

Daily Rainfall Variability at Point and Areal Scales: Evaluating Simulations of Present and Future Climate

Carol Frances McSweeney

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University
of East Anglia, Norwich.

April 2007



Climatic Research Unit
School of Environmental Sciences
University of East Anglia
Norwich NR4 7TJ

© This copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults is understood that its copyright rests with the author and no quotation from this thesis, nor any information derived therefrom, may be published without the author's prior, written consent.

Abstract

The daily variability in point observations of rainfall is not comparable to that found in grid-box average rainfall simulated by climate models due to the temporal smoothing effect of spatial averaging. This creates problems for (a) the comparisons of rainfall observations to climate model simulations that are necessary for the quantitative evaluation of daily variability in model-simulated rainfall, and (b) the application of climate model simulations at spatial scales that are smaller than the grid resolution, for climate impact assessment.

This thesis describes the development of statistical relationships between the characteristics of point and areal daily rainfall variability using measures of spatial correlation. These relationships allow estimates of 'true' areal average precipitation to be made, using a limited number of available stations, with an assessment of the uncertainty surrounding those estimates.

Relationships are developed between the dry-day probabilities of point and areal-mean rainfall, and for the parameters of the gamma distribution of wet-day amounts for point and areal rainfall, using daily station data from the UK, Zimbabwe and China.

The application of these relationships to climate model evaluation is demonstrated using three General Circulation Models (HadCM3, CGCM3 and PCM). Estimates are made of 'true' grid-box average values of dry-day probability, mean wet-day amount (mean daily intensity), the gamma distribution parameters for wet-day amounts and the 95th percentile values of wet-day amounts for grid boxes from the three GCMs over the UK and South Africa.

The relationships can also be used to make estimates of the daily variability in point rainfall from an areal average series simulated by a climate model if the values of spatial variability are known. For future climate, it may not be valid to assume that spatial correlation will be stationary, because there is evidence that suggests that rainfall in a warmer climate may become more convective, and thus potentially become more localised. Investigation using rainfall simulations for Europe from the Regional Climate Model (RCM) HadRM3H found that these simulations do indicate a shift towards a greater proportion of convective rainfall in future climate (2070-2100) under SRES scenario A2. Investigation of the level of spatial correlation between RCM grid boxes, however, indicated an increase in sub-GCM-grid-scale spatial correlation, rather than the

decrease that might be expected. An alteration to the spatial correlation of rainfall under warmer conditions cannot be ruled out, however, because the model's spatial resolution might limit its ability to represent the spatial characteristics of convective rainfall realistically.

A spatial analogue approach is used to make an estimate of the spatial correlation that might be experienced under future climate. A region is selected (The Netherlands) that, according to the RCM simulations, experiences a similar proportion of convective rainfall in its recent climate as is projected for the south-east UK in summer in 2070-2100 under SRES scenario A2. The values of spatial correlation for stations from this region are used as an estimate of the future levels of spatial correlation that might accompany the changed proportion of convective rainfall for the south-east UK. Observed UK spatial correlation values, and the possible future values estimated via this spatial analogue are both applied to the summer GCM grid-box precipitation simulated for this future period to estimate the characteristics of rainfall at points within that grid box. Even when spatial correlation is unchanged in future climate, the changes in dry-day probability, mean-wet day amount (mean daily intensity), the parameters of the gamma distribution and the 95th percentile values of wet-day amounts change by different factors depending on whether the areal or estimated point values are considered. For the mean intensity, even the direction of change differs. Applying the changes in spatial correlation causes the magnitude of the changes to be greater still, demonstrating that failure to take into account potential decreases in spatial correlation (even if those decreases are relatively small) when downscaling or disaggregating from grid-box projections could lead to an under-estimation of the temporal variability at points within the grid box.

Acknowledgements

There are many people to be thanked who have contributed to this thesis through their assistance, expertise, provision of data and funding, support and helping to preserve my sanity.

