Sao Carlos, SP, Brazil, 16 March 2018.

Dr. Zhenyao Shen,

Dear Editor

Please find below the responses to the reviewer comments on the manuscript **hess-2017-474**, entitled **"Modelling freshwater quality scenarios with ecosystem-based adaptation in the headwaters of the Cantareira System, Brazil**" and submitted to the Hydrology and Earth System Sciences (HESS) Journal for possible publication.

On behalf of my co-authors, I would like to express my thanks for the reviewers comments and corrections, which have considerably contributed to improve the manuscript. We have included all the modifications requested in the Second Review. These changes and a point-by-point response to the reviewers are described below. Also, we have highlighted the modified passages in the text.

In this new version, we better explained several parts of the text to become it easier to understand. Moreover, the final text was revised by a professional service of English language editing, the Native English Speaker **Jane Godwin Coury**.

We hope that the manuscript – which aims to compare freshwater quality scenarios under different land-use/land-cover (LULC) change, one of them related to best management practices in subtropical headwaters, using the spatially semi-distributed SWAT model in Brazilian subtropical catchments ranging from 7.2 to 1037 km^2- can help public-and-private partnerships empowering river basin committees for better decision-making and will be of interest to the HESS journal's broad readership.

Looking forward to a positive reply,

Sincerely,

Dr. Denise Taffarello.
Post-doctoral researcher at University of Sao Paulo

Reviewer Comments 1 (RC1)

"The abstract section could be concise". **Answer: Modified abstract.** We agree with this commentary and corrected the abstract accordingly (see new text)

[General comment], RC1 - "One of the main reasons for the discrepancies between monitoring data/existing literatures and model simulations might be the weakness of SWAT model to capture extreme flows or water yields." **Answer:** The authors deeply thank and welcome the comments of Reviewer #1. We agree with this general comment. Other detailed responses are described below, as follows.

Original text, Line 55, RC1 – "Colombia (2015, 2014, 2010)" **Answer:** Corrected in the updated version of the manuscript. Thank you.

Original text, "Lines 58 to 66, RC1 - "Hoekstra et al., 2011" is over cited. Could be rephrased." **Answer:** This entire paragraph was rephrased, dropping out the overcitation of Hoekstra et al (2001)'s work.

Line 141, RC1 –"... run from 2009 to 2014". **Answer:** Thank you. The new statement is: "The Water Producer/PCJ Project was developed in the period 2009-2014 in the Cantareira System region (Guimarães, 2013), using EbA scenarios and through local actions through the concept of Payment for Ecosystem Services-Water [Pagiola et al, 2013; quoted] "

Line 153, RC1 - "three data collection platforms "their geographic locations could be indicated on the study area map." **Answer:** The three DCPs are indicated on the study's area (in Table 1, Table 4 and Figure 8, new version of the paper).

Line 156, RC1: "the type of secondary data could be clearly indicated." **Answer:** We appreciate this comment. The explanation to be updated in the new version of the paper appears as follows (because of the extension of these new statements, we suggest worth appending them in a Supplementary Material section, according to HESS Editor final decision): "To reduce uncertainty about hydrological scaling effects of EbA through LULC scenarios, in the period 2011-2014 we also collected supplementary, secondary data through three strategies. First, we scheduled surveillance and interviews with local owners and farmers who explained their past, present and future(planned) best management practices related to Payment for Ecosystem Services-Water, derived from EbA initiatives, of PCJ-Produtor de Agua Project of Cantareira System´s headwaters [Pagiola et al, 2013, Brazil's Experience with Payments for Environmental Services. Payments for Environmental Services (PES) learning paper;no. 2013-1. World Bank, Washington, DC, World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/17854 License: CC BY 3.0 IGO]. These secondary information helped on linking LULC derived from EbA/PES-Water with some parameters of selected hydrologic response units (i.e. SWAT-HRUs). These surveillance on local knowledge brought a better understanding on physically-based parameters calibrated regionally, but with unsatisfactory coefficients in some catchments, i.e. Posses Catchment (13-km^2 drainage area). Second, we also gathered secondary information about the scenarios' vision storylines from the multi-agent, multi-level governance of PCJ-Produtor de Agua

Project (municipality, state and national). Because of the states' border in between Minas Gerais (MG) and São Paulo (SP) with different reference reference standards, these multi-agent vision have strongly inclucenced PES-Water/EbA practices across the transboundary (inter-state) nature of most Cantareira System's catchments. Thus, we performed extra field visits to select sites, with higher uncertainty in modelling EbA and LULC scenarios, to receive new flow gauging stations selected in companion with decision-makers representative of neighbor municipalities (Extrema-MG, Joanópolis-SP, Piracaia-SP and Nazaré Paulista-SP), states (IGAM-MG, SMA-SP and DAEE-SP), federal agencies (ANA-The Brazilian Water Agency, CPRM- Brazilian Geologic Survey, and the National Center for Monitoring & Alerts of Disasters, CEMADEN-MCTIC) and non-government organizations (WWF-Brazil, TNC-Brazil and local initiatives) (see Taffarello et al (2016-b), http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jep.2016.712152). Third, the fore-mentioned strategies aided on the identification, selection and priorization of qualitative and quantitative variables to reduce the uncertainties in the generation of pollutant loads under LULC, as proposed by other authors (see i.e. Zaffani et al, 2015; doi:10.4172/2161-0398.1000173, quoted in the references). These secondary data revealed most viable conditions for nested catchment experiments to monitor experiments and test hypotheses through a scenario-intercomparion modelling of upstream areas of the Jaguari-Jacareí, Cachoeira and Atibainha reservoirs, being updated regularly by official agencies with open access repositor of hydrological database, like ANA (http://hydroweb.ana.gov.br) and CEMADEN (http://www.cemaden.gov.br/pluviometros-automatico/)".

Lines 252-255, RC1: "Besides adopting from the existing literatures, implementing sensitivity analysis could be recommended in order to select model parameters." **Answer:** We appreciate this comment. The explanation to be updated in the new version of the paper appears as follows (because of the extension of these new statements, we suggest worth appending them in a Supplementary Material section, according to HESS Editor final decision): "The selection of modelling parameters for water yield calibration was developed not only through consulting on SWAT literature [i.e. Arnold et al, 2012; Bressiani et al, 2015; Fukunaga et al, 2015; Gassman et al, 2007; see more explanations for other review comments below] but also performing supervised analysis and comparison of parameters, from recente literature [i.e. Francesconi, W., R. Srinivasan, E. Pérez-Miñana, S.P. Willcock, M. Quintero. 2016. Using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) to model ecosystem services: A systematic review. *Journal of Hydrology* 535 (2016) 625–636. DOI:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.01.034, and Monteiro, J. A. F., Kamali, B., Srinivasan, R., Abbaspour, K., and Gücker, B. (2016) Modelling the effect of riparian vegetation restoration on sediment transport in a human-impacted Brazilian catchment. Ecohydrol., doi: 10.1002/eco.1726, now quoted]] and even from consultation of USP open access repository [see i.e. works of Rodrigues, 2014, www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-18122014-094354/pt-br.php; Bressiani, 2016, www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-04042017-155701/pt-br.php, and Mohor, 2016, www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-23032017-102949/pt-br.php]. Firstly, in spite of a much larger list of suggested parameters for modelling goals proposed by

Bressiani (2016; quoted), our regional sensitivity analysis followed the recommendations of theory and practice of mapping ecosystem services using Tier 1 and Tier 2 models [see Mendoza et al, 2012, Ch. 3, in Kareiva et al(eds), 2012; ISBN 978-0-19-958899-2] constrained by the short time series monitored for all sites, with inequal quantitative assessment, seasonality and scale effects. Secondly, from the works of Rodrigues et al [2014, doi:10.1002/2013WR014274, 2015, doi: 10.1002/2014WR016691], Bressiani et al [2015, doi: 10.3965/j.ijabe.20150803.1765] and Mohor & Mendiondo [2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.014] we selected 18 SWAT parameters and their initial range of combinations, as follows: Available water capacity, Moist bulk density, Saturated hydraulic conductivity, Baseflow alpha fator, Threshold depth of shallow aquifer to occur return flow, GW-Revap Coefficient, Groundwater delay time, Deep aquifer percolation fraction, Threshold depth of shallow aquifer to revap or percolation to the deep aquifer, Soil evaporation compensation fator, Plant uptake compensation fator, Manning roughness for the main channel, Effective hydraulic conductivity in main channel, Maximum canopy storage, Manning for overland flow, Average slope steepness, Inicial SCS CN (for antecedente moisture condition 2), and Surface runoff lag coeff. Thirdly, in-situ field validation tests were developed through experimental campaigns to test the limits of variation of streamflow and water quality (see explantations below)

Lines 276 to 279, RC1 - "It is known that SWAT model is not for extreme flows and hence water quality parameters." **Answer**: We agree with this comment. For EbA scenarios purposes, we planned set up field investigations and SWAT calibrations [see Figure 5, this HESSD paper] using the extreme conditions of 2013–14 drought through quali-quantitative freshwater monitoring at the headwaters of the Cantareira System, quoted in this paper [see i.e. Taffarello et al, 2016; doi: 10.1080/02508060.2016.1188352]. Those evidences outlined water quality results from 17 catchments, showing regional behaviour for water quality loads in drainage areas (ranging 0.66–925 km^2) for future modelling parameterization through SWAT for EbA scenarios purposes. We experimentally sampled water quality parameters of pH, water temperature, electrical conductivity, turbidity, biological oxygen demand (BOD), chemical oxygen demand (COD), total solids (TS), NO3, NO 2, PO 4, thermotolerant coliforms and Escherichia coli, in several catchments, varying the drainage area, the land use and land cover, helped us to face about uncertainty and complexity of factors affecting SWAT parameter selection. Also, a summary of these results are detailed in Table 4 (this HESSD paper).

Line 299 (RC1) could be moved to line 298. **Answer**: It was corrected in the updated version of the manuscript. Thank you.

Lines 310 (RC1) could be moved to line 309. **Answer**: It was corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.

Lines 322 (RC1) could be moved to line 321 **Answer**:It was corrected in the updated version of the manuscript.

Lines 455 to 456 (RC1) should be written with appropriate multiplication sign **Answer**: Rewritten as: "... The 52% decrease of water yield between S1 (1990) and S2 (2010) scenarios, as (14.9 -31.3)/31.3×100) might be related to a marginal increase of Eucalyptus cover..."

Line 514, RC1: "It would be useful to relate spatially the sub-basins in which the differences in land-use/land-cover are the greatest and the water yield, nitrate, total phosphorus and sediments yield differences are evident. For instance providing maps which indicate temporal changes in LULC and corresponding changes in water quality parameters considered." **Answer**: We appreciate this comment. The explanation to be updated in the new version of the paper appears as follows (because of the extension of these new statements, we suggest worth appending them in a Supplementary Material section, according to HESS Editor final decision): "Because of the significant variabilities among selected basins where in-situ monitoring were developed for EbA/PES' scenarios purposes, and because we have not performed field validation in all distributed HRU (hydrologic response units), we decided not showing regional results through maps. Whichever interpolation techniques would not be able of catch the inherent ground-context heteregeneity, and physically-based characteristics, of high-variability functionality of these subtropical catchments. Instead, we do perform initial analysis of clustering similar responses from catchments with most plausible explanations as follows. On the one hand, evidences of SWAT modelled scenarios showed two groups of river basins under EbA scenarios, with distinct land use change of native forest fractions(NF%). Our results show Group 1, with 11 of studied basins, with native forest recovery using EbA (S2+EbA), with an intermediate land use fraction as follows: NF%(S2)< NF%(S2+EbA)<NF%(S1). In turn, Group 2, of 9 river basins, showed a progressive growing fraction of native forests across scenarios, with best EbA land use impacts, as follows: NF%(S1)< NF%(S2)<NF%(S2+EbA). Basins of Group 1, are mainly located close to both urban settlements and Eucalipto plantation in Northwestern headwaters, where conservation projects have small adherence of landowners to EbA/PES-Water actions in LULC and, doing so, in SWAT outputs (see Figure 3). Moreover, catchments of Group 1 are mainly located in Eastern and Southeastern areas (Figure 3), where EbA projects of *PCJ-Produtor de Agua* are more expressive. On the other hand, the greatest impacts in water yield are inversely correlated with land-uses and water pollutant quality, but with high non-linear relationships and without explicit regional factors (see Figure 11). For an integrated assessment of hydro-services, it is worth noting phosphorus, nitrate and sediment yields have spatio-temporal changes of load production across scenarios S1, S2 and S2+EbA, which would be better understood in selected catchments, namely Alto Jaguari and Domithildes".

Line 533, RC1: "Reason for selecting the two sub-basins among the 20 sub-catchments?" **Answer**: We appreciate this comment. The explanation to be updated in the new version of the paper appears as follows (because of the extension of these new statements, we suggest worth appending them in a Supplementary Material section, according to HESS Editor final decision): "These two catchments were selected regarding the distinct groups identified in this study, contrasting the outputs from 20 sites: Upper Jaguari is selected from Group 1 and

Domithildes is selected from Group 2 [see comment 12]. Moreover, we studied the following variables in the two selected cachment. First, we analysed the fraction of water yield compromised by the grey water footprint for nitrate (ca. 0.08 to 3.9 mg/L), total phosphorous (from 0.02 to 1.2 mg/L) and sediments (approx. 0.03 to 250 mg/L). These concentrations represented dilution demands in between 0.1 % to close 1000 % of simulated water yield for a wide range, in between 10 to 500 km^2 [see Figure 12, this HESSD paper]. Second, these demands depended on: the native forest cover [i.e. in Figure 9, with S1 for year 1990, S2 for year 2010 and S2+EbA for year 2035], the flow duration curves under three LULC scenarios at 20 headwaters [Fig. 10], and the scaling effects of EbA actions on drainage areas [ranging from small catchment of 9.9 km^2 of Domithildes to medium-size catchment of 302 km^2 of Alto Jaguari]. These factors clearly affected (a) the fraction of water yield compromised by the GWF-NO_3, GWF-TP and GWF-Sed, and (b) the reference flows in duration curves, both in streamflow and in pollutant loads, especially for low-flows (higher duration probabilities [see Fig. 13 and 14]. As well, the annual regime of water yield of these two selected catchments revealed local constraints in the size of catchments ranging from 10 to 300 km^2. Thus, we pointed what limits for SWAT modeling when using the EbA assessment and PES-Water projects, by using grey water footprint, ranging from GWF-NO3 below 0.2 m^3/s to GWF-TP up to 20 m^3/s. These results did converge to the general discussion with blue and green water accounting showed in former studies of Rodrigues et al [2014; A blue/green water-based accounting framework for assessment of water security, Water Resour. Res., 50, 7187–7205, doi:10.1002/2013WR014274], now quoted in the references of this manuscript"

Line 535, RC1: "Any statistical relationship between the changes in LULC classes and grey water footprints. For instance multivariate statistical analysis.". **Answer**: For instance, the evidences we modelled with SWAT about GWF and LULC were presented in between lines 514 and 534 (first version manuscript). These results are regarded to average values regionally (20 catchments), the same test period (8-yr time series tested) and with fixed time-step modelled (SWAT monthly-basis). On the one hand, native forest land use fractions(NF%) have ranges of 41±14, 39±15% and 44±16 %, and were related to GWF-NO3 of 0.68±0.6, 0.28±0.1, and 0.44±0.1, for S1(1990), S2(2010) and S2+EbA(2035) scenarios, respectively. On the other hand, high-stand vegetation land use fraction (native, eucalipto and orchad) ranged in between 46%, 53% and 62%, for the same scenarios, respectively, not showing a trend. For GWF-TP and GWF-Sed values differ in absolute terms, and the averaged ratios of GWF/Water Yield also changed. In spite of the high variability of responses, and small period of testing, we recommend future field campaigns and further multivariate statistical analysis, but they are out of the scope of the present manuscript.

