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ABSTRACT

Water scarcity is a problem that will be exacerbated by climate change. Being able to model the effect of climate change on water scarcity is important to effectively plan the use of future water resources. This research integrated the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), climate model, and water footprint analysis to measure the impact of climate change on future water scarcity. This was achieved through two objectives. The first objective was to create a modeling framework that links the output from climate model to SWAT and combined streamflow outputs from SWAT with water footprint analysis to measure how climate change will impact water scarcity of a river basin. This was accomplished through creating a SWAT model within ArcMap and inputting a topographic, soil, land use, and weather data. Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (CFSR) data were used in lieu of observed weather data due to a lack of available data. SWAT-CUP (Calibration and Uncertainty Program) was used to calibrate two upstream streamflow gauges, then calibrate and validate a third streamflow gauge at the outlet of the Senqu basin in Lesotho. The two upstream streamflow gauges were calibrated from 1986 to 2002. The downstream streamflow gauge was calibrated from 1985 to 2002 and validated from 2003 to 2013. Three Regional Climate Models (RCM), ICHEC-EC-EARTH, MIROC-MIROC5, and CCCma-CanESM2 were downloaded from the Coordinated Regional Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX) dataset. Each RCM was downloaded with two different Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP), RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5. The RCMs were bias corrected using a cumulative distribution function mapping technique.
These RCMs as well as an average of the RCMs were used as input for the SWAT model to generate future streamflow outputs. The streamflow outputs provide the future blue water availability of the Senqu River. The results showed an overall decrease in streamflow in both RCPs. The second objective was to apply the framework to Lesotho and use the information from the ArcSWAT model and data from the Blue Water Footprint analysis to measure the future potential Blue Water Scarcity of Lesotho. This was accomplished through the Blue Water Footprint of Lesotho generated from the 5th National Blue Footprint analysis. The annual blue water scarcity was calculated as the ratio of the Blue Water Available to Blue Water Footprint. Three approaches were adopted to analyze the water scarcity of Lesotho. The first approach used the national Blue Water Footprint in the water scarcity calculation to investigate the worst-case scenario. The second approach used the modified blue water footprint based on the population living within the Senqu river basin. The third approach used a modified blue water footprint that accounted for the projected population growth of Lesotho. The results of scenario 1 showed there was moderate water scarcity in a period of four years in climate scenario of RCP8.5. The results of scenario 3 showed there were multiple cases of water scarcity in both RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 with two years of severe water scarcity. This research is limited by data availability and the results for Lesotho could be improved by accurate dam data and the fine scale water footprint analysis. The modeling framework integrating climate model, hydrology, and water footprint analysis, however, can be applied to other remote places where limited data are available.
1.1 Climate Change and Water Scarcity

The climate of the world has been changing. Over the past 50 years there has been an observed decrease in the frequency of cold days, cold nights, and frost and an observed increase in hot days and hot nights (Pachauri et al., 2014). Anthropogenic climate change is the change in climate due to emission of greenhouse gases associated with human activity. Since the industrial revolution human contribution to the amount of Carbon Dioxide (CO$_2$) in the atmosphere has grown with an increase of 70% between 1970 and 2004 (Pachauri et al., 2014). Previous studies have shown that climate change affects hydrological cycles and the amount of streamflow (Arnell, 2003, Arnell, 2004, Vorosmarty, 2000, Fry et al., 2012). Mountainous regions are especially susceptible to the effects of climate change (Parish and Funnell, 1999). Any change in the climate in a mountain range can have cascading effects on the lowlands. Many mountains throughout the world are the source for lowland river networks as well as function as long term water storage in the form of snow. Small amount of changes around the freezing temperature threshold will vary the amount of streamflow and peak discharge (Diaz et al., 2003).

As climate change affects various ecosystems, the amount of freshwater available for the world will be impacted and more people are likely to be vulnerable to water scarcity and its consecutive effects. Climate change is predicted to exacerbate water scarcity (Schewe et al., 2014). One recent example is the city of Cape Town, South Africa. Cape Town has been suffering through a two year drought that started in 2015 and was expected to run out of water in April 2018 (Onishi and Sengupta, 2018). Nearly 80% of the world’s population is exposed to a
high risk of water scarcity (Vorosmarty et al., 2010). And the global water demand is expected to increase by approximately 55% by 2050 (Oecd, 2012). Access to adequate water supply and proper sanitation methods are essential to mitigating disease throughout the world (Prüss-Ustün et al., 2014). It is estimated that by 2025 about 1.8 billion people will face absolute water scarcity (Wwdr, 2016).

The ability and tools used to measure water scarcity have evolved over the years. There are five main approaches developed to measure water scarcity. These are:


3) The Water Poverty Index (Asheesh, 2003, Smakhtin et al., 2005, Sullivan, 2002) which uses environmental and social metrics, such as ecosystem productivity, community, human health, and economic welfare, to measure whether individuals are water secure at the household and community level.

4) The International Water Management Institute (IWMI) indicator (Seckler et al., 1999) evaluates water scarcity by taking the ratio of the freshwater available for human requirements to the main water supply.

5) The Water Footprint Analysis (Hoekstra et al., 2011) which evaluates water scarcity using the water footprint of a country rather than the water withdrawal. The water footprint of a country is the amount of water appropriated for consumption, industry, and agriculture.
Blue water is defined as freshwater either in streams or groundwater. It is used to grow food, manufacture goods in industries, and sustain population in urban and rural settings. As population increases the demands for food, water, and material goods will increase (Postal, 2000). Along with population growth, climate change is a factor that may affect blue water availability. Using the water footprint instead of water withdrawal allows for a more accurate measurement as a significant portion of the water that is withdrawn is returned to the environment. The use of blue water for agriculture, industry, and domestic is accounted for in a blue water footprint analysis. A total of five global water footprint analyses have been conducted (Fader et al., 2011, Hoekstra and Chapagain, 2007, Hoekstra and Hung, 2005, Hoekstra and Mekonnen, 2012, Wang and Zimmerman, 2016). The most recent global water footprint analysis was conducted by Wang and Zimmerman (Wang and Zimmerman, 2016).

The Water Footprint accounting methodology has been incorporated with SWAT to assess water scarcity (Rodrigues et al., 2014). SWAT (Soil and Water Assessment Tool) is a semi-distributed hydrological model developed by the United States Department of Agriculture used for long term simulations of a variety of hydrological and related physical-chemical processes (Arnold et al., 1998). The framework introduced by Rodrigues et al. (2014) uses the SWAT output of soil moisture, evapotranspiration, and streamflow to calculate green and blue water scarcity, while blue water is freshwater, green water is water from precipitation that is absorbed by soil and used by plants (Figure 1).
This study expanded the framework developed by Rodrigues et al. (2014) to include climate change scenarios. Specifically, a model framework was created that integrates climate change with water availability analysis using ArcSWAT and combines with water footprint analysis to measure blue water scarcity. SWAT has been used to evaluate the impact of climate change on blue and green water resources (blue water streamflow, seasonal average change in green water storage and green water flow) of the Athabasca River Basin in Canada (Shrestha et al., 2017). Shrestha et al. (2017), however, did not include the water footprint analysis to assess water scarcity.
1.2 Water Scarcity in Lesotho

The framework created in this study was applied to the Senqu River Basin within Lesotho as a case study. SWAT has been used in many hydrological studies with respect to climate change (Cousino et al., 2015, Kang et al., 2015, Le and Sharif, 2015, Li et al., 2016, Mittal et al., 2015, Parajuli et al., 2016); however, limited studies have been conducted in the continent of Africa.

A search in the SWAT database (https://www.card.iastate.edu/swat_articles/) for SWAT models related to Africa resulted in 81 articles. One of the articles, Maliehe and Mulungu (2017), conducted a SWAT study of the water demands of the South Phuthiatsana catchment within Lesotho. Of the 81 articles, only 9 included climate change studies, however none of the climate change studies related specifically to South Africa. One of the nine studies did conduct a climate change study for the entire Africa including Lesotho but did not specifically focus on it. Of the 81 articles, only 15 related to South Africa, and none was conducted specifically for Lesotho or the Senqu River Basin with consideration of climate change. The study that included Lesotho in a climate change study evaluating the blue water availability for the entire continent of Africa was conducted by Faramarzi et. al (2013). While the blue water availability is calculated, water scarcity is not evaluated in the study.

Lesotho is a land locked country inside of South Africa with a surface area of 30,355 square kilometers. It ranges from 1400 to 3400 meters in altitude above sea level. Lesotho has the highest low point of any country in the world at 1400 meters above sea level and is the only country in the world that lies entirely above 1000 meters. Water is one of the main exports of Lesotho (London, 2017), mostly from the Senqu river.
The Senqu river originates in the Lesotho highlands and flows westward 2200 km to the west coast where it is discharges into the Atlantic Ocean. The Senqu River basin as shown in Figure 2, has a total catchment area of approximately 1 million square kilometers (Heath and Brown, 2007).

Figure 2: Map of Lesotho with the Senqu River Basin in red.

Water withdrawal within Lesotho is broken up into three main sectors: agriculture, industry, and urban and household use (Cridf, 2017). Industry, urban and household use each make up 46% of water withdrawal individually, while agriculture makes up 8%. This is represented graphically in Figure 3.
Figure 3: Water withdrawal percentage between agriculture, industry, and urban and household use within Lesotho.

The average household within Lesotho uses between 1000 and 2500 liters/month (Bello et al., 2010) and has an average of 5 members (Ministry of Health [Lesotho], 2014). Within the sector of urban households, 97% of them have access to an improved source of drinking water while only 49% have access to improved sanitation (Ministry of Health [Lesotho], 2014). In rural households, 77% of households have access to an improved source of drinking water and 52% have access to improved sanitation (Ministry of Health [Lesotho], 2014). Research containing information on specific household water allocation could not be found. However, the household water allocation observed as a Peace Corps Volunteer within Lesotho for 2 years is similar to a study conducted by Thompson et al. (2001), which evaluated the change in household water use in the three east African countries of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Figure 4 presents a graphical representation of typical household use in Lesotho using the research of Thompson et al. (2001) as a guideline.
Figure 4: Estimated amount of water used daily in a typical rural household in Lesotho based upon research by (Thompson et al., 2001) and the author’s own experience. Washing includes washing dishes, clothes, and cleaning the house.

It was estimated that a majority of daily household water use is allocated to bathing and washing; 25 liters and 23 liters respectively. Washing refers to washing dishes, clothes, and cleaning the house. Basotho (the people of Lesotho) typically have gardens where vegetables are grown, and as such have 5 liters allocated daily. Eight liters are allocated to drinking and cooking and 10 liters for livestock care.

