

# Stochastic Modeling of Multiple Streamflow Time Series in Colombian Based on Gaussian Processes

**Author:** Julián David Pastrana-Cortés

**Director:** Álvaro Angel Orozco-Gutiérrez

**Co-director:** David Augusto Cardenas-Peña

Automatic Research Group  
September 24, 2024



# Motivation


Understanding the implications of time series associated with hydrological variables, such as flow rates or reservoir levels, is essential for hydroelectric generation and the planning of other generation systems in Colombia.



(a) Irrigation



(b) Flood control



(c) Hydropower generation

## Challenges

Non-linearities, high stochasticity, and complex water resource patterns.

# The Importance of Hydrological Forecasting

Understanding hydrological processes has become increasingly critical in natural resource management. Suitable forecasting allows the anticipation capacity of extreme hydrological events such as droughts and heavy rainfall.



(a) Drought Condition



(b) Full Dam

# Problem Statement and Research Question

	AR	NN	RNN	LSTM	GP
Interpretability [7, 8]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
Nonlinearity [3]	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stochasticity	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
Long-term [4, 5, 6]	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Scalability [9, 10, 11]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Output Constraint	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗

## Research Question

How to develop a joint probabilistic prediction model for multiple hydrological series associated with electricity generation, that describes the randomness of the forecast, is scalable, utilizes task correlations to improve performance, and incorporates output constraints to ensure feasible predictions?

# Objectives

## General Objective

Develop a stochastic forecasting model for making multiple simultaneous predictions of hydrological time series. This model will take advantage of cross-correlations among the outputs to improve performance, while maintaining scalability and output constraints.

## Specific Objectives

- Develop a model that allows the forecasting of hydrological time series, properly quantifying the **uncertainty** associated with each value within the prediction horizons.
- Design a **multi-output** forecasting methodology that captures and models cross-correlations between hydrological time series, to improve forecast accuracy within forecast horizons.
- Develop a multi-output prediction methodology that handles **data constraints** across reservoirs while maintaining high forecasting performance as measured by probabilistic metrics.

# Problem Setting

We model time series using observed vectors. At each time step  $n$ , the vector  $\mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^D$  represents hydrological resources across  $D$  outputs. The input vector  $\mathbf{x}_n$  for the model is constructed from time  $n$  back to  $n - T + 1$ :


$$\mathbf{x}_n = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{v}_n \\ \mathbf{v}_{n-1} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{v}_{n-T+1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{X},$$

where  $T$  is the model order, and  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{DT}$  represents the input space. The target output vector  $\mathbf{y}_n$  is given as:


$$\mathbf{y}_n = \mathbf{v}_{n+H} \in \mathbb{R}^D,$$

where  $H$  is the prediction horizon. We build a dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{y}_n\}_{n=1}^N = \{\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}\}$ , comprising  $N$  input-output pairs.

# Reservoir Locations and Dataset Overview



The hydrological forecasting task utilizes daily streamflow data from  $D = 23$  Colombian reservoirs from January 1, 2010, to February 28, 2022.



Although volumetric measurements are recorded, they are reported in kilowatt-hours (kWh) by the hydroelectric power plants.

# Methodology

## Performance Metrics

- Mean Squared Error (MSE)
- Mean Standardized Log Loss (MSLL)
- Continuous Ranked Probability Score (CRPS)
- Negative Log Predictive Density (NLPD)

## Gaussian Process Models

- ① Start with a Sparse Variational GPs for scalable and stochastic regression.
- ② Extend to Multi-Output GPs, capturing dependencies across multiple outputs.
- ③ Introduce Chained Correlated GPs to handle non-Gaussian likelihoods.

