The El Niño event of 2015-16: Climate anomalies and their impact on groundwater resources in East and Southern Africa
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Abstract

The impact of climate variability on groundwater storage has received limited attention despite widespread dependence on groundwater as a resource for drinking water, agriculture and industry. Here, we assess the climate anomalies that occurred over Southern Africa (SA) and East Africa, south of the equator (EASE), during the major El Niño event of 2015-16, and their associated impacts on groundwater storage, across scales, through analysis of in situ groundwater piezometry and GRACE satellite data. At the continental scale, the El Niño of 2015-16 was associated with a pronounced dipole of opposing rainfall anomalies over EASE and Southern Africa, north/south of ~12°S, a characteristic pattern of ENSO. Over Southern Africa the most intense drought event in the historical record occurred, based on an analysis of the cross-scale areal intensity of surface water balance anomalies (as represented by the Standardised Precipitation-Evapotranspiration Index, SPEI), with an estimated return period of at least 200 years and a best estimate of 260 years. Climate risks are changing and we estimate that anthropogenic warming only (ignoring changes to other climate variables e.g. precipitation) has approximately doubled the risk of such an extreme SPEI drought event. These surface water balance deficits suppressed groundwater recharge, leading to a substantial groundwater storage decline indicated by both GRACE satellite and piezometric data in the Limpopo basin. Conversely, over EASE during the 2015-16 El Niño event, anomalously wet conditions were observed with an estimated return period of ~10 years, likely moderated by the absence of a strongly positive Indian Ocean Zonal Mode phase. The strong but not extreme rainy season increased groundwater storage as shown by satellite GRACE data and rising groundwater levels observed at a site in central Tanzania. We note substantial uncertainties in separating groundwater from total water storage in GRACE data and show that consistency between GRACE and piezometric estimates of groundwater storage is apparent when spatial averaging scales are comparable. These results have implications for sustainable and climate-resilient groundwater resource management, including the potential for adaptive strategies, such as managed aquifer recharge during episodic recharge events.
1. Introduction

The El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) phenomenon is the dominant single driver of climate variability and large-scale extremes across the tropics including most of Africa. Few studies have investigated the hydrological impacts of ENSO events on groundwater despite its vital role in sustaining ecosystem function as well as agricultural and domestic water supplies. Here, we quantify climate anomalies and groundwater resources over Eastern Africa, South of the Equator (EASE) and Southern Africa (SA), during the recent major El Niño event of 2015-16, which in the Pacific sector was one of the biggest on record. El Niño is typically associated with wet and dry anomalies over EASE and SA, respectively (Ropelowski and Halpert, 1987), but with considerable diversity in this response among El Niño events (Supplementary Information S1). Much of SA experienced extreme drought in 2015-16 with severe impacts on local food security, livelihoods and key sectors of the economy (SADC 2016a; 2016b; Archer et al., 2017; Siderius et al., 2018; Supplementary Information S1).

Groundwater is the dominant source of safe water for rural populations and many expanding cities in EASE and SA (MacDonald et al., 2012); in drylands, groundwater is often the only perennial source of water. Although relatively under-developed to date, groundwater resources are being developed rapidly in Africa (Taylor et al., 2009; Calow et al., 2010; Villholth et al., 2013) and feature prominently in national development plans, especially to satisfy the need for increased access to safe water and agricultural intensification under rapidly growing populations and economic development. Groundwater is especially important in Africa where surface runoff efficiency is lower than elsewhere (McMahon, 1987) and drinking of untreated surface water is associated with poor health (Hunter et al., 2010). The long-term viability of groundwater withdrawals and the livelihoods and ecosystems that groundwater sustains depend on recharge.