In Lesotho the Senqu River is used by Basotho for grazing animals, growing crops, catching fish and harvesting reeds, thatching grass, growing grass for handicrafts, wild vegetables, trees, medicinal plants and sand (Heath and Brown, 2007). Changes to water available from this river has the potential to impact the livelihood of many Basotho who reside along it. A major stressor on water availability from the Senqu River Basin is the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP).
Two dams, the Katse and Mohale, divert water from the Senqu River basin and send it to the Vaal River basin in the Gauteng Province in South Africa (Lhwp, 2008). This lowers the amount of water available to the Basotho downstream. The LHWP plans to implement three more dams along the Senqu river.

Lesotho’s high elevation mountainous areas are projected to be more sensitive to climate change (IPCC, 2007). Lesotho is also vulnerable to climate change due to its reliance on rain-fed subsistence agriculture, on water resource exports and on hydroelectricity (Mdg, 2013). The 2013 Lesotho Millennium Development Goals status report predicted shorter growing seasons and an increase in extreme weather events (Mdg, 2013). Lesotho has experienced extreme weather events in current history, for example, a drought in 2015 and 2016 which crippled many parts of the country.

Between 75% and 80% of Lesotho’s rural population relies on agriculture for their livelihood (Mdg, 2013). Any significant change in the amount of blue water available for agriculture could greatly affect the livelihood of many Basotho as well as have negative impacts on their hygiene and sanitation (Fry et al., 2008).
1.3 Motivation and Objectives

While many SWAT studies exist that evaluate climate change or evaluate water scarcity, there are no studies that could be found that utilize the streamflow outputs of SWAT to measure water scarcity with respect to climate change. There are also no studies found that evaluate the effects of climate change on the Senqu River basin within Lesotho. Therefore, the objectives of this study were: 1) To create a modeling framework that uses ArcSWAT streamflow outputs combined with water footprint analysis to measure how climate change will impact water scarcity of a river basin. 2) To apply the framework on the Senqu River basin within Lesotho to provide the insights of water scarcity in the region.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 History of Measuring Water Scarcity

Measuring water scarcity has evolved over the past few decades. Water Scarcity was first measured on a per capita basis. Falkenmark, Gleik developed a Water Scarcity Index that assumes everyone uses 1000 m$^3$ per day (Falkenmark et al., 1989, Gleick, 1996). This became a benchmark water scarcity indicator that has been accepted by the World Bank (Brown, 2011). Ohlsson created the Social Water Stress Index by taking the Water Scarcity Index and dividing it by the United Nations Development Program Human Development Index providing an insight into how economic, technological, or other means affect overall fresh water availability in a region (Ohlsson, 2000). The focus then changed from looking at water scarcity per capita to a national scale. The Water Resource Vulnerability Index (Chaves and Alipaz, 2007, Mcnulty et al., 2010, Raskin et al., 1997, Vorosmarty et al., 2005) calculated water scarcity by looking at water consumption at a national scale. The criticality ratio is commonly used in water resource analysis and is defined as the ratio of water withdrawals for human use to total renewable water resources (Alcamo et al., 2000). As population continued to increase a link between water availability and projected population growth was created (Asheesh, 2003). The need to continue to link social and economic variable to water scarcity led to the creation of the Water Poverty Index.

The Water Poverty Index is a comprehensive tool that incorporated social metrics including ecosystem productivity, community, human health, and economic welfare into
measuring water scarcity (Sullivan, 2002). Unfortunately, it is complex and lacks a standardization on how each metric is weighted.

(Pfister et al., 2009) combined the Water Scarcity Index with Life Cycle Impact Assessment to evaluate water stress of an area based on energy used in backup technology, the fraction of freshwater consumption that contributes to depletion, as well as the total water withdrawal from the watershed. Hoekstra (2003) established a method to measure water stress using water footprints. This method is explained more in the following sections. Rijsberman (2006) and Brown (2011) have discussed in length the different water scarcity indices that have been developed. Table 1 provides an overview of the different Water Scarcity Indices that have been developed.

2.2 Water Footprint Analysis

Hoekstra et al. (2011) argues that using the water footprint helps to correct common errors made in other indices. Other indices (Chaves and Alipaz, 2007, Raskin et al., 1997, Vorosmarty et al., 2005) use water withdrawal as an indicator of water use. The Water Footprint differs from Water Withdrawal in that: 1) It does not include blue water use insofar as this water is returned to where it came from, 2) It is not restricted to blue water use, but also includes green and grey water, and 3) It is not restricted to direct water use, but also includes indirect water use (Hoekstra et al., 2011). Blue water is defined as water that is sourced from surface or groundwater and is used in domestic, industry, or agricultural. Green water is water from precipitation stored in soil and is evaporated, transpired, or used by plants. Gray water is water used to create pollutants.
The three most common errors among other indices are:

1) Water withdrawal does not include the water that is returned from the catchment after use. Thus, using this as an indicator at the scale of the catchment is not a good method. A better indicator of blue water consumption is the blue water footprint.

2) Total available water is not a good metric to use to define water availability as it ignores the portion needed to maintain the environment. Thus, the demand required by the environment should be subtracted from the total water available.

3) Evaluation of water scarcity on an annual usage and availability does not paint an accurate picture of variations during the year. Monthly values would be more accurate. (Hoekstra et al., 2011)

A total of five global water footprint studies have been published to date (Fader et al., 2011, Hoekstra and Chapagain, 2007, Hoekstra and Hung, 2005, Hoekstra and Mekonnen, 2012, Wang and Zimmerman, 2016). The most recent water footprint study conducted by Wang and Zimmerman improves on previous water footprint studies by using a hybrid water footprint accounting model with better spatial and sectoral resolution (Wang and Zimmerman, 2016). Wang and Zimmerman report Water Footprints on a national scale.

The Water Footprint of a nation can be calculated through two approaches known as the top-down (input-output) approach and the bottom-up (process-based) approach. In the top-down approach the water footprint of national consumption is shown in equation 1.

$$WF_{cons,nat} = WF_{area,nat} + V_t - V_e \quad (1)$$
In equation 1, $WF_{cons,nat}$ is the water footprint of national consumption measured in m$^3$/year, $WF_{area,nat}$ is the water footprint within the nation (m$^3$/year), $V_i$ is the virtual-water import (m$^3$/year), and $V_e$ (m$^3$/year) is the virtual-water export. Virtual water is defined as the embedded water within a product.

The bottom-up approach is based on calculating the water footprint of a group of consumers where the consumers consist of the inhabitants of a nation and is defined within equation 2.

$$WF_{cons,nat} = WF_{cons,nat,dir} + WF_{cons,nat,indir} \quad (2)$$

In equation 2, $WF_{cons,nat,dir}$ is the direct water footprint used by the consumer measured in m$^3$/year. $WF_{cons,nat,indir}$ is the indirect water footprint (m$^3$/year) and refers to the water consumption and pollution of water that can be associated with the production of the goods and services used by the consumer.

More detail on the calculation of the Water Footprint using both of these methods can be found in the Water Footprint Assessment Manual (Hoekstra et al., 2011). The main difference between the two methods is the different use of input data. The bottom up approach depends on the quality of national consumption data while the top down approach relies on the quality of trade data (Hoekstra et al., 2011).
Table 1: Summary of common water scarcity indices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Index Name</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falkenmark et al. (1989)</td>
<td>Water Stress Index/Water Scarcity Index</td>
<td>WSI=WA/P; WSI=Water Stress Index (m³/capita/year); WA=Water Availability; P=Population</td>
<td>No Stress: WSI&gt;1700; Water Stress: WSI=1000-1700;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleick (1996);</td>
<td>Basic Human Water Requirements</td>
<td>WSI=WA/P; WSI=Water Stress Index (m³/capita/year); WA=Water Availability; P=Population</td>
<td>Relative Sufficiency: SWSI=0-5; Stress: SWSI=6-10; Scarcity: SWSI=11-20; Beyond the Barrier: SWSI&gt;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkenmark and Widstrand</td>
<td>Social Water Stress Index</td>
<td>SWSI=WSI/HDI; SWSI (Social Resource Water Stress Index); WSI=Water Stress Index; HDI=Human Development Index</td>
<td>No Water Stress: WTA=0-10%; Low Water Stress: WTA=10%-20%; Mid Water Stress: WTA=20%-40%; High Water Stress: WTA=40%-80%;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorosmarty (2000)</td>
<td>Local Relative Water Use and Reuse Index</td>
<td>(D+I+A)/Qc; D=Domestic Water Withdrawal; I=Industrial Water Withdrawal; A=Agricultural Water Withdrawal; Qc=Sum of all local discharges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Index Name</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan (2002)</td>
<td>Water Poverty Index</td>
<td>[ WPI = \frac{\sum (w_i \cdot x_i)}{\sum w_i} ]</td>
<td>The lowest possible level of water poverty: WPI = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WPI: water poverty index value</td>
<td>Level of water poverty: 0 &lt; WPI &lt; 100 the highest possible level of water poverty: WPI = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( x_i ): component i of the WPI structure (assessment as %)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( w_i ): weight applied to the component i.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smakhtin et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Water Stress Indicator (WSI)</td>
<td>[ WSI = \frac{\text{Withdrawals}}{(\text{MAR} - \text{EWR})} ]</td>
<td>WSI&gt;1 Overexploited (Current water use tapping into EWR);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAR=Mean Annual Runoff; EWR=Environmental Water Requirements</td>
<td>.6&lt;=WSI&lt;1 Heavily exploited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seckler et al. (1999)</td>
<td>IWMI (International Water Management Institute)</td>
<td>[ WS = \frac{\text{PWS}}{\text{UWS}} ]</td>
<td>Physical water scarcity: WS ≥ 60% (the region will not be able to meet water demand in future) to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{UWS} ): utilizable water supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{PWS} ): primary water supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoekstra (2003)</td>
<td>Blue Water Footprint Analysis</td>
<td>[ \text{BWS} = \frac{\text{BWF}}{(\text{BWA} - \text{EWN})} ]</td>
<td>low blue water scarcity (&lt;100%):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BWS=Blue Water Scarcity; BWF=Blue Water Footprint; BWA=Blue Water Available; EWN=Environmental Water Needs;</td>
<td>moderate blue water scarcity (100–150%):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significant blue water scarcity (150–200%):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>severe water scarcity (&gt;200%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Soil and Water Assessment Tool

SWAT is a semi-distributed hydrological model developed by the United States Department of Agriculture used for long term simulations of a variety of processes (Arnold et al., 1998). SWAT operates on a daily time step and is composed of eight major model components including: weather, hydrology, soil temperature and properties, plant growth, nutrients, pesticides, bacteria and pathogens, and land management (Arnold et al., 2012). ArcSWAT is a geographic information system (GIS) interface for SWAT.

