

Interactive comment on “Brief Communication: CATALYST – a multi-regional stakeholder Think Tank for fostering capacity development in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation” by M. P. Hare et al.

M. P. Hare et al.

mhare@seeconsult.org

Received and published: 31 January 2014

We would like to first thank the reviewer for his/her review and comments that will help us improve this article.

> 1. To define “capacity development” as the “stimulation and development > of capabilities” (p. 3922) is not satisfactory.

Our response: Due to limited space, we shortened the quoted definition from UNISDR.

C2435

Proposed action: In the revised version, we will use the full definition of capacity development adopted by CATALYST: “The process by which people, organisations and society systematically stimulate and develop their capability over time to achieve social and economic goals, including through improvement of knowledge, skills, systems, and institutions – within a wider social and cultural enabling environment” (UNISDR, 2009).

It can indeed be argued that even this definition does not cover all the different possible facets of capacity development, and because of this we will continue to also place emphasis on the role of knowledge production, as is currently described in our article.

> 2. Both with respect to (world) regions and hazards, the project pursues > a very broad perspective. A great number of different hazards of > interest is mentioned (p. 3922). I cannot imagine that all of them were > treated equally and in the same depth in the different regions. Please specify.

Our response: Indeed not all hazards were treated equally and in the same depth. We followed the interests of our regional stakeholders to specify the hazards to be discussed in each region, and to what depth. Participatory processes such as these are going to inevitably be biased in this way. Proposed action: In the revised version, we can make this process for the selection of hazards more explicit in two or three sentences. > > 3. The project very much depends upon the input of stakeholders from > very different world regions. While at the end (pp. 3928-29), the paper > provides some critical reflections upon the problems related to such a > process (e.g. concerning online participation), I miss an explanation of > how the stakeholders were identified and how relevant in/familiar with > the governance of (different) hazards in the respective regions they are.

Our response: CATALYST combined an initial stakeholder analysis approach (described in del. 2.2: CATALYST Report on issues, gaps and opportunities, network coverage) and a typical “snowball” method of stakeholder identification: i.e. Individuals and organisations identified in the initial stakeholder analysis as well as the contacts of

C2436

partner networks, who in turn provided more contacts. Our subsequent work generated further interest and the project was able to attract more members. Stakeholders who actually get involved in the project have been self-selecting, since they are contributing to the project on a voluntary basis – CATALYST has worked with those who can and are willing to donate their time to the project. All stakeholders selected are knowledgeable about their own sphere - it was not expected that they would be knowledgeable about all hazards., Proposed action: this process can be elaborated on in a short paragraph.

> > 4. The concepts of “region” and “best-practice transfer” need some > reflections. “Region” here refers to different countries and, thus, to > distinct modes and structures of governance (not to mention different > sub-regional types of governance!). Later in their paper, the authors > themselves are critical about the idea of best-practice transfer within > regions (p. 3926) but this problem could have been known from the very > project beginning as drought governance in Spain is certainly different > than in Serbia (to give but one example based on Fig. 1).

Our response: As the reviewer suggests we have indeed known since early on that there is a problem, but we need to try to solve these types of problems, since funding bodies and development agencies also often work at this level. This is an eternal challenge and we cannot ignore the regional focus of international bodies and funding agencies - but it comes at cost in terms of transferability, as suggested. We would on the other hand not want to slip into thinking that there can be NO transferability between countries - why set up global learning alliances, so favoured by funding agencies at the moment? We also consider transferability between countries in different regions, where there are similar problems, making sure people take into account differences in governance styles. Proposed action: We agree it would help the reader to elaborate on our perspective at the outset.

> Moreover, why did the project focus only on “best” (rather “good”) practices and not > on “poor” one

C2437

Our response: First, we need to make clear that we are working with stakeholders and the whole project has depended on their involvement. It is not a scientific project. Furthermore, we cannot run a project of this type focussing on poor practices explicitly – we would lose stakeholder participation and openness in discussions. However, the project did also address poor practices to the extent that they can be derived from discussions of best ones, plus we explicitly identified gaps and recommendations for capacity development which has intrinsically drawn attention to poor practices . Proposed action: We will add a statement which makes this more explicit.

> and if the “best” practices already exist isn't it rather the question what impedes their implementation?

Our response: This is a very relevant question to answer. Our project deliverables, such as Best Practice Papers, have drawn attention to such impediments and limits of applicability. In a brief communication such as this article we can not list all these numerous impediments just as we cannot include all the best practices identified. Proposed action: We can add a statement to clarify the good point that the reviewer is making here.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 3919, 2013.

C2438