The second version of the manuscript HESS-2018-456 has been significantly improved with respect to several technical issues related to the methodology.

However, I have still some doubts on the WRL modeling results, showing a higher consistency of the hydrological monitoring indicators with the adopted legally-binding water restrictions (WR) when modelled discharges (GR6J) are used as input, rather than when observed discharges (HYDRO) are considered (lines 364-371). Maybe, the calculation of WRLs as the median of the water restriction levels *wrl*(d) for each 10-day period is not a good choice. Have you tried with different statistics, such as the mode? Otherwise, looking at Figure 6, one might think that the hydrological monitoring indicators alone are not enough to explain the reason for the implementation or non-implementation of WRs in some of the investigated catchments in the past years. For instance, negative deviations can derive from an increase in water demands (following section 4.5 changes in water demand are disregarded in this study), whereas positive deviations can be due to the availability of other water sources, such as groundwater or water storage in reservoirs.

With reference to the potential advantage of the proposed approach for decision making in WR policy implementation, and in particular in evaluating the effectiveness of DMPs under climate change and in the definition of priority in reviewing the plans, I believe that, despite the study introduces several simplifications (e.g. WRL modeling neglects: the role of the drought committees and stakeholders, the physical and socio-economic differences among the catchments, the potential changes in water uses and so on), it represents an original and fair attempt to investigate the sensitivity of DMPs to climate change. More specifically, the risk based approach, although improvable in several parts, provides preliminary indications on the vulnerability of irrigation in relation to the likelihood of occurrence and severity of future WRs.

Technical revisions

Lines 68-69: "… in terms of vulnerability to climate change in terms of access to water for agricultural uses." Please rephrase.

Line 173: VCd is defined as a mean discharge, however I think it should be divided by the duration d, otherwise it is a flow volume.

Line 193-195: "Where appropriate, other supporting local observations such as groundwater levels, reservoir water levels, field surveys provided by the ONDE network (Beaufort et al., 2018) or feedbacks from stakeholders can be used to inform final decisions."

Line 231: "In the case of our study, this would be acceptable or not water restrictions for users,". Something is missing in this sentence.

Line 295: what do you mean with "naturalized discharges"?