Mekong River flow and hydrological extremes under climate change
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Abstract

Climate change poses critical threats to water related safety and sustainability in the Mekong River basin. Hydrological impact signals from earlier CMIP3-based assessments, however, are highly uncertain and largely ignore hydrological extremes. This paper provides one of the
first hydrological impact assessments using the CMIP5 climate projections. Furthermore, we model and analyse changes in river flow regimes and hydrological extremes (i.e. high flow and low flow conditions). In general, the Mekong’s hydrological cycle intensifies under future climate change. The scenarios ensemble mean shows increases in both seasonal and annual river discharges (annual change between +5% and +16%, depending on location). Despite the overall increasing trend, the individual scenarios show differences in the magnitude of discharge changes and, to a lesser extent, contrasting directional changes. The scenarios ensemble, however, shows reduced uncertainties in climate projection and hydrological impacts compared to earlier CMIP3-based assessments. We further found that extremely high flow events increase in both magnitude and frequency. Extremely low flows, on the other hand, are projected to occur less often under climate change. Higher low flows can help reducing dry season water shortage and controlling salinization in the downstream Mekong Delta. However, higher and more frequent peak discharges will exacerbate flood risk in the basin. Climate change induced hydrological changes will have important implications for safety, economic development and ecosystem dynamics and thus require special attention in climate change adaptation and water management.
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1 Introduction
The Mekong River basin is one of the most important transboundary rivers in Southeast Asia. Starting from the Tibetan Plateau, the 4800-km long river flows across six different countries, namely China, Myanmar, Laos PDR, Thailand, Cambodia and finally Vietnam before draining into the East Sea (also known as South China Sea). The economies and societies
along the Mekong are strongly linked to its abundant water resources (MRC, 2010). The most
important river dependent economic sectors include agriculture, energy (i.e. hydropower
production) and fishery (Västilä et al., 2010; MRC, 2011a). Currently, the Mekong basin is
home to about 70 million people and this population is expected to increase to 100 million by
2050 (Varis et al., 2012). Economic development has been accelerating rapidly over the last
decades together with substantial increases in water resources use (Jacobs et al., 2002; Lebel
et al., 2005; Piman et al., 2013). Given high dependencies on water in the basin, the issues of
securing water safety and long-term sustainability are especially important for water resources
management.

Socio-economic developments in the Mekong River basin, however, are facing critical
challenges relating to water resources, including hydrological changes caused by climate
change (Keskinen et al., 2010; MRC, 2010; Västilä et al., 2010). Existing studies (e.g.
Eastham et al., 2008; Hoanh et al., 2010; Västilä et al., 2010) suggest that climate change will
alter the current hydrological regime and thus posing challenges for ecosystems and socio-
economic developments. For instance, Västilä et al. (2010) and Hoanh et al. (2010) modelled
the Mekong’s flow regimes under the several climate change scenarios and suggested a likely
intensification of the hydrological cycle, resulting in increases in annual and seasonal river
discharges. Consequently, they also suggest increasing flood risks during the wet season in
the Cambodian and Vietnamese floodplain due to increasing river flow. Other studies (e.g.
Lauri et al., 2012 and Kingston et al., 2011) also suggest possible discharge reduction in the
dry season under some individual climate change scenarios.

Although many studies about climate change impacts on the Mekong’s hydrology exist, two
major challenges in understanding hydrological responses to climate change remain. First,
existing hydrological impact assessments prove highly uncertain. In particular, impact signals
differ markedly in the magnitudes and even directions of changes across the individual global
circulation models (GCMs) and climate change scenarios. Kingston et al. (2011) quantified
uncertainties related to the choice of GCMs and climate scenarios in projecting monthly
discharge changes and show a large range between -16% and +55%. They also noted that
hydrological changes under different GCMs and scenarios differ remarkably in magnitude
and even in contrasting directions. Another study by Lauri et al. (2012) also reported a wide
range of discharge change between -11% and +15% during the rainy season and between -
10% and +13% during the dry season. Both studies noted the uncertainty in hydrological
impact signals, which mainly associates with uncertainties in the climate change projection,
especially precipitation changes. Given these uncertainties, they all also stress the importance
to use multiple GCMs and several scenarios (i.e. an ensemble approach) rather than relying on
a single model or climate change projection. Compared to uncertainty in the future climate,
uncertainty relating to hydrological models’ schematization and parameterization seems less
important for the Mekong basin. Regarding hydrological model’s skill, many studies
including Hoanh et al., 2010; Västilä et al., 2010; Kingston et al. (2011) and Lauri et al.
(2012) reported sufficient performance in capturing the dynamics of the Mekong’s hydrology.
Several studies also reported lower modelling skill in more upstream stations (e.g. Chiang
Saen) compared to more downstream stations including Kingston et al. (2011) and Lauri et al.
(2012).