Lines 544 to 555, RC1: "As one-third of the SWAT simulation are low-flow or drought years. It is known that SWAT model is weak in capturing extreme flows. One of the reasons for the discrepancy between monitoring data and model simulation might not the weakness of the SWAT model to represent low-flows?". **Answer:** We agree with these comments. On the one hand, recent papers addressing a review of SWAT applications in Brazil outlined the challenges and prospects for reducing the discrepancies between monitoring data and existing (regional) literatures and model simulations [i.e. Bressiani et al, 2015; doi:

10.3965/j.ijabe.20150803.1765], quoted in the references. These general review is useful to address model discrepancies in a multilevel approach: quantitative water yield, water quality loads and rainfall-streamflow behaviours at a range of scales during the same period of monitoring and the inherent streamflow variability at these subtropical catchments. For that reason, our strategy selected sites through a nested catchment experiment to study these discrepancies according to the natural hydrological cycle, when possible. On the other hand, we addressed those discrepancies by quantitative calibration with a consecutive freshwater quality calibration. Our evidences showed [see i.e. Fig. 5] that at some drainage areas, in between 12 km^2 to 508 km^2, SWAT model might underestimate observed streamflows. Even in three of four campaigns, both streamflow quantitative validation and quality (NO_3) simulaton did perform close to SWAT model runs. Only the May,2014 campaign denoted a higher departure between field validation with SWAT modelling, probably because of SWAT limitation of updating water quality parameters with the extension of duration time of drought period as pointed in quoted papers of Taffarello et al [2016-a; doi: 10.1080/02508060.2016.1188352] and Mohor & Mendiondo (2017; doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.014, quoted].

Table 1, RC1: "It might be better to replace sub-basin coordinates with key modelling results and/or field observations."**Answer**: In the new, updated manuscript, we included new columns, pointing modelling results and field observations.

Table 2, RC1: "Possible reason for model underperformance for some sub-basins?" **Answer:** As mentioned in the paper, both Posses catchment and Cachoeira catchment have been constrained by limitations in SWAT modeling set-ups because of: anthropic and ilegal domestic water withdrawals across riversides and margins, with small dams affecting the streamflow regime and with, some cases, Eucalipto sp planted close to river channel during low-flows. Taffarello [2016, quoted] showed in the open-access repository pictures which described antropic impacts on water yield and water withdrawal [see www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-05042017-091421/pt-br.php]. Those human-made impacts strongly affected the SWAT underperformance in calibration and validation steps, not only on NASH, NASH-log but also on the PBIAS, especially after long period of droughts or rainfall anomalies [see Figure 5, this HESSD paper]. Because these human-made interference come from real situations at catchments studied, without special SWAT parameterisation and scaling from HRU to the whole catchments, we decided not reducing both complexity and heteregeneity through a complete, exhaustive sensitivity analysis of SWAT parameters. Instead, we recommend further works in this direction if new, more field evidences in other catchments would be available.

Table 3, RC1: "The selected SWAT parameters are not exhaustive unless sensitivity analysis is conducted." **Answer:** As explained before, the main objective of this paper submitted to HESS is not addressing sensitivity analysis among SWAT parameters. Instead, we aimed to perform hypotheses' tests of scenarios intercomparison, including EbA policies and PES-Water actions, aided by SWAT pre-calibrated parameters, linked with previous field evidences collected during sampling periods and previous modelling experiences in these basins [i.e. Rodrigues et al, 2014, doi: 10.1002/2013WR014274; Rodrigues et al, 2015; Bressiani et al, 2015, DOI: 10.1002/2014WR016691; Taffarello et al, 2016-a, DOI:10.1080/02508060.2016.1188352; Mohor & Mendiondo, 2017, DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.014]. It is worth noting this paper submitted to HESS is one of the first Brazilian contributions of coupling EbA directives into hydrological modelling using nested catchment experiments and monitoring in Brazilian Atlantic Forest [see i.e. Taffarello et al, 2016-b, DOI: 10.1016/j.cliser.2017.10.005, quoted], promoting other research groups which might develop furhter modelling hypotheses. Regarding the sensitivity analysis, as questioned, we proceeded in the calibration process, although not exhaustive. On the other hand, and given that SWAT has a very large number of parameters and our experiment involved nested catchments, rather than a single experimental basin, testing all parameters in our study case with EbA would be rather laborious. As mentioned earlier, we have then consulted previous applications of SWAT in the literature, preferably those in Brazilian basins, to find most indicated parameters to work on. From Fukunaga et al. [2015, DOI: 10.1016/j.catena.2014.10.032], Gassman et al. [2007, DOI: 10.13031/2013.23637], Arnold et al. [2012, DOI: 10.13031/2013.42256], and the good review from Bressiani et al. [2015, quoted], we firstly selected 18 SWAT parameters and with their initial ranges by Rodrigues et al [2014, 2015 quoted]. Then, we ran analysis of these 18 parameters in our sub-basins. After analyzing these preview results, we have chosen to re-calibrate some parameters in some basins. Thus, SWAT-CUP was performed in our tests, with each cycle consisted of 300 runs. In each cycle we reached new limits for each parameter or even stopped tuning a parameter. The number of cycles varied among sub-basins, from one to 5 cycles. From the all 20 nested catchments here studied in Cantareira System and using initial 18 SWAT parameters, some sites ended up the calibration with 7 parameters calibrated, while others had a total of 17 - out of those initial 18 parameters. From upstream to downstream, after the automatic step, a manual calibration refinement also took place. One example of the range of the final values is shown below in Table A.1(new).

Table A.1: Range of coefficients adopted for calibration in SWAT-CUP and final values found after manual stage calibration

Parameter*	Initial (mín	Median[1] mín	Chosen mín	Chosen máx	Median[1] máx	Initial máx
a__CANMX.hru	0	0	0	100	60	100
a__Ch_N2.rte	-0.0005	0	0	0.28	0.3	0.3
a__CN2.mgt	-15	-12	-8.67	10.31	10	15
a__GW_DELAY.gw	-15	-3	-4.161	42.69	30	50
a__GWQMN.gw	-550	-300	-415.02	360.00	350	450
r__OV_N.hru	-0.5	dismissed	-		dismissed	1
r__SHALLST.gw	-0.5	-0.3	-0.08	0.39	0.4	0.6
r__SOL_AWC().sol	-0.5	-0.25	-0.42	0.29	0.33	0.5
r__SOL_BD(1).sol	-0.2	-0.15	-0.19	0.18	0.2	0.4
r__SOL_K().sol	-0.4	-0.27	-0.32	0.35	0.37	0.5
v__Alpha_BF.gw	0.01	0.02	0.001	0.049	0.05	0.1
v__Ch_K2.rte	0	0	0	36.74	30	130
v__EPCO.hru	0.4	0.4	0.85	-[2]	1	1
v__ESCO.hru	0.4	0.7	0.69	0.95	0.95	0.95
v__GW_REVAP.gw	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.18	0.2	0.2
v__RCHRG_DP.gw	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.68	0.5	1
v__REVAPMN.gw	0	500	539.28	959.28	1000	1000
v__SURLAG.hru	0.01	1.5	0.97	5.53	4	5
IPET			(0) Priestley-Taylor			

Legends: "1": "median" of the limits adopted in following runs in SWAT-CUP. Manual calibration could overcome these limits; "2": only one sub-basin had EPCO modified. * a_ stands for "added" value, i.e. the final value in each feature (e.g. each HRU) is the original value plus the calibrated coefficient; r_ stands for ratio, i.e. the final value in each feature is the original value times 1+ the calibrated coefficient; v_ stands for value, i.e. the final value of the feature is the calibrated coefficient.

References cited:

Arnold, J. G.; Moriasi, D. N.; Gassman, P. W.; Abbaspour, K. C.; White, M. J.; Srinivasan, R. et al. (2012): SWAT. Model Use, Calibration, and Validation. Em: *Transactions of the ASABE* 55 (4), pág. 1491–1508. DOI: 10.13031/2013.42256.

Bressiani D A, Gassman P W, Fernandes J G, Garbossa L H P, Srinivasan R, Bonumá N B, et al. (2015): Review of Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) applications in Brazil: Challenges and prospects. Em: *Int J Agric & Biol Eng*, 8(3), pág. 9–35. DOI: 10.3965/j.ijabe.20150803.1765.

Fukunaga, Danilo Costa; Cecílio, Roberto Avelino; Zanetti, Sidney Sára; Oliveira, Laís Thomazini; Caiado, Marco Aurélio Costa (2015): Application of the SWAT hydrologic model to a tropical watershed at Brazil. Em: *CATENA* 125, pág. 206–213. DOI: 10.1016/j.catena.2014.10.032.

Gassman, P. W.; Reyes, M. R.; Green, C. H.; Arnold, J. G. (2007): The Soil and Water Assessment Tool. Historical Development, Applications, and Future Research Directions. Em: *Transactions of the ASABE* 50 (4), pág. 1211–1250. DOI: 10.13031/2013.23637.

Table 5, RC1: "I would like to see additional column indicating the Hydrologic Services Index. The symbol used for the sub-basins 10, 15, 17 and 19 is not defined." **Answer**: We attended this comment, appending this HSI value as a new column. The symbol used for sub-basins 10, 15, 17 and 19 was a digiting error. We appreciate your review, thank you.

Figure 2, RC1: "Sensitivity analysis is missing after SWAT-CUP" **Answer**: In this manuscript, as mentioned, we followed a step-by-step, but not exhaustive, calibration procedure using collection and assessment of data, with understanding of watersheds, identification and selection of sites and periods to calibrate and validate, definition of calibration methods, objective functions and evaluation metrics, main water balance components, with volumes and processess' representations, definition of parameters and ranges of variability, sensitivity analysis, calibration, validation, cross validation and uncertainty analysis (Bressiani, 2016, quoted; Mohor, 2016, quoted). As previously mentioned, we also consulted former SWAT modelling strategies used in these basins, available in open repository of Mohor [2016; www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-23032017-102949/pt-br.php], Bressiani [2016; www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-04042017-155701/pt-br.php] and Rodrigues [2014; http://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/18/18138/tde-18122014-094354/pt-br.php]. In our paper, we addressed an stage of calibration of SWAT-CUP (Calibration and Uncertainty Programs) software and SUFI-2 (Sequential Uncertainty Fitting) method. SUFI-2 is based in Latin Hypercube sampling [Abbaspour et al, 2015; quoted in the references). After this automatic stage, a finer adjustement with manual calibration was accomplished, following the recommendations of Mohor (2016) and Mohor & Mendiondo (2017; DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.014), quoted in the references. For deeper sensitivity analysis of SWAT parameters we recommend Bressiani (2016) who proposed not only a new systematic procedure for calibrating SWAT model in complex basins, but also a searching for a better SWAT performance and reduced optimization time, using different calibration methods on different watershed locations. Also, Rodrigues [2014, Table 2.3, page 56] adjusted some parameters for nested catchments in Cantareira System (CN2, Canmx, OV_N, SOL_K, SOL_AWC), according to land use classes.

Figure 4, RC1: "Why the upper and lower bound of coef. of PBIAS is only ± 0.15, though the model performance for some sub-basins are more than ± 0.15.". **Answer:** We appreciate your comment. We corrected this figure.

Figure 6, RC1: “How representative is the sampling of only 8 months for turbidity?” **Answer:** During the 2013/2014 field campaigns across all the nested catchments here presented, turbidity ranged between extremes of 1 and 300 NTU, with median value close to 11 NTU. These high variability captured ranges of in-situ monitored instantanous mean cross-section velocities below 1 m/s and specific streamflows ca. 0.001 to 0.025 $m^3/s/km^2$. These values captured approximately flow discharges in the range of 5% and 96% of probability of regional flow duration curves, and also affected the variability of the turbidity of water quality. Moreover, these ranges were observed during the 2013/2014 anomalous rainy season, with alternance of heavy rains and dry periods, in both reference catchments with EbA initiatives and impacted catchments with land-use changes. For those reasons, we understand, spite of having sampled only 8 months of monitoring, observed turbidity is not biased and could represent the conditions for using EbA hypothesis for the scenarios we tested. More details of experimental sampling and observational schemes are explained in Taffarello et al [2016-a; quoted]

Figure 12-a , RC1: “Legend for y-axis has typo error.” **Answer:** We appreciate your comment. It was corrected, in the updated version of Figure 12-a

Figures 13, 14 and 17, RC1: “The legends and axis values are not readable.” **Answer:** The legends of Figures 13, 14 and 17 were augmented in size and readability. We appreciated your feedback for its correction.

Reviewer Comments # 2 (RC2)

RC2 – “The hypothesis of the research is not clear, and is it “the conversation practices impact hydrological services?” **Answer**: The authors deeply thank and welcome the comments of Reviewer 2. The working hypothesis of the paper is related to, on the one hand, how conservation practices addressed by EbA impact hydrology and the ecosystem services, like maintaining, restoring or improving both the water yield and the freshwater quality, using hydrological modeling in different catchment scales. On the other hand, we hypothesized incentives of EbA policies can affect water yield and water quality through non-linear tradeoffs, with high spatiotemporal complexity, capable of being assessed by modeling, but previously supported by in-situ monitoring variables for setup boundary conditions of simulation runs. We enhanced these staments in the updated version of the manuscript, refining the statement written previously in between lines 87 to 91.

RC2 - What is the EbA, and the authors should give the readers more detailed definition. **Anwer:** The concept of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) is addressed as ‘using biodiversity and ecosystem services to help people adapt to the adverse effects of climate change’ was defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity – 10th Conference of the Parties (CoP) (CBD, 2010, quoted). Detailed definitions of EbA applied to the Cantareira’s Headwaters (this paper) can be found in Taffarello et al [2017, Climate Services (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2017.10.005]

RC2 - In addition, the paper is so long, and the authors should condense the whole text, as well as the figures and tables. **Answer:** Attending this specific comment, a new, updated version was prepared, translating some tables and figures to Supplement Material. With these actions, the new manuscript has decreased the number of words and graphical elements, but maintained only essential statements and new answers for specific revisions.

RC2 - The authors considered the land use scenarios only, but not the climate hydrological factors. **Answer:** Because the high complexity of the interaction and coupling drivers of the climate-soil-water-human nexus, the main goal of the paper aims to only test hypothesis of changes in land uses, with adaptation measures PES-Water from EbA options policies. Climate change scenarios are being incorporated in a sequential paper, but is out the scope of this presente manuscript. Some evidences of climate change onto hydrological factors, including sensitivity analysis of water withdrawal scenarios, and economic indicators in Cantareira System’s catchments throughout 2000-2100 scenarios can be found in Mohor & Mendiondo (2017; 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.014, quoted)

RC2 - The authors should explain the reason why nitrate, TP, and sediments have been select to assess greyWF. **Answer:** SWAT model outputs perform different water quality variables (see Arnold et al, 2005; Bressiani, 2016; quoted). Here we selected for greyWF through modeling some freshwater quality variables we have previously sampled in experiments, and being usable for a proper SWAT parameterization (see Taffarello et al, 2016-a; quoted). By using a higher number of freshwater variables, however, might the modelling evidences (on hypothesis testing with EbA) be either over-parameterised for analytical purposes, or even excessively-detailed for the running Brazilian standards of freshwater classification—i.e. with some outputs of freshwater quality variable 1 being above the standards, with variable 2 being below the standards, making it harder for decision-making and planning). Also, the high uncertainty in hydrological responses of pollutant loads observed in nested catchment experiments under land change in Brazilian biomes (see Zaffani, A G, Cruz N, Taffarello, D, Mendiondo, E M (2015) Uncertainties in the Generation of Pollutant Loads using Brazilian Nested Catchment Experiments under Change of Land Use & Land Cover. *J. Phys Chem Biophys*, doi: 2015.10.4172/2161-0398.1000e123; now quoted in the references of updated version) recommend more parcimonious monitoring and modeling tests to study potential tradeoffs with conservation practices and economic incentives like EbA

Page 11, Lines 295-297: RC2 - "WPL[x,t] exceeds 100%, environmental standards are violated...", it is so subjective. What's your basis?. **Answer:** We appreciate this comment. Following several authors (see Hoekstra et al, 2011; quoted), there is not an upper limit for GWF; it depends on the level of polluted loads being transported in the streamflow. These loads are originated from coupling the natural and antropic hydrosedimentological cycles, from the headwaters to the outlet of the basin. Alloctonous and autoctonous loads transported in the main flow, either during floods or even during low-flows, as during the annual flow regime, represent the pollution demand (the numerator of the equation 1, line 298). Otherwise, the dillution capacity of the river flow is represented by the annual flow regime, i.e. related to the mean water yield (the denominator of the equation 1). For that reason, demand can potentially grow beyond the capacity, "violating" the real dillution capacity or autodepuration of a rivercourse. Other water security index relating these river demand-and-capacity can be readed in the works of Rodrigues et al [2014; 2015; also quoted]. Because the pollution load thresholds are being monitored not for an unique, isolated quality variable, but for many of them, also with different thresholds of Brazilian standards, equation 1 needs a further development to represent a weighted-threshold, or composite-threshold, to discuss EbA policies through hydrological modeling and scenarios.

