Provence (France), Badajoz (Spain) and Terni (Italy). In fact, none of the cities with a relatively low degree of soil sealing show a strong increase in soil sealing (lower left box), something which should be considered favourable from a climate adaptation point of view. Inversely, cities that already have a high degree of sealing more often tend to show a strong increase in soil sealing degree as well. A total of 11 cities are found in the lower right box (3/3), all of which are located in southern or eastern Europe. Thus, there is a tendency for both unfavourable and favourable conditions (from a climate adaptation point of view) to persist. In four cities with a relatively high degree of soil sealing, the tendency to increase the amount of imperviousness is relatively low (upper right box, category 3/1). In this category of cities, we find Waterford in Ireland as well as Athina, Kavala and D. Peiraios in Greece.

Additional policies may be needed to slow down or even reverse this development. Prokop et al. (2011) provide an overview of pressures and state (i.e. sealing degree), as well as responses and policy targets per EU Member State. This list reveals that a number of countries have already implemented response measures (e.g. the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg, Denmark and the United Kingdom), while others are either commencing to do so (e.g. Portugal, France, Italy and Poland) or have no measures in place (Malta, Cyprus, Hungary and Greece). Surprisingly, response measures are not always based on a specific policy target (the Netherlands, Belgium (Flanders), Germany, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom, France and Austria).

Implemented response measures aim to improve quality of life in large urban centres by launching urban renewal programmes to revive declining urban centres (e.g. in Porto, Lisbon, Catalonia, Malmö and Vienna), programmes to redevelop brownfields (e.g. in the United Kingdom, France, the Czech Republic, and Belgium (Flanders)), and programmes for the protection of agricultural soils and landscapes (Spain, France, the Netherlands, the Czech Republic and Slovakia).

The policy targets are mostly contained in the key spatial planning regulations (the principle of sustainable development), but indicative quantitative limits for annual land take (used here as a proxy for soil sealing) only exist in Austria, Belgium (Flanders), Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.
3.3 Thermal comfort

Indicator definition

As a proxy for the thermal comfort, the indicator shows the average number of days and nights with thermal discomfort occurring in the period from April to September. The maximum effective temperature (ET) is $> = 23$ °C at daytime (12:00) and $> = 21$ °C at night-time (0:00), taking into account the UHI effect on the night-time temperature.

Justification of the indicator

One of the main consequences of climate change is a rise of ambient temperature and an increasing occurrence of heatwaves, hot days (maximum air temperature over 35 °C) and tropical nights (minimum air temperature over 20 °C).

In contrast to rural areas, cities have a large stock of buildings and infrastructure materials that serve as heat accumulators. Urban structures hamper airflow to some extent. Furthermore, human energy use and the consequent release of heat is concentrated in cities. All of these factors create the city-specific UHI phenomenon: the temperature in urban areas tends to be higher than the temperature in their rural surrounding areas. The UHI typically is a nocturnal phenomenon (Oke, 1982). While the UHI can ease impacts of cold in urban areas in winter time, it elevates temperatures in cities during summer time. This may further decrease thermal comfort of residents and even increase mortality rates during heatwaves. High night-time temperatures hamper healthy sleep and recovery of humans during the night (Grize et al., 2005).

Whether or not citizens feel comfortable within the urban microclimate depends not only on temperature, but also on a complex interaction between physical, physiological, behavioural, and psychological factors. This can be expressed by thermal comfort indicators. The indicator described here expresses thermal comfort at the scale of the city, being an index that approximates the effect of the various interactions and takes into account the integral effects of all thermal parameters. This indicator should not only measure possible enhanced mortality, but should also represent human well-being in urban environments in a more general sense under heatwaves. It should also take into account the possible UHI contribution to thermal comfort. Thus, it may be interpreted as an indicator designed to describe cities’ liveability. As such, the indicator presented here will complement the EEA Core Set Indicator CSI 012 (15) (that describes the number of consecutive hot days and tropical nights), by a city-specific indicator. A consequence of using ET as an indicator at neighbourhood to city level is that threshold exceedance does not necessarily correspond to hot or extremely hot conditions for every individual citizen. A possible feeling of discomfort on a particular day depends on behaviour and activity pattern. For example, local shade may provide a considerable relief, while intensive physical activity may increase the level of discomfort. Furthermore, citizens in warmer regions may be accustomed to slight or moderate heat stress (Baccini et al., 2008).

Methodology

To assess the thermal exposure of the human body, the integral effects of all thermal parameters must be taken into account. To this end, rather sophisticated biometeorological indices are available to assess thermal comfort. Examples include the predicted mean vote (PMV), the physiologically equivalent temperature (PET), and the recently developed universal thermal comfort index (UTCI), which are based upon models for the human heat budget. Such models use all relevant meteorological parameters as well as physiological factors as input (Fanger, 1970; Fiala et al., 2012; Höppe, 1999; 15) See http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/global-and-european-temperature/global-and-european-temperature-assessment-5 online.
Matzarakis et al., 2010). They rely on many variables, some of which are difficult to obtain in practice for large regions, and are not routinely observed and reported at meteorological stations. Therefore, they are less suited to be applied as European-wide indicators for thermal comfort.

Empirically derived indices, like the discomfort index (Thom, 1959), wet bulb globe temperature (WBGT), apparent temperature (Steadman, 1979), and wind-chill index (Steadman, 1979) have been used to describe thermal comfort for several decades. However, these simple indices only consider a limited number of the relevant meteorological parameters. Furthermore, they generally do not take into account thermal physiology directly. But clearly, the advantage of most of the empirical indices is that they can be derived from meteorological information that is generally available. Moreover, in terms of ease of communication to the general public, they are sometimes more appealing than indices based on sophisticated models.

Recently, Blazejczyk et al. (2012) compared several of the thermal comfort estimates from the simple empirical indices with the UTCI. This index has been proposed for use as the standard model to assess human thermal comfort, and is one of the indices based on a fairly complete description of the human energy balance. It was found that the so-called ET can be regarded as a reasonable proxy for the much more sophisticated UTCI. ET is computed from air temperature, water vapour pressure and wind speed, and these are generally available from meteorological observations. The findings of Blazejczyk et al. (2012) were confirmed in an independent analysis based on data from the Dutch city of Rotterdam (Swart et al., 2012).

Based on the results from the above analyses, we propose using ET as a thermal comfort index that can be considered an alternative exposure indicator. ET is estimated as follows (Blazejczyk et al., 2012):

$$ET = 37 - \frac{37 - T_{air}}{0.68 - 0.014RH + 1.76 + 1.4w^0.75} - 0.29T_{air}(1 - 0.01RH)$$

where $T_{air}$ is the air temperature (°C), RH the relative humidity of the air (%) and $w$, the average wind speed (m/s).

We computed ET 2 times per day: at 12 UTC, representing a daytime estimate of the maximum ET, and at 00 UTC, representing an night-time estimate of the minimum ET. Often, RH decreases during the day as $T_{air}$ increases, and the reverse also occurs. The maximum RH then coincides with the minimum $T_{air}$, and the reverse also occurs. Therefore, to compute the minimum, night-time ET, we take the maximum RH and the minimum $T_{air}$, while we use the minimum RH and the maximum $T_{air}$ to compute the maximum, daytime ET.

Standard meteorological data usually represent rural areas. Neither observations and data reanalyses nor RCMs explicitly take the urban landscape into account. The main difference between urban and rural temperatures are generally observed during night-time. Therefore, adjusting the minimum $T_{air}$ to represent the night-time temperature in urbanised areas by adding an estimate of the daily nocturnal UHI intensity, is proposed. Although the physical background of the UHI has been known for a long time (Oke, 1982), there is still a rather vivid and ongoing scientific research effort to determine the relation between UHI, urban characteristics and meteorological conditions from the local to the city scale. For now, until a more general relationship becomes available, we use the relationship between UHI and population density assessed by Steeneveld et al. (2011):

$$UHI_{med} = 0.1822P_d^{0.2996} (r^2 = 0.56)$$

where $UHI_{med}$ is the median UHI in K and $P_d$ is the population density. Although (2) was derived at the scale of neighbourhood, we take $P_d$ to be the population density of the city, in inhabitants per square kilometre. We use the median value of the UHI because high percentiles (e.g. 95 percentile) or maximum values would exaggerate UHIs, on average. Note that (2) is only a diagnostic and statistical relationship used to enable us to include the UHI in the thermal comfort indicator. In future, other,
more physically based relationships may be used. For example, Steeneveld et al. (2011) also found a quantitative relationship between UHIs and % green cover. Although such a relationship is physically more feasible than (2), it is not proposed here. Though many studies show the importance of urban green in mitigating heat in the urban environment, this relationship is less certain. The statistical relationship between green cover and UHI intensity may depend strongly on the specific plant species found in a particular region, and therefore may be less representative of Europe as a whole.

For now, we assume that RH in the urban outdoor areas approximately equals RH in the rural surroundings. This assumption only has a relatively small impact on the value of ET.

Observational data of wind speed in the urban environment are scarce. Meteorological models compute a wind speed that generally represents rural areas. The available datasets indicate that the wind speeds in the urban environment are much lower than in rural surroundings. Particularly during hot days, wind speeds are usually low (< 2 m s⁻¹). Preliminary estimations (Swart et al., 2012) show that only a small error is made by filling in a fixed wind speed of 1 m s⁻¹ for urban areas in Equation (1).

The ET threshold used to count occurrences of thermal discomfort is shown in Table 3.8. This table has been used to relate thermal comfort to ET in central Europe (Blazejczyk et al., 2012). Above ET = 23 °C, conditions are generally perceived as ‘warm’, which corresponds to strong heat stress in other indices. Hence, we counted the number of days where the maximum ET exceeds 23 °C. The perception of heat has typically been derived for daytime conditions. No data similar to those in Table 3.8 are available for night-time conditions. However, night-time air temperatures of 20 °C or more hamper healthy sleep and recovery of humans during the night (Grize et al., 2005). Temperatures perceived as ‘comfortable’ during the day may therefore be perceived as ‘too warm’ during the night. Therefore, we chose a (slightly) lower ET threshold for night-time conditions. ET = 21 °C (corresponding to ‘comfortable’ during daytime (see Table 3.8)) was used as the night-time threshold.

