Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Goal-oriented networks and capacity building for natural hazards – examples in the Dresden region" *by* G. Hutter

Anonymous Referee #3

The reviewer would like to thank the author for submitting a paper that reads very well and is well structured. It follows a really interesting argument by making networks in a transdisciplinary research context the main theme of the paper. Furthermore it gives an excellent overview about the network related literature (mostly from organisational studie) and relates this stock of knowledge convincingly to the empirical analysis, which is at the same time somewhat a weakness of the paper: the paper would significantly improve and would make a really relevant contribute to the more general discussion on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation if the author would relate his ideas more thoroughly to the idea of social capacities and how to build, develop and enhance them. It seems self-evident that networks are a crucial part of any societal capacity to cope with and respond to or even prepare for the impact of a flood or the

possible consequence of climate change (as it will well documented in the literature, i.e. social capital). Unfortunately, the author does not link the really insightful study to these broader discussions. The reviewer therefore encourages the author to more thoroughly construct these links throughout the paper, which implies to not change its context or collect any further empirical evidence, but to make the links to the discussion on social capacity building as well as networks in DRR and CAA more explicit.

In the following some more specific suggestions are provided:

- page 1954, line 12 ff. – the author states networks cannot be overestimated: please, be more explicit on how networks contribute to capacity building and also why networks are relevant when organisations seek to develop "innovative solutions" (couldn't one argue that networks are rather conservative, or is the author referring to the "strength of weak ties" argument of Granovetter)?

- Page 1058, line 7 ff. Why are large networks evoking high expectations to capacity building? One could argue that it is rather the trustworthiness of a network that is of greater relevance. Please, be more specific and further elaborate this point.

- Page 1060, chapter 3: Please specify how and to what extent the two networks contribute to capacity building, Is capacity building an explicit aim of the network, what links could be made to different kinds of capacities that could/should be developed in CCA and DRR?: Again, the argument rather suggestive, since the details are missing, i.e. do the networks increase the technical capacity of actors, the capacity of an entire region, is networking itself a capacity that is aimed at by the networks etc.

- Page 1073, chapter 4: I share the first that sense-making (particularly of network goals) is relevant topci. At the same time, it would be good to more explicitly link this to the idea of capacities (or even developing them). Furthermore, is sense-making just a relevant process for processes within the network? If yes, is sense-making part of capacity building or a means for capacity building that is not sufficiently recognized in the discussion?As stated initially, it would be great, if the author could position his

findings in the broader scientific literature on the role of networks in DRR and CCA and how the findings of the study may change our view on networks in this field.

Many thanks again for this valuable paper and good luck with its revision.

C405