Lines 321, RC2- in equation (3), maybe, it is a mistake about the "WPL[x,t]", is it "WPLreference". **Answer:** We appreciate the reviewer's comment. According to the equation 3, using a regional basis of intercatchment comparion with a proper non-dimensionality, WPL[x,t] represents the composite threshold of a whichever catchment studied, and regionally compared with the reference catchment ($WPL_{composite,ref}$, in relative terms as in percentage). Doing so, equation 3 can express how HSI (hydrologic system index), alternatively and regionally, would point more healthy catchments (HSI < 100%, where where EbA outputs through hydrological modeling are more evident), and other catchments where insufficient EbA effects arise. This approach could help decision-making process of Brazilian freshwater standards [see i.e. http://www.mma.gov.br/port/conama/], where multi-parameterization or variables are combined for testing scenarios of land-uses and planning. These standards are also compared with state standards and local agencies, like

CETESB [www.cetesb.sp.gov.br] and DAEE [http://www.daee.sp.gov.br/] in São Paulo and IGAM [http://igam.mg.gov.br/] in Minas Gerais, the two neighbor states sharing these Cantareira System's catchments. Furthermore, and because all these agencies use indices for freshwater health, HSI might help on identifying regional intercomparison, both from monitoring and from modelling scenarios, about WPLreference and EbA policies.

RC2 - The authors should separate the results and discussion. Some sentences, for example lines 343-345;349-354;357-360; and so on, should be put into Discussion. The independent discussion could further clearly tell the readers your finding. **Answer:** We appreciate very much this comment. The adapted these new lines in order to help the reader abou our findings, but also not exceeding the limits of total words of the manuscript.

RC2 - in Section 3.6, the authors do not depict the results from Figure 17. **Answer:** We appreciate very much this review. In Section 3.6. We appended extra statements about the comparative results of Figure 17 in the new version of the paper as follows [because of the extension of these new statements, we suggest worth appending them in a Supplementary Material section, according to Editor final decision). "Figure 17 depicts a summary of monitored and modelled water yield obseervations and scenarios compared with EbA and GWF outputs in the catchments studied at the Cantareira System. The main bold, vertical, dotted line represents the regional mean water yield, compared with water yields from simulated scenarios, also including their respective GWFs. This figure clearly points six different conditions, labelled by letters (A, B, C, D, E and F), which configurate potential scenarios of water security according to land-use change and insecurity thresholds, also showing tradoffs between water yield and grey water footprint outputs, explained in the text"

RC2 - delete the references from the conclusions. **Answer**: We corrected the conclusions, without citing any references.

RC2 - Table 1 should be moved to Supplemental information, or part of Table 1 should be merged in to Table 2. **Answer**: We appreciate this comment. We corrected and attended these suggestions, merging and realocating the tables.

RC2 - Table 8 should be moved in to Supplemental information. **Answer:** There is not a Table 8. Maybe Table 4(?). We have just moved it to Supplemental Material. Thank you.

RC2 - Fig.4, explain the meaning of the lines in the figure. **Answer**: Dotted lines represent trend lines for some selected basins here illustrated. Our interest in this figure was to question whether there would be both regional trend or scaling in the calibration coefficients, but not found in this first paper. Regional trends of the calibration can show both limits and uncertainty of modelling of complex catchments. Because of space, we decided to drop this figure out of the updated version.

Fig.5, RC2 - he sentence “Time (horizontal axis) is represented by month/year” is meaningless; further, to provide the meaning of the uncertaintybars andsample numbers. **Answer**: We appreciate this comment. We corrected the quotation. The uncertainty bars represent the minimum and maximum values of measured streamflow and pollutant loads in a cross section of the river during a field campaign of headwaters’ catchments. The high variance in observations of field evidences explain the greater variability of these headwaters at the Cantareira System

Fig.6, RC2 – what are the meaning of the“size of circles” and the numbers? **Answer:** It is only a representation of a 3-D graph, substituting the 3rd axis with the diameter of the circle proportional to the magnitude of the 3rd variable (in this case, the 3rd variable is the turbidity). The number showed the value of turbidity. The figure 6 showed that, although a coherent and proportional relation existed in between observed mean river velocity and observed specific flow, experimental evidences still depicted outliers, from not only reference catchments with EbA/PES-Water options, but also intervention catchments with no EbA/PES-Water options, reflecting an illustrative example of how complex LULC options from EbA would be exaustively sensed into hydrological parameters and simulation scenarios. For those reasons, we adapted our conclusion and recommendations for further studies about new hypothesis’ testing, according to fore-mentioned answers to reviewers.

Modelling freshwater quality scenarios with ecosystem-based adaptation in the headwaters of the Cantareira system, Brazil

Denise Taffarello[1], Raghavan Srinivasan [2], Guilherme Samprogna Mohor[1], João Luis B. Guimarães [3], Maria do Carmo Calijuri [1], Eduardo Mario Mendiondo[1]

[1]Sao Carlos School of Engineering, University of Sao Paulo, Sao Carlos, SP, 13566-590, Brazil
[2] Spatial Science Laboratory, Ecosystem Science and Management Department, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77801, USA
[3]Aquaflora Meio Ambiente, Curitiba, PR, 82100-310, Brazil

Correspondence to: Denise Taffarello (taffarellod@gmail.com; dt@sc.usp.br)

Abstract. Although hydrologic models provide hypothesis testing of complex dynamics occurring at catchments, freshwater quality modelling is still incipient at many subtropical headwaters. In Brazil, a few modelling studies assess freshwater nutrients, limiting policies on hydrologic ecosystem services. This paper aims to compare freshwater quality scenarios under different land-use/land-cover (LULC) change, one of them related to Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in Brazilian headwaters. Using the spatially semi-distributed Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model, nitrate, total phosphorous and sediment were modeled in catchments ranging from 7.2 to 1037 km². These headwaterswere elected for the Brazilian Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES)program in the Cantareira System, which has supplied water to 9 million people in Sao Paulo. We considered SWAT modelling of three LULC scenarios: (i) recent past scenario ("S1"), with historical LULC in 1990, (ii) current land use scenario ("S2"), with LULC for the period 2010-2015 with field validation, and (iii) future land use scenario with PES ("S2+EbA"). This latter scenario proposed forest cover restoration through EbA following the River Basin Plan by 2035. These three LULC scenarios were tested with a selected record of rainfall and evapotranspiration observed in 2006-2014, withthe occurrence of extreme droughts. To assess hydrologic services, we proposedthe Hydrologic Services Index (HSI), as a new composite metric comparing water pollution levels (WPL) for reference catchments, and related to the grey water footprint (greyWF) and water yield . On the one hand, water quality simulations allowed for the regionalization of greyWF at spatial scales under LULC scenarios. According to the critical threshold, HSI identified areasas less or more sustainable catchments. On the other hand, conservation practices simulated through the S2+EbA scenario envisaged not only additional and viable best management practices, but also preventive decision making at the headwaters of water supply systems.

Comentado [UdW1]: Old version with 388 words; new version 297 words (attending RC1).

Key words: water quality modelling; ecosystem-based adaptation; SWAT; grey water footprint; land-use/land-cover change; Brazil.

1 Introduction

Basin Plans comprise the main management tool and they plan sustainable use of water resources in both spatial and temporal scales. For sustainable water allocation, river plans are based on accurate data on actual water availability per basin, taking into account water needs for humans, environmental water requirements and the basin's ability to assimilate pollution (Mekonnen et al., 2015). However, adaptive management options such as ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA; see CBD, 2010; BFN/GIZ, 2013) and the water footprint (WF) (Hoekstra & Chapagain, 2008) have rarely been incorporated into Brazilian Basin Plans. Moreover, integrated quali-quantitative simulations and indicators of human appropriation of freshwater resources are seldom used in river plans. The concept of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) is addressed as 'using biodiversity and ecosystem services to help people adapt to the adverse effects of climate change', which was defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity – 10th Conference of the Parties (CoP) (CBD, 2010). Detailed definitions of EbA applied to the Cantareira's Headwaters can be found in Taffarello et al (2017).The WF still is anenvironmental indicator used in watershed plans. For example, Spain uses WF as indicator in Basin Plans (Hoekstra et al., 2017; Velázquez et al., 2011; Aldaya et al., 2010).The clean water plan of Vancouver (June/2011) established as sustainable action the reduction of the WF on its water resources management (MetroVancouver, 2011; Zubrycki et al., 2011). The Colombian government was the first to publish a complete and multi sectorial evaluation of WF in its territory. Although, this study, titled *Estudio Nacional del Agua* (Colombia, *Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales*, 2014), had not been included in the national water management plan, the strategic plan of Magdalena Cauca basin incorporates the greyWF to assess agriculture pollution (Colombia, 2014). In Brazil, a glossary of terms released by the Brazilian National Water Agency (ANA, 2015) includes the concept of WF to support water resources management.

Comentado [UdW2]: Attending Reviewer 2 Comments: RC2 - What is the EbA, and the authors should give the readers more detailed definition.

The WF (Mekonnen & Hoekstra, 2015; Hoekstra et al., 2011) measures both the direct and indirect water use within a river basin. The term water use refers to *water withdrawal*, as the consumptive use of rainwater (the green water footprint) and of surface/groundwater (the blue water footprint), and *water pollution*, i.e., the flow of water used to assimilate the pollutant loads (the grey water footprint (greyWF) (see Chapagain et al. 2006;). Given that water pollution can be considered a non-consumptive water use,the greyWF is advantageous by quantifying the effects of pollution by flow, instead of by concentration, making water demand and availability comparable.

Water footprint assessment,, comprises four phases: (1) Setting goals, (2) Accounting, (3) Sustainability assessment, and (4) Response formulation. At the WF response formulation phase, the EbA options, represented by Best Management Practices (BMP) at the catchment scale, could represent a trade-off on greyWF (Zaffani et al., 2011). That is, BMP adopted in the catchment scale could contribute indirectly to decreasing the level of water pollution. Thus, the EbA would compensate the greyWF of a certain river basin (Taffarello, 2016).

In the context of water security associated with land-use/land-cover (LULC) change, many existing conflicts over water use could be prevented (Winemiller et al., 2016; Aldaya et al., 2010; Oki & Kanae, 2006). For example, LULC influences water quality, which affects the supporting[1] and regulating[2]ecosystem services (Mulder et al., 2015; MEA, 2005) and needs to be monitored for adaptive and equitable management on the river basin scale (Taffarello et al*.,* 2016a). In spite of discussions regarding the lack of representativeness of data used in early studies with greyWF

---

[1] Examples of supporting services: nutrient cycling, primary production and soil formation.

[2] Examples of regulating services: self-depuration of pollutants, climate regulation, erosion control, flood attenuation and water borne diseases.

(Wichelns, 2015; Zhang et al., 2010; Aldaya etal., 2010; Aldaya & Llamas, 2008), we argue that the greyWF method may account for hydrologic services and provide a multidisciplinary, qualitative-quantitative integrated and transparent framework for better water policy decisions. Understanding these catchment-scale ecohydrologic processes requires not only low-frequency sampling, but also automated, *in situ*, high-frequency monitoring (Bieroza et al., 2014; Halliday et al., 2012), but also the use of ecohydrologic models to protect water quality and quantity. However, freshwater quality modelling associated with EbA, greyWF and LULC is still incipient in many river catchments. In Brazil, approximately only 5% of modelling studies evaluate nutrients in freshwater (Bressiani et al., 2015), which limits the policies on regulating ecosystem services.

In this research, we propose the regulating ecosystem services be addressed by the greyWF because it considers the water volume for self-purification of receiving water bodies affected by pollutants (Zhang et al., 2010). The working hypothesis of the paper is related to, ~~on the one hand,~~ how conservation practices addressed by EbA impact hydrology and the ecosystem services, like maintaining, restoring or improving both the water yield and the freshwater quality, using ecohydrological modeling in different catchment scales. On the other hand, we hypothesized that incentives of EbA policies can affect water yield and water quality through non-linear tradeoffs, with high spatiotemporal complexity, which can be assessed by modeling, but previously supported by in-situ monitoring variables for setup boundary conditions of simulation runs. In these scales, the greyWF can evaluate the changes in the regulating hydrologic services. Among the three water footprint components, in this study we assessed greyWF for nitrate, total phosphorous and sediments in 20 sub-basins in the headwaters of the Cantareira Water Supply System. The aim of this study is to compare freshwater quality scenarios, one of them related to EbA options through BMP and to assess greyWF under different LULC changes: (S1) historic LULC of 1990; (S2) current LULC for the period 2010-2015; and (S2+EbA) future LULC based on EbA with S2 as a baseline. This method is addressed using Nested Catchment Experiments (NCE), (see Taffarello et al., 2016a and 2016b) at a range of scales, from small catchments of 7.7 km^2 to medium-size basins of 1200 km^2 at subtropical headwaters responsible for the water supply of Sao Paulo Metropolitan Region (SPMR). This paper consists of four sections. The first section provides a brief description of the context, gap, hypothesis and our research goals. The second section describes the simulation methods used in the watershed scale and development of three LULC scenarios. We then propose some ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) approaches related to water pollution. Finally, in the fourth section, we discuss *how* the grey water footprint for nitrate or total phosphorous could be an EbA option for improving decision-making and water security in subtropical catchments under change.

Comentado [UdW3]: Attending **Reviewer Comments # 2 (RC2)**
RC2 – “The hypothesis of the research is not clear, and is it “the conversation practices impact hydrological services?”

2. Material and Methods

2.1. The case-study area

Two of the most vulnerable areas in the Brazilian South-East are the Upper Tietê (drainage area 7,390 km^2)and Piracicaba-Capivari-Jundiaí - PCJ (drainage area 14,178 km^2) watersheds, particularly due to their high population: 18 Mi inhabitants in Upper Tietê River basin, and 5 Mi in PCJ (Sao Paulo, 2017; IBGE, 2010).

In an attempt to ensure public water supply, the government built the Cantareira System, an inter-basin transfer, in two stages: **a)** between 1968 and 1974, at the end of a 35-year period that underwent a severe drought in the Piracicaba watershed, and **b)** in 1982, with the inclusion of two additional reservoirs that regularized the increasing rainfall from the mid-1970s until 2005 (Zuffo, 2015).

The study area comprises the part of the Cantareira System that drains into the Piracicaba river and which is the headwater of the Piracicaba basin (**Figure 1**). This basin is located on the borderline of the state of Minas Gerais and Sao Paulo. This part of the water supply system, in the Piracicaba watershed, consists of three main reservoirs, named after the rivers, damming the Jaguari-Jacareí, Atibainha and Cachoeira watersheds (drainage areas are 1230 km^2, 392 km^2 and 312 km^2, respectively). These rivers are main tributaries of the Piracicaba river, which is a tributary of the Tiete River system, on the left bank of the Parana Basin. The Cantareira System consists of two more reservoirs out of the Piracicaba river basin, Paiva Castro and Águas Claras, which are not part of our study area.

With respect to the water quality, the headwaters of the Cantareira System are classified as “class 1” for Jacareí, Cachoeira and Atibainha watersheds, and “class 2” for the Jaguari watershed, according to the CONAMA Resolution Nº 357/2005 (Brazil, 2005) and Sao Paulo Decree Nº 8468/1976 (Sao Paulo, 1976), which means that, with the exception of the Jaguari watershed, the others can be used with only a simple treatment. Regarding the water volume, this region has been intensely impacted by a severe and recent drought (Taffarello et al., 2016a; Escobar, 2015; Whately & Lerer, 2015; ANA, 2015; Porto & Porto, 2014). As a result of this serious water crisis, a new water policylaw on the average flow of the transfer limits of the Piracicaba watershed to the Upper Tiete watershed was postponed from 2014 to May, 2017 (ANA, 2015). The Cantareira System is located in the Atlantic Forest biome, considered a conservation hotspot because of its rich biodiversity. In spite of that, 78% of the original forest cover of the Cantareira watershed has been deforested over the past 30 years (Zuffo, 2015). In 2014, the native forest cover was 10% in Extrema, 12% in Joanópolis and 21% in Nazaré Paulista (SOS Mata Atlântica/INPE, 2015). To counteract deforestation, some environmental/financial trade-offs have been developed in the Cantareira headwaters to protect downstream water quality and the regulation of water flows. These are Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) initiatives, in which rural landowners receive economic incentives to conserve and/or restore riparian forests and implement soil conservation practices (see Chapter 3 of this thesis). The first Brazilian EbA approach was the *Water Conservator Project*, created in 2005 and implemented in Extrema, Minas Gerais (Richards et al., 2015; Pereira, 2013). The Water Producer/PCJ Project was developed from 2009 to 2014 in the Cantareira System region (Guimarães, 2013), using EbA scenarios and local actions adopting the concept of Payment for Ecosystem Services-Water (Pagiola et al, 2013;Padovezi et al., 2013through public-private partnerships, strengthening EbA in Brazil.

