10 Agriculture (crop modelling)

This section lays out the global output protocol for the agricultural sector's contribution to ISIMIP. For further details, please contact AgMIP (ag-grid@agmip.org) and ISIMIP (info@isimip.org).
Note that the variable names are chosen to comply with AgMIP conventions or are harmonized with the conventions used in the ISIMIP water sector (for irrigation water). They are given in lower-case letters only in order to prevent the use of mixed-case names in the file names (see Section 5.1.1). **Table** 6 provides an overview of all experiments to be run in the agriculture (crop modelling) sector in ISIMIP2a.

10.1 Experiments

Table 24: Experiment summary for crop models.

	Climate Data	Scenario	Management settings	Land use (LU)	Other settings (sens-scenario)	Irrigation	# Runs
Historical runs	WATCH-WFDEI	hist	default (present day) (default) fully harmonized (fullharm) harmonized season, no N constraints (harmnon)	pure crop run (no LU specifier)	historical CO2 (no co2 specifier)	firr noirr	6
	GSWP3-W5E5	hist	default (present day) (default)	pure crop run (no LU specifier)	historical CO2 (no co2 specifier)	firr noirr	2
	GSWP3-EWEMBI	hist	default (present day) (default)	pure crop run (no LU specifier)	historical CO2 (no co2 specifier)	firr noirr	2
	GSWP3	hist	default (present day) (default)	pure crop run (no LU specifier)	historical CO2 (no co2 specifier)	firr noirr	2
	PGMFD v2.1 (Princeton)	hist	default (present day) (default)	pure crop run (no LU specifier)	historical CO2 (no co2 specifier)	firr noirr	2
	WATCH (WFD)	hist	default (present day) (default)	pure crop run (no LU specifier)	historical CO2 (no co2 specifier)	firr noirr	2
							12 (per crop)

10.2 Sector-specific input

Some GGCMs require inputs on planting dates, crop variety parameters, fertilizer use and possibly other management specifics. While the agreement for the fast-track was to use each model's setting that best represents current management patterns, we'll have specific inputs on planting dates and maturity dates (to allow for spatially-explicit variety parameterization) as well as fertilizer use (N, P, K). Some experiments will be run with harmonized input data (validation and attribution studies), and some with default model settings.

Table 25: Crop-model-specific input data.

Variable	Source*	Units	Notes
Planting dates	(Sacks, Deryng, Foley, & Ramankutty, 2010), (Portmann, Siebert, & Döll, 2010), supplemented with a rule-based approach as implemented in LPJmL in regions without observational data (see Elliott et al. 2015).	Julian days (Jan 1st= 1,…)	Planting dates for primary seasons per crop and grid cell.
Approximate maturity	(Sacks, Deryng, Foley, & Ramankutty, 2010), (Portmann, Siebert, & Döll, 2010) , supplemented with a rule-based approach as implemented in LPJmL in regions without observational data (see Elliott et al. 2015).	days from planting	Growing season length in days.
Fertilizers and manure	(Mueller, et al., 2012), (Potter, Ramankutty, Bennett, & Donner, 2011),	kg ha-1 yr-1	Average nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium application rates in each grid cell, with organic and inorganic amendments aggregated

	(Liu, et al., 2010), (Foley, et al., 2011)		and converted to an "effective inorganic application rate".
Historical [CO2]	Mauna Loa/RCP historical	ppm	Annual [CO2] values from 1900-2013.

10.3 Output data and definitions

Crop Priority and naming list:

1. Wheat, maize, soy, rice [whe, mai, soy, ric]
2. All others: Sugarcane, sorghum, millet, rapeseed, sugar beet, barley, rye, oat [sug, sor, mil, rap, sgb, bar, rye, and oat] + managed grass [mgr], field peas [pea], cassava [cas], sunflower [sun], groundnuts [nut], bean [ben], potato [pot], bioenergy crops such as poplar [pop], eucalyptus [euc], miscanthus [mis] … **Note:** planting and maturity dates for bioenergy crops shall only be reported if meaningful (i.e. not for perennials).

