Multi-criteria hydrologic parameterization over European river basins Oldrich Rakovec, Rohini Kumar, Luis Samaniego, Juliane Mai, Stephan Thober and Matthias Cuntz

1. Introduction

Understanding hydrologic model uncertainty and meaningful representation of hydrological processes leads to more reliable hydrologic forecasts, which can be in particular critical under extreme hydrometeorologic conditions. Therefore, hydrologic model development and evaluation should not only focus on the simulated streamflow (model output), but also on other key hydrological variables, such as total water storage.

Objective

The objective is to assess the benefits of multi-criteria calibration for 8 large European basins. Besides traditional calibration of hydrologic model against observed discharge (Q), model parameters are additionally constrained by the GRACE terrestrial total water storage (TWS) observations.

2. The Mesoscale Hydrological Model (mHM)

The mesoscale hydrologic model (mHM) used in this study is a grid based distributed model that is based on numerical approximations of dominant hydrologic processes similar to those applied in models such as the HBV and the VIC. The model is open source and can be downloaded from www.ufz.de/mhm. It employs the multiscale parameter regionalization (MPR) technique to efficiently incorporate the sub-grid information to generate scale independent parameterization (Samaniego et al, 2010).



Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ, Leipzig, Germany (oldrich.rakovec@ufz.de)



- Objective function: Nash-Sutcliffe model efficiency (NSE)
- Time step: Q (daily) and TWS (monthly)
- Spatial resolution: $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$
- Meteorological forcings derived from E-OBS
- Calibration algorithm: DDS

Independent evaluation of parameter transferability



Time series for Q (top) and TWS (bottom) for the three calibration scenarios.



Summary performance for the at-site calibrations (left, 8 basins) and model evaluations at the other locations (right, other 7 basins).

6. Conclusions

- Initial results show that constraining model parameters with complementary data set prediction (including evaluation in other basins).
- Calibration against TWS alone is not enough to infer discharge dynamics.
- mHM parameterization is robust to TWS when evaluated at other locations.

Discharge data were obtained from the Global Runoff Data Centre (GRDC). We acknowledge the E-OBS dataset from the EU-FP6 project ENSEMBLES (http://ensembles-eu.metoffice.com) and the data providers in the ECA&D project (http://www.ecad.eu). GRACE land data (available at http:// grace.jpl.nasa.gov) processing algorithms were provided by Sean Swenson, and supported by the NASA MEaSUREs Program.



Pearson correlation between model and GRACE across the entire domain using the TWS and Q parameterization.

such as total water storage (TWS) anomaly can lead to improvement in discharge

