NERC Open Research Archive
sharing our research

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL

Article (refereed) - postprint

Kuhnert, Matthias; Yeluripati, Jagadeesh; Smith, Pete; Hoffmann, Holger; Van Oijen, Marcel; Constantin, Julie; Coucheney, Elsa; Dechow, Rene; Eckersten, Henrik; Gaiser, Thomas; Grosz, Balász; Haas, Edwin; Kersebaum, Kurt-Christian; Kiese, Ralf; Klatt, Steffen; Lewan, Elisabet; Nendel, Claas; Raynal, Helene; Sosa, Carmen; Specka, Xenia; Teixeira, Edmar; Wang, Enli; Weihermüller, Lutz; Zhao, Gang; Zhao, Zhigan; Ogle, Stephen; Ewert, Frank. 2017. **Impact analysis of climate data aggregation at different spatial scales on simulated net primary productivity for croplands**.

Contact CEH NORA team at
noraceh@ceh.ac.uk

Impact analysis of climate data aggregation at different spatial scales on simulated Net Primary Productivity for croplands

Kuhnert, Matthias[1]; Yeluripati, Jagadeesh[1,13]; Smith, Pete[1]; Hoffmann, Holger[2]; van Oijen, Marcel[3.]; Constantin, Julie[4]; Dechow, Rene[5]; Eckersten, Henrik[6]; Gaiser, Thomas[2]; Grosz, Balász[5]; Haas, Edwin[7]; Kersebaum, Kurt-Christian[8]; Kiese, Ralf[7]; Klatt, Steffen[7]; Lewan, Elisabet[9]; Nendel, Claas[8]; Raynal, Helene[4]; Sosa, Carmen[9]; Specka, Xenia[8]; Teixeira, Edmar[10]; Wang, Enli[11]; Weihermüller, Lutz[12]; Zhao, Gang[2]; Zhao, Zhigan[11]; Ogle, Stephen[14]; Ewert, Frank[2]

[1] Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, 23 St Machar Drive, Aberdeen AB24 3UU, UK

[2] Crop Science Group, INRES, University of Bonn, Katzenburgweg 5, 53115 Bonn, DE

[3] Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, CEH-Edinburgh,Bush Estate, Penicuik EH26 0QB, UK

[4] INRA, UMR 1248 AGIR & UR0875 MIA-T, F-31326 Auzeville, France

[5] Thünen-Institute of Climate-Smart-Agriculture, Bundesallee 50, 38116 Braunschweig, DE

[6] Department of Crop Production Ecology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Ulls väg 16, 750 07 Uppsala, SE

[7] Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research – Atmospheric   Environmental Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology,   Kreuzeckbahnstraße 19, 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, DE

[8] Institute of Landscape Systems Analysis, Leibniz Centre for   Agricultural Landscape Research, 15374 Müncheberg, DE

[9] Biogeophysics and water quality, Department of Soil and Environment, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Lennart Hjelms väg 9, 750   07 Uppsala, SE

[10] Systems Modelling Team (Sustainable Production Group), The New   Zealand Institute for Plant and Food Research Limited, Canterbury   Agriculture & Science Centre, Gerald St, Lincoln 7608, NZ

[11] CSIRO Land and Water, Clunies Ross Street, Canberra, ACT, AU

[12] Institute of Bio- & Geosciences Agrosphere (IBG-3), Forschungszentrum Jülich, 52425 Jülich, DE

[13] The James Hutton Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeen, AB15 8 QH, UK

[14] Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

Abstract

For spatial crop and agro-systems modelling, there is often a discrepancy between the scale of measured driving data and the target resolution. Spatial data aggregation is often necessary, which affects the uncertainty of the simulation results. Previous studies have shown that climate data aggregation has little effect on simulation of phenological stages, but effects on net primary production (NPP) might still be expected through changing the

length of the growing season and the period of grain filling. This study investigates the impact of spatial climate data aggregation on NPP simulation results, applying eleven different models for the same study region (~34000 km^2), situated in Western Germany. To isolate effects of climate, soil data and management were assumed to be constant over the entire study area and over the entire study period of 29 years. Two crops, winter wheat and silage maize, were tested as monocultures. The results show only small impacts of climate data aggregation on averages over the entire simulation period and study region. Maximum differences between the five scales in the range of 1 to 100 km grid cells show changes of 0.4 – 7.8 % and 0.0 - 4.8 % for wheat and maize, respectively, whereas the simulated potential NPP averages of the models show a wide range (1.9 - 4.2 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} and 2.7 - 6.1 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} for wheat and maize, respectively). The impact of the spatial aggregation was also tested for shorter periods to test if impacts over shorter periods level out over longer periods, which shows larger impacts for single years (up to 9.4 % for wheat and up to 13.6 % for maize). An analysis of extreme weather conditions shows an aggregation effect to the vulnerability up to 12.8 % and 15.5 % between the different resolutions for wheat and maize, respectively. Simulations of NPP averages over larger areas (e.g. regional scale) and longer time periods (several years) are relatively insensitive to climate data aggregation, but the scale of climate data is more relevant for impacts on annual averages of NPP or if the period is strongly affected or dominated by drought stress. There should be an awareness of the higher uncertainty for the NPP values if data are not available in a high resolution. On the other side, the results suggest that there is no need to simulate in high resolution for long term regional NPP averages based on the simplified assumptions (soil and management constant in time and space) used in this study.

66

1 Introduction

68

Net primary production (NPP) is a crucial ecosystem variable characterising the condition of an ecosystem (Pan et al, 2014) and it is sensitivity to climate change. Spatial NPP is difficult to measure and often biased and uncertain (Pan et al., 2014), because measurements show several limitations (indirect determination, spatially and temporally limited). Spatial modelling is an important tool for interpolation and extrapolation of measurements or for providing spatial distributed projections for regional (Reich et al., 1999; Zaehle et al., 2006; Bandaru et al., 2013; Liu et al, 2015), continental (Ciais et al., 2010) or global scale (Hemming et al., 2013; Friend et al., 2014). The regional scale is relevant for policy makers to analyse adaptation and mitigation strategies, but NPP data for this scale are often derived by extrapolating measured information from the site scale to a region by applying models developed at site scale (Zhang et al., 2015). This model-based up-scaling requires a balance between accuracy and simulation time.

Spatial modelling of NPP relies on spatially distributed input and driving data like weather data and information on soil, land use and management characteristics. Depending on environmental parameters, ecosystem characteristics and the chosen resolution, the impacts of extrapolation or interpolation may be great or small since there is e.g. a higher uncertainty for high relief areas compared to relatively flat areas as shown by Pierce and Running (1995). For this reason, estimates of error and uncertainty arising from data aggregation across scales needs to be quantified.

Several studies have highlighted the impact of data aggregation on simulation results (Cale et al., 1983; Rastetter et al., 1992; Ewert et al., 2015; Zhao et al., 2015). De Wit et al. (2005) and Hoffmann et al. (2015) investigated the impact of climate data aggregation on crop yields. While de Wit et al. (2005) varied precipitation and solar radiation only on the

92   resolutions 10 km and 50 km, Hoffmann et al. (2015) differentiated between five different

93   resolutions between 1 and 100 km and also considered aggregation effects of temperature

94   for 13 models. Both studies found only slight impacts of data aggregation on simulated yield

95   over longer time periods at a regional scale. Van Bussel et al. (2011) investigated the

96   impacts of climate aggregation on croplands and focused on phenological stages rather than

97   primary production, but they also found minor effects on simulated average values. The

98   impacts of climate data aggregation on NPP were tested by Nungesser et al. (1999) and

99   Pierce and Running (1995), both for American forests. In both studies, the impact was minor

100 for averages over the entire study area, but showed relevant impacts for smaller areas,

101 especially areas dominated by strong relief changes (Pierce and Running, 1995). In both

102 studies, the effects were tested by one model and for two resolutions of 10 and 50 km grid

103 cells in Nungesser et al. (1999), and 1 km and 110 km in Pierce and Running (1995). The

104 latter study investigated the effect for different input variables (relief, climate and soil) and

105 found that climate data aggregation was the dominant variable affecting scale differences of

106 NPP. They also observed larger scale effects for shorter time periods, which could be an

107 indication of extreme weather events that average out over larger areas or longer time

108 periods. Overall, regional simulation results over longer periods seem to be little affected by

109 climate data aggregation. Over longer periods changes of NPP level out and the impact of

110 extreme events may be not obvious in a long term average, but relevant for shorter periods.

