

Potential and Challenges of Investigating Intrinsic Uncertainty of Hydrological Models with Stochastic, Time-Dependent Parameters

Peter Reichert, Lorenz Ammann and Fabrizio Fenicia Eawag

EGU 2020, session HS-8.1.6

© Authors. All rights reserved



Content

- Motivation
- Concept
- Numerical implementation
- Case study
- Conclusions



Motivation

Hydrological process models should be stochastic, because

- 1. At the resolution, we observe them, hydrological systems are not deterministic: the same observed rainfall falling on a catchment with the same observed initial state will not lead to the same streamflow due to poor resolution of input, incomplete input, unobserved changes in state, etc.
- Stochastic process models can better cope with (unavoidable) structural errors as, even for given parameters, a state can develop into different future states with some probability rather than into a unique state.



Concept

Make parameters (fluxes) rather than state equations stochastic preserves mass balances.





Numerical implementation

Several algorithms available

- Particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo (PMCMC)
 Combine particle filter/smoother for states with either marginal likelihood or Gibbs sampling for parameters
- Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC)
 Requires analytical or automated differentiation of posterior
- Approximate Bayesian Computation (ABC)
 Very universal, but does not provide estimates of states
- Conditional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck Sampling (COUS)
 Simple interface to hydrological simulation program



Case Study

Setting

- 4 models: M1a 1 linear reservoir
 - M1b 1 nonlinear reservoir (exponent α)
 - M2a 2 linear reservoirs
 - M2b 2 reservoirs, fast res. nonlinear (exponent α_1)





Case Study

Issues with convergence





Good for M1a, bad for M2b; issue: nearly no noise in data 7



Case Study

Preliminary results

Outflow rate coefficient factor plotted as a function of reservoir level



→ Good identification of mod. deficits; reduction successful 8











Case Study Preliminary results



→ Different fluctuation time scales for the outlets of the two reservoirs lead to different fluctuation time scales of dry and wet weather discharge (see Ammann et al. 2019).



Conclusions

Opportunities

- Conceptually satisfying approach
- Correlated output errors naturally generated
- Uncertainty estimates in all model variables
- Output fluctuation time scale changes intrinsically

Challenges

- Identifiability separate stochasticity from model deficits
- Convergence
- Computational demand



References

- Reichert, P., Amman, L and Fenicia, F.
 Potential and Challenges of Investigating Intrinsic Uncertainty of Hydrological Models with Stochastic, Time-Dependent Parameters.
 To be submitted in June 2020.
- Reichert, P., and Mieleitner, J.
 Analyzing input and structural uncertainty of nonlinear dynamic models with stochastic, timedependent parameters.
 Water Resources Research, 45, W10402, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1029/2009WR007814
- Tomassini, L., Reichert, P., Künsch, H.-R. Buser, C., Knutti, R. and Borsuk, M.E.
 A smoothing algorithm for estimating stochastic, continuous-time model parameters and its application to a simple climate model. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics) 58, 679-704, 2009. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9876.2009.00678.x</u>
- Ammann, L., Fenicia, F. and Reichert, P.
 A likelihood framework for deterministic hydrological models and the importance of nonstationary autocorrelation.
 Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, 23, 2147-2172, 2019.
 https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-23-2147-2019
- Reichert P., **R package timedeppar**, to be made available in June 2020