# Gaussian Process Regression: Bayesian Non-Parametric Model

# Gaussian Process (GP) Framework

In a GP framework, the function  $f(\cdot)$  maps inputs  $x_n$  to outputs  $y_n$ . Adding i.i.d. Gaussian noise  $\epsilon$ , the model becomes:

$$y_n = f(x_n) + \epsilon$$

For test inputs  $\mathbf{X}_*$ , the joint distribution of training outputs  $\mathbf{y}$  and test outputs  $\mathbf{f}_*$  is:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{f}_* \end{bmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{K}_y & \mathbf{K}_* \\ \mathbf{K}_*^\top & \mathbf{K}_{**} \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

The posterior distribution for test points is:

$$\mathbf{f}_* | \mathbf{X}_*, \mathcal{D} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{K}_*^\top \mathbf{K}_y^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{K}_{**} - \mathbf{K}_*^\top \mathbf{K}_y^{-1} \mathbf{K}_*)$$

- $\mathbf{K}_y = \mathbf{K} + \Sigma_\epsilon$ , where  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{ND \times ND}$  is the covariance matrix for the train set and  $\Sigma_\epsilon$  contains task-wise noise.
- $\mathbf{K}_{**} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_* D \times N_* D}$  is the covariance matrix for the test set.
- $\mathbf{K}_* \in \mathbb{R}^{ND \times N_* D}$  represents the cross-covariance matrix between the training and test points.

# Variational Inference for Scalability

The prediction performance is influenced by the selected parameter set  $\theta$  and the matrix  $\Sigma_\epsilon$ . These parameters are determined by maximizing the marginal log-likelihood:

$$\{\theta_{\text{opt}}, \Sigma_{\epsilon \text{opt}}\} = \arg \max_{\theta, \Sigma_\epsilon} -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{K}_y^{-1} \mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\mathbf{K}_y| - \frac{ND}{2} \ln 2\pi,$$

with complexity  $\mathcal{O}(N^3D^3)$  due to the need to invert the matrix  $\mathbf{K}_y$ . For scalability, we introduce  $M \ll N$  inducing points  $Z$  with inducing variables  $q(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{S})$ , providing the following ELBO:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(f_d(\mathbf{x}_n))} \{ \ln p(y_{dn} \mid f_d(\mathbf{x}_n)) \} - \sum_{d=1}^D \text{KL}\{q(\mathbf{u}_d) \parallel p(\mathbf{u}_d)\},$$

where  $f_d(\mathbf{x}_n)$  represents the  $d$ -th latent function value at input  $\mathbf{x}_n$ , and  $y_{dn}$  is the corresponding observed value. This reduces the complexity to  $\mathcal{O}(NM^2D^3)$ .

# Model Setup

The GP covariance is factorized into two kernels:  $k_{\mathcal{X}}$  for input correlations and  $k_D$  for task correlations:


$$k((\mathbf{x}, d), (\mathbf{x}', d')) = k_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' | \Theta_d) k_D(d, d' | \sigma_d),$$

with:

$$k_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')^\top \Theta_d^{-2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\right),$$
$$k_D(d, d') = \sigma_d^2 \delta_{d,d'},$$



where  $\delta_{d,d'}$  is the Kronecker delta,  $\Theta_d = \text{diag}\{\Delta_{dl}\}_{l=1}^{DT}$  is the lengthscale matrix, and  $\sigma_d^2$  is the output scale. This reduces complexity to  $\mathcal{O}(NM^2D)$  by avoiding explicit task correlations.

# Grid search average values for tuning $T$ and $M$




The error increases with larger values of  $T$ . Smaller values of  $M$  are more sensitive to initialization, while larger values of  $M$  tend to overfit. The optimal parameters are  $M = 64$  and  $T = 1$ .

# Reservoir-Wise Output Scales and Noise Variance

(a) Output scales  $\sigma_d^2$ (b) Noise variances  $\Sigma_\epsilon$ 


Longer horizons typically exhibit smaller output scales and higher noise variances, indicating weaker correlations and more complex tasks.

# Reservoir-Wise Lengthscales




As the horizon increases, main diagonal lengthscales lose relevance, while off-diagonal ones gain importance.


# SVGP t-SNE Latent Mapping Space




(a) Reservoir E



(c) Reservoir L




(b) Reservoir I




(d) Reservoir U

The shared inducing points allow for the capturing of task-wise, and global information about the streamflow dynamics.

# Models Forecasting




(a) A.



(b) I.

One-day-ahead model predictions for two reservoirs. The SVGP adapts better to time-series data and captures its stochastic nature through the predictive distribution.


# MSE Scores



MSE achieved by LAR, LSTM, and SVGP forecasting models for each horizon and reservoir. The LAR and SVGP models significantly outperform the LSTM models across all scenarios.

