



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## **Effective modeling for Integrated Water Resource Management: a guide to contextual practices by phases and steps and future opportunities**

Badham, J., Elsayah, S., Guillaume, J., Hamilton, S., Hunt, R., Jakeman, A., Pierce, S., Snow, V., Babbar-Sebens, M., Fu, B., Gober, P., Hill, M., Iwanaga, T., Loucks, D., Merritt, W., Peckham, S., Richmond, A., Ames, D., & Bammer, G. (2019). Effective modeling for Integrated Water Resource Management: a guide to contextual practices by phases and steps and future opportunities. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 116, 40-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.02.013>

**Published in:**  
Environmental Modelling and Software

**Document Version:**  
Peer reviewed version

**Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**  
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

**Publisher rights**  
Copyright 2019 Elsevier.  
This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

**General rights**  
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**  
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

# Effective modeling for Integrated Water Resource Management: a guide to contextual practices by phases and steps and future opportunities

---

Jennifer Badham<sup>a</sup>, Sondoss Elsayah<sup>b,c</sup>, Joseph H.A. Guillaume<sup>d,c</sup>, Serena H. Hamilton<sup>e</sup>, Randall J. Hunt<sup>f</sup>, Anthony J. Jakeman<sup>c</sup>, Suzanne A. Pierce<sup>g</sup>, Valerie O. Snow<sup>h</sup>, Meghna Babbar-Sebens<sup>i</sup>, Baihua Fu<sup>c</sup>, Patricia Gober<sup>j</sup>, Mary C. Hill<sup>k</sup>, Takuya Iwanaga<sup>c</sup>, Daniel P. Loucks<sup>l</sup>, Wendy S. Merritt<sup>c</sup>, Scott D. Peckham<sup>m</sup>, Amy K. Richmond<sup>n</sup>, Daniel Ames<sup>o</sup>, Gabriele Bammer<sup>p</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Centre for Public Health, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT9 7BK, United Kingdom

<sup>b</sup>School of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, University of New South Wales, Australian Defence Force Academy, Canberra ACT, Australia

<sup>c</sup>Fenner School of Environment and Society, Australian National University, Canberra ACT, Australia

<sup>d</sup>Water & Development Research Group, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland

<sup>e</sup>School of Science, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup WA, Australia

<sup>f</sup>United States Geological Survey, Upper Midwest Water Science Center, Middleton WI, USA

<sup>g</sup>Environmental Science Institute, Jackson School of Geosciences, University of Texas at Austin, USA

<sup>h</sup>AgResearch, Lincoln, New Zealand

<sup>i</sup>School of Civil and Construction Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis OR, USA

<sup>j</sup>School of Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning, Arizona State University, Tempe AZ, USA

<sup>k</sup>Department of Geology, University of Kansas, Lawrence KS, USA

<sup>l</sup>School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca CU, USA

<sup>m</sup>Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research, University of Colorado, Boulder CO, USA

<sup>n</sup>Department of Geography and Environmental Engineering, United States Military Academy, West Point NY, USA

<sup>o</sup> Civil and Environmental Engineering, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, USA

<sup>p</sup> Research School of Population Health, Australian National University, Canberra ACT, Australia

60  
61  
62  
63  
64 **ABSTRACT**  
65

66 The effectiveness of Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) modeling hinges on  
67 the quality of practices employed through the process, starting from early problem definition  
68 all the way through to using the model in a way that serves its intended purpose. The adoption  
69 and implementation of effective modeling practices need to be guided by a practical  
70 understanding of the variety of decisions that modelers make, and the information  
71 considered in making these choices. There is still limited documented knowledge on the  
72 modeling workflow, and the role of contextual factors in determining this workflow and which  
73 practices to employ. This paper attempts to contribute to this knowledge gap by providing  
74 systematic guidance of the modeling practices through the phases (Planning, Development,  
75 Application, and Perpetuation) and steps that comprise the modeling process, posing  
76 questions that should be addressed. Practice-focused guidance helps explain the detailed  
77 process of conducting IWRM modeling, including the role of contextual factors in shaping  
78 practices. We draw on findings from literature and the authors' collective experience to  
79 articulate what and how contextual factors play out in employing those practices. In order to  
80 accelerate our learning about how to improve IWRM modeling, the paper concludes with five  
81 key areas for future practice-related research: knowledge sharing, overcoming data  
82 limitations, informed stakeholder involvement, social equity and management of uncertainty.  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90

91 **Keywords:** decision making, social learning, stakeholders, uncertainty, calibration,  
92 integrated modeling, IWRM  
93

94 **Highlights**  
95

- 96 • Existing lack of guidance to mobilize IWRM concepts and tools towards successful  
97 outcomes
- 98 • Practices-focused guidance explains the detailed process of conducting contextually-  
99 focused IWRM modeling
- 100 • IWRM modeling phases and steps are detailed drawing on literature from multiple  
101 areas
- 102 • Step-by-step questions are provided to inform methodological decisions and  
103 practical relevance
- 104 • Areas for future practice-related research are identified  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118

## 1. Introduction

Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) is above all a process (e.g. Molle 2008; Ibsch et al. 2016); one that “promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources, in order to maximize the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital ecosystems” (GWP 2000). IWRM principles, also known as the Dublin principles, have functioned to serve public participation in water resource decision processes and increasingly this encompasses participatory, or the related collaborative, modeling (Basco-Carrera et al. 2017). Indeed, an IWRM project typically includes substantial stakeholder engagement and is supported by at least one jointly-developed model. Such participatory modeling has recently been defined by Voinov et al. (2018) “as a purposeful learning exercise for action that engages the implicit and explicit knowledge of stakeholders to create formalized and shared representations of reality.”

Modelling for IWRM represents interactions between humans and their environment and therefore has much in common with social-ecological systems modelling and the more recent concept of socio-hydrology. “Social-ecological systems modeling” often focuses on sustainability (Ostrom 2009) or resilience (Folke 2006), while “socio-hydrology” focuses on how coupled human-water systems interact and co-evolve (Sivapalan et al. 2012). IWRM is distinguished by a practical focus on supporting water management or policy decisions in a context that typically involves stakeholders from multiple sectors. IWRM is underpinned by water balance and hydrological modelling adapted to a specific policy or planning setting. This requires connecting hydrology with other socio-environmental knowledge and component models (see e.g. Croke et al. 2014 for a case study in the Murray-Darling Basin).

The term ‘model’ however has many connotations; here we define a model as an explicit representation of features and relationships of a target system (Badham 2015). Within this definition there are many types of models, including process, physically and/or behaviorally based, gaming, actor-based, conceptual, and flowcharts. Each can have a range of characteristics such as static/dynamic, statistical/empirical/probabilistic, and distributed parameter/lumped parameter. An IWRM process can utilize any of these.

Here we emphasize quantitative models because they provide an appropriate framework for cost-benefit and other trade-off analyses, as well as playing a key role in understanding, managing, and negotiating solutions for integrated socio-environmental issues. Quantitative models: 1) can serve as boundary objects to encourage and facilitate focus in communication among participants; 2) help in problem framing and explicit boundary setting, which bridge gaps in understanding that can divide participants and bring together multiple perspectives; and 3) determine which actions out of all those possible are in fact being evaluated (i.e., which hypotheses are tested) (Falconi and Palmer 2017). Although these benefits also arise with other types of models, the rigorous process of converting qualitative statements and broad understandings (i.e. mental models) into quantitative, or at least categorical, relations allows for testing the veracity of perspectives.

178  
179  
180 Successful IWRM modeling can be effective in many ways and to varying degrees (Merritt et  
181 al. 2017). In this paper, we view success in a holistic way as the ability to embed the  
182 modeling process in a social process that connects scientists, decision makers and  
183 stakeholders, and achieves impact in accordance to its purpose, which may vary from a  
184 shared understanding of a problem to policy analysis (Hamilton et al. under review).  
185  
186

187 Our starting point is that the degree of IWRM modeling success can be enhanced by the use  
188 of effective practices throughout the model development-application lifecycle, from framing  
189 key questions and defining objectives all way through to using the model to satisfy its  
190 intended purpose(s). Adoption and implementation of effective IWRM modeling practices  
191 needs to be informed by practical and fit-for-purpose driven guidance on how to mobilize  
192 the IWRM concepts and techniques towards successful outcomes for decision making and  
193 stakeholders. Although scholars have made strides in fleshing out IWRM (e.g. Tortajada,  
194 2016), conceptualizing modeling methodologies, and reporting case studies, there is still  
195 limited documented knowledge on the modeling workflow, and the role of contextual  
196 factors in determining this workflow and the practices to employ. Practice-focused guidance  
197 may help explain at a micro-level some of the nuances experienced by those involved in  
198 IWRM modeling.  
199  
200  
201

202 We aim to contribute to bridging this knowledge gap by describing the actions needed to  
203 develop a successful IWRM modeling project. This focus on detailed steps and activities  
204 motivates the need to develop an in-depth understanding of the IWRM process, in particular  
205 seeking to understand how integration will be implemented, how stakeholder's are  
206 effectively involved, and linking the modeling decisions to the variety of factors that make  
207 up the problem and system context. We draw on findings from literature and the authors'  
208 collective experience to articulate what and how contextual factors play out in employing  
209 those practices. The guidance synthesizes findings about the modeling process drawn from  
210 literature reported in overlapping areas, including: environmental and hydrologic modeling  
211 (Jakeman et al. 2006; Anderson et al. 2015; Harmel et al. 2018), engaging stakeholders  
212 (Vennix et al. 1990; Voinov and Bousquet 2010; Voinov et al. 2018), and general modeling  
213 (Banks 1999).  
214  
215

216 In the next section, we summarize some key literature on the notion of IWRM, including  
217 main criticisms, arguing that these are concerned with the challenge of its implementation  
218 in a practical context, and that operationalizing IWRM is assisted by a good modeling  
219 process. The Phases and Steps that constitute an effective IWRM modeling process are later  
220 described in Sections 3 to 7. This is followed by an outline of key areas for future  
221 development in IWRM modeling (Section 8).  
222  
223  
224  
225

## 226 **2. Background: The concept, the criticisms and the operational role of** 227 **modeling in IWRM** 228

229 It is a well-accepted premise that modeling has a crucial role to play in the implementation  
230 of IWRM (Soncini-Sessa et al. 2007). The use of modeling for operationalization of IWRM  
231 faces important challenges for the future in terms of integration and implementation of  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236

237  
238  
239 knowledge. These challenges are inherent to the nature of the IWRM concept itself and how  
240 it can be implemented in practice. In this section, we give an overview of those challenges,  
241 and how they motivate this paper.  
242

243 The first challenge is the difficulty of managing wicked problems in water policy, when there  
244 are multiple pressures, conflicting stakeholder values, competing goals, multiple decision  
245 makers, limited resources, and deep uncertainty. The three IWRM goals of economic  
246 efficiency, equity and environmental sustainability often conflict, and so require trade-offs  
247 (Molle, 2008). Criticisms of IWRM often focus on the practical challenges of implementation.  
248 Perhaps the most strident critic has been Biswas (2004) who considers the definition of  
249 IWRM itself amorphous and questions whether integration across so many aspects is  
250 achievable. Tortajada (2016) responds to these criticisms by clarifying IWRM as a concept,  
251 as a goal in itself, and as a strategy to achieve development goals. Practical high-level  
252 guidance on what to integrate is given by Hamilton et al. (2015) who flesh out ten  
253 dimensions of integration (e.g. issues of concerns, stakeholders, spatial and temporal scales,  
254 uncertainties, etc).  
255  
256  
257

258 As an extension of this challenge, there has also been discussion in the literature about the  
259 water-energy-food nexus as either a competing paradigm to IWRM or one that could inspire  
260 improvements in the concept and operationalization of IWRM (e.g. Benson et al., 2015;  
261 Keskinen et al., 2016; Müller, 2015). But while representing a set of issues to be considered  
262 in many IWRM problem settings, the water-energy-food nexus concept may focus attention  
263 on the food and energy sectors and draw attention away from the natural environment, and  
264 possibly other social and economic water values. Climate change, environmental change  
265 and adaptation also are being increasingly recognized as a component to be integrated with  
266 IWRM, especially in regard to the planetary effort towards sustainable development and its  
267 goals (including a specific target, SDG 6.5, on the implementation of IWRM at all levels;  
268 Giupponi and Gain, 2017).  
269  
270  
271

272 The second challenge relates to handling the human element in IWRM and reconciling the  
273 conflicting agendas involved with water management (Grid 2016). For example, IWRM has  
274 been criticized in that: stakeholder engagement has been perfunctory; the concept has not  
275 been accepted and practised by local water managers (Funke et al., 2007); and technical  
276 integration in analyses has not coincided with a balanced institutional integration  
277 (Fischhendler, 2008); or the modeling has not been convincing (Middlemis 2000). On the  
278 other hand, Grid (2016) argues that while IWRM is challenging because of the human  
279 element, no other process can reconcile the conflicting agendas involved with water  
280 management.  
281  
282  
283

284 The primary challenge therefore is in building guidance on how one implements IWRM, or  
285 addresses the integration dimensions in the implementation of IWRM for a given problem.  
286 Whereas the literature includes some prescriptive guidance on how to implement an IWRM  
287 modeling process, there is still a gap in linking this advice to practice. For example, Hamilton  
288 et al. (2015) take a step towards operationalizing integration by offering a framework for  
289 mapping research methods that can be used to implement each of the integration  
290 dimensions throughout the modeling process. However, the framework remains mainly  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295

296  
297  
298 prescriptive, and work is still needed to document and reflect on the lessons from the actual  
299 execution of the modeling processes.  
300

301 In summary, we are well aware of the difficulties of operationalizing IWRM. Whilst Ibisch et  
302 al. (2016) have recently examined 14 IWRM projects and given a synthesis of lessons learnt  
303 from them, we agree with Giordano and Shah (2014) that the lessons from attempts to  
304 implement IWRM are otherwise not well-documented and have impeded its development  
305 beyond a concept for dealing with wicked water problems. If we are to add substance to  
306 carrying out successful IWRM, we need to begin to document systematically how IWRM  
307 projects are being carried out and evaluate the lessons. Being systematic will require a  
308 template that includes a set of categories defining the context of a problem so that patterns  
309 and anti-patterns of IWRM operations in specific contexts can emerge for future guidance  
310 on what and how to integrate. There is no alternative to us as a community than “learning  
311 by doing” IWRM, while reporting on it and explicitly accruing the lessons.  
312  
313  
314

315 In recognition of this need, we have been associated with a “Pursuits” project at the National  
316 Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center (SESYNC) ([https://www.sesync.org/for-](https://www.sesync.org/for-you/educator/research/themes-pursuits)  
317 [you/educator/research/themes-pursuits](https://www.sesync.org/for-you/educator/research/themes-pursuits)), funded by the United States National Science  
318 Foundation. We come from a range of backgrounds spanning science and social science of  
319 water resource management as well as public health modeling and computer science. The  
320 Pursuit project aims to address the overarching research question of “identifying the core  
321 practices that should be employed in developing and using models to support IWRM.” Thus,  
322 we argue for effective IWRM through a modeling lens. But it recognizes that such modeling  
323 needs to be a process that is well-grounded in the needs of the IWRM problem at hand,  
324 hence we also focus on guidance for applied problems. Following good practice, modeling  
325 can bring many benefits to the IWRM process including: elicitation, systemization and  
326 sharing of otherwise fragmented knowledge; management of uncertainty; facilitation of  
327 capacity development; transparency; and participation and inclusiveness.  
328  
329  
330

