



Modelling of water and energy exchanges over a sparse olive orchard in semi-arid areas.

- Wafa Chebbi ^{1,2}, Vincent Rivalland ², Pascal Fanise ², Aaron Boone ³, Lionel Jarlan ², Hechmi
 Chehab ⁴, Zohra Lili Chabaane ¹, Valérie Le Dantec ², Gilles Boulet ²
- 5 ¹ Université de Carthage/INAT/LR GREEN-TEAM, 43 avenue Charles Nicole, Tunis 1082, Tunisie
- 6 ² CESBIO, Université de Toulouse, CNES/CNRS/INRA/IRD/UPS, Toulouse, France
- 7 ³ Centre National de Recherches Météorologiques, Toulouse, France
- 8 ⁴ l'institut de l'olivier, Unité spécialisée de Sousse, Rue Ibn Khaldoun, Sousse 4061, Tunisie
- 9 * Correspondence: chebbiwafa@outlook.fr; Tel.: +21628003882

10 Abstract: In the Mediterranean basin, olive orchards occupy a large fraction of agricultural lands 11 due to its sustainability to harsh conditions, drought in particular. Since most modeling tools to 12 simulate vegetation functioning are not meant to represent very sparse crops (i.e., rainfed olive trees 13 have a vegetation fraction cover ranging from 2 to 15 %), computing the water needs and the 14 vulnerability to drought of an olive orchard is a challenge. There is indeed a very high contribution 15 of the bare soil signal to the total fluxes, and it is difficult to decipher the contribution of the tree 16 from that of the entire surface. In this context, in an attempt to study the olive tree hydrological 17 functioning at field scale (38 ha), an experimental site was setup and a Soil-Vegetation-Atmosphere 18 (SVAT) model has been applied. To represent the orchard soil-plant-atmosphere interactions, a 19 simulation with default settings was assessed using parameters derived from both the literature and 20 ground measurements. In this default configuration, neither the predicted actual nor the potential 21 transpiration could reach the observed transpiration acquired during the wet season ($R^2=0.67$, the 22 Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)=5.63 mm week-1). We show that the model fails to reproduce the 23 relevant leaf surface that transpires. To address this issue and to improve the estimate of the year-24 to-year variability of the olive tree transpiration, we propose guidance on how a SVAT model can 25 be modified to more appropriately represent the hydrological functioning of a sparse orchard. Once 26 the tree transpiration is accurately simulated (R²=0.93, RMSE=1.62 mm week⁻¹), we evaluated 27 whether the fully coupled (single patch) or a fully uncoupled (two patch) system better reproduced 28 the total fluxes and their components. Owing to the independent characteristics of the soil columns 29 inherent in the assumption of the 2-patch version, the bare soil column shows a deficiency if the 30 topsoil root extraction is not accounted for. We deduced that we cannot accurately reproduce the 31 soil evaporation in this configuration. This study open perspectives for a better representation of 32 water fluxes over sparse tree crops into both hydrological and SVAT models.

- 33 Keywords: SVAT; SURFEX ISBA; MEB; olive orchard; sparse; energy and water budgets
- 34

35 1. Introduction

36 For sparse agrosystems, it is difficult to describe the exchanges at the soil-plant-atmosphere 37 interfaces with classical one dimensional (vertical) water and energy transfer models when large 38 areas of bare soil and dense vegetation islands exist side by side as is often the case in arid and semi-39 arid environments (Cammalleri et al., 2013; Daamen and McNaughton, 2000; Hunt et al., 2002). 40 Furthermore, the wide and the deep root systems are inaccessible to classical measurement 41 approaches, difficult to study and poorly understood (Rossi et al., 2011), especially in very low 42 density and rainfed orchards when roots can extend to several meters from the stem of the tree, both 43 horizontally and vertically (Paltineanu et al., 2016). There is indeed a very high contribution of the 44 bare soil signal to the total fluxes, and it is difficult to decipher the contribution of the tree from that 45 of the entire surface (Hu et al., 2018; Piayda et al., 2017). Over these systems, the modeling tools are 46 limited by 1) the striking contrast between the bare soil and the canopy temperature response and 2)





2 of 27

the complex way the available energy is dissipated and partitioned between the sensible and latentheat fluxes.

49 Several authors such as Cammalleri et al. (2010) suggested the application of SVAT (soil 50 vegetation atmospheric transfer) models to avoid the use of crop-dependent coefficients (Mata-51 González et al., 2005; Subedi and Chávez, 2015), which are poorly understood for discontinuous 52 canopies. Evapotranspiration in rainfed agrosystems is closely controlled by the amount of rainfall 53 and its high spatial variability which has in turn an important impact on the convective systems. 54 SVAT models, which solve simultaneously the water and the energy budgets, are thus suitable tools 55 for exploring the plant-atmosphere exchanges. In addition to their useful application in climate 56 simulation in terms of the coupling with the atmosphere and the partitioning into latent and sensible 57 heat fluxes (Koster and Suarez, 1994), SVAT models could serve as a basis for up-scaling purposes 58 from plot to region (Debruyckere et al., 1997). For example, to derive evapotranspiration in catchment 59 hydrology, Olchev et al. (2008) used a regional process-based "SVAT-Regio" model that includes a 60 regionalization of meteorological information and a temporal reconstruction of the diurnal variability 61 of meteorological parameters for each grid cell within the study area. Selective integration of grid cell 62 fluxes in space and time allows estimating the energy and water fluxes for e.g. ecosystems, 63 catchments or entire study area for different periods from 1 day to several years. Through these 64 models, the availability of climatic simulations for the current century paves the way to anticipate 65 and to test the vulnerability of orchards to drought prediction by various future scenarios in sensitive 66 areas. An adequate simulation tool could also help to support farmer decision-making (e.g. 67 supplementary irrigation...). Traditionally, the representation of the evapotranspiration is based on 68 the so called "big leaf" hypothesis of the Penman-Monteith (PM) approach (Monteith, 1965), where 69 the land surface is treated as one homogenous layer and a single resistance is used for modeling all 70 sources (soil, leaves) of heat transfer. However, for partially or sparsely vegetated canopies, the PM 71 model may be inappropriate because the big leaf assumption is not fulfilled (i.e., the sources/sinks 72 for heat fluxes occur for very different conditions, esp. of temperature) (H. J. Farahani and W. C. 73 Bausch, 1995). These models do not provide any partition between soil evaporation and the plant 74 transpiration, even despite its obvious significance to the estimation of the water use over sparse 75 systems and implications for agricultural drought assessment. Some authors have restricted the 76 composition of the land covers of only two patches juxtaposed side-by-side (one unshaded bare patch 77 and one vegetated patch with its underlying shaded soil) and with little interaction between the two 78 components. In fact, the main assumption of those models is to define the sparse vegetated covers as 79 two disconnected sources of vegetation and soil, which are thermally uncoupled and do not exchange 80 water (Kustas and Norman, 1997).

81 By contrast, the development of two-source models (Shuttle-worth and Wallace, 1985) that 82 include the energy balance of the soil has improved the modeling of heat and mass exchanges for 83 sparsely vegetated surfaces. Baldocchi et al. (2000) recommend treating those cover types as a dual 84 source system. The main assumption states that the vegetation is uniformly distributed over a surface 85 (Raupach and Finnigan, 1988). Although this approach shows a fairly good performance for partially 86 covered herbaceous surfaces (low Leaf Area Index, LAI) for which turbid medium theory holds 87 (Raupach and Finnigan, 1988), it might no longer be valid when vegetation is clumped with dense 88 isolated canopies such as big trees where unshaded bare soil areas are sufficiently large to interact 89 directly with the atmosphere with only a limited influence of the nearby vegetation. Indeed, this 90 heterogeneity may change substantially the energy being absorbed by the plant canopy and the 91 substrate below it. In fact, a large part of the substrate will be in direct sunlight while the other part 92 will be in the shadow of the canopy. The resulting system might therefore exchange differently than 93 the same system with a uniform screening. The simulation of radiative transfer using turbid medium 94 assumption (Beer-Lambert law) might perform poorly since the vegetation fail to screen a large 95 fraction of the soil. Several studies (Anderson et al., 2005; Kustas and Norman, 1999) argue that 96 clumped sparse vegetation might intercept less radiation than vegetation homogenously dispersed 97 with the same LAI. An effective LAI is obtained by multiplying the observed LAI by a clumping 98 index, which describes the non-random 3D distribution of foliage. This index was incorporated by





