

1 **Tier-based approaches for landslide**  
2 **susceptibility assessment in Europe**

3 Andreas Günther<sup>1,\*</sup>, Paola Reichenbach<sup>2</sup>, Jean-Philippe Malet<sup>3</sup>, Miet Van Den  
4 Eeckhaut<sup>4</sup>, Javier Hervás<sup>4</sup>, Claire Foster<sup>5</sup>, Fausto Guzzetti<sup>2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> *Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources, Hannover, Germany*

6 <sup>2</sup> *Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Istituto di Ricerca per la Protezione*  
7 *Idrogeologica, Perugia, Italy*

8 <sup>3</sup> *Institut de Physique du Globe de Strasbourg (CNRS UMR 7516), Université de*  
9 *Strasbourg / EOST, Strasbourg France*

10 <sup>4</sup> *Institute for Environment and Sustainability, Joint Research Centre, European*  
11 *Commission, Ispra (VA), Italy*

12 <sup>5</sup> *British Geological Survey, Nottingham, United Kingdom*

13  
14 \* Correspondence:

15 Andreas Günther

16 *Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources*  
17 *Stilleweg 2, D-30655 Hannover, Germany*

18 Phone: +49 +511 643 2448

19 Email: a.guenther@bgr.de

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

# Abstract

In the framework of the European Soil Thematic Strategy and the associated proposal of a Framework Directive on the protection and sustainable use of soil, landslides were recognised as a soil threat requiring specific strategies for priority area identification, spatial hazard assessment and management. This contribution outlines the general specifications for nested, Tier-based geographical landslide zonings at small spatial scales to identify priority areas susceptible to landslides (Tier 1), and to perform quantitative susceptibility evaluations within these (Tier 2). A heuristic, synoptic-scale Tier 1 assessment exploiting a reduced set of geo-environmental factors derived from common pan-European data sources is proposed for the European Union and adjacent countries. Evaluation of the susceptibility estimate with national-level landslide inventory data suggests that a zonation of Europe according to e.g. morphology and climate, and performing separate susceptibility assessments per zone could give more reliable results. To improve the Tier 1 assessment, a geomorphological terrain zoning and landslide typology differentiation are then applied for France. A multivariate landslide susceptibility assessment using additional information on landslide conditioning and triggering factors, together with a historical catalogue of landslides, is proposed for Tier 2 analysis. An approach is tested for priority areas in Italy using small administrative mapping units, allowing for relating socio-economic census data with landslide susceptibility, which is mandatory for decision making regarding the adoption of landslide prevention and mitigation measures. The paper concludes with recommendations on further work to harmonise European landslide susceptibility assessments in the context of the European Soil Thematic Strategy.

*Keywords: Small-scale landslide zoning, Heuristic Tier 1 assessment, Statistical Tier 2 assessment, European Soil Thematic Strategy, Common landslide susceptibility criteria, Europe.*

# 1 Introduction

2 Landslide susceptibility is the likelihood of a landslide occurring in an area  
3 controlled by local terrain conditions (e.g., Brabb 1984; Guzzetti et al. 1999; Fell  
4 et al. 2008). It is the degree to which a terrain can be affected by future slope  
5 movements. Susceptibility does not consider the temporal probability of failure  
6 (i.e., when or how frequently landslides occur), or the magnitude of the expected  
7 events (i.e., how large or destructive possible failures may be) (Committee on the  
8 Review of the National Landslide Hazards Mitigation Strategy 2004). With this  
9 respect, landslide susceptibility evaluations resembling basic spatial landslide  
10 zoning differ from landslide hazard (e.g., Guzzetti et al. 1999; van Westen et al.  
11 2005), and landslide risk assessments (e.g., Glade et al. 2005; Fell et al. 2008).

12         The relevance of landslide zoning for environmental policy and decision  
13 making in Europe is set forth in the framework of the European Union’s Thematic  
14 Strategy for Soil Protection, adopted on 22 September 2006 (EC 2006a). This  
15 Strategy considers landslides as one of eight soil threats in Europe for which it is  
16 necessary to identify areas where landslides are likely to occur in the future, and  
17 where measures to reduce the impact of the threat have to be designed. To achieve  
18 these objectives, a Soil Framework Directive was proposed as a legislative  
19 initiative (EC 2006b, EC 2012). The importance of landslide zoning through  
20 spatial susceptibility assessments in Europe is additionally recognised in the  
21 European Commission’s approach to natural and man-made disaster prevention  
22 (EC 2009). Furthermore, the production of comparable maps for European Union  
23 member countries showing the expected spatial distribution of major threats  
24 including landslides has been recommended by the European Commission as a  
25 first step towards producing national-level risk maps for disaster emergency  
26 management using coherent and consistent risk assessment methodologies (EC  
27 2010).

28         To identify areas of interest for landslide zonation, the Soil Information  
29 Thematic Working Group (SIWG) of the European Soil Bureau Network (ESBN)  
30 selected i) a set of *common criteria* (i.e., environmental and thematic factor data  
31 to predict landslide susceptibility), including landslide occurrence or density,  
32 topography, bedrock, soil type, land cover, land use, climate and seismicity  
33 (Eckelmann et al. 2006), and ii) a nested assessment approach based on “Tiers”.  
34 In this context, a Tier 1 assessment is aimed at the general identification of

1 priority areas threatened by landslides using *common criteria* derived from  
2 available spatial datasets through a qualitative evaluation procedure combined  
3 with thresholds. The Tier 2 assessment is intended to perform quantitative  
4 landslide susceptibility analyses in priority areas identified by Tier 1 incorporating  
5 additional (including not yet existent) data. This framework should allow the EU  
6 member countries to delineate priority areas through a Tier 1 assessment  
7 exploiting either pan-European, low-resolution data or spatial information with  
8 higher resolution available at national or regional levels. For the identification of  
9 priority areas through Tier 1, these have to be combined with a suitable threshold  
10 to discriminate priority areas against terrains where no further action has to be  
11 taken.

12           Since the two Tiers can be conducted at various spatial scales depending  
13 on input data resolution and spatial extent, Tier 2 should not be considered an  
14 alternative for priority area delineation through Tier 1 but rather should provide  
15 more accurate spatial information for the establishment of targets and programmes  
16 of measures to combat soil threats in the EU member states (EC 2006b). The  
17 proposal for the soil framework directive attempts to provide a general framework  
18 to enable the member countries to identify priority areas, decide on appropriate  
19 general measures and targets to fight soil degradation within these, and enable a  
20 reporting policy on this (EC 2006b). In terms of landslides, the Tier-based  
21 concept for susceptibility evaluation must therefore be regarded to support general  
22 EU policy implementation but not as a regulation for measures to mitigate and  
23 monitor individual landslides and their consequences.

24           The initial work of the SIWG was put forward by the European Landslide  
25 Expert Group (<http://eusoiils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/library/themes/Landslides>) established in 2007  
26 at JRC Ispra (Hervás et al. 2007). It was recognized that since a comprehensive,  
27 distributed landslide inventory does not exist over Europe and many European  
28 regions lack information on landslides (Van Den Eeckhaut and Hervás 2012),  
29 index-based heuristic susceptibility evaluations calibrated and validated with  
30 regional level landslide data should be envisaged for continental-level Tier 1  
31 assessments (Hervás et al. 2007, Günther et al. 2008). It was further specified that  
32 Tier 1 should be performed using reduced spatial information on solely three  
33 environmental factors supposed to have a major control on all types of landslides  
34 (e.g., van Westen et al. 2009): terrain gradient, lithology and land cover.

1 Important variables merely related to landslide triggering like spatial information  
2 on groundwater and soil moisture conditions, precipitation or seismicity were  
3 excluded at this stage, because they reveal a high degree of temporal variability  
4 and are more suitable for hazard analysis. As a mapping unit, a grid cell with a  
5 size depending on input data resolution and analysis extent was recommended. A  
6 continental-level Tier 1 assessment should be prepared employing a 1 km x 1 km  
7 grid cell (Hervás et al. 2007). Tier 2 evaluations should be carried out through  
8 inventory-based, statistical analyses utilizing a wider range of environmental and  
9 triggering factor data. To allow for decision on measures/implementation plans  
10 for the landslide threat, it was recommended to use terrain units of appropriate  
11 size for the analysis. These may consist of administrative, agro-economic or  
12 geomorphometric entities allowing for a direct association of landslide  
13 susceptibility with economic or population-based census data.

14 In this work, we first present and evaluate the results of an experiment  
15 carried out in the framework of the European Landslide Expert Group, aimed at  
16 producing a preliminary synoptic-scale, index-based, landslide susceptibility  
17 assessment for Europe, reflecting a basic continental Tier 1 susceptibility  
18 evaluation. Next, we present and discuss two national-scale landslide  
19 susceptibility assessments and their associated terrain zonations for France and  
20 Italy. The example for France resembles a more advanced Tier 1 assessment since  
21 it uses the same type of reduced geo-environmental data and does not necessarily  
22 require information on landslide distribution, but introduces a differentiation  
23 according to terrain physiography and landslide typology. The example for Italy  
24 represents a small-scale Tier 2 quantitative susceptibility analysis within priority  
25 areas as defined by the continental-level Tier 1 assessment. This analysis is based  
26 on distributed landslide information and additional thematic data. We conclude  
27 discussing problems and advantages of the presented small-scale landslide  
28 susceptibility analyses, and pointing out future work to be done to improve both  
29 Tier 1 and Tier 2-compatible attempts for harmonised landslide zoning in the  
30 context of the European Soil Thematic Strategy.

31

# 1 **Basic continental-level Tier 1 assessment over**

## 2 **Europe**

3 We prepared a synoptic-scale landslide susceptibility model and an associated  
4 susceptibility map for Europe at 1:1M scale to identify priority areas for landslide  
5 zoning. The map covers the 27 EU member countries (except Cyprus) in addition  
6 to Norway, Switzerland and the Balkan states (Fig. 1). As mapping unit, a grid  
7 cell size of 1 km x 1 km was selected (Hervás et al. 2007). In this section, we first  
8 describe the data and the data evaluation approach adopted to prepare the zonation  
9 of landslide susceptibility in Europe. Then we discuss the validation of the  
10 synoptic landslide susceptibility zonation in France, Great Britain and Italy, three  
11 European countries for which comprehensive landslide information was available  
12 to us. Last, we compare the continental landslide susceptibility map with other  
13 global (Nadim et al. 2006; Hong et al. 2007) and continental (Schmidt-Thomé  
14 2006) landslide susceptibility and hazard evaluations that may also be considered  
15 for continental scale Tier 1 assessments.

### 17 **Data**

18 To model landslide susceptibility in Europe, we used small-scale geo-  
19 environmental information available in digital format from public sources,  
20 including information on terrain gradient (slope), lithology, and land cover (Table  
21 1). Information on terrain gradient was obtained from the GTOPO30 global  
22 elevation model  
23 ([http://eros.usgs.gov/#/Find\\_Data/Products\\_and\\_Data\\_Available/gtopo30\\_info](http://eros.usgs.gov/#/Find_Data/Products_and_Data_Available/gtopo30_info)). This global  
24 digital coverage of topography has a horizontal grid spacing of 30 arc seconds  
25 (approximately 1 km), and was completed in 1996 by the USGS EROS Data  
26 Center. Terrain slope was computed from the elevation data in a Geographical  
27 Information System (GIS). We acknowledge that the computed slope values, in  
28 the range 0 - 38.9° (average = 2.3°, standard deviation = 3.4°), do not represent  
29 the actual terrain gradient at any specific point, and we consider the computed  
30 slope a proxy for the general topographic gradient in the study area.

