

## Questions to Stakeholders

---

Q1: Do you agree with the definition of the perils?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q2: Do you think that it should be clarified that the peril currently named “Hail” in the SF refers to “Convective Storm”?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q3: Do you think that the peril currently named “Hail” in the SF should be renamed as “Convective Storm”?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q4: Do you think that it should be clarified that the peril currently named “Windstorm” in the SF refers to “Cyclonic storm”?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q5: Do you think that the peril currently named “Windstorm” in the SF should be renamed “Cyclonic storm”?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q6: Do you agree with the risks identified where there is a high confidence level on the current and short-term impact of climate change in Europe?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q7: Do you agree to refer to a 1.5°C warming scenario for short-term (5-10 years) projection of climate change?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain. If no, would you suggest an alternative scenario?

Q8: Do you agree to take into account adaptation measures when assessing weather-related risks?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q9: Do you agree that in light of climate change, it is necessary to explicitly consider climate change in the recalibration of the Nat Cat SF for certain perils/regions as identified in Part 3?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.



Q10: Do you agree that for relevant perils/regions where climate change is expected to have an impact, Nat Cat models explicitly considering climate change should be used if available?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.



Q11: Are you aware of models, which would explicitly consider climate change which could be used to perform the Nat Cat SF parameters' calibration?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain. If yes, please provide information about models.



Q12: Do you think that new countries should be considered in the SF in light of climate change?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

If yes, please explain which ones, why and provide sources of data/studies.

Q13: For new perils, EIOPA has focused on wildfire. Do you see additional “new” perils which could be of relevance for the SF?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

If yes, which ones?

Q14: Do you think that wildfire could potentially be material enough for the insurance sector to be considered in the SF?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q15: Are you aware of models or data which could be used for the calibration of parameters for wildfire risk in Europe?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please describe the data and/or models.

Q16: For new lobs, EIOPA has focused on agricultural insurance and NDBI. Do see additional lobs, which could be of relevance for the SF?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain. If yes, please provide lobs names.

Q17: Do you think that crop insurance could potentially be material enough for the insurance sector to be considered in the SF?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.

Q18: Do you think that adding a loading factor is the right approach to capture climate change?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.



Q19: Do you think that revaluating the correlation matrices is the right approach to capture climate change?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.



Q20: Do you agree that there is a need to formalise an approach to re-assess current Nat Cat SCR parameters on a regular basis?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain. If yes, how often should this take place? Who should participate to such a reassessment? What should be the parameters considered?



Q21: Do you agree that regular recalibration is needed but under the condition that the changes are material in order to not include artificial volatility?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain.



Q22: Do you agree that any recalibration should take in account adaptation measures in a future calibration?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

Please explain. If yes, do you have any insights on how this can be done?



\* Q23: Do you have any other comments on the draft Opinion?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No