

## ***Interactive comment on “Public participation in recovery after earthquakes in Friuli (NE Italy) and the Upper Soča Valley (NW Slovenia) in 1976, 1998, and 2004” by P. Pipan and M. Zorn***

**P. Pipan and M. Zorn**

matija.zorn@zrc-sazu.si

Received and published: 27 September 2013

1. We shall provide adequate research question or hypotheses and a more extensive thematic introduction. E.g.: The aim of the study is to examine whether there are differences in the post-earthquake recovery in different political systems.

The article is based on PhD research project by Primož Pipan with the title: Comparing Post-Earthquake Recovery in Italy and Slovenia after the Earthquakes in the Soča Valley and Friuli (see: <https://share.upr.si/fhs/PUBLIC/doktorske/Pipan-Primoz.pdf>).

Considering the additional chapter on participation: the aim of our paper is not to deal

C1268

with the participatory framework itself, but to show its implementation on selected case studies. If needed we can put some more references about the issue, but we don't consider that an additional chapter is needed.

2. a) All together 93 semi-structured interviews were conducted. First interviews were conducted from 29 October 2007 onwards, majority of the interviews were conducted in October and November 2008 and the last ones were conducted by the end of July 2009. As the most relevant informants were chosen the former and actual representatives of local and regional administration, representatives of Slovenian institutions in Italy, experts in construction, experts in protection of cultural heritage, professors on faculties, administrators, researchers and local priests. All interviews were conducted by co-author Primož Pipan as a field work for his Phd study with the title: Comparing Post-Earthquake Recovery in Italy and Slovenia after the Earthquakes in the Soča Valley and Friuli. Since his knowledge of Italian language is according to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, on the level of “B1 - Independent user” in understanding and speaking, he had no problems in communicating and translating the answers given by the informants.

2. b) The settlements were chosen at the beginning. Later they were grouped in different rungs of Arnstein ladder of participation according to information acquired with interviews compared with the information and data from the literature.

3 We shall provide more background information. Question for the editor: what is the max. length of the articles in NHESS?

4. For easier comparison of the post-earthquake recovery in Italy and Slovenia after the earthquakes in the Soča Valley and Friuli 14 case studies were selected (in the whole research: see point 1: <https://share.upr.si/fhs/PUBLIC/doktorske/Pipan-Primoz.pdf>), 7 of them in Italy (Venezia, Portis, Bordano, Lusevera, Taipana, Attimis, Resia) and 7 of them in Slovenia (Breginj, Logje, Robidišče, Drežniške Ravne, Koseč, Bovec, Čezsoča). The selected cases focused on smaller hamlets, however based on a similar

C1269

population size, position and accessibility. Because of the length limitation of the article we selected just six case studies (3 in Italy and 3 in Slovenia) which are the most representative according to different public participation approach.

5. We agree with the referee and will try to improve the paper accordingly.

6. We agree with the referee and will try to improve the paper accordingly.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 2231, 2013.