# On inclusion of water resource management in Earth System models – Part 2: Representation of water supply and allocation and opportunities for improved modeling

4

# 5 Ali Nazemi<sup>1</sup> and Howard S. Wheater<sup>1</sup>

6 [1] Global Institute for Water Security, University of Saskatchewan, 11 Innovation Boulevard,

7 Saskatoon, SK S7N 3H5, Canada

8 Correspondence to: A. Nazemi (ali.nazemi@usask.ca)

9

#### 10 Abstract

Human water use has significantly increased during the recent past. Water withdrawals from 11 surface and groundwater sources have altered terrestrial discharge and storage, with large 12 variability in time and space. These withdrawals are driven by sectoral demands for water, but are 13 14 commonly subject to supply constraints, which determine water allocation. Water supply and 15 allocation, therefore, should be considered together with water demand and appropriately included in Earth System models to address various large-scale effects with or without considering possible 16 climate interactions. In a companion paper, we review the modeling of demand in large-scale 17 models. Here, we review the algorithms developed to represent the elements of water supply and 18 allocation in Land Surface Models and Global Hydrologic Models. We note that some potentially 19 important online implications, such as the effects of large reservoirs on land-atmospheric 20 21 feedbacks, have not yet been fully investigated. Regarding offline implications, we find that there are important elements, such as groundwater availability and withdrawals, and the representation 22 of large reservoirs, which should be improved. We identify major sources of uncertainty in current 23 24 simulations due to limitations in data support, water allocation algorithms, host large-scale models as well as propagation of various biases across the integrated modeling system. Considering these 25 26 findings with those highlighted in our companion paper, we note that advancements in 27 computation and coupling techniques as well as improvements in natural and anthropogenic process representation and parameterization, large-scale models, remote sensing and data 28

assimilation can facilitate inclusion of water resource management at larger scales; however various modeling options should be carefully considered, diagnosed and intercompared. We propose a modular framework to develop integrated models based on multiple hypotheses for data support, water resource management algorithms and host models in a unified uncertainty assessment framework. A key to this development is the availability of regional scale data for model development, diagnosis and validation. We argue that the time is right for a global initiative, based on regional case studies, to move this agenda forward.

36

# 37 **1 Introduction**

The water cycle is fundamental to the functioning of the Earth System and underpins the most 38 39 basic needs of human society. However, as noted in our companion paper (hereafter referred to as Nazemi and Wheater, 2014a), the current scale of human activities significantly perturbs the 40 terrestrial water cycle, with local, regional and global implications. Such disturbances affect both 41 hydrological functioning and land-atmospheric interactions, and therefore should be explicitly 42 represented in large-scale models. We consider both Land Surface Models (LSMs) and Global 43 44 Hydrologic Models (GHMs). LSMs generally represent water, energy and carbon cycles, and can be coupled with climate models (i.e. online simulations) for integrated Earth System modeling, or 45 uncoupled from climate models (i.e., offline simulations) for large-scale impact assessment. 46 GHMs are also run in uncoupled mode for impact assessment; however, they focus exclusively on 47 48 the water cycle. In this survey, we consider the representation of water resources management in 49 these large-scale models and focus on water quantity rather than water quality. We note that while historically the effects of water management have largely been neglected in LSMs and GHMs, 50 there has been increasing interest in recent years in their inclusion and a common first step is to 51 52 estimate the demand for water, in particular associated with irrigation (see Nazemi and Wheater, 53 2014a). However, in practice water resource systems are often complex, and associated 54 infrastructure may have competing functional requirements and constraints (e.g. flood protection, 55 water supply, environmental flows, etc.), exacerbated during drought. In this paper, we turn to the 56 issues around water supply and allocation and associated representations in large-scale models.

57 Major implications are associated with water allocation from surface and ground water sources.
58 For instance, large dams and reservoirs can significantly modify downstream streamflow

2

59 characteristics (e.g., Vörösmarty et al., 1997, 2003; Oki and Kanae, 2006; Wisser et al., 2010; Tang et al., 2010; Tebakari et al., 2012; Lehner and Grill, 2013; Lai et al., 2014; Haddeland et al., 60 2014), with large regional variability (see e.g., Pokhrel et al., 2012a). Considering that almost all 61 major river systems in the Northern Hemisphere (except for the arctic and sub-arctic regions) are 62 dammed (e.g., Meybeck, 2003; Nilsson et al., 2005), it can be argued that accurate simulation of 63 continental and global runoff is impossible without considering the effects of reservoirs. Such 64 hydrologic impacts and associated environmental consequences can be studied through offline 65 LSMs or GHMs. There are, however, important land-surface implications are associated with 66 reservoir operation that require online simulations. For instance, it has also been argued that large 67 dams can have important footprints on surface energy (Hossain et al., 2012), with associated 68 effects on land-surface boundary conditions and potential interactions with local and regional 69 70 climate (MacKay et al., 2009). To understand these effects, online LSMs, i.e. coupled with climate models, are required to provide quantitative knowledge of the extent of such impacts in time and 71 72 space.

73 Groundwater resources have also been extensively perturbed during the "Anthropocene". Every year, a large amount of groundwater is pumped to the land-surface for both irrigative and non-74 irrigative purposes (e.g., Zektser and Lorne, 2004; Siebert et al., 2010). Such extraction has 75 already caused large groundwater depletion in some areas (Rodell et al., 2007, 2009; Gleeson et 76 77 al., 2010, 2012) and changed the surface water balance due to return flows from demand locations 78 to river systems and ultimately to oceans (e.g., Lettenmaier and Milly, 2009; Wada et al., 2010; Pokhrel et al., 2012b; Döll et al., 2014). In parallel, a considerable proportion of the surface water 79 diverted into irrigated areas may recharge groundwater (Döll et al., 2012). From a broader 80 perspective, groundwater aquifers (particularly shallow groundwater) can also be an important 81 control on soil moisture and wetlands, and thus influence atmospheric surface boundary conditions 82 (e.g., Maxwell et al., 2007, 2011; Fan and Miguez-Macho, 2011; Dadson et al., 2013). These online 83 effects are widely unquantified at the global scale, as the sub-surface processes below the root 84 zone have been generally assumed to be disconnected from the atmosphere (see Taylor et al., 85 2013). 86

In addition, representing water allocation practice in large-scale models is urgently required to address various emerging water security concerns including (but not limited to) human water supply (e.g. Postel, 1996), ecosystem health (e.g. Vörösmarty et al., 2010), sedimentation (e.g.

Syvitsky et al., 2005) and water quality (e.g. Skliris and Lascaratos, 2004). These latter areas are 90 beyond the scope of this paper, but highlight the need to represent human water allocation in large-91 scale models for regional and global impact assessments. For instance, the most densely-populated 92 93 parts of the globe suffer from extremely fragile water supply conditions (e.g., Grey et al., 2013; Falkenmark, 2013; Nazemi and Wheater, 2014b) and this will be amplified under future climate 94 change and population growth (e.g., Arnell, 2004; Wada et al., 2013b; Rosenzweig et al., 2014; 95 Schiermeier, 2014; Haddeland et al., 2014). While population growth directly affects water 96 demand, indirect effects include changing land and water management, with associated impacts 97 on the aquatic environment. Similarly, climate change is expected to perturb both water demand 98 99 and supply, as it also results in greater seasonal and inter-annual variability with increase in the 100 risk of extreme conditions (e.g., Dankers et al., 2014; Prudhomme et al., 2014). Looking to the 101 future, Yoshikawa et al. (2013) argued that current sources can only account for 74 percent of the global net irrigation requirements of the 2050s and supply/demand imbalance will cause a major 102 increase in global water scarcity (Alcamo et al., 2007; Hanasaki et al., 2008a, b, 2013a, b; Schewe 103 et al., 2014). In water-scarce conditions, competition for water resources becomes increasingly 104 105 important and the details of water allocation practice play a key role in the spatial and temporal distribution of water stress. These issues necessitates adaptation strategies to mitigate the effects 106 107 of water stress and extreme conditions and large-scale models are, therefore, required to assess the effects of various global changes and to examine the impact of alternative management strategies. 108

109 Representation of water allocation practice introduces a set of issues associated with management and societal preferences, local and regional differences in decision making, complexity of water 110 resources systems (particularly at larger scales), as well as lack of data support. At local and basin 111 scales, water allocation practice is mainly defined as an optimization problem, in which the aim is 112 to minimize the adverse effects of water shortage and/or to maximize the economic benefits of the 113 water resource system. The advent of search algorithms such as Linear Programming (Dantzig, 114 1965), Dynamic Programming (Bellman, 1952) and Genetic Algorithms (Goldberg, 1989) has 115 resulted in a wide variety of operational models for water resource management at small basin-116 scale (e.g., Rani and Moreira, 2010; Hossain and El-shafie, 2013; see Revelle et al., 1969 for the 117 118 early developments). These small-scale water allocation models, however, typically do not include processes related to water supply and demand and receive these variables as prescribed inputs. 119 Moreover, small-scale operational models often require detailed information about policy 120

121 constraints and operational management. This information is not generally available over larger 122 regions and at the global scale. Even if all related information were to be available, the level of 123 complexity within small-scale operational models cannot be supported globally due to high 124 dimensionality in decision variables and computational burdens. These restrictions have resulted 125 in the progressive development of macro-scale algorithms to represent water allocation practice 126 and competition among demands at regional and global scales.

127 The main objective of this paper is to overview the current literature and to identify the state of 128 available methods and applications for large-scale representations of water supply and allocation 129 in LSMs and GHMs, with relevance to both Earth System modeling and regional and global water management. Section 2 addresses the representation of surface and ground water sources. Section 130 3 discusses the linkage between available sources and prescribed demands (see Nazemi and 131 132 Wheater, 2014a) through macro-scale allocation algorithms. Section 4 reviews current large-scale 133 modeling applications and discusses the quality of available simulations. Section 5 merges the 134 findings of Nazemi and Wheater (2014a) with those obtained in Sections 2 to 4, and highlights 135 current gaps and opportunities from an integrated water resources, hydrology and land-surface modeling perspective. This is finalized by suggesting a systematic framework for model 136 137 development and uncertainty assessment to guide future efforts in inclusion of water resource management in large-scale models. Section 6 closes our survey and provides some concluding 138 139 remarks.

140

# 141 **2** Available representations of water sources in large-scale models

#### 142 **2.1 Lakes and reservoir**

Natural lakes and man-made reservoirs cover more than 2 percent of the global land surface area except for Antarctica and glaciated Greenland (Lehner and Döll, 2004). Lakes and reservoirs are important water sources due to their ability to store and release surface water for human demand. While natural lakes have been historically an important water source for human civilization, manmade reservoirs have been mainly constructed over the last 50 years. Currently, there are more than 16 million reservoirs worldwide (Lehner et al. 2011), retaining around 20 percent of the annual runoff and 10 percent of the total volume of the world's freshwater lakes (Gleick, 2000; Meybeck, 2003; Wood et al., 2011). This makes an important global water resource: Yoshikawa
et al. (2013) estimated that reservoirs allocated 500 cubic kilometers just for irrigation during the
year 2000, worldwide.

153 From the large-scale modeling perspective, lakes and reservoirs introduce heterogeneity into landsurface parameterizations, with both offline and online implications. To represent these open water 154 bodies, first they should be identified at the grid and sub-grid scales. The availability of basic data 155 156 for larger lakes and reservoirs is relatively good (see Lehner and Döll, 2004 for a comprehensive 157 list of data sources). For instance, the Global Lakes and Wetlands Database (GLWD; 158 http://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/global-lakes-and-wetlands-database) includes more than 159 250,000 lakes globally. In addition, the International Commission of Large Dams (ICOLD; http://www.icold-cigb.net/) and Global Reservoir and Dam (GRanD; http://www.gwsp.org 160 161 /products/grand-database.html) databases contain information about the location, purpose and 162 capacity of 33,000 and 7000 large dams, worldwide. However, to estimate evaporation, as well as storage and release, more specific physical characteristics, such as storage-area-depth 163 164 relationships, are required. These data are generally not available and parametric relationships have been used to approximate these properties based on various assumptions (e.g., Takeuchi, 165 1997; Liebe et al., 2005). Nonetheless, at this stage of model development, reservoir simulations 166 cannot in general be directly verified, due to the lack of observations of reservoir level and storage 167 168 (Gao et al., 2012). These data limitations may be largely solved in the relatively near future by 169 upcoming satellite missions – see the discussion of Section 5.3 below.

170 Depending on their size, lakes and reservoirs can be represented either within channel or sub-grid routing components of host large-scale models. While larger lakes and reservoirs are normally 171 represented within the river routing component and regulate the channel streamflow, smaller 172 173 bodies are mainly considered within sub-grid parameterizations as an additional pond (e.g., Döll 174 et al., 2003; Wisser et al., 2010). Ideally, natural lakes and reservoirs should differ in their 175 representation due to human management. If human management is neglected, reservoir releases 176 can be represented similar to natural lakes using simple parametric equations that link the reservoir 177 release to reservoir storage (or level) (e.g., Meigh et al., 1999;, Döll et al., 2003; Pietroniro et al., 2007; Rost et al., 2008). Lake algorithms, however, have had limited success in highly regulated 178 179 basins. This is rather intuitive: for natural lakes, the dynamics of lake storage (and hence discharge) 180 are regulated by climate and inflow variability, whereas the dynamics of reservoir discharge (and hence storage) are mainly controlled by pressures of downstream demands and management decisions. Moreover, reservoirs are often multi-functional and deal with competing demands with varying priority in time; therefore, simple lake routing algorithms are unable to fully describe reservoir functionality. Alternatively, macro-scale algorithms for reservoir operation have been suggested, which attempt to link reservoir releases to inflows, storage and prescribed human demands considering water allocation objectives – see Section 3.3.

Considering online implications, the effects of dams on near-surface energy and moisture conditions and hence land-atmospheric feedbacks can be important for large reservoirs (Hossain et al., 2012). Addressing this issue using coupled LSMs is currently a major gap in the literature and presents a challenging problem at the grid scale, since the impact of dams on the local climate can be masked by regional climate variability and surrounding land cover (e.g., Zhao and Shepherd, 2011).

#### 193 **2.2 Streamflow diversions and inter-basin water transfers**

194 Streamflow diversions of any magnitude require dams or barrages. At smaller scales, these include within-basin water transfers from local streams to nearby demands. In-basin diversions are often 195 196 represented in large-scale models by instantaneous abstractions (e.g., Hanaski et al., 2008a, 2010; Döll et al., 2009). Hydrologic routing can be alternatively considered for improved representation 197 198 (e.g., Wisser et al., 2010). It should be noted that a proportion of the diverted flow normally returns to the river systems. Heuristic algorithms have been advised to mimic the mechanism of diversion 199 200 based on returning the excess water to the river with some lag. Biemans et al. (2011) for instance represented the dynamics of diverted/return flows for irrigated areas by making water available 201 202 for consumption for 5 days; if unused, it is released back to the river. This can have important 203 implications for differentiating between the actual use and total withdrawals, in the case where 204 water is over-allocated.

Inter-basin water transfers normally involve major infrastructure and can significantly perturb the regional streamflow regime. For instance, proposed South to North water transfer schemes in China (see Liu and Zheng, 2002; Liu and Yang, 2012) would divert 44.8 billion cubic meters of water annually (http://www.internationalrivers.org/). The associated hydrological impacts are estimated to be as, or more significant than, land-use and/or land-cover changes (J. Liu et al., 2013). Inter-basin water transfer can be adequately represented by hydrologic routing. Examples
are available for some regional applications (e.g., Nakayama and Shankman, 2013a, b; Ye et al.,
2013); however, efforts to represent long-distance diversions at the global scale are limited. This
is mainly due to data issues regarding the location and specification of diversion channels globally.
This could be largely resolved in future due to improvements in remote sensing observations – see
the discussion of Section 5.3 below.

#### 216 2.3 Groundwater

217 Even large-scale models with detailed water resource management schemes have limited 218 representation of groundwater availability (see Table 1), largely due to the limitations in data related to groundwater storage, withdrawals and sub-surface properties as well as computational 219 difficulties. There have been some efforts to include groundwater in LSMs to describe the aquifer 220 221 dynamics, land-atmospheric feedbacks and watershed responses, mainly at basin and small 222 regional scales (e.g., Maxwell and Miller, 2005; Maxwell et al., 2007, 2011; Kollet and Maxwell, 2008; Ferguson and Maxwell, 2010). These studies consider a physically-based groundwater store, 223 which can be updated at each modeling time step using a 3D representation of groundwater 224 movement, and linked to land-surface calculations through soil moisture dynamics. Such 225 representations are computationally expensive and limited at the global scale, since temporal and 226 spatial domains should be finely gridded for accurate representations of groundwater movement 227 228 and soil-moisture interactions, particularly in online studies. To the best of our knowledge, no online study, characterizing the feedback effects between groundwater management and climate, 229 230 is available at the global scale. Offline representation of groundwater management has mainly been performed in the context of GHMs and involves estimation of available groundwater storage, 231 232 sub-grid groundwater recharge and groundwater withdrawals. In this section, we focus on groundwater availability and recharge and leave the discussion related to groundwater withdrawals 233 234 to Section 3.2.