2.2. Databases and model adopted

Figure 2 shows the method developed and applied to assess the regulating hydrologic services through grey WF, along with the spatial data used in this study. The simulations were enhanced by model parameterization with qualitative and quantitative primary data (Mohor et al., 2015a; Mohor et al., 2015b; Taffarello et al. 2016b) from six field campaigns between 2012 and 2014, in partnership with ANA, CPRM, TNC-Brazil, WWF, USP/EESC and municipalities. This can reduce uncertainties of the model, facilitate data interpretation and provide consistent information. We installed three data collection platforms (DCP) in catchments at Posses, Cancã and Moinho, and level and pressure sensors (see Table 1, and Figure 8) in paired sub-basins *(i)* with high original vegetation cover, and *(ii)* in basins that receive payment for ecosystem services due to participating in the *Water Producer/PCJ* project.

We obtained and organized secondary data from the region upstream of the Jaguari-Jacareí, Cachoeira and Atibainha reservoirs. We then set up a database originating from several sources: Hidroweb (ANA, 2014); Basic Sanitation Company of the State of Sao Paulo (SABESP); Integrated Center for Agrometeorology Information (CIIAGRO, 2014); Department of Water and Power (DAEE); National Institute of Meteorology (INMET) from the Center for Weather Forecasts and Climate Studies (CPTEC/INPE).

Supplement Table S1summarizes all hydrologic, pedological, meteorological and land-use data used as input for the delineation and characterization of the watersheds. The topographical data used was the Digital Elevation Model "ASTER Global DEM", 2ª version, 30-m (Tachikawa, et al., 2011), available free of charge at: http://gdex.cr.usgs.gov/gdex/. The changes in hydrologic services can be evaluated by a wide number of models (Carvalho-Santos et al, 2016; Duku et al, 2015; Quilbé & Rousseau, 2007), especially those more user-friendly for stakeholders and policy makers. Simulations in this watershed-scale ecohydrologic model (Williams et al, 2008; and Borah & Bera, 2003) allow for the quantification of important variables for ecosystem services analysis and decision-making. Some examples of ecohydrologic models with progressive applications in Brazilian basins are SWAT (Bremer et al., 2016; Francesconi et al., 2016; Bressiani et al., 2015), the models reviewed by de Mello et al. (2016), Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs (InVEST) (Sharp, 2016; Tallis et al., 2011) and Resource Investment Optimization System (RIOS) (Vogl et al., 2016).

The Soil and Water Assessment Tool - SWAT-TAMU (Arnoldet al., 1998; Arnold and Fohrer, 2005) is a public domain conceptual spatially semi-distributed model, widely used in ecohydrologic and/or agricultural studies at river basin scale (Krysanova & Whyte, 2015; Krysanova & Arnold, 2008). It divides the basin into sub-basins based on an elevation map and the sub-basins are further subdivided into *Hydrologic Response Units*(HRU). Each HRU represents a specific combination of land use, soil type and slope class within the sub-basin. The model includes climatic, hydrologic, soil, sediments and vegetation components, transport of nutrients, pesticides, bacteria, pathogens, BMP and climate change in a river basin scale (Srinivasan et al., 2014; GASSMAN et al., 2014; Arnold et al., 2012).

There have been at least 2,600 published SWAT studies (SWAT Literature Database, mid-2016). In the *SWAT Purdue Conference*, held in 2015, 118 studies were presented, of which, only 8% assessed the transport of nutrients in watersheds (SWAT Purdue, Book of Abstracts, 2015). Research using SWAT, not only for quantity but also for water quality and ecosystem service assessments (Francesconi et al., 2016; Abbaspour et al., 2015; Duku et al., 2015; Dagupatti & Srinivasan, 2015; Gassman et al., 2014) and also as an educational tool for comparing hydrologic processes (Rajib et al., 2016) have increased in recent years.

2.3. Model Set-up

The initial model set-up used the ArcSWAT interface, integrated to ArcGIS 10.0 (Environmental Systems Research Institute - ESRI, 2010, ArcSWAT 2012.10.15 in ArcGIS 10).

Discretization in sub-basins was carried out, where possible, at the same NCE sites of field investigations.

The delimitation of the basin using ArcSWAT requires a drainage area threshold, determined to 7.1km², dividing the geographical space to represent the 17 sampling sites in the research field as sub-basins, plus the limits of the three reservoirs´ drainage areas, which resulted in 20 sub-basins (**Table 1 and Figure 1b**). We highlight that the basin was designed up to the confluence of the Jaguari and Atibaia Rivers, forming the Piracicaba river, to integrate all areas of interest in the same SWAT project.

The definition of the HRU was carried out using soil maps of the state of São Paulo. (Oliveira, 1999) and land use maps were developed by Molin (2014; et al. 2015) from LANDSAT 5 TM imagery for 2010, using a 1:60,000 scale. The procedure defined 49 HRUs inside the 20 sub-basins, i.e. 49 different combinations of soil type, soil cover and slope classes in our study area.

Next, we adapted the land use map developed by Guimarães (2013), which represents a 2010 land use scenario for the Cantareira System restoring the most fragile degraded parcels (greatest potential for sediment production), to agree with the land use classes of Molin (2014). Additionally, we assumed that the Second Scenario of Guimarães (2013), who used the INVEST model to provide the ecological restoration benefits in the Cantareira System, could be achieved in 2035, considering the investments provided in the PCJ River Plan (Cobrape, 2011) to recover riparian forests in the Cantareira System. In that region the restoration of riparian forests is mostly due to Water-PES projects, which was recognized as an Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) (CBD, 2010; BFN/GIZ, 2013; Taffarello et al., 2017), we identify the third scenario as S2+EbA. Thus, **Figure 3** shows the land-use changes over time.In the “Trend Scenario” (PCJ-COBRAPE, 2011), the municipalities covered by the Cantareira System could reach a 98% collection rate, collected sewage treatment rate of 100% and $BOD_{5,20}$ removal efficiency of 95% (PCJ-COBRAPE, 2011). Some studies have suggested including other parameters such as dissolved oxygen, nitrate and phosphate polluting loads, as well as sediments to assess the water quality (Cruz, 2015; Cunha et al., 2014). Regarding the treatment costs for drinking water supply, ecosystem-based adaptation options, such as watershed restoration, seem to be more cost-effective than many technologies for water treatment (Cunha; Sabogal-Paz & Dodds, 2016).

2.4. Calibration & validation

We used the SWAT CUP 5.1.6.2 interfaces and Sequential Uncertainty Fitting (SUFI-2) algorithm for calibrating the quantity and quality parameters and also for validating the simulations in the sub-basins. Quantitative calibration was performed in stations that had more than two full years of observed data, i.e., 8 stations, namely: Posses outlet, F23, F24, F25B, F28, Atibainha reservoir, Cachoeira reservoir, Jaguari and Jacarei reservoirs (**Table 2**). A common test period for all LULC scenarios was selected, in our case, the test period ranges from 01 Jan, 2006 to 30 June, 2014. This period has the rain-anomaly of drought conditions from 2013 to 2014.

The calibration period was from October, 2007 to September, 2009, the only period with observed data in all of the above 8 stations. Validation took place from January, 2006 to September, 2007 and from October, 2009 to June, 2014. Calibration and validation of SWAT at the stations with over 2 years of data were rated as "good", according to the classification by Moriasi et al. (2007), since the Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) criterion (Nash & Sutcliffe, 1970) was greater than 0.65, except for the Posses outlet, which presented the logarithmic Nash-Sutcliffe (NSElog) (using the logarithm of streamflow, a criterion that gives greater weight to smaller flow rates) of less than 0.5, rated as "unsatisfactory".The Percent Bias (Pbias) statistics indicates the bias percentage of simulated flows relative to the observed flows (Gupta et al., 1999). Thus, when the Pbias value is closer to zero, it results in a better representation of the basin, and in lower estimate tendencies (Moriasi et al., 2007). As a general rule, if | Pbias | < 10%, it means a very good fit; 10% < | Pbias |< 15%, good; 15% < | Pbias | < 25%, satisfactory and | Pbias | > 25%, the model is inappropriate. On the other hand, the NSE coefficient translates the application efficiency of the model into more accurate predictions of flood flows, using the classification: NSE > 0.65 the model is rated as very good; 0.54 <NSE< 0.65 the model is rated as good and between 0.5 and 0.54, it is rated as satisfactory.

In the results obtained for different basin scales (**Figure 4**), the Pbias and NSE coefficients (including NSE of logarithms) indicate adequate quantitative adjustments. As the SWAT simulations include more than 200 parameters, based on research from the literature (Duku et al., 2015; Bressiani et al., 2015; Arnold et al., 2012; Garbossa et al., 2011), we selected approximately 10 parameters (see **Table 3**) to complete the calibration to simulate streamflow processes and nutrient dynamics. These parameters refer to key processes which represent soil water storage, infiltration, evapotranspiration, flow channel, boundary conditions (see Mohor et al., 2015b) and main water quality processes at hillslopes. Although our calibration is mainly focused on water yield as total runoff, freshwater quality features through pollutant loads were performed in the scenarios. Further comments related to existing literature for selected model parameters are depicted in Section S.3 with **comments on sensitivity analysis to select model parameters used in this paper (Supplementary Material)**

Comentado [UdW4]: Attending **Lines** 252-255, RC1: "Besides adopting from the existing literatures, implementing sensitivity analysis could be recommended in order to select model parameters."

Moreover, to reduce the uncertainty of our predictions, we used approximately 2500 primary data derived from an earlier stage of this research (Taffarello et al., 2016a). As a parameterization result of field investigations and ecohydrologic modelling, **Figure 5** shows parts of the calibrated model performance (lines) against field observations (dots with experimental uncertainty) for flow discharges, nitrate and total phosphorus loads for catchment areas ranging from 7.1 to 508 km^2. Finally, other water quality variables were studied based on data from field sampling.

We highlight some SWAT model limitations when we compare the simulated to observed water flows, especially in the dry season. For example, when the model was discretized on a daily resolution, the adherence level between the observed and simulated flows was considered good. However, the model did not fit well to observed values during the drought period (Feb/2014-May/2014). These differences were more significant for water quality parameters, such as nitrate and total phosphorous. We point out that the macronutrient loads found in May, 2014 were clearly higher than the loads we found in previous sampling, which occurred in wetter periods (Taffarello et al. 2016). For the sample collected in May, the model significantly underestimated the pollutant loads of nitrate. This behaviour, arising from the recent and most severe drought faced by the Cantareira System (Nobre et al., 2016; Marengo et al., 2016; Taffarello et al. 2016; Escobar, 2015; The Economist, 2015; Porto & Porto, 2014), , especially to capture nonlinearities having impacts on regulating ecosystem services during extreme flows.For EbA scenarios, we planned to set up field investigations and SWAT calibrations (see Figure 5, thispaper) using the extreme conditions of the 2013–14 drought through freshwater quality monitoring at the headwaters of the Cantareira System(see i.e. Tafarello et al, 2016-a).

2.5. The scenarios and a new index for hydrologic service assessment

Differences in flow rates and water quality (for the variables nitrate, phosphate, $BOD_{5,20}$, turbidity and faecal coliforms) for the 20 sub-basins were evaluated using flow and load duration curves for the three scenarios proposed in this study: (i) *recent past scenario* (S1), including the recorded past events for land use in 1990, (ii) *current land use scenario* (S2), which considered land uses for the 2010-2015 period as the baseline, and (iii) *future land use scenario* (S2+EbA), supposing a forest cover conversion in the protected areas, through EbA options, according to the PCJ River Basin Plan by 2035. Using these curves, from the methodology shown by Hoekstra et al. (2011), and based on Duku et al. (2015) and Cunha et al. (2012), we estimated the grey water footprint (greyWF). Next, we developed a new ecohydrologic index to assess the regulating hydrologic services in relation to the greyWF.This new indicator encompasses the former theory related to environmental sustainability of the greyWF, according to Hoekstra et al. (2011). In this study, as a relevant local impact indicator, Hoekstra et al. (2011) proposed to calculate the 'water pollution level' (WPL) within the catchment, which measures the degree of pollution. WPL is defined as a fraction of the waste assimilation capacity consumed and calculated by taking the ratio of the total of greyWF in a catchment ($\sum WF_{grey}$) to the actual runoff from that catchment (R_{act}), or, in a proxy manner, the water yield or mean water yield or long-term period (Q_{lp}). This assumption is that a water pollution level of 100 per cent means that the waste assimilation capacity has been fully consumed. Furthermore, this approach assumes that when WPL exceeds 100 %, environmental standards are violated, such as:

$$WPL\,[x,t] = \frac{\sum WF_{grey}[x,t]}{R_{act}[x,t]}, \qquad (1)$$

It is worth mentioning that for some experts, the aforementioned equation can overestimate the flow necessary to dilute pollutants. For that reason, new insights of composite indicators or thresholds are recommended, as follows.

The above assumption could overestimate WPL because it would fail considering the combined capacity of water to assimilate multiple pollutants (Hoekstra et al., 2012; Smakhtin et al., 2005). Conversely, in this study, we define an alternative indicator related to the three following fundamentals. First, the WPL should be extended to a composite index, thereby representing weights of each pollutant related to the actual runoff, here as a proxy of long-term runoff, i.e.:

$$WPL_{composite}[x,t] = \frac{\sum\{w[x,t]*WF_{grey}[x,t]\}}{R_{act}[x,t]\cong Q_{lp}[x,t]}, \qquad (2)$$

$$\sum w[x,t] = 1$$

$$0 \leq w[x,t] \leq 1$$

For this new equation, weights should be assessed, either from field experiments or even from simulation outputs. Second, we define a threshold value of WPL composite regarding the reference catchments in non-developed conditions which suggest more conservation conditions among other catchments of the same region, as $WPL_{reference}$. For this study, we selected *Domithildes* catchment as the reference catchment with conservancy measures. From this reference catchment, we define the composite reference index for the water pollution level as $WPL_{composite,ref}$ and, derived from it, the Hydrologic Service Index, as a non-dimensional factor of comparison between WPL for reference and non-reference catchments, as follows:

$$HSI[x,t]_{greyWF} = \frac{WPL\,[x,t] - WPL_{composite,ref}}{WPL_{composite,ref}}, \qquad (3)$$

3. Results

Comentado [UdW5]: Attending comments of reviewer 2, we here split discussion into a separated section from results.

In the following section, we present the results from field observations, useful not only for ecohydrologic parameterization, but also to elucidate features regarding greyWF and hydrologic services. Next, we compare the water yield and greyWF outputs from simulations under LULC scenarios, including EbA options, to finally propose a new hydrologic services indicator.

3.1. Data from field sampling

Some of the water quality and quantity variables from our freshwater monitoring are useful to assess the hydrologic services, thus they are presented in **Table 4**. These variables were selected due to their relationship with anthropic impacts on the water bodies and because of their importance for sanitation

Among the water quality variables sampled in the field step of the research (see Taffarello et al., 2016a; Taffarello et al., 2016b), we highlight turbidity because it indicates a proxy estimation about the total suspended solids in lotic environments (UNEP, 2008), related to the LULC conversion and reflects the changes in the hydrologic services. **Figure 6** shows the direct correlation between turbidity and size of the sub-basins. Turbidity can indirectly indicate anthropic impacts in streams and rivers (Martinelli et al., 1999). The lower turbidity mean values were observed in two more conserved sub-basins (which presented higher amounts of forest remnants): 2 NTU in the *reference Cancã catchment*(Domithildes)and 5 NTU in *Upper Posses*.