Table 3.8. Thresholds for effective temperature (ET) (*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET range (°C)</th>
<th>Thermal comfort class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;27</td>
<td>Hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23..27</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21..23</td>
<td>Comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17..21</td>
<td>Fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9..17</td>
<td>Cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1..9</td>
<td>Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Very cold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Note that the ET is different from air temperature.

Data specifications

EEA data references

The UMZ as a reference unit for city morphology (as best approximation of the ‘real’ city form, which often does not correspond to the administrative delineation) is available from the EEA data service (16).

NB: In the current processing, all UMZ patches located within the city’s boundaries are used (see annex).

External data references

Population density was determined by dividing the total population by the city area.

Population data were obtained from the regional statistics database at Eurostat Urban Audit cities/greater cities

- DE1001V Population on 1 January by age groups and sex - cities and greater cities (17).

The ET is calculated from the meteorological variables:

- maximum and minimum of diurnal air temperatures;
- maximum and minimum relative air humidity;
- daily average values of wind velocity.

Data were obtained from:

- gridded metrological observations (station data) (present-day) European Climate Assessment Data (ECA&D) project: E-OBS (18).

Uncertainties

Although the relationship between the ET and the UTCI is quite strong and nearly linear, a considerable scatter around the regression line remains. For example, analysis by Swart et al. (2012) shows that the ET ranges from about 22 °C to 26 °C at UTCI = 30 °C. This range crosses two ET threshold classes. Clearly, the ET ranges will become larger if a fixed wind speed is used.

The ET as applied here cannot describe micro-scale variations in thermal comfort. For example, trees or buildings may provide shade very locally, with a large impact on the UTCI of individuals via reduced radiation input, but not on the ET. Thus, the indicator used here must be considered to represent a city-scale average only.

The thresholds applied to assess the frequency of events (number of days with ET > 23 °C and number of nights with ET > 21 °C) are quite uncertain. First, it is difficult to compare the thermal comfort classes for different thermal comfort indicators. Second, thresholds may have to differ across climatic zones, but often they have been evaluated for one particular region only. Third, most thermal comfort indices apply to daytime conditions only.

Although Equation (2) can be applied at neighbourhood scale, the UHI is currently evaluated at city scale, using data averaged over the UMZ. However, city design and meteorological conditions have a strong impact on UHI intensity, even within a neighbourhood. A combination of various factors may lead to strong variations in UHI intensity in time and in space. Thus, UHI intensity is known to reveal a strong spatial as well as temporal variation. The present estimation method for UHIs does not take into account such variations.

Data used in the present methodology represent the situation at classical meteorological stations, preferably located outside urban areas. The relation to their urban (micro) climatic equivalents depends on city design, local features and meteorological conditions. An attempt has been made to adjust air temperature to urban conditions by adding an UHI effect for night-time conditions, but the description of UHIs must be considered a first-order estimate only.

Indicator assessment

Key question: What is the thermal comfort in the cities across Europe?

Web link to map

(18) See http://eca.knmi.nl online.
Map 3.6 Average number of days (averaged over a period of 11 years (2002–2012)) with a daytime ET > 23 °C (ECA&D climatological data)
Map 3.7. Average number of days (averaged over a period of 11 years (2002–2012)) with a night-time ET > 21 °C including UHI temperature (ECA&D climatological data)

The maps show present-day weather patterns. As might be expected, the mean number of days with a maximum ET > = 23 °C during daytime increases towards the south. In the southernmost cities, daytime conditions for whole summer season could represent at least slight-to-moderate heat stress. By contrast, similar conditions are rare or even absent in cities in the north of Europe and in coastal cities. However, specific differences at relatively short distance are evident as well, particularly in southern Europe. Coastal cities at the Atlantic borders of Europe tend to be cooler than inland cities or coastal ones at the Mediterranean Sea. This is a particularly noticeable feature on the Iberian Peninsula. While sea breezes and the related ventilation may be important for cooling during hot periods, the cooling effect of the sea is only captured in the present indicator insofar as it is observed in the standard meteorological data, since the wind speed is fixed. Sea breezes are not expected to affect night-time temperatures and the UHI during summer, since they are typically a daytime phenomenon, while the UHI is a night-time phenomenon.

Mostly in southern cities, during several nights the maximum ET exceeds 21 °C. This night-time ET includes an estimate of the UHI. Although the outcome of this estimate (based on Equation 2) seems to be quite small, between 0.5 °C and 3.6 °C for the cities shown on the map, the UHI effect appears to cause a significant increase in the number of nights with thermal discomfort. Without UHI correction, when using the standard rural data, the threshold value of 21 °C is often just not exceeded. Using the UHI, as has been in this indicator, will lead to exceedance of the threshold in such cases. Note that the correction represents a median UHI value. In certain cases, the UHI may become much larger. Including such variation would require an estimation of the UHI strength based on weather conditions (see Brandsma and Wolters (2012), for an example).
An illustrative example of the impact of the UHI is seen in the city pair Lisbon and Setubal in Portugal. These cities are only some 30 km apart, and both are situated near the Atlantic coast. Their background weather is quite similar, but the estimated median UHI is 2.7 °C for Lisbon and 1.3 °C for Setubal. This is the main cause of the different classification of the cities. While Lisbon has 16 nights per year on average with an ET > 21 °C, Setubal has only 3 such nights on average in the period from 2002 to 2012. It should be noted that the choice of the threshold values can substantially influence classification in these cases, with minor small deviations from the temperature threshold.

The indicator should be interpreted as a first assessment of the climate comfort condition in cities, mainly related to standard meteorological conditions and partly related to city structure, via the reduced wind speed and the estimate of the UHI during night-time. To fully assess the urban climate at neighbourhood and sub-neighbourhood level, much more detailed analyses of the urban climate are required. Examples are the Urban Climate Maps of Stuttgart (Germany) and Arnhem (the Netherlands) (EEA, 2012). In addition, it should be noted that threshold exceedance does not necessarily correspond to thermal discomfort for every individual citizen. For example, a feeling of discomfort on a particular day depends on behaviour and activity patterns. Staying in local shade provided by trees and other city structures may provide a considerable relief while intense physical activity may increase discomfort levels. Furthermore, citizens in warmer regions may be accustomed to slight or moderate heat stress (Baccini et al., 2008).

For climate change, the EEA Core Set of Indicators CSI 012 (19) shows general trends in the number of hot days (maximum air temperature > 35 °C) followed by tropical nights (minimum air temperature > 20 °C) (Figure. 2). The frequency of such occasions is expected to increase in future. An enhanced UHI due to urbanisation or climate change (EEA, 2012), not included in CSI 012, may further contribute to such an increase. This trend will not only affect southern European cities; it is expected that cities in the north will also experience a significant number of days with unfavourable conditions in future. Conditions in the north are often quite close to the threshold of moderate heat stress in present-day conditions (Steeneveld et al., 2011), so only a small increase in air temperature may cause a significant number of unfavourable events in the near future.

Figure 3.2 General trends in the number of hot days (maximum air temperature > 35 °C) followed by tropical nights (minimum air temperature > 20 °C)
Source: Fischer and Schär, 2010

To illustrate, a regional analysis for cities in the Randstad area in the Netherlands (like Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague) \(^ {20} \), also shows a significant increase in the number of nights with thermal discomfort in cities with hardly any warm nights at present. Although the analysis has been based on air temperature instead of on thermal comfort indices, it does include the UHI effect, and clearly reveals the possible impact of climate change on urban night-time conditions. The number of hot nights in the centres of these cities was found to add up to a total of, typically, about 5 days per year (~1 ‘week’), which is consistent with the results of the analysis at European scale. In the period around 2050, in some parts of the Randstad cities, the number of hot nights may add up to more than a month per year in the Dutch climate scenarios. Urbanisation may further increase the number of uncomfortable warm nights.

Cities that experience many days with high daytime ET followed by nights with high night-time ET may benefit from measures that decrease these numbers, complemented with measures to cope with such conditions. Such adaptations not only help to prevent increased mortality during heatwaves as much as possible, but also increase and maintain the liveability and attractiveness of a city. Measures to decrease the ET include boosting green infrastructure such as green urban areas, trees, green walls and roofs, where possible (EEA, 2012). This will improve the daytime and the night-time situation. At present, while cities in the south would benefit most from green infrastructure, the cities with the greatest green cover are actually found in the north (see the indicator factsheet on ‘Green urban areas’). Other structures or city design features that provide shade, prevent energy absorption or enhance ventilation may improve thermal comfort of citizens locally, but may reduce the UHI as well.

Examples of measures to cope with unfavourably hot days and warm nights are improvement in health infrastructure, heat action plans, awareness-raising and improved accessibility of green and blue areas (EEA, 2012). Some of the cities with high maximum ET in the southern countries also have a high share of elderly people who are more sensitive to heat, on average. In these cities, extra attention is needed in measures to mitigate the effects of heatwaves.

\(^ {20} \) See http://www.ruimtelijkeadaptatie.nl/en/climate-adaptation-atlas online
3.4 Water consumption

Indicator definition

This indicator shows the total consumption of water in a given city, divided by the total resident population [m³/inh].

Justification of the indicator

Expected climate change impacts include higher ambient temperature, precipitation irregularities and more frequent extreme weather events leading to prolonged periods of water scarcity and drought, among others. This increases the pressure on cities' water supply, including the need for enhanced storage of water due to frequent droughts, the need for irrigation of urban green areas, and increased personal water use as a result of higher temperatures.

