

# Why is large sample hydrology important in hydrological forecasting?

## Ilias G. Pechlivanidis<sup>1</sup>, L. Crochemore<sup>1,2</sup>, Marc Girons Lopez<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute, Norrköping, Sweden <sup>2</sup> INRAE, UR Riverly, 69100 Villeurbanne, France Correspondence to: <u>ilias.pechlivanidis@smhi.se</u>

## Objectives

- Evaluate the seasonal streamflow forecasts in Sweden and Europe as a function of lead time and initialisation month
- Understand the spatial and temporal distribution of forecast quality and the coupling with catchment characteristics
- Use machine learning to attribute forecast quality to physiographic and hydroclimatic descriptors

## The HYPE model setups

The Swedish and pan-European setups of the HYPE model (named S-HYPE and E-HYPE) were designed to provide water information to society (e.g. environmental and climate assessments) at high spatial resolution including making capabilities for making predictions for ungauged basins and using a range of different data sources. The S-HYPE and E-HYPE operational models have an average spatial resolution of 10 and 215 km<sup>2</sup> respectively; while they can provide hydrological information at about 39,500 and 35,400 sub-basins respectively.





Fig. 1. Kling-Gupta Efficiency (KGE) for: (a) S-HYPE and (b) E-HYPE.

## Exp

- <u>Swe</u>
- Ense

### Pan GC

## Dri

<u>Swe</u> We tem

km<sup>2</sup> <u>Pan</u> Seas

available at a grid spacing of approximately 36 km. The forecasts were bias-adjusted using a quantile mapping method and the HydroGFD2.0 dataset (precipitation and temperature) as reference.



We evaluate the forecasts on the model reality using the Continuous Ranked Probability Score (CRPS) and its skill score (CRPSS) to evaluate the performance and skill of the hydrological forecasts.



perimental setup	Skill dis
edish assessment emble Streamflow Prediction (ESP) methodology: 1981–2015 analysis period 25 ensemble members (-3 years window around current year) Initialisation 4 times a month 7 months lead time, weekly aggregation - <u>European assessment</u> M-based using the ECMWF prediction system (SEAS5): 1993–2015 analysis period 25 ensemble members Initialisation every month 7 months lead time, monthly aggregation	I hitialisation date 1 dec 1 dec
	Fig. 3.
edish assessment use a spatial interpolation product of daily precipitation and operature covering the whole of Sweden at a resolution of 4x4 <sup>2</sup> (PTHBV) to produce the series of ESP hindcasts.	CRPSS
<u>-European assessment</u> sonal predictions of daily mean precipitation and temperature re taken from ECMWF's seasonal forecasting system (SEAS5)	

## **Evaluation metrics**

Fig. 2. Schematic representation of CRPS and CRPSS calculation.

**Flow signatures** Normalised low flow (q95) Coefficient of variation (CV) Normalised peak distribution (PD) Declining limb density (DLD) Base flow index (BFI)

### Read more

- Girons Lopez, M., Crochemore, L., & Pechlivanidis, I. (2021). Benchmarking an operational hydrological model for providing seasonal forecasts in Sweden. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 25(3), 1189–1209. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-1189-2021



Rising limb density (RLD) Normalised relatively low flow (q70)

Fig. 7. Importance ranking of descriptors that influence the forecast quality for all months.



• Pechlivanidis, I. G., Crochemore, L., Rosberg, J., & Bosshard, T. (2020). What are the key drivers controlling the quality of seasonal streamflow forecasts? Water Resources Research, 56, e2019WR026987. https://doi.org/10.1029/2019wr026987

- Streamflow can generally be well predicted in river systems with slow hydrological responses.