

## ***Interactive comment on “Climate change adaptation frameworks: an evaluation of plans for coastal, Suffolk, UK” by J. Armstrong et al.***

**J. Armstrong et al.**

j.armstrong@lboro.ac.uk

Received and published: 17 August 2015

Thank you for your constructive comments. They are very useful to the development of the paper. Please see below for response to specific comments:

1) The authors have identified key characteristics of existing climate change adaptation initiatives and termed three principle approaches utilised by stakeholders when planning and deploying said initiatives as; Scenario – Led (SL), Decision – Centric (DC) and Vulnerability – Led (VL). The manuscript shall be updated more clearly explain this point. It is acknowledged that there have been similar efforts bound adaptation frameworks in order to evaluate and prescribe methods of ‘best practise’ (P:5, L:12 – 20).

C1512

2) Agreed. The manuscript should include specific examples of each frameworks being used in isolation, this shall be addressed. The adaptation literature acknowledges potential gaps between the ‘academic’ and ‘real world’ climate change adaptation communities and expresses the need to establish prescriptive guidelines for the implementation of appropriate adaptation initiatives (P:3, L:5-8). This paper is a contribution towards this effort by highlighting the degree to which adaptation frameworks proposed by the ‘academic’ community are utilised in ‘real world’ scenarios using long lived static infrastructure as a case study. Care will be taken by the authors to make sure that this is made clear within the manuscript.

3) Agreed. The probabilistic nature of modelling does indeed highlight accuracies as well as uncertainty. The context in which uncertainty is used throughout the paper shall be reassessed considering this point.

4) Agreed, some assumptions are present in the paper. The methodological approach used to identify adaptation projects within the study area was not comprehensive; some initiatives may not have had an online presence or did not identified using the selected ‘key’ words in the online survey. This is stated P:20, L:28 – P:21, L:9. Thank you for highlighting that there are other undefined reasons that may affect the development of an adaptation project. This point will be made clear within the manuscript.

5) ‘Academic’ literature may indeed be reluctant to advocate implementation advice for adaptation this paper attempts to uncover why this is that case. ‘Academic’ theory of ‘best practice’ for climate change adaptation initiatives does not take into account practical factors that may influence the approach from stakeholders and facilitators.

6) Thank you for highlighting this correction. Agreed there are many plausible ways to define the ‘nuclear neighbourhood’ and the bounds of the study this shall be highlighted within the manuscript. The 20km buffer reflects the buffer considered by EDF for the Environmental Impact Assessment.

7) Thank you for raising this question. Stakeholders do indeed utilise characteristics of

C1513

the SL framework frequently. Although uncertainty is high outputs

from the SL approach incorporate the most advanced projections of possible future climatic pathways. As these projections are generated by authoritative organisations (IPCC, UKCP09) stakeholders may feel that they are imperative to their adaptation initiatives and are therefore incorporated.

8) As mentioned in point 4 not all stakeholder groups and adaptation initiatives present in the nuclear neighbourhood were included in the paper, this is recognised as a methodological limitation. With regards to the reference 'Environmental' and 'Conservation' groups there is a large conservation movement in the area with the presence of specific organisations focussed on this such as the RSPB, Suffolk Wildlife Trust but it is recognised that the term 'Environmental' could encompass 'Conservation' as such the authors will consider the most appropriate terminology.

Thank you for your technical corrections they shall all be addresses within the manuscript.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 4059, 2015.