31 Spatial information on lithology was obtained exploiting the European Soil  
32 Database (ESDB) (Heineke et al. 1998; Panagos et al. 2012;  
33 [http://eussoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB\\_Archive/ESDB/index.htm](http://eussoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/ESDB_Archive/ESDB/index.htm)). The geometry of the ESDB

1 is provided by soil mapping units (SMU), which can be related to more than 20  
2 attributes of so-called Soil Typological Units (STU) describing several properties  
3 of dominant and co-dominant soils. To obtain the lithological information  
4 required for the analysis, the attribute “dominant parent material” at level 2  
5 (MAT12), subdivided in 41 classes of soil parent material, was selected. The  
6 SMU polygons attributed to MAT12 have been rasterized at a 1 km × 1 km grid  
7 resolution. The soil parent material information attributed in the ESDB comprises  
8 first-order genetic and petrologic information on geological materials on which  
9 soils evolve, derived from different European geological map datasets (Finke et  
10 al. 2001). We have chosen the dominant parent material data from the ESDB  
11 against alternative digital data (e.g., solid bedrock geology from the International  
12 Geological Map of Europe; Asch 2005) as a proxy for near-surface lithology  
13 because of its higher resolution and because it also renders spatial information on  
14 the distribution of quaternary and unconsolidated geological materials.

15 We obtained spatial information on land cover from the Pan-European  
16 Land Cover Monitoring Project (PELCOM) which produced a gridded, 1 km × 1  
17 km resolution land cover database for the period 1996-1999 ([http://www.geo-](http://www.geo-informatie.nl/projects/pelcom/)  
18 [informatie.nl/projects/pelcom/](http://www.geo-informatie.nl/projects/pelcom/)). The land cover information, in 14 classes, was  
19 obtained from multi-temporal and multi-spectral NOAA-AVHRR satellite  
20 imagery and other ancillary data (namely CORINE and Digital Chart of the  
21 World). For the purpose of this study, terrains covered by the three classes ice and  
22 snow, sea, and inland waters were excluded from the analysis, and eleven classes  
23 of land cover were considered.

24 For the synoptic-scale analysis of landslide susceptibility in Europe, we re-  
25 classified the terrain gradient, lithological, and land cover information in a  
26 reduced number of classes, including: (i) five classes of terrain slope, (ii) five  
27 lithological classes representing major lithological complexes as derived from the  
28 soil parent material information, and (iii) five land cover classes (Fig. 2). The  
29 reclassification of the input data was based on our understanding of the landslide  
30 phenomena in Europe, and on the known or expected relevance of the three  
31 considered environmental factors in controlling the susceptibility to landslides.  
32 However, it should be mentioned that the proposed parameter classification tries  
33 to globally specify the input data for all types of landslides and has clear  
34 limitations with respect to regionally differentiated interpretations (see further).

1 In addition to the mentioned environmental data, we used national-scale  
2 landslide information for France, Great Britain, and Italy (Fig. 3) to evaluate the  
3 preliminary European susceptibility zonation. The three countries cover 22% of  
4 the study area. For France, we used the national landslide database BDMvT (a  
5 French acronym for *Base de Données Nationale Mouvements de Terrain*,  
6 <http://www.bdmvt.net/>) (Fig. 3A). The inventory is the result of a joint effort of the  
7 Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières, the Laboratoire des Ponts et  
8 Chaussées, and the Restauration des Terrain en Montagne. The database contains  
9 information on 17,598 landslides (June 2010), including movement type (Varnes  
10 1978), geographical location, date and time of occurrence, state of activity, and  
11 damage caused by the collected landslides. For Great Britain, we used the  
12 National Landslide Database produced and maintained by the British Geological  
13 Survey, which lists detailed information on 15,897 landslides (October 2011).  
14 Compilation of the database started in the late 1980's through a combination of  
15 existing data sources. Since then, information on more than 6,000 additional  
16 landslides was added to the database (Foster et al. 2008; Evans et al. 2011) (Fig.  
17 3B). For Italy, we used the catalogue of historical landslides compiled by the AVI  
18 project (an Italian acronym for *Aree Vulnerate Italiane*, Areas Affected by  
19 Landslides and Floods in Italy, <http://sici.irpi.cnr.it/>) through a methodical search  
20 of national, regional, and local chronicles and historical archives (Guzzetti et al.  
21 1994; Guzzetti and Tonelli 2004). Landslides listed in the catalogue were mapped  
22 as points at 1:25,000 or 1:100,000 scale, and a level of geographic accuracy, in  
23 five classes, was attributed to each mapped landslide. The original AVI catalogue  
24 covers the period from pre-1900 to 2002. To minimize the effects of  
25 incompleteness in the early period of the catalogue, for the assessment of  
26 landslide susceptibility we selected 15,503 landslides in the 52-year period 1950-  
27 2001 (Fig. 3C). We chose this historical dataset against a more recent and more  
28 exhaustive national-level landslide inventory prepared by the IFFI project  
29 ([http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/site/en-GB/Projects/IFFI\\_Project/default.html](http://www.isprambiente.gov.it/site/en-GB/Projects/IFFI_Project/default.html),  
30 Trigilia et al. 2010) because this data was not completely available for this study.  
31 Moreover, we preferred to use the historical catalogue for Italy to allow for  
32 temporal validation of a statistical Tier 2 example discussed below.



1 **Methodology**

2 We adopted a heuristic approach, quantified through an Analytic Hierarchy  
3 Process (AHP) technique for susceptibility evaluation. This is an expert-based,  
4 stepwise classification technique designed to hierarchically organize criteria (here:  
5 environmental variables influencing landslide susceptibility) to solve complex  
6 decisions through pairwise comparisons of their relative importance on a scale  
7 from 1 - 9 (Saaty 1980). AHP has been applied for heuristic landslide  
8 susceptibility zoning lacking extensive inventory information (e.g., Barredo et al.  
9 2000; Gorsevski et al. 2006; Yalcin 2008; Castellanos Albella and van Westen  
10 2008).

11 For organizing the three equally classified spatial criteria for landslide  
12 susceptibility used in this study, first the relative weights for the five individual  
13 classes of each criterion (i.e., slope gradient, lithology, and land cover) were  
14 directly assigned based on our understanding of landslide susceptibility over  
15 Europe as predicted by the data used in this study. Steeper terrain was attributed a  
16 higher susceptibility than gentle terrain. Soft materials (e.g., predominantly clayey  
17 and unconsolidated lithologies) known to be prone to failure were assigned a high  
18 weight, and strong lithologies (e.g., metamorphic and highly consolidated rocks)  
19 were attributed a low weight. Forests and grasslands were considered more prone  
20 to landslides than croplands and wetlands. For convenience, all factor weights  
21 were normalized (Table 2).

22 Next, the relative importance of the three used criteria in conditioning  
23 slope instability in Europe was decided. For this instance, pairwise comparisons  
24 of the three factors were performed within the AHP giving slope a moderately  
25 higher importance than lithology, slope a strongly higher importance than land  
26 cover, and lithology a moderately higher importance than land cover. This  
27 operation results in normalized weight values of 0.64 for slope, 0.26 for lithology,  
28 and 0.10 for land cover (Table 2), with an consistency ratio of 0.03 indicating a  
29 valid pairwise comparison matrix (Saaty and Vargas, 1984). We acknowledge that  
30 the relative importance of the single criteria may not work everywhere in the  
31 study area, and the corresponding weights assigned to the criteria may result in  
32 local inconsistencies. However, we maintain that the assigned normalized relative  
33 weights are reasonable for most of Europe.

1 The integration of the weighted parameter classes into a landslide  
2 susceptibility index  $S$  was determined using their weighted linear sum (Voogd  
3 1983) with

$$S = \sum_{j=1}^{n=3} w_j \cdot x_{ij} \quad (1)$$

5 where  $w_j$  is the weight of criterion  $j$  and  $x_{ij}$  is the weight of class  $i$  for criterion  $j$ .  
6 Finally, the continuous susceptibility index resulting from the weighted linear  
7 summation of the criteria classes with Eq. 1 was classified into five levels  
8 through equal-interval slicing, used to prepare the synoptic-scale landslide  
9 susceptibility zonation of Europe shown in Fig. 4A. In Fig. 4B, total area and  
10 landslide proportions of the five susceptibility categories are shown, together with  
11 the frequency distribution of the continuous landslide susceptibility index  $S$ . From  
12 this it can be inferred that 41.1% of the landslide locations in Britain, France and  
13 Italy are within the two highest susceptibility classes covering an area of 16.6%,  
14 and only 7.9% of landslides are present in the majority of the study area attributed  
15 to the lowest susceptibility class (39.3%). We therefore suggest the applied  
16 classification of  $S$  resulting from trivial equal-interval slicing capable to produce a  
17 reasonable synoptic landslide susceptibility zonation.

### 19 **Landslide susceptibility map**

20 The resulting synoptic-scale landslide susceptibility map for Europe (Fig. 4A) can  
21 be evaluated qualitatively and quantitatively. For a qualitative evaluation, a visual  
22 inspection of Fig. 4A reveals that areas where susceptibility to landslides is high  
23 or very high concentrate in the main European mountain chains, including the  
24 Alps, the Apennines, the Pyrenees, the Dinarides and the Carpathians.  
25 Susceptibility is also high or very high in the mountains and hills of Greece and  
26 Crete, in southern Spain, in southern Norway, and in western Scotland. Further  
27 inspection of Fig. 4A shows that areas where susceptibility to landslides is low or  
28 very low concentrate in Central and Northern Europe, include large portions of  
29 the Iberian Peninsula, and ample parts of the Eastern European lowland.  
30 Comparison of the susceptibility map (Fig. 4A) with the terrain gradient map (Fig.  
31 2A) reveals that more than 50% of the highly susceptible terrain (3.0% of Europe)  
32 exhibits terrain gradients exceeding  $15^\circ$  and more than 95% of the area classified

1 as having a very low landslide susceptibility (39.3% of Europe) has a terrain  
2 gradient lower than  $1^\circ$ . Visual inspection of Fig. 4A also reveals areas where the  
3 continental-scale susceptibility assessment underestimates the propensity of the  
4 terrain to generate landslides. This is particularly evident in generally low-relief  
5 areas of northern Europe (e.g., southern England, northern France) and Central  
6 European highlands known to be landslide-prone. Additionally, many coastal  
7 areas in e.g. England, France and Italy are underrepresented in terms of landslide  
8 susceptibility. These circumstances result from the global susceptibility evaluation  
9 that does not incorporate physiography-specific class weights of the geo-  
10 environmental data used.

11 A quantitative evaluation of the performance of the synoptic landslide  
12 susceptibility zonation of Europe can be performed exploiting the landslide  
13 information available for France, Great Britain and Italy (Fig. 3). For the purpose,  
14 we prepared Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC) curves (Metz 1978;  
15 Mason and Graham 2002; Fawcett 2006) using the three individual national  
16 landslide datasets and the ensemble of the three datasets (Fig. 4C). Adopting the  
17 Area Under the ROC Curve (AUC) metric as a quantitative measure of the ability  
18 of the susceptibility model to predict the landslide locations, we notice that the  
19 synoptic-scale susceptibility zonation performed best in France (AUC = 0.75),  
20 followed by Great Britain (AUC = 0.64) and Italy (AUC = 0.61). Considering the  
21 ensemble of the landslide information in the three countries, the metric was AUC  
22 = 0.72. It has to be emphasized that the ROC evaluation can only be considered as  
23 an indication of model performance in areas where distributed landslide  
24 information is available, and cannot be used as a quality criterion for the overall  
25 susceptibility map.