A direct indicator that describes water scarcity in terms of precipitation, water availability at the surface and underground, the quality of available water and water demand is not available at city level. Thus, water consumption per capita is selected as a proxy indicator for which data are available, and that partially reflects the fact that the level of water consumption may indicate the level of dependency on water sources and the potential vulnerability to the climate effects that may decrease water availability in future. The more water a city uses, the more vulnerable it will be should there be a reduction or disruption of its supply.

Methodology

The indicator itself is the quotient of two Urban Audit indicators for cities/greater cities: Indicator EN3003V ‘Total consumption of water’ (m³) and DE1001V ‘Total resident population’(inhabitants) resulting in consumption per capita (m³/inh)

Data specifications

EEA data references
None

External data references

Eurostat Urban Audit database (21):

- EN3003V Total use of water (m³);
- DE1001V Population on 1 January by age group and sex — cities and greater cities.

Uncertainties

If urban areas have a high amount of industry, the indicator will show a higher consumption per capita. Chemical industries and the production of food, beverages, pulp or paper can significantly increase apparent consumption per capita, even if household consumption of water is decreasing. A full indicator assessment should therefore consider the industry present in the city.

The total population only includes residents in the city. Cities with a high number of commuters tend to have higher water consumption per capita. Touristic hubs increase the number of people in the city significantly during high seasons. Therefore, the apparent water consumption per capita in such a city also tends to be higher.

The total use of water (EN3003V) does not include water leakages, nor any unpaid water losses in general, and therefore does not provide a full picture of how much pressure is exerted on the water sources by consumption. When analysing this indicator, it is recommended that it be complemented with data on water supply losses.

The indicator does not provide any information on water that is available for the given city. Cities with high water consumption due to industry tend to be located near reliable water sources. Assessments using this indicator should always examine the water availability for the given city as well. A suitable complementary indicator for this might be the Water Exploitation Index (WEI), for example, although this is not available at city level.

While big cities have almost always centralised their water supply, which allows for good data collection, smaller cities often have a certain share of self-supply (e.g. private wells and water boreholes), which might be omitted from statistics. For analysis of this indicator, it is recommended that information be used from the Urban Audit indicator EN3004V ‘Number of dwellings’ connected to potable drinking water system.

Not all cities have data available for all years. The Urban Audit database does not give exact dates for a particular year, but rather gives one value per 3-year period. This means that data for particular cities and countries sometimes refer to different years and might reflect different climatic conditions in those particular years. Therefore, a longer observation period is needed in order to draw reliable conclusions.

**Indicator assessment**

Key questions: How much water is used in the city in relative terms? Does the level of water consumption in cities increase their sensitivity to water scarcity and droughts?

**Web link to maps**

[http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=51347de552ef4e2f82b90706f6a24474](http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=51347de552ef4e2f82b90706f6a24474)
Map 3.8 Water consumption per capita (2004)
Map 3.9 Water consumption per capita (2008)
The WEI is an indicator of the level of pressure that human activity exerts on natural water resources; it gives an indication of how total water demand puts pressure on the water resource (CSI 018 (22)). The WEI is a water scarcity indicator currently being applied at national level, computing the mean annual demand for freshwater, divided by long-term average freshwater resources. Therefore, it is not city specific, though it contextualises cities’ water consumption and increases explanatory power for assessment. The warning threshold for the WEI which distinguishes a non-stressed from a stressed region is around 20% (Raskin et al., 1997). Most European countries are in this range, with a wide distribution pattern: Iceland, Norway and Latvia have the lowest WEI values (<1%). But other regions are also found in this range, including countries like Slovenia, Bulgaria, Ireland and Albania.

Severe water stress can occur where the WEI exceeds 40%, indicating strong competition for water but not necessarily enough extraction to trigger frequent water crises. Some experts argue that freshwater ecosystems cannot remain healthy if the waters in a river basin are abstracted as intensely as indicated by a WEI in excess of 40% (Alcamo et al., 2000). Countries like Malta, Italy, Spain and Belgium are in this intermediate range, between 20% and 40%. Other experts consider that 40% is too low a threshold, and that water resources could be used much more intensively, up to a 60% threshold. In any case, this group exhibits the greatest vulnerability to water stress, but at European scale, only Cyprus reaches such values.

(22) See [http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/use-of-freshwater-resources/ds_resolveuid/1187781a1582ae689ad29d812bc1ae5b](http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/use-of-freshwater-resources/ds_resolveuid/1187781a1582ae689ad29d812bc1ae5b) online.
Irregular water use in urban environments, especially where scarcity problems could emerge, is an issue that crucially needs to be understood in Europe. Is climate one of the most explicative drivers of domestic water consumption? Is domestic water consumption supposed to vary depending on climate variables, especially temperature and rainfall?

The World Health Organization (WHO) calculates that people need between 40 l and 70 l of water per day, to meet basic health and hygiene needs (Inman and Jeffrey, 2006). This is equivalent to between 15 m³ and 25 m³ per inhabitant per year. Urban water consumption in Europe differs considerably across countries; it is generally higher in south-western countries such as Italy or Spain, and lower in the central and western parts of the continent such as Germany.

In 2004, there is a huge discrepancy in data, ranging from relatively low values that are slightly above the WHO-suggested minimum value (about 30 m³/inh/year in several Polish cities), to very high values that eventually include irrigation for agriculture (around 200 m³/inh/year some Bulgarian and Norwegian cities). Assessing trends between two or three data points is difficult, as it may be that none of those years can be considered a ‘typical’ year, hence providing false information that skews the real trend.

Poland and Romania both have many cities with low values. Both countries also have low WEI values, which makes the positive message conveyed by this indicator mode solid. At the other end of the spectrum are Bulgaria and Norway, and a cluster of cities in the Alps region.

From other sources and reports, a general trend can be observed: cities are making efforts to reduce water consumption. However, since the available data are scarcely comparable across particular cities and years, this cannot be convincingly demonstrated here. The best results obtained in the period from 2004 to 2008 were presented by some German, Swiss and Italian cities that reduced water consumption by more than 25 m³/inh. However, contrary to the indicated effort, the general trend between 2004 and 2008 was for an increase in consumption — by an average of 2.84 m³/inh in the 147 cities assessed. Most of this increase is in Spain, where almost all cities had higher values in 2008 than in 2004. Spain is also a country with a high WEI.

To tackle increasing water scarcity, cities should make their water consumption and supply more efficient. Losses from transfer are generally high: values of about 30 % of loss are not uncommon. There is also a need for better data, so as to be able to evaluate the situation in European cities in a more robust way.
3.5 River flooding

Indicator definition

The share of city’s urban area [%] potentially vulnerable to river floods.

Further sub-indicators to be developed are:
(1) share of residential area potentially sensitive to flooding [%];
(2) share of transport infrastructure potentially sensitive to flooding [% by type];
(3) share of industrial and commercial area potentially sensitive to flooding [%].

Justification of the indicator

Climate change brings changes in precipitation patterns all around Europe. Changes in periodicity and amount will increase the number of flood events. River floods are a common natural disaster in Europe, and — along with storms — they are the most important natural hazard in Europe in terms of economic damage. River floods can result in huge economic losses, due to damage to infrastructure, property and agricultural land, as well as indirect losses in or beyond the flooded areas, such as production losses caused by damaged transport or energy infrastructure. Urbanisation and associated increases of impermeable land surface coupled with housing and business development of river floodplains aggravate flood risk in urban areas.

Urban infrastructures provide citizens with various services such as provision of water, electricity, transport, housing, social services and places of work or leisure. Flooding of these infrastructures means a substantial disturbance of public life, and undermines the security of service supply (Lenz, 2009). Once, beyond a certain water level or threshold, floods can seriously affect an infrastructure system upon which other infrastructures, companies/industries or the urban populations depends. Then, another significant issue is the duration of outage of an infrastructure, which depends, among others, on the speed of onset, specific critical time frames, and the average time needed to restore its functionality.

Methodology

The intersections of three layers (area potentially vulnerable to flooding, UMZ and the land use layer of the Urban Atlas) allow identification of which areas per land use category might be flooded. This indicator focuses the analysis on residential areas, transport infrastructure, and built-up areas of industrial and commercial categories.

Table 3.9 Residential, industrial and commercial, transport area and related classes in the Urban Atlas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Nomenclature — Urban Atlas level 4 class legend</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11100</td>
<td>Continuous Urban Fabric (S.L. &gt; 80 %)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11210</td>
<td>Discontinuous Dense Urban Fabric (S.L.: 50 %–80 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11220</td>
<td>Discontinuous Medium Density Urban Fabric (S.L.: 30 %–50 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11230</td>
<td>Discontinuous Low Density Urban Fabric (S.L.: 10 %–30 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11240</td>
<td>Discontinuous Very Low Density Urban Fabric (S.L. &lt; 10 %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11300</td>
<td>Isolated Structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12100</td>
<td>Industrial, commercial, public, military and private units</td>
<td>Industrial and commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The procedure follows these steps:

1. intersection of potential flooded areas (LISFLOOD) with Urban Atlas layer;
2. intersection with city’s urban area;
3. statistical analysis in order to obtain the potentially flooded area (in %) for every Urban Atlas city and category:
   a. share of residential areas potentially flooded in % (11100, 11210, 11220, 11230, 11240, 11300);
   b. share of transport areas potentially flooded in % (12210, 12220, 12230, 12300, 12400);
   c. share of industrial, commercial areas potentially flooded in % (12100).

For each city, the potentially flooded area is divided by the total area (city’s urban area ; see annex) in order to obtain the percentage according to their use.

The indicator is based on elevation and does not include flood protection measures like dams, dikes, etc., as data for these are not yet available. Areas shown here as potentially at risk of flood might in reality be protected by adaptation measures. However, since measures can fail in certain circumstances, the risk remains.

