

Development of a countrywide spatially predictive hydrological model for Panama using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool

Shriram Varadarajan^{1,1}, José Fabrega^{2,2}, and Brian Leung^{1,1}

¹McGill University

²Universidad Tecnológica de Panamá

November 30, 2022

Abstract

Panama faces seasonal floods and droughts as well as rising freshwater demands ranging from domestic consumption to hydro-power and the operation of the Panama Canal. A process-based hydrological model of the country is a desirable scenario planning tool to complement the existing national water security plan. In Panama as in much of the Global South, sufficient observed data do not exist for all watersheds to calibrate complex hydrological models. Understanding and improving the performance of uncalibrated hydrological models could greatly expand their utility in such regions. In this study, we build and validate an uncalibrated Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) model for Panama. We extend the default precipitation submodel and demonstrate the importance of sufficiently accounting for spatial autocorrelation patterns in precipitation inputs: we found large improvements over the default model, not only for monthly means (NSE = 0.88, from NSE= 0.69 for default SWAT), but especially for standard deviations (NSE = 0.59, from 0.27) and maxima (NSE = 0.51, from 0.21) of discharge across locations and months. We found a strong seasonal trend and regional differences in the spatial autocorrelation of rainfall, suggesting that this phenomenon should not be modeled statically. The resulting precipitation and hydrology models provide important baseline information for Panama, especially on variability and extremes, and could serve as a template for other regions with limited data.

Predicting spatiotemporal variation in runoff in a data-sparse region: analyses of a whole-country model for Panama

Authors: Shriram Varadarajan¹, José Fabrega⁴, Brian Leung^{1,2,3}

Affiliations:

1. Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 1B1
2. Bieler School of Environment, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H3A 2A7
3. Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, PO Box 0843-03092, Panama City, Panama
4. Universidad Tecnológica de Panamá, Campus Victor Levi Sasso, Ancón, Vía Centenario, Panamá City, Panamá

Corresponding author: Shriram Varadarajan, shriram.varadarajan@mail.mcgill.ca

Other contact emails:

jose.fabrega@utp.ac.pa

brian.leung2@mcgill.ca

Funding:

- i NSERC (National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada) Discovery Grant to Brian Leung
- ii MSSI (McGill Sustainability Systems Initiative) grant to Brian Leung

1 **Keywords**

2 Hydrological modeling, Soil and Water Assessment Tool, Neotropical hydrology, Sustainability

3 **Abstract**

4 **Study region**

5 Panama faces seasonal floods and droughts as well as rising freshwater demands ranging from
6 domestic consumption to hydro-power and the operation of the Panama Canal. A process-based
7 hydrological model of the country is a desirable scenario planning tool to complement the
8 existing national water security plan.

9 **Study focus**

10 In Panama as in much of the Global South, sufficient observed data do not exist for all
11 watersheds to calibrate complex hydrological models. Understanding and improving the
12 performance of uncalibrated hydrological models could greatly expand their utility in such
13 regions. In this study, we build and validate an uncalibrated Soil and Water Assessment Tool
14 (SWAT) model for Panama. We extend the default precipitation submodel and demonstrate the
15 importance of sufficiently accounting for spatial autocorrelation patterns in precipitation
16 inputs: we found large improvements over the default model, not only for monthly means (NSE
17 = 0.88, from NSE= 0.69 for default SWAT), but especially for standard deviations (NSE = 0.59,
18 from 0.27) and maxima (NSE = 0.51, from 0.21) of discharge across locations and months.

19 **New hydrological insights for region**

20 We found a strong seasonal trend and regional differences in the spatial autocorrelation of
21 rainfall, suggesting that this phenomenon should not be modeled statically. The resulting
22 precipitation and hydrology models provide important baseline information for Panama,
23 especially on variability and extremes, and could serve as a template for other regions with
24 limited data.

25 **1. Introduction**

26 The potential impacts of changes in the hydrological cycle brought about by climate change and
27 human activity range from shortages of potable water (FAO 2018, p. 31) to increasing frequency
28 and impact of floods and droughts (e.g., Hirabayashi et al. 2013). Changing patterns of
29 precipitation and hydrology also strongly influence local vegetation and may negatively affect
30 biodiversity (e.g., distance to water and precipitation were found to be two of the best predictors
31 of species distributions, Bradie & Leung 2017). The capacity to predict the nature of changes in
32 hydrological patterns will be crucial for effective risk mitigation and building systemic
33 resilience. Given spatial heterogeneity in these dynamics, identifying critical regions at high risk
34 for reductions in water availability and increases in extreme events must be an integral part of
35 planning and management strategy. The need for this type of analysis is even more pronounced
36 in the Global South, where the threat of climate change is compounded by economic and
37 infrastructural inequality (Roberts 2001, Chapagain et al. 2020).

