# Retrospective forecasts of the upcoming winter season snow accumulation in the Inn headwaters (European Alps)

Kristian Förster[1], Florian Hanzer[1], Elena Stoll[2], Adam A. Scaife[3,4], Craig MacLachlan[3], Johannes Schöber[5], Matthias Huttenlau[2], Stefan Achleitner[6], and Ulrich Strasser[1]

[1]Institute of Geography, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria
[2]alpS - Centre for Climate Change Adaptation, Innsbruck, Austria
[3]Met Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, Devon, United Kingdom
[4]College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, United Kingdom
[5]TIWAG, Tiroler Wasserkraft AG, Innsbruck, Austria
[6]Unit of Hydraulic Engineering, Institute of Infrastructure, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

*Correspondence to:* Kristian Förster (kristian.foerster@uibk.ac.at)

**Abstract.** This article presents analyses of retrospective seasonal forecasts of snow accumulation. Re-forecasts with 4 months lead time from two coupled atmosphere-ocean general circulation models (NCEP CFSv2 and MetOffice GloSea5) drive the Alpine Water balance and Runoff Estimation model (AWARE) in order to predict mid-winter snow accumulation in the Inn headwaters. As the snowpack is a hydrological storage that evolves during the winter season, it is strongly dependent on precipitation totals of the previous months. Climate model (CM) predictions of precipitation totals integrated from November to February (NDJF) compare reasonably well with observations. This predictive skill is retained in subsequent water balance simulations when snow water equivalent (SWE) in February is considered. Given the AWARE simulations driven by observed meteorological fields as a benchmark for SWE analyses, the correlation achieved using GloSea5-AWARE SWE predictions is $r = 0.57$. The tendency of SWE anomalies (i.e. the sign of anomalies) is correctly predicted in 11 of 13 years. For CFSv2, the corresponding values are $r = 0.28$ and 7 of 13 years. The results suggest that some seasonal predictions may be capable of predicting tendencies of hydrological model storages in parts of Europe.

## 1 Introduction

Seasonal predictions are an emerging new field in hydrology (e.g., Yuan et al., 2015; Svensson et al., 2015; Mackay et al., 2015) complementing current progress in predicting long-term developments in changed hydrological conditions as a consequence of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emission. In contrast to climate change projections, seasonal predictions focus on hydrological states of the upcoming months from their dependence on initial states (Warner, 2011). These can provide "Climate Services": A set of tools, products and information, serving decision makers and practitioners and bringing all types of information on climate research into practice at all levels of society (Vaughan and Dessai, 2014). This makes them relevant for detecting anticipated short-term changes in hydrological systems as requested by international research programmes such as "World Climate Research Programme" (WCRP, e.g., Kirtman and Pirani, 2009), "Future Earth" (Greenslade and Berkhout, 2014), and more specialised programmes like, e.g., the International Network for Alpine Research Catchment Hydrology (INARCH,

Pomeroy et al., 2015) which is part of the Global Energy and Water Cycle Exchanges Project (GEWEX, Chahine, 1992). In this context, seasonal predictions contribute, on the one hand, to cope with the WCRP "Grand Challenges" (Reid et al., 2010), and are used on the other hand to detect short-term changes in coupled hydrological-societal systems. The latter consideration of water and humans (Sivapalan et al., 2012) seeks to better understand interactions between society and hydrological systems

5  for which seasonal predictions can also be seen as relevant. The goal of the current scientific decade of the International Association of Hydrological Sciences (IAHS) is to better understand these interactions on different scales of time (Montanari et al., 2013).

Seasonal outlooks of hydrological variables have been prepared for decades. Observed system states and rules with regional relevance have been utilised to prepare monthly outlooks (Pagano et al., 2004; Bell et al., 2017). A common way to predict

10  future hydrological states is to run a hydrological model based on known initial states and force it with ensembles of meteorological data observed in the past. This methodology is well known and referred to as Ensemble Streamflow Prediction (ESP, Wood and Lettenmaier, 2008). Its combination with meteorological data as forcing (reverse-ESP) is also subject to recent research on predictability of hydrological systems (e.g. the VESPA approach, Wood et al., 2016). In the last decades, coupled Atmosphere-Ocean General Circulation Models (AOGCM) have become a viable method for seasonal predictions (Svensson

15  et al., 2015). These climate model (CM)-based forecasts provide future meteorological/climatological conditions for the next weeks (sub-seasonal forecasts), months (seasonal forecasts), or decades (decadal forecasts) on a physical basis rather than on statistics. An overview about the state-of-the-art of CM-based seasonal predictions is provided by Doblas-Reyes et al. (2013) and Yuan et al. (2015). Like numerical weather prediction, seasonal forecasts are an initial-state problem since predictions of the atmospheric states of the upcoming months strongly depend on the initial states of the atmosphere, oceans, land, and sea

20  ice. In contrast to weather predictions, the need for considering ocean and sea ice dynamics is crucial since these components of the climate system affect atmospheric phenomena on time scales beyond typical weather predictions. Another important difference from numerical weather predictions is the dependence of seasonal predictions on boundary conditions. Like long-term climate predictions which are based on anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, CM-based seasonal predictions require adequate definitions of boundary conditions (Doblas-Reyes et al., 2013).

25  The skill of CM-based seasonal predictions is not distributed equally in space and time (Smith et al., 2012; Kim et al., 2012; Kirtman et al., 2014). For instance, the skill in Europe is much lower than in the tropics, where phenomena like El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) are predictable with higher accuracy (Yuan et al., 2015). Current progress on improving predictability has been recently reported by Scaife et al. (2014) who demonstrated skilful predictions of the North Atlantic Oscillation, a feature that is relevant for seasonal predictions in Europe. Bruno Soares and Dessai (2015) found that there is a

30  mismatch in supply and demand regarding seasonal forecast products which is limited by skill levels in some regions although the authors also detected additional non-scientific reasons for this mismatch like, e.g., insufficient communication of forecasts to the users.