331 The paper does not delve into the necessary institutional and governance reforms  
332 advocated by many for IWRM. Moreover, we feel that there is still much progress to be  
333 made by working within whatever current governance constraints exist but also using  
334 modeling to infer and communicate how new arrangements and approaches might improve  
335 the effectiveness of water resource management. At its core, our paper’s main aim is to  
336 address ‘the how’ of IWRM modeling by guiding modelers and commissioners of projects on  
337 what questions to ask and what issues to address, thereby prompting decisions through a  
338 model-grounded process for an IWRM problem.  
339  
340  
341  
342

### 343 **3. Introducing Phases and Steps for effective IWRM modeling**

344  
345 IWRM modeling actions can be broadly grouped into four phases (cf. Hamilton et al. 2015).  
346 The *Planning Phase* identifies what is to be achieved, how this is to be accomplished, and  
347 what resources can be brought to bear. The model is built and tested during the  
348 *Development Phase*, and then used in the *Application Phase*. Finally, models that become  
349 part of the ongoing policy or decision-making process, or are for routine operational use,  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354

355  
356  
357 require a *Perpetuation Phase*. These phases are sufficiently general that they typically apply  
358 to the widest range of IWRM activities and model types.  
359

360 Within these general phases are more specific steps (see left side of Table 1) or activities  
361 associated with the IWRM modeling process, which may be implemented in different ways.  
362 We provide a modeling-centric view of an IWRM decision support process. A policy-centric  
363 or stakeholder-centric view might identify and emphasize phases somewhat differently,  
364 connecting to these to varying extents – depending on the level of (policy maker or other)  
365 stakeholder involvement. In the broader IWRM arena, different authors have separated the  
366 modeling process into distinct actions. For example, Black et al. (2014) focus on the use of  
367 models to analyze water resource planning scenarios and their guidance is principally  
368 intended for modelers. We step back and focus on what fundamentally is to be considered  
369 and achieved in each of the four phases and accompanying steps for the context in which  
370 the IWRM process operates. The framework described here emphasizes flexibility and  
371 directs project attention to key points and questions as a way to facilitate better access to  
372 the IWRM concepts and tools available.  
373  
374  
375

376 Here we define ‘context’ as the social and project characteristics that influence which steps  
377 are brought to bear and how they are implemented; in any application, specifics of what  
378 happens within the steps may differ. Important contexts for the model development include  
379 the general role of the modeling, the funding levels for the effort, level of stakeholder  
380 conflict, type of governance setting, relevant scales of the problem, and tolerance for  
381 uncertainty.  
382  
383

384 Description of each step within a phase is elucidated in the following sections using brief  
385 examples drawn from a range of IWRM settings, typically based on quantitative water  
386 management modeling with substantial stakeholder involvement. Given the broad nature of  
387 IWRM problems, examples alluded to here are necessarily illustrative rather than  
388 comprehensive.  
389  
390

391 Although the phases are broadly chronological, ordering is not intended to imply that the  
392 steps are necessarily sequential. The steps presented in this paper are not intended to form  
393 a rigid checklist, but capture key practices that should be considered and performed as  
394 needed. A great deal of overlap and iteration between phases and steps can be expected,  
395 some steps may be conducted concurrently whilst in particular projects others may not be  
396 needed at all. For example, tasks undertaken in the first *Planning Phase* might be revisited  
397 during the *Development Phase* if data are found to be of poorer quality than expected or the  
398 desired model outputs change. Similarly, there is likely to be overlapping parallel progress  
399 between data collection, model construction and testing, as testing reveals weaknesses in  
400 the model and identifies additional data that would be required to reduce uncertainty in  
401 important model outputs. Such concurrent cyclic iteration is widely understood to be a part  
402 of hydrological (and other) models, where the *Development* and *Application* phases of  
403 modeling provoke revisiting of previous efforts.  
404  
405  
406

407 Each step of the model can be seen as a path which has ‘forks’ where alternative choices  
408 can be made. The choices made by the modeling team can affect the quality of the modeling  
409 results. For example, choosing one stakeholder group over another can affect the relevance  
410  
411  
412  
413



of the information included in the model. Lahtinen et al. (2017) have developed a checklist to help modelers “evaluate alternative paths, and recognize and act on situations where changing the path may be desirable.” While not discussed further here, it is a useful complementary tool.

Table 1: Phases and steps in the modeling process in IWRM and desired results.

Step	Desired Results
<b>Planning Phase</b>	
Problem definition and scoping	Concise and sufficiently complete picture of modeling objective(s); including whether these are scientific understanding, decision making and/or social learning at the highest level. Articulation of what is to be integrated especially if these are water issues only or also cross-sectoral issues
Stakeholder Planning	Description of stakeholders to be involved in the IWRM process, and how and when they are to be engaged; identify sectoral interests and jurisdictional levels; identify how modeling results will be integrated into stakeholder processes
Project management planning	Negotiated workplan of activities, including time and cost; good understanding of cost-benefit of different levels of effort on data collection and modeling regarding hydrology, water use and management, depending on nature of their integration with stakeholder processes; also includes decision-support processes.
Preliminary conceptual model	Broad description of the characteristics, relationships and processes important to solve the IWRM problem; IWRM outcomes of interest at relevant spatial and temporal scales – hydrological, ecological, social, economic indicators; controllable (policy) and uncontrollable drivers (climate, boundary conditions); helps define “bounding box” of what processes the model will include
<b>Development Phase</b>	
Data collection	Compilation of available data including evaluations of data quality (hydrology, water use, socioeconomic and management); ensure leveraging of existing knowledge and avoid “reinventing the wheel” (e.g. using existing water databases)
Construction	Efficient development of one or more quantitative tools that provide a concise but appropriate representation of the system of interest, typically including some elements of the hydrological, water use and water management system
Model Calibration	Model inputs and processes refined so that output is similar to, or consistent with, observations and/or qualitative information in known situations (especially water availability and water use); maximize the flow of information from the observations to the

473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531

	model inputs; adequately represent past and current conditions to foster acceptance of model predictions
Uncertainty analysis	Description of the reliability and accuracy of model predictions (e.g. water availability, ability to meet demand, ecosystem and socio-economic outcomes); provide stakeholders with a basis for discerning when one model output is different than another; articulate main sources of prediction uncertainty and suggest future data that could be collected if uncertainty is too high
Testing/evaluation	Model is correctly implemented and suitable for its purpose; verify that the model performs for conditions outside of those included in calibration (e.g., extreme drought), while taking into consideration the relevance of the model assumptions to the conditions outside the calibration.
<b>Application Phase</b>	
Experimentation	Learning biophysical and socioeconomic constraints on the system, exploring possible trade-offs among socio-economic and environmental outcomes, more trust/acceptance of modeling tool
Analysis and Visualization	Concise compilation of salient model outputs tuned for fulfilling the model objective, e.g. hydrological, ecological and socio-economic indicators; provide concise encapsulations of important model insights and outputs
Communication of results	Effective exchange of important insights and outcomes of modeling; tradeoffs of IWRM indicators; ensure that benefits of the work for different audiences are well justified
<b>Perpetuation Phase</b>	
Documentation	Provide the information to use, reproduce, adapt and update the model; maximize the efficiency of future models of the system; have defensible model for legal arena (e.g. in prior appropriations of water allocation regimes, or supporting water use permit decisions)
Process evaluation	Gain insight in what went right/wrong, why, and what could be improved for future IWRM projects from multiple project stakeholder viewpoints; leverage insights for more efficient IWRM efforts in the future
Monitoring and maintenance	Assimilate new information into model (e.g. more recent climate data, new ecological information, and socio-economic survey results), including data about predictive accuracy, and issues of hosting and end-user support addressed; provide approach to address uncertainty resulting from unknowable future

## 4. Phase 1: Planning

The *Planning Phase* defines what the modeling is intended to achieve within the context of the larger IWRM project, who should be involved, and what resources are required. It converts an initial need that 'a model or set of models is required' into a description of the model(s) and a plan for how to meet that need efficiently and effectively. Models may need developing or, if suitable, can be adapted from already developed models. This phase comprises four steps: *Problem Definition and Scoping*; *Stakeholder Planning*; *Resource Planning*; and *Preliminary Conceptual Model*.

### 4.1 Problem definition and scoping

The first step is one of clarification and agreement about what are the objectives, and especially which water-centric issues and cross-sectoral issues (e.g. climate, food, energy, environmental, cultural) are essential to be addressed. This essentially determines what is (and is not) to be modeled. A key aspect is to identify the questions that the modeling should answer. However, the form and scope of these questions and their answers are shaped by the intended users of the model(s) and identified stakeholders, as well as the function (or role) that the model(s) and modeling process is to have within the broader IWRM project.

Clearly defining the problem, and how the model is to be used to address the problem, determines many of the decisions made during subsequent modeling steps. Some of these decisions are: whose views and knowledge are to be included, which functions and processes are required of the model(s), expected level of model accuracy and complexity, and how model utility will be tested.

#### **Model function**

Fundamentally, a model is simply a representation of knowledge about a system, and that representation can be used in different ways (Badham 2015; Kelly et al. 2013; Oxley et al. 2004). An IWRM modeling process is policy-oriented because the defining characteristic of IWRM, as outlined earlier, is its focus on the human and decision-making dimensions of issues, such as ways to equitably manage sources of water, or how to cost-effectively allocate volumes of water in a river system to different uses and the environment. Commonly, policy-oriented modeling is supported by quantitative models of a particular water resource or other aspects of the socio-environmental system, which form the foundation for exploration of options and constraints. A major component of these models tends to be physically based, but sometimes data based, models, that advance scientific knowledge of, or improve scientific tools applied to, that resource. Typical examples include hydrology models (Beven 2012) which aim at understanding surface water behaviours, hydrogeological models (Anderson et al. 2015) to advance the knowledge of groundwater systems, and water quality models (Chapra 2008; Merritt et al. 2003) to comprehend the fate of nutrients and/or contaminants in water. But increasingly these are supplemented or integrated with modeling of the human dimensions (Noel and Cai 2017; Kelly et al. 2013), especially their behavior and decision making at various levels such as individual (e.g.

591  
592  
593 farmer, household), industry (irrigation), community (rural, urban), and policy jurisdiction  
594 (local, regional, national).  
595

596 Policy-oriented models can be further subdivided into those models used for policy support  
597 or decision making and those for conceptual thinking and (social) learning. Models used for  
598 policy support and decision making extrapolate from knowledge and behaviour to estimate  
599 potential consequences, or a range of consequences, of potential actions. While everyday  
600 use of water models can include forecasting for operational objectives (e.g. reservoir real-  
601 time operational decisions for flood control; Hsu and Wei 2007), IWRM modeling is typically  
602 for longer-term strategic, and/or multiple, objectives such as assessing spatiotemporal  
603 tradeoffs of impacts resulting from alternative management options (e.g. for licensing  
604 abstraction volumes and locations under a varying climate). These models are used either  
605 directly by the decision maker (or their advisors), or the modeling team may summarize the  
606 model's outputs for different scenarios as advice for decision makers.  
607  
608  
609

610 Models for thinking and learning use the model to communicate, visualize, and explore the  
611 system to inform the diverse groups concerned with a project. Such models can also  
612 integrate knowledge elicited from those groups (e.g. see El Sawah et al. 2015 for cognitive  
613 mapping of stakeholder system understanding). In this process, the model acts as a  
614 translator, or boundary object, between groups with different understanding and languages  
615 about the problem. The emphasis is on restricting all imaginable system behaviours to those  
616 that are reasonably likely, while at the same time providing insights, improving mental  
617 models, and fostering interaction and communication among stakeholders. The modeling  
618 process itself is often an important part of this role, with possible cognitive or social  
619 outcomes including systems thinking, consensus building, and conflict reduction (Belt and  
620 Blake 2015). For example, Pahl-Wostl and Hare (2004) describe benefits of a learning  
621 activity that included gaining insights into complexities of the system, and greater  
622 understanding of the actors' own perspectives and the role of other actors. In addition, the  
623 openness of the process fostered the discussion of innovative ideas.  
624  
625  
626  
627

628 Although presented as somewhat distinct in this discussion, the purpose of a modeling  
629 exercise may be manifold. A model that promotes social learning may also be taken further  
630 and used for policy support. Likewise, scientific models may be harnessed by a modeling  
631 system in order to provide policy support. Furthermore, the role may change during an  
632 IWRM process, with different aspects of the model emphasized at different points; for  
633 example, social learning when generating options, but then policy support when the options  
634 are being compared.  
635  
636

637 Although developing a model or models may be the main deliverable of an IWRM project,  
638 some complex projects may involve several sources of evidence and methods, perhaps with  
639 the model playing a relatively minor part (Bots and van Daalen 2008). For example, there  
640 may be formal legal hearings and submission processes to obtain the views of members of  
641 the public as well as key stakeholder organizations. In such a situation, the model modeling  
642 needs to complement and interact with the non-modeling activities and sources of  
643 information. Consider for example the objectives of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan in  
644 Australia where the objective was to determine a sustainable limit of water extraction in the  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649

650 basin. Largely existing hydrological and ecological models were adapted to address this  
651 objective, supplemented by socioeconomic analyses.  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656

### 657 ***Model question and scope***

658 Clarification of the modeling purpose, role and use triggers the first model design decision:  
659 what are the questions the modeling is answering? Questions can be framed around a set of  
660 inputs and outputs. IWRM inputs typically include drivers that impact water systems (e.g.  
661 climate change, water use needs for energy, urban or agriculture demands), stressors (e.g.  
662 over-exploitation of water resources), and management and policy options (e.g. riparian  
663 buffer management, water allocation policy), where financial and socioeconomic impacts  
664 are associated with each driver. Outputs of interest feed IWRM outcomes that need to be  
665 improved or maintained to address the identified issue(s). An example question is 'which  
666 management interventions acting in which locations are most likely to lead to desired  
667 outcomes?' A typical output would be the nature and magnitude of change in the physical  
668 water resource. Examples include 'how much water reaches the end of the river given a  
669 rainfall, population and abstraction scenario?', or 'how much is some measure of pollution  
670 reduced, and perhaps at what cost, given a specific change in policy?' The modeling may  
671 generate several outputs that each answer a different question, or multiple outputs might  
672 be used to answer a single question.  
673  
674  
675  
676

677 As IWRM projects typically involve researchers and stakeholders from different disciplinary  
678 backgrounds and experiences, there can be different perspectives on what key questions  
679 need to be investigated (Brandt et al. 2013). Coherent framing of questions can be  
680 challenging and time-consuming, but the process of (re)framing the modeling questions is  
681 an essential exercise for building a shared understanding about the modeling inquiry and its  
682 implications for the system. The process also sets relationships between stakeholders that  
683 will be active during the remainder of the IWRM process.  
684  
685

686 Problem definition facilitates subsequent boundary setting and scoping of the problem  
687 domain, identifying what aspects of the system are to be included/excluded from the model  
688 in terms of its relevance, or contribution to addressing the question of interest. Of course  
689 some elements of the setting may change over time. Challenges to problem definition are  
690 inevitable as IWRM is a wicked problem characterized by multiple, and often conflicting,  
691 viewpoints about the problem, possible solutions, who will be affected by the problem, and  
692 who should take part in solving the problem. Based on the plausible interpretations of these  
693 issues and questions, there are multiple problems to be defined and boundaries to be set  
694 (Walker et al. 2003). Dewulf and Bouwen (2008) offer an example case study where three  
695 actors (i.e. water power plant, water management authority, and sand miners) have  
696 divergent problem frames about water management problems in their region. The water  
697 plant, which provides electricity to the region, defines the goal as reducing soil erosion and  
698 resulting sediment flow to the reservoirs. On the other hand, miners do not frame sediment  
699 as a threat but as an economic opportunity. Problem definition is not a straightforward  
700 exercise, but an organic process through which stakeholders reflect on their existing  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708