38 In Panama, our study area, a national framework for water resource management already exists
39 in the form of the Plan Nacional de Seguridad Hídrica or National Water Security Plan (Comité
40 de Alto Nivel de Seguridad Hídrica, 2016), which predicts a rise in water insecurity as human
41 consumption reaches 50% of freshwater availability in the country by 2050. Freshwater is also a
42 key resource for the Panama Canal system, which requires 52 million gallons per ship transit.
43 The Canal Authority came close to having to impose draft restrictions due to lack of water during
44 the wet season in 2015, an El Niño year (Autoridad del Canal de Panamá, 2015). The canal is
45 uniquely important not only to Panama's economy with \$2.6 billion in revenue (OECD 2017),
46 but also as a key node in the global shipping trade. Additionally, about 45% of the country's
47 electrical capacity is accounted for by hydropower (Autoridad de Servicios Públicos 2021),

making variability in flow patterns critical to predict. Along with droughts like the one in 2015, floods and associated landslides are also problems faced by the country (e.g., Wohl and Ogden, 2013). These changes are projected to have further downstream effects ranging from agricultural yield changes to the persistence of Chagas disease (Fábrega et al. 2013). Beyond human impacts, Panama is also at the center of one of the world's most biodiverse regions (Myers et al. 2000), and the rich tropical forests and aquatic ecosystems that support this diversity are heavily reliant on the health of its waterways.

In this study, we use the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT, Arnold et al. 1998) to build a countrywide hydrological model of Panama. SWAT is a process-based model that incorporates information about meteorology, physical geography, and human land use to simulate the entire hydrological cycle of the study area. Spatial variation is made explicit in SWAT by splitting each watershed into 'subbasins' of non-branching stream segments and their drainage areas, and further splitting each subbasin into a set of Hydrological Response Units (HRUs) which represent a particular combination of slope, land use, land management, and soil type. SWAT can thus provide sophisticated and holistic hydrological projections for given patterns of changes in its inputs.

The utility of SWAT in simulating single watersheds with model parameters calibrated to local conditions, at least at the monthly timestep, is well established (e.g., Perez-Valdivia et al., 2017). However, the calibration procedures are complex and require comprehensive and high-quality hydrological data (Abbaspour et al. 2015), which are not available for many watersheds in most regions of the Global South. Yet, models such as SWAT use physics-based equations, and thus in principle could have predictive power even without calibration. While uncalibrated SWAT models have been shown to perform well in some contexts (Srinivasan et al. 2010), its

71 performance needs to be tested in different regions, and for different phenomena of interest (e.g.,
72 mean, variation and extremes in flow). Improvements to model structure and parameter
73 calibration can be considered separate avenues of improving predictive power (Butts et al. 2004)
74 and an improved soil submodel for SWAT has been shown to improve streamflow and nitrate
75 load predictions even in the absence of parameter calibration (Qi et al. 2020). In particular, the
76 ability to adequately describe environmental inputs will likely be a key determinant in the ability
77 to predict hydrological patterns, and will also pose a greater challenge in the Global South
78 compared to regions with more complete data. That said, precipitation gauges are generally more
79 numerous and available than hydrological measurement stations, and given that precipitation
80 patterns are the most direct driver of hydrological phenomena, precipitation input would be a
81 logical focus of attention.

82 In the present study we thus propose modifications to the precipitation submodel of SWAT, and
83 demonstrate that it is crucial to capture regional and spatio-temporal autocorrelation patterns in
84 precipitation. For both the default SWAT model and one with our modified precipitation
85 algorithm, we examine predictive power for water availability (mean monthly discharge) as well
86 as variability (standard deviation and maxima of discharge) across space and time. We also
87 examine the performance of the models within each watershed, and identify characteristics of
88 watersheds that explain the variation in this performance.

89 2. Methods

90 2.1 SWAT Model Setup

91 The SWAT model requires a set of spatially explicit inputs for the study area: a digital elevation
92 model (DEM), a soil map, a land use map, and a set of weather station locations. The weather
93 stations further must be provided with precipitation, solar radiation, relative humidity, and wind
94 data in the form of either (i) records for each day of the simulation or (ii) parameters for a
95 rainfall distribution that the model samples from on each simulated day. The data sources used
96 for each of the above in the current study are summarized in Table 1. Data on river discharge
97 from the ETESA (Empresa de Transmisión Eléctrica, S.A; <https://www.etsa.com.pa/>)
98 hydrological monitoring network from the period 2005 – 2015 was used for model validation,
99 while ETESA precipitation data from the periods 1990 – 2000 and 2005 – 2015 were used for
100 fitting the precipitation submodel parameters and running the validation simulation respectively.
101 All of the above rain gauges and hydrological monitoring stations are mapped in Figure 1.