In current representations, often groundwater availability in general, or the nonrenewable and nonlocal blue water (NNBW) in particular, is assumed as an unlimited local source (e.g., Rost et al., 2008; Biemans et al., 2011; Pokhrel et al., 2012a,b). NNBW is a technical term defined as an "imaginary" source that implicitly accounts for nonrenewable fossil groundwater or other water sources that are not explicitly represented in the model. This can cause major uncertainties in 240 estimation of actual withdrawals (see Section 3.2). Efforts have been made to improve this assumption. For instance, Strzepek et al. (2012) bounded groundwater availability by considering 241 a threshold for groundwater allocation. Wada et al. (2013a) proposed a conceptual linear 242 groundwater reservoir, parameterized globally based on lithology and topography, to estimate the 243 groundwater availability at the grid-scale using the baseflow as a proxy. Although this conceptual 244 representation provides an efficient scheme for global simulations, it ignores the baseflow 245 reduction due to groundwater depletion. In a more recent attempt, Döll et al. (2014) continuously 246 simulated the daily groundwater storage using the difference between groundwater recharge and 247 the sum of baseflow and net groundwater abstraction, with base flow declining with decreasing 248 groundwater storage. Both algorithms, however, do not consider inter-grid lateral groundwater 249 250 movement, which can have an important impact on water availability across various scales. 251 Although lateral groundwater movement is widely studied in aquifer studies at smaller basin and regional scales (e.g., Ye et al., 2013), it is currently a key missing process representation at larger 252 253 regional and global scales (Taylor et al., 2013).

254 Groundwater recharge includes the movement of water from the unsaturated soil zone to a saturated groundwater body. There are a number of approaches to represent the vertical water 255 256 movement in large-scale models, including heuristic methods (e.g., Döll et al., 2003), conceptual 257 "leaky-buckets" (e.g., Wada et al., 2010), or numerical solutions of the physically-based Richards' 258 equation (Best et al., 2011; D. B. Clark et al., 2011). These approaches are based on various 259 assumptions and are subject to large uncertainties. Heuristic schemes relate the recharge rate to surface runoff, using a set of parameters based on catchment, soil and aquifer characteristics. These 260 representations are often simplistic and may result in large estimation errors, particularly in arid 261 and semi-arid regions (Polcher et al., 2011). Conceptual approaches widely assume a steady-state 262 condition and use the unsaturated hydraulic conductivity to represent groundwater recharge with 263 or without considering capillary rise (van Beek and Bierkens, 2008; Wada et al., 2010; van Beek 264 et al., 2011; Wada et al., 2013a; Ye et al., 2013). In a global study, Wada et al. (2012) used this 265 approach to account for additional recharge from irrigated lands based on the unsaturated hydraulic 266 267 conductivity at field capacity. This can be important for representing the excess water diverted 268 from both surface and groundwater sources. Although conceptual representations are efficient for large-scale studies, still limitations remain in these schemes due to large heterogeneities in soil 269 characteristics, a common assumption of steady-state recharge rate, as well as the inherent 270

uncertainty associated with soil hydraulic properties. The physically-based approaches remove the
steady-state assumption; nonetheless as discussed above, they require a detailed numerical scheme
for solving a highly non-linear partial differential equation. This is subject to various
computational difficulties at larger scales, and invariably there is a gap between the scale for which
Richards' equation was developed and the scale at which it is implemented in large-scale
groundwater and hydrologic models (Beven, 2006a; Gentine et al., 2012).

#### 277 2.4 Desalination and water reuse

278 Water reuse and desalination are currently minor water resources at the global scale and have been 279 widely ignored in large-scale models. Nonetheless, it should be noted that these water sources have local relevance and are important in several water-limited regions (Wade Miller, 2006; Pokhrel et 280 al., 2012a). Wada et al. (2011) estimated that annual desalinated water use is around 15 cubic 281 282 kilometers globally, of which Kazakhstan uses 10 percent of the total volume. Desalinated water 283 availability can be estimated using a bottom-up approach based on the information available about treatment and water reuse capacity at the grid-scale (Strzepek et al., 2012). These data, however, 284 are limited and uncertain globally. Alternatively, top-down approaches try to downscale 285 286 countrywide data. Wada et al. (2011, 2013a), for instance, downscaled the countrywide data on water reuse and desalination using a gridded population map. Considering that water reuse and 287 desalination will likely be more important in future due to increased water scarcity at the global 288 289 scale, we suggest more effort in representing these sources, including data collection to support future algorithm developments – see Section 5.3 below. 290

291

# **3 Available representations of water allocation in large-scale models**

Water allocation distributes the available water sources among competing demands and should typically include a set of management decisions to systematically (1) link the prescribed demands to available sources of water; (2) determine allocation objectives as well as priorities in case of water shortage; and (3) withdraw the available water based on allocation objectives and management constraints. At this stage of model development, there are limited examples for representation of water allocation at larger scales. These studies are offline and have multiple sources of uncertainty. Table 1 summarizes some examples from the recent literature. In this section, we briefly discuss the main requirements and available algorithms for representing waterallocation in large-scale models.

#### 302 3.1 Main requirements

303 The first basic requirement is to identify which sources are available to supply the water demands within each computational grid. The majority of current allocation schemes assume that grid-based 304 305 demands can be supplied from the sources available within the local grid. This assumption is intuitive and easy to implement, however, it naturally ignores long distance water transfers. 306 307 Various modifications have been proposed to overcome this limitation. Relative elevation and 308 travel time of water from source to demand have been used to condition demands to available sources upstream. For example, Hanaskai et al. (2006) assumed that large reservoirs can supply 309 downstream demands that are located within 1100 km (based on a travel time of 1 month). 310 311 Similarly, Wada et al. (2011) considered a criterion of approximately 600 km and Biemans et al. (2011) 250 km. These rules are evidently simplistic but can be easily implemented. They also 312 generally assume steady-state conditions, so that the allocated water can be simply abstracted from 313 the source and added at the demand location at the same time step. Alternatively, routing schemes 314 can provide a more accurate basis for representing the water delivery and avoid this limitation -315 see the discussion of Section 5.5 below. 316

317 The second important issue is to determine objectives of and priorities for water allocation, particularly during shortage. In the absence of access to local operating rules, this requires defining 318 319 a set of generic rules to assign the relative preference of each demand and to define the purpose of water allocation. Both irrigative (e.g., Rost et al., 2008; Döll et al., 2009; Wada et al., 2013a) and 320 321 non-irrigative demands (e.g., Hanasaki et al., 2008a; Strzepek et al. 2010, 2012; Blanc et al., 2013) 322 have been given the highest priority. In cases where multiple demands with the same priority are 323 derived from a unique source of water, the deficit is typically shared proportionately to the 324 demands (e.g., Biemans et al., 2011). Based on priorities and assumptions made regarding water 325 availability, several allocation objectives have been used (see Table 1). It should be noted that water resource management is commonly multi-purpose and allocation objectives and priorities 326 can change within a typical operational year. For example, many reservoirs are designed for two 327 conflicting objectives, i.e. irrigation supply and flood control. To account for this, Voisin et al. 328 329 (2013a) used rule curves to drop the reservoir storages before snowmelt starts while maintaining

the storage in the reservoir to provide releases for irrigation, water supply and hydropower in the remaining part of the year. More specifically, they developed flood control storage targets to complement the irrigation release targets, with mass balance conservation. They showed that this modification can improve the simulation of regulated flow and maintain the spatiotemporal consistency of reservoir levels.

Finally, allocation algorithms are required to estimate groundwater abstractions and reservoir 335 336 releases at each simulation time step based on allocation objectives and priorities. Groundwater 337 abstraction algorithms are generally limited, due to significant gaps in information about 338 groundwater availability and actual groundwater withdrawals at the global scale. Although current data availability for lakes and reservoirs storages is also poor, runoff data are relatively available 339 regionally and globally, which can be used for algorithm development and performance 340 341 assessment through comparison of simulated and observed discharges downstream of reservoirs. 342 Apart from local or national data, data of the Global Runoff Data Centre (GRDC; 343 http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/) have been widely used for validation of macro-scale reservoir 344 operation algorithms.

# 345 **3.2 Grid-based groundwater abstractions**

Groundwater abstractions include both sustainable (renewable) and unsustainable (non-renewable) water uses. While sustainability of groundwater withdrawals is a complex issue, in particular related to environmental impacts of abstraction, the distinction between these for large-scale applications is generally based on the grid-based groundwater recharge, as any abstraction exceeding recharge rate results in groundwater depletion, and therefore, can be considered as unsustainable. So far, groundwater withdrawals have been estimated through either bottom-up or top-down algorithms, both subject to large uncertainty.

In bottom-up procedures, the groundwater abstraction is identified using grid-based estimates of surface and groundwater availability as well as the water demand. If the groundwater and/or NNBW is considered as an infinite sources (Rost et al., 2008; Hanasaki et al., 2010; Wisser et al., 2010; Pokhrel et al., 2012a,b), then the groundwater or NNBW abstraction is equal to estimated demand minus estimated water availability at the grid scale. In this case, priorities are not inherently considered; however NNBW has the advantage that it explicitly accounts for the water that should come to the system from outside the modeled domain. If the groundwater availability is bounded at the grid or basin scale, then the maximum groundwater withdrawal cannot exceed the local groundwater availability (e.g. Strzepek et al., 2012; Wada et al., 2013a); however, errors in estimations of surface water availability and water demands can still directly propagate into estimation of groundwater withdrawals.

Top-down approaches are based on using recorded regional groundwater withdrawals or 364 365 downscaling national groundwater abstractions data to finer spatial scales. Siebert et al. (2010) 366 created a global dataset for irrigation water supply from groundwater abstractions based on FAO-367 AQUASTAT (http://www.fao. org/nr/water/aquastat/main/index.stm) and other census and subnational data. In an another effort, Wada et al. (2010, 2012) used the data of the International 368 Groundwater Resources Assessment Center (IGRAC; www.igrac.net) to estimate the countrywide 369 370 groundwater use for year 2000. These estimates were further downscaled to  $0.5^{\circ} \times 0.5^{\circ}$  grids, based 371 on a global map of yearly total water demand. In a countywide study, Blanc et al. (2013) used the groundwater withdrawal data of the USGS for the year 2005 (USGS, 2011) and repeated the data 372 373 for every year of simulation. These approaches are also limited by the fact that the actual groundwater pumping might be considerably more than the recorded data (e.g., Foster and Loucks, 374 375 2006; Wada et al., 2012) and groundwater withdrawals can have considerable inter-annual 376 variability. Current and upcoming remote sensing technologies can address some of the issues 377 around groundwater data availability - see Section 5.3 below.

#### 378 3.3 Macro-scale reservoir operation

379 Current macro-scale reservoir operation algorithms are designed for offline applications and 380 included in large-scale models for characterizing the impacts of reservoirs on terrestrial water storage, runoff and water supply. These algorithms can be roughly divided into two general 381 382 categories based on either simulating the reservoir release using a set of prescribed operational 383 rules or using search algorithms to find optimal reservoir release. In brief, simulation-based 384 schemes are based on a set of functional rules that use initial storage as well as inflows and demand pressure during a typical operational period to simulate releases during the operational period. In 385 contrast, optimization-based algorithms search for optimal releases at each time step given an ideal 386 387 storage at the end of the operational year, storage at the beginning of the year and expected inflows 388 and demands during the year. Naturally, optimization-based algorithms are more computationally expensive; nonetheless, they are more suitable for evaluating competition among water demands and effects of policy change, due to the ability to explicitly include multiple allocation objectives to guide the search for optimal releases. In contrast, simulation-based algorithms are more efficient and can be potentially modified to support online simulations – see Section 5.4. Table 2 summarizes some representative examples from the current literature.

#### 394 **3.3.1 Available simulation-based algorithms**

Current simulation-based algorithms are heavily influenced by the work of Hanasaki et al. (2006), 395 396 which was initially proposed for global routing models but extended to GHMs (Hanasaki et al., 397 2008a, 2010) and LSMs (Pokhrel et al., 2012a,b). The algorithm distinguishes between operational rules for irrigation and non-irrigation purposes. The algorithm also accounts for both inter-annual 398 variability and seasonality in reservoir releases. In simple terms, the total release in a typical 399 400 operational year is first determined based on the reservoir capacity, initial storage and the annual 401 mean natural inflow to the reservoir. Second, the monthly fluctuations in the reservoir release are parameterized based on annual mean natural inflow, mean annual demand and the prescribed 402 monthly demand. Note that demands are considered as total water withdrawals rather than 403 consumptive uses. Finally, monthly fluctuations are corrected based on inter-annual variability in 404 total reservoir releases (estimated during the first step) to provide actual monthly reservoir 405 releases. The correction, depending on the purpose and size of reservoir, is based on the ratio of 406 407 initial reservoir storage to total capacity, the ratio of reservoir capacity to annual mean inflow, and/or the monthly mean natural inflows to the reservoir – see Hanasaki et al. (2006) for related 408 formulations. 409

410 Hanasaki et al.'s algorithm has been widely used in the recent literature as it provides a generic 411 and flexible framework to represent reservoir operation. Döll et al. (2009) implemented this 412 algorithm to represent operation of large reservoirs within the framework of WaterGAP (Alcamo et al., 2003). They considered some modifications to accommodate losses from the reservoir and 413 414 to characterize the dynamics of demand pressure on reservoirs based on consumptive uses rather than total water withdrawals. Biemans et al. (2011) modified Hanasaki et al.'s algorithm by 415 extracting the reservoir releases using annual and monthly mean regulated inflows (rather than 416 corresponding natural flows), limiting the demand pressure only to irrigation and changing the 417 release rules during high demand periods. These modifications were further added to the Joint UK 418

419 Land Environment Simulator (JULES; Best et al., 2011, D. B. Clark et al., 2011) for offline 420 simulations (Polcher et al., 2011). Voisin et al. (2013a) made a regional intercomparison between 421 various simulation-based algorithms for the Columbia River Basin and concluded that deriving 422 releases based on withdrawals rather than consumptive uses results in improved simulations of 423 downstream flows. They also indicated that the choice of natural or regulated inflows depends on 424 the severity of the demand pressure and water allocation: If the overall water demand is high with 425 respect to mean annual inflow, it would be better to drive the algorithm with mean monthly regulated inflow; otherwise it is better to use the natural flow, due to large uncertainties associated 426 with water demand estimates, and therefore, regulated flows. Although this study is limited to one 427 428 region, it provided an assessment of uncertainties in estimating the reservoir releases due to uncertainties in estimating both inflows and water demand – see the discussion of Section 4. 429

430 Existing simulation-based schemes are not limited to the above algorithms. Efforts have been made 431 to simulate the reservoir releases using parametric functions, in which the parameters can be 432 calibrated using observed downstream flows. For example, Wisser et al. (2010) advised a set of 433 functional rules to parameterize the release from large reservoirs using the actual inflow and the long-term mean inflow to the reservoirs. More recently, Wu and Chen (2012) proposed a new 434 algorithm by explicit consideration of operational rule curves, locally specified for each reservoir. 435 In brief, rule curves are a set of pre-defined reservoir levels that divide the total reservoir capacity 436 437 into different storage zones. These storage zones can be further associated with demands 438 conditioned on the reservoir using various assumptions. The algorithm considers the reservoir operation at a given day as a deviation from mean releases at that day and represents this by a 439 weighted sum of individual variations as the result of allocation for each individual water demand. 440 Demand-specific allocations can be therefore characterized based on rule curves, the available 441 storage, total capacity as well as the history of inflow to the reservoir. Accordingly the total release 442 443 at any given day can be defined as a parametric function, in which the parameters can be tuned using observed downstream flows. Although they noted that the operational parameters are 444 445 inherently time-varying, as the purpose of dam can change with time, a systematic scheme for dealing with non-stationary parametric estimation has not been provided. This remains for future 446 447 efforts – see Section 5.4.

## 448 **3.3.2 Available optimization-based algorithms**

449 Optimization-based schemes were initially proposed by Haddeland et al. (2006a) and implemented 450 further in Haddeland et al. (2006b, 2007). These algorithms are heavily inspired by small-scale 451 reservoir operation algorithms within the engineering literature, particularly Dynamic 452 Programming (see Voisin et al., 2013a), and strongly rely on estimates of expected inflow and demand. Therefore, they are not suitable for online simulations, however they can be valuable for 453 integrated impact assessment over large grids and/or assessment regions in offline mode (see e.g., 454 455 Strzepek et al., 2010; 2012; Blanc et al., 2013). In brief, the calculation starts by targeting the reservoir storage at the end of a typical operational year based on expected demands. Then, the 456 minimum release at each daily time step is defined based on the expected streamflow at the dam's 457 458 location to maintain a minimum flow requirement downstream of the reservoir. Accordingly, the 459 maximum allowable daily release is determined based on simulated daily inflow, minimum 460 release, reservoir storage at the beginning of the operational year and the targeted storage at the end of the year. Minimum and maximum releases introduce a feasible release range, where a search 461 algorithm can be used to find the optimal monthly releases that provide the minimum deficit during 462 the year and the least violation from the target storage at the end of the year. Adam et al. (2007) 463 464 slightly changed this algorithm by considering new thresholds for allowable release and storage and used maximization of hydropower revenue as the objective function for reservoir operation. 465

There are two main issues with the proposed scheme. First, feasible reservoir releases are 466 467 determined based on forecasted (or expected - Haddeland, 2014; personal communication) flow 468 at dam location; and uncertainties in flow estimates can largely affect the search for optimal releases. Second, a high dimensional search (e.g. 12 releases in the case of a monthly release 469 simulation) must be performed for each operational year, which is computationally demanding. 470 These issues were noted by van Beek et al. (2011). They modified the Haddeland et al. (2006a) 471 algorithm to decrease the complexity and uncertainty associated with the algorithm. First, they 472 defined the expected inflow for each month prospectively as a function of the flow in the same 473 474 month of the previous years; therefore, they omitted using prognostic flow forecasts. In order to reduce the dimensionality of search, they considered reservoir release as a harmonic function; 475 therefore, only release at beginnings of the release and the discharge periods needed to be 476 477 determined. As the actual inflow values become available, the release can be consequently updated so that the final storage at the end of release period can meet the predefined target storage. With 478 respect to determining the reservoir inflow based on naturalized or regulated flows, van Beek et 479

al. (2011) noted that either set-ups can be used, depending on how the observed discharge is
simulated at the large-scale. This is due to large uncertainties in simulating the regulated runoff –
see the discussion below.