709  
710  
711 problem frames, negotiate differences, and ideally re-construct their views to reach a  
712 shared representation of the problem.  
713

714 Although many IWRM applications are typically confined to the physical boundary settings  
715 of targeted water systems, emerging concepts, such as 'virtual water' which involves the  
716 role of food trade in compensating water deficit, can stretch beyond the biophysical  
717 boundary (Yang and Zehnder 2007). Social and economic considerations can also stretch the  
718 physical boundary; for example, income used to sustain a regional community may be  
719 derived not just from activities within the IWRM zone but may be supplemented from  
720 additional work outside a catchment. 'Nexus thinking' is another driver for expanding  
721 system boundaries by promoting the importance of attending to the food-water-energy-  
722 environment linkages and cross-sector impacts (Hussey and Pittock, 2012). Framing water  
723 problems using a nexus lens extends many of the aspects that need to be attended to,  
724 including stakeholder groups to be involved, goals and risks to be considered, governance  
725 and regulatory framework, and the interdependencies among the modeled systems.  
726  
727

728 However, different problem interpretations are not only attributed to different stakeholder  
729 views and systems of interest. The disciplinary background of the research team can be  
730 another challenge. Whereas diverse disciplinary teams are often cited as beneficial for  
731 problem definition and even critical for the success of an IWRM modeling process, the  
732 assumption that any interdisciplinary team will effectively work together to develop an  
733 integrated problem cannot be taken at face value (Nicolson, 2002). Interdisciplinary teams  
734 do have their challenges and can stumble over their differences (Bark et al., 2016), such  
735 as different views about what constitutes data, different research agendas, etc.. There is still  
736 a need for more guidance into how interdisciplinary teams can work together in IWRM  
737 modeling projects to negotiate their differences and reach an integrated understanding of  
738 the problem.  
739  
740  
741  
742

#### 743 **4.2 Stakeholder Planning**

744

745 IWRM inevitably involves multiple stakeholders and interest groups that include domain  
746 experts. Effective stakeholder engagement leverages diverse knowledge and perspectives in  
747 order to inform what water-related issues are addressed, the subsequent construction of  
748 realistic input data, scenarios, and potential management solutions (El Sawah et al. 2015).  
749 The extent of stakeholder involvement, however, depends on both the project needs and  
750 the interests of the particular stakeholders. The purpose, timing, ways and mode of  
751 engagement may also differ for different stakeholder groups. Stakeholder planning steps  
752 must consider several questions such as:  
753  
754

- 755 • Which stakeholders to engage, separately, together and when (disciplines, domain  
756 knowledge, relevant interests)?
  - 757 • What role does the main client or funding agency play relative to other stakeholders?
  - 758 • Are there cultural or other sensitivities to consider?
  - 759 • How much authority should the stakeholders have in making decisions about the  
760 model?
  - 761 • At what points in the modeling process is their input most important?
  - 762 • Will stakeholders be involved as individuals or part of a group?
- 763  
764  
765  
766  
767

- 768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777
- How will information flow from/to stakeholders and the model?
  - How does the project provide value to the stakeholders?
  - What is required to enable the stakeholders to engage effectively?
  - What commitment is required from the stakeholders and are they sufficiently interested and available to make that commitment?
  - What is required to build trust?

778 Plans for stakeholder engagement should be developed, monitored, and adjusted in concert  
779 with the stakeholders who are to be engaged (Barreteau et al. 2010). Four forms of  
780 engaging IWRM stakeholders in modeling have been identified (Hare 2011): (1) front- and  
781 back-end modeling where stakeholders are involved at the early and last stages of the  
782 project; (2) co-construction where stakeholders are involved throughout the model  
783 development process; (3) front-end modeling where participation is limited to the early  
784 stage; and (4) back-end modeling where stakeholders are brought in at the end of the  
785 modeling process. In general, it is best to engage representative stakeholders as early and as  
786 often as possible (Langsdale et al. 2013), checking in with regular status discussions at all  
787 stages of the modeling effort. Extensive engagement is particularly important in projects  
788 oriented towards promoting social learning and collaboration, and requiring high levels of  
789 trust. However, the early stages of a project typically involve more abstract discussions;  
790 hence, there is a tension between involving stakeholders early and consuming their time  
791 with little progress, or later and running the risk of them feeling that key decisions have  
792 already been made. Developing and maintaining stakeholder interest is key to resolving this  
793 tension.  
794  
795  
796  
797

#### 798 **4.3 Project management planning**

799 Like all substantial projects, the modeling process requires resources such as time, funding,  
800 data (see *Data collection* step below) and skilled personnel. In some cases, there can be  
801 externally imposed deadlines or funding constraints that must be met, which in turn can  
802 drive problem definition, choice of model used, and the modeling process. Even without  
803 fixed constraints, government or regulatory authorities are likely to contribute much of the  
804 funding and some technical skills, and may have a different role in supporting planning from  
805 other stakeholders.  
806  
807

808 Stakeholder engagement discussions should cover what support is desired and what is  
809 available, and then be revised as more is learned as the IWRM process progresses. Key  
810 decision points in the modeling process should be coordinated with stakeholders to ensure  
811 agreement on what is (broadly) being done, when and with whom. This typically is a  
812 negotiated process between (some) stakeholders and the modelers and can be aided by  
813 developing a workplan of activities that is revisited throughout the project to allow response  
814 to changing priorities, resource constraints, or leveraging opportunities. In the context of  
815 IWRM, more resources are typically required for larger projects in order to facilitate the  
816 communication and collaboration that typically include a greater variety of stakeholders  
817 with different perspectives, disciplinary backgrounds and experiences (van Asselt et al.  
818 2002).  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826

#### 4.4 Preliminary conceptual model

The preliminary conceptual model forms the basis for transitioning between the *Planning* and *Development* phases. It is a broad, qualitative outline of the model design and identifies the main features that must be included in the model(s) that is (are) to be constructed.

Conceptual models typically include:

- desired outputs of the model, which are those that represent the effects of controllable and uncontrollable drivers on the societally relevant resources and indicators;
- key entities or system components that drive the desired outputs of the model (such as land and water use behaviour; policy that influences how water is extracted; ecosystem impacts; river flow, aquifer responses of interest, and water quantity and quality)
- broad relationships and connecting processes between these entities; and
- uncertain elements that are to be explored during the decision-making process, such as policy options and those exogenous factors outside of policy control (e.g. climate, other sectoral influences such as from energy or agricultural policy).

The objective of the preliminary conceptualization is to describe aspects of the IWRM issues and the influences that contribute to these issues. These elements are then refined to those that are relevant to the output for IWRM outcomes and scenarios, and to the comparison of those scenarios for any negotiation or recommendation. A conceptual model defines connections between important components of the IWRM issue, and includes model inputs and model outputs, and intermediate states and processes that are relevant.

Some entities and processes do not influence the relevant output but may be important to stakeholders to improve relevance and make the model more accessible to end users (Elsawah et al. 2017). Therefore, the development of the preliminary conceptual model can also be a useful activity for building a shared understanding among the project stakeholders about the system drivers, and how they will be addressed in the model (Bertone et al. 2016).

Throughout the conceptualization process, substantial discussions are indispensable regarding how the model will be used, what limitations might need to be overcome, what alternatives should be considered, and how multiple models will work together. The conceptual model design step focuses on higher-level views of the IWRM problem, for example determining boundaries of the problem (e.g. what is in, what is out), temporal and spatial scales and extent and general level of complexity required for the intended decision level (e.g. whether short term operational, medium term management, or long term planning). Determining the appropriate scales can be challenging because the components of socio-environmental models in the IWRM domain can have different spatial boundaries and characteristic process time scales, and the stakeholders may be interested in issues that occur at different scales. For example, farmers are likely to be interested in impacts at the spatial scale of an individual farm and the temporal scales of both a single season, and a span of several years, while water resource planners are more likely to be interested in sustainable watershed spatial scales over a decadal planning horizon. There may also be a



886  
887  
888  
889 mismatch between stakeholders' scales of interest and the scales of relevant biophysical  
890 and socioeconomic processes (Hamilton et al. 2015).

891  
892 Conceptual models are typically constructed with some sort of diagram using arrows to  
893 mark influential relationships and flows (Argent et al. 2016; Robinson 2008; Jakeman et al.  
894 2006). Narratives or other visual and textual descriptions of 'what happens if' may also be  
895 useful (e.g. rich pictures). Data collection and knowledge elicitation methods are commonly  
896 used to develop the preliminary conceptual model, such as desktop literature review, expert  
897 and stakeholder interviews, and workshops (Vennix et al. 1990).

899  
900 The components and processes should be broadly described in terms suitable for  
901 stakeholders who are not modeling experts. Qualitative descriptions regarding how a  
902 change of one component or process can change the state of another can be valuable, and  
903 can provide insight regarding the direction of change, whether it is a relatively small or large  
904 effect, and what other factors may influence that relationship (Liu et al. 2008). Quantitative  
905 measures and the detailed rules and equations specifying relationships are established in  
906 the *Development Phase*.

908  
909 Conceptual models are also useful when adapting and/or integrating pre-existing models,  
910 which may well be required by the water management sector because of their legacy of,  
911 and commitment to, their previous investments in hydrological model types in particular.  
912 Here revisiting the conceptual model relates the existing model(s) to what may be a new  
913 problem, as well as identifying and resolving any conceptual differences between the  
914 adopted model and the problem as perceived by the modeler and stakeholders (Belete et  
915 al., 2017). This is an essential step before further resource investments are made.

### 917 **Modeling technique**

918  
919 As the conceptual model is clarified, the type of model or models to be used must also be  
920 decided. There are usually many different possible models that could be selected, each with  
921 different strengths (Kelly et al. 2013; Fulton et al. 2015; Hamilton et al. 2015). Selection is  
922 influenced by factors including the level of knowledge about the system of interest, the level  
923 of spatiotemporal detail to be represented, the type of processes to be represented, and  
924 the nature of the data to drive and calibrate the model (see Badham 2015; Kelly et al. 2013;  
925 Anderson et al. 2015 for guidance). Broadly, however, conceptual, abstract or toy models, or  
926 serious games, are typically more suitable for social learning and communication-oriented  
927 purposes (Argent et al. 2016; Van der Wal et al. 2016). Decision-support, on the other hand,  
928 typically requires mathematical or computer models, which require more quantitative data  
929 and different skills to develop.

932  
933 Method selection may also involve trading off among the 'best' method, modeling effort,  
934 and participation in the model development (and possibly also model application).  
935 Sophisticated physically based mathematical models, for example, can be difficult for non-  
936 specialists to understand the model's structure and relationships between model input and  
937 output, and thus explore. Adapting an existing computer model for a new IWRM objective  
938 can reduce the need for skills and time, and the model may be already familiar to some  
939 participants, but this may be at the expense of overall engagement. The experience of  
940

945  
946  
947 working with some form of a model can assist non-specialists to contribute to IWRM more  
948 effectively than discussing the specification of the expert knowledge to be embedded in the  
949 model. For example, Monks et al. (2014) describe a modeling effort where those involved in  
950 conceptualizing and developing the model had less time for exploring with the model, but  
951 explored more adventurously than those who were provided with pre-prepared models and  
952 given more time for exploration.  
953  
954

## 955 **5. Phase 2: Development**

956  
957 The *Development Phase* converts the preliminary conceptual model into a complete model,  
958 ready for its intended purpose within the project. This phase comprises five steps: *Data*  
959 *Collection*; *Model Construction*; *Calibration*; *Uncertainty Analysis*; and *Testing*. In this phase,  
960 the steps are particularly interwoven and some elements must be undertaken in parallel or  
961 iteratively. For example, testing (which is a challenge in multi-component IWRM models,  
962 especially those with system feedbacks) is an ongoing process during model construction, as  
963 it may be necessary to test, and re-test, each model element, its linkages and the full model  
964 itself to ensure that the new or modified element has not interacted incorrectly with  
965 existing elements (Bertolino 2003; Vale et al. 2016). Even steps that appear sequential may  
966 be revisited; for example, an unsuccessful attempt to calibrate the model might lead to  
967 amendments in the model implementation (revisiting construction), which could further  
968 require additional data to be collected. Nevertheless, it is useful to identify separate steps,  
969 to ensure all key activities are given due consideration in the modeling process.  
970  
971

972 For mathematical or computer models, much of this phase is technical, with the modelers  
973 working from literature, expert opinion, data, as well as with stakeholders to formalize the  
974 important processes and system properties (previously outlined in the conceptual model).  
975 Although not discussed in depth here, similar steps are performed in the modeling process  
976 for qualitative models for exploratory and communication purposes (Malekpour et al.,  
977 2016). These methods typically use diagrams and structured discussion to rigorously  
978 describe relations between stresses and system responses, and test the final model with  
979 stakeholders to ensure it reflects the shared understanding of the system.  
980  
981

### 982 **5.1 Data collection**

983  
984 Data are required to implement the conceptual model and to test that implementation. In  
985 IWRM models, these data may be a mixture of numerical values as is commonly the case for  
986 hydrological components, and categorical information where measurements and knowledge  
987 are less precise or more qualitative as could occur with some social or ecological  
988 components. As well as measurements, relevant data encompass information from  
989 established theory, existing models, published studies, assumptions, stakeholders and  
990 expert opinion. Data collection involves compiling, cataloguing, obtaining and evaluating all  
991 of these forms of knowledge. This step also identifies the data and knowledge that are not  
992 available and considers potential proxies for those gaps.  
993  
994

995 Some of the specific questions to be considered in this step include:

- 996 • what data are needed to represent theories included in the model (for each  
997 relationship and overall)?  
998  
999

- how accurate do the data need to be?
- what quantitative data are available?
- what is the quality of the quantitative data?
- what are the temporal and spatial scopes and resolutions of available quantitative data?
- what qualitative data are available, particularly with respect to the social and ecological elements of the system?
- how can gaps between available and needed data be addressed?
- are there any privacy, intellectual property (IP) or other constraints on the use of relevant data?
- do any datasets contain sensitive information?

Once compiled, some of the data may need to be cleaned, transformed into another format, or rescaled to be compatible with the other data or the model requirements. Note that more data may become available throughout the modeling process as stakeholders gain understanding and interest.

## 5.2 Model Construction

The model construction step converts the conceptual model design into a functioning quantitative model or models. This involves rigorously developing the details of all the processes to be represented in the model(s). Each process must be formalized as an equation or a set of rules that specifically describe what happens in the model(s) in situations likely to be encountered, and then implemented within the model(s). For example, deterministic differential equations could be used to simulate the way in which water availability changes over time due to extraction, evapotranspiration, or other processes. Alternatively, relations could be represented probabilistically, for example 'if the population increases by more than 20%, then water requirements will increase by 20% (with 50% probability) or 10% (with 50% probability)'.

Development of the detailed equations or rules may need to consider alternate models, such as those including alternative ideas about system geometry or processes, which arise from discussion between stakeholders and the modelers. Considering alternative model concepts is often an extremely useful communication approach, especially if they are perceived to be rival or advocacy models (Ferré 2017). These contentious alternative models can help identify what future data collection might discriminate between the rival ideas, and allow all stakeholders to have their ideas considered and vetted within the framework provided by the modeling process.

