Assessment of SWAT spatial and temporal transferability for a high altitude glacierised catchment

Maria Andrianaki[1], Juna Shrestha[1], Florian Kobierska[2], Nikolaos P. Nikolaidis[3], Stefano M. Bernasconi[1]

[1] Geological Institute, ETH Zurich, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland
[2] Agroscope, Reckenholzstrasse 191, CH-8046 Zürich
[3] Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Crete, 73100 Chania, Greece

Correspondence to: Maria Andrianaki (mandrianaki@hotmail.com)

Abstract. In this study, we investigated the application and the transferability of the Soil Water and Assessment Tool (SWAT) in a partly glacierised alpine catchment, characterised by extreme climatic conditions and steep terrain. The model was initially calibrated for the 10 km^2 watershed of the Damma glacier Critical Zone Observatory (CZO) in central Switzerland using monitoring data for the period of 2009–2011 and then was evaluated for 2012–2013 in the same area. Model performance was found to be satisfactory against both the Nash Sutcliffe criterion (NS) and a benchmark efficiency (BE). The transferability of the model was assessed by using the parameters calibrated on the small watershed and applying the model to the approximately 100 km^2 catchment that drains into the hydropower reservoir of the Göscheneralpsee and includes the Damma glacier CZO. Model results were compared to the reservoir inflow data from 1997 to 2010 and it was found that the model predicted successfully snowmelt timing and autumn recession but could not accurately capture the peak flow for certain years. Runoff was slightly overestimated from late May to June, when it is dominated by snowmelt. Finally, we investigated the response of the greater catchment to climate change using three different climate change scenarios and the results were compared to those of a previous study, where two different hydrological models, PREVAH and ALPINE 3D, were used. The methodology presented here, where SWAT is calibrated for a small watershed and then applied for a bigger area with similar climatic conditions and geographical characteristics, could work even under extreme conditions like ours. However, a greater attention should be given to the differences between glacier melt and snowmelt dynamics. In conclusion, this assessment test on the transferability of SWAT on different scales, gave valuable information about the strengths and weaknesses of the model when it was applied under conditions different to those that it was calibrated.

1 Introduction

The use of calibrated watershed models enables researchers and stakeholders to assess the impact of environmental changes and, as many studies have pointed out, is of high importance in water management (e.g. Arnold et al., 1998; Abbaspour et al., 2007). Climate change simulations provide crucial information for the assessment of its impact on water resources, water quality, and aquatic ecosystems (Farinotti et al., 2012; Aili et al., 2019). However, watershed modelling in high altitude alpine areas is rather challenging due to the rough terrain, heterogeneous land cover, extreme climatic conditions and glacier dynamics (Viviroli and Weingartner, 2004; Farinotti et al., 2012; Rahman et al., 2013), with the main challenge to be the lack of observed and sufficient quality data in ungauged watersheds (Sivapalan et al., 2003; Viviroli et al., 2009b; Bocchiola et al., 2011).

Modelling and predicting the runoff of ungauged watersheds is one of the big challenges that hydrologists face today (Sivapalan et al., 2003; Hrachowitz et al., 2013). A common approach to address this problem is to calibrate a hydrological model for a gauged watershed using observed data and then transfer the model to the ungauged watershed by transferring the model parameters (Merz and Blöschl, 2003; Sivapalan et al., 2003). A large number of methods have been suggested for transferring model parameters, which include regression techniques between the model parameters and catchment attributes (e.g. Parajka et al., 2005; Deckers et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2018) and similarity approaches such as spatial proximity and physical similarity (e.g. Bárdossy, 2007; Wagener et al., 2007; Patil and Stieglitz, 2014). However, as Thirel et al. (2015) point out, it is essential to assess and evaluate the ability of the hydrological models to perform efficiently under conditions different from those in which they were developed or calibrated.

The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) developed by the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS) is a public domain and open source integrated model and has been used worldwide for various applications. As a semi-distributed model, it allows the spatial variation of the parameters by dividing the basin into a number of sub-basins (Arnold et al., 1998; Srinivasan et al., 1998). It is equipped with a snowmelt algorithm based on a simple temperature-index approach, which, although simple, is proved to be very effective in numerous studies (Hock, 2003) especially when net solar radiation is the dominant driving energy for snowmelt (Debele et al., 2010).

SWAT has been widely used in many studies for the simulation of runoff and nutrient cycling in agricultural and forested sites. Although there is an increasing interest in applying SWAT on snow-dominated (Grusson et al., 2015) and glacierised watersheds (Rahman et al., 2013; Garee et al., 2017; Omani et al., 2017), its transferability at spatial and temporal scales under the extreme conditions of these high altitude environments has not been tested yet. In this study, we have a quite unique situation of a small well gauged watershed, the Damma glacier watershed, which is part of the larger catchment feeding the Göscheneralpsee reservoir, for which we have hydrological data thanks to its use by the hydroelectric power plant. This way we were able to assess the spatial and temporal transferability and upscaling of SWAT, by calibrating the model for the Damma glacier watershed and then transferring it to the greater area feeding the Göscheneralpsee reservoir. Subsequently, climate change simulations were conducted in order to assess the transferability of the model on a temporal scale. The assessment was conducted by comparing our findings with those of a previous study for the same area, which used two other hydrological models with different characteristics, PREVAH and ALPINE3D (Kobierska et al., 2013).

2 Study Site

The Damma glacier watershed (Fig. 1) is situated in the central Swiss Alps in Switzerland and was one of the Critical Zone Observatories established within the European project SoilTrEC (Banwart et al., 2011). It is located at an altitude between 1790 m and 3200 m above sea level, has a total area of 10 km^2 and a typical alpine climate with an average yearly temperature of 1 $^{\circ}$C and yearly precipitation of 2400 mm (Kobierska et al., 2013). Damma glacier covers 50 % of the watershed and due to climate change has retreated at an average rate of 10 m per year in the last 90 years. However, during 1920–1928 and 1970–1992 the recession was interrupted and the glacier grew, resulting in two moraines (Kobierska et al., 2011). After the retreat of the glacier a soil chronosequence is

77 developed, which has a total length of 1 km (Bernasconi et al., 2008; Bernasconi et al., 2011; Kobierska et al.,

78 2013). The bedrock is coarse-grained granite of the Aare massif and is composed of quartz, plagioclase, potassium

79 feldspar, biotite and muscovite (Schaltegger, 1990). Our study site was extensively described in Bernasconi et al.

80 (2011).

81

82 The Göscheneralpsee (Fig. 1) is a hydropower reservoir of a volume of 75 million m^3. A 100 km^2 and 20 % glacier

83 covered catchment drains into the reservoir. It includes the watersheds of the Damma, Chelen and Tiefen glaciers

84 and the Voralptal watershed. The Tiefen glacier and Voralptal watersheds do not drain directly into the reservoir

85 but their runoff is redirected through two tunnels. The site is described extensively in Kobierska et al. (2013).

