Previous Impact Models in China

CISNAR Team, CAS, China March, 2000

Climate Change Impact Studies

- Z Climate Change Impact on Agricultural Production in China
- Z Climate Change Impact on Surface Runoff
- Z Climate Change Impact on Water Demands in China
- Z Sensitivity of Different Ep Methods to Temperature
- Z Impact on Distribution of Climate Zones in China

Other Researches

by Dr. Liu Yunfen

- IJ Climate Change Impact on Fishery Production at Coastal Area in China
- IJ Study on CO2 Emission flux from Ecosystem in the Eastern Part of Qingzang Plateau
- IJ Stud on CO2 Emission from Farmland Soil in Tibetan Plateau
- IJ Study on Carbon Cycle in the Agroecosystem of China

Climate Change Impact on Agricultural Production in China

Rice Wheat Maize







Conclusion

Negative and positive impacts were found in different areas to three staple crops. Totally, the output will increase by about 4.827 Mtons, assuming that the planting area keep as that in 1993.

Climate Change Impact on Surface Runoff

River Discharge Change (future/present in percentage)

| | Annual | Spring | Summer | Autumn | Winter |
|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Songhuajiang River | 128 | 168 | 64 | 197 | - |
| Yellow River | 40 | 68 | 38 | 38 | 32 |
| Yangtze River | 38 | 43 | 34 | 34 | 43 |
| Yaluzangbu River | 40 | 60 | 35 | 34 | 45 |

DISCUSSION

- Water withdrawal in the upper reaches of the water basins is not taken into account
- Only one climate change scenario was used in the study

Climate Change Impact on Water Demands in China

- Irrigation Water Demand Projection
- Residential Water Demand Projection

Crop water requirements and

Climate Irrigation index and annual average temperature



Urban Residential Water Demand and

Residential water use and annual average temperature



14

Irrigation Water Demand

IWD = A.B

Where:

IWD is annual irrigation water demand;*A* is effective irrigated;*B* is irrigation index.*B* can be calculated as following:

B = (PET - P)/f

Where:

PET is the total crop potential evapotranspiration during growing season; P is the total precipitation during growing season; f is irrigation efficiency.

Irrigation Water Demand under Doubled CO₂



Residential Water Demand Projection

RWD = I.P.R

Where:

RWD is annual residential water demand;

I is residential water use per capita;

P is total population;

R is the adjusting factor to consider the ratio of agricultural population.

I = 2.9484T + 11.64

Where:

T is annual temperature.





Sensitivity of Different Ep Methods to Temperature

- Modified Penman
- Priestly-Taylor
- Thornthwaite
- Local

Characteristics of Selected River Basins

| River Basin | Observing Station | Catchment Area (Km ²) | Climate Zone |
|----------------|----------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Yangtze River | Hankou | 1488036 | Subtropic, Humid |
| Yellow River | Lanzhou | 222551 | Temperate, Semi-arid |
| Yujiang River | Nanning | 75520 | Subtropic, Humid |
| Lasha River | Lasha | 27482 | Plateau Temp., Semi-arid |

Sensitivity of Different Ep Methods to Temperature

a. Lasha River

| | 1°C | 2°C | 3°C | 4°C | 5°C |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Modified Penman | 3.6 | 7.2 | 10.8 | 14.5 | 19.0 |
| Priestly-Taylor | 3.5 | 7.0 | 10.5 | 14.0 | 17.5 |
| Thornthwaite | 10.2 | 20.2 | 32.2 | 43.6 | 51.0 |
| Local | б.4 | 12.8 | 19.3 | 27.4 | 34.5 |

b. Yellow River

| | 1°C | 2°C | 3°C | 4°C | 5°C |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Modified Penman | 3.2 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 12.8 | 16.5 |
| Priestly-Taylor | 3.2 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 12.8 | 16.0 |
| Thornthwaite | 15.1 | 31.8 | 47.4 | 68.7 | 97.5 |
| Local | 10.1 | 20.2 | 31.4 | 42.3 | 53.2 |

c. Yangtze River

| | | $2^{\circ}C$ | 3°C | 4°C | 5°C |
|-----------------|------|--------------|------|------|------|
| Modified Penman | 2.8 | 5.7 | 8.5 | 11.5 | 14.2 |
| Priestly-Taylor | 2.5 | 5.0 | 7.5 | 10.4 | 13.0 |
| Thornthwaite | 12.5 | 25.5 | 38.9 | 50.0 | 66.8 |
| Local | 3.2 | 6.5 | 9.8 | 13.4 | 16.2 |