Unlike surface water, research evaluating associations between groundwater storage and ENSO, or indeed other modes of climate variability is rather limited (e.g. Holman et al., 2011, Kuss and Gurdak, 2014), despite evidence that climate variability and extreme rainfall preferentially drive or restrict groundwater recharge. Several studies have shown recharge to be episodic in semi-arid regions of Africa (Meyer et al., 2005, van Wyk et al., 2011, Taylor et
al., 2013, Cuthbert et al., 2017) and elsewhere (Jasechko and Taylor, 2015, Cuthbert et al., 2016), highlighting the need to understand patterns and drivers of climate variability both temporarily and spatially, that influence recharge. Bonsor et al. (2018) analysed recent (2002-2016) trends in, and seasonality of groundwater storage within 12 African sedimentary basins implied from GRACE satellite data. Here, we employ evidence from both in situ observations (piezometry) and GRACE satellite data to examine the effect of large-scale interannual climate anomalies on groundwater across spatial scales for locations and domains that represent the rainfall anomaly gradient over EASA and SA associated with characteristic El Niño response, exemplified by the event of 2015-16. Beyond a few site-specific studies, the impacts of larger-scale climate extremes on groundwater remain substantially unresolved. This hinders our ability to determine acceptable levels of groundwater abstraction and depletion. This study aims to quantify and understand the responses, during the 2015-16 El Niño of (i) the surface/terrestrial water balance and (ii) groundwater storage over EASE and SA from regional to local scales. Further, it seeks to place the 2015-16 El Niño event statistically in the historical context.

2. Data and methods

2.1. Climate data and analysis

We analyse data over the broad region of Africa South of the Equator and over an extended austral summer wet season of October-April, which encompasses the full wet season over SA (excluding the Cape region) and those parts of EASA (south of ~5°S), which experience a similarly annual unimodal rainfall regime (Dunning et al., 2016), and will accommodate the response time of groundwater systems to climate. This region also experiences a coherent ENSO signal (Section 3.1). We use the Standardized Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI) (Vicente-Serrano et al., 2010), which is a simple representation of surface water balance anomalies, derived over this 7-month season (SPEI-7), described in Supplementary Information S2. Note that some findings will be sensitive to the choice of drought index.

We assess the extent and intensity of SPEI-7 anomalies across two large sub-domains across EASE (4-12°S, 30-40°E) and SA (10-35°S, 10-40°E). These domains are specified to (i)
encompass the anomalous wet and dry dipole conditions, respectively, typically experienced during El Niño events (figure S1(b)) and specifically in 2015-16 (figure 1(a)). (ii) Ensure common unimodal annual rainfall with Austral summer wet season (with the exception of the extreme southwest SA). For each domain, the areal extent and intensity of SPEI-7 was determined separately using Intensity-Areal-extent Frequency (IAF) curves of Mishra and Cherkauer (2010). IAF curves express the relationship between the intensity and areal extent of SPEI, allowing comparison between years, irrespective of the precise spatial location of dry/wet conditions within the domain. We estimate the return periods (Supplementary Information S3) of SPEI-7 IAFs observed during the 2015-16 and other El Niño event(s).

2.2 Groundwater storage estimates from GRACE satellite data

Regional-scale changes in groundwater storage (GWS) (2002-16) are estimated (Supplementary Information S4) from GRACE satellite measurements of total terrestrial water storage (TWS) anomalies, by subtracting changes in the other terrestrial stores, which, in our tropical region, comprise soil moisture (SMS) and surface water (SWS) stores (eq.1), themselves estimated from Land-Surface Model (LSM) simulations.

\[ \Delta \text{GWS} = \Delta \text{TWS} - (\Delta \text{SMS} + \Delta \text{SWS}) \] (eq. 1)

Where \( \Delta \) refers to the anomaly with respect to the long-term data series. To address uncertainty associated with different GRACE processing strategies and with derivation of \( \Delta \text{GWS} \), we apply an ensemble mean of three GRACE TWS estimates and four LSM product estimates of SMS and SWS, and we provide the associated uncertainty ranges for each term.