Comentado [UdW6]: Relocated to Discusion section, attending reviewer 2's comments

Otherwise, we found a positive relationship between nitrate concentrations and both discharge and mean water level (**Figure 7**). It can be inferred that higher concentrations of macronutrients would be found in downstream areas. This trend can be associated to the nutrient migration (Cunha et al., 2013) and land-use change (Zaffani et al., 2015), as well as point source pollution. In addition, the absence of the riparian forest in 70% of protected area (36.844 ha) of the Cantareira System

(Guimarães, 2013) can increase the sediment transport from riparian areas to rivers and make pollutant filtration more difficult, leading to higher nitrate concentrations downstream.

3.2. LULC change scenarios

The variations in LULC affect freshwater quality which, in turn, affect the dynamics of aquatic ecosystems (Zaffani et al., 2015; Botelho et al., 2013; Hamel et al., 2013; Bach & Ostrowski, 2013; Kaiser et al., 2013). These changes impact the hydrologic services, especially regulating and supporting ecosystem services (Mulder et al., 2015; Molin et al., 2017).

The LULC of each sub-basin, according to a past-condition scenario (S1, in 1990), a present-condition (S2, in 2010) and a future (S2+Eba, in 2035) LULC scenario, using the same weather input datafiles, is shown in **Table 5**.

We evaluated the effects of LULC change scenarios in 20 catchments in the Jaguari, Cachoeira and Moinho sub-basins, South-East Brazil. Concerning the land-use change, the main soil use 25 years ago was: pasture (in 50% of the sub-basins) and native vegetation (in 45% of the sub-basins). According to ISA (2012) and Molin (2014), the 5% of the remaining area were divided into vegetables, eucalyptus, sparse human settlements, bare soil and mining. The main activity in the past (1990) was extensive cattle raising for milk production by small producers in the region (ANA, 2012; Veiga Neto, 2008).

By assessing the temporal trends of increment or reduction of native remnants, we examined the periods 1990-2010 versus 2010-2035. From 1990 to 2010, the percentage of forest increased by 50% in the *Domithildes* sub-basin, which was the reference catchment of the Water Producer/PCJ project, (see Taffarello et al., 2016a), *Moinho, Cachoeira dos Pretos, F34, B. Jacareí, B. Atibainha, B. Cachoeira, Pq Eventos, F25B* and *B. Jaguari* (**Figure 9**). Concerning the period from 2010-2035, the model was set up considering an increase in native vegetation in all sub-basins from forest remnants in 2010, and from the new BMP practices of reforestation with native species in 20 sub-basins by 2035 (**Figure 9**). The hydro-services in the *Posses* and *Salto* catchments and in the *Cachoeira* sub-basin will be increased by 2035 as a function of the efforts on EbA which currently exist in the region (Richards et al., 2017; Richards et al., 2015; Santos, 2014).

Comentado [UdW7]: Attending Reviewer 2, we relocate this paragraph into discussions

3.3. Water yield as a function of soil cover

Comentado [UdW8]: Attending reviewer 2 comments, this section was relocated to discussion

In this research, we chose to use quali-quantitative duration curves for integrated assessment of availability and quality of water. The flow-and-load duration curve, comparable to histograms of relative cumulative frequencies of flows and loads of a waterbody, is a simple and important analysis in hydrology (Collischonn & Dornelles, 2013). In quantitative terms, the flow duration curve shows the probabilistic temporal distribution of water availability (Cruz & Silveira, 2007), relating the flow in the river cross section to the percentage of time in which it is equalled or exceeded (Cruz & Tucci, 2008).

The three scenarios S1, S2 and S2+EbA resulted in different flow values for the 20 sub-basins (**Figure 10**). Based on the arithmetic mean of time series of monthly water yields, related to catchment areas, and assessed for all modelled sub-basins (N=20), the results show average values of water yield: 31.4 ± 25.2 L/s/km^2 for S1 (1990), 14.9 ± 11.5 L/s/km^2 for S2 (2010) and 21.4 ± 15.3 L/s/km^2 for S2+EbA (2035), respectively. This very high variation can be due to the complexity of river basin systems and the various sources of uncertainty in the representation of ecohydrologic processes.

The three scenarios analysed and the ecohydrologic monitoring provide different types of information for the same catchments..

The 52% decrease of water yield between S1 (1990) and S2 (2010) scenarios, as (14.9 -31.3)/31.3×100) might be related to a marginal increase in the Eucalyptus cover.. In fact, from 1990 to 2010, eucalyptus cover increased +6.8 % in total land cover, but +181% in relative terms. Another possible explanation is the decrease in native vegetation from 1990 to 2010, with -1.8 % in total land cover, but -4.3%, in relative terms.

In parallel, we evaluated the water yield. Thus, the flow-and-load duration curves summarize the flow and pollutant load variability, thereby showing potential links and impacts for aquatic ecosystem sustainability (Cunha et al., 2012; Cruz & Tucci, 2008). From these curves, we obtained two different behaviours for the studied sub-basins (**Figure 10**):

Behaviour I:the water yield in 2010 reduced in relation to 1990 and the water yield in 2035 might exceed the 1990 levels. The examples are: *Upper Jaguari*, *Cachoeira* sub-basin (including the *Cachoeira dos Pretos, Chalé Ponto Verde, Ponte Cachoeira, F24 outlet)* and *Moinho* catchments;

Behaviour II:the water yield after 2010 was reduced until 2035 and this water yield recuperation was not possible for the values in 1990. Examples, in decreasing size of drainage areas, are: *Atibainha, B. Jaguari, F25B, Parque de Eventos, F23, B.Atibainha, F34, F30, Salto, Posses Outlet, Domithildes, Portal das Estrelas* (*Middle Posses*).

On the one hand, according to **Figure 11**, the water yield of S1 is inversely proportional to the land use of mixed forest cover. The water yield in S2 indicates a constant value of approximately 17 L/s/km^2. Moreover, for the S2+EbA scenario, which incorporates the EbA approach through BMP, the water yield is approximately 17 L/s/km^2, but with a slight increase in the water yield when the percentage of forest cover is higher than 50%. Presumably, this slight increase in the water yield would be related to the type of best management practices (BMP) of the recovery forests, which still did not achieve evapotranspiration rates of the climax stage. In the riparian forest recovery, evapotranspiration rates are lower and, thus, a greater amount of precipitation reaches the soil and rivers through the canopy. This process could benefit other hydrologic components, such as runoff, increasing water flows into the rivers. This effect can possibly explain the **behaviour I**catchments (see **Fig. 10**).

Comentado [UdW9]: Attending reviewer 2, we carry this section to discussion

3.4. Relationships between land-use/land-cover change and grey water footprint

For an integrated assessment of hydro-services, we analysed the spatio-temporal conditions of load production at the sub-basin scale (see more information on Section S.4 "Comments on differences in land-use/land-cover in sub-basins studied", in Supplementary Material). As we studied rural sub-basins, water pollution is mainly produced by diffuse sources, such as fertilizers and agrochemicals. In this context, we evaluated the evolution of greyWF to show nitrate (N-NO_3), total phosphorus (TP) and sediment (Sed) yields (indicated by turbidity) of scenarios S1, S2 and S2+EbA. First, we calculated the nitrate loads generated from the 20 sub-basins in the three scenarios. Second, we did the same for total phosphorous loads and sediment yields. Third, considering the river regime, we calculated the greyWF for nitrate, total phosphorous and sediments in each sub-basin to develop a new composite index that assesses the sustainability of hydrologic services.

Concerning nitrate, the sampled concentrations were low. In addition, SWAT simulations also brought very low outputs, and the greyWF-NO_3 varied from 0.11 L/s/km^2 (in *Atibainha* subbasin in S2 (2010) scenario) to 2.83 L/s/km^2 (in *Middle Posses* catchment, *Portal das Estrelas*, under S2+EbA (2035) scenario). Considering Brazilian water quality standards for nitrate, the maximum allowed concentration is 10 mg/L (Brasil, 2005). These low amounts of nitrate loads make the greyWF-NO_3 fall to low values in the three scenarios analysed (between 1 and 10%; **Figure 12a**).

In relation to total phosphorous (TP), the load duration curves from S1, S2 and S2+EbA scenarios showed disparities. For example, the greyWF-TP decreased in all sub-basins between 1990, 2010 and 2035. From 2010 to 2035, the model predicts a new behaviour for the greyWF-TP.

Results of the greyWF for TP, NO_3 and sediments enabled us to infer hydrologicalregionalization for nutrient loads. Among the 20 sub-basins studied, we selected 2 sub-basins as study cases to illustrate the links between LULC and greyWF: (1) the *Upper Jaguari* and (2) *Domithildes*. The reasons for selecting the two sub-basins among the 20 sub-catchments are detailed in Section S.5 of Supplementary Material

3.4.1 Case study I: Upper Jaguari sub-basin

The Upper Jaguari (**Figure 13**) has 302 km^2 and is the second most upstream sub-basin within the Cantareira System (downstream of only *F28* sub-basin, with 277 km^2). Comparing scenario 1990 (S1) and 2010 (S2), the results showed evidence that the native forest decayed approx. 10 %. Indeed, scenario 2035 (S2+EbA) still assumes a very small decrease in the native forest. This decrease may be due to the increase in secondary forests by BMP, which could stabilise the native forest LULC by 70% until 2035. The mean annual simulated water yields, in spite of high variability of simulated scenarios, pointed out values of 18 L.s^{-1}.km^2 (1990, S1), 13 L/s/km^2 (2010, S2) and 21 L/s/km^2 (for 2035, S2+EbA).

Comentado [UdW10]: Attending reviewer 2's comments

3.4.2 Case study II: Domithildes headwater

The *Domithildes* catchment (9.9 km^2) is located in the *Cancã* catchment. Similar to *Upper Jaguari, Domithildes* is one of the most conserved sub-basins, mainly with native forests. The native forest fraction remained constant (see **Figure 14**) from S1 (51% in 1990) to S2 (52% in 2010). However, unlike the *Upper Jaguari* sub-basin (see **Figure 13**), native vegetation could increase by 56% in S2+EbA (2035). Due to the fact that Domithildes was adopted as a reference basin for Water Producer/PCJ, the augmented fraction of native forest by 2035 could show an increase of secondary forest.

Regarding water yield, the *Domithildes* catchment was classified as a second type of 'subbasin behaviour' (Section 3.3). There is a positive increment of water yield between 2010 (~18 L/s/km^2) and 2035 (~23 L/s/km^2), although this situation may not achieve values obtained for S1 conditions in 1990 (~ 29 L/s/km^2).

3.5. Results of a new index for hydrologic service assessment

Comentado [UdW11]: Attending reviewer 2's comments

A new index for hydrologic service assessment was developed as a simple relation between greyWF and water yield, using a fraction between water demand (numerator) and availability (denominator). Some authors commonly use this fraction as a direct approach to water scarcity (i.e. Smakhtin, et al., 2005; Hoekstra et al, .2013; McNulty et al., 2010; among others). Therefore, we first assessed greyWF by respective drainage basins (**Figure 15**). Then, we calculated the water pollution levels.

Results in **Figure 16** show the composite water pollution level (WPLcomposite) *versus* drainage areas and compared with the HSI. The baseline *WPLcomposite,ref* is related to the *Domithildes* catchment (horizontal, dotted line in **Figure 16**). This line divides the graph into two regions: less sustainable basins (*HSI*>0) and more sustainable basins (*HIS*<=0). More sustainable basins (*HIS*<0) are *Salto, Cachoeira* nested catchments (*Cachoeira dos Pretos, Chalé Ponto Verde* and *Ponte Cachoe*ira), as well as *F28, F24* and the *Upper Jaguari* basin.

3.6. Comparison of field investigation and modelled scenarios

Field, experimental data (Taffarello et al., 2016a) with modelled scenarios of land-use and land-cover change, including the EbA hypothesis were integrated into a summary figure in the Supplementary Material (see Suppementary Figure S.1).

4.Discussion

This section discusses field data, LULC change scenarios, GWF and water yield, not only in general aspects, but also in selected catchments fore-mentioned in Section 3.

4.1 On field data

Other conserved subbasins also presented low mean values of turbidity (< 6.5 NTU): *intervention Cancã* catchment (5 NTU), and *Cachoeira dos Pretos* (6 NTU). We found the highest turbidity, above 40 NTU which is considered the maximum established water quality standard for Brazilian Class 1 (BRASIL, 2005):at*Parque de Eventos* (283 NTU), at*F23* (180 NTU) and at *Salto outlet* (160 NTU). However, these three sampling sites are located at water bodies of Class 2, where the maximum turbidity allowed is up to 100 NTU (BRAZIL, 2005). Due to these areas have the highest urbanization among the sampled sites, they are in non-compliance with Brazilian environmental standards. Arroio Júnior (2013) found a decreasing relation between turbidity and drainage areas in another catchment located in Sao Paulo state. Temporal turbidity patterns show that on the one hand in 11 out of 17 monitored sites, the higher values of turbidity occurred in December, 2013, the only field campaign with significant precipitation (35.3 mm) and with a higher antecedent precipitation index (API =

123.7mm). This can be due to carrying allochthone particles, which are drained into rivers by precipitation. Similarly, Arroio Júnior (2013) also observed higher turbidity in the rainy season (December, 2012) which can lead to erosive processes. On the other hand, Zaffani et al. (2015) showed that turbidity did not vary over the hydrologic year in medium-size, rural and peri-urban watersheds ranging from 1 to 242 km^2. In this case, other factors may have had an influence, such as deforestation, seasonal variability, soil use type, sewage and mining (CETESB, 2015; Tundisi, 2014).

4.2 On LULC change scenarios

In the S2 Scenario (2010), the main soil use is pasture in 58% of the sub-basins and forest in 40% of them. From 1990 to 2010, there was a significant conversion of soil cover, with a slow reduction of pasture areas (-2%) and native remnants (-5%) and with a progressive increase of eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* sp.), an exotic forest in Brazil. Eucalypt soil use varied from +1%, within *Posses* up to +31% in the *Chalé Ponto Verde* sub-basin in 2010. Eucalyptus cover, however, did not achieve 10% of the soil uses in any of the simulated sub-basins in 1990. In the third scenario (S2 + EbA), we hypothesized incentives of public policies for forest conservation and restoration, due to the strengthening of EbA in the Cantareira System. This could lead to an increase in native vegetation reaching percentages of 15% in the *Posses outlet* and 69% in the *F28 sub-basin*. In this scenario, the higher percentages of native vegetation would occur in the sub-basins *F28, Upper Jaguari and Cachoeira dos Pretos*.

Despite this general increase in native forest cover, we highlight the deforestation which occurred in the *F23* sub-basin in the Camanducaia river. Currently, although the basin has 34% of native forest cover, this rate has tended to decrease since 1990. The *F23 outlet* (sub-basin 2) had 37% of native forest cover in 1990, which then became 34 % in 2010 and the S2+EbA Scenario predicts that F23 could reach 36.2% of native forest by 2035, returning to the percentages found in 1990. Another critical situation is the *Posses outlet* (SWAT sub-basin 6): despite the conservation efforts which have been made in the region through the *Water Conservation* project (see Richards et al., 2015; Santos, 2014; Pereira, 2013), the current percentage of native remnants is 13%, which can become 16% in 2035, however not achieving the rate in 1990 (22%). This can potentially disrupt the regulating and provision hydrologic services provided by Posses sub-basin and needs to be evaluated in depth.

Spatio-temporal patterns of the main soil uses which compete with forest cover are analysed: pasture and eucalyptus. First, related to pasture, it can be observed that it was the main use in the past in 60% of the sub-basins (in 1990) and, currently, it has become the majority LULC, approximately 40%. Our scenarios indicate that due to EbA strengthening, encouraging the links between environmental conservation and forest restoration, 20% of the sub-basins could be mainly occupied by pasture (sub-basins 2, 4, 6 and 7). This rate is reasonable, considering rural sub-basins. Moreover, the reduction in pasture in the Cantareira System was more evident in the 1990-2010 period than in the 2010-2035 scenario. This can be explained by, at least, three factors: i) rural landowners awareness of the relevance of converting pasture to native forest to generate and maintain ecosystem services in the Cantareira System (Saad, 2016; Extrema, 2015; Mota da Silva, 2014; Padovezi et al., 2013; Gonçalvez, 2013; Veiga-Neto, 2008); ii) seasonal changes in the ecosystem structure which can increase the ecosystem resilience (Mulder et al., 2015) and an observed significant increase, mainly in the 1990-2010 period, of non-native species plantations.