86 **3 Model and Data**

87 **3.1 SWAT model**

88 In this study, we used SWAT 2012 coupled with the ArcView SWAT interface, a GIS-based graphical user

89 interface (Di Luzio et al., 2002) that enables the delineation of the watershed, definition of subbasins, and initial

90 parameterisation. It is a semi distributed, time continuous watershed simulator operating on a daily time step.

91

92 Each watershed is divided into subbasins, for which slope, river features, and weather data are considered.

93 Furthermore, the watershed is divided into hydrologic response units (HRUs), which are small surface units with

94 distinctive soil-land use combinations and necessary to capture spatially explicit processes. Each process is

95 simulated for each HRU and then summed up for the subbasin by a weighted average. Subsequently the amount

96 of water, sediment and nutrients that come out from each subbasin enter the respective river.

97

98 A modified SCS curve number method is used to calculate the surface runoff for each HRU, based on land use,

99 soil parameters, and weather conditions. The water is stored in four storage volumes: snow, soil moisture, shallow

100 aquifer and deep aquifer. The processes considered within the soil profile are infiltration, evaporation, plant uptake,

101 lateral flow, and percolation. The factors controlling snow melt are the air and snowpack temperature, the melting

102 rate and the area covered by snow. The updated snow cover model takes into account shading, drifting, topography

103 and landcover to create a nonuniform snow cover (Neitsch et al., 2011). Furthermore, runoff from frozen soil can

104 also be calculated by defining if the temperature in the first soil layer is less than 0°C. Even though the model still

105 allows significant infiltration when the frozen soils are dry, the runoff of frozen soils is larger than that of other

106 soils. A detailed description of the theory behind the model is found in Arnold et al. (1998) and Srinivasan et al.

107 (1998).

108

109 Snow processes in high alpine areas are strongly influenced by the terrain features (Ahl et al., 2008; Zhang et al.,

110 2008). Fontaine et al. (2002) revealed the importance of improving SWAT algorithms to include in the model the

111 influence of elevation and season on the dynamics of the snowpack. They found that the definition of elevation

112 bands within the model subbasins can significantly improve the performance of the model in watersheds at high

113 altitudes and with large elevation gradients. With the improved snow melting algorithm (Fontaine et al., 2002),

114 streamflow in alpine regions can be successfully simulated by SWAT (Rahman et al., 2013; Grusson et al., 2015;

115 Omani et al., 2017).

3.2 Input data

The input data required by SWAT are: topography, soil, land use and meteorological data.

3.2.1 Topography

For the topography of both study areas a high precision Digital elevation model (DEM) with 2 m grid cells (swissALTI3D), produced by the Swiss Federal office for Topography (https://shop.swisstopo.admin.ch/de/products/height_models/alti3D) was used.

3.2.2 Soil and land use map

In order to better describe the glacier forefield, detailed soil and land use maps were created based on the observations, field and experimental data from the Biglink and SoilTrEC projects (Bernasconi et al., 2011; Dumig et al., 2011; Andrianaki et al., 2017). The soil map was created by adding new soil types to the SWAT database while the land use classes were based on existing types in the database. For the greater area feeding the Göscheneralpsee, the soil map used was produced and provided by the Swiss Federal Statistical Office at a scale of 1:200,000. For land use, we used the Corine land cover dataset 2006 (version 16, 100m resolution) produced by the European Environmental Agency (http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/corine-land-cover-2006-raster-2).

3.2.3 Climate data

Meteorological data from one local weather station and one station of the SwissMetNet network were used. The weather stations are located at the Damma glacier watershed (2025 m a.s.l.) and at Gütsch (2283 m a.s.l.). The meteorological data of the weather Gütsch were provided by MeteoSwiss. The selection of the weather station Gütsch was based on the results of previous research that showed that it has the best correlation in comparison to other weather stations located in the area (Magnusson et al., 2011) with a long enough record for this study. The data from both stations consist of records of air temperature, precipitation, wind speed, relative humidity, incoming short-wave radiation sub-hourly from 2007–2013 for Damma weather station and hourly from 1981–2010 for Gütsch. The lapse rates for temperature and precipitation, which are very important parameters in SWAT model since they affect snow and glacier melt, and the interpolation methods were based on the findings of Magnusson et al. (2011) who carried out non prognostic hydrological simulations for the Damma glacier watershed. The precipitation and temperature lapse rate parameters of the model are PLAPS and TLAPS and were set to 5 mm km^{-1} and -5.84 $^{\circ}$C km^{-1} respectively.

Climate change scenarios: The climate change predictions were provided by the EU regional climate modelling initiative ENSEMBLES (van der Linden and Mitchell, 2009) and were based on the emission scenario A1B. The model chains produced by the ENSEMBLES project are a combination of a general circulation model (GCM) with a regional climate model (RCM). The delta-change method was used for the creation of the datasets (Bosshard et al., 2011). Temperature and precipitation predictions are calculated using daily temperature changes ΔT, and precipitation scaling factors ΔP. Incoming short-wave irradiation, wind speed and relative humidity were left unchanged. Under the scenario when no action for the mitigation of climate change is taken, according to the A1B scenario it is predicted that by the end of the century in Switzerland, the mean temperature will increase by 2.7–4.1°C and the precipitation will decrease 18%–24% in the summer months (CH2011, 2011).

154 In this study, three climate scenarios with interpolated data for Gütsch weather station are used. These scenarios

155 are: the CNRM ARPEGE ALADIN scenario, the ETHZ HadCM3Q0 CLM scenario, which predicts the highest

156 ΔT and ΔP in comparison to the other two, and the SHMI BCM RCA scenario, which predicts the lowest ΔT and

157 ΔP, referred to as CNRM, ETHZ and SHMI scenarios respectively. These three scenarios were chosen because

158 they are the same used in the previous study of Kobierska et al. (2013). The following periods were selected:

159 Reference period T0: 1981–2010

160 T1: 2021–2050

161 T2: 2070–2099

162

163 The highest ΔT for the T1 period is predicted to be 1.5°C in the mid-summer, 2.5°C in late spring, and below

164 1.0°C in early summer for the CNRM, ETHZ and SHMI respectively and for the T2 period is approximately 5°C

165 in the mid-summer, 4°C along the whole summer and 3°C in early summer. The biggest temperature increase is

166 predicted at the end of the century when the strongest agreement between the different model chains is observed.

167 Projected precipitation changes for the T1 period show a clear trend towards dryer summers, while for the rest of

168 the year are within the natural variability. The trend of dryer summers is most prominent for the T2 period.

169 Furthermore, most model chains predict slightly higher precipitation in autumn.

170 **3.2.4 Runoff data**

171 Runoff of the Dammareuss stream that drains the Damma glacier watershed was measured every half an hour at a

172 gauging station at the outlet of the watershed (Magnusson et al., 2011). The runoff of the total area that feeds the

173 Göscheneralpsee is the inflow of the reservoir and the data from 1997–2010 were provided by the energy company

174 responsible for the management of the reservoir.