Notably, all earlier studies used the SRES emission scenarios (Nakicenovic et al., 2000),
which were developed for the Climate Models Inter-comparison Project phase 3 (CMIP3).
These scenarios, which only include non-intervention scenarios, have recently been replaced
by the Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) scenarios (van Vuuren et al., 2011; Stocker et al 2013), resulting in a broader range of climate change. These most recent climate change scenarios (i.e. the CMIP5) are not yet routinely used to assess the hydrological impacts in the Mekong basin. The CMIP5 scenarios also exhibit important improvements, both in terms of the GCMs’ technical development (Taylor et al., 2011; Knutti and Sedláček, 2013) and the efficiency to reproduce the historic climate conditions (Shabeh uh et al., 2015). These important improvements and updates are highly relevant and require to update the hydrological projections for the Mekong. In this study, we will do this update and reflect whether the CMIP3 uncertainties relating to the hydrological signal will be reduced as well.

Second, although hydrological extremes under future climatic change are very relevant for water management and climate change adaptation (Piman et al., 2013; Cosslett and Cosslett, 2014), very little insights have been gained on this topic so far in the Mekong. Previous studies typically analysed hydrological changes at monthly and seasonal timescales and less studies focused on changes in frequency and severity of extreme events (i.e. climate change induced floods and droughts). This knowledge gap also relates to the fact that uncertainties, especially those relating to future monsoon and precipitation changes, prevail the CMIP3 climate change projections. Given high level of policy-relevance and important improvements in CMIP5 climate change projections, future changes in extreme high and low river flows should be comprehensively assessed and made available to decision makers.

In this paper, we aim to address these knowledge gaps in understanding the Mekong’s hydrology under climate change. A distributed hydrological model was setup and calibrated for the whole Mekong River (Sect. 3.1 and 4.1). We selected a set of 10 climate change
experiments for five GCMs and two RCPs from the CMIP5 and performed a downscaling and bias-correction on the climate model output (Sect. 3.2). Future changes in precipitation and temperature (Sect. 4.2) and subsequently the Mekong’s annual and monthly discharge changes were quantified (Sect. 4.3). In addition, we quantified changes in hydrological extremes, focusing on both extreme low and high flows (Sect. 4.4). We will also reflect on the robustness of the hydrological signals and show improvements in uncertainty compared to other CMIP3-based studies (Sect. 5.1).

2 The Mekong River basin

The Mekong (Fig. 1) is an average-sized river basin compared to other major rivers of the world. Its total drainage area is about 795,000 km², distributed unevenly across six Southeast Asian countries (MRC, 2005). The river’s annual discharge volume of 475 km³, is considerably higher than similarly sized river basins. Despite its moderate area, the Mekong ranks tenth in terms of annual discharge volume (Dai and Trenberth, 2002). This implies that the basin receives higher precipitation amount per unit area, owing to its dominant tropical monsoon climate (Adamson et al., 2009; Renaud et al., 2012). Elevation in the basin ranges between above 5,000m in the Tibetan Plateau to only a few meters above sea level in the downstream river delta.

[Figure 1]

The Mekong’s hydrological regime is largely driven by monsoonal activities, most importantly the South-West Monsoon and to a lesser extent the North-East Monsoon (Costa-Cabral et al., 2007; MRC, 2009; Delgado et al., 2012). The South-West Monsoon is dominant from May to September, whereas the North-East Monsoon is active from November to February. These monsoonal activities characterize the basin’s hydrology into two
hydrological seasons with distinctive flow characteristics. A substantially larger proportion of
the annual flow is generated during the wet seasons (June-November). Depending on location,
the wet season flow accounts for between 75% and 85% of the total annual flow (calculated
from MRC, 2005). Seasonal variation in river flow, especially the flood pulse occurring in the
downstream delta (i.e. the Tonle Sap Lake in Cambodia and the Vietnamese Mekong delta),
supports a highly productive aquatic ecosystem and one of the world’s major rice production
area (Lamberts and Koponen, 2008; Arias et al., 2012).

Hydrological changes, including changes in extreme high and low flows, increase safety risks
and undermine economic productivity in the basin, especially in the low-lying river delta
(Eastham et al., 2008; Arias et al., 2014). Extreme floods caused by intensive and wide-spread
precipitation events result in vast inundation and thereby damaging crops, infrastructure and,
in very extreme cases (e.g. flood events in 2000 and 2011), disrupting the whole downstream
delta’s functioning. The catastrophic flood in 2000 with an estimated total economic loss of
over $200 million (Cosslett and Cosslett, 2014) illustrates the severe flood damage in this
area. Extreme low flows also affect agriculture production, which largely depends on surface
water irrigation in many parts of the basin. Lack of upstream inflow during the dry season
also exacerbates the risk of salt water intrusion, affecting the downstream delta’s ecosystems,
domestic water supply and agricultural production (Smajgl et al., 2015).

3 Methodology

3.1 Hydrological model

VMod (Lauri et al., 2006) is a distributed hydrological model using a square grid
representation of river basins. This grid uses multiple raster layers containing data for flow
direction, river network, soil and land use. The simulation process starts with interpolating climate input for each grid cell from climate input data. VMod requires minimally four daily climate forcing variables (i.e. maximum, minimum and average air temperatures, and precipitation). Climate forcing data is calculated for each grid cell using an inverse distance weighted interpolation. Potential evapotranspiration (PET) is calculated using the Hargreaves-Samani method (Hargreaves and Samani, 1982), where PET is calculated using daily maximum, minimum temperatures, latitude and calendar day of the year. The soil is simulated as two distinctive layers and soil surface processes are simulated following Dingman (1994). After calculating the water balance, runoff is routed from cell to cell and finally into the river network. A detailed description of the VMod model’s algorithms and equations is available in the model’s manual (Lauri et al., 2006).

In this study, we used the modelling setup for the Mekong River basin from Lauri et al. (2012). This Mekong modelling setup was prepared from several soil, land use and elevation datasets, allowing for daily hydrological simulation at 5km x 5km spatial resolution. Soil data was prepared from the FAO soil map of the world (FAO, 2003). Soil data were prepared by first reclassifying the original data into eight classes and then aggregated to a 5km x 5km grid. Land use data was prepared by reclassifying the original Global Land Cover 2000 data (GLC2000, 2003) into nine classes and then aggregated to the model’s grid. The GLC2000 provides land cover data that is most suitable to our calibration and validation time period (i.e., 1981-2001). The flow direction data was prepared from the SRTM90m elevations (Jarvis et al., 2008). The elevation data along the main river’s branches was adjusted to force these branches into the proper flow direction. More detailed information on the model setup and its parameterization for the Mekong basin is available in Lauri et al. (2012).
We calibrated and validated the hydrological model against observed daily river discharges at seven gauging stations: Chiang Saen, Vientiane, Nakhon Phanom, Mukdahan, Pakse, Stung Treng and Kratie (Fig. 1). Observed discharge data was obtained from the Mekong River Commission’s hydrological database (MRC, 2011b). Calibration and validation periods are 1981-1991 and 1991-2001 respectively. The hydrological model’s performance was assessed using discharge plots and model performance indices. In particular, the daily river discharges plots and the flow duration curves (Vogel and Fennessey, 1995) were used to visually check the goodness of fit between observed and simulated data. Furthermore, the Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency NSE (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) and relative biases indices were used to quantify the model’s performance during calibration and validation. The model’s over- and underestimation of total annual river discharge, high flow and low flow indices (i.e. Q5 and Q95, respectively) were assessed by calculating the relative biases. These Q5 (high flow) and Q95 (low flow) are commonly used indices in hydrological analyses, defined as the values that exceed the discharge time series data by 5% and 95% of the time, respectively. The biases are calculated as simulated values divided by observed values under the same time period of interest.

We started the model calibration by using the initial parameterization from Lauri et al. (2012). Simulation performance was further improved by manually adjusting several model’s parameters. In particular, discharge amount and timing at key stations were calibrated to better match with observed data by changing the two soil layers’ depth and their water storage capacities. Vertical and horizontal infiltration rates were also adjusted to further improve simulations of high flows and low flows. Lastly, snowmelt rate and temperature thresholds for
snow precipitation and snowmelt were adjusted to improve model performance at the upper
catchment above Chiang Saen (Northern Thailand). All parameter values were adjusted
within the physically realistic range described in Lauri et al. (2006) and Sarkkula et al. (2010).

3.2 Climate data

We prepared climate data for the historic period (1971-2000) and the future period (2036-
2065) using various datasets. Historic temperature was prepared from the WATCH Forcing
Data (Weedon et al., 2011), which is a global historic climate dataset for the 1958-2001
period, produced from the 40-year ECMWF Re-Analysis (Uppala et al., 2005) and bias-
corrected using the CRU-TS2.1 observed data (Mitchell and Jones, 2005). This dataset is
widely used in various global and regional studies (e.g. van Vliet et al., 2013; Leng et al.,
2015; Veldkamp et al., 2015). Precipitation data was extracted from the APHRODITE dataset
(Yatagai et al., 2012), which is an observation-based precipitation dataset, developed from a
high-density network of rain gauges over Asia. This dataset has been evaluated as one of the
best gridded precipitation datasets for hydrological modelling purpose in the Mekong basin
(Lauri et al., 2014). We further discuss potential implications of using the combined
WATCH-APHRODITE data in Sect.5.3.

