

Interactive comment on “Partnerships for affordable and equitable disaster insurance” by J. Mysiak and C. D. Pérez-Blanco

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 September 2015

The paper “Partnership for affordable and equitable disaster insurance” provides i) a very detailed review on the legal background around the insurance instruments against natural disasters that contemplate the partnership between private and public sector for EU countries; ii) in the words of authors it offers concise policy guiding principles. More in detail, the extensiveness of this paper allows to address several issues related to the legal background that rules the provision of insurance such as the policy context, the public/private partnership, the insurance market regulation, state aid, solidarity, and civil and environmental liability.

My general impression is that there is a need for papers aiming at providing an overview of the legal background of the insurance sector for natural disaster, since it is a field very alive in this moment. However, this is an aspect not very well discussed in this
C1803

version of the work. Indeed, there is the need to address several issues that, at this moment, make the paper hard to digest. My main concerns are the following:

- 1) The title is quite cryptic and it does not allow for a precise configuration of the paper, I suggest a reconsideration of it;
- 2) The work lacks of a precise structure and, in this version, it is very difficult to read and it is very hard to find a clear research idea as well. So far, it looks like a list of concepts not very well interconnected among them. This structure makes the paper difficult to read and sometimes boring. For instance: Section 5, Section 6 and Section 7 might be condensed in a shorter single section. Moreover, is it really important to leave the part on solidarity (at least in the view of public-private partnership)? Furthermore, Section 3 is very long and sometimes I got lost in the story. To overrule this issue, I suggest a massive use of tables: for instance, a Table may summarize the main characteristics of PPP in section 3. The same approach could be repeated throughout the paper.
- 3) The authors do not meet all the objectives listed in the paper. Particularly I refer to the assessment of the implications of the reforms and to the aim of offering concise policy guiding principles. On this regard, both the aims are quite hidden in the paper (I found policy-guiding principles mentioned only in the conclusion and the assessment of the reforms in sentences scattered throughout the paper). I suggest a revision of the aims of the work. A dedicated section on them would be appreciated.
- 4) The paper sometimes covers issues at European Union level (as for PPP) and sometimes reports comparisons between legislations of Member States. I suggest “homogenization of the treatment” meaning that EU legislation should be primary quoted and then it might be interesting to make examples coming from concrete cases of the Member States (at least in few cases).

Other Comments:

- 1) Page(P) 4798, Lines(LL) 20-22. Please clarify the concept of progressively fat tailed

probability distribution (notice that, although the journal's readers own technical expertise, many others readers might be interested in reading the article because of the legal perspective of the topic, i.e. lawyers, policymakers and so on).

2) P.4799, LL. 12-14 Please explain better the concept of low probability – high impact and the link with insurance.

3) P.4801 L. 10. Please explore the link between damage and losses.

4) P. 4802 LL. 2-5 The current financial crises should be marginal here, or at most you could mention as a tighter constraint. PPP should hold even without financial crises.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 4797, 2015.