

***Interactive comment on “HESS Opinions
“Crash tests for a standardized evaluation of
hydrological models”” by V. Andréassian et al.***

Dr Andréassian

vazken.andreassian@cemagref.fr

Received and published: 4 June 2009

I have read your 'opinion paper' whose thesis I fully support but am sceptical about the practical effect of your heroic effort - and you can guess why: the KCT will be avoided under whatever excuses available because modellers, especially those who want to 'market' their products, know only too well that they would not pass it. And this is true in particular for the most important cases where the models are intended for applications in situations other than those under which they have been developed and calibrated, e.g.. for modelling of hydrological processes after changes in climate, land use, etc. - which is what the water management planners are chiefly interested in. I had no illusions in this regard when I wrote my paper, but the logic of modelling led me

C1069

to develop the "testing principle" to its, let's say, "theoretical limit".

I thus have nothing to add but am curious about the responses your paper will (may) elicit.

By the way, Robin Clarke may be interested since he recently wrote a paper in which he attempted to put some "quantitative flesh" on the "qualitative skeleton" of my paper. If you have not done so already, you may wish to put him on your mailing list.

Vit Klemes

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 3669, 2009.

C1070