Table A1

Author	Scenario	Expected uncertainty
Bertrand-Krajewski *et al.* 2000a	D=1000mm Different equations for flow	> 40% for h/D < 0.05 ±18% for h/D > 0.25 (Cont) ±15% for h/D > 0.25 (GMS)
Bertrand-Krajewski *et al.* 2000b	Common situations in France	± 50% to ± 100%
USBR 2001	Good installation conditions Appropriate maintenance and calibration	± 10%
WAPUG 2002	Modelling	Dry weather: [-10%, +10%] in V and Qp Wet weather: [-10%, +20%] in V [-15%, +25%] in Qp
Harmel *et al.* 2006	Small streams Different quality control procedures	Best-case scenario: ± 3 % Typical scenarios: 6 up to 19 % Worst case scenario: ± 42%
Ribeiro *et al.*2009	Circa 2301/s	6.5% - 11%
Legend:	D: diameter h/D: relative water depth V: volume	Qp: peak flow Cont: continuity equation GMS: Gauckler-Manning-Strickler equation

Table A2

Site	Year	$RMSEP_{rel}$ for variable *p*				
		1 day	2 days	3 days	4 days	5 days
Q03	2006	8,5%	8,6%	8,3%	**7,8%**	7,8%
	2007	9,0%	7,9%	7,8%	**7,3%**	8,9%
Q08	2006	9,9%	10,4%	**9,7%**	10,0%	10,1%
	2007	5,5%	6,2%	**5,4%**	6,4%	6,7%
Q41	2006	22,6%	22,5%	**22,4%**	26,8%	22,5%
	2007	10,8%	10,5%	**9,7%**	16,5%	16,4%

Legend: (see Table 1) Very Good 0% - 5% | Good 5% - 10% | Satisfactory 10% – 20% | Unsatisfactory > 20%

Table A3

Site	Year	$RMSEP_{rel}$ for variable *p*					
		1 hour	2 hours	3 hours	4 hours	5 hours	6 hours
Q03	2006	12,2%	11,5%	**11,3%**	11,5%	11,5%	11,6%
	2007	13,4%	**12,1%**	12,1%	12,3%	12,6%	12,9%
Q08	2006	12,6%	9,6%	**9,0%**	9,0%	9,1%	9,1%
	2007	13,7%	9,7%	**9,4%**	9,4%	9,4%	9,7%
Q41	2006	12,5%	**12,2%**	12,3%	12,5%	12,4%	12,5%
	2007	11,5%	**10,2%**	10,3%	10,8%	10,5%	10,6%
Legend: (see Table 1)		Very Good 0% - 5%	Good 5% - 10%	Satisfactory 10% – 20%	Unsatisfactory > 20%		