

Article (refereed)

Clark, Douglas; Gedney, Nicola. 2008 Representing the effects of subgrid variability of soil moisture on runoff generation in a land surface model. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 113 (D10111). doi:10.1029/2007/JD008940

©2008. American Geophysical Union. All Rights Reserved.

This version available at <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/5176/>

NERC has developed NORA to enable users to access research outputs wholly or partially funded by NERC. Copyright and other rights for material on this site are retained by the authors and/or other rights owners. Users should read the terms and conditions of use of this material at <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/policies.html#access>

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this and the publisher's version remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from this article.

<http://www.agu.org/journals/>

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Representing the effects of subgrid variability of soil moisture on runoff
generation in a land surface model

Douglas B. Clark,

Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, United
Kingdom

Nicola Gedney,

Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research, Met Office, Joint
Centre for Hydrometeorological Research, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: D.B.Clark, CEH Wallingford, Crowmarsh Gifford,
Oxfordshire, OX10 8BB, United Kingdom. E-mail: dbcl@ceh.ac.uk

1 **Abstract**

2

3 Different representations of runoff generation processes were implemented in the MOSES land
4 surface model which is used with mesoscale and global atmospheric models. The standard model
5 was compared with versions in which runoff generation was described by parameterizations based
6 on either the Probability Distributed Model (PDM) or modified forms of TOPMODEL, all of which
7 used probability functions to describe the subgrid distribution of soil moisture. The model results
8 were compared with observed streamflow in three catchments in southern France. After calibration,
9 the PDM- and TOPMODEL-based parameterizations performed substantially better than the
10 standard model. The TOPMODEL approach gave the best results through allowing a more
11 responsive subsurface flow that contributed to peak flows and also better captured the slower
12 changes during recessions. This approach was sensitive to uncertainty in the value of the
13 topographic index. The PDM-based model only changed the calculation of surface runoff and
14 retained the standard description of subsurface runoff, and this limited the possible improvement in
15 performance. In principle the values of the new parameters can be determined from observations,
16 but in practice calibration is likely to be required. However, for each new parameterization, a single
17 set of parameter values was found that performed well in all catchments. The simulated soil
18 moisture and surface heat fluxes during summer dry periods were affected by the choice of runoff
19 parameterization.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 **1. Introduction**

3 Land surface models for use in climate and NWP models have traditionally concentrated on
4 the modeling of the radiative and turbulent fluxes that the atmospheric models require as boundary
5 conditions. Further, there has been a tendency to develop relatively sophisticated one-dimensional
6 models, in which the detail is in the vertical, while ignoring issues of horizontal heterogeneity
7 within a gridbox [*Koster et al.*, 2000]. Both of these historical factors have tended to mean that the
8 generation of runoff is treated very simply in land surface models. However, an unrealistic
9 simulation of runoff can have detrimental effects on the simulation of evaporation [*Koster and*
10 *Milly*, 1997] and hence on the partitioning of the surface energy fluxes. Furthermore, researchers
11 are making increasing use of coupled models, linking atmosphere, land and ocean, in which runoff
12 is a quantity of primary concern.

13 The processes governing the generation of runoff at the scale of a hillslope are complex and
14 vary strongly with time and space. Runoff is often considered to be either surface runoff in which
15 the water flows over the land surface, or subsurface runoff. Surface runoff can be divided into that
16 generated by infiltration excess and saturation excess mechanisms. Infiltration excess runoff occurs
17 when the rainfall rate is greater than that at which the water can infiltrate into the soil. Rainfall in
18 excess of infiltration will then flow downslope as overland flow towards stream channels.
19 Saturation excess overland flow occurs when rain falls onto saturated soil, often in valley bottoms
20 and riparian areas. In either case, water that infiltrates the soil will eventually reach a layer of low
21 permeability, at which point it becomes a downslope subsurface flow. In many catchments aquifers
22 also contribute to the subsurface flow.

23 A coarse resolution land surface model cannot explicitly model the complexities of runoff
24 generation within a catchment and instead aims to represent the major processes via subgrid
25 parameterizations. A popular solution involves the use of probability distribution functions (pdfs) to
26 represent subgrid variability, usually either a pdf of soil storage capacity [e.g., *Dumenil and Todini*,

1 1992; *Wood et al.*, 1992; *Liang and Xie*, 2001] or of topographic characteristics [e.g., *Famiglietti*
2 *and Wood*, 1994; *Stieglitz et al.*, 1997; *Ducharne et al.*, 2000; *Chen and Kumar*, 2001; *Gedney and*
3 *Cox*, 2003]. Both approaches aim to describe the impact of subgrid variability of soil moisture on
4 runoff production.

5 In models that use a pdf of storage capacity, the distribution can be treated as a convenient
6 functional form, as in the VIC model [*Wood et al.*, 1992], but can also be understood in terms of a
7 statistical distribution of connected soil moisture stores and their overall response to rainfall, as in
8 the Probability Distributed Model (PDM, [*Moore*, 1985].) The parameters of the distribution can be
9 found from calibration of the overall runoff model, or an attempt can be made to infer them from
10 physical characteristics of the catchment such as topography and soils [*Dumenil and Todini*, 1992;
11 *Hagemann and Gates*, 2003]. The second type of model is based on TOPMODEL [*Beven and*
12 *Kirkby*, 1979]. The tendency of each location within a catchment to be saturated is estimated using a
13 topographic index λ , defined as $\lambda = \ln(a / \tan \beta)$, where a is the area draining to this location per
14 unit contour length and $\tan \beta$ is the slope of the land surface. The pdf of λ is used to calculate the
15 overall saturated area. *Famiglietti and Wood* [1994] combined TOPMODEL with a land surface
16 model, while *Stieglitz et al.* [1997] developed a simpler version of TOPMODEL for climate models
17 and applied the equations to the single soil column that represented the average state of the
18 catchment.

19 The increasing availability of relatively high resolution fields of terrain height has meant that
20 parameterizations based on the TOPMODEL approach have been implemented in several models
21 [*Ducharne et al.*, 2000; *Chen and Kumar*, 2001; *Habets and Saulnier*, 2001; *Warrach et al.*, 2002;
22 *Niu and Yang*, 2003]. Although TOPMODEL is physically-based, many of the assumptions only
23 hold in certain catchments or at certain times [*Beven*, 1997] and must be regarded as poorer
24 approximations at the scale of climate models.

25 *Habets and Saulnier* [2001] compared the VIC and TOPMODEL-type approaches and found
26 little difference in results, but a study by *Warrach et al.* [2002] found in favor of TOPMODEL.

1 Other studies have compared a TOPMODEL-type approach with simpler schemes and found that
2 the topographic approach gave better estimates of runoff, with improved subsurface flow again
3 being important [*Stieglitz et al.*, 1997; *Chen and Kumar*, 2001].

4 The land surface model used in the present study is the Met Office Surface Exchange Scheme
5 (MOSES, *Essery et al.*, 2003). MOSES has been used with both PDM [*Blyth*, 2002; *Boone et al.*,
6 2004] and TOPMODEL-type parameterizations of runoff [*Gedney and Cox*, 2003], but a
7 comparison of these has not previously been attempted. The present work was motivated by the
8 desire to identify which parameterization better represented observed river flows and complements
9 previous studies by testing a range of model formulations on the same data and presenting
10 sensitivity studies.

11 The remainder of this paper is arranged as follows: Section 2 describes the model and data
12 used, and Section 3 presents results with the standard model. Sections 4 to 6 give the results of
13 alternative parameterizations, before Section 7 provides an overall comparison of the models.
14
15

16 **2. Model, Data and Methodology**

17 **2.1. Description of the Model**

18 Details of MOSES can be found in *Essery et al.* [2003], while a few key features will be
19 highlighted here. The soil is divided into vertical layers and moisture fluxes between layers are
20 modeled using a finite difference approximation to the Richards' equation, with the soil hydraulic
21 characteristics following *Clapp and Hornberger* [1978]. Water drains from the bottom of the soil
22 column at a rate equal to the hydraulic conductivity of the bottom layer. Surface runoff is generated
23 by the infiltration excess mechanism following *Dolman and Gregory* [1992], assuming an
24 exponential distribution of point rainfall rate across the fraction of the catchment where it is raining.
25 Infiltration excess runoff is relatively rare on the gridscale of a climate model, and most runoff from

1 MOSES is via drainage. Alternative parameterizations for runoff generation were introduced, as
2 described below, but all other aspects of the model, including the calculation of infiltration excess
3 runoff, were unchanged.

