

EGU23-2001

https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu23-2001 EGU General Assembly 2023 © Author(s) 2023. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Functional relationships reveal differences in the water cycle representation of global water models

Sebastian Gnann¹, Robert Reinecke¹, Lina Stein¹, Yoshihide Wada^{2,3}, Wim Thiery⁴, Hannes Müller Schmid^{5,6}, Yusuke Satoh⁷, Yadu Pokhrel⁸, Sebastian Ostberg⁹, Aristeidis Koutroulis¹⁰, Naota Hanasaki¹¹, Manolis Grillakis¹⁰, Simon N. Gosling¹², Peter Burek³, Marc F. P. Bierkens^{13,14}, and Thorsten Wagener¹

¹Institute of Environmental Science and Geography, University of Potsdam, Potsdam, Germany

Global water models are widely used for policy-making and in scientific studies, but substantial inter-model differences highlight the need for additional evaluation. Here we evaluate global water models by assessing so-called functional relationships between system forcing and response variables. The more widely used comparisons between observed and simulated fluxes provide insight into model behavior for the representative area of an observation, and can therefore potentially improve the model for that area. Functional relationships, by contrast, aim to capture how system forcing and response variables co-vary across large scales, and thus offer the potential for model improvement over large areas. Using 30-year annual averages from 8 global water models, we quantify such functional relationships by calculating correlations between key forcing variables (precipitation, net radiation) and water fluxes (actual evapotranspiration, groundwater recharge, total runoff). We find strong disagreement for groundwater recharge, some disagreement for total runoff, and the best agreement for evapotranspiration. Observationand theory-derived functional relationships show varying agreements with models, indicating where model representations and our process understanding are particularly uncertain. Overall, our results suggest that model improvement is most important for the representation of energy

²Climate and Livability, Biological and Environmental Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

³International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria

⁴Department of Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

⁵Institute of Physical Geography, Goethe University Frankfurt, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

⁶Senckenberg Leibniz Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre (SBiK-F), Frankfurt am Main, Germany

⁷Moon Soul Graduate School of Future Strategy, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Korea

⁸Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

⁹Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Member of the Leibniz Association, Potsdam, Germany

¹⁰School of Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Crete, Greece

¹¹National Institute for Environmental Studies, Tsukuba, Japan

¹²School of Geography, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom

¹³Department of Physical Geography, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

¹⁴Unit Soil and Groundwater Systems, Deltares, Utrecht, The Netherlands

balance processes, recharge processes, and generally for model behavior in dry and cold regions. We argue that advancing our ability to simulate global hydrology requires a better perceptual understanding of the global water cycle. To evaluate if our models match that understanding, we should explore alternative evaluation strategies, such as the use of functional relationships.