

## **Reviewer # 2**

The article gives very interesting and useful information on the different situations in the European countries on information availability and decision making in relation to sea level rise. Good and extensive overview of the gathered information.

## **Response to reviewer #2**

Thank you very much for the time dedicated to review the manuscript and for comments and suggestions provided.

In what follows these comments and suggestions are addressed, where each comment is presented as given (in black) and then we specify how it will be addressed (in blue).

---

The importance of exchange information on data, projections and plans could be worked out a bit more. If neighboring countries come to different conclusions of the rate of slr and the urgency this could lead to misunderstanding and confusion in society. If countries have plans to adapt to a rising sea level that effect and/or do not match with the plans of a neighbouring country, this could have severe adverse consequences.

The reviewer's observation is indeed sound. Discrepancies on these matters may lead to variations in the perceived urgency and necessity for a unified response to a global issue demanding action at a transnational level. We will incorporate a cautionary comment regarding this aspect in the discussion section. However, it is important to note that the manuscript is reflecting the current perception of the stakeholders, while companion papers are analyzing in depth the current state of data/information availability on SLR and adaptation policies across Europe. We will also make reference to those papers.

The data suggest a comforting similar sense of urgency and prioritization of sea level rise issues on slr, specifically on uncertainty. Not mentioned is the difference in time horizon that there might be for planning and decision making in relation to the scientific scope. For policy makers there is a need for systems that helps Risk informed decision making. This could be a joint interest to work on.

Once more, the reviewer's observation is sound. While one of the primary focus of concerns was on aspects such as uncertainty, it is essential to note that the aspects explicitly mentioned are not exhaustive. In fact, any addressed in this manuscript must be contextualized and supplemented by its status across European basins, as extensively analyzed in companion papers focusing on SLR information, impacts, adaptation and governance. As mentioned before, we will include a comment making reference to those papers to contextualize the perception of stakeholders again the current status of knowledge in Europe.

The article is providing a good basis for further cooperation and is hopefully providing for next steps. On exchanging information on monitoring, methods for projections, instruments, approach, process of preparing adaption plans, decisions making, etc.. It

would give the article more value if suggestions would be added for further steps or cooperation.

Thank you for the comment. Indeed, during some of the workshops, participants highlighted the importance of international cooperation to share experiences and knowledge. Furthermore, the variations observed in responses across different regions as well as common concerns and interests suggest the value of such knowledge transfer to enhance harmonization across European basins. We will include a recommendation in this sense as concluding remark.

Some small details:

Fig 2b: Other (what is added after 'other' can be skipped; the explanations for other is not mentioned below)

Thanks. It will be removed or changed to "other locations". It was included to indicate that some respondents were from other basins outside Europe.

Fig 6: result presentations are likely to give a reverse idea while no plans or no ineffective plans are figured green, while red stands for good, sufficient and effective plans.

Thanks for the comment. While it's understandable that our perception of colors often associates green with positive and red with negative, it is important to note that in this context, colors merely represent percentages. We have employed a consistent scale (included in the figure) throughout the manuscript to minimize any potential confusion. Nevertheless, we will assess the feasibility of adjusting the scale to minimize such perceived confusion.