# MSLL Score

Reservoir



Achieved MSLL for LAR and SVGP models across horizons and reservoirs. Longer horizons yield larger errors. The SVGP models exhibits lower error and a slower error increase with the horizon compared to the LAR models.

# Performance t-test

Performance metrics for LAR, LSTM, and SVGP across horizons  $H$ . Bold and asterisk indicate a  $p$ -value  $p < 1\%$  (LAR vs. SVGP, LSTM vs. SVGP). SVGP outperforms all models, except LAR at  $H = 1$ , where linear dependence is stronger. As horizon increases, SVGP captures complex input-output relations, significantly outperforming the other models.

<b>H</b>	<b>MSE</b>			<b>MSLL</b>		<b>CRPS</b>	
	<b>LAR</b>	<b>LSTM</b>	<b>SVGP</b>	<b>LAR</b>	<b>SVGP</b>	<b>LAR</b>	<b>SVGP</b>
1	0.51	0.96	0.52 *	-0.39	-0.53	0.34	0.32
2	0.63	1.01	<b>0.61 *</b>	-0.27	<b>-0.42</b>	0.39	<b>0.36</b>
3	0.68	1.02	<b>0.65 *</b>	-0.22	<b>-0.38</b>	0.41	<b>0.38</b>
4	0.72	1.03	<b>0.69 *</b>	-0.18	<b>-0.34</b>	0.42	<b>0.39</b>
5	0.74	1.06	<b>0.71 *</b>	-0.17	<b>-0.33</b>	0.43	<b>0.40</b>
6	0.76	1.07	<b>0.72 *</b>	-0.16	<b>-0.32</b>	0.44	<b>0.40</b>
7	0.76	1.11	<b>0.74 *</b>	-0.15	<b>-0.31</b>	0.44	<b>0.41</b>
14	0.83	1.12	<b>0.79 *</b>	-0.10	<b>-0.27</b>	0.46	<b>0.43</b>
21	0.88	1.08	<b>0.83 *</b>	-0.07	<b>-0.23</b>	0.48	<b>0.45</b>
30	0.91	1.06	<b>0.88 *</b>	-0.05	<b>-0.20</b>	0.49	<b>0.46</b>
Grand Average	0.74	1.05	<b>0.71 *</b>	-0.18	<b>-0.33</b>	0.43	<b>0.40</b>

## To Conclude

The proposed methodology reduces computational complexity from cubic to linear, improving scalability for large datasets.

The optimal number of inducing points provides regularization, avoiding overfitting while capturing key data features.

The model strategically places shared inducing points, balancing task-specific and global dynamics to enhance streamflow forecasting.

Adaptive lengthscales allow the model to adjust to varying prediction horizons, improving robustness for multi-output tasks.

The SVGP model outperforms LAR and LSTM by better handling dynamics, providing uncertainty estimates, and showing slower error growth over long horizons.

# Multi-Output Gaussian Processes: Modeling Inter-Output Dependencies

# Independent Gaussian Process (IGP)

## Independent Process

$$u_d(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k_d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$$



## Latent Process

$$f_d(\mathbf{x}) = u_d(\mathbf{x})$$



## Multi-Output Model

$$\mathbf{f}_* \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \mathbf{0}, \sum_{d=1}^D \mathbf{B}_d \otimes K_{d**} \right)$$



- $\mathbf{B}_d = (\delta_{d,d'}) \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$ .
- $K_{d**} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_* \times N_*}$  is the  $d$ -th covariance matrix at  $X_*$  test inputs.
- $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product.



# Linear Model of Coregionalization GP (LMCGP)

## Independent Process

$$u_q(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k_q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$$


## Latent Process

$$f_d(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{q=1}^Q a_{d,q} u_q(\mathbf{x})$$

## Multi-Output Model

$$\mathbf{f}_* \sim \mathcal{N} \left( \mathbf{0}, \sum_{q=1}^Q \mathbf{B}_q \otimes K_{q**} \right)$$

- $\mathbf{B}_q = (a_{d,q} a_{d',q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times D}$  is the  $q$ -th coregionalization matrix.
- $K_{q**} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_* \times N_*}$ .



