

Interactive comment on “An approach for evaluating the role of protection measures in rock fall hazard zoning based on the Swiss experience” by Erika Prina Howald et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 29 September 2016

The presented article provides a framework on how to standardize the evaluation of protection measures against rockfall. This evaluation then further can be used to evaluate its hazard/risk mitigation.

1) For the application of the procedure I see one major issue: The article clearly states that the framework presented does not contain specific details on how to for example choose the values for the penalty factor. I.e., such decisions are to be made by the operator. The problem now is on how to guarantee a consistency of the database's contents and how to avoid individual influences originating from different operators. Only, if this consistency is guaranteed the database will be usable also regarding a larger area.

C1

2) The article could also setup some ideas on how to achieve above demanded consistency. Further, some rough estimations on the necessary effort per protection measure and per area could be included. The experience resp. the data due to the existing data retrieval in Vaud probably exist.

3) The article could also rely on existing similar databases regarding an inclusion into the presented method. E.g. the canton of Graubünden has an inventory on their protection measures: <http://map.geo.gr.ch/verbauungen> and <http://www.mfrei-infra.ch/cms/fileadmin/pdf/SchutzbauManagement2013.pdf> The Swiss BAFU e.g. recommends the so-called KUF1-Handbook <http://www.bafu.admin.ch/wirtschaft/15300/15310/15316/index.html>

4) What happens if the operator cannot answer detailed/important information on certain protection measures?

Short correction page 4 line 20: “was” → “is”.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-265, 2016.

C2