111 Reichstein et al. (2013) describe the temporal and spatial scale as very important to detect

112 impacts of extreme weather conditions on the carbon balance and see a risk of miss out

113 extreme weather conditions by integration of weather data across scales. Impacts of

114 extreme weather are also depending on the temporal scale, which is not yet tested for

115 impacts on NPP. However, there is a lack of studies determining the effect on NPP

116 simulations of croplands, and no study to date has analysed the relevance of extreme events

117 during climate data aggregation.

118 Therefore, the objective of this paper is to quantify error and uncertainty of NPP simulations

119 of croplands caused by climate data aggregation across five resolutions (1, 10, 25, 50 and

120 100 km grid cell side length). This study addresses the three questions i) what are the

121 impacts on long term NPP averages over the entire region? ii) how does the aggregation

122 effect change over shorter time periods? iii) is the aggregation effect more pronounced in

123 years with extreme weather conditions compared to "normal" years? These questions are

124 answered by using a simulation approach involving eleven different models. Additionally, a

125 vulnerability analysis helps to identify the impact of climate data aggregation for years with

126 extreme weather conditions. Thus, we provide the first systematic analysis considering the

127 impact of spatial weather data aggregation on NPP using five resolutions and 11 different

128 models.

129

130 **2 Methods**

131

132 *2.1 Aggregation effect*

133 Spatial modelling approaches are containing uncertainty, because uncertainty of input data

134 and limited data availability requires data aggregation, which also contribute to the

135 uncertainty. In this study we focused on the impact of data aggregation on uncertainty.

136 Spatial data base on point measurement, small scale measurements or approaches that

137 averaging the data already during the measurement process. In the data aggregation these

138 data sets get interpolated, extrapolated and averaged to provide data in its spatial

139 distribution. This data aggregation increases the uncertainty of the data sets. Beside the

140 impacts of data aggregation, the chosen format of the model approach adds uncertainty to

141 the data, too. Spatial model approaches often using data organized in grid maps, while

142 natural conditions do not follow any symmetric pattern. Therefore, gridded data already

143 contain uncertainty, which also varies with changing scale. Our focus in this study is on the

144 impact of changing scales of grid map data on simulation results. Because there is a strong

145 interaction of different processes, we concentrate on the impact of changing weather data

146 as an important driver for plant growth. As we only compare simulated NPP values, we are

147 not using the term uncertainty, but aggregation effect ($E_{aggregation}$), which can be formulated

148 as:

149 $$E_{aggregation} = \frac{max(VAL_{res\_1}, ...VAL_{res\_n}) - min(VAL_{res\_1}, ...VAL_{res\_n})}{VAL_{res\_1}} \qquad (1)$$

150 In this study the aggregation effect is defined as the maximum difference between the

151 simulated NPP averages between the different resolutions and it is quantified by the

152 difference between maximum NPP average and minimum NPP average of the five

153 resolutions:

154

155 $$E_{aggregation,model} = \frac{max(NPP_{Res1,model}, ...NPP_{Res100,model}) - min(NPP_{Res1,model}, ...NPP_{Res100,model})}{NPP_{Res1,model}} \qquad (2)$$

156

157 This allows a model specific calculation of the effect and is independent of any trends

158 towards the coarser resolution. The difference describes the maximum expected bias by

159 picking one resolution in comparison to the results of another resolution. This calculation is

160 applicable on different spatial or temporal averages.

161 The aggregation effect can also applied on ensemble runs, which is possible in two different

162 ways. $E_{aggregation}$ can be calculate for the resolution specific averages over all models with

163 the formulation:

164 $$E_{aggregation,average} = \frac{max(\overline{NPP_{Res1}}, ...\overline{NPP_{Res100}}) - min(\overline{NPP_{Res1}}, ...\overline{NPP_{Res100}})}{\overline{NPP_{Res1}}} \qquad (3)$$

165 This allows the quantification of the aggregation effect for ensemble runs.

166

167 *2.2 Study area*

168 The study area is the state North Rhine-Westphalia situated in the West of Germany. The

169 state is 34084 km^2 in size with an elevation from 0 to 843 m above sea level, with lower

6

170 plains in the North West and higher elevations in the South-East. The land-use is dominated

171 by agriculture (more than 60 % of the area), but in this study the entire area (including the

172 40 % of forest, urban areas and infrastructure as well as water bodies) was considered to

173 be cropland. To standardize the simulation runs monocultures of either winter wheat

174 (*Triticum aestivum* L.) or silage maize (*Zea mays* L.) were assumed for the entire area.

175 The driving daily weather data are provided at five different resolutions (1, 10, 25, 50 and

176 100 km grid cells), while soil data (typical soil type) and management (good agricultural

177 practice) were assumed to be constant during the study period and over the entire study

178 area. The chosen soil type is a sandy loam, which is typical for this region and the

179 management includes ploughing, sowing, harvest and three (130, 52, 26 kg ha^{-1}) and two

180 (30, 208 kg ha^{-1}) fertilizer applications during spring for wheat and maize, respectively (for

181 details see Hoffmann et al., 2015). The models were not calibrated for the study area, but

182 were adjusted based on 30-year yield averages (1982-2011) of about 8 t ha^{-1} for winter

183 wheat and 14 t ha^{-1} for silage maize. The weather data, presented and discussed by Zhao

184 et al. (2015) and Hoffmann et al. (2015), show a 30 year average temperature of 9.7 °C, an

185 average annual precipitation of 899 mm and mean annual global radiation of 3758 MJ m^{-2}

186 a^{-1} (1982-2011) with the standard deviations of 1.2 °C, 214.0 mm a-1 and 169.4 MJ m^{-2} a^{-1},

187 respectively. The coldest year was 2004 with an average temperature of 8.9 °C and the

188 warmest year was 1983 (11.2 °C). The driest year was 2001 with 516.2 mm precipitation.

189 All coarser resolutions of the weather data were based on the grid cells of the 1 km resolution

190 for daily time steps. The data show a decrease of temperature (from 9.7 °C to 9.4 °C) and

191 precipitation (from 899 mm to 824 mm) starting from the 1 km resolutions towards the

192 coarsest resolution of 100 km.

193

194 *2.3 Modelling applications*

195 There are three different approaches using different model settings to analyse the impact of

196 different processes contributing to the simulation of NPP. In a first approach, no limitations

197 to growth factors, other than temperature and radiation, are simulated explicitly (switched

198 off or compensated in all models). We denote this potential, non-limited growth, potential

199 NPP or PN. The second approach considers only water-limitation (WN), while the third

200 approach considers nitrogen and water limitation (NN). The way limitations are switched off

201 differs between the models. Some models switched off the stress factors, other models

202 compensated the stress by providing additional water and nutrient applications.

203 The settings for management are presented by Hoffmann et al. (2015). The sowing date is

204 fixed for all models, while for harvest only a latest date is suggested (if the phenological

205 model does not determine maturity before this date, there will be an automatic harvest).

206

207 *2.4 Models*

208 Eleven models participated in this study; eight crop models and three biogeochemical

209 models (Table1). All models provide data on a daily time step (except CENTURY which uses

210 a monthly time step), consider the complete range of management practices (except AgroC

211 that does not consider nitrogen limitation) and provide simulations for the two considered

212 crops, wheat and maize (except COUP that only simulates wheat). The growing season for

213 the crop models is determined by internal phenological models based on a fixed sowing

214 date, while the three biogeochemical models CENTURY, DailyDayCent and

215 LandscapeDNDC and the crop model STICS also used a fixed harvest date (i.e. fixed length

216 of the growing season).

