



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Reducing volcanic risk on Fogo Volcano, Cape-Verde, through a participatory approach: which out coming?” by P. Texier-Teixeira et al.

P. Texier-Teixeira et al.

franck.lavigne@univ-paris1.fr

Received and published: 9 May 2014

We want to thank the three Referees who commented our article. We found all advices and suggestions helpful, and we took into account almost all corrections suggested. We have to give a special answer to some Bruno Faria’s comments:

1. Thank you very much to give us more information about the institutional system of monitoring of the volcano. We made the corrections you suggested to us.
2. For the title: it’s true that we deal only with Cha das Caldeiras. It was clearly a choice, because most of the economical stakes of Fogo around tourism are in Cha. It’s

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



almost the only village, which is located inside the caldera and inside the Natural Park of Fogo. And it was our choice to focus on this protected area. But we agree that other villages are exposed to volcanic threat linked to lava flows. As social geography work, we focused on socio-economical interests more than on geological interest in terms of hazard. Economical value on east flank is thus less important, even if it could be also very interesting to do some investigations. But it will be for another program of research. We precise at the beginning of the article that most of the work was lead in Cha das Caldeiras. However, we deal also with the risk management, and we expose ideas and reflexion upon the volcanic risk in Fogo, not only in Cha das Caldeiras, which justify this title. But if NHESS staff ask for it, we could change our title into: “Reducing volcanic risk on Fogo volcano, Cape Verde, in the village of Cha das Caldeiras, through a participatory approach: which out coming?”

3. P6565, line 15: the distance from Cape Verde is exactly between 650 km (Boa Vista) to 730 km (Fogo) from Africa, and not 800 km as we wrote by mistake (but it's not 550 km. . .) So we made the correction from 800 to 700 km.

4. We made all correction suggested about population growth, and problems of monitoring of volcano management between INMG and LEC, as requested.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 6559, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