SWAT has been used for a myriad of watershed, land use management, water quality, and climate change studies (Cousino et al., 2015, Hayhoe, July 2007, Li et al., 2016, Parajuli et al., 2016, Park et al., 2011, Pierce et al., 2009, Prasad et al., Elhassan et al., 2015, Geza and Mccray, 2008, Lam et al., 2010, Ullrich and Volk, 2009, Arias et al., 2014, Arias et al., 2012).

There are many SWAT studies that focus on climate change, water scarcity, and water footprints, but there are not any that could be found that use SWAT outputs to measure the effects of climate change on water scarcity using the water footprint analysis. A search through the SWAT database (https://www.card.iastate.edu/swat_articles/) for relevant literature was conducted and the results are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Soil and Water Assessment Tool database search of articles containing water scarcity, water footprint, and climate change studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>Application Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>water footprint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>water scarcity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>water scarcity</td>
<td>climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>water footprint</td>
<td>climate change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 demonstrates that while there are a number of articles that focus on water scarcity, there are only 7 that evaluate both water scarcity and climate change. Notable articles that appeared in the search result that relate to just water scarcity include Rodrigues et al. (2014) which created a modeling framework for measuring water scarcity using the water footprint concepts, but did not include a climate change analysis. Schuol et al. (2008) modeled the blue and green water availability of Africa and measured water scarcity using the Water Stress Index. From the 7 articles measuring both water scarcity and climate change impact only Abu-Allaban et al. (2015) and Shrestha et al. (2017) measure the water scarcity impact of climate change on a river basin. However, they do not evaluate water scarcity using the water footprint, but evaluate the relative change in streamflow. Faramarzi et al. (2013) modeled the impact of climate change of blue and green water availability of Africa and evaluated the relative change in total water yield of the continent.

The search of the SWAT database relating to the Senqu basin within Lesotho returns even less studies. Only one SWAT study has been conducted within Lesotho. Maliehe and Mulungu (2017) evaluate the water demand of the South Phuthiatsana river basin. There have been no SWAT studies relating to climate change conducted within Lesotho. Faramarzi et al. (2013) included Lesotho in the assessment of climate change impacts on the blue and green water availability in Africa but did not measure water scarcity of Lesotho. Figure 5 shows the total number of articles within the SWAT database of a particular topic. The ‘X’ denoted in Figure 5 is the gap in knowledge this paper fills, by combining SWAT with the water footprint analysis to measure the impact of climate change on water scarcity in Lesotho.
SWAT divides a watershed into sub-basins or sub-watersheds and then further divides these sub-basins into hydrologic response units (HRUs). A sub-basin possesses a geographic position in the watershed and is spatially related to other sub-basins. HRUs are portions of a sub-basin that possess unique land use/management/soil attributes. Input data including topography, weather, land use, and soil properties, are used to calculate the runoff, sediment and nutrient loadings from each HRU and then summed together to determine the total loadings from the sub-basin (Arnold et al., 2012, Arnold et al., 2002).

The main inputs needed to perform a SWAT hydrological analysis are a digital elevation model (DEM), daily weather data, soil map, and land use map. Input weather data includes min/max temperatures, precipitation, solar radiation, wind speed, and relative humidity on a daily time step (Arnold et al., 2002).

Figure 5: Review of articles within the SWAT database. The total number of articles for a topic is listed. 'X' is the gap in knowledge this paper fills, by combining SWAT with the water footprint analysis to measure the impact of climate change on water scarcity in Lesotho.
SWAT outputs variables on three levels titled the HRU output file, the sub-basin output file, and the main channel or reach output file. A summary output file is also created. These files contain a number of outputs including: flow in cubic meters per second (cms) and flow out (cms) of sub-basins, evapotranspiration (cms), sediment concentration in and out (mg/kg) of sub-basins, organic Nitrogen and Phosphorus loads (kg). For a full list of outputs see the SWAT input output manual (Arnold et al., 2002). The SWAT output used in this study will be the FLOW_OUT variable measured in cms.

Water balance is the driving force behind all of the processes in SWAT. The hydrologic cycle simulated by SWAT is based on the water balance equation:

\[ SW_t = SW_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \left( R_{day} - Q_{surf} - E_a - w_{seep} - Q_{gw} \right) \]  

(3)

In equation 3, \( SW_t \) is the final water content (mm H\(_2\)O), \( SW_0 \) is the initial soil water content on day \( i \) (mm H\(_2\)O), \( t \) is the time (days), \( R_{day} \) is the amount of precipitation on day \( i \) (mm H\(_2\)O), \( Q_{surf} \) is the amount of surface runoff on day \( i \) (mm H\(_2\)O), \( E_a \) is the amount of evapotranspiration on day \( i \) (mm H\(_2\)O), \( w_{seep} \) is the amount of water entering the vadose zone from the soil profile on day \( i \) (mm H\(_2\)O), and \( Q_{gw} \) is the amount of ground water return flow on day \( i \) (mm H\(_2\)O). Detailed information regarding the calculation of each of the variables can be found in (Neitsch et al., 2011).

A SWAT model can be calibrated in a number of ways. However, the first step in calibration for any model includes a determination of the most sensitive parameters in the SWAT model through the use of a sensitivity analysis. A sensitivity analysis is the process of determining rate of change in model output with respect to changes in model input (parameters) (Arnold et al., 2012).
There are generally two types of sensitivity analysis that are performed, local and global. A local sensitivity analysis consists of changing one variable at a time while a global consists of allowing all the variables to change. The disadvantage of using a local sensitivity analysis is the value of one parameter depends on the value of related parameters. The disadvantage of global sensitivity analysis is that it requires a large amount of simulations.

2.4 General Circulation Models

When modeling the impact of climate change within SWAT, global coupled ocean-atmosphere general circulation models (GCM) are used to simulate future meteorological variables. GCMs are mathematical models developed to study the climate of the Earth. Many GCMs have been developed by various institutions to study the future impact of climate change on Earth.

In order to compare the projections from many models, a standard set of climate scenarios was developed in 1995 by the Working Group on Coupled Modeling (WGCM) under the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) called the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) (Pcmdi, 2017). The goal of the CMIP was to provide climate scientists with a database of coupled GCM simulations that follow standardized boundary conditions (https://cmip.llnl.gov/history.html). Climate scenarios were developed by CMIP to better understand the uncertainty between the human contributions to climate change, the response of the Earth system to human activities, the impacts of a range of future climates, the implications of different approaches to mitigation and adaption (Moss et al., 2010). Emission scenarios are descriptions of future potential emissions that affect the Earth’s radiation balance and are used to provide input to climate models.
Currently the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) fifth assessment report (AR5) (Ipcc, 2013) analyzes the impact of climate change using the 4\textsuperscript{th} phase of CMIP known as CMIP5. The emission scenarios used within CMIP5 are defined as Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP). There are four RCPs named RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP6.0, and RCP 8.5. Each of these numbers represents the estimated targeted radiative forcing at the year 2100. For example, RCP4.5 represents a concentration pathway that approximately results in a radiative forcing of 4.5 W m\(^{-2}\) at the year 2100 relative to pre-industrial conditions (Taylor et al., 2011).

One limitation of using GCMs for regional hydrological studies is the coarseness of the resolution. To overcome this limitation the WCRP established the Coordinated Regional Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX) dataset (Lennard et al., 2015). CORDEX created a framework in which scientists around the world created high-resolution Regional Climate Model (RCM) projections using the CMIP5 RCPs. Where various GCMs resolution ranged from 88 km to 785 km the CORDEX RCM resolution is 69 km (Enes, 2017). RCMs were created for Africa and were selected for use in this study due to their finer resolution over GCMs.

\textbf{2.5 Bias Correcting Climate Models}

If the output from a GCM or RCM is not corrected for biases, the model will produce simulations that are not realistic (Hansen et al., 2006, Sharma et al., 2007). Bias correction methods use a transformation algorithm to adjust RCM and GCM outputs. The purpose of bias correction is to identify possible biases between observed and simulated climate variables.
It is assumed that the correction algorithms and its parameterization for current climate conditions are also valid for future conditions. Multiple bias correction methodologies have been developed and those that have been used in research include: change factor and downscaling methods (Park et al., 2011), stochastic weather generators (Le and Sharif, 2015), cumulative distribution functions (Pisinaras, 2016), change factor for temperature and quantile mapping for precipitation (Basheer et al., 2016), artificial neural networks (Kang et al., 2015), or through the use of a fitted histogram equalization function (Yan et al., 2015) and daily bias corrected and constructed analogs (Ficklin et al., 2015). A complete review of downscaling methods can be found in (Maraun et al., 2010). Table 3 provides the main bias correction methodologies used.

The six main methods of bias correcting summarized in Table 3 are linear scaling, local intensity scaling (LOCI), power transformation, variance scaling, delta change, and distribution mapping. Linear scaling corrects the RCM data by adjusting the mean monthly values with a correction factor. While the bias correction is fairly simple to perform, it adjusts all events, including extreme weather events, with the same correction factor. It also cannot correct for the frequency of which precipitation events occur. LOCI attempts to make up for the disadvantages of linear scaling by adjusting the RCM data to have the same mean, wet-day frequencies, and intensity as the observed data (Schmidli et al., 2006). However, LOCI cannot reproduce the effect of regional processes and does not allow for precipitation variances to be corrected. Power transformation and variance scaling adjust both the variance and mean of precipitation and temperature respectively. However, the power transformation of precipitation is unable to accurately correct the probability of dry days and precipitation intensity. The delta-change approach does not account for potential future changes in climate. In other words, the delta-change approach does not allow the number of dry vs wet days to change (Graham et al., 2007).
Distribution mapping matches the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the simulated data to the observed data. The simulated data now matches the statistics of the observed data e.g. the mean and standard deviation as well as the probability of a precipitation event of the simulated data now match the observed data. The distribution method, however, cannot accurately correct the interannual variability of the simulated data. Teutschbein and Seibert (2012) conducted a review of these bias correction methodologies and compared each of them against each other to see which method provided more accurate monthly streamflow. The distribution mapping method was found to be the best correction method in the study.
Table 3: Common bias correction methodologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear Scaling</td>
<td>Lenderink et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Adjusts monthly mean values and offers corrected data with a variability more consistent with the original RCM data (Graham et al 2007a). Corrected RCM simulations will perfectly agree in their monthly mean values with the observations</td>
<td>Accounts for bias in mean</td>
<td>1) All events are adjusted with the same correction factor. 2) Unable to correct for bias in wet-day frequency and intensity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Intensity Scaling</td>
<td>Schmidli et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Adjusts both mean and wet-day frequencies and wet day intensities in three steps. The adjusted control and scenario precipitation both have the same mean, wet-day frequency and intensity as the observed time series.</td>
<td>Adjusts mean and wet day frequencies and intensities.</td>
<td>1) Does not reproduce the effect of regional process. 2) Does not allow for difference in variance to be corrected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Transformation of Precipitation</td>
<td>Leander and Buishand (2007)</td>
<td>Uses an exponential form, $a \cdot P^b$ to adjust variance of precipitation time series. Find parameter $b$ by matching coefficient of variation (CV) of RCM with CV of observed daily precipitation. Then long term monthly mean of observed precip is matched with historical RCM using linear scaling.</td>
<td>Accounts and corrects for both mean and variance in precipitation time series</td>
<td>1) Limited to precipitation 2) Does not provide corrected RCM data with accurate probability of dry days and precipitation intensity. (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Scaling of Temperature</td>
<td>Chen et al. (2011)</td>
<td>RCM-simulated time series is adjusted by linear scaling then are shifted on a monthly basis to a zero mean. (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012)</td>
<td>Corrects for mean and variance</td>
<td>Limited to temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution mapping</td>
<td>Sennikovs and Bethers (2009)</td>
<td>Corrects the distribution function of RCM-simulated climate values to agree with the observed distribution function. Create a transfer function to shift the occurrence distributions of precipitation and temperature (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012)</td>
<td>Simulated data statistically matches observed data</td>
<td>Does not correct interannual variability and temperature/precipitation correlation properties of simulated data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Study Site and Overview of Methodology