102 Watershed delineation was carried out in ArcSWAT. A threshold of 5000 cells was chosen as the
103 minimum inflow into an outlet for which a subbasin would be defined, which amounts to a
104 drainage area of about 40.5 km² given the DEM cell size at the equator. Areas smaller than this
105 which drain directly into the sea or either neighboring country were not part of the model,
106 resulting in a model delineation covering roughly 65,000 km² or 86% of the total land area of
107 Panama. SWAT further assigns each non-branching segment of stream its own subbasin unit and
108 calculates Hydrological Response Units (HRUs) within each subbasin based on existing
109 combinations of soils, land use, and slope. SWAT generates daily mean discharge output (m³s⁻¹)
110 at the outlet of each subbasin, so additional outlets were manually defined at the location of each

hydrological measurement station (52 in total) to provide direct comparison points. This resulted in a delineation of 980 subbasins in total.

2.2 Precipitation interpolation

Daily precipitation data from ETESA was downloaded for 249 rain gauge locations across Panama, of which 120 were active during the simulation period of 2005 - 2015, though many had substantial temporal gaps in their records. SWAT requires daily precipitation values for each subbasin (980 in total in the current model) and thus some method of interpolation is required to fill both spatial and temporal gaps in the data coverage. For spatial gaps, the method used by default is a nearest neighbor (or Thiessen polygon) interpolation from each subbasin centroid to the nearest rain gauge. For temporal gaps, the default method is sampling from an empirically determined rainfall distribution at rain gauge locations using a skew-normal distribution (see Neitsch et al., 2011). Means, standard deviations, skew, and wet-dry transition probability values were calculated at all gauge locations using the observations spanning the period of 1990 - 2000. Henceforth this method will be referred to as the default model.

In our modified method, interpolation of precipitation gauge data at each subbasin centroid was carried out for each day, and separately for each of six climatic regions that the country was split into (Figure 2). We first tested a single-step inverse-distance weighting model, with a single distance-decay parameter (α , see Eq 1) fit by region and month (this model was named '**RDW1**', for 'single-step regional distance weighting'). Then, we tested a two-step method ('**RDW2**') at each location which incorporated an explicit prediction of rainfall occurrence: (1) first we predicted the probability of a wet or dry day (occurrence) using a logistic regression on the inverse distance-weighted mean of observations in the region (using a threshold observation <

133 0.5 mm, dry gauges were given a value of 0 and wet gauges a value of 1); (2) then, given the
 134 probability of a wet day, we performed a binomial trial; and if a wet day was generated, we
 135 interpolated the quantity of rain, again using an inverse distance weighted mean of all observed
 136 quantities of precipitation within the region for that day. Dry days were assigned a quantity of 0
 137 mm. The two steps involved a single parameter each, α_1 and α_2 , which controlled the decay of the
 138 relative weighting with distance.

$$139 \quad p_{ikt} = \frac{\sum p_{jkt} e^{-\alpha_{kt} d_{ijkt}}}{\sum e^{-\alpha_{kt} d_{ijkt}}} \quad \text{Eq 1}$$

140 Where p_{ikt} was the precipitation value of interest (i.e., either wet/dry or quantity of rain), p_{jkt} denoted all measured
 141 precipitation values, d_{ijkt} was the distance between points i and j, and α_{kt} was a shape parameter.
 142 These α_{kt} values were fit separately to each monthly time interval (t), and each of 6 regions (k) in
 143 Panama, to capture expected differences in spatial and seasonal autocorrelation patterns. In the
 144 RDW2 model, the predicted total quantity of rain across a region on a given day (q_1) was
 145 reallocated to those locations that were predicted to be wet on that day (with a total quantity q_2 ,
 146 where $q_2 \leq q_1$), i.e. the predicted quantity in each of these locations was scaled by the ratio
 147 q_1/q_2 , to prevent underestimation caused by the independent prediction of occurrence using
 148 binomial trials.

149 Each fitted parameter (α in Eq 1) represented the strength of the distance-weighting, with high α
 150 severely penalizing information from gauges further away from the target point and prioritizing
 151 immediate neighbors. The fitting process, minimizing the sum of squared deviations, was run
 152 using the gauge data from 1990 – 2000, and the fitted algorithm was then used to interpolate
 153 daily values at the 980 subbasin centroids using gauge data from 2005 - 2015 for the validation
 154 run.

155 2.3 Model evaluation

156 As the objective was to gain insight into patterns of water distribution, the hydrological model
157 results were compared against river discharge data from ETESA, which was not used to calibrate
158 or parameterize any part of the models. R^2 , Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE, Nash and Sutcliffe
159 1970), and percentage bias ('Pbias') of mean model predictions against mean observed daily
160 discharge values were calculated for each month and station across the entire simulation period
161 and these were used as metrics of the ability to predict average flow.

162 We also used NSE, R^2 , and Pbias to examine the ability of the hydrological model to estimate
163 variation in runoff at a given location, using as metrics (i) standard deviation of discharge and
164 (ii) the magnitudes of the 3 highest daily discharge events across the simulation period in each
165 location-month combination. We chose the latter to represent of the extreme highs of the
166 discharge distribution for that combination and as a coarse indicator of flood risk.

167 Finally, we used NSE and R^2 to examine the model's ability to simulate the observed monthly
168 time series of mean discharge within each basin from 2005 – 2015. Instead of spatial variation
169 across locations, this procedure tested the ability of the model to capture temporal variation
170 within each watershed (using the lowermost hydrological station in each of 35 watersheds). We
171 posited several variables across that could explain variation in model predictiveness, namely: (i)
172 elevation of the observation (as we did not account for orographic effects explicitly), (ii)
173 existence of a precipitation gauge within the same subbasin as the observation and (iii) number
174 of precipitation gauges in the region (both as measures of the relevance and quantity of
175 precipitation information), (v) number of subbasins in the watershed (as larger watersheds could
176 have more complex behaviour), (vi) number of subbasins downstream from the observation (as

177 interior reaches could behave differently regardless of elevation), and (vi) simulated standard
178 deviation of mean monthly discharge at the location (as the ability to predict flow might depend
179 on variability). We used a stepwise forward selection algorithm in R to arrive at the linear
180 combination of these variables and their pairwise combinations with the lowest AIC value.

181 **3. Results**

182 **3.1 Precipitation interpolation**

183 In the regional distance weighted (RDW1 and RDW2) models, there was a strong seasonal signal
184 in the autocorrelation patterns as represented by the fitted distance-decay parameters (α , Figure
185 3). Maximum values of the α parameters correspond to the greatest weighting of the closest
186 stations and, correspondingly, the fastest decay in weighting with distance. These maxima
187 consistently occurred for both precipitation occurrence and quantity in April and October, and
188 these months represent the two transitions between the wet (generally May to November) and
189 dry seasons. Over the remainder of each season, parameter values decline and then rise gradually
190 (for both the single parameter in RDW1 and the occurrence parameter in RDW2) or remain
191 generally low (for the quantity parameter in RDW2) until the next seasonal transition. Variation
192 across region was comparatively higher for both RDW2 parameters than for the single RDW1
193 parameter.

194 **3.2 Model evaluation**

195 The standard SWAT model using default precipitation interpolation performed reasonably well
196 for mean discharge across locations with an NSE of 0.69. Improving the precipitation
197 interpolation approach yielded even better predictions; NSE = 0.88 using the RDW2 model and

198 NSE = 0.89 using the RDW1 model. While the default model worked well for mean discharge
199 (NSE = 0.69), it was less able to capture variability, with NSE = 0.26 for standard deviation of
200 locations-month combinations. In contrast, for standard deviation, the RDW2 model achieved
201 NSE = 0.59 and RDW1 NSE = 0.53, which compared very favorably with the default model. For
202 predicting maxima of daily discharge at each location-month combination, we found again that
203 the default model performed poorly, with NSE = 0.22, while the RDW2 model achieved a higher
204 NSE of 0.53, and RDW1 again performed similarly to RDW2 with NSE = 0.51. Notably,
205 however, Pbias values were significantly larger in magnitude for the RDW1 model than for
206 RDW2 across all analyses. These results are summarized in Table 2 and Figure 4.

207 We also examined the ability to predict temporal patterns within each watershed for the default
208 and RDW models across the ten-year period (Figure 5). We found that the default model
209 performed generally poorly, being a worse predictor in 24 out of 35 sites than simply using the
210 observed mean (i.e. NSE < 0). The RDW2 model performed significantly better: while 8 sites
211 still performed poorly (NSE < 0), 15 (43%) sites had satisfactory performance at NSE > 0.5, and
212 the median NSE was 0.4 across locations. The RDW1 model performed intermediately, with no
213 sites achieving NSE > 0.5 and a median NSE of 0.21. RDW2 was chosen as the overall best
214 model due to this as well as the lower magnitude of bias mentioned above.

215 While there were areas of failure, the performance of RDW2 was largely predictable. 71% of the
216 variation in NSE across locations was explained by six variables and two interaction terms. The
217 variables were (i) elevation, (ii) total number of rain gauges in region, (iii) number of
218 downstream subbasins, (iv) size of watershed (i.e., number of subbasins), (v) simulated standard
219 deviation of discharge, and (vi) presence of (of which (ii), (iv), and (vi) were significant), and

220 the significant interaction terms were between watershed size and number of downstream
221 subbasins, and between watershed size and simulated standard deviation (Table 3).

222 **4. Discussion**

223 Panama faces a variety of issues related to potential changes in the water cycle ranging from
224 shortages of drinking water and hydropower to increased impact of floods and droughts. While
225 sophisticated hydrological modeling tools such as SWAT exist, the data available with which to
226 build and calibrate such models is generally more limited in Panama and other countries of the
227 Global South. Thus, while Srinivasan et al. (2010) demonstrated that an uncalibrated SWAT
228 model predicted streamflow similarly to calibrated ones in the Upper Mississippi basin of the
229 USA, testing the performance of such a model in Panama is necessary, given differences in
230 environmental conditions and limitations of the available input data. Indeed, we found that while
231 the default SWAT model performed well for predicting monthly mean flow across watersheds, it
232 fared poorly for predicting monthly standard deviations and maxima. Substantial improvements
233 were obtained across all three metrics by using a 2-stage interpolation algorithm for precipitation
234 (i.e., our RDW2 model).

235 These findings highlight the importance of validating model performance in different regions,
236 but also the potential promise of uncalibrated models even in locations where hydrological data
237 are limited. Standard deviations and maxima, which the default model predict poorly, represent
238 information about streamflow distributions that are crucially important in the predictive
239 modeling of flood risk (e.g. van der Wiel et al. 2019). Furthermore, variability in water
240 availability is a critical indicator of potential water scarcity, and has significant impacts on
241 human water use, despite often being overlooked in favour of annual means (Damkjaer &

Taylor, 2017). Modeling studies also show that hydropower output is sensitive to variability in hydroclimatic inputs (Arriagada et al., 2019, Chowdhury et al. 2020). While future hydroclimate projections for Panama have been made for monthly mean discharge (Fabr ga et al. 2013), the present study lays the groundwork for improved projections based on a more sophisticated hydrological model with higher spatial resolution and finer prediction of variability and extremes.

The relative predictive failure of the default model was due to the precipitation model which by default matches each subbasin to its nearest precipitation gauge, and fills temporal gaps in the daily records of each gauge by sampling from an empirical distribution that models the behavior of that gauge (Neitsch et al. 2011). This sampling is done independently of any other gauge value on that day. As these temporal gaps occurred frequently (the mean precipitation gauge was only active on 60% of days from 2005 to 2015), the result of this independent sampling would tend to average out variability across subbasins, and contribute to the observed pattern of underestimated variances and extremes of streamflow in the default model. Such spatial and especially temporal gaps in rainfall data have been shown to have significant negative impacts on SWAT performance (Tan and Yang 2020). In contrast, due to the use of distance-weighted interpolation fitted on seasonal and regional spatial patterns of precipitation, estimated values across gauges within a region on a given day more faithfully replicated real precipitation patterns in the RDW1 and RDW2 models.

While both distance-weighted models were clear improvements on the default model, RDW2 also outperformed RDW1 markedly in terms of percentage bias of all metrics, with RDW1 generally underpredicting streamflow volume and variability. Most often, distance-weighted interpolation for precipitation has been modeled as a single step calculating quantity of rain (e.g.

265 Chen and Liu, 2012; Cheng et al., 2017; Tuo et al., 2016; Xue et al., 2018), as in the RDW1
266 model. Yet, two-step interpolation treating (i) the occurrence of precipitation and (ii) the quantity
267 separately has been found to regenerate more realistic patterns of spatial variability for daily
268 precipitation (Hwang et al. 2012), as these two factors need not be linearly related and cannot be
269 captured with a single distance function. RDW2 is thus, overall, the best model of the three
270 tested.

271 Better accounting for spatial relatedness of precipitation gauges was also crucial for estimating
272 fluctuations in streamflow across time within each watershed (as opposed to variation across
273 watersheds discussed above). The uncalibrated default SWAT model generally performed no
274 better than simply using the mean flow in most watersheds (median NSE < 0), again highlighting
275 the importance of testing in different regions and for different metrics. With our RDW2 model,
276 the median watershed NSE was 0.4 and 43% of locations achieved NSE > 0.5 , defined to be
277 ‘satisfactory’ performance by Moriasi et al. (2007). Furthermore, we could largely identify
278 where failures in the RDW2 model occurred, explaining 71% of the variation in basin NSEs, and
279 showed that the total number of gauges in the region and the presence of a gauge in the subbasin
280 itself were both predictors of higher NSE at a given location.