Second, regarding the eucalyptus cover, the future scenario shows an increasing threat to the regulating and supporting services as a result of the exotic forest in expansion. In 2035, eucalyptus cover may include, on average, 12% of the total area of the 20 catchments studied here. This is significant in comparison with 10% in 2010 and only 2% in 1990 for the same catchments. The scenario for 2035 shows that the maintenance of hydrologic services deserves attention, because eucalyptus monoculture can potentially impact not only the headwaters, but entire landscapes, threatening the ecosystem dynamics. Moreover, these plantations, with an average wood yield of 50 to 60 m^3 of *Urograndis* per hectare, need high quantities of agrochemicals, due to the low diversity of the population and low adaptation to climate change (Kageyama & dos Santos, 2015). In short, here we highlight the threat on biodiversity that has been brought by alien species in headwaters and the changes that it can promote on native species (Hulme & Le Roux, 2016) which, in turn, impact the ecosystem services.

4.3 On water yield and LULC

On the other hand, we observed in *Posses, Salto, Jaguari, Cancã* and *Atibainha* catchments an inverse situation (**behaviour II**). This effect can be related to the hydrologic response produced by: (a) type of catchment; (b) size of catchment; (c) the low soil moisture in the red-yellow latosol (Embrapa, 2016), which did not favour high evapotranspiration rates; (d) the riparian forest, originating from the EbA or Water-PES actions, that should still be at the initial stages, not achieving a climax in 20 years (this explanation therefore assumes that the baseline of PES actions was in 2015, although there are examples of restored forests in Extrema-MG with high evapotranspiration rates, as can usually be found in climax forests); and (e) unpredictability, non-linearity and uncertainty (Ferraz et al., 2013; Lima & Zakia, 2006).

The role of the forest in the hydrologic cycle in river basin scales has been debated for centuries. Riparian native forests, eucalyptus and riparian forests in recuperation (shown here as orchard) have different hydrologic responses. There is still a lack of knowledge regarding the influence of different types and phases of vegetation on the hydrologic processes. Bayer (2014) found that the vegetation height and leaf area index are inversely proportional to the water flows, which corroborate previous studies (Hibbert, 1967). Riparian forest restoration increases the mean evapotranspiration, reducing the water yield (Molin, 2014; Salemi et al., 2012; Lima & Zakia, 2006; Andreassian, 2004). Restoration increases the water storage capability into the catchment throughout the riparian zone, contributing to the higher water flow in the dry season (Lima & Zakia, 2000). This can lead to unexpected results regarding water yield. Furthermore, at small catchments of temperate climate, researchers estimated that deforestation in 40% of the catchments would increase the runoff of 130 ± 89 $mm.year^{-1}$ considering the entire water cycle in the catchment scale (Collischonn & Dornelles, 2013). In addition, there is high dispersion in the results based monitoring (usually, in paired catchments or Nested Catchment Experiment - NCE), which makes it more difficult to predict the flow as a result of soil use conversion. Similarly, we found high dispersion in the comparison between water yields *versus* different land cover in 20 sub-basins of the subtropical climate (**Figure 11**).

BMP have been in progress since 2005 in the *Posses Outlet* (sub-basin 6, **Table 5**) and *Middle Posses (Portal das Estrelas*, Nº 7), and since 2009 in *Domithildes, F30* and *Moinho* catchments (Subbasins 9, 11 and 20, respectively). These BMP originated from the *Water Conservator* and *Water Producer/PCJ* projects. In these cases, we recommend that public agencies take care when defending PES as inductors of more water availability (ANA, 2013). Parts of these results and previous investigations, which were made through NCE (Taffarello et al., 2016a), point out the opposite, i.e., in the more conserved catchments, we found lower water yields. Despite the fact that there are many Water-PES programs in Brazil (Pagiola, von Glehn & Taffarello, 2013; Guedes & Seehusen, 2011), measurements of the effect on water yield under forest restoration are still lacking in tropical and subtropical conditions (Taffarello et al., 2016a; Salemi et al., 2012). However, the benefits of riparian forests on water quality, margin stability, reduction of water erosion and silting are clear in the scientific literature (Santos, 2014; dos Santos et al., 2014; Studinski et al., 2012; Udawatta et al., 2010).

4.4 On GWF, LULC and water yield in selected catchments: Upper Jaguari and Domithildes

The discussion of the variabilityin GWF and water yield isbased inthe hydrologic conditions simulated in the test period from 2006 to 2014. In turn, this test period was selected due to high availability of rainfall stations under operation, which would potentially better perform distributed modelling at several sub-basins using SWAT. For the three scenarios simulated, the relationships between the native forest cover and mean water yield are different from each other.

On the one hand,in Upper Jaguari ("Alto Jaguari"), for scenario S1 (1990), the higher the native forest cover, the lower the water yield. This scenario behaviour is extended at experimental sites, and even strongly documented in the literature (Salemi et al, 2012; Smarthust et al., 2012, Collischon & Dornelles, 2013). For scenario S2 (2010) the water yield seems not fully related to native forest LULC, oscillating around an average value of 18 L/s/km^2. In scenario S2+EbA (2035), however, there is a slight increase in water yield when native forest cover is higher than 50%. This proportional relation between water yield and forest cover in the S2+EbA is both controversial and contrary to results published by some authors (e.g. Collischonn & Dornelles, 2013; Salemi et al., 2012). For example, monitoring data shows a reduction in the water yield with higher native forest land cover (Taffarello et al., 2016a). Salemi and co-authors, in a review on the effect of riparian forest on water yield, found that riparian vegetation cover decreases water yield on a daily to annual basis.

Furthermore, the greyWF-NO_3 of the *Upper Jaguari* basin showed 0.14 L/s/km^2 for scenario S1 (1990), increased to 0.23 L/s/km^2 for scenario S2 (2010) and could grow to ca. 0.54 L/s/km^2 in S2+EbA scenario (in 2035). However, this result is different from the one expected in the hypothesis testing through modelling. The null hypothesis states that increasing native forest cover is correlated to decreasing nutrient loads flowing to streams. The results, modelled by SWAT, predicted an increase in the greyWF by 2035. The simulated increase in the native forest (approx. +5%) appears to be insufficient for buffering nitrogen loads from animal excrements such as mammals or zooplankton. For a more in-depth analysis, other factors that influence the greyWF should be evaluated thoroughly.

On the other hand, in "Domithildes" catchment (reference catchment), other factors, such as native vegetation, could influence the hydrologic cycle decreasing water yields in the 2010 scenario (S2).

One explanation of this water yield decrease could be the positive LULC of *Eucalyptus sp.* to +5% in 2010 (S2). Regardless of other factors, +1% of eucalyptus land-use fraction in *Domithildes* will represent -2 L/s/km^2 of water yield, or -63 mm per year, in the same range of results reported by Salemi (2012) and close to Semthurst et al (2015).

Comparing seasonal water yields, the results showed higher variability around monthly flow averages for the S2+EbA (2035) scenario. These deviations in monthly flows by the S2+Eba (2035) scenario were higher in wetter months between November and March. The regulation of water yield, in both rainy and dry conditions, is more effective when quantified through variance (Molin, 2014). In spite of these uncertainties, scenarios modelled by SWAT estimated the highest mean monthly water yield in February (38 L/s/km^2) and the lowest mean monthly water yield in September and October (8 L/s/km^2). On the one hand, the results showed that a growing rate of native vegetation LULC since 2010 would serve to attenuate both e-flows peaks, especially in the rainy season (see flow duration curves), and pollutant filtration (see duration curves of N-NO_3 loads). On the other hand, the more native forest cover, the lower the water yield (Bayer, 2014; Molin, 2014; Burt & Swank, 1992). Thus, the progressive increase of water yield from 2010 to 2035, compared to a higher total forest cover, could indicate other factors, such as forest connectivity, forest climax and secondary factors such as BMP, that could produce non-linear conditions of water yield from the local scale to the catchment scale.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

Although the water-forest system interaction is a classic issue in Hydrology, the impacts of vegetation on quali-quantitative aspects of water resources need to be better understood.

Supported by field experiments and quali-quantitative simulations under different scenarios including EbA options with BMP, our results showed evidence of nonlinear relationships among LULC, water yield, greyWF of nitrate, total phosphorus and sediments, which irreversibly affect the composite of water pollution level (WPL), the definition of WPL of reference (here established at Domithildes catchment) and the hydrologic service index (HSIAlthough there was a coherent and proportional relation between the observed mean river velocity and observed specific flow, experimental evidence still depicted outliers, not only in reference catchments with EbA/PES-Water options, but also in intervention catchments with no EbA/PES-Water options. These evidences point illustrative examples of how complex LULC options from EbA would be exhaustively sensed into hydrological parameters and simulation scenarios using SWAT or other distributed models.Despite using a semi-distributed model for assessing non-point sources of pollution mainly tested under different LULC scenarios, our results showed that the intrinsic nature of flow-load duration curves, LULC and greyWF are constrained to high uncertainties and nonlinearities both from *in-situ* sampling and from processes interactions of modelling. Our results show the need to evaluate many uncertainty sources, such as: model sensitivity analysis, observed streamflow data, ecohydrologic model performance, residual analysis, etc. To attain goals of EbA, using HSI through greyWF assessment and composite of WPL, some conditions are needed to better fit models to field observations, as follows: (i) monitoring and, if possible, constrainingillegal inputs of high-concentrated pollutants, especially from growing urban settlements, (ii) restoring riparian vegetation, especially at HRUs where EbA scenarios introduce more sensitivity of water yields and GWF and (iii) modelling EbA effects at HRUs where trapping and removing inflowing sediments are more evident. For the health of river ecosystems, we used HSI, flow regimes and WPLcomposite, as composing alternative environmental flows Although the role of vegetation on streamflow has been widely studied, very few investigations have been reported in Brazilianwith control nutrient sources, transportation and delivery. Moreover, further field and modelling research is needed when integrating LULC, EbA and greyWF through hydrologically-distributed models. Thus, future research could clarify the influence of vegetation on water quality and the role of anthropogenic and natural drivers in ecohydrologic processes on a catchment-scale.

5. Acknowledgments

A Supplementary Material of this paper is available at HESS link. This paperwas supported by the Sao Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) [grants #2012/22013-4; #2014/15080-2; and #2008/58161-1 “Assessment of Impacts and Vulnerability to Climate Change in Brazil and Strategies for Adaptation Options”], CAPES 88887.091743/2014-01 (ProAlertas CEPED/USP), CNPq 465501/2014-1 & FAPESP 2014/50848-9 INCT-II (Climate Change, Water Security), CNPq PQ 312056/2016-8 (EESC-USPCEMADEN/MCTIC) & CAPES PROEX (PPGSHS, EESC/USP).We thank two graduates in environmental engineering at USP-Lorena, Cauê Fontão and Rodolfo Cursino, for providing updated information on water footprint for the introduction of the manuscript, Two anonymous reviewers carefully motivate us to: correct errors, detail useful information and perform abetter final version of this paper. Co-authors declare no conflict of interest, also with checking for originality and with equal contribution to this paper.

References

ALDAYA, M.M., MARTÍNEZ-SANTOS, P. LLAMAS, M.R. Incorporating the Water Footprint and Virtual Water into Policy: Reflections from the Mancha Occidental Region, Spain. Water Resour Manage, 24, 941–958, 2010. DOI 10.1007/s11269-009-9480-8.

ARNOLD, J. G., MORIASI, D. N., GASSMAN, P. W., ABBASPOUR, K. C., WHITE, M. J., SRINIVASAN, R., ... & KANNAN, N. SWAT: Model use, calibration, and validation. Transactions of the ASABE, 55(4), 1491-1508, 2012.

BFN/GIS FEDERAL AGENCY FOR NATURE CONSERVATION / DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR INTERNATIONALE ZUSAMMENARBEIT (GIZ) GMBH. Natural solutions to climate change: The ABC of Ecosystem-based Adaptation. Summary and Conclusions from an International Expert Workshop held 4-9 August 2013 on the Isle of Vilm, Germany, 2013.

BIEROZA, M. Z., HEATHWAITE, A. L., MULLINGER, N. J., & KEENAN, P. O. Understanding nutrient biogeochemistry in agricultural catchments: the challenge of appropriate monitoring frequencies. Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts, 16(7), 1676-1691, 2014.

BOITHIAS, L., SAUVAGE, S., LARNIER, K., ROUX, H., RICHARD, E., SANCHEZ-PÉREZ, J. M., & ESTOURNEL, C. Modelling river discharge and sediments fluxes at sub-daily time-step: Insight into the CRUE-SIM project devoted to Mediterranean coastal flash floods, 2015.

BORAH, D. K., & M. BERA. Watershed-scale hydrologic and nonpoint-source pollution models: Review of applications. Trans. ASABE 47(3), 789-803, 2004.

BRAZIL (2005). Resolução CONAMA nº 357/2005, March, 17th 2005. Dispõe sobre a classificação dos corpos de água e diretrizes ambientais para o seu enquadramento, bem como estabelece as condições e padrões de lançamento de efluentes, e dá outras providências [Establishing the classification of water bodies and environmental guidelines for frameworks, as well as establishing conditions and standards for wastewater release]. Diário Oficial da União, 18 de março de 2005, p.58-63.

BRAZILIAN INSTITUTE OF GEOGRAPHY AND STATISTICS – IBGE (2010). Demographic Census 2010. Available at: http://loja.ibge.gov.br/atlas-do-censo-demografico-2010.html, Accessed on July, 2017.

BREMER, L. L., AUERBACH, D. A., GOLDSTEIN, J. H., VOGL, A. L., SHEMIE, D., KROEGER, T., ... & HERRON, C. One size does not fit all: Natural infrastructure investments within the Latin American Water Funds Partnership. Ecosystem Services, 17, 217-236, 2016.

BRESSIANI D A, GASSMAN P W, FERNANDES J G, GARBOSSA L H P, SRINIVASAN R, BONUMÁ N B. ... MENDIONDO, E.M. Review of Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) applications in Brazil: Challenges and prospects. Int J Agric & Biol Eng, 2015; 8(3), 9—35, 2015. DOI: 10.3965/j.ijabe.20150803.1765.

BURT, T. P., & SWANK, W. T. Flow frequency responses to hardwood-to-grass conversion and subsequent succession. Hydrological Processes, 6(2), 179-188, 1992.

CARVALHO-SANTOS, C., NUNES, J. P., MONTEIRO, A. T., HEIN, L., & HONRADO, J. P. Assessing the effects of land cover and future climate conditions on the provision of hydrological services in a medium-sized watershed of Portugal. Hydrological Processes, 30:720-738, 2016.

CBD (2010). Convention on Biological Diversity: X/33 Biodiversity and climate change, Decision Adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its Tenth Meeting; UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/x/33; 29 October 2010. Nagoya, Japan: Secretariat of Convention on Biological Diversity, 2010.

CETESB – Companhia Ambiental do Estado de Sao Paulo. Portal de Licenciamento Ambiental, 2016. [https://portalambiental.cetesb.sp.gov.br/pla/welcome.do]

CHAPAGAIN AK, HOEKSTRA AY, SAVENIJE HHG. Water saving through international trade of agricultural products. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 10, 455–468, 2006.

COLLISCHONN, W. & DORNELLES, F. Hidrologia para engenharia e ciências ambientais. Porto Alegre: Associação Brasileira de Recursos Hídricos (ABRH), 2013.

COLLISCHONN, W., HAAS, R., ANDREOLLI, I., & TUCCI, C. E. M. Forecasting River Uruguay flow using rainfall forecasts from a regional weather-prediction model. Journal of Hydrology, 305(1), 87-98, 2005.

COLOMBIA. Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarollo Sostenible, Plan estrategico macrocuenca Magdalena Cauca, 2015.

COLOMBIA. Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarollo Sostenible, Planes de ordenación y manejo de cuencas hidrográficas (POMCA), 2014.

COLOMBIA. Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarollo Sostenible, Política nacional para a gestíon integral del recurso hídrico, 2010.

CRUZ, J.C. & TUCCI, C.E.M. Estimativa da Disponibilidade Hídrica Através da Curva de Permanência (Water availability estimation through flow duration curves). Revista Brasileira de Recursos Hídricos, 13 (1), 111-124, 2008.

CRUZ, J.C., & SILVEIRA, G. D. Disponibilidade Hídrica para outorga (i): Avaliação por seção hidrológica de referência (Water availability for legal water withdrawals (i): Evaluation by reference river cross section) . Revista Rega–Gestão de Água da América Latina, 4(2), 51-64, 2007.