d. Yujiang River

| | l°C | $2^{\circ}C$ | 3°C | 4°C | 5°C |
|-----------------|------|--------------|------|------|------|
| Modified Penman | 3.6 | 7.8 | 10.8 | 14.5 | 19.0 |
| Priestly-Taylor | 3.2 | 6.4 | 9.6 | 12.8 | 16.9 |
| Thornthwaite | 12.0 | 24.0 | 38.0 | 50.0 | 65.0 |
| Local | 4.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 19.0 |

Relative Changes in Annual Potential Evapotranspiration (Ep), Evapotranspiration (Ev) and Runoff (R) in Different Basins under Different Climate Scenarios Lasha River

| | Mo Penma | dified n Method | Priestly-Taylor Method | | Thorn Me | thwaite thod | Local Method | |
|----------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| <u>%</u> | | E _p | | E _{rc} | | E _p | | , íp |
| T⁰3 | 1 | 0.8 | 10.5 | | 32.2 | | 19.3 | |
| T⁰5 | 1 | 9.0 | 17.5 | | 51.0 | | 34.5 | |
| % | R | $\mathrm{E_v}$ | R | $\mathrm{E_v}$ | R | $\mathrm{E_v}$ | R | E_v |
| T°3P%0 | -13.82 | 4.80 | -9.87 | 4.90 | -15.46 | 19.30 | -16.79 | 13.2 |
| T°3 P%15 | 44.56 | 30.78 | 32.41 | 30.97 | -6.93 | 40.20 | 14.88 | 27.89 |
| T°3 P%-5 | -58.69 | -21.13 | -43.38 | -20.42 | -51.47 | -14.57 | -47.34 | -7.74 |
| T°5 P%0 | -15.96 | 7.40 | -17.15 | 8.40 | -21.42 | 28.69 | -22.43 | 18.47 |
| T°5 P%15 | 22.74 | 34.47 | 24.83 | 35.77 | -11.37 | 59.44 | 4.67 | 31.45 |
| T°5 P%-5 | -47.63 | -24.53 | -58.26 | -28.46 | -74.65 | 3.38 | -49.87 | -6.68 |

Relative Changes in Annual Potential Evapotranspiration (Ep), Evapotranspiration (Ev) and Runoff (R) in Different Basins under Different Climate Scenarios

Yellow River

| | Mo Penma | dified n Method | Priestly-Taylor Method | | Thorn Me | thwaite thod | Local Method | | |
|----------|-------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| % | | E _p | | E _{rc} | E _p | | E | р | |
| T°3 | | 9.6 | 9.6 | | 47.4 | | 31.4 | | |
| T°5 | 1 | 6.5 | 16.0 | | 9 | 7.5 | 53 | .2 | |
| % | R | E _v | R | E _v | R | E _v | R | E_v | |
| T°3P%0 | -12.67 | 4.23 | -13.06 | 4.63 | -5.86 | 2.46 | -27.32 | -3.86 | |
| T°3 P%15 | 40.13 | 25.18 | 41.46 | 25.77 | -1.04 | 5.87 | 20.46 | 18.71 | |
| T°3 P%-5 | -58.97 | -20.07 | -57.24 | -23.46 | -10.79 | -1.68 | -38.92 | -4.83 | |
| T°5 P%0 | -20.46 | 5.61 | -20.80 | 6.84 | -7.80 | 4.74 | -34.58 | 4.96 | |
| T°5 P%15 | 28.84 | 22.84 | 29.76 | 34.21 | -4.32 | 9.95 | 18.28 | 11.03 | |
| T°5 P%-5 | -59.63 | -18.51 | -69.07 | -20.34 | -21.25 | -1.03 | -59.17 | -4.54 | |

Relative Changes in Annual Potential Evapotranspiration (Ep), Evapotranspiration (Ev) and Runoff (R) in Different Basins under Different Climate Scenarios

