

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-105-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on nhess-2021-105

Tatjana Bolic (Referee)

Referee comment on "EUNADICS-AV early warning system dedicated to supporting aviation in the case of a crisis from natural airborne hazards and radionuclide clouds" by Hugues Brenot et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-105-RC2>, 2021

The paper describes the results of the EUNADICS AV project, which developed different natural hazards observation and notification products, with the goal to support aviation in the cases of airborne natural hazards. My expertise is in aviation, so I cannot judge the background scientific quality, even though it seems impressive to me - the number of different tools, observations and notifications.

I do have several comments, that would require minor text revisions:

- In the abstract the authors say "All the ATM stakeholders (e.g. pilots, airlines and passengers) can access and benefit of these alert products through this free channel." I find this a bit strong as a statement. Any memeber of public can access these products, that is true, but it is unclear how they can benefit, as there is no explanation of the meaning of any of the products - one would need to be a scientist to understand what they are looking at. This is true even for graphical products where different colors are set for different concentrations (or similar), but there is no explanation what it means for layman - even for aviation stakeholder - what is red zone? Can I fly through it or not? If not, how far should I keep? All this to say that these products have greaat value for aviation, but they are still missing an important part which is the "translation" of its meaning for aviation stakeholders that are not meterologists or atmoshperic scientist (if this is a good term at all).
- In section 5 the authors say "EUNADICS is a SESAR (Single European Sky ATM Research; <https://www.sesarju.eu>) enabling project with regard to the definitions provided in the SESAR 2020 Programme Execution Framework, delivering SESAR Technological Solutions." I would strongly suggest to rephrase this sentence, as the project itslef is not even connected to SESAR, and the products developed are not "enabling" in the sense that is used in SESAR (enabling in SESAR means a technology that is a necessary building block of an ATM infrastructure - in a sense that without it, there is no new ATM infrastructure. I would suggest to rephrase into "supporting" or similar wording.
- Next, the authors say:"EUNADICS pass maturity phase V2 with regard to the 7-phase concept as introduced by the European Operational Concept Validation Methodology (E-

OCVM, 2010)...". E-OCVM presents guidance for V1-V3 of the 8 phases of ATM products life-cycle. However, I don't think that EUNADICS can claim V2 maturity level according to EOCVM, as human factors, safety, business, environmental and standards cases were not performed for any of the products. The point of the cases is to assess the impact of the solution on a wide set of matters in the ATM. These cases are requirements that need to be passed, in order for a solution/product to mature from V1 to V2 or from V2 to V3. The EUNADICS project could easily claim TRLs 2,3 or even 4, of the H2020 technology levels, but not V2 of EOCVM. mainly because the EOCVM requires the assessment of how the products can be implemented in ATM and what would the impact be, and that was not done (the various cases) in the project, nor was that the point of the project).

- In line 925, what do you mean by "environment). EUNADICS EWS passes with success the performance verification."?
- Finally, a suggestion to authors regarding the TRL levels of their products, in aviation setting. A product can be deemed operational in aviation if intended end-users can access the information, understand it and make decisions based on the understood information. If the presented information is not understandable by the end-user (e.g. pilot, air traffic controller), the product will not be used, even if it is completely accurate, and reliable. That is the reason for having various cases in the EOCVM methodology - to make new technology not only work, but to be understood. Some of the next steps, in my opinion should be identification of the end-users, and tailoring of the product for their use. If the end-users are only national meteorological providers, VAACs and similar, then the TRL of EUNADICS products is very high, and probably close to operational. But, if the products should be shared with other, non-scientific types of end-users, there is still a lot of work to reach high TRL levels, and that work is mainly on making the information understandable to these users.
- Please review the paper for English proofing. It is overall of good quality, but there are typos and some non-English phrases that make reading slightly harder.