CUNHA, D. G. F., SABOGAL-PAZ, L. P., & DODDS, W. K. Land use influence on raw surface water quality and treatment costs for drinking supply in São Paulo State (Brazil). Ecological Engineering, 94, 516-524, 2016.

CUNHA, D,G.F.; CALIJURI, M.C.; MENDIONDO, E.M. Integração entre curvas de permanência de quantidade e qualidade da água como uma ferramenta para a gestão eficiente dos recursos hídricos Integration between flow and load duration curves as a tool for efficient water resources management) .Rev. Eng. Sanit. Ambient. Vol. (17), 369-376, 2012.

DAEE-SP (Departamento de Água e Energia Elétrica do Estado de São Paulo). Estudo de Regionalização de Vazões do Estado de São Paulo, FCTH-USP-DAEE, São Paulo (Study of natural flow regionalisation in the State of São Paulo, FCTH-USP-DAEE, São Paulo), Águas e Energia Elétrica journal – DAEE, year 5, 14, 1988.

DOS SANTOS, A. C. A., SURITA, C. A., & ALLEONI, B. S. C. Qualidade das águas do rio Tietê e os serviços ecossistêmicos - Exemplo para a UGRHI 10, CBH-SMT. Anais do XII Simpósio de Recursos Hídricos do Nordeste. 4-7 November, Natal, RN, Brasil (Water quality of Tietê river and ecosystem services – example for the UGRHI 10, CBH-SMT), 2014.

DUKU, C., RATHJENS, H., ZWART, S. J. AND HEIN, L. Towards ecosystem accounting: a comprehensive approach to modelling multiple hydrological ecosystem services. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 4377–4396, 2015.

ELLISON, D., N FUTTER, M., & BISHOP, K. On the forest cover–water yield debate: from demand-to supply-side thinking. Global Change Biology, 18(3), 806-820, 2012.

ESCOBAR, H. Drought triggers alarms in Brazil's biggest metropolis. Science, 347(6224), 812–812, 2015. http://doi.org/10.1126/science.347.6224.812.

FRANCESCONI, W., SRINIVASAN, R., PÉREZ-MIÑANA, E., WILLCOCK, S. P., & QUINTERO, M. Using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) to model ecosystem services: A systematic review. Journal of Hydrology, 535, 625-636, 2016.

Fukunaga, D C; Cecílio, R A; Zanetti, S S; Oliveira, L T; Caiado, M A C (2015): Application of the SWAT hydrologic model to a tropical watershed at Brazil. *CATENA* 125: 206–213. DOI: 10.1016/j.catena.2014.10.032.

GARBOSSA, L. H. P., VASCONCELOS, L. R. C., LAPA, K. R., BLAINSKI, É., & PINHEIRO, A. The use and results of the Soil and Water Assessment Tool in Brazil: A review from 1999 until 2010. In: 2011 International SWAT Conference, 2011.

Gassman, P. W.; Reyes, M. R.; Green, C. H.; Arnold, J. G. (2007): The Soil and Water Assessment Tool. Historical Development, Applications, and Future Research Directions. *Transactions of the ASABE* 50 (4): 1211–1250. DOI: 10.13031/2013.23637.

GASSMAN, P. W. SADEGHI, A.M. AND SRINIVASAN, R. Applications of the SWAT Model Special Section: Overview and Insights. Journal of Environmental Quality, 43:1–8, 2014. doi:10.2134/jeq2013.11.0466.

GUEDES, F. B. & SEEHUSEN, S. E. Pagamentos por serviços ambientais na Mata Atlântica: lições aprendidas e desafios (Payments for environmental services in the Atlantic Forest: lessons learnt and challenges). Brasília: MMA, 2011.

GUPTA, H. V., BASTIDAS, L., SOROOSHIAN, S., SHUTTLEWORTH,W. J., AND YANG, Z. L. Parameter estimation of a land surface scheme using multi-criteria methods, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 104, 19491– 19503, 1999.

HALLIDAY, S. J., WADE, A. J., SKEFFINGTON, R. A., NEAL, C., REYNOLDS, B., ROWLAND, P., ... & NORRIS, D. An analysis of long-term trends, seasonality and short-term dynamics in water quality data from Plynlimon, Wales. Science of the Total Environment, 434, 186-200, 2012.

HAMEL, P.; DALY, E.; FLETCHER, T.D. Source-control stormwater management for mitigating the impacts of urbanization on baseflow: A review. Journal of Hydrology, 485. 201-211, 2013.

HIBBERT, ALDEN R. Forest treatment effects on water yield, in International Symposium on Forest Hydrology, pp. 527-543, Pergamon, New York, 1967.

HOEKSTRA, A. Y. & CHAPAGAIN, A. K. Globalization of Water: Sharing the Planet's Freshwater Resources, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2008.

HOEKSTRA, A.Y. & MEKONNEN, M.M. The water footprint of humanity, Proc. PNAS 109(9), 3232-3237, 2012.

HOEKSTRA, A. Y., M. M. MEKONNEN, A. K. CHAPAGAIN, R. E. MATHEWS, and B. D. RICHTER. Global monthly water scarcity: Blue water footprints versus blue water availability, PLoS ONE, 7(2), 2012. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0032688.

HULME, P. E., & LE ROUX, J. J. Invasive species shape evolution. Science, 352(6284), 422-422, 2016.

KAGEYAMA, P.Y. & dos SANTOS, J.D. Biotecnologia Florestal: onde estamos e para onde vamos? [Forest Biotechnology: where are we and where are we going?] Opiniões journal, 40, Set-Nov., 2015.

KAPUSTKA, L.A. & LANDIS, W.G. Introduction, in Environmental Risk Assessment and Management from a Landscape Perspective (eds L. A. Kapustka and W. G. Landis), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA., 2010. doi: 10.1002/9780470593028.ch1.

KRYSANOVA, V. & ARNOLD, J. Advances in ecohydrological modelling with SWAT—a review, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 53:5, 939-947, 2008. DOI: 10.1623/hysj.53.5.939.

KRYSANOVA, V., WHITE, M. Advances in water resources assessment with SWAT—an overview, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 60:5, 771-783, 2015.DOI: 10.1080/02626667.2015.1029482.

LIMA, W. P., & BRITO ZAKIA, M. J. Hidrologia de matas ciliares. Matas ciliares: conservação e recuperação [Hydrology of riparian forests]. Edusp, São Paulo, 33-44, 2000.

LIMA, W. P., & ZAKIA, M. J. D. B. As florestas plantadas e a água [Planted forests and water]. Rio Claro: Editora Rima, 2006.

MARTINELLI, L. A., PICCOLO, M. C., TOWNSEND, A. R., VITOUSEK, P. M., CUEVAS, E., MCDOWELL, W., ... & TRESEDER, K. Nitrogen stable isotopic composition of leaves and soil: tropical versus temperate forests. In New Perspectives on Nitrogen Cycling in the Temperate and Tropical Americas (pp. 45-65). Springer Netherlands, 1999.

MEA, MILLENIUM ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT. Ecosystems and human well-being, synthesis (Island, Washington, DC), 2005.

MEKONNEN, M.M. & HOEKSTRA, A.Y. Global Gray Water Footprint and Water Pollution Levels Related to Anthropogenic Nitrogen Loads to Fresh Water. Environ. Sci. Technol., 49, 12860−12868. Doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b03191, 2015.

METROVANCOUVER. Drinking Water Management Plan. 18p., 2011. Available at: http://www.metrovancouver.org/, accessed on July, 2017.

Mohor, G. S., Mendiondo, E M (2017) Economic indicators of Hydrologic Drought Insurance Under Water Demand & Climate Change Scenarios in a Brazilian Context, Ecological Economics, DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2017.04.014MOHOR S.G., TAFFARELLO, D., & MENDIONDO, E.M. Análise multidimensional e modelagem com dados experimentais do monitoramento hidrológico do projeto “Produtor de Água/PCJ”. [Multidimensional analysis and hydrologic modelling with experimental data from Water Producer/PCJ hydrologic monitoring]. Anais do XXI Simpósio Brasileiro de Recursos Hídricos, 2015a.

MOHOR S.G., TAFFARELLO, D., MENDIONDO, E.M. Simulações em modelo semi-distribuído aprimoradas com dados experimentais de monitoramento hidrológico nas bacias hidrográficas dos rios PCJ [Simulations in a semi-distributed model with experimental data from Water Producer/PCL hydrologic monitoring]. Anais do XXI Simpósio Brasileiro de Recursos Hídricos, 2015b.

MOLIN, P. G. Dynamic modelling of native vegetation in the Piracicaba River basin and its effects on ecosystem services. Piracicaba. Paulo Guilherme Molin. University of São Paulo “Luiz de Queiroz”, 2014.

MOLIN, P. G., SOUZA E MIRANDA JÉSSICA VILLELA, F. T. DE S., FRANSOZI, A. A., & FERRAZ, S. F. B. Mapeamento de uso e cobertura do solo da bacia do rio Piracicaba, SP: Anos 1990, 2000 e 2010. [Mapping of land use in the Piracicaba river basin, SP: 1990, 2000 and 2010]. Circular Técnica do IPEF, 207, 1–11, 2015. Accessed from http://www.ipef.br/publicacoes/ctecnica/

MOLIN, P.G.; GERGEL, S.E.; SOARES-FILHO, B.S.; FERRAZ, S.F.B. Spatial determinants of Atlantic Forest loss and recovery in Brazil. Landscape Ecol. 32:857–870, 2017. DOI 10.1007/s10980-017-0490-2.

MORIASI, D.N., J. G. ARNOLD, M. W. VAN LIEW, R. L. BINGNER, R. D. HARMEL, T. L. VEITH. Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations.Transactions of the ASABE, 50(3): 885−900, 2007.

MULDER, C., BENNETT, E.M., BOHAN, D.A., BONKOWSKI, M. CARPENTER, S.R., CHALMERS, R., CRAMER, W. 10 Years Later: Revisiting Priorities for Science and Society a Decade After the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. In: Guy Woodward and David A. Bohan, editors, Advances in Ecological Research, 53, Oxford: Academic Press, pp. 1-53, 2015.

NASH, J. E., & SUTCLIFFE, J. V. River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I—A discussion of principles. Journal of Hydrology, 10(3), 282-290, 1970.

NATIONAL WATER AGENCY [ANA]. Portaria n. 149, de 26 de março, 2015. Recomenda o uso da Lista de Termos para o “Thesaurus de Recursos Hídricos”. (Environmental law no 149, March 26th, 2015. Recommend using the list of terms for the “Water Resources Thesaurus”, 2015.

NELSON, E., MENDOZA, G., REGETZ, J., POLASKY, S., TALLIS, H., CAMERON, D., ...& LONSDORF, E. Modeling multiple ecosystem services, biodiversity conservation, commodity production, and tradeoffs at landscape scales.Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 7(1), 4-11, 2009.

OKI, T., AND S. KANAE, Global hydrological cycles and world water resources, Science, 313(5790), 1068–1072, 2006. doi:10.1126/ science.1128845

OLDEN J.D.; KENNARD, M.J.; BRADLEY J. P. A framework for hydrologic classification with a review of methodologies and applications in Ecohydrology. Ecohydrology, 2011. DOI: 10.1002/eco.251. Acessado em Dezembro, 2011.

OLIVEIRA, J. B. Soils from São Paulo State: description of the soil classes registered in the pedologic map. Campinas, 1999.

PADOVEZI, A., VIANI, R. A. G., KUBOTA, U., TAFFARELLO, D., FARIA, M., BRACALE, H., FERRARI, V., & CARVALHO, F. H. Produtor de Água na bacia hidrográfica Piracicaba/Capivari/Jundiaí [Water Producer in the Piracicaba/Capivari/Jundiaí River Basin]. In: Experiências de pagamentos por serviços ambientais no Brasil. Org. Pagiola, S., Von Glehn, H. C. & Taffarello, D., São Paulo: Secretaria de Estado do Meio Ambiente / Banco Mundial. p. 99-113, 2013.

PAGIOLA, S., VON GLEHN, H. C., & TAFFARELLO, D. (Org.). Experiências de Pagamentos por Serviços Ambientais no Brasil [Payment for Environmental Services experiences in Brazil]. São Paulo: Secretaria de Estado do Meio Ambiente / Banco Mundial. 336p., 2013.

PEREIRA, D.R., MARTINEZ, M.A., SILVA, D.D., AND PRUSKI, F.F. Hydrological simulation in a basin of typical tropical climate and soil using the SWAT Model Part II: Simulation of hydrological variables and soil use scenarios. Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies, 5, 149-163, 2016.

POFF, N LEROY & JOHN H MATTHEWS. Environmental flows in the Anthropocence: past progress and future prospects. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 5: 667–675, 2013. Available in www.sciencedirect.com. Accessed on December, 2013.

POFF, N. L., & ZIMMERMAN, J. K. Ecological responses to altered flow regimes: a literature review to inform the science and management of environmental flows. Freshwater Biology, 55(1), 194-205, 2010.

PORTO, M. F. A. & PORTO, R. L.L. Em busca da Gestão de Recursos Hídricos para a Cidade Resiliente [In pursuit of Water Resources Management for a Resilient City]. Revista DAE, 1, 6-11, 2014. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4322/dae.2014.124. Retrieved from http://doi.editoracubo.com.br/10.4322/dae.2014.124.

POSNER, S., VERUTES, G., KOH, I., DENU, D., & RICKETTS, T. Global use of ecosystem service models. Ecosystem Services, 17, 131-141, 2016.

PRUDHOMME, C., IGNAZIO GIUNTOLI, EMMA L. ROBINSON, DOUGLAS B. CLARK, NIGEL W. ARNELL, RUTGER DANKERS, BALÁZS M. FEKETE, WIETSE FRANSSEN, DIETER GERTEN, SIMON N. GOSLING, STEFAN HAGEMANN, HANNAH, D.M. …WISSER, D. Hydrological droughts in the 21st century, hotspots and uncertainties from a global multimodel ensemble experiment. PNAS: 3262–3267, 2014.

QUILBÉ, R., & ROUSSEAU, A. N. GIBSI: an integrated modelling system for watershed management? sample applications and current developments. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 4(3), 1301-1335, 2007.

RAJIB, M. A., MERWADE, V., KIM, I. L., ZHAO, L., SONG, C., & ZHE, S. SWATShare–a web platform for collaborative research and education through online sharing, simulation and visualization of SWAT models. Environmental Modelling & Software, 75, 498-512, 2016.

RICHARDS, R.C.; CHRIS J. KENNEDY, THOMAS E. LOVEJOY, PEDRO H.S. BRANCALION. Considering farmer land use decisions in efforts to 'scale up' Payments for Watershed Services, Ecosystem Services, 23, 238-247, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2016.12.016.

RICHARDS, R.C.; REROLLE, J.; ARONSON, J.; PEREIRA, P.H.; GONÇALVES, H.; BRANCALION, P.H.S. Governing a pioneer program on payment for watershed services: Stakeholder involvement, legal frameworks and early lessons from the Atlantic forest of Brazil. Ecosystem Services: Science, Policy and Practice, 16: 23-32, 2015.

Rodrigues, D. B, Gupta, H V, Mendiondo, E M (2014) A blue/green water-based accounting framework for assessment of water security, Water Resour. Res., 50, 7187–7205, doi:10.1002/2013WR014274

Rodrigues, D, Gupta, H, Mendiondo, E M, Oliveira, P T (2015) Assessing uncertainties in surface water security: An empirical multimodel, Water Res. Research, DOI: 10.1002/2014WR016691

SALEMI, L. F., GROPPO, J. D., TREVISAN, R., SEGHESI, G. B., DE MORAES, J. M., DE BARROS FERRAZ, S. F., & MARTINELLI, L. A. Hydrological consequences of land-use change from forest to pasture in the Atlantic rain forest region. Revista Ambiente & Água, 7(3), 127, 2012.

SANTOS, C. P. Indicadores de qualidade de água em sistemas de pagamentos por serviços ambientais. Estudo de caso: Extrema – MG. [Water quality indicators in payment for ecosystem service schemes]. Dissertação de Mestrado, ESALQ, Universidade de São Paulo, 2014.

SANTOS, L.L. Modelos hidráulicos-hidrológicos: conceitos e aplicações. (Hydraulic-hydrologic models: concepts and applications) Revista Brasileira de Geografia Física, 2(3): 01-19, 2009.

