



Global Tsunami Model -Tsunami Hazard Assessment – the way forward towards Tsunami Risk analysis and mitigation

Steven J. Gibbons, Norwegian Geotechnical Institute

and the Global Tsunami Model team

Acknowledgement

This work has received funding from the European High-Performance Computing Joint Undertaking (JU) under Grant Agreement No 101093038 (ChEESE-2P).









Background:

Why GTM?

GTM – The Global Tsunami Model

- Previous multi-institutional work on hazard and risk for UNISDR/UNDRR
 - Need for a Collective effort for improved understanding of global tsunami hazard and risk
 - Need for a competence center for tsunami hazard and risk assessment









NG



GTM's vision: Saving lives, reducing losses, and enhancing resilience through the advancement of tsunami science, provision of expert information, promoting dialog about tsunami hazard and risk

GTM's mission: Within community building







A competence center for tsunami hazard and risk Establish curated pools of experts and training the next generation Promote and foster the implementation of state-of-the-art scientific developments

Within scientific products and services

Provide services and products related to tsunami hazard and risk Develop reference tsunami hazard and risk models and maps Improve and develop tsunami analysis methods, tools and good practices

Within outreach and collaboration

Contribute to multi-hazard and risk assessment Communicate uncertainty transparently Work with users of tsunami hazard and risk products to ensure relevance Contribute to risk management reduction and education; to fulfil the SFDRR 2015-2030 and SDGs

GTM Evolution:



Formation of the legal entity - GTM Association

Global Tsunami Model Association – first organization formally representing GTM - formally founded 29.9.2024 in Rome

(founded as a German e.V. - *eingetragener Verein*, or non-economic association)

- Further rounds of registration before the organization will start to work effectively
- First General Assembly expected to be held in conjunction with the EGU General Assembly in Vienna late April 2025
- GTM will invite institutions and researchers working within tsunami hazard and risk analysis and related fields as members

(Presently updating institutions that have previously signed Letters of Interest)

• Discussions with supporters and sponsors will be initiated









GTM Core Products – High TRL products and services

- Fully global and regional PTHA
- Offshore hazard curves with uncertainty
- Onshore extrapolation (e.g. GIS)
- Local PTHA execution
- Workflows for PTHA execution
- HPC support
- Expert Brokerage
- Panels and Developers for PTHA at different scales
- Support related to Early Warning
- On demand consultancy services from partners e.g.
- Modelling and hazard from non-seismic sources
- Hazard and Risk assessment
- Support related to Early Warning







Tsumaps-NEAM regional assessment





HPC support – PTHA execution





Landslide tsunami modelling



A global probabilistic tsunami hazard assessment from earthquake sources

GARETH DAVIES^{*1}, JONATHAN GRIFFIN¹, FINN LØVHOLT², SYLFEST GLIMSDAL², CARL HARBITZ², HONG KIE THIO³, STEFANO LORITO⁴, ROBERTO BASILI⁴, JACOPO SELVA⁴, ERIC GEIST⁵ & MARIA ANA BAPTISTA^{6,7}

Publication: Geological Society, London, Special Publications • Volume 456 • Pages 219 - 244 https://doi.org/10.1144/SP456.5



Within the EUROHPC-JU funded project ChEESE-2P (Center of Excellence for Exascale in the Solid Earth), an update to the Global Tsunami Hazard Map is being developed: The Global Tsunami Model Probabilistic Tsunami Hazard Assessment WorkFlow (GTM PTHA WF)

This flagship GTM product involves the following objectives in short, medium, and long term perspectives:

- A Global Hazard Model Workflow (The GTM PTHA Engine)
- Standardized output for Risk Calculations
- Flexibility in input seismic source model
- Multiple scales (both source and coastline)
- Heterogeneous slip
- Interoperability with GEM Input/Output
- Interoperability with
 Probabilistic Tsunami Forecast (PTF)
- Incorporation of tides
- Modelling future sea-level rise