175 **3.2.5 Glacier extent**

176 Data on the glacier extent for the present period but also for the two periods of the climate change scenarios were

177 provided by Paul et al (2007). They estimated the evolution of the Swiss glaciers by using hypsographic modelling,

178 based on the shift of the equilibrium line altitude. However, SWAT is not a model that considers glacier flow

179 dynamics and therefore, in this study, the glaciers were incorporated in SWAT as the initial snow content in each

180 subbasin and for each elevation band.

181 **4 Methodology**

182 The purpose of this study is to assess the transferability of SWAT in temporal and spatial scales at a high altitude

183 alpine and glacierised site. This way it is tested whether the model can be transferred and is capable for the

184 simulation of runoff but also for further climate change studies on an ungauged glacierised watershed.

185 Furthermore, this methodology tests its robustness under these extreme climatic and geographical conditions. For

186 this reason, SWAT was initially calibrated for the small Damma watershed, which is well monitored through the

187 CZO projects, and then it was upscaled and applied for the greater area that feeds the Göscheneralpsee reservoir

188 and includes the Damma glacier watershed. The upscaling of the model was verified by comparing model results

189 with the reservoir input flow data provided by the managing company.

190

191 Since the Damma glacier watershed is part of the greater Göscheneralpsee feeding catchment, the parameters of
192 the model were transferred using the spatial proximity approach, with no further regionalisation procedure. In this
193 case, the initial setup of SWAT for the greater catchment was conducted using the input data presented in section
194 3.2 and only the parameters presented in Table 1 were changed to the calibrated values derived from the calibration
195 of the Damma glacier watershed. The initial parameterisation of the model during the setup and the watershed
196 delineation assisted in the transferability of the model since a number of parameters is already defined based on
197 the topography, land use and soil data.
198
199 Subsequently, the model was further transferred on a temporal scale, by conducting climate change simulations
200 and results were compared with those of a previous study for the same area, which used two other hydrological
201 models with different characteristics, PREVAH and Alpine 3D (Kobierska et al., 2013).
202
203 This methodology is a modified version of the proxy-basin test introduced by Klemeš (1986), which is one of the
204 proposed testing schemes for the enhancement of the calibration and validation procedure in hydrological
205 modelling. According to Klemeš (1986) the proxy basin test can be used to test the geographical transposability
206 of the model between two regions, for subsequent simulation of the streamflow in ungauged watersheds with
207 similar characteristics. The model is calibrated and validated for two watersheds and if the results are acceptable
208 it is then considered safe to be transferred and used at a third watershed with similar characteristics.

209 **5 Model setup, calibration and evaluation**

210 SWAT was initially setup for the Damma glacier CZO and the greater area feeding the Göscheneralpsee using the
211 topography, soil and land use data presented in section 3.2. Following the delineation procedure, the Damma
212 watershed and the greater area were divided into 5 and 25 subbasins respectively. By setting the lowest possible
213 thresholds for land use, slope and soil, 48 HRUs were created for Damma watershed and 285 HRUs for the greater
214 area. Finally, six elevation bands were defined for each subbasin of both study sites. The setup was complete with
215 the addition of the meteorological input and the definition of the initial snow for each elevation band of each
216 subbasin. For the climate change simulations, the meteorological input consists of the climate change scenarios
217 described in section 3.2.3 and the initial snow that corresponds to the first year of each future period, as calculated
218 by the glacier extent data described in section 3.2.5.

219 **5.1 Model calibration**

220 SWAT was calibrated for the Damma watershed only, using the meteorological data from 2009 to 2011 and
221 evaluated with the data from 2012 to 2013. Data for the years 2007 and 2008 were used for the warm-up and the
222 stability of the model. The calibration was firstly conducted manually. The most important parameters are the ones
223 controlling snow melt such as the snowpack temperature lag factor (TIMP), the snow melt factors (SMFMX and
224 SMFMN), the snow fall and snow melt temperatures (SFTMP and SMTMP respectively) and finally the
225 CN_FROZ, which was set to active. In SWAT input files, a different set of snow parameters can be applied for
226 each subbasin, which can enable the user to simulate differently the snow covered from the glacier covered
227 subbasins. However, most of the subbasins of the Damma glacier watershed, delineated during the initial setup of

228   the model, were partially glacier covered, it was decided to apply the same snow parameters for all the subbasins.
229   This means that the same parameters were applied for both glacier and snow dynamics.

230

231   Groundwater flow parameters such as the groundwater delay time (GW_DELAY), the base flow alpha factor
232   (ALPHA_BF) and the surface runoff lag coefficient (SURLAG) were also found to play an important role on the
233   performance of the model. Evapotranspiration (ET) related parameters were not significant since our study site is
234   above the tree line and ET is relatively minor.

235

236   The manual calibration was followed by an automatic calibration and uncertainty analysis using the SWAT-CUP
237   software with the Sequential Uncertainty Fitting ver. 2 (SUFI-2) algorithm for inverse modelling (Abbaspour et
238   al., 2007). Starting with some initial parameter values, SUFI-2 is iterated until (a) the 95% prediction uncertainty
239   (95PPU) between the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles include more than 90% of the measured data and (b) the average
240   distance between the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles is smaller than the standard deviation of the measured data. A
241   model is considered calibrated when the chosen criterion between the best simulation and calibration data reaches
242   the best value (Abbaspour et al., 2007). The parameters introduced in SWAT-CUP as well as their range are the
243   ones that were identified during the manual calibration as the most important.

244

245   The criterion used for the calibration with SWAT-CUP is the Nash-Sutcliffe (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) model
246   efficiency (NS), since it was the criterion available in SUFI-2 that is commonly used in hydrological studies. The
247   NS shows the relationship between the measured and the simulated runoff (Eq. 1). The performance of the
248   calibrated model was further evaluated by the square of Pearson's product moment correlation R^2, which represents
249   the proportion of total variance of measured data that can be explained by simulated data. Better model
250   performance is considered when both criteria are close to 1. NS coefficients greater than 0.75 are considered
251   ''good,'' whereas values between 0.75 and 0.36 as ''satisfactory'' (Wang and Melesse, 2006).

252    $$NS = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n}[q_{obs}(t) - q_{sim}(t)]^2}{\sum_{t=1}^{n}[q_{obs}(t) - q_{mean}(t)]^2}$$ (1)

253   where q_{obs} is the observed runoff; q_{sim} is the simulated runoff by SWAT; and q_{mean} is the mean observed value.

254

255   However, as Schaefli and Gupta (2007) pointed out, the NS criterion is not enough to judge the efficiency of the
256   model when simulating runoff with high seasonality like the one in high altitude watersheds. Therefore, as an
257   additional criterion for the performance of the model, a benchmark efficiency indicator was calculated, according
258   to Eq. 2:

259    $$BE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n}[q_{obs}(t) - q_{sim}(t)]^2}{\sum_{t=1}^{n}[q_{obs}(t) - q_b(t)]^2}$$ (2)

260   where q_{obs} and q_{sim} are as above and q_b is runoff given by the benchmark model. The calendar day model was
261   chosen as benchmark (Schaefli and Gupta, 2007), which is the observed interannual mean runoff for every calendar
262   day.

