Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-209-RC2, 2016

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "An integrated methodology to develop a standard for landslide early warning system" *by* T. F. Fathani et al.

K. Crowley (Referee)

Kate.Crowley@niwa.co.nz

Received and published: 30 June 2016

This is an excellent contribution to the Nat Hazards Earth Syst. Sci Discussions. It is a thoughtful discussion on an interesting and important topic. I enjoyed reading this paper, in particular its interdisciplinary approach to addressing what is essentially an interdisciplinary issue that should cut across both physical and social realms. In particular I appreciate the elements that refer to the need for culturally sensitive and informed approaches, co-ownership/development and implementation of the system. These are all excellent points.

There are a few minor points that the authors may wish to reflect upon:

Page 1-4: The flow and grammar needs some further attention. It is always a challenge for researchers to write a paper that flows, and although these authors have done a

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

very good job, the first pages need further attention.

Page 2, paragraph 25: The glossary reference. This is an important point but the sentence somewhat downplays the importance by referring to a glossary – something common across many manuals. It would be good if the authors adjusted or added to this sentence to reflect the importance of having a common, clear and accepted technical and non-technical language within the standards – perhaps also add a point to why this is especially important in terms of landslides highlighting the differing applications of terminology and types.

Page 3, paragraph 20: Requires an additional line at the end of paragraph 19 to help the reader. For example, the following sections explore each of the 7 elements within the proposal EWS in turn.

Page 4, paragraph 15 Risk consciousness should be risk perception?

For the discussion/ case study:

It would be excellent to highlight some key challenges and unexpected observations from the case study. This I such an important element of the paper and it would be great to have more detail on how the EWS impact will be monitored going forwards. It is almost there but just needs a bit more depth.

Specially, it would strengthen the paper if the authors could reflect on the resource intensive nature of the EWS proposed. The authors have included a very important paragraph on government commitment (great!!) but it would be good to gain the authors reflection on which elements are resource intensive and for whom. The researches – both in terms of people and funding for equipment – seem to be a major issue in the implementation of EWS worldwide. How did the authors manage to overcome this and implement in so many locations? What were the challenges and what were some of the solutions?

I feel the discussion lacks a little depth at the moment – drawing on the authors reflec-

tions and ‘top tips’ for applications of the standard could provide some interest.

Otherwise, a very good paper on a very relevant topic.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-209, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper