


K.A.R.L.[®]-PRO REPORT

NATURAL HAZARD AND RISK ANALYSIS



K.A.R.L.® analyzes are used exclusively for loss prevention and early detection of risks. They are based on scientific data, facts and correlations. They also take account of the potential damage levels that may arise as a function of the specific physical sensitivity of certain goods under external impact.

Loss statistics of the insurance industry are not included in the analyzes. Therefore, risk figures calculated by K.A.R.L.® are not suitable as a basis for insurance premiums.

TASK

Task-ID: Hollywood Sign, California

Analysis of location dated: 15.09.2025 10:36:00

by: KA Köln.Assekuranz Agentur GmbH

Version: 5.1.0.4

LOCATION UNDER SURVEY

Hollywood Sign, California

GEOGRAPHICAL SITUATION


Latitude / Longitude (decimal):	34,134085 -118,321656
Estimated Elevation (m above sea level):	353,40
Elevation from Digital Elevation Model (m above sea level):	353,40
Type of Landscape:	low mountain range
Lowest Elevation within 1 km (m above sea level):	175,00
Highest Elevation within 1 km (m above sea level):	471,00
Approximate Distance to Coast (km):	21

This data was transferred partly automatically from a global digital elevation model, which is based on radar survey. Deviations from the real elevation are possible at places where the radar signal has been reflected by roofs or trees. (Source: NASA, SRTM V4)

NB: The assumed local elevation has been interpolated from the elevation model under worst-case aspects. It may be lower than the real ground elevation.

The specified distance from the coast corresponds to the straight line to the nearest point of the elevation model, which has not been defined as mainland. Therefore, under certain circumstances also estuaries or large river mouths can be interpreted as marine areas.

SUMMARY OF THE RISK ANALYSIS



(*) There might be a risk of surge resulting from heavy rainfall (see Chapters 4 and 5)!

Location: Hollywood Sign, California

Due to the local landscape highly unfavourable soil conditions were presumed when determining the intensity of the earthquake (e.g. subsoil of fine grained and water saturated sediments with a low degree of compactness and artificially filled in ground). Under these circumstances should there be an earthquake it could lead to heavy subsidence, slides and possibly liquefaction. We strongly recommend examination of the subsoil at the location.

VULNERABILITIES AND VALUES AT RISK

Values at Risk

TOTAL (%):	100
------------	-----

This risk analysis concerns the following goods / facilities / buildings:

Büroimmobilie oder Geschosswohnungsbau, über 7 Etagen

RISK FIGURES

PERIL RISK as % p.a.

Volcanism:	0,0000 (-)
Earthquake:	0,4462 (increased)
Tsunami:	0,0000 (-)
Surge / River Flood:	0,0000 (-)
Storm Surge:	0,0000 (-)
Storm:	0,0263 (very low)
Tornado:	0,0043 (very low)
Hail:	0,0003 (very low)
SUM (without Heavy Rainfall):	0,4771 (increased)
Heavy Rainfall:	0,0096 (very low)

The risk analysis has been calculated considering the vulnerabilities (sensivity of the goods / facilities / buildings that could be threatened by the examined natural hazards) defined by the user mentioned below.

The risks detected by K.A.R.L.[®] are calculated by numerical modelling. First of all the potential losses are calculated for statistical return periods of between 1 and max. 10.000 years. From this a mean annual loss is deduced as a significant figure for the Risk at the location.

Example (simplified): Should a total loss of 1 Mio. EUR be expected due to flooding only once a century then the mean annual loss (= RISK) is 10.000 EUR p.a.. The identical risk would result from the occurrence of e.g. 4 single events causing damage of 0,1 Mio., 0,3 Mio., 0,4 Mio. and 0,2 Mio. EUR collectively. The average then is also 10.000 EUR p.a..

Regardless of the object's value the risk can be expressed as a yearly percentage which would be, in the above example, 1 % of the total value of the object per year (i.e. RELATIVE RISK).

