WORKING GROUP 2 REPORT
M1-M24

COST ACTION 23126 ALERTHUB

www.alerthub.eu

Contents

Introduction 3
1. Systematic Literature Review (SLR) 3
1.1. Preliminary Findings: Challenges (RQ1) 4
1.2. Preliminary Findings: Underlying Factors (RQ2) 4
1.3. Preliminary Findings: Proposed Solutions (RQ3) 5
2. Grey Literature Review (GLR) 6
2.1. Methodological Preparations 6
2.2. Progress to Date 6
3. Next Steps 6
3.1. Integrating WG2 Findings within AlertHub 6
4. Strengthening Governance through the Steering Committee 7
5. Conclusion 7

Introduction

The AlertHub COST Action aims to establish a European, interdisciplinary cohort dedicated to enhancing warning communication for climate-related extreme weather hazards. As climate change intensifies the frequency and severity of such events, effective communication of warnings has become crucial in reducing risks and improving community resilience. To address this challenge, AlertHub constructs a platform to facilitate knowledge transfer between researchers and practitioners, to identify best practices and governance strategies, and to nurture new formats for collaboration across borders.

Within this overarching framework, Working Group 2 (WG2) bears the mandate of mapping the main challenges in implementing effective warning communication, and proposing evidence-based insights into potential solutions. WG2's methodology comprises two interlinked strands: first, a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) of peer-reviewed academic research, and second, a Grey Literature Review (GLR), drawing from reports, guidelines, and evaluations produced by governmental bodies and international institutions. This report presents the progress made by WG2 up to month 12 (M24), summarizing the preliminary outcomes of the SLR and the progress of the GLR, and situating these within the broader objectives of AlertHub.

1. Systematic Literature Review (SLR)

The SLR was conceived with the explicit objective of uncovering the recurrent patterns of challenges, structural drivers, and proposed solutions regarding warning communication systems across Europe. Employing a transparent protocol aligned with PRISMA-2020 standards and facilitated by tools such as the litsearchr R package, WG2 executed a comprehensive search across major scholarly databases, focusing on English-language studies published since 2000. From an initially broad set of results, titles and abstracts were screened for relevance by WG2 leads, while full texts were subject to dual independent coding by WG2 members to ensure reliability. Each included study underwent extraction into a structured codebook capturing dimensions such as hazard context, jurisdiction, methodological approach, theoretical underpinnings, and key findings addressing three central research questions:

- ✓ *RQ1 – What are the principal challenges in implementing effective warning communication systems?*
- ✓ *RQ2 – What underlying factors fuel these challenges?*
- ✓ *RQ3 – What solutions have been proposed or tested to improve effectiveness?*

1.1. Preliminary Findings: Challenges (RQ1)

The review surfaced a constellation of interrelated challenges. Delayed or insufficiently precise forecasts often truncate crucial response windows, reducing the effectiveness of warnings. Coordination gaps among institutions and between agencies and communities were consistently reported, hindering timely dissemination. Many warning infrastructures remain technologically or infrastructurally limited, with outdated monitoring systems compromising data reliability.

Risk communicators frequently struggled with messaging clarity: warnings were perceived as overly technical, inaccessible, or inconsistent, undermining public trust and comprehension. Informational messaging often failed to account for social heterogeneity, neglecting vulnerable populations such as the elderly, migrants, and individuals with disabilities. Moreover, conveying uncertainty—an inherent aspect of hazard forecasting—remains a persistent challenge. Finally, constrained resources in staffing, funding, and equipment further weakened system responsiveness.

1.2. Preliminary Findings: Underlying Factors (RQ2)

Beneath these surface challenges lie deeper structural and systemic issues. Institutional fragmentation marked by overlapping mandates and poor interagency coordination emerges as a major barrier. Disparities in political agendas, where short-term priorities overshadow longer-term preparedness investments, exacerbate the situation. Cross-border hazards illustrate how governance failures at transnational levels can compound local vulnerabilities.

Meanwhile, entrenched socioeconomic inequities, seen in the differential exposure and preparation of marginalized communities, hamper equitable access to warnings. Social and cultural contexts, including language barriers and trust deficits, further influence how warnings are interpreted.