**Data specifications**

**EEA data references**

The Urban Atlas \(^{(2)}\) is providing Europe-wide comparable land use and land cover data for large urban zones with more than 100 000 inhabitants as defined by the Urban Audit. GIS data can be downloaded together with a map for each urban area covered, and a report containing metadata. A web map service is also published \(^{(24)}\).

The UMZ as a reference unit for city morphology (as the best approximation of the ‘real’ city form, which often does not correspond to the administrative delineation) is available from the EEA data service \(^{(25)}\).

NB: In the current processing, all UMZ patches located within the city’s boundaries are used (see annex)

---


External data references

Fluvial flooding: The discharge return levels were derived for every river pixel for return periods of 100 years. For time windows of 30 years (control represents 1961–1990, and future period represents 2071–2100), a Gumbel distribution was fitted to the annual maximum discharges simulated by LISFLOOD in every grid cell of the modelled domain based on 12 models and the A1B scenario (Rojas et al. (2012)26 and Rojas et al. (2013)27).

Uncertainties

Uncertainties originate mainly from the climate projections used in the flood model. To assess climate change impacts on flood hazard, one needs high-resolution climate simulations. To build the database, simulations from 12 climate experiments have been used within the ENSEMBLES project. Further information on uncertainties is provided in Rojas et al. (2012).

The threatened areas of the city are based on flooding from 1961 to 1990. This period does not capture major flood events of the past 25 years (among others, the eastern Europe flood in 1997, and the central Europe flood in 2002) that may have been more typical for the future climate extremes. If these events had been included, the threatened area would probably have been larger.

Moreover, because the assessment period is in the past, some areas that were previously flooded are no longer flood-prone, due to implemented adaptation measures. The potentially flooded area will probably be smaller due to this fact.

We also used the city’s urban area based on the urban characteristics of 2006. One may assume that this is (slightly) different from the period in which we have data about floods (1961–1990), and that it will be slightly different in future.

Indicator assessment

Key question: How potentially vulnerable are cities — their people, economic assets and infrastructure — to river flooding?

Map 3.11 Percentage of cities’ urban area flooded (period 1961–1990)
Map 3.12 Percentage of cities’ urban area flooded (period 2071–2100)
Floods are natural phenomena that have always been present in Europe. The changing climate and sprawling cities are likely to increase the flood risk in Europe, in terms of economic damage in urban areas.

Cities in Europe have often been built by rivers: they offered water, transport and a source of food. Most of the historical centres in European cities are located close to rivers. The highest share of cities that have a high percentage of their areas at potential risk of river floods are found along big European rivers — the Danube, Rhine, Rhone, Moldau-Elbe, Po and Vistula.

It is expected that in the period from 2070 to 2100, cities in central and western Europe will face more severe flooding. The highest relative increase is expected for cities in Portugal, the United Kingdom, France, west Germany and the Balkans. Eastern parts of Europe will see a reduced flood pressure. Northern Germany, Poland and other Baltic states and some cities in Czech Republic may see a slight to severe reduction of floods. However, change is expressed in relative terms; thus, a high relative change of the area at risk might actually be a rather small change in the absolute area, if the original urban area sensitive to flooding was already small.

Adaptation measures include flood-proof urban design, technical protection against floods, early warning systems and ecosystem measures to increase the capacity of green areas to retain water. This calls for a regional approach.

Proper integrated measures in land use, forestry and agriculture can reduce the frequency of floods, and proper urban planning and technical adaptations can limit their impacts on residential, industrial and commercial areas, and transport infrastructures.
3.6 Coastal flooding

Indicator definition

The share of city's urban area [%] that is low-lying and would potentially be inundated by a sea level rise of 1 m combined with a 100 year return-period storm-surge event, if no coastal defence systems are in place.

Justification of the indicator

One important impact of climate change is sea level rise. In Europe, significant economic, social and infrastructural assets are located at or near the coastline. Cities located at the coast face the possibility of being flooded by the sea. Sea floods can damage residential, commercial and industrial areas of the city as well as interrupt transport infrastructure, thus limiting the city's accessibility and reducing supplies. Coastal flooding occurs when the sea level exceeds normal levels due to storm surges and tidal waves; chances of these occurring increase by sea level rise. In deltas and river mouths, flooding may be caused by a combination of fluvial flooding with storm surges or otherwise exceptionally high sea levels. In Europe, coastal flooding has already caused much damage in low-lying areas around the North Sea (Hildén et al., 2010). Increasing exposure is expected in the future as climate change intensifies.

As a consequence of climate change, the flood return periods may change owing to sea level rise, and may cause more frequent flood events and/or higher water levels (EEA, 2012). However, vulnerability varies due to socio-economic or demographic differences in coastal areas, such as urban sprawl and presence of technical measures to prevent flooding.

Methodology

Assessing the exposure of urban areas to the risk of coastal flooding is based on information about:

- return periods of flooding;
- the rate of sea level rise, which is one of the factors causing increased flood damage in coastal areas (e.g. climate change);
- frequency of storms leading to more frequent sea surges.

The data on maximum storm surge heights (100-year event of actual climate) as generated by the ‘Dynamic and interactive vulnerability assessment’ (DIVA) project were used to determine actual medium inundation heights along coastal segments of each NUTS 3 (28) region. To account for the effects of climate change, 1 m of potential sea level rise until 2100 was calculated on top of these values (29). In order to determine potentially inundated areas, the Hydro1k digital elevation model was utilised. By identifying the cells below the respective regional inundation threshold, continuous areas have been delineated, which can be considered as potentially at risk of storm surge-related inundation. However, one should bear in mind that coastal defence systems have been neglected in this analysis, as the employed database lacks this information.

The inundation information has been combined with the urban area of all coastal cities. For each city, the proportion of the area affected by a 1-metre sea level rise is computed and represented by coloured dots in the map. As this indicator is simply based on elevation by identifying low-lying areas,

(28) NUTS: Nomenclature of Units for Territorial Statistics; a geocode standard for referencing the subdivisions of countries for statistical purposes. NUTS 3 is the most detailed level.
(29) For useful overviews of sea level rise projections, see Horton et al. (2014) and Vermeer and Rahmstorf (2009).
and does not take into account existing adaptation measures like dikes, the actual risk is likely to be much lower than the indicator shows.

**Data specifications**

**EEA data references**

The UMZ as reference unit for city morphology (as the best approximation of the ‘real’ city form, which often does not correspond to the administrative delineation) is available from the EEA data service (30).

NB: In the current processing, all UMZ patches located within the city’s boundaries are used (see annex)

**External data references**


Technische Universität Dortmund, Institute of Spatial Planning (IRPUD) (32).

Urban Audit database (Eurostat) (33).

**Uncertainties**

The main uncertainties relate to the DIVA flood-modelling methodology. The spatial extent of a coastal flood largely depends on the methodology used and its definition (Visser et al., 2012). As a wave moves inland, its height will diminish. The decay rate depends largely on terrain and surface features, as well as on factors specific to the storm generating the wave.

Data uncertainties are mainly related to data accuracy for the 1-metre level rise used to run the model. The Hydro1k digital elevation model was utilised. Coastal defence systems have been omitted from this analysis since the database employed does not contain this information. Including defence infrastructures like dams or dikes in the analysis would most certainly improve the share of urban area vulnerable to floods, especially in the case of the Netherlands.

**Indicator assessment**

Key question: How potentially vulnerable are cities across Europe regarding flooding, due to projected sea-level rise in combination with storm surge events?

**Web link to map**

[http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=ffd7c266c4844678bf4cad410100ba89](http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=ffd7c266c4844678bf4cad410100ba89)

---


(31) See [http://www.diva-model.net/ online](http://www.diva-model.net/).


Map 3.14 Potential coastal inundation exposure as a result of a 1-metre sea level rise combined with a 100-year return period storm-surge event

The map shows how major cities might be affected by the change of inundation height, given a 100-year coastal storm surge event on top of a 1-metre sea level rise. Primarily cities on the Dutch, German, Belgium and northern Italian coastlines can expect severe changes. Due to data constraints, coastal defence systems such as dikes could not be considered in these calculations, so the map only shows the potential effect on urban areas. The hotspots which emerge from this analysis, however, appear to be plausible, and can serve as a basis for checking local and regional preparedness for climate change–influenced coastal storm surges.
Map 3.15 Low-lying urban areas under potential inundation exposure due to projected sea-level rise in combination with storm surge events

While our map shows potential inundation risks without any defences, adding regional information shows that cities are actually less exposed to the threat. There are flood adaptation measures in many cities and regions. For example, the storm defence infrastructure in the Netherlands comprises 13 dams, including barriers, sluices, locks, dikes, and levees, to reduce the length of the Dutch coastline and protect the areas within and around the Rhine-Meuse-Scheldt delta from the North Sea (Map 3.15, Figure 3.3). However, these cities will still be as sensitive or even more sensitive to flooding in the (rare) event of the defence measures failing. In fact, while exposure to coastal floods may be reduced by improved flood defence systems, the sensitivity might actually increase, due to more physical and economic assets as well as more people living in low-lying areas.
Figure 3.3 Flood protection measures in the Netherlands to protect land from flooding by the North Sea
3.7 Forest fires

Indicator definition

The share of areas and their population in and around cities at high risk of forest fires.

Sub-indicators:

1. share of areas in cities, and related peri-urban areas, exposed to high risk of forest fire [%];
2. share of population in cities, and related peri-urban areas, exposed to high risk of forest fire [%];
3. share of residential areas in cities, and related peri-urban areas, exposed to high risk of forest fire [%];
4. share of transport infrastructure in cities, and related peri-urban areas in high risk area of forest fire [%];
5. share of commercial areas in cities, and related peri-urban areas in high risk area of forest fire [%].