In the present study, we focus on a way to make seasonal predictions better exploitable for demands in context of hydro power generation in the Alps. For this application, it would be interesting to know if the upcoming winter season will be above

35  or below average regarding the accumulation of snow. The amount of water released as a consequence of snow melt in spring

is a key parameter for the management of reservoirs. We present a systematic evaluation in order to detect the predictability of above and below average snow accumulation. To achieve this goal, CM-based seasonal forecasts are employed as input data to a water balance model that predicts snow water equivalent (SWE) and runoff in the Inn headwaters. A new aspect of this work is the focus on *hydrological storages* instead of instantaneous hydrological fluxes. Considering hydrological storages

5  together with seasonal predictions currently receives little attention (see, e.g., Sene et al., 2016; Mackay et al., 2015; Bell et al., 2017). It is expected that the focus on integrated storages (e.g., mid-winter snow accumulation) is more robust than considering instantaneous fluxes (e.g., precipitation, runoff) in seasonal predictions.

Based on that, the research question remains: Can we detect above or below average snow conditions on the basis of CM-based seasonal predictions? To answer this, CM-based and hydrological modelling is applied in an alpine case study. In Section

10  2 the relevant information about the study area, the climate data, the CM-based seasonal predictions, the water balance model, and the methodology for detecting the predictability of snow accumulation are described. In Section 3, the results are presented, compiled and discussed. Finally, Section 4 provides concluding remarks and an outlook for future work.

## 2  Material and methods

### 2.1  Study area

15  The Inn headwaters catchment upstream of the Kirchbichl gauging station covers an area of $9{,}310\,\mathrm{km}^2$ (see, Fig. 1). Elevations in the catchment range between 486 and 4049 m a.s.l., with a mean elevation of approximately 2000 m a.s.l. About 3% of the catchment area is covered by glaciers. During the winter season runoff is lowest since a major fraction of precipitation is accumulated to the snow cover. In spring snow melt causes an increase in runoff reaching its maximum in August when glacier melt is highest. For the period 1985–2009, the average areal precipitation and runoff amount to $1225\,\mathrm{mm\,yr^{-1}}$ and

20  $1000\,\mathrm{mm\,yr^{-1}}$, respectively. In the second half of the 20th century, several reservoirs have been built in the study area. Their capacity in total is $638 \cdot 10^6\ \mathrm{m}^3$.

### 2.2  Climate data and seasonal predictions

#### 2.2.1  Climate data

The climate data provided by the HISTALP project (Historical Instrumental Climatological Surface Time Series of the Greater

25  Alpine Region, Auer et al., 2007) is a suitable dataset for studies on climatology and long-term changes of temperature and precipitation in the Alps. The data has been compiled for a long period of time (1800-2010) and includes a dense observational station network from different countries in the Greater Alpine Region. Moreover, it has been quality checked and homogenised (Auer et al., 2007; Chimani et al., 2013). Mean temperature and precipitation depth are provided on a grid with a temporal resolution of one month and a spatial resolution of five minutes (approx. 6 km).

### 2.2.2 Climatological forecasts

In the framework of this study, the term "climatological forecasts" refers to simulations based on long-term averages of air temperature and precipitation depth for each month based on the HISTALP data. For instance, considering a climatological forecast for January, mean air temperature and precipitation depth are computed through averaging each variable over all Januaries in a multi-year period. This understanding differs from other definitions of climatological forecasts in which a climatological forecast is constructed by randomly selecting valid values for January in that period instead of averaging.

### 2.2.3 Climate model-based seasonal predictions

In this study, two different AOGCMs are utilised as input data for further analyses of seasonal predictions. As outlined earlier, the requirements of CM-based seasonal predictions exceed the extent of numerical weather predictions with respect to the forecast horizon and the number of subsystems of the climate system that need to be considered. Due to the extended forecast horizon, oceans and sea ice need to be incorporated in the models as well (see, e.g., Smith et al., 2012; Doblas-Reyes et al., 2013; Yuan et al., 2015). In this study, two different AOGCMs are applied independently:

– NCEP's (National Centers for Environmental Prediction) Coupled Forecast System model version 2 (CFSv2, Saha et al., 2014) is an operational seasonal prediction system. Forecasts are initialised four times a day. The horizontal resolution is 0.5°(approx. 40 km). In order to derive monthly forecasts, runs between the 8th day of the previous month and the 7th day of the current month are utilised in order to generate a lagged ensemble. This methodology is proposed by Yuan et al. (2013) who applied this method to re-forecasts. Since re-forecasts are only available for every 5th day, a typical ensemble of CFSv2 re-forecasts comprises 24 members per month. The archive of re-forecasts includes data from 1985 to 2009. The maximum lead time is 9 months.

– MetOffice Global Seasonal forecast system version 5 (GloSea5) is a seasonal prediction system that runs operationally at the MetOffice (MacLachlan et al., 2015; Scaife et al., 2014). Compared to CFSv2, it has a higher ocean horizontal resolution (0.25°, approx. 20 km). The data applied in this study was provided by the SPECS project ("Seasonal-to-decadal climate Prediction for the improvement of European Climate Services", http://www.specs-fp7.eu/) and covers the period between 1996 and 2010. Re-forecasts for winter were used with initial start dates: 25 Oct., 01 Nov., and 09 Nov. For each date, 3 runs are available which gives an ensemble of 9 members per winter. This subset of hindcasts has a lead time of 4 months for each run.