Elements within the overall model(s) may require translation. For example, they may be at different temporal or spatial scales, which then require upscaling and downscaling to communicate (Hamilton et al. 2015). Or aspects of the system may be conceptualized with different paradigms or units, so inputs and outputs need to be transformed from one type to another. For example, water quantity may be required for some equations, and flows for others. One approach is to construct the quantitative model with several sub-models that address components of the conceptual model and overall system, which facilitates the use of different types of equations or rules where different considerations are important. The sub-models typically pass relevant information to each other and detailed description of the

1063  
1064  
1065 communication between sub-models is developed prior to model construction. Different  
1066 approaches to variables (such as scales) must be reconciled for interoperability of the sub-  
1067 models (Brandmeyer and Karimi 2000) and evaluated for conflicting assumptions between  
1068 sub-models (Mackay and Robinson 2000). Such considerations are especially important for  
1069 IWRM models, which include quantification of hydrologic, environmental, decision-making  
1070 and other social processes.  
1071

1072  
1073 Technical implementation of the model may be achieved by adopting pre-existing modeling  
1074 platforms, libraries, or else developing the model from scratch. These options indicate, from  
1075 least to most, the required amount of software development knowledge that has to be on  
1076 hand. Platforms refer to software packages that allow a user to construct a model without  
1077 any coding knowledge, often through the use of a graphical user interface. Libraries provide  
1078 a pre-developed model or set of models along with utilities and toolsets, interaction with  
1079 which often requires code to be written. Research is often conducted in specialized niche  
1080 contexts not covered by generalized platforms and so it is not uncommon for some amount  
1081 of code to be written (Ahalt et al. 2014).  
1082

1083  
1084 Development of an integrated model requires collaboration between domain specialists  
1085 (e.g. surface and groundwater hydrologists, various types of social scientists including  
1086 economists, social and policy domains, ecologists, etc.), and leadership from integrated  
1087 modeling experts, regardless of the development approach adopted. Implicit assumptions  
1088 or misunderstandings through the model development process will likely  
1089 induce unrecognised limitations in the model's functionality. Tests to identify these  
1090 mismatches and other general errors should be designed and developed, preferably before  
1091 any model construction begins but may also be created post hoc. Doing so communicates to  
1092 others what the intended model limitations are, and provides confidence that the model  
1093 functions as intended.. These tests may be modified throughout the model construction  
1094 process. This subject is expanded further in Section 5.5 Testing of model robustness.  
1095

1096  
1097 As well as the technical process of building the model, the model construction step includes  
1098 consideration of broader model choices and constraints on the implementation. Such issues  
1099 include:  
1100

- 1101 • the limitations or assumptions associated with the modeling techniques being used  
1102 and how these are to be managed; this includes the levels of abstractions and  
1103 simplifications;
- 1104 • whether there are licensing or other constraints on the tools used to develop or apply  
1105 the model;
- 1106 • accessibility and usability of the eventual model - including issues of interface design  
1107 for computer based models;
- 1108 • potential reusability of parts of the model; and
- 1109 • the intellectual property rights that should be asserted for the developed model.  
1110

1111  
1112 At the conclusion of this step, the quantitative model(s) is (are) 'run' and transforms model  
1113 inputs into outputs of interest. However, how well these outputs represent the socio-  
1114 environmental system is not yet evaluated, which is the focus of the remaining steps in this  
1115 phase.  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121

### 5.3 Calibration

Calibration adjusts model parameters and other model factors such as boundary conditions to best reproduce observational data, often done formally using a metric and possibly constraints in an objective function, though visual and other qualitative approaches may have value (Bennett et al. 2013). Qualitative approaches to parameter settings can be especially useful in non-hydrological components (e.g. ecological, social processes) of IWRM models where data on observations are more scant and expert knowledge is required. Some model components in IWRM, particularly of a hydrological nature, are capable of accurately representing major relations and predictions that reflect broad properties of the system. Typically, other predictions will have less certainty, such as those requiring knowledge of small-scale properties of the system (e.g., preferential flowpaths needed to accurately simulate groundwater travel times), or those related to the social components of the system. After initial model construction, model parameters and other model factors are varied to better fit what was measured or expected from a given system for a set of conditions, a process called history matching. The model output is compared to observed or expected equivalents in the data to assess how well the model is able to represent the system of interest. When the observed data themselves are inadequate to constrain all model parameters, theory and expert soft-knowledge can provide further constraints. If the modeling contradicts well-grounded theory, this may point to an error in the data or the model structure.

Model parameter reasonableness is usually not judged using exact values, as they are not typically available; distributions or plausible ranges are used instead. Observational data are subject to a range of uncertainties and biases, including measurement or sampling errors and spatial and temporal heterogeneity. History matching does not require, or even expect, an exact match between observed data and model output. Indeed, too close a match can suggest overfitting, where the model is fitting errors within the data, which commonly degrade the model's ability to make predictions in other conditions beyond those operating in the calibration period. Some level of tolerance or an acceptability threshold is therefore required. When a model both fits the observations (or conforms to expectations) and has reasonable values for model parameters and other factors, it is deemed calibrated (Anderson et al. 2015, Ch 9).

It is important to apply history matching with multiple criteria. These criteria should include many different observation types in order to break correlations between model variables. Different observation types in the hydrological component of IWRM models could for example include measurements of water balance terms – evapotranspiration, groundwater levels, streamflow rates etc. In addition, decisions related to how to weigh the importance of the different observation/expectation types, and constraints on them, directly influences the trade-offs in fit (Anderson et al. 2015). Diverse comparisons can also reveal different areas where the model is strong or weak (Haasnoot et al. 2014; Parker 2009) and many weak signals that each assess different aspects of reality can be more informative than strong performance against a single aspect of behavior (Grimm 2005). However, even with several criteria, judging calibration may not be straightforward.

1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239

Communication with stakeholders during calibration commonly includes discussing data or processes important to the model that may not have been sufficiently considered. It may also include showing how different calibration approaches yield different results, and if these differences may have different practical implications. Moreover, the calibration step should also clarify that many alternative models may fit or explain the same observational dataset(s).

Typically, a model is only useful for decision support if it is perceived to be credible by stakeholders; often model credibility is primarily influenced by its ability to simulate what has been observed in the socio-environmental system. This can be challenging as stakeholders often obtain an understanding of inherent uncertainty in the modeling process from their everyday experience of the weather report. However, rather than immediate evaluation being available, as it is for a weather forecast, the timeframe of IWRM processes represented may be combinations of months, years, decades, and even longer. Thus, continual evaluation of model outputs such as is done with weather forecasting is generally difficult to conduct. Rather, the IWRM model calibration functions best when it provides tests that are meaningful and intuitive to stakeholders, which in turn facilitates building the stakeholder trust required for adopting the modeling results.

#### 5.4 Uncertainty analysis

Once a model is calibrated to what is known about the system it can become a generator for predictions in other situations, where data are typically not available. Model predictions portray the estimated effect of changes to model inputs that represent current stresses (such as land use management, or stream or aquifer pumping rates), and/or future conditions of which there could be many in IWRM cross-sectoral issues (such as changes in climate, energy use and demographic patterns, or policy changes like managed aquifer recharge opportunities, and water trading rules). However, a model's ability to create representative predictions is expected to be worse than its ability to simulate calibration conditions. There is uncertainty in the model that was constructed – not only in the ability of field, social survey and other observations to constrain the model inputs and the necessarily-simplified structure of the model that represents the IWRM system being modeled – but also in how specified future conditions represent what actually occurs. An *Uncertainty analysis* describes the uncertainty in the model output under stipulated conditions; input data used to calibrate the model, model structure and other assumptions, parameterization, output data used for calibration and future scenarios used for simulation of the model.

If model outputs used for calibration are very sensitive to one or more model factors (that is, model outputs vary substantially), the plausible values of the model factors will be constrained in calibration, and their uncertainty is reduced. When those model factors are also important to model predictions, the prediction is expected to have less uncertainty. When calibration data do not appreciably constrain the model factors important for a prediction, that prediction is constrained primarily by soft-knowledge and may have a high degree of uncertainty.

1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298

There are many ways to assess and describe uncertainty in the predictions (Guzman et al. 2015); the best representation will depend on the context in which the IWRM problem operates, and the requirements and understanding of the stakeholders (Hunt 2017). In IWRM, where cost-benefit trade-offs are often assessed, a more quantitative approach to characterizing uncertainty can be valuable (Guillaume et al. 2016). Most straightforward is a simple reporting of model predictions under a few specific conditions (e.g., streamflow depletion, land use practices, water allocations or environmental flow releases under drought and wet conditions).

However, most approaches involve a large number of simulations under different conditions so that the uncertainty can be described over the full range of modeled behaviour. Basic investigation of uncertainty might include a sensitivity analysis (e.g. Hill and Tiedeman 2006; Norton 2015) adjusts different model factors by some known amounts and examines the effects on the key model outputs. Higher level uncertainty investigation might include Monte Carlo methods that report uncertainty in terms of a probability distribution of predictions/simulations, which are generated by running the model many times using samples pulled from a probabilistic representation of the model factors (referred to as realizations). Monte Carlo is computationally expensive because there are many combinations possible, hence many model runs are required to characterize the behaviour of the model across the scenario and parameter space (Anderson et al. 2015, pp.471–476). This is especially the case for IWRM modeling where potentially a large number of input and output variables are of interest as the investigations expand to multiple systems that incorporate hydrological, ecological and socioeconomic systems. It may therefore be more appropriate to sample the model inputs more efficiently; Latin Hypercube, quasi Monte Carlo and constrained walking methods (Campolongo et al. 2007) are examples of pseudo Monte Carlo sampling methods. Emulation methods are increasingly being used to build faster-running surrogate models of those models whose runtimes preclude Monte Carlo type sampling (Asher et al. 2015; Razavi et al. 2012; Machac et al. 2018). In this way, sensitivity and uncertainty analysis can be undertaken using the response surface of the surrogate model (e.g. Yang et al. 2018).

There are two additional uncertainty approaches that are well suited for IWRM problems. One is scenario modeling, especially plausible but extreme-case scenarios (Anderson et al. 2015, pp.458–460; Kwakkel, 2017; Guivarch et al. 2017; Mills et al. 2018; Anderson et al. 2018). In this case a set of model inputs is developed that represent factors that, when combined, simulate the conceivable extreme (but also intermediate) outcomes that might be reasonably expected. In this case, the analysis represents outer edges and intermediate points of the envelope of possible model forecasts, which can inform the IWRM decision making beyond simple reporting of expected outcomes. This approach is well-suited to simulating future conditions such as climate scenarios and cross-sectoral influences and can be undertaken in a flexibly prescribed robust decision-making framework. A second, more qualitative approach is quality assurance of the modeling process itself (Refsgaard et al. 2007) where checks are undertaken to ensure that a model has been properly applied, and decisions and choices are monitored and recorded to enable transparency and reproducibility of the process.

## 5.5 Testing of model robustness

Before it can be used in the *Application Phase*, the model should be tested in several ways. As the model is constructed, the individual elements must also be tested to ensure the construction correctly implements the rules as intended. Standard model testing includes debugging and unit-consistency checking (Balci, 1994; Jakeman et al. 2006). As new components are being added to the model, additional tests are run to ensure the new component has not generated errors in the already tested parts of the model. Tests of sufficient scale and scope increase confidence that model behaviour is as intended. In practice, this approach is similar to Bayesian inference – rarely can it be determined that model behaviour is ‘correct’ across all possible scenarios, but a large number of successful tests increases confidence (Davidson-Pilon 2015).

The ability to invoke these tests in an automated manner can help ensure a sustainable pace of model development. This is especially true for larger-scale projects as automated running of tests (which may be run after a change in a model for example) aids in reducing the time and resource costs that may be incurred as model complexity increases. Having such tests, and the requisite infrastructure in place assists in the model construction process, maintenance (see Section 7.3 Monitoring and maintenance), and may serve as further technical documentation of the underlying processes within the model (see Section 7.1 Documentation). However, effective testing is much broader than model verification, including evaluation against a model’s intended purpose and assessing the accuracy of model outputs (Bennett et al. 2013).

Conditions simulated during calibration may not encompass the range of conditions that the model will use to generate predictions in the *Application Phase*. Tests of the model’s robustness can build credibility in these forecasts, including checks such as:

- can the model successfully simulate extreme conditions (e.g. drought or flooding)?
- do test cases generate output that is consistent with manual calculations or other existing models?
- does altering a variable to an extreme value change model outputs in an expected way?

Such checks may also reveal issues with data sets in use such as:

- implausible positive/negative values (e.g. data sets were generated with interpolation)
- mismatch in expected spatial and temporal resolution and range across model elements
- mismatch in assumed value types exchanged between models elements, e.g. a categorical classification given as a textual representation ( “one”) as opposed to its numerical equivalent

A common form of qualitative assessment involves domain experts who review the model logic and simulated output details to assess the degree to which a model appears effective in terms of its stated aims (i.e., face validity) (van der Sluijs et al. 2005). There may also be the opportunity to quantitatively assess predictions directly, using a split-sample or cross-validation approach (where some data are not used during calibration, but instead provide test cases). If insufficient data are available for this, then a post-audit might be performed



1358  
1359  
1360 after sufficient time has passed that a prediction can be evaluated, or in an ongoing process  
1361 as new observations are acquired such as those derived from adaptive management.  
1362

1363 A final check involves revisiting appropriateness, or a model's fitness-for-use. This could  
1364 include assessing whether the user interface is sufficiently easy to use by the intended  
1365 users, easy to understand (from the user's perspective, not the modeler's), and sufficiently  
1366 well explained in lay terms. For models developed for participatory or educational purposes,  
1367 the criteria pertaining to its usefulness may be more important than achieving a high  
1368 performance or accuracy (Elsawah, et al. 2017). Using the case study of the Chesapeake Bay  
1369 coastal system, Allison et al. (2018) argue further that, for addressing wicked problems in  
1370 socio-ecological systems, it is more important that one seeks holistic modeling of results  
1371 yielding robust directions of system change than high numerical precision of outputs  
1372 achieved through increasing model complexity. Jakeman and Letcher (2003) argue similarly  
1373 that, in IWRM modeling, the broad objective should not be about treating system outputs as  
1374 accurate predictions. It should be aimed at allowing differentiation between system  
1375 outcomes under different conditions (e.g. policy drivers), at least with a qualitative  
1376 confidence.  
1377  
1378  
1379

## 1380 **6. Phase 3: Application**

1381  
1382 Application of the model ensues according to the modeling purpose determined during the  
1383 *Planning Phase*. For simulation games, mathematical models and computer simulations,  
1384 using the model includes both running the model with various settings or options and  
1385 analyzing the generated output. For diagrammatic and other models used for thinking and  
1386 learning, application of the model is more qualitative and generally consists of one or more  
1387 discussions and a report concerning the contents. Yet, such discussions are also critical for  
1388 mathematical models and computer simulations, as this phase can enhance understanding  
1389 of impacts of decisions made regarding model structure and input data from earlier steps.  
1390  
1391  
1392

1393 This phase comprises three steps: *Experimentation*, *Analysis and Visualization*, and  
1394 *Communication*. These steps are often iterative, with discussion about the results from  
1395 initial model runs stimulating additional questions that lead to further experimentation,  
1396 analysis and discussion. The modeling project is most effective when the *Application Phase*  
1397 provides stakeholders with an understanding of how the model works, builds confidence in  
1398 the model, and supports substantive discussion about IWRM trade-offs and issues.  
1399  
1400

### 1401 **6.1 Experimentation**

1402 There are two key considerations for practical experimentation in order to obtain robust  
1403 results: which parameter and other factor combinations are to be used, and how many runs  
1404 are required. Each modeling effort will have different responses, though some broad  
1405 generalizations apply across most IWRM problems.  
1406  
1407

1408 A mathematical or computational model will typically have two broad types of  
1409 manipulation. The first selects between specific scenarios of interest, where scenarios  
1410 reflect simulated system stressors or conditions different from calibration stresses and  
1411 conditions. Scenario definition can encompass a range of possible changes, such as:  
1412 different policy options (e.g. water trading rules, regulation of water quality, varying  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416

operating rules or conditions for a dam); and conditions (e.g. high or low rainfall, high or low farm input prices and product returns, land use set at historical patterns or allowed to vary over time); together with the parameter values or distributions that define the scenario (such as the amount of rain each day during a high rainfall year). The second manipulation goes beyond specific scenarios of interest by using computational methods to explore the plausible ranges of model parameters and other factors more broadly.

