• Direct costs related to reinstatement works for damaged portions of the property (structures and the land).
• Stabilization works required to render the site to an tolerable risk level for the landslide.
• Professional and approvals fees.
• Consequential costs (such as legal fees and alternative temporary accommodation).

It does not include additional stabilisation works to address other landslides which may affect the property.

6.3.3 Estimate the market value.

This may be achieved by reference to property sale values within the local area which will reflect the value of the land plus structures. The client is likely to have some knowledge of the local market values. Again, a broad-brush guesstimate should often suffice.

6.3.4 Consider the resulting Consequence classification, such as using Appendix C, and implied accuracy of the above estimates.

It is not expected that the assessor will be a quantity surveyor or have similar experience, but that sensible estimates, possibly as a range, can be made and documented. Statement of limits of accuracy or uncertainty are appropriate for sensitivity and appraisal analysis.

6.4 EVALUATION OF CONSEQUENCES TO PERSONS

The following factors influence the likelihood of deaths and injuries or vulnerability \( V(D:T) \) of persons who are impacted by a landslide:

• Volume of slide.
• Type of slide, mechanism of slide initiation and velocity of sliding.
• Depth of slide.
• Whether the landslide debris buries the person(s).
• Whether the person(s) are in the open or enclosed in a vehicle or building.
• Whether the vehicle or building collapses when impacted by debris.
• The type of collapse if the vehicle or building collapses.

Persons are very vulnerable in the event of complete or substantial burial by debris, or the collapse of a building. It should be noted that even small slides, and single boulders, can kill people.

Appendix F provides some indicative examples of vulnerability values. The Commentary provides some more detailed discussion.

7 RISK ESTIMATION

7.1 QUANTITATIVE RISK ESTIMATION

Quantitative risk estimation involves integration of the frequency analysis and the consequences.

For property, the risk can be calculated from:

\[
R_{(Prop)} = P(H) \times P(S:H) \times P(T:S) \times V_{(Prop:S)} \times E
\]

Where

- \( R_{(Prop)} \) is the risk (annual loss of property value).
- \( P(H) \) is the annual probability of the landslide.
- \( P(S:H) \) is the probability of spatial impact by the landslide on the property, taking into account the travel distance and travel direction.
- \( P(T:S) \) is the temporal spatial probability. For houses and other buildings \( P(T:S) = 1.0 \). For Vehicles and other moving elements at risk \( 1.0 < P(T:S) < 0 \).
- \( V_{(Prop:S)} \) is the vulnerability of the property to the spatial impact (proportion of property value lost).
- \( E \) is the element at risk (e.g. the value or net present value of the property).

For loss of life, the individual risk can be calculated from:

\[
R_{(LoL)} = P(H) \times P(S:H) \times P(T:S) \times V_{(D:T)}
\]

Where

- \( R_{(LoL)} \) is the risk (annual probability of loss of life (death) of an individual).
- \( P(H) \) is the annual probability of the landslide.
- \( P(S:H) \) is the probability of spatial impact of the landslide impacting a building (location) taking into account the travel distance and travel direction given the event.
- \( P(T:S) \) is the temporal spatial probability (e.g. of the building or location being occupied by the individual) given the spatial impact and allowing for the possibility of evacuation given there is warning of the landslide occurrence.
- \( V_{(D:T)} \) is the vulnerability of the individual (probability of loss of life of the individual given the impact).

A full risk analysis involves consideration of all landslide hazards for the site (e.g. large, deep seated landsliding, smaller slides, boulder falls, debris flows) and all the elements at risk.
For comparison with tolerable risk criteria, the individual risk from all the landslide hazards affecting the person most at risk, or the property, should be summed.

The assessment must clearly state whether it pertains to ‘as existing’ conditions or following implementation of recommended risk mitigation measures, thereby giving the ‘residual risk’.

### 7.2 SEMI-QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RISK ESTIMATION FOR RISK TO PROPERTY

When considering the risk to property, it may be useful to use qualitative terms to report the results of the analysis, rather than quantitative values. The risk calculation may be completed quantitatively or by the use of qualitative terms.

A semi quantitative analysis (where the likelihood is linked to an indicative probability) or a qualitative analysis may be used:

- As an initial screening process to identify hazards and risks which require more detailed consideration and analysis.
- When the level of risk does not justify the time and effort required for more detailed analysis.
- Where the possibility of obtaining numerical data is limited such that a quantitative analysis is unlikely to be meaningful or may be misleading.

Section 7.3 describes a suitable and preferred terminology.

### 7.3 RISK MATRIX FOR PROPERTY LOSS

**a) Adopt a defined qualitative terminology for likelihood, consequence and risk.**

Qualitative terminology is presented in Appendix C for property loss. The terminology has been developed from Appendix G in AGS (2000) taking into account the experience and comments as discussed in the Commentary.

For ease of use, the frequency estimate, expressed as an annualized probability and taking into account the probability of spatial impact, is expressed qualitatively as likelihood.