217 Five of the models determine NPP based on the radiation use efficiency concept (AgroC,

218 APSIM, APSIMmod., COUP, LINTUL, STICS), while other models determine NPP based on

219 the difference between gross primary production and respiration (HERMES, MONICA),

220 calculated directly (DailyDayCent) or other approaches (LandscapeDNDC). More details

221 about the models are provided in Hoffmann et al. (2015).

222

223 Table 1: List of the participating models.

No.	Model	References
1	HERMES	Kersebaum 2007, 2011
2	APSIM	Keating et al. 2003; Holzworth et al. 2014
3	COUP	Conrad & Fohrer 2009; Jansson & Karlberg 2004
4	DailyDayCent	Del Grosso et al. 2001, 2006; Parton et al. 2001; Yeluripati et al. 2009
5	LandscapeDNDC	Haas et al. 2012; Kraus et al., 2014
6	LINTUL	Van Ittersum et al. 2003; Shibu et al. 2010
7	MONICA	Nendel et al. 2011
8	STICS	Bergez et al. 2013; Brisson et al. 1998, 2008
9	APSIMmod	Chen et al. 2010; Keating et al. 2003; Wang et al. 2002
10	CENTURY	Parton et al., 1993, 1995
11	AgroC	Herbst et al., 2008

224

225

226 *2.5 Evaluation of aggregation effects over different time periods*

227 The simulation results (NPP averages over the entire study area) were averaged over

228 different periods (1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 29 years) to examine the maximum differences

229 between the five resolutions as influenced by the different temporal scales. The number of

230 averages considered varies for the different time periods (29, 6, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1, respectively).

231 The analysis for the periods 20 and 25 years were applied twice, covering mainly the first

232 and the last years with some data overlap. The results are presented as the mean

233 aggregation effect as well as the maximum aggregation effect between the five resolutions.

234

235 *2.6 Vulnerability Analysis*

236 Vulnerability and risk are terms that are widely used in different communities and described

237 in different contexts with different definitions. In this study we use an approach developed

238 by van Oijen et al. (2014), designed to investigate impacts of extreme weather events on

239 carbon dynamics. The approach, based on an abiotic definition of extreme periods,

240   compares the impacts on a chosen biotic ecosystem variable on the defined "extreme" or

241   "hazardous" and "not extreme" or "non-hazardous" conditions. Van Oijen et al. (2014) chose

242   the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index (SPEI), developed by Vicente-

243   Serrano et al. (2010), as the abiotic factor separating hazardous from non-hazardous

244   conditions. SPEI is a drought index based on the difference between potential

245   evapotranspiration and precipitation. If the precipitation exceed the potential

246   evapotranspiration for the given time period, SPEI shows positive values, while negative

247   values represent a water deficit based on the calculated difference and indicate a drought

248   impact. There is no fixed threshold, which defines an extreme drought impact or growth

249   reducing conditions and SPEI can be calculated for any duration. The index is normalized

250   and normal distributed. The average is about 0 for the considered period of 1982-2011 with

251   64 % of the values between -1 and +1 and 19 % below -1 for the 1 km resolution. These

252   statistics stay the same for all resolutions, with the exception of the number of values in the

253   -1 to +1 interval, which drops down to 63 % for the 100 km resolution. The potential

254   evapotranspiration can be calculated with different approaches, while in this study the

255   method developed by Thornthwaite (1948) is used.

256   SPEI is one of the indices that considers both, precipitation and temperature in the

257   calculation, rather than only precipitation, but is still easy to apply, which makes it an

258   attractive index to use in this study.. Van Oijen et al. (2014) suggest two thresholds to

259   separate hazardous from non-hazardous conditions: SPEI < -1 and SPEI < -2. For the actual

260   study region there is only a small number of SPEI values below -2, so SPEI < -1 was chosen

261   as the threshold. Following van Oijen et al. (2014), the period to calculate the SPEI is

262   restricted to half a year. In contrast to the approach of van Oijen et al. (2014), who suggested

263   the period April-September, the period February – July was used in this study to better reflect

264   the crop growth period. The system variable used in this study is NPP.

265 Vulnerability (*V*) describes a possible damage/impact on a system and the risk (*R*) is
266 described by the product of the probability (*P*) that a hazardous event (*H*) occurs and its
267 impact on the system.

268

269 $R = P(H) \cdot V$ (2)

270

271 This equation represents the relation between probability, and vulnerability and can be
272 expressed by using the reduction of the NPP by the hazardous periods, described as risk:

273

274 $R = E(NPP|non - hazardous) - E(NPP)$ (3)

275

276 *E(NPP|non-hazardous)* is the average value of NPP for all grid cells and years with a SPEI
277 ≥ -1 and *E(NPP)* is the overall average of NPP (including both, hazardous and non-
278 hazardous conditions). The vulnerability describes the difference of the NPP averages for
279 the non-hazardous and the hazardous years and grid cells.

280

281 $V = E(NPP|non - hazardous) - E(NPP|hazardous)$ (4)

282

283 **3 Results**

284

285 *3.1 NPP differences between the models*

286 The different model simulations of NPP are compared for the 1 km grid resolution, which is
287 considered to be the "best" result for each model separately and thus used as the baseline.
288 The results for wheat vary for the different models with mean values for 29 years of
289 simulation 1.9 - 4.2 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}, 1.9 - 4.1 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} and 1.8 – 4.1 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} NPP for PN,
290 WN and NN, respectively (Figure 1). The simulation results of STICS and AgorC show the
291 highest variation over the 29 years, while the results of COUP and LandscapeDNDC vary
292 only within a narrow range. Some of the models are sensitive to water limitation (e.g. COUP),

11

293   which is reflected by the differences between the PN and the WN approach (Figure 1), other

294   models show minimal impacts of water limitation (e.g. STICS). The spatial distribution of the

295   results shows a dependency on elevation (Figure 2). However, the spatial distribution of high

296   and low NPP values is different between the models. While most models show higher NPP

297   values for low elevation and lower values in the higher elevations, the other group of models

298   (AgroC, COUP, LINTUL, APSIM and APSIMmod) show the opposite spatial separation of high

299   and low NPP values.

300   The simulated NPP for maize (7.4 - 12.8 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}, 7.3 - 12.7 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} and 7.2 – 10.0 g

301   C m^{-2} d^{-1} for PN, WN and NN, respectively) show higher maximum values than the NPP for

302   wheat, and indicate an even lower sensitivity to water limitation, which is represented by a

303   comparison of the simulation results of PN and WN (Figure 3). The extreme NPP values for

304   APSIMmod and LandscapeDNDC for wheat and maize, respectively, are outside the range

305   of the other models, but are included in all analyses.

306


307
308
309   Figure 1: Simulated NPP for winter wheat at 1 km resolution for potential growth (PN), under water

310   limitation (WN) and under nutrient and water limitation (NN). The models are in the order HERMES

311   (HE), APSIMmod (A2), COUP (CO), DailyDayCent (DA), LandscapeDNDC (DN), LINTUL (LI),

312   MONICA (MO), STICS (ST), APSIM (AI), CENTURY (CE) and AgroC (AG).

313

314
315

Figure 2: Spatial distribution of the 29 year averages of NPP for the 11 models assuming wheat

mono-culture for the PN approach.

Figure 3: Simulated NPP values for silage maize at 1 km resolution for potential growth (PN),

under water limitation (WN) and under nutrient and water limitation (NN). The models are in the

orgerHERMES (HE), APSIMmod (A2), DailyDayCent (DA), LandscapeDNDC (DN), LINTUL (LI),

MONICA (MO), STICS (ST), APSIM (AI), CENTURY (CE) and AgroC (AG).