2.3 Groundwater storage estimates from piezometric observations

Groundwater level records were compiled in two sites situated at the heart of the two EASE/SA ENSO rainfall dipole centres of action (figure 1(a)) over the period of August 2002 to July 2016 (Supplementary Information S5): (i) The Makutapora wellfield (35.75°E, 5.90°S) in central Tanzania (EASE) where data from three stations were averaged, representing an area of ~60 km² (Taylor et al., 2013); and (ii) the Limpopo Basin in SA (~28-32°E, 22.5-25°S), where data from 40 stations representing ~47,000 km² were averaged.
3. Results and discussion

3.1 Climate anomalies over EASE and SA during the 2015-16 El Niño event

3.1.1 EASE/SA climate anomalies

The 2015-16 El Niño was the second strongest event within the available ~165-year Pacific Ocean Sea Surface Temperature (SST) record, with SST anomalies exceeding 2°C for 6 months from October 2015 (figure S1(b)). By some measures 2015-16 was the strongest El Niño since 1950 (Supplementary Information S1). Many of the observed climate anomalies around the world were typical of El Niño years (Blunden and Arndt 2016). Over our study region, a pronounced north-south dipole in SPEI-7 anomalies was observed (figure 1(a)), indicating intense and extensive drought over SA (negative SPEI-7) and the wetter than normal conditions over EASE (positive SPEI-7). In detail, most of SA south of 10°S experienced a substantial water balance deficit: exceptional drought (SPEI < -2) conditions were experienced over extensive parts of northern South Africa and northern Namibia, southern Botswana and Zambia, as well as most of Zimbabwe and southern Mozambique and Malawi (figure 1(a)). Most of EASE experienced above average rainfall during this period, with SPEI values >1 across most of Tanzania, and a localised exceptionally wet region over the northernmost part of Mozambique. The Makutapora and Limpopo sites (figure 1(a)) are located in areas representative of the large-scale north/south rainfall dipole.

This spatial dipole pattern is very similar to the characteristic pattern of anomalies during El Niño across the region, as represented by the leading Empirical Orthogonal Function (EOF) of interannual variability (figure S1(b), Section S1) which correlates strongly with ENSO and Indian Ocean SSTs figure S1(c). Indeed, the EOF coefficient value for 2015-16 is the second highest within the entire 1901-2016 period. As such, across our study region 2015-16 represents an extreme exemplar of the characteristic El Niño climate response. Of course, a complex set of planetary, regional and local scale processes related to, and independent of, El Niño are fully responsible for the observed anomalies (e.g. Blamey et al., 2018). The structure of the atmospheric anomalies, specifically the mean meridional overturning circulation associated with the large-scale SPEI-7 anomalies (figure 2(a)) shows large-scale anomalous
ascent over EASE between ~0° and 10°S indicative of enhanced deep convection, with compensating descent over SA throughout the depth of the troposphere, which acts to suppress convection. The low-level horizontal circulation (figure 2(b)) indicates key features associated with the SPEI-7 dipole, notably: (i) An anomalous southerly flow from the southern Indian Ocean into continental SA (Feature A in figure 2(b)), which weakens the transport of water vapour from the humid tropical Indian Ocean leading to a decrease in moisture flux convergence over SA. This is associated with a weakening of the mean ‘Mascarene’ subtropical high over the Southern Indian Ocean (Feature B in figure 2(b)). (ii) Over EASE there are anomalous low-level westerlies over Tanzania (Feature C in figure 2(b)), which weaken the mean easterlies and enhance convergence over Tanzania, a structure characteristic of wet spells (Berhan and Zaitchik, 2014; Nicholson 2017).

Groundwater recharge in the semi-arid tropics is favoured by high intensity rainfall events (Owor, 2009; Jasechko and Taylor, 2015) within wet seasons, which may be modulated by climate anomalies during El Niño conditions. During 2015-16, the intensities of the 80th percentile of daily rainfall, a simple proxy of potential groundwater recharge-relevant rainfall, increased by ~1-5 mm day⁻¹ across much of EASE (figure 1(b)), representing a 100-150% increase in many places. Whilst the association of rainfall intensity and enhanced recharge across large and heterogeneous regions remains to be resolved, this intensification of rainfall is consistent with greater groundwater recharge. Across SA the magnitude of the 80th percentile reduced by ~1-2 mm day⁻¹, potentially reducing groundwater recharge.