Reporting per growing seasons:

To resolve potential double harvests within one year, crop yields should be reported per growing season and not per calendar year. Thus, in the NetCDF output files, do not use a time dimension but instead a unitless coordinate variable with integer values; more information on how to construct these files in **Section** 5.1.6 and in our ISIMIP website (https://www.isimip.org/protocol/preparing-simulation-files/). Cumulative growing season variables such as, e.g., actual evapotranspiration or precipitation are to be accumulated over the growing season. The first season in the file (growing-season=0) is then the first complete growing season of the time period provided by the input data without any assumed spin-up data, which equates to the growing season with the first planting after this date. To ensure that data can be matched to individual years in post-processing, it is essential to also provide the actual planting dates (as day of the year), actual planting years (year), anthesis dates (as day of the year), year of anthesis (year), maturity dates (day of the year), and year of maturity (year). This procedure is identical to the GGCMI convention (Elliott, et al., 2015).

[6] There will be no distinction between winter and spring wheat.

Table 26: Output variables for crop models.

Variable (long name)	Variable name	Unit	Resolution	Comments
Key model output				
Crop yields	**yield-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	dry matter (t ha-1 per growing season)	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Crop-specific Yield may be identical to above-ground biomass (biom) if the entire plant is harvested, e.g., for bioenergy production.
Irrigation water withdrawal (assuming unlimited water supply)	**pirrww-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	mm per growing season	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	*Irrigation water withdrawn in case of optimal irrigation (in addition to rainfall), assuming no losses in conveyance and application.*
Key diagnostic variables				
Actual evapotranspiration	**aet-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	mm per growing season	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	portion of all water (including rain) that is evapo-transpired, the water amount should be accumulated over the entire growing period (**not** the calendar year)
Nitrogen application rate	**initr-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	kg ha-1 per growing season	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Total nitrogen application rate. If organic and inorganic amendments are applied, rate should be reported as effective inorganic nitrogen input (ignoring residues).
Actual planting dates	**plantday-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	Day of year	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	
Anthesis dates	**anthday-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	Days from planting date	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	

Maturity dates	**matyday-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	Days from planting date	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	
Additional output variables (optional)				
Above ground biomass (dry matter)	**biom-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	t ha-1 per growing season	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	The whole plant biomass above ground
Soil carbon emissions	**sco2-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	kg C ha-1	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Ideally should be modeled with realistic land-use history and initial carbon pools. Subject to extra study.
Nitrous oxide emissions	**sn2o-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	kg N2O-N ha-1	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Ideally should be modeled with realistic land-use history and initial carbon pools. Subject to extra study.
Total N uptake (total growing season sum)	**tnup-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	kg ha -1 yr -1	monthly (0.5°x0.5°)	Nitrogen balance: uptake
Total N inputs (total growing season sum)	**tnin-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	kg ha -1 yr -1	monthly (0.5°x0.5°)	Nitrogen balance: inputs
Total N losses (total growing season sum)	**tnloss-<crop>-<irrigation setting>**	kg ha -1 yr -1	monthly (0.5°x0.5°)	Nitrogen balance: losses
Growing season temperature sum	**sumt_<crop>**	deg c-days yr-1	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Sum of daily mean temperature over growing season
Growing season radiation	**gsrsds_<crop>**	w m-2 yr-1	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Average growing season shortwave solar radiation
Growing season precipitation	**gsprcp_<crop>**	mm ha-1 yr-1	per growing season (0.5°x0.5°)	Total growing season precipitation per crop

Note: The reporting periods for some output variables were changed from "yearly" to "per growing season" in April 2019. Please be aware that model outputs submitted before this date, may still contain yearly data. Some models (e.g., LPJmL) report outputs for additional crops ("cas" cassava, "mil" millet, "nut" groundnut, "pea" peas, "rap" rapeseed, "sgb" sugar beet, "sug" sugarcane, "sun" sunflower, "mgr" managed grass). The model EPIC-BOKU provides outputs for alternative PET equations (Hargreaves (hg), Penman-Monteith (pe), Priestley Taylor (pt), Baier-Robertson (br)).