3.2 Model specific aggregation effect

The aggregation effect as described in equation 1 shows a range for all models of 0.4 – 7.8

% and 0 - 4.8 % for wheat and maize, respectively (Table 2). The analysis of the medians

shows slightly larger aggregation effects with 0.3 – 11.4 % and 0.0 – 10.0 % for wheat and

13

maize, respectively (Table 2). There are no obvious trends in the changes of NPP from the 1 km resolution to 100 km resolution, neither for the crops nor for the different models (Figures 4 and 5). However, the models LandscapeDNDC, MONICA, CENTURY and DailyDayCent show relatively small changes (< 1.2 %) for both crops, and HERMES for the wheat simulations, while APSIM, APSIMmod and AgroC show relatively high aggregation effects (more than 4.8 %) between the different scales. The aggregation effect varies between the models as does the trend. While APSIMmod, LINTUL, AgroC and APSIM show increasing NPP values towards coarser resolutions for the wheat simulations, HERMES, MONICA, CENTURY and DailyDayCent show decreasing NPP. The simulation results of COUP and STICS show no trend, but a minimum NPP averages for the resolutions of 10 km and 50 km, respectively. The median is affected for some models, especially for the maize simulations, more than the average values and most models show stronger changes for WN and NN than for PN (Table 2). The results for maize support the findings of the wheat simulations, but the scale effect is smaller and effect and trends differ for some models between the two crops. HERMES and DailyDayCent show minimal differences between the resolutions, while APSIMmod, LINTUL, MONICA, STICS and APSIM show a decreasing trend with AgroC and LandscapeDNDC showing an increasing trend towards coarser resolutions.

The aggregation effect for the model ensemble is calculated for the resolution specific average over all models (equation 3). The effect is below 0.9 % for wheat and 2.0 % for maize, which is below all aggregation effects of the individual models.

354
355
356 Figure 4: Simulated NPP of wheat for the potential growth (PN). These boxplots represent the

357 variability over 29 NPP averages over the growing season for the five resolutions (1, 10, 25, 50

358 and 100 km).

359

360

361 Figure 5: Simulated NPP of maize for the potential growth (PN). These boxplots represent the

362 variability over 29 NPP averages over the growing season for the five resolutions (1, 10, 25, 50

363 and 100 km).

364

365 Table 2: Relative maximum differences of NPP averages (AVG) and median (MED) between the

366 five resolutions [%]. The values represent the simulation results of wheat (W) and maize (M) for the

367 three approaches (PN, WN, NN). All differences are related to the resolution with the lowest NPP

368 average. The models are HERMES (HE), APSIMmod (A2), COUP (CO), DailyDayCent (DA),

369 LandscapeDNDC (DN), LINTUL (LI), MONICA (MO), STICS (ST), APSIM (AI), CENTURY (CE)

370 and AgroC (AG). Changes of greater 3 % are highlighted by grey boxes.

371

|	HE	A2	CO	DA	DN	LI	MO	ST	AI	CE	AG
AVG W PN	0.9	5.0	2.2	1.1	n.s.	4.7	0.8	2.0	4.9	0.9	7.8
AVG W WN	0.8	4.8	2.2	0.7	0.2	2.4	1.1	1.8	4.8	0.8	7.8
AVG W NN	0.5	5.4	2.2	0.5	1.6	3.0	1.2	2.0	5.4	0.7	n.s.
AVG M PN	1.3	2.0	n.s.	0.1	1.3	2.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	0.0	3.2
AVG M WN	1.3	2.0	n.s.	0.3	1.2	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.0	0.5	3.5
AVG M NN	4.8	2.0	n.s.	1.2	2.8	1.7	1.5	2.0	2.0	0.6	n.s.
MED W PN	0.9	4.9	2.2	1.0	n.s.	4.7	0.8	2.0	4.9	0.9	7.8
MED W WN	1.5	7.8	2.3	1.8	0.3	3.2	2.9	2.1	7.8	1.4	11.4
MED W NN	0.9	8.8	2.3	1.6	1.0	3.8	3.0	2.3	8.8	1.3	n.s.
MED M PN	0.7	10.0	n.s.	0.1	2.8	8.7	3.8	3.3	10.0	0.0	3.1
MED M WN	0.7	10.0	n.s.	0.5	2.7	10.0	3.3	3.7	10.0	0.3	3.9
MED M NN	4.0	10.0	n.s.	0.7	5.5	8.8	3.3	3.8	10.0	0.3	n.s.

372 n.s. not simulated
373

374 *3.3 Aggregation effect over different time periods*

375 The impact of scales is also tested for periods shorter than 29 years (Figure 6 and 7). The

376 simulation results are averaged for each time step (according to the considered period of 1,

377 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 years) over the entire area (for each resolution separately). While the

378 maximum aggregation effect is strongest for a single year and does not change greatly for

379 periods of 10 years or longer, the average aggregation effect stays almost the same, but

380 decreases for the 29 year period. The effects are the same for all models for both crops

381 (Figure 6 and 7), but the values differ.

382
383 Figure 6: The relative differences between the maximum and minimum NPP (wheat PN) between

384 the resolutions for data averaged over different time periods (annual to 29 year averages). On the

385 left side the differences are averaged for each period, while the right side shows the maximum

386 values for each period.

387

388
389 Figure 7: The relative differences between the maximum and minimum NPP (maize PN) between

390 the resolutions for data averaged over different time periods (annual to 29 year averages). On the

391 left side the differences are averaged for each period, while the right side shows the maximum

392 values for each period.

393

394 Table 3: Minimum and maximum average length of the growing season of wheat for each

395 resolution (overall averages) as determined in the different models. The shortest length represents,

396 in all cases, the length of the growing season for resolution of 1km and longest growing season

397 was for all models the resolution of 100 km.

398

model	min. length [d]	max. length [d]	change [d]
HERMES	256.1	257.6	1.5
APSIMmod	249.9	253.9	4.0
COUP	239.3	241.7	2.4
LINTUL	243.9	249.1	5.2
MONICA	259.5	261.1	1.6
STICS	236.4	239.0	2.6
APSIM	254.7	257.1	2.4
AgroC	238.2	243.3	5.1

399

400 The NPP values in this study represent NPP during growing season. Length of growing

401 season varies between the different models and the different years (Table 3), because of

402 different phenological sub-models and inter-annual variations of temperature. As already

403 mentioned, the date for the latest possible harvest is fixed and this date is used as actual

404 harvest by the models CENTURY, DailyDayCent and LandscapeDNDC. The highest

405 differences between the lengths of the growing season are observed for LINTUL and AgroC,

406 while there are relative little changes for HERMES and MONICA.

407

408 *3.4 Vulnerability analysis*

409 The results of the vulnerability analysis are represented in Figures 8 and 9, showing

410 vulnerability (grey bars) and the risk (black bars) for each model and resolution. Negative

411 values indicate a higher NPP average for hazardous conditions than for the non-hazardous

412 conditions (vulnerability) or a higher NPP for the overall average than for the non-hazardous

413 conditions (risk). The analysis shows positive values for vulnerability and risk for all

414 simulation results of wheat, except for DailyDayCent and the two APSIM models (Figure 8).

415 The values between the different resolutions vary for the different models. The vulnerability

416 analysis for the maize simulations shows a negative risk and vulnerability for

417 LandscapeDNDC, while LINTUL and DailyDayCent vary between the resolutions (Figure 9).

418 Overall, vulnerability and risk differ for most models depending on the resolution, but there

419 is no clear trend for increase or decrease of vulnerability or risk towards coarser resolution.