Climate change scenarios were prepared from the most recent CMIP5 climate projection.
Since the regional climate model data of the Coordinated Regional Climate Downscaling
Experiment – CORDEX (Giorgi and Gutowski, 2015) so far only covers one GCM for the
Mekong region, we decided to use GCM projections as basis for this climate impact
assessment. We therefore downscaled the GCM projections ourselves. Given the relatively
large number of GCMs under CMIP5, we first did a model selection by reviewing literature
on GCM performance. We selected those GCMs that better reproduce historic tropical
temperature and precipitation conditions, implying their suitability to be used in the Mekong
region. For historic temperature simulations, Huang et al. (2014) assessed the CMIP5 models
efficiency for the Mekong basin and suggested BCC-CSM1-1, CSIRO-MK3-6-0, HadGEM2-
ES and MIROC-ESM-CHEM as the better-performing models. Shabeh uh et al., (2015)
evaluated the GCM’s performance in simulating seasonal precipitation focusing on
monsoonal activities for three major river basins in South and Southeast Asia, including the
Mekong. They concluded that the MPI models, MIROC5 and CSIRO-Mk3-6-0, CCSM4,
CESM1-CAM5, GFDL-ESM2G, IPSL-CMA-MR, MIROC-ESM and MIROC-ESM-CHEM
perform better than other GCMs in the assessment. Furthermore, we also consulted
Sillmann’s et al. (2013) model evaluation to represent climate extremes. They indicated that
ACCESS-1.0, CCSM4, MPI models and HadGEM2-ES are amongst the better performing
models. Based on these GCM evaluations, we selected five GCMs for this study (Table 1).
For each GCM, we extracted climate data for two different RCPs, namely RCP4.5 and
RCP8.5. The RCP4.5 is a medium to low scenario assuming a stabilization of radiative
forcing to 4.5W/m^2 by 2100 (Thomson et al., 2011). The RCP8.5 is a high radiative forcing
scenario assuming a rising radiative forcing leading to 8.5W/m^2 by 2100 (Riahi et al., 2011).
By selecting a mid-range and a high-end scenario, we expect to capture a reasonable range in
climatic and hydrological projections for the Mekong basin. Given our focus on hydrological
extremes under climate change, we did not consider RCP2.6, which is the lowest radiative
forcing scenario.

[Table 1]
Since the GCMs’ spatial resolution is generally too coarse for a basin-scale study, we re-gridded the climate data to a 0.5°x0.5° grid using bilinear interpolation. Subsequently, the data is subjected to a statistical bias-correction, using the method developed by Piani et al. (2010) to correct biases in the GCM simulations. This bias-correction is done by developing transfer functions, which match the GCM historic (1959-2000) data’s monthly statistics to an independent, observed climatology. We used the WATCH Forcing Data and APHRODITE as independent datasets. The developed transfer functions were then applied on the future climate data to correct the biases in the GCM’s future climate projection. Detailed information on the bias-correction method is available in Piani et al. (2010).

3.3 Analysing hydrological changes

We employed several techniques to analyse different aspects of hydrological changes. First, annual and monthly discharges’ statistics were calculated to understand changes in the river’s flow regime. Second, we calculated the Q5 and Q95 to analyse changes in high flow and low flow conditions, respectively. Lastly, we fitted discharge data to suitable extreme values distributions to investigate the magnitude and frequency of extreme high flows and low flows. Yearly peak river discharges data was fitted to the Generalized Extreme Value distribution (Stedinger et al., 1993; Dung et al., 2015). Similarly, maximum cumulative discharge deficit, defined as the total deficit under a threshold, were fitted to the Generalized Pareto distribution (Tallaksen et al., 2004; Hurkmans et al., 2010) to analyse extreme low flows. The threshold to calculate cumulative discharge deficit is defined as Q75 (discharge value exceeded 75% of the time) under future climate change (Hisdal et al., 2004). Hydrological changes were calculated under individual scenarios and under ensembles, i.e. average changes from multiple GCMs and both RCPs.
4 Results

4.1 Performance of the hydrological simulations

[Table 2]

The calibration and validation results are presented in Table 2. The simulated river discharges in general match relatively well to the observed data. The NSE values show very good performance (0.88-0.96) for all considered stations. Similarly, the relative biases in total discharge, and the high flows (Q5) and low flows (Q95) indices are all within acceptable ranges, except for relatively lower performance at the most upstream Chiang Saen station. Discharge biases show underestimation of annual discharge at Chiang Saen by 10% and 12% during the calibration and validation, respectively. This underestimation is also shown by the flow duration curve, where simulated low flows exhibits more biases than high flows (Fig. 2). Low flow biases at Chiang Saen could be explained by unaccounted flow regulation by upstream hydropower dams during the dry season, as suggested by Adamson (2001), Lauri et al. (2012) and Räsänen et al. (2012). Besides, lower accuracy of APHRODITE precipitation data in the mountainous area above Chiang Saen could also affect the model’s performance. Discharge biases, however, are only substantial at Chiang Saen station and quickly improve further downstream (see Table 2). Lastly, daily discharge plots also show good matches between simulated and observed discharges for both calibration and validation periods (Fig. 2). Based on these validations, we conclude that the model set up is suitable for our modelling purposes.

[Figure 2]
4.2 Climate change projection

We analysed future changes in temperature and precipitation projected by the GCMs and RCPs by comparing climate data between the baseline (1971-2000) and future (2036-2065) periods. Since we only assessed hydrological changes down to Kratie (Cambodia), we excluded the downstream area below this station (i.e. South of latitude 12.5°N) when calculating temperature and precipitation changes.