3 of 27

99 Kustas and Norman (1999) in the thermal-based Two-Source Energy Balance (TSEB) model as the 100 ratio between the real canopy gap fraction and its equivalent in homogenous conditions. The beam 101 extinction coefficient is estimated assuming that the leaf angle distribution is ellipsoidal. The sparse-102 crop model of (Shuttleworth and Wallace, 1985) has also been extended to several multilayer models 103 such as the Clumping (C) model (Brenner and Incoll, 1997). The C model overcomes the limitation of 104 uniformly distributed vegetation over a surface in the S-W model and considers three sources from 105 where LE is transferred to the atmosphere: the canopy, the soil under canopy, and the soil between 106 rows. Further than the radiation exchange, for most of these one- or two-dimensional models, the 107 stand evapotranspiration partitioning (i.e., the soil evaporation and the vegetation transpiration) is 108 obtained by weighing the whole flux by the cover fraction of each component. Usually, the cover 109 fraction is also deduced from the Beer-Lambert law (Brenner and Incoll, 1997; Cammalleri et al., 2010). 110 Some authors such as Taconet et al. (1986) distinguished two different partition factors: one for the 111 radiation partition (i.e., an average shielding factor) and another for momentum partition, which is 112 expressed as a function of LAI. In these two cases, total fluxes such as ET are thus not necessarily 113 equal to the already weighted sum of its components from the bare soil patch and the vegetated 114 patch. This simplified modelling (i.e., abstraction of the vegetated canopy as a turbid medium) 115 neglected the spatial separation of individual tree crowns forms. Thus, many authors proposed 116 to calculate the transpiration as the separate sums of sunlit and shaded fractions, weighted by their 117 respective leaf area within the canopy (Ding et al., 2014). A more realistic solution is provided by 118 three-dimensional (3D) models, which consider the canopy as an array of 3D cells characterized by 119 an individual LAI, which scale up water and carbon exchanges from the leaf to the canopy within 120 complex covers. Sinoquet et al. (2001) designed the model Radiation Absorption, Transpiration and 121 photosynthesis (RATP, (Sinoquet et al., 2001)) to simulate the spatial distribution of radiation and 122 leaf-gas exchanges within vegetation canopies as a function of canopy structure, canopy microclimate 123 and physical and physiological leaf properties. The spatially explicit 3D model MAESPA computes 124 also radiation absorption, photosynthesis and transpiration at the scale of a leaf within the crown of 125 individual trees within a stand, using spatial and temporal leaf-level biochemical properties linked 126 with stomatal gas regulation and the Penman-Monteith equation (Bowden and Bauerle, 2008). 127 However, 3D models are complex to implement, time and data consuming and currently cannot be 128 embedded in regional scale LSMs (Menenti et al., 2004).

129 Sparse vegetation covers (i.e., the partially covered vegetation during first stages of growth of 130 some crops, row crops ...) are widespread but show also a great diversity in heterogeneity 131 levels/types. Compared to sparse herbaceous plants, sparse woody plants are developed vertically. 132 In particular, contrary to natural ecosystems, the trees are planted in rows in regular tillage farming 133 systems. Rainfed olive is a typical example of such sparse agrosystems. Under semi-arid conditions 134 that are typical to the Mediterranean basin, the rainfed olive trees (Olea europaea) are largely planted 135 with traditional management practices that consist in decreasing the planting density to improve the 136 soil volume explored by the roots (Connor et al., 2014). The lower the rainfall is, the higher the 137 distance between the trees will be. The required SVAT model should be adapted to the woody 138 vascular system of the olive and to their specific geometrics. In particular, the water use strategy of 139 such orchards and their adaptive properties must be taken into account.

140 There are two main concerns in our case: 1/ the very low fraction cover in the study site equal to 141 7 %, which can be regarded as bare soil, results in low fraction of net radiation available to the 142 vegetation if the partitioning is based on this horizontal projection fraction. It seems also that "big 143 leaf" potential evapotranspiration derived from most SVAT models, which use the vegetation 144 fraction cover as weighting factor for the turbulent fluxes partition, do not allow to achieve a 145 sufficient order of magnitude compared to the observed one. For example, to simulate a transpiration 146 value equivalent to the maximum of 3 mm day⁻¹ recorded during the wet period over the same study 147 site (Chebbi et al., 2018), a potential amount of 3/(fc=0.07)=42 mm day⁻¹ is required. Knowing that the 148 observed transpiration was accurately checked in (Chebbi et al., 2018) while compared to the 149 difference between the observed evapotranspiration and evaporation, there is a clear deficiency in 150 the modeled potential transpiration rate to represent the contribution of transpiration to the whole





4 of 27

151 area in the case of fraction cover partitioning. Clumping index would even decrease this fraction. 152 Moreover, the order of magnitude of our observed transpiration rate falls in the range documented 153 in the literature (Moreno et al., 1996; Tognetti et al., 2006). Indeed, Santos et al. (2018) reported mean 154 transpiration of 1.5 mm per day with maximum values observed in the summer under deficit 155 irrigation treatment over 10 years old olive trees with a spacing of (4.2×8 m) in southern Alentejo, 156 Portugal. Similarly, Moriondo et al. (2019) validated their model (dedicated to the simulation of 157 growth and development of olive trees) against a set of data collected over a rainfed olive grove in 158 Italy with ground cover of 0.19. In their research, it was also found that the simulated as well as the 159 observed transpirations reach 3 mm day⁻¹ on July. The area average transpiration is clearly stemming 160 from a larger surface than what can be classically computed from a turbid medium with clump LAI 161 of woody trees (roughly 3) weighted by the fraction cover, and must be calculated by aggregating a 162 larger leaf-atmosphere interacting layer. 2/ Overall, two surface schemes (coupled and uncoupled 163 sources) are available to represent the energy and water transfers over discontinuous canopies. 164 However, each of them contains some truth in our particular but widespread cover. Indeed, there is 165 no clear-cut recommendation to choose the appropriate scheme surface for very sparse trees. Boulet 166 et al. (1999) compared both surface descriptions (one compartment also named "series", and two 167 compartments, i.e. "patch") and pointed out that this second configuration better simulates the 168 energy balance for very heterogeneous covers and provides especially a more realistic estimate of 169 unshaded soil and vegetation individual skin temperatures and the corresponding shaded soil 170 temperatures. They proposed a sparseness index that helps to select the appropriate configuration. 171 This index is a function of the tree height and width and the spacing between rows. However, Blyth 172 and Harding (1995) applied both configurations (patch and series) for the tiger bush experimental 173 site during the HAPEX-Sahel experiment in Niger, and demonstrated that the horizontal heat transfer 174 between the unshaded bare soil and the vegetation is significant and is not taken into account in the 175 uncoupled configuration. Likewise, Aouade et al. (2019) demonstrated that the convective fluxes and 176 the evapotranspiration partition is also better reproduced based on a coupled approach for 177 moderately sparse irrigated orchards. Lhomme and Chehbouni (1999) clarified also the inconsistency 178 in some models describing sparse covers, in terms of convective transfers, because rough elements 179 (vegetation or trees) have an impact on the turbulent processes over the unshaded bare soil and vice 180 versa, and this interaction could not be neglected.

181 The overall objective of this study is to better understand, through SVAT modeling and a 182 detailed experimental dataset (Chebbi, 2017), the thermo-hydric functioning of the olive tree under 183 the present climatic conditions and above all the evolution of this functioning under predicted climate 184 changes. The ISBA (Interaction Sol-Biosphère-Atmosphère) model, used here, is a part of the 185 Externalized SURFace (SURFEX) modeling platform (Masson et al., 2013). Its first version based on a 186 single energy balance approach was built by Noilhan and Planton (1989) and it has been recently 187 extended to represent multiple energy balances in a coupled manner by Boone et al. (2017a). 188 Therefore, its patch parameterization is classically the same one used to represent the sub-grid 189 variability in land surface models coupled with atmospheric models (such as the SURFEX platform) 190 (Masson et al., 2013). The model is used by a large number of communities (global and regional 191 climate, hydrology ...) and over a large range of covers. Consequently, our work contributes to the 192 improvement of the ISBA parameterization within the particular context of isolated trees in semi-arid 193 areas. The choice of this model for the present study can be justified by its ability to test future 194 scenarios based on future climate forcing and to predict the cover response to more recurrent drought 195 periods. It is also a complete physical model, that enables the comparison of the two configurations 196 (coupled/series and uncoupled/patch) and includes different soil water transfer schemes (i.e., force-197 restore and multilayer diffusion).

198The model was applied using parameters determined from observations or from the literature.199First, the different ISBA outputs were compared with observed data, including an analysis of an200inconsistency when dealing with the observed vegetation fraction cover of 7 % as the weighting of201the evaporation E and transpiration T components. Then, the model was slightly revised to address202some inconsistencies, principally the evapotranspiration partition. In particular, we look how the





5 of 27

effective area that transpires can be increased to match that observed T. Finally, the second issue deals with the choice between the patch (or uncoupled) approach and the layer (or coupled) approach and which is the configuration that better reproduce the water and energy exchanges, with respect to the vegetation sparseness and structure of this discontinuous canopy.

207 2. Materials and Methods

208 2.1. Study site

The experimental field is a rainfed olive grove in Kairouan, central Tunisia, which is a semi-arid area. Chebbi et al. (2018) provided a detailed description of the site. Details about the instrumentation and the database are available online (Chebbi, 2017). The plants are spaced on a regular grid of 20 m by 20 m (about 25 trees ha⁻¹ and a fraction vegetation cover of 7 %) and the mean canopy height is maintained at about 5 m. The soil is loamy sand, with an average content of clay, silt and sand of 8 %, 4 % and 88 %, respectively.

215 The study was conducted during three successive hydrological years from 2013 to 2016 (starting 216 from September to August) at a half-hourly time step. The setup consisted of instrumented towers 217 with adjacent pits, a tall one close to the tree and a shorter one over the bare soil at the center of a 218 square delimited by four trees (including the one that is instrumented). Therefore, one tower/pit 219 couple is dedicated to the tree functioning and another is related to the bare soil at the inter-row. For 220 the meteorological data, the air temperature and the relative humidity were sampled above the tree 221 at 9.5 m height and above bare soil at 2.4 m height. Both wind speed and wind direction were 222 measured using a 3D sonic anemometer (Campbell S. CSAT3, USA) in the highest tower and a wind 223 transducer (Young RM 05103, USA) over the bare soil. The rainfall was collected through a rain gauge 224 (Campbell S. SBS-500, USA).

225 For the energy budget components, the vegetation net radiation was estimated using NR01 net 226 radiometer (Husekflux, Delft, the Netherlands) installed above the olive tree. The bare soil net 227 radiation was measured by an NR-Lite Net Radiometer (Kipp and Zonen, Delft, Holland). At the 228 orchard scale, the whole net radiation was obtained by a weighted average of vegetation and bare 229 soil data by their fraction covers. Similarly, the soil heat flux below the tree (i.e., in the shade for the 230 most part of the morning till late in the afternoon) and the soil heat within the unshaded bare soil 231 were determined separately using heat flux plates (Hukseflux HFP01, Delft, the Netherlands) 232 inserted at a depth of 2 cm. The turbulent heat fluxes were derived from the eddy covariance method 233 and the flux source area contains a mean vegetation fraction of about 7 %. With the aim of partitioning 234 the latent heat flux, the transpiration was measured continuously by inserting TDP50 sensors in the 235 4 trees surrounding the flux tower. The bare soil evaporation was reconstructed from the observed 236 soil water content at the top 5 cm (see Chebbi et al. (2018) for further details).

The surface temperatures above the vegetation and above the bare soil were derived from
 thermal radiometer IR120 (Apogee Instruments Inc., Logan, UT, USA) measurements.

239 2.2. Model application and parametrisation

In order to mimic the surface heterogeneity, the ISBA model is based on the tiling method that consists in dividing the surface area into as many homogenous entities as vegetation types juxtaposed side-by-side in one grid. The term "patch" is used to designate this sub-grid variability, and each patch is described by a single source approach (i.e., one single energy budget). The output fluxes are aggregated and transferred to the atmosphere meteorological model (such as the Application of Research to Operations at Mesoscale (AROME) model (Seity et al., 2011)).

This tile version of ISBA allows implementing easily the uncoupled (patch) configuration. One bare soil patch represents the unshaded soil and the other one the vegetated area with the underlying shaded soil (Fig. 1b). This configuration is based on the assumption that the turbulent mixing at the plant-atmosphere interface occurs without disturbing the physical processes of the exposed bare soil. The two components are thermally uncoupled and do not exchange water (Kustas and Norman, 1997). In that case, there is no radiation exchange between the exposed bare soil patch and the





6 of 27

vegetation patch, and each one receives the whole amount of incoming radiation and precipitation forcing. The water and heat soil transfers are computed by solving the dynamic equations driving the evolution of the temperature and soil water content profiles in the soil. After computing the soil water budgets separately for each patch, total fluxes are determined through weigthing the soil and vegetation fluxes by the relative area of each patch.

257 To characterize the soil and the vegetation functioning, input parameters are those classically 258 used in most land surface models (LSM) such as the vegetation fraction cover, the canopy height, the 259 minimum stomatal resistance, the Leaf Area Index, the albedo, the soil hydrodynamic parameters, 260 the soil layer depths, the root fraction for each layer and the aerodynamic roughness. The patch 261 number corresponds to one of the 19 plant functional types proposed in the model library. This 262 vegetation classification is in line with the Ecoclimap table (an available database for ecosystems 263 types that provide a consistent set of land surface parameters) which can be used for a standard 264 application of ISBA. The model scheme has been adapted to include soil multilayer diffusion option 265 (Boone et al., 2000; Decharme et al., 2011) in order to represent the heterogeneous vertical distribution 266 of soil properties. The soil layer number is defined according to the observed soil layer characteristics 267 (hydrodynamic and thermal). The soil water transfers are controlled through the retention and 268 hydraulic conductivity curves (Noilhan and Planton, 1989). The soil hydrodynamic parameters are 269 counted using the soil texture (sand and clay percentage) and 4 empirical pedo-transfer functions are 270 proposed while applying Brooks and Corey (1964) and Clapp and Hornberger (1978) formulations. 271 The added value of the multilayer scheme is the specification of root vertical distribution and the 272 ability to model the strong near-surface gradients of soil moisture and temperature.

273 For the 1P configuration (Fig. 1a) which is implemented here using the dual-source Multi-Energy 274 Budget version (MEB) of ISBA model developed by Boone et al. (2017) and Napoly et al. (2017), the 275 most relevant difference corresponds to the manner in which the vegetation and the bare soil 276 interactions with the atmosphere are represented. The two sources are fully coupled. The infinite thin 277 layer of vegetation that covers the bare soil controlled the absorbed, the reflected and the transmitted 278 incoming radiation through the shielding factor veg. The root extraction is then extended to the bare 279 soil fraction and is computed at the surface as well as at depth as a component of the soil water 280 balance. The distinctive features of this version are the use of the multi-layer solar radiation transfer 281 scheme (Carrer et al., 2013) and the resolution of multiple energy budgets at the surface of one patch, 282 which are coupled with each other and with the atmosphere. The radiative transfer is still weighted 283 by the fraction cover veg and is based on the Beer-Lambert law.

Insert Fig. 1 here

For the rest of the paper, while the coupled/series configuration is referred to as "1P", the uncoupled/patch configuration is referred to as "2P". The "2P-BG" and "2P-VEG" designed the bare soil patch and vegetation patch of the 2P configuration, respectively. The model inputs for the two configurations are displayed on Table 1, in which the ground measurements are the main source of the model inputs. The forcing data (the global and the atmospheric radiation, the humidity and the temperature of the air, the speed and the direction of the wind, the atmospheric pressure and the rain) are determined in-situ.

292

284

Insert Table 1 here

For the soil discretization, the number of layers and depth were defined in agreement with the heat and water measurement depths. The vertical soil texture was prescribed for all layers according to observations (Table 2).

296

Insert Table 2 here

While all the other parameters remain equal, the LAI (Leaf Area Index) is the parameter that varies between both simulations. For the 2P simulation, we consider the LAI on the vegetated patch (*veg*=1) which is computed as the ratio between the leaf area and the area of the soil below the tree (also named "clump LAI"). However, for the 1P configuration, the LAI includes the area of soil which is not covered by vegetation and is expressed as:

LAI=veg×CLAI+(1-veg)×0





7 of 27

303 In addition, due to the presence of the vegetation (i.e. rough elements on a smoother substrate), 304 the roughness of the bare soil in the coupled configuration needs an adjustment to represent the extra 305 shear stress. Therefore, Raupach (1992) proposed a method for calculating the effective roughness 306 and displacement height of a set of scattered rough elements (made up of isolated obstacles such as 307 trees, shrubs, etc.). This method assimilates the rough elements to cylinders of known width (b) and 308 height (h) compatible to the height of vegetation and located on average at a defined distance from 309 each other (D). This description makes it possible to synthesize the turbulence screen in a roughness 310 density that characterizes the landscape. The starting point of the method is how the shear stress 311 changes together with the wind profile when adding one, then two and then n rough cylindrical 312 elements over the substrate.