It is possible that singular claims may significantly exceed the calculated risks. Therefore they are separately listed below together with the corresponding statistical return periods. The CALCULATED MAXIMUM LOSS states the highest possible single loss for each model calculated. For this figure no statistical return period will be given.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FURTHER STEPS

Some risks have been identified as notable or above. Further investigations are necessary. Due to this it's recommended to clarify the following issues:

EARTHQUAKE:

Ask for information about the earthquake resistance of buildings concerned. These should be able to resist earthquakes with an MM-intensity of more than IX. Possible information sources: National building regulations, foundation ground expertise, documents concerning structural analysis.

Ask for information about the local subsoil conditions. It should not consist of soft, fine grained and water saturated sediments. Possible information sources: Open building pits, accessible construction plans, civil engineering offices, geological maps.

NOTES FOR INTERPRETATION

The calculated results by K.A.R.L.[®] and the statements in this report are to be considered as a guide only. They only INDICATE which perils can cause specific risks and where further action might be necessary. Their purpose is to prioritize further research and installation of protective devices. In no way can they replace a detailed and scientific analysis of the location itself by an expert.

Please note further: Is a risk identified and named, there is always an endangerment which, under certain circumstances, might cause severe damage. The classification of a risk as “VERY LOW” or “LOW” therefore only means, that such an extreme event occurs very seldom and not that it is impossible. Whether further protection is necessary even in a low risk situation depends on the value and the vulnerability of the goods at the location. Are the risks classified as “NOTABLE” to “VERY HIGH”, further investigation of the situation is always advisable in order to define the level of risk more precisely.

Such an investigation can be conducted by a detailed analysis of the location (K.A.R.L.[®]-EXPERT) by our own experts if requested.

This risk analysis was generated automatically. It was not checked for plausibility by an expert. Certain facts only visible in maps, air or satellite reconnaissance pictures, which might have influenced the risk evaluation, could not be taken into account.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions:

Team K.A.R.L.[®] (team.karl@koeln-assekuranz.com)

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS

Mean Annual Temperature:	18,8 °C
Coldest Month:	Jan. with 7,7 °C
Warmest Month:	Aug. with 31,4 °C
Number of days per year $\geq 20^{\circ}\text{C}$: (mean temperature)	161
Mean Elevation of Frost Line above sea level:	1910 m
Annual Precipitation:	371 mm
Quarter with Maximum Precipitation:	J-F-M with 231 mm
Quarter with Minimum Precipitation:	M-J-J with 7 mm

The climate data given here are dynamically adapted to the respective current year on the basis of a climate model (NCAR Community Climate System Model (CCSM), Scenario A1b).

Theoretical Availability of Water:	3 mm p.a.
------------------------------------	-----------

Explanation: The availability of water is calculated as the difference between the annual precipitation and the evaporation. Theoretically, this amount of water is available as surface water or replenishes the groundwater storage. In the location under survey the amount is below 20 mm p.a.. The location is situated in an arid area.

Index of Severe Weather:	average (0,84)
--------------------------	----------------

Explanation: Köln.Assekuranz has calculated the index of severe weather using various climatic parameters. With this index the frequency and degree of severe weather can be compared to the conditions in Western Europe. The following Indices of severe weather are characteristic for certain regions: Stockholm: 0,6 London: 0,7 Cologne: 1,0 Munich: 1,3 Milan: 1,5 Osaka: 2,3 Hong-Kong: 4,2 Cayenne (French.Guayana): 5,1 West-Columbia: 11,7 Mumbai: 12,7

Flash Frequency (Occurrences per sq. km p.a.): 0,5

Explanation: NASA satellites observe the flash frequency globally. The following flash frequencies (number p.a. and km²) are typical for certain regions: Stockholm: 0,4 London: 1,0 Cayenne (French Guayana): 1,6 Cologne: 2,0 Munich: 2,0 Osaka: 4,7 Mumbay: 6,0 Milano: 12,0 Hong-Kong: 15,0 West-Colombia: 25,0


Only about 10 % of all registered flashes actually hit the ground.

Calculated maximum Snow Load (kg/m²): 0

No significant snow loads are to be expected from the given facts.

FOR THE STRUCTURAL DESIGN OF BUILDINGS ONLY SNOW LOADS ARE ALLOWED WHICH ARE PUBLISHED BY THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES. CONTACT YOUR MUNICIPAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT.