281 Additionally, our findings suggest that spatial patterning of rainfall varied over time, with peaks
282 in parameter values of the distance-weighted interpolation kernel in the months of April and
283 October. High parameter values indicate that nearby gauges are much more predictive of
284 precipitation at a point than ones further away. Low parameter values on the other hand indicate
285 a broader averaging, and more regional forcing. The two months of highest parameter values,
286 April and October, coincide with the periods of change in patterns of observed variation in
287 rainfall (Fabrega et al., 2013) as well as periods of strongest increase and decrease in average

rainfall respectively (Kusunoki et al., 2019). Further elucidation of the processes that lead to the variation in spatial autocorrelation captured by the current model may aid in the development of a dynamical procedure that can account for nonstationarity. While seasonal and regional patterns of spatial autocorrelation in precipitation and their effects on extreme events are being studied in some arid and semi-arid areas in regions such as China (Xu et al., 2021) and Iran (Darand et al., 2017, Rousta et al. 2017), they remain understudied in the tropics where they may also be of importance.

Conclusions

Our findings indicate that uncalibrated hydrological models such as SWAT can be predictive, and that a key limitation in Panama had been the default precipitation sub-model. Improving description of precipitation input by incorporating information about regional and seasonal differences in spatial autocorrelation patterns dramatically improved predictions across a number of metrics, including means, standard deviations, and maxima of monthly streamflow across watersheds, as well as the time series of monthly flow in each watershed. As precipitation gauges tend to be common and relatively simple to set up, the application of hydrological models across large and heterogeneous spatial contexts becomes much more feasible, even in regions where data limitations make hydrological calibration difficult.

309 Data availability

310 All data of simulation results and code used in the present analysis are available at
311 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6111112>.

312 References

- 313 Abbaspour, K. C. *et al.* A continental-scale hydrology and water quality model for Europe:
314 Calibration and uncertainty of a high-resolution large-scale SWAT model. *Journal of*
315 *Hydrology* **524**, 733–752 (2015).
- 316 Arnold *et al.* SWAT: Model Use, Calibration, and Validation. *Transactions of the ASABE* **55**,
317 1491–1508 (2012).
- 318 Arriagada, P., Dieppois, B., Sidibe, M. & Link, O. Impacts of Climate Change and Climate
319 Variability on Hydropower Potential in Data-Scarce Regions Subjected to Multi-Decadal
320 Variability. *Energies* **12**, 2747 (2019).
- 321 Autoridad del Canal de Panamá (ACP). Canal de Panamá suspende restricción al calado de
322 buques – Canal de Panamá. [https://micanaldepanama.com/canal-de-panama-suspende-](https://micanaldepanama.com/canal-de-panama-suspende-restriccion-al-calado-de-buques/)
323 [restriccion-al-calado-de-buques/](https://micanaldepanama.com/canal-de-panama-suspende-restriccion-al-calado-de-buques/) (2015). Accessed 15 Feb 2022.
- 324 Autoridad de Servicios Públicos (ASEP). 2021. Available from: [https://www.asep.gob.pa/wp-](https://www.asep.gob.pa/wp-content/uploads/electricidad/estadisticas/2020/segundo_semestre/oferta.pdf)
325 [content/uploads/electricidad/estadisticas/2020/segundo_semestre/oferta.pdf](https://www.asep.gob.pa/wp-content/uploads/electricidad/estadisticas/2020/segundo_semestre/oferta.pdf). Accessed 15
326 Feb 2022.
- 327 Bradie, J. & Leung, B. A quantitative synthesis of the importance of variables used in MaxEnt
328 species distribution models. *Journal of Biogeography* **44**, 1344–1361 (2017).
- 329 Butts, M. B., Payne, J. T., Kristensen, M. & Madsen, H. An evaluation of the impact of model
330 structure on hydrological modelling uncertainty for streamflow simulation. *Journal of*
331 *Hydrology* **298**, 242–266 (2004).
- 332 Chapagain, D., Baarsch, F., Schaeffer, M. & D’haen, S. Climate change adaptation costs in
333 developing countries: insights from existing estimates. *Climate and Development* **12**, 934–
334 942 (2020).
- 335 Chen, F.-W. & Liu, C.-W. Estimation of the spatial rainfall distribution using inverse distance
336 weighting (IDW) in the middle of Taiwan. *Paddy Water Environ* **10**, 209–222 (2012).
- 337 Cheng, M. *et al.* Performance Assessment of Spatial Interpolation of Precipitation for
338 Hydrological Process Simulation in the Three Gorges Basin. *Water* **9**, 838 (2017).

