

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

**Nadine Gerner**

gerner.nadine@eglv.de

Received and published: 28 August 2020

The paper provides a valuable framework on how to select and evaluate appropriate climate change adaptation measures. This is of high importance and can assist cities to decide on the most fitting, most effective, least costly and/or most socially just measure. As cities are currently investing into adaptation measures, the BINGO results provide guidance in the right moment in order to avoid miss-investments. I would have expected more mentioning of similar research projects, reports on green blue infrastructure and citation of publications. I was missing an explanation on how the pre-selection of measures is to be conducted. This should at least be coarsely described.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



It is only mentioned in line 60, that it is based on hazard and risk identification analyses. Instead, the chapter on economic frameworks is very detailed and can potentially be shortened a bit. Also, I was missing the mentioning and a short presentation of the case studies in the beginning. Further, I suggest to combine tables 1, 2 and 3. The arrows in figure 1 could be enlarged a bit. Line 141 refers to “part 1”, which is not provided. 142: Please explain a bit the “risk assessment” that is mentioned here. Line 199 talks about “indicators” a bit out of the blue, please elaborate a bit on indicators used for the assessments. Line 201-203 contains the word “simulating” 3 times. Line 223 mentions “criteria” which could also be called “indicators”. Line 262 uses the word “parameters” – is this the same as “criteria” or “indicators”? Please make sure that consistent wording is applied. Line 264: Not clear between what the pairwise comparisons are to be conducted. Line 267: What is an AHP analysis? Line 366: First mentioning of “CSOs” – provide full word. In the Discussion I would find sub-headings quite helpful, e.g. “6.1. technical infrastructure measures”, “6.2. blue/green solutions” and “6.3. behavioral measures”. Line 399: Do you mean “water is too cheap” – instead of “cheap water”? Line 403-404: The description of “Reduction of low water elevation” should be provided earlier in the manuscript. This measure is mentioned several times earlier, but the explanation of what is meant with this measure, comes in the very end. Please also consider that such a decision has to be agreed to by authorities in order to ensure that the minimal ecologically required water flow in the downstream river sections is ensured. Line 414: Instead of “values” maybe “thresholds/aims” would be a more appropriate term. Table 4: Name “Benefits and limitations of the applied analysis” as caption.

---

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

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

