

Interactive comment on “Selecting and analysing climate change adaptation measures at six research sites across Europe” by Henk-Jan van Alphen et al.

Henk-Jan van Alphen et al.

henk-jan.van.alphen@kwrwater.nl

Received and published: 29 October 2020

Thank you for reading our paper and providing thoughtful comments. We will try to address your comments in this response and of course in the possible revision of the paper.

We will include more references to existing literature and published project outcomes, as well as improve the reference list so that it is complete and searchable.

With regard to the tool mentioned in section 2, we will include a more detailed description of the tool, its structure and its relation to the databases.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Section 4.1, which you refer to, is just meant as an introduction to the challenges in analysing socio-economic implications – and the bridge to the answers and guidance to overcome these challenges. Details are given in our paper in the subsequent chapters. We will write an additional sentence to clarify this at the end of section 4.1.

For section 4.2 (figure 1), we believe that MCA, but also CBA and CEA can be designed to also include qualitative elements (e.g. “full” CBA). We suggest to add “full” CBA to the CBA cell in figure 1. We agree that social justice can be part of a full CBA, but since we did not include it in the CBA we also describe it separately in this paper.

We will abbreviate the description of the economic frameworks as you suggest with regard to section 4.3-4.6.

With regard to apparent contradiction of the decadal predictions for 2025. The BINGO-project started in 2015, which is also the starting point for the decadal predictions, hence the time horizon of 2025. We will clarify this in the text.

We agree that it is not always possible to trace the elements of the discussion to the analysis, which can be improved by making stronger links between the discussion and the preceding parts. We kindly accept your suggestion to merge and supplementing the tables and move them (in part) to the introduction.

With regard to your comment on the inclusion of future states in the economic analysis: the cases in general covered a range of decadal predictions (2015-2025) and their effects on e.g. raw water availability. Thus, a potential range of changes is covered. Costs are usually based on the lifetime of a measure, calculated either as annual costs (annuity method, dynamic cost calculation) or as present value of costs (also dynamic cost calculation). Thus, economics cover a plausible time horizon. We will expand the manuscript for the final draft with explaining sentences.

We hope we have covered the main points to your satisfaction and want to thank you again for your thoughtful review.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-181>, 2020.

NHESSD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