Overall, surface air temperature increases consistently under all GCMs and RCPs (Fig. 3). All GCMs project higher temperature increase in the RCP8.5 than in the RCP4.5. In particular, the RCP8.5 ensemble shows an increase of +2.4°C whereas the RCP4.5 ensemble projects +1.9°C. Temperature increase differs amongst the individual GCMs and RCPs. The lowest basin-average temperature increase of 1.5°C is projected by the MPI-RCP4.5, whereas the ACCESS-RCP8.5 projects the highest increase of 3.5°C. A majority of scenarios project temperature increases between 1.5°C and 2.5°C, including CCSM-RCP8.5, CSIRO-RCP4.5, CSIRO-RCP8.5, HadGEM-RCP4.5, HadGEM-RCP8.5 and MPI-RCP4.5. Notably, the ACCESS GCM shows markedly more temperature increase compared to other models. The spatial patterns of temperature increases are relatively similar between the scenarios: temperature tends to increase more in the upper catchment area in China, large parts of Thailand and sometimes also in the Vietnamese Mekong delta (Fig. 3). Areas with lower future temperature increases are located mostly in the eastern part of the Mekong’s lower basin including Eastern Cambodia and the Central Highlands of Vietnam.

[Figure 3]
Total annual precipitation in the Mekong basin is projected to increase under most (i.e. 9 out of 10) climate change scenarios. Only the HadGEM-RCP8.5 scenario projects a slight reduction (i.e. -3%) in annual precipitation. Annual precipitation changes between -3% (HadGEM-RCP8.5) and +5% (CCSM-RCP8.5), with an ensemble mean of +3% across all the scenarios. The scenarios also show larger range of basin-wide precipitation changes under the RCP8.5 (i.e. between -3% and +5%) compared to that under the RCP4.5 (i.e. between +3% and +4%). Notably, these ranges of precipitation changes are typically smaller than those derived from earlier CMIP3-based assessments (i.e. Eastham et al., (2008); Kingston et al., (2011); Lauri et al., (2012) and Thompson et al., (2013)). Details on cross-studies comparison are shown in Table 4. Reduced uncertainties in precipitation projection will likely improve robustness of the projected hydrological changes.

Despite the overall increasing signal, all scenarios project contrasting directional changes where precipitation increases in some areas and reduces in others (Fig. 4). The upper catchment area (i.e. above Chiang Saen) exhibits substantial precipitation increase under all scenarios. The lower Mekong area, on the other hand, shows both increase and reduction in annual rainfall, depending on location. Many GCMs, including CSIRO, HadGEM and MPI project rainfall reduction in the eastern part of the lower Mekong basin (i.e. Southern Laos, Eastern Cambodia and the Vietnamese central highlands), especially under the RCP8.5 scenario.

4.3 Changes in the flow regime

This section presents changes in annual, seasonal and monthly river discharges under climate change. Annual changes are presented for all seven mainstream stations (see locations in Fig.
1) while we limit the rest of the results to three representative stations to maintain the paper’s focus. These stations are Vientiane (Laos PDR), Mukdahan (Thailand) and Kratie (Cambodia), each representing the upper, middle and lower parts of the basin, respectively.

The GCM ensemble mean, lowest and highest changes in annual river discharge are presented in Table 3 for both RCPs. The ensemble means in both the RCP4.5 and the RCP8.5 show a general increase of the Mekong’s mean flow under climate change. Annual discharges increase between +5% (at Kratie and Stung Treng) and +15% (at Chiang Saen), indicating more substantial increase in the upstream stations compared to the downstream ones. Despite the general increasing signal based on ensemble mean, annual discharges also reduce slightly under some individual scenarios. The reductions range from -1% (at Chiang Saen, scenario CSIR0-RCP4.5) to -7% (at Stung Treng and Kratie, scenario HadGEM-RCP8.5). While the ensemble means under the two RCPs are very similar, the RCP8.5 exhibits a larger range in projected discharge changes (Table 3). This larger range is associated to more differentiated precipitation changes under individual GCMs in the RCP8.5 compared to those in the RCP4.5 (see Fig. 4).

Fig. 5 shows changes in monthly river discharges under climate change. Overall, the scenario ensembles show higher monthly river flow at all considered stations, except for a slight reduction in June. Absolute discharge increases are more substantial in the wet season compared to those in the dry season. In terms of timing, the RCP4.5 shows largest increases in November, while the RCP8.5 shows largest increase in August. Although absolute increases are more substantial during the wet season months, relative increases are higher
during the dry season. For instance, discharge in April could increase up to +40% (+360 m$^3$/s) at Vientiane and +25% (+480 m$^3$/s) at Kratie. Despite the overall increasing trends, discharge in June is projected to reduce slightly at all three stations, ranging between -810 m$^3$/s (-8%) at Kratie, followed by -530 m$^3$/s (-8%) at Mukdahan and -210 m$^3$/s (-5%) at Vientiane. On the seasonal timescale, discharges increase at all stations during both the wet and dry seasons.

[Figure 5]

Cross-GCMs comparisons show that monthly discharge changes during the wet season are more variable compared to the dry season. Fig. 5 clearly shows that the ensemble’s projection ranges become markedly larger in the wet season, implying higher uncertainty in the hydrological change signal. For example, projected river discharge in August at Mukdahan ranges between 15,400 m$^3$/s (scenario HadGEM-RCP8.5) and 22,300 m$^3$/s (scenario MPI-RCP8.5). This is a spread of 6,900 m$^3$/s, equivalent to 36% of the average discharge in August. Moreover, the individual GCMs also show contrasting directional discharge changes in the wet season months. The CSIRO and HadGEM models project reductions in discharge during June-October, whereas the other models project discharge increases during the same period. These contrasting directional changes mainly result from the disagreement among GCMs on the future precipitation regime in the Mekong basin. This disagreement highlights one of the key uncertainties in projecting future climatic change and subsequently hydrological responses in the Mekong basin, as also noted by Kingston et al. (2011).

