Evaluation of the hydrological cycle in the context of climate change

H2020-MSCA-RISE-2018, 2019- 2023 Grant agreement no: 823965

Open Project Day

isardSAT, Barcelona | March 11th, 2022











Evaluation of the hydrological cycle in the context of climate change

Roger Clavera-Gispert and Pere Quintana-Seguí Observatori de l'Ebre (Universitat Ramon Llull - CSIC)

Open Project Day

isardSAT, Barcelona | March 11th, 2022





Water cycle



- Most of these processes are difficult to observe and quantify.
- We can measure some of these parameters *in-situ* (scattered points) or with remote sensing (not the complete system).
- Therefore, we need other tools such as hydrological modeling to be able to evaluate the hydrological cycle.



Public Domain. The USGS Water Science School - The Water Cycle Howard Perlman and John Evans (USGS)

Study Area: The Pyrenees



The Pyrenees : Natural water towers. It stretches 415 km from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean.

It is 150 kilometers wide (N-S axis). Main basins: Ebro, Adour and Garonne

Water surplus. Values above 1000 mm/year near the watershed and on the northern slope. The adjacent plains lower water balance, even negative values. **Rivers from the Pyrenees are** the main source of water resources in surrounding areas: providing water needs to

- 0 more than 15 million people
- supplying electricity 0
- extensive irrigated regions 0



- High spatial heterogeneity of precipitation.
 A gradient appears from west to east:
 The transition between the two extremes occurs gradually.

Western valleys:

- The maximum is in autumn (spring's one is
 - secondary).
- Minimum is in summer.

Eastern valleys:

- The maximum is in spring (autumn's one is
 - secondary).
- Minimum is in winter.

Main precipitation caused by the humid Atlantic air masses. There is the altitudinal gradient, where precipitation increases as altitude increases.

Observations



— Observations

We have 67 gauging stations, that provide quality observations of near natural discharge time series from 1980 to 2013



The stations are in a natural or semi-natural regime (not influenced by dams or intensively irrigated areas)

Open Project Day | isardSAT, Barcelona | March 11th, 2022 | 5

Hydrogram s9020

Physically based model.

- 1. **SAFRAN** (PIRAGUA_atmos_analysis): Gridded dataset of all meteorological variables needed to run a LSM. Based on SAFRAN
- 2. **SURFEX:** Simulation of land-surface fluxes and stocks.
- 3. **RAPID:** Converts runoff and drainage to streamflow.

Almost no calibration needed!

Performance: Good performance in streamflow simulation (peaks and mean).







Conceptual based semi-distributed model.

- Operates on a daily time step at the catchment scale.
- Has been designed to evaluate the impact of management on water, sediment, and agricultural chemical yields in ungauged catchments

SWAT, as a conceptual model, requires
calibration and validation:Model Initialization1980-1985Calibration1986-2005Validation2006-2013

Performance: Good performance in streamflow simulation (peaks and mean).



Modelling: SWAT



SAFRAN (PIRAGUA_atmos_analysis) gridded dataset (all meteorological variables)





Land Use



In the models, land use does not change. Thus, the streamflow changes due to changes in land use will be reflected in the observations but not in the simulated streamflow.

Spatial patterns of changes in the area of broad land-use categories in Europe.

Changes refer to the period 1990–2006

Tobias Kuemmerle et al. (2016)



Descriptive statistics







Descriptive statistics







We used the Kling-Gupta efficiency (KGE) test as a goodness-of-fit test to evaluate the simulations

- **a**: discharge variability
- **eta**: bias between simulated and observed.
- **r**_c: discharge dynamics.
- $\mathbf{KGE} = 1 \operatorname{sqrt}\{(\boldsymbol{\beta}-1)^2 + (\boldsymbol{a}-1)^2 + (\boldsymbol{r}_s-1)^2\} \quad Pool \ et \ al. \ (2018)$

Evaluating simulations



Both models give good KGE values (mostly KGE>-0.41), being SWAT's higher than SASER's. However, it should be noted, that SWAT has been calibrated for this purpose.



Trend Analysis



- Mann-Kendall test: to analyze for consistently in increasing or decreasing trends
- Sen's slope: to compute the slope of the trend

Sometimes, prewhitening the series, when there is autocorrelation, is needed.

We can see that trends in Q10 are more or less flat, but differences increase in Q90, even a change of sign in the trend can be observed.