10.4 Experiments

10.4.1 Historic runs and validation experiment

Specification of the historical run

Simulations for the historical period should be provided as pure crop runs (i.e. assuming the crop growing all over the world), based on the climate input described in Section 4. For each crop, there should be a full irrigation run (firr) and a no-irrigation run (noirr). Within ISIMIP2a we also ask for historical runs with three different degrees of harmonization as given in **Table** 27.

Table 27: Scenario settings for crop model simulations

Simulation	Comments
Default	Model should use their individual “best representation” of the historical period with regard to sowing dates, harvesting dates, fertilizer application rates and crop varieties.
Fully harmonized	Simulations based on prescribed “present day” fertilization rates (available for download) and fixed planting and harvesting dates (also available for download). Modelers should have planting as closely as possible to these dates, but it may be admissible to use these dates as indicators for planting windows (depending on model specifics).
Harmonized seasons with no N constraints	For models with an explicit description of the nitrogen cycle: harmnon simulations should be run with nitrogen stress turned off completely or (if that’s not possible) with very high N application rates to make model results comparable between those GGCMs that have explicit N dynamics and those that do not. For models without the nitrogen cycle: harmnon and fullharm simulations are the same and do not need to be duplicated.

Each of these three variants should be combined with a no-irrigation and full irrigation assumption, resulting (for the models with an explicit representation of the nitrogen cycle) in 6 runs for the respective climate input data set (cf. **Table** 6).

Specification of PET equation

Running simulations with different PET equations implicate submitting different version of your model, with a consequent different model name; i.e. if you create a second set of simulations using Priestley Taylor PET equation, you shall use your <model-name> in the initial version, and <model-name>-pt in the second run. We recommend you these abbreviations: ‘hg’ for Hargreaves, ‘pe’ for Penman-Monteith, ‘pt’ for Priestley Taylor, and ‘br’ for Baier-Robertson.

Specification of the validation procedure

For the validation task the pure crop simulations should

1) be masked by the following LU patterns: ”Dynamic MIRCA” (reconstruction of historical LU based on HYDE and MIRCA2000, see Section 4.3.

2) averaging and aggregation will be performed in the post-processing and depending on what data we compare to. It could include de-trending (to compare with possibly de-trended observations).

15 References

Arnell, N. (1999). A simple water balance model for the simulation of streamflow over a large geographic domain. *Journal of Hydrology*, *217*(3–4), 314–335.

Cescatti, A., & Piutti, E. (1998). Silvicultural alternatives, competition regime and sensitivity to climate in a European beech forest. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *102*(2), 213-223.

Choulga, M., Kourzeneva, E., Zakharova, E., & Doganovsky, A. (2014). Estimation of the mean depth of boreal lakes for use in numerical weather prediction and climate modelling, Tellus A. *Dyn. Meteorol. Oceanogr.*, *66*(1), 21295.

Cucchi, M., Weedon, G. P., Amici, A., Bellouin, N., Lange, S., Müller Schmied, H., Hersbach, H. and Buontempo, C. (2020) WFDE5: bias-adjusted ERA5 reanalysis data for impact studies. *Earth System Science Data*, 12, 2097–2120.

Davie, J. C., Falloon, P. D., Kahana, R., Dankers, R., Betts, R., Portmann, F. T., . . . Arnell, N. (2013). Comparing projections of future changes in runoff and water resources from hydrological and ecosystem models in ISI-MIP. *Earth System Dynamics Discussions*, *4*(1), 279–315.

De Lary, R. (October, 2015). *Massif des Landes de Gascogne. II – ETAT DES CONNAISSANCES TECHNIQUES.* Bordeaux: CRPF Aquitaine.

Dirmeyer, P. A., Gao, X., Zhao, M., Guo, Z., Oki, T. and Hanasaki, N. (2006) GSWP-2: Multimodel Analysis and Implications for Our Perception of the Land Surface. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 87(10), 1381–98.

Dlugokencky, E., & Tans, P. (2019). *Trends in atmospheric carbon dioxide*. Retrieved November 2, 2019, from National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Earth System Research Laboratory (NOAA/ESRL):

https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/gl_data.html

Döll, P., & Schmied, H. M. (2012). How is the impact of climate change on river flow regimes related to the impact on mean annual runoff? A global-scale analysis. *Environmental Research Letters*, *7*(1), 14037.