The Senqu river basin within Lesotho was evaluated in this research. Figure 6 denotes a detailed map of the Senqu basin with the locations of the dams, streamflow gauge stations, Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (CFSR) stations, and RCM stations. The Senqu river basin contains three different streamflow gauges, SG5, SG17, and SG3. SG5 and SG17 are upstream from the basin outlet streamflow gauge, SG3. SG17 lies directly downstream of the Mohale dam, and SG5 lies downstream of the Katse dam. Mean annual temperature range from 15.2 °C (59.36 °F) in the lowlands to 7 °C (44.6 °F) in the highlands. Precipitation varies from year to year and most of it occurs during the seven-month wet summer season from October to April. The peak rainfall period is from December to February and most parts of the country record over 100 mm per month (Lms, 2013). The Senqu river basin has a basin area of approximately 20000 km² and ranges in elevation from 1400 m to 3470 m. Figure 7 shows an overview of the methodology as well as the data sets presented in this study and how they are used to ultimately calculate water scarcity.
Figure 6: Map of Senqu River Basin study site. Locations of dams, gauging stations, Regional Climate Model (RCM) stations, and Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (CFSR) stations are displayed.
Figure 7: Modeling framework for evaluating blue water scarcity using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT). The abbreviations in the figure are: DEM (Digital Elevation Model), CFSR (Climate Forecast System Reanalysis), CMIP5 (Coupled Model Intercomparison Project), SWAT-CUP (SWAT Calibration and Uncertainty Program), EFR (Environmental Flow Requirement), RCP (Representative Concentration Pathway), CDF (Cumulative Distribution Function)
3.2 The ArcSWAT Model

SWAT is used in this study to evaluate the blue water available in the Senqu river basin by using streamflow (FLOW_OUT) at the river basin exit, SG3. The FLOW_OUT SWAT output variable is measured in cubic meters per second (cms) and is used as a measure of the total water available of the Senqu river.

The inputs that are required for SWAT to perform a hydrologic analysis are a digital elevation model, soils map, land use map, and weather data. To also perform a climate change study, future climate data will be inputted into the ArcSWAT model. Detailed information on the inputs are below.

3.2.1 Digital Elevation Model

A 90 m digital elevation model (DEM) of Lesotho was obtained from CGIAR Consortium for Spatial Information based on the global Shuttle Radar Terrain Mission (http://srtm.cgiar.org). This information was used to delineate rivers and watersheds within the ArcSWAT interface.

3.2.2 Soils Map

A soils map of the world was downloaded from the Food and Agriculture Organization (Team, 2007). The area covering Lesotho was extracted using ArcMap and was projected into UTM35S. Lesotho is largely composed of Rhodic Ferralsols, Lithosols, Solodic Planosols, Eutric Planosols, and Chromic Cambisols.
3.2.3 Land Use Map

A land use map was downloaded from the Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development (RCMRD) GeoPortal (http://geoportal.rcmrd.org). The map has data from 2014 and contains the land use classifications of Natural Forest, Plantation Forest, Grassland, Shrubland, Orchard, Annual Cropland, Vegetated Wetland, Water Body, Settlement, Mine and Quarry, and Otherland.

3.2.4 Weather Data

Past weather data from 1970-2010 including daily precipitation, and temperature recordings were procured from the Lesotho Meteorological Services (LMS). SWAT also requires the location of local weather stations. After these data were acquired, it was determined to be unfit for use in the SWAT model. Continuous data are needed for the SWAT model, and the data from LMS is missing several months and some years of data. Because of this, modeled data from the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (CFSR) were used. CFSR model simulations provide climate data in areas where regional climate data may not be available due to lack of resources. The CFSR is a global, high resolution, coupled atmosphere-ocean-land surface-sea ice system designed to provide the best estimate of the state of these coupled domains (Ncar, 2017). The CFSR simulations use data from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP). CFSR daily precipitation and temperature data are available globally for time periods from 1979 to March 2011. The data are given at a 38-km resolution. A study by Fuka et. al (2014) demonstrated that using CFSR precipitation and temperature data to force a watershed model provides stream charge simulations that are as good or better than models forced using traditional weather gauging stations data (Fuka et al., 2014). This data has been obtained for
Lesotho and the locations of the CFSR station are shown in Figure 6 located at the beginning of this section. Each CFSR station is denoted with a ‘C’ followed by a number.

### 3.2.5 Future Climate Data

Future climate projections were obtained from the Coordinated Regional Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX) dataset. This data includes precipitation, min/max temperature, relative humidity, solar radiation, and wind speed on a daily timescale. CORDEX are regionally downscaled climate models established by the World Climate Research Program (WCRP) (Lennard et al., 2015). The RCPs chosen for study were 4.5 and 8.5. The RCPs are described in further detail in (Moss et al., 2010). The models in this study were also chosen based on their location in the family tree, which indicates the similarity among models (Knutti et al., 2013). The models chosen are relatively independent based on their location in the tree. (Pierce et al., 2009) showed that regardless of the GCMs selected based on the quality of their simulation in the region of interest, the results do not provide systematically different results then choosing models randomly. They found that using a multi model ensemble is superior to using any one model. After approximately five models, the model skill asymptotes meaning adding more models does not significantly change the accuracy of the results.

GCMs are used to generate large scale climate scenarios. When performing an impact assessment on a smaller region, it is necessary to downscale the outputs from the GCMs. This is due to scale related sensitivities. GCMs that are not downscaled do not accurately capture weather events on a regional scale. CORDEX data provides downscaled GCM data that was used in this study. The GCMs chosen from the CORDEX database were ICEHC-EC-EARTH, MIROC-MICROC5, and CCCma-CanESM2. Each of the GCMs were downscaled using the
RCA4 model developed by the Swedish Mereological and Hydrological Institute (Kjellstrom et al.)

The bias correction chosen for this study is the distribution mapping method. This method is found throughout literature and has been given many names including ‘probability mapping’ (Block Paul et al., 2009, Ines and Hansen, 2006), ‘quantile-quantile mapping’ (Boé et al., 2007, Johnson and Sharma, 2011, Piani et al., 2010), and ‘histogram equalization’ (Rojas et al., 2011, Sennikovs and Bthers, 2009). Distribution mapping is done by creating a transfer function to shift the occurrence distributions of precipitation and temperature (Sennikovs and Bthers, 2009). For precipitation events the Gamma distribution (Thom, 1958) with shape parameter $\alpha$ and scale parameter $\beta$ is assumed to be suitable. $x$ is the normalized daily precipitation and thepdf is the probability density function.

\[
pdf(x) = \frac{\frac{-x}{\beta} \cdot x^{\alpha-1}}{\beta^\alpha \cdot \Gamma(\alpha)}; x \geq 0; \alpha, \beta > 0 \tag{4}
\]

This methodology has been used in multiple studies to analyze precipitation data (Block Paul et al., 2009, Boé et al., 2007, Ines and Hansen, 2006, Johnson and Sharma, 2011, Piani et al., 2009, Piani et al., 2010). The shape parameter, $\alpha$, controls the profile of the distribution. If $\alpha<1$ this indicates an exponentially shaped Gamma distribution which is asymptotic at both axes. If $\alpha=1$ this is a special case and characterizes an exponential distribution. If $\alpha>1$ the shape is a skewed unimodal distribution curve. The scale parameter, $\beta$, determines the dispersion of the Gamma distribution (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012). If $\beta$ is small it leads to a more compressed distribution which has lower probabilities of extreme events. Whereas if $\beta$ is larger this causes a stretched distribution and shows higher probabilities of extreme events.
In order to create a transfer function $y = f(x)$, where $x$ and $y$ are the simulated and corrected values of precipitation respectively, and such that the distribution of $y$ matches that of the observations, the cumulative distribution function is plotted (Piani et al., 2009). The Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) is defined in equation 5.

$$CDF(x) = \int_0^x \frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{\beta^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha)} dx' + CDF(0) \quad (5)$$

$CDF(0)$ is the fraction of days with no precipitation. The transfer function of $y = f(x)$ will obey the equation: $CDF_{obs}(f(x)) = CDF_{sim}(x)$. Figure 8 shows a graphical representation of the process using a synthetic data set.

![Figure 8](image)

Figure 8: The Probability Density Function (PDF) (a) and Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) (b) of a synthetic data set. Obs and sim are the observed and simulated data respectively. The CDF is obtained by integrating the PDF in a. The transfer function is obtained by solving: $CDF_{obs}(f(x)) = CDF_{sim}(x)$ in b.
Temperature is mapped similarly with a transfer function. Temperature is assumed to fit the Gaussian distribution in equation 6.

\[ f_N(x|\mu, \delta^2) = x^{(\alpha-1)} \cdot \frac{1}{\delta \sqrt{2\pi}} \cdot e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\delta^2}} ; x \in \mathbb{R} \]  

(6)

where \( \mu \) is the location parameter and \( \delta \) is the scaling parameter. The scale parameter, \( \delta \), determines the standard deviation which shows how much the Gaussian distribution is stretched or compressed. The location parameter, \( \mu \), is the mean and determines the location of the distribution. The transfer function is derived in a similar fashion to the precipitation, where the CDF is computed by integrating the Gaussian distribution and solving for \( CDF_{obs}(f(x)) = CDF_{sim}(x) \).