3.1.2. The 2015-16 event in the historical context

SPEI-7 IAF curves represent water balance anomalies across all spatial scales. For the SA region, 2015/16 experienced the most extreme SPEI-7 drought within the historical period, with an estimated IAF curve return period of ~260 years (range 190-290 years) (figure 3(a)). The 2015-16 drought was of greater intensity than those during previous El Niño events of comparable magnitude, 1997-98 and 1982-83, whose SPEI-7 IAF curve return periods are estimated to be only ~6 years (range 4-9 years) and ~43 years (range 35-47 years), respectively. The contrasting intensity of SA drought between these events highlights the diversity in responses over EASE/SA to El Niño, related to both the different character of the
events in the Pacific sector (2015-16 was strongest in the central rather than East Pacific as in 1997-98, see Section S1), and the specific regional circulation features during these events which modulate the diverse ENSO teleconnections to SA (Ratnam et al., 2014; Blamey et al., 2018). Moreover, the 2015-16 drought followed a moderate drought in 2014-15 (Blamey et al., 2018), which had important implications for groundwater levels (Section 3.2.2), and statistically this 2-year drought event remarkably unlikely. The extreme SPEI-7 anomalies over SA in 2015-16 result from low rainfall and extremely high temperatures (Brundel and Arndt, 2016, Russo et al., 2016), potentially related to land-atmosphere feedback processes (e.g. Seneviratne et al., 2010), through reduced vegetation and soil moisture, perhaps persisting from 2014-15. Uncertainty in the strength of land-atmosphere coupling over SA remains high with contradictory results from model analyses (e.g. Koster et al., 2008) and combined observation-model analysis (Ferguson et al., 2012), suggesting weak and strong coupling, respectively.

Further, warming across SA in recent decades can be attributed substantially to anthropogenic radiative forcing (Bindoff et al., 2013). As such climate risks are changing. We estimate that the risk of a 2015-16 magnitude SPEI-7 drought over SA to have increased by approximately two times due to the effects purely of anthropogenic warming, ignoring changes to other climate variables and variability (see Supplementary Information S3). Other drought indices may have differing sensitivities to temperature.

Over the EASE domain as a whole, the 2015-16 event was wet but not extreme, with an SPEI-7 IAF curve estimated return period (figure 3(b)) of only ~10 years (range 5-12 years). The anomalies were far weaker than that during the 1997-98 El Niño (figure 3b). These differences may be associated with the state of the Indian Ocean Zonal Model (IOZM), an east-west structure of coupled ocean-atmosphere circulation, influencing convection and rainfall over East Africa (Saji et al., 1999, Supplementary Information S1). The 1997-98 El Niño coincided with a very strong positive IOZM event, unlike that of 2015-16, in which the IOZM was weakly positive. Indeed, the wettest EASE year on record, 1961-1962, experienced a very strongly positive IOZM event but no El Niño event (Nicholson, 2015).

3.2 Impact of 2015-16 climate anomalies on groundwater storage

3.2.1 Large-scale estimates of $\Delta TWS$, $\Delta SMS$, $\Delta SWS$ and $\Delta GWS$
Regionally, GRACE ensemble-mean ΔTWS anomalies (figure 4(a)), and estimated ΔGWS (eq. 1, figure 4(d)), for 2015-16 reflect the north-south dipole over EASE/SA associated with the El Niño-related SPEI-7 climate anomalies (figure 1(a)). Positive ΔTWS and ΔGWS anomalies exist north of ~10°S across EASE (including the Makutapora site), the central DRC and northern Angola. Negative ΔTWS and ΔGWS anomalies occur over an extensive region of eastern SA including the Limpopo site. However, despite broad-scale structural similarity, there are some apparent inconsistencies between ΔTWS (and other components of the water budget, including ΔGWS) and the SPEI-7 climate signal that we consider below.