Döll, P., Kaspar, F., & Lehner, B. (2003). A global hydrological model for deriving water availability indicators: Model tuning and validation. *Journal of Hydrology*, *270*(1–2), 105–134.

Duncker, P. S., Barreiro, S. M., Hengeveld, G. M., Lind, T., Mason, W. L., Ambrozy, S., & Spiecker, H. (2012). Classification of Forest Management Approaches: A New Conceptual Framework and Its Applicability to European Forestry. *Ecology and Society*, *17*(4).

Elliott, J., Müller, C., Deryng, D., Chryssanthacopoulos, J., Boote, K. J., Büchner, M., . . . Ruane, A. C. (2015). The Global Gridded Crop Model Intercomparison: Data and modeling protocols for Phase 1 (v1.0). *Geosci. Model Dev.*, *8*, 261-277.

Fekete, B. M., Vörösmarty, C. J., & Grabs, W. (2000). Global Composite Runoff Fields on Observed River Discharge and Simulated Water Balances. *GRDC Reports*, *22*(115).

Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., . . . Hill. (2011). Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, *478*(7369), 337-342.

Fürstenau, C., Badeck, F. W., Lasch, P., Lexer, M. J., Lindner, M., Mohr, P., & Suckow, F. (2007). Multiple-use forest management in consideration of climate change and the interests of stakeholder groups. *Eur J Forest Res*, *126*, 225-239.

González, J. R., & Palahí, M. (2005). Optimising the management of Pinus sylvestris L. stand under risk of fire in Catalonia (north-east of Spain). *Ann. For. Sci. 62*, *62*, 493-501.

Gosling, S. N., & Arnell, N. W. (2011). Simulating current global river runoff with a global hydrological model: Model revisions, validation, and sensitivity analysis. *Hydrological Processes*, *25*(7), 1129–1145.

Gosling, S. N., Warren, R., Arnell, N. W., Good, P., Caesar, J., Bernie, D., . . . Smith, S. M. (2011). A review of recent developments in climate change science. Part II: The global-scale impacts of climate change. *Progress in Physical Geography*, *35*(4), 443–464.

Gutsch, M., Lasch, P., Suckow, F., & Reyer, C. (2011). Management of mixed oak-pine forests under climate scenario uncertainty. *Forest Systems*, *20*(3), 453-463.

Haddeland, I. C. (2011). Multimodel estimate of the global terrestrial water balance: setup and first results. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *110531121709055*.

Haith, D. A., & Shoemaker., L. L. (1987). Generalized Watershed Loading Functions for stream flow nutrients. *Water Resour. Bull.*, *23*, 471-478.

Håkanson, L. (1995). Models to predict Secchi depth in small glacial lakes. *Aquatic Science*, *57*(1), 31–53.

Hanewinkela, M., & Pretzsch, H. (2000). Modelling the conversion from even-aged to uneven-aged stands of Norway spruce (Picea abies L. Karst.) with a distance-dependent growth simulator. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *134*, 55-70.

Hein, S., & Dhôte, J.-F. (2006). Effect of species composition, stand density and site index on the basal area increment of oak trees (Quercus sp.) in mixed stands with beech (Fagus sylvatica L.) in northern France. *Ann. For. Sci.*, *63*, 457-467.

Hijmans, R., Cameron, S., Parra, J., Jones, P., & Jarvis, A. (2005). Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, *25*, 1965-1978.

Hurtt, G., Chini, L., Sahajpal, R., Frolking, S., & et al, .. (2020). Harmonization of global land-use change and management for the period 850-2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *13*, 5425-5464.

Kerr, G. (1996). The effect of heavy or 'free growth' thinning on oak (Quercus petraea and Q. robur). *Forestry: An International Journal of Forest Research*, *69*(4), 303-317.