Climate Diagram



Explanation: The STEADMAN heat index reflects the perceived temperature in the higher temperature range. The long-term average values of real temperatures and humidity are included in his calculation. A perceived temperature of up to 26 ° C is defined as not critical to health. At the location under survey, this value is never exceeded in any month. This means that a pleasant climate for Europeans can be expected throughout the seasons.

HAZARD AND RISK ANALYSIS

The following HAZARDS are recalculated by K.A.R.L.® for each individual evaluation on the basis of scientific data. Existing hazard maps (see section Data Sources) are only used for control and comparison purposes. The RISKS derived from the hazards also depend on local factors (terrain height, existing protective measures, building quality, etc.) and the vulnerabilities predefined by the user specified below (specific sensitivities of the potentially affected goods / plants / buildings to the natural hazards investigated).

1. Volcanism

Due to the high sensitivity (vulnerability) of the on-site goods there is a potential hazard that requires a closer examination of the risk situation.

One possible active volcano found within 200 km radius from the location under survey.

Occurrence of last eruptions is not known.

Vulnerability Volcanism

Volcanic eruptions are characterized by different phenomena such as volcanic bombs, streams of lava and ashfall. Hence, the vulnerability is defined as a loss percentage depending on the distance from the crater. It refers to "Büroimmobilie oder Geschosswohnungsbau, über 7 Etagen" and has been used to calculate the following risk figures.



Active risk relevant volcanoes within a radius of 200 km

Distance (km)	Name	Country	Type	Last Eruption	RP-VEI3	Risk (% p.a.)
170,0	Lavic Lake	US-California	Volcanic field	unsure	30000	0,0001

RP-VEI3 = Estimated Return Period (RP) of a large eruption of the intensity 3 and higher (VEI = Volcanic Eruption Index). For strato-, somma- and submarine volcanoes the risk has been increased or decreased according to a modification of the distance. * = RP-VEI3 was determined by KA from the Eruption History.

Risk Figures Volcanism

Calculated Max. Loss (%):	2,0
Relative Risk (%/year):	0,0000

For further explanations see section RISK FIGURES.

Under these conditions the risk of volcanism is to be classified as unimportant.

Further explanations:

Basically all volcanoes that have erupted within the last 20.000 year are considered as potentially active. In special cases such as e.g. the Yellowstone Volcano (USA) longer periods of time have been considered.

2. Earthquake


The site is located in an area where a very high earthquake hazard is to be expected.

There have been a total of 2384 earthquakes since the year 1856 within a radius of 50 km from the location under survey. Their hypocentres were comparably close to the surface at a depth of less than 100 km. The mean depth of the hypocentres was 9 km.

This data was evaluated statistically leading to the following results:

Frequency of Earthquakes

The sample of earthquakes has been categorized according to their magnitudes and occurrence probabilities. The latter have been normed to a reference area of 7854 km² (R = 50 km). The Gutenberg-Richter-relation (see diagram below) shows the occurrence probabilities (Y) for different magnitudes (X).



The strongest earthquake registered so far occurred on 17.1.1994 12:30 at a distance of 25 km from the location under survey. Its magnitude was $M_w = 6,7$.

The classification of the earthquake hazard is usually done with a 475 year event taken from statistical frequency analysis. In this case this would mean a magnitude of $M_w = 6,8$ and an MM-Intensity of X (intense, well built structures and constructions destroyed) at the location under survey. Due to the local landscape highly unfavourable soil conditions were presumed when determining the intensity of the earthquake (e.g. subsoil of fine grained and water saturated sediments with a low degree of compactness and artificially filled in ground). Under these circumstances should there be an earthquake it could lead to heavy subsidence, slides and possibly liquefaction. We strongly recommend examination of the subsoil at the location.

Expected MM-Intensities at the location

Return Period 10 years:	III-IV
Return Period 20 years:	IV
Return Period 50 years:	VI
Return Period 100 years:	VII-VIII
Return Period 200 years:	IX
Return Period 475 years:	X
Return Period 1000 years:	XI
Return Period 2000 years:	XI-XII

MM-Intensities (Modified Mercalli Scale)

I. Instrumental	Not felt by many people unless in favourable conditions.
II. Weak	Felt only by a few people at best, especially on the upper floors of buildings. Delicately suspended objects may swing.
III. Slight	Felt quite noticeably by people indoors, especially on the upper floors of buildings. Many do not recognize it as an earthquake. Standing motor cars may rock slightly. Vibration similar to the passing of a truck. Duration estimated.
IV. Moderate	Felt indoors by many people, outdoors by few people during the day. At night some awakened. Dishes, windows, doors disturbed; walls make cracking sound. Sensation like heavy truck striking building. Standing motor cars rock noticeably. Dishes and windows rattle alarmingly.
V. Rather Strong	Felt outside by most, may not be felt by some outside in non-favourable conditions. Dishes and windows may break and large bells will ring. Vibrations like large train passing close to house.
VI. Strong	Felt by all; many frightened and run outdoors, walk unsteadily. Windows, dishes, glassware broken; books fall off shelves; some heavy moved or overturned; a few instances off fallen plaster. Damage slight.
VII. Very Strong	Difficult to stand; furniture broken; damage negligible in building of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well built ordinary structures; considerable damage in poorly built badly designed structures; some chimneys broken. Noticed by people driving motor cars.
VIII. Destructive	Damage slight in specially designed structures; considerable in ordinary substantial buildings with partial collapse. Damage great in poorly built structures. Fall of chimneys, factory stacks, columns, monuments, walls. Heavy furniture moved.
IX. Violent	General panic; damage considerable in specially designed structures, well designed frame structures thrown out of plumb. Damage great in substantial buildings, with partial collapse. Buildings shifted off foundations.
X. Intense	Some well built wooden structures destroyed; most masonry and frame structures destroyed with foundation. Rails bent.
XI. Extreme	Few, if any masonry structures remain standing. Bridges destroyed. Rails bent greatly.
XII. Cataclysmic	Total destruction - Everything is destroyed. Lines of sight an level distorted. Objects thrown into the air. The ground moves in waves or ripples. Large amounts of rock move positions. Landscape altered, or levelled by several meters. In some cases, even the routs of rivers are changed.

Vulnerability Earthquake

The vulnerability has been defined as loss percentage depending on the MM-Intensity at the location under investigation and refers to "Büroimmobilie oder Geschosswohnungsbau, über 7 Etagen". It has been used to calculate the following risk figures.



Risk Figures Earthquake

Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 50 years (%):	0,47
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 100 years (%):	5,0
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 200 years (%):	38
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 500 years (%):	74
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 1000 years (%):	95
Calculated Max. Loss (%):	100
Relative Risk (%/year):	0,4462

For further explanations see section RISK FIGURES.

According to these conditions the earthquake risk is classified as increased.


Further Explanations:

The **MAGNITUDE** is generally an index for the energy released during an earthquake at its hypocentre and could therefore also be given in Joule or Watt seconds. Various methods of measuring the magnitude of earthquakes are in use, leading to different scales of magnitudes (e.g. Mb, MS, Mw etc.). Nowadays, the moment magnitude (Mw) is commonly in use. The released energy can be best described by this method. We converted for our statistical evaluation as far as possible all the different magnitude figures into the Mw scale.

The **INTENSITY** on the other hand does not describe the force of an earthquake but its effects noticeable and visible on the surface. It is given in a scale of 12 steps, written in Roman figures. Alternatively it could be given as the ground acceleration at the location of observation. The intensity decreases strongly with the distance from the epicentre. Furthermore, the intensity very much depends on the local condition of the geological ground. Soft ground consisting of fine grained sediments and in addition water saturated can significantly increase the intensity of the earthquake, particularly in the case of artificially filled in ground.

Relationship between Magnitude and Intensity (schematic)

The **MAGNITUDE** is generally an index for the energy released during an earthquake at the hypocentre. The **INTENSITY** on the other hand describes its effects noticeable and visible on the surface. It is given in a scale of 12 steps, written in Roman figures.



3. Tsunami

Considering the elevation of the location of 353,40 m above sea level there is no need for examination. Tsunamis can be ruled out at the location under survey.

4. Surge (River Flood, Flash Flood, Drainage Failure)

The hazard analysis based upon the digital elevation model came to the following conclusion:

The location under survey is in an area not endangered by surge. However, following extreme precipitation and given unfavourable circumstances, water can penetrate into buildings and especially flood underground spaces such as cellars.

Under these conditions no immediate risk of surge can be identified from the given facts.

However, local floods can also be triggered by heavy rainfall events. The associated risk is discussed in the following section (Heavy Rainfall).

NB: The exact elevation was not given, but is most important for a correct classification of the risk of surge. It is strongly recommended to find out the exact elevation and repeat this analysis.

5. Heavy Rainfall

Heavy rainfall is usually a relatively limited phenomenon and can also occur in flood-safe zones. Conversely, floods or flash floods can be caused by heavy rainfall events which occur far away

from the investigated location, but do not hit it directly. The hazard locations of a heavy rainfall event and the associated flash flood are therefore not identical. Hence, K.A.R.L.[®] assesses flood and heavy rain risks separately, as these are independent risks.

Heavy rainfall can cause damage, which - unlike flooding - can occur under the influence of unfavorable conditions in the smallest possible space. In the first place, there is water inrush into cellars and underground garages as well as their entrances, inner courtyards closed on all sides, underpasses and small local depressions. All structures mentioned are often constructed and have only a small surface area. K.A.R.L.[®] is therefore unable to recognize them on the basis of the digital elevation models used. In addition, there is possible damage caused by the ingress of rainwater into buildings, vehicles and means of transport (wagons, containers, boxes, packaging foils, etc.) as well as impairments caused by washed out infrastructure systems.

Furthermore, the risk of being affected or damaged by heavy rain depends highly on the absorption capacity of the local sewage systems. Due to economic considerations, these are normally only designed for rainfall that occurs at statistical intervals of 3 to 10 years (design rainfall). A higher degree of protection is rare to find and is therefore not used in this context. If the design rainfall is exceeded, it results in overflow, the leakage of sewer water on the surface and the associated consequential damage.

A model developed by KA based on globally available climate data and calibrated on the basis of measured precipitation data from more than 1,700 weather stations worldwide is used to calculate the heavy rain hazard and the resulting risk. For each point on earth (except Antarctica), this model provides the approximate values of the maximum daily precipitation to be expected for return periods between 1 and 10,000 years.

Maximum Daily Precipitation (calculated by K.A.R.L.[®] model)

5-year (mm per day)	99
10-year (mm per day)	127
20-year (mm per day)	159
50-year (mm per day)	206
100-year (mm per day)	247
200-year (mm per day)	291
500-year (mm per day)	355
1000-year (mm per day)	408
MAX (mm per day)	609

There are no globally valid and comparable definitions of the terms design rain and heavy rain. What is perceived as heavy rain depends mainly on the regional climate. In addition, the local environmental conditions that make a heavy rainfall a damaging event can hardly be specified. Against this background, it is not possible to determine specific vulnerabilities on the one hand and, on the other hand, there is no global comprehensive information on the dimensioning of

wastewater systems available. The following generalized assumptions are used in the present analysis:

1. The design rainfall is based on the local 5-yearly daily precipitation, to be stated as precipitation height in mm (from K.A.R.L.® rounded up or down to the nearest full 50 mm/day). The maximum design rainfall is assumed to be 250 mm/day. Furthermore, it is assumed that the design rainfall calculated by K.A.R.L.® is only included in the dimensioning of sewage systems with a probability of 25%. On the other hand, it is assumed with a probability of 75% that the design rainfall will hardly be higher than 100 mm/day.
2. Precipitation events below or at the level of the assumed design rainfall do not cause any damage.
3. Precipitation events exceeding the assumed design basis rainfall are regarded as heavy rainfall.
4. The factor by which a heavy rainfall of a given return period exceeds the assumed design rainfall is decisive for the potential degree of damage.
5. The highest possible damage is assumed by K.A.R.L.® if a heavy rainfall event produces 5 times the amount of precipitation of the assumed design rainfall. It is equated with the maximum damage which, according to the vulnerability used, applies to floods. Between the first exceedance of the design rainfall and the potential maximum value, an exponential increase in the loss potential is assumed.

