

Interactive comment on “A framework for profiling the characteristics of risk governance in natural hazard contexts” by G. Walker et al.

G. Walker et al.

g.p.walker@lancaster.ac.uk

Received and published: 21 August 2013

We reproduce sections of the reviewers comments, followed by our response after a **

'The paper addresses a topic of interest in a clear and competent way. Its contents and conclusions are definitely relevant for research on risk governance and represent a good starting point for future research on this topic. However, the empirical part, with the three examples from different European contexts, is methodologically weak because the authors ground their analysis only on the opinions and views of few stakeholders and researchers. This clearly opens up issues related to the reliability of the results. If possible, a second round of interviews or at least a feedback to support the presented findings is highly recommended.'

C949

** We welcome the positive comments. On the empirical parts the key focus of the paper was to outline and explain the development of the risk governance profiling tool, rather than to conduct, analyse and present a rigorous empirical study. We will make this clearer in the final version of the paper. In effect, we see the process of developing the tool, the context to its development and the trialling of the framework as the main elements of research to be reported in the paper. The three case studies presented are experimental - we tendered the profiling tool as a trial. Some comments were derived from the stakeholders and researchers, but we view the use of the risk governance framework as 'self-analytical' and therefore any judgements on the profiles would be best made by those embedded in the particular risk governance context. The suggested second round of interviews would not be possible due to time and resource constraints.

'Chapter 2 and 3: the paper is about the methodology/frameworks for the analysis of risk governance and these 2 chapters are supposedly background sections. Yet, the authors should include also a narrow selection of studies that have come closest to their work but nevertheless failed to navigate the waters that they now chart (i.e. what are the other frameworks for profiling the characteristics of risk governance? What characteristics do they use?). This will also help them to make the link between the background and the results stronger and more consistent than it is at present.'

** At the time of writing, we did not identify any literature reporting on attempts to profile risk governance in a natural hazards context. The development of the profiling tool took place within an environment of experts (as reported in the paper) who were also not aware of similar existing profiling tools and the framework was trialled in this expert environment. We are aware of studies incorporating vulnerability profiling and we will do a further search for literature on the analysis of risk governance qualities pertaining to natural hazards before making final revisions to the paper.

'Chapter 4: do the authors need to describe all the project phases in so much detail? For the reader it is more interesting to know why they choose the eight governance

C950

characteristics -and not others- and how they define them. In other words, in this section it would be better to focus more on the operationalisation of the concept of risk governance.'

** We will condense elements of section 4 when making final revisions to the paper. We made some changes to the paper in the technical review stage to make better links between the background and context and the identification of the risk governance characteristics selected to form the basis of the profiling tool.

'Conclusion: it is suggested to include some comments about: i) the limitations of the study ii) the innovative results for risk governance theory and methodology deriving from the three examples presented by the authors.'

** We will, as suggested, elaborate on the limitations of the study in the conclusions of the paper. The limitations of the methods mean that we cannot go too far in drawing wider conclusions from the empirical examples and whilst a more thorough application could enable this, that is a matter for future research.

'In conclusion, the framework elaborated for profiling the characteristics of risk governance in different natural hazard contexts definitely represents an innovative result.'

** We welcome the recognition that this is an innovative development in the field.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 2207, 2013.