483

#### 484 **4 Current large-scale modeling applications**

Water supply and allocation schemes reviewed in Sections 2 and 3 have been used in a wide range 485 486 of offline applications for estimation of human impacts on the terrestrial water cycle. Despite disagreements between different simulation results, the current literature agrees that the effects of 487 488 water allocation are more pronounced at finer spatial and temporal scales. As an earlier, Haddeland et al. (2007) studied the impacts of reservoir operation coupled with irrigation on continental runoff 489 490 and argued that water allocation has resulted in 2.5 and 6 percent increase in annual runoff volume in North America and Asia, respectively. This is almost canceled out by increased evaporation due 491 492 to irrigation. Nonetheless, as the analysis moves from global and continental to regional and large catchment scales, the effects of water allocation become more profound. For instance, while the 493 494 mean annual runoff decreased in the western US by around 9 percent during a historical control period, the rate of decrement is around 37 percent in the Colorado River during the same period 495 (Haddeland et al., 2006b). The results of the most recent global multi-model intercomparison 496 497 showed that direct impacts of the water resource management in some regions, e.g., parts of Asia 498 and in the western US, are similar or even more than the climate change effects (see Haddeland et al., 2014). Similarly, the effects of water allocation are more significant at finer time scales. For 499 instance, Adam et al. (2007) noted that reservoirs have a minor effect on annual flows in Eurasian 500 watersheds but have significant seasonal effects by changing the flow timing and seasonal 501 amplitudes (see also Döll et al., 2009; van Beek et al., 2011, Biemans et al., 2011). 502

These simulations, however, are highly uncertain (see e.g., Haddeland et al., 2011, 2014) due to major limitations in algorithms reviewed above, host large-scale models and data support. The efficiency of available water allocation algorithms can be diagnosed by comparing the streamflow obtained from simulations with observations. Currently, macro-scale water allocation schemes cannot fully describe the dynamics of regulated streamflows and there can be major disagreements between the regulated discharges obtained from different reservoir algorithms (Voisin et al., 2013a). It has been shown that calibration can improve the quality of reservoir operation 510 algorithms (e.g. Wu and Chen, 2012); however, calibration is also associated with uncertainty and can potentially hinder model applications for future projections due to possible temporal and 511 spatial variations in optimal parameters. Hanasaki et al. (2006) as well as Döll et al. (2009) showed 512 that simulation-based algorithms can generally provide improved discharge simulations compared 513 to lake routing algorithms. However, it should be noted that simulations still remain substantially 514 biased in highly regulated catchments (e.g. San Francisco River, US; Syr Darya, Central Asia) and 515 in cold regions (e.g. Saskatchewan and Churchill Rivers in Canada), particularly during high flows 516 (e.g. Hanasaki et al., 2008a; Biemans et al., 2011; Pokhrel et al., 2012a). The simulation algorithm 517 of Wu and Chen (2012) was found to be more accurate in simulating both storage and release 518 519 compared to simple multi-linear regression and the target-release scheme embedded in SWAT (Arnold et al., 1998); however, it was tested only at the local scale and it is not clear how the 520 521 algorithm can perform in other regions with different climate, level of regulation and allocation objectives. Very similar conclusions were obtained for optimization-based algorithms. Discharge 522 simulations are generally improved compared to the no reservoir condition (e.g., Haddeland et al., 523 2006a); however, there are still significant deficiencies in simulating highly regulated flows, 524 525 particularly in mountainous and cold regions such as Colorado River in the US as well as Yukon and Mackenzie Rivers in Canada (e.g., Haddeland et al., 2006b; Adam et al., 2007). This relates 526 527 in particular to prognostic reservoir inflows, which remain highly uncertain in these environments; this uncertainty contributes to the uncertainty in assigning optimal reservoir releases, often in 528 529 dynamic and complex manners (Nazemi and Wheater, 2014c; Muller Schmied et al. 2014).

From a broader perspective, the current performance of reservoir operation and water allocation 530 algorithms must be seen in the context of the hydrological performance of the host large-scale 531 models, including how well the water demand has been represented (see Nazemi and Wheater, 532 2014a). Currently, there are large biases in modeling hydrological processes across various scale 533 and runoff estimates remain widely divergent (e.g., Wisser et al., 2010; Haddeland et al., 2011; 534 Gudmundsson et al., 2012; Hejazi et al., 2013). In particular, it has been shown that current 535 simulations systematically underestimate streamflow in the arctic and sub-arctic regions and 536 overestimate the observations in dry catchments; and reservoir operation algorithms mainly 537 538 improve the timing of the flow, but not the volume (e.g., van Beek et al., 2011). While there are many potential reasons for this, one key source of this limitation is the quality of gridded 539 precipitation products (Biemans et al., 2009; 2011). Rost et al. (2008) used different precipitation 540

products to simulate the regulated river discharge and found substantial variations in simulated discharge due to the choice of precipitation data. Moreover, they showed that sometimes the total precipitation estimate could be less than the total observed discharge after abstraction and regulation. Upcoming satellite missions can address some of the issues regarding historical forcing (see the discussion of Section 5.3); however, uncertainty in future precipitation (and other climate variables) should be dealt systematically using multiple climate forcing options based on various combinations of concentration pathways, climate models and downscaling procedures.

548 Turning from surface water to groundwater issues, almost all available global studies agree on a significant increasing trend in groundwater withdrawal from the late 20<sup>th</sup> century onward. As an 549 example, Wada et al. (2013a) argued that from 1990 to 2010, the rate of global groundwater 550 withdrawal increased by around 3 percent a year. These results are in relatively good agreement 551 552 with major observed depletions in some regional aquifers (see Gleeson et al., 2012). However, 553 various quantified assessments and further conclusions such as regarding groundwater-induced 554 sea-level rise remain highly uncertain and show major disagreements due to crude representation 555 of groundwater availability, recharge and withdrawal, as discussed in Sections 2.3 and 3.2 (see e.g., Wada et al., 2010; Pokhrel et al., 2012b; Döll et al., 2014). This highlights an urgent necessity 556 557 for improving the representation of human-groundwater interactions at larger scales.

558

# 559 **5 Towards an improved representation of water resource management in large**-560 **scale models**

## 561 **5.1 Ideal representation and remaining gaps**

Throughout our survey, we highlighted the importance of including water supply and allocation in 562 563 conjunction with water demand (see Nazemi and Wheater, 2014a) in models that are relevant to 564 Earth system modeling and/or are required for understanding the effects of water resource management on the Earth System, with both online and offline implications. From an integrated 565 566 water resource management and land-surface modeling perspective, water demands can be considered as functions of climate, vegetation and soil-moisture as well as socio-economic and 567 policy variables (see Nazemi and Wheater, 2014a). As shown in this paper, water supply is driven 568 by water demands but controlled by natural surface and ground water availability, which determine 569

570 the maximum possible water allocation. Therefore, water demand and water supply should be systematically linked through a feedback loop, represented by water allocation. This integrated 571 572 water resource system should be then linked to natural land-surface processes at the grid scale. 573 This is rather intuitive: When considered in a typical grid, water allocation perturbs hydrological 574 and land-surface variables within the grid. In parallel, the combined effects of land-surface and hydrological processes govern the variations in surface and ground water availability, which 575 576 consequently determine water demand (and accordingly water allocation) in the next simulation step. Figure 1 shows a simplified schematic for this integrated modeling framework, in which grid-577 based calculations of natural and anthropogenic land-surface are further coupled with climate 578 579 through grid-based land-atmospheric feedbacks.

580 Major gaps remain in representing water resource management in LSMs in the way defined above. 581 First, as also discussed in Nazemi and Wheater (2014a), the key consideration in Earth System 582 modeling is the conservation of mass, energy and water; however, this is widely violated in current 583 models that include elements of water resource management (see Polcher, 2014). For instance, 584 considering groundwater or NNBW as unlimited water sources necessitates bringing water to the 585 system from outside the modeling domain, breaking the assumption that the Earth System is a closed system. This has particular importance when understanding the effects of human-water 586 interactions on the climate and sea-level rise is sought. 587

588 Second, water resource management often takes place at the sub-grid resolution of current LSMs 589 used for simulations over large regional and global scales (i.e., 50 kilometers and more). Including 590 the elements of water resource management therefore requires moving towards a "hyperresolution" scale (a few kilometers or less) for explicit representation (see Wood et al., 591 2011) and/or adding new sub-grid parameterizations related to human-water interactions, as 592 illustrated in Figure 1. However, as the resolutions become finer or more sub-grid parameterization 593 594 are added, modeling complexity, computational burdens and data requirements increase 595 significantly, particularly in online simulation in which finer modeling resolution and better discretization of soil and vegetation is generally required to capture land-atmospheric feedbacks 596 and possible climate responses (see Sorooshian et al., 2011a). 597

598 Third, we have noted that all currently available efforts in including water supply and allocation 599 in large-scale models are offline and have been made mainly in the context of GHMs. GHMs

20

provide an efficient platform for algorithm development and testing given the relative lack of computational constraints. However, self-evidently understanding online effects of large reservoir storage and large-scale groundwater pumping needs online simulations using coupled LSMs. At this stage of model development, however, many algorithms originally designed for offline applications might not be suitable for online implementations. An important example is reservoir operation, as both optimization- and simulation-based algorithms have some levels of prognosis that hinder their application in coupled simulations.

Fourth, online applications are associated with complexity in representing various feedbacks and time-scaling mismatch among different LSM component and water resource management (see Wang et al., 2004). In addition, current performance of online simulations is limited due to significant biases across different components and propagation of these biases throughout the fully coupled system.

612 Fifth, we have highlighted major limitations even in offline representation of water resource management at larger scales due to various sources of uncertainty. These uncertainties are due to 613 (1) data support, particularly with respect to precipitation, actual water use and land-surface 614 615 characteristics; (2) water demand, supply and allocation algorithms, particularly with respect to 616 irrigation demand estimation, reservoir operation and groundwater withdrawals; as well as (3) host large-scale models, particularly with respect to those calculations that determine surface and 617 ground water availability. It should be noted that here we only focus on epistemic sources of 618 619 uncertainty, which needs to be addressed, quantified, communicated and possibly reduced (see 620 Beven and Alcock, 2012). Table 3 summarizes various aspects of uncertainty related to data support, algorithmic procedures and host models, identified for estimation of water demand (see 621 622 Nazemi and Wheater, 2014a) as well as water supply and allocation (see Sections 2 to 4) in offline mode. It is often quite difficult to identify the exact source of uncertainty due to complex 623 624 interconnections between various elements; and currently, a formal framework to test and validate 625 the water resource management components in the face of various sources of uncertainty is not available (see also Beven and Cloke, 2012). In following sections, we briefly focus on these gaps 626 627 and highlight the opportunities to address them and move towards the integrated representation proposed in Figure 1. 628

# **5.2** Outstanding challenges – closing the water balance and online simulations

630 At this stage of research, issues around closing the water balance and online simulations are the most fundamental challenges in representing water resource management in Earth System models. 631 632 Closing the water balance requires considering all the sources of human water withdrawals and uses in the system and integrating them into the host large-scale models. One major gap in 633 representing the water sources is groundwater, which is ignored or crudely represented in most 634 current models. In parallel, as noted above, performing online simulations requires moving 635 636 towards finer spatial and temporal scales and handling various sources of bias within the integrated system. Although providing an extensive discussion on issues around integrating groundwater 637 models with LSMs as well as online Earth System modeling remains beyond the scope of this 638 639 paper, here we attempt to briefly point to the main challenges and highlight a few opportunities for future developments. 640

641 Technically, the issues around coupling LSMs with groundwater and/or climate models are rather 642 similar. In principle, (1) both require couplers to build an integrated model from independent 643 models; (2) both require refining temporal and spatial resolutions; (3) both substantially increase 644 the complexity of calculations; (4) both need research in terms of improving and adding new algorithms for process representations; and finally (5) both require handling various sources of 645 uncertainty. Research on coupling individual models in an integrated Earth System modeling 646 framework is ongoing and currently there are various coupling strategies available (e.g., Dunlop 647 648 et al., 2014). One challenge in coupling the elements of water resource management with climate 649 is the mismatch between temporal scales of water resource management and natural cycles in the Earth System (Wang et al., 2004; Michetti and Zampieri, 2014). For instance, capturing the online 650 651 effects of evaporation from reservoirs requires running the climate model with fine temporal resolution; although the reservoir evaporation is mainly a function of reservoir temperature and 652 area, which vary slowly. Research, therefore, should be done to compare and optimize existing 653 654 coupling strategies to handle such inconsistencies in time scaling.

One major need for representing groundwater and for online simulations is the necessity for moving towards finer spatial resolutions. This can result in various challenges. First, even if the spatial resolution increases, several sources of heterogeneity would still be ignored, as current LSMs do not consider them. For instance, LSMs usually define plant species based on Plant Functional Types (PFTs), within which all parameters are identical. However, current LSMs recognize only limited PFTs and hence they typically ignore much of the biodiversity (Sato et al., 661 2014). Improvement in LSMs in terms of adding more detail into land-surface parameterization 662 can provide opportunities to represent such sources of heterogeneity. Second, going toward finer 663 modeling resolutions requires improved data support at finer scales. Although, fine resolution data are becoming more and more available (e.g., for soil properties - see Sato et al., 2014), such 664 datasets are normally obtained from multiple independent sources, which differ in terms of their 665 quality (see S. Liu et al., 2013). More efforts towards producing standardized and accurate data 666 667 sources can support future fine-grid Earth System modeling. Finally, moving towards finer scales requires a new set of process representations and parameterizations (Hurrell et al., 2013). There 668 are new developments along scale-aware parameterizations (e.g., Hurrell et al. 2009) that can help 669 670 refine parameterizations for finer spatial scales.

One important issue with online simulations and groundwater modeling is the computational 671 672 complexities compared to offline surface water simulations (e.g. Hill et al., 2004; Kollet et al., 673 2010; Wood et al., 2011). Wehner et al. (2008) suggested opportunities to address computational 674 burdens, including hardware design (i.e., building enhanced computer processors for a specific 675 application) and use of distributed and grid systems. A wide range of applications exists for grid 676 and cloud computing systems (see Schwiegelshohn et al., 2010; Lecca et al., 2011; Fernández-677 Quiruelas et al., 2011). Improved computational power can also provide a basis to explore various model resolutions to identify critical scales for process representations (see Gentine et al., 2012) 678 679 and to support computationally expensive offline calculations, such as groundwater processes, 680 dynamic crop growth, river routing and model calibration (e.g. von Bloh et al., 2010; Rouholahnejad et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2013). 681

Understanding and handling various sources of uncertainty requires activities towards evaluating 682 model performance against observations, which includes new diagnostics for systematic 683 assessments of the modeling system. One key challenge is the fact that LSMs are run over large 684 grids, whereas validation data for land-surface variables and groundwater can be only obtained at 685 local scales. There are several attempts to overcome this issue. For instance, FLUXNET 686 (daac.ornl.gov/FLUXNET/fluxnet.shtml) coordinates regional and global analyses of observations 687 688 from micrometeorological tower sites to fill validation gap for online LSMs. As Sato et al. (2014) indicated, such observation networks can facilitate diagnosing the LSMs efficiency and sources of 689 errors over large geographical scales. Moreover, a large number of combinations of model 690 configurations should be tested to ensure reliability and performance of individual components 691

and characterize the bias propagation from one component to others (Hurrell et al., 2013). For that purpose, it should be noted that increased modeling complexity does not necessarily result in an improved precision (see Sato et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2014); therefore, a systematic approach is required to test, intercompare and falsify modeling options in the light of validation data available.

This will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.6.

#### 697 **5.3 Data support**

As noted through our survey, major data limitations exist in representing various aspects of water resource management, which are related to forcing, parameterization, calibration and validation of water demand, supply and allocation algorithms (see also Table 3). At this stage of research, major gaps are noted in spatial and temporal quality and coverage of the data related to climate, hydrology, socio-economy, policy and water resource management that are required to drive or to support large-scale models (see Wood et al., 2011; Gleick et al., 2013; Oki et al., 2013).

704 One important opportunity to improve data support is the use of remote sensing technology, which 705 can provide a synoptic view of the state of land-surface and atmospheric variables (see Sorooshian 706 et al., 2011b; Asrar et al., 2013) and a reliable data support for dynamic forcing, parameter estimation as well as evaluation of large-scale models (see Dijk and Renzullo, 2011; Trenberth 707 and Asrar, 2012). For instance, Landsat missions (http://landsat.gsfc.nasa.gov; see Williams et al. 708 709 2006) have captured long-term variations in global land-cover with a temporal resolution of 16 days and spatial resolution of up to 30 meter, which can help to parameterize anthropogenic 710 711 activities such as crop growth and reservoir area. More recently, passive MODerate Resolution 712 Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS; http://modis.gsfc.nasa.gov; see Savtchenko et al., 2004) 713 provide a wide range of land-surface information and have already been applied for various largescale modeling studies, including validation of online models (Sorooshian et al., 2011a), high 714 715 resolution parameterization (Ke et al., 2012) and monitoring storage in large reservoirs (Gao et al., 716 2012). Assimilation of MODIS land measurements with meteorological data and the Penman-717 Monteith equation has also provided 8-day, monthly and annual evapotranspiration estimates at 1 km resolution globally (Mu et al., 2007, 2011). This can provide a basis to evaluate simulated 718 evapotranspiration over land-surface (see Section 5.4). Another important product is the Gravity 719 720 Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE; http://www.csr.utexas.edu/grace/; see Tapley et al., 721 2004), measuring changes in the total terrestrial water storage at rather coarser resolutions.

GRACE data have already been used in studies related to regional groundwater depletion (e.g.,
Rodell et al., 2007, 2009), model calibration (e.g., Sun et al., 2012) and validation of large-scale
simulations (e.g., Pokhrel et al., 2012a,b; Döll et al., 2014).