Efficient methods of parameter space sampling may be used to limit the number of simulations required, which is particularly useful when model runtimes are prohibitively long. Although the process is similar to the uncertainty analyses conducted during the *Development Phase*, the purpose and hence selection of input values and the analysis are different. Here, the model is manipulated to explore 'what-ifs' posed by stakeholders and to understand the uncertainty associated with specific scenarios rather than to characterize the robustness of the model.

## 6.2 Analysis and visualization

The objective of the *Analysis and Visualization* step is to distil the insights gained from model development and experimentation in order to identify those meaningful to the stakeholders, including decision makers. However, multiple scenarios and experimentation runs, combined with a likely diversity of interests and expertise of the stakeholders, can make the reporting lengthy and analysis complex. Simple analytical approaches such as regression methods are of limited use as there is typically no single equation for the overall system. Instead, multidimensional visualization methods (such as heat maps, box plots and arrays of charts) allow communication of important relations, insights and system responses. Communication may be further aided by contextualizing the presented analysis. Analyses may be contextualized by overlaying data on a map (providing spatial context), comparisons against historical events (temporal context) and simulated results (scenario context).

Some key questions to consider during the *Analysis and Visualization* step:

- how do outputs important for decision making respond to changes in inputs, parameters and other factors, including interventions?
- are there thresholds or tipping points in the parameter space?
- what are the likely outcomes to the questions addressed by the modeling?
- are the results sufficiently accurate?
- are some stakeholders more adversely affected by model shortcomings than others?
- in addition to the most likely outcome predicted by the modeling, what is the distribution of outcomes for individual stakeholders?

In addition, if comparing IWRM options:

- can any options be excluded because a better option exists that applies to all situations tested (referred to as dominance)?
- are best options in some situations undesirable in others?
- are there robust options that are good in all feasible (or even probable) situations even if there are no situations in which they are the best? (Lempert and Collins 2007).

1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534

Once all possible model results are culled to those that have utility and relevance for the IWRM decision-making process, they are finalized for distribution beyond the modeling team.

### 6.3 Communication

The final aspect of model application is to communicate the insights from the modeling process in a way that most effectively contributes to model credibility and to policy or other decision making. One of the key challenges in an IWRM process is how to communicate with stakeholders about model results in a way that enables the stakeholders to understand the system being modeled. At a minimum, the model's scope, assumptions and capacity should be clearly specified in terms of what the model can and cannot do, to help the audience understand the model limitations.

To achieve effective communication, the modeler should consider the needs and background of the stakeholders and tailor the results accordingly. Even a simple model may be difficult to explain, particularly when there is a large disparity with respect to technical knowledge between the modelers and the stakeholders. One must balance an inclination to relate too much detail against appearances of hiding important model information. Skilful meeting facilitation will often be required to ensure equity among stakeholders, which is more challenging where there are diverse or contentious stakeholder interests and with increased importance of decisions.

An audience analysis may be useful to help plan the communication. This analysis includes questions about the motivations for the stakeholders' participation, their understanding of the system, and their prior experience with models (Hall et al. 2014). It may be desirable to segment the stakeholders based on the audience analysis, for example by offering some groups tailored discussion beforehand, and therefore providing a better opportunity for all to contribute meaningfully when they all meet together.

One approach to communication is to focus on the issue for which the modeling was developed, presenting the key insights and connections as a narrative (Richels 1981). The objective is to be clear and concise, and assist stakeholders in understanding the relevant issues, with the modeling supporting the discussion. Once the essential story is clear, more detailed discussion is required about the critical modeling assumptions, limitations, and their implications for results and recommendations.

Another approach is to use iterative discovery, where the modelers and stakeholders jointly investigate a series of scenarios, particularly for complex problems that involve deep uncertainty (Fu et al. 2015). Rather than simply providing the results, this method involves running the model alternating with discussion to raise new questions and propose further scenarios to be run. The iteration fosters a knowledge partnership between modelers and stakeholders, including decision makers, enhancing the modelers' understanding of stakeholder needs and their understanding of modelers' knowledge, thus leading to more useful presentation of results. This contributes to stakeholder confidence in the modeling (and modeler) and therefore greater acceptance of the model results. Moreover, both the

1535  
1536  
1537 stakeholders and the modelers attain a better understanding of the modeling assumptions  
1538 and how they could potentially impact any decisions.  
1539

1540 To address confusion over terms or concepts in both the model and analytical techniques  
1541 used, the verbal or written presentation of models should be carefully crafted so that key,  
1542 but unfamiliar, terms are illustrated with examples and thought experiments, and feedback  
1543 should be sought from the audience to verify that they understand. The presentation should  
1544 utilise images, visual aids and strategies (Kelleher and Wagener 2011), as well as actual  
1545 examples, from similar systems, particularly when complex ideas are being discussed.  
1546  
1547

1548 In addition to the potentially technical nature of the discussion, stakeholders may have a  
1549 different perspective of the system that can lead to difficulty in forming a mental picture of  
1550 how the model represents the system and dissonance with their pre-existing understanding  
1551 of that system. If the modeling provides a different system view than that held by the  
1552 audience, it is important to not dismiss their perspective, but to use their own relevant  
1553 observations to begin to see the alternative perspectives (Hall et al. 2014). Such  
1554 perspectives can form the basis for additional scenarios.  
1555  
1556

## 1557 **7. Phase 4: Perpetuation**

1558

1559 The *Perpetuation Phase* plans for the future. This phase comprises three steps:  
1560 *Documentation, Process Evaluation, and Monitoring and Maintenance*. Where relevant, this  
1561 phase integrates the model into ongoing policy processes and ensures it is maintained and  
1562 updated when required, and/or when new observations become available so that the model  
1563 can contribute to future decisions.  
1564

1565 Models for decision support often require a high degree of technical development and  
1566 testing to provide appropriate estimates as meaningful input to decisions, especially those  
1567 involving high risks and intensive investments. This can incur large costs. Reuse of the model  
1568 for future or similar applications can help to justify that cost. For example, an Australian  
1569 multi-year basin-scale modeling investment assessed future water availability in the Murray-  
1570 Darling Basin and the impacts of development, water extraction and climate (CSIRO 2008).  
1571 Subsequent model outputs continued to provide scientific evidence to assist in later  
1572 development of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.  
1573  
1574  
1575

1576 In contrast, some models are used only once. For example, models developed as thinking  
1577 tools for a given stakeholder group and timeframe are required only during the participatory  
1578 process, to generate the intended learning (Pidd 2004). Even in such cases, however, the  
1579 steps in the *Perpetuation Phase* should be explicitly considered. For example, while a full  
1580 process evaluation is unlikely to be appropriate, reflection on the modeling process and  
1581 discussion with the stakeholders about what they found useful can improve future similar  
1582 modeling exercises.  
1583  
1584

### 1585 **7.1 Documentation**

1586

1587 The type of model documentation and the detail included depend primarily on who will use  
1588 the model(s) in the immediate present and future. There are three common types of model  
1589 documentation: user documentation, technical documentation, and the project report.  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593

1594  
1595  
1596 User documentation should assist users in running and interpreting the model outputs. It  
1597 should be focused on providing clear instructions for the main model objectives. This  
1598 documentation may include:

- 1600 • user interface description (including screenshots)
- 1601 • interpretation of each input and output along with sources of data
- 1602 • tutorials with incremental examples for training and credibility
- 1603 • examples that reflect real scenarios
- 1604 • guidance for running the model and description of potential common pitfalls.

1607 Technical documentation has two parts. The first is a model archive that includes machine-  
1608 readable model input, output, executable, and source code (if available). The second  
1609 provides detailed descriptions of the model(s) and justification for the choices made in the  
1610 model design. It will typically include:

- 1612 • choice of modeling type and method (including how limitations are managed)
- 1613 • assumptions and their justification or reasons
- 1614 • rules and equations
- 1615 • scales of representation
- 1616 • variable definitions and codes (data dictionary)
- 1617 • calibration method and results, preferably with relevant uncertainty assessments
- 1618 • data sources, including references for theory.

1621 Such documentation serves two purposes: scientific credibility and support for future  
1622 development. Model results must be able to be reproduced and replicated if they are to be  
1623 considered part of the scientific method (Morin et al. 2012; Peng 2011). Technical detail  
1624 about the modeling is therefore critical for credible model use in IWRM applications. In  
1625 addition to demonstrating scientific rigour, such detail may be necessary to meet legal  
1626 obligations associated with some decision support models.

1628  
1629 If a model is intended to have an enduring presence, then technical documentation that  
1630 includes description of code or software is necessary to allow a future developer to modify  
1631 or add to the existing code base. Its role is to describe each function, method, routine, or  
1632 class and why it was constructed in the way that it was. Modern code documentation is  
1633 frequently done within the code of the model itself using a variety of tools available to auto-  
1634 generate or extract that documentation. Examples depicting how the code can be used may  
1635 be included and doubly serve as executable test snippets. The advantage of including  
1636 documentation within the code itself is that it is more likely to be updated as the model is  
1637 developed or modified.

1640 Well-documented (and tested) code can be considered a necessary requirement to achieve  
1641 full reproducibility and transparency and eases the maintenance burden. Often textual or  
1642 narrative descriptions of the represented processes do not fully capture assumptions made  
1643 during development (both conceptual and technical) which results in implementation  
1644 differences. Subsequent implementations relying solely on descriptive documentation may  
1645 have differing behavior, compromising model verifiability (Hutton et al. 2016). If elements of  
1646 the model(s) were developed in a sufficiently abstracted manner it is possible to reuse these  
1647 beyond the original use case. This is the underlying concept applied in component-based  
1648

1653  
1654  
1655 modeling practices which require models to be coded to a standardized specification  
1656 (Peckham et al. 2013). Adhering to such standards may also allow semantic information to  
1657 be extracted, enabling high-level comparisons between different models within a model  
1658 repository.  
1659

1660  
1661 Several guidelines exist that are intended to ensure adequate information is provided to  
1662 enable replication and reproducibility. These include reporting for deterministic models  
1663 (Anderson et al. 2015; Reilly and Harbaugh 2004), the ODD protocol (Overview, Design  
1664 Concepts, and Details) for agent-based models (Grimm et al. 2010; Müller et al. 2013) and  
1665 SD-Doc approaches for documenting system dynamics (Martinez-Moyano 2012).  
1666

1667  
1668 The project report is written for the client who commissioned the modeling. It summarizes  
1669 the analysis and provides a written form of communication focusing on the specific  
1670 scenarios of interest. Key elements include: scenarios and results, selected graphical and  
1671 other visualizations (interactive where warranted) to highlight messages, and information  
1672 about the limits of the results (including assumptions, uncertainty analysis, and plausible  
1673 parameter values that would generate different results).  
1674

1675  
1676 Regardless of model purpose, model documentation should be continuously developed over  
1677 the course of the project. Furthermore, it is difficult to conceive of a situation in which a  
1678 single person is able to contribute all the requisite domain knowledge, model  
1679 implementation details, model interactions, and data including sources, types, and pre- and  
1680 post-processes applied. Documentation is therefore most likely be developed  
1681 collaboratively.  
1682

## 1683 **7.2 Process Evaluation**

1684  
1685 Evaluation of the modeling process assesses whether the desired role of the modeling was  
1686 effectively and efficiently achieved within the broader project. A formal process evaluation  
1687 informs future modeling projects and should consider issues such as:  
1688

- 1689 • did the model and modeling process meet the role originally envisaged, and were  
1690 changes to that role intended and appropriate?
- 1691 • how effective was the engagement of stakeholders?
- 1692 • who needs to be added to any future modeling process?
- 1693 • did the project meet time and budget objectives?
- 1694 • how much adjustment was required to the original plans?
- 1695 • what would have improved the modeling process, and at which phase/step?

1696  
1697 Depending on the modeling purpose, several criteria have been developed for evaluating a  
1698 modeling exercise. For example, Haasnoot and Middelkoop (2012) suggested three criteria:  
1699 predictive success (has the future turned out as envisaged), decision success/robustness  
1700 (have 'good' decisions subsequently been made) and learning success (have scenarios  
1701 enabled participation and learning). A different set of criteria was suggested by Alcamo and  
1702 Henrichs (2008): relevance, credibility, legitimacy and creativity. Merritt et al. (2017)  
1703 identified 33 factors for realizing success in an analysis of 15 water resource projects. Of the  
1704 four factors considered to be the most necessary – all of them largely non-technical – three  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711

1712  
1713  
1714 related to aspects of stakeholder engagement in the modeling process, the other to critical  
1715 thinking around problem framing and the role of models.  
1716  
1717  
1718

### 1719 **7.3 Monitoring and maintenance**

1720 The final step is to put into place the plans and mechanisms to ensure that, if needed, the  
1721 modeling is updated as required and continues to be relevant for any policy process in  
1722 which it is embedded. This can be particularly problematic if the policy organization does  
1723 not have technical expertise or funds to maintain the model(s), or if a model has been  
1724 developed by an outside entity so that a transition process is required.  
1725  
1726

1727 If the model is to be maintained beyond its final documented form, the key elements of the  
1728 maintenance plan are to establish a process for updating any input data, documenting new  
1729 data sources, and deciding the timing and assigning responsibility for the updating. A  
1730 succession plan is also required to provide continuity and maintain the knowledge base  
1731 about the purpose and results of the model. This plan should include lists of materials  
1732 (including documentation and training materials) and where they can be obtained.  
1733  
1734

1735 Many models are revised and adapted for different but related policy questions (for  
1736 example, a similar decision but located in a different area of the problem domain).  
1737

1738 Maintenance questions to be considered include:

- 1739 • how easy is it to adapt the model (conceptualization as well as implementation), for  
1740 example to another catchment or set of water resource issues?
- 1741 • what expertise, data and other resources are required in order to make changes to the  
1742 existing model?
- 1743 • what changes in model design might be needed in the future (for example, boundary  
1744 conditions, scales, processes, etc.)?
- 1745 • who can approve changes?
- 1746 • what are the implications for the policy process when important existing model  
1747 outputs appreciably change as the model is changed?
- 1748 • which steps in the modeling process will most likely need to be reiterated or revisited,  
1749 and can any steps be excluded in specific situations?  
1750  
1751