SAO PAULO STATE. Water Resources Situation Report of the Sao Paulo state [Relatório de Situação dos Recursos Hídricos do estado de São Paulo], 2017.Available at: http://www.sigrh.sp.gov.br/public/uploads/ckfinder/files/RSE_2016_Final_Recursos_Hidricos.pdf, Accessed on July, 2017.

SAO PAULO STATE. Decree nº 8486, from September 08, 1976. Approving the regulations of the law nº 997/76, related to the prevention and control of the environmental pollution. (Available at http://www.cetesb.sp.gov.br/userfiles/file/ institucional/legislacao/dec-8468.pdf, accessed on Nov. 14, 2014).

SCHYNS JF, HOEKSTRA AY. The Added Value of Water Footprint Assessment for National Water Policy: A Case Study for Morocco. PLoS ONE 9(6) e99705, 2014. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099705.

SHARP, R., TALLIS, H.T., RICKETTS, T., GUERRY, A.D., WOOD, S.A., CHAPLIN-KRAMER, R., NELSON, E., ENNAANAY, D., WOLNY, S., OLWERO, N., VIGERSTOL, K., PENNINGTON, D., MENDOZA, G., AUKEMA, J., FOSTER, J., FORREST, J., CAMERON, D., ARKEMA, K., LONSDORF, E., KENNEDY, C., VERUTES, G., KIM, C.K., GUANNEL, G., PAPENFUS, M., TOFT, J., MARSIK, M., BERNHARDT, J., GRIFFIN, R., GLOWINSKI, K., CHAUMONT, N., PERELMAN, A., LACAYO, M. MANDLE, L., HAMEL, P., VOGL, A.L., ROGERS, L., AND BIERBOWER, W. InVEST +VERSION+ User's Guide. The Natural Capital Project, Stanford University, University of Minnesota, The Nature Conservancy, and World Wildlife Fund, 2016.

STUDINSKI, J. M., HARTMAN, K. J., NILES, J. M., & KEYSER, P. The effects of riparian forest disturbance on stream temperature, sedimentation, and morphology. Hydrobiologia, 686(1), 107-117, 2012.

SWAT 2015 Conference Book of Abstracts, Purde, USA. 2015. http://swat.tamu.edu/media/114933/swat-purdue-2015-book-of-abstracts.pdf. Accessed on [2015-12-07].

TACHIKAWA, T., HATO, M., KAKU, M., & IWASAKI, A. Characteristics of ASTER GDEM Version. In Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium (IGARSS) (pp. 3657–3660). Vancouver, Canada: IEEE International, 2011.

TAFFARELLO, D., SAMPROGNA MOHOR, G., CALIJURI, M.C., & MENDIONDO, E. M. Field Investigations Of The 2013–14 Drought Through Quali-Quantitative Freshwater Monitoring At The Headwaters Of The Cantareira System, Brazil. Water International, 41(5), 776-800, 2016a., doi: 10.1080/02508060.2016.1188352

TAFFARELLO, D., GUIMARÃES, J., LOMBARDI, R.K.S., CALIJURI, M.C., AND MENDIONDO, E.M. Hydrologic monitoring Plan of the Brazilian Water Producer/PCJ project, Journal of Environmental Protection, 7, 1956-1970, 2016b. Doi: 10.4236/jep.2016.712152.

Taffarello, D, Calijuri, M C, Viani, R A G, Marengo, J A, Mendiondo, E M (2017) Hydrological services in the Atlantic Forest, Brazil: An ecosystem-based adaptation using ecohydrological monitoring, Climate Services 8:1-16, doi: 10.1016/j.cliser.2017.10.005

THALER, S., ZESSNER, M., DE LIS, F. B., KREUZINGER, N., & FEHRINGER, R. Considerations on methodological challenges for water footprint calculations.Water Science and Technology, 65(7), 1258-1264, 2012.

THARME, R.E. A global perspective on environmental flow assessment: emerging trends in the development and application of environmental flow methodologies for rivers. River Research and Applications, v.19, p.397-442, 2003.

THE ECONOMIST. Drought in São Paulo. March 9th 2015. (Retrieved from http://www.economist.com/blogs/graphicdetail/2015/03/sao-paulo drought# comments, accessed on March 9th, 2015.

TUCCI, C. E., & CLARKE, R. T. Environmental issues in the la Plata basin. International Journal of Water Resources Development, 14(2), 157-173, 1998.

UDAWATTA, R. P., GARRETT, H. E., & KALLENBACH, R. L. Agroforestry and grass buffer effects on water quality in grazed pastures. Agroforestry Systems, 79(1), 81-87, 2010.

VEIGA NETO, F. C. A Construção dos Mercados de Serviços Ambientais e suas Implicações para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável no Brasil. (Constructing Environmental Service Markets and their implications for Sustainable Development in Brazil). Tese de Doutorado. CPDA – UFRRJ, 2008.

VELÁZQUEZ, E.; MADRID, C.; BELTRÁN, M. Rethinking the Concepts of Virtual Water and Water Footprint in Relation to the Production–Consumption Binomial and the Water–Energy Nexus. Water Resources Management, v. 25, n. 2, p. 743-761, 2011.

VOGL, A.; TALLIS, H.; DOUGLASS, J.; SHARP, R.; WOLNY, S.; VEIGA, F.; BENITEZ, S.; LEÓN, J.; GAME, E.; PETRY, P.; GUIMERÃES, J.; LOZANO, J.S. Resource Investment Optimization System: Introduction & Theoretical Documentation. May, 2016. 20p. Available at: http://www.naturalcapitalproject.org/software/#rios. Accessed on 2016-22-06.

WADE, A. J., NEAL, C., BUTTERFIELD, D., & FUTTER, M. N. Assessing nitrogen dynamics in European ecosystems, integrating measurement and modelling conclusions. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8(4), 846-857, 2004.

WHATELY, M., & LERER, R. Brazil drought: water rationing alone won’t save Sao Paulo. The Guardian, 2015. http://www. theguardian. com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/feb/11/brazil-drought-ngo-alliance-50-ngos-saving-water-collapse.

WICHELNS, D. Virtual water and water footprints do not provide helpful insight regarding international trade or water scarcity. Ecological Indicators, 52, 277-283, 2015.

WINEMILLER, K. O., MCINTYRE, P. B., CASTELLO, L., FLUET-CHOUINARD, E., GIARRIZZO, T., NAM, S., ... & STIASSNY, M. L. J. Balancing hydropower and biodiversity in the Amazon, Congo, and Mekong. Science, 351(6269), 128-129, 2016.

ZAFFANI, A. G., CRUZ, N. R., TAFFARELLO, D., & MENDIONDO, E. M. Uncertainties in the Generation of Pollutant Loads in the Context of Disaster Risk Management using Brazilian Nested Catchment Experiments under Progressive Change of Land Use and Land Cover. J Phys Chem Biophys, 5(173), 2161-0398, 2015.

ZHANG, Y.; SINGH, S.; BAKSHI, B.R. Accounting for ecosystem services in life cycle assessment, Part I: a critical review. Environmental Science & Technology, 44 (7), 2232-2242, 2010.

ZUBRYCKI, K., DIMPLE ROY, D., VENEMA, H. & BROOKS, D. Water Security in Canada: Responsibilities of the federal government. International Institute for Sustainable Development, 2011.

ZUFFO, A.C. Aprendizados das crises da água: O que faremos com eles? [Lessons learnt from water crises: What can we do about them?] Apresentação em Mesa Redonda no XXI Simposio Brasileiro de Recursos Hídricos. Brasília: 22-27 Nov., 2015.

TABLES

Table 1: Sub-basins delimited in SWAT with drainage areas and geographic locations.

SWAT sub-basin	Gauge station	Field observations (2013-2014)	Modelling LULC/EbA scenarios	Drainage area (km^2)	Coordinates	
					Lat.	Long.
1	AltoJaguari	Yes	Yes	302.2	-22.820	-46.154
2	F23Basin	Yes	Yes	508.1	-22.827	-46.314
3	F28Basin	Yes	Yes	276.8	-22.806	-45.989
4	Salto Basin	Yes	Yes	15.0	-22.838	-46.218
5	Parquede Eventos	Yes	Yes	926.5	-22.853	-46.325
6	Posses Exut [*]	Yes	Yes	11.9	-22.833	-46.231
7	Portal das Estrelas	Yes	Yes	7.1	-22.820	-46.244
8	F25Basin	Yes	Yes	971.9	-22.850	-46.346
9	Domithildes[**]	Yes	Yes	9.9	-22.886	-46.222
10	Jaguari Basin	No	Yes	1037.0	-22.896	-46.385
11	F30 [*]	Yes	Yes	15.1	-22.935	-46.212
12	Ponte Cachoeira.	Yes	Yes	121.0	-22.967	-46.171
13	Chale Ponte Verde	Yes	Yes	107.9	-22.964	-46.181
14	Cachoeira dos Pretos	Yes	Yes	101.2	-22.968	-46.171

15	Jacarei Basin	No	Yes	200.5	-22.959	-46.341
16	F24	Yes	Yes	293.5	-22.983	-46.244
17	Cachoeira Basin	Yes	Yes	391.7	-46.209	-46.276
18	F34 Basin	Yes	Yes	129.2	-23.073	-46.209
19	Atibainha Basin	No	Yes	313.8	-23.182	-46.342
20	Moinho [*]	Yes	Yes	16.9	-23.209	-46.357

Legend: * indicates new data collection stations installed for experimental monitoring according to ANA/CPRM standards; ** indicates experimental stations for research purposes. Source: Taffarello et al (2016-a)

Table 2: Characteristics of quantitative calibration and validation of SWAT in studied catchments (Moriasi et al., 2007). Area delimited by Digital Terrain Model (adapted from Mohor, 2016):

Gauge station	Area (km^2)	Pbias(%)	NSE(-)	NSELog(-)	Pbias(%)	NSE(-)	NSE Log(-)	Performance level of calibration and validation (Moriasi et al., 2007)
		Calibration			Validation			
Posses	13.3	-22.0	0.68	0.52	15.4	0.78	0.38	Unsatisfactory/very good
F28	281.5	5.3	0.80	0.68	14.2	0.72	0.31	Very good/good
F24	294.5	-13.3	0.69	0.71	-1.7	0.65	0.34	Satisfactory/satisfactory
Atibainha	331.7	-14.5	0.60	0.55	1.7	0.71	0.54	Satisfactory/good
Cachoeira	397.3	-26.6	0.49	0.31	-46.7	0.27	0.05	Unsatisfactory/unsatisfactory
F23	511.2	-1.8	0.88	0.90	12.0	0.84	0.77	Very good/ very good
F25B	981.4	3.6	0.91	0.89	11.4	0.77	0.72	Very good/ very good
Jag+Jac	1276.9	-12.0	0.83	0.87	-8.4	0.82	0.73	Very good/ very good

Table 3: Calibrated SWAT parameters in the headwaters of the Cantareira Water Supply System.

	Description	Parameter	Fitted values
Water Quantity	Initial SCS curve number (moisture condition II) for runoff potential.	CN2	<0.25
	Soil evaporation compensation factor.	ESCO	<0.2
	Plant uptake compensation factor.	EPCO	<1.0
	Maximum canopy storage (mm).	CANMX	Varies by vegetal cover
	Manning's coefficient "n" value for the main channel.	CH_N2	0.025
Water Quality	Nitrate percolation coefficient	NPERCO	0.2
	Minimum value of the USLE C coefficient for water erosion related to the land cover	USLE_C	Varies by land use (< 0.4)

Comentado [UdW12]: Attending reviewer's comments, we moved this table to supplementary material of the paper, as Supplementary Table S.4

Comentado [UdW13]: Attending to comments of reviewer 1 and reviewer 2, table 5 was moved to Supplementary Material, as Supplement Table S.3

FIGURES



Figure 1: Location of Cantareira Water Supply System in the Piracicaba and Upper Tietê watersheds.



Figure 2: Methodological scheme for assessing hydrologic services based on greyWF.



Figure 3: Land-use change during 1990 (Scenario S1), 2010 (Scenario S2) and 2035 (Scenario S2+EbA) in the headwaters of the Cantareira Water Supply System:



Figure 4: Model calibration related to drainage areas of catchments in the Cantareira System.

Comentado [UdW14]: Attending reviewer 1 comments, the previous figure was changed, retiring the trend lines and depicting PBIAS and NSE, during calibration and validation, for some of the 20 catchments simulated with SWAT.



Figure 5: Comparison between flow discharges (upper part) and nitrate loads (lower part), through observed (dotted lines), simulated by SWAT (solid lines) and field validation through instantaneous experimental samples (marked points with uncertainty intervals) at monitored stations of *Posses Outlet* (left part), *F23Camanducaia* (center part) and *F24-Cachoeira* (right part). The uncertainty barswere determined using instantaneous velocities measured in the river cross-sections during 2013/14 field campaigns (see Taffarello et al, 2016-a). The uncertainty bars represent the minimum and maximum values of measured streamflow and pollutant loads in a cross section of the river during a field campaign of headwater catchments.



Figure 6: Experimental sampling of turbidity (size of circles), observed flows and mean velocities in river cross sections of 17 catchments in Cantareira System headwater (Oct, 2013 - May, 2014). This picture shows the high interdependence and complexity to integrate any standardparameterization, at a regional scale, of SWAT model linking potential scenarios of LULC, water yield and freshwater quality in medium-size basins and headwaters.



Figure 7: Multidimensional chart of hydraulic and water quality variables sampled in field campaigns in the headwaters of the Cantareira Water Supply System between Oct, 2013 - May, 2014.



Figure 8: Study area divided into sub-basins for hypothesis testing using semi-distributed SWAT model.



Figure 9: Native forest cover in S1 (1990), S2 (2010) and S2+EbA (2035).



Figure 10: Flow duration curves under three LULC scenarios: S1(1990), S2(2010) and S2+EbA(2035) at headwaters of the Cantareira Water Supply System.



Figure 10: Flow duration curves under three LULC scenarios: S1(1990), S2(2010) and S2+EbA(2035) at headwaters of the Cantareira Water Supply System(cont.).



Figure 11: LULC scenarios for specific water yield for 20 drainage areas at Jaguari, Cachoeira and Atibainha watersheds, according to S1 (1990), S2 (2010) and S2+EbA (2035) scenarios.



Figure 12: Fraction of water yield (mean Q) compromised by the grey water footprint of nitrate (GWF-NO3), total phosphorous (GWF-TP) and sediments(GWF-Sed) versus drainage area **(a)**, and versus selectedsub-basins **(b)**.



Figure 13: Synthesis chart of case study *Upper Jaguari* sub-basin (drainage area = 302 km^2). Left, upper chart: localization at the drainage areas of Cantareira System: Center, upper chart: LULC conditions for scenarios S1 (1990), S2 (2010) and S2+EbA (2035): Right, upper chart: comparison of water yields simulated for conditions of S1, S2 and S2+EbA: Left, lower chart: water yield scenarios compared with intra-annual regime of S2+EbA scenario: Center, lower chart: comparison of duration curves of flows for S1, S2 and S2+EbA conditions: Right, lower chart: duration curves of N-NO3 loads for S1, S2 and S2+EbA.



Figure 14: Synthesis chart of case study *Domithildes* catchment (drainage area = 9.9 km^2). Left, upper chart: localization at the drainage areas of the Cantareira System: Center, upper chart: LULC conditions for scenarios S1 (1990), S2 (2010) and S2+EbA (2035): Right, upper chart: comparison of water yields simulated for conditions of S1, S2 and S2+EbA: Left, lower chart: water yield scenarios compared with intra-annual regime of S2+EbA scenario: Center, lower chart: comparison of duration curves of flows for S1, S2 and S2+EbA conditions: Right, lower chart: duration curves of N-NO3 loads for S1, S2 and S2+EbA.



Figure 15: Relationships between Grey Water Footprint for Nitrate (a) and Total Phosphorous (b) according to three LULC scenarios (1990, 2010 and 2035) and size of the drainage areas of headwaters in the Cantareira Water Supply System.



Figure 16: Hydrologic Service Index (circle ratio) related to drainage area of river basin (horizontal axis) and composite of water pollution index (vertical axis) for S2+EbA scenario: Equal weights of nitrate, total phosphorus and dissolved sediments are expressed in *WPLcomposite*.