

Interactive comment on “A methodology to conduct wind damage field surveys for high impact weather events from convective origin” by Oriol Rodríguez et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 25 October 2019

As authors state in the introduction, the objective of the paper is “to propose a methodology to conduct wind-field damage assessments of convective-driven events in a systematic way, to contribute to the creation and maintenance of homogeneous databases”. Accordingly, the authors present first the methodology they propose, followed by its critical analysis and by two real implementations.

The objective of the paper, as stated in the introduction (note that in the conclusions the objective changes in “to provide guidelines for gathering pictures and locations of damage on manmade structures and on vegetation, using smartphones or photo cameras with geolocation capability”), is in the scope of the journal and is also related

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



to a very important weakness of natural hazards research and practice, being the lack of standardised data on past hazardous events. Still, the paper suffers from many criticalities, which prevent its publication in the present form. In the following, such criticalities are explained in detail while I did not supply specific comments, at this stage of the review.

Main criticalities

Methodology. I really appreciate all the anecdotal experience put in the paper by authors. Still, the methodology lacks of a clear logical structure; for example, some of the tasks included in the section 2.1 “survey planning” (e.g. gathering information and pictures on damage location on the media and social networks) are also included in the preliminary considerations discussed in the section methodology. Likewise, the section called “previous considerations” seems more related to preliminary considerations. With respect to this point, I think that a flowchart of the methodology, showing its steps in a logical order could support both possible users and readers. Moreover, the proposed methodology is not a systematic or a standardised one: only some indications of which could be the different aspects to be surveyed are provided (see e.g. section 2.2.2) without a systematic and standardised procedure for their survey and collection (e.g. by means of pre-defined questions in a form). The only “step” that, in some way, is standardised is the witness enquiries (section 2.2.4), for which pre-defined questions are provided. The lack of standardisation is a big limit towards the objective of creating homogenous databases, given that the parameters/aspects to be surveyed, the way they must be surveyed/measured, and the possible values assumed by each of them is a subjective choice of the surveyor.

Objective of the survey. The objective of the survey is not really clear. Is it reproducing the damage scenario? Is it identifying the kind of event for insurance purposes? Given the effort requires by on-field surveys, I think that the multi-usability of collected data should be pursued (see references below). For example, what about the amount of damage data collected? Are they used only to characterise the hazard? This arises

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

also the question of whether the products (deliverables) identified in the paper are suitable for multi-purposes uses of data

Case studies. Case studies do not supply examples of how to implement the methodology but simply describe the events and the scenarios resulting from the survey. I think this is due to the lack of standardised tools for the implementation of the methodology previously commented.

References

De Groeve T., Poljansek K. & Ehrlich D. Recording disasters losses: recommendation for a European approach. JRC Scientific and Policy Report [online]. 2013. Available at: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/111111111/29296/1/lbna26111enn.pdf>.

De Groeve T., Poljansek K., Ehrlich D. & Corbane C. Current status and best practices for disaster loss data recording in EU Member States. JRC Scientific and Policy Report [online]. 2014. Available at: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC92290/lbna26879enn.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-294>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)