420 The average risk for wheat simulations is about 0.02 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} ± 0.02 g C m^{-2} d^{-1}, with no

421 trend between the different resolutions and the average vulnerability of 0.13 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} with

422 a standard deviation of 0.10 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} shows also no clear trend. The differences of

423 vulnerability between the five resolutions show the maximum difference between 1.6 % for

424 CENTURY and 12.8 % for LINTUL (maximum difference relative to the average NPP of

425 resolution of 1 km) for wheat and between 1.1 % (CENTURY) to 15.5 % (MONICA) for

426 maize. In these calculations the models AgroC, APSIM, APSIMmod and DailyDayCent for

427 wheat and APSIMmod, LandscapeDNDC and LINTUL for maize are not considered,

428 because the results of these models indicate no vulnerability to drought under these

429 conditions. In contrast to wheat, the vulnerability analysis of maize shows mainly negative

430 values (Figure 9), except for STICS and AgroC (positive values), and DailyDayCent and

431 LINTUL (varying values). The number of values (cells and years with a SPEI < -1) may affect

432 the results, but the number of extreme cells (based on SPEI) is within a narrow range of

433 17.6 – 18.2 % for the different resolutions, so the relative numbers of hazardous cells stays

434 about the same.

435

436
437 Figure 8: Vulnerability (grey bar) and risk (black bar) for 11 models for water limitation simulation

438 results of NPP (WN). The results represent the simulation results for wheat for the period 1983-

439 2011. The terms vulnerability and risk are used in the definition by van Oijen et al. (2014) and

440 describe the impacts of hazardous in comparison to non-hazardous conditions (see also section

441 2.6).

442
443

444
445 Figure 9: Vulnerability (grey bar) and risk (black bar) for 10 models simulated for water limitation

446 considered (WN). The results represent the simulation results for maize for the period 1983-2011.

447 The terms vulnerability and risk are used in the definition by van Oijen et al. (2014) and describe

448 the impacts of hazardous in comparison to non-hazardous conditions (see also section 2.6).

449

450 **4 Discussion**

451

452 *4.1 NPP differences between the models*

453 The simulated potential NPP averages of the growing season for the 1 km resolution range

454 from 1.8 to 4.1 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} and 7.4-12.8 g C m^{-2} d^{-1} for wheat and maize, respectively, which

455 is higher than annual NPP averages of European croplands (550 ± 50 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1}; Schulze

456 et al., 2010)and this is expected for crops in the study region. Because the 1 km grid maps

457 are the highest resolution, we assume these data as the most accurate of the available data

458 and use these data as baseline, because detailed measurements with crop yields in its

459 spatial distribution are missing. As mentioned, the results base on simulation runs of

460 uncalibrated models, but adjusted to proxies for a 30 year average of crop yield. In spatial

461 modelling data for calibration are rarely available or, if available, often restricted to one or

462 some point measurements. This makes appropriate calibration for spatial modelling difficult

463 and adjustment to a 30 year is an appropriate method to set up the model. The two models

464 with low NPP for wheat (APSIMmod) and high NPP for maize (LandscapeDNDC) are most

465 likely under- and over-estimates of NPP, because of the lack of calibration. As the results

466 are not unrealistic for crop yields in central Europe, the results from both models are used

467 in the analysis. The NPP differs between the models up to 2.3 and 5.4 g C m^{-2} yr^{-1} for wheat

468 and maize, respectively, while the range for yield, the target variable of the model settings,

469 is with 7.6 to 8.7 t ha^{-1} and 15.4 to 17.6 t ha^{-1} for wheat and maize, respectively, smaller

470 (Hoffmann et al., 2015). As mentioned above, the approaches for calculating NPP are

471 different and by grouping the models according to these approaches of radiation use

472 efficiency, difference between GPP and respiration or direct calculation of NPP reduces the

21

473 differences within the groups. The two exceptions for wheat (APSIMmod) and for maize

474 (LandscapeDNDC) are already mentioned above. This means the model structure affects

475 the NPP and the differences in the structure induce the wide range of NPP averages.

476 A comparison between the PN, WN and NN approaches enables water limitation and

477 nitrogen limitation impacts on NPP to be detected. Nitrogen limitations play a minor role for

478 the study region, because of sufficient fertilization. As Figure 1 shows, the results of the

479 COUP model indicate a strong sensitivity to water limitation (26 - 30 % decrease of average

480 NPP), and LINTUL is also sensitive to water limitation (4.7 - 6.1 % decrease of average

481 NPP), while the other models only show little sensitivity to drought stress on the overall

482 averages (all < 2 % difference). The differences of sensitivity between the models do not

483 show a specific impact on the aggregation affect. Neither the strength of the effect nor the

484 changes between PN and PW are similar to each other or different to the other models.

485 The contradicting spatial distribution of high and low NPP values reflect different crop

486 parameters and phenological sub-models applied in the different models. In contrast to the

487 NPP, the distribution of yield does not necessarily show a similar spatial pattern in the study

488 area. These differences between NPP and yield are related to the different impacts of

489 temperature changes on the simulation of phenological stages, which affects the lengths of

490 the growing season differently to the length of the grain filling period. There is additional

491 biomass production of wheat from the extension of the growing season, while the grain filling

492 period does not necessarily benefit from warmer climatic conditions. The example shows

493 the results for the year 2003, which was a severe drought period (Ciais et al., 2010) starting

494 from mid-July and was considered by the calculation of the SPEI in the vulnerability analysis.

495 The harvest at lower elevation started before the drought period, while the primary

496 production at higher elevation was affected by the drought. The extension of the growing

497 season allowed an over-compensation of NPP by a growing season that was 53 days longer,

498 while the yield values were affected by drought, which could not be compensated for by a 7

499　day longer grain filling period. Both day of anthesis and day of maturity are determined based

500　on temperature sums by the phenological model. For warmer areas, both will be earlier in

501　the year compared to colder areas during the same period. In contrast, biomass production

502　benefits from an extension of the growing season, due to additional days of production.

503　However, the period between anthesis and maturity (both dates are represented by

504　averages overall years and grid cells per resolution) is up to 5 days shorter when coarser

505　resolution data are used for all models (Table 3). The models with the higher NPP in the

506　higher elevated areas show the largest scale effect, which reflects a sensitive reaction of

507　the phenological models to temperature changes. Van Bussel et al. (2011) reported minimal

508　scale effects on the phenological stages, but these changes have still larger impacts on

509　NPP.

510

511　*4.2 Model specific aggregation effect*

512　The differences between the resolutions of the wheat NPP simulations show three groups

513　of models. APSIM, LINTUL, APSIMmod and AgroC show stronger effects (2.4-7.8 %) than

514　the other models, and HERMES, CENTURY, DailyDayCent and MONICA show minimal

515　impacts (<1.2 %), while COUP and STICS lie between (1.8-2.2 %). The groups of models

516　with medium and strong aggregation effects are all models that determine NPP based on

517　the radiation use efficiency, while the other models use temperature based approaches.

518　Hoffmann et al. (2015) investigated the aggregation effect on yields for the same set of

519　models and suggested that the aggregation effect on radiation may not be much higher than

520　on temperature, but the models might be sensitive to changes in radiation. Despite trends

521　of decreasing temperature and solar radiation at coarser resolution (Figure 2 and Table 2 in

522　Hoffmann et al., 2015), some models show increasing potential NPP values (LINTUL,

523　APSIMmod and AgroC for wheat and DailyDayCent, LandscapeDNDC and AgroC for

524　maize). These contradictory trends are also related to an extended growing season caused

by different approaches for the calculation of the phenological stages. Therefore, decreasing temperatures affect an extension of the growing season which compensates, or over-compensates, the effect of lower temperatures and radiation on crop growth as already discussed above. The growing season is extended by 1.5 to 5 days on average at coarser resolutions for wheat, and 1-2 days on average for maize simulations (Table 3), accompanied by a temperature decrease of 0.3°C (Hoffmann et al., 2015). As the model structure differs, the models show a different sensitivity to this effect and differ in their trends through the different resolutions. These results concur with the findings by van Bussel et al. (2011), who found only small impacts of climate aggregation on determined phenological stages. The models APSIMmod, LINTUL and AgroC showed the longest (4-5 days) extension to the average growing season towards the coarser resolutions, while all other models showed lower extensions (<2.5 days). The models with the larger aggregation effects are the same models that show large differences in the length of the growing season. The findings of the overall aggregation effect on NPP agrees to the findings of Nungesser et al. (1999), who found a mean uncertainty of < 2 % on NPP by modifying precipitation and solar radiation for resolutions of 10 and 50 km. The average differences for the wheat NN approach in this study (1.2 %) is also in this range, but includes a large increase for AgroC of up to 3.3 %. Pierce and Running (1995) determined an aggregation error of 15 – 30 %, depending on the time step, while the maximum time period is one year and the higher values are related to impacts on daily NPP. The relative small aggregation effect agrees also to the findings of de Wit et al. (2005), who found only small impacts of climate data aggregation on yield. Hoffmann et al. (2015) analysed the aggregation effect for yield and found an uncertainty of 0.2 t ha^{-1} (30 year average, over the entire study area and considering the simulation results of 13 models), which is about 2.5 % to the determined yield. A comparison with the maximum aggregation effects on yield for each model shows 4.2 - 8.4 % and 3.6 – 7.6 % for wheat PN and WN, respectively, higher impacts on yield than

