What happens to our ISIMIP simulations when we don't calibrate our lake models?

(...and what could we do about it?)

progress update

Tom Lorimer, Fabian Bärenbold, James Runnalls, Damien Bouffard, Martin Schmid ISIMIP meeting (Lake Sector) 2023, Prague



Why?

Calibration compensates for:

model imperfections



image: Copernicus

both of these issues will be present in the ISIMIP Global Lakes simulations... ...but without in-situ data to calibrate our models

forcing imperfections



image: Marco Papetti

How?

Our plan

ions



ge: Marco Papetti





What happened?

Model performance



Lake temperature data split into calibration and validation sets based on availability





What happened?

Model bias

Kilpisjarvi Neuchatel Stechlin Arendsee Ngoring Tahoe Green Thun Muggelsee Sunapee Windermere Kinneret Feeagh BlackOak Rotorua -owerLakeZurich Bosumtw Sparkling Tarawera Ki<



ake model parameters are



Looking in more detail, we see a systematic bias using default parameters, but this can be somewhat corrected post-hoc by using the mean of the calibrated parameters:

> So far, none of the predictors is better than the mean, but that's good news, because this is how modellers often set un their ISIMIP Global Lakes simulations



Predicting calibrated parameters





*lakes with calibrated RMS error < 2 C))



mean

So what?

Progress on the original plan

NS

Marco Papetti



So what?

Open questions

Predict parameters based on model error?

How does this translate to other models?

How does this translate to ISIMIP 3b forcing?





So what?

Outlook

Predict parameters based on model error? > Yes.

How does this translate to other models? > Joint project with other modellers arising from Girona workshop

How does this translate to ISIMIP 3b forcing? > ?????