For funding, I thank the Natural Environmental Research Council (NERC), and also the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, (CEH). The data I have used comes from a number of sources; The British Atmospheric Data Centre (UK station data), Zimbabwean Meteorological Service (Zimbabwean station data), Oak Ridge National Laboratory in the United States (Chinese station data), The South African Weather Bureau (South African station data, via David Foxall), RCM data made available by the PRUDENCE Project at the Danish Meteorological Institute, and GCM data made available by the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Inter-comparison for the IPCC.

I am very grateful to my supervisory committee Tim Osborn, Phil Jones, Nick Reynard and Kevin Hiscock for their guidance and support. Thanks go to Tim particularly who, as my primary supervisor, has guided me through every stage of my PhD research with great expertise, patience and good humour.

I'd also like to thank everyone in CRU for their help, encouragement and friendship which have made working in the unit so enjoyable. Particular thanks go to Marie Ekström for her help and advice, and also to Mike Salmon for providing top-rate IT support.

The last few months spent finishing my thesis have been made considerably easier thanks to the flexibility that my new employer, Mark New, has allowed me in my work for Oxford University. I am very grateful to Mark for his support and generosity in this.

Finally, thanks go to all the people who have provided the encouragement, reassurance and much needed distractions; Fellow PhD students who have helped me to consume the vast majority of Columbia's coffee exports over the last three-and-a-half years: Kate, Oli, Jade, Matt, Charlotte, Sian and David; former CRU PhD students Mark, Stephen and Craig; My family; and Paul.

Contents

1	Introduction and Overview	1
	Contents.....	1
1.1	Rainfall Variability and Extremes: Why the Concern?	1
1.2	Simulation of Daily Rainfall Variability and Extremes Using Climate Models	2
1.3	Temporal Variability of Daily Rainfall at Different Spatial Scales.....	4
1.4	Evaluation of Daily Rainfall Simulated by Climate Models	6
1.5	Daily Rainfall Simulations of Future Climate for Impacts Studies.....	7
1.6	Aims and Objectives and Structure of the Thesis	8
2.	Literature Review.....	11
	Contents.....	11
2.1.	Introduction.....	12
2.1.1.	A note on convective and synoptic precipitation events.....	12
2.2.	Daily Precipitation Variability in a Warmer Climate	14
2.2.1.	Theoretical Changes to the Hydrological Cycle and their Influence on Precipitation Variability.....	14
2.2.2.	Changes to Precipitation Variability in Model Simulations	17
2.2.3.	Observed Changes to Daily Precipitation Characteristics	23
2.2.4.	Summary.....	26
2.3.	Evaluating Characteristics of Daily Precipitation in Climate Simulations.....	28
2.3.1.	Climate Models and Precipitation	30
2.3.2.	Previous Evaluations of Variability and Extremes in Climate Model Experiments	31
2.3.3.	Evaluation of Variability and Extremes in Climate Model Experiments: Model Inter-comparison and General Results	38
2.3.4.	Other Studies Addressing the Spatial Scaling Properties of Rainfall Variability and Extremes.....	39
2.3.5.	Summary.....	41
2.4.	Representing Sub-grid-scale Precipitation Variability in Climate Change Scenarios.....	43

2.4.1.	Areal Rainfall Projections: Problems for Regional Hydrological Impact Assessment	43
2.4.2.	Downscaling Techniques	44
2.4.3.	The Relevance of Scaling Relationships Under Future Climate Conditions	46
2.4.4.	Summary	47
2.5.	Summary of Literature Review and Research Objectives	48
3.	Estimating Dry-Day Probability for Areal Rainfall	51
	Contents	51
3.1.	Introduction	52
3.2.	Study Regions and Station Data	54
3.3.	Development of Methodology	60
3.3.1.	Selection of Wet-Day/Dry-Day Threshold	60
3.3.2.	Dry-Day Probability in an n -Station-Mean Series and the Effective Number of Independent Stations (n')	61
3.3.3.	Spatial Dependence Between Dry-Day Occurrences	64
3.4.	Application to Data	69
3.4.1.	Estimating Dry-Day Probability in an Average of n Stations	69
3.4.2.	Uncertainty in Estimates of Dry-Day Probability for an n -Station Average	71
3.5.	Application of Methodology to the Estimation of Dry-Day Probability in a ‘True’ Grid-Box Mean	73
3.5.1.	Extension of Methodology to Estimation of Dry-Day Probability in the ‘True’ Grid-Box Mean (N stations)	74
3.5.2.	Uncertainty in Estimates of Dry-Day Probability for a ‘True’ Areal Mean	83
3.6.	Discussion and Conclusions	85
4.	Estimating the Distribution of Wet-Day Amounts for Areal Rainfall Using the Gamma Distribution	89
	Contents	89
4.1.	Introduction	90