725 Upcoming satellite missions can further support representation of water resources management. 726 For instance, precipitation is a key limitation in hydrological modeling in general, but is also important for irrigation demand and scheduling. The upcoming Global Precipitation Measurement 727 728 mission (GPM; http://gpm.nasa.gov) will collect data at 10km resolution, every 3 hours, globally. 729 The upcoming Soil Moisture Active Passive mission (SMAP; see Entekhabi et al. 2010) will 730 provide improved global soil moisture measurements every 24 hours without sensitivity to cloud 731 cover. This can be considered as an important data support for irrigation demand algorithms. Another upcoming remote sensing mission is the Surface Water and Ocean Topography mission 732 733 (SWOT; see Fu et al., 2009; Biancamaria et al., 2010; Durand et al., 2010), which will provide 734 fine-scale measurements of various surface water stores, including reservoirs as well as natural 735 and man-made channels. Such information at the global scale has the potential to revolutionize 736 representation, calibration and validation of algorithms related to estimation of inflow to 737 reservoirs, reservoir releases and inter-basin water transfers.

738 There are also important improvements in sharing ground-based data and simulation results, including some inspiring grass-root data collection efforts. For example, the International 739 Groundwater Resources Assessment Centre (IGRAC; www.un-igrac.org) assigns an associate 740 741 expert to each one-degree grid cell to submit monthly groundwater levels. Such data can be a 742 critical source for testing groundwater withdrawal algorithms. Similar grass-root efforts could be 743 made to record other water resource management data, particularly with respect to actual (rather than licensed) water uses, local management policies and water technologies. We also note that 744 sharing of gridded climate forcing and simulation results is important and provides a basis for 745 746 consistent model intercomparison efforts. One example is the recently finished EU-WATCH program (http://www.eu-watch.org/), which provides forcing and simulation results of WATCH's 747 Model Intercomparison Project (WaterMIP; http://www.eu-watch.org/watermip). 748

## 749 **5.4 Water resource management algorithms**

25

Computational algorithms for representing the elements of water resource management have various sources of uncertainty (see Table 3) and improving the related representations and reducing the modeling uncertainty can be considered as an important avenue for future developments. Some important opportunities include enhancing the simulation-based reservoir operation algorithms for online applications and various applications of calibration, data assimilation and system identification techniques.

756 One crucial limitation of current reservoir operation algorithms, as noted above, is in 757 online applications. Simulation-based schemes provide a basis to move forward, however, modifications are required to relax prognostic inputs and to represent the thermal and 758 evaporative functions of reservoirs for online applications. Modeling schemes have been 759 already developed for representing energy balance of natural lakes at sub-grid scale (e.g., 760 MacKay, 2011; MacKay and Seglenieks, 2013) and can be merged with improved 761 simulation-based reservoir operation algorithms to simultaneously characterize reservoir 762 release, storage and evaporation as well as land-atmospheric feedbacks. However, an 763 764 important question remains in how to address substantial biases in estimation of reservoir release due to the uncertainty in estimation of reservoir inflows, particularly in online 765 766 simulations. This issue can be partially handled using data assimilation frameworks; but 767 substantial uncertainty remains in future simulation, where assimilation is not possible. 768 Therefore, efforts should be made to represent reservoirs in a robust manner that can handle 769 the inflow biases.

770 Calibration using observed, simulated or assimilated system behavior can be used to • 771 implicitly represent management and sub-grid heterogeneity. One example would be to address diversity in irrigation demand by finding "representative parameters" that match 772 773 the assimilated evaporation over a typical irrigated grid. Calibration with ability to identify time-varying parameters could also be used to improve the performance of reservoir 774 operation algorithms and provide a basis to account for variations in water allocation 775 practice in time and potentially in space by considering functioning of multiple reservoirs. 776 Another opportunity is to improve functional mappings of system response and demand 777 • 778 through system identification techniques. These techniques can range from statistical 779 regression models to more sophisticated machine-learning techniques such as artificial 780 neural networks (e.g., Nazemi et al., 2006a) and genetic symbolic regression (e.g.,

Hassanzadeh et al., 2014). One example would be building functional relationships for 781 782 estimation of irrigative or non-irrigative water demands and/or uses. Another would be to 783 represent reservoir operations through transfer functions and enhanced rule-based models as well as building different decision support systems for handling operations taking place 784 at different time scales (i.e. hydropower with a 5-minute market, floods with sub-hourly to 785 hourly time step, and monthly seasonal water supply). This can provide an interesting 786 prospect to extract operational rules from observed data and to incorporate soft variables 787 such as social values and expert insights into modeling water resource management (e.g., 788 Nazemi et al., 2002). This can provide various opportunities, for instance for describing 789 790 the operation of multiple reservoirs at the basin scale, which is widely ignored in the current large-scale reservoir operation schemes. 791

#### 792 **5.5 Host models**

793 Limitations in host models can introduce a wide range of uncertainties (see Table 3). This is due to the fact that water resource management algorithms are fully embedded within the host models 794 and interact with calculations related to land-surface process at the grid scale (see Figure 1). For 795 instance, estimation of antecedent soil moisture affects estimation of irrigation demand. Similarly, 796 797 estimates of inflows to reservoirs govern the calculations related to reservoir releases and storage. Currently, there are major limitations in representing soil moisture, snow cover, permafrost, 798 evapotranspiration, deep percolation and runoff in large-scale models and they cannot be 799 800 represented without large uncertainty (Lawrence et al., 2012; Trenberth and Asrar, 2012; Oki et 801 al., 2013). Moreover, host models often contain missing processes. For instance, current host 802 models often ignore the effects of increased  $CO_2$  concentration on irrigation demand. This may 803 result in large uncertainties under climate change effects (see Wada et al., 2013b).

While an extensive review of these issues goes beyond the scope of this paper, we note that substantial efforts continue to be made to include missing processes and to improve current parameterizations of natural and anthropogenic processes in large-scale models, particularly in the context of LSMs. For instance, the Community Land Model (CLM; Oleson et al., 2004; 2008; Lawrence et al., 2011) has been recently improved by new algorithms for representing permafrost (Swenson et al., 2012), agriculture (Drewniak et al., 2013) and irrigation (Levis and Sacks, 2011; Levis et al., 2012). Another important development is the vector-based river routing algorithms

(e.g. Li et al., 2013a,b) that can improve the representation of natural and anthropogenic channel 811 processes such as reservoir stores, streamflow diversions and inter-basin water transfers (see 812 Lehner and Grill, 2013). Another key opportunity is the application of data assimilation and/or 813 calibration techniques to reduce parametric uncertainty and to improve prediction capability. Some 814 systematic frameworks for calibration and parameterization of land-surface processes are 815 suggested (Rosolem et al. 2012, 2013). We expect improvements in process representations and 816 parameterizations related to LSMs will increase in near future due to the need that has been already 817 recognized (e.g., Wood et al., 2011; Lawrence et al., 2012; Trenberth and Asrar, 2012; Gleick et 818 819 al., 2013; Oki et al., 2013; Dadson et al., 2013).

## 820 **5.6 A framework to move forward**

821 Several improvements need to be made in order to appropriately represent the elements of water resource management in Earth System models. We noted that moving towards including the 822 823 elements of water resource management in a way described in Figure 1 requires continuous 824 developments in water resource management algorithms, host LSMs, online land-atmospheric 825 coupling and data support. We pointed to the main gaps and provided a brief overview on the 826 opportunities for overcoming these limitations. As far as the algorithms related to representing 827 water resource management are concerned, Table 4 summarizes improvements that need to be made before we can properly represent human-water interaction in Earth System models, along 828 with targeted temporal and spatial resolutions. Modeling resolutions can vary across various 829 elements of water resource managements due to the difference in how different elements affect 830 831 water and energy balance at the land-surface. For instance, irrigation and crop growth directly 832 affect both energy and water balance at the sub-grid scale, with substantial difference between crop function during a day. Therefore, irrigation should be represented at a fine temporal and 833 spatial resolution to capture potential climate responses. Reservoirs also affect water and energy 834 balance; however, as noted above reservoir area and surface temperature vary slowly and therefore 835 there is no need to approach a finer time-scale than the scale needed for representing the water 836 837 balance and downstream releases.

As noted throughout our survey, a variety of modeling options for representing key elements of water resource management at larger scales is currently available and new details about natural 840 and anthropogenic processes are continually being added to Earth System models. Nonetheless, major limitations exist in current data, algorithms and host models, which induce major biases 841 842 within components and complicate uncertainty quantification and model tractability. At this juncture, a primary task for model development should be to test and compare different data and 843 modeling alternatives in an integrated system. This requires considering model hierarchy and the 844 links between different components and exploring individual and integrated model space with 845 respect to accuracy, identifiability and capability for generalization. This, in turn, can direct where 846 future attempts should be focused to reduce uncertainties further (see also Smith et al., 2014; 847 Michetti and Zampieri, 2014). Guidelines are available for (1) considering multiple working 848 hypotheses for supporting and representing relevant sub-processes and modeling component; (2) 849 850 constructing different simulations based on various combinations of the considered options and (3) rejecting them if they fail to describe new data, violate their underlying assumptions and/or can 851 be equally described by simpler models (M. P. Clark et al., 2011; see Popper, 1959). Modular 852 853 systems, such as the recently released WRF-Hydro (Gochis et al., 2013), are particularly suitable for building such a framework as they provide a tool for constructing/falsifying different 854 hypotheses for process representations, parameterizations and data support in a unified 855 computational platform. 856

857 To address this and to move towards the integrated representation of water resource management 858 in LSMs, suggested in Figure 1, we propose a systematic framework for improving the 859 incorporation of water resource management through building, testing and falsifying various modeling options. Figure 2 shows this framework based on the links between different modeling 860 components. In brief, Figure 2 divides the model development into six components, related to (A) 861 modeling set-up and data configuration, (B) climate modeling, (C) land-surface modeling, (D) 862 water resource management representation, (E) calibration and parametric identification, as well 863 as (F) testing and falsification. The framework starts with prior knowledge (A), coming from the 864 modeling purpose, current modeling capabilities and limitations and the knowledge obtained from 865 previous modeling attempts. According to the prior knowledge and emerging advancements, a 866 867 range of modeling scales can be selected and multiple working hypotheses can be configured to 868 represent the data and modeling options in (B) to (E). Depending on the mode and period of simulation, climate data or more generally climate models (B) are required to force or to be coupled 869 with land-surface processes. The land-surface component (C) includes relevant sub-modules 870

871 related to natural processes, water supply and allocation and irrigative and non-irrigative 872 withdrawals. The anthropogenic activities are controlled by the water resource management 873 component (D), which requires inputs from land-surface and climate components to determine water availability and to estimate various demands with the aid of these and/or other proxies (priori 874 knowledge). Rules for prioritizing, partitioning and allocating water demands are reflected in a 875 management decisions sub-module that further drives water allocation in the land-surface 876 modeling component. Sub-modules within (C) and (D) often contain unknown parameters that 877 need to be identified through prior knowledge or calibration. As a result, calibration and parameter 878 identification algorithms (E) with capability for further uncertainty assessment are a key 879 880 requirement. Population-based optimization algorithms are particularly suitable for parameter identification as they provide a range of behavioral parameters, which can be analyzed through 881 882 advanced visualization schemes and provide valuable insights into modeling uncertainty, identifiability and multiple performance measures (e.g. Nazemi et al., 2006b, 2008; Pryke et al., 883 2007). Moreover, population-based algorithms can provide methodological linkage to uncertainty 884 assessment through various diagnostic tests. Guidelines are provided to test and falsify models 885 886 through various evaluation criteria such as parametric identifiability (e.g. Beven, 2006b), Pareto optimality (Gupta et al., 1998), predictive uncertainty (Wagener et al. 2004) and limits of 887 888 acceptability (Beven and Alcock, 2012).

889 Due to the current stage of model development, there is a need to approach the framework 890 suggested in Figure 2 with a sequential workflow, as certain improvements should be made first before we can improve others. Figure 3 divides the suggested framework into four sequential 891 working packages. First, various options for data support, water resource management (WRM) 892 algorithms and host models should be benchmarked, tested and intercompared individually to 893 highlight their relative suitability in further offline simulation. This would naturally result in 894 falsifying some of the working hypotheses. The selected options then should be mixed-and-895 896 matched in an offline mode. The offline simulation efficiency should be then explored and intercompared between various integrated settings to assess the biases propagated across the 897 system and examine the robustness of the individual components in an integrated offline 898 899 simulation. The non-falsified options in this stage can be further improved and configured for online simulation, which can be then coupled with climate models in a way described in Figure 2. 900

901 A key requirement for implementing the suggested framework is the availability of suitable data, 902 at an appropriate scale, for algorithm development and intercomparison. Although global studies 903 are important to improve our knowledge of the Earth System and global water supply, our ability 904 to conduct a comprehensive global study as proposed in Figure 2 is currently limited due to methodological, computational and funding barriers. We argue that a network of regional case 905 studies, however, could provide access to local data, and a sample of comparative examples to 906 907 support algorithm intercomparison and further development. We note, for example, the success of model intercomparison projects such as MOPEX (Duan et al., 2006) for hydrological modeling, 908 and suggest that the time is right to develop a similar initiative for the incorporation of 909 anthropogenic effects in hydrological models. One possibility is to draw on the resources of the 910 set of Regional Hydroclimate Projects (RHPs) supported by the Global Energy and Water 911 Exchanges (GEWEX) initiative of the World Climate Research Program (WCRP). As an example, 912 our home river basin in western Canada, the 340,000 km<sup>2</sup> trans-boundary Saskatchewan River 913 Basin (SaskRB), is a GEWEX RHP, embodies a complex large scale water resources system 914 (Nazemi et al., 2013), and poses globally-relevant science and management challenges (see 915 916 Wheater and Gober, 2013). These require improved representation of water resource management at larger scales to diagnose the changes in the regional discharge, climate and water security as the 917 918 result of current and future water resource management and climate change. Such RHPs could provide a basis for model development and intercomparison to support inclusion of water resource 919 920 management in Earth System models for fully coupled global simulations. We have already started 921 to explore various modeling options and the ways of improving individual algorithms (i.e. stage 1 922 of sequential model development protocol illustrated in Figure 3) throughout the SaskRB. For instance, we have benchmarked several reservoir operation algorithms using observed inflows and 923 924 assessed the possibility of improving simulation using calibration. We have realized that the efficiency of reservoir operation algorithms can be considerably improved if the assumption of 925 926 fixed model parameterization is relaxed and the algorithm parameters are identified through calibration against observed reservoir level and discharge. We are about to finalize this study and 927 will present our findings through a technical paper in near future. 928

929

## 930 6 Summary and concluding remarks

31

931 Human water supply and allocation have intensively perturbed the water cycle. We noted that the 932 inclusion of these anthropogenic activities in Earth System models poses a new set of modeling 933 challenges and progress has remained incomplete. Despite some major developments, we noted that current limitations significantly degrade the modeling capability at larger scales, particularly 934 with respect to future conditions, and neglect potentially-significant sources of change to land-935 atmospheric system. We highlighted important deficiencies related to representing groundwater 936 937 stores and withdrawals as well online implications of large reservoirs. We also noted that current water allocation algorithms have considerable limitations in representing streamflow in regulated 938 catchments. We argued that these limitations are attributed to uncertainties in data support, water 939 940 allocation algorithms and host large-scale models.

We identified four opportunities for improvements. These are advancements in (1) high 941 942 performance computing and coupling techniques; (2) remote sensing, data collection and data 943 sharing; (3) calibration algorithms, system identification techniques and assimilation products; and 944 (4) ongoing improvements in host models including both process representation and parameter 945 identification. As there are several options available for data support, water resource management algorithms and host models, we proposed a modular framework for testing various modeling and 946 data options, which can be configured by multiple working hypotheses and implemented in a 947 unified and fully integrated modeling framework. The selected working hypotheses can be tested 948 949 and falsified on the basis of available information, intercomparison and/or various model diagnosis 950 frameworks. Similar to other recent commentaries (e.g., M. P. Clark et al., 2011; see also Beven et al., 2012), we believe that such a systematic framework in essential for improving current 951 modeling capability in both offline and online modes and can be pursued using regional case 952 953 studies, before aiming for fully coupled global simulations. WCRP RHPs are one source of suitable 954 examples to move this agenda forward.

It should be noted that filling current gaps in the inclusion of water resource management in Earth System models requires substantial efforts across a wide range of disciplines, from social and policy sciences to economics and water management, from natural sciences to engineering and mathematical modeling, and from remote sensing to hardware technology and computer science. Interdisciplinary research efforts, therefore, are important. Moreover, for various reasons including funding limitations, the community needs to fully recognize the role of collaboration and explore 961 various opportunities to share data and resources for efficient model developments and for962 consistent intercomparisons.

Finally, it should be indicated that our survey considered water resource management from a water quantity perspective. Water quality concerns are increasingly associated with growing human water demand and can also impact water supply and allocation. Coupling water quality and quantity in Earth System models is however very much in its infancy and much future effort will be required to fill this gap. We hope that our survey will trigger more attention towards the necessity for improving current Earth System modeling capability to respond to the needs and challenges of the "Anthropocene".

970

#### 971 Acknowledgments

The first author has attended NASA's Applied Remote Sensing Training free webminar series (http://water.gsfc.nasa.gov/) and would like to thank Amita Mehta, Evan Johnson and John Bolten for providing useful materials related to remote sensing technology. Financial support for this survey was provided by the Canada Excellence Research Chair in Water Security at the University of Saskatchewan. The authors gratefully acknowledge the constructive comments from two anonymous reviewers as well as Jan Polcher, Ingjerd Haddeland and Bruce Davison, which have enabled us to make significant improvements to this paper.