The terminology is aimed primarily at residential development but may also be used for other situations. It is noted that provision of specific numerical values at the Notional Boundaries for the terms adopted does not reduce the uncertainty that may be associated with assessment of appropriate numerical values.

Where sufficient data is available, the risk should be determined from a quantitative analysis. The results can then be objectively compared, especially with quantified allowable risk criteria.

Where there is insufficient data or the study is at a walk over or preliminary design level, then use of qualitative methods or terms may be more appropriate. Use of risk ranking schemes, where component inputs are assigned relative ranks, may be suitable for initial screening. In other cases, it is likely that expression of the likelihood, consequence and risk using qualitative terms is preferable for communication purposes; (for example using terminology as in Appendix C). Selection of the appropriate term should be based on an appropriate evaluation of likelihood or consequence ranges.

Semi-quantitative methods may be a combination of both, for example considering risk to property qualitatively, and risk to life quantitatively based on the appropriate best estimates of likelihood.

**b) The practitioner should adopt the preferred risk matrix presented in Appendix C.**

The terminology presented in Appendix C of this Practice Note has addressed the shortcomings identified with the scheme in Appendix G AGS (2000). Appendix G of AGS (2000) is now superseded and should no longer be used. Adoption of Appendix C as a preferred risk matrix will assist with uniformity of assessment and interpretation. This is discussed further in the Commentary.

The regulator should only accept non standard schemes where the terms have been clearly defined, the terms have been explained in relation to the preferred terminology, and it can be reasonably demonstrated by the practitioner that the alternative is better suited to the particular circumstances of the assessment.

### 7.4 ESTIMATION OF RISK OF LOSS OF LIFE

**a) Estimate the risk of loss of life quantitatively for the person most at risk.**

The annual probability of loss of life for the person most at risk from the landslide(s) should be estimated using the equations in Section 7.1. The person most at risk will often but not always be the person with the greatest spatial temporal probability.
The individual risk, as determined by summing the risk, for the person most at risk, from all the landslide hazards, is used for comparison with the tolerable risk criteria.

b) For situations where there is a potential for large numbers of lives to be lost in a single landslide event, estimate the frequency (f) – number (N) of lives lost pairs and total annual risk.

If the possible loss of large numbers of lives from a landslide incident is high, society will generally expect that the probability that the incident might actually occur should be low. This accounts for society’s particular intolerance to incidents that cause many simultaneous casualties and is embodied in the criteria for tolerable societal risk. Societal Risk is discussed further in the Commentary.

In many cases there will be more than one landslide hazard (e.g. rockfall, which may lead to one or two lives lost; medium volume rapid landslide which may lead to several lives lost; and large rapid landslide which may lead to many lives lost). The frequency (annual probability, “f”) of the “event” and the number of lives lost (N) should be estimated for each landslide hazard.

The total annual risk = \( \sum (f \times N) \) should also be estimated.

8 RISK ASSESSMENT

8.1 RISK EVALUATION

Evaluate the risks against Tolerable Risk Criteria for loss of life and property loss.

Accept the risks if tolerable, or seek to reduce risks to tolerable levels by risk mitigation.

The main objectives of risk evaluation are usually to decide whether to accept or treat the risks and to set priorities. The Tolerable Risk Criteria are usually imposed by the regulator, unless agreed otherwise with the owner/client.

Non-technical clients may seek guidance from the practitioner on whether to accept the risk. In these situations, risk comparisons, discussion of treatment options and explanation of the risk management process can help the client make his decision.

It is desirable, if not essential, that the practitioner who prepared the risk assessment be involved in the decision making process because the process is often iterative, requiring assessment of the sensitivity of calculations to assumptions, modification of the development proposed and revision of risk mitigation measures.

Risk evaluation involves making judgements about the significance and tolerability of the estimated risk. Evaluation may involve comparison of the assessed risks with other risks or with risk acceptance criteria related to finance, loss of life or other values. Risk evaluation may include consideration of issues such as environmental effects, public reaction, politics, business or public confidence and fear of litigation.

In a simple situation where the client/owner is the only affected party, risk evaluation may be a simple value judgement. In more complex situations, value judgements on acceptable risk appropriate to the particular situation are still made as part of an acceptable process of risk management.

8.2 TOLERABLE RISK CRITERIA

The regulator is to establish the Tolerable Risk Criteria for loss of life and property loss.

As discussed in Section 3.5, the regulator is the appropriate authority to set standards for tolerable risk which may relate not only to perceived safety in relation to other risks, but also to government policy. Implementation of a tolerable risk level has implications to the community at large, both in terms of relative risks or safety and in terms of economic impact on the community.

The Commentary provides discussion and gives the AGS recommendations in relation to tolerable risk for loss of life. These are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: AGS Suggested Tolerable loss of life individual risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Suggested Tolerable Loss of Life Risk for the person most at risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Slope (1) / Existing Development (2)</td>
<td>10^{-4} / annum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Constructed Slope (3) / New Development (4) / Existing Landslide (5)</td>
<td>10^{-5} / annum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>