4.4 Changes in hydrological extremes

This section subsequently presents changes in Q5 (high flow), Q95 (low flow) and hydrological extremes. Relative changes in high flows (Q5) and low flows (Q95) at Vientiane, Mukdahan and Kratie are shown in Fig. 6. Overall, high flows are projected to
increase at all considered stations. The scenario ensemble means show increases in Q5 of +8%, +5% and +6% at Vientiane, Mukdahan and Kratie, respectively. However, high flows also slightly reduce in two scenarios. In particular, the CSIRO-RCP8.5 projects high flow reduction at Vientiane (-6%) and Mukdahan (-3%). Similarly, the HadGEM-RCP8.5 also suggests reductions of -1%, -2% and -4% of high flows at Vientiane, Mukdahan and Kratie, respectively. Low flows are projected to increase under all considered scenarios, implying more water availability during the dry season. On average, Q95 increases most substantially at Vientiane (+41%), followed by Mukdahan (+30%) and Kratie (+20%).

[Figure 6]

[Figure 7]

The non-exceedance curves of yearly peak discharges (Fig. 7) show substantial increases in extremely high flow at all considered stations. The baseline’s non-exceedance curves are always lower than those from the GCM ensemble means, implying increases in both the magnitudes and frequencies of annual peak flows. At Vientiane, for instance, the maximum river discharge occurring once every ten years is projected to increase from 23,800 m$^3$/s to 27,900 m$^3$/s (RCP4.5) and 28,500 m$^3$/s (RCP8.5). Similarly, yearly peak discharges at Kratie increases from 61,700 m$^3$/s to 65,000 m$^3$/s (RCP4.5) and 66,900 m$^3$/s (RCP8.5).

[Figure 8]

Lastly, both magnitude and frequency of extremely low flows are projected to reduce due to more water availability during the dry season. Higher dry season discharge results in reductions in the total discharge deficits, defined as the total deficit under a threshold (Q75
value under climate change). The non-exceedance curves in Fig. 8 shows that these deficits reduce substantially at all three representative stations. Discharge deficits are lowest at Vientiane, ranging between 68,000m$^3$/s (2-yr return period) and 100,000m$^3$/s (20-yr return period) under the baseline condition. These deficits are projected to reduce by almost 50%, to 30,000m$^3$/s and 58,000m$^3$/s under the RCP8.5 scenario. Similarly, discharge deficits also reduce substantially at Mukdahan and Kratie. Fig. 8 also shows that future discharge deficits are relatively similar between the RCP4.5 and the RCP8.5.

5 Discussion

We have presented climatic and hydrological changes in the Mekong River basin based on a relatively large ensemble of CMIP5 GCMs and climate change scenarios. Motivated by improvements in CMIP5 GCMs technicalities and performance, we further analysed changes in extreme hydrological conditions under climate change. As such, our results provide important updates and new insights to the current knowledge base about hydrological response to climate change. Additionally, the results also reveal important implications for water resources management and climate change adaptation.

5.1 Comparison: Impact signal and improvements in uncertainties

Our results further confirm and solidify the Mekong’s hydrological intensification in response to climate change (Sect. 4.3, 4.4). In general, hydrological impact signals from the CMIP5 scenarios are in line with findings from most previous CMIP3-based studies. This study projects an increase of +5% in average annual river discharge at Kratie, compared to +10%, +4% and +3% by Hoanh et al. (2010), Västilä et al. (2010) and Lauri et al. (2012), respectively. Similar to these studies, our results also show increasing monthly and seasonal
river discharges. Despite the differences in GCMs choices, climate experiment generations (i.e. CMIP5 versus CMIP3) and downscaling approaches, the increasing trend in annual and seasonal river flow is robust across different studies. Therefore, certain confidence can be placed on the general direction of the Mekong’s hydrological change under climate change.

[Table 4]

Furthermore, the projected impact signals in this study exhibit less uncertainty compared to similar CMIP3-based assessments. A cross-study comparison (see Table 4) for the representative Kratie station shows that both the impact signal’s range and cross-scenarios agreement on directional changes improved markedly in this CMIP5-based study. In particular, the ranges of annual discharge change, i.e. 3% to 8% (RCP4.5) and -7% to 11% (RCP8.5) are typically smaller than those projected by earlier studies including Eastham et al. (2008), Kingston et al. (2011), Lauri et al., (2012) and Thompson et al., (2013). Similarly, the projected precipitation changes also show less uncertainty in the CMIP5 scenarios compared to the CMIP3 scenarios. Additionally, directional discharge changes also shows better consensus in this study. The CMIP5-based ensemble’s impact signal (i.e. increasing annual discharge) is supported by nine out of ten individual scenarios, whereas other studies show relatively lower consensus. Lastly, we compared uncertainty in hydrological extremes by calculating the coefficient of variation for projected yearly peak discharges between studies. Due to limited data availability, we only compared our study with Lauri et al. (2012). Both studies have ensembles of ten projections, grouped into a mid-range scenario (i.e. RCP4.5 versus SRES-B1) and a high scenario (i.e. RCP8.5 versus SRES-A1B). Overall, our CMIP5-based projection exhibits lower uncertainty, shown by lower coefficients of variation for both the mid-range scenarios (24% versus 38%) and the high scenario (25% versus 38%). Reduced uncertainty detected in our study is also in line with studies by Sperber et al., (2012) and
Shabeh Uh et al. (2015) where they found improved representations of the Asian summer monsoon by the CMIP5 models.