4

5 **2.2 PDM-based Runoff Scheme**

6 The Probability Distributed Model (PDM) is described by *Moore* [1985] and *Moore and Bell*
7 [2002]. In PDM, the distribution of soil storage capacity within a catchment is modeled by a pdf. In
8 this study each catchment was modeled as a single gridbox and the following development uses the
9 gridbox mean storage S . As precipitation is added to the soil stores, the smaller stores are the first to
10 saturate. The fraction of the gridbox that is saturated can be shown to be

$$11 \quad f_{sat} = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{S - S_0}{S_{max} - S_0} \right)^{\frac{b}{b+1}}$$

12 where S_0 is the minimum storage below which there is no surface saturation, S_{max} is the maximum
13 possible gridbox storage (at saturation) and b is a shape parameter. The interpretation of the value
14 of b in terms of the shape of the pdf is discussed by *Moore* [1985]. Subsequent precipitation on the
15 saturated fraction of the catchment generates surface runoff, which is calculated as shown in the
16 Appendix. Surface runoff can be generated before the entire catchment is saturated, and the amount
17 of runoff depends in part on the antecedent soil moisture. Note that if $S_0=0$, PDM reduces to the
18 form used in several models, including VIC. MOSES_PDM calculated saturation excess surface
19 runoff following PDM and introduced three new parameters. Available data were used to prescribe
20 S_{max} (see Section 4.1), leaving b and S_0 to be calibrated.

21

1 2.3. TOPMODEL-based Runoff Scheme

2 For details of the theory underlying TOPMODEL, see *Beven and Kirkby* [1979] and
3 *Sivapalan et al.* [1987]. In TOPMODEL, the spatial variability of soil moisture is parameterized in
4 terms of the spatial distribution of λ . The saturated hydraulic conductivity, K_s , is assumed to
5 decrease with depth beneath the surface (z) as

$$6 K_s(z) = K_{s0} e^{-fz}$$

7 where K_{s0} is the saturated conductivity at the soil surface and f is a decay parameter. *Chen*
8 *and Kumar* [2001] introduced an anisotropy factor, α , to account for differences of K_s in the vertical
9 and horizontal directions, $K_{sx} = \alpha K_{sz}$ (hereafter, the subscript z is dropped and K_s refers to the
10 vertical direction). Lateral subsurface flow (known as baseflow) occurs at a rate given by

$$11 R_b = \frac{\alpha K_{s0}}{f} e^{-\Lambda} e^{-fz_w} \quad (1)$$

12 where Λ and z_w are the catchment averages of λ and the depth to the water table respectively.
13 Given z_w , the saturated fraction of the catchment can be calculated from the pdf of λ [*Beven and*
14 *Kirkby*, 1979]. For a rainfall rate P (net of interception), saturation excess surface runoff is
15 calculated as

$$16 R_s = f_{sat} P.$$

17 TOPMODEL was implemented in the current work following the approach of *Stieglitz et al.*
18 [1997], and this version of the model was called MOSES_TOP. There was no drainage though the
19 bottom of the soil column and the depth to water table was diagnosed using an equilibrium
20 assumption for the soil water at each timestep, following *Chen and Kumar* [2001]. The baseflow
21 was partitioned between layers beneath the water table according to the transmissivity of each layer.
22 Some previous studies [e.g. *Chen and Kumar*, 2001] calculated evaporation separately for the

1 saturated and unsaturated fractions of the catchment, but MOSES_TOP used the gridbox average
2 soil moisture when calculating transpiration.

3 MOSES_TOP involved several new parameters. Available data were used to prescribe K_{s0}
4 (see Section 5.2) and the two parameters used to describe the pdf of λ , leaving f and α to be
5 calibrated.

6 **2.4 The Study Area, Data Sources and Methodology**

7 This study focuses on three subcatchments of the Rhône basin in southeast France that were
8 also considered as part of the Rhône-AGG experiment [Boone *et al.*, 2004]. Brief details of each are
9 given in Table 1, while their locations can be seen in Fig.1 of Boone *et al.* [2004]. All of the
10 catchments were relatively wet, with annual precipitation in excess of 1200mm and relatively little
11 snowfall.

12 Land surface and soil properties were specified as in the Rhône-AGG experiment.
13 Simulations with MOSES and MOSES_PDM used four soil layers, with total depth equal to the
14 observed catchment-average (typically 2 to 3 m). Simulations with MOSES_TOP used the same top
15 four layers, but added two deeper layers to take the bottom of the soil column to 10m. Each
16 catchment was represented as a single grid box. The areas of the catchments correspond to a length
17 scale of 30-50km, which is sufficiently large to include substantial subgrid variability of surface and
18 soil characteristics. The model was driven by 3-hourly, catchment-average meteorological
19 conditions (see Boone *et al.*, 2004).

20 Model performance was assessed by comparing simulated and observed streamflow. Only the
21 treatment of runoff in the model was altered, hence some of the error in simulations could be a
22 result of deficiencies in other parameterizations. MOSES has no representation of runoff routing in
23 streams, but all parts of the three catchments are closer than one day's travel to the catchment
24 outlet (A.Boone, personal communication, 2003) and the need for explicit consideration of flow
25 routing was avoided by comparing three-day averages of modeled runoff and observed streamflow.

1 The model was spun up by repeatedly simulating the period August 1985 to July 1986 until a quasi-
2 steady state was obtained. Each integration was then continued for three years to July 1989.
3 Calibration used data for August 1986 to July 1987, and August 1987 to July 1989 was used as a
4 validation period to assess the model performance outside the calibration period.

5 The statistic that is used in most of the analysis that follows is the modeling efficiency [*Nash*
6 *and Sutcliffe, 1970*], defined as

$$7 \quad E = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (M_i - O_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (O_i - \bar{O})^2}$$

8 where M_i denotes a modeled value at time i , O_i an observed value, an overbar indicates the average
9 and the sum is over N times. E is a measure of the extent to which the model is an improvement
10 over using the average observed flow, with a perfect model giving $E=1$. The quadratic nature of E
11 means that it is sensitive to outliers, and mistimed peaks result in substantially lower values. The
12 model bias ($\bar{M} - \bar{O}$) and mean absolute error (MAE; $1/N \sum_{i=1}^N |M_i - O_i|$) are also used below.

13 Calibration was performed by specifying a set of values for each parameter, and running the
14 model for all possible combinations of values. This was considered to give reasonable estimates of
15 the optimal parameter values because the response surfaces were relatively smooth.

16

17 **3. Simulations with MOSES**

18 Summary statistics for simulations with MOSES are given in Table 2. On average, MOSES
19 produced more runoff than observed, with a large wet bias in the Ognon. The bias in the Ognon
20 could be reduced by calibrating the soil hydraulic properties, but a substantial bias remained and it
21 was decided to use the soil properties as given for all catchments.

22 Precipitation and observed and modeled streamflow for one year in the Ain are shown in
23 Fig.1a and b. The modeled flow was dominated by drainage (over 99% of the total), with negligible

1 surface runoff. (All runs in the present study produced small amounts of infiltration excess runoff.)
2 The modeled peaks were generally too low and late, consistent with the fact that runoff was largely
3 generated by drainage through the bottom of the soil column, while there was too much flow during
4 recessions. Qualitatively similar results were obtained for all catchments.

6 **4. Simulations with MOSES_PDM**

7 **4.1 Calibration of MOSES_PDM**

8 The pdf of soil storage capacities used in MOSES_PDM is described by the shape parameter
9 b and the storage parameters S_0 and S_{max} . S_{max} was set to $\theta_{sat} z_{pdm}$, where θ_{sat} is the volumetric
10 moisture content at saturation. z_{pdm} is the depth over which soil moisture is considered for PDM and
11 was taken to be 1m. The model was calibrated for each catchment by varying b between 0 and 10,
12 and S_0/S_{max} between 0 and 1. The optimal parameter values are given in Table 3, while Fig.2
13 illustrates the E values. In this figure, MOSES and then three runs of MOSES_PDM are shown for
14 each catchment (the runs with TOPMODEL are considered later). The MOSES_PDM runs are: (1)
15 PDM_0: the best calibrated model with the constraint that S_0 was zero (2) PDM_calib: the best
16 calibrated model for each catchment (3) PDM_best: the single pair of parameter values that, when
17 used for all catchments, gave the best results averaged over the three catchments. In the remainder
18 of this work, such a “best” set of values is termed a “best overall” set. The final group in this figure,
19 labeled “average”, shows the efficiency averaged over the three catchments. (Note that in Fig.2, E
20 for PDM_calib in the Ognon is less than that for the best overall model because E is given for the
21 validation period, not the calibration period.)

22 For the Ain and Ardeche, MOSES_PDM performed substantially better than MOSES. The
23 final set of results in Fig.2 confirms that, on average, MOSES_PDM performed substantially better
24 than MOSES. On average, restricting the model to $S_0=0$ (PDM_0, as used in VIC) still resulted in
25 considerable improvement over MOSES, but non-zero values of S_0 gave better results. It was not

1 surprising that adding a parameter allowed better simulations, but non-zero values of S_0 also make
2 physical sense, as discussed below. The best overall model (PDM_best) had parameter values
3 $S_0/S_{max}=0.75$, $b=10$.

4 The modeled streamflow for the Ain, using the “best overall” parameters, is shown in Fig.1c.
5 Comparison with the MOSES results (Fig.1b) shows that the timing of the peaks was better
6 simulated by MOSES_PDM, but the peaks remained low. Fig.1d shows that subsurface drainage
7 was dominant (over 75%), with saturation excess surface runoff contributing to the peaks.
8 MOSES_PDM also showed excessive flow during recessions, consistent with the fact that drainage
9 was simulated in the same way as by MOSES. The lower infiltration with PDM was largely
10 balanced by reduced drainage, and total runoff was very similar between runs with and without
11 PDM.

12 **4.2 Sensitivity of MOSES_PDM**

13 The sensitivity of MOSES_PDM to parameter values is illustrated by the whiskers shown
14 next to PDM_best in Fig.2. These show the effects of varying S_0 by $\pm 10\%$ about its value in the best
15 overall model. The sensitivity to b was too small to be plotted in this way. In every catchment, the
16 sensitivity was sufficiently small as to mean that the “best overall” parameters gave better results
17 than MOSES.

18 These results are best interpreted with the help of Fig.3, which shows the response surface for
19 the Ain. Small values of S_0 meant that nearly every rainfall event would result in surface runoff, in
20 which case $b < 1$ was best (relatively more larger stores – see *Moore* [1985]) since this gave a
21 smaller saturated fraction and reduced the size of the runoff peaks. The highest efficiency was
22 found with $S_0/S_{max} \sim 0.7$, meaning that no saturation excess runoff was generated until the soil was
23 70% saturated. This gave good results by generating surface runoff to augment large peaks of
24 streamflow when the catchment was very wet, while not generating any surface runoff over a drier
25 catchment. This seems reasonable, since for many dry catchments one would expect there to be

1 little or no saturated area (outside channels) and a rainfall event could all be absorbed by the soil
2 without any surface runoff. $S_0/S_{max} \sim 0.7$ favoured larger values of b (relatively more small stores)
3 since these tend to give more runoff during the peak flows. As small b or large S_0 increased the ratio
4 of subsurface to surface runoff, the best runs in Fig.3 were all dominated by subsurface flow.

5 The simpler parameterization with $S_0=0$ was very sensitive to b and an advantage of allowing
6 larger values of the threshold S_0 was that this sensitivity was reduced, particularly for $S_0/S_{max} \sim 0.7$.
7 In all catchments the response surface of E showed slow variation around the optimum. This meant
8 that the simulation for a given catchment was not critically dependent upon the exact parameter
9 values and, more importantly, it was possible to identify a “best overall” set of parameters.

10 **4.3 A Priori Estimation of Parameter Values for MOSES_PDM**

11 The values of b can be set by calibration [e.g. *Warrach et al.*, 2002] or may be considered
12 constant over all catchments [e.g. *Habets et al.*, 1999]. Other studies have attempted to link the
13 parameters of PDM-like models to physical characteristics. *Dumenil and Todini* [1992] calculated
14 b as a simple function of the subgrid standard deviation of elevation, so that hilly terrain gave a
15 larger value of b and would tend to give more runoff. *Hagemann and Gates* [2003] used a soil
16 dataset to characterize the subgrid distribution of soil storage and fitted a pdf to this.

17 In the present work, the relatively low sensitivity of MOSES_PDM to parameter values meant
18 that both methods for estimating values *a priori* gave reasonable results. However, better results
19 were obtained by using a single set of calibrated parameters for all catchments. Moreover, both *a*
20 *priori* methods are potentially sensitive to the resolution of the data used. More catchments would
21 need to be studied to determine if there is any useful relationship between parameter values and
22 catchment characteristics, and in the meantime we propose to use the “best overall” parameters for
23 all catchments.

24

25

1 **5. Simulations with MOSES_TOP**

2 **5.1 Estimation of parameters of the topographic index**

3 The pdf of λ for each catchment was modeled as a two-parameter gamma distribution, using
4 the HYDRO1K global dataset (<http://edc.usgs.gov/products/elevation/gtopo30/hydro>) to calculate
5 the mean (Λ) and standard deviation (σ_λ) of λ for each catchment. These statistics are sensitive to
6 the resolution of the elevation data used [e.g., *Wolock and Price*, 1994; *Zhang and Montgomery*,
7 1994; *Saulnier et al.*, 1997; *Kumar et al.*, 2000; *Wolock and McCabe*, 2000; *Ibbitt and Woods*,
8 2004; *Bormann*, 2006; *Pradhan et al.*, 2006]. Generally Λ decreases as finer resolution data are
9 used, while *Kumar et al.* [2000] showed that σ_λ also decreases. For global or other large-scale
10 applications, data on a 1 km grid (such as HYDRO1K) are often used, but *Ibbitt and Woods* [2004]
11 suggested that data at much greater resolution would be required to estimate the “true” value. Figure
12 4 summarises the results of several published estimates of how Λ varies with grid size. These
13 studies have considered different locations and there is considerable scatter between the results. In
14 general there appears to be a modest decrease of Λ down to grid sizes of the order of 100m, with a
15 much larger rate of decrease for smaller grid sizes. *Ibbitt and Woods* [2004] and *Pradhan et al.*
16 [2006] have considered how a theory for downscaling might be developed, but as yet there is no
17 robust method with which to adjust Λ .

18 Far from it being the case that Λ has a value that can be defined via readily-available
19 topographic data, the value of Λ is highly uncertain. Some studies authors have acknowledged the
20 scale-dependence of Λ , and have attempted to correct for it. For example, *Chen and Kumar* [2001]
21 downscaled from 1km to 90m, while *Niu and Yang* [2003] downscaled from 1km to 100m.
22 However, Fig.4 suggests that estimates of Λ may continue to vary to much smaller scales. This
23 uncertainty in Λ is important because, as will be shown later, variations in Λ of this size can result
24 in substantially different model performance.

1 In the current work, the simple relationship $\Lambda = \Lambda_{1000}^{-5}$ was used to calculate Λ from the
2 HYDRO1K value of Λ_{1000} . This arbitrary rule was intended to capture some of the behaviour shown
3 in Fig.4 as the grid size decreases from 1km to of the order of 10m. Implicit in this approach was
4 the assumption that there is a “correct” value of Λ , which might be determined with high resolution
5 data. This gave values of 7.6, 6.0 and 7.3 for the Ain, Ardeche and Ognon respectively. No attempt
6 was made to account for the effect of data resolution on σ_λ . The calculated values of Λ are clearly
7 subject to large uncertainty and the sensitivity of the models to the value of Λ is explored below.