26 An additional quantitative evaluation of the susceptibility model consists  
27 in comparing the performance of the susceptibility zonation with the performance  
28 of a classification based solely on slope gradient (Remondo et al. 2003). Dashed  
29 lines in Fig. 4C show ROC curves obtained comparing the spatial distribution of  
30 landslides with the distribution of terrain gradient in France, Great Britain, and  
31 Italy. The AUC metrics for the three individual countries (France AUC = 0.73,  
32 Great Britain AUC = 0.60, Italy AUC = 0.60), and for the combined landslide  
33 dataset (AUC = 0.67), show that the performance of the AHP-based multi-criteria  
34 classification model was consistently higher than the performance of the

1 corresponding classifications obtained using solely the terrain slope. The  
2 differences in the AUC values measure the improvement in the terrain  
3 classification resulting from the use of the lithology and the land cover  
4 information, in addition to the slope information. We acknowledge that the size of  
5 the improvement is partly dependent on the relative weights attributed  
6 heuristically to the three susceptibility criteria (i.e., 0.64 for terrain gradient, 0.26  
7 for lithology, and 0.10 for land cover).

8 To use our continental-level evaluation for the delineation of priority areas  
9 against terrains where no further action is necessary, a suitable susceptibility  
10 index threshold value has to be established. Based on our synoptic scale analysis,  
11 we conservatively consider areas classified as very high, high and moderate  
12 susceptibility as priority areas subjected to quantitative, inventory-based landslide  
13 susceptibility evaluations (Tier 2). Application of this threshold classifies 36% of  
14 the analysed area as subjected to Tier 2 (Fig. 4). Because it is not known to what  
15 extent landslides can be expected in specific areas classified as moderately  
16 susceptible, we used a precautionary principle to identify priority areas over  
17 Europe.

### 19 **Comparison with continental and global landslide susceptibility models**

20 The ability of our synoptic-scale landslide susceptibility assessment for Europe  
21 (Fig. 4A) to predict the landslide locations in Great Britain, France and Italy  
22 collected for this study can be compared to that of existing continental (Schmidt-  
23 Thomé 2006) and global (Nadim et al. 2006; Hong et al. 2007) assessments of  
24 landslide susceptibility and hazard (Fig. 5). In the context of the European Spatial  
25 Planning Observation Network (ESPON) Programme, Schmidt-Thomé (2006)  
26 published a map showing the distribution of landslide “hazard” in Europe (Fig.  
27 5A). The map adopted the NUTS (*Nomenclature des Unités Territoriales*  
28 *Statistiques*) level 3 administrative units, and showed the propensity to landslides  
29 for these mapping units in two classes: “low hazard” and “high hazard”. Although  
30 solely based on the opinion of experts of European geological surveys and  
31 suffering from data gaps, the resulting continental map was the first to recognize  
32 the importance and extent of landslide problems in Europe. A comparison of the  
33 new synoptic-scale landslide susceptibility zonation (Fig. 4A) with the ESPON  
34 “hazard” map of Europe (Fig. 5A) indicates that the ESPON zonation predicted

1 correctly nearly 80% of the locations of the known landslides in France (Fig. 3A),  
2 Great Britain (Fig. 3B) and Italy (Fig. 3C). However, the number and areal extent  
3 of the NUTS 3 units predicted as landslide prone by the ESPON model and for  
4 which no information is available in the three national inventories (i.e., false  
5 positives) is large, reducing the credibility of the map. We attribute this  
6 overestimation of landslide susceptibility to the large average size of the mapping  
7 units, and we conclude that a NUTS level 3 mapping unit is inadequate (too large)  
8 for the accurate definition of landslide susceptibility in Europe.

9         Hong et al. (2007) produced a global landslide susceptibility assessment  
10 exploiting geo-environmental information obtained from a variety of geospatial  
11 data sources, including (i) the GTOPO30 elevation dataset, (ii) land cover  
12 information obtained by processing data captured by the Moderate Resolution  
13 Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) sensor aboard the NASA Terra and Aqua  
14 satellites, and (iii) soil information extracted from the 2003 edition of the Digital  
15 Soil of the World (FAO, <http://www.fao.org>) and from a soil database of the  
16 International Satellite Land Surface Climatology Project Initiative (ISLSCP,  
17 <http://www.gewex.org/islscp.html>). The coarse resolution geo-environmental  
18 information was combined using a weighted linear combination method proposed  
19 by Ayalew et al. (2004), with the weights attributed to the different landslide-  
20 controlling factors decided heuristically. The result consisted in a low-resolution  
21 (15 arc minutes, approx. 28 km) global map showing landslide susceptibility in  
22 five classes, from very low to very high susceptibility. Kirschbaum et al. (2009)  
23 used this global landslide susceptibility zonation combined with satellite-derived  
24 rainfall estimates to provide dynamic forecasts of landslide hazard in near real  
25 time. Visual comparison of the European portion of the global landslide  
26 susceptibility zonation of Hong et al. (2007) (Fig. 5B) with the new synoptic-scale  
27 landslide susceptibility assessment for Europe made for this study (Fig. 4A)  
28 indicates that, apart from their incompatible resolution, the resulting maps show a  
29 certain degree of coincidence. However, in contrast to the susceptibility estimate  
30 presented here, the map from Hong et al. (2007) is more pessimistic in Southern  
31 Europe (e.g., the Iberian Peninsula and the East European basins).

32         Nadim et al. (2006) were first to produce a global map showing landslide  
33 (and snow avalanche) hazard areas and risk hotspots. Their pioneering worldwide  
34 hazard assessment was prepared through a linear combination of conditioning and

1 triggering factors modulated by weights decided on expert opinion (e.g., Mora and  
2 Vahrson 1994). The factors considered in the analysis included (i) terrain slope  
3 computed from the GTOPO30 elevation dataset, (ii) lithology obtained  
4 simplifying the 1:25M scale Geological Map of the World (CGMW 2000), and  
5 (iii) soil moisture characteristics extracted from a moisture index global archive  
6 for the period 1962-1990 (Willmot and Feddema 1992). The triggering factors  
7 included (i) estimates for the 100-year extreme monthly rainfall obtained from the  
8 Global Precipitation Climatology Centre managed by the German National  
9 Meteorological Service (Rudolf et al. 2005), and (ii) the expected Peak Ground  
10 Acceleration with a return period of 475 years, obtained from the Global Seismic  
11 Hazard Programme (<http://www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/GSHAP/>). The resulting global  
12 map with a resolution of 30 arc seconds (approx. 1 km x 1 km) was classified into  
13 nine hazard classes, where only the values from six through nine are  
14 downloadable as a raster dataset from  
15 <http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/chrr/research/hotspots/coredata.html>. Visual comparison of  
16 our landslide susceptibility zonation for Europe (Fig. 4A) with the section for  
17 Europe of the four highest hazard classes of the global map of Nadim et al. (2006)  
18 (Fig. 5C) indicates that the latter exclusively delineates areas in high mountainous  
19 regions having moderately to high landslide hazard and renders no information for  
20 more than 90% of the area, including many European countries also facing  
21 landslide problems (e.g., Great Britain, Germany, Belgium).

22 We evaluated the capability of the continental (Schmidt-Thomé  
23 2006) and the global (Nadim et al. 2006; Hong et al. 2007) assessments of  
24 landslide susceptibility and hazard to predict the landslide locations in Great  
25 Britain, France and Italy in comparison to the new synoptic-scale susceptibility  
26 assessment for Europe (Fig. 4). For this purpose, we compared the extent of the  
27 various susceptibility classes with the location of slope failures in the ensemble of  
28 the three historical landslide inventories available for France (Fig. 3A), Great  
29 Britain (Fig. 3B) and Italy (Fig. 3C). This was used to construct the ROC curves  
30 shown in Fig. 5D. Inspection of the ROC curves shows that the performance of  
31 the susceptibility classification in France, Great Britain and Italy (AUC = 0.72)  
32 was larger than the performance of the global classification of Hong et al. (2007)  
33 (AUC = 0.68) for the same three countries. Further analysis of the ROC curves  
34 reveals that the global hazard classification of Nadim et al. (2006) exhibited a “j”-

1 shaped ROC curve with  $AUC = 0.45$ , mostly attributed to the fact that the map  
2 only covers 3% of the area with more than 70% of the landslides outside the  
3 hazard classes.

4 The continental and global landslide susceptibility and hazard zonations  
5 discussed above may be alternatively considered as Tier 1 assessment for the  
6 delineation of priority areas over Europe. The ESPON map (Fig. 5A) could be  
7 straightforwardly used for this purpose since it directly aims to delineate “hazard”  
8 zones against “no hazard” terrains. However, size and geometry of the mapping  
9 units (NUTS 3), data gaps and the general spatial overestimation of threatened  
10 terrain portions (58%) makes the use of this map problematic. A possible  
11 threshold to identify priority areas through the global susceptibility map of Hong et  
12 al. (2007) (Fig. 5B) would be the aggregation of the terrains classified as very  
13 highly, highly and moderately susceptible. Although the spatial distribution of  
14 these areas has clear significance for landslide zoning over Europe, the resolution  
15 of the map is too low (28 km) and the estimate is pessimistic, resulting in the  
16 assignment of 61% percent of the area for Tier 2 zoning. In contrast, the “hotspot”  
17 map of Nadim et al. (2006) has the same resolution as the map proposed here. The  
18 map only assigns a relatively small proportion (3%) of the analysed area over  
19 Europe as priority terrains for Tier 2 landslide zoning when considering the spatial  
20 distribution of the available classes medium to very high (Fig. 5C). This  
21 disagreement mostly results from the fact that the “hotspot” map represents a  
22 hazard scenario map rather than a susceptibility map (through e.g. the  
23 incorporation of landslide triggering factors as precipitation and seismicity),  
24 classified on a global landslide hazard scale. However, since the map does not  
25 identify priority areas in many European countries facing landslide problems, it  
26 should not be used as a Tier 1 evaluation.

