

Interactive comment on “Forecasting droughts in East Africa” by E. Mwangi et al.

S. Moges

semu.moges.2000@gmail.com

Received and published: 18 October 2013

The paper is an excellent attempt to improve the existing drought forecasting capability in horn of Africa using dynamical model forecast and recently available initial conditions (ERA interim. Its shape in terms of scientific significance and quality is excellent. It has been presented in coherent manner. It attempts to build on currently available consensus forecasting in the horn of Africa. Therefore, it has border societal impact. It is therefore a publishable paper.

Some observation:

1. General

The model forecasting skill performs better in the OND than MAM season. I suppose the MAM season is more important than the OND season in terms of agricultural ac-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



tivity. I believe improving the skill in MAM has broader impact to human security in that part of the world. Therefore, you may suggest areas of improvements required towards enhancing the MAM drought predictability.

2. specific

Page 10213, line 21-23

“The set of hindcast are initialised using ERA Interim reanalysis for the period 1981–2010”. My analysis cloud cover using the ERA40 product shows higher cloud cover activity in the Easter Africa (particularly Ethiopia), which means higher rainfall incidence than actually is. I am not sure about ERA how far the improvement is in the interim product but what is the level of performance of ERA interim in the horn of Africa? Can we undermine the effect of initial conditions in introducing bias?

3. Can we fairly conclude the Consensus Outlook is still the better alternative tool for drought forecasting in the horn of Africa?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 10209, 2013.

HESSD

10, C5682–C5683, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C5683