5.2 Implications for water management

Projected hydrological changes, especially increases in high flows and low flows conditions under climate change show important implications for water management in the river basin. Firstly, higher peak discharges occurring at higher frequencies during the wet season will increase the flood risks across the basin. Higher flood risk will be particularly relevant for human safety and agricultural production in the lower Mekong region, including the Cambodian and Vietnamese delta. Vast agriculture areas along the main rivers and in the delta’s floodplain will likely experience higher flood water levels, thus having higher risks of reduced productivity and crop failure. Higher river flow, combined with sea level rise will also result in higher flood risks for urban areas in the Mekong Delta.

Secondly, increased water availability during the dry season suggested by the Q95 and discharge deficit analyses can have positive implications. The projected higher river discharge during the dry season months could help to mitigate water shortage in the basin. Higher dry season flow will also contribute to control salt water intrusion in the Vietnamese Mekong delta, where fresh water flow from upstream is currently used to control the salt gradient in rivers and canals in the coastal area. Additionally, projected discharge reduction at the beginning of the wet season (i.e. in June) probably has negative impacts on ecological and agricultural productivity. Flow alteration in the early wet season will likely change the sediment and nutrient dynamics in the downstream floodplains, which are very important for existing ecosystems and agricultural practices (Arias et al., 2012). Lastly, rainfall reduction in
some areas of the lower Mekong could damage agricultural production, especially rainfed agriculture.

5.3 Limitations and way forward

We acknowledge several limitations and potential sources of error in this research. First, combining two historic climate datasets (i.e. the WATCH and the APHRODITE) may introduce errors due to inconsistencies. However, our datasets selection is motivated by careful consideration of data quality and availability. Although APHRODITE provides high quality precipitation data (Vu et al., 2012; Lauri et al., 2014), this dataset lacks temperature data needed for the hydrological model. We therefore supplement temperature data from the commonly used WATCH Forcing Data. Furthermore, calibration and validation results show that our hydrological simulation based on the combined climate forcing data is able to realistically reproduce historic river discharge. Given relatively lower modelling skill at Chiang Saen, interpreting hydrological impact signal at this station requires extra caution. Combinations of temperature and precipitation datasets were also shown by Lauri et al. (2014) to yield sufficient accuracy in hydrological modelling in the Mekong basin. Second, this paper only uses one bias-correction method (i.e. Piani et al., 2010) for climate data preparation. This could affect the derived hydrological impact signal (Hagemann et al., 2011) but is unlikely to change the main signal of hydrological change. Additionally, including other bias-correction methods is outside this paper’s scope given our primary interest to understand how the Mekong’s hydrology will change under climate change. Third, due to limited data availability, we could not include climate change projections from regional climate models (e.g. CORDEX) in our study. Such inclusion of highly-resolved climate projection could be useful, not only for this study, but also for the current knowledge base.
about the Mekong’s hydrology under climate change. The scope of this study is to understand
how climate change will affect Mekong’s hydrology including extremes. Hydrological
changes, however, are simultaneously driven by multiple factors including irrigated land
expansion, urbanization, hydropower dams and inter-basin water transfer. For example,
several studies including Lauri et al. (2012), Piman et al. (2013) and MRC (2011a) have
shown that irrigation expansion, hydropower dam construction and water transfer projects can
largely alter flow regime. Such anthropogenic factors should be subjected to future studies in
order to yield more comprehensive insights about the Mekong’s future hydrology and water
resources. Of special importance in this regard is the need to assess the interactions between
different drivers and the resulted hydrological changes.

6 Conclusions

This study is one of the first hydrological impact assessments for the Mekong River basin
focusing on hydrological extremes under climate change. We aim to cover this particularly
important knowledge gap, and thereby better informing and supporting policy and decision
making in the Southeast Asia’s largest river basin.

Climate change scenarios show that temperature consistently increases across the basin, with
higher rises in the upper basin in China, large parts of Thailand and the Vietnamese Mekong
delta. Basin-wide precipitation also increases under a majority of scenarios (9 out of 10), but
certain areas also exhibit reducing signal. As a result, the Mekong’s hydrology will intensify,
characterized by increases in annual river discharge at all stations. The scenario ensemble
means also show increases in seasonal discharges, for both wet and dry seasons. Discharge
increases are more substantial during the wet season, but the ensemble ranges are more
variable compared to the dry season. Considerably different and sometimes contrasting
directional discharge changes exist in our scenarios ensemble. This uncertainty, although reduces markedly compared to earlier CMIP3-based assessments, highlights a challenge in quantifying future hydrological change. It emphasizes the importance of, first, using ensemble approach in hydrological assessments, and second, developing robust, adaptive approaches to water management under climate change.