for NPP, but also only small changes of the aggregation effect between the PN and WN simulations. Despite the high differences of precipitation between the five resolutions, the aggregation effect do not change strongly for the approaches WN and NN. For most models the aggregation effect even decrease. This can be explained by the little relevance of drought and nitrogen limitation for long term averages in the considered region. In regions with higher drought or nutrient stress the aggregation effect might be higher. The region is picked to represent an agricultural managed area in central Europe and the results can be transferred to comparable regions. Regions of other climate conditions (higher drought stress) or with different management practices (higher nutrient stress) might show different aggregation effects and further work needs to be done in upcoming studies to get a conclusive answer on this.

The differences between the aggregation effect for the average and the median NPP reflects the impacts on the variance. Changes due to aggregation may be more relevant for more extreme years and show stronger impacts that are levelled out in the average values. It can be assumed that the extremes are more likely to impact negatively on the NPP values, since the maximum growth will be restricted. The strongest differences arising from the aggregation effect on averages and median are detected for models that show a decreasing aggregation effect towards the coarser resolution. The effect may be compensated by the general trend of the NPP values for coarser resolutions.

If the simulation runs are used as ensembles, the aggregation effect are relatively low. For the wheat simulation the aggregation effect is almost as low as the minimal effect on an individual model run and can be explained by the different trends of the individual simulation approaches of the different models. In contrast, the simulations on maize show similar trends from the high resolution to the low resolution for models that show a high aggregation affect, which is reflected in a higher aggregation effect than for the wheat simulation. However, with 2 % is this effect still small.

578 *4.3 Aggregation effect over different time periods*

579 The analysis considered 29 year averages, while the impact of scale increases for shorter

580 time periods (Figures 6 and 7). The scale effect shows the highest differences for single

581 years, and stabilises to constant differences or only minor changes for periods of 15 years

582 and longer. This suggests that the resolution of choice depends on the temporal scale as

583 well as on the research question. The mean uncertainty for longer periods will be below 4

584 %. The maximum aggregation effect for single years can be more than 9 % for wheat and

585 more than 13 % for maize, but will decrease to below 4 % for time periods longer than 10

586 years. While the largest impact on the aggregation for the maximum differences is from 1 to

587 5 years, the mean aggregation effect shows the maximum change for the step from 25 to

588 29 years. The NPP is a non-linear process and is especially affected by extreme events

589 (Reichstein et al., 2013). Extreme weather conditions have an impact for a short period and

590 affect often only a year and can be reduced by spatial averaging of the climate data. This

591 spatial averaging is represented by the higher aggregation effect for the annual data, but

592 this effect is already compensated by averaging over longer time periods. The impact of the

593 temporal averages is represented in the two graphs in figure 7, which shows lower impacts

594 on the averaged short term aggregation effect than on the maximum impact for a year.

595 Pierce and Running (1995) also found changes of the aggregation effect depending on

596 temporal scale. They observed decreasing aggregation errors for increasing periods, which

597 supports our findings. However, their study considers daily to annual time periods and not

598 period lasting 1 – 29 years. An error of 15 % is in agreement with the maximum values of

599 the analysis of the annual aggregation effect, which shows a range of 1.6 – 9.4 % for wheat

600 and 3.4 - 13.6 % for maize.

601

602 *4.4 Vulnerability analysis*

The impact of the the simulated phenological stages is already mentioned earlier in context of other effects, but is also important in the vulnerability analysis through varying the length of the growing season. Van Oijen et al., 2014 suggested the period from April to September as the best period to determine the drought index and found minimal impacts by starting this calculation of the drought index earlier, while we show a strong impact in this study. Van Oijen et al. (2014) used a biogeochemical model with fixed harvest dates for crop simulations or considered simulation results of forests and croplands with a fixed length of the growing season, but the models in this study are mainly crop models with dynamic growing season length. Therefore, in some years, the growing season ends before any drought impacts on crop growth occur, as for the year 2003. Van Bussel et al. (2011) described the scale impact on the modelling of phenological stages as minor, but these changes can affect other processes as, in this case, the impact of a drought period on primary production. In this study the relevant period to define hazardous conditions for the vulnerability analysis is from February to July, which is similar to the length of the growing season for most, but not all, models.

Not all models show sensitivity to the hazardous conditions defined by the SPEI. For the model DailyDayCent, the threshold of the SPEI = -1 is not significant in comparison to the internal drought effects. As the index SPEI is calculated by precipitation and temperature, there might be a discrepancy in the detection of extreme weather events by the APSIM models, which use the radiation use efficiency to determine NPP. In contrast to the vulnerability analysis of wheat, the analysis for maize shows no impact of drought or negative values for vulnerability, with the exceptions STICS and MONICA, because maize is a C_4 plant and is more drought tolerant (Lopes et al., 2011). The comparison of the WN and PN simulation runs support the findings of the vulnerability analysis, as most models show only small differences. Analysis for higher thresholds is not useful for the considered study area, because the number of grid cells for hazardous conditions becomes too small

for solid statistics. Regarding the resolution, the results show either all positive or negative values (HERMES, STICS, CENTURY, APSIMmod, LandscapeDNDC, APSIM, AgroC), or marginal differences to zero vulnerability (DailyDayCent, LINTUL, MONICA). The number of extreme weather events is expected to decrease at coarser scales, but the overall averages show little change between the resolutions. The expected pattern of stronger impacts of extreme events for finer scales with lower impacts at coarser scales is not seen. Assuming a threshold from SPEI = -1 to define drought conditions affects the same ratio of hazardous grid cells for the different resolutions. In contrast to the initial assumption of less extreme events, the number of grid-cells defined as extreme show the same or even higher ratio for the coarser resolution. One reason is the temporal scale for the NPP calculation, which is annual. In the vulnerability analysis the extreme events are defined during the first half of the year, which includes the drought of 2003 which had negative impacts on cropland NPP (Ciais et al., 2010), but not all model results are affected by this drought, because of an earlier harvest. Extreme events, therefore, appear to play a minor role in this area for long term averages.

The aggregation effect is stronger for the vulnerability than for the NPP averages. Despite for AgroC and for the wheat simulation results of APSIMmod the aggregation effect for the vulnerability at least doubles in comparison to the long term averages. The effect might be influenced by fewer years considered in the vulnerability analysis, but the maximum values even exceed the effect for annual averages. This shows that especially periods with extreme weather conditions get stronger affected by the aggregation of climate input data than other years. Over long term averages these impacts may level out.

5 Conclusions

28

654 NPP differs, depending on spatial resolution of climate input data by up to almost 8 % and

655 5 % for wheat and maize, respectively. For most models, the overall averages are affected

656 by only 2 % or less, but for shorter time periods (shorter than 15 years), the aggregation

657 effect may rise for annual NPP to over 9 or over 13 % for wheat and maize, respectively. It

658 is concluded that a large part of the aggregation effect is related to the changes in

659 phenology. The aggregation effect affects the vulnerability stronger than long term averages,

660 which shows the stronger impact of aggregation effects for periods with extreme weather

661 conditions. A finer spatial resolution of climate input data will not greatly improve simulations

662 for long term averages of NPP or vulnerability, but for periods shorter than 15 years, or areas

663 with extreme conditions finer resolution matters and at most differed by 13 % for averages.