339 Chowdhury, A. F. M. K., Dang, T. D., Bagchi, A. & Galelli, S. Expected Benefits of Laos’
340 Hydropower Development Curbed by Hydroclimatic Variability and Limited Transmission
341 Capacity: Opportunities to Reform. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*
342 **146**, 05020019 (2020).

343 Comité de Alto Nivel de Seguridad Hídrica. Plan Nacional de Seguridad Hídrica 2015-2050:
344 Agua para Todos. Panamá, República de Panamá. (2016)

345 Damkjaer, S. & Taylor, R. The measurement of water scarcity: Defining a meaningful indicator.
346 *Ambio* **46**, 513–531 (2017).

347 Darand, M., Dostkamyan, M. & Rehmani, M. I. A. Spatial autocorrelation analysis of extreme
348 precipitation in Iran. *Russ. Meteorol. Hydrol.* **42**, 415–424 (2017).

349 F.A.O. The future of food and agriculture – Alternative pathways to 2050. (2018).

350 Fábrega, J. *et al.* Hydroclimate projections for Panama in the late 21st Century. *Hydrological*
351 *Research Letters* **7**, 23–29 (2013).

352 Hirabayashi, Y. *et al.* Global flood risk under climate change. *Nature Climate Change* **3**, 816–
353 821 (2013).

354 Hwang, Y., Clark, M. R., Rajagopalan, B. & Leavesley, G. H. Spatial interpolation schemes of
355 daily precipitation for hydrologic modeling. *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk*
356 *Assessment* vol. 26 295320 (2012).

357 Kusunoki, S., Nakaegawa, T., Pinzón, R., Sanchez-Galan, J. E. & Fábrega, J. R. Future
358 precipitation changes over Panama projected with the atmospheric global model MRI-
359 AGCM3.2. *Clim Dyn* **53**, 5019–5034 (2019).

360 Moriasi, D. N. *et al.* Model Evaluation Guidelines for Systematic Quantification of Accuracy in
361 Watershed Simulations. *Transactions of the ASABE* **50**, 885–900 (2007).

362 Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., da Fonseca, G. A. B. & Kent, J. Biodiversity
363 hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* **403**, 853–858 (2000).

364 Nash, J. E. & Sutcliffe, J. V. River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I — A
365 discussion of principles. *Journal of Hydrology* **10**, 282–290 (1970).

366 Neitsch, S.L., Williams, J.R., Arnold, J.G. and Kiniry, J.R. (2011) Soil and Water Assessment
367 Tool Theoretical Documentation Version 2009. Texas Water Resources Institute, College
368 Station.

369 Perez-Valdivia, C., Cade-Menun, B. & McMartin, D. W. Hydrological modeling of the pipestone
370 creek watershed using the Soil Water Assessment Tool (SWAT): Assessing impacts of
371 wetland drainage on hydrology. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies* **14**, 109–129 (2017).

372 Qi, J. *et al.* SWAT ungauged: Water quality modeling in the Upper Mississippi River Basin.
373 *Journal of Hydrology* **584**, 124601 (2020).

374 Roberts, J. T. Global inequality and climate change. *Society and Natural Resources* **14**, 501–509
375 (2001).

- Rousta, I., Doostkamian, M., Haghighi, E., Ghafarian Malamiri, H. R. & Yarahmadi, P. Analysis of spatial autocorrelation patterns of heavy and super-heavy rainfall in Iran. *Adv. Atmos. Sci.* **34**, 1069–1081 (2017).
- Srinivasan, R., Zhang, X. & Arnold, J.. SWAT Ungauged: Hydrological Budget and Crop Yield Predictions in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. *Transactions of the ASABE* **53**, 1533–1546 (2010).
- Tan, M. L. & Yang, X. Effect of rainfall station density, distribution and missing values on SWAT outputs in tropical region. *Journal of Hydrology* **584**, 124660 (2020).
- Tuo, Y., Duan, Z., Disse, M. & Chiogna, G. Evaluation of precipitation input for SWAT modeling in Alpine catchment: A case study in the Adige river basin (Italy). *Science of The Total Environment* **573**, 66–82 (2016).
- van der Wiel, K., Wanders, N., Selten, F. M. & Bierkens, M. F. P. Added Value of Large Ensemble Simulations for Assessing Extreme River Discharge in a 2 °C Warmer World. *Geophysical Research Letters* **46**, 2093–2102 (2019).
- Wohl, E. & Ogden, F. L. Organic carbon export in the form of wood during an extreme tropical storm, Upper Rio Chagres, Panama. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* **38**, 1407–1416 (2013).
- Xu, L., Zheng, C. & Ma, Y. Variations in precipitation extremes in the arid and semi-arid regions of China. *International Journal of Climatology* **41**, 1542–1554 (2021).
- Xue, F., Shi, P., Qu, S., Wang, J. & Zhou, Y. Evaluating the impact of spatial variability of precipitation on streamflow simulation using a SWAT model. *Water Policy* **21**, 178–196 (2018).