Yangtze River

| | Modified | | Priestly-Taylor | | Thornthwaite | | Local | |
|------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | Penmar | n Method | Met | thod | Met | thod | Method | |
| % |] | Ep | E _{rc} | | E _p | | E _p | |
| T°3 | 8.5 | | 7.5 | | 38.9 | | 9.8 | |
| T ^o 5 | 1 | 4.2 | 13.0 | | 66.8 | | 16.2 | |
| % | R | E _v | R | E _v | R | E _v | R | E _v |
| T°3P%0 | -5.53 | 6.67 | -4.35 | 4.18 | 4.67 | -3.47 | -0.88 | 0.42 |
| T°3 P%15 | 34.83 | 21.18 | 26.25 | 15.21 | 5.50 | 16.33 | 20.21 | 7.48 |
| T°3 P%-5 | -38.26 | -11.69 | -36.63 | -9.24 | -13.38 | -15.24 | -11.06 | -4.11 |
| T°5 P%0 | -5.96 | 8.83 | -6.37 | 6.26 | 12.02 | -3.81 | 1.13 | 1.25 |
| T°5 P%15 | 21.72 | 20.25 | 24.72 | 20.42 | 36.67 | 16.54 | 25.72 | 18.42 |
| T°5 P%-5 | -28.41 | -7.98 | -31.56 | -5.91 | -10.44 | -20.26 | -7.62 | -6.07 |

Relative Changes in Annual Potential Evapotranspiration (Ep), Evapotranspiration (Ev) and Runoff (R) in Different Basins under Different Climate Scenarios Yujiang River

| | Moo | dified | Priestly | -Taylor | Thornthwaite | | Local | |
|------------------|--------|----------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|-------|----------------|---------|
| | Penmar | n Method | Method | | Method | | Method | |
| % |] | Ep | E _{rc} | | E _p | | E _p | |
| T ^o 3 | 1 | 0.8 | 9.6 | | 38.0 | | 12.0 | |
| T ^o 5 | 1 | 9.0 | 16.9 | | 65 | .0 | 19 | 0.0 |
| % | R | E _v | R | E_{v} | R | E_v | R | E_{v} |
| T°3P%0 | -5.08 | 6.15 | -5.18 | 5.04 | -23.56 | 19.18 | -2.76 | 1.94 |
| T°3 P%15 | 30.48 | 20.27 | 32.29 | 20.79 | 24.81 | 27.73 | 19.45 | 9.87 |
| T°3 P%-5 | -36.62 | -10.83 | -36.88 | -10.45 | -62.75 | 3.17 | -9.74 | -6.22 |
| T°5 P%0 | -7.79 | 8.77 | -4.69 | 4.22 | -34.45 | 26.64 | -2.66 | 3.15 |
| T°5 P%15 | 29.81 | 21.28 | 16.63 | 13.78 | 5.68 | 33.71 | 23.45 | 20.74 |
| T°5 P%-5 | -39.93 | -7.90 | -21.75 | -3.99 | -67.71 | 12.58 | -8.17 | -5.41 |

Conclusions

- Different Ep methods bring about considerable differences in modeled runoff values, the choice of the Ep method in assessing the impact of climate change on river basin discharge is important
- Empirical methods, mainly temperature based, give significantly different marginal changes to temperature fluctuations

Impact on Distribution of Climate Zones in China

Climate Zones under Current Climate



Climate Zones under Mean Climate Scenario of 11 GCMs



The End

Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of CCC1991



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GFDLT91



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GFDLR30



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GFDL985



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GFDQFX



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GISS995



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GISS998



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of GISS996



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of OSU1988



Climate Zones under Climate Scenario of UKMET88



Some Facts

- Climate change imposes impacts on bothWater supply and Water demand (directly/indirectly)
- 1.5°C increase in temperature led to 20 ~ 30% of increase in irrigation water demands, while 4.5°C increase can make the irrigation demand double

Information Inventory

- Social economic data (provincial level)
- Climate data
- Data on water use in cities
- Data about Irrigation (provincial level)
- River discharge data
- Background data on water basins
- Sectoral water use for water basins
- Water supply capacity and actual water supply of water conservancy facilities by water basins
- China water basin boundaries map
- China river system map
- China vegetation map
- China geographical map
- China soil map

Research Approach



Percentage of Changes in Annual Evaporation



Percentage of Changes in Annual Runoff



Difference of Potential Evapotranspiration between Present and Future Climate



Differences of Surface Runoff between Present and Future Climate



Seasonal River Discharge under Present Climate



Seasonal River Discharge under Future Climate

