

Interactive comment on “Towards systematic planning of small-scale hydrological intervention-based research” by K. E. R. Pramana et al.

K. E. R. Pramana et al.

k.e.r.pramana@gmail.com

Received and published: 1 December 2015

We thank Anonymous Referee #3 for the comments and valuable suggestions, which would allow us to propose a stronger paper about planning field research campaigns in small-scale hydrologic interventions. Indeed, our shared experience in field research allows us to document our perspectives – including how data are treated and how to make most of scarce funding. It is clear, however, that we indeed have to strengthen the structure to allow us to make the main point more clearly. The referee recognizes the two ingredients of the discussion paper. We have aimed to write them as logical constituting parts, but apparently have not succeeded. We do want to write about

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



planning field research campaigns on small-scale hydrologic interventions and its outcomes, as we think those are related. However, finding the balance is a challenge, as has become clear from the referee reports. As the referee suggests, our goal is to discuss planning of small-scale projects. We explained in the general response to all referees how we propose to realize that, with the appropriate level of detail for field realities, both in terms of hydrology and human agency.

It is unfortunate that we seem to have given the impression that we focus on human intervention as theft/vandalism. Whereas we indeed did not “probe into the causes and mitigation” of human agency, we did discuss that attitudes of people towards the intervention and the related studies could change over time. Furthermore, we acknowledge that “moving field instruments” (sometimes called theft) can be simply caused by curiosity. Indeed, our focus is how to deal with human agency. Our first answer is calling for recognition of human agency as something that will happen and can be anticipated upon.

Our results suggest that the interventions and the hydrologic research are indeed mostly interchangeable. This does not mean that local people perceive the two as the same, but it does mean that researchers need to acknowledge they are not independent of the intervention. As mentioned above, we also found that support for the intervention does not mean instruments do not move. The specific problem we raise that the location of the intervention might shift in time due to negotiation with local people is a clear case where intervention and research are closely linked. In other words, the intervention will influence its research (e.g. require new observation wells which need funding).

We do want to argue that simplistic participation theory is “not useful”, we tried to show that step-wise ideas of participation – eg that support is one-directional – are less useful. We think that including our comments on these linear ideas on participation are useful, as these simplistic ideas are still being discussed and used. We do acknowledge, however, that we need to include more details on community participation in our

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



case studies. We attempted to discuss local people's motivation in participating (positively or negatively) in hydrological research. In our case, we focus then on how to solve the negative part and conclude that we need to deal with it regardless the local people motivation.

Indeed, our cost-benefit approach is related to "value of information" analysis. We did perform a qualitative "value of information" analysis based on the example of Blume et al (2008). In order to avoid mathematical analysis beyond the scope of the paper, we did not perform such analysis any further, as adding this line to the concepts we propose would be overkill. We do acknowledge the need to provide something like a "conceptual diagram" to pull our arguments, evidence, and approach together.

Although presented as a minor comment, we do think we did not intend to include the word "NOT" on page 9515 l8. We think we could have anticipated upon some events. We acknowledge than using the "let alone" in the next part of the sentence is confusing. We should have simply written "and (partially) avoided".

We will include the suggested material on the Delphi Method.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 9489, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper