

39 islands of the Macaronesia. The technical team involved consisted of experts from Ca-
 40 nary Islands, Azores, Madeira and Cape Verde Islands [4]. Although the final document
 41 is yet to be published, the methodology has already been shared with the scientific com-
 42 munity in international conferences and technical papers ([1], [2], [3]).

43 2 Method developed in MACASTAB

44 The method developed in the project MACASTAB, specifically for volcanic slopes,
 45 rests in two rating systems and one index. The VSR (Volcanic Slope Rating), the
 46 VRHRS (Volcanic Rockfall Hazard Rating System) and the ISVS (index of suscepti-
 47 bility for volcanic slopes).

48 The VSR is a geomechanical classification for volcanic slopes. It depends on 7 dif-
 49 ferent parameters, rock mass strength, block size, smoothness, persistence and separa-
 50 tion of the discontinuities, rock mass heterogeneity index (IH) and surface regularity.
 51 Each of these parameters is measurable in the field and the sum of the ratings gives the
 52 value of VSR.

53 For the case of road slopes, VSR gives way to VRHRS. The VRHRS consists of
 54 applying to the VSR two adjustment factors that incorporate the risk analysis of the
 55 slope (based on the geometry of the slope, the geometry of the road and prior instabili-
 56 ties) and the degree of exposure of the element to be protected (road, vehicle, pedes-
 57 trian) when it crosses the study area.

58 **Table 1.** Recommendations according to VRHRS

VRHRS score	Group	Recommendations
> 500	A (maximum risk)	Road slopes that require immediate action
300 - 500	B	Road slopes with short to medium term priority of action
< 300	C (minimum risk)	Road slopes with low priority of action

59 The ISVS depends on several parameters, namely the “Type of Rock Mass”, which
 60 includes three different lithological groups, the “Slope Angle”, classified into three in-
 61 tervals ($<45^\circ$, $45-75^\circ$ and $>75^\circ$), the “Sea or Gully Erosion”, consisting of slope prox-
 62 imity to the coast or gullies and “Instability Indicators” related to previous instability
 63 processes. The ISVS is calculated by scoring the four described parameters and estab-
 64 lishing four degrees of susceptibility to instability. The maximum value for susceptibil-
 65 ity is 100, even if a higher value results from the calculation.

66 **Table 2.** Degree of susceptibility according to ISVS

ISVS score	Susceptibility
< 35	Low
35 -59	Moderate
60 - 79	High
> 80	Very High

67 3 Results

68 Both indexes, VRHRS and ISVS, were applied in São Nicolau (Cape Verde Islands).
 69 The studies conducted were funded by the LEC – EPE (Laboratory of Civil Engineering
 70 of Cape Verde) in collaboration with the DNA (National Directorate for the Environ-
 71 ment of Cape Verde).

72 A total of 28 slopes, distributed all over the island, some with prior registered acci-
 73 dents, were evaluated. The new methodology was then applied to the various sites,
 74 which consisted mainly in determining the values of VRHRS and ISVS. It was finally
 75 possible to establish the slope susceptibility and the level of risk involved, which al-
 76 lowed for recommendations regarding the several slopes stability.

77 The location of the slopes is given in Fig. 1. The estimated values for the indexes are
 78 on Table 3.

79



80

81 **Fig. 1.** Location of the slopes analyzed in S. Nicolau.



82

83 **Fig. 2.** Slopes 10, 17, 21 and 26 (from upper left, clock wise)

Table 3. Susceptibility and recommendations for the slopes analyzed

Slopes	VSR	VRHRS	Group	Recommendations	ISVS	Susceptibility
01	56	204	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	78	High
02	60	98	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	55	Moderate
03	53	225	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	24	Low
05	67	221	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	66	High
06	66	231	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	48	Moderate
07	62	234	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	66	High
08	45	331	B	Short to medium term priority of action	108	Very High
09	70	247	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	36	Moderate
10	86	425	B	Short to medium term priority of action	78	High
11	36	269	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	48	Moderate
12	71	174	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	66	High
14	66	231	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	66	High
16	70	229	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	72	High
17	59	333	B	Short to medium term priority of action	78	High
18	55	79	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	84	Very High
19	65	76	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	48	Moderate
21	44	354	B	Short to medium term priority of action	24	Low
22	40	339	B	Short to medium term priority of action	96	Very High
23	55	187	C	Road slopes with low priority of action	78	High
26	58	376	B	Short to medium term priority of action	48	Moderate

85 **4 Discussion**

86 From the 28 analyzed slopes, we were able to classify 22. For the remaining 6, due to
 87 difficulties to access them, we could not collect all necessary data. As for the “Recom-
 88 mendations”, fourteen slopes with low priority of action and six with short to medium
 89 term priority of action were identified. As for slope susceptibility, we were able to dis-
 90 tinguish 2 slopes with low susceptibility, 6 moderate, 9 high and 3 slopes with very
 91 high susceptibility.

92 **5 Conclusions**

93 A new method for assessing risk in volcanic rock slopes has been developed. With the
 94 indexes VRHRS and ISVS it is possible to easily determine the slope susceptibility to
 95 instability and to establish the priority of action. This new method was applied to road
 96 embankments in the island of S. Nicolau and the results were reported to the munici-
 97 palities who will, in due time, perform all the preventive measures necessary.

98 We are confident that this new method will help ensure the safety of infrastructures
99 and population by enabling an easy and fast identification of the slopes presenting a
100 higher risk of rockfalls.

101 **References**

- 102 1. Amaral, P., Malheiro, A., Teixeira, L., Sousa, J. F.; Jubera, J., Hernández-Gutiérrez, L.,
103 González de Vallejo, L., Leyva, S., Miranda, A., Delgado, A., & Victória, S.: Geomechanical
104 characterization of volcanic materials of Azores and Madeira archipelago. EGU General
105 Assembly 2018 - Geophysical Research Abstracts. Vienna, Austria. (2018).
- 106 2. Amaral, P., Teixeira, L., Malheiro, A., Marques, F., Moniz, L., & Sousa, J. F.: An expedited
107 assessment of slope instability on volcanic terrains in Azores archipelago. Proceedings of
108 the XVII ECSMGE-2019. Reykjavik, Iceland. (2019).
- 109 3. González de Vallejo, L., Hernández-Gutiérrez, L., Miranda, A., & Ferrer, M.: Rockfall Hazard
110 Assessment in Volcanic Regions Based on ISVS and IRVS Geomechanical Indices. Geosciences,
111 (2020, June).
- 112 4. MACASTAB Homepage, <http://macastab.com/?lang=en>, last accessed 2020/08/30.