

Interactive comment on “The “WFD-effect” on upstream-downstream relations in international river basins – insights from the Rhine and the Elbe basins” by S. Moellenkamp

S. Barles (Editor)

sabine.barles@univ-paris8.fr

Received and published: 19 September 2007

Two reviews of the manuscript have now been achieved and published as "Referee Comments" in HESSD, together with a short comment. I hereby acknowledge the authors of reviews and short comment for their work and valuable appreciation. They agree in finding this paper useful and interesting, despite some weak points. Based on these evaluations and my own reading of the manuscript, the latter is accepted for publication in the special issue "Man and river systems: Long term interactions between societies and nature in regional scale watersheds" of HESS with major changes.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

The author is asked to write an "Author Comment" within 4 weeks to respond to the referee comments and attributed short comments, and to submit a revised version of the manuscript accordingly. In doing so, she shall address each point of the referee comments and provide a list of the changes introduced to the manuscript.

In addition to the minor demands from referees that should be answered and lead to some precisions in the manuscript, it appears that its main weakness lies in the empirical study: 1) its purpose is not clear (is it a study of the effects of WFD or a study of what people involved in river basin management think the effects would be) and should be specified in Sect. 1.4. (that would partially answer some comments of Referee #1); 2) as the three reviews/comments suggest or state in different ways, the case studies are too much affirmative and give not enough proofs or clarifications of what is claimed (for instance about the strengthening effect of WFD for downstream countries, about the role of EC and the interactions with other European policies, the effects of polluter-pays principle and the possible contradiction with previous solutions); 3) Sect. 3.3 that should be the core of the manuscript, represents only a quarter of the text ? this clearly illustrates the need to reinforce it. In addition, some of the bibliographical suggestions should be taken into account.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 1407, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper