

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

**V. Andréassian et al.**

vazken.andreassian@cemagref.fr

Received and published: 4 August 2009

Thank you John for your comments, from which we would like to underline two elements:

. The MOPEX initiative was indeed a great opportunity - for us and for all those who took part in it - to realize how much could be learnt by working with large datasets... and how difficult it could be to convince all of our colleagues to use these large datasets!

. You are certainly right to mention that a fundamental question is “what can hydrologists do to make our models most useful to society”. In our mind, a crash test is

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



precisely what is needed to turn a 'great model' into a 'useful' one. There is no point in claiming to have the 'best' model. Being 'right' is meaningless as long as we are alone to know it. This is why we believe in a collective approach to model testing. In our opinion, if a modeler wants to contribute to the overall improvement of hydrological models, he has to contribute to a collective action to test the models. The outcome of model comparison approaches is after all secondary. What made the "crash test" efficient to improve car safety is the fact that it became a standard in the car industry.

---

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

