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INTRODUCTION
Public funding for reducing risks of natural hazards is getting scarcer. At least in Austria, the budget for technical mitigation against mountain hazards is actually stagnating at approx. € 160 million per annum. Hence, economic efficiency and prioritization of measures that reduce risks due to natural hazards is of high importance. This paper compiles the results of the work package “Alpine Hazards” of the EU-FP7 project ConHaz. Starting with a general description of Alpine hazards and specific vulnerabilities of mountain regions, an analysis of current methods of cost assessments in countries within the European Alps was done for the cost categories of direct, indirect and intangible costs. Moreover, different methods for decision support are described and evaluated. Parallel, data on real losses and actual expenses for public safety were gathered. Finally, research gaps, end-user needs, and recommendations for cost assessments of the different damage categories are discussed.

ALPINE HAZARDS AND SPECIAL VULNERABILITIES OF MOUNTAIN AREAS
Relief energy can be seen as the key driver of hazardous processes and consecutive losses. So, mountain hazards or Alpine hazards are risks triggered by the downhill movement of water, snow, ice, debris and rocks (UNDR0 1991). These processes include avalanches, floods, debris flows, and landslides. Moreover, Alpine hazards are characterised by intermixtures of mediums and multiple processes as well as cascade effects. In addition, there is very limited space for settlement and economic activities in mountain regions. Combined with a mostly high concentration of assets in valleys, missing possibilities of the substitution of lifelines, especially lateral valleys are at high risk of getting isolated as a consequence of road blockages. Besides these predispositions, Alpine economies depend to a high share on tourism and have a high variability of (temporal) residents.

DATA ON ALPINE HAZARDS - SCALE AND PURPOSE DRIVEN
We analysed different data sources for the occurrences of mountain hazards in the European Alps at the supranational and national scale and associated damages. Although the DOMODIS guideline (Hübl et al., 2002) can serve as a common framework for event documentation, the data bases implemented in the different countries differ. Due to different scopes and entry thresholds, data entries are inconsistent and difficult to compare. For example, national data bases are much more detailed than global data bases, which totally underestimate local and regional events with a relatively low economic loss. Further, there is a huge data gap with regard to indirect losses. So, a minimum standard for data collection and storage, more international collaboration and linking event and damage data would be wishful.

COST TYPES OF NATURAL HAZARDS
In general, the assessment of costs triggered by natural hazards can be done before (ex-ante) and after (ex-post) an event. Tab.1 compiles the most important cost categories related to the risk cycle.
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Tab. 1 Overview about cost types occurring in different stages of hazard events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stage of risk cycle</th>
<th>emergency management and response</th>
<th>reconstruction and recovery</th>
<th>event and risk analysis</th>
<th>prevention and preparedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main cost category</td>
<td>variable operational costs</td>
<td>ex-post damage and losses</td>
<td>planning costs and decision support</td>
<td>costs for risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples</td>
<td>emergency management</td>
<td>direct losses (asset losses)</td>
<td>risk analysis</td>
<td>annual costs for emergency infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rescue</td>
<td>losses due to business interruption</td>
<td>ex-ante estimation of costs and benefits of risk reduction options</td>
<td>investment and construction costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health care and supply</td>
<td>(long-term) output losses (indirect losses)</td>
<td>concept and design of risk reduction measures</td>
<td>costs for operation, use, maintenance and disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repair critical infrastructure</td>
<td>losses of non-market goods (intangible effects)</td>
<td>decision support for choosing the optimal risk reduction option (e.g. CBA)</td>
<td>co-costs (e.g. environmental costs), co-benefits (e.g. recreational areas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIRECT, INDIRECT AND INTANGIBLE LOSSES - SOME FACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Damage functions are a common approach to assess direct damages of different alpine hazards. However, most studies focus on direct damage on buildings, whereas very little is known about damage to infrastructure. Also, there is a lack of multi-hazard approaches. More detailed methods are needed - preferably with regional damage functions that include intensity as well as resistance parameters. Furthermore, efforts to assess multiple hazard losses by an integrated approach should be enhanced. In the case of (long-term) indirect effects, only macro-economic and primarily science-based approaches are known. Therefore, on the local and regional scale, methods should be developed to assess interruptions of economic activities. Network failure approach is currently the best available method for the regional scale, but these approaches often neglect the measurement of economic flows. Further research on possible methods for the evaluation of indirect effects and case studies in Alpine valleys should be undertaken. Loss of life as an intangible loss is frequently quantified by counting casualties and injured people, but occasionally also by assessing e.g. the value of a statistical life. Other intangible effects are usually not assessed although a lot of approaches exist. However, the usefulness and reliability of such estimates are questioned by stakeholders. There is a great need for knowledge transfer on available valuation methods, participatory approaches and cooperation among different hazard communities.

CONCLUSIONS

Cost assessments of damage, prevention and response measures to natural hazards provide crucial information for decision support and policy development in the fields of natural hazard and risk management as well as of planning for adaptation to climate change. Given that a multiplicity of analyses and case studies exist for assessing costs of alpine hazards, mitigation and adaptation measures as well as their benefits, the identification, compilation and assessment of such methods is essential as a basis for recommendations to end-users for assessing costs of natural risks. Moreover, a reliable costing approach for the complex hazard situations is desirable and should be part of a comprehensive risk management and adaptation strategy.
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