# Variational Inference, ELBO, and Predictive Distribution

We extend variational inference to include the independent set, utilizing the inducing variables  $u_q$  derived from independent processes. The ELBO is given by:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(f_{dn})} \{ \log p(y_{dn} | f_{dn}) \} - \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{KL}\{q(\mathbf{u}_q) \parallel p(\mathbf{u}_q)\}$$

The posterior over test points  $X_*$ ,  $p(\mathbf{f}_* | \mathbf{y})$ , is given by:

$$p(\mathbf{f}_* | \mathbf{y}) \approx q(\mathbf{f}_*) = \int p(\mathbf{f}_* | \mathbf{u}) q(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}$$

Gaussian noise  $\sigma_{Nd}^2$  is added to obtain the predictive distribution.

# Model Setup

## Covariance Function (LMCGP)

The LMCGP model uses a squared exponential kernel:

$$k_q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' | \Theta_q) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')^\top \Theta_q^{-2}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}')\right)$$

Here,  $\Theta_q$  is the lengthscale matrix, and  $\mathbf{B}_q$  works as outputscale.


## Optimization and Model Variants

Strong dependencies between parameters may cause poor local minima [12]. We address this by combining Natural Gradient (NG) to optimize variational parameters, and Adam for the rest [13].


### Variants:

- IGP: Independent GP (Adam).
- IGP+: Independent GP (Adam+NG).
- LMCGP: Correlated GP (Adam+NG)


# Tuning Q



(a) CRPS



(b) MSE



Number of Independent GPs (Q)

(c) MSLL




Number of Independent GPs (Q)


(d) NLPD

Performance metrics for LMCGP models as a function of the number of independent GPs. We select  $Q = 17$  as the proper parameter

# Lengthscale and $a_{d,q}$ Values ( $H=1$ )




(a)




(b)

Lengthscale values (left) and coefficients  $a_{d,q}$  (right) for horizon  $H = 1$  reveal two feature usage patterns: focused extraction from few features and broad dynamics capture from many, with smaller individual contributions.

# Lengthscale and $a_{d,q}$ Values ( $H=30$ )




(a)




(b)

For horizon  $H = 30$ , lengthscale values (left) and coefficients  $a_{d,q}$  (right) show less selective input feature usage. All independent GPs incorporate more features due to the extended time gap. The  $a_{d,q}$  coefficients are smaller, indicating weaker individual feature contributions to each output.

# LMCGP vs IGP+ vs IGP




(a) NLPD




(b) MSLL

Bar plots comparing LMCGP, IGP+, and IGP model performance across different horizons  $H$ . The Adam+NG optimizer significantly boosts performance, and with LMCGP showing the most improvement, especially for larger horizons.

# Model Forecasting



(a) A.



(b) I.

Test data for two reservoirs in one day ahead LMCGP model prediction. The model more accurately follows the peaks due its complex behavior.

## To Conclude

The LMCGP effectively captures shared features and dynamics for multi-output tasks. However, increasing the number of independent GPs beyond a threshold leads to instability.

The lengthscale matrix and task dependency coefficients,  $a_{d,q}$ , provide critical insights into feature selection, with some GPs specializing in specific tasks and others covering a broader range of outputs.

To improve optimization performance, using Adam + NG optimizer proved superior to traditional methods, leading to more robust results.

The LMCGP outperformed the IGP in terms of NLPD and MSLL across all horizons, emphasizing the benefits of task dependency modeling.

The LMCGP's forecasting ability showed stronger learning of complex patterns by leveraging data from multiple tasks.

# Chained Correlated Gaussian Processes

# Chained Correlated GP (ChdGP)

## Independent Process

$$u_q(\mathbf{x}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k_q(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}'))$$


## Latent Process

$$f_{d,j}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{q=1}^Q a_{d,j,q} u_q(\mathbf{x})$$

## Likelihood

$$p(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{f}) = \prod_{d=1}^D p(y_d \mid \theta_{d,1}, \dots, \theta_{d,J_d})$$

- $\theta_{d,j} = g_{d,j}(f_{d,j})$  is a likelihood parameter.
- $g_{d,j}(\cdot)$  is a deterministic function.