Kim, H. (. (n.d.). *Global Soil Wetness Project Phase 3*. Retrieved from Global Soil Wetness Project Phase 3: http://hydro.iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp/GSWP3/

Klein Goldewijk, D. i. (2016). *A historical land use data set for the Holocene; HYDE 3.2 (replaced)*. Utrecht University. DANS.

Koster, R. D., Fekete, B. M., Huffman, G. J., & Stackhouse, P. W. (2006). Revisiting a hydrological analysis framework with International Satellite Land Surface Climatology Project Initiative 2 rainfall, net radiation, and runoff fields. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *111*(D22), D22S05.

Kourzeneva, E. (2010). External data for lake parameterization in Numerical Weather Prediction and climate modeling. *Boreal Environ. Res.*, *15*(2), 165–177.

Lähde, E., Laiho, O., & Lin, J. C. (2010). Silvicultural alternatives in an uneven-sized forest dominated by Picea abies. *Journal of Forest Research*, *15*(1), 14-20.

Lange, S. (2019a). WFDE5 over land merged with ERA5 over the ocean (W5E5). V. 1.0. doi:10.5880/pik.2019.023

Lange, S. (2019b). Earth2Observe, WFDEI and ERA-Interim data Merged and Bias-corrected for ISIMIP (EWEMBI) v1.1. *GFZ Data Services*. doi:10.5880/pik.2019.004

Lange, S. (2019c). Trend-preserving bias adjustment and statistical downscaling with ISIMIP3BASD (v1.0). *Geoscientific*

Model Development, 12, 3055–3070.

Lange, S. (2020). ISIMIP3BASD v2.4.1. *Zenodo*, doi:10.5281/zenodo.3898426.

Lascha, P., Badecka, F.-W., Suckowa, F., Lindnera, M., & Mohr, P. (2005). Model-based analysis of management alternatives at stand and regional level in Brandenburg. *Forest Ecology and Management*, *207*, 59-74.

Lehner, B., & Döll, P. (2004). Development and validation of a global database of lakes, reservoirs and wetlands. *J. Hydrol.*, *296*(1-4), 1-22.

Liu, J., You, L., Amini, M., Obersteiner, M., Herrero, M., Zehnder, A. J., & Yang, H. (2010). A high-resolution assessment on global nitrogen flows in cropland. *National Academy of Sciences*, *107*(17), 8035-8040.

Loustau, D., Bosc, A., Colin, A., Ogée, J., Davi, H., Francois, C., . . . Delage, F. (2005). Modeling climate change effects on the potential production of French plains forests at the sub-regional level. *Tree physiology*, *25*, 813-23.

Meinshausen, M., Raper, S. C., & Wigley, T. M. (2011). Emulating coupled atmosphere-ocean and carbon cycle models with a simpler model, MAGICC6 – Part 1: Model description and calibration. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, *11*(4), 1417–1456.

Millero, F., & Poisson, A. (1981). International one-atmosphere equation of state of seawater. *Deep-Sea Research*, *28*, 625-629.

Monfreda, C., Ramankutty, N., & Foley, J. (2008). Farming the planet: 2. Geographic distribution of crop areas, yields, physiological types, and net primary production in the year 2000. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *22*(GB1022).

Mueller, N., Gerber, J., Johnston, M., Ray, D., Ramankutty, N., & Foley, J. (2012). Closing yield gaps through nutrient and water management. *Nature*, *490*, 254-257.

Mund, M. (2004). *Carbon pools of European beech forests (Fagus sylvatica) under different silvicultural management*. Göttingen: Forschungszentrum Waldökosysteme.

Oleson, K. W., Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Lawrence, D. M., Thornton, P. E., Lawrence, P. J., . . . Qian, T. (2008). Improvements to the Community Land Model and their impact on the hydrological cycle. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, *113*(G1), G01021.

Pape, R. (1999). Effects of Thinning Regime on the Wood Properties and Stem Quality of Picea abies. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, *14*(1), 38-50.

Portmann, F., Siebert, S., & Döll, P. (2010). MIRCA2000 – global monthly irrigated and rainfed crop areas around the year 2000: a new high-resolution data set for agricultural and hydrological modeling. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *24*(1).