263

264   Table 1 shows the default and the after calibration values of the SWAT parameters that were changed during
265   calibration. TIMP was set to a very low value indicating that the glacier is not affected by the temperature of the
266   previous day as much as the snowpack would be. Snow and glacier melt in Damma watershed occurs from April
267   to September, a fact that explains the low value of the SMFMN (0.1 mmH$_2$O / °C-day), the minimum melt factor,

268   while the SMFMX is set to the value of 4.7 mmH$_2$O / ^{o}C-day. SMTMP is also sensitive since it is the controlling

269   factor for the initialisation of the snow melt and the availability of melted snow on a specific day. SURLAG and

270   GW_DELAY play an important role in the model performance as they control the melted snow routing process

271   and the hydrologic response of the watershed. Damma glacier watershed has a fast response and therefore

272   GW_DELAY was set to 0.5 days and ALPHA_BF to 0.95.

273

274   The results of the calibrated model for the daily runoff and the observed data are presented in Fig. 2(a), while

275   cumulative runoff is presented in Fig. 2(c). The fit of the model to the observed data is satisfactory and the results

276   of the calibrated model matched the observed data throughout most of the year. The graph of the cumulative runoff

277   (Fig. 2c) shows that runoff is slightly overestimated in July and August, when it is dominated by glacier melt. Best

278   results occur for the years 2009 and 2010. 2011 is characterised by unusually warm and dry months of September,

279   October and November which resulted in a slight underestimation of the runoff. The NS efficiency is 0.84 and R^2

280   is 0.85, which means that overall SWAT performance for the calibrated period is considered very satisfactory,

281   especially considering the fact that results are in daily steps that influence the NS value. BE for this period is 0.22,

282   a value that we consider to be satisfactory.

5.2 Model evaluation

284   SWAT was evaluated using the meteorological data for 2012 and 2013 and the results as well as the measured

285   runoff are presented in Fig. 2(b). Figure 2(d) presents the cumulative graphs. The model performed efficiently,

286   similarly to the calibration period, with a Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency of 0.85, R^2 0.86 and the BE 0.25. Although,

287   due to the lack of longer monitoring data, the total calibration-evaluation period 2009-2013 is short, it still includes

288   a relatively large variability in the weather conditions and precipitation amounts and despite this variability the

289   overall model performance is satisfactory. The small seasonal differences in model performance are due to the

290   evolution of runoff generation throughout the season: runoff in spring and early summer (May, June) comes mainly

291   from snowmelt while in July and August from glacier melt.

6 Results and Discussion

6.1 Upscaling SWAT to the greater catchment feeding the Göscheneralpsee reservoir

294   The results of the model for the greater area that feeds the Göscheneralpsee, are presented in Fig. 3(a) together

295   with the measured inflow in the reservoir. The observed and predictive cumulative flow is presented in Fig. 3(b).

296   Both Figures 3(a) and 3(b) show that there is an overestimation of total runoff for the period 1999-2002, which

297   might be linked to the higher precipitation amounts during this period. Measured precipitation measured at Gütsch

298   weather station for this period is up to 46 % higher than the average precipitation of 1981-2010.

299

300   The cumulative graph (Fig 3b) shows that there is an overall good agreement between model results and the

301   measured reservoir inflow. However, the performance criteria had relatively lower values, with NS efficiency

302   equal to 0.49, R^2 equal to 0.72 and BE to -1. This is why the predictability of the model was further tested by

303   analysing key parameters related to median runoff such as spring snowmelt timing, timing of peak flow, autumn

304   recession period and the centre of mass (COM), which can indicate temporal shifts in the hydrological regime.

305   Table 2 shows the difference in days between the observed and simulated values of the above parameters for each

year of the period 1997-2010. A 15 day moving average window was applied to daily runoff. Snowmelt timing and autumn recession are simulated successfully since the differences for most years are zero or close to zero, except for the years 2000 and 2002 for autumn recession. Peak flow timing shows some inconsistencies between observed and simulated data for certain years, which are mainly related to the fact that for these years and during the snowmelt period, SWAT produces results with higher peaks. Finally, the COM of the simulated data is in good agreement with that of the observed data, with an average difference of 4 days.

On the whole, SWAT performance is considered to be acceptable and it was successfully transferred to the greater Göscheneralpsee feeding catchment. One of the main reasons for the deterioration of the model performance is that SWAT does not differentiate between snow and glacier dynamics. In Omani et al. (2017) this issue was addressed by applying different snow parameters to the glacier covered subbasins than those applied for the non glacierised ones. However, the subbasins in our calibration watershed, the Damma glacier watershed, were partly glacierised and for this reason it was decided to apply only one set of snow parameters for the whole watershed.

Furthermore, some inconsistency is caused by the fact that for the two out of the four of the watersheds of the greater area feeding the Göscheneralpsee, runoff is drained through tunnels into the reservoir. Furthermore, Damma is characterised by very steep slopes (even up to nearly 80 degrees) and the groundwater-surface water interactions are less significant since runoff originates mainly from snowmelt, glacier melt and rainfall (Magnuson et al., 2012). For this reason, the ALPHA_BF parameter of SWAT was set to a high value and the GW_DELAY to low, parameter trends that characterise a watershed like Damma. However, a very high ALPHA_BF and low GW_DELAY might not be able to fully describe the Göscheneralpsee feeding area. The combination of these two factors could be the reason why some of the simulated peaks are higher but also narrower compared to the observed inflows into the reservoir and SWAT does not simulate efficiently the winter low flows, shown in Fig. 4.

Finally, SWAT results were compared to results from PREVAH and ALPINE3D models, already published in Magnusson et al. (2011) and Kobierska et al. (2013) (Fig. 4). PREVAH is a semi-distributed conceptual hydrological model suited for applications in mountainous regions (Viviroli et al., 2009a; Viviroli et al., 2009b) while ALPINE3D is a fully distributed energy balance model (Lehning et al., 2006).

Figure 4 shows the interannual average of the period 1997-2010 daily reservoir inflow for each model. SWAT overestimated the inflow of the snowmelt period, from May to the beginning of July, while from mid July to late September its results are close to the observed values and in agreement with the other two models. Finally, in October inflow is slightly underestimated. The seasonality in variation between model results and observed values is linked to the application of only one melt rate for both snowmelt and glacier melt periods. The best fit of the model is observed when glacier melt is the major contributor to runoff, while it is overestimated during the snowmelt period. Seasonal variability in model performance is observed not only for SWAT but also for ALPINE3D and PREVAH, as ALPINE3D underestimated the reservoir inflow during the snowmelt period, from May to June, while on the other hand runoff was slightly overestimated by PREVAH in October and November (Kobierska et al., 2013).