The distribution mapping method was chosen because it gave the best correction results when compared against the linear scaling, local intensity scaling, power transformation and variance scaling methodologies (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012).

The software used to bias correct the data was the tool called CMhyd. CMhyd is a tool that has many bias correction methodologies. Teutschbein and Seibert (2012) provide a review of the bias correction methodologies included in CMhyd.

3.2.6 Limitations of Data

It is important to note the limitations of the data used in this study. Lesotho is a small developing country, and as such publicly available data were limited in their capacity to produce accurate results. Any results elucidated from this study should be looked at with the knowledge of its limitations and should only be used to guide water policy or water resource allocation with much caution.
3.2.6.1 Limitations of SWAT Input Data

The sources of the main SWAT inputs were described in Sections 3.2.1-3.2.5. The limitations of those inputs are presented in Table 4. The soils map obtained from Food and Agricultural Organization is a global soil map since a soils map of Lesotho could not be found. The global soil map is very coarse, and does not show all of the soil types within Lesotho. There are five main soil types prevalent in Lesotho, and the FAO map only provides data on three. The land use map obtained from the RCMRD Geoportal is not up to date. The map presents land use in Lesotho in the year 2014. It also has land use classifications that are not within the SWAT land use classification database. While many of the RCMRD land use classifications could match with the appropriate SWAT classification, there was one RCMRD classification labeled ‘Otherland’ that could not be appropriately matched within the SWAT classification database. The author attempted to contact the map producer but was unable to obtain clarification on what ‘Otherland’ was and had to make a best estimation. The term ‘Otherland’ was approximately 3% of the total land use and was reclassified as ‘South Western Range’. This choice was made based on the land use that was already classified, the land use that was missing, and the author’s knowledge of Lesotho. The author lived in Lesotho for 2 years as a Peace Corps volunteer and traveled around the country.

CFSR weather data were used in lieu of observed weather data as stated previously. While observed weather data was available for some parts of Lesotho, it was missing several months, and sometimes years of data. The observed weather stations overlapped with the CFSR virtual stations in five locations within Lesotho. A Kruskal-Wallace test was performed to evaluate whether there was a significant difference between the precipitation data at these locations.
Of the five locations, two of them reported as having a significant difference between the data sets. This suggests the CFSR data set does not accurately capture precipitation events at all parts of Lesotho, but due to lack of available data the CFSR data was used.

Table 4: Limitations of Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) input data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map</td>
<td>Food and Agricultural Organization</td>
<td>This is a global soil map and the resolution for the Senqu River basin is coarse. This map doesn't accurately capture all the soil variety within the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Map</td>
<td>RCMRD Geoportal (<a href="http://geoportal.rcmrd.org">http://geoportal.rcmrd.org</a>)</td>
<td>This land use map is from 2014 and some of the land use types could not be found within the SWAT land use classification system. The term 'Otherland' within the land use map also was subject to the author's best estimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>Climate Forecast System Reanalysis (CFSR)</td>
<td>CFSR weather data was used in lieu of observed weather data. CFSR data was significantly different in some locations than the observed weather data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.6.2 Limitations of Global Climate Model Data

As discussed previously, there have been limited SWAT studies evaluating the impact of climate change in Southern Africa. GCMs and RCMs such as the HadRM3P are prevalent for developed countries such as the United States (Mote et al., 2015). The CORDEX-Africa project provides 10 RCMs for the Africa region. The choice of GCM for the study region can have an impact on the future SWAT projections. The CORDEX-Africa GCMs were all able to simulate the seasonal mean and annual cycle accurately across Africa, but in some locations individual models can exhibit significant biases in some sub-regions and seasons (Nikulin et al., 2012). A common problem within a majority of the CORDEX-Africa GCMs is precipitation events occurring too early during the diurnal cycle.
It is recommended and has been shown that using a multi-model average helps offset climate variability errors within individual models and produces climate events similar to observation data (Pierce et al., 2009). However, using a multi-model ensemble does not correct the systematic bias in the precipitation during the diurnal cycle (Nikulin et al., 2012). This study used a multi-model ensemble as well as individual models, but because of the lack of studies within the region, the GCMs chosen for the study may not produce as accurate of results if other GCMs had been chosen.

3.2.7 Calibration and Validation

The Sequential Uncertainty Fitting (SUFI-2) algorithm (Abbaspour et al., 2004, Abbaspour et al., 2006) within SWAT-CUP (Abbaspour, 2011) was used for model calibration, validation, sensitivity, and uncertainty analysis. SUFI-2 utilizes an objective function to capture the majority of observed data within a 95% prediction uncertainty (95PPU) in an iterative process. The Nash-Sutcliffe (NS) objective function was chosen for this study. The 95PPU is calculated at the 2.5% and 97.5% level of the cumulative distribution of output variables obtained through Latin hypercube sampling. With each iteration the 95PPU gets smaller. The model was ran for 1000 simulations for 5 iterations. After each iteration of 1000 simulations, the program adjusted the input parameters.

Two statistics known as the P-factor and the R-factor are used to quantify the fit between the 95PPU and the observed variable. The P-factor is the percentage of observed data enveloped by the model and the R-factor is the thickness of the 95PPU envelope. The larger they are the better the 95PPU fit. It is recommended a P-factor > 70% and a R-factor close to 1 for streamflow (Abbaspour, 2011). Other common statistics used to measure the goodness of fit of the calibrated/validated model are the Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) and coefficient of
determination ($R^2$), Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency (NSE), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE), RMSE-observations standard deviation ratio (RSR), and Percent Bias (PBIAS). The statistics used to measure the goodness of fit in this study were the NSE, RSR, and PBIAS. Although the $R^2$ value is given by SWAT-CUP, it was not used as a determining statistic for this model evaluation. The $R^2$ statistic is oversensitive to outliers and insensitive to additive and proportional differences and has not been recommended to be used to determine the goodness of fit for hydraulic models (Legates and McCabe, 1999).

The NSE is provided in equation 7 and is a normalized statistic that determines the relative magnitude of the residual variance compared to the measured data variance (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970). $Y_{i}^{obs}$ is the $i$th observation for the observed dataset being evaluated, $Y_{i}^{sim}$ is the $i$th simulated value for the modeled dataset, $Y_{i}^{mean}$ is the mean of the observed dataset, and $n$ is the total number of observations.

$$NSE = \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i}^{obs} - Y_{i}^{sim})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i}^{obs} - Y_{i}^{mean})^2} \right]$$

(7)

The NSE ranges from $-\infty$ to 1, where 1 is the optimal value. If the NSE value is negative, it means the mean of the observed data set is a better predictor of the observed data than the simulated value, which is not acceptable. The NSE has been used in several hydrological studies, and Servat and Dezetter (1991) found the NSE to be the best objective function for reflecting the overall fit of a hydrograph. The generally accepted range of NSE values is provided by (Moriasi et al., 2007) and are in Table 5.

The PBIAS provided in equation 8, measures the average tendency of the simulated data to be larger or smaller than their observed counterparts (Gupta Hoshin et al., 1999). The variables in the given equation are the same as in the NSE equation.
The best value for the PBIAS is zero, where a low magnitude indicates accurate model simulation. The PBIAS is used in this study because 1) It was recommended by the American Society of Civil Engineers (Asce, 1993), and 2) it has the ability to clearly indicate poor model performance (Moriasi et al., 2007).

The RSR provided in equation 9 is calculated as the ratio of the RMSE and the standard deviation. The RSR standardizes the RMSE using the observation’s standard deviation.

\[
RSR = \frac{RMSE}{STDEV_{obs}} = \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_{i}^{obs} - Y_{i}^{sim})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_{i}^{obs} - Y_{i}^{mean})^2} \right]^{1/2}
\]  

(9)

The RSR has an optimal value of 0, which indicates a perfect model simulation. The RSR was chosen because it is a common statistic used in error index statistics and is a clear indicator of model performance (Moriasi et al., 2007).

Table 5: General performance ratings for recommended statistics for a monthly time step (Moriasi et al., 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>RSR</th>
<th>NSE</th>
<th>PBIAS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>0.00≤RSR≤0.50</td>
<td>0.75&lt;NSE≤1.00</td>
<td>PBIAS &lt; ±10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0.50&lt;RSR≤0.60</td>
<td>0.65&lt;NSE≤0.75</td>
<td>±10 ≤ PBIAS &lt; ±15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>0.60&lt;RSR≤0.70</td>
<td>0.50&lt;NSE≤0.65</td>
<td>±15 ≤ PBIAS &lt; ±25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>RSR&gt;0.7</td>
<td>NSE≤0.50</td>
<td>PBIAS ≥ ±25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three streamflow gauging stations were calibrated for the period given in Table 6. The two upstream streamflow gauges, SG5, and SG17, were calibrated from 1986 to 2002. The downstream streamflow gauge, SG3 was calibrated from 1985 to 2002 and validated from 2003 to 2013.
Table 6: Calibration and validation periods for streamflow gauging stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Calibration Period</th>
<th>Validation Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG3</td>
<td>1985-2002</td>
<td>2003-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG5</td>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG17</td>
<td>1985-1990</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration Analysis

An Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration analysis is a common tool used to evaluate whether dams impact the hydrologic characteristics of a river basin (Cochrane et al., 2014, Timpe and Kaplan, 2017). An Indicators of Hydrologic analysis was performed in this study to determine the impact of the Katse and Mohale dams on the flow of the river at the three gauging stations. Flow duration curves were created for each station for pre-dam and post-dam analysis. A Kruskal-Wallace test was performed on each flow duration curve to determine if there was a significant difference in change of streamflow between pre and post dam construction. The null hypothesis of the Kruskal-Wallace test assumes the two sets of data are not significantly different. If the calculated p-value is less than 0.05 ($p<0.05$) the null hypothesis can be rejected.

