



1 **Demonstrating the use of UNSEEN climate data for hydrological** 2 **applications: case studies for extreme floods and droughts in** 3 **England**

4 Kay, Alison L¹, Dunstone, Nick ², Kay, Gillian², Bell, Victoria A¹, Hannaford, Jamie¹

5 ¹UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Wallingford, UK, OX10 8BB

6 ²Met Office, Exeter, UK, EX1 3PB

7 *Correspondence to:* A Kay (alkay@ceh.ac.uk)

8 **Abstract.** Meteorological and hydrological hazards present challenges to people and ecosystems worldwide, but
9 the limited length of observational data means that the possible extreme range is not fully understood. Here, a
10 large ensemble of climate model data is combined with a simple grid-based hydrological model, to assess
11 unprecedented but plausible hydrological extremes in the current climate across England. Two case studies are
12 selected—dry (Summer 2022) and wet (Autumn 2023)—with the hydrological model initialised from known
13 conditions then run forward for several months using the large climate ensemble. The modelling chain provides a
14 large set of plausible events including extremes outside the range from use of observed data, with the lowest flows
15 around 28% lower on average for the Summer 2022 drought study and the highest flows around 42% higher on
16 average for the Autumn 2023 flood study. The temporal evolution and spatial dependence of extremes is
17 investigated, including the potential time-scale of recovery of flows to normal and the chance of persistent
18 extremes. Being able to plan for such events could help improve the resilience of water supply systems to drought,
19 and improve flood risk management and incident response.

20 **Keywords.** River flows, extreme events, floods, droughts, hydrological modelling

21 **1 Introduction**

22 Meteorological and hydrological hazards — storms, floods and droughts — present challenges to people,
23 infrastructure and ecosystems globally (Beevers et al. 2022; Mokhtari et al. 2023). The relatively limited period
24 of available observational data means that the possible range of extremes of such events is often not fully
25 understood. For example, Thompson et al. (2017) show that in SE England there is a 7% chance of exceeding the
26 current observed rainfall record in at least one month in any given winter, with a 34% chance of breaking a regional
27 record somewhere in England and Wales. Similarly, Kent et al. (2022) investigate plausible summer rainfall
28 extremes, showing an approximately 1% chance per year of exceeding current daily rainfall records in the UK in
29 the current climate. Chan et al. (2023b) show an approximately 9% chance of a summer month with lower rainfall
30 than the observed driest summer in SE England in the current climate. When such unprecedented events do
31 inevitably occur, they can lead to very severe impacts (Bertola et al. 2023). This is not just because of their
32 unprecedented magnitude but due to inherent unpreparedness, given that water supply systems, flood
33 infrastructure, and related risk management strategies are typically adapted to historical ranges of variability
34 (Kjeldsen and Prosdocimi 2016,).

35 One possible way to assess how events may unfold is the use of a so-called ‘storyline’ approach; a storyline is
36 typically defined as a “physically self-consistent unfolding of past events, or of plausible future events or
37 pathways” (Shepherd et al. 2018). This approach has been advocated in the context of future climate change, as a



1 way of circumventing the deep uncertainties associated with future climate projections by placing more emphasis
2 on driving factors and plausibility than probability (Shepherd et al. 2018). In this context it has links to so-called
3 H++ scenarios, which are plausible but high-end scenarios of climate change (Reynard et al. 2017). But storylines
4 can equally be applied in the context of past events by developing plausible counterfactuals, i.e. alternative ways
5 that those events could have unfolded even in the current climate (Sillmann et al. 2021). For example, Chan et al.
6 (2022) developed storylines for the UK drought of 2010-2012, by applying changes to the observed event based
7 on i) antecedent conditions (applying progressively drier conditions), ii) temporal sequencing (adding a dry winter
8 before or after the observed event), and iii) climate change. The results showed the importance of hydrological
9 initial conditions, and the vulnerability of catchments in Britain to a ‘third dry winter’. Such studies can aid
10 preparedness by enabling planning for events similar to, but more extreme than, known events (with known
11 responses and impacts). However, the development of storylines in this way requires expert judgment on
12 plausibility, and on the factors important to the development of a particular event. Possible spatial factors may
13 also be neglected; for example Chan et al. (2022) apply the same storylines for catchments across Britain, treating
14 catchments essentially independently.

15 The use of large ensembles of climate data can reduce the need for expert judgment and enable spatially consistent
16 analyses and estimation of likelihoods. The extreme winter rainfall study of Thompson et al. (2017) was based on
17 a large ensemble of high-resolution initialised global climate simulations (termed ‘UNSEEN’, UNprecedented
18 Simulated Extremes using ENsembles), thus “directly sampling more extreme cases than the available
19 observations, allowing the identification of unprecedented rainfall events to assess their likelihood in the real
20 world”. Statistical modelling could also be used to estimate the probability of unprecedented rainfall from
21 observations, and this is increasingly done in practice in UK water resources management using stochastic
22 simulation (e.g. Dawkins et al. 2022). However, the use of a dynamical model is judged to better preserve physical
23 plausibility and spatial dependence (Thompson et al. 2017). Data from either could be used to drive hydrological
24 models, to enable subsequent assessment of potentially unprecedented hydrological extremes, but the likely better
25 representation of spatial structures in dynamical models is important if large or multiple (not independent)
26 catchments are being considered. Chan et al. (2023a) use a large ensemble of seasonal global model hindcast data
27 to drive catchment-based hydrological models for 16 catchments (plus a groundwater model for 10 boreholes) in
28 the Anglian region of England, and used the summer 2022 drought as a case study to explore plausible storylines
29 of development into 2023. Brunner and Slater (2022) show that pooling reforecast ensemble members of European
30 river flows enables more robust estimates of very extreme flood events (those occurring less than twice in 100
31 years), with reduced uncertainty bounds compared to observation-based estimates.

32 Here, an expanded version of the UNSEEN ensemble of Thompson et al. (2017) is used in combination with a
33 simple grid-based hydrological model for Great Britain, to assess unprecedented but plausible hydrological
34 extremes in the current climate. For hydrological modelling, the antecedent conditions (e.g. water stored in the
35 soil and groundwater) are an important factor in subsequent river flows. Thus two case studies are selected, one
36 very dry (Summer 2022, associated with a major national-scale drought) and one very wet (Autumn 2023,
37 associated with persistent and large-scale flooding), with the hydrological model initialised from known
38 conditions at the start of each case study, then run forward for a number of months using the large ensemble of
39 UNSEEN climate data. The case studies are used to illustrate the potential of the approach to provide
40 unprecedented but plausible temporal and spatial hydrological extremes.



1 **2 Data and methods**

2 **2.1 The UNSEEN climate datasets**


3 The UNSEEN dataset used in this study comes from two hindcast ensembles of the Met Office Decadal Prediction
4 System version 3 (DePreSys3; Dunstone et al. 2016), which is based on the Hadley Centre global coupled model
5 (GCM) HadGEM3-GC3 (Williams et al. 2018). The model has an atmospheric grid resolution of ~60 km in the
6 midlatitudes, and an ocean resolution of 0.25°. The first ensemble is initialised every 1st November and the second
7 is initialised every 1st May, and each has forty ensemble members (realisations) but they are run for different
8 lengths of time:

- 9 • 16-month periods starting in each November from 1959 up to 2021;
10 • 11-month periods starting in each May from 1960 up to 2022.

11 Differences between ensemble members are solely due to natural variability (i.e. there are no changes to GCM
12 structure or parameterisation). Monthly rainfall rates are provided (mm/day) on a lat-long grid, for a region
13 covering (most of) the UK (Figure 1a). The data for each realisation in an n-month period are considered
14 dependent.

15 The GCM rainfall data are processed via the two steps below.

- 16 1. *Bias-corrected using simple monthly factors.* The 60km grids of correction factors are derived for each month
17 of the Nov-initialised and May-initialised data separately (i.e. there are 16 resulting grids of correction factors
18 for the Nov-initialised runs and 11 for the May-initialised runs), by comparing the GCM monthly mean
19 precipitation across all initialisation-years and realisations against monthly mean observed precipitation from
20 HadUK-Grid 1km data for 1961-2020 (Met Office et al. 2021) averaged up to the GCM grid. The grids of
21 correction factors are then smoothed using a 3x3 grid around each cell, with a weight of 1/2 for the centre
22 cell and 1/16 for each of the 8 surrounding cells (unless any surrounding cell has missing data, in which case
23 its weight is added to that of the centre cell). A similar bias correction is derived for RCM precipitation data
24 by Kay (2021). Maps of the correction factors are shown in Supp. Figures S1 and S2.
- 25 2. *Downscaled to the 1km GB national grid.* The hydrological model (Section 2.2) requires 1km inputs, which
26 are derived from the ~60km lat-lon data by identifying the GCM grid box to use for each 1km grid box (Figure
27 1a) and distributing non-uniformly over the 1km grid boxes within each GCM grid box by using ratios of
28 1km to GCM grid box-mean standard average annual rainfall (SAAR) (Bell et al. 2007; Kay et al. 2023b).
29 The SAAR ratios are shown in Figure 1b.



1

2 **Figure 1 a) Identifying GCM grid boxes on the GB national grid. b) The SAAR ratios used for downscaling GCM**
 3 **rainfall to the 1km grid. c) The 17 UK Hydrological Outlook regions, with the eight regions used here in the left-hand**
 4 **list (green) and the rest in the right-hand list (blue).**

5 **2.2 The hydrological model**

6 The Grid-to-Grid (G2G) is a grid-based runoff-production and routing model, operating on a 1km grid at a 15-
 7 minute time-step across Great Britain (Bell et al. 2009). It is used for operational flood forecasting for England,
 8 Wales and Scotland (Price et al. 2012; Cranston et al. 2012), and has been used to estimate the potential future



1 impacts of climate change on river flows across Britain (e.g. Kay et al. 2023a). However, the short time-step of
2 the model (required for stability of the routing scheme given the 1km grid scale) means that runs take a not
3 insignificant amount of time. For a seasonal forecasting application, where a relatively large number of runs were
4 required using coarse (temporal and spatial) climate data, a simple monthly Water Balance Model (WBM) was
5 developed, based upon G2G (Bell et al. 2013, 2017).

6 The WBM uses data from long historical runs of G2G (e.g. the long-term mean of the min and max subsurface
7 water storage depths, and the long-term mean monthly actual evaporation (AE)) as well as information on the
8 network of flow paths used by G2G, and is initialised using an estimate of subsurface water storage on a 1km grid
9 across GB, also taken from G2G for the required data. The WBM forms one component of the UK Hydrological
10 Outlook (UKHO; Prudhomme et al. 2017, hydoutuk.net.ukho.ceh.ac.uk), where it is initialised using a G2G
11 estimate of subsurface water storage derived using the most recent observations of rainfall and potential
12 evaporation (PE), and then run forward driven by an ensemble of Met Office rainfall forecasts for 1- and 3-months
13 ahead, to provide forecasts of regional mean river flows.

14 Bell et al. (2017) provide an assessment of the performance of the WBM compared to G2G, driving both with
15 observed 5km gridded rainfall data (1962-2010) and initialising the WBM from G2G at the start of each month.
16 Regional means of standardised 1km river flows for 17 regions across GB, for 1- and 3-months ahead, show
17 correlations of over 0.8 in all cases.

18 **2.3 Applying the climate data – two case studies**

19 As described in Section 2.2, the WBM needs to be initialised using an estimate of subsurface water storage on a
20 1km grid across GB, which is generally taken from a run of G2G driven by observed rainfall and PE data. Here,
21 the WBM is initialised for two case study events;

- 22 1. Summer 2022 drought, and
- 23 2. Autumn 2023 flood.


24 For each case study, the G2G model is run with daily observed data up to the end of the previous month, to produce
25 the initial conditions used by the monthly WBM. The observed data consists of 1km HadUK-Grid precipitation
26 (Met Office et al. 2021) and MORECS PE (Hough and Jones 1997). Then the WBM is run forwards for a number
27 of months using both UNSEEN ensembles for all realisations and all initialisation-years (1961-2022), regardless
28 of the year in which the UNSEEN climate data was initialised (hereafter ‘WBM UNSEEN’, Table 1).

29 For each case study, the WBM is also run forwards for the same period using all years of historical HadUK-Grid
30 1km precipitation data (1961-2022; hereafter ‘WBM Obs’). This is analogous to the ‘Ensemble Streamflow
31 Prediction’ method used as part of the UKHO (Harrigan et al. 2018).

32 The use of UNSEEN (and observed) data from all years allows the widest examination of possible subsequent
33 rainfall pathways following summer 2022 and autumn 2023. The relatively long lead-times of the UNSEEN data
34 used here (Table 1), and hence the relatively weak predictable UK rainfall signals, results in a large dataset with
35 a wide range of possible outcomes including well-sampled dry (after summer 2022) and wet (after autumn 2023)
36 extreme tails. The WBM Obs ensemble provides a ‘benchmark’ that enables an assessment of the added-value of
37 the WBM UNSEEN ensemble.



1 **Table 1** The time-periods covered by the Nov- and May-initialised UNSEEN climate ensembles, and their use in each
 2 case study. The grey boxes indicate UNSEEN data months regarded as spin-up. The green vertical lines indicate the
 3 WBM initialisation for each case study (end-July 2022 for the summer 2022 drought study and end-October 2023 for
 4 the Autumn 2023 flood study).



5

6 **2.3.1 Summer 2022 drought**

7 July 2022 was exceptionally warm and dry in the UK, with widespread record-breaking maximum temperatures
 8 and extremely low rainfall across England (<10% of average over large parts of the south-east) (Barker et al.
 9 2024). The preceding months had also been dry, leading to river flows and reservoirs reaching exceptionally low
 10 levels across much of England and the introduction of temporary use bans by several water companies in southern
 11 England (Barker et al. 2024).

12 We here ask the question ‘how much worse might the situation have become’? To do this, the WBM is initialised
 13 from G2G sub-surface conditions from end-July 2022 and run to end-Feb 2023 (7 months), with every UNSEEN
 14 initialisation-year and realisation, and with every observed data year. This gives 4960 WBM UNSEEN runs for
 15 each month (2 ensembles * 62 initialisation-years * 40 realisations), vs only 62 historical sequences for WBM
 16 Obs, hence enabling a more robust assessment of rare low extremes.