Systematic analyses are performed for 1996 – 2009 (the period in which both models are available) . Only those re-forecasts that start in November are considered. The lead time is limited to 4 months to predict snow conditions in February.

### 2.3 Water balance simulations using AWARE

The Alpine Water balance and Runoff Estimation model (AWARE, Förster et al., 2016) is a deterministic hydrological model operating on a regular grid at one month time steps. The model has been designed to estimate anomalies in hydrological

variables at the catchment scale from anomalies in meteorological fields predicted by climate models. The coarse temporal resolution allows one to carry out seasonal predictions considering a large number of individual runs at a minimum of computational costs which justifies the coarse time step. As the study's focus is on anomalies in seasonal characteristics, using a monthly scale water balance model is feasible (Kling et al., 2012; Bock et al., 2016) and these models are also applied for
5  seasonal hydrological predictions (Bell et al., 2017).

Required meteorological forcing data include both mean monthly air temperature and monthly precipitation totals provided as grids or station data, which makes the model parsimonious with respect to data requirements. Altitudinal gradients are applied in order to realistically redistribute temperature and distribution on the model grid resulting in a decrease in temperature with increasing elevation and an increase in precipitation on the mountains. Even though the model is also capable of reading
10  shortwave radiation fields (Förster et al., 2016) in order to improve ice melt predictions, a simplified snow- and ice-melt simulation using air temperature only is possible. This simplification considers the fact that air temperature and precipitation are readily available and more predictable compared to some other meteorological fields. In order to perform simulations with this minimal input of data, the Thornthwaite (1948) evapotranspiration approach is applied. The soil water balance is computed following the approach of McCabe and Markstrom (2007). A linear storage is applied in order to account for the recession of
15  runoff typically related to groundwater processes.

The model assumes a baseline (reference) meteorological dataset for calibration, which is shown in Figure 2 using the HISTALP data from 1996 to 2009 as the reference period. The Nash-Sutcliffe model efficiency (NSE) amounts to $E = 0.92$ which might be viewed as very good model performance. As suggested by Schaefli and Gupta (2007), the benchmark Nash-Sutcliffe model efficiency is computed as well ($E_b = 0.45$). This benchmark NSE value accounts for strong effects of seasonal-
20  ity. While the standard NSE indicates if a model is better than the average of observed values, the benchmark NSE proves if the model performance exceeds the corresponding value of a simple model that simply predicts long-term averages for each month. Since the benchmark NSE is also greater than zero, the model is more skillful than applying long-term averages. According to Klemeš (1986) a split sample test is applied including an independent validation period ranging from 1984 to 1995. The corresponding NSE and benchmark NSE are 0.91 and 0.25, respectively. As the model performance of the validation period
25  is comparable to the calibration period, the model is found to be suitable for predictions. The mismatch of runoff simulations in winter, especially in March can be attributed to the effects of reservoirs on river flow in the catchment area which are not represented in the model so far. In this period water is released from seasonal storages which are filled in summer.

Another advantage of the one month time step is the lower complexity with respect to downscaling of climate model data. Current approaches focus on statistical (e.g., Crochemore et al., 2016) or dynamical downscaling (e.g., Förster et al., 2014)
30  of coarse atmospheric data fields (e.g., derived by climate models). AWARE builds upon a simple and robust approach which is based on anomalies. For instance, Marzeion et al. (2012) successfully add anomalies from other datasets to a reference climatology to compute glacier mass balances at the global scale. In order to account for different spreads of distributions, standardised anomalies are considered in our study. According to Wilks (2006) this approach is feasible when "working simultaneously with batches of data that are related, but not strictly comparable". This is a typical situation in case of observational

data and re-forecasts. Standardised anomalies $z_x$ are simply computed for a variable $x$, taking into consideration its long-term mean $\bar{x}$ for a given month and the corresponding empirical standard deviation $\tilde{s}_x$ (Wilks, 2006):

$$z_x = \frac{x - \bar{x}}{\tilde{s}_x} \tag{1}$$

Given that two datasets $x$ and $y$ are comparable (e.g., reference climatology and the climatology of re-forecasts), their standardised anomalies $z_x$ and $z_y$ might be viewed comparable as well. Based on the assumption that $z_x = z_y$, Eq. 1 can be rearranged to

$$x = \frac{y - \bar{y}}{\tilde{s}_y} \cdot \tilde{s}_x + \bar{x}. \tag{2}$$

Anomalies of the climate model (i.e. $y - \bar{y}$) can easily be transformed to the climatology of the reference data set (i.e., $x$). Mean values and standard deviations are computed separately for each month and climate data set including HISTALP, CFSv2, and GloSea5. In this way, anomalies predicted by the climate models can be reliably transformed to typical anomalies of the observational data.