6.2 SWAT transferability on a temporal scale

As a next step, we simulated climate change scenarios for the greater area that feeds the Göscheneralpsee and compared the results with the climate change study in Kobierska et al. (2013) using the same time periods as follows:

Reference period T0: 1981–2010

T1: 2021–2050

T2: 2070–2099

The results of SWAT are presented as the interannual average reservoir inflow for each different scenario in Fig. 5(a) for the T1 period and in Fig. 5(b) for T2. The reference period shows the results of SWAT forced by the meteorological data of the Gütsch weather station for the period 1981-2010.

During the reference period, runoff peaks in mid June when snowmelt is combined with glacier melt. During the T1 period from July to September, all scenarios predict lower reservoir inflow than the reference period, indicating that the glacier melt cannot compensate the predicted decrease in precipitation. From September until the end of the season, the predictions of all scenarios are higher than the reference period, which is explained by the higher predicted precipitation during autumn. The annual peak remains in mid June.

For T2 period, reservoir inflow from spring to June is predicted to increase significantly for all three scenarios due to more intense snowmelt and higher precipitation. Based on the available glacier extent data described in section 3.2.5, we estimated that in 2070, the total glacier volume would be reduced to almost half, resulting in less glacier melt between July and late August. For this reason, and in combination with the significant decrease in precipitation, predicted by all scenarios for this period, the simulated runoff is lower than that of the reference. Finally, the snow free period is predicted to extend until December instead of September.

At the end of the T2 period, only a small part of the glacier is predicted to remain in high elevation. The date of peak flow would shift to be in the beginning of June. The main projected runoff volume is observed in spring and early summer while during the glacier melt period, is significantly lower than that of the reference period. Overall the total water yield for the scenarios in T2 period is predicted to decrease.

To better observe the seasonal changes of estimated reservoir inflow, Fig. 6 shows the interannual average inflow for a) May-June, b) July-August and c) September-October for the T1 and T2 periods divided by the average of the reference period of the same months for all the three scenarios. In May and June, as mentioned above, projected runoff is mainly dominated by snowmelt. The three climate change scenarios predict increased temperatures and higher precipitation during May and June which result in faster snowmelt and therefore in the increased predicted runoff, as observed in Fig. 6(a). The increase is higher in the T2 period due to the higher temperatures. The only exemption to that is the SHMI scenario for the near future period, since it is the colder scenario that predicts the lowest temperature and precipitation changes. In July and August, climate change scenarios predict a significant decrease in precipitation, which is also depicted in the predicted reservoir inflow. The scenario that has the most drastic effect is the ETHZ because it is the scenario that predicts the most prominent increase in the temperature and decrease in the precipitation. For September and October, results do not show a clear trend for the warmer

386   ETHZ scenario, however for the CNRM and SHMI scenarios, predicted runoff is lower than the reference. Finally,

387   the predicted inflow of the far future period T2 shows higher fluctuations from year to year than that of the near

388   future period especially from September to October.

389

390   The climate change predictions of SWAT and the subsequent conclusions show many similarities in the seasonal

391   variations with that of ALPINE3D and PREVAH. There are however uncertainties and differences between the

392   models. Table 3 presents a comparison of the shift in days for the highest peak day and the COM between the three

393   models for all the scenarios. Although the shift of COM is in good agreement among the three models for each

394   scenario, the models differed significantly concerning the shift in highest peak day. ALPINE3D and PREVAH

395   predict the peak flow to shift approximately by three and six weeks for the T1 and T2 periods respectively

396   (Kobierska et al., 2013). On the other hand, the shift of the highest peak day with SWAT is significantly smaller

397   since a 10 day shift is predicted only with the warmer ETHZ scenario for the T1 period while a maximum shift of

398   approximately three weeks is predicted for the T2 period (Table 3). This finding suggests that ALPINE3D and

399   PREVAH responded at a greater extend to glacier melt regarding the climate change scenarios than SWAT. This

400   observation could be attributed to the application of one set of snow parameters for both glacier and snowmelt,

401   even though the initial glacier cover was adjusted for both future periods, T1 and T2, according to the available

402   glacier cover predictions. However, it should be noted that by transferring the model from the small Damma

403   watershed to the greater area, we increased considerably the uncertainty regarding the hydrological modelling.

404   Therefore, a further quantitative comparison between the models could not be made.

405   **7 Conclusions**

406   This study is an assessment of the transferability or upscaling of SWAT on a spatial and temporal scale for a partly

407   glacierised catchment at a high altitude. For this reason, we followed an approach similar to the proxy-basin test

408   introduced by Klemeš (1986).

409

410   Firstly, SWAT was calibrated and evaluated for the Damma glacier watershed and it was demonstrated that despite

411   the extreme conditions of this high alpine watershed, SWAT performed successfully, with satisfactory NS and BE

412   efficiencies. Subsequently, we assessed the transferability of the model by upscaling and applying SWAT for the

413   greater area that drains into the Göscheneralpsee reservoir and includes the Damma glacier watershed. By

414   comparing model results with existing inflow data, we showed that the model was able to predict key parameters

415   such as the snowmelt timing, autumn recession period and the peak flow timing. However, overestimation of

416   runoff during the snowmelt period, highlights the importance of taking into account the difference in snow and

417   glacier dynamics. It showed that better performance could have been achieved if different parameters for snow

418   and glacier melt had been applied. This observation is quite important for study sites where streamflow is greatly

419   dependent on both snow- and glacier melt.

420

421   The temporal transferability of SWAT was analysed by assessing the impact of climate change on the hydrology

422   of the greater catchment and comparing these results with a previous climate change study conducted for the same

423   area. Climate change predictions showed that the hydrological regime will change significantly in the future

424   especially towards the end of the century. Although the results of SWAT show many similarities in the seasonal

425 pattern of the predicted runoff with the results of PREVAH and ALPINE3D, there are also significant differences.
426 These differences are related to the lack of sensitivity of SWAT to changes in the snowmelt and glacier melt
427 dynamics. As the contribution of glacier melt to runoff is predicted to decrease, the significance of snowmelt
428 becomes more prominent. It is therefore important when applying SWAT on high altitude watersheds to
429 distinguish the glacier covered or snow dominated subbasins and pay particular attention to the applied snow
430 parameters. This climate change study identifies qualitatively the impact of climate change on our study site but
431 no further quantifications could be made or further conclusions drawn.

432

433 In conclusion, our findings show how important are the transferability assessment tests in identifying the strengths
434 and weaknesses of the hydrological models, when they are applied under extreme climatic and geographical
435 conditions or even under conditions different to the ones that were created and calibrated. They become even more
436 important when they concern the widely used hydrological models like SWAT. Regarding the transferability of
437 the model at a temporal scale and under climate change, more detailed tests such as the ones proposed by Klemeš
438 (1986) and Thirel et al. (2015) could give more insightful results. Finally, the upscaling methodology used here,
439 where SWAT is calibrated for a small watershed and then applied for a greater area that includes the calibration
440 watershed, is a simple but still effective approach. It can be valuable in predicting streamflow of ungauged
441 watersheds, in large scale hydrological simulations and for policy makers working in water management.