4.2. The Gamma Distribution and Point and Areal Rainfall.....	91
4.2.1. Introduction to the Gamma Distribution.....	91
4.2.2. Fitting the Gamma Distribution to Daily Rainfall Data.....	93
4.2.3. Testing Goodness-of-Fit of the Gamma Distribution for Point and Areal Rainfall	95
4.3. Development of Methodology	105
4.3.1. Spatial Dependence Between Wet-Day Values.....	106
4.3.2. Empirical Relationships Between Single-Station and n -Station Timeseries	108
4.3.3. Estimation of n -Station-Mean Scale Parameter (β_n).....	111
4.3.4. Estimation of n -Station-Mean Shape Parameter (α_n).....	114
4.3.5. Summary.....	123
4.4. Application of Methodology to the Estimation of Gamma Parameters of ‘True’ Areal Mean Precipitation.....	124
4.4.1. Extension of Methodology to the Estimation of Gamma Parameters of the ‘True’ Areal Mean.....	124
4.4.2. Estimated Gamma Parameters for ‘True’ Areal Mean	130
4.4.3. Additional Uncertainty in Estimates of α_N and β_N for Small Values of n	133
4.5. Estimating Distribution Extremes Using the Gamma Parameters	137
4.5.1. Assessment of Goodness-of-Fit at Distribution Tails.....	137
4.5.2. Estimating Percentile Values from the Gamma Distribution.....	139
4.6. Discussion and Summary	142
5. Evaluating Climate Model Simulations of Daily Rainfall Using Estimated Areal- Rainfall Parameters	145
Contents.....	145
5.1. Introduction.....	146
5.2. Model Details.....	147
5.3. Method	148
5.4. Model Evaluation over the UK	151
5.4.1. HadCM3	151
5.4.2. CCC CGCM3	159
5.4.3. PCM.....	164

5.5. Model Evaluation over South Africa.....	171
5.5.1. South African Data and Methods	171
5.5.2. HadCM3	176
5.5.3. CCC CGCM3	179
5.5.4. NCAR PCM.....	183
5.6. Discussion and Summary	186
5.6.1. Discussion of Model Performance.....	186
5.6.2. Discussion of Model Evaluation Method	187
6. Changes to the Spatial Variability of Daily Rainfall in Scenarios of Future Climate	189
Contents.....	189
6.1. Introduction.....	190
6.2. Data and Methods.....	193
6.3. Mean Daily Rainfall in Recent and Future Climate	195
6.4. Synoptic and Convective Rainfall in Recent and Future Climate.....	198
6.4.1. Synoptic Rainfall	198
6.4.2. Convective Rainfall	202
6.4.3. Proportional Contribution of Convective Rainfall to the Total Rainfall	205
6.4.4. Summary.....	209
6.5. Spatial Correlation in Recent and Future Climate.....	210
6.5.1. Recent Climate	210
6.5.2. Future Climate	215
6.5.3. Discussion.....	216
6.6. Conclusions.....	218