## 1752 **8. Five key areas for future development in IWRM modeling**

1753 Although there is always room for improvement, IWRM is now endowed with a rich set of  
1754 techniques for modeling both social and biophysical aspects of a system. As described in  
1755 Section 2, there are also many authors providing different prescriptions and  
1756 recommendations for operationalizing IWRM. We have argued here that the overarching  
1757 challenge for the future is integration and implementation (Bammer, 2013) of the  
1758 knowledge gained from experience. While the application of IWRM in regions with weak  
1759 institutions is often seen to be challenging, the need to better tailor analysis to policy  
1760 making contexts is universal – a key concern, for instance, in the field of policy analytics  
1761 (Tsoukias et al., 2013; Daniell et al., 2016; De Marchi et al., 2016). We focus now on five key  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770

1771  
1772  
1773 areas for future development: knowledge sharing, overcoming data limitations, informed  
1774 stakeholder involvement, social equity, and management of uncertainty.  
1775  
1776  
1777

### 1778 *Knowledge sharing*

1779  
1780 The ability of the IWRM modeling community to share and exchange knowledge about the  
1781 practices employed throughout the modeling process is essential for growing the field and  
1782 expanding its applications. Knowledge about how to frame a particular IWRM problem and  
1783 perform particular modeling activities (i.e. knowledge-in-use) is valuable for beginners  
1784 learning the craft of modeling, distilling information about learnt lessons, and promoting  
1785 ideas about new solutions. Knowledge sharing of practices is also valuable to inform  
1786 comparison across multiple dimensions (e.g. methodological design, case studies, issues of  
1787 interest).  
1788

1789  
1790 A prime challenge is to document systematically, and with sufficient detail, the approach  
1791 taken in projects so that the knowledge of how to do IWRM modeling and lessons learnt  
1792 accrue for future projects. It should be possible to document a wide selection of IWRM  
1793 projects to form the basis for on-going knowledge sharing in future. Systematic and  
1794 consistent documentation practices and tools for this purpose still need to be developed. To  
1795 support transparency and learning, documentation should not only be focused on  
1796 describing the modeling process 'as what happened', but cover the reasoning (i.e. why did it  
1797 happen) behind the decisions and observed outcomes throughout the process. And ideally,  
1798 it should entail critical reflection on what could have been done differently (Lahtinen et al.,  
1799 2017).  
1800

1801  
1802 One promising approach is the use of patterns to elicit, capture, and formalize this  
1803 knowledge (Alexander et al. 1997). A pattern is defined as a (representation of a) solution to  
1804 a recurrent problem in a particular context. A pattern could be with respect to any  
1805 component of the IWRM process where modeling-related decisions are taken. Patterns can  
1806 be represented in different forms and presentation (i.e. diagram, template). Regardless of  
1807 the presentation, a pattern must have the following elements: (1) a name to facilitate use  
1808 and communication, (2) problem description, (3) solution, and (4) context. The premise of  
1809 the pattern approach is that once the successful practice has been recognized as a pattern  
1810 and expressed in some pattern form, it may then be reapplied to similar problems/contexts,  
1811 which will eventually lead to improved practices, new observations, and new or refined  
1812 existing patterns. Discovering and capturing the relationships among patterns results in a  
1813 'pattern language', which provides a shared lexicon for the community to communicate  
1814 about the different contexts where patterns can be used.  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819

### 1820 *Overcoming data limitations*

1821  
1822 Data can pose a challenge to IWRM, especially in relation to the multiple and diverse types  
1823 of data (including quantitative and qualitative) representing the various system  
1824 components, and their different scales and quality. The type of data for a given project can  
1825 determine whether or not a certain type of model can be used, or how well it can be  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829



1830  
1831  
1832 applied. To address this, there has been increased interest in more flexible, semi-  
1833 quantitative modeling approaches, such as Bayesian networks (e.g. Ticehurst et al., 2007), as  
1834 well as different couplings of multiple methods (e.g. Nikolic and Simonovic 2015).

1835  
1836 Limited data can place a major constraint on IWRM modeling. Basic hydrologic and  
1837 meteorological data can be patchy and unreliable in countries in developing regions and  
1838 those where governments place a low priority on investment in monitoring networks. New  
1839 forms of observations, such as remotely sensed data, provide promising opportunities for  
1840 IWRM, particularly in data-poor environments. However, these require more efficient ways  
1841 of extracting useful information from the raw data (Montanari et al. 2013). Poor availability  
1842 of socioeconomic data, with the general exception of census data, is widespread, and  
1843 presents a major barrier to understanding feedbacks between society and the environment,  
1844 undermining many water management endeavours (McDonnell 2008). Social media present  
1845 an opportunity for bridging at least some of these gaps. In addition, stakeholder  
1846 involvement in the modeling process will continue to be important role in capturing social  
1847 variables and processes.  
1848  
1849  
1850

#### 1851 1852 1853 *Informed stakeholder involvement* 1854

1855 A common criticism is that stakeholder involvement is inadequate in decision support  
1856 system (DSS) exercises generally, not just in IWRM (for example Zasada et al. (2017) in a  
1857 survey of EU-funded research programs on DSS for agricultural and environmental issues).  
1858 This is despite recognition (e.g. Merritt et al., 2017 for water resource projects, and  
1859 McIntosh et al. 2011) that attention to associated non-technical issues (i.e. social and  
1860 behavioral) is vital to success, in particular when the purpose is to support decision making  
1861 and social learning. For example, as noted earlier, Merritt et al. (2017) identified aiming for  
1862 open and transparent communication, good relationships and trust, and sufficient  
1863 interaction between the development team and users as three of four main factors crucial  
1864 to success. Thus, time spent in the design phase, where stakeholder engagement usually  
1865 begins, is time well spent to avoid rushing into poor decisions that can lock the project onto  
1866 the wrong path (Nicolson, 2002). Projects therefore require the will and resources for  
1867 attending to these aspects. This may also require more flexible funding arrangements that  
1868 recognize the value in fostering evolving understanding of the problem, and imposing soft  
1869 deliverables (e.g. problem formulation documents) rather than rushing into quantitative  
1870 deliverables.  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874

1875 A more technical issue in this respect is integration of stakeholder interests, preferences,  
1876 and attitudes to risk into the modeling process, for example in terms of indicators or  
1877 objective functions. Variations in all these elements can lead to completely different results  
1878 and negotiated solutions. Model output can be converted into indicators by filtering the  
1879 uncertainty in many ways, e.g. using different robustness criteria (e.g. McPhail et al 2018),  
1880 leading to different (rival) problem framings (e.g. Quinn et al. 2017). This is not as simple as  
1881 just obtaining and providing data from/to the end user. More thought and effort needs to  
1882 be paid to methods like interactive data visualization that meet stakeholders' information  
1883 needs and empower them to explore the problem and devise possible solutions.  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888

1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947

Bridging scales is a particular challenge in stakeholder engagement within IWRM. In principle, stakeholders are well placed to comment on their immediate problems and changes they wish to see. However, they may not be in a good position to account for their own future needs, let alone consider how best to achieve them given others' preferences and interactions within the system. Modeling plays an important role in supporting stakeholders in making sense of the IWRM situation at longer timescales and larger spatial scales, but connecting abstract strategic ideas to concrete operational concerns remains difficult. Rather than trying to determine an ideal scale to use in IWRM models, it will be important in the future to reflect on the range of strategies available for bridging scales in a way that brings the necessary stakeholders together to achieve meaningful progress when implementing IWRM.

### *Social equity*

Social equity is often sidelined in IWRM models, especially compared with standard cost-benefit considerations of different trade-offs. The distribution of benefits from water and, in particular, whether the needs and rights of different groups are met (Peña 2011) warrants greater consideration. The need to better consider the totality of benefits and costs associated with water management (including indirect outcomes, non-use values, option values, etc.), and how these vary between each person and group, is a broader challenge for IWRM in general.

Social equity in water management is not just about equity of outcomes (benefits and costs), but also equity in the decision-making process, especially having a voice or opportunity to influence the process (i.e. procedural justice; Syme et al. 1999). Given that the equity dimension is typically poorly captured in models, its consideration in the modeling process then relies heavily upon interpretation of model results and implications (Stojanovic et al. 2016).

Adequately addressing issues of equity in modeling necessitates careful consideration in the *Stakeholder Planning* step to ensure fair representation of stakeholder groups in the process and consideration of social processes and alternate knowledge sources or potential solutions – particularly in the *Planning Phase* and *Application Phase* steps. Budds (2009) argued that failure to do so in the La Ligua river basin in Chile and reliance upon a “purely physical assessment in response to a situation that was predominantly socio-political” led to a positioning of the model-based assessment and its commissioning agency as the only legitimate knowledge source, which closed down a range of possible solutions. Decisions made using the assessment then disadvantaged poor farmers who had not created the groundwater scarcity problem (Budds, 2009). The intent of modeling in the context of IWRM should be that the modeling process facilitates procedural justice and at the very least is not a further barrier to equity.

### *Uncertainty management*

1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006

Uncertainty pervades the treatment of IWRM problems. Users and managers of a water resource deal with uncertainty every day, in a variety of ways. The use of modeling itself is a powerful way of organizing information to understand and reduce uncertainties. Measures for managing uncertainty in management and modeling are still mostly considered separately, rather than being integrated, though some research areas are making progress on this front, e.g. in the deep uncertainty literature (Kwakkel et al. 2016; Maier et al. 2016). Much of the attention to uncertainty in the water resources literature focuses on sensitivity and uncertainty analysis of the hydrological models. Unfortunately, these are among the most certain of integrated model components, and the human and ecological processes warrant much more attention (Hunt and Welter 2010). Here we see an opportunity to prioritize uncertainty sources and deal with those most crucial. Among other things, this will involve attention to uncertainty assessment of model components but also the propagation between the component linkages, where there are often feedbacks. Qualitative uncertainty assessment (e.g. der Sluijs et al. 2005; Refsgaard et al. 2006) will be a necessary, perhaps even the main, ingredient.

A key issue is understanding how uncertainty accumulates and diminishes within an IWRM process (including the model itself), and therefore where efforts can be targeted to constrain it. Combining uncertainty in future conditions, system understanding and stakeholder preferences quickly leads to an explosion in possible system outcomes, which can be overwhelming for stakeholders to consider. In addition to obtaining additional information or facilitating consensus processes, uncertainty can be made more manageable, for example by using adaptive approaches and looking for robustness rather than eliminating uncertainty. Especially where uncertainty leads to disagreement, these techniques can be important to achieve progress in implementing IWRM without needing perfect understanding of a system. Work on these techniques has not, however, been completely synthesized and needs further efforts to support their implementation.

## 9. Conclusion

Despite promising benefits and high expectations, the potential of IWRM in translating integration aspirations to successful on-ground results has not yet been fully realized. It is well recognized in the literature that modeling has a crucial role to play in operationalizing and successfully implementing IWRM. This paper attempts to contribute to improving the implementation of an IWRM modeling project by providing a practical and fit-for-context guidance of the practices employed through the various modeling phases and steps. These practices explain the details of employing IWRM modeling.

Our general approach identifies four broad phases that occur during the modeling process: *Planning, Development, Application* and *Perpetuation*. These phases are common to diverse IWRM projects. Each phase comprises several steps or tasks. While one or more steps may not be required for some projects, it is valuable to consider the relevance of each step so that omission is an explicit decision and not simply an oversight. In practice, there will be many ways to implement each step. Appropriate methods and level of stakeholder

2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065

engagement depend on the specific characteristics of the IWRM problem - aspects of the system being modeled as well as other contextual factors (e.g. funding, institutional setting, data available or level of stakeholder conflict). We have therefore focused on the objectives of the step and guided how the step may be undertaken.

Finally, we identified some important gaps in IWRM modeling practice-related research, highlighting the need for advances in knowledge sharing, overcoming data limitations, informed stakeholder involvement, social equity, and management of uncertainty and some potential methods for answering those questions.

In short, effective IWRM modeling should involve a process and set of practices that are fit for the given context and well-grounded in the IWRM problem at hand. The implementation of effective modeling practice can play an important role in facilitating the *what* and *how* of IWRM, by contributing to identifying and understanding of the elements that underpin the problem, and guiding the questions to ask and the issues to address.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the SESYNC (National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center) Core Modeling Practices in IWRM project under funding received by the National Science Foundation DBI-1052875. Badham's contribution was partially supported under National Institute of Health Research (UK) grant CDF-2014-07-020.

## References

- Ahalt, S., Band, L., Christopherson, L., Idaszak, R., Lenhardt, C., Minsker, B., Palmer, M., Shelley, M., Tiemann, M., Zimmerman, A., 2014. Water Science Software Institute: Agile and Open Source Scientific Software Development. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 16, 18–26.
- Alcamo, J., Henrichs, T., 2008. Towards guidelines for environmental scenario analysis. In: J. Alcamo (ed) *Environmental Futures: The Practice of Environmental Scenario Analysis. Developments in Integrated Environmental Assessment*, 2, 13-35.
- Alexander, C., Ishikawa, S., Silverstein, M., Jacobson, M., Fiksdahl-King, I., Angel, S., 1997. *A pattern language: Towns, buildings, construction*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Allison, A.E.F., Dickson, M.E., Fisher, K.T., Thrush, S.F., 2018. Dilemmas of modelling and decision-making in environmental research. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 99, 147-155.
- Anderson, R., Keshwani, D., Guru, A., Hang, H., Irmak, S., Subbiah, J., 2018. An integrated modeling framework for crop and biofuel systems using the DSSAT and GREET models. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 108, 40-50.
- Anderson, M.P., Woessner, W.W., Hunt, R.J., 2015. *Applied Groundwater Modeling*, Boston, MA: Academic Press.