3.4 Water Scarcity

Blue water scarcity provided in equation 10 was defined as the ratio of the blue water footprint in the basin to the blue water available in that basin (Hoekstra et al., 2011).

$$BW_{scarcity}(x,t) = \frac{BW_{footprint}(x,t)}{BW_{available}(x,t)}$$

The blue water footprint, $BW_{footprint}(x,t)$, of human activities is defined as “the volume of surface and groundwater consumed as a result of that activity, whereby consumption refers to the volume of freshwater used and then evaporated or incorporated into a product” (Hoekstra et al., 2012). $BW_{available}$ is the amount of water that is available for use for a specific location (x) at time of year (t). Not all of the water that resides within the river is available for use.
Hence, the definition of $BW_{\text{available}}$ is the amount of water that can be abstracted without affecting the ecology of the river. The amount of water needed by the river to maintain its ecology is known as the Environmental Flow Requirement (EFR). The EFR of the Senqu river is unknown, hence the presumptive standard method will be used (Richter et al., 2012). The presumptive standard method assumes that 20% of the natural monthly mean flow can be allocated for consumptive use. It has been used in similar previous studies in calculating water availability when the EFR of a river was unknown (Hoekstra et al., 2012, Rodrigues et al., 2014). Hoekstra et al. (2012) used the presumptive method when evaluating the water availability of the Senqu river within South Africa. EFR is represented in equation 11.

$$EFR_{x,t} = 0.8 \cdot Q_{\text{mean}(x,t)} \quad (11)$$

where $Q_{\text{mean}(x,t)}$ is the long term monthly mean, for a specific location (x) at time of year (t). In this study, $Q_{\text{mean}(x,t)}$ is defined as the streamflow at the SG3 location. The term $BW_{\text{available}}$ is then computed in equation 12.

$$BW_{\text{available}} = Q_{(x,t)} - EFR_{x,t} \quad (12)$$

Hoekstra et al. (2012) measures the blue water footprint of water basins by converting the data from the National Water Footprint Report (Mekonnen and Hoekstra, 2011). The National Water Footprint Report gives the blue water footprints of individual countries. Hoekstra et al. (2012) converts this data into Blue Water Footprints by basins. This report will use the original data from the National Water Footprint Report and use the data to measure the Blue Water Scarcity of Lesotho.
This study calculated the Blue Water Scarcity on a yearly basis. The SWAT output provided the Blue Water Available from the SG3 river basin outlet. The Blue Water Footprint was assumed to be constant for the future scenarios. What this study answers, is given Lesotho’s water footprint, how will future climate change scenarios impact Lesotho’s blue water scarcity. The degree of blue water scarcity was divided into four categories as provided by Hoekstra and Mekonnen (2012):

- **Low blue water scarcity** (<100%): the blue water footprint is lower than 20% of natural runoff and does not exceed blue water availability; river runoff is unmodified or slightly modified; presumed environmental flow requirements are not violated.
- **Moderate blue water scarcity** (100–150%): the blue water footprint is between 20 and 30% of natural runoff; runoff is moderately modified; environmental flow requirements are not met.
- **Significant blue water scarcity** (150–200%): the blue water footprint is between 30 and 40% of natural runoff; runoff is significantly modified; environmental flow requirements are not met.
- **Severe water scarcity** (>200%). The monthly blue water footprint exceeds 40% of natural runoff; runoff is seriously modified; environmental flow requirements are not met.

The latest global water footprint analysis provides Lesotho’s blue water footprint to be 2850 million m$^3$/year (Wang and Zimmerman, 2016). This is the blue water footprint for the entirety of Lesotho. Since the Senqu river basin is approximately two-thirds the size of Lesotho, it would not be accurate to judge Lesotho’s level of water scarcity on its entire footprint. Three scenarios were used which evaluate the water footprint based on population.
The first scenario was a conservative outlook which evaluated the entire country assuming that the Senqu River basin is the sole source of water. Hence the entire water footprint of Lesotho was used. The second scenario took the national blue water footprint and divided by the total population of Lesotho to obtain a per capita water footprint. The modified water footprint was obtained by multiplying per capita water footprint by the population within the Senqu basin. The third scenario used the per capita blue water footprint and multiplied by the projected population growth per year. This provided a water footprint that increased yearly with expected population growth. The economic status of Lesotho was assumed to remain constant, and the increased blue water demand due to population growth was evaluated. Scenario 3 evaluated water scarcity over the entirety of Lesotho similar to Scenario 1. This was done because it is not known in which areas of Lesotho the population would increase. The projected population increase from 2020 to 2100 is presented in Figure 9.
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Figure 9: Projected population increase in Lesotho from 2020 to 2100. Data obtained from the World Population Review (Lesotho Population, 2018).
The projected population growth rate was obtained from the World Population Review online database (Lesotho Population, 2018). The population of Lesotho is expected to reach approximately 3.9 million people by 2100.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Bias Correction

Each GCM station was downscaled using the same RCA4 method and had the same spatial location within Lesotho. Each downscaled GCM is henceforth referred to as RCM. Each RCM precipitation and min/max temperature were bias-corrected using the CDF mapping procedure. Figure 10 shows the results of the ICHEC CDF mapping procedure for precipitation while Figures 11 and 12 show CDF mapping for min and max temperatures respectively at RCM station 1. Only the ICHEC bias corrected data are shown below for the first station. The bias correction methodology corrects all of the RCM models at each station in the same way. It is not necessary to graphically represent each RCM result.

Figure 10: ICHEC precipitation Cumulative Distribution Function mapping results for station 1. ICHEC-BC-1 refers to the bias-corrected Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.
Figure 11: ICHEC minimum temperature Cumulative Distribution Function mapping results for station 1. ICHEC-BC-1 refers to the bias-corrected Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.

![ICHEC-Tmin-RCM1](image1)

The term ICHEC-BC-1 refers to the bias-corrected RCM data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the CFSR weather data at location C1. The bias correction was successful in correcting the raw RCM CDF to match the CFSR weather data. The bias-corrected precipitation and temperature results now reproduce the daily mean and the standard deviation on a monthly basis of the CFSR data set shown in Figures 13 through 16.
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Figure 13: Monthly mean precipitation results for ICHEC bias correction. ICHEC-BC-1 refers to the bias-corrected Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbiased-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.

The CDF mapping helped to correct the mean monthly precipitation as presented in Figure 13. The ICHEC-RAW-1 data was greater over simulating the amount of precipitation for every month. After CDF mapping, the ICHEC-BC-1 matches the CFSR-1 precipitation.

Figure 14: Monthly standard deviation precipitation results for ICHEC bias correction. ICHEC-BC-1 refers to the bias-corrected Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbiased-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.

Figure 14 demonstrates that before CDF mapping, the raw RCM monthly standard deviation of precipitation, ICHEC-RAW-1, was much greater than the CFSR-1.
After CDF mapping, the bias corrected data, ICHEC-BC-1, much more closely matches CFSR-1. It is not an exact match in all instances, but it is much more representative of the precipitation in the region.
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Figure 15: Monthly mean maximum temperature results for ICHEC bias correction. Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.

Figure 15 demonstrates that before CDF mapping, the raw RCM mean monthly maximum temperature, ICHEC-RAW-1, was significantly less than the CFSR-1. After CDF mapping, the bias corrected data, ICHEC-BC-1, much more closely matches CFSR-1.

![Graph showing mean monthly minimum temperature results for ICHEC bias correction.](image)

Figure 16: Monthly mean minimum temperature results for ICHEC bias correction. Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.
Figure 16 demonstrates that before CDF mapping, the raw RCM mean monthly minimum temperature, ICHEC-RAW-1, was similar to CFSR-1. Minimum temperature didn’t have much variance and didn’t differ from the CFSR. After CDF mapping, the bias corrected data, ICHEC-BC-1, matches CFSR-1.
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Figure 17: Monthly standard deviation of maximum temperature results for ICHEC bias correction. Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the unbias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.

Figure 17 demonstrates that before CDF mapping, the raw RCM standard deviation of mean maximum temperature, ICHEC-RAW-1, was significantly less than CFSR-1. ICHEC-RAW-1 matched CFSR-1 between July and August. The overall shape of ICHEC-RAW-1 closely resembles CFSR-1. After CDF mapping, the bias corrected data, ICHEC-BC-1, much more closely matches CFSR-1.
Figure 18: Monthly standard deviation of minimum temperature results for ICHEC bias correction. Regional Climate Model (RCM) data at location R1, ICHEC-RAW-1 refers to the un-bias-corrected RCM weather data at location R1, and CFSR-1 refers to the Climate Forecast System Reanalysis weather data at location C1.

Figure 18 demonstrates that before CDF mapping, the raw RCM standard deviation of mean minimum temperature, ICHEC-RAW-1, did not resemble CFSR-1. ICHEC-RAW-1 was similar in value to CFSR-1 between January and May, then was significantly less than CFSR-1 between June and July. After CDF mapping, the bias corrected data, ICHEC-BC-1, much more closely matches CFSR-1.

### 4.1.2 Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration Results

The Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration analysis was performed for all three gauging stations, SG5, SG17 and SG3. The generated flow duration curves and subsequent Kruskal-Wallace test for pre and post dam periods demonstrated that for SG5 and SG17 a significant difference in streamflow occurred while SG3 was not significantly impacted by the construction of the dams. This is thought to be due to the SG3 station being significantly downstream of both of the dams. The flow duration curve along with the p-value statistic for SG5, SG17, and SG3 are shown in Figures 19, 20, and 21 respectively.
Figure 19: Flow Duration Curve displaying impact of the Katse dam on streamflow at the SG-5 gauging station as well as the Kruskal-Wallace p-statistic. The p-statistic is less than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is rejected and the flows are determined to be significantly different.

The flow duration curve displayed in Figure 19 shows the impact of the Katse dam on streamflow gauge SG-5 over a pre-impact and post-impact period of 13 years. High flows do not appear to be impacted by the dam, however, low flows that occur at least 60% of the time appear to be significantly different. The post-impact period has a higher flow rate on flows that occur at between 60% and 100% of the time. The Kruskal-Wallace test produced a p-statistic of $7.7 \times 10^{-4}$ which signifies the null hypothesis may be rejected and the flows are significantly different.

Figure 20: Flow Duration Curve displaying impact of the Mohale dam on streamflow at the SG-17 gauging station as well as the Kruskal-Wallace p-statistic. The p-statistic is less than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is rejected and the flows are determined to be significantly different.

The flow duration curve displayed in Figure 19 shows the impact of the Katse dam on streamflow gauge SG-5 over a pre-impact and post-impact period of 13 years. High flows do not appear to be impacted by the dam, however, low flows that occur at least 60% of the time appear to be significantly different. The post-impact period has a higher flow rate on flows that occur at between 60% and 100% of the time. The Kruskal-Wallace test produced a p-statistic of $7.7 \times 10^{-4}$ which signifies the null hypothesis may be rejected and the flows are significantly different.
flow duration curve displayed in Figure 20 shows the displays of the Mohale dam on streamflow gauge SG-17 over a pre-impact and post-impact period of 10 years. Both the probability of high and low flows appears to be significantly different. The pre-impact period has a higher flow rate between 0% and 60% exceedance probability. The post-impact period has higher flow rate between 60% and 100% exceedance probability. The Kruskal-Wallace test produced a p-statistic of 6.98x10^{-33} which signifies the null hypothesis may be rejected and the flows are significantly different.

![Flow Duration Curve](image)

Figure 21: Flow Duration Curve displaying impact of the Katse and Mohale dam on streamflow at the SG-3 gauging station as well as the Kruskal-Wallace p-statistic. The p-statistic is greater than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis is not rejected and the flows are not determined to be significantly different.