1.3. Preliminary Findings: Proposed Solutions (RQ3)

The SLR cataloged a robust range of strategies, spanning technical innovations, community-centered approaches, and institutional reforms. Community engagement, education, and participatory communication emerged as effective means to build resilience and trust. Technological interventions (e.g., mobile applications, dashboards, and geospatial alerting systems) were shown to enhance timeliness and reach.

Improved forecasting, leveraging real-time data integration and precision targeting, strengthens warning accuracy. Infrastructure investments, including nature-based solutions like green buffers, reduce hazard exposure. Institutional reforms, crafted to enhance interagency coordination and update policy frameworks, build governance resilience. Finally, context-sensitive communication that incorporates local cultural knowledge and addresses the needs of high-risk groups improved system uptake and equity. Figure 1 shows a summary of the preliminary findings.




Figure 1. Preliminary findings of the systematic literature review

2. Grey Literature Review (GLR)

While the SLR expands our understanding through academic lenses, the GLR focuses on real-world practices and policies through documents produced by governments, intergovernmental bodies, and institutional actors. This strand is particularly suited to unearth practical guidelines, evaluation reports on specific cases, and governance tools not always present in scholarly literature.

2.1. Methodological Preparations

The GLR protocol defines a temporal frame (documents produced from 2015 onward), geographic eligibility (Europe and European Union agencies), and document types (after-action reports, preparedness plans, handbooks, simulation exercises, and policy briefs). WG2 has constructed a shared database, in which WG2 members contribute identified documents. Each record is encoded according to a standardized template capturing metadata hazard focus, geographic scale, communication channels, and thematic alignment with the three RQs.

2.2. Progress to Date

Since the inception of AlertHub, WG2 members from multiple countries have contributed to the GLR repository. Initial entries cover national-level event debriefs, EU framework documents, and simulation-based guidance. Screening criteria have been refined through pilot coding exercises, assuring consistency. The coding has been completed, and the data analysis for the GLR has been initiated.

3. Next Steps

From months 25 to 36, WG2 will advance the following:

- ✓ Conduct data analysis for the GLR.
- ✓ Synthesize findings for each RQ across grey literature sources.
- ✓ Prepare comparative integration between SLR and GLR outputs, to identify overlaps, divergences, and complementarities.

3.1. Integrating WG2 Findings within AlertHub

The insights emerging from both strands of WG2's methodology feed directly into th ebroader goals of AlertHub. The Action aspires to develop an open-access knowledge platform that surfaces legal frameworks, technological challenges, and institutional best practices. The SLR and GLR outputs will constitute the empirical backbone of this platform, enabling evidence-based identification of effective warning approaches and guiding governance

recommendations.

Furthermore, AlertHub seeks to foster cross-border collaboration and knowledge exchange among stakeholders. By synthesizing academic findings with practitioner-oriented grey literature, WG2 contributes a critical bridge between theory and practice. In doing so, WG2 supports AlertHub's mission of promoting durable impact in warning communication research and policy.

4. Strengthening Governance through the Steering Committee

To further enhance the governance structure of WG2, an Steering Committee was formally established at the beginning of this project. This Board consists of five senior and experienced academics and professionals drawn from WG2 members, who provide strategic guidance, ensure methodological rigor, and contribute to the dissemination and uptake of WG2 findings. Their involvement reinforces the Action's commitment to both scientific excellence and practical relevance, while also serving as a mechanism to connect WG2 outputs with broader stakeholder communities.

5. Conclusion

At M24, WG2 has achieved substantial progress: the Systematic Literature Review has been completed. The paper developed by over 20 WG2 members has been submitted to an academic journal and is currently under review. Meanwhile, the Grey Literature Review is underway, with an operational database, collected documents, and refined protocols in place.

The coming months will transition GLR to full analysis and begin integrated synthesis across SLR and GLR results. This comparative dimension will enrich AlertHub's repository, providing multidimensional evidence for designing resilient warning systems that are technologically sound, policy-relevant, and socially equitable.

Altogether, WG2's work is foundational to the AlertHub vision: a European interdisciplinary network that transforms our understanding of warning communication into practical tools, shared knowledge, and collective capacity, ultimately reducing risk and harm from climate-related disasters.