### 2.4 Model experiment for analysing the predictability of snow accumulation

The long-term simulations of the water balance provide monthly snapshots of valid system states for each state variable at any point in time. For each CM-based seasonal prediction run starting in November, system states for SWE, soil moisture, and groundwater storage computed for October are defined as initial states. In total four AWARE runs driven with different forcing datasets are available for each winter season between 1997 and 2009 (November to February, NDJF):

1. HISTALP-AWARE: Long-term continuous run based on observed HISTALP data (see, Sect. 2.2.1 and Fig. 2),

2. CF-AWARE: Climatological forecasts (CF) with average conditions computed using HISTALP (see, Sect. 2.2.2),

3. GloSea5-AWARE: CM-based seasonal forecast using GloSea5, and

4. CFSv2-AWARE: CM-based seasonal forecast using CFSv2.

The ensemble provided by CM-based seasonal forecasts of meteorological quantities is averaged prior to the water balance simulations. In general, ensemble seasonal predictions are subject to low signal to noise ratios. The signal in the ensemble mean is small in most cases and using members individually will mask the signal (Scaife et al., 2014; Eade et al., 2014). In general, each ensemble member of input data is individually processed in hydrological forecasting, which is why the averaging is typically implemented afterwards. However, a skill improvement is reported by recent seasonal prediction studies (e.g., Bell et al., 2017) in which the concept of averaging is applied prior to hydrological simulations. This approach seems feasible given that the time step of hydrological simulations is one month. Although the hydrological model is a conceptual model that mimics the basic physical principles, the temporal scale does not allow to capture the full dynamics of hydrological processes

that are typically studied on smaller scales. Thus, the coarse temporal resolution of the modelling approach is to a certain degree "statistical" in nature which justifies the application of mean ensemble inputs. Moreover, the utilisation of standardised anomalies applied to CM-based seasonal forecasts in the AWARE model accounts for variance corrections to the ensemble mean values as suggested by Eade et al. (2014). Appropriate uncertainty can also be added to the predictions to ensure reliable

5 probabilistic forecasts.

The basin-average time series of these water balance simulations are directly comparable. While the continuous long-term simulation represents a reference run (#1) serving as benchmark for seasonal predictions, the climatological forecasts (#2) help to judge whether anomalies will be above or below average. Correlations between the reference run and the water balance simulations forced by CM-based forecasts (#3 and #4) are computed to assess the predictive skill. Moreover, the tendency or

10 sign of anomalies is compared through counting the coincidence of above (below) average anomalies in the reference run and the seasonal predictions.

## 3 Results and Discussion

Figure 3(a) demonstrates the annual cycle of modelled SWE. The black dashed line is the mean value of all years. It compares well with the black bold line which represents the climatological simulations based on AWARE using average air temperature

15 and precipitation depth for each month. Thus, the climatological forecast is suitable to compute average snow conditions (see also Fig. 3(c) which includes the spatial distribution of average SWE in February). Full time series are shown in Fig. 3(b). The boundary conditions of the climatological forecast are equal in each year. However, the initial conditions differ according to the initialisation each year in October which is obtained from the long-term run. Figure 3(d) depicts a subset of SWE observations compiled by Schöber et al. (2016). In contrast to the cited study, which explains the methodology of SWE sampling in detail,

20 here only stations above 1400 m a.s.l. have been selected in order to better match the average catchment elevation (Sect. 2.1). The correlation between computed SWE in February and the SWE observations in February is $r = 0.65$ (Fig. 3(b) vs. Fig. 3(d)). This comparison should be interpreted with caution. First, despite the fact that a sub-selection of stations that better match the mean elevation of the catchment has been chosen for this analysis, the full range of elevation bands in the basin is not fully covered by the observational dataset. Moreover, scaling issues limit spatial and temporal representativeness, since

25 averaged point-scale measurements recorded on a weekly scale are compared to basin-scale water balance simulation with one month time step. However, observed and computed SWE compare reasonably well. This underlines the applicability of AWARE to predict SWE.

In a next step, anomalies computed using AWARE forced by CM-based seasonal forecasts are compared to the corresponding values of the reference run (HISTALP-AWARE, #1). This evaluation is demonstrated in Fig. 4 for temperature, precipitation

30 depth, and SWE in February. Anomalies in temperature and precipitation depth refer to the period November to February (NDJF) in each winter and represent average values at the basin scale (i.e. the mean of all grid points of the meteorological fields in AWARE). In this way, the values are subject to the statical transformations and elevation dependent redistributions as outlined in Section 2.3. The anomalies of the reference AWARE run driven by HISTALP are shown in the top panels of Fig. 4.

Their correlation is set to 1 by definition since this run is viewed as reference. The seasonal forecasts computed using AWARE driven by GloSea5 (center) and CFSv2 (bottom) are also displayed. Correlation coefficients computed for NDJF temperature anomalies range from $r = 0.17$ (CFSv2) to $r = 0.32$ (GloSea5). Tendencies in anomalies (i.e. the prediction of correct signs of anomalies) also vary between the models. This becomes obvious when counting the shaded areas indicating a mismatch

5  between the seasonal forecast and the reference run. While GloSea5 correctly predicted the sign of temperature anomalies in 9 of 13 winters, the hitrate (i.e. the number of correctly predicted states divided by the total number of winters) achieved for CFSv2 only amounts to 8 of 13.

The skill in precipitation predictions is higher regarding both correlation and hitrate. In the case of GloSea5, the hitrate of correctly predicted anomalies is 9 of 13 ($r = 0.61$). As for temperature, the model skill of precipitation predictions computed

10  by CFSv2 is also lower (hitrate 7 of 13, $r = 0.31$). However, the number of correctly predicted tendencies might be viewed as good results since the seasonal forecasts includes a lead time of 4 months. Single months show lower scores, suggesting that a temporal integration improves the robustness of results consistent with our approach using hydrological storages rather than fluxes.

Figure 4(c) highlights that the predictive skill achieved for precipitation depth is also prevailing for SWE in February. Even

15  though correlation coefficients are slightly lower compared to precipitation depth (GloSea5: $r = 0.57$, CFSv2: $r = 0.28$), SWE values in February computed by AWARE driven by CM-based forecasts compare well to those of the reference run. The hitrate achieved using GloSea even reaches 11 of 13 while the hitrate of CFSv2 remains at the level of 7 of 13.