442 **Author Contributions**

443 Maria Andrianaki applied SWAT model, analysed data and prepared the manuscript with contributions from all
444 co-authors. Juna Shrestha reviewed the manuscript and assisted in the modelling procedure. Florian Kobierska
445 provided meteorological and runoff data. Nikolaos P. Nikolaidis provided guidance for the research goals. Stefano
446 M. Bernasconi was the supervisor of the research project and provided the funding that lead to this publication.

447 **Competing interests**

448 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

449 **Acknowledgements**

450 This study was supported by the European Commission FP 7 Collaborative Project: Soil Transformations in
451 European Catchments (SoilTrEC) (Grant Agreement No. 244118). We thank Thomas Bosshard (Institute for
452 Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH Zürich, Switzerland), Frank Paul (Department of Geography, University
453 of Zürich, Switzerland), MeteoSwiss and SwissTopo for providing all the necessary data for the completion of this
454 study. We would also like to thank the Editor and the reviewers for their valuable contributions in improving this
455 manuscript.

References

Abbaspour, K. C., Yang, J., Maximov, I., Siber, R., Bogner, K., Mieleitner, J., Zobrist, J., and Srinivasan, R.: Modelling hydrology and water quality in the pre-alpine/alpine Thur watershed using SWAT, J. Hydrol., 333, 413-430, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.09.014, 2007.

Ahl, R. S., Woods, S. W., and Zuuring, H. R.: Hydrologic Calibration and Validation of SWAT in a Snow-Dominated Rocky Mountain Watershed, Montana, U.S.A., J. Am. Water Resour. As., 44, 1411-1430, 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2008.00233.x, 2008.

Aili, T., Soncini, A., Bianchi, A., Diolaiuti, G., D'Agata, C., Bocchiola, D. J. T., and Climatology, A.: Assessing water resources under climate change in high-altitude catchments: a methodology and an application in the Italian Alps, Theor. Appl. Climatol., 135, 135-156, 10.1007/s00704-017-2366-4, 2019.

Andrianaki, M., Bernasconi, S. M., and Nikolaidis, N. P.: Chapter Eight - Quantifying the Incipient Development of Soil Structure and Functions Within a Glacial Forefield Chronosequence, in: Advances in Agronomy, edited by: Steven, A. B., and Donald, L. S., Academic Press, 215-239, 2017.

Arnold, J. G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R. S., and Williams, J. R.: Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment - Part 1: Model development, J. Am. Water Resour. As., 34, 73-89, 10.1111/j.1752-1688.1998.tb05961.x, 1998.

Banwart, S., Bernasconi, S. M., Bloem, J., Blum, W., Brandao, M., Brantley, S., Chabaux, F., Duffy, C., Kram, P., Lair, G., Lundin, L., Nikolaidis, N., Novak, M., Panagos, P., Ragnarsdottir, K. V., Reynolds, B., Rousseva, S., de Ruiter, P., van Gaans, P., van Riemsdijk, W., White, T., and Zhang, B.: Soil Processes and Functions in Critical Zone Observatories: Hypotheses and Experimental Design, Vadose Zone J., 10, 974-987, 10.2136/vzj2010.0136, 2011.

Bárdossy, A.: Calibration of hydrological model parameters for ungauged catchments, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 11, 703-710, 10.5194/hess-11-703-2007, 2007.

Bavay, M., Grünewald, T., and Lehning, M.: Response of snow cover and runoff to climate change in high Alpine catchments of Eastern Switzerland, Adv. Water Resour., 55, 4-16, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.12.009, 2013.

Bernasconi, S. M., Christl, I., Hajdas, I., Zimmermann, S., Hagedorn, F., Smittenberg, R. H., Furrer, G., Zeyer, J., Brunner, I., Frey, B., Plotze, M., Lapanje, A., Edwards, P., Venterink, H. O., Goransson, H., Frossard, E., Bunemann, E., Jansa, J., Tamburini, F., Welc, M., Mitchell, E., Bourdon, B., Kretzschmar, R., Reynolds, B., Lemarchand, E., Wiederhold, J., Tipper, E., Kiczka, M., Hindshaw, R., Stahli, M., Jonas, T., Magnusson, J., Bauder, A., Farinotti, D., Huss, M., Wacker, L., Abbaspour, K., and Biglink Project, M.: Weathering, soil formation and initial ecosystem evolution on a glacier forefield: a case study from the Damma Glacier, Switzerland, Mineral. Mag., 72, 19-22, 10.1180/minmag.2008.072.1.19, 2008.

Bernasconi, S. M., Bauder, A., Bourdon, B., Brunner, I., Bunemann, E., Christl, I., Derungs, N., Edwards, P., Farinotti, D., Frey, B., Frossard, E., Furrer, G., Gierga, M., Goransson, H., Gulland, K., Hagedorn, F., Hajdas, I., Hindshaw, R., Ivy-Ochs, S., Jansa, J., Jonas, T., Kiczka, M., Kretzschmar, R., Lemarchand, E., Luster, J., Magnusson, J., Mitchell, E. A. D., Venterink, H. O., Plotze, M., Reynolds, B., Smittenberg, R. H., Stahli, M., Tamburini, F., Tipper, E. T., Wacker, L., Welc, M., Wiederhold, J. G., Zeyer, J., Zimmermann, S., and Zumsteg, A.: Chemical and Biological Gradients along the Damma Glacier Soil Chronosequence, Switzerland, Vadose Zone J., 10, 867-883, 10.2136/vzj2010.0129, 2011.

Bosshard, T., Kotlarski, S., Ewen, T., and Schär, C.: Spectral representation of the annual cycle in the climate change signal, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 15, 2777-2788, 10.5194/hess-15-2777-2011, 2011.

497   CH2011: Swiss Climate Change Scenarios CH2011, published by C2SM, MeteoSwiss, ETH, NCCR Climate, and

498   OcCC, Zurich, Switzerland, 88 pp., 2011.

499   Bocchiola, D., Diolaiuti, G., Soncini, A., Mihalcea, C., D'Agata, C., Mayer, C., Lambrecht, A., Rosso, R., and

500   Smiraglia, C.: Prediction of future hydrological regimes in poorly gauged high altitude basins: the case study of

501   the upper Indus, Pakistan, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 15, 2059-2075, 10.5194/hess-15-2059-2011, 2011.

502   Corine landcover database: http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/corine-land-cover-2006-raster-2, last

503   access: 30 May 2019.