Hydrogram s9020





Trend Analysis



Binary classification: sign of the trend

- Contingency tables
- Scores

ADOUR									
		OBSE	RVAT	IONS					
		+	Ξ.				+	÷	
SASER	+	461	213	674	SWAT	+	423	170	593
	-	175	570	745		-	213	620	833
		636	783	1419			636	790	1426
Accuracy		0.73					0.73		
F1 Score		0.70					0.69		
MCC		0.45					0.45		
Kanna		0.45					0.45		

EBRO E									
		OBSERV	ATIONS						
		+	-				+	-	
SASER	+	208	115	323	SWAT	+	152	74	226
	2	269	656	925		-	325	698	1023
		477	771	1248			477	772	1249
Accuracy		0.69					0.68		
F1 Score		0.52					0.43		
мсс		0.32					0.28		
Карра		0.31					0.26		



Trend Analysis



Binary classification: sign of the trend Sen's slope visualization **Contingency tables** Sen's slope Sen's slope Scores SASER SASER O: SS / S: SS O: SS / S: SS ADOUR P33 EASTERN EBRO P33 O: SS / X: SS / W: no SS O: SS / X: SS / W: no SS 0.4 O: SS / X: no SS / W: SS O: SS / X: no SS / W: SS ADOUR O: SS / S: no SS Spring O: SS / S: no SS Spring V O: no SS / S: no SS V 0: no SS / S: no SS OBSERVATIONS SWAT SM/AT 0.2 0.2 0 0: 55 / 5: 55 O 0: SS / S: SS < 0: SS / X: SS / W: no SS < 0: SS / X: SS / W: no SS 423 170 593 461 213 674 SASER SWAT + < O: SS / X: no SS / W: SS < 0: SS / X: no SS / W: SS -< 0: SS / S: no SS 175 570 745 213 620 833 < 0: SS / S: no SS 2 1 V O: no SS / S: no SS O: no SS / S: no SS 636 783 1419 636 790 1426 2 1 0.73 0.73 Accuracy -0.4 -0.4 F1 Score 0.70 0.69 0.45 MCC 0.45 -0.6 Kappa 0.45 0.45 -0.6 -0.4 0.4 -0.2 0.2 -0.2 0.4 Observations (mm/day/year) Observations (mm/day/year) Sen's slope Sen's slope SASER SASER 0: SS / S: SS 0: SS / S: SS ADOUR P23 EASTERN EBRO P23 O: SS / X: SS / W: no SS O: SS / X: SS / W: no SS 0.4 0.4 O: SS / X: no SS / W: SS O: SS / X: no SS / W: SS O: SS / S: no SS O: SS / S: no SS Spring EBRO E Spring V O: no SS / S: no SS O: no SS / S: no SS ear) SWAT SWAT OBSERVATIONS 0.2 0.2 -O 0: SS / S: SS O 0: SS / S: SS < 0: SS / X: SS / W: no SS < 0: SS / X: SS / W: no SS < 0: SS / X: no SS / W: SS < 0: SS / X: no SS / W: SS 323 SWAT + 152 74 208 115 SASER 226 < 0: SS / S: no SS < 0: SS / S: no SS 269 V 0: no SS / S: no SS 0: no SS / S: no SS 656 325 698 1023 925 477 771 1248 477 772 1249 -0.3 0.69 0.68 Accuracy -0.4 -0.4 F1 Score 0.52 0.43 MCC 0.32 0.28 -0.6 --0.6 -0.4 -0.2 0.2 -0.6 0.0 0.6 -0.2 0.4 Kappa 0.31 0.26 Observations (mm/day/year) Observations (mm/day/year)

Trend Analysis Conclusions





Trend Analysis Conclusions





Conclusions and next steps



WE ARE STILL WORKING ON THE RESULTS !!!

- We observe :
 - more streamflow in the northern slope than in southern slope of Pyrenees (no surprise)
 - o more streamflow in the western Pyrenees than in the eastern Pyrenees (no surprise)
- We obtained very different values from simulations, showing a great uncertainty. Concluding that it is good to use different models and approaches.
- It seems to be:
 - \circ In the longer period (33 years) there are more trends in observations than in simulations.
 - In the shorter period (23 years) the trends in observations and in the simulations are more similar.

One explanation could be that, during the 1980s, climate change was not as marked as changes in land use.

On the other hand, climate change was already noticeable in the 1990s.

We are working on:

analyzing the data

Next:

• Compare the hydrological cycle modeled by different scenarios for the historical period and for future climate predictions.





Thank you!

rclavera@obsebre.es - pquintana@obsebre.es

isardSAT









Tis