

Interactive comment on “Forecasters priorities for improving probabilistic flood forecasts” by F. Wetterhall et al.

D. Koutsoyiannis (Referee)

dk@itia.ntua.gr

Received and published: 18 June 2013

DK said:

"I believe voting is irrelevant in scientific affairs. Is it a matter of voting for, say, a priority to “Increase the average skill of the medium range forecast (> 3 days)” in order to materialize it? "

FP said:

"I strongly disagree with the comment - setting priorities in a research agenda is common may it be through funding mechanisms or through research programs. Naturally, this does not mean that the priority will materialize, but it allows to focus attention, in

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



this case, on the end user needs."

Good to know about this disagreement. Should I be happy about current funding mechanisms and research agendas? Do I understand it well that there is no problem if a voted priority would not materialize? Should I help focus attention on infeasible tasks? Why not go a little further and provoke voting to abolish uncertainty in forecasts, to extend predictability, not to >3 days, but to >3 months, or even, in climate affairs, for >3 centuries (which is also safer against refutation)?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 2215, 2013.

HESD

10, C2670–C2671, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