The flow duration curve displayed in Figure 21 displays the impact of the Katse, and Mohale dam on streamflow gauge SG-3 over a pre-impact and post-impact period of 7 years. The pre-impact and post-impact period have a similar flow rate between 0% and 80% exceedance probability. The post-impact period has higher flow rate between 80% and 100% exceedance probability. The Kruskal-Wallace test produced a p-statistic of 0.04 which signifies the null hypothesis may not be rejected and the flows are not significantly different.
4.1.3 Calibration and Validation Results

A global sensitivity analysis was performed to identify the parameters stream flow was sensitive to. Overall, seven parameters were found to be most important: Snow fall temperature (SUB_SFTMP), precipitation lapse rate (PLAPS), temperature lapse rate (TLAPS), groundwater delay time (GW_DELAY), Soil evaporation compensation factor (ESCO), the SCS curve number (CN2), and the hydraulic conductivity (CH_K2). A complete description of all the SWAT parameters can be found in the SWAT user manual (Arnold et al., 2002).

Table 7 provides a list of these parameters and their descriptions, as well as the final minimum and maximum values used for calibration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v_SUB_SFTMP.sno</td>
<td>Snow fall temperature</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_PLAPS.sub</td>
<td>Precipitation lapse rate</td>
<td>mm/km</td>
<td>71.68</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_TLAPS.sub</td>
<td>Temperature lapse rate</td>
<td>C/km</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_GW_DELAY.gw</td>
<td>Groundwater delay time</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>230.4</td>
<td>491.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_ESCO.hru</td>
<td>SCS runoff curve number for moisture condition II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r_CN2.mgt</td>
<td>Effective hydraulic conductivity in the main channel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_CH_K2.rte</td>
<td></td>
<td>mm/h</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>369.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG5 and SG17 were calibrated first between the years of 1985 and 1990. These are the years before construction of the dams began. Because specific information regarding the design of the dams were unknown, they could not be simulated within ArcSWAT. The results of the Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration showed that the dams significantly altered the streamflow at the SG5 and SG17 gauge station, thus they were only calibrated for the years before dam construction and not validated. SG3 was not significantly impacted by dam construction and was used for calibration pre-dam construction and for validation post-dam construction.
The results of their calibration statistics are shown in Table 8 as well as Figures 22 and 23 respectively. SG5 and SG17 were only calibrated and not validated due to the lack of available data on the dam specifications. After SG5 and SG17 were calibrated their parameters were held steady and SG3 was calibrated. SG3 was calibrated from 1985-2002 and validated from 2003-2013. The results of the calibration and validation are shown in Figure 24.

Table 8: Calibration and validation statistics for the three streamflow gauges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calibration</th>
<th>Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG5</td>
<td>SG17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIAS</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSR</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calibration statistics for each of the stations varied in performance. The NSE value for SG5 was in the unsatisfactory range. This is due to the model’s inability to simulate extreme events accurately. The NSE is also sensitive to outlying flows. Another reason for poor performance could be due to the lower number of observed data available for SG5 as compared to the other two stations. The NSE for SG17 and SG3 both fell into the satisfactory performance range. The PBIAS for SG5 and both SG3 calibration and validation were in the very good performance range while SG17 fell into the good range. This indicates an accurate model simulation when comparing the simulated values to the observed data. The RSR was in the unsatisfactory range for SG17, but in the satisfactory range for SG5 and SG3.
Figure 22: Calibration results for the SG5 streamflow gauge station.

Figure 23: Calibration results for the SG17 streamflow gauge station.
Figure 24: Calibration and validation results for the SG3 streamflow gauge station.
4.1.4 Climate Change Impact on Precipitation

After the SWAT model was calibrated and validated, the bias-corrected weather inputs for each RCM was inputted into the model. An average model ensemble was also inputted into the model by averaging the weather inputs of each RCM and it is denoted as Ensemble. The relative changes in precipitation and streamflow for each of the RCPs were analyzed based on the wet and dry seasons in Lesotho. The wet season is from October to April and the dry season is from May to September. The study period of 2020 to 2100 was broken into two periods denoted as mid-century and late-century. Mid-century is denoted from 2020-2060 and late-century is denoted from 2061-2100. Table 9 shows the relative precipitation change when compared to the respective model historic period (1979-2005).

Table 9: Relative changes in average precipitation for each Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) during the wet season (Oct-Apr) and dry season (May-Sept). Mid-Century refers to the years 2020-2060 and late-century refers to 2061-2100. The highlighted figures in each column denote significant differences between the RCPs. The different colors for the MIROC model indicate which numbers should be compared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICHEC</th>
<th>MIROC</th>
<th>CCCma</th>
<th>Ensemble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wet - RCP4.5 (Mid-Century)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry - RCP4.5 (Mid-Century)</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wet - RCP4.5 (Late-Century)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry - RCP4.5 (Late-Century)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wet - RCP8.5 (Mid-Century)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry - RCP8.5 (Mid-Century)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wet - RCP8.5 (Late-Century)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry - RCP8.5 (Late-Century)</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of precipitation change varied between the wet and dry seasons. The results varied depending on the RCM used. Typically, 3 of the 4 RCM outputs agreed on an overall increase or decrease in precipitation. An increase in three of the model outputs for the wet season in both the mid and late century in RCP 4.5.
There was a decrease in the overall precipitation during the dry period in the RCP 4.5 during the mid-century and an increase in precipitation during the late century.

RCP 8.5 produced similar trends in precipitation change as RCP 4.5. The largest differences between RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 are highlighted in the table. For example, the ICHEC-RCP 4.5 model scenario resulted in a decrease of 13% in precipitation for the mid-century dry period, while the ICHEC-RCP 8.5 model resulted in an increase of 16% during the mid-century dry period. The different colors for the MIROC RCM indicate which numbers should be compared. Figures 25 and 26 show the average monthly relative precipitation change for RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 respectively.

The average monthly percent change in precipitation for RCP 4.5 is presented in Figure 25. The mid-century had a tendency to decrease in precipitation for all the RCMs. The late-century experienced an overall decrease to precipitation in the beginning of the year and an increase from September to December. The MIROC RCM showed the greatest increase in precipitation (104%) during September in the late-century.

The average monthly percent change in precipitation for RCP 8.5 is presented in Figure 26. The percent change fluctuated between increasing and decreasing for all the climate models during the mid-century. The ICEC RCM saw the greatest increase during August of the mid-century. The late century experienced an average decrease in precipitation until September where it increased through December.
Figure 25: Average Monthly Percent Change in Precipitation for Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5 for both mid-century (2020-2060) and late-century (2061-2100). Mid-century had a tendency to decrease in precipitation. The late-century experienced an overall decrease to precipitation in the beginning of the year and an increase from September to December.
Figure 26: Average Monthly Precipitation Percent Change for Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 for both mid-century (2020-2060) and late-century (2061-2100). The percent change fluctuated between increasing and decreasing for all the climate models during the mid-century. The late century experienced a decrease in precipitation until September where it increased through December.
4.1.5 Projected Blue Water Yield (Streamflow)

The average relative change in streamflow for the wet and dry seasons of each RCP is presented in Table 10. Just as the relative change in precipitation was compared to the historic period, the relative change in streamflow was compared in the same way. Mid-century and late-century are defined the same way as in the previous section.

Table 10: Relative change in streamflow for wet season (Oct-Apr) and dry season (May-Sept) for each Representative Concentration Pathway. Mid-Century refers to the years 2020-2060 and late-century refers to 2061-2100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCP</th>
<th>Wet</th>
<th>Dry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCP4.5</td>
<td>ICHEC</td>
<td>MIROC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Century</td>
<td>-42%</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-Century</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>-42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP8.5</td>
<td>ICHEC</td>
<td>MIROC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Century</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late-Century</td>
<td>-39%</td>
<td>-56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Each RCM was compared to its respective historic reference baseflow period. The historic reference baseflow period is from 1979-2005. Each RCM showed a significant decrease in streamflow for each RCP. The larger decreases in streamflow occurred during the dry season for both RCPs. There was not a large difference in percent change in streamflow between RCP4.5 and RCP8.5. Figures 27 and 28 show the average monthly percent changes in streamflow for RCP 4.5 and 8.5 respectively. There is not a large difference in the average monthly streamflow between the two periods (2020-2060 and 2061-2100). There is only one instance where there is a positive change in streamflow for both the RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 periods and that is produced by the CCCma RCM. The CCCma produced a positive change in average January streamflow in the late century.
Figure 27: Average Monthly Percent Change in Streamflow Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5 for both mid-century (2020-2060) and late-century (2061-2100). Both periods experienced a negative decrease in streamflow. The CCCma model saw a brief increase in streamflow for January in the late century.
Figure 28: Average Monthly Streamflow Percent Change for Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5 for both mid-century (2020-2060) and late-century (2061-2100). Both periods experienced a negative decrease in streamflow. The CCCma model saw a brief increase in streamflow for January in the late century.
The average monthly percent change in streamflow for RCP 4.5 is presented in Figure 27. The percent change fluctuated between increasing and decreasing for all the climate models during the mid-century. Both periods experienced a negative decrease in streamflow for all the RCMs. The only increase in streamflow was simulated by the CCCma model for January (4%) during the late century. The average monthly percent change in streamflow for RCP 8.5 is presented in Figure 28. The percent change fluctuated between increasing and decreasing for all the climate models during the mid-century. Both periods experienced a negative decrease in streamflow for all the RCMs. The only increase in streamflow was simulated by the CCCma model for January (9%) during the late century.

4.1.6 Water Scarcity Analysis

4.1.6.1 Historic Water Scarcity

The historic water scarcity spanning the years 1979-2005 is displayed in Figure 29.

Figure 29: Historic water scarcity from 1979-2005. The observed water scarcity was calculated using observed streamflow.
The historic water scarcity was calculated by adjusting the national blue water footprint to represent the population during the respective year. The historic national blue water footprint was estimated by multiplying the national water footprint per capita (1519 m³ yr⁻¹ per person) by the population of the nation during the appropriate year. All of the RCMs in Figure 29 have very low water scarcity as compared with the estimated water scarcity based on the observed streamflow data. The historic water scarcity showed two instances of significant water scarcity in 1983 and 1984, and one instance of moderate water scarcity in 1992. The years of water scarcity in the historical water scarcity match the years Lesotho faced drought, documented for the years 1983, 1990, and 2002 (Masih et al., 2014). The RCMs failed to capture the extreme climate events that resulted in drought occurrence. This is not uncommon as RCMs have difficulty capturing and replicating historical extreme weather events (Panaou et al., 2018). This increases uncertainty in their ability to capture future extreme weather events.