7. Using Climate Analogues to Estimate Spatial Correlation in Future Climate	219
Contents.....	219
7.1. Introduction.....	220
7.2. Method	221
7.2.1. Selection of an Analogue Region	222
7.2.2. Calculation of Spatial Correlation over the Analogue Region	224
7.2.3. Estimation of Point-scale Daily Precipitation Characteristics using Estimates of Changes in Spatial Correlation for the Future	226
7.3. Results	227
7.4. Summary.....	232
Chapter 8.....	233
8. Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Work.....	233
Contents.....	233
8.1. Summary and Main Conclusions.....	233
8.1.1. Developments and Findings Relating to Research Objective 1	234
8.1.2. Developments and Findings Relating to Research Objective 2.....	235
8.2. Recommendations for Further Work.....	237
References	239
Index of Equations.....	253
Glossary of Mathematical Terms.....	256

List of Tables and Figures

Chapter 1

Figure 1-1: Precipitation simulation problems imposed by restricted climate model resolution. ... 3

Chapter 2

Figure 2-1: Schematic outline of the sequence of processes involved in climate change and moisture content of the atmosphere (after Trenberth, 1998). 14

Figure 2-2: Schematic outline of sequence of processes involved in climate change and how the increasing moisture content of the atmosphere alters rainfall rates (after Trenberth, 1998, 1999). 15

Figure 2-3: Regionally averaged changes in 20-yr return period values of extreme precipitation, and corresponding changes in annual means expressed by percentage, simulated by CGCM2 in 2090 compared to 2000. Changes in extremes are indicated by darker colours, changes in means in lighter colours (Kharin and Zwiers, 2005). 19

Figure 2-4: Latitudinal profiles of the simulated zonal mean changes in the annual mean rates of precipitation (dotted line) and evaporation (solid line) by 2035-2065 under scenario IS92a using a coupled GCM (Wetherald and Manabe, 2002). 20

Figure 2-5: Annual cycle of (a) monthly mean convective precipitation and (b) the ratio of convective to total precipitation (%) over North America simulated using RCM MM5. Solid bars are for present-day climate (1990-1999) and non-filled bars are for future climate (2090-2099) under 2xCO₂ (Chen *et al.*, 2005) 22

Chapter 3

Table 3-1: Hypothetical correlative properties of station pairs for different daily rainfall measurements, when different measures of correlation are used. 67

Table 3-2: 'True' grid box mean $r(w/d)$ and N' for an example UK grid box. The same values calculated, and given in brackets, directly from the n available stations for comparison. 80

Figure 3-1: Locations of stations in UK dataset (170 stations)	55
Figure 3-2: Locations of stations in Chinese dataset (180 stations)	56
Figure 3-3: Locations of stations in Zimbabwean dataset (51 stations)	56
Figure 3-4: Number of stations with 70% or more complete data for the three regions, UK (blue), China (red) and Zimbabwe (green).	57
Figure 3-5: Mean daily rainfall and dry-day probability averaged over available stations for the 3 datasets (UK, China and Zimbabwe).....	58
Figure 3-6: Contour map of mean annual precipitation over China, 1951-1998 (Ye <i>et al.</i> , 2004)	58
Figure 3-7: Locations of Chinese precipitation stations, A and B.....	59
Figure 3-8: Mean daily rainfall and dry-day probability at Chinese stations A and B.....	59
Figure 3-9: Comparison of r with $r(w/d)$ for randomly selected station pairs from the UK data set.	67
Figure 3-10: Comparison of r with $r(w/d)$ for randomly selected station pairs from the Chinese data set.	68
Figure 3-11: Comparison of r with $r(w/d)$ for randomly selected station pairs from the Zimbabwean data set.	68
Figure 3-12: Estimated $P(d)_n$ versus Actual $P(d)_n$ for random n -station mean series from UK (Blue), Zimbabwe (Green) and Chinese (Red) station data.	70
Figure 3-13: Estimated $P(d)$ versus Actual $P(d)$ for random n -station mean series from UK (Blue), Zimbabwe (Green) and Chinese (Red) station data with 95% confidence limits.....	72
Figure 3-14: Example UK grid box: 3.75 x 2.5 degree, selected to give maximum station coverage.....	73
Figure 3-15: Correlation ($r(w/d)$) decay curves for 4 example stations (Batheaston, Cardington, Oxford and Stansted, for JJA (left) and DJF (right)).	78
Figure 3-16: The distribution of separation distances between randomly selected pairs of points in a grid box (based on 10000 station pairs).....	79
Figure 3-17: Variations in grid-box mean $r(w/d)$ when based on random samples of n stations out of the available 58.	81
Figure 3-18: Variations in grid-box mean point $P(d)$ when based on random samples of n stations out of the available 58.	82
Figure 3-20: Seasonal dry-day probability for an example UK grid box calculated by 3 different methods: a) mean $P(d)$ of 58 available stations in the region (yellow), (b) $P(d)$ in areal	