## 28 **Differentiated national-level Tier 1 assessment:** 29 **Application over France**

30 In accordance to the general specifications for heuristic Tier 1 landslide  
31 susceptibility modelling proposed by Hervás et al. (2007), the national assessment  
32 for France is based on the same reduced *common criteria* (e.g., spatial information  
33 on terrain gradient, soil parent material as a proxy for lithology, and land cover),

1 but the input data sets differ in terms of resolution and taxonomy. Additionally  
2 and most importantly, the susceptibility evaluation employs a differentiation  
3 according to landslide typology (flows, slides and falls), and terrain physiography  
4 (coasts, mountains and plains).  
5

## 6 **Data**

7 Information on slope gradient was derived from the French elevation database  
8 (BD-Altitude®), at 50 m × 50 m ground resolution. For susceptibility modelling,  
9 terrain slope was computed and reclassified in 13 equally spaced classes (5°  
10 interval), from 0° to > 60°. Information on soil parent material was obtained from  
11 the 1:1M scale digital Geological Map of France, and the associated digital  
12 database prepared by BRGM (2005). Since the original lithological information  
13 was too complex (and too detailed) for the purpose of the study, the data was  
14 grouped in 24 lithological classes based on information on lithology, structure,  
15 and age of the rocks. Also, the lithological information originally available in  
16 vector format was transformed to a 50 m × 50 m resolution grid spatially coherent  
17 with the terrain gradient data. Information on land cover was obtained from the  
18 CORINE Land Cover 2000 and 2006 databases (CLC2000, CLC2006) available  
19 at 1:100,000 scale. For France, the databases show land cover characteristics in  
20 ten classes, for terrain units larger than 0.25 km<sup>2</sup>. Information on landslides for  
21 model calibration was obtained from the French national BDMvT inventory (Fig.  
22 2A). This is the same inventory used for the evaluation of the synoptic-scale  
23 landslide susceptibility assessment for Europe. All the slope failures listed in the  
24 BDMvT inventory were classified as falls, flows, or slides, depending on their  
25 primary type of movement (Varnes 1978).  
26

## 27 **Methodology**

28 To evaluate landslide susceptibility in France, a Spatial Multi-Criteria Evaluation  
29 (SMCE) technique (Figueira et al. 2005) as implemented in the ILWIS® software  
30 was adopted (Castellanos Abella and van Westen 2008; Malet et al. 2009). The  
31 technique is conceptually and operationally based on an AHP to decide on criteria  
32 and criteria class weights as also used to determine landslide susceptibility over  
33 Europe in this paper. Specifically, SMCE is used to hierarchically organize the  
34 criteria classes and to associate normalized weight values through pairwise



1 comparisons, rank ordering or direct assignments. In our analysis, we directly  
2 assigned class weights taken into consideration the frequency ratio of landslides  
3 from the French inventory over the criteria classes. Susceptibility was ascertained  
4 utilizing the following procedure: First, the French territory (excluding Corsica,  
5 the overseas territories and other minor islands) was partitioned into three main  
6 physiographic units: (i) mountains, (ii) plains, and (iii) coastal areas. This was  
7 done to respect the fact that same criteria classes have a different influence on  
8 landslide susceptibility based on their specific physiographic setting. Moreover,  
9 coastal regions were treated separately since coastal landslides can hardly be  
10 compared to inland mass movements because of their different controlling  
11 characteristics. Mountains and plains were outlined using the general criteria  
12 proposed by Nordregio (2004). Coastal areas were defined geometrically,  
13 constructing a 1-km wide buffer along the coastline.

14 After partitioning the French landslide inventory into three types (i.e.,  
15 slides, flows and falls), weights for the individual criteria classes (i.e., 13 classes  
16 of terrain slope, 24 classes of lithology, and 10 classes of land cover) were  
17 assigned for each landslide type. Next, using a pairwise comparison approach  
18 similar to the European example, normalized relative weights were assigned to the  
19 ensembles of terrain gradient (0.58), lithology (0.28), and land cover (0.13)  
20 classes. These weights measure the relative importance of the three geo-  
21 environmental factors, and modulate the weights assigned to the individual  
22 criteria classes.. For simplification, the same parameter weights were assigned to  
23 the geo-environmental controlling factors for the three different landslide types.

24 A set of typology-specific susceptibility maps (i.e., for slides, flows and  
25 topples) was produced for each physiographic region (i.e., coasts, mountains and  
26 plains) using a weighted linear summation of the established weights following  
27 (1). The terrain-specific susceptibility maps for each landslide type were spatially  
28 combined, and the typology-specific susceptibility indices were classified into  
29 four susceptibility levels (very low, low, moderate, and high) using a Jenks  
30 natural breaks classification (Jenks 1967). More information on the national level  
31 landslide susceptibility map for France can be found in Malet et al. (in revision).

## 1 **Landslide susceptibility maps**

2 Map results of the modelling approach described above for the national-scale  
3 susceptibility to falls, flows, and slides are portrayed in Fig. 6A-C. In the three  
4 maps, susceptibility is shown in four classes, from very low (VL) to high (H).  
5 Visual inspection of Fig. 6A-C shows that the geographical pattern of  
6 susceptibility varies for the three considered landslide types. Susceptibility to falls  
7 (Fig. 6C) is largest in areas where the terrain is steep and rock slopes are  
8 widespread, favouring the occurrence of rock falls, topples, and minor rock slides.  
9 Susceptibility to slides (Fig. 6A) is moderate to high in the French Alps and the  
10 Pyrenees, and in hilly areas where terrain slope and associations of rock types  
11 control the susceptibility to slides. Areas exhibiting a moderate to high  
12 susceptibility to landslides of the flow type (Fig. 6B) are widespread in France  
13 and more abundant than the corresponding areas for falls and slides. Susceptibility  
14 to flows is generally large in areas with soft rocks..

15         Based on the three separate susceptibility zonations for falls, flows and  
16 slides (Fig. 6A-C), an attempt was made to produce a single, comprehensive  
17 zonation of landslide susceptibility for France (Fig. 6D). For the purpose, the  
18 three susceptibility maps prepared for the three landslide types were combined to  
19 obtain a single map that considers the susceptibility to all landslide types. This  
20 was performed using a very conservative approach (Fig. 6E): for each grid cell,  
21 the three different susceptibility values for falls, flows and slides (in four classes)  
22 were compared, and the largest cell value was attributed to the grid cell as a  
23 measure of the general susceptibility. This association approach was selected to  
24 respect the precautionary principle that guides the French legislation on natural  
25 hazard and risk assessment, and the production of Risk Prevention Plans  
26 (MATE/METL 1999). Inspection of Fig. 6D reveals that the majority of the  
27 French territory (75%) is classified as having moderate (31%) or high (44%)  
28 susceptibility. The remaining territory (25%) is attributed a low (19%) or very low  
29 (6%) susceptibility. We acknowledge that the significant proportion of territory  
30 classified as having a moderate or high susceptibility largely depends on the  
31 conservative technique adopted to associate the individual zonations, which  
32 favoured the attribution of high values of susceptibility to the individual grid cells.

33         To better illustrate the distribution of the compound susceptibility classes  
34 over France we compared the relative spatial proportions of the individual

1 susceptibility levels in plain and mountain sub-units and the areal percentages of  
2 all susceptibility classes for the two physiographic units (Fig. 7A). It can be  
3 observed that the three lowest susceptibility classes reveal very similar relative  
4 proportions, but the percentages of grid cells attributed to high susceptibility is  
5 equal in the plain and the much smaller mountain units. The fact that a much  
6 higher area proportion in the mountain unit is attributed to high landslide  
7 susceptibility when compared to the plain unit is also illustrated when comparing  
8 the areal percentages of all susceptibility classes for the two physiographic units  
9 (Fig. 7B). Again, the high spatial extents of terrains classified as highly  
10 susceptible to landslides result from the conservative association procedure  
11 applied to combine the individual susceptibility estimates for flows, slides and  
12 falls.

13 To evaluate the national-scale landslide susceptibility zonation shown in  
14 Fig. 6D, we compared the distribution of the areas where landslide susceptibility  
15 is considered high (red areas in Fig. 6D) with the distribution of small  
16 administrative units (municipalities) where at least one landslide event is reported  
17 in the national BDMvT inventory. Results are summarized in Fig. 8, which shows  
18 that many municipalities affected by historical landslides were correctly predicted  
19 as highly susceptible by the comprehensive national-scale model. However, the  
20 susceptibility model also attributes high level of susceptibility to areas where  
21 information on historical landslides is not present in the BDMvT inventory. The  
22 main cause for this discrepancy is the fact that the BDMvT database is incomplete  
23 and has a low accuracy in many regions (departments) in France, especially in  
24 highly landslide-prone regions like the Pyrenees or the French Alps (Fig. 8).

25 A possible susceptibility threshold for the delineation of priority areas  
26 subjected to the Tier 2 evaluation differs from the value applied at European-level.  
27 The conservative association scheme applied to derive the composite  
28 susceptibility map for France from the three typology-specific assessments result  
29 in a more pessimistic (but probably more reasonable) evaluation, and for this  
30 reason we recommend to consider only the highest susceptibility level (44% of the  
31 territory) for a Tier 2 evaluation here (Fig. 8A).

# 1 **Generalized Tier 2 assessment for priority areas in**

## 2 **Italy**

3 For Italy, geo-environmental and distributed landslide information is available to  
4 attempt a national-scale, statistically-based, landslide susceptibility zonation as an  
5 example for a Tier 2 evaluation. Even though the synoptic assessment described  
6 below does not account for differentiation according to landslide typology or  
7 terrain physiography, it demonstrates that statistical landslide susceptibility  
8 analyses can be conducted over entire nations at small spatial scales if the required  
9 geo-environmental (spatial predictors) and thematic (distributed and accurate  
10 landslide data) information is available. The example below also incorporates  
11 additional spatial data that should be used for Tier 2 assessments, and employs a  
12 different mapping unit (municipality) for susceptibility estimations following the  
13 general requirements for Tier 2 landslide susceptibility evaluations (Hervás et al.  
14 2007). In the Tier 2 example discussed below, only those municipalities identified  
15 as susceptible to landslides by the continental Tier 1 evaluation were analyzed.  
16 The municipalities were selected following a conservative approach that identifies  
17 municipalities having one or more grid cells classified as moderately to very high  
18 susceptible by the synoptic continental Tier 1 evaluation as priority areas (82% of  
19 the Italian territory).

### 21 **Data**

22 The geo-environmental information consists of medium to coarse resolution  
23 topographic (elevation), lithological, soil type, and climate data shown in Table 4.  
24 Elevation information is represented by a 90 m × 90 m DEM acquired by the  
25 Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) in February of 2000, and distributed  
26 by the U.S. Geological Survey (<http://srtm.usgs.gov/>) in 91 adjacent tiles. The DEM  
27 was used to obtain raster GIS morphometric maps including (i) maps of  
28 descriptive statistics (i.e., minimum, maximum, range, mean, standard deviation)  
29 of elevation and terrain gradient (slope), and (ii) a map showing topographic  
30 subdivisions i.e., highlands, uplands and lowlands (Guzzetti and Reichenbach  
31 1994). Information on rock types was obtained from the Geological Map of Italy  
32 published at 1:1M scale by Compagnoni et al. (1976-1983). For the susceptibility  
33 modelling, the 145 rock units shown in this map were grouped into 10 main

1 lithological complexes comprising similar rock types. Information on soil types  
2 was obtained from the Soil Map of Italy published at 1:1M scale by Mancini  
3 (1966). For the susceptibility analysis, the original soil information shown in the  
4 small-scale scale map was grouped into eight classes of soil thickness and 11  
5 classes of soil types. Climatic information for Italy, including mean cumulated  
6 annual rainfall and mean annual temperature for the period 1961-1990 was  
7 obtained from the Centro Nazionale Cartografia Pedologica (L'Abate and  
8 Costantini 2004). The landslide information used for susceptibility modelling was  
9 the catalogue of historical landslides in Italy compiled by the AVI Project  
10 (Guzzetti et al. 1994; Guzzetti and Tonelli 2004). This is the same landslide  
11 information used for the evaluation of the synoptic-scale landslide susceptibility  
12 assessment for Europe discussed above.