17 **2.3.2 Autumn 2023 flood**

18 October 2023 was exceptionally wet across most of England, with rainfall totals exceeding 250% of average in
 19 some areas, and the preceding three months had also been relatively wet (Hannaford et al. 2023). This led to river
 20 flows reaching notably high levels across much of England, with elevated flood risk in many areas.

21 We again ask the question ‘how much worse might the situation become’? In a similar way to the Summer 2022
 22 analysis, the WBM is initialised from G2G sub-surface conditions from end-Oct 2023 and run to end-Feb 2024
 23 (4 months), with every UNSEEN initialisation-year and realisation, and with every observed data year. This again
 24 gives 4960 WBM UNSEEN runs for each month, vs only 62 for WBM Obs, hence enabling a more robust
 25 assessment of rare high extremes.



1 **2.4 Flow analyses**

2 The WBM provides monthly mean river flows on a 1km grid, but in the UKHO these are typically standardised
3 (by dividing by long-term mean flow from a set of observation-driven runs) and the standardised flows are
4 displayed on a 1km grid or averaged across 17 regions (Figure 1c). This WBM approach was originally developed
5 to provide an indication of the relative magnitude of monthly and regional mean river flows across GB using
6 spatially-coarse GloSEA5 rainfall forecasts (Bell et al. 2017). A very similar approach is used here; although the
7 DePreSys3 hindcasts have an improved spatial resolution, they are still relatively coarse, and focusing on regional
8 mean flows greatly simplifies subsequent analyses and plotting. The results focus on eight regions of England;
9 NW England, Northumbria, Severn-Trent, Yorkshire, Thames, Anglian, Wessex, SE England (Figure 1c).

10 **2.4.1 Fidelity tests**

11 Fidelity tests on WBM flow estimates are performed in a similar way to that applied for the UNSEEN rainfall
12 data (Thompson et al. 2017 Fig. 2). That is, for each case study and region,

- 13 • the WBM UNSEEN (May- and Nov-initialised) simulated flows are resampled 1000 times, with each sample
14 randomly selected from the 40*2 available realisations for the year, producing a time-series of the same length
15 as the WBM Obs time-series;
- 16 • for each resample, the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis statistics are calculated;
- 17 • the same statistics are calculated for the WBM Obs simulated flows;
- 18 • if, for all four statistics, the WBM Obs flow value sits within the 2.5%-97.5% range of the values from the
19 1000 resamples of the WBM UNSEEN simulations, then the WBM UNSEEN simulations are considered to
20 have passed the test (i.e. the distributions of WBM Obs and WBM UNSEEN flow values for the region and
21 month are considered indistinguishable). If the test is only failed for one of the four statistics, then this is
22 noted.

23 Passing the fidelity tests gives confidence in the ability of the WBM and UNSEEN GCM precipitation to simulate
24 appropriate distributions of monthly mean river flows in a region, given the WBM initialisation for each case
25 study.

26 **2.4.2 Extreme flows**

27 For each case study, the monthly time-series of regional mean flows from the full set of years and realisations of
28 WBM UNSEEN are plotted as the median and range (5th-95th percentiles, and overall min and max). The Nov-
29 and May-initialised ensembles are combined together. For comparison, the median and range from WBM Obs are
30 also shown.

31 For historical context, the time-series of monthly regional mean flows for the previous two years are shown for
32 each region, along with long-term mean flow ranges derived for the preceding years (from 1963). These are
33 derived from runs of the WBM driven by observed data for 1963-2023, with initialisation (using G2G data) at the
34 start of every month (hereafter 'WBM Obs 1m'). For each region, long-term mean flow ranges are derived by
35 extracting the 5th, 13th, 28th, 72th, 87th and 95th percentiles for each month, along with overall min and max. These
36 percentiles are chosen to match those defining the seven classes used in the UKHO: 'Exceptional low' (<5th),



1 'Notably low' (5th-13th), 'Below normal' (13th-28th), 'Normal' (28th-72th), 'Above normal' (72th-87th), 'Notably
2 high' (87th-95th), 'Exceptionally high' (>95th) (ukho.ceh.ac.uk).

3 The 'WBM Obs 1m' run described above is not directly comparable to the 'WBM UNSEEN' and 'WBM Obs'
4 ensemble runs, since the former is re-initialised from G2G for every month whereas the latter are only initialised
5 at the start of each case study then run forward for the n -months of each study (where n is 7 for the Summer 2022
6 drought and 4 for the Autumn 2023 flood). To demonstrate any difference this may make, a further run is done
7 using observed driving data for each case study but only initialising at the start then running forward for n months
8 (hereafter 'WBM Obs n -m').

9 **2.4.3 Temporal and spatial variation in extreme flows**

10 The UNSEEN-derived extreme flows are assessed, for each case study, by selecting and plotting the ensemble
11 member giving the most extreme flows for each month of the simulation, and investigating how these vary
12 temporally (for consecutive months) and spatially (for neighbouring regions). The UNSEEN ensemble member
13 is defined by the ensemble (Nov or May), the initialisation-year, and the realisation number (out of 40); see
14 Section 2.1.

15 **2.4.4 Recovery or persistence of extreme flows**

16 The long term mean flow bands (Section 2.4.2) are used to assess the chance of flows recovering to 'normal' by
17 each month, in each region, for each case study. For example, for the Summer 2022 drought case study, in each
18 region each ensemble member is assessed to see whether the flows have reached the 'normal' flow band (or
19 higher) by month m but are still in a lower flow band for each month of the simulation prior to month m . Similarly,
20 for the Autumn 2023 flood case study, in each region each ensemble member is assessed to see whether the flows
21 have reached the 'normal' flow band (or lower) by month m but are still in a higher flow band for each month of
22 the simulation prior to month m . The number of ensemble members recovering to 'normal' is then expressed as a
23 percentage of the full ensemble, and plotted for each region and each case study. In a similar way, the chance of
24 flows remaining at least exceptionally low (high) is assessed for Summer 2022 (Autumn 2023).

25 **3 Results**

26 **3.1 Fidelity tests**

27 The results of the flow fidelity tests are summarised in Table 2 for the each case study, indicating a pass ('1') or
28 fail (≤ 0) for each month and region, with a negative number indicating which statistic the test failed on if it only
29 failed on one of the four. These show overall pass-rates of 86% and 78% for the Summer 2022 drought and
30 Autumn 2023 flood events respectively. Note that there are no failures only on the mean ('-1'), because of the
31 correction applied to GCM precipitation data for mean monthly rainfall (Section 2.1).

32 Most of the failures occur in February; the pass-rates leaving out February are 96% and 96% respectively. The
33 failures in February are only related to the standard deviation ('-2'), which is due to this being too low for rainfall
34 in the climate model runs (Kelder et al. 2022). This is partly due to the extremely wet Feb 2020 (Davies et al.
35 2021); removing this from the February fidelity testing leads to passes in 6 out of 8 regions for both the Summer



1 2022 drought and Autumn 2023 flood (compared to only 2 when Feb 2020 is included). In each case, the test still
 2 fails in Thames and SE England.

3 **Table 2** The results of fidelity tests for the Summer 2022 drought (left) and Autumn 2023 flood (right) case studies. ‘1’
 4 indicates a PASS for all four statistics, while ≤ 0 indicates a FAIL for at least one statistic. If there is only a FAIL on
 5 one statistic then the negative number indicates which (-1 mean, -2 sd, -3 skewness, -4 kurtosis).

