

Evaluating Diverse Potential Evapotranspiration Methodologies and Databases for the Amazon River Basin

Sara M. Vallejo-Bernal, Alejandra M. Carmona and Germán Poveda



Department of Geosciences and Environment, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Medellín, Colombia.

e-mail: smvallejob@unal.edu.co

1. Introduction: Potential evapotranspiration (*PET*), is a highly relevant hydro-climatological variable since it takes part in the three fundamental laws of conservation: mass, energy and carbon. In the Amazon River basin, PET plays a fundamental role, given the ability of the forest to regulate climate at local, regional and worldwide scales. This is possible mainly because of its trees transfer every day around 20 billion tons of water to the atmosphere and about 17 billion tons of water to the ocean (Nobre, 2014).

2. Objetive: The main goal of this work is to evaluate and test different PET estimation methodologies, based on the coupling between water and energy balances, using diverse combinations of databases. Specifically, we aim at determining which methodology, which database

4. Models: and which record length of the hydrological variables yields the most accurate estimate of *PET* in the Amazon River basin.

3. Databases:

Variable	Database	Spatial Resolution	Period of record
Actual evapotranspiration (<i>AET</i>)	GLEAM	0.25°x0.25°	1984-2007
	MPI	0.50°x0.50°	1982-2008
Precipitation (<i>P</i>)	CHIRPS	0.05°x0.05°	1981-2014
	TRMM 3B43	0.25°x0.25°	1998-2013

Budyko (1958):

• Choudhury (1999):

• Yang, et al. (2008):





$AET = \frac{PET \cdot P}{[P^{1.58} + PET^{1.58}]^{1/1.58}}$

• Carmona, et al. (2015): $AET = \frac{0.66 \cdot P}{\left(\frac{P}{PET}\right)^{0.83}}$

5. Results:

5.1. PET estimation and sensitivity to the record period of the hydrological variables:

5.2. Models and databases evaluation:



6. Conclusions:

- The relative error obtained when comparing the estimation of PET with both coincident and discordant periods of record of AET and P, is not negligible for all data sets and models used in the calculations. Moreover, we obtained considerably high relative errors when using GLEAM and CHIRPS regardless of the model.
- Although the four evaluated models are based on the same fundamental hypothesis of coupled water and energy balances (Budyko, 1958), estimates for *PET* obtained with Budyko, Choudhury and Yang et al's equations have probability distribution functions with significant differences with respect to the one from the equation by Carmona et al., (2015).
- Our results suggest that there are some databases and Budyko-type equations (Budyko, Choudhury and Yang et al., 2008) that are not entirely adequate to estimate *PET* in wet environments such as the Amazon River basin.

7. References:

Budyko, M I., (1958), The heat balance of the Earth's surface. US Department of Commerce. Washington, D.C.

Choudhury, B J., (1999), Evaluation of an empirical equation for annual evaporation using field observations and results from a biophysical model, J. Hydrol., 216, 99 – 110.

Yang, H., et al. (2008), New analytical derivation of the mean annual water-energy balance equation, Water Resour. Res., 44, W03410.

llamarme alarmista hágalo. @ www.elespectador.com. Retrieved from (2014), Si quiere Nobre. Α.. http://www.elespectador.com/noticias/medio-ambiente/si-quiere-llamarme-alarmista-hagalo-articulo-509610

Carmona, A M., et al. (2015), A scaling approach to Budyko's framework and the complementary relationship of evapotranspiration in humid environments: case study of the Amazon River basin, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 10515-10557.

Acknowledgments: S. M. Vallejo-Bernal's and G. Poveda's work was supported by Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Travel support to attend the 8th GEWEX Open Science Conference was provided by the Organizer Committee and Universidad Nacional de Colombia.