Interactive comment on ""Are we talking just a bit of water out of bank? Or is it Armageddon?" Front line perspectives on transitioning to probabilistic fluvial flood forecasts in England" *by* Louise Arnal et al.

Jan Verkade (Referee)

jan.verkade@deltares.nl

Received and published: 10 November 2019

The manuscript describes the 'transition' of the Environment Agency towards using probabilistic fluvial flood forecasts. The topic is very relevant and worthy of analysis indeed.

Having said that, I think the manuscript would benefit from (i) a better description of what it aims to achieve (ii) additional analysis that would justify the recommendations that are made.

Re (i). The research, through the interviews, provides data that documents the view of various individuals at a single point in time, regarding a change in an organization's processes and procedures. I like to make the analogy with "observations" in the quantitative sciences. Observations can be used to provide evidence of the plausibility of some hypothesis - or of the absence thereof. Such a 'hypothesis' element would greatly improve the quality of the manuscript - and provide a response to the "So What?" question that, post reading the manuscript, continues to linger in my mind.

Re (ii). Based on the interview data, recommendations are phrased. While some of these may be very worthwhile indeed, I think recommendations can only be made based on an analysis where objectives are offset with achievements or projected achievements. Ergo, I think recommendations can only be made if the agency's objectives (with respect to the production and use of probabilistic forecasts) are described. Have these objectives been described in the 2016 National Flood Resilience Review that is cited, maybe? Or are documented elsewhere?

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.geosci-commun-discuss.net/gc-2019-18/gc-2019-18-RC3-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-18, 2019.