average series constructed using the arithmetic mean of 58 stations (green), and (c) estimated true areal $P(d)$ (blue) and the 95% confidence limits of this estimate..... 84

Chapter 4

Table 4-1: ‘True’ grid box mean $r(wet)$ and N' for an example UK grid box. The same values are calculated, given in brackets, directly from the n available (58) stations for comparison. . 127

Figure 4-1: Gamma distribution frequency distributions for a different values of the shape parameter, α when scale parameter, β , is kept constant at 1 (left) and for values of the scale parameter, β , when shape parameter α is kept constant at 2 (right)..... 90

Figure 4-2: Example of the Gamma distribution fitted to (left) wet day values, and (right) to wet-day values-0.25..... 93

Figure 4-3: PP plots, with D_n values, and Lilliefors test results, for two stations based on original data to 1 decimal place (left) and the for same stations but with uniform randomly selected additional decimal places (right). 95

Figure 4-4: Goodness of fit test plots gamma distribution to JJA and DJF wet-day rainfall amounts for an example station in UK. From left to right: Histogram, Q-Q plot (with 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values marked), and P-P plot. 97

Figure 4-5: Goodness of fit test plots gamma distribution to JJA and DJF wet-day rainfall amounts for an example station in China. From left to right: Histogram, Q-Q plot (with 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values marked), and P-P plot. 98

Figure 4-6: Goodness of fit test plots gamma distribution to JJA and DJF wet-day rainfall amounts for an example station in Zimbabwe. From left to right: Histogram, Q-Q plot (with 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values marked), and P-P plot..... 99

Figure 4-7: Goodness of fit test plots gamma distribution to JJA and DJF wet-day rainfall amounts for an example n -station average in UK. From left to right: Histogram, Q-Q plot (with 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values marked), and P-P plot. 100

Figure 4-8: Goodness of fit test plots gamma distribution to JJA and DJF wet-day rainfall amounts for an example n -station average in China. From left to right: Histogram, Q-Q plot (with 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values marked), and P-P plot 101

Figure 4-9: Goodness of fit test plots gamma distribution to JJA and DJF wet-day rainfall amounts for an example n -station average in Zimbabwe. From left to right: Histogram, Q-Q plot (with 90th, 95th and 99th percentile values marked), and P-P plot..... 102

Figure 4-10: Comparison of ‘ r ’ with ‘ $r(wet)$ ’ for randomly selected station pairs from the UK data set.....	105
Figure 4-11 Comparison of ‘ r ’ with ‘ $r(wet)$ ’ for randomly selected station pairs from the Zimbabwean data set.	105
Figure 4-12 Comparison of ‘ r ’ with ‘ $r(wet)$ ’ for randomly selected station pairs from the Chinese data set.	106
Figure 4-13: Ratio of n -station to mean single-station β vs effective n (n') for randomly selected sample clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), Zimbabwean (Green) and Chinese (Red) station data sets. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	107
Figure 4-14: Ratio of n -station to mean single-station α vs effective n (n') for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), Zimbabwean (Green) and Chinese (Red) station data sets. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	108
Figure 4-15: Ratio of n -station to mean single-station β vs effective n (n') for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), Zimbabwean (Green) and Chinese (Red) station data sets, fitted with a negative exponential function. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	110
Figure 4-16: Estimated β_n compared with actual β_n for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), China (Red) and Zimbabwe (Green), with 95% confidence intervals. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.....	111
Figure 4-17: Estimated α_n compared with actual α_n for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), China (Red) and Zimbabwe (Green). Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.....	113
Figure 4-18: Estimated α_n compared with actual α_n for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), Zimbabwe (Green) and China (Red). Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.....	114
Figure 4-19: Estimated α_n compared with actual α_n for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), Zimbabwe (Green) and China (Red), when estimated α_n values are based on actual β_n and $P(d)_n$. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	116
Figure 4-20: Error in estimates of α_n when based on actual values of β_n and $P(d)_n$ compared with mean daily rainfall (mm) for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue),	