313 3. Results and discussions

314 *3.1. The energy balance*

315 The modeling of the water and energy fluxes over heterogeneous covers, like our olive groves, 316 faces many significant issues related to both the low LAI and the complex 3D structure of the trees 317 (Unland et al., 1996). One of the main purposes of the study is to simulate the energy budget 318 components over such sparse cover. The closure of the observed energy budget was already checked 319 and the errors in the measurements were discussed in our previous study (Chebbi et al., 2018). Taking 320 into consideration the negligible LAI value, we first attempted to consider the orchard as a bare soil 321 in ISBA and investigated whether this assumption can provide a fairly realistic simulation of the 322 energy fluxes. The model was not able to track the seasonal dynamics particularly for the latent heat 323 flux which decrease sharply after each rain event (not shown). In addition, the RMSE between the 324 observed total fluxes over the orchard and the simulated fluxes from the sole bare soil patch were 325 significant about 31.46, 73.24, 58.23 and 44.12 W m⁻² for Rn, G, LE and H, respectively. This highlights 326 the interest in representing appropriately the tree which has a major impact on the fluxes. The results 327 of the simulation that includes the water and energy exchanges of the tree are shown in the Figure 2. 328 Over the whole study period, the simulated energy fluxes were plotted against the observed one in 329 scatterplots of the diurnal mean values of each component. The correlation coefficients of each 330 simulation are also provided (Fig. 2).

331 332

Insert Fig. 2 here

For all the energy budget terms, the RMSE between observations and simulations do not exceed the range of the measurement error and the current acceptable threshold of 50 W m⁻² (Wilson et al., 2002), with lower values for the heat soil flux and the latent (21.21 W m⁻² and 24.06 W m⁻² respectively). The sensible heat flux is the dominant turbulent flux compared to the latent heat flux that always remains lower than 100 W m⁻².

338 3.2. how representative the fraction cover is to partition evapotranspiration into evaporation andtranspiration?

340 Once the energy balance was checked, the evapotranspiration partitioning is set as one of the 341 goals of our study (Fig. 3). The observations show three contrasting years: a dry year (2013), a wet 342 year (2014) and a moderately dry year (2015). The weekly dynamics of the evapotranspiration were 343 plotted and the comparison between measurements and simulations were shown (Fig. 3). In 344 comparison with the partitioning observations, we note that the results were less satisfactory than 345 the total energy budget components. Although the whole evapotranspiration was well reproduced 346 with an RMSE of about 4.53 mm per week and a coefficient of determination equal to 0.64, the ISBA 347 configuration, based on the observed set of vegetation and soil related parameters described above, 348 showed a poor performance and failed to quantify its two components separately: the evaporation 349 from the bare soil and the transpiration from the tree (Fig. 3).

350 Insert Fig. 3 here





8 of 27

351 The figure 3 shows that the tree transpiration is highly underestimated during the wet year, 352 which explains the high values of RMSE, while the two dry years show better results. In order to 353 check whether the maximum rate of transpiration, that is when the root zone soil moisture is high 354 enough to prevent water stress, the potential transpiration rate for the entire surface as computed 355 with the low value of vegetation fraction (0.07) was plotted (Fig. 3b). This means that, during the two 356 dry years 2013 and 2015, the simulated evapotranspiration corresponds numerically to the potential 357 rate instead of a high level of tree water stress one would expect during those dry years, and during 358 the wet year 2014, the simulated potential rate of evapotranspiration is far below the observed 359 maximum of transpiration (3 mm day-1). The good results in 2013 and 2015 might thus be for the 360 wrong reason (moisture limited transpiration rate that corresponds to the potential rate of a 7 % 361 relative transpiration area).

362 The significant difference between the simulated and the observed transpiration can mainly be 363 related to an unrealistic proportion of transpiration area to the entire surface. The Beer-Lambert law, 364 which is usually used to represent a uniform layer of small reflective elements, may not work here 365 and fail to represent the very dense foliage located over a small area. In addition, contrarily to natural 366 ecosystems such as African savannah (i.e., where there is water use competition between the trees 367 and the grass growing after rain events), the orchard bare soil, is regularly ploughed and as a 368 consequence the water present in the whole unsaturated zone except for the shallow surface is 369 available exclusively for the olive tree.

To overcome this issue, in our case with only 7 % of vegetation fraction cover (almost a bare soil) that represents the limit of the applicability domain of the model, we will try to adjust artificially the appropriate parameters as an attempt to fit the observed transpiration without changing the model formulation. For this purpose, to increase the potential and the actual transpiration, the first assumption was to increase the effective area of leaves that transpires by testing various vegetation fraction covers. A sensitivity study was provided in Table 3.

376

Insert Table 3 here

The minimum RMSE on transpiration simulations corresponds to the *veg* equal to 0.28 (equivalent to the observed *veg* multiplied by 4). This corresponds roughly to the ratio between a transpiring area seen as a disk (projected area) in the case of 2D vegetation covers and a sphere (real transpiring surface) for the isolated trees. This factor 4 was also reported by Lang (1991), where the Cauchy theorem (i.e, the surface area of any convex body is equal to four times its silhouette average area) was applied to estimate the surface area of pine needles.

Figure 4 shows the simulated actual and potential transpiration rates after increasing *veg.* Though the transpiration results were improved at the beginning of the wet season, it is not the case for the whole period. The predicted potential transpiration values rise properly and reach precisely the observations during the wet period. Although the simulated transpiration fits the measured transpiration during the first dry season 2013/2014, the model underestimates the transpiration and simulates too much water stress during the second part of the wet season 2014/2015 and after.

389

Insert Fig. 4 here

390 3.3. The need to represent the water suply

391 Cammalleri et al. (2013) found that the Penman-Monteith model well reproduces the olive tree 392 functioning under moderate water conditions but is unable to reach the evapotranspiration level 393 during dry periods over an olive orchard in Sicily with a vegetation fraction cover of about 0.35. These 394 findings are also consistent with our previous results in Chebbi et al. (2018). Chebbi et al. (2018) 395 demonstrated that there is a lack of closure of the top first meter soil water balance of the olive grove 396 in the observations. More specifically the sum of the soil storage and the evapotranspiration far 397 exceeds the rainfall amount during dry periods. For example, the relevant rainfall events occurring 398 in the winter and the spring of 2014 refill the deep soil horizons and maintain high values of 399 transpiration even in the next summer and autumn of 2014, where there is a deficit of the soil water 400 balance (i.e., the sum of the soil storage and the evapotranspiration minus the rainfall is equal to 200 401 mm). Ramos and Santos (2009) illustrate the use of a larger amount of water for transpiration (404





9 of 27

402 mm) than the rainfall amount (240 mm) over a dry-farming olive grove as a result of an adaptation 403 to severe water stress conditions. In our agricultural system, this can be explained by an upslope 404 mound (infiltration strip) designed for water harvesting and the slope of the plot which is slight but 405 sufficient to promote lateral water redistribution. On top of that, a geophysical survey conducted 406 over the study site (not shown) proves that there is a discontinuity at 2 m depth related probably to 407 a less permeable layer and/or moisture accumulation. In the region of Bouhajla, a region near our 408 experimental site, Kanzari et al. (2012) also found that there is a semi-permeable silty-clay layer 409 located around 2 m which moderates the water infiltration and causes the creation of a water-410 saturated layer during the wettest periods. To support this assumption, figure 4 shows that even after 411 increasing the vegetation fraction cover, the observed transpiration fits the potential curve during the 412 dry summer of 2014. This means that the tree has access to water.

413 This additional deep water supply was quantified on the basis of the deficit of the top meter soil 414 energy balance as reported by Chebbi et al. (2018). The associated value of about 200 mm was divided 415 arbitrarily by the number of time steps from June to August 2014. The model was slightly adjusted 416 by adding this amount of water onto the deeper soil layer, at each time step, as a steady source term 417 to the water budget.

418

Insert Fig. 5 here

The simulated transpiration with this water supply of 200 mm better fits the observed transpiration (Fig. 5), as evidenced by the decrease in the RMSE to 1.62 mm week⁻¹ and the increase in the determination coefficient to 0.93. This confirms our assumptions of the deep root extraction during dry seasons. One can note also that this additional water do not prevent the plant from suffering from water stress in the following season, which is correctly reproduced by the simulation.

424 3.4. The coupled or the uncoupled scheme?

425 Now that the transpiration level is correctly reproduced, the two configurations (1P and 2P) 426 were tested to obtain adequate physical representation of transfers from this sparse vegetation 427 canopy. In this context, a careful analysis of the soil evaporation, as a relevant component of the water 428 budget in this cover, and a comparison of the energy balance components thereafter provide us with 429 the possibility to select one of the two surface schemes.

