Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussions

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-96-RC1, 2021

Comment on nhess-2021-96

Tatjana Bolic (Referee)

Referee comment on "An ensemble of state-of-the-art ash dispersion models: towards probabilistic forecasts to increase the resilience of air traffic against volcanic eruptions" by Matthieu Plu et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-96-RC1, 2021

The authors could consider re-writing the Introductory section as it is jumping from ATM to ash forecast to costs in circular manner.

The authors cite the ICAO - Volcanic Ash Contingency Plan - European and North Atlantic Regions. The plan spells out that in these regions, the air traffic management performed by air navigation service providers should not impose flight restrictions, unless in the very close proximity of the erupting volcano. The latest version specifies that the airlines are those that choose how to address this hazard. If they have their SAfety Risk Assessment (SRA) for operations in the presence of volcanic ash accepted by appropriate authority, than the air traffic control cannot restrict their flight plans, if submitted in accordance to the (SRA). Based on this, I would suggest the authors to change the references from the "conservative ATM" (i.e. line 410) or ATM to the flight planning or airline choices, as this is currently the case.

In the attached pdf, a few small corrections are indicated and some typoes.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2021-96/nhess-2021-96-RC1-supplement.pdf