Justification of the indicator

During recent decades, fire frequency and fire extent have changed, as have burning patterns, especially in terms of expansion of fire-prone areas (Arianoutsou et al., 2008; Fernandes et al., 2010; Koutsias et al., 2012). Fire seasons have lengthened as a result of recent changes in land use (e.g. abandonment of agricultural lands, inadequate forest management), long seasonal droughts, environmental disturbances and human activities (Martinez et al., 2009; Romero-Calcerrada et al., 2010).

The steady expansion of urban centres and the resultant construction of peripheral residential neighbourhoods characterised by low-density housing led to a growing intermingling between wild land and urban areas (wild land–urban interface or WUI), that has increased the risk of forest fires in many residential areas. It is estimated that around three-quarters of fire ignition points in Mediterranean countries are located in this mixed type of land characterised by a high aggregation of vegetation and a high density of houses (Vélez, 2009).

Residential areas in high fire-prone regions are most exposed to fire damage, with serious consequences. For example, forest fires in Greece in 2007 caused thousands of people to lose their homes (Bassi et al., 2008). The sensitivity of settlements is usually related to structure (i.e. lower density increases sensitivity) and isolation. Other factors that increase the sensitivity of settlements are the characteristics of the surrounding vegetation, as well as topographic aspects (Marzano et al., 2008).

There is also a significant danger for the population beyond direct fire damage, related to smoke, ash and fire fumes for areas that are not in immediate contact with fire. However, this indicator does not include these effects.

The indicator also assesses possible exposure of transport infrastructures by considering them in urban areas that are prone to forest fires. As shown by the 2007 fire season in Greece, fire can significantly influence transport networks, and can affect the operability and functionality of the national and local road network.

Methodology

The indicator provides an overview of the extent of urban and peri-urban areas potentially directly affected by forest fires, by combining the following variables.

Area
1. Select the city’s urban area as reference units.
2. Delineate peri-urban areas around the city’s urban area:
   - a buffer of 20 km outside the border of the city’s urban area;
   - a buffer inward of the city’s urban area, proportional to the degree of soil sealing (up to 50% confirmed by sensitivity analysis). Inward of the city’s urban area, we do not consider any distance, just the degree of soil sealing. It is generally accepted that vulnerability to fires is higher in low-density settlements, due to a higher proportion of flammable vegetation in the area.
3. Cross the areas selected in 2 with the Burnt areas perimeter from JRC data (2000–2012), resulting in a classification of peri-urban areas and low dense areas inwards the city’s urban area, according to the Burnt areas perimeter from JRC data (2000–2012).

Population

4. Cross 3 with the population grid resulting in the total population in peri-urban areas exposed to different degrees of fire danger.
5. For each city’s urban area, calculate the ratio between population in high risk areas (from 4) and total population (city’s urban area +peri-urban area).

Residential areas

6. Cross 3 with selected residential areas in the Urban Atlas (classes 11100 to 11300).
7. For each city’s urban area, calculate the ratio between residential areas in high risk zones (from 6) and total residential areas (city’s urban area +peri-urban area).

Commercial areas

8. Cross 3 with selected industrial, commercial, public, military and private units areas in the Urban Atlas (class 12100).
9. For each city’s urban area, calculate the ratio between commercial, public, military and private units areas in high risk zone (from 8) and total residential areas (city’s urban area +peri-urban area).

Transport network areas

11. Calculate percentage of transport network area at high risk of forest fire in the buffer of 20 km and low dense areas inwards.

Table 3.10 Residential, industrial and commercial, transport area and related classes in the Urban Atlas used for forest fire risk assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 4 class legend Urban Atlas (residential, commercial and transport)</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11100 Continuous Urban Fabric (S.L. &gt; 80 %)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11210 Discontinuous Dense Urban Fabric (S.L.: 50 %–80 %)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11220 Discontinuous Medium Density Urban Fabric (S.L.: 30 %–50 %)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11230 Discontinuous Low Density Urban Fabric (S.L.: 10 %–30 %)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11240 Discontinuous Very Low Density Urban Fabric (S.L. &lt; 10 %)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figures 3.4 and 3.5 show how the methodology as described here is applied to the city of Genoa.

Figure 3.4 Example of the delineation of peri-urban areas around UMZs in the city of Genoa
Figure 3.5 Example of population density in relation to the forest fire risk in the city of Genoa

Data specifications

EEA data references

The UMZ as a reference unit for city morphology (as the best approximation of the ‘real’ city form, which often does not correspond to the administrative delineation) is available from the EEA data service (34).

NB: In the current processing, all UMZ patches located within the city’s boundaries are used.

Degree of sealed surfaces: can be most easily calculated via the NDVI from satellite images. In the frame of GMES (Copernicus) precursor activities, EEA produced a high-resolution soil-sealing layer for the whole of Europe for the year 2006, based on the same satellite pictures as were used for CORINE land cover data (35).

The ‘imperviousness 2009’ data were produced by the FP7 Geoland2 project (36).

High-resolution land cover data for built-up areas with degree of imperviousness 2009. A histogram smoothing procedure was applied to address minor inconsistencies.

Classes: 0: unsealed; 1-100: degrees of sealing/imperviousness; 254: clouds, no data; 255: outside area.

External data references

Map of meteorological fire danger (European Commission: Forest Fires in Europe, Middle East and North Africa 2011 (37). Fire danger indices, which are routinely used to rate the fire potential due to

---

weather conditions. The Canadian Fire Weather Index (FWI) is used in the European Forest Fire Information System (EFFIS) to rate the daily fire danger conditions in Europe.

Rapid damage assessment. The rapid damage assessment (RDA) module of EFFIS has been implemented since 2003. It maps burned areas during the fire season by analysing Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) daily images with a 250-metre spatial resolution (38).

GMES Urban Atlas database provides reliable, intercomparable, high-resolution land use maps for 305 Large Urban Zones and their surroundings for the reference year 2006. These data are used to identify residential areas (classes 1100 to 11300) (39).

Population density grid for 2006 based on GEOSTAT data (raster). This data set contains the number of inhabitants per square kilometre for the reference year 2006 that are located within the Grid_ETRS89-LAEA_1K. The data set should be referred to as GEOSTAT_Grid_POP_2006_1 (40).

Uncertainties

The explanatory power of this indicator may be disputed in the area of transport networks, because these are of paramount importance in ascertaining the impact of forest fire on urban and peri-urban areas. For example, wide roads can interrupt fuel continuity; primary and secondary roads are important for accessibility in extinguishing the forest fire, as well as for evacuation routes. A high proportion of such kinds of infrastructure in fire-prone areas means increased vulnerability of an urban area. This applies not only to the region, but also to the larger urban area, as it might also depend on the services provided by the infrastructure at risk.

Indicator assessment

Key question: How sensitive is an urban area — its people and assets — to a direct impact (i.e. the sensitivity of being burnt) of forest fire under the current situation and future climate changes?

Map 3.16 Population currently at high direct risk areas of forest fires
Map 3.17 Share of residential areas at high direct risk of forest fires
Map 3.18 Share of commercial areas at high direct risk of forest fires
Map 3.19 Percentage of transport infrastructure in European cities and related peri-urban areas at high direct risk of forest fires

The maps show that the largest shares of people and residential areas vulnerable to fire are in southern countries. Results highlight that all Portuguese cities show a high percentage (> 16 %) of residential area at high direct risk of forest fires. Southern France and Greece present the same pattern, while in southern Italy, the situation is more variable. Commercial areas appear less vulnerable than people and residential areas. Nevertheless, northern Portugal, southern France, southern Italy and Greece are the countries with the majority of commercial areas vulnerable to fires. Similarly, this pattern is shown, but is more marked, with transport infrastructures (Map 3.19) (41).

This is particularly important also in the context of projected changes on fire danger, as estimated by the JRC. Results highlighted a marked increase of fire danger, particularly in south-western Europe, and an enlargement of the fire-prone area going north (European Commission: Forest Fires in Europe, Middle East and North Africa 2011) (42).

(41) For the UK only, data on the population are available.
3.8 Elderly people

Indicator definition

The share of the urban population aged 65 or older in European cities, represented in [%] of the total population.

Justification of the indicator

Elderly people in general are more sensitive to environmental stressors such as heatwaves, flooding, water scarcity or forest fires, due to various factors that accompany older age. A higher percentage of elderly people in a city indicates a higher social sensitivity of that city for exposure to these impacts. The proportion of elderly people also affects the age dependency ratio, which in turn affects response capacity in a city.

Health is a key determinant for climate change vulnerability (Brooks et al., 2005). Older people are, on average, more sensitive to health-related impacts of climate change than younger people. Generally speaking, they are also less mobile, and less able to avoid or cope with climate stressors and extreme events. Many studies consider the elderly more vulnerable to a variety of climate-related stressors: extreme weather events (Brooks et al., 2005; Fernandez et al., 2002); high temperatures and resulting mortality and morbidity (Huynen et al., 2001; Kovats and Hajat, 2008); respiratory problems related to forest fires, for instance (Johnston et al., 2012).

The share of population over 65 years of age in European cities serves as an indicator of social sensitivity, and it also serves as a proxy for health, in the absence of large-scale data on information about physiological (e.g. cardiovascular) health.

Methodology

The indicator is the quotient of two Urban Audit indicators for cities/greater cities: indicator DE1028I ‘Proportion of population aged 65-74 years’ and DE1055I ‘Proportion of population aged 75 years and over’.

Data specifications

EEA data references

None.

External data references

Eurostat Urban Audit database (43):

- DE1028I Proportion of population aged 65-74 years;
- DE1055I Proportion of population aged 75 years and over.

Uncertainties

Other possible age thresholds could be considered. Life expectancy and ageing of the population in Europe are increasing. Many studies mention an age of 65 years and older for the increase in sensitivity for high temperatures to heat. However, this age threshold is often a predetermined age, and therefore, it remains unclear at which age above 65 years the sensitivity really increases. To date, only a few studies have analysed this in greater detail. For instance, an analysis of the impact of the 2003 heatwave for Greater London shows a clear increase in daily mortality among elderly people above the

(43) See http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview online.
age of 75 years, whereas no notable effect was observed for the group aged between 65 and 74 years (Kovats and Hajat, 2008).