	Summer 2022 drought							Autumn 2023 flood			
	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
NWEngland	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	1	1	-2
Northumbria	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	-3	1	-2
Severn-Trent	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	1	1	-2
Yorkshire	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	1	1	-2
Thames	1	1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	1	1	-2
Anglian	1	1	-4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Wessex	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
SEEngland	0	1	1	1	1	1	-2	1	1	1	-2


6

7 3.2 Extreme flows

8 Plots of the median and range of regional mean flows are shown in Figure 2 for the Summer 2022 drought case
 9 study, and Figure 3 for the Autumn 2023 flood case study. These show that using the large ensemble of UNSEEN
 10 data gives more extreme flows than using all of the historical observed data (red dotted lines vs grey dotted lines),
 11 although the 5th, 50th and 95th percentiles from WBM UNSEEN and WBM Obs are all similar (orange dashed and
 12 dot-dashed vs grey dashed and dot-dashed), as expected from the fidelity tests. It should be emphasised that, for
 13 both WBM UNSEEN and WBM Obs, the min and max (dotted lines) represent the overall envelope of the
 14 ensemble of simulations for each month, so they do not necessarily represent a plausible monthly evolution of the
 15 flows (see Section 3.3). On average across the 8 regions, for the 7 months of the Summer 2022 drought case study
 16 the low envelope of the WBM UNSEEN flows is 28% lower than that of the WBM Obs flows, and for the 4
 17 months of the Autumn 2023 flood case study the high envelope of the WBM UNSEEN flows is 42% higher than
 18 that of the WBM Obs flows.


19 Figure 2 also shows that the simulations from WBM Obs 1m (black solid line; initialised at the start of every
 20 month) and WBM Obs n-m (black dashed line; only initialised at the start of the case study period) are very
 21 similar. However, Figure 3 shows that the WBM Obs n-m simulation tends to over-estimate high flows relative
 22 to the WBM Obs 1m re-initialised simulation; see Section 4.2 of Discussion.

23 The effect of initialisation is clear in all regions, but longer-lasting in some. For example, for the Summer 2022
 24 drought study the conditions in July 2022 are obviously very dry (below normal in all regions, and exceptionally
 25 low in some). In Severn-Trent the max from WBM Obs (top grey dotted) has increased from below the long-term
 26 max to match it by Feb 2023, whereas in Thames the WBM Obs max is still well below the long-term max by
 27 then. In all regions though, the min from WBM Obs (lower grey dotted) stays below the long-term min.



1

2 **Figure 2** Regional mean flows for the Summer 2022 drought case study. The dashed/dot-dashed/dotted lines show the
 3 median/5th-95th/min-max across the ensemble using all the observed driving data (grey) and all the UNSEEN driving
 4 data (orange/red) for the WBM initialised from end-July 2022. The WBM flows driven by observed data for Jan 2021-
 5 Feb 2023 and initialised at the start of every month are also shown (WBM Obs 1m; solid black line), as are the WBM
 6 flows driven by observed data for Aug 2022-Feb 2023 but only initialised at the start (WBM Obs n-m; dashed black
 7 line). For historical context, the coloured areas show the ranges from WBM Obs 1m for 1963-2020: min, 5th, 13th, 28th,
 8 72th, 87th, 95th, max percentiles. Note the log-scale on the y-axis, to emphasise lower flows.



1
 2 **Figure 3** As Figure 2 but for the Autumn 2023 flood case study. For historical context, the coloured areas show the
 3 **ranges from WBM Obs 1m for 1963-2021: min, 5th, 13th, 28th, 72th, 87th, 95th, max percentiles.**
 4 Similarly, for the Autumn 2023 flood study the conditions in October 2023 are very wet (above normal in all
 5 regions, and exceptionally high in some). In Northumbria the max from WBM Obs (top grey dotted) has decreased
 6 from above the long-term max to match it by Dec 2023, whereas in Anglian the WBM Obs max is still well above
 7 the long-term max even by Feb 2024. This is due to the presence of significant groundwater stores in regions to
 8 the south/east of England, which typically respond much more slowly to weather conditions than the shallower



1 stores typically found to the north/west of England (Svensson et al. 2015). The WBM has information about the
2 spatial differences in sub-surface stores from the data it takes from long historical runs of G2G (Section 2.2).


3 **3.3 Temporal and spatial variation in extreme flows**

4 It is important to note that the WBM UNSEEN extremes for consecutive months are often not given by the same
5 UNSEEN climate ensemble member (ensemble, initialisation-year and realisation; Section 2.1). Similarly, the
6 extremes for different regions, even neighbouring ones, are often not given by the same ensemble member. This
7 is illustrated for four regions for the Summer 2022 drought (Figure 4) and for the Autumn 2023 flood (Figure 5).
8 Similarly, the WBM Obs extremes for consecutive months will likely not be given by the same ensemble
9 member.


10 For the Summer 2022 drought, Figure 4 shows that the ensemble members giving the lowest flows in August,
11 September or October 2022 each have a fast recovery in flows through the autumn. In contrast, the ensemble
12 members giving the lowest flows in late autumn and early winter 2022 are often low (but not lowest) earlier in
13 the year too, particularly in the Thames and Anglian regions, which are more influenced by slower-responding
14 groundwater systems. In no cases is the ensemble member giving the lowest flows for one month also that giving
15 the lowest flows for the following month. In only three cases does the ensemble member giving the lowest flows
16 in a given month and region also give the lowest flows for that month in a neighbouring region (Sep and Oct 2022
17 in Thames and Anglian, and Jan 2023 in Thames and Severn-Trent).

18 For the Autumn 2023 flood, Figure 5 shows that in no cases is the ensemble member giving the highest flows for
19 one month also that giving the highest flows for the following month, and only rarely is the ensemble member
20 giving the highest flows in a given month also very extreme in earlier/later months. The only real exception is the
21 ensemble member which gives the highest flows in Anglian in November 2023, which also gives flows higher
22 than previous observed records (although not the highest from the UNSEEN ensemble) for Dec 2023 and Jan
23 2024, falling back into the 'exceptionally high' range in Feb 2024. In only one case does the ensemble member
24 giving the highest flows in a given month and region also give the highest flows for that month in a neighbouring
25 region (Dec 2023 in Anglian and Severn-Trent).

26 These results also need to be interpreted in the context of the fidelity test results. In particular, in most regions the
27 fidelity tests were failed in February (Table 2), although this was mostly related to the extreme February observed
28 in 2020 so it may be that the results can otherwise be seen as representative. The fidelity tests were also failed in
29 the first month (August) of the Summer 2022 drought study in SE England, so those results may be less reliable.



1
 2 **Figure 4** Regional mean flows for the Summer 2022 drought case study, for the ensemble member giving the lowest
 3 flow in each month (Aug 2022 to Feb 2023; coloured solid lines, with labels identifying the ensemble member by
 4 ensemble (Nov or May), initialisation-year and realisation number). As in Figure 2, the dashed/dotted lines show the
 5 median/min-max across the ensemble using all the UNSEEN driving data (orange) for the WBM initialised from end-
 6 July 2022, and the WBM flows driven by observed data for Jul 2022-Feb 2023 and initialised at the start of every month
 7 are also shown (WBM Obs 1m; solid black line). For historical context, the coloured areas show the ranges from WBM
 8 Obs 1m for 1963-2020: min, 5th, 13th, 28th, 72th, 87th, 95th, max percentiles.




1
 2 **Figure 5** As Figure 4 but for the Autumn 2023 flood case study. For historical context, the coloured areas show the
 3 ranges from WBM Obs 1m for 1963-2021: min, 5th, 13th, 28th, 72th, 87th, 95th, max percentiles.

4 **3.4 Recovery or persistence of extreme flows**

5 The chance of flows recovering to ‘normal’, or remaining exceptionally low (or lower), by each month in each
 6 region for the Summer 2022 drought is shown in Figure 6. Flows in more northerly regions (NW England,
 7 Northumbria, Yorkshire) were very likely to have recovered to ‘normal’ by early 2023, whereas other regions
 8 show a slower recovery (from a lower starting point) — Anglian shows only around an 80% chance of recovery
 9 by early 2023 (Figure 6a). Conversely, the analysis of persistence of extremes shows around a 3% chance of flows



- 1 remaining exceptionally low in early 2023 in the Anglian region, with a zero chance of persistent low flows in
- 2 northerly regions (Figure 6b).




3
 4 **Figure 6** The percentage of ensemble members showing a) recovery of flows to (at least) normal by each month, or b)
 5 remaining at least exceptionally extreme by each month, for the Summer 2022 drought case study.

6 For the Autumn 2023 flood, flows in regions to the north are very likely to have recovered to ‘normal’ by early
 7 2024, whereas flows in regions to the south/east show only around a 70-85% chance of recovery by then, with
 8 Anglian and Severn Trent worst (Figure 7a). Conversely, the analysis of persistence of extremes shows around a
 9 3% chance of flows remaining exceptionally high (or higher) in early 2023 in the Wessex region, with a zero
 10 chance of persistent high flows in the northerly regions (Figure 7b).

11 For both case studies, there are differences between the monthly percentages of recovery and persistence estimated
 12 from the WBM UNSEEN ensemble and the WBM Obs ensemble (coloured bars vs outlined bars). The percentages
 13 derived from the WBM UNSEEN ensemble appear to vary more smoothly from month to month than those
 14 derived from the much smaller WBM Obs ensemble, and the larger ensemble size means that the rarer persistent



1 extremes should be estimated more robustly. The general patterns for recovery to normal flows are relatively
 2 similar, but the patterns for persistence of exceptionally extreme flows are more different. In some regions there
 3 are persistent extremes in the WBM UNSEEN ensemble that do not exist at all in the WBM Obs ensemble (e.g.
 4 Wessex for the Summer 2022 drought lasting into 2023, and Thames and Severn-Trent for the Autumn 2023 flood
 5 lasting into 2024), but in other regions the opposite is the case (e.g. SE England for the Summer 2022 drought
 6 lasting into 2023, and Yorkshire for the Autumn 2023 flood lasting into 2024).



7
 8 **Figure 7** As Figure 6 but for the Autumn 2023 flood case study.

9 **4 Discussion**

10 **4.1 Case study outcomes**

11 Both the flood and drought case studies demonstrate the potential of using the large ensemble of UNSEEN climate
 12 data in combination with a simple grid-based national-scale hydrological model. The modelling chain provides a
 13 large set of plausible events including extremes outside the range from use of observed data, with the lowest flows



1 around 28% lower on average for the Summer 2022 drought study and the highest flows around 42% higher on
2 average for the Autumn 2023 flood study. It enables the investigation of the temporal evolution and spatial
3 dependence of extremes, including the potential time-scale and speed of recovery of flows to a normal range and
4 possible persistence of extremes across a number of months.

5 For the Summer 2022 drought case study, Figure 4 showed the existence of ensemble members giving very low
6 flows through to February 2023, particularly in the Thames and Anglian regions which are more influenced by
7 slower-responding groundwater systems. In reality, recovery of regional mean flows to normal happened
8 relatively quickly in autumn 2022 (black line), although there were localised drought concerns in parts of eastern
9 England into summer 2023, and concerns about a further drought developing more widely in early 2023 following
10 a dry winter (Sefton et al. 2023); some ensemble members show this possibility (e.g. realisation 19 from Nov
11 1993 in Thames – blue line in Figure 4).

12 Chan et al. (2023a) also used the summer 2022 drought as a case study to explore storylines of development of
13 extremes into 2023, but using a different seasonal hindcast dataset and only looking at selected catchments and
14 boreholes in the Anglian region of England. They split their large ensemble into four clusters (based on
15 atmospheric circulation indices), and showed that the clusters characterising drier-than-average winters resulted
16 in continuation of the drought into 2023. This highlights a further advantage of the use of large ensembles of
17 climate model data – the ability to characterise the large-scale drivers of extreme events.

18 For the Autumn 2023 flood case study, Figure 5 showed the ensemble member giving the highest flows in the
19 Anglian region in Nov 2023 also gave flows higher than previous records for Dec 2023 and Jan 2024, before
20 falling back into the ‘exceptionally high’ range in Feb 2024. Also, the ensemble member giving the highest flows
21 in Dec 2023 in Anglian gave the highest flows in the neighbouring Severn-Trent region. In reality, after a wet
22 December 2023 (Turner et al. 2024), severe flooding occurred over much of England very early in January 2024,
23 with over 250 flood warnings issued by the Environment Agency and over 1000 properties flooded
24 ([floodlist.com/europe/united-kingdom/storm-henk-floods-january-2024](https://www.floodlist.com/europe/united-kingdom/storm-henk-floods-january-2024)). Flows then dropped back to some
25 extent later in January 2024, following drier weather across much of England (Sefton et al. 2024), before rising
26 again in February 2024, which was exceptionally wet across much of England leading to record high flows in
27 some catchments (nrfa.ceh.ac.uk/sites/default/files/HS_202402.pdf); some ensemble members show this
28 possibility (e.g. realisation 11 from May 2020 in Anglian – dark red line in Figure 5).

29 For each case study, the selection of ensemble members illustrating temporal and spatial variation (Section 3.3)
30 focussed on those that gave the most extreme flows for any given region and month. However, Section 3.4
31 included a summary of the percentage of ensemble members where flows remained at least exceptionally extreme
32 by each month. This illustrated a clear possibility of persistent extremes in some regions to the south/east, with
33 the chance of at least exceptionally low flows persisting from Summer 2022 into 2023 being ~3% in Anglian, and
34 the chance of at least exceptionally high flows persisting from Autumn 2023 into 2024 being ~3% for Wessex.
35 The selection of ensemble members could also focus on any giving extreme low/high flows across multiple
36 regions, to enable study of possible spatially extensive extreme events.



1 **4.2 Limitations of the models and data**

2 The WBM applied here is a very simple monthly hydrological model, which has both advantages and
3 disadvantages. The monthly time-step of the model means that it runs very quickly, so can easily be used for large
4 climate ensembles such as those applied here. However, it also assumes climatological AE (derived from long
5 historical runs of G2G). The effect of this will likely be less in so-called water-limited areas to the south/east of
6 England (where AE is generally limited by soil water availability, especially in summer) and in so-called energy-
7 limited areas to the north/west of England (where AE is generally limited by PE), but it could have a larger effect
8 in the more energy-water balanced areas in between (Kay et al. 2013), and also during more extreme wet/dry
9 periods when AE should probably be higher/lower. This could be the reason for the possible over-estimation of
10 high flows from the WBM Obs n-m run, relative to the WBM Obs 1m run which is re-initialised from G2G at the
11 start of each month (Figure 3). Future work will investigate this possibility, and assess whether simple adjustments
12 can be made to the WBM to improve simulation of extreme events.