430 For the soil evaporation, to account for the uncertainty in the bare soil functioning due to the 431 imperfect pedo-transfer functions, a calibration was carried out on the soil hydrodynamic properties 432 of each layer. The main objective of this analysis is to explore whether one can decrease the RMSE 433 between the simulated and observed evaporation rates due to inaccurate soil transfer parameters. 434 Therefore, different pedo-transfer functions were tested. Those are proposed by the model and 435 described above and combined with a large set of sand and clay fractions to produce a range of 436 corresponding values of soil conductivity and potential matric at saturation. An optimization, based 437 on the minimization of RMSE between the measured and the observed daily soil evaporation, was 438 carried out to define the percentage of sand for the different soil layers and the corresponding soil 439 hydrodynamic parameters (not shown). While changing the soil properties, the choice of the 440 percentage of sand as a key parameter for the calibration is explained by the need to maintain a 441 consistent global behavior of the textural classes. Although a lower RMSE was recorded for a 442 maximum percentage of sand (100 %) for the 2P simulation, this simulation was not consistent with 443 the observations and produced very high evaporation rates. Hence, no matter what the soil 444 hydrodynamic parameters were, the model overestimated the evaporation and the minimum 445 difference between the cumulative observed transpiration and that of simulated transpiration could 446 reach 115 mm. In addition, the RMSE was about 0.56 mm per day and the coefficient of correlation 447 was about 0.25 (Fig. 6).

The figure 7 illustrates an RMSE for the 1P simulation (1.66 mm week⁻¹) which is lower than that of the 2P simulation (2.21 mm week⁻¹) (Chebbi et al., 2018). The correlation coefficient at weekly timescale is about 0.59 and 0.46 for the 1P and the 2P simulations, respectively. Both versions of ISBA (1P and 2P) used the same formulation of the evaporation efficiency as the method to reconstruct evaporation in Chebbi et al. (2018), but in the later the top soil water content is taken from





10 of 27

d53 observations, while in ISBA the soil moisture content is modeled. The main difference between the
simulated surface soil moisture by the 1P and the 2P versions is the consequence of the lack of roots
in the bare soil patch for the 2P simulation.

456 Indeed, the reality is that the olive trees roots are distributed across the entire inter-row area and 457 thus the whole bare soil fraction (see the root density observation in (Chebbi et al., 2018)). There is 458 even an increase in the root density at the mid-row spacing which is in accordance with the overlap 459 between the neighboring tree roots. There is also some root extraction in the top soil layer because 460 the soil water content measurement near the tree trunk and in the inter-row bare soil at 5 cm depth 461 provides similar results. Another way to confirm this finding is to estimate approximately the amount 462 of water extracted by the tree from the bare soil patch (i.e., the observed root extraction in the first 463 soil layer weighted by the fraction of transpiring area f_c and divided by the bare soil relative fraction 464 (1-fc). So, it is not surprising that the difference between the over-simulated evaporation and this 465 estimated amount of water extracted by the tree is consistent with the reconstructed soil evaporation 466 of the bare soil patch (Fig. 6). In conclusion, it appears that splitting the cover into two different soil 467 water budgets is not representative of the water transfer occurring in reality.

468

Insert Fig. 6 here

469 From the energy balance point of view, the results of the two configurations that include the tree 470 functioning are shown in the figure 8. Regarding the simulation of the total surface energy budget 471 components, the series configuration provides better results than that of the patch one. Since the 472 albedo value was forced to the model, the small spread in the net radiation can be explained by the 473 surface temperature gap between the two configurations. In contrast, the RMSE of the ground heat 474 flux from the 2P configuration is higher than the 1P configurations and exceeds the current acceptable 475 threshold of 50 W m⁻² (Wilson et al., 2002). This is explained by the weighted average (by a low 476 vegetation fraction cover) of a soil heat flux from hot and dry unshaded bare soil, which increases the 477 conductive fluxes, and another from the vegetation patch where the convective fluxes are dominant. 478 Therefore, the resultant flux is close to the bare soil flux and less consistent with in-situ observations. 479 The 1P configuration improves the simulation of the ground heat flux since it limits the incoming 480 radiation that reaches the bare soil. For the turbulent fluxes, the lower RMSE value was obtained from 481 the 1P configuration for the latent heat flux (15 W m⁻²) and from the 2P one for the sensible heat flux 482 (38 W m⁻²). The improvement of the latent heat flux scores compared to the initial ones gives us more 483 confidence in our assumptions. In fact, it appears that splitting the cover into two patches with no 484 interaction at the aerodynamic level (i.e., uncoupled convective fluxes scheme) does not reflect the 485 real turbulent transfers.

486 5. Conclusions

487 A simulation of the energy and water budgets was carried out with the ISBA LSM model over 488 very sparse olive orchard with only 7 % of vegetation fraction cover. To evaluate the added value of 489 each of them in the comprehension of the ecosystem hydrological functioning, two schemes (series 490 and patch) already available on the model were tested. In our case, although we found that the series 491 configuration is more adequate to reproduce the total fluxes, it failed to partition the 492 evapotranspiration components. As a step towards the improvement of the model performance over 493 such areas, several assumptions were made and the relevant parameters were adjusted. We assumed 494 here that the vegetation fraction cover measured at nadir-view cannot be representative of the 3D 495 structure of the olive tree and the dense foliage that transpires. In the alternative, we proposed to 496 vary the vegetation fraction cover in order to increase the transpiration until reaching the 497 observations order of magnitude. The result is to consider not the evaporative surface of a disc 498 corresponding to the classical projection of the crown on the ground, but that of the surface of a 499 sphere that matches roughly the tree crown. The model, after this adjustment, gives overall 500 satisfactory results but tends to simulate higher water stress than the observed one during dry 501 seasons. This was justified by a deep accumulation of water because of the low slope of the land and 502 the increase of the clay fraction of a deep layer. The partitioning results were improved without 503 altering the consistency of the other outputs as compared to observations. The uniqueness and the





$11 \ \mathrm{of} \ 27$

504 effectiveness of the olive tree transpiration process revealed by this exploratory study calls for further 505 measurement and modeling studies in this unusual and interesting environment.

As in the research of Kennedy et al. (2019), which implements plant hydraulics in the Community Land Model (CLM5), our future study will focus on modifying the ISBA model to represent some processes typical to large woody species such as an improved stomatal functionning more adapted to the semi-arid context, better stress functions, the variations in xylem water storage, and more importantly the root system and its hydraulic redistribution through sap flow sensors in line with previous works of (Nadezhdina et al., 2015).

512 Acknowledgments:

513 Financial support from the MISTRALS/SICMED program, the ALTOS European project of
514 PRIMA program, the ERANET-MED CHAAMS project, the FLUXMED European project of WATER
515 JPI program and the CNES/TOSCA program for the PITEAS project are gratefully acknowledged.
516 This research is carried out in the frame of the NAILA international laboratory.

517 518

519 References

520	Anderson, M.C., Norman, J.M., Kustas, W.P., Li, F., Prueger, J.H., Mecikalski, J.R., Anderson, M.C., Norman,		
521	J.M., Kustas, W.P., Li, F., Prueger, J.H., Mecikalski, J.R., 2005. Effects of Vegetation Clumping on Two-		
522	Source Model Estimates of Surface Energy Fluxes from an Agricultural Landscape during SMACEX. J.		
523	Hydrometeorol. 6, 892–909. https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM465.1		
524	Aouade, G., Jarlan, L., Ezzahar, J., Er-raki, S., Napoly, A., Benkaddour, A., Khabba, S., Boulet, G., Garrigues, S.,		
525	Chehbouni, A., Boone, A., 2019. Evapotranspiration partition using the multiple energy balance version of		
526	the ISBA-A-gs land surface model over two irrigated crops in a semi-arid Mediterranean region		
527	(Marrakech, Morocco). Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss. 1–44. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-532		
528	Baldocchi, D.D., Law, B.E., Anthoni, P.M., 2000. On measuring and modeling energy fluxes above the floor of a		
529	homogeneous and heterogeneous conifer forest. Agric. For. Meteorol. 102, 187-206.		
530	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(00)00098-8		
531	Blyth, E.M., Harding, R.J., 1995. Application of aggregation models to surface heat flux from the Sahelian tiger		
532	bush. Agric. For. Meteorol. 72, 213–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1923(94)02164-F		
533	Boone, A., Masson, V., Meyers, T., Noilhan, J., 2000. The Influence of the Inclusion of Soil Freezing on Simulations		
534	by a Soil–Vegetation–Atmosphere Transfer Scheme. J. Appl. Meteorol. 39, 1544–1569.		
535	https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0450(2000)039<1544:TIOTIO>2.0.CO;2		
536	Boone, A., Samuelsson, P., Gollvik, S., Napoly, A., Jarlan, L., Brun, E., Decharme, B., 2017a. The interactions		
537	between soil-biosphere-atmosphere land surface model with a multi-energy balance (ISBA-MEB) option		
538	in SURFEXv8-Part 1: Model description. Geosci. Model Dev. 10, 843–872. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-		
539	843-2017		
540	Boone, A., Samuelsson, P., Gollvik, S., Napoly, A., Jarlan, L., Brun, E., Decharme, B., Boone aarona, A., 2017b.		
541	The interactions between soil-biosphere-atmosphere land surface model with a multi-energy balance		
542	(ISBA-MEB) option in SURFEXv8-Part 1: Model description. Geosci. Model Dev 10, 843-872.		
543	https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-843-2017		