Viewed more closely, the partitioning of large-scale ΔTWS anomalies between the modelled ΔSMS, ΔSWS and residual ΔGWS is spatially complex. First, we note that ΔSWS (figure 4(c)) plays only a minor role across the domain. Further, the coherence of the spatial structure in anomalies in ΔSMS (figure 4(b)) is much less clear than for ΔTWS, reflecting uncertainties in soil moisture among individual LSMs, as highlighted by Scanlon et al. (2018). Then, considering the drought region over SA, a number of features emerge. (i) The relative magnitude of ΔTWS deficits over South Africa are less than those of the SPEI-7, compared to the northern more humid parts of SA (compare figures 4(a) and 1(a)). This difference may be expected since ΔTWS is an absolute measure of water volume whereas SPEI-7 is a standardised anomaly relative to climate. Consequently, these measures may be expected to diverge across mean rainfall gradients. Further, SPEI-7 reflects potential rather than actual evapotranspiration. (ii) Over the northern sector of Zambia, Zimbabwe and Malawi the strongly negative ΔTWS anomaly is almost equally shared between modelled reductions in ΔSMS and ΔGWS. (iii) To the south over South Africa however, the (rather weaker) ΔTWS deficits are effectively accounted for by ΔSMS anomalies such that ΔGWS anomalies are actually close to zero or indeed slightly positive. The Limpopo study site lies at a transition zone between regions with apparently strongly reduced ΔGWS to the northeast and close to zero or slightly positive ΔGWS to the southwest. As geology is broadly continuous across the region, the transition is largely related to uncertainty in the estimation of modelled ΔSMS.

Considering the anomalous wet region over EASE to the north of ~10°S, ΔGWS broadly mirrors the structure of ΔTWS, but the detailed picture is complex. Over most of Tanzania and
Angola positive ΔTWS anomalies are largely partitioned into the ΔGWS rather than ΔSMS, whereas over southern DRC the reverse is the case. Moreover, there are interesting apparent contradictions between the climate SPEI-7 and GRACE ΔTWS data. Over Namibia and southern Angola, negative SPEI-7 (figure 1(a) and ΔSMS, figure 4(b)) coincides with positive ΔTWS anomalies (figure 4(a)) leading to very strong positive ΔGWS anomalies (figure 4(d)) that are inconsistent with climate anomalies from SPEI-7. Conversely, and more locally, over northern Mozambique, a positive ΔSMS anomaly, resulting from the driving rainfall data (see the SPEI-7 wet anomaly, figure 1(a)) is not reflected in a strong ΔTWS signal, which leaves a counterintuitive, negative residual response in ΔGWS. As such, GRACE ΔGWS exhibits inconsistent responses to both apparent anomalous dry and wet conditions, likely to be a result of limitations in observational precipitation data and LSMs.

3.2.2 In situ and GRACE-derived estimates of ΔGWS at the Makutapora and Limpopo Basins

Piezometry for the two observatory sites and changes in GWS estimated from GRACE and LSMs are shown in figure 5. First, we note that uncertainty in the mean GRACE ΔGWS estimate (blue shading around blue line in figures 5(a) and 5(b)), whilst often large, is generally smaller than the signals of inter-annual variability which are the main focus of our analysis. However, variability in mean GRACE ΔGWS within recharge seasons is small relative to uncertainty, such that we cannot confidently draw inferences at these timescales.

Specifically, at the SA Limpopo site, observed piezometry (figure 5(a)) shows an annual cycle in GWS in most years with a ‘saw tooth’ pattern representing steady recessions in GWS during the dry season from May to October followed by rapid increases typically starting in December in response to the onset of the wet season to peak post-wet season in April (lagging peak rainfall by ~1-2 months). GWS in 2015-16 is well below average with a seasonal but subdued GWS rise delayed (until March) due to the highly anomalous early wet season drought. The GWS rise in March-April following rains in March is the second smallest on record; only 2002-3 has lower seasonal increase in GWS. The 2015-16 drought is preceded by negligible recharge in the dry year of 2014-15 (figure 5(a)), such that GWS as of mid-2016 was lowest in the 14-year record. As such, the major drought of 2015-16 compounded weak recharge in the previous year.
to leave GWS at historically low levels. This may have been compounded by increased abstractions during these dry years.

Comparison of piezometry and GRACE derived GWS, suggests a broad correspondence at least when annually or seasonally averaged, \( r = 0.62 \), significant at the 0.01 probability level. The prolonged decline over 2014-16 is observed in both GRACE and piezometry. When averaged over all years, the mean annual cycle is similar in phase and magnitude (not shown). As such, at least broad temporal averaging scales GRACE is corroborated by piezometry at the Limpopo site, where the scales of spatial averaging are similar. However, within-seasons, the uncertainty in GRACE \( \Delta \text{GWS} \) leads to a much ‘noisier’ mean signal at Limpopo which cannot resolve the annual ‘saw-tooth’ pattern (figure 5(b)); in GRACE \( \Delta \text{GWS} \) individual years have a rather variable annual cycle despite a clear cycle in rainfall. Notably, the apparent strong rise in \( \Delta \text{GWS} \) during early season 2015-16, not corroborated by piezometry or rainfall coincides with the greatest uncertainty within the record.

At the EASE Makutapora site, observed piezometric-GWS (figure 5(b)) shows little inter-annual variability, with long periods of GWS recessions e.g. 2002-6, 2012-16, interrupted by irregular and infrequent GWS increases, in declining order of magnitude 2006-7, 2009-10 and 2015-16, all El Niño years. The wet conditions in 2015-16 produced a major recharge event though observed piezometric responses are smaller than in 2006-7 and 2009-10, despite higher rainfall (figure 5(b)). Under highly dynamic pumping regimes (figure 5(c)), GWS changes are only a partial proxy for groundwater recharge; the sharp increase (~50%) in wellfield pumping in May 2015 served to diminish the response in piezometric-GWS to the 2015-16 El Niño. Overall, however, the findings are consistent with the analysis of Taylor et al. (2013) who note highly episodic recharge at Makutapora over the period since the 1960s associated with years of heavy rainfall. The 2015-16 El Niño event represents a major event driving GWS at the Makutapora wellfield, despite moderate rainfall anomalies over EASE.

There is only a rather general association between GRACE and piezometric estimates of groundwater storage variability at the Makutapora site. The magnitude of major GRACE increases in \( \Delta \text{GWS} \) in individual years matches fairly well with the episodic piezometry events of 2006-7, 2009-10 and 2015-16, although the second largest GRACE \( \Delta \text{GWS} \) increase occurs...
in 2014-15 with no response apparent in piezometry. Overall, the correlation of GRACE ΔGWS and piezometric GWS of 0.51 is only moderate (significant at the 0.05 probability level) but clearly reflects the low frequency multi-annual trends (at least up to 2013) as well as interannual variability.

However, stark differences between GRACE and piezometry are apparent. In contrast to piezometry, GRACE (figure 5(b)) shows increases in ΔGWS in almost every year (with lag of ~1 month after the rainfall annual peak), suggesting recharge occurs annually, in contrast to the piezometry. Further, GRACE ΔGWS replicates the low frequency recessionary trend over the period 2002-07 but not since 2012. Resolving these contradictions is problematic but two likely explanations emerge (i) Incommensurate scales of observation from piezometry (area ~60 km²) and GRACE (~200,000 km²). More localised processes may dominate the piezometry record, perhaps including recharge sensitivity to contributions from local river and wetland flooding in addition to rainfall. Further, the effects of local pumping will strongly influence the piezometric record. This could explain the low frequency trend discrepancy, in which the former period 2002-07 reflects a widespread groundwater recession, following the anomalously high recharge during the El Niño event of 1997-98 (Taylor et al., 2013), whilst the recent accelerated trend reflects the effects of the rapid increase in abstraction, which may have a more localised effect apparent only in the piezometric observations. As such the piezometric record shows only episodic recharge whilst the GRACE indicated annual and episodic recharge processes. (ii) Errors in GRACE ΔGWS resulting from inaccurate accounting of ΔSMS and ΔSWS, which leaves a residual artefact of an annual positive ΔGWS signal, see Section 3.1, Shamsudduha et al. (2017) and Scanlon et al. (2018). Such errors may not be adequately accounted for in the uncertainty estimates in GRACE ΔGWS given for example the similarity in LSM design and driving data. Indeed, at both the Limpopo and Makutapora sites, we note stronger correlations between seasonal local rainfall and piezometric GWS than with GRACE ΔGWS (not shown).