8 **5.2 Calibration of MOSES_TOP**

9 Existing global datasets generally do not contain enough information to specify a vertical
10 profile of K_s . Previous studies have adopted a variety of approaches to relate a given value of K_s to a
11 surface value (K_{s0}) and the decay parameter f [Stieglitz *et al.*, 1997; Chen and Kumar, 2001;
12 Warrach *et al.*, 2002; Decharme *et al.*, 2006]. For the current work, the value of K_s that was
13 provided for each catchment was assumed to be the average down to a depth of 2m (results were not
14 particularly sensitive to this depth). The value of K_{s0} was then calculated for each value of f . This
15 resulted in relatively large values of K_s close to the surface, consistent with the existence of
16 macropores and less compacted soil in these layers.

17 MOSES_TOP was calibrated by varying f over the range 1 to 9, and α over the range 1 to 100.
18 This range of α was motivated by results in the literature. Chen and Kumar [2001] used a value of
19 2000, found by calibration, while Niu and Yang [2003] used values in the range 10-20. In a review
20 of published results, largely from laboratory and pumping tests, Kumar [2004] noted values in the
21 range of 0.4 to 562, with most studies suggesting a maximum of less than 100.

22 The calibrated parameter values are shown in Table 4. Again, it was possible to identify a
23 single set of parameters that gave good results in all catchments: $f=3.0$, $\alpha=100$. The values of f
24 found by calibration were of the order of 3-4 and were broadly consistent with those found in
25 previous modeling studies [Stieglitz *et al.*, 1997; Chen and Kumar, 2001; Warrach *et al.*, 2002; Niu

1 and Yang, 2003; Decharme et al., 2006], and certainly within the wide range found by Beven [1982]
2 in observations. The last line in Table 4 shows that the decision to restrict α to values of 100 or less
3 did not drastically affect the results.

4 The last two bars in each section of Figure 2 represent E for MOSES_TOP calibrated for each
5 catchment, and MOSES_TOP with “best overall” parameters. Simulations with MOSES_TOP
6 were better than those with MOSES in all catchments, particularly the Ain and Ardeche. The
7 simulated hydrograph shown in Fig.1e confirms that the timing and size of peak flows were well
8 captured by MOSES_TOP, and recessions were also generally well matched. Figure 1f shows that
9 the optimal parameters resulted in runoff that consisted largely of subsurface flow (84%). Although
10 MOSES and MOSES_TOP were both dominated by subsurface flow, the more rapid variations of
11 MOSES_TOP compared much more favorably with the observed streamflow.

12 **5.3 Sensitivity of MOSES_TOP**

13 The sensitivity of MOSES_TOP to the values of f and α is illustrated for the Ain in Fig.5a.
14 With $f=3$, using $\alpha=1$ gave simulations that were much too ‘flashy’ due to low baseflow and a large
15 saturated fraction. A better match to observations was found with larger values of α which gave
16 increased baseflow and smaller saturated fraction. Sensitivity to α was small for $\alpha \geq 200$, but was
17 much greater when α was in the range suggested as physically plausible, namely $\alpha \sim 100$. (This result
18 is sensitive to the value of Λ – see below).

19 Larger values of f gave faster decrease of K_s with depth, which tended to produce a higher
20 water table (i.e. closer to the surface) and greater baseflow. With $\alpha=2000$, using $f=1$ gave a lower
21 water table but low flows were too high and peaks too low. $f=8$ meant the low flows were too small,
22 but the column could wet up quickly, giving large saturated fraction and peak flows that were too
23 great. Hence an intermediate value of f gave best results (Fig.5a).

24 The model’s sensitivity to Λ is summarized in Fig5b, which shows E as a function of $\Delta\Lambda_{1000}$,
25 the amount subtracted from Λ_{1000} . Increasing Λ decreases baseflow by Eq.1 and gives a higher

1 water table. Figure 5b shows that for $f=3$, $\alpha =1000$, sensitivity to Λ was low for values of $\Delta\Lambda_{1000}<-$
 2 2. For $\alpha =100$, $\Delta\Lambda_{1000}<-5$ was required and the standard runs ($\Delta\Lambda_{1000}=-5$) lay in this regime. For
 3 $\alpha=1$, $\Delta\Lambda_{1000}\approx-10$ (c.f. average $\Lambda_{1000}=11.6$) was required to get similarly large E values. This
 4 parameter interdependency is considered further in the next section.

5 **5.4 Interplay Between Parameters of MOSES_TOP**

6 Previous studies with TOPMODEL noted that the same runoff could be obtained in
 7 simulations with different values of Λ , as long as the transmissivity values were adjusted
 8 appropriately [Franchini *et al.*, 1996; Saulnier *et al.*, 1997]. For TOPMODEL, the problem was
 9 often approached in terms of how to adjust Λ so that values of K_{s0} found by calibration could be
 10 applied in models of different gridbox size. In the present work, K_{s0} was set using soil data and in
 11 that sense was removed from the problem. However, the introduction of α means that the terms α
 12 and $e^{-\Lambda}$ in Eq.1 can show similar compensation, assuming the same depth to water table. That is,
 13 considering two simulations with identical values of f , K_{s0} and z_w , but the first uses (Λ_1, α_1) while
 14 the second has the distinct values (Λ_2, α_2) , Eq.1 shows that the same runoff will result if

$$15 \quad \alpha_2 = \alpha_1 \exp(\Lambda_2 - \Lambda_1) \quad (2).$$

16 Franchini *et al.* [1996] show that the assumption of equal z_w is generally valid for TOPMODEL,
 17 and comparisons of simulations confirmed that Eq.2 was also a good approximation for
 18 MOSES_TOP across a wide range of parameter space. This compensation between parameters
 19 explains the family of curves seen in Fig.5b, with the maximum E found at smaller Λ as α
 20 decreases. The large values of α that were found by calibration in Chen and Kumar[2001] may, in
 21 part, have been necessary to adjust for insufficient downscaling of Λ .

22 The TOPMODEL-type parameterization used here is, in some senses, over-parameterized.
 23 The values of α and Λ are highly uncertain, and there is compensation between them. This
 24 motivated Niu and Yang [2003] to develop an alternative parameterization, which is described in
 25 Section 6.2 below.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

6. Alternative TOPMODEL-type Parameterizations

The previous section established that a parameterization based on TOPMODEL gave the best simulations of runoff. TOPMODEL has been implemented in a variety of ways in land surface models. This section considers the sensitivity of our model to aspects of the parameterization.

6.1 Description of MOSES_TOPgc

Gedney and Cox [2003] implemented TOPMODEL in MOSES assuming that the exponential profile of K_s only held below the bottom of the standard soil model at 3m. The standard soil layers were augmented by a deeper layer in which a simplified treatment of soil water was used. In the present work, tests showed that this model was relatively unresponsive because the soil moisture in the deep layer was assumed to all lie below the water table, with a dry layer between this and the bottom of the standard soil model. To produce a more realistic response of the water table, the moisture distribution in the deep layer was taken to be in equilibrium with the drainage at the bottom of the standard soil model. This modified version was used here as MOSES_TOPgc

MOSES_TOP and MOSES_TOPgc differed in terms of the vertical variation of K_s and in the number of soil layers. Both required the parameters f and α to be calibrated, and Λ was set to Λ_{1000-5} .

6.2 Description of MOSES_TOPsim

Niu and Yang [2003] and *Niu et al.* [2005] described a model called SIMTOP that was inspired by the form of TOPMODEL, but was considered simpler. In the present study, this model was implemented as MOSES_TOPsim. The saturated fraction was calculated as

1
$$f_{sat} = f_{max} \exp(-cfz_w)$$

2 where f_{max} is the saturated fraction when the mean depth to the water table is zero, and can be found
3 as the fraction of the catchment with $\lambda \geq \Lambda$. The value of c was found by fitting an exponential
4 distribution to that part of the pdf with $\lambda \geq \Lambda$, where an exponential often gives a good fit [*Woods*
5 *and Sivapalan*, 1997; *Niu et al.*, 2005]. Subsurface runoff is calculated as

6
$$R_b = R_{bmax} e^{-fz_w} \quad (3)$$

7 where the parameter R_{bmax} is the subsurface runoff when the depth to the water table is zero. *Niu et*
8 *al.* 2005] considered that the advantage of using Eq.3 rather than Eq.1 to calculate R_b was that the
9 single, entirely calibrated term R_{bmax} replaced the product of α , K_{s0} , $1/f$ and e^{-A} .