12 of 27

544 545	Boulet, G., Chehbouni, A., Braud, I., Vauclin, M., 1999. Mosaic versus dual source approaches for modelling the surface energy balance of a semi-arid land. Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss. 3, 247–258.
546 547	Bowden, J.D., Bauerle, W.L., 2008. Measuring and modeling the variation in species-specific transpiration in temperate deciduous hardwoods. Tree Physiol. 28, 1675–1683. https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/28.11.1675
548 549	Brenner, A.J., Incoll, L.D., 1997. The effect of clumping and stomatal response on evaporation from sparsely vegetated shrublands. Agric. For. Meteorol. 84, 187–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(96)02368-4
550	Brooks, R.H., Corey, A.T., 1964. Hydraulic properties of porous media. Hydrol. Pap. 3, 1–27.
551 552 553 554	Cammalleri, C., Agnese, C., Ciraolo, G., Minacapilli, M., Provenzano, G., Rallo, G., 2010. Actual evapotranspiration assessment by means of a coupled energy/hydrologic balance model: Validation over an olive grove by means of scintillometry and measurements of soil water contents. J. Hydrol. 392, 70–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHYDROL.2010.07.046
555 556 557	Cammalleri, C., Rallo, G., Agnese, C., Ciraolo, G., Minacapilli, M., Provenzano, G., 2013. Combined use of eddy covariance and sap flow techniques for partition of ET fluxes and water stress assessment in an irrigated olive orchard. Agric. Water Manag. 120, 89–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2012.10.003
558 559 560 561	 Carrer, D., Roujean, JL., Lafont, S., Calvet, JC., Boone, A., Decharme, B., Delire, C., Gastellu-Etchegorry, JP., 2013. A canopy radiative transfer scheme with explicit FAPAR for the interactive vegetation model ISBA- A-gs: Impact on carbon fluxes. J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosciences 118, 888–903. https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrg.20070
562 563	Chebbi, W., 2017. nasrallah flux database [WWW Document]. SEDOO OMP website. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.6096/MISTRALS-SICMED.1479
564 565 566	Chebbi, W., Boulet, G., Le Dantec, V., Lili Chabaane, Z., Fanise, P., Mougenot, B., Ayari, H., 2018. Analysis of evapotranspiration components of a rainfed olive orchard during three contrasting years in a semi-arid climate. Agric. For. Meteorol. 256–257, 159–178. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AGRFORMET.2018.02.020
567 568	Clapp, R.B., Hornberger, G.M., 1978. Empirical equations for some soil hydraulic properties. Water Resour. Res. 14, 601–604. https://doi.org/10.1029/WR014i004p00601
569 570 571	Connor, D.J., Gómez-del-Campo, M., Rousseaux, M.C., Searles, P.S., 2014. Structure, management and productivity of hedgerow olive orchards: A review. Sci. Hortic. (Amsterdam). 169, 71–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2014.02.010
572 573	Daamen, C.C., McNaughton, K.G., 2000. Modeling Energy Fluxes from Sparse Canopies and Understorys. Agron. J. 92, 837. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2000.925837x
574 575 576	Dbara, S., Haworth, M., Emiliani, G., Ben Mimoun, M., Gómez-Cadenas, A., Centritto, M., 2016. Partial Root- Zone Drying of Olive (Olea europaea var. 'Chetoui') Induces Reduced Yield under Field Conditions. PLoS One 11, e0157089. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157089

577 Decharme, B., Boone, A., Delire, C., Noilhan, J., 2011. Local evaluation of the Interaction between Soil Biosphere





13 of 27

578 579	Atmosphere soil multilayer diffusion scheme using four pedotransfer functions. J. Geophys. Res. 116, D20126. https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JD016002
580	Ding, R., Kang, S., Du, T., Hao, X., Zhang, Y., 2014. Scaling up stomatal conductance from leaf to canopy using
581	a dual-leaf model for estimating crop evapotranspiration. PLoS One 9, e95584.
582	https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0095584
583	Garratt, J., 1994. Review: the atmospheric boundary layer. Earth-Science Rev. 37, 89–134.
584	https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-8252(94)90026-4
585	H. J. Farahani, W. C. Bausch, 1995. Performance of Evapotranspiration Models for Maize — Bare Soil to Closed
586	Canopy. Trans. ASAE 38, 1049–1059. https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.27922
587	 Hu, H., Chen, L., Liu, H., Ali Khan, M., Tie, Q., Zhang, X., Tian, F., 2018. Comparison of the Vegetation Effect on
588	ET Partitioning Based on Eddy Covariance Method at Five Different Sites of Northern China. Remote Sens.
589	10, 1755. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10111755
590	Hunt, J.E., Kelliher, F.M., McSeveny, T.M., Byers, J.N., 2002. Evaporation and carbon dioxide exchange between
591	the atmosphere and a tussock grassland during a summer drought. Agric. For. Meteorol. 111, 65–82.
592	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(02)00006-0
593	Jarvis, P.G., 1976. The Interpretation of the Variations in Leaf Water Potential and Stomatal Conductance Found
594	in Canopies in the Field. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 273, 593–610.
595	https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1976.0035
596	Kanzari, S., Hachicha, M., Bouhlila, R., Battle-Sales, J., 2012. Characterization and modeling of water movement
597	and salts transfer in a semi-arid region of Tunisia (Bou Hajla, Kairouan) - Salinization risk of soils and
598	aquifers. Comput. Electron. Agric. 86, 34–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2011.09.010
599	Kennedy, D., Swenson, S., Oleson, K.W., Lawrence, D.M., Fisher, R., Lola da Costa, A.C., Gentine, P., 2019.
600	Implementing Plant Hydraulics in the Community Land Model, Version 5. J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst. 11,
601	485–513. https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001500
602	Kustas, W.P., Norman, J.M., 1999. Evaluation of soil and vegetation heat flux predictions using a simple two-
603	source model with radiometric temperatures for partial canopy cover. Agric. For. Meteorol. 94, 13–29.
604	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(99)00005-2
605 606	Kustas, W.P., Norman, J.M., 1997. A two-source approach for estimating turbulent fluxes using multiple angle thermal infrared observations. Water Resour. Res. 33, 1495–1508. https://doi.org/10.1029/97WR00704
607	Lang, A.R.G., 1991. Application of some of Cauchy's theorems to estimation of surface areas of leaves, needles
608	and branches of plants, and light transmittance. Agric. For. Meteorol. 55, 191–212.
609	https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1923(91)90062-U
610	Lhomme, JP., Chehbouni, A., 1999. Comments on dual-source vegetation-atmosphere transfer models. Agric.

611 For. Meteorol. 94, 269–273. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1923(98)00109-9





14 of 27

 612 613 614 615 616 617 	 Masson, V., Le Moigne, P., Martin, E., Faroux, S., Alias, A., Alkama, R., Belamari, S., Barbu, A., Boone, A., Bouyssel, F., Brousseau, P., Brun, E., Calvet, JC., Carrer, D., Decharme, B., Delire, C., Donier, S., Essaouini, K., Gibelin, AL., Giordani, H., Habets, F., Jidane, M., Kerdraon, G., Kourzeneva, E., Lafaysse, M., Lafont, S., Lebeaupin Brossier, C., Lemonsu, A., Mahfouf, JF., Marguinaud, P., Mokhtari, M., Morin, S., Pigeon, G., Salgado, R., Seity, Y., Taillefer, F., Tanguy, G., Tulet, P., Vincendon, B., Vionnet, V., Voldoire, A., 2013. Model Development. Eur. Geosci. Union 6, 929–960. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-6-929-2013
618	Mata-González, R., McLendon, T., Martin, D.W., 2005. The Inappropriate Use of Crop Transpiration Coefficients
619	(K c) to Estimate Evapotranspiration in Arid Ecosystems: A Review. Arid L. Res. Manag. 19, 285–295.
620	https://doi.org/10.1080/15324980590951469
621 622	Menenti, M., Jia, L., Bastiaanssen, W., 2004. Energy and water flow through the soil - vegetation - atmosphere system: the fiction of measurements and the reality of models.
623	Moreno, F., Fernandez, J.E., Clothier, B.E., Green, S.R., 1996. Transpiration and root water uptake by olive trees.
624	Plant Soil 184, 85–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00029277
625	Moriondo, M., Leolini, L., Brilli, L., Dibari, C., Tognetti, R., Giovannelli, A., Rapi, B., Battista, P., Caruso, G.,
626	Gucci, R., Argenti, G., Raschi, A., Centritto, M., Cantini, C., Bindi, M., 2019. A simple model simulating
627	development and growth of an olive grove. Eur. J. Agron. 105, 129–145.
628	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2019.02.002
629	Nadezhdina, N., Ferreira, M.I., Conceição, N., Pacheco, C.A., Häusler, M., David, T.S., 2015. Water uptake and
630	hydraulic redistribution under a seasonal climate: long-term study in a rainfed olive orchard.
631	Ecohydrology 8, 387–397. https://doi.org/10.1002/eco.1545
632	Napoly, A., Boone, A., Samuelsson, P., Gollvik, S., Martin, E., Seferian, R., Carrer, D., Decharme, B., Jarlan, L.,
633	2017. The interactions between soil-biosphere-atmosphere (ISBA) land surface model multi-energy
634	balance (MEB) option in SURFEXv8 – Part 2: Introduction of a litter formulation and model evaluation for
635	local-scale forest sites. Geosci. Model Dev. 10, 1621–1644. https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-1621-2017
636	Noilhan, J., Planton, S., 1989. A Simple Parameterization of Land Surface Processes for Meteorological Models.
637	Mon. Weather Rev. 117, 536–549. https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0493(1989)117<0536:ASPOLS>2.0.CO;2
638	Olchev, A., Ibrom, A., Priess, J., Erasmi, S., Leemhuis, C., Twele, A., Radler, K., Kreilein, H., Panferov, O.,
639	Gravenhorst, G., 2008. Effects of land-use changes on evapotranspiration of tropical rain forest margin
640	area in Central Sulawesi (Indonesia): Modelling study with a regional SVAT model. Ecol. Modell. 212,
641	131–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2007.10.022
642	Paltineanu, C., Septar, L., Gavat, C., Chitu, E., Oprita, A., Moale, C., Calciu, I., Vizitiu, O., Lamureanu, G., 2016.
643	Characterising root density of peach trees in a semi-arid Chernozem to increase plant density. Int.
644	Agrophysics 30, 67–74. https://doi.org/10.1515/intag-2015-0079
645	Piayda, A., Dubbert, M., Siegwolf, R., Cuntz, M., Werner, C., 2017. Quantification of dynamic soil-vegetation
646	feedbacks following an isotopically labelled precipitation pulse. Biogeosciences 14, 2293–2306.
647	https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-2293-2017