Lastly, we found substantial changes in hydrological extremes concerning both low flow and high flow conditions. Water availability during dry season consistently increases under all climate change scenarios, suggesting positive impacts on water supply and salinity control in the downstream delta. Wet season discharges and annual peak flows will increase substantially, implying important consequences for risk management, especially in securing safety of water infrastructures, and in controlling flood risk in the Mekong delta. Given robust evidences of changes in hydrological extremes, shifting research and management focuses to these low-probability but potentially high-damage events is important to reduce climate change impacts and associated risks.
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Table 1. Selected CMIP5 GCMs for climatic and hydrological change assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GCM name</th>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS1-0</td>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>CSIRO-BOM - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Australia and Bureau of Meteorology, Australia</td>
<td>1.875° x 1.25°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSM4</td>
<td>CCSM</td>
<td>NCAR - National Center for Atmospheric Research</td>
<td>1.25° x 0.94°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO-Mk3.6.0</td>
<td>CSIRO</td>
<td>CSIRO-QCCCE - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation in collaboration with the Queensland Climate Change Centre of Excellence</td>
<td>1.875° x 1.875°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HadGEM2-ES</td>
<td>HadGEM</td>
<td>MOHC - Met Office Hadley Centre and Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais</td>
<td>1.875° x 1.24°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPI-ESM-LR</td>
<td>MPI</td>
<td>MPI-M Max Planck Institute for Meteorology</td>
<td>1.875° x 1.875°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Model performance indices calculated from daily time series for calibration (C) and validation (V) periods. See station locations in Fig. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stations</th>
<th>NSE</th>
<th>Relative total bias</th>
<th>Q5 high flow relative bias</th>
<th>Q95 low flow relative bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Saen</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vientiane</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakhon Phanom</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukdahan</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakse</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kratie</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Relative changes in annual river discharges at the Mekong’s mainstream stations for 2036-2065 relative to 1971-2000. Lowest and highest changes are presented with the corresponding climate change scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>RCP 4.5</th>
<th>RCP 8.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensemble mean (%)</td>
<td>Range (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Saen</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+4 - +29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vientiane</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+1 - +17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakhon Phanom</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>-1 - +12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukdahan</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-1 - +11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakse</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+2 - +10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stung Treng</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+3 - +8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kratie</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+3 - +8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4. Comparing projected precipitation and discharge changes across studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eastham et al. 2008</th>
<th>Kingston et al. 2011</th>
<th>Lauri et al. 2012</th>
<th>Thompson et al. 2013</th>
<th>Hoang et al. 2015 (this study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of annual precipitation change</strong></td>
<td>0.5% to 36% (A1B)</td>
<td>-3% to 10% (up to 6°C warming)</td>
<td>-2.5% to 8.6% (A1B)</td>
<td>-3% to 12.2% (2°C warming)</td>
<td>3% to 4% (RCP4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2% to 5.8% (B1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3% to 5% (RCP8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenarios projecting higher annual precipitation</strong></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>4 out of 7</td>
<td>9 out of 10</td>
<td>4 out of 7</td>
<td>9 out of 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of annual discharge change</strong></td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>-5.4% to 4.5% (up to 6°C warming)</td>
<td>-10.6% to 13.4% (A1B)</td>
<td>-14.7% to +8.2% (2°C warming)</td>
<td>3% to 8% (RCP4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.9% to 8.1% (B1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7% to 11% (RCP8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenarios projecting higher annual discharge</strong></td>
<td>Majority of GCMs show increasing trend</td>
<td>4 out of 7</td>
<td>7 out of 10</td>
<td>3 out of 7</td>
<td>9 out of 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. The Mekong River basin’s elevation map and locations of mainstream gauging stations.
Figure 2. Daily discharge plots (left) and flow duration curves (right) during calibration and validation at Chiang Saen (upper plots) and Kratie (lower plots). See station locations in Fig. 1.
Figure 3. Projected change in daily mean temperature (°C) under future climate (2036-2065) compared to baseline situation (1971-2000).
Figure 4. Projected change in total annual precipitation (%) under future climate (2036-2065) compared to the baseline climate (1971-2000).
Figure 5. Projected monthly river discharge (left and middle panels) and relative changes (right panel) under climate change for 2036-2065 relative to 1971-2000.
Figure 6. Projected changes in Q5 (high flow) and Q95 (low flow) under climate change for 2036-2065 relative to 1971-2000.
Figure 7. Non-exceedance curves of yearly peak discharges under baseline (1971-2000) and future climate (2036-2065).
Figure 8. Non-exceedance curves of yearly maximum cumulative discharge deficits (i.e. total deficit below the Q75 threshold) under baseline and future climate