10 MOSES_TOPsim was implemented with four soil layers down to the depth given in the soil
11 dataset. In all other respects, MOSES_TOPsim followed MOSES_TOP.

12 **6.3 Calibration of MOSES_TOPgc and MOSES_TOPsim**

13 Table 4 shows that, after calibration, MOSES_TOPgc performed slightly better than
14 MOSES_TOP. MOSES_TOPgc, for which K_s decays only in the deep layer, favored higher values
15 of f which reduced K_s more quickly in the deep layer. Sensitivity to parameter values was also
16 similar in each model (not shown). In summary, the modifications of *Gedney and Cox* [2003]
17 appear to have largely retained the functioning of a model based on *Stieglitz et al.* [1997].

18 MOSES_TOPsim was calibrated by varying f in the range 0 to 8, and R_{bmax} over $0.5-10 \times 10^{-4}$
19 $\text{kg m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. Table 4 shows that this version of the model could be calibrated to give statistics very
20 similar to those of MOSES_TOP and MOSES_TOPgc. The optimum value of $f=3$ was similar to
21 that found by *Niu et al.* [2005], while $R_{bmax}=1.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ kg m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ was slightly larger, although
22 different catchments were studied. Again, the optimum parameters meant more subsurface runoff
23 (89%) than surface runoff. By equating Eq.1 and Eq.3, using $f=3$ and other values appropriate to the

1 catchments, we find that $R_{bmax}=1.0\times 10^{-3}$ kg m⁻² s⁻¹ is equivalent to $\alpha\approx 250$ on average, which is
2 comparable to the values used for MOSES_TOP.

3

4

5 **7. Intercomparison of models**

6 **7.1 Runoff**

7 The ability of each model to simulate the observed streamflow is summarized in Table 5,
8 while values of E can be compared in Fig.2. In Table 5, values shown are for the best overall
9 parameter values for each model (that is, the parameter values that when used in all catchments
10 gave the largest E averaged over all catchments). For E and MAE , all of the parameterizations
11 scored better than the original MOSES. The best models were MOSES_TOPgc and
12 MOSES_TOPsim. Similar results held for the bias, although MOSES_TOP actually increased the
13 bias. The fact that all statistics tended to improve while calibration considered only E , increases our
14 confidence that the new models are a real improvement. The sensitivity of the calibrated models to
15 changes in parameters around the optima was also broadly similar – as shown in Fig.2 for
16 MOSES_PDM and MOSES_TOP.

17 In view of the remaining uncertainties, and the likelihood of variations between catchments,
18 all the TOPMODEL-type parameterizations can be considered to belong to a “top group” that
19 performed best. The fact that all the TOPMODEL-type formulations can be calibrated to perform
20 similarly is not surprising, given that the process representation is very similar in each. The
21 TOPMODEL approach gave subsurface runoff that could vary more rapidly than the formulation
22 used in MOSES and MOSES_PDM. The longer term behavior in recessions was also captured
23 better, as shown by the autocorrelation of streamflow, which is shown for the Ain in Fig.6. That is,
24 the alternative formulation of subsurface flow in the TOPMODEL-type models was crucial to their
25 superiority, with a lesser contribution from the saturation excess surface flow (although the two are

1 intimately linked). At the scale of these catchments ($>1000 \text{ km}^2$) it is quite possible that, outside of
2 the stream network, subsurface flow is dominant.

3 While the TOPMODEL group introduced alternative ways of calculating both surface and
4 subsurface runoff, MOSES_PDM represented an intermediate class in which only the calculation of
5 surface runoff was altered from MOSES. Consistent with this, results were intermediate between
6 those of MOSES and the TOPMODEL group, although E values were close to those of the latter.
7 For MOSES_PDM, the inclusion of saturation excess surface runoff during rain events greatly
8 improved the simulation of peak flows. The contribution of surface runoff meant MOSES_PDM
9 showed more variation than MOSES over timescales of a few days, but at longer timescales the
10 curve for MOSES_PDM relaxes back onto that for MOSES (Fig. 6), because both simulated
11 drainage in the same way. It seems likely that the performance of MOSES and MOSES_PDM could
12 be improved by altering the representation of subsurface drainage (and calibrating any additional
13 parameters), but this was not investigated here.

14 The new parameterizations tended to perform better than MOSES in the Ain and Ardeche, but
15 their superiority was less marked in the Ognon. In the Ain and Ardeche, the correlation of
16 precipitation and streamflow was greatest when streamflow was lagged by one day (not shown). In
17 the Ognon, the maximum correlation occurred with a lag of 3 days. This simple result could be
18 influenced by several factors, but suggests a difference between the catchments. The nature of this
19 difference is unknown, but possible factors are that the Ognon has extensive limestone and karst
20 [BRGM, 1970, although some is also present in the Ain], and is also the flattest catchment studied.

21

22 **7.2 Soil water and energy balance**

23 The catchments studied here were relatively wet and the various parameterizations tested had
24 relatively little impact on the total runoff or evaporation: soil evaporation was rarely limited by
25 moisture availability and changes in surface runoff were largely balanced by opposite changes in

1 the subsurface. However, moisture stress became more important in drier summers and then the
2 calculated turbulent fluxes were sensitive to the parameterization of subgrid variability. Figure 7a
3 show the soil wetness (expressed as a fraction of saturation) in the top 1m of soil for the Ardeche
4 catchment during part of 1986. (MOSES, MOSES_PDM and MOSES_TOPgc simulated similar
5 soil wetness during this period, so only MOSES is shown. Similarly, MOSES_TOPsim was similar
6 to MOSES_TOP.) In MOSES, the period of vegetation stress started a month earlier and lasted
7 longer than with MOSES_TOP, with substantial impacts on the modeled evaporation (Fig.7b).
8 Cumulative evaporation was 28% greater in MOSES_TOP over the period June to September 1984
9 while sensible heat was 31% lower (not shown). Differences of this magnitude would have
10 substantial impact on an atmospheric model: if this average heat flux difference was assumed to
11 occur over 12 hours of daytime and to diverge in a 1km deep boundary layer, the temperature
12 difference would be ~1.3K.

13 Although all the TOPMODEL-based models were calibrated to give similar performance for
14 runoff, their internal state variables often had rather different values. For example, during the period
15 shown in Fig.7 the water table was on average 1.4m deeper in MOSES_TOPgc than in
16 MOSES_TOP, as a result of differences in parameterization and parameter values. Although this
17 difference was not significant to the present work, it could be important for other processes, for
18 example trace gas emission over wetlands.

19

20 **8. Discussion**

21 When calibrated, both the PDM and TOPMODEL-type approaches perform better than the
22 standard MOSES model which has no representation of subgrid soil moisture variability. The
23 TOPMODEL-type approach is found to be superior over three catchments of the size of a typical
24 gridbox in an atmospheric model. This is in agreement with the findings of *Warrach et al.*[2002] for
25 a single, small catchment. The similar forms and results of the TOPMODEL-type parameterizations
26 suggest that any of these models could be used, but this result will have to be confirmed for other

1 environments. The PDM and TOPMODEL-TYPE approaches have optimum parameter values that
2 do not vary much for the three catchments studied, suggesting that detailed calibration may not be
3 required for every catchment.

4 For models using a PDM-like approach, *Dumenil and Todini* [1992] and *Hagemann and*
5 *Gates* [2003] have suggested how the parameters can be related to catchment characteristics, but
6 these require further investigation and most studies have calibrated the parameters.

