

Interactive comment on “Watershed regulation and local action: analysis of the Senegal River watershed management by a regional organisation and public participation” by A. M. Sène et al.

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. I hereby acknowledge the referees for their work and valuable comments. They agree in finding this paper interesting, despite numerous weak points. Based on these evaluations and my own reading of the manuscript, the latter is not accepted for publication in the special issue "Man and river systems: Long term interactions between societies and nature in regional scale watersheds" of HESS.

This decision lies on several reasons.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

1) The theoretical background - especially for what concerns participation - is not strong enough, as stated by referee #2, and the authors do not question enough the need for participation itself, especially in the considered context.

2) I add that general and local contextualisation are missing. Dealing with public participation needs to explain who is the so-called public: who are the various riparian populations? What are their characteristics, their relations to the river and to water in general, their expectations? Who are the users of the river basin? What are the various organisations involved (in addition to the institutions mentioned in the manuscript)? What about gender? The authors emphasize the question of power related to participation, but what about power according to the various and conflicting interests (see for instance the brief allusion to Senegalese Sugar Company, p. 1924 and 1926, and the briefest one to Senegalese Society of Waters, p. 1926)? More generally and for what concerns participation, what is characteristic of Senegal basin (and why?) and what is similar to other situations elsewhere?

3) The case study lacks demonstration, it is too much affirmative and gives not enough proofs or clarifications of what is claimed, as stated by referee #1. Furthermore, the case study remains abstract. For instance, the question of dams, that seems so important, remains unclear, and the explanations are too vague. The overemphasis on texts together with the underdevelopment of fieldwork give the impression that the authors beat around the bush.

4) The English writing needs lots of improvements (this reason by itself would perhaps not lead to rejection, but adds to the others).

All those remarks do not question the interest of the presented work. My suggestion would be that the authors strengthen their study according to these various comments and the referees' ones before submitting to a journal or another.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 1917, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper