P24: Identification of flood hazard areas	
Maturity score	
Mean: 2.7	STD: 0.61

Constraints and limitations

- False positives from the changes on the land surface, not caused by flooding.
- Difficulties in detecting floods in urban or densely vegetated areas.
- False positives caused by differences in relative orbits of Sentinel-1
- Complex in areas of local hydrology
- · Limitations in detecting water under vegetation,
- Discrimination of "Artificial flooding" from irrigated fields (E.g. rice paddy fields).

Relevant user needs

- UN12: Analysis of potential risks in specific regions.
- UN13: Need to geo-map clients.
- UN14: Need to screen the feasibility of projects against different hazard criteria.
- UN37: Projection of risk to portfolio assets into the future.
- UN43: Need to monitor changing precipitation patterns and flood risk in the vicinity of vulnerable assets.

R&D gaps

- Limitations of revisit time-frequency (potentially missing flood events or max flood peak)
- Unavailability of global high-resolution DEM

Potential improvements drivers

- More revisit time of SAR data.
- Additional data on vulnerability and exposure is required to evaluate the impacts of some perils/hazards.
- Global high-resolution DEM.

Utilisation level review

Utilisation score

Mean: 3.13 **STD:** 0.60

No utilisation

Low utilisation

Medium utilisation

- The product is already satisfying the technical and usability requirements.
- Lack of a single database, costs, and the need may not be as crucial in some sectors like the asset management space (different story for insurance, and re-insurance companies which need this product)
- Efforts to use this EO product more are ongoing in academic literature. Higher utilisation is blocked because of a lack of data to combine with this EO product e.g., the boundary locations of assets, buildings, and other properties.

High utilisation

Critical gaps related to relevant user needs

Guideline gap

UN37: Projection of risk to portfolio assets into the future.