

Climate Hazards

Log of meetings & decisions

Lizzie, Isabelle Chuine, Ben Cook, Victor van der Meersch

August 15, 2023

Contents

1	Meeting notes	1
1.1	9 August 2023: Emails from Ben & Victor about projections	1
1.2	8 August 2023: Meet with Ben Cook	1
1.3	18 July 2023: Email from Victor with projections methods	2
1.4	14 July 2023: What I have done recently	2
1.5	23 juin 2023 with Isabelle & Victor	3
1.6	22 juin: Stuff I did today & chatting with Victor	3
1.7	20 juin with Victor & Isabelle	8
1.8	19 juin 2023 with Victor & Isabelle; email from Ben	8
1.9	16 juin, email from Victor with the excellent title, ‘PHENOFIT delighths’	9
1.10	20 avril, with Isabelle & Iñaki	9
1.11	18-19 avril, discussions with Iñaki	9
1.12	14 avril, with Isabelle & Victor: PET	10
1.13	14 avril, with Isabelle	10
1.14	7 avril, with Isabelle	11
1.15	4 April 2023 with Ben	12
1.16	19 mars 2023: Leaf index	12
1.17	15 mars 2023	13
1.18	17 mars 2023	13
1.19	9 mars 2023	13
1.20	Before 9 mars 2023	14

1 Meeting notes

1.1 9 August 2023: Emails from Ben & Victor about projections

Victor wrote:

You may find further information in this paper, where they first downscaled projections using the ERA5 reanalysis (coarser resolution than ERA5-Land they now use). In particular, figure 4 (right panel) gives an idea of the difference between ERA5 reanalysis and downscaling results.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2021.106900>

And Ben replied:

I looked through quickly, but nothing seems to be particularly odd here. You can kind of see in the first linked paper how, even in the downscaled data, the extreme ends of the PDFs extend a bit further in the models than in the observations (Figure 2). This figure is for the whole globe, so I would expect these minor difference to be larger at small scales.

As I mentioned yesterday, I think it would be good to compare the observed time series to the historical simulated time series, and also just stitch the historical and projection data so that we can see how everything looks at once.

1.2 8 August 2023: Meet with Ben Cook

First we discussed what to do with the model projections data and how to decide if it is okay to use

I should do a moving average and STITCH projection data together with the historical data.

This is a LOW warming scenario; better to look at the 7.0 scenario (or the highest scenario we can get) and see if the warming signal gets stronger.

Noise in the models is higher than historical models, but maybe not so bad....

Initial conditions should be end of historical simulation (so should be 2015).

Get more info on the downscaling (just a bias correction? Or did they also scale the variance?).

Also, we're looking at individual grid cells, so the re-analysis (historical) product could be smoothing things spatially in a way the model data is not smoothed (for example, the historical data may be smoothed through local stations). You could check for this by correlating with nearby grid cells and map the correlations to see if the re-analysis (historical data) is more correlated across space than the model data.

Could also plot the overlapping historical period and model period (if they provide those from the models).

If it works and we want to use the model forecasts, you do model averaging as the last step.

Basically four scenarios:

2.6

4.5

7.0

8.5

Then we discussed which scenario is realistic.

When Ben says 'we're on track for 4.5' he is referring to the 'policies and action.' Before Paris Agreement when there was no international agreement, the worst case scenario (8.5) seemed more possible, but it now seems unrealistic to think we will keep it under +2C by 2100 but also equally unlikely that we will hit 4-5C by 2100. He thinks of 2C and 4C as reasonable best and

worse scenarios and we should be communicating those options.

Discussion of the action tracker webpage (CAT thermometer):

- Blue is polices and action – what is happening now, based on our best guess of current policies. You can check compliance information.
- The other colors are planned policies.
- In blue and purple (less aspirational ones) the climate keeps warming after 2100.