- 2066  
2067  
2068  
2069 Argent, R.M., Sojda, R.S., Giupponi, C., McIntosh, B., Voinov, A.A., Maier, H.R., 2016. Best  
2070 practices for conceptual modelling in environmental planning and management.  
2071 Environmental Modelling and Software, 80, 113–121.  
2072
- 2073 Asher, M., Croke, B.F.W., Jakeman, A.J., Peeters, L., 2015. A review of surrogate models and  
2074 their application to groundwater modeling. Water Resources Research, 51(8), 5957-  
2075 5973.  
2076
- 2077 Badham, J.M., 2015. Functionality, Accuracy, and Feasibility: Talking with Modelers. Journal  
2078 on Policy and Complex Systems 1(2), 60–87.  
2079
- 2080 Balci, O., 1994. Validation, verification, and testing techniques throughout the life cycle of a  
2081 simulation study. Annals of Operations Research 53(1), 121-173.  
2082
- 2083 Bammer, G., 2013. Disciplining Interdisciplinary: Integration and Implementation Sciences  
2084 for Researching Complex Real-World Problems. ANU Press.  
2085 <https://doi.org/10.22459/DI.01.2013>  
2086
- 2087 Banks, J., 1999. Introduction to simulation. In: Proceedings of the 1999 Winter Simulation  
2088 Conference. Available at: <http://www.informs-sim.org/wsc99papers/001.PDF>.  
2089
- 2090 Bark, R. H., Kragt, M. E., & Robson, B. J. (2016). Evaluating an interdisciplinary research  
2091 project: Lessons learned for organisations, researchers and funders. International  
2092 Journal of Project Management, 34(8), 1449-1459.  
2093
- 2094 Barreteau, O., Bots, P., Daniell, K., 2010. A framework for clarifying participation in  
2095 participatory research to prevent its rejection for the wrong reasons. Ecology and  
2096 Society, 15(2), Art 1.  
2097
- 2098 Basco-Carrera, L., Warren, A., van Beek, E., Jonoski, A., Giardino, A., 2017. Collaborative or  
2099 participatory modelling? A framework for water resources management.  
2100 Environmental Modelling and Software, 91, 95-110.  
2101
- 2102 Belete, G.F., Voinov, A., Laniak, G.F., 2017. An overview of the model integration process:  
2103 From pre-integration assessment to testing. Environmental Modelling and Software  
2104 87, 49-63.  
2105
- 2106 Belt, M. van den, Blake, D., 2015. Mediated Modeling in Water Resource Dialogues  
2107 Connecting Multiple Scales. JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources  
2108 Association 51(6), 1581–1599.  
2109
- 2110 Bennett, N.D., Croke, B.F.W., Guariso, G., Guillaume, J.H.A., Hamilton, S.H., Jakeman, A.J.,  
2111 Marsilli-Libelli, S., Newham, L.T.H., Norton, J.P., Perrin, C., Pierce, S.A., Robson, B.,  
2112 Seppelt, R., Voinov, A.A., Fath, B.D., Andreassian, V., 2013. Characterising  
2113 performance of environmental models. Environmental Modelling and Software 40,  
2114 1-20.  
2115
- 2116 Bertolino, A., 2003. Software Testing Research and Practice. 10th International Workshop on  
2117 Abstract State Machines, [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36498-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-36498-6_1), 1–21.  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124

- 2125  
2126  
2127 Bertone, E., Sahin, O., Richards, R., Roiko, A., 2016. Extreme events, water quality and  
2128 health: A participatory Bayesian risk assessment tool for managers of reservoirs.  
2129 Journal of Cleaner Production 135, 657–667.  
2130  
2131  
2132 Beven, K.J., 2012. Rainfall-runoff modelling: the primer. Second Edition. John Wiley & Sons,  
2133 Chichester.  
2134  
2135 Biswas A.K., 2004. Integrated water resources management: a reassessment. Water  
2136 International 29, 248-256.  
2137  
2138 Black, D., Wallbrink, P., Jordan, P.W., 2014. Towards best practice implementation and  
2139 application of models for analysis of water resources management scenarios.  
2140 Environmental Modelling and Software 52, 136–148.  
2141  
2142 Black, D.C., Wallbrink, P.J., Jordan, P.W., 2014. Towards best practice implementation and  
2143 application of models for analysis of water resources management scenarios.  
2144 Environmental Modelling and Software 52, 136-148.  
2145  
2146  
2147 Bots, P.W.G., Van Daalen, C.E., 2008. Participatory Model Construction and Model Use in  
2148 Natural Resource Management: a Framework for Reflection. Systemic Practice and  
2149 Action Research 21(6), 389–407.  
2150  
2151 Brandmeyer, J.E., Karimi, H.A., 2000. Coupling methodologies for environmental models.  
2152 Environmental Modelling and Software 15(5), 479-488.  
2153  
2154 Brandt, P., Ernst, A., Gralla, F., Luederitz, C., Lang, D.J., Newig, J., Reinert, F., Abson, D.J., von  
2155 Wehrden, H., 2013. A review of transdisciplinary research in sustainability science.  
2156 Ecological Economics 92, 1-15.  
2157  
2158 Budds, J., 2009. Contested H<sub>2</sub>O: Science, policy and politics in water resources management  
2159 in Chile. Geoforum, 40(3), 418-430.  
2160  
2161  
2162 Campolongo, F., Cariboni, J., Saltelli, A., 2007. An effective screening design for sensitivity  
2163 analysis of large models. Environmental Modelling and Software 22, 1509-1518.  
2164  
2165 Chapra, S.C., 2008. Surface Water-Quality Modeling. Waveland Press. 844 pp.  
2166  
2167 Croke, B.F.W., Blakers, R.S., Elsayah, S., Fu, B., Guillaume, J.H.A., Kelly, R.A., Patrick, M.J.,  
2168 Ross, A., Ticehurst, J., Bartel, R., Jakeman, A.J., 2014. Marrying hydrological  
2169 modelling and integrated assessment for the needs of water resource management.  
2170 In Evolving water resource Systems: Understanding, predicting and managing water-  
2171 society interactions. Proceedings of ICWRS2014, Bologna, Italy, June. IAHS Publ. 36X,  
2172 2014.  
2173  
2174  
2175 Croke, B.F.W., Ticehurst, J.L., Letcher, R.A, Norton, J.P., Newham, L.T.H., Jakeman, A.J., 2007.  
2176 Integrated assessment of water resources: Australian experiences. Water Resources  
2177 Management 21, 351-373.  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183

- 2184  
2185  
2186 CSIRO, 2008. Water availability in the Murray-Darling basin : a report from CSIRO to the  
2187 Australian Government, CSIRO Murray Darling Sustainable Yields Project.  
2188
- 2189 Davidson-Pilon, C., 2015. Bayesian Methods for Hackers: Probabilistic Programming and  
2190 Bayesian Inference. Addison-Wesley, USA.  
2191
- 2192 Daniell, K.A., Morton, A., Ríos Insua, D., 2016. Policy analysis and policy analytics. Annals of  
2193 Operations Research, 236, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-015-1902-9>  
2194  
2195
- 2196 De Marchi, G., Lucertini, G., Tsoukiàs, A., 2016. From evidence-based policy making to policy  
2197 analytics. Ann. Oper. Res. 236, 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-014-1578-6>  
2198
- 2199 Dewulf, A., Bouwen, A., 2008. Frames, scales and actors. In Proceedings of the European  
2200 Group of Public Administration Conference, Erasmus University, Rotterdam.  
2201
- 2202 El Sawah, S., Guillaume, J.H.A., Filatova, T., Rook, J., Jakeman, A.J., 2015. A methodology for  
2203 eliciting, representing, and analysing stakeholder knowledge for decision making on  
2204 complex socio-ecological systems: from cognitive maps to agent-based models.  
2205 Journal of Environmental Management 151, 500-516.  
2206
- 2207 El Sawah, S., McLucas, A., Mazanov, J., 2017. An empirical investigation into the learning  
2208 effects of management flight simulators: A mental models approach. European  
2209 Journal of Operational Research 259(1), 262-272.  
2210
- 2211 El Sawah, S., Pierce, S. A., Hamilton, S. H., Van Delden, H., Haase, D., Elmahdi, A., Jakeman,  
2212 A.J., 2017. An overview of the system dynamics process for integrated modelling of  
2213 socio-ecological systems: Lessons on good modelling practice from five case studies.  
2214 Environmental Modelling and Software 93, 127-145.  
2215
- 2216 Falconi, S.M., Palmer, R.N., 2017. An interdisciplinary framework for participatory modeling  
2217 design and evaluation—What makes models effective participatory decision tools?  
2218 Water Resources Research 53(2), 1625-1645.  
2219
- 2220 Ferré, T.P.A., 2017. Revisiting the relationship between data, models, and decision-making.  
2221 Groundwater 55(5), 604-614.  
2222
- 2223 Folke, C., 2006. Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems  
2224 analyses. Global Environmental Change, 16, 253-267.  
2225
- 2226 Fu, B., Guillaume, J.H.A., Jakeman, A.J., 2015. An iterative method for discovering feasible  
2227 management interventions and targets conjointly using uncertainty visualizations.  
2228 Environmental Modelling and Software 71, 159-173.  
2229
- 2230 Fulton, E.A., Boschetti, F., Sporcic, M., Jones, T., Little, L.R., Dambacher, J.M., Gray, R., Scott,  
2231 R., Gorton, R., 2015. A multi-model approach to engaging stakeholder and modellers  
2232 in complex environmental problems. Environmental Science and Policy 48, 44–56.  
2233
- 2234 Giordano, M., Shah, T., 2014. From IWRM back to integrated water resources management.  
2235 International Journal of Water Resources Development, 30(3), 364-376.  
2236  
2237  
2238  
2239  
2240  
2241  
2242

- 2243  
2244  
2245  
2246  
2247  
2248  
2249  
2250  
2251  
2252  
2253  
2254  
2255  
2256  
2257  
2258  
2259  
2260  
2261  
2262  
2263  
2264  
2265  
2266  
2267  
2268  
2269  
2270  
2271  
2272  
2273  
2274  
2275  
2276  
2277  
2278  
2279  
2280  
2281  
2282  
2283  
2284  
2285  
2286  
2287  
2288  
2289  
2290  
2291  
2292  
2293  
2294  
2295  
2296  
2297  
2298  
2299  
2300  
2301
- Giupponi, C., Gain, A.K., 2017. Integrated water resources management (IWRM) for climate change adaptation. *Regional Environmental Change* 17(7), 1865-1867.
- Grid, N.S., 2016. *Integrated Water Resource Management: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Grimm, V., 2005. Pattern-Oriented Modeling of Agent-Based Complex Systems: Lessons from Ecology. *Science* 310(5750), 987-991.
- Grimm, V., Berger, U., DeAngelis, D.L., Polhill, J.G., Giske, J., Railsback, S.F., 2010. The ODD protocol: A review and first update. *Ecological Modelling* 221(23), 2760-2768.
- Guillaume, J.H.A., Hunt, R.J., Comunian, A., Blakers, R.S., Fu., 2016. Methods for Exploring Uncertainty in Groundwater Management Predictions. In: A. Jakeman, O. Barreteau, R. Hunt, J.D. Rinaudo and A. Ross (eds). *Integrated Groundwater Management*. Springer International Publishing, pp. 711-737.
- Guivarch, C., Lempert, R., Trutnevyte, E., 2017. Scenario techniques for energy and environmental research: an overview of recent developments to broaden the capacity to deal with complexity and uncertainty. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 97, 201-210.
- Guzman, J.A., Shirmohammadi, A., Sadeghi, A., Wang, X., Chu, M.L., Jha, M.K., Parajuli, P.B., Harmel, R.D., Khare, Y.P., Hernandez, J., 2015. Uncertainty considerations in calibration and validation of hydrological and water quality models. *Transactions of the ASABE* 58(6), 1745-1762.
- GWP, 2000. *Integrated Water Resources Management*, Stockholm, Sweden: Global Water Partnership. Available at: <http://www.gwp.org/globalassets/global/toolbox/publications/background-papers/04-integrated-water-resources-management-2000-english.pdf>.
- Haasnoot, M., Middelkoop, H., 2012. A history of futures: a review of scenario use in water policy studies in the Netherlands. *Environmental Science and Policy* 19, 108-120.
- Haasnoot, M., Van Deursen, W.P.A., Guillaume, J.H.A., Kwakkel, J.H., Van Beek, E., Middelkoop, H., 2014. Fit for purpose? Building and evaluating a fast, integrated model for exploring water policy pathways. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 60, 99-120.
- Hall, D.M., Lazarus, E.D., Swannack, T.M., 2014. Strategies for communicating systems models. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 55, 70-76.
- Hamilton, S.H., El Sawah, S., Guillaume, J.H.A., Jakeman, A.J., Pierce, S., 2015. Integrated assessment and modelling: Overview and synthesis of salient dimensions. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 64, 215-229.
- Hamilton (in review)



- 2302  
2303  
2304 Hare, M., 2011. Forms of Participatory Modelling and its Potential for Widespread Adoption  
2305 in the Water Sector. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 21(6), 386-402.  
2306  
2307 Harmel, R.D., Baffaut, C., Douglas-Mankin, K.R., 2018. Review and development of ASABE  
2308 engineering practice 621: guidelines for calibrating validating, and evaluating  
2309 hydrologic and water quality models. *Transactions of the ASABE* 61(4), 1393-1401.  
2310  
2311 Hill, M.C., Tiedeman, C.R., 2006. *Effective groundwater model calibration: with analysis of*  
2312 *data, sensitivities, predictions, and uncertainty.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.  
2313  
2314 Hsu, N.-S., Wei, C.-C., 2007. A multipurpose reservoir real-time operation model for flood  
2315 control during typhoon invasion. *Journal of Hydrology* 336 (3-4), 282-293.  
2316  
2317  
2318 Hunt, R.J., 2017. Applied Uncertainty. *Groundwater* 55(6), 771-772.  
2319  
2320 Hunt, R.J., Welter, D.E., 2010. Taking account of “unknown unknowns”. *Groundwater* 48  
2321 (4): 477.  
2322  
2323 Hussey, K., Pittock, J., 2012. The energy-water nexus: Managing the links between energy  
2324 and water for a sustainable future. *Ecology and Society*, 17(1).  
2325  
2326 Hutton, C., Wagener, T., Freer, J., Han, D., Duffy, C., Arheimer, B., 2016. Most computational  
2327 hydrology is not reproducible, so is it really science? *Water Resources Research* 52,  
2328 7548-7555. Jakeman, A.J., Letcher, R.A., 2003. Integrated assessment and modelling:  
2329 features, principles and examples for catchment management. *Environmental*  
2330 *Modelling and Software*, 18(6), 491-501.  
2331  
2332  
2333 Ibisch, R.B., Bogardi, J.J., Borchardt, D., 2016. *Integrated Water Resources Management:*  
2334 *concepts, research and implementation.* Springer, ISBN 978-3-319-25069-4.  
2335  
2336 Jakeman, A.J., Letcher, R.A., 2003. *Integrated Assessment and Modelling: Features,*  
2337 *Principles and Examples for Catchment Management.* *Environmental Modelling and*  
2338 *Software*, 18, 491-501.  
2339  
2340 Jakeman, A.J., Letcher, R.A., Norton, J.P., 2006. Ten iterative steps in development and  
2341 evaluation of environmental models. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 21,  
2342 602-614.  
2343  
2344  
2345 Kelleher, C. Wagener, T., 2011. Ten guidelines for effective data visualization in scientific  
2346 publications. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 26, 822-827.  
2347  
2348 Kelly (Letcher), R.A., Jakeman, A.J., Barreteau, O., Borsuk, M.E., ElSawah, S., Hamilton, S.H.,  
2349 Henriksen, H.J., Kuikka, S., Maier, H.R., Rizzoli, A.E., van Delden, H., Voinov, A.A.,  
2350 2013. Selecting among five common modelling approaches for integrated  
2351 environmental assessment and management. *Environmental Modelling and*  
2352 *Software* 47, 159-181.  
2353  
2354  
2355 Keskinen, M., Guillaume, J.H.A., Kattelus, M., Porkka, M., Räsänen, T.A., Varis, O., 2016.  
2356 *Water* 2016, 8(5), 193. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w8050193> Kwakkel, J.H., 2017. The  
2357  
2358  
2359  
2360

2361  
2362  
2363 Exploratory Modeling Workbench: An open source toolkit for exploratory modeling,  
2364 scenario discovery, and (multi-objective) robust decision making. *Environmental*  
2365 *Modelling and Software*, 96, 239-250.  
2366

2367 Lahtinen, T.J., Guillaume, J.H.A., Hämäläinen, R.P., 2017. Why pay attention to paths in the  
2368 practice of environmental modelling?, *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 92,  
2369 74–81.  
2370

2371  
2372 Langsdale, S., Beall, A., Bourget, E., Hagen, E., Kudlas, S., Palmer, R., Tate, D., Werick, W.,  
2373 2013. Collaborative Modeling for Decision Support in Water Resources: Principles  
2374 and Best Practices. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 49(3), 629-  
2375 638.  
2376

2377 Lempert, R.J., Collins, M.T., 2007. Managing the Risk of Uncertain Threshold Responses:  
2378 Comparison of Robust, Optimum, and Precautionary Approaches. *Risk Analysis* 27(4),  
2379 1009–1026.  
2380

