Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, C1935–C1936, 2013
www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C1935/2013/

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Brief Communication: CATALYST – a multi-regional stakeholder Think Tank for fostering capacity development in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation" *by* M. P. Hare et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 2 December 2013

Dear authors,

your brief communication intends to inform about an (at the time of submission: still ongoing) European coordination project which is pursues a very broad perspective with respect to (world) regions and hazards. Thus taking the paper as a report on a certain type of research project, I suggest a minor revision.

Please reflect upon the following issues:

1. To define “capacity development” as the “stimulation and development of capabilities” (p. 3922) is not satisfactory.

2. Both with respect to (world) regions and hazards, the project pursues a very broad perspective. A great number of different hazards of interest is mentioned (p. 3922). I cannot imagine that all of them were treated equally and in the same depth in the different regions. Please specify.

3. The project very much depends upon the input of stakeholders from very different world regions. While at the end (pp. 3928-29), the paper provides some critical reflections upon the problems related to such a process (e.g. concerning online participation), I miss an explanation of how the stakeholders were identified and how relevant in/familiar with the governance of (different) hazards in the respective regions they are.

4. The concepts of “region” and “best-practice transfer” need some reflections. “Region” here refers to different countries and, thus, to distinct modes and structures of governance (not to mention different sub-regional types of governance!). Later in their paper, the authors themselves are critical about the idea of best-practice transfer within regions (p. 3926) but this problem could have been known from the very project beginning as drought governance in Spain is certainly different than in Serbia (to give but one example based on Fig. 1). Moreover, why did the project focus only on “best” (rather “good”) practices and not on “poor” ones – and if the “best” practices already exist isn’t it rather the question what impedes their implementation?

5. Recommendation 3.3 is rather vague in demanding “more sophisticated multi-level approaches” (p. 3928).

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 3919, 2013.