

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 September 2020

The paper describes three types of analysis that can support selection of adaptation measures. The analyses have been applied to six research cases across Europe. Overall the paper provides practical insights in the many considerations that need to be made in such a decision making process on what benefits to incorporate in the analysis, how to value or rate them, what implementation barriers to consider (and what this means for the inclusion of stakeholders) and how to assess potential increase in injustice as a result of adaptation. Altogether this is a big story that has been addressed, mostly on its separate components, extensively in literature. It is difficult to find out what are the new elements this paper tries to add to the already existing body of literature. If it does add new elements they are difficult to distinguish as the paper fails to

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



pose clear research questions and structure the outcomes accordingly. The number of analyses: governance, socio-economic and social justice is too much, too generic and for a large part common practice to arrive at clear new conclusions. The paper would benefit if a clear choice would have been made for one or two of those analyses with a focus on new elements. To show the reader what is new, a better and more structural assessment of existing literature would be needed: what is the current status quo what is BINGO adding? Social justice could be this new element and a good methodology to introduce this into adaptation decision making could be very useful. The current short description and consecutive analysis are not yet convincing. It may give the impression that social justice analysis for most common adaptation solutions is obsolete. In its presentation the paper can be improved a lot by more concise and precise language. A review by a native speaker is recommended. In conclusion I think the paper needs rethinking of the key questions and messages, selection of topics and restructuring. A journal that is more focused on governance and implementation issues of adaptation seems more appropriate. A few comments by section: Abstract: the main conclusion that decision relevant outcomes have been achieved is not made clear by the results. Research questions are missing. 3.1 Unclear what improvements have been made to the 3-layer framework 4.1 Challenges are posed but not sufficiently explained and supported by references 4.2 Many of these MCA/CE/CBA frameworks have been proposed in previous EU research projects such as ECONADAPT and BASE and published. 5.3 should be 'the application of social justice Discussion: this section does not systematically discuss what has been presented in previous sections but presents a whole suite of new observations from the cases that are insightful however lack structure and coherence with the rest of the paper. cumbersome language examples r105 'analysis of the assessment by analysis ... r119 This issue is also linked to, r125 so called toolbox, r153 Integration of stakeholders..

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