7 In principle, an attractive feature of TOPMODEL is that readily-available elevation data can
8 be used to define an important input, namely the pdf of λ . However, many studies have shown that
9 the pdf is sensitive to the resolution of the data, and so even the topographic parameters are
10 uncertain. This uncertainty has led some to abandon or revise the use of λ in their models [*Niu et*
11 *al.*, 2005; *Decharme et al.*, 2006]. In the present work, compensation between parameters meant
12 that the importance of uncertainty in λ varied with the value of α . In the present study, the approach
13 taken was to adjust Λ (broadly in line with that suggested by scaling studies) and calibrate α within
14 the range suggested as physically reasonable. The robustness of this procedure will be investigated
15 in future work. Users of TOPMODEL-type models must be aware of the uncertainty in λ and its
16 possible impact on their model and its calibration.

17 Despite the large uncertainty in global fields of λ , there does appear to be useful information
18 in this data. For example, our unpublished work shows significant correlations between HYDRO1K
19 λ and observed extent of inundation. Thus although the absolute value of λ is uncertain, it might be
20 possible to employ a relatively simple downscaling or correction method, and retain useful
21 information about spatial variability.

22 The large uncertainty in parameter values for the models studied suggests that some
23 calibration is currently essential for models of runoff generation. The need to calibrate a model is
24 not necessarily a major obstacle to global implementation if, as was the case here, the model is not
25 very sensitive to variations of parameter values around the optimum values. Further, *Gulden et al.*
26 [2007] suggest that a suitable choice of hydrological parameterization can reduce the sensitivity of a

1 model to poor choices of uncertain parameter values, although which of the schemes tested here
2 would fare best in that respect has not been examined.

3 Although it is tempting to relate all these models, and in particular those based on
4 TOPMODEL, to processes that occur on the scale of a small catchment, they are all highly
5 simplified representations of reality. Particularly at larger scales, the parameterizations may be
6 better thought of as convenient functional forms that capture some of the essential dynamics of
7 catchments.

8

9

10 **9. Conclusions**

11 The impact of different parameterizations of runoff generation in the MOSES land surface
12 model was tested using observed streamflow from three mesoscale catchments. Parameterizations
13 based on the Probability Distributed Model (PDM) and TOPMODEL were implemented. Runoff in
14 the standard MOSES is dominated by drainage which varies too slowly to match the observed
15 streamflow. MOSES_PDM added a representation of saturation excess surface runoff to the
16 standard model, while the TOPMODEL-based models additionally altered the representation of
17 subsurface runoff. After calibration, the alternative parameterizations performed considerably better
18 than the standard model. The best results were found using any of the parameterizations based on
19 TOPMODEL, which were better because they allowed the subsurface runoff to vary more quickly,
20 with smaller volumes of surface runoff contributing to flow peaks. Although all the new models
21 required extra calibration, a single set of parameter values was identified for each that could be used
22 in all catchments with results comparable to those found from calibration. Attention was drawn to
23 uncertainty in the value of the topographic index, which is an important parameter in TOPMODEL-
24 type models. The simulation of turbulent fluxes during dry periods was sensitive to the choice of
25 parameterization, which would be important when coupled to an atmospheric model.

1 Our future work aims to extend this work to other environments, and to investigate the use of
2 catchment characteristics for estimating parameters *a priori*. We also intend to investigate the use of
3 remote sensing products for the assessment of runoff parameterizations, particularly moisture stress
4 [e.g. *Anderson et al.*, 2007], inundation and wetland extent [e.g. *Prigent et al.*, 2001] and changes
5 in terrestrial water storage [e.g. *Niu et al.*, 2007].

1 Acknowledgements

2 This work was supported by the UK Natural Environment Research Council and the UK
3 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs under the Climate Prediction Programme
4 PECD 7/12/37. The Rhone-AGG data, including the meteorological driving data, were provided by
5 Météo-France, CNRM. Observations of streamflow were provided through the FRIEND project.

8 Appendix: The calculation of saturation excess surface runoff in MOSES_PDM

9
10 Given a rainfall rate P (net of interception) over a timestep of length Δt , the rate of saturation
11 excess surface runoff (R_s) is found as

$$12 \quad R_s \Delta t = P \Delta t + S - S_{\max} + (S_{\max} - S_o) \left[(1 - f_{sat})^{1/(b+1)} - \frac{P \Delta t}{(b+1)(S_{\max} - S_o)} \right]^{b+1}$$

13 for $P \Delta t > (1+b)(S_{\max} - S_o)(1 - f_{sat})^{1/(b+1)}$

$$14 \quad R_s \Delta t = P \Delta t + S - S_{\max}$$

15 for $P \Delta t \leq (1+b)(S_{\max} - S_o)(1 - f_{sat})^{1/(b+1)}$

16 where b, f_{sat}, S, S_{\max} and S_o are as described in Section 2.2.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

References

Anderson, M. C., J. M. Norman, J. R. Mecikalski, J. A. Otkin, and W. P. Kustas (2007), A climatological study of evapotranspiration and moisture stress across the continental United States based on thermal remote sensing: 2. Surface moisture climatology, *J. Geophys. Res. - Atmospheres*, *112*, D11112, doi:10.1029/2006JD007507

Beven, K. (1982), On Subsurface Stormflow - an Analysis of Response-Times, *Hydrol. Sci. J.-J. Sci. Hydrol.*, *27*, 505-521

Beven, K. (1997), TOPMODEL: A critique, *Hydrological Processes*, *11*, 1069-1085

Beven, K. J., and M. J. Kirkby (1979), A physically based, variable contributing area model of basin hydrology, *Hydrological Sciences Bulletin*, *24*, 43-69

Blyth, E. (2002), Modelling soil moisture for a grassland and a woodland site in south-east England, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, *6*, 39-47

Boone, A., F. Habets, J. Noilhan, D. Clark, P. Dirmeyer, S. Fox, Y. Gusev, I. Haddeland, R. Koster, D. Lohmann, S. Mahanama, K. Mitchell, O. Nasonova, G. Y. Niu, A. Pitman, J. Polcher, A. B. Shmakin, K. Tanaka, B. van den Hurk, S. Verant, D. Verseghy, P. Viterbo, and Z. L. Yang (2004), The Rhone-aggregation land surface scheme intercomparison project: An overview, *J. Climate* *17*, 187-208

Bormann, H. (2006), Impact of spatial data resolution on simulated catchment water balances and model performance of the multi-scale TOPLATS model, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, *10*, 165-179

- 1 BRGM (1970), *Atlas des eaux souterraines de la France (Atlas of groundwater in France)*, Bureau
2 de Recherches Geologiques et Minières, Paris.
- 3 Chen, J., and P. Kumar (2001), Topographic influence on the seasonal and interannual variation of
4 water and energy balance of basins in North America, *J. Climate* 14, 1989-2014
- 5 Clapp, R. B., and G. M. Hornberger (1978), Empirical equations for some soil hydraulic properties,
6 *Wat Resour Res*, 14, 601-604
- 7 Decharme, B., H. Douville, A. Boone, F. Habets, and J. Noilhan (2006), Impact of an exponential
8 profile of saturated hydraulic conductivity within the ISBA LSM: Simulations over the Rhone
9 Basin, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 7, 61-80
- 10 Dolman, A. J., and D. Gregory (1992), The parametrization of rainfall interception in GCMs, *Q. J.*
11 *R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 118, 455-467
- 12 Ducharne, A., R. D. Koster, M. J. Suarez, M. Stieglitz, and P. Kumar (2000), A catchment-based
13 approach to modeling land surface processes in a general circulation model 2. Parameter estimation
14 and model demonstration, *J. Geophys. Res. - Atmospheres*, 105, 24823-24838
- 15 Dumenil, L., and E. Todini (1992), A rainfall-runoff scheme for use in the Hamburg climate model,
16 in *Advances in theoretical hydrology, a tribute to James Dooge*, edited by J. P. O'Kane, pp. 129-
17 157, Elsevier.
- 18 Essery, R. L. H., M. J. Best, R. A. Betts, P. M. Cox, and C. M. Taylor (2003), Explicit
19 representation of subgrid heterogeneity in a GCM land surface scheme, *Journal of*
20 *Hydrometeorology*, 4, 530-543
- 21 Famiglietti, J. S., and E. F. Wood (1994), Multiscale Modeling of Spatially-Variable Water and
22 Energy-Balance Processes, *Water Resources Research*, 30, 3061-3078