Zimbabwe (Green) and China (Red). Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	117
Figure 4-21: Estimated α_n compared with actual α_n for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), China (Red) and Zimbabwe (Green), excluding cases where mean daily rainfall is less than 0.3mm and with 95% confidence intervals +0.18 and -0.09. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	119
Figure 4-22: Estimated α_n compared with actual α_n for randomly selected clusters of n stations from the UK (Blue), China (Red) and Zimbabwe (Green), excluding cases where mean daily rainfall is less than 0.3mm. Plot symbols indicate different seasons: \diamond = MAM, \square =JJA, Δ =SON, x =DJF.	120
Figure 4-23: Example Correlation decay curves from four stations (Batheaston, Cardington, Oxford and Stansted) from within the example UK grid box for JJA (left) and DJF (right).	125
Figure 4-24: Grid-box average correlation decay curve (red) with those for each individual station (black).....	126
Figure 4-25: Seasonal gamma parameters for the distribution of wet-day rainfall amounts an example UK grid box calculated by three different methods: a) mean α and β of 58 available stations in the region (yellow), (b) α and β of areal average series constructed using the arithmetic mean of 58 stations (green), and (c) ‘best guess’ estimates of α and β of the ‘true’ areal mean (blue) and the 95% confidence limits.....	128
Figure 4-26: Probability distributions for wet-day rainfall amounts based on the gamma shape and scale parameters, α and β , for an example UK grid box calculated by three different methods: a) mean α and β of 58 available stations in the region (yellow), (b) α and β of the average series constructed using the arithmetic mean of 58 stations (green), and (c) ‘best guess’ estimates of α and β of the ‘True’ areal mean (blue).....	129
Figure 4-27: As for Figure 4-26 but the distributions are scaled according to their corresponding wet-day probability.....	130
Figure 4-28: Variations in estimated gamma scale parameter, β , of the ‘true’ areal mean rainfall when, based on random sub-samples of n stations out of the available 58.	132
Figure 4-29: Variations in estimated gamma scale parameter, β , of the ‘true’ areal mean rainfall when, based on random sub-samples of n stations out of the available 58.	132
Figure 4-30: Variations in estimated grid-box mean inter-station wet-day correlation of rainfall, $\overline{r(wet)}$, based on random sub-samples of n stations out of the available 58.....	134

Figure 4-31: Variations in estimated grid-box mean single-station gamma scale parameter, $\overline{\beta_{n=1}}$, based on random sub-samples of n stations out of the available 58.....	134
Figure 4-32: Percentile threshold values from the fitted distribution compared with those calculated directly from data for 90 th , 95 th and 99 th percentiles, for n -station average series' from UK (blue), China (red), and Zimbabwe (green).	136
Figure 4-33: Estimated vs Observed values of $P95_n$, when the Observed value is determined by (a) the fitted distribution and (b) directly from the data.	137
Figure 4-34: Relationship between the estimation error of $P95_n$ and the number of values on which the distribution is fitted (n_{wet}).....	138
Figure 4-35: 95% confidence limits for estimation of $P95_n$	139

