Projected impacts of climate change on large-scale water resources at 1.5°C, 2°C and 4°C global warming

Richard Betts, Lamprini Papadamitriou, Aris Koutroulis, Pierre Friedlingstein, Catherine Morfopoulos, Klaus Wyser



JULES Annual Meeting, Harper Adams University, 5th September 2018



Context: the United Nations Paris Agreement aims to limit global warming to "well below" 2°C relative to pre-industrial – "pursuing efforts" to limit to 1.5°C

Key questions:

- 1. What will be the impacts at 2°C?
- 2. How much of these can we avoid if we achieve 1.5°C?
- 3. What will be the consequences of missing these targets? Eg. what happens at 4°C?

Address this here for **freshwater resources**, using climate projections to drive **JULES** to simulate changes in **runoff**



Global mean temperature anomaly (°C) **RCP8.5** 6 **RCP6.0 RCP4.5** 5 **RCP2.6** 4 3 2°C 2 1.5°C CMIP5 multi-model 1 0 900 CO₂ concentrations 800 CO₂ conc. (ppm) 700 600 500 400 300 1900 1950 2000 2050 2100

in RCPs (Representative Concentration Pathways)

Global mean

temperature

projected by

ensemble

Year



Here focus on RCP8.5 scenario



Existing CMIP5 projections with RCP8.5: GHGS, sea surface temperatures, sea ice

> New higherresolution models than in CMIP5 (atmosphere only)

HadGEM3 N216 60 km grid, 85 levels

EC-Earth T511 40km grid, 91 levels







Various impacts sectors: use JULES for water resources



JULES setup

"JULES-W1" configuration – as used in Water sector of ISIMIP (Inter-Sectoral Impacts Model Intercomparison Project) Phase 2 (Papadimitriou *et al.*, 2016; 2017)

Global domain, 0.5° resolution

Vegetation: 5PFTs prescribed at present-day state Plant physiology responds to changing CO₂ concentrations (ie: stomatal closure affects transpiration, but no change in leaf area index or vegetation distribution)

No irrigation, crops or glaciers

Driving data from HELIX climate projections bias-corrected with observations (Watch Forcing Data Era-Interim) – as in ISIMIP2



Key questions arising from the experimental design:

What is the role of the different SST and sea ice change patterns for regional climate changes?

Do the two atmosphere models respond differently?



Projected changes in annual mean runoff at 2°C global warming: JULES driven by HadGEM3 atmosphere with patterns of SST and sea ice change from 6 CMIP5 models

0

%

-1

10

1

50

75

Ensemble Mean



IPSL-CM5A-LR





GFDL-ESM2M

-75 -50 -10



HadGEM2-ES

IPSL-CM5A-MR





ACCESS1-0





Global mean % changes in precipitation (P), annual mean runoff (Rmean) and 10th %ile runoff (Rlow) at 1.5°C and 2°C global warming

JULES driven by HadGEM3 atmosphere model with SSTs and sea ice from 6 CMIP5 climate models



Ranges of projected changes in annual mean runoff in major river basins



Ranges of projected changes in low runoff (10th %ile) in major river basins



Does the choice of atmosphere model make a difference to regional responses to SSTs?

precipitation at

-40

-30

mean

4°C global

warming

-50

IPSL-CM5A-LR CMIP5 Hi-Res Change in annual Hi-Res:HadGEM3 -20 -1010 20 30 0

pr %

Original IPSL model in CMIP5

FC-Farth T511 with **IPSL SSTs**

HadGEM3-GA3 N216 with IPSL SSTs

50

40



Effect of different atmosphere models with same SSTs

Hydrological drought (10th %ile low flows) simulated by JULES

Common SST driving models











What does this mean for people?

Use 3 different scenarios of population and economic state from the Shared Socioeconomic Pathways (SSPs)

SSP3 "high challenge to adaptation"SSP2 "medium challenge to adaptation"SSP5 "high challenge to adaptation"





Relative Population difference for the SSP2 scenario (medium challenge to adaptation) relative to the SSP3 (high challenge to adaptation)



Relative Population difference for the SSP5 scenario (low challenge to adaptation) relative to the SSP3 (high challenge to adaptation)



-50% -20% -10% -5% -2% +2% +5% +10% +20% +50%

Water demand projections at time of passing global warming levels (ensemble mean) 1.5°C 2°C 4°C Water demand change for the SSP3 scenario (high challenge to adaptation) relative to the baseline





Relative water demand difference for the SSP2 scenario (medium challenge to adaptation) relative to the SSP3 (high challenge to adaptation)



Relative water demand difference for the SSP5 scenario (low challenge to adaptation) relative to the SSP3 (high challenge to adaptation)



-60% -50% -40% -30% -20% -10% 0% +20%



Changes in water resource vulnerability to at 2°C global warming (ensemble mean)



High challenge to adaptation

Medium challenge to adaptation

Low challenge to adaptation

Vulnerability change

Decreased vulnerability Increased vulnerability



Global vulnerability: fraction of land area



High challenges to adaptationMedium challenges to adaptationLow challenges to adaptation







High challenges to adaptation Medium challenges to adaptation Low challenges to adaptation



Conclusions

• At **2°C global warming**, complex geographical pattern of changes in freshwater resources. **Many areas get wetter but some get drier**

- Uncertainty in this depends on sea surface temperature and sea ice patterns, and also on which atmosphere model is used
- Generally **smaller changes at 1.5°C** but not in all basins (may be noise of variability)
- Generally larger changes at 4°C
- Uncertainty increases with global warming
- Socioeconomic scenario is a first-order effect on human impact
- For scenario with low challenge to adaptation, global water resource vulnerability projected to decrease
- For scenario with **high challenge to adaptation**, global water resource **vulnerability could either increase or decrease** with warming depending on patterns of climate change