1.3 18 July 2023: Email from Victor with projections methods

Here's the paper associated with future climate simulations : <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2022.108669>

It has been done by researchers from IPSL, a research institute which develop one of the GCMs included in the CMIP6 (IPSL-CM6A-LR). I chose these data as they were downscaled with ERA5-Land data - and thus it should be coherent with the data we used for PHENOFIT simulations.

1.4 14 July 2023: What I have done recently

I ran two versions of a new Quercus model (first just changing the leaf model, then using a whole new parameter set from Victor). See `climhazards_QuercusUpdatedModel.pdf` Isabelle wrote (and I agree): “The new results with Victor-CMAES parameters make more sense actually than Duputie parameters and surely there is something to dig into there for Victor and me related to his PhD project.” So I will move forward with these results.

I also looked at whether flowering dormancy for Pinus could be driving some of the temperature variance results (see `pinusflowerendodorm.pdf` and `pinusflowerendodormMeanTemp.pdf`) by estimating flower endodormancy (Isabelle sent the function and I pulled the parameters). Looking at this Isabelle explained:

What I see is that more variance generates more days that fall out of the range of optimal chilling which is between -5 and 0°C for the parameter set of Pinus of Duputié, so chilling accumulation slows down and dormancy break date is delayed.

1.5 23 juin 2023 with Isabelle & Victor

Last day in Montpellier! With Victor and Isabelle, we went through results to date:

We reviewed first the historical results, see Fig. 1.

Next the mean warming simulations. In understanding *Fagus* results (Fig. 2) we discussed how we could see that at low latitudes (Fig. 3) that there was reduced CarbonSurvival (not enough cold means late dormancy) and thus FruitMaturationDate gets later. While at higher latitudes (Fig. 4) there is an increase in the FruitIndex as FruitMaturation is higher.

I should review the *Pinus* results in Duputie et al. 2015. For our mean results, it looks like carbon could be the issue again.

For the mean results for *Quercus* we wondered whether the Leaf model parameterization was driving the results. It's currently set to have a -4.5 maximum temperature. To check this we created an updated file (`Quercus_robur_ADuputie_updated23June2023.species`) using the leaf




Figure 1: These results build through the multiplicative components of fitness (which are multiplied together): Survival (left), Survival*FruitIndex (middle) and Fitness, which is Survival*FruitIndex*MaturationIndex (right). Given high survival and little change between the middle and right panels we can see that *Fagus* is determined mainly by FruitIndex (this makes sense as it is often affected by frost damage, having a low tolerance of low temperatures). We see next the for *Pinus* survival dominates (often it does not meet the chill requirement for leafout and thus has no carbon and low CarbonSurvival so low total Survival) and finally, fir *Quercus* it's MaturationIndex (this makes sense as the fruits are quite large and can take a long time to mature—it doesn't always happen according to this model).

model parameterization from Van der Meersch & Chuine 2023 (`cmaes_fit_subset2_rep2.species`). I need to run this new model parameterization.

Then we reviewed the SD sims. I took less notes, but there was a fair bit of similar drivers for each species (e.g., for *Fagus*, which is more frost sensitive we see lower LeafIndex at the higher latitude models likely due to frost) but also a lot of discussion over the balance of where higher SD would put some of the non-linear curves.

1.6 22 juin: Stuff I did today & chatting with Victor

Discussed authorship with Isabelle, she does not care too much, but in her lab she usually puts herself last.

Using Victor's nice file, I updated my code the PET is adjusted depending on temperature. On quick glance, it did not do much. But Victor and I checked and it did impact FruitIndex, which




Figure 2: *Fagus* across 0 (1) to +5 (6) meaning warming.




Figure 3: *Fagus* across 0 (1) to +5 (6) meaning warming across fitness components.




Figure 4: *Fagus* across 0 (1) to +5 (6) meaning warming across fitness components.

was expect (not DroughtIndex as also expected).

I tested whether increasing SD in a simple threshold model should make the leafout date earlier. Answer is no.