979

# 980 **References**

Adam, J. C., Haddeland, I., Su, F., and Lettenmaier, D. P.: Simulation of reservoir influences on
annual and seasonal streamflow changes for the Lena, Yenisei and Ob'rivers, J. Geophys. Res.Atmos., 112, D24114, doi:10.1029/2007JD008525, 2007.

Adam, J. C. and Lettenmaier D. P.: Application of new precipitation and reconstructed streamflow
products to streamflow trend attribution in northern Eurasia, Journal of Climate, 21(8), 807-1828,
2008.

Alcamo, J., Döll P., Henrichs T., Kaspar F., Lehner B., Rösch T. and Siebert S.: Development and
testing of the WaterGAP 2 global model of water use and availability, Hydrological Sciences
Journal, 48(3), 317-337, 2003.

33

- Alcamo, J., Flörke, M., and Märker, M.: Future long-term changes in global water resources driven
- by socio-economic and climatic changes, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 52(2), 247-275, 2007.
- Arnell, N. W.: Climate change and global water resources: SRES emissions and socio-economic
  scenarios, Global environmental change, 14(1), 31-52, 2004.
- 994 Arnold, J. G., Srinivasan R., Muttiah R. S. and Williams J. R.: Large area hydrologic modeling
- and assessment part i: model development, JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources
- 996 Association, 34, 73–89, doi: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.1998.tb05961.x, 1998.
- Asrar, G. R., Hurrell J. W. and Busalacchi A. J.: A need for "actionable" climate science and
  information: summary of WCRP Open Science Conference, Bulletin of the American
  Meteorological Society, 94(2), ES8-ES12, 2013.
- Bellman, R.: On the theory of dynamic programming, Proceedings of the National Academy ofSciences, 38(8), 716-719, 1952.
- Bergström, S. and Singh V. P.: The HBV model, In Computer models of watershed hydrology, pp.
  443-476, Edited by V. P. Singh, Water Resources Publications, Colorado, USA., 1995.
- Best, M. J., Pryor M., Clark D. B., et al.: The Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES),
  model description–Part 1: energy and water fluxes, Geoscientific Model Development, 4(3), 677699, 2011.
- Beven, K.: Searching for the Holy Grail of scientific hydrology: Q t= H (S?, R?,? t) A as closure,
  Hydrology & Earth System Sciences, 10(5), 609-618, 2006a.
- Beven, K.: A manifesto for the equifinality thesis, Journal of hydrology, 320(1), 18-36, 2006b.
- 1010 Beven, K. J. and Cloke H. L.: Comment on "Hyperresolution global land surface modeling:
- 1011 Meeting a grand challenge for monitoring Earth's terrestrial water" by Eric F. Wood et al., Water
- 1012 Resour. Res., 48, W01801, doi: 10.1029/2011WR010982, 2012.
- Beven, K. J. and Alcock R. E.: Modelling everything everywhere: a new approach to decisionmaking for water management under uncertainty, Freshwater Biology, 57(s1), 124-132, 2012.
- 1015 Beven, K., Smith P., Westerberg I. and Freer J.: Comment on "Pursuing the method of multiple
- 1016 working hypotheses for hydrological modeling" by P. Clark et al., Water Resour. Res., 48,
- 1017 W11801, doi:10.1029/2012WR012282, 2012.

- Biancamaria, S., Andreadis, K. M., Durand, M., Clark, E. A, Rodriguez, E., Mognard, N.M.,
  Alsdorf, D. E., Lettenmaier, D. P., and Oudin, Y.: Preliminary characterization of SWOT
  hydrology error budget and global capabilities, IEEE J. Sel. Top. Appl., 3, 6–19, 2010.
- 1021 Biemans, H., Hutjes R. W. A., Kabat P., Strengers B. J., Gerten D. and Rost S.: Effects of
- 1022 Precipitation Uncertainty on Discharge Calculations for Main River Basins, Journal of
- 1023 Hydrometeorology, 10(4), 1011-1025, 2009.
- Biemans, H., Haddeland I., Kabat P., Ludwig F., Hutjes R. W. A., Heinke J., Bloh W. von and
  Gerten D.: Impact of reservoirs on river discharge and irrigation water supply during the 20th
  century, Water Resour. Res., 47, W03509, doi: 10.1029/2009WR008929, 2011.
- Blanc, E., Strzepek K., Schlosser A., Jacoby H.D., Gueneau A., Fant C., Rausch S. and Reilly J.:
  Analysis of U.S. water resources under climate change, MIT Joint Program on the Science and
  Policy of Global Change. Report No.239, http://globalchange.mit.edu/files/document/
  MITJPSPGC\_Rpt239.pdf (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2013.
- 1031 Chen, J. and Wu, Y.: Exploring hydrological process features of the East River (Dongjiang) basin
  1032 in south China using VIC and SWAT, in: Proceedings of the International Association of
  1033 Hydrological Sciences and the International Water Resources Association Conference,
  1034 Guangzhou, China, IAHS Press, Wallingford, UK, 116–123, 2008.
- 1035 Chow, V.T., Maidment D. R., and Mays L.W.: Applied Hydrology, McGraw-Hill Series in Water
  1036 Resources and Environmental Engineering, McGraw-Hill, New York. ISBN 0-07-010810-2. xiii,
  1037 572 pp, 1998.
- 1038 Clark, D. B., M.Mercado L., Sitch S., et al.: The joint UK land environment simulator (JULES),
  1039 model description–Part 2: carbon fluxes and vegetation dynamics, Geoscientific Model
  1040 Development, 4(3), 701-722, 2011.
- 1041 Clark, M. P., Kavetski D. and Fenicia F.: Pursuing the method of multiple working hypotheses for
  1042 hydrological modeling, Water Resour. Res., 47, W09301, doi: 10.1029/2010WR009827, 2011.
- Dadson, S., Acreman, M., and Harding, R.: Water security, global change and land–atmosphere
  feedbacks, Philos. T. Roy. Soc. A, 371, 2002, doi: 10.1098/rsta.2012.0412, 2013.
- 1045 Dankers, R., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., Falloon, P. D., Fekete, B. M., Gosling, S. N., Heinke, J.,
- 1046 Kim, H., Masaki, Y., Satoh, Y., Stacke, T., Wada, Y., and Wisser, D.: First look at changes in

- flood hazard in the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project ensemble, P. Natl. Acad.
  Sci. USA, 111(9), doi:10.1073/pnas.1302078110, 2014.
- 1049 Dantzig, G. B.: Linear Programming and Extensions, Princeton University Press, New Jersey,1050 USA, 1965.
- 1051 Dijk A. V. and Renzullo L. J.: Water resource monitoring systems and the role of satellite 1052 observations, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 15(1), 39-55, 2011.
- Dirmeyer, P. A., Dolman A. J. and Sato N.: The pilot phase of the global soil wetness project,
  Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 80(5), 851-878, 1999.
- Döll, P., Kaspar F. and Lehner B.: A global hydrological model for deriving water availability
  indicators: model tuning and validation, Journal of Hydrology, 270(1), 105-134, 2003.
- Döll, P., Fiedler K. and Zhang J.: Global-scale analysis of river flow alterations due to water
  withdrawals and reservoirs, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 6(4), 4773-4812,
  2009.
- Döll, P., Hoffmann-Dobrev, H., Portmann, F. T., Siebert, S., Eicker, A., Rodell, M., Strassberg,
  G., and Scanlon, B. R.: Impact of water withdrawals from groundwater and surface water on
  continental water storage variations, J. Geodyn., 59, 143–156, 2012.
- 1063 Döll, P., Müller Schmied, H., Schuh, C., Portmann, F. T., and Eicker, A.: Global-scale assessment
- 1064 of groundwater depletion and related groundwater abstractions: Combining hydrological modeling
- 1065 with information from well observations and GRACE satellites. Water Resources Research, 50(7),
- 1066 5698-5720, doi: 10.1002/2014WR015595, 2014.
- 1067 Drewniak, B., Song J., Prell J., Kotamarthi V. R. and Jacob R.: Modeling agriculture in the 1068 Community Land Model, Geoscientific Model Development Discussions, 5, 4137-4185, 2012.
- 1069 Duan, Q., Schaake, J., Andreassian, V., Franks, S., Goteti, G., Gupta, H. V., Gusev, Y. M., Habets,
- 1070 F., Hall, A., Hay, L., Hogue, T., Huang, M., Leavesley, G., Liang, X., Nasonova, O. N., Noilhan,
- 1071 J., Oudin, L., Sorooshian, S., Wagener, T., and Wood, E. F.: Model Parameter Estimation
- 1072 Experiment (MOPEX): an overview of science strategy and major results from the second and
- 1073 third workshops, J. Hydrol., 320, 3–17, 2006.
- Dunlap, R., Vertenstein, M., Valcke, S. and Craig, T.: Second Workshop on Coupling
  Technologies for Earth System Models, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 95(2),
  ES34-ES38, 2014.
- 1077 Durand, M., Rodriguez, E., Alsdorf, D. E. and Trigg, M.: Estimating river depth from remote
- 1078 sensing swath interferometry measurements of river height, slope, and width, IEEE Journal of
- 1079 Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 3(1), 20-31, 2010.
- 1080 Entekhabi, D., Njoku, E. G., O'Neill, P. E., Kellogg, K. H., Crow, W. T., Edelstein, W. N., Entin,
- 1081 J. K., Goodman, S. D., Jackson, T. J., Johnson, J., Kimball, J., Piepmeier, J. R., Koster, R. D.,
- 1082 Martin, N., McDonald, K. C., Moghaddam, M., Moran, S., Reichle, R., Shi, J.-C., Spencer, M. W.,
- 1083 Thurman, S. W., Leung Tsang; and Van Zyl, J.: The Soil Moisture Active Passive (SMAP)
- 1084 mission, Proc. IEEE, 98, 704–716, 2010.
- Falkenmark, M.: Growing water scarcity in agriculture: future challenge to global water security,
  Philos. T. Roy. Soc. A, 371, 2002 ,doi: 10.1098/rsta.2012.0410, 2013.
- Fan, Y. and Miguez-Macho G.: A simple hydrologic framework for simulating wetlands in climate
  and earth system models, Clim. Dyn., 37, 253-278, 2011.
- Fekete, B. M., Vörösmarty C. J. and Grabs W.: Global, composite runoff fields based on observed
  river discharge and simulated water balances, http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/EN/02\_
  srvcs/24\_rprtsrs/report\_22.pdf?\_\_blob=publicationFile (retrieved May 6, 2014), 1999.
- Fekete, B. M., Vöröosmarty, C. J., and Grabs, W.: High-resolution fields of global runoff
  combining observed river discharge and simulated water balances, Global Biogeochem. Cy.,
  16(3), 15-1, doi:10.1029/1999GB001254, 2002.
- Ferguson, I. M. and Maxwell, R. M.: The role of groundwater in watershed response and land
  surface feedbacks under climate change, Water Resour. Res., 46, W00F02, doi: 10.1029/
  1999GB001254, 2010.
- Fernández-Quiruelas, V., Fernández J., Cofiño A. S., Fita L. and Gutiérrez J. M.: Benefits and
  requirements of grid computing for climate applications: An example with the community
  atmospheric model, Environmental Modelling & Software, 26(9), 1057-1069, 2011.

- Foster, S. and Loucks D. P.: Non-renewable groundwater resources: A guidebook on Sociallysustainable Management for Water-policy Makers. UNESCO, http://unesdoc.unesco.
  org/images/0014/ 001469/146997e.pdf (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2006.
- Fu, L. L., Alsdorf, D., Rodriguez, E., Morrow, R., Mognard, N., Lambin, J., Vaze, P., and Lafon,
  T.: The SWOT (Surface Water and Ocean Topography) mission: spaceborne radar interferometry
  for oceanographic and hydrological applications, in: Proceedings of OCEANOBS'09 Conference,
  available at: http://bprc.osu.edu/water/publications/oceanobs 09\_swot.pdf (last access: 6 May
- 1108 2014), 2009.
- Gao, H., Birkett C. and Lettenmaier D.P.: Global monitoring of large reservoir storage from
  satellite remote sensing, Water Resources Research, 48(9), W09504, doi:
  10.1029/2012WR012063, 2012.
- 1112 Gentine, P., Troy T. J., Lintner B. R. and Findell K. L.: Scaling in surface hydrology: progress and
- challenges, Journal of Contemporary Water research and education, 147(1), 28-40, 2012.
- Gerten, D., Schaphoff S., Haberlandt U., Lucht W. and Sitch S.: Terrestrial vegetation and water
  balance—hydrological evaluation of a dynamic global vegetation model, Journal of Hydrology,
  286(1), 249-270, 2004.
- 1117 Gleeson, T., VanderSteen, J., Sophocleous, M. A., Taniguchi, M., Alley, W. M., Allen, D. M., and
- 1118 Zhou, Y.: Groundwater sustainability strategies, Nat. Geosci., 3, 378–379, 2010.
- Gleeson, T., Wada Y., Bierkens M. F. and Beek L. P. van: Water balance of global aquifers
  revealed by groundwater footprint, Nature, 488(7410), 197-200, 2012.
- Gleick P. H.: The world's water 2000–2001: the biennial report on freshwater resources, Island
  Press, Washington, DC: 2000.
- 1123 Gleick, P. H., Cooley H., Famiglietti J. S., Lettenmaier D. P., Oki T., Vörösmarty C. J. and Wood
- 1124 E. F.: Improving Understanding of the Global Hydrologic Cycle, In Climate Science for Serving
- Society, Edited by G. R. Asrar and J. W. Hurrell, pp. 151-184, Springer Netherlands., 2013.
- 1126 Gochis, D.J., Yu W. and Yates D.N.: The WRF-Hydro model technical description and user's
- 1127 guide, version 1.0, NCAR Technical Document, http://www.ral.ucar.edu/projects/wrf\_hydro/
- 1128 (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2013.

- Goldberg, D. E.: Genetic algorithms in search, optimization, and machine learning, Reading MenloPark, Addison-wesley, 1989.
- 1131 Grey, D., Garrick, D., Blackmore, D., Kelman, J., Muller, M., and Sadoff, C.: Water security in
- 1132 one blue planet: twenty-first century policy challenges for science, Philos. T. Roy. Soc. A, 371,
- 1133 2002, doi: 10.1098/rsta.2012.0406, 2013.
- Gudmundsson, L., Tallaksen, L. M., Stahl, K., Clark, D. B., Dumont, E., Hagemann, S., Bertrand,
  N., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Hanasaki, N., Voss, F., and Koirala, S.: Comparing large-scale
  hydrological model simulations to observed runoff percentiles in Europe, J. Hydrometeorol., 13,
  604–620, 2012.
- 1138 Gupta, H. V., Sorooshian S. and Yapo P. O.: Toward improved calibration of hydrologic models:
- Multiple and noncommensurable measures of information, Water Resour. Res., 34(4), 751–763,
  doi: 10.1029/97WR03495, 1998.
- Haddeland, I., Skaugen T. and Lettenmaier D. P.: Anthropogenic impacts on continental surface
  water fluxes, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, L08406, doi: 10.1029/2006GL026047, 2006a.
- Haddeland, I., Lettenmaier D. P. and Skaugen T.: Effects of irrigation on the water and energy
  balances of the Colorado and Mekong river basins, Journal of Hydrology, 324(1), 210-223, 2006b.
- Haddeland, I., Skaugen T. and Lettenmaier D. P.: Hydrologic effects of land and water
  management in North America and Asia: 1700-1992, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
  Discussions, 11(2), 1035-1045, 2007.
- 1148 Haddeland, I., Clark, D. B., Franssen, W., Ludwig, F., Voß, F., Arnell, N. W., Bertrand, N., Best,
- 1149 M., Folwell, S., Gerten, D., Gomes, S., Gosling, S. N., Hagemann, S., Hanasaki, N., Harding, R.,
- 1150 Heinke, J., Kabat, P., Koirala, S., Oki, T., Polcher, J., Stacke, T., Viterbo, P., Weedon, G. P., and
- 1151 Yeh, P.: Multimodel estimate of the global terrestrial water balance: setup and first results, J.
- 1152 Hydrometeorol., 12, 869–884, doi: 10.1175/2011JHM1324.1, 2011.
- 1153 Haddeland, I., Biemans, H., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Hanasaki, N., Konzmann, M., Ludwig, F.,
- 1154 Masaki, Y., Schewe, J., Stacke, T., Tessler, Z. D., Wada, Y., Wisser, D.: Global water resources
- 1155 affected by human interventions and climate change, Proceedings of the National Academy of
- 1156 Sciences, 111(9), 3251-3256, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1222475110, 2014.