1 Franchini, M., J. Wendling, C. Obled, and E. Todini (1996), Physical interpretation and sensitivity
2 analysis of the TOPMODEL, *J. Hydrol.*, *175*, 293-338

3 Gedney, N., and P. M. Cox (2003), The sensitivity of global climate model simulations to the
4 representation of soil moisture heterogeneity, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *4*, 1265-1275

5 Gulden, L. E., E. Rosero, Z. L. Yang, M. Rodell, C. S. Jackson, G. Y. Niu, P. J. F. Yeh, and J.
6 Famiglietti (2007), Improving land-surface model hydrology: Is an explicit aquifer model better
7 than a deeper soil profile?, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *34*, L09402,
8 doi:09410.01029/02007GL029804

9 Habets, F., J. Noilhan, C. Golaz, J. P. Goutorbe, P. Lacarrere, E. Leblois, E. Ledoux, E. Martin, C.
10 Oettle, and D. Vidal-Madjar (1999), The ISBA surface scheme in a macroscale hydrological model
11 applied to the Hapex-Mobilhy area - Part II: Simulation of streamflows and annual water budget, *J.*
12 *Hydrol.*, *217*, 97-118

13 Habets, F., and G. M. Saulnier (2001), Subgrid runoff parameterization, *Phys. Chem. Earth Pt B-*
14 *Hydrol. Oceans Atmos.*, *26*, 455-459

15 Hagemann, S., and L. D. Gates (2003), Improving a subgrid runoff parameterization scheme for
16 climate models by the use of high resolution data derived from satellite observations, *Climate*
17 *Dynamics*, *21*, 349-359

18 Ibbitt, R., and R. Woods (2004), Re-scaling the topographic index to improve the representation of
19 physical processes in catchment models, *J. Hydrol.*, *293*, 205-218

20 Koster, R. D., and P. C. D. Milly (1997), The interplay between transpiration and runoff
21 formulations in land surface schemes used with atmospheric models, *J. Climate* *10*, 1578-1591

1 Koster, R. D., M. J. Suarez, A. Ducharne, M. Stieglitz, and P. Kumar (2000), A catchment-based
2 approach to modeling land surface processes in a general circulation model 1. Model structure, *J.*
3 *Geophys. Res. - Atmospheres*, *105*, 24809-24822

4 Kumar, P. (2004), Layer averaged Richard's equation with lateral flow, *Advances in Water*
5 *Resources*, *27*, 522-532

6 Kumar, P., K. L. Verdin, and S. K. Greenlee (2000), Basin level statistical properties of topographic
7 index for North America, *Advances in Water Resources*, *23*, 571-578

8 Liang, X., and Z. H. Xie (2001), A new surface runoff parameterization with subgrid-scale soil
9 heterogeneity for land surface models, *Advances in Water Resources*, *24*, 1173-1193

10 Moore, R. J. (1985), The Probability-Distributed Principle and Runoff Production at Point and
11 Basin Scales, *Hydrol. Sci. J.-J. Sci. Hydrol.*, *30*, 273-297

12 Moore, R. J., and V. A. Bell (2002), Incorporation of groundwater losses and well level data in
13 rainfall-runoff models illustrated using the PDM, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, *6*, 25-38

14 Nash, J. E., and J. V. Sutcliffe (1970), River flow forecasting through conceptual models. 1. A
15 discussion of principles, *J. Hydrol.*, *10*, 282-290

16 Niu, G. Y., and Z. L. Yang (2003), The versatile integrator of surface atmospheric processes - Part
17 2: evaluation of three topography-based runoff schemes, *Global and Planetary Change*, *38*, 191-
18 208

19 Niu, G. Y., Z. L. Yang, R. E. Dickinson, and L. E. Gulden (2005), A simple TOPMODEL-based
20 runoff parameterization (SIMTOP) for use in global climate models, *J. Geophys. Res. -*
21 *Atmospheres*, *110*, D21106, doi:21110.21029/22005JD006111

1 Niu, G. Y., Z. L. Yang, R. E. Dickinson, L. E. Gulden, and H. Su (2007), Development of a simple
2 groundwater model for use in climate models and evaluation with Gravity Recovery and Climate
3 Experiment data, *J. Geophys. Res. - Atmospheres*, *112*, D07103, doi:07110.01029/02006JD007522

4 Pradhan, N. R., Y. Tachikawa, and K. Takara (2006), A downscaling method of topographic index
5 distribution for matching the scales of model application and parameter identification, *Hydrological*
6 *Processes*, *20*, 1385-1405

7 Prigent, C., E. Matthews, F. Aires, and W. B. Rossow (2001), Remote sensing of global wetland
8 dynamics with multiple satellite data sets, *Geophysical Research Letters*, *28*, 4631-4634

9 Saulnier, G. M., C. Obled, and K. Beven (1997), Analytical compensation between DTM grid
10 resolution and effective values of saturated hydraulic conductivity within the TOPMODEL
11 framework, *Hydrological Processes*, *11*, 1331-1346

12 Sivapalan, M., K. Beven, and E. F. Wood (1987), On Hydrologic Similarity .2. A Scaled Model of
13 Storm Runoff Production, *Water Resources Research*, *23*, 2266-2278

14 Stieglitz, M., D. Rind, J. Famiglietti, and C. Rosenzweig (1997), An efficient approach to modeling
15 the topographic control of surface hydrology for regional and global climate modeling, *J. Climate*
16 *10*, 118-137

17 Warrach, K., M. Stieglitz, H. T. Mengelkamp, and E. Raschke (2002), Advantages of a
18 topographically controlled runoff simulation in a soil-vegetation-atmosphere transfer model,
19 *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *3*, 131-148

20 Wolock, D. M., and G. J. McCabe (2000), Differences in topographic characteristics computed
21 from 100- and 1000-m resolution digital elevation model data, *Hydrological Processes*, *14*, 987-
22 1002

- 1 Wolock, D. M., and C. V. Price (1994), Effects of Digital Elevation Model Map Scale and Data
2 Resolution on a Topography-Based Watershed Model, *Water Resources Research*, 30, 3041-3052
- 3 Wood, E. F., D. P. Lettenmaier, and V. G. Zartarian (1992), A Land-Surface Hydrology
4 Parameterization with Subgrid Variability for General-Circulation Models, *J. Geophys. Res. -*
5 *Atmospheres*, 97, 2717-2728
- 6 Woods, R. A., and M. Sivapalan (1997), A connection between topographically driven runoff
7 generation and channel network structure, *Water Resources Research*, 33, 2939-2950
- 8 Zhang, W. H., and D. R. Montgomery (1994), Digital Elevation Model Grid Size, Landscape
9 Representation, and Hydrologic Simulations, *Water Resources Research*, 30, 1019-1028
- 10
- 11

1 Figure 1: Examples of 3-day average precipitation and streamflow for the Ain, during part of the
2 validation period. (a) The components of precipitation. The scale on the right hand side shows the
3 precipitation in terms of an equivalent streamflow rate. (b) streamflow as modelled by MOSES -
4 this was almost all subsurface flow (c) streamflow as modelled by calibrated MOSES_PDM (d)
5 surface and subsurface components of runoff from MOSES_PDM (e) as c but for calibrated
6 MOSES_TOP (f) as d but for calibrated MOSES_TOP.

7
8
9 Figure 2: Efficiency for 3-day average flow during the validation period, comparing MOSES with
10 modified versions of the model. Values are shown for three catchments, and the average over the
11 catchments. For each, six models are compared. The first bar represents MOSES, the next three bars
12 represent versions of MOSES_PDM, and the final two bars represent versions of MOSES_TOP.
13 For MOSES_PDM, PDM_0 denotes a model with $S_0=0$, PDM_calib is the calibrated model for
14 each catchment and PDM_best is the best overall model. The adjacent whiskers indicate the range
15 given by varying $S_0 \pm 10\%$ about the best overall model. For MOSES_TOP, TOP_calib denotes the
16 calibrated model for each catchment and TOP_best is the best overall model. The whiskers indicate
17 the range given by varying f and α by $\pm 10\%$ about the best overall model.