4. Concluding Discussion

We quantify the climate anomalies and groundwater response during the major El Niño event of 2015-16, over Southern and Eastern Africa, south of the equator, across a range of spatial
scales from regional to local. Our analysis confirms that the event was associated with a pronounced north/south dipole pattern of positive/negative rainfall and water balance anomalies over EASE/SA, typical of the ENSO teleconnection to the region. It was the second largest such dipole event on record since 1900. We must not overlook, however, the considerable diversity in climate anomalies over Africa between El Niño events.

The response of the water balance including GWS to these climate anomalies is marked. Over EASE, total rainfall and daily intensities were higher than normal and we estimate the return period for the SPEI-7 water balance metric, over the domain as a whole, to be ~10 years. Wet anomalies over EASE were actually moderated by the occurrence of only a rather weak IOZM event. Nevertheless, the anomalously wet conditions led to strong groundwater recharge over the EASE domain as evidenced from GRACE. At our study site, the Makutapora wellfield in Tanzania, 2015-16 the strong El Niño-related rainfall reversed a long-term decline in in-situ observed groundwater storage where pumping is intensive and had recently increased. Changes in GWS estimated from an ensemble of GRACE and LSMs also reflect the occurrence of substantial groundwater recharge in 2015-16 and indicate annual groundwater recharge across the region. Broadly, the analysis reinforces the importance of large-scale climate events in driving episodic recharge, critical to replenish heavily exploited aquifers.

Over SA, the 2015-16 El Niño was associated with extreme drought, the strongest within the observed 116-year record, with an estimated return period of ~260 years, resulting from exceptionally low rainfall and high temperatures. The drought resulted in groundwater storage declines through most of the wet season at our Limpopo study site, with strongly reduced recharge experienced, the second lowest on record. Furthermore, this followed a dry year 2014-15 leading to two consecutive years of low recharge and the greatest recession on record. Clearly, groundwater provides a valuable buffer for periods of reduced surface water availability in drought conditions, although as our results at Limpopo show, consecutive dry years lead to marked storage reduction. Climate projections suggest reduced early season rainfall across much of SA (Lazenby et al. 2018) compounding rising temperatures, and the implications of this for climate resilience require a better understanding of these impacts on groundwater recharge as well as surface water resources.
GRACE data and LSM outputs are clearly useful in complementing in-situ data, but a number of issues emerge. Although at the broadest scale the GRACE ΔGWS anomalies in 2015-16 are consistent with rainfall anomalies, there are a number of apparent inconsistencies over quite large areas. Resolving the underlying reasons for these is problematic, but likely candidates include the effects of poor climate data over Southern Africa, influencing and compounded by uncertainties in ΔSMS and ΔSWS estimates simulated by land surface models, on which the estimation of GRACE ΔGWS depends. When averaged over comparable scales at Limpopo GRACE and piezometry agree well, at least for seasonal averages. Comparison with the local observations shows that GRACE GWS estimates are considerably noisier, especially at Makutapora where the spatial averaging scale of in-situ data and GRACE differ greatly. Local groundwater abstractions are apparent in the Makutapora record and very likely at Limpopo.