Chapter 5

Table 5-1: Technical details of the 3 GCMs evaluated (Dai <i>et al.</i> , 2006, Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2006).....	147
Figure 5-1: HadCM3 UK grid box positions.....	151
Figure 5-2: Model Evaluation Results for HadCM3 UK Grid box 1. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'.	153
Figure 5-3: Model Evaluation Results for HadCM3 UK Grid box 2.	154
Figure 5-4: Model Evaluation Results for HadCM3 UK Grid box 3.	154
Figure 5-5: Model Evaluation Results for HadCM3 UK Grid box 4.	155
Figure 5-6: Gamma probability density functions fitted to HadCM3 Box 3 wet-day amounts, multiplied by box 3 wet-day probability.	157
Figure 5-7: CGCM3 UK grid box positions.....	159
Figure 5-8: Model Evaluation Results for CGCM3 UK grid box 1. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'.	160
Figure 5-9: Model evaluation results for CGCM3 UK grid box 2.	161
Figure 5-10: Model evaluation results for CGCM3 UK grid box 3.	161
Figure 5-11: Model evaluation results for CGCM3 UK grid box 4.	162

Figure 5-12: Model evaluation results for CGCM3 UK grid box 5.	162
Figure 5-13: Gamma probability density functions fitted to CGCM3 grid-box 3 wet-day amounts, multiplied by Box 3 wet-day probability.	163
Figure 5-14: PCM UK grid box positions	164
Figure 5-15: Model evaluation results for PCM UK grid box 1. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'	165
Figure 5-16: Model evaluation results for PCM UK grid box 2.	166
Figure 5-17: Model evaluation results for PCM UK grid box 3.	166
Figure 5-18: Model evaluation results for PCM UK grid box 4.	167
Figure 5-19: Model evaluation results for PCM UK grid box 5.	167
Figure 5-20: Model evaluation results for PCM UK grid box 6.	168
Figure 5-21: Gamma probability density functions fitted to PCM grid-box 5 wet-day amounts, multiplied by Box 5 wet-day probability.	169
Figure 5-22: Examples of correlation decay curves for $r(w/d)$, with curves fitted according to Equation 5-1.	172
Figure 5-23: Example of confidence limits for South African dry-day probability and mean wet-day amount for areal rainfall estimates. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'	174
Figure 5-24: Examples of correlation decay curves for $r(wet)$, with curves fitted according to Equation 5-2.	175
Figure 5-25: HadCM3 South African grid box positions and rain gauge locations.	176
Figure 5-26: Model Evaluation Results for HadCM3 SA grid box 1. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'	177
Figure 5-27: Gamma probability density functions fitted to HadCM3 SA grid-box 1 wet-day amounts, multiplied by box 1 wet-day probability.	178
Figure 5-28: CGCM3 South African grid box positions and rain-gauge locations.	179
Figure 5-29: Model Evaluation Results for CGCM3 SA grid box 3. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are	

Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'	180
Figure 5-30: Gamma probability density functions fitted to CGCM3 SA grid-box 3 wet-day amounts, multiplied by box 3 wet-day probability.....	182
Figure 5-31: PCM South African grid box positions	183
Figure 5-32: Model Evaluation Results for PCM SA grid box 4. Red=Model, Blue=Observed (best estimate of true areal mean, together with 95% confidence intervals). Also shown are Yellow=average observed 'point' values, Green=observed 'areal' values as arithmetic mean of available station series'	184
Figure 5-33: Gamma probability density functions fitted to PCM SA grid-box 4 wet-day amounts, multiplied by box 4 wet-day probability.	185

Chapter 6

Figure 6-1: Mean daily rainfall (total in mm) simulated by HadRM3H for Europe – Control run 1960-1990.....	195
Figure 6-2: Mean daily rainfall (total in mm) simulated by HadRM3H for Europe –2070-2100 under scenario A2.....	196
Figure 6-3: Change in mean daily rainfall (total) simulated by HadRM3H for Europe from 1960-1990 to 2070-2100 under scenario A2.	197
Figure 6-4: Seasonal changes in mean daily total rainfall (mm) between 1961-90 (black) and 2070-2099 (red) under scenario A2 for the UK (dotted) and Europe (solid).	197
Figure 6-5: Mean daily synoptic rainfall (mm) simulated by HadRM3H for Europe – Control run 1960-1990.....	199
Figure 6-6: Mean daily synoptic rainfall (total in mm) simulated by HadRM3H for Europe – 2070-2100 under scenario A2.	200
Figure 6-7: Change in mean daily synoptic rainfall (mm) simulated by HadRM3H for Europe from 1960-1990 to 2070-2100 under scenario A2.	201
Figure 6-8: Seasonal changes in mean daily synoptic rainfall (mm) between 1961-90 (black) and 2070-2099 (red) under scenario A2 for the UK (dotted) and Europe (solid).	201
Figure 6-9: Mean daily convective rainfall simulated by HadRM3H for Europe – Control run 1960-1990.....	202