406 Tables and figures

407 Table 1. Data sources for building the SWAT model.

Data layer	Source
DEM (Digital Elevation Model)	USGS Earth Resources Observation And Science (EROS) Center. (2017). Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) 1 Arc-Second Global [Data set]. U.S. Geological Survey. https://doi.org/10.5066/F7PR7TFT
Soil map	FAO-UNESCO Soil Map of the World, accessible at https://data.apps.fao.org/map/catalog/srv/eng/catalog.search#/metadata/446ed430-8383-11db-b9b2-000d939bc5d8
Land use map	<p>iii For fitting the precipitation submodel, simulation period 1990 – 2000;</p> <p>iv For the validation simulation, 2005 – 2015; "Panama 2012 Forest Cover and Land Use", STRI GIS Data Portal, accessible at https://stridata-si.opendata.arcgis.com/maps/SI::panama-2012-forest-cover-and-land-use-tile-layer/about</p>
Precipitation & discharge	ETESA hydrological and meteorological stations, STRI meteorological stations
Other climate variables (Solar radiation, wind, relative humidity, temperature)	National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (CFSR) data, available at https://globalweather.tamu.edu/

408

409

410 Table 2. Summary of simulation results; all statistics calculated by location and calendar month
 411 across the whole country.

Model	Summary statistics (monthly discharge, m ³ /s)								
	Mean			Standard deviation			Maxima		
	R ²	NSE	pbias	R ²	NSE	pbias	R ²	NSE	pbias
Default	0.70	0.69	-11.4	0.34	0.27	0.3	0.32	0.21	1.0
1-step regional distance-weighted (RDW1)	0.90	0.89	-15.3	0.60	0.53	-30.1	0.52	0.49	-23.5
2-step regional distance-weighted (RDW2)	0.88	0.88	-9.5	0.61	0.59	-0.9	0.53	0.51	-4.1

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422 Table 3. Linear regression model summary for predictors of within-basin NSE value. AIC =
 423 5.74, adjusted R² of prediction = 0.71.

Predictor	Coefficient	Std. Error	Significance (p < 0.05)
Intercept	0.55	0.07	*
1. Elevation	-0.17	0.09	
2. Total number of gauges in region	0.12	0.05	*
3. Number of downstream subbasins	0.24	0.13	
4. Size of watershed (# subbasins)	-0.28	0.08	*
5. Simulated standard deviation of discharge	-0.05	0.06	
6. Presence of rain gauge within subbasin	0.12	0.05	*
Interaction term 3*4	-0.38	0.09	*
Interaction term 4*5	-0.39	0.11	*
Interaction term 1*3	-0.26	0.17	
Interaction term 2*5	0.11	0.09	

424


425

426


427

428

Figure 1: Map of meteorological and hydrological stations used in simulation. Basin area upstream of gauge locations used for validation highlighted in blue (30 basins), all other regions were ungauged for the period of 2005 – 2015. Not all meteorological stations are necessarily active at any given point.




441 Figure 2: Climatic regions as delineated on the area covered by the SWAT model. 1 – Caribbean
442 side of the Tabasará mountains, 2 – Pacific side of the Tabasará mountains, 3 – Azuero
443 peninsula, 4 – Central Panama, 5 – East-Central Panama, 6 – Darien region




444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451

Figure 3: Distance weighting parameter values for RDW1 (α_0) and RDW2 (α_1 for occurrence, α_2 for quantity) model. A higher value of the parameter indicates that closer neighbours are weighted much higher than ones further away, and a lower value indicates a slower distance-decay function and thus a more even distribution of weights across the region.



470 Figure 4: Scatterplots of model performance in predicting mean monthly discharge, standard
 471 deviations, and daily maxima of monthly discharge by location and calendar month



472 Figure 5: NSE for monthly mean prediction across 2005 – 2015 by basin for (a) default model,
 473 (b) RDW1 model, and (c) RDW2 model. Basins with $\text{NSE} \leq 0$ are not labeled.