- 1157 Hanasaki, N., Kanae S. and Oki T.: A reservoir operation scheme for global river routing models,
- 1158 Journal of Hydrology, 327(1), 22-41, 2006.
- 1159 Hanasaki, N., Kanae S., Oki T., et al.: An integrated model for the assessment of global water
- 1160 resources–Part 1: Model description and input meteorological forcing, Hydrology and Earth
- 1161 System Sciences, 12(4), 1007-1025, 2008a.
- 1162 Hanasaki, N., Kanae S., Oki T., et al.: An integrated model for the assessment of global water
- resources–Part 2: Applications and assessments, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 12(4),
  1027-1037, 2008b.
- 1165 Hanasaki, N., Inuzuka T., Kanae S. and Oki T.: An estimation of global virtual water flow and
- sources of water withdrawal for major crops and livestock products using a global hydrological
- 1167 model, Journal of Hydrology, 384(3), 232-244, 2010.
- Hanasaki, N., Fujimori S., Yamamoto T., et al.: A global water scarcity assessment under Shared
  Socio-economic Pathways- Part 1: Water use, Hydrology & Earth System Sciences Discussion,
  9(12), 13879-13932, 2013a.
- 1171 Hanasaki, N., Fujimori S., Yamamoto T., et al.: A global water scarcity assessment under Shared
- 1172 Socio-economic Pathways-Part 2: Water availability and scarcity, Hydrology & Earth System
- 1173 Sciences Discussion, 9(12), 13933-13994, 2013b.
- Hassanzadeh, E., Nazemi A. and Elshorbagy A.: Quantile-Based Downscaling of Precipitation
  Using Genetic Programming: Application to IDF Curves in Saskatoon, J. Hydrol. Eng., 19(5),
  943–955, 2014.
- 1177 Hejazi, M. I., Edmonds J., Clarke L., et al.: Integrated assessment of global water scarcity over the
- 1178 21st century-Part 1: Global water supply and demand under extreme radiative forcing, Hydrology
- and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 10, 3327-3381, 2013.
- Hill, C., DeLuca, C., Suarez, M., and Da Silva, A.: The architecture of the Earth System Modeling
  framework, Comput. Sci. Eng., 6, 18–28, 2004.
- 1182 Hossain, F., Degu, A. M., Yigzaw, W., Burian, S., Niyogi, D., Shepherd, J., Pielke, R.: Climate
- 1183 feedback-based provisions for dam design, operations, and water management in the 21st century,
- 1184 J. Hydrol. Eng., 17, 837–850, 2012.

- 1185 Hossain, M. S. and El-shafie A.: Intelligent Systems in Optimizing Reservoir Operation Policy: A
- 1186 Review, Water Resources Management, 27(9), 3387-3407, 2013.
- 1187 Huggins, L. F. and Burney, J. R.: Surface runoff, storage and routing, in: Hydrologic Modeling of
- 1188 Small Watersheds, edited by: Haan, C. T., Johnson, H. P., and Brakensiek, D. L., American Society
- 1189 of Agricultural Engineers, St. Joseph, Michigan, USA, 169–225, 1982.
- 1190 Hurrell, J., Meehl, G. A., Bader, D., Delworth, T. L., Kirtman, B., and Wielicki, B.: A unified
- modeling approach to climate system prediction. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society,90(12), 1819-1832, 2009.
- 1193 Hurrell, J.W., Holland, M. M., Gent, P. R., Ghan, S., Kay J. E., Kushner, P. J., Lamarque, J.-F.,
- 1194 Large, W. G., Lawrence, D., Lindsay, K., Lipscomb, W. H., Long, M. C., Mahowald, N., Marsh,
- 1195 D. R., Neale, R. B., Rasch, P., Vavrus, S., Vertenstein, M., Bader, D., Collins, W. D., Hack, J. J.,
- 1196 Kiehl, J. and Marshall, S: The community earth system model: a framework for collaborative
- research, Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 94, 1339–1360. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-1200121.1, 2013.
- Ke, Y., Leung L. R., Huang M., Coleman A. M., Li H. and Wigmosta M. S.: Development of high
  resolution land surface parameters for the Community Land Model, Geoscientific Model
  Development, 5(6), 1341-1362, 2012.
- Kollet, S. J. and Maxwell, R. M.: Capturing the influence of groundwater dynamics on land surface
  processes using an integrated, distributed watershed model, Water Resour. Res., 44, W02402, doi:
  10.1029/2007WR006004, 2008.
- Kollet, S. J., Maxwell, R. M., Woodward, C. S., Smith, S., Vanderborght, J., Vereecken, H., and
  Simmer, C.: Proof of concept of regional scale hydrologic simulations at hydrologic resolution
  utilizing massively parallel computer resources, Water resources research, 46(4), W04201,
  doi:10.1029/2009WR008730, 2010.
- Lai, X., Jiang, J., Yang, G. and Lu, X. X.: Should the Three Gorges Dam be blamed for the
  extremely low water levels in the middle–lower Yangtze River?, Hydrol. Process., 28, 150–160,
  doi: 10.1002/hyp. 10077, 2014.
- Lawrence, D. M., Oleson, K. W., Flanner, M. G., Thornton, P. E., Swenson, S. C., Lawrence, P.
  J., Zeng, X., Yang, Z.-L., Levis, S., Sakaguchi, K., Bonan, G. B., and Slater, A. G.:

- Parameterization improvements and functional and structural advances in Version 4 of the
  Community Land Model, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 3, M03001, doi:10.1029/2011MS00045,
  2011.
- 1217 Lawrence, D. M., Maxwell, R., Swenson, S., Lopez, S., and Famiglietti, J.: Challenges of
- 1218 Representing and Predicting Multi-Scale Human–Water Cycle Interactions in Terrestrial Systems,
- 1219 available at: http://climatemodeling.science.energy.gov/sites/default/files/Topic\_3\_30 final.pdf
- 1220 (last access: 6 May 2014), 2012.
- Lecca, G., Petitdidier, M., Hluchy, L., Ivanovic, M., Kussul, N., Ray, N., and Thieron V.: Grid computing technology for hydrological applications, J. Hydrol., 403, 186–199, 2011.
- Lehner, B. and Döll, P.: Development and validation of a global database of lakes, reservoirs and
  wetlands, Journal of Hydrology, 296(1), 1-22, 2004.
- Lehner, B., Verdin K. and Jarvis A.: New Global Hydrography Derived From Spaceborne
  Elevation Data, Eos Trans. AGU, 89(10), 93–94, doi: 10.1029/2008EO100001. 89, 2008.
- 1227 Lehner, B., Liermann, C. R., Revenga, C., Vörösmarty, C., Fekete, B., Crouzet, P., Döll, P.,
- 1228 Endejan, M., Frenken, K., Magome, J., Nilsson, C., Robertson, J. C., Rödel, R., Sindorf, N., and
- 1229 Wisser, D.: High-resolution mapping of the world's reservoirs and dams for sustainable river-flow
- 1230 management, Front. Ecol. Environ., 9, 494–502, 2011.
- Lehner, B. and Grill G.: Global river hydrography and network routing: baseline data and new
  approaches to study the world's large river systems, Hydrol. Process., 27, 2171–2186, doi:
  10.1002/hyp.9740, 2013.
- Lettenmaier, D. P. and Milly P. C. D.: Land waters and sea level, Nature Geoscience, 2(7), 452-454, 2009.
- Levis, S. and Sacks W.: Technical descriptions of the interactive crop management
  (CLM4CNcrop) and interactive irrigation models in version 4 of the Community Land Model,
  http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/cesm1.1/clm/CLMcropANDirrigTechDescriptions.pdf
  (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2011.
- Levis, S., Bonan G. B., Kluzek E., Thornton P. E., Jones A., Sacks W. J. and Kucharik C. J.:
  Interactive Crop Management in the Community Earth System Model (CESM1): Seasonal
  Influences on Land-Atmosphere Fluxes, Journal of Climate, 25(14), 4839-4859, 2012.

- Li, H., Huang, M., Wigmosta, M., Ke, Y., Coleman, A., Leung, L. R., Wang, A., and Ricciuto, D.
  M.: Evaluating runoff simulations from the Community Land Model 4.0 using observations from
  flux towers and a mountainous watershed, J. Geophys. Res., 116, D24120, doi: 10.1029
  /2011JD016276, 2011.
- Li, H. Y., Huang, M., Tesfa, T., Ke, Y., Sun, Y., Liu, Y. and Leung, L. R.: A subbasin-based framework to represent land surface processes in an Earth System Model. Geoscientific Model Development Discussions, 6(2), 2699-2730, doi:10.5194/gmdd-6-2699-2013, 2013a.
- Li, H., Wigmosta, M. S., Wu, H., Huang, M., Ke, Y., Coleman, A. M., and Leung, L. R.: A
  physically based runoff routing model for land surface and earth system models, J.
  Hydrometeorol., 14, 808–828, 2013b.
- 1253 Liang, X., Lettenmaier D. P., Wood E. F. and Burges S. J.: A simple hydrologically based model
- 1254 of land surface water and energy fluxes for general circulation models, Journal of Geophysical
- 1255 Research: Atmospheres (1984–2012), 99(D7), 14415-14428, 1994.
- Liebe, J., Giesen N. Van De and Andreini M.: Estimation of small reservoir storage capacities ina semi-arid environment: A case study in the Upper East Region of Ghana, Physics and Chemistry
- 1258 of the Earth, Parts A/B/C, 30(6), 448-454, 2005.
- Liu, C. and Zheng H.: South-to-north water transfer schemes for China, International Journal ofWater Resources Development, 18(3), 453-471, 2002.
- Liu, J. and Yang W.: Water sustainability for China and beyond, Science, 337(6095), 649-650,2012.
- Liu, J., Zang, C., Tian, S., Liu, J., Yang, H., Jia, S., You, L., Liu, B., and Zhang, M.: Water
  conservancy projects in China: achievements, challenges and way forward, Global Environ.
  Change, 23, 633–643, 2013.
- Liu S., Wei Y., Post W. M., Cook R. B., Schaefer K., Thornton M. M.: The Unified North
  American Soil Map and its implication on the soil organic carbon stock in North America,
  Biogeosciences, 10, 2915–2930, doi:10.5194/bg-10-2915-2013, 2013.
- 1269 Lohmann, D., Nolte-Holube R. and Raschke E.: A large-scale horizontal routing model to be
- 1270 coupled to land surface parametrization schemes, Tellus A, 48, 708–721, doi: 10.1034/j.1600-
- 1271 0870.1996.t01-3-00009.x., 1996.

- Lohmann, D., Raschke E., Nijssen B. and Lettenmaier D. P.: Regional scale hydrology: I.
  Formulation of the VIC-2L model coupled to a routing model, Hydrological Sciences Journal,
  43(1), 131-141, 1998.
- 1275 MacKay, M. D., Neale, P. J., Arp, C. D., De Senerpont Domis, L. N., Fang, X., Gal, G., Jöhnk, K.
- 1276 D., Kirillin, G., Lenters, J. D., Litchman, E., MacIntyre, S., Marsh, P., Melack, J., Mooij, W. M.,
- 1277 Peeters, F., Quesada, A., Schladow, S. G., Schmid, M., Spence, C., and Stokes, S. L.: Modeling
- lakes and reservoirs in the climate system, Limnol. Oceanogr., 54, 2315–2329, 2009.
- MacKay, M. D.: A process oriented small lake dynamical scheme for coupled climate modeling
  applications, in: AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts, Vol. 1, TS36, p. 1359, 2011.
- MacKay, M. D., and Seglenieks, F.: On the simulation of Laurentian Great Lakes water levels
  under projections of global climate change, Climatic Change, 117, 55–67, 2013.
- 1283 Maxwell, R. M. and Miller N. L.: Development of a coupled land surface and groundwater model,
- 1284 J. Hydrometeorol, 6(3), 233-247, 2005.
- Maxwell, R. M., Chow F. K. and Kollet S. J.: The groundwater-land-surface-atmosphere
  connection: soil moisture effects on the atmospheric boundary layer in fully-coupled simulations,
  Adv. Wat. Resour., 30, 2447–2466, 2007.
- 1288 Maxwell, R. M., Lundquist, J. K., Mirocha, J. D., Smith, S. G., Woodward, C. S., and Tompson,
- A. F. B.: Development of a coupled groundwater–atmosphere model, Mon. Weather Rev., 139,
  96–116, 2011.
- Meigh, J. R., McKenzie, A. A. and Sene, K. J.: A grid-based approach to water scarcity estimates
  for eastern and southern Africa, Water Resources Management, 13(2), 85-115, 1999.
- Meybeck, M.: Global analysis of river systems: from Earth system controls to Anthropocene
  syndromes, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological
  Sciences, 358(1440), 1935-1955, 2003.
- Michetti, M., and Zampieri, M.: Climate–Human–Land Interactions: A Review of Major
  Modelling Approaches. Land, 3(3), 793-833, doi: 10.3390/land3030793, 2014.
- 1298 Mu, Q., Zhao M. and Running S. W.: Development of a global evapotranspiration algorithm based
- 1299 on MODIS and global meteorology data, Remote Sensing of Environment, 111(4), 519-536, 2007.

- Mu, Q., Zhao M. and Running S. W.: Improvements to a MODIS global terrestrial
  evapotranspiration algorithm, Remote Sensing of Environment, 115(8), 1781-1800, 2011.
- Müller Schmied, H., Eisner, S., Franz, D., Wattenbach, M., Portmann, F. T., Flörke, M., Döll, P.:
  Sensitivity of simulated global-scale freshwater fluxes and storages to input data, hydrological
  model structure, human water use and calibration, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18(9), 3511-3538,
  10.5194/hess-18-3511-2014, 2014.
- Nakayama, T. and Shankman D.: Impact of the Three-Gorges Dam and water transfer project onChangjiang floods, Global and Planetary Change, 100, 38-50, 2013a.
- Nakayama, T. and Shankman D.: Evaluation of uneven water resource and relation between
  anthropogenic water withdrawal and ecosystem degradation in Changjiang and Yellow River
  basins, Hydrol. Process., 27, 3350–3362. doi: 10.1002/hyp.9835, 2013b.
- Nazemi, A., Akbarzadeh, M. R., and Hosseini, S. M.: Fuzzy-stochastic linear programming in
  water resources engineering, in: Proceeding of Fuzzy Information Processing Society, NAFIPS
  2002, IEEE, New Jersey, USA, doi:10.1109/NAFIPS.2002.1018060, 227–232, 2002.
- Nazemi, A., Hosseini S. M. and Akbarzadeh-T M. R: Soft computing-based nonlinear fusion
  algorithms for describing non-Darcy flow in porous media, Journal of Hydraulic Research, 44(2),
  269-282, 2006a.
- Nazemi, A., Yao, X., and Chan, A. H.: Extracting a set of robust Pareto-optimal parameters for
  hydrologic models using NSGA-II and SCEM, in: Proceedings of IEEE Congress on Evolutionary
  Computation (CEC 2006), Vancouver, Canada, doi:10.1109/CEC.2006.1688539, 1901–1908,
  2006b.
- Nazemi, A., Chan A. H. and Yao X.: Selecting representative parameters of rainfall-runoff models
  using multi-objective calibration results and a fuzzy clustering algorithm, In BHS 10th National
  Hydrology Symposium, 13-20, Exeter, UK, 2008.
- 1324 Nazemi, A., Wheater, H. S., Chun, K. P., and Elshorbagy, A.: A stochastic reconstruction
- 1325 framework for analysis of water resource system vulnerability to climate-induced changes in river
- 1326 flow regime, Water Resour. Res., 49, 291-305, doi:10.1029/2012WR012755, 2013.

45

- 1327 Nazemi, A. and Wheater H. S.: On inclusion of water resource management in Earth System
- 1328 models Part 1: Problem definition and representation of water demand, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.
- 1329 Discuss., 11, 8239-8298, doi: 10.5194/hessd-11-8239-2014, 2014a.
- Nazemi, A. and H. S. Wheater: Assessing the Vulnerability of Water Supply to Changing
  Streamflow Conditions, Eos Trans. AGU, 95(32), 288, doi: 10.1002/2014EO320007, 2014b.
- 1332 Nazemi, A. and Wheater H. S.: How can the uncertainty in the natural inflow regime propagate
- 1333 into the assessment of water resource systems? Adv. Water Resour., 63, 131-142, http:
- 1334 //dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2013.11.009, 2014c.
- 1335 Nilsson, C., Reidy C. A., Dynesius M. and Revenga C.: Fragmentation and flow regulation of the
- 1336 world's large river systems, Science, 308(5720), 405-408, 2005.
- Oki, T. and Kanae S.: Global hydrological cycles and world water resources, Science, 313(5790),
  1068-1072, 2006.
- Oki, T. and Sud Y. C.: Design of Total Runoff Integrating Pathways (TRIP)—A global river
  channel network, Earth interactions, 2(1), 1-37, 1998.
- Oki, T., Agata Y., Kanae S., Saruhashi T., Yang D. and Musiake K.: Global assessment of current
  water resources using total runoff integrating pathways, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 46(6),
  983-995, 2001.
- Oki, T., Blyth E. M., Berbery E. H. and Alcaraz-Segura D.: Land Use and Land Cover Changes
  and Their Impacts on Hydroclimate, Ecosystems and Society, In Climate Science for Serving
  Society, Edited by G. R. Asrar and J. W. Hurrell, pp. 185-203, Springer, Netherlands., 2013.
- Oleson, K. W., Dai, Y., Bonan, G. B., Bosilovichm, M., Dickinson, R., Dirmeyer, P., Hoffman,
  F., Houser, P., Levis, S., Niu, G.-Y., Thornton, P., Vertenstein, M., Yang, Z., and Zeng, X.:
  Technical description of the community land model (CLM), NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN461+STR, 173, doi: 10.5065/D6N877R0, 2004.
- Oleson, K. W., Niu, G. Y., Yang, Z. L., Lawrence, D. M., Thornton, P. E., Lawrence, P. J., Stöckli,
  R., Dickinson, R. E., Bonan, G. B., Levis, S., Dai, A., and Qian, T.: Improvements to the
  Community Land Model and their impact on the hydrological cycle, J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeo.,
  113, G01021, 2008.