15 of 27

648	Ramos, A.F., Santos, F.L., 2009. Water use, transpiration, and crop coefficients for olives (cv. Cordovil), grown			
649	in orchards in Southern Portugal. Biosyst. Eng. 102, 321–333.			
650	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2008.12.006			
651	Raupach, M., Finnigan, J., 1988. Single-layer models of evaporation from plant canopies are incorrect but useful,			
652	whereas multilayer models are correct but useless: discuss. Aust. J. Plant Physiol. 15, 705–716.			
653	Raupach, M.R., 1992. Drag and drag partition on rough surfaces. Boundary-Layer Meteorol. 60, 375–395.			
654	https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00155203			
655	Rossi, R., Amato, M., Bitella, G., Bochicchio, R., Ferreira Gomes, J.J., Lovelli, S., Martorella, E., Favale, P., 2011.			
656	Electrical resistivity tomography as a non-destructive method for mapping root biomass in an orchard.			
657	Eur. J. Soil Sci. 62, 206–215. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2389.2010.01329.x			
658	Rubio, E., Caselles, V., Badenas, C., 1997. Emissivity measurements of several soils and vegetation types in the			
659	8–14, μm Wave band: Analysis of two field methods. Remote Sens. Environ. 59, 490–521.			
660	https://doi.org/10.1016/S0034-4257(96)00123-X			
661	Santos, F., Santos, L., F., 2018. Olive Water Use, Crop Coefficient, Yield, and Water Productivity under Two			
662	Deficit Irrigation Strategies. Agronomy 8, 89. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy8060089			
663	Seity, Y., Brousseau, P., Malardel, S., Hello, G., Bénard, P., Bouttier, F., Lac, C., Masson, V., Seity, Y., Brousseau,			
664	P., Malardel, S., Hello, G., Bénard, P., Bouttier, F., Lac, C., Masson, V., 2011. The AROME-France			
665	Convective-Scale Operational Model. Mon. Weather Rev. 139, 976–991.			
666	https://doi.org/10.1175/2010MWR3425.1			
667	Shuttleworth, W.J., Wallace, J.S., 1985. Evaporation from sparse crops-an energy combination theory. Q. J. R.			
668	Meteorol. Soc. 111, 839–855. https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.49711146910			
669	Sinoquet, H., Le Roux, X., Adam, B., Ameglio, T., Daudet, F.A., 2001. RATP: a model for simulating the spatial			
670	distribution of radiation absorption, transpiration and photosynthesis within canopies: application to an			
671	isolated tree crown. Plant, Cell Environ. 24, 395–406. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3040.2001.00694.x			
672	Subedi, A., Chávez, J.L., 2015. Crop Evapotranspiration (ET) Estimation Models: A Review and Discussion of			
673	the Applicability and Limitations of ET Methods. J. Agric. Sci. 7, p50. https://doi.org/10.5539/jas.v7n6p50			
674	Taconet, O., Bernard, R., Vidal-Madjar, D., 1986. Evapotranspiration over an Agricultural Region Using a Surface			
675	Flux/Temperature Model Based on NOAA-AVHRR Data. J. Clim. Appl. Meteorol.			
676	https://doi.org/10.2307/26182589			
677	Tognetti, R., d'Andria, R., Lavini, A., Morelli, G., 2006. The effect of deficit irrigation on crop yield and vegetative			
678	development of Olea europaea L. (cvs. Frantoio and Leccino). Eur. J. Agron. 25, 356-364.			
679	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2006.07.003			
680	Unland, H.E., Houser, P.R., Shuttleworth, W.J., Yang, ZL., 1996. Surface flux measurement and modeling at a			
681	semi-arid Sonoran Desert site. Agric. For. Meteorol. 82, 119-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-			
682	1923(96)02330-1			







Fig. 1: the 1P (a) and 2P (b) configurations









Fig. 2: scatterplots between the observed and the simulated energy budget terms during the study period ((a): Rn; (b): G; (c): LE and (d): H)









(a)



(b)





19 of 27



Fig. 3: the weekly evapotranspiration and its partitioning and their associated scores; (a) ETR: total evapotranspiration, (b) T: the actual and the potential transpiration and (c) E: bare ground evaporation

694



Fig. 4: a comparison between the actual and the potential transpiration with a fraction cover $f_{\rm c}$ of 0.28









Fig. 5: a comparison between the measured and the simulated transpiration after the water supply at a weekly scale and their related statistical scores

696



Fig. 6: the cumulative sum of the simulated evaporation from the 2P run , the simulated evaporation minus the estimated water extracted by roots from the bare soil top layer (Tsoil) and the determined evaporation from soil water content measurements









Fig. 7: the simulated evaporation from the 1P and the 2P run after increasing the vegetation fraction cover and adding the water supply.













Fig. 8: scatterplots between the observed and the simulated energy budget terms ((a): Rn; (b): G; (c): LE and (d): H) derived from the 1P and the 2P configurations



713

714



23 of 27

Tables

Table 1: The initial SVAT input parameters					
Parameter Value Source					
Layers number	6	Observations			
Layer depth	0.075;0.225;0.4;0.75;1;2 m	-			
Soil depth	1 m	Observations			
water content at saturation	0.35	Observations			
Field capacity	0.15	Observations			
Wilting point	0.05	Observations			
Soil albedo	0.32	Observations			
Vegetation albedo	0.28	Observations			
Soil emissivity	0.96	Literature (Rubio et al., 1997)			
Vagatation amiggivity	0.08	Literature (Rubio et al., 1997)			
vegetation emissivity	0.98	/default value			
Z_0	0.52 m for 1P 0.02 for 2P-BG	Estimated according to (Raupach, 1992) modified by (Verhoef, 1995)			
	0.73 for 2P-VEG	Literature (Garratt, 1994)			
Zom/Zoh	50	Default value			
veg	0.07	Observations			
LAI	$3.2 \text{ m}^2/\text{m}^2$ of soil	Observations			
Tree height	5.67 m	Observations			
Minimum stomatal resistance	160 m/s	Literature (Dbara et al., 2016) /default value			
Root fraction	9;20;18;13;8;40 %	Observations to a depth of 0.6 m and extrapolation to 2 m depth based on literature (Moreno et al., 1996)			

715

Table 2: the measured soil texture between 0 and 1m depth

depth (m)	Sand (%)	Clay (%)	Silt (%)
0	88.2	8	3.8
0.1	88.2	8	3.8
0.2	88.2	8.5	3.3
0.4	81.1	14.5	4.4
0.6	79.9	13.9	6.2
0.8	80.7	13.6	5.7
1	88.2	7.3	4.5
1.6	88.2	7.3	4.5