504   Debele, B., Srinivasan, R., and Gosain, A. K.: Comparison of Process-Based and Temperature-Index Snowmelt

505   Modeling in SWAT, Water Resour. Manag., 24, 1065-1088, 10.1007/s11269-009-9486-2, 2010.

506   Di Luzio, M., Srinivasan, R., and Arnold, J. G.: Integration of watershed tools and SWAT model into basins, J.

507   Am. Water Resour. As., 38, 1127-1141, 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2002.tb05551.x, 2002.

508   Deckers, D. L. E. H., Booij, M. J., Rientjes, T. H. M., and Krol, M. S. J. W. R. M.: Catchment Variability and

509   Parameter Estimation in Multi-Objective Regionalisation of a Rainfall–Runoff Model, Water Resour. Manag., 24,

510   3961-3985, 10.1007/s11269-010-9642-8, 2010.

511   Dumig, A., Smittenberg, R., and Kogel-Knabner, I.: Concurrent evolution of organic and mineral components

512   during initial soil development after retreat of the Damma glacier, Switzerland, Geoderma, 163, 83-94,

513   10.1016/j.geoderma.2011.04.006, 2011.

514   Farinotti, D., Usselmann, S., Huss, M., Bauder, A., and Funk, M.: Runoff evolution in the Swiss Alps: projections

515   for selected high-alpine catchments based on ENSEMBLES scenarios, Hydrol. Process., 26, 1909-1924,

516   doi:10.1002/hyp.8276, 2012

517   Fontaine, T. A., Cruickshank, T. S., Arnold, J. G., and Hotchkiss, R. H.: Development of a snowfall–snowmelt

518   routine for mountainous terrain for the soil water assessment tool (SWAT), J. Hydrol., 262, 209-223,

519   http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(02)00029-X, 2002.

520   Garee, K., Chen, X., Bao, A., Wang, Y., and Meng, F.: Hydrological Modeling of the Upper Indus Basin: A Case

521   Study from a High-Altitude Glacierized Catchment Hunza, Water, 9, doi:10.3390/w9010017, 2017.

522   Grusson, Y., Sun, X., Gascoin, S., Sauvage, S., Raghavan, S., Anctil, F., and Sáchez-Pérez, J.-M.: Assessing the

523   capability of the SWAT model to simulate snow, snow melt and streamflow dynamics over an alpine watershed,

524   J. Hydrol., 531, 574-588, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2015.10.070, 2015.

525   Hock, R.: Temperature index melt modelling in mountain areas, J. Hydrol., 282, 104-115,

526   http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1694(03)00257-9, 2003.

527   Hrachowitz, M., Savenije, H. H. G., Blöschl, G., McDonnell, J. J., Sivapalan, M., Pomeroy, J. W., Arheimer, B.,

528   Blume, T., Clark, M. P., Ehret, U., Fenicia, F., Freer, J. E., Gelfan, A., Gupta, H. V., Hughes, D. A., Hut, R. W.,

529   Montanari, A., Pande, S., Tetzlaff, D., Troch, P. A., Uhlenbrook, S., Wagener, T., Winsemius, H. C., Woods, R.

530   A., Zehe, E., and Cudennec, C.: A decade of Predictions in Ungauged Basins (PUB)—a review, Hydrol. Sci. J.,

531   58, 1198-1255, 10.1080/02626667.2013.803183, 2013.

532   Klemeš, V.: Operational Testing of Hydrological Simulation-Models, Hydrol. Sci. J., 31, 13-24,

533   https://doi.org/10.1080/02626668609491024, 1986.

534   Kobierska, F., Jonas, T., Magnusson, J., Zappa, M., Bavay, M., Bosshard, T., Paul, F., and Bernasconi, S. M.:

535   Climate change effects on snow melt and discharge of a partly glacierized watershed in Central Switzerland

536   (SoilTrec   Critical   Zone   Observatory),   Appl.   Geochem.,   26,   Supplement,   S60-S62,

537   10.1016/j.apgeochem.2011.03.029, 2011.

Kobierska, F., Jonas, T., Zappa, M., Bavay, M., Magnusson, J., and Bernasconi, S. M.: Future runoff from a partly glacierized watershed in Central Switzerland: A two-model approach, Adv. Water Resour., 55, 204-214, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.07.024, 2013.

Lehning, M., Völksch, I., Gustafsson, D., Nguyen, T. A., Stähli, M., and Zappa, M.: ALPINE3D: a detailed model of mountain surface processes and its application to snow hydrology, Hydrol. Process., 20, 2111-2128, 10.1002/hyp.6204, 2006.

Magnusson, J., Farinotti, D., Jonas, T., and Bavay, M.: Quantitative evaluation of different hydrological modelling approaches in a partly glacierized Swiss watershed, Hydrol. Process., 25, 2071-2084, 10.1002/hyp.7958, 2011.

Magnusson, J., Jonas, T., and Kirchner, J. W.: Temperature dynamics of a proglacial stream: Identifying dominant energy balance components and inferring spatially integrated hydraulic geometry, Water Resour. Res., 48, W06510, doi:10.1029/2011WR011378, 2012.

Merz, R., and Blöschl, G.: Regionalisation of catchment model parameters, J. Hydrol., 287, 95-123, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2003.09.028, 2004.

Nash, J. E., and Sutcliffe, J. V.: River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I — A discussion of principles, J. Hydrol., 10, 282-290, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(70)90255-6, 1970.

Neitsch, S. L., Arnold, J. G., Kiniry, J. R., and Williams, J. R.: Soil and water assessment tool—Theoretical documentation—Version 2009, Texas Water Resources Institute technical report No. 406, Texas 77843-2118, 2011.

Omani, N., Srinivasan, R., Karthikeyan, R., and Smith, P.: Hydrological Modeling of Highly Glacierized Basins (Andes, Alps, and Central Asia), Water, 9, 111, 2017.

Parajka, J., Merz, R., and Blöschl, G.: A comparison of regionalisation methods for catchment model parameters, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 9, 157-171, 10.5194/hess-9-157-2005, 2005.

Patil, S., and Stieglitz, M.: Modelling daily streamflow at ungauged catchments: what information is necessary?, Hydrol. Process., 28, 1159-1169, 10.1002/hyp.9660, 2014.

Paul, F., Maisch, M., Rothenbühler, C., Hoelzle, M., and Haeberli, W.: Calculation and visualisation of future glacier extent in the Swiss Alps by means of hypsographic modelling, Global Planet. Change, 55, 343-357, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2006.08.003, 2007.

Rahman, K., Maringanti, C., Beniston, M., Widmer, F., Abbaspour, K., and Lehmann, A.: Streamflow Modeling in a Highly Managed Mountainous Glacier Watershed Using SWAT: The Upper Rhone River Watershed Case in Switzerland, Water Resour. Manag., 27, 323-339, 10.1007/s11269-012-0188-9, 2013.

SwissALTI3D: https://shop.swisstopo.admin.ch/de/products/height_models/alti3D, last access: 30 May 2019.