On this basis, it is assumed in the present case that the local drainage systems at the investigated site are (or should be) designed for a design rainfall of 100 mm per day and that no damage from heavy rainfall is to be expected up to this precipitation level. Under the regional meteorological conditions, precipitation can only be classified as heavy rain if it exceeds this value.

This results in the following risk figures.

Risk Figures Heavy Rainfall

Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 50 years (%):	0
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 100 years (%):	0
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 200 years (%):	0
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 500 years (%):	1,4
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 1000 years (%):	2,9
Calculated Max. Loss (%):	10
Relative Risk (%/year):	0,0096

According to these conditions the risk of heavy rainfall is classified as very low.

6. Storm Surge

Due to the local elevation of more than 10 m above sea level there is no need for examination. Storm surge can be excluded as far as humanly possible.

7. Storm


The site under investigation is located in a region where a mean storm hazard can be assumed.

The calculation of the storm hazard with K.A.R.L.[®] is based on KA's own analyzes of approximately 5000 weather stations worldwide. These stations provide relevant long term measurements of local wind speeds. In this context, no distinction is made between tropical cyclones and extratropical storms. Furthermore, we used the digital elevation model to examine whether the landscape morphology around the location might influence the maximum wind speed to be expected there.

Wind forces of ≥ 8 Bft (≥ 72 km/h) might occur several times a year, according to the statistical analysis of the data. A 100 year storm event would mean a local maximum wind speed of 142 km/h.

Frequency of Storms

The following diagram shows the wind speed of the maximum expected strong gusts depending on their individual return periods. Wind speeds are classified as follows : storms 89-102 km/h, severe storms 103-117 km/h, gales and tropical storms 118-177 km/h; severe tropical storms > 178 km/h



Vulnerability Storm

The vulnerability has been defined as loss percentage depending on the possible wind speed at the location under investigation and refers to "Büroimmobilie oder Geschosswohnungsbau, über 7 Etagen". It has been used to calculate the following risk figures.



Risk Figures Storm

Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 50 years (%):	0,21
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 100 years (%):	0,57
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 200 years (%):	1,1
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 500 years (%):	2,4
Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 1000 years (%):	3,6
Relative Risk (%/year):	0,0263

For further explanations see section RISK FIGURES.

According to these conditions the risk of storm is classified as very low.

8. Tornado

The site under investigation is located in a region where the tornado hazard is insignificant according to current knowledge.

The calculation of the hazard of tornados by K.A.R.L.[®] is based upon regional climatic parameters and geographical factors. Furthermore, within the model it was considered that large plains or slightly hilly landscapes would favour the occurrence of tornados. On the other hand, a strongly varied landscape prevents the formation of tornados or only permits tornados of a short duration. The model was calibrated using meteorological and climatic data from the USA. (Source: NOAA).

Therefore, in the region of the location under survey the statistical probability of 0,0428 severe tornados p.a. is to be reckoned with on a reference area of 10.000 square km as a worst case.

Furthermore, it was presumed that significant damage only occurs when the location is directly hit by a tornado. In this case total loss is to be expected. A tornado normally only has a width of 500 m and hence, even in an area with a high hazard of tornados a direct hit occurs seldom. Therefore, in comparison to other natural risks the calculated tornado risks are generally relatively low.

The definition of vulnerability regarding tornados is based on a maximum loss potential of 100 %.

Risk Figures Tornado

Calculated Max. Loss (%):	100
Relative Risk (%/year):	0,0043

For further explanations see section RISK FIGURES.

According to these conditions the risk of tornados is classified as very low.

9. Hail

The site under investigation is located in a region where a low hazard of hail can be assumed.

The calculation of the hazard of hail by K.A.R.L is based upon a model developed by KA. Regional climatic parameters were analysed whether they favour or hinder the formation of hail or how their effects might be mutually cancelled out. Furthermore, since hail is mostly coupled with thunderstorm, the frequency of flashes has been included in the model. The model was calibrated using meteorological and climatic data from the USA. (Source: NOAA).

