Towards a theory of evaluation for global water models

Sebastian Gnann & Thorsten Wagener



The need for a "theory of evaluation"

- Global water models are used for high impact studies & policymaking
- We thus need adequate evaluation strategies for large scale models
- However, we do not have an agreed upon evaluation framework



Universita

Article

2

Safe and just Earth system boundaries

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06083-8	Johan Rockström ^{12,323} , Joyeeta Gupta ^{4,5} , Dahe Qin ^{6,7,8} , Steven J. Lade ^{3,9,102} , Jesse F. Abrams ¹¹ , Lauren S. Andersen ¹ , David I. Armstrong McKay ^{3,11,12} , Xuemei Bal ¹⁰ , Govindasamy Bala ¹³ , Stuart E. Bunn ⁴ , Daniel Ciobanu ³ , Fabrice DeClerck ^{15,16} , Kristie Ebi ¹⁷ , Lauren Gifford ¹⁸ , Christopher Gordon ¹⁹ , Syezlin Hasan ⁴⁴ , Norichika Kanie ²⁰ , Timothy M. Lenton ¹¹ , Sina Lorian ¹¹ , Diana M. Liverman ¹⁸ , Awaz Mohamed ²¹ , Nebojsa Nakicenovic ²² , David Obura ²³ , Daniel Ospina ⁹ , Klaudia Prodani ⁴ , Crelis Rammelt ⁴ , Boris Sakschewski ¹ , Joeri Scholtens ⁴ , Ben Stewart-Koster ¹⁴ , Thejna Tharammal ²⁴ , Detlef van Vuuren ^{25,26} , Peter H. Verburg ^{27,28} , Ricarda Winkelmann ^{1,29} , Caroline Zimm ²² , Elena M. Bennett ^{30,31} , Stefan Bringezu ³² , Wendy Broadgate ⁹ , Pamela A. Green ³³ , Lei Huang ³⁴ , Lisa Jacobson ⁹ , Christopher Ndehedehe ^{14,35} , Simona Pedde ^{0,36} , Juan Rocha ^{3,9} , Marten Scheffer ³⁷ , Lena Schulte-Uebbing ^{25,38} , Wim de Vries ³⁸ , Cunde Xiao ^{6,39} , Chi Xu ⁴⁰ , Xinwu Xu ^{7,8} , Noelia Zafra-Calvo ⁴¹ & Xin Zhang ⁴²
Received: 23 June 2022	
Accepted: 14 April 2023	
Published online: 31 May 2023	
Open access	
Check for updates	

nature



An evaluation framework should be **fit for purpose**



Uses of models

- Large scale
- Data scarce regions
- Changing conditions

Alexander von

Universi

Users of models

- Researchers
- Model developers
- Stakeholders

Fit for purpose evaluation for uses of models

- Evaluation is often done as for catchment scale models, but there are alternatives
- Evaluation using functional relationships that capture large scale relationships across places
- Response-based evaluation to evaluate how models respond to changing conditions

Alexander von





Historical, plausible

Wagener et al. (2022)

OUTPUT

4

Examples of functional relationships



Wet warm Wet cold Dry cold Dry cold

> Gnann et al. (submitted)

Examples of functional relationships



Gnann et al. (submitted)

STIFTUNG

Precipitation-recharge relationships differ widely between models and observations

7





Gnann et al. (submitted)

Precipitation-recharge relationships differ widely between models and observations



There are many more evaluation approaches

- "Traditional" point comparison (e.g. using NSE)
- Elasticities (e.g. Zhang et al., 2023, Nature Water)
- Trends (e.g. Scanlon et al., 2018, PNAS)

We should think – as a community –
 about what each evaluation approach can and cannot do (e.g. Gleeson et al., 2021, GMD)





Community-driven model evaluation frameworks



Taking water model evaluation to the next level

Improved process understanding

Explore process basis of functional relationships and learn more about hydrology

Improved models

Figure out which models cannot capture relationships and why

Improved data sets

Learn where we have data gaps (in functional space) and thus should measure



Next steps towards a "theory of evaluation"

- Possible elements of an evaluation framework
 - Evaluation approaches and their process basis
 - How to use evaluation for model improvement
 - Benchmark evaluation datasets
- Discussion: benchmarks for ISIMIP models?
 - Variables (streamflow, recharge, evaporation)
 - Gradients (precipitation, radiation)
 - Automatic quality control

References

- Rockström, J., Gupta, J., Qin, D., Lade, S. J., Abrams, J. F., Andersen, L. S., ... & Zhang, X. (2023). Safe and just Earth system boundaries. Nature, 1-10.
- Gnann, S., Reinecke, R., Stein, L., Wada, Y., Thiery, W., Schmied, H. M., ... & Wagener, T. (2022). Functional relationships reveal differences in the water cycle representation of global water models. *Under Review.*
- Gleeson, T., Wagener, T., Döll, P., Zipper, S. C., West, C., Wada, Y., ... & Bierkens, M. F. (2021). GMD Perspective: The quest to improve the evaluation of groundwater representation in continental to global scale models. *Geoscientific Model Development Discussions*, 2021, 1-59.
- MacDonald, A. M., Lark, R. M., Taylor, R. G., Abiye, T., Fallas, H. C., Favreau, G., ... & West, C. (2021). Mapping groundwater recharge in Africa from ground observations and implications for water security. *Environmental Research Letters*, *16*(3), 034012.
- Wagener, T., Reinecke, R., & Pianosi, F. (2022). On the evaluation of climate change impact models. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *13*(3), e772.
- Zhang, Y., Zheng, H., Zhang, X., Leung, L. R., Liu, C., Zheng, C., ... & Blöschl, G. (2023). Future global streamflow declines are probably more severe than previously estimated. *Nature Water*, 1(3), 261-271.
- Scanlon, B. R., Zhang, Z., Save, H., Sun, A. Y., Müller Schmied, H., Van Beek, L. P., ... & Bierkens, M. F. (2018). Global models
 underestimate large decadal declining and rising water storage trends relative to GRACE satellite data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(6), E1080-E1089.
- Eyring, V., Cox, P. M., Flato, G. M., Gleckler, P. J., Abramowitz, G., Caldwell, P., ... & Williamson, M. S. (2019). Taking climate model evaluation to the next level. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(2), 102-110.
- Eker, S., Rovenskaya, E., Obersteiner, M., & Langan, S. (2018). Practice and perspectives in the validation of resource management models. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 5359.

