

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

Reply to Ref. 1:

1 Definitional and operational ambiguity - Ref. comment: it is not clear ... the definition of recovery across cases. In some of the cases, the author(s) look at the length of time to the completion of recovery, while in others the author(s) look at the aesthetics of the new settlements and construction. A stronger paper would define the exact meaning of recovery early in the paper and ensure that it brings evidence to support these claims.

We try to clear this point with the clear distinction of terms “recovery” and “reconstruc-

C1271

tion”. Unfortunately we didn’t use the latter in the paper which maybe lead to this comment.

- Ref. comment: on page 5 the author(s) argue that “Venzone stands out in Italy as an exemplary case of post-earthquake recovery,” but it is not clear why.

Venzone stands out in Italy as an exemplary case of post-earthquake “reconstruction” because: 1. The architectural cultural heritage was preserved (which is important in the case if there is any valuable architectural heritage). 2. The involvement of citizens. 3. The length of time of reconstruction is here of marginal importance since the inhabitants themselves choose the longer version of reconstruction following the aim: rebuild “where in was and how it was”.

- Ref. comment: on page 6, the author(s) argue that “recovery in Resia took a very long time.”

Here we used the term “recovery” instead of “reconstruction”.

- Ref. comment: Does the length of time matter more than preserving cultural heritage? [in Resia]

Neither of them matter more as they are different. If the reconstruction took a very long time we would suppose that it would be done perfectly which was not the case in Resia, that’s why we pointed this out.

- Ref. comment: exactly how the political systems themselves affect recovery, ... including financial resources, bottom up involvement, and communist/capitalist setting ... a stronger paper would better tease out exactly how these factors played a role in the recovery.

While the point of financial resources is debatable we can for sure argue about different values which are typical for different political setting. As we didn’t quantify the importance of different factors, we can’t exactly answer this, but we can show if the combination of factors lead to more or less public participation (e.g. Fig 1).

C1272

- Ref. comment: On page 7, in the case study of Breginj, the author(s) underscores how “due to a lack of funds, this renovation was not carried out until 2004.” Are financial resources the most critical? Do they differ in communist and capitalist systems?

The financial resources are not the most critical. What is critical, are the values of the authorities which are different in communist and capitalist systems. In case of Breginj the values of cultural heritage were seen as not important by the communist authorities, therefore they did not provide enough financial resources for its reconstruction.

2. Data - Ref. comment: is unclear how many interviews were carried out, with whom they were carried out, and how long those interviews took

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. Interviews took on average 1.5 hours.

- Ref. comment: It is very difficult to feel convinced about the role of political institutions, bottom up citizen involvement, or other factors in so short a description. These case studies should be expanded and perhaps focused on fewer cities.

We agree that the descriptions are short and we'll try to extend them with more background information (question for the editor: how long can be the article?). Unfortunately we cannot shorten the number of case studies as they provide the most representative cases according to different public participation approach in Italy and Slovenia.

3. Confusing structure

- Ref. comment: case studies are so short; potential explanatory variables, including political structures, bottom up involvement, and financial resources, it is difficult to evaluate these claims; how recovery is defined We'll provide some more background information about the research area (as also noted by Ref. 2) and try to clear the points that the referee pointed out.

C1273

- Ref. comment on some additional references: We thank the referee for directing us to some new references which we'll include in the paper, e.g. Aldrich (2012), Kage (2011; Civic Engagement in Postwar Japan) and Chamlee-Wright (2010; The Cultural and Political Economy of Recovery: Social Learning in a Post-Disaster Environment).

- Ref. comment: Finally, I did not find figures 3 through 9 relevant to the text and would argue against their inclusion in this article

Unfortunately we do not share the same opinion, as we think that the figures can provide the reader with clearer perspective of the damage and reconstruction. We forgot to insert Fig. 7 in the text – this will be inserted in chapter 4.5.

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

C1274