Potter, P., Ramankutty, N., Bennett, E. M., & Donner, S. D. (2011). Global fertilizer and manure, version 1: nitrogen fertilizer application. *NASA Socioeconomic Data and Applications Center*.

Pukkala, T., Miina, J., Kurttila, M., & Kolström, T. (1998). A spatial yield model for optimizing the thinning regime of mixed stands of Pinus sylvestris and Picea abies. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, *13*(1-4), 31-42.

Sacks, W. J., Deryng, D., Foley, J. A., & Ramankutty, N. (2010). Crop planting dates: an analysis of global patterns. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *19*(5), 607-620.

Schneiderman, E. M., Pierson, D. C., Lounsbury, D. G., & Zion, M. S. (2002). Modeling the hydrochemistry of the Cannonsville watershed with Generalized Watershed Loading Functions (GWLF). *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.*, *38*, 1323-1347.

Schütz, J.-P., Götz, M., Schmid, W., & Mandallaz, D. (2006). Vulnerability of spruce (Picea abies) and beech (Fagus sylvatica) forest stands to storms and consequences for silviculture. *Eur J Forest Res*, *125*, 291-302.

Shatwell, T., Thiery, W., & Kirillin, G. (2019). Future projections of temperature and mixing regime of European temperate lakes. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, *23*(3), 1533-1551.

Sheffield, J., Goteti, G., & Wood, E. F. (2006). Development of a 50-Year High-Resolution Global Dataset of Meteorological Forcings for Land Surface Modeling. *Journal of Climate*, *19*(13), 3088–3111.

Štefančík, I. (2012). Growth characteristics of oak (Quercus petraea [Mattusch.] Liebl.) stand under different thinning regimes. *Journal of Forest Science*, *58*(2), 67-78.

Sterba, H. (1987). Estimating Potential Density from Thinning Experiments and Inventory Data. *Forest Science*, *33*(4), 1022-1034.

Stock, C. A., Dunne, J. P., & John, J. G. (2014). Global-scale carbon and energy flows through the marine planktonic food web: An analysis with a coupled physical-biological model. *Progress in Oceanography*, *120*, 1-28.

Subin, Z. M., Riley, W. J., & Mironov, D. (2012). An improved lake model for climate simulations: Model structure, evaluation, and sensitivity analyses in CESM1. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.*, *4*(1), M02001.

Thivolle-Cazat, A. (2013). *Disponibilité en bois en Aquitaine de 2012 à 2025*. Bordeaux: FCBA, IGN, INRA, CRPF Aquitaine.

Tian, H., Yang, J., Lu, C., Xu, R., Canadell, J. G., Jackson, R., . . . Wini. (2018). The global N2O Model Intercomparison Project (NMIP): Objectives, Simu- lation Protocol and Expected Products. *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*

Weedon, G. P., Balsamo, G., Bellouin, N., Gomes, S., Best, M. J., & Viterbo, P. (2014). The WFDEI meteorological forcing data set: WATCH Forcing Data methodology applied to ERA-Interim reanalysis data. *Water Resources Research*, *50*, 7505–7514.

Weedon, G. P., Gomes, S., Viterbo, P., Shuttleworth, W. J., Blyth, E., Österle, H., . . . Best, M. (2011). Creation of the WATCH Forcing Data and Its Use to Assess Global and Regional Reference Crop Evaporation over Land during the Twentieth Century. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *12*(5), 823–848.

Wu, B., Yu, B., Yue, W., Shu, S., Tan, W., Hu, C., . . . Liu, H. (2013). A Voxel-Based Method for Automated Identification and Morphological Parameters Estimation of Individual Street Trees from Mobile Laser Scanning Data. *Remote Sensing*, *5*(2), 584-611.

Yoshimura, K., & Kanamitsu, M. (2008). Dynamical Global Downscaling of Global Reanalysis. *Monthly Weather Review*, *136*(8), 2983–2998.

Yoshimura, K., & Kanamitsu, M. (2013). Incremental Correction for the Dynamical Downscaling of Ensemble Mean Atmospheric Fields. *Monthly Weather Review*, *141*(9), 3087–3101.