Stochastic decadal simulation: Utility for water resource planning
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Skillful decadal forecasts over land, particularly at regional scales, remain to be demonstrated.

A potentially useful alternative: Synthetic data sequences, conditioned by observations and including a regional climate change component.

Practical example: The Berg and Breede Water Management Areas, Western Cape, South Africa.
Recent initialized precipitation forecasts - Africa

Data courtesy Doug Smith (see Smith et al., Science 2007)

- **Verification:** 2-5 yr mean precipitation, using GPCC
- **Conclusion:** Initialization does not improve forecast skill for (southernmost) Africa at this lead.
An alternative: Synthetic approach can help to delimit uncertainty

- Two realizations from a stochastic model, for an individual station within an economically significant watershed. (data are trivariate).
- Decadal-mean precip for 2041-2050 falls at the fifth percentile for both, but within-decade variations differ.
- Detailed statistics are conditioned by obs; long-term trends by IPCC
Study area (in part): Berg river watershed

- Length: ~300km
- Area: 7715 km²
- Headwaters in Drakenstein mountains, ~1000 m.a.s.l.
- Precipitation, temperature gradients with elevation
- Principal H₂O source for Cape Town, including commercial, industrial
- Economically significant agricultural resource
- Extant data, hydrology and economic models make for an excellent “testbed.”
Green arrows: Subjective judgment required
Simulation design issues

- Projection of regional forced signal
  - Estimation of regional response
  - Implicit role for IPCC models
- Identification of systematic signal components
  - Here, meaning “significantly different from AR(1)”
  - A key decision: How to represent? One option: “WARM”
- Stationarity assumptions
  - Second moments
  - Serial autocorrelation (→ AR(1) variability)
  - Seasonal cycle, daily statistics
  - Local/regional covariation – spatial scale of decadal “footprint”
- Description of uncertainty
  - Arises at many levels: intermodel, scenario, estimation…
  - Not solely a matter of amplitude, but also temporal behavior
- Multivariate model
  - May be required by downstream modeling framework
  - Best if training data conforms…
Regional pr response to global mean temperature change: Weak in 20c, decidedly negative in 21c.

Because (a) consensus among the IPCC models is strong, and (b) region lies at the poleward margin of the dry subtropics, 21c sensitivity is utilized.

Consequence: Simulated precipitation decreases by about 10% by mid-century (annual mean).
A regular oscillation with 18-yr period has been reported for Southern Africa precip. This was not detected by a wavelet analysis (figure).

Spectra for Tmax, Tmin show no evidence for systematic processes, i.e., different than AR(1).

Annual-decadal simulation component then requires just two elements: Climatic trend and stochastic variations.
Multivariate setting: pr, Tmax, Tmin

Observations: 50 yr of daily data (1950-1999) for 171 quinary catchments in the Berg (mostly) and Breede WMAs.

Forced trends from IPCC (A1B)
- For Tmax, Tmin, via 20C regression
- For pr, via 21C regression

Because there is no evidence for systematic low-frequency variations, only trend and stochastic components are modeled.

Annual–multidecadal variability simulated with VAR(1) model.

Subannual variations generated by block resampling observations.
Formally, $y_t = Ay_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, where

$y_t$ is a three-component vector (pr, Tmax, Tmin) at time $t$,

$A$ is a $3 \times 3$ matrix of coefficients, and

$\varepsilon_t$ is a noise process that is white in time, not necessarily in (parameter) space.

- Historically, VAR models are associated more with econometrics than with climate, but structurally, a VAR model of order 1 is essentially a linear inverse model.

- For simulation purposes, two data characteristics are of primary concern: Intervariable correlation and serial autocorrelation in the individual variables.
Intervariable correlation

Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pr</th>
<th>Tmax</th>
<th>Tmin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmax</td>
<td>-0.447</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmin</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pr</th>
<th>Tmax</th>
<th>Tmin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pr</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmax</td>
<td>-0.445</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmin</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serial autocorrelation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pr</th>
<th>Tmax</th>
<th>Tmin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sim</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tmin significant at 0.05, Tmax not quite...
p-value for rejecting H0: Residuals are not lag-1 autocorrelated.
Regression is on the MMM global mean temperature.
Annual mean temperature (top), precip (below).
Screened for filled data – removes many gridpoints from consideration.
Individual station records are well-correlated with the “regional” signal: Catchment behaves coherently (top).

“Decadal” signal downscaled to station level via linear regression.

Subannual variations: block-resampled from observations \(\rightarrow\) spatial coherence.

Single simulation “instance” propagated to entire catchment, enabling distributed streamflow scenarios.

Station-level simulation; T trends are local
By mid-21st century, mean annual precip is projected to lie at about the present fifth percentile for decadal means. This shift is less than $1\sigma$ for interannual variability. Follow-on models will help to “interpret” stochastically simulated variability, in the context of projected demand.
Some concluding remarks

- Method might be termed a “decadal weather generator,” but some elements assume particular importance in this framework:
  - Mandatory treatment of secular (i.e., climate change) trends
  - Explicit consideration of low-frequency variability
- Changepoints, anthropogenically-induced shifts in variance not evident in the (50-yr) observational record; no provision made for these in simulations.
- Relevant paleodata – if they existed – could possibly play a role.
- Uncertainty in GCM sensitivity to be treated
- Simulations are presently being run in the first “downstream” model: Agricultural Catchments Research Unit (ACRU) agrohydrology model, University of KwaZulu-Natal. Stay tuned!

~~~ The End ~~~

amg@iri.columbia.edu