# Variational Inference, ELBO and Predictive Distribution

We can extend our variational inference, providing the following ELBO:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & \sum_{d=1}^D \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}_{q(f_{d,1,n}), \dots, q(f_{d,J_d,n})} \{ \log p(y_{d,n} | f_{d,1,n}, \dots, f_{d,J_d,n}) \} \\ & - \sum_{q=1}^Q \text{KL} \{ q(\mathbf{u}_q) \| p(\mathbf{u}_q) \}\end{aligned}$$

The approximated posterior over test points is given by:

$$p(\mathbf{f}_* | \mathbf{y}) \approx q(\mathbf{f}_*) = \int p(\mathbf{f}_* | \mathbf{u}) q(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}$$

And the predictive distribution for a new output  $\mathbf{y}_*$ :

$$p(\mathbf{y}_* | \mathbf{y}) \approx \int p(\mathbf{y}_* | \mathbf{f}_*) q(\mathbf{f}_*) d\mathbf{f}_*,$$

The expectation values can be approximated via Monte Carlo methods.



# Model Setup

We again make use of squared exponential kernel to construct the covariance function and Adam + NG framework to train the models.

## Gaussian Likelihood: Chd Normal

$$p(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{f}) = \prod_{d=1}^D \mathcal{N}(y_d \mid g_{d,1}(f_{d,1}), g_{d,2}(f_{d,2}))$$


In this formulation,  $g_{d,1}(\cdot) = \cdot$ , while  $g_{d,2}(\cdot) = \ln(\exp(\cdot) + 1)$ .

## Gamma Likelihood: Chd Gamma


$$p(\mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{f}) = \prod_{d=1}^D \text{Gamma}(y_d \mid g_{d,1}(f_{d,1}), g_{d,2}(f_{d,2}))$$

In this formulation  $g_{d,1}(\cdot) = g_{d,2}(\cdot) = \ln(\exp(\cdot) + 1)$ .

# Tuning Q for Chd Normal



(a) CRPS



(b) MSE




(c) MSLL




(d) NLPD

Performance metrics for ChdGP Normal model as a function of the number of independent GPs  $Q$ . We select  $Q = 15$  as the optimal value before instability patterns.

# ChdGP Normal vs LMCGP




(a) NLPD




(b) MSLL

Bar plots comparing the performance of LMCGP, and ChdGP Normal models for different  $H$  values. Chained setting outperform LMCGP across all scenarios.

# ChdGP Normal Forecasting




(a) I.



(b) O.


Test data for two reservoirs in one day ahead ChdGP Normal model prediction.  
Predictive variance dynamically adapt over uncertainty complexity.

# Tuning Q for Chd Gamma




NLPD metric for ChdGP Gamma models as a function of the number of independent GPs. The tuning step is more stable as  $Q$  increases. We select  $Q = 26$  as the optimal value.

# ChdnGP Gamma vs ChdGP Normal




Comparison of NLPD metric across different prediction horizons for the ChdGP Normal, and ChdGP Gamma models. Gamma likelihood better explains data, providing better performance.

# ChdGP Gamma Forecasting



(a) I.



(b) O.

Test data for four reservoirs in one day ahead of ChdGP Gamma model prediction. This setting does not allocate predictive distribution for negative values. Mean and Median become different in peak presence, suggesting asymmetric distribution.

## To Conclude

The ChdGP model generalizes all previously developed GP-based models, enhancing expressiveness by modeling likelihood parameters and enabling the handling of natural output restrictions.

The ChdGP Normal model outperformed the LMCGP model across all forecasting horizons, primarily due to its ability to adaptively vary data noise over the input space, providing a more refined capture of the underlying data structure.

The ChdGP with Gamma likelihood ensured non-negative predictions. The tuning process revealed a significant improvement in model stability as the number of independent GPs ( $Q$ ) increased, suggesting superior data modeling capabilities.

The Gamma likelihood configuration outperformed the Gaussian likelihood across all evaluated horizons by avoiding the allocation of predictive distribution mass to negative values and utilizing an asymmetric distribution to more effectively handle peak outliers.

# Grand Conclusions

The Sparse Variational Gaussian Process (SVGP) model demonstrated superior performance over state-of-the-art methods like LSTM and linear autoregression. It effectively captured nonlinear relationships and provided uncertainty estimates, outperforming alternative models across various forecasting horizons.

By linearly combining independent GPs, we developed the Linear Model of Coregionalization GP (LMCGP), enhancing prediction accuracy through shared features and task-specific information. To improve optimization, we introduced a combined Adam + Natural Gradients (NG) framework, resulting in more stable solutions.

Finally, to ensure non-negative streamflow predictions, we introduced the Chained Correlated Gaussian Process (ChdGP) with a Gamma likelihood. This model showed improved stability and accuracy, particularly in capturing periodic patterns and peak occurrences, making it a promising approach for hydrological forecasting.

# Generation of Knowledge Products

## Article Published (Q1)



Article

### Scalable and Interpretable Forecasting of Hydrological Time Series Based on Variational Gaussian Processes

## Proceeding Published



Proceeding Paper

### Multi-Output Variational Gaussian Process for Daily Forecasting of Hydrological Resources <sup>†</sup>

## Registered Software *hydrogpower*



MINISTERIO DEL INTERIOR  
DIRECCION NACIONAL DE DERECHO DE AUTOR  
UNIDAD ADMINISTRATIVA ESPECIAL  
OFICINA DE REGISTRO

CERTIFICADO DE REGISTRO DE SOPORTE LOGICO - SOFTWARE

Libro - Tomo - Partida

13-98-419

Fecha Registro

29-may.-2024

# References

- [1] [ [1]]Zaher Mundher Yaseen, Mohammed Falah Allawi, Ali A. Yousif, Othman Jaafar, Firdaus Mohamad Hamzah, and Ahmed El-Shafie. Non-tuned machine learning approach for hydrological time series forecasting. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 30(5):1479–1491, 2018.
- [2] [ [2]]Mahsa H. Kashani, Mohammad Ali Ghorbani, Yagob Dinipashoh, and Sedaghat Shahmorad. Integration of volterra model with artificial neural networks for rainfall-runoff simulation in forested catchment of northern iran. *Journal of Hydrology*, 540:340–354, 2016.
- [3] [ [3]]Muhammed Sit, Bekir Z. Demiray, Zhongrun Xiang, Gregory J. Ewing, Yusuf Sermet, and Ibrahim Demir. A comprehensive review of deep learning applications in hydrology and water resources. *Water Science and Technology*, 82(12):2635–2670, 08 2020.
- [4] [ [4]]Sajjad Abdollahi, Jalil Raeisi, Mohammadreza Khalilianpour, Farshad Ahmadi, and Ozgur Kisi. Daily mean streamflow prediction in perennial and non-perennial rivers using four data driven techniques. *Water Resources Management*, 31(15):4855–4874, 2017.
- [5] [ [5]]Jenq-Tzong Shiau and Hui-Ting Hsu. Suitability of ann-based daily streamflow extension models: a case study of gaoping river basin, taiwan. *Water Resources Management*, 30(4):1499–1513, 2016.
- [6] [ [6]]Md. Munir Hayet Khan, Nur Shazwani Muhammad, and Ahmed El-Shafie. Wavelet based hybrid ann-arima models for meteorological drought forecasting. *Journal of Hydrology*, 590:125380, 2020.
- [7] [ [7]]Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles, 2017.
- [8] [ [8]]Yarin Gal and Zoubin Ghahramani. Dropout as a Bayesian approximation: Representing model uncertainty in deep learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1050–1059, 2016.
- [9] [ [9]]John Quilty and Jan Adamowski. A stochastic wavelet-based data-driven framework for forecasting uncertain multiscale hydrological and water resources processes. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 130:104718, 2020.
- [10] [ [10]]Wen jing Niu and Zhong kai Feng. Evaluating the performances of several artificial intelligence methods in forecasting daily streamflow time series for sustainable water resources management. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 64:102562, 2021.
- [11] [ [11]]Wessel P. Bruinsma, Eric Perim, Will Tebbutt, J. Scott Hosking, Arno Solin, and Richard E. Turner. Scalable exact inference in multi-output gaussian processes, 2020.
- [12] [ [12]]Juan-José Giraldo and Mauricio A Alvarez. A fully natural gradient scheme for improving inference of the heterogeneous multioutput gaussian process model. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 33(11):6429–6442, 2021.
- [13] [ [13]]Hugh Salimbeni, Stefanos Eleftheriadis, and James Hensman. Natural gradients in practice: Non-conjugate variational inference in gaussian process models. In Amos Storkey and Fernando Perez-Cruz, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 84 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 689–697. PMLR, 09–11 Apr 2018.