

## ***Interactive comment on “Why a regional approach to postgraduate water education makes sense – the WaterNet experience in Southern Africa” by L. Jonker et al.***

**L. Jonker et al.**

p.vanderzaag@unesco-ihe.org

Received and published: 20 August 2012

Response by the authors to referee 2

We thank the reviewer for valuable comments and suggestions. Here is our response to all specific comments raised:

1. RC: Specific comment 1.

AC: This concern we address by changing lines 12 to 21 on p. 3583. The first objective (lines 12 -18) was changed to the conceptual framework of the study, and it was

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



explicitly stated that the paper reports on a first attempt at evaluating the success of WaterNet. We also replaced the second and third objective with three objectives that more accurately reflect our aim with the paper namely, describe WaterNet, assess the contribution of WaterNet to the capacity needs in the region and the contribution to research output. We will change the abstract in line with these changes and in this way we believe we will bring the abstract and objectives in line with what the paper offers.

## 2. RC specific comment 2.

AC: To address the concern regarding other water networks in Southern Africa and elsewhere (Saci-Water in South East Asia) we will insert a paragraph in section 3 after line 8 on p. 3585.

## 3. RC specific comment 3.

AC: This concern will be addressed in section 5 which deals with the Master Degree by giving more information on the evolution of the curriculum and some discussion on the implications of the evolution.

## 4. RC specific comment 4.

AC: A description of the analytical methods used will be included after the objectives.

## 5. RC specific comment 5.

AC: It was never our intention to present a network analysis of WaterNet in this paper. We currently do not have the data to do so.

## 6. RC specific comment 6.

AC: the WaterNet programme is premised on the basis that a multi-disciplinary approach is required to modern day water management. Reconceptualising the paper in terms of hydrology will not give an accurate reflection of the WaterNet story.

## 7. RC specific comment 7.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



AC: The objectives have been reformulated to more accurately reflect the content of the paper. In line with the new objectives the title of section 7 will be changed from 'Impact' to 'Successes' which we believe reflect the intention of the paper more accurately.

#### 8. RC specific comment 8.

AC: The comments contained under specific comment 8 are important and deserve attention. However, it will take some time to access the data required to answer the questions posed in specific comments 8. We therefore do not think we will be able to address the issues of specific comment 8 in this paper.

#### 9. RC specific comment 9.

AC: An initial attempt to trace the students was not very successful. A new tracer study is planned and it is hoped that we would be able to accurately track the graduates.

#### 10. RC specific comment 10.

AC: Will be addressed in sub-section 7.1 by adding a rationale for the specific mention of gender.

#### 11. RC specific comment 11.

AC: The three lessons will be incorporated in a discussion on the structure of WaterNet, the successes achieved in capacity building and the successes in facilitating research. In this way they should be better contextualised than is currently the case.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 3581, 2012.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)