664 The biggest changes are detected for the steps from 1 km to 10 km resolution and from 50

665 km to 100 km. The current study suggests that long term NPP averages over large areas

666 (e.g. regional scale) are relatively insensitive to climate data aggregation, whereas data

667 aggregation would influence average NPP under extreme weather conditions. Based on

668 these results there is no need to simulate long term NPP averages for a high resolution, if

669 soil type and management do not vary in time and space. As this is an unrealistic scenario,

670 more work is required to investigate the impacts, for heterogenetic soil types and varying

671 management conditions.

672

Acknowledgements

676

References

678 Beguería, S, Vicente-Serrano SM (2012). Calculation of the Standardised Precipitation-
679 Evapotranspiration Index.

680

681 Bergez JE, Chabrier P, Gary C, Jeuffroy MH, Makowski D, Quesnel G, Ramat E, Raynal
682 H, Rousse N, Wallach D, Debaeke P, Durand P, Duru M, Dury J, Faverdin P, Gascuel-
683 Odoux C, Garcia F (2013) An open platform to build, evaluate and simulate integrated
684 models of farming and agro-ecosystems. Environ Modell Softw 39: 39–49

685

686 Brisson N, Mary B, Ripoche D, Jeuffroy MH, Ruget F, Nicoullaud B, Gate P, Devienne-
687 barret F, Recous S, Tayot X, Plenet D, Cellier P, Machet J, Marc J, Delécolle R (1998)
688 STICS : a generic model for the simulation of crops and their water and nitrogen balances .
689 1. Theory and parameterization applied to wheat and corn. Agronomie 18: 311–346

690

691 Brisson N, Launay M, Mary B, Beaudoin N (2008) Conceptual basis, formalisations and
692 parameterization of the STICS crop model, Quae. ed.

693

694 Cale WG, Oneill RV, Gardner RH (1983) Aggregation error in non-linear ecological
695 models. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 100(3), 539-550

696

697 Chen C, Wang E, Yu Q (2010) Modeling wheat and maize productivity as affected by
698 climate variation and irrigation supply in North China Plain. Agron J 102: 1037-1049

699

700 Conrad Y, Fohrer N (2009) Modelling of nitrogen leaching under complex winter wheat and
701 red clover crop rotation on a drained agricultural field. Physics and Chemistry of the Earth
702 34: 530-540

703

704 Del Grosso SJ, Parton WJ, Mosier AR, Hartman MD, Brenner J, Ojima DS, Schimel DS

705 (2001) Simulated interaction of carbon dynamics and nitrogen trace gas fluxes using the

706 DAYCENT model. In: Schaffer M (Ed.), Modeling Carbon and Nitrogen Dynamics for Soil

707 Management. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, USA, pp. 303–332.

708

709 Del Grosso SJ, Parton W, Mosier AR, Walsh MK, Ojima D, Thornton PE (2006) DAYCENT

710 national scale simulations of N2O emissions from cropped soils in the USA. J. Environ.

711 Qual. 35: 1451–1460

712 Ewert F van Bussel LGJ, Zhao G, Hoffmann H, Gaiser T, Specka X, Nendel C, Kersebaum

713 K-C, Sosa C, Lewan E, Yeluripati J, Kuhnert M, Tao F, Rötter R, Constantin J, Raynal H,

714 Wallach D, Teixeira E, Grosz B, Bach M, Doro L, Roggero PP, Zhao Z, Wang E, Kiese R,

715 Haas E, Eckersten H, Trombi G, Bindi M, Klein C, Biernath C, Heinlein F, Priesack E,

716 Cammarano D, Asseng S, Elliott J, Glotter M, Basso B, Baigorria GA, Romero CC,

717 Moriondo M (2015). Uncertainties in Scaling-Up Crop Models for Large-Area Climate

718 Change Impact Assessments. In: Rosenzweig, C; Hillel, D. Handbook of Climate Change

719 and Agroecosystems. ICP Series on Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation, and Mitigation:

720 Volume 3

721

722 Haas E, Klatt S, Fröhlich A, Werner C, Kiese R, Grote R, Butterbach-Bahl K (2012)

723 LandscapeDNDC: A process model for simulation of biosphere-atmosphere-hydrosphere

724 exchange processes at site and regional scale. Landscape Ecology; DOI:

725 10.1007/s10980-012-9772-x

726

727 Herbst M, Hellebrand HJ, Bauer J, Huisman JA, Šimůnek J, Weihermüller L, Graf A,

728 Vanderborght J, Vereecken H (2008). Multiyear heterotrophic soil respiration: Evaluation of

729 a coupled CO_2 transport and carbon turnover model. Ecological Modelling. 214: 271-283.

730

731 Hoffmann H, Zhao G, van Bussel LGJ, Enders A, Specka X, Sosa C, Yeluripati J, Tao F,

732 Constantin J, Raynal H, Teixeira E, B. Grosz B, L. Doro L, Zhao Z, Wang E, Nendel C,

733 Kersebaum KC, Haas E, Kiese R, Klatt S, Eckersten H, Vanuytrecht E, Kuhnert M, Lewan

734 E, Rötter R, Roggero PP, Wallach D, Cammarano D, Asseng S, Krauss G, Siebert S,

735 Gaiser T, Ewert F (2015). Variability of effects of spatial climate data aggregation on

736 regional yield simulation by crop models. Climate Research, Vol. 65: 53–69.

737

738 Holzworth DP, Huth NI, deVoil PG, Zurcher EJ, Herrmann NI, McLean G, Chenu K, van

739 Oosterom EJ, Snow V, Murphy C, Moore AD, Brown H, Whish JPM, Verrall S, Fainges J,

740 Bell LW, Peake AS, Poulton PL, Hochman Z, Thorburn PJ, Gaydon DS, Dalgliesh NP,

741 Rodriguez D, Cox H, Chapman S, Doherty A, Teixeira E, Sharp J, Cichota R, Vogeler I, Li

742 FY, Wang E, Hammer GL, Robertson MJ, Dimes JP, Whitbread AM, Hunt J, van Rees H,

743 McClelland T, Carberry PS, Hargreaves JNG, MacLeod N, McDonald C, Harsdorf J,

744 Wedgwood S, Keating BA (2014) APSIM – Evolution towards a new generation of

745 agricultural systems simulation. Environmental Modelling & Software

746

747 Jansson PE, Karlberg L (2004) Coupled heat and mass transfer model for soil-plant-

748 atmosphere systems, Royal Institute of Technology, Department of Civil and

749 Environmental Engineering, Stockholm, Sweden, 435 pp. , URL:

750 http://www2.lwr.kth.se/Vara%20Datorprogram/CoupModel/NetHelp/default.htm (last fetch:

751 10.06.2014)

752

753 Keating BA, Carberry PS, Hammer GL, Probert ME, Robertson MJ, Holzworth DP, Huth

754 NI, Hargreaves G, Meinke H, Hochman Z, Maclean G, Verburg K, Snow V, Dimes JP,

755 Silburn M, Wang E, Brown S, Bristow KL, Asseng S, Chapman SC, McCown RL,

756 Freebairn DM, Smith CJ (2003) An overview of APSIM, a model designed for farming

757 systems simulation. Eur J Agron 18: 267-288

758

759 Kersebaum KC (2007) Modelling nitrogen dynamics in soil-crop systems with HERMES.

760 Nutrient cycling in agroecosystems 77: 39-52

761

762 Kersebaum KC (2011) Special features of the HERMES model and additional procedures

763 for parameterization, calibration, validation, and applications In: L.R. Ahuja and L. Ma

764 (ed.): Advances in Agr Syst Modeling Series 2. 65-94

765

766 Li Z, Liu S, Tan Z, Bliss, NB, Young CJ, West TO, Ogle SM (2014). Comparing cropland

767 net primary production estimates from inventory, a satellite-based model, and a process-

768 based model in the Midwest of the United States. Ecological Modelling 277, pp. 1–12

769

770 Lopes MS, Araus JL, van Heerden PDR, Foyer CH (2011). Enhancing drought tolerance in

771 C4 crops. Journal of Experimental Botany, Vol. 62, No. 9, pp. 3135–3153,

772

773 Nendel C, Berg M, Kersebaum KC, Mirschel W, Specka X, Wegehenkel M, Wenkel KO,

774 Wieland R (2011) The MONICA model: Testing predictability for crop growth, soil moisture

775 and nitrogen dynamics. Ecol Model 222: 1614-1625

776

777 Nungesser MK, Joyce MLA, David A (1999). Effects of spatial aggregation on predictions

778 of forest climate change response. Cimate Research, Vol. 11, pp. 109–124

779

780   Pierce LL, Running SW (1995). The effects of aggregating sub-grid land surface variation

781   on large-scale estimates of net primary production. Landscape Ecology vol. 10 no. 4 pp

782   239-253.

783

784   Hemming D, Bettsa R, Collins M (2013). Sensitivity and uncertainty of modelled terrestrial

785   net primary productivity to doubled CO2 and associated climate change for a relatively

786   large perturbed physics ensemble. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology 170, pp. 79–88

787

788   Pan S, Tian H, Dangal SRS, Ouyang Z, Tao B, Ren W, Lu C, Running S(2014).

789   Modeling and Monitoring Terrestrial Primary Production in a Changing Global

790   Environment: Toward a Multiscale Synthesis of Observation and Simulation. Advances in

791   Meteorology. Volume 2014, Article ID 965936, 17

792   pages,http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/965936

793

794   Parton WJ, Scurlock JMO, Ojima DS, Gilmanov TG, Scholes RJ, Schimel DS, Kirchner T,

795   Menaut J-C, Seastedt T, Garcia Moya E, Kamnalrut A, Kinyamario JI (1993). Observations

796   and modeling of biomass and soil organic matter dynamics for the grassland biome

797   worldwide. Global Biogeochem. Cycles 7, 785–809.

798

799   Parton WJ, Scurlock JMO, Ojima DS, Schimel DS, Hall .O (1995). Impact of climate

800   change on grassland production and soil carbon worldwide. Global Change Biol. 1, 13–22.

801

802   Parton WJ, Holland EA, Del Grosso SJ, Hartman MD, Martin RE, Mosier AR, Ojima DS,

803   Schimel DS (2001) Generalized model for NOx and N2O emissions from soils. J.

804   Geophys. Res. 106: 17403-17420

805

806 Raes D, Steduto P, Hsiao TC, Fereres E (2009) AquaCrop-the FAO crop model to

807 simulate yield response to water: ii. Main algorithms and software description. Agron J

808 101: 438-447

809

810 Raes D, Steduto P, Hsiao T, Fereres E (2012) AquaCrop version 4.0 Reference Manual.

811 FAO, Rome. 406p.

812

813 Rastetter EB, King AW, Cosby BJ, Hornberger GM, Oneill RV, Hobbie JE (1992)

814 Aggregating fine-scale ecological knowledge to model coarser-scale attributes of

815 ecosystems. Ecol Appl 2: 55-70

816

817 Reich PB, Turner DP, Bolstad P (1999). An Approach to Spatially Distributed Modeling of

818 Net Primary Production (NPP) at the Landscape Scale and Its Application in Validation of

819 EOS NPP Products. Remote Sensing of Environment 70:69–81

820

821 Reichstein M, Bahn M, Ciais P, Frank D, Mahecha MD, Seneviratne SI, Zscheischler J,

822 Beer C, Buchmann N, Frank DC, Papale D, Rammig A, Smith P,Thonicke K, van der

823 Velde M, Vicca S, Walz A, Wattenbach M (2013). Climate extremes and the carbon cycle.

824 Nature 500, 287-295

825

826 Schulze ED, Ciais P, Luyssaert S, Schrumpf M, Janssen IA, Thiruchittampalam B,

827 Theloke J, Saurat M, Bringezu S, Lelieveld J, Lohila A, Rebmann C, Jung M, Bastviken D,

828 Abril G, Grass G, Leip A, Freibauer A, Kutsch W, Don A, Nieschulze J, Börner A, Gash JH,

829 Dolman AJ (2010). The European carbon balance. Part 4: integration of carbon and other

830 trace-gas fluxes. Global Change Biology 16, 1451–1469, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-

831 2486.2010.02215.x

832

833 Shibu ME, Leffelaar PA, van Keulen H, Aggarwal PK (2010) LINTUL3, a simulation model

834 for nitrogen-limited situations: Application to rice. Eur J Agron 32: 255-271

835

836 Thornthwaite, CW, 1948: An approach toward a rational classification of climate. Geogr.

837 Rev., 38, 55–94.

838

839 van Bussel LGJ, Ewert F, Leffelaar PA (2011). Effects of data aggregation on simulations

840 of crop phenology. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment, 142, 75-84

841

842 Van Ittersum M, Leffelaar P, Van Keulen H, Kropff M, Bastiaans L, Goudriaan J (2003) On

843 approaches and applications of the Wageningen crop models. Eur J Agron 18: 201-234

844

845 Van Oijen M, Thomson A, Ewert F (2009). Spatial upscaling of process-based vegetation

846 models: An overview of common methods and a case-study for the U.K., StatGIS

847 GeoInformatics for Environmental Surveillance., Milos Island, Greece, 17-19 June 2009.,

848 p. 6.

849

850 Van Oijen M, Balkovi J, Beer C, Cameron DR, Ciais P, Cramer W, Kato T, Kuhnert M,

851 Martin R, Myneni R, Rammig A, Rolinski S, Soussana JF, Thonicke K, Van der Velde M,

852 Xu L (2014) Impact of droughts on the carbon cycle in European vegetation: a probabilistic

853 risk analysis using six vegetation models. Biogeosciences, 11, 6357–6375

854

855 Vicente-Serrano SM, Begueria S, Lopez-Moreno JI (2010). A multiscalar drought index

856 sensitive to global warming: the standardized precipitation evapotranspiration index, J.

857 Clim., 23, 1696–1718

858

859 Wallach D, Rivington M, Mearns LO, Antle J (2014). AgMIP White Paper on

860 Characterizing and Quantifying Uncertainty.

861

862 Wang E, Robertson M, Hammer G, Carberry P, Holzworth D, Meinke H, Chapman S,

863 Hargreaves J, Huth N, McLean G (2002) Development of a generic crop model template in

864 the cropping system model APSIM. Eur J Agron 18: 121-140

865

866 Yeluripati JB, Van Oijen M, Wattenbach M, Neftel A, Ammann A, Parton WJ, Smith P

867 (2009) Bayesian calibration as a tool for initialising the carbon pools of dynamic soil

868 models. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 41: 2579–2583

869

870 Zhang X, Izaurrald RC, Manowitz DH, Sahajpal R, West TO, Thomson AM, Xu M, Zhao K,

871 LeDuc SD, Williams JR (2015). Regional scale cropland carbon budgets: Evaluating a

872 geospatial agricultural modeling system using inventory data. Environmental Modelling &

873 Software 63, 199-216

874

875 Zhao G, Hoffmann H, Van Bussel LGJ, Enders A, Specka X, Sosa C, Yeluripati J, Tao FL

876 Constantin J, Teixera E, Grosz B, Doro L, Zhao Z, Nendel C, Kiese R, Raynal H,

877 Eckersten H, Haas E, Wang E, Kuhnert M, Trombi G, Bindi M, Lewan E, Bach M,

878 Kersebaum KC, Rötter R, Roggero PP, Wallach D, Krauss G, Siebert S, Gaiser T, Ewert F

879 (2015) Effect of weather data aggregation on regional crop simulation for different crops,

880 production conditions, and response variables. Clim Res

881

882