Our results highlight the potential for adaptive strategies, such as managed aquifer recharge, for optimising the capture or storage of episodic recharge in East Africa during El Niño and/or positive IOZM events, and by corollary over Southern Africa during La Niña events (given the opposing dipole structure of ENSO-related rainfall anomalies across SA/EASE). Of course other modes of climate variability driving rainfall extremes are also important. Such interventions can enhance the positive role of groundwater in climate-resilient water and drought management. At Makutapora, managed aquifer recharge exploiting El Niño and/or positive IOZM events may contribute to resilient urban water supply systems for the city of Dodoma. Our findings strengthen the case for a greater understanding of the drivers of rainfall extremes over Africa and their relationship with recharge processes under past, current and future climates and at various temporal and spatial scales. Such knowledge is crucial to inform water management policies and practices for sustainable and climate resilient development in a region undergoing rapid development of groundwater resources.
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Figure 1. Large-scale climate anomalies over the study region for October-April 2015-16. (a) SPEI-7 (b) Anomalies of the 80th percentile of daily TRMM rainfall (mm day$^{-1}$). Boxes in (a) show the EASE (small box) and SA (large box) domains used in the SPEI-7 IAF analysis (see Section 2.1 and S3). The piezometer observation locations are also shown.
Figure 2. Circulation anomalies for October-April 2015-2016. (a) Latitude-height transect plot of anomalous meridional overturning circulation (streamlines of vertical and meridional wind) and vertical velocity anomalies (m s\(^{-1}\), shaded) averaged over the 35-37°E. This latitude transect is shown as a red line on the map in figure 2(b). (b) Vertically integrated moisture flux anomalies (g kg\(^{-1}\)m s\(^{-2}\), vectors) and rainfall anomalies (mm day\(^{-1}\), shaded).
Figure 3. Intensity-Areal extent-Frequency (IAF) curves (See Section S3 for details of method) estimated from the seasonal men SPEI-7 (derived with Penman-Monteith PET, see text for uncertainty ranges) over (a) the southern Africa domain (10.5°-35.5°S, see box in figure 1a); (b) the east Africa domain 30°-40°E, 4°-12°S, see box in figure 1a). On the x-axis is the areal extent over which the SPEI is averaged and the y-axis is the SPEI-7 drought intensity. Solid coloured lines show the IAF curves for the study El Niño event years; 2015-16 (red), 1997-98 (blue), 1982-83 (green) and (in (b) only) the 1961-62 Indian Ocean Zonal Mode event (purple). Black lines are the IAF curves for selected benchmark return periods, from top to bottom in (a) and bottom to top in (b)), 50 years (dotted), 100 years (dashed) and 200 years (dot-dashed).
Figure 4. Water storage anomaly components (cm) over the study domain for the wet season (October-April) of 2015-16 minus long term annual mean 2003-15. (a) GRACE ensemble mean total water storage anomaly (ΔTWS, from CSR, JPL-Mascons, GRGS GRACE products); (b) GLDAS ensemble mean soil moisture storage anomaly (ΔSMS, 4 land surface models: CLM, NOAH, VIC, MOSAIC); (c) GLDAS ensemble mean surface runoff or surface water storage anomaly (ΔSWS, from 4 land surface models: CLM, NOAH, VIC, MOSAIC); and (d) GRACE-GLDAS derived ensemble mean groundwater storage anomaly (ΔGWS, from 3 estimates of ΔGWS from 3 GRACE products).
Figure 5. (a) Time series of estimates of monthly ∆GWS anomaly (cm) at Limpopo from August 2002 to July 2016 derived from GRACE averaged over an area approximately ~120,000 km² (bold blue line is the mean of CSR, JPL-Mascons and GRGS products, light blue shading representing uncertainty across the three products and four LSMs) and piezometry (red line, mean of all stations, red shading represents uncertainty). Monthly rainfall (from GPCP product, cm) shown as bars with mean monthly rainfall indicated by a dashed line. (b) As (a) but for Makutapora. (c) Monthly groundwater abstraction at Makutapora.