

This behaviour was not well understood  
The effect is real and not an artefact of noise and uncertainty  
it cannot directly explain the observed  
not without some rescaling factor

extra degrees of freedom potentially reduce long-term predictive power  
simplified processing  
compromises the precision  
Idealisation noise is by far the most dominant noise component

there were apparent discrepancies  
there was an error  
the observed behaviour cannot easily be explained

estimates are uncertain  
are subject to uncertainties  
predictions are subject to uncertainties  
Some of the physical processes are not well understood

unavoidable human errors regularly cause huge discrepancies  
there is the additional issue of unexpected movement  
which occurs unfortunately frequently  
which increases the uncertainty

the large and associated uncertainty cannot be rejected as yet  
reliable knowledge on uncertainties is not available  
focus on the very obvious  
that can be identified without that knowledge

due to noise structure and uncertainty  
based on the evidence  
sufficient uncertainty remains

In view of the uncertainties  
inherent in the previous point  
to arrive at an acceptable explanation  
Because of time correlated uncertainties  
(and the lack of knowledge about such uncertainties)  
Uncertainties should be quantified

extracted from:  
Report EP201506209625  
Wadden Sea Long term Subsidence Studies - Overview report, June 2015  
Nederlandse Aardolie Maatschappij (NAM)