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

Schaltegger, U.: The central Aar granite – Highly differentiated calc-alkaline magmatism in the Aar massif (central Alps, Switzerland), Eur. J. Mineral., 2, 245-259, 1990.

Sivapalan, M., Takeuchi, K., Franks, S.W., Gupta, V.K., Karambiri, H., Lakschmi, V., Liang, X., McDonnel, J.J., Mendiondo, E.M., O`Connell, P.E., Oki, T., Pomeroy, J.W., Schertzer, D., Uhlenbrook, S. and Zehe E., IAHS Decade on Predictions in Ungauged Basins, PUB. 2003–2012: shaping an exciting future for the hydrological sciences. Hydrological Sciences Journal, 48 (6), 857–880, https://doi.org/10.1623/hysj.48.6.857.51421, 2003.

577 Srinivasan, R., Ramanarayanan, T. S., Arnold, J. G., and Bednarz, S. T.: Large area hydrologic modeling and
578 assessment - Part II: Model application, J. Am. Water Resour. As., 34, 91-101, 10.1111/j.1752-
579 1688.1998.tb05962.x, 1998.

580 Thirel, G., Andréassian, V., and Perrin, C.: On the need to test hydrological models under changing conditions,
581 Hydrol. Sci. J., 60, 1165-1173, 10.1080/02626667.2015.1050027, 2015.

582 Viviroli, D. and Weingartner, R.: The hydrological significance of mountains: from regional to global scale,
583 Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 8, 1017-1030, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-8-1017-2004, 2004.

584 Viviroli, D., Zappa, M., Schwanbeck, J., Gurtz, J., and Weingartner, R.: Continuous simulation for flood
585 estimation in ungauged mesoscale catchments of Switzerland – Part I: Modelling framework and calibration
586 results, J. Hydrol., 377, 191-207, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.08.023, 2009a.

587 Viviroli, D., Mittelbach, H., Gurtz, J., and Weingartner, R.: Continuous simulation for flood estimation in
588 ungauged mesoscale catchments of Switzerland – Part II: Parameter regionalisation and flood estimation results,
589 J. Hydrol., 377, 208-225, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.08.022, 2009b.

590 Wagener, T., Sivapalan, M., Troch, P., and Woods, R.: Catchment Classification and Hydrologic Similarity,
591 Geography Compass, 1, 901-931, 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2007.00039.x, 2007.

592 Wang, X., and Melesse, A. M.: Effects of STATSGO and SSURGO as inputs in SWAT model's snowmelt
593 simulation, J. Am. Water Resour. As., 42, 1217-1236, 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2006.tb05296.x, 2006.

594 Zhang, X. S., Srinivasan, R., Debele, B., and Hao, F. H.: Runoff simulation of the headwaters of the Yellow River
595 using the SWAT model with three snowmelt algorithms, J. Am. Water Resour. As., 44, 48-61, 10.1111/j.1752-
596 1688.2007.00137.x, 2008.

597 Zhang, Y., Chiew, F. H. S., Li, M., and Post, D.: Predicting Runoff Signatures Using Regression and Hydrological
598 Modeling Approaches, Water Resour. Res., 54, 7859-7878, 10.1029/2018wr023325, 2018.

599
600
601
602

603 **Table 1 The default and calibrated values of the most sensitive SWAT parameters**

Parameter	Unit	Cal. Value	Default
SFTMP	°C	-0.5	1
SMTMP	°C	2.5	0.5
SMFMX	mm H_2O / °C day^{-1}	4.7	4.5
SMFMN	mm H_2O / °C day^{-1}	0.1	4.5
TIMP		0.011	1
SURLAG		0.001	4
CNCOEF		0.5	1
SNOCOVMX	mm H_2O	500	1
SNO50COV	%	0.3	0.5
ALPHA_BF	days	0.95	0.048
GW_DELAY		0.5	31
GW_REVAP		0.02	0.02

		0.0001	0
LAT_TTIME		0.0001	0
CN2		35	
SLSOIL	m	5	
ESCO		1	0.95
SOL_AWC	mm H$_2$O/mm soil	0.05	

604

605

606

Table 2 Difference in days of the simulated from the measured values of the snowmelt timing, autumn recession period, peak flow timing and the centre of mass (COM), for the greater catchment feeding the Göscheneralpsee.

Year	Snowmelt timing	Autumn recession period	Peak flow timing	COM
1997	0	1	-48	7
1998	2	1	-2	4
1999	-4	0	-27	-1
2000	0	-16	19	-3
2001	0	1	-1	1
2002	0	-19	0	8
2003	2	5	-2	1
2004	1	4	21	2
2005	1	0	-1	4
2006	3	1	-3	4
2007	3	1	-7	8
2008	-2	0	2	3
2009	1	0	13	5
2010	2	0	-1	-6

623

624

625

626

627

Table 3 Shift in days of the centre of mass (COM) and shift in the highest runoff peak of the interannual average reservoir inflow for all the three scenarios. T1 and T2 stand for the T1 and T2 periods respectively.

Parameter	Model	ETHZ T1	CNRM T1	SHMI T1	ETHZ T2	CNRM T2	SHMI T2
COM shift	SWAT	-2	-1	1	-6	-4	2
(days)	Alpine 3D	-2	-1	0	-4	-6	1
	PREVAH	-6	-2	3	-7	-8	3
Peak day shift	SWAT	-10	0	0	-22	-16	-13

| (days) | Alpine 3D | -12 | -12 | -6 | -45 | -44 | -30 |
| | PREVAH | -29 | -16 | -6 | -43 | -39 | -38 |

630

631

632

633

634

Figure 1 Map showing the Damma glacier watershed on the left and the greater area that feeds the Göscheneralpsee on the right.

637

638

639

640 **Figure 2 Results of SWAT in comparison to the measured runoff of the Damma glacier watershed for a) and c) the**
641 **calibration period 2009-2011 and b) and d) the evaluation period 2012-2013. Graphs in c) and d) show the accumulative**
642 **runoff.**

643

644

645

646   **Figure 3 Results of SWAT and the measured inflow of the Göscheneralpsee reservoir for the period 1997-2010. Graphs**
647   **in (b) show the measured and simulated cumulative inflow over this period.**

648

649

650

651

Figure 4 Interannual average of the results of SWAT, ALPINE3D and PREVAH models and the measured runoff of the Göscheneralpsee feeding catchment for the 1997-2010 period.

654

655

656

657 **Figure 5 Interannual average of SWAT results of the three climate change scenarios and the reference period T0 for**
658 **the Göscheneralpsee feeding catchment a) for the T1 period 2021-2050 and b) for the T2 period 2070-2099. A 30 day**
659 **average window is applied.**

660

Figure 6 Seasonal changes of the reservoir inflow simulated with SWAT for the Göscheneralpsee reservoir for the reference T0 and future periods T1 and T2 for all three climate change scenarios. The interannual mean of the months a) May and June, b) July and August and c) September and October is taken.

664