

***Interactive comment on “A description of the global land-surface precipitation data products of the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre with sample applications including centennial (trend) analysis from 1901–present” by A. Becker et al.***

**A. Becker et al.**

andreas.becker@dwd.de

Received and published: 21 December 2012

For easy reference I will respond the SC of J. Grieser para by para while repeating the SC lines, and citing them with ""

General remark: Reference is made to C215 provided by the ESSD Editors in return to C206 that contained a number of personal accusations on the authors and did not meet the standard of comments to be made on this open discussion paper platform. We are very grateful to the Editor for his reminder on the minimum standard of comments made

C303

with C215. As there was no such comment made by the Editors on SC C255 we will answer point by point the accusations made therein, just to protect our reputation. This is also made with regard to the fact that the comments of Referee 2 showed some readiness to believe the serious accusation of inappropriate citing which we strongly object.

SC: "Again: The authors pretend that the VASClimO dataset belongs to the GPCC at various locations in this manuscript, e.g. on page 928 lines 1 and 2, page 958, lines 4 to 6, while they attribute it to Beck et al. (2005) on page 256, lines 25 to 28. The VASClimO dataset is neither produced on behalf nor by means of the GPCC. They got it neither as a gift nor was it sold to the GPCC. I developed this dataset in a private initiative on my private computers. Two of the authors deliberately published wrong statements in Rudolf and Schneider (2005) explicitly claiming the VASClimO product as a GPCC product."

We do not renounce the citation of Beck et al. (2005) paper (with al = Grieser and Rudolf) as this represents the most appropriate citable document on the VASClimO data set that has been indeed designed, developed and generated by the two scientists C. Beck and J. Grieser during their tenure with DWD within the so-called DEKLIM-VASClimO project under supervision and mentorship of B. Rudolf. In citing this paper we actually respect the contribution of J. Grieser. However the VASClimO data set has aged, and as the follower data set HOMPRA will soon be released, we decided not to issue anymore DOIs for this data set but to reserve this for HOMPRA as already sketched in the paper.

Of course the VASClimO data set belongs to the GPCC portfolio of data sets! It was part of the deliveries expected from the DEKLIM Project VASClimO awarded to GPCC at DWD and J. Grieser was paid on this project through DWD for almost 5 years. Unfortunately J. Grieser has not understood until today all terms and conditions of his tenure contract with DWD. He hasn't done so even during his tenure, while utilizing his own personal hardware, which was against the rules at DWD, but of course is

C304

no reason to claim personal ownership on the results generated on it. J. Griesers intellectual contribution is sufficiently respected by the citation mentioned above.

SC: "On page 943, lines 11 and 12, the authors claim 'Since year 2008, when Version 4 of the precipitation reanalysis was issued, the GPCC has enhanced its gridding method to a climate anomaly method.' Note that the VASCLimO dataset of which the GPCC still claims that it is produced by the GPCC is published in 2005 and anomalies are interpolated!"

We thank J. Grieser for this remark. Indeed the anomaly method itself was firstly tested at GPCC with the development of the VASCLimO dataset, while its application to the entire GPCC product portfolio has not been completed before 2008 as written in the original manuscript. We have revised the text accordingly. The altered text has also been moved into the Introduction to comply with a recommendation made by Referee#1.

SC: "On page 951, lines 12 to 19 the authors indicate that the datasets discussed in the 'following section' (sec.7) are based on anomalies from GPCC's climatological normals. This might be true for some of the datasets discussed in sec. 7. I doubt that it is true for HOMPRA since this dataset does not exist yet. (Why do they discuss a non-existing dataset in the first place?) It is definitely not true for the VASCLimO dataset which is based on the FAO Agromet climate data which are not at all quality controlled and cover a wide range of observation periods."

Our statement is true for all DOI referenced data sets discussed and introduced in this paper. And it is the method of work for the HOMPRA data set as well that will take full advantage of the GPCC climatology Version 2011 or its follower scheduled for the end of 2013. As said before, VASCLimO is only mentioned here for the sake of comprehensiveness. There is no need to change any line in the manuscript because of the above statement.

SC: "From page 941, line 24, to page 942, line 3, they shortly explain why the use of

C305

Shepards method as it was done by the GPCC for 20 years now is not reasonable, without, however, mentioning that they used it as is all the years. They did not mention that I proposed doing the simple changes to adapt the fortran code they bought from David Legates already in 2002. They do not mention that they react now that I informed the scientific community about their misuse of Shepard's method."

The above para of C256 contains factual errors. All GPCC modifications made on the Shepards method were already made by David Legates during the original installation based on Fortran Code made from 25-August until 03-September 1991. The belonging documentation was received 2 weeks later. In June 1994 this code was transcoded to C-code prior to the operationalization of the GPCC in 1995. At this time the second radius  $\epsilon_2$ , J. Grieser refers to as 'simple change' was introduced to the operational C-code. I do not know which piece of fortran code J. Grieser is referring to here but the Legates contributions do not run in Fortran at GPCC since almost 20 years.

SC: "Their simple solution of throwing away all but 219 out of 4000 stations in Germany instead of using them by meaningful interpolation lacks any explanation (page 948 lines 16 to 18). It remains open which stations are used and why?"

The removal of all but 219 stations in Germany was only made for the global sampling error assessment to yield a homogeneous station distribution. For the re-processing products all German stations are potentially considered through the method detailed in Sect. 4.1 of the paper. Anyway, to address this potential misunderstanding we have added in brackets '(for this assessment only)' in Section 5.2, bullet (a), describing the quantitative error assessment.

SC: "They cite Rudolf et al. 1992 where two of the authors claimed that Shepard's method deliberately extrapolates out of the range of observations as if they still believe the non-sense they wrote, maybe out of ignorance."

We do not cite Rudolf et al., 1992 for this purpose.

C306

SC: "Given the fact that most of the authors have deliberately published wrong statements several times in recent years as well as the wrong statements they clearly wrote in this manuscript, the question is not what is wrong with this manuscript but what is right. Who knows? Maybe not even the authors."

I do not think that this statement copes with the minimum standards on an ESSD comment requested by the ESSD Editors with C215, so I abstain from an appropriate answer, also to avoid extension of antagonistic discussions that have affected already many other platforms in the past years. I can only apologize for the fact that also the ESSDD platform was abused by J. Grieser for his personal crusade against the GPCC.

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 5, 921, 2012.