**Indicator assessment**

Key question: What is the share of elderly people in cities as an indication of current and future sensitivity and response capacity to climate change impacts?

**Web link to maps**

[http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=395b44bba1d643dfa7a72019d94af b77](http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=395b44bba1d643dfa7a72019d94af b77)

Map 3.20. Share of urban population with an age of 65 years or older (2004)
Map 3.21 Share of urban population with an age of 65 years or older (2011)
Map 3.22 Trend in share of urban population with an age of 65 years or older (2004–2011)

This population group currently constitutes about 17.5% of the total population of Europe (2011), but this share is expected to rise to 29.5% by the year 2060. The share of people aged 80 years or older (4.1% in 2010) will nearly triple by 2060, to reach 11.5% (Eurostat Population Projections 2010-based, Europop2010). This demographic trend will lead to an increased sensitivity to climate impacts. This change also affects the age dependency ratio, i.e. the ratio between older and younger people, relevant for how elderly people are supported economically and tended in the event of extreme climatic events.

The proportion of elderly people in cities is higher in the area extending from Italy to Germany and into northern Spain. In Belgium and Germany, this proportion usually follows the country average. Cities in northern Italy, meanwhile, tend to have values above the country average. For other countries, such as Bulgaria, France, Romania, southern Spain and the United Kingdom, the share of elderly people in most cities is lower than the country average (EEA, 2012).

Population ageing is a long-term trend, which began several decades ago in the EU. This ageing is visible in the development of the age structure of the population, and is reflected in an increasing share of older persons and a declining share of young and working-age persons in the total population.

The share of the population aged less than 15 years in the EU-27 population decreased by 3.7 percentage points in the past 2 decades, while the share of the older population (65 years and above) increased by 3.6 percentage points. As a result, the top of the EU-27 age pyramid for 2011 has widened and will continue to do so until 2060 (see Figure 3.6). The growth in the relative share of older people may be explained by increased longevity as life expectancy has risen; this development is often referred to as ‘ageing at the top’ of the population pyramid.
Figure 3.6 Changes in share of age classes in EU-27 population (year 2011)
Source: EUROSTAT

Table 3.11 Overview of trends in ages in several European cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT002C</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT004C</td>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT006C</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE001C</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE002C</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE003C</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR001C</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO001C</td>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI001C</td>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK001C</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban Audit data confirm the overall ageing trend. As an example of the data, cities in northern Italy (Turin, Milan, Genoa) have high values above 23 %, while other major European cities start at a lower value, but have higher growth rates for elderly populations. In Germany, the values of share of population aged 65 and over are around 17 % to 18 % (Berlin, Hamburg, Munich). Paris, Bucharest and Helsinki show values around 14 %. In the United Kingdom, the share of elderly people in most cities is lower than in rural areas (London: 11.97 %) (Table 3.11).

The heatwave that affected Europe in the summer of 2003 caused more than 19 000 excess deaths, according to official estimates, making it one of the deadliest hot-weather disasters in a century. The highest maximum temperature in Europe was recorded in the metropolitan area of Milan, with a mean value of 39 °C in August. In this area, an increase of 23 % of deaths for all causes throughout the
summer was observed, as compared with the mean number of deaths recorded in summer during the period from 1995 to 2002 (Russo and Bisanti, 2004).
3.9 Socio-economic status

Indicator definition

The share of households in cities with less than half the national average income, represented in [%] of the total population.

Justification of the indicator

Economic status is a widely recognised determinant for vulnerability and response capacity (IPCC, 2001 and 2007). It relates to both social sensitivity and response capacity.

In terms of social sensitivity, low income at household level may result in poor quality of housing as well as lack of access to resources and transportation. As a result, low-income households may be more sensitive to climatic risks such as heat-related mortality (Reid et al., 2009; Stafoggia et al., 2006; WHO, 2004). At the individual level, people with low income are also more likely to have a chronic disease or other medical risk factors, such as obesity or mental illness, which will increase their vulnerability (Kovats and Hajat, 2008).

In terms of response capacity, economic assets, capital resources, financial means and wealth play an important role in vulnerability and responses to climate change and related hazards (Smit and Pilifosova, 2001; Yohe and Tol, 2002). Wealthy nations, regions and communities are more likely to be in a better position to adapt to changes in the climate, by being able to bear the costs of adaptation, although wealth alone is not a sufficient indicator of the capacity to adapt (IPCC, 2001 and 2007). Economic resources are also predictive of the availability of technological options for adaptation and risk-spreading processes such as insurance coverage (Yohe and Tol, 2002).

Economic resources can be distributed unequally, resulting in a lower response capacity. It is typically argued that response capacity will be greater if resources and power in governing resources for adaptation are equitably allocated within a community or nation or at global level (IPCC, 2001). At the community level, low income is often linked to patterns of social marginalisation such as class and ethnic divisions (Blaikie et al., 1994).

The percentage of households with less than half the national average income is used as an indicator of social sensitivity and response capacity to climate-induced risks at urban level. While various indicators relate to the economic circumstances of the population (e.g. gross domestic product (GDP) figures, per capita income, unemployment, ratio of first to fourth quintile earnings), the various economic indicators highlight different perspectives on economic status and response capacity. These need to be considered when further interpreting and assessing indicator results.

Methodology

The indicator was part of the Urban Audit database for cities/greater cities: ‘Proportion of households with less than half the national average income’. The indicator represents the reference years 2007 and 2008.

Note: Data collection for this indicator has been discontinued by Eurostat. Another indicator will have to be selected for future use.

Data specifications

EEA data references

None.

External data references
Eurostat Urban Audit database (44):

- Share of households in cities with less than half the national average income (data 2008), discontinued by Eurostat.

Uncertainties

While various indicators relate to the economic circumstances of the population (e.g. GDP figures, per capita income, unemployment, ratio of first to fourth quintile earnings), the various economic indicators highlight different perspectives on economic status and response capacity. These need to be considered in interpreting and assessing the indicator results. Large inequalities within cities may blur the difference in income and associated sensitivity/response capacity between cities.

The reference year 2008 is not available for all countries; only 78 cities have data available.

Indicator assessment

Key question: What is the share of people with a lower socio-economic status in European cities?

Web link to map

http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=b7dbf7120856411f961f13d61c13928a

Map 3.23 Percentage of households with less than half national average income (2008)

The patterns of low socio-economic status at urban level differ from national and regional perspectives on economic development. Even if urban income levels are generally higher than the national averages, the indicator shows that even in wealthy countries (e.g., Austria, Germany and the Netherlands) there

\[ \text{(44) See } \text{http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview online.} \]
are cities with considerable low-income populations. Simultaneously, less wealthy nations (e.g. Bulgaria) may not experience relative urban poverty. Compared to the absolute GDP figures (in euros) for cities across Europe (EEA, 2012), which demonstrate a rather clear west–east divide, this indicator uses income levels relative to national averages, thus better reflecting differing costs of adaptation, and highlighting potential social sensitivity and lack of response capacity within nations.

The indicator highlights the need for more detailed analysis on the causes of low socio-economic status in relation to vulnerability. Important questions relate to the persistence of low income status, and the role of immigration and ethnic divides. University towns (e.g. Tartu, Estonia) present an interesting case: here, large transitory student populations with low socio-economic status have high levels of education.
3.10 Education

Indicator definition

The share of population aged 15 to 64, qualified at tertiary level (ISCED 5-6), living in cities, represented in [%] of the total population.

Justification of the indicator

The indicator was selected based on the assumption that the education levels of urban populations contribute positively to the response capacity, through higher awareness and understanding of climate change impacts and adaptation options, thus increasing the response capacity of the society.

Awareness is needed to recognise the problem of adaptation. Awareness builds on the knowledge base and education levels of the local population, but also on values such as equality and perceptions of climate change as a problem. Knowledge, values and perceptions pose social limits to adaptation. These limits can severely increase vulnerability, but they are also mutable (Adger et al., 2009). Education is a key means of altering such social limits to adaptation. Education levels are also an significant predictor of civic and political participation in Europe (Gallego, 2008), something which supports collective action.

Research on disaster mortality suggests that education is a major factor in reducing human vulnerability. Adger et al. (2004) tested national-level vulnerability and response-capacity indicators against the outcome of disaster mortality. Their analysis pointed to human health status, governance and education as being key factors of human vulnerability. The level of scepticism over climate change may decline with an increasing level of education (Whitmarsh, 2011). However, it was also observed by this author that political views strongly affect scepticism and uncertainty over climate change. Weber (2010) believes that at least for some people, better (environmental) science and statistics education can familiarise people with the scientific presentation of climate change information, and thus increase their understanding of the issue.

The link between education via awareness to response capacity is indirect. Thus, the level of education serves as a proxy for awareness of the climate change problem and related response measures.

Tertiary education, the level of education following secondary schooling, was selected as indicator for education. Universities and other higher education institutions play an essential role in society, creating new knowledge, transferring knowledge to students and fostering innovation. Around 20 million students (undergraduate and postgraduate) studied in the 4000 higher education institutions in the EU-27 in 2010.

Methodology

Data on education in Urban Audit cities/greater cities were collected. Proportion of population aged 15 to 65, qualified at tertiary level, living in Urban Audit cities [%] TE2031I - Proportion of working age population qualified at level 5 or 6 ISCED - TE2031V - DE1046V + DE1049V + DE1052V + DE1025V

Data specifications

EEA data references

None.

External data references
Eurostat Urban Audit database (45):

- TE2031I Proportion of working-age population qualified at level 5 or 6 ISCED.