Victor does not use GUI for PHENOFIT, so someday I should probably switch to doing it without the GUI for safety? Especially if doing many rooms.

Drought effects are separate from temperature effects; no interaction... Isabelle thinks they are multiplicative effects. Limit for growth is 0.4 relative extractable water for all C3 species. Isabelle will send the reference.

Victor: PET should effect FruitIndex (and it does! Phew). It should not effect DroughtIndex in PHENOFIT4 (also appears true). I compared between the PHENOFIT output before fixing PET and after.

It looks like the fixed dates for PHENOFIT must be the same date for all years, to discuss with Isabelle.

1.7 20 juin with Victor & Isabelle

Today we agreed to focus on mean shifts (0-5C over baseline) and variance shifts (need to look at at data but should do lower and higher) and then we could someday later put together a FEW of the combos, but not all of them (not the full factorial I have been coding; this is sort of a relief as we have a lot going on).

Maybe don't change the WHC, if we are interested better to change the precipitation regimes.... We talked a lot about how to know what is driving total fitness and how that is changing over simulations (or time or space). We discussed Mahalanobis distance to look at distance from where the three components of fitness (Survival, FruitIndex, MaturationIndex) all equal 1 (1 is highest possible). Maybe also PCA (perhaps across all metrics, but then you do not get the fact that some metrics matter more (survival more critical than FruitIndex for example)).

1.8 19 juin 2023 with Victor & Isabelle; email from Ben

I am back in Montpellier! Lots of stuff happening

Start year in phenofit (should be the first year you have data – it will just be that you only get output from the FOLLOWING year). I already updated this in howto-phenofit.txt.

Looking at historical results with Isabelle

- Prunus has a stronger chilling limit, which may make the leaf unfolding dates later and mean that rarely is there frost.
- The 0 (zero) FruitIndex for Fagus probably due to 0 LeafIndex (which is probably due to frost)
- For Quercus there is -999 for FruitMaturationDate (only twice); Isabelle looked this up and it means the data is not set. For now I set the code to replace the -999 with 366.

Breaking down PHENOFIT model: See scan I should take of 22 juin merged notes.

Check the frost resistance of the 3 spp (I added to my `_dothis` list).

Email from Ben (19 June 2023)

For this we need to finalize which forecasted SSP scenarios to look at. We don't have many choices based on where our co-author Victor van der Meersch pulls data

- either SSP 245 or SSP585 (aka SSP 2 (4.5) etc. I believe). I said we should do SSP585 as that seems more likely than SSP245 right now. Questions:

Okay, so SSP2-4.5 is probably the closest track to where we are heading thanks to the Paris Agreement. 8.5 is going to be VERY warm, and likely represent a worst case scenario that we are likely to avoid assuming current policies continue into the future. This is actually a pretty useful website that gets updated regularly, showing where we are likely to be based on different policy assumptions:

<https://climateactiontracker.org/global/cat-thermometer/>

So you can see, the blue range is centered on 2.7 C, which represents current policies that have been implemented. If I recall correctly, I believe multi-model for 4.5 puts us around 3 C, or a little higher, and multi-model for 8.5 put us around 5 C. So I think to be a bit easier to defend, 4.5 is the way to go. That said, if you want a range, I think it is fine to use and present both. It would be something similar to what we did for Nacho's paper, where we compared 2 vs 4 degrees of warming.

In related news I don't think we ever confirmed which PET method to use. We cannot get the RH to do the easier one so are planning to use the Penman Monteith ...

d) Does Penman Monteith sound okay to use for this?

Yes, if you have the data for it, Penman-Monteith is considered the gold standard for PET estimates.

Sorry for the rush-the next few weeks are hectic, especially with Luca's school year ending and holiday coming up. But things will slow down starting mid-July.

1.9 16 juin, email from Victor with the excellent title, 'PHENOFIT delighths'

Ouch, this one was tricky.

I downloaded your files on my computer and tried running Phenofit on my side. I didn't find the error right away - even by adding several check messages printed to the log.

Drum roll... we must always have 4 comment lines before climate data, as in the historical climate files I sent you. So far, I was lucky enough to avoid this error...

1.10 20 avril, with Isabelle & Iñaki

See green and gray notebook.

1.11 18-19 avril, discussions with Iñaki

See also `ChatsInaki.txt`. But here are the main notes copied over:

- References on damage due to high heat:
 - Thierry Simonneau worked on 2019 heat wave and why it destroyed so many vineyards in Montpellier (LaCave) – he sent the presentation and thought they had a presentation about sentinel tool (more on anthocyanin) – see INRAe talk here
 - Otherwise work may be in gray literature; he thinks in fruit trees (e.g., cherries get double fruits)

- Wheat they think 25 C affects yield – is that damage? If yes, they this in their models.
- Apples with burned skin etc (also damage) and depends on canopy.
- Also check Zaka thesis and look up Gaetan (umlaut on e) Louarn (Zaka PhD advisor) ... look up P3F system they have and SICLEX
- Incl. air temperature of 30-35 C means leaf surface temperature approaches protein denaturation limits; he does not know (ask Isabelle again)

1.12 14 avril, with Isabelle & Victor: PET

PET ... we do not have RH from ERA5LAND so we cannot use Ben's easy equation (see below). Instead we could use the complicated Penman Monteith which is the Standard FAO method; ET_o in Chapter 2. See also docs/2023Apr_ETVictor.pdf. And he shared his code.

T_{dew} is e_a

e_a is basically $vabar$

e_s is basically vas (and you can compute with T_{min} and T_{max} ...

1.13 14 avril, with Isabelle

This meeting covered:

- References on risk (damage) versus longer growing season
- What output from PHENOFIT to look at (long discussion)
- Visiting in June: Avoid 26-28 (away) June and 13, 15 (she is busy)

References on risk (damage) versus longer growing season

Yann has some work (I think she meant frost damage); perhaps do a lit review for Chinese species. I asked about *high temperatures* and she is not aware of any, but said there is some literature on floral necrosis (during spring) in crop literature probably. Also, there was heat damage at Peuchabon (field station) due to high temperature and some work on cuticles from this – some by Nicolas Martin (who is now at INRAe Avignon, forest group) but she does not think that it is published.

Air temperature of 30-35 C means leaf surface temperature approaches protein denaturation limits. See paper by Yann Vitasse on this, also ag literature

Which output from PHENOFIT?

A little more complicated than I thought!

1. LeafIndex – impacted only by frost (and contributes to maturation index). We think it should be only impacted by frost. This is continually updated inside the model so Isabelle is checking when the version that is written out is taken.
2. FruitIndex – impacted only by frost (lost due to frost on flowers or perhaps small fruit present early enough to get frosted)

3. MaturationIndex – this one is more of a pain than I realized!
 - (a) It depends on: Length of the growing season (including drought during it I think) and LeafIndex
 - (b) So if we want to look at impacts of GSL we'd need to look at MaturationIndex x GSL and see how strong the relationship is (could also look MaturationIndex x LeafIndex)
 - ...

So we need to extract:

1. LeafIndex
2. FruitIndex
3. MaturationIndex
4. Fitness – which is the product of survival*FruitIndex*MaturationIndex (in our case, survival should generally always be 1 since this is only below 1 due to lethal cold temperatures and we're not in that range and drought)
5. LeafSenescence and LeafUnfolding dates – this will give GSL, which matters to MaturationIndex for QUEROB and FAGSYL (but likely not PINSYSL) ... could check
6. Could also check (not critical) that LeafUnfolding date is good metric – it should be HIGHLY correlated with FloweringDate and FruitInitDate.

Pinus spp mature fruit over two years; in PHENOFIT the maturation takes place in one year so flowering date and season length should matter less to MaturationIndex (may want to double check model). Thus we **predict** that warming does not impact MaturationIndex for PINSYL as much as for other two species, but all will be impacted by increased variability due to frost loss (though now that I transcribe these notes, I think the least impact should be on species that leaf out the latest, which I suspect is also PINSYL).

I asked about partitioning PHENOFIT fitness due to each part and Isabelle said they did something a little like this in Morin et al. 2006 'Process-based modeling of species' distributions: What limits temperate tree species' range boundaries'

A few more notes maybe in green and gray notebook, but I think I got most stuff here.

1.14 7 avril, with Isabelle

This meeting covered:

- WHC (water holding capacity)
- Coding simulations in PHENOFIT
- Problems with fitness values

WHC. Try 50 and 100%. See ‘Lien entre dommages dus a la crise et reserve utile en eau des sols.doc’ on Lizzie’s computer for some background that helped Isabelle select these.

Coding simulations in PHENOFIT. Use different longitudes as way to code different simulations. (Latitude is used in the model for photoperiod, but longitude is just used as location marker so should be fine.) Isabelle also thought same lat/lon with different data in different rows would work, but using longitude seems easier.

Problems with fitness values. I ran PHENOFIT on the historical data using my gradient of sites from Italy, through Germany and onward to Sweden, but I got pretty low fitness values for FAGSYL and QUEROB. Isabelle said this happens. They usually convert to 0/1 so you don’t notice this. She also said they have seen that the fitness is higher closer to where the data used to parameterize the model comes from (see `Phenofit4_Anne_Duputie.pdf` on Lizzie’s computer). So, Isabelle said it might have to do with where the data that the parameterized with from (France) versus where our points are (more Central Europe). We discussed changing to other parameters for the leaf phenology (from a K. Kramer book), but then Isabelle realized that we don’t have similar parameters to use for flowering. So I changed to sites that track more through France.

1.15 4 April 2023 with Ben

Calculating ET ... and a little more on simulated climate data

Detrending removes trends in central tendency

1. Use detrended data for long-term baseline
 - (a) Z-score them
 - (b) Then multiple the SD by 1.2 for a 20% increase in variability *normal distribution
 - (c) Check your output

ET ... **MAKE sure to use min and max RH correctly**

- if you have relative humidity and temperature, then that’s enough
- Use this: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clausius%E2%80%93Clapeyron_relation#August%E2%80%93Roche%E2%80%93Magnus_formula
- This is how Ben typically does it
- Need: max RH and min RH (and temperature)
- Remember: Tmax is associated Tmin RH (and vice versa)
- RH tells you how saturated the air is; use temperature to calculate how much water the air is
 - Step 1: Put in the August Roche Magnus – hypothetical maximum (e_s) using just T
 - see the link: Basically it’s $6.1^{((17.625 * T) / (T + 234))}$
 - Step 2: Now multiple e_s by RH: $e_s * (RH)$
 - (Make relative RH is measured as a fraction)
 - Now you have the ET!
 - Check with an online calculator! Or check that every degree warmer get about a 7% increase.

1.16 19 mars 2023: Leaf index

Isabelle wrote: I found LeafIndex : it is the leafIndex at the end of the season, the day before senescence date, so it integrates all frost damages since bud set (or almost).

1.17 15 mars 2023

See ChatsBenNotes.txt for thoughts on how to do the climate.

Isabelle also emailed me:

I asked about a copy of Budyko, M. I. (1974) Climate and life. International Geographic Series (ed. by D.H. Miller), pp 508. Academic Press, New York, NY and she replied: "If I do, this is a paper copy which is somewhere in the furniture between our desks!"

PHENOFIT 5 reference for carbon model: A generic process-based Simulator for mediterranean landscapes (SIERRA): design and validation exercises (Mouillot)

Recommended refs in Chuine_PTB2010 for why growing season length and growth might be related and wrote, "I haven't done the biblio on that topic recently but you will find a couple of references in the second paper attached. As I said, growing season length is related to NPP but not necessarily to growth."

1.18 17 mars 2023

MW Isabelle:

- Two ideas for climate
- How to adjust for other climate variables
- How to ask for climate data from Victor
- Which months around budburst

1.19 9 mars 2023

1. Sites

- (a) Previously discussed: Southern beech forest as site (Massan and sites in Pyrenees) may not be ideal as lengthening of growing season is not happening in southern range (because drought is shortening the length of the growing season; senescence now in August sometimes). That's the REAL world though, the current PhenoFit shows it lengthening (Isabelle has a postdoc starting in May who may try to work on the drought aspect to fix this)
- (b) Right now the model (Phenofit 4; Delpierre) does not include drought effect on senescence ... just temperature and daylength affect senescence
- (c) But do we need specific sites? Only if we want to compare to what is happening... But we do need for some climate data.
- (d) But be sure to pick a site that is FLAT (because using climate re-analysis)

2. Adding heat damage: Need good experimental data ... 60C at surface for adult leaves, lower for young leaves (June 2019 saw leaf damage, even on Holm Oak) – so no, don't add.

3. Species

- (a) There are parameterized models for 20 species or so, could use one of these. Or, an artificial species – make up parameters.
- (b) Work with a broadleaf and an evergreen needleleaf.
- (c) *Quercus robur* and *patraea* are basically the same species.
- (d) Actually do these three (based on comparisons and having well parameterized models for them) Do *querob/quepet* (pick one), *fagsyl*, and *pinsyl*. Look at the overlay distributions for somewhere flat and not too far south. Look at the new European atlas (European atlas of forest trees) <https://forest.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en/european-atlas/> .. see also SI of Duputie...

4. Phenofit5 is still being parameterizing and tested. Used already for beach and Oak.

5. What we'll measure?

- (a) Phenofit 4 has annual fitness: $\text{sum}(\text{survival} + \text{reproductive success})$... reproductive success is based on ripe fruit by end of season before leaf senescence. Survival has a crude carbon metric. – so fitness is constrained by spring frost and length of season.
- (b) Survival is the product of 3 survival parts (temp, drought, carbon: most of survival is drought).
- (c) MaturationIndex is a metric of if the season was long enough so this is a way to measure season length
- (d) FruitIndex and LeafIndex only go below 1 due to frost ... so these are ways to measure frost loss.
- (e) LeafDormancyBreakDate relates to leaf-unfolding and to frost risk.
- (f) We can hold phenology constant (at least in PHENOFIT 4)...YES! Can do this – when initializing you can do this, 'activate the date files' – give it specific dates (see methods Duputie et al. 2015 on plasticity GCB). Not sure if it works for Phenofit 5 (see Gauzere Evolution Letters 2020 new standing variability in phenology may make this hard).

6. Some notes on climate. ...

- (a) ERA5land model at 10km (includes scenarios and future)
- (b) WHC is hard to calculate – so many want to try across three values (low/medium/high).

1.20 Before 9 mars 2023

Notes from getting going ...

- What site and species do we want to use?
 - Ideally one with an existing model we do not have to spend a long time verifying?
 - Both historical climate and future climate ... so we can compare
 - But also one where some events (frost, heat damage) may have shifted at the same time that growing season length or seasonal warmth has had an impact.

- High temperatures?
- What do we want to measure?
 - Phenological shifts related to end/start of season and particular damage events
 - Tissue or ideally reproduction lost due to each event type
 - Reproduction changes due to longer/warmer season
 - What else?
- What *in silico* experiments do we want to run?
 - Historical climate
 - CMIP future climate scenario (maybe) – characterize future climate: what is mean shift, what is variance shift?
 - Historical climate + 2C?
 - Historical climate with increased variability in spring (and summer?)
 - Historical climate + 2C? with increased variability in spring (and summer?)
 - We want to test how phenological shifts x extremes matter, so I wonder if there is a scenario where we can try to hold phenology more constant and layer on climate variability? Not sure what that will show us ...