2381 Liu, Y., Gupta, H., Springer, E., Wagener, T., 2008. Linking science with environmental  
2382 decision making: Experiences from an integrated modelling approach to supporting  
2383 sustainable water resources management. *Environmental Modelling and Software*  
2384 23, 846-858.  
2385  
2386

2387 Macha, D., Reichert, P., Rieckermann, J., Del Giudice, D., Albert, C., 2018. Accelerating  
2388 Bayesian inference within hydrological modeling with a mechanistic emulator.  
2389 *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 109, 66-79.  
2390

2391 Mackay, D.S., Robinson, V.B., 2000. A multiple criteria decision support system for testing  
2392 integrated environmental models. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 113(1), 53-67.  
2393

2394 Maier, H.R., Guillaume, J.H.A., van Delden, H., Riddell, G.A., Haasnoot, M., Kwakkel, J.H.,  
2395 2016. An uncertain future, deep uncertainty, scenarios, robustness and adaptation:  
2396 How do they fit together? *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 81, 154–164.  
2397

2398 Malekpour, S., de Haan, F.J., & Brown, R.R., 2016. A methodology to enable exploratory  
2399 thinking in strategic planning. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 105, 192-  
2400 202.  
2401  
2402

2403 Martinez-Moyano, I.J., 2012. Documentation for model transparency. *System Dynamics*  
2404 *Review* 28(2), 199–208.  
2405

2406 McDonnell, R.A., 2008. Challenges for Integrated Water Resources Management: how do we  
2407 provide the knowledge to support truly integrated thinking? *International Journal of*  
2408 *Water Resources Development*, 24(1), 131-143.  
2409

2410 McIntosh, B.S., Ascough II, J.C., Twery, M., Chew, J., Elmahdi, A., Haase, D., Harou, J.J.,  
2411 Hepting, D., Cuddy, S., Jakeman, A.J., Chen, S., Kassahun, A., Lautenbach, S.,  
2412 Matthews, K., Merritt, W., Quinn, N.W.T., Rodriguez-Roda, I., Sieber, S., Stavenga,  
2413 M., Sulis, A., Ticehurst, J., Volk, M., Wrobel, M., van Delden, H., El-Sawah, S., Rizzoli,  
2414 A.E., Voinov, A.A., 2011. Environmental decision support systems (EDSS)  
2415  
2416  
2417  
2418  
2419

2420  
2421  
2422 development - Challenges and best practices. *Environmental Modelling and Software*  
2423 26 (12), 1389-1402.  
2424

2425 McPhail, C., Maier, H.R., Kwakkel, J.H., Giuliani, M., Castelletti, A., Westra, S., 2018.  
2426 Robustness metrics: How are they calculated, when should they be used and why do  
2427 they give different results? *Earth's Future*, 6, 169-191.  
2428  
2429

2430 Merritt, W.S., Fu, B., Ticehurst, J.L., El Sawah, S., Vigiak, O., Roberts, A.M., Dyer, F., C.A.,  
2431 Pollino, C.A., Guillaume, J.H.A., Croke, B.F.W., Jakeman, A.J., 2017. Realizing  
2432 modelling outcomes: A synthesis of success factors and their use in a retrospective  
2433 analysis of 15 Australian water resource projects. *Environmental Modelling and*  
2434 *Software* 94, 63-72.  
2435

2436 Merritt, W.S., Letcher, R.A., Jakeman, A.J., 2003. A review of erosion and sediment transport  
2437 models. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 18, 761-799.  
2438

2439 Middlemis, H., 2000. Groundwater flow modelling guideline. Report for the Murray-Darling  
2440 Basin Commission. Aquaterra Consulting Pty Ltd., South Perth. Western Australia.  
2441 Project no. 125. [https://www.mdba.gov.au/sites/default/files/archived/mdbc-GW-](https://www.mdba.gov.au/sites/default/files/archived/mdbc-GW-reports/2175_GW_flow_modelling_guideline.pdf)  
2442 [reports/2175\\_GW\\_flow\\_modelling\\_guideline.pdf](https://www.mdba.gov.au/sites/default/files/archived/mdbc-GW-reports/2175_GW_flow_modelling_guideline.pdf)  
2443  
2444

2445 Mills, A.K., Bolte, J.P., Ruggiero, P., Serafinj, K.A., Liped, E., Corcoran, P., Stevenson, J.,  
2446 Zanocco, C., Lach, D., 2018. Exploring the impacts of climate and policy changes on  
2447 coastal community resilience: simulating alternative future scenarios. *Environmental*  
2448 *Modeling and Software*, 109, 80-92.  
2449

2450 Molle, F. 2008. Nirvana concepts, narratives and policy models: Insight from the water  
2451 sector. *Water Alternatives* 1(1), 131-156.  
2452

2453 Monks, T., Robinson, S., Kotiadis, K., 2016. Can involving clients in simulation studies help  
2454 them solve their future problems? A transfer of learning experiment. *European*  
2455 *Journal of Operational Research* 249(3), 919-930.  
2456  
2457

2458 Montanari, A., Young, G., Savenije, H., Hughes, D., Wagener, T., Ren, L., Koutsoyiannis, D.,  
2459 Cudennec, C., Grimaldi, S., Bloeschl, G., Sivapalan, M., Beven, K, Gupta, H., Arheimer,  
2460 B., Huang, Y., Schumann, A., Post, D., Srinivasan, V., Boegh, E., Hubert, P., Harman,  
2461 C., Thompson, S., Rogger, M., Hipsey, M., Toth, E., Viglione, A., Di Baldassarre, G.,  
2462 Schaeffli, B., McMillan, H., Schymanski, S. J., Characklis, G., Yu, B., Pang, Z., Belyaev,  
2463 V., 2013. *Panta Rhei – Everything Flows: Change in Hydrology and Society – The IAHS*  
2464 *Scientific Decade, 2013-2022. Hydrologic Sciences Journal*, 58(6), 1256-1275. doi:  
2465 10.1080/02626667.2013.809088.  
2466  
2467

2468 Morin, A., Urban, J., Adams, P.D., Foster, I., Sali, A., Baker, D., Sliz, P., 2012. Shining Light into  
2469 Black Boxes. *Science* 336(6078), 159–160.  
2470

2471 Müller, B., Bohn, F., Dreiler, G., Groeneveld, J., Klassert, C., Martin, R., Schlüter, M., Schulze,  
2472 J., Weise, H., Schwarz, N., 2013. Describing human decisions in agent-based models -  
2473 ODD + D, an extension of the ODD protocol. *Environmental Modelling and Software*  
2474 48, 37-48.  
2475  
2476  
2477  
2478

- 2479  
2480  
2481  
2482  
2483  
2484  
2485  
2486  
2487  
2488  
2489  
2490  
2491  
2492  
2493  
2494  
2495  
2496  
2497  
2498  
2499  
2500  
2501  
2502  
2503  
2504  
2505  
2506  
2507  
2508  
2509  
2510  
2511  
2512  
2513  
2514  
2515  
2516  
2517  
2518  
2519  
2520  
2521  
2522  
2523  
2524  
2525  
2526  
2527  
2528  
2529  
2530  
2531  
2532  
2533  
2534  
2535  
2536  
2537
- Nicolson, C.R., Starfield, A.M., Kofinas, G.P., Kruse, J.A., 2002. Ten heuristics for interdisciplinary modeling projects. *Ecosystems*, 5(4), 376-384.
- Nikolic, V.V., Simonovic, S.P., 2015. Multi-method modeling framework for support of integrated water resources management. *Environmental Processes* 2(3), 461-483.
- Noel, P.H., Cai, X., 2017. On the role of individuals in models of coupled human and natural systems: lessons from a case study in the Republican River Basin. *Environmental Modeling and Software*, 92, 1-16.
- Norton, J., 2015. An introduction to sensitivity assessment of simulation models. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 69, 166-174.
- Ostrom, E., 2009. A general framework for analysing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, 325, 419-422.
- Oxley, T., Winder, N., McIntosh, B., Mulligan, M., Engelen, G., 2004. Integrated modelling and decision-support tools: a Mediterranean example. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 19(11), 999-1010.
- Pahl-Wostl, C., Hare, M., 2004. Processes of social learning in integrated resources management. *Journal of Applied and Community Psychology* 14,193-206.
- Parker, W.S., 2009. Confirmation and adequacy-for-Purpose in Climate Modelling. *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 83(1), 233-249.
- Peckham, S.D., Hutton, E.W.H., Norris, B., 2013. A component-based approach to integrated modeling in the geosciences: The design of CSDMS. *Computers and Geosciences*, 53, 3-12.
- Peña, H., 2011. Social Equity and Integrated Water Resources Management. *Global Water Partnership (GWP). Technical Committee Background Paper Series No. 15.*  
<https://www.gwp.org/globalassets/global/toolbox/publications/background-papers/15-social-equity-and-integrated-water-resources-management-2011.pdf>
- Peng, R.D., 2011. Reproducible Research in Computational Science. *Science* 334(6060), 1226-1227.
- Pidd, M., 2004. Complementarity in systems modelling. In: M. Pidd (ed). *Systems Modelling: Theory and Practice*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd, pp. 1-20.
- Quinn, J.D., Reed, P.M., Giuliani, M., Castelletti, A., 2017. Rival framings: A framework for discovering how problem formulation uncertainties shape risk management trade-offs in water resources systems, *Water Resources Research*, 53(8), 7208-7233.
- Razavi, A., Tolson, B.A., Burn, D.H., 2012. Review of surrogate modeling in water resources, *Water Resources Research*, 48, W07401, doi:10.1029/2011WR011527.
- Reilly, T.E., Harbaugh, A.W., 2004. Guidelines for Evaluating Ground-Water Flow Models. *Scientific Investigations Report 2004-5038*. US Geological Survey Publication.

- 2538  
2539  
2540 Richels, R., 1981. Building Good Models is Not Enough. *Interfaces* 11(4), 48–54.  
2541  
2542 Refsgaard, J.C., van der Sluijs, H.J., van der Sluijs, A.L., Vanrolleghem, P.A., 2007. Uncertainty in the  
2543 environmental modelling process a framework and guidance. *Environmental*  
2544 *Modelling and Software*, 22(11), 1543-1556.  
2545  
2546 Robinson, S., 2008. Conceptual modelling for simulation Part I: definition and requirements.  
2547 *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 59(3), 278-290.  
2548  
2549 Sivapalan, M., Savenije, H.H., Blöschl, G., 2012. Socio-hydrology: a new science of people  
2550 and water. *Hydrological Processes*, 26, 1270–1276. doi:10.1002/hyp.8426.  
2551  
2552 Soncini Sessa, R., Castelletti, A., Weber, E., 2007. Integrated and participatory water  
2553 resources management: Theory, Elsevier, Amsterdam, NL.  
2554  
2555 Stojanovic, T., McNae, H., Tett, P., Reis, J., Smith, H.D., Dillingham, I., 2016. The “social”  
2556 aspect of social-ecological systems: a critique of analytical frameworks and findings  
2557 from a multisite study of coastal sustainability. *Ecology and Society* 21(3), 15.  
2558  
2559 Syme, G.J., Nancarrow, B.E., McCreddin, J.A., 1999. Defining the components of fairness in  
2560 the allocation of water to environmental and human uses. *Journal of Environmental*  
2561 *Management* 57, 51–70.  
2562  
2563 Ticehurst, J.L., Newham, L.T.H., Rissik, D., Letcher, R.A., Jakeman, A.J., 2007. A Bayesian  
2564 network approach for assessing the sustainability of coastal lakes in New South  
2565 Wales, Australia. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 22, 1129-1139.  
2566  
2567 Tortajada, C., 2016. Revisiting Integrated Water Resources Management: From Concept to  
2568 Implementation. Routledge.  
2569  
2570 Tsoukias, A., Montibeller, G., Lucertini, G., Belton, V., 2013. Policy analytics: an agenda for  
2571 research and practice. *EURO Journal on Decision Processes*, 1, 115–134.  
2572 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40070-013-0008-3>  
2573  
2574 Vale, T., Crnkovic, I., De Almeida, E.S., Silveira Neto, P.A.D.M., Cavalcanti, Y.C., Meira,  
2575 S.R.D.L., 2016. Twenty-eight years of component-based software engineering.  
2576 *Journal of Systems and Software* 111, 128–148.  
2577  
2578 van Asselt Marjolein, B.A., Rijkens-Klomp, N., 2002. A look in the mirror: reflection on  
2579 participation in Integrated Assessment from a methodological perspective. *Global*  
2580 *Environmental Change* 12(3), 167-184.  
2581  
2582 van der Sluijs, J.P., Craye, M., Funtowicz, S., Klopogge, P., Ravetz, J., Risbey, J., 2005  
2583 Combining quantitative and qualitative measures of uncertainty in model-based  
2584 environmental assessment: the NUSAP system. *Risk Analysis* 25(2), 481-492.  
2585  
2586 Van der Wal, M.M., de Kraker, J., Kroeze, C., Kirschner, P.A., Valkering, P., 2016. Can  
2587 computer models be used for social learning? A serious game in water management.  
2588 *Environmental Modelling and Software* 75, 119–132.  
2589  
2590  
2591  
2592  
2593  
2594  
2595  
2596

- 2597  
2598  
2599 Vennix, J.A.M., Gubbels, J.W., Post, D., Poppen, H.J., 1990. A structured approach to  
2600 knowledge elicitation in conceptual model building. *System Dynamics Review* 6(2),  
2601 194–208.  
2602  
2603  
2604 Voinov, A., Bousquet, F., 2010. Modelling with stakeholders. *Environmental Modelling and*  
2605 *Software* 25(11), 1268–1281.  
2606  
2607 Voinov, A.A., Jenni, K., Gray, S., Kolagani, N., Glynn, P.D., Bommel, P., Prell, C., Zellner, M.,  
2608 Paolisso, M., Jordan, R., Sterling, E., Olabisi, L.S., Giabbanelli, P.J., Sun, Z., Le Page, C.,  
2609 Elsayah, S., BenDor, T.K., Hubacek, K., Laursen, B.K., Jetter, A., Basco-Carrera, L.,  
2610 Singer, A., Young, L., Brunacini, J., Smajgl, A., 2018. Tools and methods in  
2611 participatory modeling: selecting the right tool for the right job. *Environmental*  
2612 *Modeling and Software*, 109, 232-255.  
2613  
2614 Walker, W., Harremoës, P., Rotmans, J., Van der Sluijs, J., Van Asselt, M., Janssen, P., Krayen  
2615 von Krauss, M.P., 2003. Defining uncertainty: A conceptual basis for uncertainty  
2616 management in model-based decision support. *Integrated Assessment*, 4(1), 5–17.  
2617  
2618 Yang, J., Jakeman, A.J., Fang, G., Chen, X., 2018. Uncertainty analysis of a semi-distributed  
2619 hydrologic model based on a Gaussian process emulator. *Environmental Modelling*  
2620 *and Software*, 101, 289-300.  
2621  
2622  
2623 Yang, H., Zehnder, A., 2007. “Virtual water”: an unfolding concept in integrated water  
2624 resources management. *Water Resources Research* 43, W12301.  
2625  
2626  
2627  
2628  
2629  
2630  
2631  
2632  
2633  
2634  
2635  
2636  
2637  
2638  
2639  
2640  
2641  
2642  
2643  
2644  
2645  
2646  
2647  
2648  
2649  
2650  
2651  
2652  
2653  
2654  
2655