- REAL EXAMPLES CHEESE
- Important to encapsulate the GTM Global Hazard Model in a workflow that
 - can be adapted to different scales/different seismic source models
- Important to be interoperable with existing products, e.g. OpenQuake (both input and output)

GTM global tsunami

NG





15°E 16°E 17°E 18°E 19°E



Romano et al. (2016, 2020)

NG

B) 200 GP lit∨ Subduction earthquakes (BL99) Data median (2km depth bins) Depth-dependent fit 30 GPa PRFM 10 20 30 Depth (km)

37°N

36°N

15°E 16°E 17°E 18°E 19°E

Depth dependence

Davies and Griffin (2019)

Greater complexity both at source and coastline









- PTHA to Support local decision making
- Science informed decision making, planning, and capacity building
- Models adaptable for local tsunami risk reduction

NGI ChEESE

Application of PTHA results to defining evacuation maps

frontiers

GTM global tsunami

NG

in Earth Science



"From hazard to risk: The science of planning for future tsunamis" November 7-8, 2024, Eugene, Oregon

Watch/Red Area (Rd 10c=15.1m)

Worst case inundation

Watch/Red Area (Rd tor=13.2m)

Worst case inundation

15.34

15.34

ARISTOTLE – example of rapid post assessment – exposure integration

NG



Calculation of exposed persons for a large potential earthquake close to Japan

Putting it all together – past examples from GAR 2015. The new PTHA products can give refined opportunities

Loss Exceedance Curves/Probable maximum loss







New GTM Hazard model can potentially enable a first step towards improved loss modelling

- Improved quantitative loss models
- Compatibility with OpenQuake interoperatbility with . GEM products on hazard and risk and risk integration
- Improved hazard representation globally integrating new hazard improvements
- Global to local scaling
- Better risk information
- NB this analysis would mainly concern direct loss due to building damage
- Dialogue with Insurance sector necessary for further integration to estimate insured losses

Knowledge Gaps – Tsunami Hazard Assessment

(from Behrens et al., 2001)

Knowledge Gaps in Source Representation

Gaps in Earthquake Source Representation

Limited Past Events and Data to Inform Hazard Models (S1)

Fault Identification, Fault and Source Zone Parameterization and Tsunamigenic Potential Characterization (S2)

Variety, Complexity, and Dynamics of Fault Mechanics (S3)

Empirical Scaling Relations (S4)

Complex, Non-stationary Seismic Cycle (S5)

Gaps in Volcanic Source Representation

Variety of Potential Volcanic Sources (V1)

Difficulties in Constraining Recurrence Rates (V2)

Gaps in Modeling Tsunami Generation and Propagation (V3)

Lack of Data From the Geological Record (V4)

Limited Availability of Well Recorded Past Events or Benchmark Studies (V5)



Gaps in Landslide Source Representation Lack of Understanding and Likelihoods for

Difference of Onshore and Offshore Landslides (L2)

Limited Constraints on landslide dynamics/material behavior (L3)

Limited Availability of Benchmarks (L4)

Tsunamigenic Landslide Volumes (L1)



Limited Past Events to Inform Hazard Models (L5)

Gaps in Meteorological Source Representation

Lack of Understanding the Potential and Likelihood for Tsunamigenic Meteorological Patterns (M1)

High Sensitivity to Several Parameters and Lack of Understanding of Local Amplification Factors (M2)

Limited Availability of Benchmark Studies (M3)

Limited Past Events and Data to Inform Hazard Models (M4)

) CRS

Gaps in Modelling Intensity

Gaps in Hydrodynamic Tsunami Modeling, Generation, Propagation, and Run-up

PTHA Uncertainty Treatment for Tsunami Inundation Processes (H1)

Tsunami Generation (H2)

Uncertainty and Variability due to Numerical Model for Tsunami Propagation (H3)

Nonlinearity and Resonances (H4) – includes e.g. tides

Quantifying the Influence of Modeling Assumptions and Scaling (H5)

Modeling Situations With Complex Tsunami Inundation (H6)





Knowledge Gaps – Vulnerability and Risk

(from Behrens et al., 2001)