A Bernoulli experiment helps to judge whether these hitrates differ from the performance of a "fair coin" for predicting above and below average conditions. The null hypothesis is: The hitrate of the seasonal forecasts does not differ from a

20  random 50:50 probability (binomial test). Given the total number of winters $n = 13$ and a level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$, the null hypothesis is rejected for hitrates above 9 of 13. This means that according to the results shown in Fig. 4, for seasonal predictions of SWE using GloSea5 this test rejects the null hypothesis, indicating significant skill. In contrast, the scores for CFSv2 are not significant.

Regardless the limitations discussed with respect to observed SWE, the correlations are much lower if the observations

25  from Fig. 3(d) are involved in skill computations. The correlation between observed anomalies and GloSea5 is $r = 0.21$ while the corresponding value achieved using CFSv2 is only $r = 0.11$. These values are much lower than the correlations achieved using the reference run. This finding might also be related to possible mismatches in representativeness between observations and simulations. However, the comparison between HISTALP-AWARE and the CM-based seasonal forecasts highlights model skill when using CM-based forecasts. This comparison revealed a reasonably good agreement between seasonal forecasts and

30  the reference run and the skill of CM-based forecasts is promising.

Finally, Fig. 5 depicts time series of the water balance of the snow storage for each year and each AWARE model run. Monthly precipitation (separated for rainfall and snowfall), cumulative snowmelt, and SWE are plotted. Moreover, the snow accumulation of the reference run (HISTALP-AWARE, #1) and the climatological forecast (CF-AWARE, #2) are displayed. The latter is subject to the same forcing in each year but is initialised according to the system states of AWARE in late fall. If

35  the SWE computed by HISTALP-AWARE exceeds the corresponding value of CF-AWARE, above average snow accumulation

prevails. Accordingly, the opposite is true for below average conditions. A similar comparison is possible for the predictions of GloSea5-AWARE and CFSv2. If the CM-based forecast and HISTALP-AWARE simultaneously indicate either above or below average conditions, a label "HIT" is added to the corresponding seasonal forecast. The overall hitrate is readable from Fig. 4. Even though monthly precipitation depth differs between HISTALP-AWARE and the CM-based forecasts, the NDJF
5  precipitation totals might compensate this monthly scale differences resulting in a good match of SWE values in February. This is obvious for many of the winter seasons shown in Fig. 5 (e.g., 1998/99 and 2000/01) and confirms the previous finding that improved model skill is possible when storages instead of instantaneous fluxes are considered.

## 4   Conclusions

In this study, a systematic evaluation of CM-seasonal winter forecasts starting in November has been performed using a water
10  balance model. A new method has been developed focussing on hydrological storages instead of instantaneous hydrological fluxes. In this way, basin-scale averages of temperature and precipitation depth are temporally integrated in order to achieve November to February (NDJF) averages and totals, respectively. Given a lead time of 4 months, the application of the water balance model then allows predicting SWE in February which is relevant for many sectors like water management or hydro power generation. Based on year-by-year evaluation of re-forecasts using correlation analyses and a Binomial test, the results
15  achieved using GloSea5 and CFSv2 indicate that dynamical (CM-based) seasonal forecasts can provide skill.

Regarding predictability, the location of the study area is also of particular interest in the process of interpreting the results. Due to the fact that the Alps are situated in a transition zone between northern and southern Europe, the influence of large-scale climate patterns, such as the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), should be analysed more detailed in the future. It is also known that El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) impacts the climate in Europe in late winter and stratospheric sudden warmings are
20  also important (Ineson and Scaife, 2008; Scaife et al., 2016). A first assessment of possible connections between the NAO on the one hand and snow and glacier related states on the other hand only resulted in low correlations (c.f. Beniston and Jungo, 2002; Scherrer et al., 2004; Bartolini et al., 2009; Marzeion and Nesje, 2012). However, in the southern and western parts of the Alps this relationship between NAO and snow and ice properties might be explained more clearly. Recent skill improvements regarding CM-based seasonal predictions might explain our detectable skill (Scaife et al., 2014). Future work should address
25  climatological processes that are related to model skill and involve other basins in different parts of the Alps.

Besides studying the climatological perspective of predictability, the results also revealed uncertainties involved in hydrological modelling using the water balance model and scaling issues regarding the representativeness of point scale SWE observations. These findings also suggest improvements regarding both the provision of basin-scale SWE observations and the water balance model as an outlook for future work. Low flow conditions in March might be better predicted if the model would
30  account for artificial reservoirs in the study area. This feature will be added to the model in the future.

However, the results of this study show that it is possible to detect skilful signals from dynamical (CM-based) seasonal predictions of hydrological storages in Europe, where seasonal predictions are still challenging. The results suggest that some seasonal predictions may be capable of predicting tendencies of hydrological model storages, although the skill of these pre-

dictions is in many cases low in Europe. The basic idea of this study is that a focus on hydrological storages rather than on hydrological fluxes might help in exploiting seasonal predictions. The first results of the methodology are promising with respect to practical applications in which hitrates above 70% might be seen as a reasonable target accuracy. Since snowmelt predictions are of particular interest in the study area, a similar approach could be applied to CM-based seasonal forecasts

5 initialised in May. Future research should also address predictability studies in other regions. Moreover, it would be interesting to study the predictability of other hydrological storages like, e.g., glaciers, lakes or groundwater. A focus on probabilistic forecasts also is an interesting prospect for the future.