Therefore, hailstones with an average diameter of < 1 cm have to be reckoned nearly every year, 1,0 ±0,7 cm with about every 10 years and hailstones with an average diameter of 2,5 ±0,8 cm have to be reckoned with about every 100 years.

No hail protection measures have been given. This information has been taken into consideration in the following risk analysis.

Vulnerability Hail

The vulnerability has been defined as loss percentage depending on the mean diameter of the hailstones and refers to "Büroimmobilie oder Geschosswohnungsbau, über 7 Etagen". It has been used to calculate the following risk figures.



Risk Figures Hail

Probable Maximum Loss, Return Period 50 years (%):	0
Calculated Max. Loss (%):	1,0
Relative Risk (%/year):	0,0003

For further explanations see section RISK FIGURES.

According to these conditions the risk of hail is classified as very low.

METHODOLOGY

The risk and hazard classifications determined by K.A.R.L.® are based on globally available geological, geographic and meteorological data sets that are stored, continuously maintained, extended and specified at KA. The methods of calculation are constantly being improved and adapted to the state of knowledge. Hence, the results refer solely to the state of knowledge at the time of this report.

The calculation methods are not based upon past claim events, they are only verified by them. This guarantees that the modelling of risks follows scientific principles and is not influenced by a random and sometimes incomplete collection of claim data.

Any missing or incomplete data is supplemented in the best plausible way by special estimation procedures developed by KA. These procedures follow generally the WORST CASE PRINCIPLE. Therefore, risk evaluations with a large amount of estimated parameters may lead to higher risk results.

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

This risk analysis was generated automatically. It was not checked for plausibility by an expert. Certain facts only visible in maps, air or satellite reconnaissance pictures which might have influenced the risk evaluation, could not be taken into account.

SOURCES OF DATA

A.Jarvis, H.I.Reuter, A.Nelson, E.Guevara, 2008, Hole-filled seamless SRTM data V4, International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)

Giardini, D., Grünthal, G., Shedlock, K. M. and Zhang, P.: The GSHAP Global Seismic Hazard Map. In: Lee, W., Kanamori, H., Jennings, P. and Kisslinger, C. (eds.): International Handbook of Earthquake & Engineering Seismology, International Geophysics Series 81 B, Academic Press, Amsterdam, 1233-1239, 2003

KA Köln.Assekuranz Agentur GmbH, our own data source and investigations

Munich RE, "topics" (various editions)

NASA - Global Hydrology Resource Center (GHRC)

NCAR GIS Program. 2012. Climate Change Scenarios, version 2.0. Community Climate System Model, June 2004 version 3.0. <http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/ccsm3.0/> was used to derive data products. NCAR/UCAR. URL: <http://www.gisclimatechange.org>. Data Access Date june 2017

NOAA - National Geophysical Data Center (NGDC)

NOAA - National Climatic Data Center (NCDC)

Smithsonian Institution (Washington), Global Volcanism Program

Stive, Marcel J.F. et al, How the Dutch plan to stay dry over the next Century, published in ICE-Civil Engineering (164) 2011, CE3, pp 114-212, ISSN0965 089X

U.S. Geological Survey, Department of the Interior/USGS

Van Dantzig, D. (1956) Economic decision problems for flood prevention, Econometrica 24(3): 276–287

Yongcun Cheng, Ole Baltazar Andersen, (2010). Improvement in global ocean tide model in shallow water regions. Poster, SV.1-68 45, OSTST, Lisbon, Oct.18-22

Data from the given sources are only evaluated and interpreted by KA. No data is passed on to third parties.

IMPRINT

KA Köln.Assekuranz Agentur GmbH

Scheidtweilerstr. 4

50933 Köln

Tel.: +49 (221) 3 97 61 – 200

Fax: +49 (221) 3 97 61 – 301

info@koeln-assekuranz.com

www.koeln-assekuranz.com

© 2025

KA Köln.Assekuranz Agentur GmbH