

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your thorough review of our revised draft. We have addressed your comments in the new draft, please find a point by point response below (lines refer to the marked-up manuscript).

l.75: municipalities or communities (l.495)?

*Must be communities, we have changed the wording (l.71)*

l.82: Please give an explanation and reference from the peer-reviewed literature for Communities of Practice.

*We have added two references with a brief explanation (l.81-84)*

l.108-110: Please add this sentence to the previous paragraph (2 approaches).

*We have done so (l.105-108)*

l.110-124: It is not clear how many measures in the online portfolio are from the desk study, how many are new and/or how many are a combination (specific implementation). How (and by whom) were the governance needs of the existing measures from the desk study assessed? Isn't a governance assessment case specific?

*We have provided more explanation about how many measures were compiled in each step and how we reached the selection for the online portfolio. (l.110-113)*

*We have assessed the governance needs for the measures in the portfolio on a general level (not site specific) (l.124).*

l.135 Table 1: Considering the advantage of the flexibility of the socio-economic approach, as mentioned in the response, and in light of the added descriptions of the cases studies in Section 6, please add here the socio-economic method (MCA, CBA..) used for each measure or case study (and refer to figure 1). Consider making the research site a subheader, instead of a column, to keep the overview clear.

*We have changed Table 1 according to your suggestion.*

l.157: Please add the questionnaire as supplemental information.

*We have added the questionnaire as supplemental information*

l.278: anno → year

*We have changed the wording (l.249)*

I.418-489: Here you mix analysis methods and case studies in a not always easy-to-follow manner, sometimes 1 method 3 case studies, sometimes 1 case study 2 methods. Please re-organize a bit.

*We have reorganized the text so that each part follows the same structure. (I.383-453)*

I.419: Socio-economic and governance -> Socio-economic

*We have changed the wording (I.375)*

I.435-439: Mm3 (as elsewhere in the manuscript)

*We have changed all instances in the text*

I.441: propose an increase

*We have changed the wording (I.384)*

I.490-514: Please clarify what analysis methods were used to elucidate all this information.

*We have added CEA and MCA to the description. (I.476-483) This can now also be found in Table 1.*

I.495: Water Authority?

*We have changed the wording (I.484)*

I.513: Not clear what specific groups.

*We have added the specific groups (households of the downstream communities of Peristerona Watershed and farmers that have access to treated waste water (I.501-502)*

I.634-638: Derived from socio-economics or social justice or both?

*Derived from social justice, we have added that to the text (I.558)*

I.641-644: Please stay with same order (governance before socio-economics)

*We have changed the order (I.565-570)*

Again, many thanks for the review and we hope to have addressed these comments to your satisfaction.