13 To define landslide susceptibility in Italy, the municipality was selected as  
14 the mapping unit of reference. Italy is subdivided into 8102 municipalities,  
15 administrative subdivisions ranging in size from 0.1 km<sup>2</sup> (Atrani, Campania) to  
16 1,285 km<sup>2</sup> (Rome) (mean area = 37.3 km<sup>2</sup>, std. dev. = 50.0 km<sup>2</sup>). For the 6159  
17 (76,0%) municipalities identified as susceptible to landslides by the continental  
18 Tier 1 evaluation, we computed from the criteria in Table 4 the following 61  
19 variables: (i) 10 variables describing descriptive statistics for terrain morphometry  
20 (minimum, maximum, range, mean, standard deviation of elevation and slope),  
21 (ii) three variables showing topographic setting (i.e., highlands, uplands, and  
22 lowlands), (iii) the percentage of the 10 main lithological complexes aggregated  
23 from the Geological Map of Italy of Compagnoni et al. (1976-1983), (iv) the  
24 percentage of the eight classes of soil thickness and of the 11 classes of soil types  
25 derived from the Soil Map of Italy of Mancini (1966), (v) 18 variables describing  
26 meteorological and climate conditions obtained through ordinary kriging of the  
27 long term annual values of about 1000 reference meteorological stations  
28 (L'Abate and Costantini 2004,  
29 <http://abp.entecra.it/soilmaps/ita/pedoclima30.html>), and (vi) one variable for the  
30 presence or absence of historical landslide events in the neighbouring  
31 municipalities. The presence (or absence) of one or more of the landslides listed in  
32 the AVI catalogue (Guzzetti et al. 1994; Guzzetti and Tonelli 2004) in each of the  
33 6159 municipalities selected for the Tier 2 analysis was adopted as the dependent,  
34 classification variable for the multivariate modelling. For the purpose, the

1 landslide information in the historical catalogue was split into two sets: (i) a  
2 training set covering the 41-year period 1950-1990 was used to construct (train) a  
3 multivariate classification model (7704 landslide events in 2608 municipalities),  
4 and (ii) a validation set covering the 11-year period 1991-2001 was used to  
5 validate (evaluate) the model prediction skills (10750 landslide events in 2801  
6 municipalities).

## 8 **Methodology**

9 Landslide susceptibility in Italy was determined applying linear discriminant  
10 analysis, a consolidated multivariate technique introduced by Fisher (1936) to  
11 classify samples into alternative groups on the basis of a set of measurements  
12 (Michie et al. 1994; Brown 1998), and commonly adopted by geomorphologists to  
13 determine landslide susceptibility at different spatial scales (e.g., Guzzetti et al.  
14 1999). For landslide susceptibility assessment, the two groups (G) commonly  
15 established, are: (i) mapping units free of landslides ( $G_0$ , municipalities without  
16 landslide events), and (ii) mapping units having landslides ( $G_1$ , municipalities  
17 with landslide events).

18 The scope of discriminant analysis is to determine the group membership  
19 of a mapping unit by finding a linear combination of the geo-environmental  
20 variables which maximizes the differences between the populations of stable and  
21 unstable mapping units, with minimal error. To obtain this, consider a set of  $m$   
22 environmental variables  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m$  for each mapping unit,  $r$ , by means of which  
23 it is desired to discriminate the region between the groups of stable ( $G_0$ ) and  
24 unstable ( $G_1$ ) units, and let  $Z$  be the linear combination of the input variables, such  
25 as

$$26 \quad Z = \beta_1 v_1(r) + \beta_2 v_2(r) + \dots + \beta_m v_m(r) \quad (2)$$

27 For discriminant analysis, the task is to determine the coefficients  $\beta_i$  enabling  $Z$  to  
28 serve as an index for differentiating between members of the two groups. The  
29 relative contribution of each independent geo-environmental variable to the  
30 discriminating function can be evaluated by the standardized discriminant  
31 function coefficients (SDFC). The SDFC show the relative importance (i.e. the  
32 “weight”) of each variable as a predictor of slope instability. Variables with large  
33 coefficients (in absolute value) are more strongly associated with the presence or

1 the absence of landslides, with positive and negative coefficients indicating  
2 respectively positive and negative correlation with instability within a mapping  
3 unit. It should be noted that this model is highly similar to SMCE. However, the  
4 important difference is that the coefficients in Eq. 2 are obtained through a  
5 quantitative statistical analysis.

6 Through a step-wise procedure, the linear discriminant function selected  
7 18 variables out of the 61 variables described above as the best predictors of the  
8 presence (or absence) of historical landslides in the 6159 Italian municipalities, in  
9 the training period 1950-1990. The selected geo-environmental variables  
10 indicated in Table 5 include seven morphological, three lithological, one soil type,  
11 six climate-related, and one variable describing the presence/absence of historical  
12 landslides in the neighbouring municipalities.

### 14 **Landslide susceptibility map**

15 Fig. 9A portrays the landslide susceptibility map obtained for the Italian territory  
16 that has been identified as susceptible to landslides by the continental-level Tier 1  
17 evaluation. In the map, the individual municipalities are classified based on their  
18 probability of pertaining to the group of municipalities that have experienced (or  
19 have not experienced) one or more historical landslides listed in the AVI  
20 catalogue in the training period 1950-1990. To decide the levels of landslide  
21 susceptibility, the inference was made that if a municipality was predicted to have  
22 a high or very high probability of containing a historical landslide, the same  
23 municipality is expected to have a high (orange) or very high (red) susceptibility,  
24 i.e. a high or very high propensity to generate future landslides. Similarly, if a  
25 municipality has a low or very low probability of containing a known historical  
26 landslide, the same municipality was attributed a low (light green) or very low  
27 (green) susceptibility, i.e. a low or very low propensity to generate future  
28 landslides. Areas attributed moderate susceptibility in the map (Fig. 9A) represent  
29 a special case. These are municipalities for which the linear discriminant model  
30 was unable to decide convincingly (i.e. with a probability  $P > |0.55|$ ) if the  
31 municipality pertains to the unstable (having historical landslides) or the stable  
32 (not having historical landslides) groups. These municipalities are of uncertain  
33 attribution and further information is necessary to decide their level of landslide  
34 susceptibility.

1 Overall, the linear discriminant model has classified correctly 3999  
2 (64.9%) of the 6159 Italian municipalities evaluated in the Tier 2 analysis. This is  
3 a quantitative measure of the degree of fit of the susceptibility model, i.e. of the  
4 ability of the statistical classification procedure to match the geographical  
5 distribution of the known historical landslides. Of the correctly classified  
6 municipalities, 2272 (64.0%) were classified as unstable (i.e., prone to  
7 landsliding) and 1727 (66%) were classified as stable (i.e., not prone to  
8 landslides) by the model. With the information above, a contingency table was  
9 created that illustrates the significance of the model (Fig. 9B).

10 Inspection of Fig. 9A reveals the geographical distribution of the predicted  
11 landslide susceptibility. The Tier 2 model predicts susceptibility to be high to very  
12 high in 2369 municipalities (29,3% of the total number of analyzed municipalities.  
13 In particular, susceptibility is predicted to be very high in the Alps, the Apennines,  
14 and in parts of Sicily. Fig. 9A further shows local problems with the national  
15 assessment. As an example, the Calabria region, southern Italy, is attributed  
16 susceptibility levels lower than expected. This is a consequence of the  
17 incompleteness of the historical landslide information in the AVI catalogue in this  
18 region.

19 Availability of an independent landslide validation set covering the period  
20 1991-2001 allowed evaluating the prediction skill of the susceptibility model. By  
21 substituting the model training (1950-1990) dataset with the model validation  
22 (1991-2001) dataset, the linear discriminant model classified correctly 3800  
23 (61.7%) of the 6159 municipalities. This is a quantitative measure of the  
24 prediction skill of the national-scale susceptibility assessment (e.g., Chung and  
25 Fabbri 2003; Guzzetti et al. 2006). Of the 3800 municipalities that were correctly  
26 predicted by the model, 1724 were predicted unstable (i.e. landslide prone), and  
27 2076 were predicted stable by the model.

28 As a further quantitative test of the model fitting performance and  
29 prediction skills, we prepared ROC curves both for the training set (continuous  
30 line in Fig. 9C) and for the validation set (dashed line in Fig. 9C). The resulting  
31 quality metric are  $AUC = 0.70$  for the training set and  $AUC = 0.66$  for the  
32 validation set. We consider these values satisfactory with respect to the quality  
33 and resolution of the available geo-environmental and landslide information, and  
34 the difficulty of the prediction, limited to a 11-year period 1991-2001.



# 1 Discussion

2 The continental-level Tier 1 assessment presented in this work shows that both  
3 thematic information and methods are available to produce a harmonised, small-  
4 scale susceptibility map over Europe that allows for the identification of priority  
5 areas when evaluated with exemplary national-level landslide inventory data.  
6 According to the draft of the European Soil Framework Directive, those priority  
7 areas represent terrains that should be subjected to detailed spatial evaluations of  
8 soil threats, i.e. landslide susceptibility (EC 2006b). A comparison with already  
9 available global and continental landslide susceptibility and hazard zonations  
10 alternatively considered for Tier 1 analyses further indicates the advanced validity  
11 of the proposed map. However, other European-level landslide susceptibility,  
12 hazard and risk zonations as prepared in the framework of the EU-FP7 SafeLand  
13 project (Jaedicke et al. 2011; Van Den Eeckhaut et al. 2011) could provide  
14 alternatives to the continental-level assessment presented here, if evaluated better.  
15 In any case, generalized landslide susceptibility modelling over highly complex  
16 areas like Europe generally proves difficult, also when considering the diversity of  
17 landslide phenomena. This is also true for the pan-European susceptibility map  
18 presented here, as evidenced by the ROC analyses illustrating predictive  
19 capabilities that should be improved. A solution may consist in preparing different  
20 susceptibility zonations for different climatic and physiographical regions,  
21 adopting specific sets of weights decided on regional climato-physiographical  
22 conditions.

23 The main reason for selecting an expert-based approach – as opposed to  
24 e.g., a statistically based approach – for Tier 1 analyses was the lack of sufficient  
25 landslide information. For Europe, a complete coverage of landslide information  
26 is not available, and will not be available in the near future. However, information  
27 on landslides exists for many countries or regions in Europe (Van Den Eeckhaut  
28 and Hervás 2012). Since landslide information is the major prerequisite for all  
29 kinds of susceptibility assessments (e.g., van Westen et al. 2009), availability of  
30 extended data over Europe will allow determining new and improved weights for  
31 the susceptibility criteria considered, especially when a climato-physiographic  
32 terrain zoning is introduced. However, it can be suspected that even if more  
33 landslide information is collected and harmonised, it will still remain incomplete  
34 and inaccurate in many areas. This is illustrated by the Tier 1 application over

1 France, where many highly landslide prone areas lack distributed landslide data  
2 and straightforward, inventory-based statistical assessments are hampered even  
3 though a harmonised national-level inventory is available. It can be suspected that  
4 both the lack and spatial heterogeneity of landslide information will require expert  
5 knowledge in many European regions even in the near future. In turn, more  
6 detailed information in areas representative for specific climato-physiographic  
7 settings over Europe could allow for calibration of statistical landslide  
8 susceptibility models through careful selection of landslide- and landslide-free  
9 terrain elements, as recently demonstrated by Van Den Eeckhaut et al. (2011). We  
10 suppose that such computations will provide a clue for cross-validation of  
11 heuristic assessments through data-driven techniques and will enhance the  
12 robustness of the models in the future.

13         The continental-level Tier 1 landslide susceptibility zonation prepared in  
14 this work considers all types of landslides. However, the national Tier 1 modelling  
15 of landslide susceptibility in France has shown unambiguously that the  
16 susceptibility to different major landslide types (i.e., slides, flows, falls/topples)  
17 varies geographically. Also future continent-wide Tier 1 landslide susceptibility  
18 assessments should be prepared accordingly. However, this will require a  
19 typologically separated landslide inventory for model calibration and evaluation.