18
19
20 Figure 3: Sensitivity of MOSES_PDM to parameter values, using data for the Ain from the
21 validation period.

22
23
24 Figure 4: Published estimates of how the average topographic index changes with the resolution of
25 the input data. Bracketed numbers in the legend give the range of resolution considered in each

1 study. The results for Ibbit and Woods (2004) are extrapolated down to 1m, using the relationship
2 proposed in their Fig.9.

3

4

5 Figure 5: Sensitivity of MOSES_TOP to parameter values, using data from the Ain catchment in the
6 validation period. (a) Sensitivity to α [with $f=3$] and f [with $\alpha=100$]. Λ was given by its adjusted
7 value Λ_{1000-5} (b) Sensitivity to Λ with $f=3$, for four values of α . $\Delta\Lambda_{1000}$ is the difference from Λ_{1000} .

8

9

10 Figure 6: Autocorrelation of 3-day average flow in the Ain during the validation period, for
11 observed and modelled flows.

12

13

14 Figure 7: Modelled 5-day averages for the Ardeche, as simulated by MOSES and MOSES_TOP. (a)
15 Soil wetness in the top 1m as a fraction of saturation. The dashed line shows the wetness above
16 which transpiration is not restricted by soil water. (b) Soil evaporation (transpiration plus
17 evaporation from the soil surface).

1 TABLE 1: Statistics of the catchments. Elevation statistics were calculated from HYDRO1K data.
 2 The runoff ratio is the ratio of streamflow to precipitation. Precipitation and runoff ratio are for
 3 August 1986-July 1989. The runoff ratio for the Ardeche is for August 1987-July 1989.

4

	Area (km ²)	Average elevation (m)	Standard deviation of elevation (m)	Precipitation (mm)	Runoff ratio
Ain at Vouglans	1120	742	198	1699	0.81
Ardeche at Sauze	2240	571	364	1430	0.64
St Martin					
Ognon at Pesmes	2040	336	120	1275	0.47

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1 TABLE 2: Statistics of the streamflow observed and modeled by MOSES for August 1986 to July
 2 1989, calculated using three-day averaged flow.

	Observed mean flow ($\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$)	Bias (%)	Mean absolute error (%)	Efficiency
Ain	42.3	3	53	0.50
Ardeche	64.8	-4	42	0.64
Ognon	37.4	25	46	0.65

3

1 TABLE 3: Values of the calibrated parameters and model efficiency (E) during the validation
2 period, for MOSES_PDM. b is the shape factor, S_0 is the soil water storage below which there is no
3 surface runoff and S_{max} is the maximum possible gridbox soil water storage. Model versions were
4 PDM_0 (with $S_0=0$) and PDM_calib (calibrated for each catchment). Overall best denotes the single
5 set of parameter values that gave best results when used for all catchments, and the E value is the
6 average over the catchments.

7

	PDM_0		PDM_calib		
	b	E	S_0/S_{max}	B	E
Ain	0.25	0.67	0.75	10	0.75
Ardeche	0.25	0.79	0.75	10	0.88
Ognon	0.0	0.65	0.75	0.5	0.69
Overall best	0.0	0.60	0.75	10	0.78

8

1 TABLE 4: Values of the calibrated parameters and model efficiency (E) during the validation
2 period, for versions of MOSES with TOPMODEL-type parameterizations. f is the decay coefficient
3 for saturated hydraulic conductivity, α is the anisotropy, which was allowed to vary between 1 and
4 100, and R_{bmax} is the subsurface flow rate for water table depth of zero. Overall best denotes the
5 single set of parameter values that gave best results when used for all catchments, and the E value is
6 the average over the catchments. Overall best is also shown for runs with MOSES_TOP in which α
7 was allowed to vary between 1 and 2000.

	MOSES-TOP			MOSES-TOPgc			MOSES-TOPsim		
	f (m ⁻¹)	α	E	f (m ⁻¹)	α	E	f (m ⁻¹)	R_{bmax}	E
								(10 ⁻³ kg m ⁻² s ⁻¹)	
Ain	3.0	100	0.87	7.0	100	0.87	3.0	0.8	0.89
Ardeche	3.0	75	0.87	4.5	75	0.90	3.0	1.0	0.84
Ognon	2.5	100	0.76	3.5	100	0.81	2.5	1.0	0.79
Overall	3.0	100	0.81	4.5	100	0.84	3.0	1.0	0.82
best									
Overall	3.5	2000	0.85	-	-	-	-	-	-
best									
($\alpha \leq 2000$)									

10

11

1 TABLE 5: Summary of performance of each model during the validation period. All runs used the
 2 “best overall” parameters for the model, i.e. the same parameters were used in all catchments.
 3 “Average” is the average over all catchments.

		MOSES	MOSES- PDM	MOSES- TOP	MOSES- TOPgc	MOSES- TOPsim
Efficiency	Ain	0.50	0.75	0.87	0.87	0.89
	Aredeche	0.64	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.84
	Ognon	0.65	0.71	0.69	0.75	0.76
	Average	0.60	0.78	0.81	0.84	0.83
Bias (%) (model- observed)	Ain	+2.8	+2.5	-3.4	-1.7	-0.0
	Aredeche	-3.7	-3.6	-8.1	-4.0	-8.5
	Ognon	+25.4	+25.4	+21.3	+21.3	+21.9
	Average of absolute values	+10.6	+10.5	+11.0	+9.0	+9.5
MAE (%)	Ain	53	37	25	26	23
	Aredeche	42	29	24	25	26
	Ognon	46	42	35	33	33
	Average	47	36	28	28	27

4




Figure 1: Examples of 3-day average precipitation and streamflow for the Ain, during part of the validation period. (a) The components of precipitation. The scale on the right hand side shows the precipitation in terms of an equivalent streamflow rate. (b) streamflow as modelled by MOSES - this was almost all subsurface flow (c) streamflow as modelled by calibrated MOSES_PDM (d) surface and subsurface components of runoff from MOSES_PDM (e) as c but for calibrated MOSES_TOP (f) as d but for calibrated MOSES_TOP.




Figure 2: Efficiency for 3-day average flow during the validation period, comparing MOSES with modified versions of the model. Values are shown for three catchments, and the average over the catchments. For each, six models are compared. The first bar represents MOSES, the next three bars represent versions of MOSES_PDM, and the final two bars represent versions of MOSES_TOP. For MOSES_PDM, PDM_0 denotes a model with $S_0=0$, PDM_calib is the calibrated model for each catchment and PDM_best is the best overall model. The adjacent whiskers indicate the range given by varying S_0 by $\pm 10\%$ about the best overall model. For MOSES_TOP, TOP_calib denotes the calibrated model for each catchment and TOP_best is the best overall model. The whiskers indicate the range given by varying f and α by $\pm 10\%$ about the best overall model.




Figure 3: Sensitivity of MOSES_PDM to parameter values, using data for the Ain from the validation period.




Figure 4: Published estimates of how the average topographic index changes with the resolution of the input data. Bracketed numbers in the legend give the range of resolution considered in each study. The results for Ibbitt and Woods (2004) are extrapolated down to 1m, using the relationship proposed in their Fig.9.




Figure 5: Sensitivity of MOSES_TOP to parameter values, using data from the Ain catchment in the validation period. (a) Sensitivity to α [with $f=3$] and f [with $\alpha=100$]. Λ was given by its adjusted value $\Lambda_{1000} - 5$ (b) Sensitivity to Λ with $f=3$, for four values of α . $\Delta\Lambda_{1000}$ is the difference from Λ_{1000} .




Figure 6: Autocorrelation of 3-day average flow in the Ain during the validation period, for observed and modelled flows.




Figure 7: Modelled 5-day averages for the Ardeche, as simulated by MOSES and MOSES_TOP. (a) Soil wetness in the top 1m as a fraction of saturation. The dashed line shows the wetness above which transpiration is not restricted by soil water. (b) Soil evaporation (transpiration plus evaporation from the soil surface).