Framework Questions
Why are the maps produced in different risk workflows different in terms of projection, resolution, availability of coordinates, etc.? This should be standardized in order to have comparability of the results and thus better understandability for non-specialists in the field.
In some workflows (such as floods), the calculation of future hazard is based on an average value of an ensemble of all available models, which is the correct approach. However, in other workflows (such as snow), calculations of future hazard are based on individual models without allowing for averaging of all values, which is incorrect. Is there any intention to fix this significant issue?
Would it be possible for the project to provide some training (e.g. one or more webinars) on the usage of climate data and models?
In 10-12 April 2025, Anatolia experienced a severe Agricultural Frost disaster devastating nearly half of Türkiye's cropland. Total economic impact including direct crop yield loss, lost exports, employment effects and replanting will be around 10-15 billion Euro. Developing a new workflow for Agricultural Frost Hazard and Risk Assessment to analyse magnitude, frequency and yield/revenue losses will be highly beneficial for all countries in terms of food security. Do you have a plan to extend CRA Workflows- new workflow for Agricultural Frost hazard or extending SNOW workflow to cover also Frost hazard?
To what extent can the CLIMAAX framework be adapted to sector-specific contexts, such as livestock farming, where indicators like heat stress on animals or feed availability play a central role?
How does the framework address uncertainty quantification and communication within Climate Risk Assessments (CRAs), especially when results are used for informing policy decisions at regional or municipal levels?
Are there plans to develop implementation support tools (e.g., policy toolkits) that facilitate the operationalization of CRA outputs into regional adaptation and emergency management strategies, particularly in alignment with RAST Step 3?
Given the heterogeneity of socio-economic conditions in agriculture (e.g., scale and vulnerability of smallholder dairy farms), how does the CLIMAAX framework accommodate risk prioritization that goes beyond hazard intensity alone?

When selecting all variables and a wide range of years simultaneously, the dataset size becomes very large. Therefore, will a standard API query structure be used in the studies, or will flexible queries be created based on the selected variables and years according to the purpose of the analysis?
How does the CLIMAAX methodology account for inaccuracies in modeling hydrological phenomena in intermittent (temporary) rivers? Specifically, we obtained water depths ranging from 2.0 m (10-year return period) to 5.0 m (500-year return period) for our city center, which seems excessive for a river that dries up for most of the year. How should we interpret these results?
How can we validate the calculated material damages when they do not reflect current market prices and economic conditions in our region? The results show estimated damages ranging from €60 million (10-year period) to €110 million (500-year period) with an average expected annual damage of €7.77 million, which seems disproportionately high compared to our municipality's budget and economic reality?
How does the CLIMAAX methodology account for inaccuracies in modeling hydrological phenomena in intermittent (temporary) rivers? Specifically, we obtained water depths ranging from 2.0 m (10-year return period) to 5.0 m (500-year return period) for our city center, which seems excessive for a river that dries up for most of the year. How should we interpret these results?
How does the methodology account for demographic changes when determining the number of people subject to evacuation? We have contradictory results from different analyses: one graph indicates 700-900 evacuees across different return periods (with an average annual evacuation of 76 people), while a table suggests 9,344-12,290 people needed for evacuation - a difference of more than 10 times. Given our current population of 87,361 people and its declining trend, which of these values should we consider reliable for our emergency planning? What methodological approach should we use to resolve such significant discrepancies in evacuation numbers?
How does CLIMAAX deal with the uncertainty inherent in climate projections in its risk assessments?
How does the CLIMAAX methodology address the issue of interdependence between different sectors and systems (e.g. energy, water, transport) in risk assessment? Are there tools for modelling these cascading effects?
Is there a plan to extend the framework with some easy to understand and implement guidelines, how particular phases and related outcomes communicate to relevant target stakeholders?

Does it make sense to consider also costs and benefits identification for the framework implementation, mainly in connection for the future sustainability and further improvement of the framework?
Could it be also possible to indicate in which phase, what kind of expertise is foreseen to be allocated in order to support better planning and resource management? Are there foreseen some activities related to the monitoring of the framework implementation and further maturation in the future?
During the course of the project work, it may be possible to identify climate hazards within a municipality that are not included in the FSTP or the municipality's respective CLIMAAX project contract. Can they be included in the study additionally, and by what procedure?
In a number of cases, there are no or very limited numbers of ground-based meteorological stations within a study area. At the same time, where the area is characterised by a very rich presence of local climate-forming factors (topography, orography, inclinations and exposures of mountain slopes, diverse vegetation, water bodies, urban areas, etc.), model-generated data cannot reflect the impact of these local factors. This stems from the relatively larger scale resolution of these factors relative to the smaller scale resolution of the modelled data. Shouldn't local project teams start by developing an assessment of the most important local climate factors and creating appropriate coefficients to transform model values & bring them closer to reality?
The project objectives, among others, are implicitly aimed at increasing knowledge and understanding of climate issues among stakeholders, including authorities, decision-makers, business sector representatives, vulnerable groups, the general population. Would it be possible for the project to centrally provide a list of selectable approaches and actions to help local teams choose actions to increase climate understanding and improve stakeholder attitudes towards climate action?
Could the project centrally propose a catalogue of unified actions and measures for climate hazard mitigation and adaptation? Local teams/communities could then select generic baseline measures from this catalogue, to which they could additionally add their own specific measures appropriate to local climate conditions.
At the end of phase 1, did some of the beneficiaries of the 1st CLIMAAX Open Call combine or cross-reference several hazards to better identify and understand the risks in the area?