20         Where multiple susceptibility assessments are available for different  
21 landslide types and climato-physiographic regions, the problem consists in  
22 combining the individual assessments into a single (comprehensive) Tier 1  
23 landslide susceptibility assessment. The experiment conducted in France adopting  
24 a conservative combination through the assignment of the highest susceptibility  
25 pixel value obtained for one of the three landslide types, based on the  
26 precautionary principle underpinning the French legislation on natural hazards,  
27 resulted in a significantly large portion of the territory classified as susceptible to  
28 landslides (75% of the area classified as “high” and “moderate”, Fig. 6). Even  
29 though this result may be considered unrealistic in places, combinations of  
30 individual landslide susceptibility evaluations will most probably always be more  
31 pessimistic than generalized assessments which in most cases underestimate the  
32 propensity of non-mountainous terrains to generate landslides. We therefore  
33 conclude that spatially combined, climato-physiographically and typologically  
34 specific susceptibility assessments will offer a better insight in the spatial

1 distribution of the landslide problem over Europe at the synoptic scale and hence  
2 enable a better delineation of priority areas through Tier 1 assessments. However,  
3 this requires appropriate spatial association and classification schemes for the  
4 combination of specific susceptibility estimates such as e.g. summation or  
5 reclassification of typology-specific susceptibility estimates.

6 For the delineation of priority areas subjected to quantitative Tier 2  
7 analyses against areas where no further action has to be taken, appropriate  
8 threshold levels have to be defined for any Tier 1 analysis. Our Tier 1 assessments  
9 show that the definition of such thresholds may be determined by the kind of Tier  
10 1 analysis, e.g. whether a differentiated or undifferentiated analysis in terms of  
11 landslide typology is conducted. In the synoptic continental-level evaluation  
12 presented here (Fig. 4), it seems appropriate to use the three highest susceptibility  
13 levels (i.e., very high, high, moderate) as a threshold for areas in which Tier 2  
14 analyses should be performed. The application of this threshold assigns 36% of  
15 the analysed area as to be subjected to Tier 2. In contrast, the differentiated Tier 1  
16 analysis over France (Fig. 6) calls for a rather different susceptibility threshold  
17 due to the conservative association method applied to produce the compound  
18 susceptibility map. We recommend to exclusively use the highest susceptibility  
19 class here (resulting in 44% of the area subjected to Tier 2) since this is suggested  
20 to provide a reliable overview of the main areas known to be prone to landslides.  
21 For comparison, the synoptic continental-level Tier 1 assessment with the  
22 threshold specified above delineates 33% of the French continental territory as  
23 subjected to Tier 2. Albeit the priority areas defined by both assessments show a  
24 good first-order correlation (compare Fig. 4 and 6), this discrepancy is mainly due  
25 to the rather different Tier 1 evaluations (e.g., synoptic vs. differentiated)  
26 conducted at continental and national levels.

27 Following the general specifications for the assessment of soil threats, Tier  
28 2 analyses should allow to decide on appropriate programmes of measures to  
29 evaluate and combat soil threats as proposed in the draft of the Soil Framework  
30 Directive (EC 2006b), but should not be considered alternative to Tier 1 in terms  
31 of delineation of priority areas (Eckelmann et al. 2006; Hervás et al. 2007).  
32 Additionally, a Tier 2 analysis should provide quantitative measures on the spatial  
33 distribution of landslide susceptibility, and can incorporate data that is not yet  
34 available. We have presented a quantitative, statistical landslide susceptibility

1 analysis for priority areas in Italy, based on distributed and multitemporal  
2 landslide information allowing for establishment and validation of the inventory-  
3 based assessment through a multivariate classification technique. The evaluation  
4 is based on an administrative mapping unit (municipality), having the advantage  
5 of allowing for a direct association between the landslide susceptibility  
6 information and societal and (agro)economical data, including population census  
7 data. These associations must be considered essential for the effective evaluation  
8 of any soil threat at small spatial scales, and therefore we argue that the kind of  
9 mapping unit is, together with the application of quantitative evaluation  
10 techniques based on distributed landslide information, considered the major  
11 specification for Tier 2 analyses. Our Tier 2-compatible analysis over susceptible  
12 terrains in Italy therefore demonstrates that such evaluations can be conducted  
13 even at small spatial scales if the required geo-environmental and landslide  
14 information is available together with a mapping unit of a suitable size.

15         The exemplary Tier 2 analysis presented employs an administrative  
16 mapping unit that does not reflect the geo-environmental conditions controlling  
17 the geographical and temporal occurrence of landslides in an area. For this reason,  
18 further geomorphographic subdivision based on the specific (local) geo-  
19 environmental settings would be required.. Alternatively, the establishment of  
20 appropriate geographical management units for the general assessment of soil  
21 threats (including landslides) in the context of Tier 2 evaluations may be enforced  
22 within the further development of the Soil Thematic Strategy. In any case,  
23 application of Tier 2 should not be conducted using terrain units larger than  
24 municipalities.

25         The example for a synoptic Tier 2 evaluation presented here does not  
26 account for a differentiation according to landslide typology. However, for future  
27 development of the Tier 2 approach, it seems very important to claim for  
28 typologically-specific landslide susceptibility evaluations. Since a Tier 2  
29 assessment also calls for additional spatial data to assess landslide susceptibility,  
30 the *common criteria* for Tier 2 should be reconsidered in such that the most  
31 important geo-environmental factors governing the susceptibility to at least a  
32 basic typological landslide differentiation according to slides, falls and flows  
33 should be identified and specified, apart from the requirement of distributed  
34 landslide inventories in areas subjected to Tier 2. It should also be noted that a

1 further testing on the compatibility between Tier 1 and Tier 2 at small spatial  
2 scales should be conducted for a geomorphological unit (e.g., Alpine chain) rather  
3 than on national levels. However, since the required data (distributed landslide  
4 information and an appropriate mapping unit) was exclusively available for Italy  
5 in this study, this could not be achieved here.

6 Based on the examples shown in this paper, Tier-based assessments may  
7 not be considered as strictly scale-dependent. In fact, both Tier 1 and Tier 2  
8 compatible assessments can be conducted at several spatial scales as determined  
9 by the scale of the input data and the scale/size of the mapping unit of reference.  
10 This is demonstrated by the different Tier 1 evaluations presented in this work  
11 where the continental-level evaluation uses a 1 km x 1 km grid cell as a mapping  
12 unit, whereas the national-level evaluation for France utilizes a 50 m x 50 m grid  
13 cell. Both evaluations aim to delineate priority areas and do not necessarily  
14 require landslide information to be carried out. In contrast, any Tier 2 evaluation  
15 should be based on distributed landslide information and should allow for the  
16 decision on measures/implementation plans to mitigate landslides. In this context,  
17 it depends on data availability and purpose for the user to perform any of the two  
18 Tier evaluations.

## 20 **Conclusions**

21 After having presented and discussed examples for small-scale landslide  
22 susceptibility analyses at continental and national levels, we conclude our  
23 contribution specifying the major requirements for future developments of the  
24 Tier-based landslide zoning approaches in the context of the European Union's  
25 Soil Thematic Strategy.

26 A Tier 1 landslide susceptibility analysis is aimed at the identification of  
27 priority areas (Eckelmann et al. 2006). It should be based on a reduced set of  
28 *common criteria* considering three geo-environmental factors (terrain gradient,  
29 lithology, and land cover) and evaluated/validated with representative landslide  
30 information (Hervás et al. 2007). Based on a synoptic analysis at the continental  
31 level and a differentiated evaluation at the national level for France considering  
32 major landslide types and physiographic regions, we conclude that landslide  
33 susceptibility can be successfully evaluated for the delineation of priority areas

1 with the reduced environmental information. However, any synoptic analysis at  
2 the continental level can be supposed to give a biased overview on landslide  
3 susceptibility since not considering specific landslide types or climato-  
4 physiographic settings. At present, we continue gathering locational and  
5 topological information on landslide events in Europe at national and regional  
6 levels (Van Den Eeckhaut and Hervás 2012) and elaborating a climato-  
7 physiographic terrain delineation allowing for specification of model regions  
8 throughout Europe. This will allow for a differentiated Tier 1 modelling approach  
9 at the continental level. First preliminary results are promising and indicate that a  
10 more advanced continental scale susceptibility evaluation suitable for better  
11 delineation of priority areas can be elaborated in the future (Günther et al. in  
12 press).

13 In the context of a Tier 2 landslide susceptibility evaluation to be  
14 conducted in priority areas identified by Tier 1, our Tier 2 attempt for Italy shows  
15 that quantitative, statistical landslide susceptibility evaluations can be conducted  
16 even at small spatial scales, provided that enhanced geo-environmental data on  
17 landslide controlling factors, together with (most importantly) distributed and  
18 harmonised landslide data is available. Considering the latter, we conclude that  
19 Tier 2 areas as identified by Tier 1 should delineate regions where distributed,  
20 multi-temporal landslide inventory data with topological information should be  
21 gathered as required for inventory-based, statistical Tier 2 evaluations. For the  
22 exemplary Tier 2 evaluation presented here, we recommend a small administrative  
23 mapping unit (municipality) for spatial evaluation since the decision on  
24 measures/implementation plans based on Tier 2 analysis to assess the landslide  
25 threat requires an association of landslide susceptibility with (agro) economic or  
26 population-related census data. However, since geo-environmental conditions are  
27 in most cases not associated with administrative units, we conclude that the  
28 definition of suitable Tier 2 mapping units should be enforced within the further  
29 development of the Soil Thematic Strategy for general Tier 2-based assessments  
30 of soil threats. Furthermore, we conclude that Tier 2 evaluations in terms of  
31 landslides should be conducted individually for at least three major types of  
32 landslides (e.g., slides, flows and falls).