13 The WBM also does not account for snow at all; although G2G has an optional snow module (Bell et al. 2016) it
14 is not applied for the long historical runs used to provide data for the setup of the WBM, nor for the runs used for
15 WBM initialisation. The lack of snow accounting will not have a significant effect for most regions of England
16 most of the time, particularly given the monthly time-step of the WBM, as there are very few large and/or long-
17 lasting accumulations of snow in most of England, although it is more important in parts of Scotland (Kay 2016).

18 The monthly time-step of the WBM, and the resolution of the UNSEEN data, is likely sufficient for investigating
19 extreme low flows/droughts, which typically evolve relatively slowly due to rainfall deficits over extended periods
20 of time. For extreme high flows/floods, a finer time-step would really be required as they can develop and recede
21 much more quickly, particularly for smaller or flashier catchments. Despite this, the WBM can give a good
22 indication of flood potential for most of England, because the main driver of floods here is soil moisture excess
23 rather than extreme precipitation or snowmelt (Berghuijs et al. 2019). One potential approach could be to use a
24 simple and fast-running model, like the WBM, to run a large ensemble, then select individual members of interest
25 based on the outcomes from those runs. A much smaller set of runs of a more detailed model, like G2G, could
26 then be performed using the particular members of interest to gain the extra temporal (and spatial) detail, provided
27 (at least) daily precipitation data were available. Only monthly rainfall totals are available for the UNSEEN
28 ensembles applied here, but future options will be investigated.

29 A simple bias correction was applied to the UNSEEN climate data before use to drive the hydrological model
30 (Section 2.1). Applying this correction improved the results of the fidelity testing (not shown), although February
31 in particular still has issues (related to the standard deviation of February rainfall being too low; Section 3.1).
32 Bias-correction was also applied to climate data prior to use for hydrological modelling by Chan et al. (2023a,b).
33 Brunner and Slater (2022) apply a bias correction to simulated river flows, but highlight that, compared to
34 observation-based estimates of extreme floods, their method can “introduce biases arising from the simulated
35 meteorology and hydrological model”.

36 **5 Conclusions**

37 The UNSEEN climate datasets provide a large ensemble of alternative historical climate realisations, allowing the
38 direct sampling of more extreme meteorological events than the available observations, and a better assessment



1 of the likelihood of events (Thompson et al. 2017; Kelder et al. 2020). When combined with a simple hydrological
2 model, this similarly allows the direct sampling of more extreme hydrological events and better assessment of
3 likelihood. Both are conditional on a demonstration of fidelity for the event of interest.

4 An important issue for the hydrological modelling component is antecedent conditions. Here, two recent periods,
5 one very dry and one very wet, were selected as case studies to initialise and run the simple hydrological model
6 with the large ensemble of UNSEEN climate data. These case studies illustrate the potential of the approach to
7 assess the temporal evolution and spatial dependence of unprecedented but plausible hydrological extremes.
8 Clearly other periods could be similarly simulated and investigated, for example the summer 1976 drought, which
9 was one of the most extreme and extensive meteorological and hydrological droughts in recent history (Rudd et
10 al. 2017), and the widespread flooding of winter 2013/14, which was the wettest winter in Britain since records
11 began (Kay et al. 2018). The method could also be applied to other countries/regions, with an appropriate
12 hydrological model and using the same or similar global climate ensemble data.

13 Future work could include analysing the large-scale atmospheric drivers of selected hydrological extremes,
14 whether a record extreme for an individual month or persistently extreme for a number of months, which could
15 improve understanding of extreme events and their evolution. More detailed hydrological modelling, with (at
16 least) daily precipitation data, would ideally be used for flood case studies, when results could also be investigated
17 at a finer spatial scale, and additional hydrodynamic modelling (or pre-modelled design floods) could then provide
18 information on flood extents and impacts (e.g. Kay et al. 2018). Similarly, additional water resource system
19 modelling could provide information on drought impacts (e.g. Borgomeo et al. 2014). Soil moisture extremes
20 could also be investigated, with consequent impacts for agriculture as well as a range of natural hazards (e.g. Kay
21 et al. 2022), and other variables like groundwater levels could be investigated in a similar framework.

22 Being able to plan for unprecedented but plausible hydrological extremes is important in terms of improving the
23 resilience of water supply systems to drought (Chan et al. 2023a), and improving flood risk management and
24 incident response (Brunner and Slater 2022; Ganapathy et al. 2024). The UK water industry now has a statutory
25 obligation to demonstrate resilience to droughts that are more extreme than those recorded in the past, including
26 very rare events (e.g. 1:200 and 1:500 year) (Counsell and Durant, 2023). Similarly, for fluvial flood risk
27 management there is statutory requirement to plan for very extreme (rare) events that may lie outside observational
28 envelopes. In practice this is achieved through stochastic methods (e.g. using weather generators to produce long
29 precipitation series that are then run through hydrological and supply system models) or statistical methods
30 (pooling flood events from many catchments, or Probable Maximum Precipitation/Flood analyses). The UNSEEN
31 modelling chain described here provides a physically-informed alternative to complement these primarily
32 statistical approaches, with potential for use in both long-term water resource/flood risk planning and emergency
33 drought/flood response contexts.

34 The use of methods such as those presented here, deriving unprecedented events from historical case studies, can
35 aid preparedness by enabling planning for events similar to, but more extreme than, known events (with known
36 responses and impacts). Increasing resilience to potential extremes in the current climate will also provide some
37 resilience to the effects of climate change, which is expected to increase both floods and droughts in future in the
38 UK (e.g. Lane and Kay 2021; Kay et al. 2021; Rudd et al. 2019, 2023).

39 **Data availability.** The data are available from the authors upon reasonable request.



