

Manuscript nness-2021-217: “Invited perspectives: When research meets practice: challenges, opportunities and suggestions from the implementation of the Floods Directive in the largest Italian river basin” – Final response to comments from referee 1

We would like to thank the referee and the editor for this second round of review. In the following, we supply a point by point answer to the comments further raised by the referee.

RC1.1 A main point here is the overarching relevance of the project as a demonstration example in order to provide a “perspective” for research activities on Natural Hazards in a more general sense. While it is mentioned in the text that the initial impetus came from formal requirement of a revision of flood risk maps and flood risk management plans, a positive effect on the availability of impact data for the setup and calibration of damage models arising from the involvement of the respective authorities is still not clearly spelled out.

As already mentioned in the manuscript, the project provided many perspectives for research activities, highlighting gaps and needs on which research is currently under development, e.g., regarding the (quantitative) estimation of flood mortality, indirect damage to people, direct and indirect damage to economic activities, damage to cultural and environmental assets, and damage to infrastructures, also with specific reference to coastal areas (lines 93-96). With respect to the production or gathering of “new” impact data, by considering also comment RC1.6 made by the reviewer in the first round, we suspect he/she did not really understand the objective of MOVIDA, that is not the ex-post damage assessment. In MOVIDA, existing or newly developed damage models are implemented to supply an estimation of expected flood impacts on a certain area at risk, in the support of decision making. The implemented models were chosen among those calibrated and validated (in their developing phase) in contexts that are comparable to the implementation one.

RC1.2 The website provides just a blank page without content. I tried this out using different web browsers. Please check!

We are really sorry, but we did not realise the webpage was out of order. We are fixing the problem, but it still requires some days. If the manuscript will be accepted and the problem will not be fixed yet, we commit to remove the reference during the proofing correction stage. We also added further references to complement the existing one (line 45-46)

RC1.3 I am referring to your last sentence: “Our wish is the creation of real opportunities to work in this direction, as the definition of a European platform, a COST action or, more ambitiously, an inclusive, big (research) project supported by the European Commission.!”. I do not understand this statement in the context of your manuscript and of your response. While you suggest replicating the partnership between academia and public institutions, it is not clear what the role of COST actions or big research projects should be. Rather, such initiatives could be started on a regional basis, for example motivated by demands from the Floods Directive.

As the referee highlights, we suggest and wish to replicate the partnership between academia and institutions at the European Level, just to find common solutions to Floods Directive (and more in general Flood Risk Management) requirements. The development of a European platform, a COST action, or an EU project is, in our opinion, a concrete way to support the creation of such partnership, both from an economic and a logistic perspective. As said, it is just our opinion. We leave the editor to decide about the appropriateness of the sentence for the scope of the special issue. If it is not appropriate, we will simply delete the sentence.