

Interactive comment on “Hydrological education and training needs in Sub-Saharan Africa: requirements, constraints and progress” by D. A. Hughes

D.A. Hughes

d.hughes@ru.ac.za

Received and published: 25 January 2012

David Love makes some very good points in his comments. The first is about what are science-based courses and what are not. I agree that some courses on water resources management proceed from a science-base and that WaterNet would be such an example. There are others, however, that do not proceed from a science-base. While I am not criticising such courses, I am trying to emphasise that they do not contribute to the development of the science, even if they do contribute to the WRM training needs. I did not mean to suggest that this is a competition, merely that both

C5873

forms of training are required (I will look carefully at the wording and ensure that the message comes across properly). However, the fact that SADC has prioritised the need for WR managers has already tended to prejudice the training in the region in favour of management rather than high-level scientific development. I did not intend to suggest that foreign funding is problematic, just that there should be a balance and that there is a need for greater financial commitment from national governments.

On the issue of existing networks, I agree that there are some and they are extremely useful. However, I also think that those that exist are not very well integrated. I did not provide and specific details about WaterNet as I was (and still am) under the impression that a paper on this topic will also be submitted as part of the same special issue (hence my rather vague reference to the paper by David Love).

I will look through the paper in more detail and check to ensure that the messages about training needs and financial support that I am trying to send in the paper are as clear as possible.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 10565, 2011.