Figure 6-10: Mean daily convective rainfall simulated by HadRM3H for Europe – 2070-2100 under scenario A2.....	203
Figure 6-11: Change in mean daily convective rainfall simulated by HadRM3H from 1960-1990 under scenario A2.....	204
Figure 6-12: Seasonal changes in mean daily convective rainfall (mm) between 1961-90 (black) and 2070-2099 (red) under scenario A2 for the UK (dotted) and Europe (solid).	204
Figure 6-13: Convective fraction of mean daily rainfall over Europe simulated by HadRM3H – Control run 1960-1990.	206
Figure 6-14: Convective fraction of mean daily rainfall in HadRM3H simulations for Europe under scenario A2 – 2070-2100.....	207
Figure 6-15: Change in convective fraction of mean daily rainfall simulated by HadRM3H from 1960-1990 to 2070-2100 under scenario A2.	208
Figure 6-16: Mean convective fraction of total rainfall over Europe (solid) and UK (dotted) in control run 1960-1990 (black) and A2 scenario perturbed run 2070-2100 (red).	208
Figure 6-17: Spatial correlation (measured as the mean correlation over distances up to 400km) over Europe in control run (1960-1990) precipitation simulated by HadRM3H.	211
Figure 6-18: Spatial correlation of mean daily rainfall in control run (1960-1990) precipitation simulated by HadRM3H. Solid = European Average, dotted = UK average.	212
Figure 6-19: Spatial correlation (measured as the area below the correlation decay curve up to a distance of 400km) in daily rainfall over Europe from control run (1960-1990) synoptic precipitation simulated by HadRM3H.....	213
Figure 6-20: Spatial correlation in daily convective rainfall over Europe in control run (1960-1990) precipitation simulated by HadRM3H.	214
Figure 6-21: Spatial correlation averaged over Europe (solid) and UK (dotted) in the convective (left) and synoptic (right) components of total daily rainfall.	214
Figure 6-22: Change in spatial correlation (measured as the area below the correlation decay curve up to a distance of 400km) in total correlation simulated by HadRM3H.....	215
Figure 6-23: Mean change in average spatial correlation in total rainfall over Europe (solid) and UK (dotted) in control run 1960-1990 (black) and A2 scenario perturbed run 2070-2100 (red).	216

Chapter 7

Table 7-1: Convective fraction of total rainfall in HadCM3 ‘South east UK’ grid box, simulated by HadRM3H under scenario A2.....	222
Table 7-2: Average grid-box correlation statistics for grid boxes in UK and the Netherlands.	225
Table 7-3: Parameters of daily rainfall for the south-east UK simulated using HadCM3, at areal (grid-box) spatial scale and modified to represent the point spatial scale.....	228
Table 7-4: Change factors in parameters of daily rainfall simulated for south-east UK by HadCM3 at areal (grid-box) spatial scale and modified to represent the point spatial scale.	228
Figure 7-1: Potential analogue areas with present day convective fraction between 0.692 and 0.762. the UK grid box and the selected grid box are highlighted.	223
Figure 7-2: Station locations for analogue region, the Netherlands, Germany and Belgium.	224
Figure 7-3: Distribution of wet-day amounts, taking into account wet-day frequency, at grid-box scale (red) and point scale based on present-day spatial variability (green) and an estimate of possible future spatial variability (purple). Right hand plot is the same but with uses a logarithmic y-axis.....	230

Chapter 8

Table 8-1: Estimated uncertainty margins for estimates of dry-day probability and the gamma distribution parameters for wet-day amounts for ‘true’ areal mean rainfall.....	235
---	-----