33 Finally, it is important to mention that the spatial assessment of rather  
34 localized soil threats like landslides cannot be sufficiently addressed through

1 small-scale evaluations as the Tier-based concept proposed in the framework of  
2 the Soil Thematic Strategy. Therefore, it does not substitute landslide-specific  
3 statistical or physically-based susceptibility modelling in local, highly landslide  
4 affected areas as indicated by Tier 2 (i.e., “Tier 3”, Hervás et al. 2007) necessary  
5 for local landslide mitigation plans.  
6

## 7 **Acknowledgements**

8 This work was conducted in the framework of the activities of the European  
9 Landslide Expert Group on “Guidelines for Mapping Areas at Risk of Landslides  
10 in Europe” (<http://eusoils.jrc.ec.europa.eu/library/themes/landslides/wg.html>), and  
11 of the International Consortium on Landslides project IPL-162 “Tier-based  
12 harmonised approach for landslide susceptibility mapping over Europe”. We  
13 thank the other members of the European Landslide Expert Group (J. Chaçon, P.  
14 Hobbs, O. Maquaire, A. Pasuto, E. Poyiadji, F. Tagliavini, A. Trigilia) for all the  
15 fruitful discussions. We are indebted to D. Kirschbaum Bach (NASA) for  
16 providing the portion for Europe of the global landslide susceptibility map of  
17 Hong et al. (2007). We thank L. Montanarella (JRC) and R. Baritz (BGR) for the  
18 support. We also like to thank two anonymous reviewers and the journal editor for  
19 their valuable comments that helped to improve the presentation. FG and PR  
20 supported by the EU-FP7 DORIS project (<http://www.doris-project.eu/>), EC  
21 Contract n. 242212.  
22

## 23 **References**

- 24 Asch K (2005) The 1:5 Million International Geological Map of Europe and Adjacent Areas  
25 (IGME 5000). Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe, Hannover, Germany  
26 Ayalew L, Yamagishi H, Ugawa N (2004) Landslide susceptibility mapping using GIS-based  
27 weighted linear combination, the case in Tsugawa area of Agano River, Niigata  
28 Prefecture, Japan. *Landslides* 1:73-81  
29 Barredo JI, Benavides A, Hervás J, van Westen CJ (2000) Comparing heuristic landslide hazard  
30 assessment techniques using GIS in the Tirajana basin, Gran Canaria Island, Spain.  
31 *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 2:9-23  
32 Brabb EE (1984) Innovative approaches to landslide hazard mapping. *Proc 4th Int Symp*  
33 *Landslides, Toronto*, 1:307-324

- 1 BRGM (2005) The Geological Map of France 1:1 Million. Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et  
 2 Minières, Paris, France
- 3 Brown CE (1998) Applied Multiple Statistics in Geohydrology and Related Sciences. Springer-  
 4 Verlag, New York
- 5 Castellanos Abella EA, van Westen C (2008) Qualitative landslide susceptibility assessment by  
 6 multicriteria analysis: a case study from San Antonio del Sur, Guantánamo, Cuba.  
 7 Geomorphology 94:453-466
- 8 Chung C-JF, Fabbri AG (2003) Validation of Spatial Prediction Models for Landslide Hazard  
 9 Mapping. Natural Hazards 30:3 451-472
- 10 Committee on the Review of the National Landslide Hazards Mitigation Strategy (2004)  
 11 Partnerships for reducing landslide risk: assessment of the National Landslide Hazards  
 12 Mitigation Strategy. National Academies Press, Washington DC
- 13 Compagnoni B, Damiani AV, Valletta M, Finetti I, Cirese E, Pannuti S, Sorrentino F, Rigano C  
 14 (eds) (1976-1983) Carta Geologica d'Italia. Servizio Geologico d'Italia, Stabilimento  
 15 Salomone, Rome, scale 1:500,000, 5 sheets
- 16 EC 2006a Thematic Strategy for Soil Protection. COM(2006)231 final. Commission of the  
 17 European Communities, Brussels, Belgium
- 18 EC 2006b Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a  
 19 framework for the protection of soil and amending Directive 2004/35/EC.  
 20 COM(2006)232 final. Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, Belgium
- 21 EC 2009. A Community approach on the prevention of natural and man-made disasters.  
 22 COM(2009) 82 final, 23.2.2009, Brussels, Belgium
- 23 EC 2010. Risk Assessment and Mapping Guidelines for Disaster Management. SEC(2010) 1626  
 24 final, 21.12.2010, Brussels, Belgium
- 25 EC 2012. The implementation of the Soil Thematic Strategy and ongoing activities. Report from  
 26 the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and  
 27 Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM(2012) 46, Brussels, Belgium.
- 28 Eckelmann W, Baritz R, Bialousz S, Bielek P, Carre F, Houskova B, Jones RJA, Kibblewhite MG,  
 29 Kozak J, Le Bas C, Toth G, Varallyay G, Yli Halla M, Zupan M (2006) Common criteria  
 30 for risk area identification according to soil threats. European Soil Bureau Research  
 31 Report No. 20, EUR 22185 EN. Office for Official Publications of the European  
 32 Communities, Luxembourg
- 33 Evans E, Pennington C, Foster F, in press. Mapping a nation's landslides: a novel multistage  
 34 methodology. Proceedings of the 2nd World Landslide Forum, 3-9 October 2011, Rome,  
 35 Italy
- 36 Fawcett T (2006) An introduction to ROC analysis. Pattern Recog Lett 27:861-874
- 37 Fell R, Corominas J, Bonnard C, Cascini L, Leroi E, Savage WZ (2008) Guidelines for landslide  
 38 susceptibility, hazard and risk zoning for land use planning. Eng Geol 102:85-98
- 39 Figueira J, Greco S, Ehrgott M (2005) Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: State of the Art  
 40 Surveys. Springer-Verlag, New York



- 1 Finke P, Hartwich R, Dudal R, Ibáñez J, Jamagne M, King D, Montanarella L, Yassoglou N  
2 (2001) Georeferenced soil database for Europe, Manual of procedures, Version 1.1.  
3 European Soil Bureau Research Report No. 5, EUR 18092 EN. Office for Official  
4 Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg
- 5 Fisher RA (1936) The use of multiple measurements in taxonomic problems. *Annals of Eugenics*  
6 7:179-188
- 7 Foster C, Gibson A, Wildman G (2008) The new national landslide database and landslide hazard  
8 assessment of Great Britain. *Proceedings of the First World Landslide Forum, Tokyo, 18-*  
9 *21 November 2008, pp 203-206*
- 10 Glade T, Anderson MG, Crozier MJ (eds) (2005) *Landslide risk assessment*. John Wiley
- 11 Gorsevski PV, Jankowski P, Gessler PE (2006) An heuristic approach for mapping landslide  
12 hazard by integrating fuzzy logic with analytic hierarchy process. *Control Cybern*  
13 35(1):121–146
- 14 Guzzetti F, Carrara A, Cardinali M, Reichenbach P (1999) Landslide hazard evaluation: an aid to a  
15 sustainable development. *Geomorphology* 31:181-216
- 16 Guzzetti F, Cardinali M, Reichenbach P (1994) The AVI Project: A bibliographical and archive  
17 inventory of landslides and floods in Italy. *Environ Manag* 18:623-633
- 18 Guzzetti F, Reichenbach P (1994) Toward the definition of topographic divisions of Italy.  
19 *Geomorphology* 11:57-74
- 20 Guzzetti F, Tonelli G (2004) Information system on hydrological and geomorphological  
21 catastrophes in Italy (SICI): a tool for managing landslides and flood hazards in Italy. *Nat*  
22 *Hazards Earth Syst Sci* 4:213-232
- 23 Guzzetti F, Reichenbach P, Ardizzone A, Cardinali M, Galli M (2006) Estimating the quality of  
24 landslide susceptibility models. *Geomorphology* 81:166-184
- 25 Günther A, Reichenbach P, Hervás J (2008) Approaches for delineating areas susceptible to  
26 landslides in the framework of the European Soil Thematic Strategy. *Proceedings of the*  
27 *First World Landslide Forum, Tokyo, 18-21 November 2008, pp. 235-238*
- 28 Günther A, Van Den Eeckhaut M, Reichenbach P, Hervás J, Malet JP, Foster C, Guzzetti F, in  
29 press. New developments in harmonized landslide susceptibility mapping over Europe in  
30 the framework of the European Soil Thematic Strategy. *Proceedings of the 2nd World*  
31 *Landslide Forum, 3-9 October, 2011, Rome, Italy*
- 32 Heineke HJ, Eckelmann W, Thomasson AJ, Jones RJA, Montanarella L, Buckley B (eds) *Land*  
33 *Information Systems: Developments for planning the sustainable use of land resources*.  
34 European Soil Bureau Research Report No. 4, EUR 17729 EN. Office for Official  
35 Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg
- 36 Hervás J, Günther A, Reichenbach P, Chacón J, Pasuto A, Malet J-P, Trigila A, Hobbs P,  
37 Maquaire O, Tagliavini F, Poyiadji E, Guerrieri L, Montanarella L (2007)  
38 Recommendations on a common approach for mapping areas at risk of landslides in  
39 Europe. In: Hervás J (ed), *Guidelines for Mapping Areas at Risk of Landslides in Europe*.  
40 *Proceedings Experts Meeting, Ispra, Italy, 23-24 October 2007. JRC Report EUR 23093*  
41 *EN. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg*

- 1 Hong Y, Adler R, Huffman G (2007) Use of satellite remote sensing data in the mapping of global  
2 landslide susceptibility. *Nat. Hazards* 43:245-256.
- 3 Jaedicke C, Van Den Eeckhaut M, Nadim F, Hervás J, Kalsnes B, Smith T, Tofani V, Ciurean R,  
4 Winter M (2011) Identification of landslide hazard and risk "hotspots" in Europe.  
5 *Geophysical Research Abstracts* 13, EGU2011-10398
- 6 Jenks GF (1967) The data model concept in statistical mapping. *International Yearbook of*  
7 *Cartography* 7:186-190
- 8 Kirschbaum DB, Adler R, Hong Y, Lerner-Lam A (2009) Evaluation of a preliminary satellite-  
9 based landslide hazard algorithm using global landslide inventories. *Nat. Hazards Earth*  
10 *Syst. Sci.* 9:673-686
- 11 L'Abate G, Costantini EAC (2004). GIS pedoclimatico d'Italia. Progetto PANDA. Istituto  
12 Sperimentale Studio e Difesa del Suolo, Centro Nazionale Cartografia Pedologica.  
13 Firenze, Italia. CD-Rom (<http://abp.entecra.it/soilmaps/ita/pedoclima3.html>) Mancini F  
14 (ed) (1966) Soil map of Italy. Società Geografica, A.G.A.F.-A. and R. Senatori Publisher,  
15 scale 1:1,000,000
- 16 Malet JP, Thiery Y, Puissant A, Hervás J, Günther A, Grandjean G (2009). Landslide  
17 susceptibility mapping at 1:1M scale over France: exploratory results with a heuristic  
18 model. In: Malet J-P, Remaître A, Boogard TA (eds): *Proceedings of the International*  
19 *Conference on Landslide Processes: from Geomorphologic Mapping to Dynamic*  
20 *Modelling*, Strasbourg, France, CERG Editions, pp 315-320
- 21 Malet JP, Puissant A., Mathieu A, Van Den Eeckhaut M, Fressard M, in revision. Landslide  
22 susceptibility assessment at 1:1M scale for France. *Landslides*, 15p
- 23 Mason SJ, Graham NE (2002) Areas beneath the relative operating characteristics (ROC) and  
24 relative operating levels (ROL) curves: Statistical significance and interpretation. *Q J*  
25 *Royal Meteor Soc* 128:2145-2166
- 26 MATE/METL (1999) Plan de Prévention des Risques (PPR) - Risques de Mouvements de terrain.  
27 Guide Méthodologique. Ministère de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Environnement  
28 (MATE), Ministère de l'Équipement des Transports et du Logement (METL), La  
29 Documentation Française, Paris, 45pp
- 30 Metz CE (1978) Basic principles of ROC analysis. *Seminars in Nuclear Medicine*, 8:283-298
- 31 Michie D, Spiegelhalter DJ, Taylor CC (eds) (1994) *Machine Learning, Neural and Statistical*  
32 *Classification*. Internet version (<http://www.amsta.leeds.ac.uk/~charles/statlog/>)
- 33 Mora S, Vahrson W (1994) Macrozonation methodology for landslide hazard determination. *Bull*  
34 *Assoc Eng Geol* 31(1):49-58
- 35 Nadim F, Kjekstad O, Peduzzi P, Herold C, Jaedicke C (2006) Global landslide and avalanche  
36 hotspots. *Landslides* 3:159-173.
- 37 Nordregio (2004) *Mountain Areas in Europe: Analysis of mountain areas in EU member states,*  
38 *acceding and other European countries*. Brussels: Final Report EC Project No  
39 2002.CE.16.0.AT.136