- Pietroniro, A., Fortin V., Kouwen N., et al.: Development of the MESH modelling system for
  hydrological ensemble forecasting of the Laurentian Great Lakes at the regional scale, Hydrology
  and Earth System Sciences, 11(4), 1279-1294, 2007.
- 1358 Pokhrel, Y. N., Hanasaki, N., Koirala, S., Cho, J., Yeh, P. J.-F., Kim, H., Kanae, S., and Oki, T.:
- 1359 Incorporating anthropogenic water regulation modules into a land surface model, J.
- 1360 Hydrometeorol., 13, 255–269, 2012a.
- Pokhrel, Y. N., Hanasaki N., Yeh P. J., Yamada T. J., Kanae S. and Oki T.: Model estimates of
  sea-level change due to anthropogenic impacts on terrestrial water storage, Nature Geoscience,
  389–392, doi: 10.1038/ngeo1476, 2012b.
- Polcher, J., Bertrand, N., Biemans, H., Clark, D. B., Floerke, M., Gedney, N., Gerten, D., Stacke,
  T., van Vliet, M., Voss, F.: Improvements in hydrological processes in general hydrological
  models and land surface models within WATCH, WATCH Technical Report Number 34,
  available at: http://www.eu-watch.org/publications/technical-reports (last access: 6 May 2014),
  2011.
- 1369 Polcher, J.: Interactive comment on "On inclusion of water resource management in Earth System
- 1370 models Part 1: Problem definition and representation of water demand" by A. Nazemi and H. S.
- 1371 Wheater, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11, C3403–C3410, available at: www.hydrol-earth-
- 1372 syst-sci-discuss.net/11/C3403/2014/, 2014.
- Ponce, V. M. and Changanti P. V.: Variable-parameter Muskingum-Cunge method revisited,
  Journal of Hydrology, 162(3), 433-439, 1994.
- 1375 Popper, K.: The logic of scientific discovery, 1995 edition, Routledge, London, 1959.
- 1376 Prudhomme, C., Giuntoli, I., Robinson, E. L., Clark, D. B., Arnell, N. W., Dankers, R., Fekete, B.
- 1377 M., Franssen, W., Gerten, D., Gosling, S. N., Hagemann, S., Hannah, D. M., Kim, H., Masaki, Y.,
- 1378 Satoh, Y., Stacke, T., Wada, Y., and Wisser, D.: Hydrological droughts in the 21st century,
- 1379 hotspots and uncertainties from a global multimodel ensemble experiment, P. Natl. Acad. Sci.
- 1380 USA, 111(9), 3262-3267, doi:10.1073/pnas. 1222473110, 2014.
- 1381 Pryke, A., Mostaghim S. and Nazemi A.: Heatmap visualization of population based multi
- objective algorithms, In Evolutionary multi-criterion optimization, pp. 361-375, Springer, Berlin
  Heidelberg., 2007.

- Rani, D. and Moreira M. M.: Simulation–optimization modeling: a survey and potential
  application in reservoir systems operation, Water resources management, 24(6), 1107-1138, 2010.
- Revelle, C., Joeres E. and Kirby W.: The Linear Decision Rule in Reservoir Management and
  Design: 1, Development of the Stochastic Model, Water Resour. Res., 5(4), 767–777, doi:
- 1388 10.1029/WR005i004p00767, 1969.
  - Rodell, M., Chen J., Kato H., Famiglietti J. S., Nigro J. and Wilson C. R.: Estimating groundwater
    storage changes in the Mississippi River basin (USA) using GRACE, Hydrogeology Journal,
    15(1), 159-166, 2007.
  - Rodell, M., Velicogna I. and Famiglietti J. S.: Satellite-based estimates of groundwater depletion
    in India, Nature, 460(7258), 999-1002, 2009.
  - 1394 Rosenzweig, C., Elliott, J., Deryng, D., Ruane, A. C., Müller, C., Arneth, A., Boote, K. J., Folberth,
  - 1395 C., Glotter, M., Khabarov, N., Neumann, K., Piontek, F., Pugh, T. A. M., Schmid, E., Stehfest, E.,
  - Yang, H., Jones, J. W.: Assessing agricultural risks of climate change in the 21st century in a
    global gridded crop model intercomparison, P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 111 (9), 3268-3273,
    doi:10.1073/pnas.1222463110, 2014.
  - Rosolem, R., Gupta H. V., Shuttleworth W. J., Zeng X. and de Gonçalves L. G. G.: A fully
    multiple-criteria implementation of the Sobol? method for parameter sensitivity analysis, J.
    Geophys. Res., 117, D07103, doi: 10.1029/2011JD016355, 2012.
  - Rosolem, R., Gupta H. V., Shuttleworth W. J., Gonçalves L. G. G. de and Zeng X.: Towards a
    comprehensive approach to parameter estimation in land surface parameterization schemes,
    Hydrol. Process., 27: 2075–2097. doi: 10.1002/hyp.9362, 2013.
  - 1405 Rost, S., Gerten, D., Bondeau, A., Luncht, W., Rohwer, J. and Schaphoff, S.: Agricultural green
  - and blue water consumption and its influence on the global water system, Water Resour. Res., 44,
  - 1407 W09405, doi: 10.1029/2007WR006331, 2008.
  - 1408 Rouholahnejad, E., Abbaspour, K. C., Vejdani, M., Srinivasan, R., Schulin, R., and Lehmann, A.:
  - A parallelization framework for calibration of hydrological models, Environ. Model. Softw., 31,
    28–36, 2012.
  - 1411 Sato, H., Ito, A., Ito, A., Ise, T. and Kato, E.: Current status and future of land surface models. Soil
  - 1412 Science and Plant Nutrition, in press, doi: 10.1080/00380768.2014.917593, 2014.

- 1413 Savtchenko, A., Ouzounov, D., Ahmad, S., Acker, J., Leptoukh, G., Koziana, J., and Nickless, D.:
- 1414 Terra and Aqua MODIS products available from NASA GES DAAC, Adv. Space Res., 34, 710–
  1415 714, 2004.
- 1416 Schewe, J., Heinke, J., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Arnell, N. W., Clark, D. B., Dankers, R., Eisner,
- 1417 S., Fekete, B. M., Colón-González, F. J., Gosling, S. N., Kim, H., Liu, X., Masaki, Y., Portmann,
- 1418 F. T., Satoh, Y., Stacke, T., Tang, Q., Wada, Y., Wisser, D., Albrecht, T., Frieler, K., Piontek, F.,
- 1419 Warszawski, L., Kabat, P.: Multimodel assessment of water scarcity under climate change, P. Natl.
- 1420 Acad. Sci. USA, 111 (9), 3245-3250, doi:10.1073/pnas. 1222460110, 2014.
- 1421 Postel, S. L. and Daily, G. C. and Ehrlich P. R.: Human appropriation of renewable fresh water,
- 1422 Science, 271, 785–788, 1996.
- Schiermeier, Q.:Water risk as world warms, Nature, 505, 7481, 10-11, doi:10.1038/ 505010a,
  2014.
- 1425 Schwiegelshohn, U., Badia, R. M., Bubak, M., Danelutto, M., Dustdar, S., Gagliardi, F., Geiger,
- 1426 A., Hluchy, L., Kranzlmüller, D., Erwin Laure, E., Priol, T., Reinefeld, A., Resch, M., Reuter, A.,
- 1427 Rienhoff, O., Rüter, T., Sloot, S., Talia, D., Ullmann, K., Yahyapour, R., von Voigt, G.:
- 1428 Perspectives on grid computing, Future Gener. Comp. Sy., 26, 1104–1115, 2010.
- Siebert, S., Burke J., Faures J. M., Frenken K., Hoogeveen J., Döll P. and Portmann F. T.:
  Groundwater use for irrigation–a global inventory, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
  Discussions, 7(3), 3977-4021, 2010.
- 1432 Skliris, N. and Lascaratos, A.: Impacts of the Nile River damming on the thermohaline circulation
- 1433 and water mass characteristics of the Mediterranean Sea, Journal of Marine Systems, 52(1), 121-
- 1434 143, doi: 10.1016/j.jmarsys.2004.02.005, 2004.
- 1435 Smith, M. J., Palmer, P. I., Purves, D. W., Vanderwel, M. C., Lyutsarev, V., Calderhead, B., Joppa,
- 1436 L. N., Bishop, C. M., Emmott, S.: Changing How Earth System Modeling is Done to Provide More
- 1437 Useful Information for Decision Making, Science, and Society, Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 95(9),
- 1438 1453-1464, doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-13-00080.1, 2014.
- 1439 Sorooshian, S., Li J., Hsu K.-l. and Gao X.: How significant is the impact of irrigation on the local
- 1440 hydroclimate in California's Central Valley? Comparison of model results with ground and
- remote-sensing data, J. Geophys. Res., 116, D06102, doi: 10.1029/2010JD014775, 2011a.

- Sorooshian, S., AghaKouchak, A., Arkin, P., Eylander, J, Foufoula-Georgiou, E., Harmon, R.,
  Hendrickx, J. M. H., Imam, B., Kuligowski, R., Skahill, B., Skofronick-Jackson, G.: Advanced
  concepts on remote sensing of precipitation at multiple scales, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 92, 1353–
  1357, 2011b.
- Strzepek, K., Schlosser, A., Farmer, W., Awadalla, S., Baker, J., Rosegrant M., and Gao X.:
  Modeling the global water resource system in an integrated assessment modeling framework:
  IGSM-WRS, MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change. Report No. 189,
  available at: http://dspace.mit.edu/ handle/1721.1/61767 (last access: 6 May 2014), 2010.
- 1450 Strzepek, K., Schlosser, A., Gueneau, A. Gao, X., Blanc, É, Fant, C., Rasheed B., and Jacoby, H.
- 1451 D.: Modeling water resource system under climate change: IGSM-WRS, MIT Joint Program on 1452 the Science and Policy of Global Change. Report No. 236. http://dspace.mit.edu/
- 1453 handle/1721.1/75774 (last access: 6 May 2014), 2012.
- Sun, A. Y., Green R., Swenson S. and Rodell M.: Toward calibration of regional groundwater
  models using GRACE data, Journal of Hydrology, 422, 1-9, 2012.
- Swenson S. C., D. M. Lawrence and Lee H.: Improved simulation of the terrestrial hydrological
  cycle in permafrost regions by the Community Land Model, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 4,
  M08002, doi: 10.1029/2012MS000165, 2012.
- Syvitski, J. P. M., Vorosmarty, C. J., Kettner, A. J., and Green, P.: Impact of humans on the flux
  of terrestrial sediment to the global coastal ocean, Science, 308, 376-380, 2005.
- Takata, K., Emori S. and Watanabe T.: Development of the minimal advanced treatments of
  surface interaction and runoff, Global and Planetary Change, 38(1), 209-222, 2003.
- Takeuchi, K.: Least marginal environmental impact rule for reservoir development, Hydrological
  sciences journal, 42(4), 583-597, 1997.
- Tang, Q., Gao H., Yeh P., Oki T., Su F. and Lettenmaier D. P.: Dynamics of Terrestrial Water
  Storage Change from Satellite and Surface Observations and Modeling, Journal of
  Hydrometeorology, 11(1), 156-170, 2010.
- Tapley, B. D., Bettadpur, S, Ries, J. C., Thompson, P. F., and Watkins, M. M.: GRACE
  measurements of mass variability in the Earth system, Science, 305(5683), 503-505, 2004.

- 1470 Taylor, R. G., Scanlon, B., Döll, P., Rodell, M., van Beek, R., Wada, Y., Longuevergne, L.,
- 1471 Leblanc, M., Famiglietti, J. S., Edmunds, M., Konikow, L., Green, T. R., Chen, J., Taniguchi, M.,
- 1472 Bierkens, M. F. P., MacDonald, A., Fan, Y., Maxwell, R. M., Yechieli, Y., Gurdak, J. J., Allen, D.
- 1473 M., Shamsudduha, M., Hiscock, K., Yeh, P. J.-F., Holman, I., Treidel, H.: Ground water and
- 1474 climate change, Nat. Clim. Change, 3, 322–329, 2013.
- Tebakari, T., Yoshitani J. and Suvanpimol P.: Impact of large?scale reservoir operation on flow
  regime in the Chao Phraya River basin, Thailand, Hydrological Processes, 26(16), 2411-2420,
  2012.
- 1478 Trenberth, K. E. and Asrar G. R.: Challenges and opportunities in water cycle research: WCRP
  1479 contributions, Surveys in Geophysics, 35, 515-532, 2012.
- USGS: Water Use in the United States, http://water.usgs.gov/watuse/data/2005/index.html
  (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2011.
- 1482 Van Beek, L. P. H. and Bierkens M. F. P.: The Global Hydrological Model PCR-GLOBWB:
- 1483 Conceptualization, Parameterization and Verification, Report Department of Physical Geography,
  1484 Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands, http: //vanbeek.geo.uu.nl/suppinfo/
  1485 vanbeekbierkens2009.pdf (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2009.
- van Beek, L. P. H., Wada Y. and Bierkens M. F. P.: Global monthly water stress: 1. Water balance
  and water availability, Water Resour. Res., 47, W07517, doi: 10.1029/2010WR009791, 2011.
- Voisin, N., Li H., Ward D., et al.: On an improved sub-regional water resources management
  representation for integration into earth system models, Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
  Discussions, 10(3), 3501-3540, 2013a.
- Voisin, N., Liu L., Hejazi M., et al.: One-way coupling of an integrated assessment model and a
  water resources model: evaluation and implications of future changes over the US Midwest,
  Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 10(5), 6359-6406, 2013b.
- 1494 Von Bloh, W., Rost S., Gerten D. and Lucht W.: Efficient parallelization of a dynamic global
  1495 vegetation model with river routing, Environmental Modelling & Software, 25(6), 685-690, 2010.
- 1496 Vörösmarty, C. J., Sharma K. P., Fekete B. M., Copeland A. H., Holden J., Marble J. and Lough
- 1497 J. A.: The storage and aging of continental runoff in large reservoir systems of the world, Ambio,
- 1498 26(4), 210-219, 1997.

- 1499 Vörösmarty, C. J., Federer C. A. and Schloss A. L.: Potential evaporation functions compared on
- 1500 US watersheds: Possible implications for global-scale water balance and terrestrial ecosystem
- 1501 modeling, Journal of Hydrology, 207(3), 147-169, 1998.
- 1502 Vörösmarty, C. J., Meybeck M., Fekete B., Sharma K., Green P. and Syvitski J. P.: Anthropogenic
- 1503 sediment retention: major global impact from registered river impoundments, Global and Planetary
- 1504 Change, 39(1), 169-190, 2003.
- Vörösmarty, C. J., McIntyre, P. B., Gessner, M. O., Dudgeon, D., Prusevich, A., Green, P.,
  Glidden, S., Bunn, S. E., Sullivan, C. A., Reidy Liermann, C., and Davies, P. M.: Global threats
  to human water security and river biodiversity, Nature, 467, 555-561, 2010.
- 1508 Wada, Y., Beek L. P. H. van, Kempen C. M. van, Reckman J. W. T. M., Vasak S. and Bierkens
- M. F. P.: Global depletion of groundwater resources, Geophys. Res. Lett., 37, L20402, doi:
  10.1029/2010GL044571, 2010.
- Wada, Y., Beek L. P. H. van, Viviroli D., Dürr H. H., Weingartner R. and Bierkens M. F. P.:
  Global monthly water stress: 2. Water demand and severity of water stress, Water Resour. Res.,
  47, W07518, doi: 10.1029/2010WR009792, 2011.
- Wada, Y., Beek L. P. H. van and Bierkens M. F. P.: Nonsustainable groundwater sustaining
  irrigation: A global assessment, Water Resour. Res., 48, W00L06, doi: 10.1029/2011WR010562,
  2012.
- Wada, Y., Wisser D. and Bierkens M. F. P.: Global modeling of withdrawal, allocation and
  consumptive use of surface water and groundwater resources, Earth System Dynamics
  Discussions, 4(1), 355-392, 2013a.
- 1520 Wada, Y., Wisser, D., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Gerten, D., Haddeland, I., Hanasaki, N., Masaki, Y.,
- 1521 Portmann, F. T., Stacke, T., Tessler, Z., Schewe, J.: Multimodel projections and uncertainties of
- 1522 irrigation water demand under climate change, Geophys. Res. Lett., 40, 4626–4632, 2013b.
- Wade Miller, G.: Integrated concepts in water reuse: managing global water needs, Desalination,
  187(1), 65-75, 2006.
- Wagener, T., Wheater, H. S., and Gupta, H. V.: Rainfall-Runoff Modelling in Gauged andUngauged Catchments, Imperial College Press, London, UK, 2004.

- 1527 Wang, Y., Leung, L. R., McGREGOR, J. L., Lee, D. K., Wang, W. C., Ding, Y., and Kimura, F.:
- 1528 Regional climate modeling: progress, challenges, and prospects, Journal of the Meteorological
- 1529 Society of Japan, 82(6), 1599-1628, 2004.
- 1530 Wehner, M., Oliker L. and Shalf J.: Towards ultra-high resolution models of climate and weather,
- 1531 International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications, 22(2), 149-165, 2008.
- Wheater, H. and Gober P.: Water security in the Canadian Prairies: science and management
  challenges, Philos. Trans. R. Soc., Ser. A, 371(2002), 20120409, doi:10.1098/rsta.2012.0409,
  2013.
- Williams, D. L., Goward S. and Arvidson T.: Landsat: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow,
  Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing, 72(10), 1171-1178, 2006.
- 1537 Wisser, D., Fekete B. M., Vörösmarty C. J. and Schumann A. H.: Reconstructing 20th century
- 1538 global hydrography: a contribution to the Global Terrestrial Network-Hydrology (GTN-H),
- 1539 Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 14(1), 1-24, 2010.
- 1540 Wood, E. F., Roundy, J. K., Troy, T. J., van Beek, L. P. H., Bierkens, M. F. P., Blyth, E., de Roo,
- 1541 A., Döll, P., Ek, M., Famiglietti, J., Gochis, D., van de Giesen, N., Houser, P., Jaffé, P. R., Kollet,
- 1542 S., Lehner, B., Lettenmaier, D. P., Peters-Lidard, C., Sivapalan, M., Sheffield, J., Wade, A.,
- Whitehead, P.: Hyperresolution global land surface modeling: meeting a grand challenge for
  monitoring Earth's terrestrial water, Water Resour. Res., 47, W05301,
  doi:10.1029/2010WR010090, 2011.
- Wu, Y., Chen J. and Sivakumar B.: Numerical Modeling of Operation and Hydrologic Effects of
  Xinfengjiang Reservoir in Southern China, In Proc. MODSIM 2007 International Congress on
  Modelling and Simulation, pp. 1561-1567, http://mssanz.org.au/MODSIM07/papers/
  24\_s17/NumericalModeling \_s17\_Wu\_.pdf (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2007.
- Wu, Y. and Chen J.: An Operation-Based Scheme for a Multiyear and Multipurpose Reservoir to
  Enhance Macroscale Hydrologic Models, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 13(1), 270-283, 2012.
- Wu, Y., Li T., Sun L. and Chen J.: Parallelization of a hydrological model using the message
  passing interface, Environmental Modelling & Software, 43, 124-132, 2013.