- 1 **Author contribution.** Conceptualisation and methodology: all authors. Formal analysis and visualisation: AK.
- 2 Funding acquisition: JH. Writing – original draft: AK. Writing – review and editing: all authors.
- 3 **Competing interests.** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.
- 4 **Acknowledgements.** This work was supported by the Natural Environment Research Council award number
- 5 NE/X019063/1 (Hydro-JULES). Thanks to UKCEH colleague Wilson Chan for comments on the draft
- 6 manuscript.
- 7 **References**
- 8 Barker, L.J., Hannaford, J., Magee, E., Turner, S., Sefton, C., Parry, S., Evans, J., Szczykulska, M., Haxton, T.
- 9 (2024). An appraisal of the severity of the 2022 drought and its impacts. *Weather*, doi:10.1002/wea.4531.
- 10 Beevers, L., Popescu, I., Pregolato, M., Liu, Y., Wright, N. (2022). Identifying hotspots of hydro-hazards under
- 11 global change: A worldwide review. *Front. Water*, 4, 879536, doi: 10.3389/frwa.2022.879536.
- 12 Bell, V.A., Kay, A.L., Jones, R.G., Moore, R.J. (2007). Development of a high resolution grid-based river flow
- 13 model for use with regional climate model output. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 11(1), 532–549.
- 14 Bell, V.A., Kay, A.L., Jones, R.G., Moore, R.J., Reynard, N.S. (2009). Use of soil data in a grid-based
- 15 hydrological model to estimate spatial variation in changing flood risk across the UK. *Journal of Hydrology*,
- 16 377(3–4), 335–350, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.08.031.
- 17 Bell, V.A., Davies, H.N., Kay, A.L., Marsh, T.J., Brookshaw, A., Jenkins A. (2013). Developing a large-scale
- 18 water-balance approach to seasonal forecasting: application to the 2012 drought in Britain. *Hydrological*
- 19 *Processes*, 27(20), 3003–3012. doi:10.1002/hyp.9863.
- 20 Bell, V.A., Kay, A.L., Davies, H.N., Jones, R.G. (2016). An assessment of the possible impacts of climate change
- 21 on snow and peak river flows across Britain. *Climatic Change*, 136(3), 539–553, doi:10.1007/s10584-016-1637-
- 22 x.
- 23 Bell, V.A., Davies, H.N., Kay, A.L., Brookshaw, A., Scaife, A.A. (2017). A national-scale seasonal hydrological
- 24 forecast system: development and evaluation over Britain. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21, 4681–4691.
- 25 Berghuijs, W.R., Harrigan, S., Molnar, P., Slater, L.J., Kirchner, J.W. (2019). The relative importance of different
- 26 flood-generating mechanisms across Europe. *Water Resources Research*, 55, 4582–4593,
- 27 doi:10.1029/2019WR024841.
- 28 Bertola, M., Blöschl, G., Bohac, M. et al. (2023). Megafloods in Europe can be anticipated from observations in
- 29 hydrologically similar catchments. *Nat. Geosci.* 16, 982–988.
- 30 Borgomeo, E., Hall, J.W., Fung, F., Watts, G., Colquhoun, K., Lambert, C. (2014). Risk-based water resources
- 31 planning: Incorporating probabilistic nonstationary climate uncertainties. *Water Resour. Res.*, 50(8), 6850–6873.
- 32 Brunner, M.I., Slater, L.J. (2022). Extreme floods in Europe: going beyond observations using reforecast ensemble
- 33 pooling. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 26, 469–482.
- 34 Chan, W.C.H., Shepherd, T.G., Facer-Childs, K., Darch, G., Arnell, N.W. (2022). Storylines of UK drought based
- 35 on the 2010–2012 event. *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci* 26, 1755–1777. doi:10.5194/hess-26-1755-2022.
- 36 Chan, W.C.H., Arnell, N.W., Darch, G., Facer-Childs, K., Shepherd, T.G., Tanguy, M. (2023a). Added value of
- 37 seasonal hindcasts for UK hydrological drought outlook. *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*,
- 38 doi:10.5194/nhess-2023-74.
- 39 Chan, W.C.H., Arnell, N.W., Darch, G., Facer-Childs, K., Shepherd, T.G., Tanguy, M., van der Wiel, K. (2023b).
- 40 Current and future risk of unprecedented hydrological droughts in Great Britain, *Journal of Hydrology*,
- 41 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2023.130074.



- 1 Counsell, C., Durant, M. (2023). Water supply: observed and projected. In: Environment Agency, 2023. Annex
2 to the review of the research and scientific understanding of drought. Environment Agency, Bristol. 669pp.
3 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-the-research-and-scientific-understanding-of-drought>
- 4 Cranston, M., Maxey, R., Tavendale, A., Buchanan, P., Motion, A., Cole, S., Robson, A., Moore, R.J., Minnett, A.
5 (2012). Countrywide flood forecasting in Scotland: challenges for hydrometeorological model uncertainty and
6 prediction. In: Weather Radar and Hydrology (ed. by R.J Moore, S.J. Cole & A.J. Illingworth) (Proc. Exeter
7 Symp., April 2011), IAHS Publ. no. 351, 538-543.
- 8 Davies, P.A., McCarthy, M., Christidis, N., Dunstone, N., Fereday, D., Kendon, M., Knight, J.R., Scaife, A.A.,
9 Sexton, D. (2021). The wet and stormy UK winter of 2019/2020. *Weather*, 76(12), 396-402.
- 10 Dawkins, L.C., Osborne, J.M., Economou, T., Darch, G.J.C., Stoner, O.R. (2022). The Advanced Meteorology
11 Explorer: a novel stochastic, gridded daily rainfall generator. *Journal of Hydrology*, 607, 127478.
- 12 Dunstone, N., Smith, D., Scaife, A. et al. Skilful predictions of the winter North Atlantic Oscillation one year
13 ahead. *Nature Geosci* 9, 809–814 (2016), doi:10.1038/ngeo2824.
- 14 Ganapathy, A., Hannah, D.M., Agarwal, A. (2024). Improved estimation of extreme floods with data pooling and
15 mixed probability distribution. *Journal of Hydrology*, 629, 130633.
- 16 Hannaford, J., Suman, G., Howson, T., Bloomfield, J., Clemas, S. (2023). Hydrological summary for the United
17 Kingdom: October 2023. Wallingford, UK, UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 12pp.
- 18 Harrigan, S., Prudhomme, C., Parry, S., Smith, K., Tanguy, M. (2018). Benchmarking ensemble streamflow
19 prediction skill in the UK. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 22, 2023–2039.
- 20 Hough, M.N., Jones, R.J.A. (1997) The United Kingdom Meteorological Office rainfall and evaporation
21 calculation system: MORECS version 2.0-an overview, *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.*, 1, 227–239, doi:10.5194/nhess-
22 1-227-1997.
- 23 Kay, A.L. (2016). A review of snow in Britain: the historical picture and future projections. *Progress in Physical*
24 *Geography*, 40(5) 676–698, doi:10.1177/0309133316650617.
- 25 Kay, A.L. (2021). Simulation of river flow in Britain under climate change: baseline performance and future
26 seasonal changes. *Hydrological Processes*, 35(4), e14137, doi:10.1002/hyp.14137.
- 27 Kay, A.L., Bell, V.A., Blyth, E.M., Crooks, S.M., Davies, H.N., Reynard, N.S. (2013). A hydrological perspective
28 on evaporation: historical trends and future projections in Britain. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*, 4(3),
29 193–208, doi:10.2166/wcc.2013.014.
- 30 Kay, A.L., Booth, N., Lamb R., Raven, E. Schaller, N., Sparrow, S. (2018). Flood event attribution and damage
31 estimation using national-scale grid-based modelling: Winter 2013/14 in Great Britain. *International Journal of*
32 *Climatology*, 38(14), 5205-5219, doi:10.1002/joc5721.
- 33 Kay, A.L., Davies, H.N., Lane, R.A., Rudd, A.C., Bell, V.A. (2021). Grid-based simulation of river flows in
34 Northern Ireland: model performance and future flow changes. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 38,
35 100967, doi:10.1016/j.ejrh.2021.100967.
- 36 Kay, A.L., Lane, R.A., Bell, V.A. (2022). Grid-based simulation of soil moisture in the UK: future changes in
37 extremes and wetting and drying dates. *Environmental Research Letters*, 17(7), 074029, doi:10.1088/1748-
38 9326/ac7a4e.
- 39 Kay, A.L., Bell, V.A., Davies, H.N., Lane, R.A., Rudd, A.C. (2023a). The UKSCAPE-G2G river flow and soil
40 moisture datasets: Grid-to-Grid model estimates for the UK for historical and potential future climates. *Earth Syst.*
41 *Sci. Data*, 15, 2533–2546, doi:10.5194/essd-15-2533-2023.
- 42 Kay, A.L., Rudd, A.C. and Coulson, J. (2023b). Spatial downscaling of precipitation for hydrological modelling:
43 assessing a simple method and its application under climate change in Britain. *Hydrological Processes*, 37(2),
44 e14823, doi:10.1002/hyp.14823.