**Uncertainties**

Uncertainties are related to education being one proxy of awareness and related corollary phenomena such as civic engagement. Education should be seen as a factor in building awareness, but it is not necessarily decisive in all cases. Also, other measures of education might be possible in this context, ranging from illiteracy to higher education. The choice between secondary and tertiary education is somewhat arbitrary. In the European context, using lower level differences in education would not differentiate between cities, but using tertiary education may overemphasise the role of university cities.

Data uncertainties could also be related to possible national differences in how students are registered as residents in cities. If students are not registered as residents, the indicator may show a substantially lower value.

**Indicator assessment**

Key question: What is the level of education of the city’s population indicating the potential to create a higher awareness and coping capacity?

**Web link to maps**

http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=c118515b02e84a61990247b4bd035b93

Map 3.30 Proportion of population aged 15 to 64, qualified at tertiary level (2008)
Map 3.31 Proportion of population aged 15 to 64 qualified at tertiary level (2012)
Map 3.32 Proportion of population aged 15 to 64 qualified at tertiary level (trend 2003–2012)

Cities with the highest percentage of people having a level of education following tertiary schooling in all years between 2003 and 2012 are present in Scandinavia, the Baltic States and the Benelux countries. This suggests that European cities might be divided in terms of response capacity based on this awareness proxy indicator. It also suggests that education and awareness do not necessarily correlate with income levels. This division could potentially be bridged by further developing knowledge exchange programmes and strengthening equity and participatory processes. It is quite evident that Polish cities form a cluster in the lower part of the index, with values below 10 %. The EU 2020 Agenda (46) has taken an significant step forward, by setting the target for tertiary graduation rates at an ambitious 40%.

Large differences can exist within one country: for instance, Hamm (11.4 %) and Erlangen (40.6 %) in Germany. The main industrial branches in Hamm are the coal-mining industry, steel industry, chemical industry and the car component supplier industry. Erlangen is dominated by the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg and the numerous branch offices of Siemens AG, as well as a large research Institute of the Fraunhofer Society and the Max Planck Institute for the Science of Light. These findings suggest that differences in education levels and awareness may arise between declining industrial areas and knowledge-intensive university cities, contributing to a higher response capacity for the latter.

---

3.11 Trust

Indicator definition

The share of respondents thinking, generally speaking, that most people in the city can be trusted (synthetic index 0–100), represented in [%] of the total respondents.

Justification of the indicator

The presence of competent and efficient institutions (defined as the formal and informal structures and practices that bind society) can enable adaptation to take place, and reduce the impacts of climate-related risks (IPCC, 2001). Countries that have well-developed and functioning institutions are considered to have a higher response capacity. Well-developed institutions and governance structures not only have the capacity to deal with present-day challenges, but also allow planning for the future.

Social capital has been seen as an elusive but important aspect of institutional adaptive capacity. It refers to the norms and networks that enable people to act collectively. One of the dimensions of social capital is trust, both in other people and in institutions. Thus, it can be seen as an underlying factor of institutional response capacity, relevant for predicting whether communities will act together in facing future challenges of climate change adaptation (Adger, 2003; Adger et al., 2009; Yohe and Tol, 2002).

Higher levels of trust are conducive to good governance, and they increase the probability that city residents will work together to enhance local response capacity.

Methodology

The perception surveys on the quality of life in European cities in 2009 (EC, 2010) and 2012 (EC, 2013c) aimed at measuring local perceptions in selected European cities. The data are based on surveys/interviews of randomly selected citizens. The Flash Eurobarometer survey (No 277) in 2009 included 75 cities, each with 500 randomly selected citizens (aged 15 and older) interviewed. This constituted a representative profile of the wider population; respondents were taken from all areas of the designated cities. In total, more than 37 500 interviews were conducted between 30 October and 10 November 2009. This perception survey included all capital cities of the countries concerned, together with between one and six more cities in the larger countries. Similarly, the Flash Eurobarometer survey (No 366) in 2012 was conducted in 79 cities and 4 areas surrounding big cities, with a total of more than 41 000 citizens interviewed between 15 November and 7 December of 2012.

The information is provided as ‘synthetic index’. From the perception survey data, an index was calculated by subtracting the negative answers from the positive ones, and dividing the result by the total number of answers (‘very much agree’ and ‘quite agree’ are counted as positive answers, whereas ‘very much disagree’ and ‘quite disagree’ are negative answers).This initial index has a minimum of – 1 and a maximum of + 1. To make it easier to use, the index was then multiplied by 50, and 50 was then added to the result. The resulting index covers values between 0 and 100. A value above 50 means positive answers predominate; values below 50 mean more negative answers.

Data specifications

EEA data references

None.

External data references
Urban Audit Perceptions Surveys 2009 and 2012 (EC, 2010 and 2013c). Alongside the Urban Audit data collection, in December 2006 and again in November 2009, a perception survey was conducted in 75 cities in the EU-28, and in 79 cities in 2012 (17).

Uncertainties

Perceptions of the interpersonal may be affected by multiple factors, and there is uncertainty as to how well perceptions on trust correspond to adaptive actions taken. The link between trust and response capacity is indirect. Similarly, changes in the levels of trust can be affected by many factors, and do not necessarily lead to proportional changes in response capacity.

Indicator assessment

Key question: What is the level of interpersonal trust in European cities with potential for a higher response capacity?

Web link to maps

http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=66898b22be334a7884e471a2d45f9f32

Map 3.27 Trust in other people (2009)

Map3.28 Trust in other people (2012)
Map 3.29 Trust in other people (trend in percentage, 2009–2012)

In both perception reports, for 2010 and 2013, cities in Germany, Austria, the Benelux and Scandinavian countries score particularly high on indicators relating to the qualifications of the population and social trust (Aalborg 90 %, Luxembourg (city) 87 %, Munich 84 %).

In the 2010 report, about one-third of the cities, less than half of the interviewees somewhat or strongly agreed that most of their fellow citizens could be trusted. Several capital cities of eastern European countries are at the lower end of the scale; these included Sofia, Bucharest, Budapest, Riga, Prague, Bratislava, Zagreb and Warsaw. In these capitals, between 21 % and 41 % of respondents generally agreed that most people living in their city could be trusted.

The survey of 2013 shows that in a large majority of the cities (64 out of 83), at least 50 % of respondents agreed that people can be trusted in their city. In 12 cities, this number exceeded 80 %, notably in Aalborg (92 %), Oulu (91 %), Groningen (90 %) and Oviedo (89 %). Of the 6 Nordic cities included in the scope of the survey, 5 recorded more than 80 %, the exception being Malmo (69 %).

With respect to changes from 2009 to 2012, the majority of cities in Europe show low variations in social trust, suggesting that the patterns are relatively stable over time. However, some high-ranking cities have seen negative trends (Berlin − 15 %, Luxembourg (city) − 11 %, Brussels − 7 %) while some southern and eastern cities have a more positive perception of this subject (Sofia + 86 %, Zagreb + 38 %, Riga + 39 %, Vilnius + 27 %, Naples + 26 %).
3.12 City commitment

Indicator definition

The share of respondents agreeing somewhat or strongly that their city was committed to fight climate change, represented in [%] of the total respondents.

Justification of the indicator

The indicator is based on the assumption that awareness of the issues of climate change leads to a greater chance of action not only on climate mitigation but also on adaptation. This seems to be justified, as cities committed to other sustainability issues tend to acknowledge the need for adaptation. Also, the climate change agenda in cities has expanded from mitigation to adaptation, and the two are increasingly addressed in parallel. A global survey among cities in the ICLEI network found that 79% of the cities observed changes in weather or occurrence of natural hazards that they attribute to climate change; 68% reported that they are pursuing adaptation planning (Carmin et al., 2012). Similar percentages have been reported in an EU survey on cities, with 70% reporting adaptation measures, even if most of these are in the ‘early stages of adaptation’ (AEA, 2012).

Methodology

The perception survey on the quality of life in European cities (EC, 2010 and 2013c) aimed at measuring local perceptions in 75 cities in the EU. The data are based on surveys/interviews of randomly selected citizens.

The information is provided as a ‘synthetic index’. From the perception survey data, an index was calculated by subtracting the negative answers from the positive ones, and dividing the result by the total number of answers (‘very much agree’ and ‘quite agree’ are counted as positive answers, whereas ‘very much disagree’ and ‘quite disagree’ are negative answers). This initial index has a minimum of –1 and a maximum of +1. To make it easier to use, the index was then multiplied by 50, and 50 was then added to the result. The resulting index covers values between 0 and 100. A value above 50 means positive answers predominate; below 50, there are more negative answers.

Data specifications

EEA data references

None.

External data references

Urban Audit Perceptions Survey 2009 and Survey 2012 (EC, 2010 and 2013c) Parallel to the Urban Audit data collection, in December 2006 and again in November 2009, a perception survey was conducted in 75 cities in the EU-28 (48).

Uncertainties

Perceptions of local government may be affected by multiple factors, and there is uncertainty as to how well perceptions on local climate action correspond to actions taken. The indicator does not differentiate between adaptation and mitigation of climate impacts. The data rely on perception surveys, where uncertainties may exist with respect to evaluating climate change commitments of local actors as opposed to perceptions derived from other local government actions.

(48) See http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview online.
Indicator assessment

Key question: To what extent are the local authorities committed to fight climate change?

Web link to maps

http://eea.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=50eb789e44044dbb2e27946c1e92c16

Map 3.30 Perception of the city population that authorities are committed to fight climate change (2009)
Map 3.31 Perception of the city population that authorities are committed to fight climate change (2012)
The cities where most citizens feel that their administration is committed to fighting climate change are predominantly located in western and northern Europe. Even if trends are negative in some western countries, overall, awareness-raising activities are expected to have more effect when they target eastern and southern countries.

