

Interactive comment on “Stakeholder discourse and water management in a catchment in northern Italy” by P. S. Lupo Stanghellini and D. Collentine

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 November 2007

General comments:

The paper is very clear, deals with an interesting topic (participation in the WFD context and use of models in order to favour and improve it), and provides a relevant analysis on the basis of a well-described case study. It has its place in HESS and the special issue.

The main weakness of the paper is that it is too much "CATCH-centered" - CATCH is the name of the model used by the authors. More precisely, that means that apart Sect. 1 and 2, all the paper deals with CATCH with not enough contextualisation, critical point of view, and theoretical background. The paper would be much more convincing

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

by adopting such a scientific posture. The authors will find more precise suggestions (among others) in the specific comments.

Revised accordingly, the paper should be published.

Specific comments:

Title: perhaps a subtitle mentioning the method/model used would be more precise.

Introduction: should end with a short description of the paper and its structure.

Sect. 2

1732, 16-23: unclear because contains both a description of what participation can be and the way it is envisaged in WFD.

Sect. 3

The description is made from a very technical point of view. The theoretical background, the scientific context are not mentioned. Who originated the CATCH model? In what context?

1735, 10, the role of the facilitator should be more precisely described (and who is he?), as he seems to be the key person in the process.

1738: isn't the point of view about stakeholders (about the choice of representatives) a little naïve? There are many reasons for choosing one or another, according to strategy, involvement, etc.

Sect. 4

1738-39: some information about water management in the study area is missing.

1743, 11-15: where do the maps come from? Were they prepared by the research team (on what bases), or are they existing maps, but from where?

1747, 9-20, and Table 4. The notion of ?positive effect? (or negative) can be unclear.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

For instance, a new pricing policy has a negative effect on domestic use: what does that mean? That there will be less water consumption in the domestic sector, or more? If it is less, it can be viewed as a positive environmental effect? Please be more precise about those notions in the paper.

1751, 7-20: were these conclusions confirmed by interviews (or anything else) with the stakeholders? If not these are only conjectures. These arguments should be strengthened.

1752, 7-11: it a friendly atmosphere a end in itself? From time to time isn't it necessary to have conflicts about controversial points in order to progress?

More generally, it would be interesting to compare the workshops results to other ones given by other methods: what is new in the stakeholders conclusions, if compared to what is usually stated about water quality, management, etc. ?

Conclusion

Too much "CATCH-centered". What about the future of the area? What about further developments? What about comparisons?

Technical comments:

Language: clear but very repetitive (for instance 1737, 15-28; 1748, 10-20).

1732, 27; 1734, 7; 1744, 10, etc.: I am not sure of the right use of past participle (but I am not native English) "aimed at"?

1734, 17: "lay knowledge"?: unclear.

1737, 13: "reviewed;" should be "reviewed:"

1738, 23: population: for what year?

1745, 3: "zeroes"="zeros"

1751, 3: "88,33%"=too precise according to the number of municipalities. 88% is

enough.

1751,5: same remark about 31,25.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 1729, 2007.

HESSD

4, S1487–S1490, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper