

Contents

List of Figures	i
List of Tables	ii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Observation data	1
2 RS data analysis	2
2.1 Review of RS products	2
2.2 Precipitation products	3
2.3 Evapotranspiration products	4
2.4 Grace solutions (change in storage)	6
2.5 Runoff comparison	8
2.6 Water Balance error	10
3 Selection of RS products for WA	12
References	14
Annexes	15

List of Figures

1	Mindanao River Basin	1
2	Discharge at river mouth of Mindanao River	2
3	Precipitation products for Mindanao River Basin	3
4	Correlation between precipitation products (unit: mm/month)	3
5	Monthly mean precipitation for Mindanao River Basin	4
6	Annual precipitation for Mindanao River Basin	4
7	Annual evapotranspiration for Mindanao River Basin	5
8	Correlation between actual evapotranspiration products (unit: mm/month)	5
9	Monthly mean actual evapotranspiration for Mindanao River Basin	6
10	Annual actual evapotranspiration for Mindanao River Basin	6
11	GRACE products for Mindanao River Basin	7
12	Correlation between GRACE products (unit: mm/month)	7
13	Monthly mean storage change for Mindanao River Basin	8
14	Annual storage change for Mindanao River Basin	8
15	Performance of different combinations of the remote sensing products to calculate the runoff generated	9
16	Water Balance error	11
17	Yearly mean runoff generation map of the best combination	12

List of Tables

1	Remote sensing products	2
2	The annual $P - ET - \Delta S$ and ΔS , (unit: $Mm^3/year$)	12

1 Introduction

The Mindanao River Basin is one of the selected pilot basins for Rapid Water Accounting. It covers an area of 21,503 km² (between 124°6'E 6°3'N and 125°27'E 8°33'N), see Figure 1.

The catchment contains the area from the mountains of Impasug-ong in Bukidnon (known as Upper Pulangi River), Kabacan River (relabelled as Mindanao River), Lower Pulangi River and Ligawasan Marsh.




Figure 1: Mindanao River Basin

1.1 Observation data

Discharge is collected from Flood Observatory. Two flooding periods can be found, which happened in 2008 and 2011, see Figure 2.




Figure 2: Discharge at river mouth of Mindanao River

2 RS data analysis

The purpose of this study is to select remote sensing products for water accounting, by evaluating the performance of water balance analysis. Three evaluation criteria are applied in the study, Pearson correlation coefficient (PCC), coefficient of determination (R²) and root mean square error (RMSE). PCC - The covariance of the two variables divided by the product of their standard deviations. It has a value between +1 and -1, where 1 is total positive linear correlation, 0 is no linear correlation, and -1 is total negative linear correlation.

R² - The proportion of the variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from the independent variable(s). Best possible score is 1.0 and it can be negative (because the model can be arbitrarily worse).

RMSE - The standard deviation of the residuals (prediction errors). It is a measure of how spread out these residuals are. In other words, it tells you how concentrated the data is around the line of best fit.

2.1 Review of RS products

To evaluate remote sensing products for water balance analysis, three precipitation products, five evapotranspiration products and three GRACE solutions are collected, see Table 1. After download products, all data was clipped to Mindanao River Basin. Then the datasets were resampled to spatial resolution of 0.05 degree and aggregated to monthly and yearly time series. The detail description of each product can be found in Annexes.

Table 1: Remote sensing products

Product	Type	Duration	Temporal Res.	Spatial Res.
ALEXI	Evapotranspiration	2005 - 2012	daily	0.05°
CMRSET	Evapotranspiration	2005 - 2012	monthly	0.05°
GLEAM	Evapotranspiration	2005 - 2012	monthly	0.25°
MOD16A2	Evapotranspiration	2005 - 2012	eight-daily	463m
SSEBop	Evapotranspiration	2005 - 2012	monthly	1km
CHIRPS	Precipitation	2005 - 2012	monthly	0.05°
GPM	Precipitation	2005 - 2012	monthly	0.1°
TRMM	Precipitation	2005 - 2012	monthly	0.25°

Product	Type	Duration	Temporal Res.	Spatial Res.
CSR	GRACE	2005 - 2012	quasi-monthly	1°
GFZ	GRACE	2005 - 2012	quasi-monthly	1°
JPL	GRACE	2005 - 2012	quasi-monthly	1°

2.2 Precipitation products

The precipitation products present similar pattern. Figure 3 shows the time series plots of precipitation from the three products. There is no missing values from 2005 to 2013. CHIRPS has the higher precipitation in the summer.




Figure 3: Precipitation products for Mindanao River Basin

Figure 4 shows the correlation between the products. TRMM and GPM obtained the highest correlation with PCC of 0.97, while CHIRPS versus GPM had the lowest PCC of 0.29.




Figure 4: Correlation between precipitation products (unit: mm/month)

The monthly mean and annual precipitation from the products are illustrated in the Figure 5 and Fig-

ure 6. CHIRPS had highest values in wet season while TRMM shows lowest values in dry months. GPM values were largely between CHIRPS and TRMM in most of the months. The annual precipitation values do not show significant differences either among the different products except for 2012 when CHIRPS showed a significant higher value compared to the other products (up to 85 mm/year)




Figure 5: Monthly mean precipitation for Mindanao River Basin




Figure 6: Annual precipitation for Mindanao River Basin

2.3 Evapotranspiration products

The evapotranspiration products have similar pattern. Figure 7 shows the time series plots of precipitation from the five products. CHIRPS has the higher precipitation in the summer.




Figure 7: Annual evapotranspiration for Mindanao River Basin

In terms of correlation, CMRSET and GLEAM showed the highest correlation with PCC of 0.82, while SSEBop versus MOD16A2 had the lowest PCC of -0.3, see Figure 8.




Figure 8: Correlation between actual evapotranspiration products (unit: mm/month)

The monthly mean and annual actual evapotranspiration from the products are plotted in the Figure 9 and Figure 10. The highest values in wet season was occurred in MOD16A2 while MOD16A2 presented highest values in dry months. GLEAM values were largely between MOD16A2 and CMRSET in most of the months.

The annual actual evapotranspiration values do not show significant differences either among the dif-

ferent products except for 2010 when MOD16A2 showed a significant higher value compared to the other products (up to 800mm/year)




Figure 9: Monthly mean actual evapotranspiration for Mindanao River Basin




Figure 10: Annual actual evapotranspiration for Mindanao River Basin

2.4 Grace solutions (change in storage)

The GRACE products show similar pattern. Figure 11 is the time series plots of precipitation from the three products. CSR estimates larger dynamic of storage change compare with other products.




Figure 11: GRACE products for Mindanao River Basin

In terms of correlation, CMRSET and GLEAM showed the correlation with PCC of 0.82, which means the products are relatively correlated, see Figure 12.




Figure 12: Correlation between GRACE products (unit: mm/month)

The monthly mean and annual storage change from the products are illustrated in the Figure 13 and Figure 14. GFZ solution produced larger volume of storage gain in wet season, CMRSETlost less storage in dry months.




Figure 13: Monthly mean storage change for Mindanao River Basin




Figure 14: Annual storage change for Mindanao River Basin

2.5 Runoff comparison

Total 60 different possible combinations to compute the water balance for Mindanao River Basin from three precipitation, five evapotranspiration and three GRACE solutions, see Figure 15.

PCC values vary from -0.04 to 0.29. The best performing combination in terms of PCC is GLEAM for evapotranspiration, GPM for precipitation and CSR for change in storage. The second best combination is GLEAM, GPM and GFZ with PCC of 0.26.

R2 values are in the range from -0.90 to 0.06. The best performing combination in terms of R2 is MOD16A2 for evapotranspiration, GPM for precipitation and CSR for change in storage. The second best combination is CMRSET, GPM and CSR with PCC of 0.05.

The minimum RMSE value is 64.44. The best performing combination in terms of RMSE is CMRSET for evapotranspiration, GPM for precipitation and GFZ for change in storage. The second best combination is CMRSET, GPM and JPL with PCC of 64.72.





Figure 15: Performance of different combinations of the remote sensing products to calculate the runoff generated

2.6 Water Balance error

Water balance error is the difference between $P - ET - \Delta S$ and runoff. Figure 16 shows the yearly mean water balance error. The combination GPM and MOD16A2 has the lowest error ranging around 1.35%. However GPM, CMRSET and GFZ has the lowest absolute error $584.81 \text{ Mm}^3/\text{year}$. The runoff maps of these two are plotted in Figure 17.

**Figure 16:** Water Balance error




Figure 17: Yearly mean runoff generation map of the best combination

3 Selection of RS products for WA

Due to the PCC and R² scores are not large enough, which means the correlation is not significant between water balance calculated by different combination and runoff. RMSE is considered as the first criteria to select the best combination of remote sensing products in this study.

Thus, evapotranspiration precipitation product GPM, product CMRSET and GRACE solution GFZ are selected for further analysis.

Without the full information on other basin transfers, the water balance $P - ET - \Delta S$ is considered in reasonable agreement with outflow. The total observed outflow is 3% lower than the water balance. The average $P - ET - \Delta S$ is $585 \text{ Mm}^3/\text{year}$ higher than the sum of flow at outlet. The largest difference is found in the year 2012, which might be attributed to other unaccounted transfers, see Table 2.

Table 2: The annual $P - ET - \Delta S$ and ΔS , (unit: Mm^3/year)

Year	P	ET	ΔS	$P - ET - \Delta S$	Q	Diff	%Diff
2005	43522	29755	-151	13918	13171	747	6
2006	43777	29616	-10	14170	16063	-1892	-12
2007	43650	29405	366	13879	15815	-1936	-12
2008	59217	29764	273	29180	26240	2940	11
2009	55307	29938	-653	26022	25128	894	4
2010	51478	30601	337	20541	16035	4506	28
2011	58280	29171	762	28347	23374	4974	21

Year	P	ET	ΔS	$P - ET - \Delta S$	Q	Diff	%Diff
2012	49785	30214	-158	19730	25283	-5553	-22

References

Annexes

Annexes.csv