#### CASCADING UNCERTAINTY IN FLOOD FORECASTING

#### Florian Pappenberger<sup>1</sup>

#### Renata Romanowicz<sup>1</sup>, Keith Beven<sup>1</sup>, Peter Young<sup>1</sup>,

#### Patrick Matgen<sup>2</sup>, Jens Bartholmes<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Environmental Science/Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, LA1 4YQ, UK
<sup>2</sup> Département en Environnement et Agro-Biotechnologies, Centre de Recherche Public-Gabriel Lippmann, Luxembourg
<sup>3</sup> European Commission, DG Joint Research Centre, Floods and other weather driven natural hazards, Italy

CHR-Workshop – Expert Consultation, Bern, 30-31 March 2006





#### CASCADING UNCERTAINTY IN FLOOD FORECASTING

- Communication between models, modellers & other stakeholders
- spatial and temporal uncertainties in the inputs
- the antecedent conditions
- the geometry of the river channel and floodplains
- the probability of infrastructure failure;
- characteristics of the system (model parameters);
- limitations of the models to fully represent the surface and subsurface flow processes in flood generation and routing
- etc ...



### **Cascading Uncertainty**

This is a complicated nonlinear systems in which analytical solutions do not apply

Estimation of predictive uncertainty of distributed models demands very significant computational resources even when the analysis is done off-line (so that time is not critical) rather than in real time. There are two solutions:



### **Data-Based Approach**

- The Data-based Mechanistic (DBM) approach to modelling rainfall-flow processes involves four main stages:
  - *identification* of the model structure;
  - *estimation* of the parameters that characterize this identified model structure;
  - *interpretation* of the estimated model in physically meaningful terms;
  - validation of the estimated model on rainfall-flow data that is different from the calibration data used in the identification and estimation analysis.



#### Data-based identified





#### SDP



#### Validation period



# D

#### **Slow & Fast component**





### **Flood** inundation





#### Forecast (EPS)



#### National Flood Forecast System FRMRC

UNIVERSIT



#### **Cascading Uncertainty**



Data-based mechanistic modelling





## P Physically based modelling



#### Physically based modelling (GLUE)





#### **Functional Similarity**







P

## **Inundation Model**

On which percentiles are decisions derived?



5

A. 5% Quantile

11.0 m

0.0 m

10

20

15

10



0.0 m

10

5



POT

see Jutta Thielen (Talk tomorrow) & Jens Bartholmes (Poster)



LANCASTER

UNIVERS

## P Dominant source of uncertainty



#### Sensitivity of RR



# Sensitivity of flood inundation to input uncertainty

LANCASTER

×

# Sensitivity of flood inundation to input uncertainty



### Conclusions

- DBM models are very good for real-time forecasting within the natural delay of the system (e.g. Alzette 4hrs and Severn 36hrs)
- DBM + EPS is the only way to predict with DBM beyond the natural time delay (although they maybe radar etc in between). More sophisticated framework needs to be developed
- Cascading uncertainty offers an exciting opportunity to learn more about our models, challenge our understanding and scrutinise our decisions
- Global Sensitivity Analysis offers a methodology which can be used to guide research and identify model inadequacy





#### The ultimate **guide** to choose an **uncertainty analysis method** *A Wiki Project*





# www.floodrisk.net



#### SPARE SLIDES



#### Cascading Uncertainty (Physically based models)

Possible, but need some methods to reduce the number of runs More research needed to understand the dominant sources of uncertainty



#### Conclusions

- EPS
- Data-based mechanistic models seem to be superior in real-time flood forecasting (in cascading uncertainties)
- Physically based models should be used for flood scenario studies and distributed predictions



#### Sensitivity RR