- 1 Kelder, T., Müller, M., Slater, L.J., Marjoribanks, T.I., Wilby, R.L., Prudhomme, C., Bohlinger, P., Ferranti, L.,
2 Nipen, T. (2020). Using UNSEEN trends to detect decadal changes in 100-year precipitation extremes. *Climate*
3 *and Atmospheric Science*, 3, 47.
- 4 Kelder, T., Marjoribanks, T.I., Slater, L.J., Prudhomme, C., Wilby, R.L., Wagemann, J., Dunstone, N. (2022). An
5 open workflow to gain insights about low-likelihood high-impact weather events from initialized predictions.
6 *Meteorological Applications*, 29(3), e2065. doi:10.1002/met.2065.
- 7 Kent, C., Dunstone, N., Tucker, S., Scaife, A.A., Brown, S., Kendon, E.J., Smith, D., McLean, L., Greenwood, S.
8 (2022). Estimating unprecedented extremes in UK summer daily rainfall. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 17, 014041.
- 9 Kjeldsen, T.R. and Prodocimi, I. (2016). Assessing the element of surprise of record-breaking flood events.
10 *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 11(51), S541-S553.
- 11 Lane, R.A., Kay, A.L. (2021). Climate change impact on the magnitude and timing of hydrological extremes
12 across Great Britain. *Frontiers in Water*, 3, 684982, doi:10.3389/frwa.2021.684982.
- 13 Met Office, Hollis, D., McCarthy, M., Kendon, M., Legg, T., Simpson, I. (2021). HadUK-Grid gridded and
14 regional average climate observations for the UK.
15 <http://catalogue.ceda.ac.uk/uuid/4dc8450d889a491ebb20e724debe2dfb>.
- 16 Mokhtari, M., Faridi, P., Masoodi, M., Mehran Ahmadi, S. (2023). Perspective Chapter: A Global View of Natural
17 Hazards Related Disasters [Internet]. *Natural Hazards - New Insights*. IntechOpen.
18 doi:10.5772/intechopen.111582.
- 19 Price, D., Pilling, C., Robbins, G., Lane, A., Boyce, G., Fenwick, K., Moore, R.J., Coles, J., Harrison, T., Van
20 Dijk, M. (2012). Representing the spatial variability of rainfall for input to the G2G distributed flood forecasting
21 model: operational experience from the Flood Forecasting Centre. In: Moore, R.J.; Cole, S.J.; Illingworth, A.J.,
22 (eds.) *Weather Radar and Hydrology*, Proc. Exeter Symp., April 2011. International Association of Hydrological
23 Sciences, 532-537. (IAHS Publ., 351).
- 24 Prudhomme, C., Hannaford, J., Harrigan, S., Boorman, D., Knight, J., Bell, V., Jackson, C., Svensson, C., Parry,
25 S., Bachiller-Jareno, N., Davies, H., Davis, R., Mackay, J., McKenzie, A., Rudd, A., Smith, K., Bloomfield, J.,
26 Ward, R., Jenkins, A. (2017). Hydrological Outlook UK: an operational streamflow and groundwater level
27 forecasting system at monthly to seasonal time scales, *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 62:16, 2753-2768, doi:
28 10.1080/02626667.2017.1395032
- 29 Reynard, N.S., Kay, A.L., Anderson, M., Donovan, B., Duckworth, C. (2017). The evolution of climate change
30 guidance for fluvial flood risk management in England. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 41(2), 222–237,
31 doi:10.1177/0309133317702566.
- 32 Rudd, A.C., Bell, V.A., Kay, A.L. (2017). National-scale analysis of simulated hydrological droughts (1891-
33 2015). *Journal of Hydrology*, 550, 368-385.
- 34 Rudd, A.C., Kay, A.L., Bell, V.A. (2019). National-scale analysis of future river flow and soil moisture droughts:
35 potential changes in drought characteristics. *Climatic Change*, 156(3), 323–340, doi:10.1007/s10584-019-02528-
36 0.
- 37 Rudd, A.C., Kay, A.L., Sayers, P.B. (2023). Climate change impacts on flood peaks in Britain for a range of global
38 mean surface temperature changes. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 16(1), e12863, doi:10.1111/jfr3.12863.
- 39 Sefton, C., Suman, G., Smith, R., Crane, E., Clemas, S. (2023). Hydrological summary for the United Kingdom:
40 February 2023. Wallingford, UK, UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 12pp.
- 41 Sefton, C., Kumar, A., Smith, R., Bloomfield, J., Clemas, S. (2024) Hydrological summary for the United
42 Kingdom: January 2024. Wallingford, UK, UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 12pp.
- 43 Shepherd, T.G., Boyd, E., Calel, R.A. et al. (2018). Storylines: an alternative approach to representing uncertainty
44 in physical aspects of climate change. *Climatic Change* 151, 555–571, doi:10.1007/s10584-018-2317-9



- 1 Sillmann, J., Shepherd, T.G., van den Hurk, B., Hazeleger, W., Martius, O., Slingo, J., Zscheischler, J. (2021).
- 2 Event-based storylines to address climate risk. *Earth's Future*, 9, e2020EF001783.
- 3 Svensson, C., Brookshaw, A., Scaife, A.A., Bell, V.A., Mackay, J.D., Jackson, C.R., Hannaford, J., Davies, H.N.,
- 4 Arribas, A., Stanley, S. (2015). Long-range forecasts of UK winter hydrology. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 10(6), 064006.
- 5 Thompson, V., Dunstone, N.J., Scaife, A.A., Smith, D.M., Slingo, J.M., Brown, S., Belcher, S.E. (2017). High
- 6 risk of unprecedented UK rainfall in the current climate. *Nature Communications*, 8,107, doi:10.1038/s41467-
- 7 017-00275-3.
- 8 Turner, S., Magee, E., Howson, T., Crane, E., Clemas, S. (2024). Hydrological summary for the United Kingdom:
- 9 December 2023. Wallingford, UK, UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 12pp.
- 10 Williams, K. D., Harris, C. M., Bodas-Salcedo, A., Camp, J., Comer, R. E., Copsey, D., Fereday, D., Graham, T.,
- 11 Hill, R., Hinton, T., Hyder, P., Ineson, S., Masato, G., Milton, S. F., Roberts, M. J., Rowell, D. P., Sanchez, C.,
- 12 Shelly, A., Sinha, B., Walters, D. N., West, A., Woollings, T., Xavier, P. K.: The Met Office Global Coupled
- 13 model 2.0 (GC2) configuration, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 8, 1509–1524, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-1509-2015, 2015.