The 2010 survey (field data of 2009) shows that the proportion of respondents who somewhat or strongly agreed that their city was committed to fight climate change (e.g. by promoting ecofriendly means of transport) ranged from 14% in Sofia to 76% in Luxembourg. Munich, Newcastle and Bordeaux joined Luxembourg at the higher end of the ranking (between 68% and 70% agreed), while Burgas and Palermo joined Sofia at the lower end (20% and 26% agreed, respectively). Considerably less variation was observed in the proportion of respondents who strongly agreed that their city was committed to fighting climate change — in the majority of cities in this study, between one-tenth and one-fifth of respondents expressed strong agreement.

In the 2013 survey (field data of 2012), when asked about their city's commitment to the fight against climate change, a majority of respondents in almost two-thirds of the cities surveyed (54 of 83) agree with this statement. In 8 cities, the level of agreement is at least 70%. The highest agreement rates are in Bordeaux, Strasbourg (both 81%), Zurich (79%) and Luxembourg (77%).

Trends in the perception that local authorities are fighting against climate change show some improvement for cities at the lower level, like Sofia (which saw an increase by 171%). This warrants
further research, but may suggest a phenomenon of ‘take-off’ in countries where climate change has not been on the agenda to date.

The 2009-to-2012 trend of people’s perception of the fight against climate change shows some interesting cases, representative of the different groups of trends and geographical areas in Europe. Comparing this survey with the indicator ‘Most people can be trusted’, reveals that some cities are in the same group of trends. Sofia is in the positive trend (+171 % and +86 %), Munich is in the equal group (0 % and −2 %), and Marseille is in the negative trend (−21 % and −35 %).
3.13 Cities engaged in initiatives

Indicator definition

A range of initiatives exist to address the environmental challenges that cities face through networking and competition between cities. This indicator shows the number of initiatives aiming at improving climate- (both adaptation and mitigation, including e.g. energy neutrality) and environment-related measures that a city is engaged in. Initiatives included in the indicator are: Mayors Adapt - Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy\textsuperscript{49}, Compact of Mayors\textsuperscript{50}, C40 with adaptation action\textsuperscript{51}, Making Cities Resilient (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, UNISDR)\textsuperscript{52}, European Green Capital Award (EGCA)\textsuperscript{53}, European Green Leaf (EGL)\textsuperscript{54}, Metropolis no regret\textsuperscript{55}, and Rockefeller 100 resilient cities\textsuperscript{56}.

Justification of the indicator

The indicator is based on the assumption that cities that are involved in one or more initiatives are more aware of the issues of climate change, which leads to a greater chance of action not only on climate mitigation but also on adaptation. Moreover, being involved in an initiative entails being involved in events and platforms that further the exchange of knowledge, lessons learned and good examples that will support cities in developing their own climate strategies.

Methodology

For a number of European cities and municipalities, the database contains binary values on the engagement in the eight above-mentioned climate-, energy- and environment-related initiatives (“1” if they are engaged, “0” if they aren’t) by the end of 2015. However, the European Green Capital Award on the one hand and the European Green Leaf on the other are mutually exclusive as the former applies to cities above 100.000 inhabitants whereas the latter addresses cities and towns with between 20.000 and 100.000 inhabitants. Moreover, the database only contains cities that are engaged in at least one initiative. By consequence, on the map (i.e. Map 3.33 below) the values (i.e., the sum of the single binary values) range from 1 to 7 as the maximum possible.

Map 3.34 below presents a subset of the cities and municipalities, that are engaged in the EU Mayors Adapt initiative. Map 3.35 is again another subset of cities and municipalities that are engaged in the UNISDR initiative “Making Cities Resilient”.

\textsuperscript{49} http://mayors-adapt.eu/
\textsuperscript{50} www.compactofmayors.org
\textsuperscript{51} http://www.c40.org/networks/climate_change_risk_assessment
\textsuperscript{52} http://www.unisdr.org/campaign/resilientcities
\textsuperscript{53} http://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/
\textsuperscript{54} http://ec.europa.eu/environment/europeangreencapital/europeangreenleaf/
\textsuperscript{55} http://www.circlesofclimate.org
\textsuperscript{56} http://www.100resilientcities.org
Data specifications

**EEA data references**

None.

**External data references**

Data of Mayors Adapt and Making Cities Resilient (UNISDR) are received from the secretariats directly. Data for the other initiatives are derived from the respective websites.

Uncertainties

The level of adaptation activity in the cities engaged in these initiatives can vary substantially, but they all have to comply with the minimum standards of the respective initiative. Further, cities may be very active in adaptation efforts without being involved in one of the European or international initiatives included in this indicator.

Some initiatives are closer related to adaptation (e.g., Mayors Adapt) and others only in a wider and less comprehensive way (e.g., Making Cities Resilient).

Several of the smaller municipalities could not be geographically located by any of the spatial databases available and did also not have metadata with coordinates attached to them. It was therefore necessary to extract Lat/Lon information from Wikipedia. Despite of this internet based coordinates search, two municipalities could not be located: Povera (IT) and Platten (AT). Consequently, those municipalities are not displayed on the map.

Indicator assessment

**Key question:** To what extent are the local authorities committed to be engaged in climate change adaptation and mitigation initiatives?
Most of the European cities included in the Map 3.33 are committed to one initiative, mostly the mayors Adapt - Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy (many in, a.o., Belgium, Greece, Italy and Spain)(Map 3.34) or Making Cities Resilient (many in, a.o., Austria and Italy)(Map 3.35). A substantial number of cities is committed to two initiatives in differing combinations; only few are committed to three or more initiatives. Only Barcelona is committed to all seven initiatives.
Since 2014, around 150 cities have committed themselves to taking adaptation action by signing up to the EU Mayors Adapt initiative by the end of 2015. The signatory cities either develop a comprehensive adaptation strategy or integrate climate change adaptation into relevant existing plans. Mayors Adapt follows the model of the Covenant of Mayors, which has become the key European initiative on urban mitigation action, with more than 6 700 signatories. In October 2015, the initiatives merged as a new Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy. The new covenant is open to non-European cities too and builds upon the success of the two original initiatives.

A high proportion of Mayors Adapt signatories have not yet developed an adaptation strategy or have not yet provided any information (www.mayors-adapt.eu/).
Cities participating in the UNISDR initiative Making Cities Resilient that have reported on the 10 Essentials (2015)

The global "Making Cities Resilient" campaign addresses issues of local governance and urban risk. Local governments are the closest level to the citizens and to their communities and local government officials are faced with the threat of disasters on a daily basis and need better access to policies and tools to effectively deal with them. The campaign is seeking to convince city leaders and local governments to commit to a checklist of Ten Essentials for Making Cities Resilient and to work alongside local activists, grassroots networks and national authorities. In 2015, 2551 cities globally are committed to the Campaign. The second phase that started in 2016 is dedicated to implementation. The Campaign now aims to ensure that the commitments made by governments are integrated into the local context.

Of the 470 European cities (EEA member countries) participating in UNISDR’s Making Cities Resilient campaign, only 118 have provided a 10 Essentials\(^{57}\) report by the end of 2015. The majority of those score 2 out of 5 on their average level of disaster risk preparedness. If the availability of a report indicates how seriously cities are taking the process, then few regions seem to be particularly active (Map Error! Reference source not found. 3.35). Cities in a few regions in Italy and Austria are in particular active.

---

\(^{57}\) The 10 Essentials describe disaster risk preparedness criteria that are generally relevant to addressing climate change impacts. However, it does not mean that climate change adaptation is systematically considered.
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Annex: Definition of the city and the city’s urban area

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper describes the methodology with which the spatial reference unit for the production of many of the urban vulnerability indicators presented in the report have been computed.

There are two ways to delineate a city boundary: (i) with the administrative ‘city’ or ‘greater city’ (where available) used as an approximation of the city in the Urban Audit\(^{58}\), and (ii) with the urban morphological zones (UMZ) produced for the EEA\(^{59}\). While the Urban Audit city/greater city is the administrative reference unit for many socio-economic indicators (with all the known weaknesses that administrative boundaries have when it comes to European comparisons, e.g. different scales), the UMZs better reflect the physical outlines of the cities.

To take advantage of both reference units (accepted and coded reference for European socio-economic indicators on the one hand, and the better representation of the real city boundary on the other hand), both data sets have been combined by applying GIS geoprocessing techniques. Input data, workflow and results are presented in the paragraphs below.

2. INPUT DATA SETS

As mentioned in the introduction, the two input data sets are:

- The city/greater city layer from the Urban Audit;
- the UMZs 2006.

For most cities the boundary used in the Urban Audit corresponds to the general perception of that city. In most countries, the city/greater city corresponds to the level LAU2.

An UMZ is defined as ‘a set of urban areas laying less than 200 m apart’. Those urban areas are defined with land cover classes contributing to the urban tissue and function. UMZ are derived from CORINE Land Cover (CLC) by using urban core classes (residential, industrial and commercial, green urban areas) and adding enlarged core classes if they fulfil certain neighbourhood conditions of the core classes.

\(^{58}\) [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/spatial-units](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/spatial-units)

3. PROCESSING

Both data sets are available as shape files. First, both data sets are overlaid, and subsequently, the UMZs, which contain many more objects than the city/greater city layers, are clipped by the outlines of the cities or greater city defined in the Urban Audit database. The result is an UMZ layer that only contains those UMZ objects that are located within the cities/greater city. UMZ objects that cross the city/greater city boundaries are cut off along the borders. The last processing step is the creation of one UMZ per city/greater city, so that all UMZ objects located within the city/greater city become one object (they are logically rather than physically connected, i.e. they possess only one object ID).

These objects build the basic spatial reference unit for the computation of further indicators, in particular for extraction of the Urban Atlas information. This spatial unit is called the ‘city’s urban area’ here.
Map A1.2 Workflow illustration; city of Luxembourg in red (left), containing UMZs located inside the city in grey; the resulting Urban Atlas map of the city’s urban area (right)

Data sources:
UMZ_v15_2006 Urban Morphological Zones 2006 (EEA)

Urban Audit database (Eurostat)
http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/cities/overview

Urban Atlas (EEA)