## 5 Data availability

- CFSv2 re-forecast data: https://nomads.ncdc.noaa.gov/data/cfsr-rfl-mmda/flxf/

10 - HISTALP: http://www.zamg.ac.at/histalp/index.php

*Author contributions.* K. Förster prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors, designed the study, performed the water balance simulations and predictability analyses. He and F. Hanzer developed the AWARE model which has been designed for this kind of study. E. Stoll contributed to downscaling of climate model output and reviewed the literature with respect to connections between snow and glacier observations on the one hand and the NAO index on the other hand. A. A. Scaife and C. MacLachlan computed and provided

15 the GloSea5 re-forecasts and helped with data usage, interpretation of the results and improving the methodology. Snow observations in the study area were evaluated by J. Schöber who also contributed to interpreting anomalies in SWE. M. Huttenlau coordinated the project. S. Achleitner and U. Strasser are key researchers of the project. They supervised the scientific work and helped discussing the results and improving the methodology.

*Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

20 *Acknowledgements.* This work was carried out as part of the project "W01 MUSICALS II – Multiscale Snow/Ice Melt Discharge Simulation for Alpine Reservoirs" at alpS – Centre for Climate Change Adaptation in Innsbruck, Austria. The K1-Centre alpS is funded through the Federal Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology (BMVIT), the Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy (BMWFW), as well as the Austrian federal states of Tyrol and Vorarlberg within the scope of COMET – Competence Centers for Excellent Technologies. The Programme COMET is managed by the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG). We want to thank TIWAG – Tiroler Wasserkraft

25 AG for the collaboration and co-funding the project. Another thanks goes to the NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) for the provision the CFSv2 data. The retrospective forecasts of the GloSea5 model were kindly provided by SPECS project ("Seasonal-to-decadal climate Prediction for the improvement of European Climate Services", http://www.specs-fp7.eu/). We would like to thank Felix Oesterle who wrote the script to automatically retrieve and convert CFSv2 data. Assistance with HISTALP data provided by Anna-Maria Tilg and Barbara Chimani is greatly appreciated. A.A.S. and C.M. were supported

30 by the joint DECC/Defra MetOffice Hadley Centre Programme (GA01101).

# References

Auer, I., Böhm, R., Jurkovic, A., Lipa, W., Orlik, A., Potzmann, R., Schöner, W., Ungersböck, M., Matulla, C., Briffa, K., Jones, P., Efthymi-adis, D., Brunetti, M., Nanni, T., Maugeri, M., Mercalli, L., Mestre, O., Moisselin, J.-M., Begert, M., Müller-Westermeier, G., Kveton, V., Bochnicek, O., Stastny, P., Lapin, M., Szalai, S., Szentimrey, T., Cegnar, T., Dolinar, M., Gajic-Capka, M., Zaninovic, K., Majstorovic, Z., and Nieplova, E.: HISTALP—historical instrumental climatological surface time series of the Greater Alpine Region, Int. J. Climatol., 27, 17–46, doi:10.1002/joc.1377, 2007.

Bartolini, E., Claps, P., and D'Odorico, P.: Interannual variability of winter precipitation in the European Alps: relations with the North Atlantic Oscillation., Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 13, 17–25, 2009.

Bell, V. A., Davies, H. N., Kay, A. L., Brookshaw, A., and Scaife, A. A.: A national-scale seasonal hydrological forecast system: development and evaluation over Britain, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., pp. 1–19, doi:10.5194/hess-2017-154, 2017.

Beniston, M. and Jungo, P.: Shifts in the distributions of pressure, temperature and moisture and changes in the typical weather patterns in the Alpine region in response to the behavior of the North Atlantic Oscillation, Theor. Appl. Climatol., 71, 29–42, doi:10.1007/s704-002-8206-7, 2002.

Bock, A. R., Hay, L. E., McCabe, G. J., Markstrom, S. L., and Atkinson, R. D.: Parameter regionalization of a monthly water balance model for the conterminous United States, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20, 2861–2876, doi:10.5194/hess-20-2861-2016, 2016.

Bruno Soares, M. and Dessai, S.: Exploring the use of seasonal climate forecasts in Europe through expert elicitation, Clim. Risk Manage., 10, 8–16, doi:10.1016/j.crm.2015.07.001, 2015.

Chahine, M. T.: GEWEX: The global energy and water cycle experiment, Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union, 73, 9–14, 1992.

Chimani, B., Matulla, C., Böhm, R., and Hofstätter, M.: A new high resolution absolute temperature grid for the Greater Alpine Region back to 1780, Int. J. Climatol., 33, 2129–2141, doi:10.1002/joc.3574, 2013.

Crochemore, L., Ramos, M.-H., and Pappenberger, F.: Bias correcting precipitation forecasts to improve the skill of seasonal streamflow forecasts, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 20, 3601–3618, doi:10.5194/hess-20-3601-2016, 2016.

Doblas-Reyes, F. J., García-Serrano, J., Lienert, F., Biescas, A. P., and Rodrigues, L. R. L.: Seasonal climate predictability and forecasting: Status and prospects, WIREs Clim. Change, 4, 245–268, doi:10.1002/wcc.217, 2013.

Eade, R., Smith, D., Scaife, A., Wallace, E., Dunstone, N., Hermanson, L., and Robinson, N.: Do seasonal-to-decadal climate predictions underestimate the predictability of the real world?, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 5620–5628, doi:10.1002/2014gl061146, 2014.

Förster, K., Meon, G., Marke, T., and Strasser, U.: Effect of meteorological forcing and snow model complexity on hydrological simulations in the Sieber catchment (Harz Mountains, Germany), Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 18, 4703–4720, doi:10.5194/hess-18-4703-2014, 2014.

Förster, K., Oesterle, F., Hanzer, F., Schöber, J., Huttenlau, M., and Strasser, U.: A snow and ice melt seasonal prediction modelling system for Alpine reservoirs, Proc. Int. Assoc. Hydrol. Sci., 374, 143–150, doi:10.5194/piahs-374-143-2016, 2016.