Gaps in Exposure Modeling

Lack of Detail (E1) – e.g. often missing tsunami-relevant info

Lack of Exposure Data (E2)

Lack of Tsunami Exposure Model and Taxonomy (E3)

Spatio-Temporal Variability (E4)

Gaps in Physical Vulnerability Methods

Limitation in Asset Types and Geographical Scope (P1)

Effect of Multiple Hazard on Empirical Tsunami Fragility Mode (P2)

Lack of Consensus Regarding Best Tsunami Intensity Measure (P3)

Gaps in Building Analysis and Assessment for Use in Analytical Tsunami Fragility (P4)

Gaps in Risk and Resilience Metrics

Gaps Related to Characterization and Propagation of Uncertainties (R1) Challenges in Characterizing Vulnerability Functions (R2) Lack of a Tsunami Consequences Database (R3) General Lack of Risk Studies for Networks and Lifelines (R4) Assessing Tsunami Risk in a Multi-Hazard and Multi-Risk Framework (R5) Lack of Understanding and Quantification of Mortality (R6) The Weakness of Capturing Multi-Faceted Aspects of Vulnerability (R7)

Gaps in Social Vulnerability, Multi-Dimensional Vulnerability and Risk Indicators

The Difficulty of "Quantifying" Social Vulnerability (I1)

Ambiguities in Definition of Community Resilience (I2)

Lack of Tsunami Vulnerability Index (I3)

Integrated Approaches to Consider the Multi-Dimensional Aspects of Tsunami Risk (I4)

Considering Community Response and Organizational Capacities (I5)

Incorporating Risk Perception in the Formulation and Analysis of Complex Risks (I6)



Towards tsunami risk analysis and mitigation – selected knowledge gaps (I)

- Limitations in present day physical vulnerability models limits risk understanding
 - Possible way forward: Provide datasets of validated empirical and analytical vulnerability models for regional risk assessment.
 - Methods:
 - Numerical modelling of structural response, Loss modelling, Statistical modelling
 - Applications: Catastrophe (CAT) Modelling, Assessment of incurred losses for emergency planning

- Limited overview of the social impact and capacity for understanding risk - this will affect how effective mitigation measures will be
 - Possible way forward:
 - Provide research into and develop indicators for tsunami preparedness, inclusiveness of the warnings systems and evacuation plans.
 - Methods:

participatory methods (focus groups, surveys, expert elicitation), geospatial modelling

• Applications:

Emergency and Evacuation Planning, Prevention, capacity building, Disaster risk-based urban planning



•

Towards tsunami risk analysis and mitigation – selected knowledge gaps (II)

- Limitations in understanding of human exposure and risk to tsunami inundation
 - **Possible way forward:** Conduct research to improve high-res, spatio-temporal maps of human exposure.

• Methods:

Data collection from local communities, Machine-learning, Agent-based modelling

• Applications:

Emergency Planning, "On-the-fly" exposure capture for impact forecasting

- Limited understanding of cascading impacts of tsunamis and societal resilience
 - Possible way forward:

Provide research into impact of tsunami on lifelines and supply chains, household economy (micro-economical metrics).

- Methods: Risk-integrated approaches Consequence Models.
- Applications: Emergency and Evacuation Planning, Disaster risk-based urban planning, CAT Modelling, Estimate of Contingent Business Interruption



Summary

- The Global Tsunami Model (GTM) is now established as a formal entity
- A main objective of GTM is to help reducing losses from tsunamis (c.f. SFDRR)
- The first technical priority in GTM is to provide a robust, updateable, and scalable Global Probabilistic Hazard model.

(Currently updating the existing global hazard model)

- The global model should be interoperable with OpenQuake to provide compatibility with GEM products and more seamlessly provide risk products
- We are taking the first steps towards using the hazard products towards risk mitigation e.g.
 - Evacuation maps
 - Rapid response analysis
 - Loss modelling
 - Vulnerability and risk analysis is a more immature discipline than PTHA
- Vital to have a risk community to improve our knowledge and procedures, and provide standards
 - This would be an important objective and the next step beyond the new global hazard model





On safe ground