716

717

718

Table 3: the scores between the simulated and the measured transpiration for different vegetation fraction covers

veg	RMSE	R ²	NASH
0.07	1.24	0.53	-43.55





24 of 27

0.14	1.03	0.43	-9.62
0.21	0.99	0.32	-5.37
0.28	0.89	0.21	-4.35
0.35	0.94	0.11	-3.83
0.42	0.99	0.05	-3.58
0.49	1.03	0.02	-3.46

719 720

721





 $25 \ \mathrm{of} \ 27$

Annex 1: the model description

For the surface energy budget, the net radiation (R_n) , the sensible heat flux (H) and the latent heat flux (LE) are expressed in W/m² as follows:

$$R_n = R_g(1 - \alpha) + \varepsilon (R_{atm} - \sigma T_s^4) \tag{1}$$

$$H = \rho_a C_p C_H V_a (T_s - T_a) \tag{2}$$

$$LE = L_v(E_g + E_v) \tag{3}$$

$$E_g = (1 - veg)\rho_a C_H V_a [h_u q_{sat}(T_s) - q_a]$$
(4)

$$E_{v} = veg\rho_{a}C_{H}V_{a}h_{v}[q_{sat}(T_{s}) - q_{a}]$$
⁽⁵⁾

726 Where R_g and R_{atm} are the global and the atmospheric radiation respectively, α is the combined 727 soil/vegetation albedo, ε is the total surface emissivity weighted by the vegetation cover (veg), σ is the 728 Stefan-Boltzmann constant, Ts is the total surface temperature, Qa is the air density, Cp is the air specific 729 heat, V_a is the wind speed, T_a is the air temperature, C_H is the drag coefficient, L_v is the latent heat of 730 vaporization, $q_{sat}(T_s)$ is the saturated specific humidity at the temperature T_{sr} qa is the atmospheric 731 specific humidity, hu is the evaporation efficiency which depends on the top soil layer water content, 732 h_v is the Halstead coefficient which is meant to represent both the leaf intercepted water evaporation 733 and the plant transpiration $h_{\nu} = (1 - \delta)R_a/(R_a + R_s) + \delta$, R_s is the aerodynamic resistance and R_s is 734 the surface resistance.

The surface resistance that monitors the transpiration is defined by (Jarvis, 1976) and controlled by the minimal stomatal resistance parameter R_{smin} .

737 The surface heat flux (G) corresponds to the residual term of the energy budget equation and is 738 expressed as follows:

$$G = R_n - H - LE \tag{6}$$

739 The surface temperature, which is associated with the soil temperature at the top soil layer, depends 740 on *veg*, the surface heat flux and the heat characteristics of the layer below. The thermal gradients at 741 the surface and within the soil are governed by the Fourrier law and are written as follows:

$$\frac{dT_s}{dt} = C_T [G - \frac{\bar{\lambda}_1}{\Delta z_1} (T_s - T_2)] \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dT_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{c_{g_i}} \frac{1}{\Delta z_{i_1}} [\frac{\bar{\lambda}_{i-1}}{\Delta \bar{z}_{i-1}} (T_{i-1} - T_i) - \frac{\bar{\lambda}_i}{\Delta \bar{z}_i} (T_i - T_{i+1})]; \qquad i=2...n$$
(8)

742 Where $\Delta z' = (\Delta z_i + \Delta z_{i+1})/2$ is the layer i depth, $\Delta \bar{z}_i$ is the spacing between the nodes of the layers i 743 and i-1, Cgi is the layer-averaged soil heat capacity, $\bar{\lambda}_i$ is the inverse-weighted arithmetic mean of the 744 soil thermal conductivity at the interface between two consecutive nodes.

For the description of the soil water transfer, the model is based on the Richards equation on its mixed form using both state variables: the soil water content and water pressure head. This equation is applicable independently of the saturation state in addition to its privilege in the modeling of heterogeneous soil property (texture) profile.

By analogy with the thermal gradient resolution, the liquid-vapor exchanges of soil water arewritten as follows:

$$\frac{dw_1}{dt} = \frac{1}{\Delta z_1} \left[-\bar{k}_1 \left(\frac{\psi_1 - \psi_2}{\Delta \bar{z}_1} + 1 \right) - \bar{\vartheta}_1 \left(\frac{\psi_1 - \psi_2}{\Delta \bar{z}_1} \right) + \frac{S_1}{\rho_w} \right]$$
(9)

$$\frac{dw_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{\Delta z_i} \left[\left(F_{i-1} - F_i + \frac{S_i}{\rho_w} \right) \quad i=2...n$$
(10)





26 of 27

$$F_{i} = \bar{k}_{i} \left(\frac{\psi_{i} - \psi_{i+1}}{\Delta \bar{z}_{i}} + 1 \right) + \bar{\vartheta}_{i} \left(\frac{\psi_{i} - \psi_{i+1}}{\Delta \bar{z}_{i}} \right)$$

$$\tag{11}$$

751

763

752 Where S_i is the soil-water source (infiltration) /sink (soil evaporation and root extraction) term, 753 ψ_i is the soil matric potential, \bar{k}_i is the geometric mean of soil hydraulic conductivity, $\bar{\vartheta}_i$ the 754 geometric means of the isothermal vapor conductivity.

(Boone et al., 2017b) developed the dual-source Multi-Energy Budget version (MEB). The distinctive features of this version are the use of the multi-layer solar radiation transfer scheme and the resolution of multiple energy budgets at the surface of one patch, which are coupled with each other and with the atmosphere. The energy budgets at the surface are expressed as prognostic equations governing the dynamics of the bulk vegetation canopy T_v, for ice and snow free conditions.

$$C_{\nu}\frac{\partial T_{\nu}}{\partial t} = R_{n\nu} - H_{\nu} - LE_{\nu} \tag{12}$$

$$C_{g,1}\frac{\partial T_{g,1}}{\partial t} = R_{ng} - H_g - LE_g - G_{g,1}$$
(13)

760 Where $T_{g,1}$ is the uppermost surface soil temperature, L_f is the latent heat of fusion (J.kg⁻¹). g 761 refers to the ground, v to the vegetation and c to the interface between the canopy air space and the 762 vegetation.

For the water budget for the uppermost soil layer, the equation is:

$$\rho_{w}\Delta z_{g,1}\frac{\partial w_{g,1}}{\partial t} = P_{r} - P_{rv} - D_{rv} - E_{g} - R_{0} - F_{g,1}$$
(14)

764 Where $w_{g,1}$ is the uppermost soil water content layer, $P_r - P_{rv}$ is the remaining rainfall after 765 interception, F is the soil water vertical flux, E_g is the ground evaporation, R₀ is the surface runoff and 766 D_{rv} is the canopy drip of liquid water.

The different fluxes are expressed as a function of resistances $(R_a = \frac{1}{V_a C_H})$ in s.m⁻¹ instead of the dimensionless heat and mass exchange coefficient (C_H). The resistances represent the water extraction efficiency at the soil-plant-atmosphere interfaces.

770 The sensible heat fluxes are defined as follows:

$$H_{\nu=}\rho_a \frac{(T_\nu - T_c)}{R_{a\nu-c}} \tag{15}$$

$$H_{g=}\rho_a \frac{(T_g - T_c)}{R_{ag-c}} \tag{16}$$

$$H_c = \rho_a \frac{(T_c - T_a)}{R_{ac-c}} \tag{17}$$

771 Where ρ_a is the lowest atmospheric layer average air density, T_c is the specific temperature of the canopy air space.

Though the sensible heat fluxes (i.e. the H variables) that are expressed in terms of temperature
herein for simplicity, thermodynamic variables such as potential temperature or dry static energy are
used in the actual model computations (see Boone et al. (2017))

776 Similarly, the three water vapor fluxes are determined as:

$$E_{\nu=}\rho_a h_{s\nu} \frac{(\mathsf{q}_{sat\nu} - \mathsf{q}_c)}{R_{a\nu-c}} \tag{18}$$

$$E_{g=}\rho_a \frac{\left(\mathbf{q}_g - \mathbf{q}_c\right)}{R_{aa-c}} \tag{19}$$





27 of 27

(20)

$$E_{c=}\rho_{a}\frac{(q_{c}-q_{a})}{R_{ac-a}}$$

777 Where q_c is the specific humidity of the canopy air space and h_{sv} is the Halstead coefficient for 778 the canopy evapotranspiration.

779The radiative transfer is based on the Beer-Lambert law and the heat conduction fluxes are780defined in ISBA-MEB and for ISBA referring to Eq. 6, Eq. 7 and Eq. 8. In ISBA, Ts represents the mixed781surface temperature (soil and vegetation) and the thermal inertia coefficient (CT) is used. In MEB,782despite $T_{g,1}$ equivalence to T_{s} , it only have a conformity with the temperature of the bare soil. We also783tend to choose the effective heat capacity (Cg=1/CT) in this version.

784 Both of the heat capacities C and the thermal conductivities λ are functions of the organic 785 content and the texture of the soil.