Greenslade, D. and Berkhout, F.: Future Earth-Research for Global Sustainability, in: EGU General Assembly Conference Abstracts, vol. 16, 2014.

Ineson, S. and Scaife, A. A.: The role of the stratosphere in the European climate response to El Niño, Nat. Geosci., 2, 32–36, doi:10.1038/ngeo381, 2008.

Kim, H.-M., Webster, P. J., and Curry, J. A.: Seasonal prediction skill of ECMWF System 4 and NCEP CFSv2 retrospective forecast for the Northern Hemisphere Winter, Climate Dyn., 39, 2957–2973, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1364-6, 2012.

Kirtman, B. and Pirani, A.: The State of the Art of Seasonal Prediction: Outcomes and Recommendations from the First World Climate Research Program Workshop on Seasonal Prediction, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 90, 455–458, doi:10.1175/2008BAMS2707.1, 2009.

Kirtman, B., Power, S. B., Adedoyin, J. A., Boer, G. J., Camilloni, I., Doblas-Reyes, F. J., Fiore, A. M., Kimoto, M., Meehl, G. A., Prather, M., Sarr, A., Schar, C., Sutton, R., van Oldenborgh, G. J., Vecchi, G., and Wang, H. J.: Near-term climate change: projections and predictability, in: Climate change 2013 : the physical science basis : contribution to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M. M., Allen, S. K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P. M., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

Klemeš, V.: Operational testing of hydrological simulation models, Hydrol. Sci. J., 31, 13–24, doi:10.1080/02626668609491024, 1986.

Kling, H., Fuchs, M., and Paulin, M.: Runoff conditions in the upper Danube basin under an ensemble of climate change scenarios, J. Hydrol., 424-425, 264–277, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2012.01.011, 2012.

Mackay, J., Jackson, C., Brookshaw, A., Scaife, A., Cook, J., and Ward, R.: Seasonal forecasting of groundwater levels in principal aquifers of the United Kingdom, J. Hydrol., 530, 815 – 828, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.10.018, 2015.

MacLachlan, C., Arribas, A., Peterson, K. A., Maidens, A., Fereday, D., Scaife, A. A., Gordon, M., Vellinga, M., Williams, A., Comer, R. E., Camp, J., Xavier, P., and Madec, G.: Global Seasonal forecast system version 5 (GloSea5): A High-Resolution Seasonal Forecast System, Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 141, 1072–1084, doi:10.1002/qj.2396, 2015.

Marzeion, B. and Nesje, A.: Spatial patterns of North Atlantic Oscillation influence on mass balance variability of European glaciers, Cryosphere, 6, 661–673, doi:10.5194/tc-6-661-2012, 2012.

Marzeion, B., Jarosch, A. H., and Hofer, M.: Past and future sea-level change from the surface mass balance of glaciers, Cryosphere, 6, 1295–1322, doi:10.5194/tc-6-1295-2012, 2012.

McCabe, G. J. and Markstrom, S. L.: A Monthly Water-Balance Model Driven By a Graphical User Interface, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File report, https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2007/1088/, accessed on 22 Feb 2017, 2007.

Montanari, A., Young, G., Savenije, H., Hughes, D., Wagener, T., Ren, L. L., Koutsoyiannis, D., Cudennec, C., Toth, E., Grimaldi, S., Blöschl, G., Sivapalan, M., Beven, K., Gupta, H., Hipsey, M., Schaefli, B., Arheimer, B., Boegh, E., Schymanski, S. J., Di Baldassarre, G., Yu, B., Hubert, P., Huang, Y., Schumann, A., Post, D. A., Srinivasan, V., Harman, C., Thompson, S., Rogger, M., Viglione, A., McMillan, H., Characklis, G., Pang, Z., and Belyaev, V.: "Panta Rhei—Everything Flows": Change in hydrology and society—The IAHS Scientific Decade 2013–2022, Hydrolog. Sci. J., 58, 1256–1275, doi:10.1080/02626667.2013.809088, 2013.

Pagano, T., Garen, D., and Sorooshian, S.: Evaluation of official western US seasonal water supply outlooks, 1922-2002, J. Hydrometeorol., 5, 896–909, doi:10.1175/1525-7541(2004)005<0896:EOOWUS>2.0.CO;2, 2004.

Pomeroy, J., Bernhardt, M., and Marks, D.: Water resources: Research network to track alpine water, Nature, 521, 32–32, doi:10.1038/521032c, correspondence, 2015.

Reid, W. V., Chen, D., Goldfarb, L., Hackmann, H., Lee, Y. T., Mokhele, K., Ostrom, E., Raivio, K., Rockstrom, J., Schellnhuber, H. J., and Whyte, A.: Earth System Science for Global Sustainability: Grand Challenges, Science, 330, 916–917, doi:10.1126/science.1196263, 2010.

Saha, S., Moorthi, S., Wu, X., Wang, J., Nadiga, S., Tripp, P., Behringer, D., Hou, Y.-T., Chuang, H.-y., Iredell, M., Ek, M., Meng, J., Yang, R., Mendez, M. P., van den Dool, H., Zhang, Q., Wang, W., Chen, M., and Becker, E.: The NCEP Climate Forecast System Version 2, J. Climate, 27, 2185–2208, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00823.1, 2014.

Scaife, A. A., Arribas, A., Blockley, E., Brookshaw, A., Clark, R. T., Dunstone, N., Eade, R., Fereday, D., Folland, C. K., Gordon, M., Hermanson, L., Knight, J. R., Lea, D. J., MacLachlan, C., Maidens, A., Martin, M., Peterson, A. K., Smith, D., Vellinga, M., Wallace, E., Waters, J., and Williams, A.: Skillful long-range prediction of European and North American winters, Geophys. Res. Lett., 41, 2514–2519, doi:10.1002/2014GL059637, 2014.