- 1 Panagos P, Van Liedekerke M, Jones A, Montanarella L (2012) European Soil Data Centre:  
2 Response to European policy support and public data requirements. *Land Use Policy*  
3 29(2):329-338
- 4 Remondo J, González-Díez A, Díaz de Terán JR, Cendrero A, Fabbri A, Chung CJF (2003)  
5 Validation of landslide susceptibility maps; examples and applications from a case study  
6 in Northern Spain. *Nat Hazards* 30(3):437-449
- 7 Rudolf B, Beck C, Grieser J, Schneider U (2005) Global precipitation analysis products. Deutscher  
8 Wetterdienst, Offenbach a. M., Germany
- 9 Saaty T (1980) *The Analytical Hierarchy Process*. McGraw Hill, New York
- 10 Saaty T, Vargas LG (1984) Comparison of eigenvalue and logarithmic least squares and least  
11 squares methods in estimating ratios. *Mathematical Modelling* 5: 309-324.
- 12 Schmidt-Thomé P (2006) Natural and technological hazards and risks affecting the spatial  
13 development of European regions. *Geol. Survey of Finland, Special Paper*, 42, 17-63
- 14 Trigila A, Iadanza C, Spizzichino D (2010) Quality assessment of the Italian Landslide Inventory  
15 using GIS processing. *Landslides* 7, 455–470
- 16 Van Den Eeckhaut M, Hervás J (2012) State of the art of national landslide databases in Europe  
17 and their potential for assessing landslide susceptibility, hazard and risk. *Geomorphology*  
18 139-140:545-558
- 19 Van Den Eeckhaut M, Hervás J, Jaedicke C, Malet JP, Montanarella L, Nadim F (2011). Statistical  
20 modelling of Europe-wide landslide susceptibility using limited landslide inventory data.  
21 *Landslides*. DOI: 10.1007/s10346-011-0299-z
- 22 van Westen CJ, Van Asch TWJ, Soeters R (2005) Landslide hazard and risk zonation: why is it  
23 still so difficult? *Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the Environment* 65:167-184
- 24 van Westen CJ, Castellanos E, Kuriakose SL (2009) Spatial data for landslide susceptibility,  
25 hazard and vulnerability assessment: an overview. *Eng. Geol.* 102:112-131
- 26 Varnes DJ (1978) Slope movements: types and processes. In: Schuster RL, Krizek RJ (eds)  
27 *Landslide analysis and control*, National Academy of Sciences, Transportation Research  
28 Board Special Report 176, Washington, pp 11-33
- 29 Voogd H (1983) *Multi-criteria Evaluation for Urban and Regional Planning*. Pion, London
- 30 Willmott CJ, Feddema JJ (1992) A more rational climatic moisture index. *Prof Geogr* 44(1):84-88
- 31 Yalcin A (2008) GIS-based landslide susceptibility mapping using analytical hierarchy process  
32 and bivariate statistics in Ardesen (Turkey): Comparisons of results and confirmations.  
33 *Catena* 72(1):1-12
- 34

## 35 **Figure Captions**

36 **Fig. 1** Location and extent of study areas

37 **Fig. 2** Spatial data used for the synoptic-scale analysis of landslide susceptibility in Europe  
38 grouped into five classes. (A) Terrain slope, obtained from the global GTOPO 30 terrain elevation  
39 dataset. (B) Lithological complexes in Europe, obtained from the “dominant soil parent material”

1 information of the Soil Geographical Database of Eurasia. (C) Land cover information in five  
2 classes, obtained from the PELCOM dataset

3 **Fig. 3** Landslide inventory maps for three European countries. (A) National landslide database for  
4 France (BDMvT) showing 17,598 landslides (June 2010). (B) National Landslide Database for  
5 Great Britain, showing 15,897 landslides (October 2011). (C) National archive of historical  
6 landslides in Italy, compiled by the AVI project, showing 15,503 landslides for the period 1950 -  
7 2001

8 **Fig. 4** Basic Tier 1 landslide susceptibility assessment for Europe. (A) Synoptic-scale landslide  
9 susceptibility map. (B) Histogram showing the frequency distribution of the computed values of  
10 the normalized landslide susceptibility index  $S$  in Europe and pie charts reflecting total area and  
11 landslide frequencies of the five susceptibility levels. (C) Receiver Operating Characteristics  
12 (ROC) curves of susceptibility estimates and slope raster for three countries with landslide  
13 information and for the whole analysed area using the combined inventory information

14 **Fig. 5** Continental scale and global scale landslide susceptibility assessments. (A) ESPON  
15 landslide hazard zonation of Schmidt-Thomé (2006). (B) Portion of Europe of the global landslide  
16 susceptibility map of Hong et al. (2007). (C) Portion of Europe of Global landslide “hotspot” map  
17 of Nadim et al. (2006), without the four lowest susceptibility classes. (D) ROC plots comparing  
18 the performance of the different susceptibility zonations against the distribution of landslides in  
19 France (Figure 3A), Great Britain (Figure 3B), and Italy (Figure 3C)

20 **Fig. 6** Differentiated Tier 1 landslide susceptibility assessment for France. (A-C) Individual  
21 landslide susceptibility maps for slides, flows, and falls. (D) Compound landslide susceptibility  
22 map. (E): Association method employed to produce the compound susceptibility map from the  
23 typology-specific maps

24 **Fig. 7** Distribution of susceptibility classes of the compound Tier 1 landslide susceptibility map  
25 for France. (A) Relative proportions of plain and mountain areas in the different susceptibility  
26 classes. (B) Areal percentages of susceptibility levels in plain and mountain areas. Coastal areas  
27 were not analysed here due to their small spatial extent (0.15% of study area)

28 **Fig. 8** Evaluation of the differentiated Tier 1 susceptibility assessment in France: (A) Compound  
29 landslide susceptibility map classified in susceptible and non susceptible areas. (B) Representation  
30 of municipalities (red dots) affected by at least one landslide event

31 **Fig. 9** Tier 2 landslide susceptibility assessment for Italy. (A) Map showing municipalities  
32 classified by the multivariate statistical analysis (colour coded: municipalities identified as priority  
33 areas by the continental-level evaluation in Fig. 4; gray : municipalities outside the priority areas).  
34 (B) Confusion matrix showing municipalities with/without landslide events against the prediction  
35 from the statistical model. (C) Analysis of the prediction skill of the landslide susceptibility model.  
36 The continuous ROC curve shows the model fitting performance ( $AUC = 0.70$ ); the dashed line  
37 shows the prediction-rate curve ( $AUC = 0.66$ ) obtained considering the number of events of the  
38 landslide validation set

Author reply letter

Manuscript LASL-461, Version 2

“Tier-based approaches for landslide susceptibility assessment in Europe”

A. Günther et al.

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for the re-evaluation of our manuscript. We highly appreciate the comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly, together with additional checking of typos and language. We hope that this improved version can be accepted.

Sincerely Yours,

Andreas Günther (on behalf of all authors)

### **Reply to comments**

*“Page 2 (abstract), line 15. "a historical ..." (not "an historical")*

Corrected.

*“ibid, line 16. doubled commas”*

Corrected.

*“Page 23, line 7 and page 24, line 2. First time you right "6159 Italian municipalities?? second time "6160 Italian municipalities?? What No is correct?”.*

It is 6159 municipalities, we have corrected that throughout.

*“Page 23, line 9 (+ Table 5). One soil type. Is it correct that only one soil type is included? Are other types of soils indifferent for landsliding? And what about soil thickness? May be I'm wrong, but in Table 4 this parameter is indicated”*

In Table 4, the spatial criteria used for the Tier 2 analysis are indicated, from which 61 variables for the statistical modelling were derived. They are outlined on page 21. In Table 5 and the paragraph at page 23 are listed only those variables that have been selected by the stepwise procedure. We have made this clearer now in the “Data” and “Methodology” sections describing the Tier 2 model on page 20 – 23.

In a stepwise discriminant function analysis, a model of discrimination is built step-by-step. Specifically, at each step variables are reviewed and evaluated to determine which one will contribute most to the discrimination between groups. The Wilks' Lambda is the statistical procedure that we have selected in SPSS to add or remove variables from the analysis.

**Table 1** Landslide susceptibility criteria used for the synoptic-scale landslide susceptibility model and associated terrain zonation for Europe. The number of classes corresponds to expert-based susceptibility reclassification of the thematic variables

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Classes</i>
Slope angle	GTOPO30	1:1M	1 × 1 km	5
Lithology	European Soil Database	1:1M	vector map	5
Land cover	PELCOM	1:1M	1 × 1 km	5

**Table 2** Weights attributed to the landslide susceptibility criteria used for the assessment of landslide susceptibility in Europe through an Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) technique

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Factor weight</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Class weight</i>
Slope angle	0.64	< 1°	0.07
		1 ≤ 2°	0.13
		2 ≤ 5°	0.20
		5 ≤ 15°	0.27
		> 15°	0.33
Lithology	0.26	Organic/detrital	0.07
		(Glacio)fluvial/sandy/loamy	0.13
		Volcanic/crystalline	0.20
		Schists/alluvium/colluvium	0.27
		Clayey/flyschoid/calcareous	0.33
Land cover	0.10	Urban/wetlands	0.07
		Arable/shrubs	0.13
		Crops/barren	0.20
		Coniferous/mixed forests	0.27
		Grassland/deciduous forests	0.33



**Table 3** Spatial criteria used for the national-scale Tier 1 landslide susceptibility model for France. The number of classes is the result of a reclassification of the original thematic variables

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Classes</i>
Slope	IGN DEM (BD-Altitude®)	1:100,000	50 × 50 m	13
Soil parent material	BRGM Geological Map, 6 <sup>th</sup> ed.	1:1 M	vector map	24
Land cover	Corine Land Cover	1:100,000	50 × 50 m	10

**Table 4** Spatial criteria used for the Tier 2 landslide susceptibility model in priority areas of Italy. The number of classes is the result of a reclassification of the original thematic variables

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Scale</i>	<i>Resolution</i>	<i>Classes</i>
Elevation	SRTM		90 × 90 m	n.a.
Slope	SRTM		90 × 90 m	n.a.
Lithology	Compagnoni et al. (eds) (1976-1983)	1:1M	vector map	10
Soil thickness	Mancini (ed) (1966)	1:1M	vector map	8
Soil type	Mancini (ed) (1966)	1:1M	vector map	11
Mean cumulated annual rainfall	L'Abate and Costantini (2004)			9
Mean annual temperature	L'Abate and Costantini (2004)			9
Landslide in the neighboring municipalities	AVI catalogue			2

**Table 5** List of the 18 variables entered in the Tier 2 discriminant model of landslide susceptibility in Italy. Positive coefficients are correlated to the presence of landslides. Negative coefficients are correlated to the absence of landslides

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Variable description</i>	<i>SDFC</i>
Morphology	Municipality mean elevation	-.443
	Standard deviation of municipality elevation	-.724
	Municipality minimum slope angle	-.206
	Municipality mean slope angle	.243
	Standard deviation of municipality slope angle	-.647
	Municipality slope range	1,070
	Municipality elevation range	1,125
Lithology	Continental deposits	-.252
	Sandstone	.132
	Limestone	-.261
Soil Type	Brown soils	.140
Climate	Mean annual temperature (range 9.5-12.0)	.123
	Mean annual temperature (range 12.0-13.5)	.270
	Mean annual temperature (range 13.5-15.0)	.260
	Mean annual temperature (range 17.7-20.0)	-.093
	Annual rainfall (range 698-809)	-.133
	Annual rainfall (range 973-1213)	-.116
Neighboring	Historical landslide event in the neighbor municipality	.190




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5






Figure 6




Figure 7




Figure 8




Figure 9