- 1554 Ye, A., Duan, Q., Chu, W., Xu, J., and Mao, Y.: The impact of the South–North Water Transfer
- 1555 Project (CTP)'s central route on groundwater table in the Hai River basin, North China, Hydrol.
- 1556 Process., doi:10.1002/hyp.10081, in press, 2013.
- 1557 Yoshikawa, S., Cho J., Yamada H. G., Hanasaki N., Khajuria A. and Kanae S.: An assessment of
- 1558 global net irrigation water requirements from various water supply sources to sustain irrigation:
- rivers and reservoirs (1960–2000 and 2050), Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions,
- 1560 10(1), 1251-1288, 2013.
- Zektser, I. S. and Lorne E.: Groundwater resources of the world: and their use, http: //unesdoc.
  unesco.org/images/0013/001344/134433e.pdf (retrieved May 6, 2014), 2004.
- 1563 Zhao, F. and Shepherd M.: Precipitation Changes near Three Gorges Dam, China. Part I: A
- 1564 Spatiotemporal Validation Analysis, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 13(2), 735-745, 2012.

1565

|                            |  | Water su                                      | ipply                                  |                           | Water allocation   |   |   |  |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Reference                  | Diversions                                 | Reservoirs                                    | Groundwater<br>store                   | Desalination<br>and reuse | Supply-demand<br>dependency                                | Priorities in demands                               | Operational objectives                        |  |
| Haddeland et al. (2006b)   | In- and inter-grid<br>abstraction          | Macro-scale operation <sup>1</sup>            | N/A                                    | N/A                       | Reservoir can supply up to 5 grids downstream <sup>2</sup> | Irrigation, flood control,<br>hydropower, others    | Minimize deficit, maximize<br>hydropower      |  |
| Hanasaki et al.<br>(2008a) | In- and inter-grid<br>abstraction          | Macro-scale<br>operation                      | N/A                                    | N/A                       | Reservoir can supply up to 10 grids downstream             | Municipal, industrial,<br>irrigation                | Allocate available water                      |  |
| Rost et al. (2008)         | Local abstraction                          | Lake routing                                  | NNBW assume                            | d unlimited <sup>3</sup>  | Local grid   | Irrigation only                                     | Meet demand using available water             |  |
| Döll et al.<br>(2009)      | In- and inter-grid<br>abstraction          | Macro-scale operation                         | N/A                                    | N/A                       | Reservoir can supply up to 5 grids downstream              | Irrigation, non-irrigation                          | Meet total demand <sup>4</sup>                |  |
| Hanasaki et al.<br>(2010)  | Local abstraction                          | Macro-scale<br>operation/local<br>abstraction | NNBW assume                            | ed unlimited              | Local grid   | Irrigation and livestock only                       | Meet total demand using unlimited NNBW        |  |
| Strzepek et al.<br>(2010)  | Local abstraction                          | Macro-scale operation <sup>5</sup>            | Countrywide<br>estimates               | N/A                       | Local basin  | Domestic, industry, livestock,<br>irrigation        | Maximize profitability                        |  |
| Wisser et al.<br>(2010)    | In-grid<br>hydrologic<br>routing           | Macro-scale<br>operation                      | Unlimited local<br>source <sup>6</sup> | N/A                       | Local grid   | Irrigation only                                     | Meet total demand using unlimited groundwater |  |
| Biemans et al. (2011)      | Local<br>abstraction,<br>Heuristic routing | Macro-scale operation                         | NNBW assume                            | d unlimited <sup>7</sup>  | Reservoir can supply up to 5 grids downstream              | Irrigation only                                     | Proportional allocation of available water    |  |
| Wada et al.<br>(2011)      | In- and inter-grid<br>abstraction          | Macro-scale operation                         | Countrywide<br>estimates               | Countrywide<br>estimates  | Reservoir can supply up to 600 km downstream               | Irrigation, flood control,<br>hydropower, others    | Minimize deficit, maximize<br>hydropower      |  |
| Pokhrel et al.<br>(2012a)  | Local abstraction                          | Macro-scale<br>operation                      | NNBW assume                            | ed unlimited              | Local grid   | Irrigation, non-irrigation                          | Meet total demand using<br>unlimited NNBW     |  |
| Strzepek et al. (2012)     | Local abstraction                          | Macro-scale operation <sup>5</sup>            | Basin-scale<br>threshold               | Function of<br>capacity   | Local basin  | Non-agricultural,<br>Agricultural                   | Minimize groundwater use and spill            |  |
| Blanc et al.<br>(2013)     | Local<br>abstraction,<br>Heuristic routing | Macro-scale operation <sup>5</sup>            | Basin-scale<br>threshold               | N/A                       | Local basin  | Non-agricultural,<br>Agricultural                   | Minimize groundwater use and spill            |  |
| Hanasaki et al.<br>(2013b) | Local abstraction                          | Macro-scale operation                         | N/A                                    | N/A                       | Local grid   | Municipal, industrial,<br>irrigation                | Allocate available water                      |  |
| Voisin et al.<br>(2013a,b) | In- and inter-grid<br>abstraction          | Macro-scale<br>operation                      | N/A                                    | N/A                       | Reservoir can supply up to 200 km downstream               | irrigation, flood control,<br>hydropower and others | Allocate available water                      |  |
| Wada et al.<br>(2013a)     | In- and inter-grid<br>abstraction          | Macro-scale<br>operation                      | Conceptual<br>reservoir                | Countrywide<br>estimates  | Reservoir can supply up to 600 km downstream               | Irrigation, non-irrigation                          | Allocate available water                      |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Simultaneous operation of multiple dams in a river basin was not considered.
<sup>2</sup> See Haddeland et al. (2006a).
<sup>3</sup> Simulations without assuming unlimited groundwater store were also performed. .
<sup>4</sup> Demand that cannot be allocated in any given day is allocated later in the year or in the next year, when water is available.
<sup>5</sup> A virtual reservoir is considered for each basin.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Shallow groundwater is represented as a runoff retention pool, which delays runoff before it enters streams.
 <sup>7</sup> Simulations with considering only surface water availability were also performed.

|  | -   |   |                        |   |  |
|--|---|---|------------------------|---|--|
| Reference                              | Host model  | Routing<br>algorithm  | Type of operation      | Reservoir data                              | Validation discharge data  |
| Hanasaki et<br>al. (2006)              | N/A   | TRIP (Oki and<br>Sud, 1998)   | Simulation-<br>based   | WRD98<br>(ICOLD)                            | GSWP (Dirmeyer et al., 1999;<br>Oki et al., 2001)  |
| Haddeland et<br>al. (2006a,b,<br>2007) | VIC (Liang et<br>al., 1994)                             | Linearized<br>Saint-Venant<br>(Lohmann et al.,<br>1996, 1998)                           | Optimizatio<br>n-based | ICOLD;<br>Vörösmarty et al.<br>(1997, 2003) | USGS( http://waterdata.usgs.gov)<br>USBR (http:// www. usbr.gov)<br>GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/) |
| Adam et al.<br>(2007)                  | VIC (Liang et<br>al., 1994)                             | Unit<br>hydrograph and<br>Linearized<br>Saint-Venant<br>(Lohmann et al.,<br>1996, 1998) | Optimizatio<br>n-based | ICOLD;<br>Vörösmarty et al.<br>(1997, 2003) | Adam and Lettenmaier (2008)  |
| Hanasaki et<br>al. (2008a)             | H08 (Hanasaki<br>et al., 2008a,b)                       | TRIP (Oki and<br>Sud, 1998)   | Simulation-<br>based   | WRD98<br>(ICOLD)                            | GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/)   |
| Döll et al.<br>(2009)                  | WaterGAP<br>(Alcamo et al.,<br>2003)                    | HBV<br>(Bergström and<br>Singh, 1995)   | Simulation-<br>based   | GRanD (Lehner<br>et al., 2008)              | GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/)   |
| Wisser et al.<br>(2010)                | WBMplus<br>(Vörösmarty et<br>al., 1998)                 | Muskingum-<br>Cunge (Ponce<br>and Changanti,<br>1994)                                   | Simulation-<br>based   | ICOLD                                       | UNH-GRDC (Fekete et al., 1999,<br>2002)  |
| Biemans et al. (2011)`                 | LPJmL (Gerten<br>et al., 2004;<br>Rost et al.,<br>2008) | Linear reservoir<br>model (Huggins<br>and Burney,<br>1982)                              | Optimizatio<br>n-based | GRanD (Lehner<br>et al., 2011)              | GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/)   |
| Van Beek et<br>al. (2011)              | PCR-GLOBWB<br>(van Beek and<br>Bierkens, 2009)          | Kinematic<br>Saint-Venant<br>(Chow et al.,<br>1998)                                     | Optimizatio<br>n-based | GLWD1 (Lehner<br>and Döll, 2004)            | GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/)   |
| Wu and Chen<br>(2012)                  | SWAT (Arnold<br>et al., 1998)                           | SWAT (Arnold<br>et al., 1998)   | Simulation-<br>based   | Wu et al. (2007)                            | Chen and Wu $(2008)^1$   |
| Pokhrel et al.<br>(2012a)              | MASTIRO<br>(Takata et al.,<br>2003)                     | TRIP (Oki et al., 2001)   | Simulation-<br>based   | WRD98<br>(ICOLD)                            | GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/)   |
| Voisin et al.<br>(2013a)               | VIC (Liang et<br>al., 1994)                             | MOSART (Li et<br>al., 2013a,b)  | Simulation-<br>based   | GRanD (Lehner<br>et al., 2011)              | USGS( http://waterdata.usgs.gov)<br>USBR (http:// www. usbr.gov)<br>GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/) |
| Voisin et al.<br>(2013b)               | SCLM (Li et<br>al., 2011;<br>Lawrence et al.,<br>2011)  | MOSART (Li et<br>al., 2013a,b)  | Simulation-<br>based   | GRanD (Lehner<br>et al., 2011)              | USGS( http://waterdata.usgs.gov)<br>USBR (http:// www. usbr.gov)<br>GRDC<br>(http://www.bafg.de/GRDC/) |

Table 2. Representative examples of available macro-scale reservoir operation algorithms implemented in large-scale models

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Discharge data used for calibration as well

| Table 3. Uncertainties in current offline re | presentations of water resource | management in large-scale models |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Table 5. Oncertainties in current offine re  | presentations of water resource | management in large-seale models |

| Component   | Type of<br>activity             | Specification                                 | Data uncertainty   | Algorithm uncertainty  | Host model uncertainty <sup>1</sup>  |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Water demand<br>(Nazemi and<br>Wheater,<br>2014a) | Irrigative<br>demands           | Irrigation                                    | Climate forcing; soil, crop, land-use and land management<br>including sub-grid heterogeneities; actual diversions;<br>socio-economy and technological variables; agricultural<br>management | Characterizing the potential evapotranspiration and crop<br>water demand; representing the sub-grid crop diversity,<br>irrigation expansion, crop change, return flows | Estimation of actual<br>evapotranspiration, soil water<br>movement, runoff and canopy losses;<br>considering CO <sub>2</sub> effects |
|   | Non-<br>irrigative<br>demands   | Industrial uses                               | Location, diversity and capacity of uses; actual<br>diversions; downscaling proxies; socio-economy and<br>technological variables  | Seasonal variations in industrial water needs; structural and<br>parametric uncertainty in estimation and projection of<br>industrial demand.                          | N/A  |
|   |                                 | Energy-related uses                           | Location, diversity and capacity of uses; actual diversions;<br>downscaling proxies; socio-economy and technological<br>variables  | Seasonal variations in energy-related water needs;<br>structural and parametric uncertainty in estimation and<br>projection of industrial demand.                      | N/A  |
|   |                                 | Municipal<br>Uses                             | Population; diversity in uses; actual diversions and uses;<br>downscaling proxies; socio-economy and technological<br>variables  | Seasonal variations in municipal water needs, structural and<br>parametric uncertainty in estimation and projection of<br>municipal demand                             | N/A  |
|   |                                 | Livestock uses                                | Heads; socio-economy   | Seasonal variations in livestock water need; return flows  | N/A  |
|   |                                 | Environmental flows                           | Habitat and ecosystem needs in time and space  | Over-simplicity of demand calculation  | Hydrological processes upstream  |
|   | Water<br>supply                 | River diversion                               | Location of diversion; capacity, slope and other properties of diversion networks  | Diversion losses, return flows   | Channel routing  |
|   |                                 | Lakes and reservoirs<br>storages <sup>2</sup> | Precipitation; reservoir location and characteristics; actual storage; small dams  | Crude representation of reservoir releases using<br>representations of natural lake, losses from reservoir   | Hydrological processes upstream of dams, channel routing   |
|   |                                 | Inter-basin tra                               |  | Location of diversion; capacity, slope and other water<br>transfer properties; management policies; actual water<br>transfer.  | Diversion losses, simplicity of heuristic algorithms   |
|   |                                 | Reused water                                  | Location, capacity and actual desalinated water supply   | Limited representations  | N/A  |
| Water<br>allocation (see _<br>Sections 2 to 4)    |                                 |   | Groundwater storage  | Soil properties, groundwater movement  | Crude representation of groundwater availability, ignoring inter-cell lateral groundwater movements                                  |
|   |                                 | Operational objectives                        | Management policies and local constraints  | Limitations of common objective functions; Temporal and spatial variations in operational objective  | Estimation of water demand and supply  |
|   | Water<br>allocation<br>practice | Demand-Supply<br>dependency                   | Management policies and local constraints, topography, diversion channels  | Steady-state assumption  | Estimation of water demand and supply  |
|   |                                 | Priorities                                    | Management policies and local constraints  | Temporal and spatial variations in priorities  | Estimation of water demand and supply  |
|   |                                 | Reservoir operations                          | Management policies and local constraints  | Simplicity of operational rules in simulation-based<br>approaches, complexity of optimization-based algorithms,<br>prognosis of both approaches                        | Operational objectives, inflow to reservoirs, water demand   |
|   |                                 | Groundwater withdrawal                        | Wells location, groundwater management, actual pumping capacities  | Crude representation of groundwater withdrawals based on both top-down and bottom-up algorithms  | Groundwater storage, surface water<br>availability, grid-based water<br>demands  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Uncertainties from host-model also include the uncertainties that can extend from other algorithms, related to water resource management, embedded in host models (see Figure 1). <sup>2</sup> See also reservoir operations.

Table 4. Required developments to include the elements of water resource management in Earth System models (see also Table 3)

| Water<br>resource<br>management<br>component | Required algorithmic improvements  | Targeted spatial<br>scale  | Targeted<br>temporal scale  | Data support for parameterization and validation   |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Irrigation<br>demands                        | Improving the calculation of<br>crop-specific water demand<br>considering the effect of<br>CO <sub>2</sub> , considering soil-water<br>movement and other losses | Hyperresolution<br>and sub-grid<br>scale   | Sub-daily/sub-<br>hourly (for online<br>simulations)  | Crop and soil<br>diversity, measured<br>or assimilated<br>evaporation over<br>irrigated lands  |
| Non-irrigative<br>human demands              | Improving the mapping<br>relationship, representing<br>the diversity of non-<br>irrigative demands   | Large grids with<br>the ability to be<br>downscaled into<br>finer resolutions<br>using socio-<br>economic and<br>climate proxies | Yearly and<br>monthly with the<br>ability to be<br>downscaled into<br>finer scales using<br>socio-economic<br>and climate proxies | Water use data,<br>gridded climate and<br>regional socio-<br>economic data   |
| Environmental flow needs                     | Improving the demand<br>approximation considering<br>the diversity in the aquatic<br>life  | Catchment scale  | Monthly and less  | Aquatic<br>biodiversity and<br>water use, climate<br>information, water<br>temperature, water<br>quality   |
| Lakes and reservoirs                         | Improving the<br>representation of release and<br>storage, linking hydrologic<br>representation with energy-<br>balance components                               | Grid and sub-<br>grid  | Daily   | Reservoir storage<br>and water level,<br>release downstream<br>of reservoirs,<br>storage-area-<br>elevation<br>relationships,<br>operational<br>objectives |
| Water<br>diversions                          | Representing in-grid and<br>inter-grid water diversions<br>including losses  | Grid and inter-<br>grid  | Daily   | Water distribution<br>specifications,<br>location of<br>abstractions   |
| Groundwater                                  | Improving the<br>representation of<br>groundwater storage and<br>recharge  | Grid   | Daily (shorter in online simulations)   | Soil properties, well<br>locations, pumping<br>capacities  |
| Water resuse<br>and desalination             | Improving the<br>representation of water<br>reuse and desalination and<br>the annual dynamics of<br>water supply from each<br>facility                           | Grid   | Yearly with the<br>ability to be<br>downscaled into<br>finer time scales<br>using climate and<br>socio-economic<br>proxies        | Location and<br>capacity of<br>facilities, gridded<br>climate, regional<br>socio-economic data   |



Figure 1. A fully coupled framework for inclusion of water resources management in a typical LSM grid



Figure 2. A modular framework for improving the inclusion of water resource management in LSMs through building, testing and falsifying multiple working hypotheses



Figure 3. A sequential workflow for benchmarking, improving and including the elements of water resource management into offline and online Earth System simulations