5   Scaife, A. A., Karpechko, A. Y., Baldwin, M. P., Brookshaw, A., Butler, A. H., Eade, R., Gordon, M., MacLachlan, C., Martin, N., Dunstone, N., and Smith, D.: Seasonal winter forecasts and the stratosphere, Atmos. Sci. Lett., 17, 51–56, doi:10.1002/asl.598, 2016.

Schaefli, B. and Gupta, H. V.: Do Nash values have value?, Hydrol. Processes, 21, 2075–2080, doi:10.1002/hyp.6825, 2007.

Scherrer, S. C., Appenzeller, C., and Laternser, M.: Trends in Swiss Alpine snow days: The role of local- and large-scale climate variability, Geophys. Res. Lett., 31, L13 215, 1–4, doi:10.1029/2004GL020255, 2004.

10  Schöber, J., Achleitner, S., Bellinger, J., Kirnbauer, R., and Schöberl, F.: Analysis and modelling of snow bulk density in the Tyrolean Alps, Hydrol. Res., 47, 419–441, doi:10.2166/nh.2015.132, 2016.

Sene, K., Piper, B., Wykeham, D., McSweeney, R. T., Tych, W., and Beven, K.: Long-term variations in the net inflow record for Lake Malawi, Hydrol. Res., doi:10.2166/nh.2016.143, 2016.

Sivapalan, M., Savenije, H. H. G., and Blöschl, G.: Socio-hydrology: A new science of people and water, Hydrol. Processes, 26, 1270–1276, doi:10.1002/hyp.8426, 2012.

15  Smith, D. M., Scaife, A. A., and Kirtman, B. P.: What is the current state of scientific knowledge with regard to seasonal and decadal forecasting?, Environ. Res. Lett., 7, 015 602, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/015602, 2012.

Svensson, C., Brookshaw, A., Scaife, A. A., Bell, V. A., Mackay, J. D., Jackson, C. R., Hannaford, J., Davies, H. N., Arribas, A., and Stanley, S.: Long-range forecasts of UK winter hydrology, Environ. Res. Lett., 10, 064 006, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/10/6/064006, 2015.

20  Thornthwaite, C. W.: An Approach toward a Rational Classification of Climate, Geogr. Rev., 38, 55–94, doi:10.2307/210739, 1948.

Vaughan, C. and Dessai, S.: Climate services for society: origins, institutional arrangements, and design elements for an evaluation framework, Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Change, 5, 587–603, doi:10.1002/wcc.290, 2014.

Warner, T. T.: Numerical weather and climate prediction, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; New York, 2011.

Wilks, D. S.: Statistical methods in the atmospheric sciences, no. v. 91 in International geophysics series, Academic Press, Amsterdam; Boston, 2nd ed edn., 2006.

25  Wood, A. W. and Lettenmaier, D. P.: An ensemble approach for attribution of hydrologic prediction uncertainty, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, L14 401, 5–5, doi:10.1029/2008GL034648, 2008.

Wood, A. W., Hopson, T., Newman, A., Brekke, L., Arnold, J., and Clark, M.: Quantifying Streamflow Forecast Skill Elasticity to Initial Condition and Climate Prediction Skill, J. Hydrometeorol., 17, 651–668, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-14-0213.1, 2016.

30  Yuan, X., Wood, E. F., Roundy, J. K., and Pan, M.: CFSv2-Based Seasonal Hydroclimatic Forecasts over the Conterminous United States, J. Climate, 26, 4828–4847, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00683.1, 2013.

Yuan, X., Wood, E. F., and Ma, Z.: A review on climate-model-based seasonal hydrologic forecasting: Physical understanding and system development, WIREs Water, 2, 523–536, doi:10.1002/wat2.1088, 2015.

**Figure 1.** Map of the Inn headwaters upstream of the Kirchbichl gauging station. Major land use classes are shown along with the topography.

**Figure 2.** Specific runoff hydrographs for observed and modelled runoff at Kirchbichl gauging station and the corresponding performance measures $E$ (Nash-Sutcliffe model efficiency, NSE) and $E_b$ (benchmark NSE).

**Figure 3.** Observed and simulated snow states. (a) Range and standard deviation of SWE time series computed for single years and the corresponding mean monthly averages derived from AWARE using HISTALP data. Average SWE conditions computed using climatological historical data are displayed as well. (b) This plot shows the same data but as time series between 1997-2009. (c) Map showing the average spatial SWE distribution computed for February. (d) SWE observations in February collected from stations in the study area above 1400 m a.s.l. (Schöber et al., 2016). The error bars show the ± 1 standard deviation of observations for each year (see Schöber et al., 2016, for further details on SWE sampling).

**Figure 4.** Anomalies of (a) basin-scale NDJF temperature, (b) NDJF areal precipitation depth, and (c) snow accumulation in February. Water balance simulations driven by CM-based seasonal forecasts are compared to water balance simulation driven by HISTALP. Shaded areas indicate years in which the sign of anomalies does not match the reference run.

**Figure 5.** Water balance of the basin-scale snow storage for each year and each forcing dataset used for AWARE simulations. CF is the climatological forecast (longterm averages of HISTALP) which can be viewed as forecast yielding average conditions. The evolution of snow accumulation is categorized either "HIT" or "–" if the sign of anomalies obtained from HISTALP-AWARE and CM-based AWARE runs matches or mismatches, respectively.