### 4.1.6.2 Future Water Scarcity

Water scarcity was calculated using the water footprint in three scenarios. Scenario 1 assumes the Senqu river basin is the sole source of blue water available, and the entire national blue water footprint of 2850 million m³ yr⁻¹ is used in the calculation of water scarcity. The water footprint for scenario 2 was calculated as 1425 million m³ yr⁻¹, which is estimated as the product of the water footprint per capita (1519 m³ yr⁻¹ per person) and the population living in the water basin. The water footprint for scenario 3 was calculated by using the water footprint per capita (1519 m³ yr⁻¹ per person) and multiplying by the projected population of Lesotho through 2100. Figures 30 – 33 display the results of the water scarcity analysis for scenario 1 on an annual basis.
Figure 30: Water Scarcity Scenario 1 mid-century (2020-2060) for Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5. Scenario 1 assumes the Senqu river basin is the sole source of blue water available, and the entire national blue water footprint is used in the calculation of water scarcity.

Figure 31: Water Scarcity Scenario 1 late century (2061-2100) for Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5. Scenario 1 assumes the Senqu river basin is the sole source of blue water available, and the entire national blue water footprint is used in the calculation of water scarcity.
There were no water scarcity measurements above 100% for RCP 4.5 for both the mid and late century time periods. This indicates low blue water scarcity for the period. The MIROC RCM produced the water scarcity measurement of 93% during the year 2044. The ICHEC, MIROC, and Ensemble each produced a similar peak in water scarcity in the years 2060, 2066, and 2078.

Figure 32: Water Scarcity Scenario 1 mid-century (2020-2060) for Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. Scenario 1 assumes the Senqu river basin is the sole source of blue water available, and the entire national blue water footprint is used in the calculation of water scarcity.
Figure 33: Water Scarcity Scenario 1 late-century (2061-2100) for Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. Scenario 1 assumes the Senqu river basin is the sole source of blue water available, and the entire national blue water footprint is used in the calculation of water scarcity.

RCP 8.5 produced four years in total that the water scarcity was above 100%. The MIROC model produced a value of 104% in 2028 and 101% in 2088. The CCCma model produced a value of 111% in 2030 and 101% in 2063. Values between 100% and 150% represent the blue water availability is exceeded and the environmental flow requirements of the stream are not met.

The results for scenario 2 have significantly lower water scarcity measurements than scenario 1. The time series graphs for scenario 2 are presented in Figures 34-37. There were only 2 years in mid-century RCP 8.5 where the water scarcity measurement was above 50% but no measurement exceeded 60%.
Figure 34: Water Scarcity Scenario 2 mid-century (2020-2060) for Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5. Scenario 2 is a modified national water footprint using only the population within the Senqu basin.

The MIROC RCM within Figure 34 produced the highest incidence of water scarcity of 47% in 2044. All the values fell within low water scarcity.

Figure 35: Water Scarcity Scenario 2 late-century (2061-2100) Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5. Scenario 2 is a modified national water footprint using only the population within the Senqu basin.
Figure 36: Water Scarcity Scenario 2 mid-century (2020-2060) Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. Scenario 2 is a modified national water footprint using only the population within the Senqu basin.

Figure 37: Water Scarcity Scenario 2 late-century (2061-2100) Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. Scenario 2 is a modified national water footprint using only the population within the Senqu basin.
The RCP 4.5 Scenario 3 (including population growth) mid-century results give multiple years of moderate water scarcity and a few years of significant water scarcity. The MIROC RCM produced the largest values of water scarcity of 151% in 2044 and 2055 and a value of 154% in 2059. The time series graphs for Scenario 3 are presented in Figures 38-41.

Figure 38: Water Scarcity Scenario 3 mid-century (2020-2060) Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5. Scenario 3 is a modified national water footprint that increases with projected population within Lesotho.
Figure 39: Water Scarcity Scenario 3 late-century (2061-2100) Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5. Scenario 3 is a modified national water footprint that increases with projected population within Lesotho.

Figure 40: Water Scarcity Scenario 3 mid-century (2020-2060) Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. Scenario 3 is a modified national water footprint that increases with projected population within Lesotho.
Figure 41: Water Scarcity Scenario 3 mid-century (2020-2060) Representative Concentration Pathway 8.5. Scenario 3 is a modified national water footprint that increases with projected population within Lesotho.

The RCP 4.5 Scenario 3 late-century results have multiple years of moderate and significant water scarcity. The Ensemble RCM produced 12 years of moderate water scarcity and 1 year of significant water scarcity. The ICHEC, MIROC, and Ensemble each produced a year of significant water scarcity in the year 2066 with values of 186%, 167%, and 162% respectively. The MIROC RCM produced the other reported year of significant water scarcity of 152% in 2089.

The RCP 8.5 Scenario 3 mid-century results have multiple years of moderate water scarcity and significant water scarcity. The Ensemble RCM produced 5 years of moderate water scarcity in the years 2030, and 2057-2060. The CCCma RCM produced the year of significant water scarcity in the year 2030 with a percentage of 155%. The MIRCO RCM produced 6 years of moderate water scarcity which was the most of any of the RCMs. The RCP 8.5 Scenario 3 mid-century results have multiple years of moderate water scarcity and significant water scarcity and two years of severe water scarcity. The MIROC and ICHEC RCMs produce the severe water scarcity results of 209% in 2088 and 206% in 2093.
The MIROC RCM produced the most years of water scarcity with 11 years of moderate water scarcity, 4 years of significant water scarcity, and 1 year of severe water scarcity.

Figure 42: A comparison of the frequency of water scarcity events between each Regional Climate Model for scenario 3 from 2020-2100. Scenario 3 is a modified national water footprint that increases with projected population within Lesotho. Representation Concentration Pathway 4.5 and 8.5 are both given for comparison.

Figure 42 is a comparison of the frequency of water scarcity events within scenario 3 between each RCM. The ICHEC and MIROC RCMs had a greater number of years with moderate water scarcity in RCP 4.5 than RCP 8.5. The ICHEC and MIROC RCMs each produced a year of severe water scarcity in RCP 8.5. The MIRCO RCM produced more water scarcity events greater than 100% (low water scarcity), than any other RCM.
Figure 43: Comparison between each scenario of the frequency a Regional Climate Model (RCM) produced a water scarcity value greater than 100% with respect to the other RCMs. Scenario 1 assumes the Senqu river basin is the sole source of blue water available, and the entire national blue water footprint is used in the calculation of water scarcity. Scenario 2 is a modified national water footprint using only the population within the Senqu basin. Scenario 3 is a modified national water footprint that increases with projected population within Lesotho. Representation Concentration Pathway 4.5 and 8.5 are both given for comparison.

Figure 43 represents a comparison between each scenario of the number of times an RCM produced a water scarcity value greater than 100% with respect to the other RCMs. In scenario 1 RCP 4.5, no RCM produced a water scarcity value greater than 100%. In scenario 1 RCP 8.5 the MICROC and CCCma RCMs both produced the same amount of water scarcity values greater than 100%. Scenario 2 had no water scarcity events for both RCPs. Within scenario 3 RCP 4.5 the MIROC RCM had the greatest number of water scarcity events, followed by the ICHEC, Ensemble, then CCCma RCMs. Within scenario 3 RCP 8.5 the MIROC RCM also produced more water scarcity events than the other RCMs, followed by the Ensemble, CCCma, then ICHEC RCMs.
4.2 Discussion

The major findings of this research show that Lesotho is not likely to suffer from Blue Water Scarcity in the future within the Senqu river basin in scenario 1 and scenario 2. However, Lesotho is likely to suffer from moderate, significant and even severe cases of water scarcity under Scenario 3, which incorporates expected rates of population growth. As expected, the most severe cases of waters scarcity occurred in RCP 8.5 for all the scenarios. It makes sense that RCP 8.5 showed higher percentages of water scarcity than RCP 4.5, as it is representative of a more extreme climate induced radiative forcing. The MIROC RCM produced the most water scarcity events across all the scenarios. Adjusting the national water footprint to estimate future demand in response to population growth in scenario 3 resulted in many more cases of future water scarcity. Since the MIROC RCM produced the most water scarcity events and scenario 3 produced the most severe cases of water scarcity, the MIROC RCM within scenario 3 can be considered as a worst-case scenario for this study. In RCP 4.5 MIROC produced 56 years of low water scarcity, 21 years of moderate water scarcity, and 6 years of significant water scarcity from 2020-2100. In RCP 8.5 MIROC produced 59 years of low water scarcity, 17 years of moderate water scarcity, 4 years of significant water scarcity and 1 year of severe water scarcity from 2020-2100. Any year of water scarcity worse than ‘low water scarcity’ will not only have adverse effects on the Basotho, but also on the ecological system within the Senqu river. In order to meet water needs, Basotho will have to withdraw more water than is necessary to maintain the ecology of the Senqu river. This can have cascading effects on the economy and nutrition of Basotho who use the river as a source of food and livelihood. Droughts have stricken Lesotho in the past, 1968, 1983, 1990, 2002, 2007, 2011 leaving many Basotho without reliable access to blue water (Masih et al., 2014).
One reason droughts are hard on Basotho, and why future water scarcity is dangerous is the lack of integrated water resource infrastructure within Lesotho. Currently there are not interconnections between the water sources used to support the LHWP and the domestic and industrial demands of the Basotho in the lowlands (The World Bank, 2016). While one part of the country may have water, it is unable to effectively supply it to needed areas.

An important note to consider when evaluating the results of this study is the uncertainty attributed to future projections of the GCMs. Each of the RCMs in this study produced varying results and depending on the RCM one chooses to look at, they may find different levels of water scarcity. For example, in scenario 3 in RCP 8.5 the ICHEC RCM yields a water scarcity rating of 45% while the CCCma RCM yields 191% in the year 2063. That is the difference between low water scarcity and significant water scarcity respectively. When the RCMs evaluated past water scarcity in Lesotho, they failed to capture historical extreme weather events which resulted in droughts. RCMs have difficulty capturing and replicating historical extreme weather events (Panaou et al., 2018). A study by Shrestha et al. (2016) demonstrates the uncertainty of the choice of GCM on predicted future streamflow projections produced by SWAT (Shrestha et al., 2016). This increases uncertainty in their ability to capture future extreme weather events.

This study found an overall decrease of streamflow in Lesotho for each RCP, which disagrees with the results of a study performed by Farmarzi et al. in which the impacts of climate change on freshwater availability for the entirety of Africa were evaluated with SWAT (Faramarzi et al., 2013). The study by Farmarzi et al. found that the blue water available in Lesotho will increase in the future.
The two studies differ in that 1) Farmarzi et al. evaluates the blue water available for the entirety of Lesotho, 2) blue water available is calculated using the water yield plus the deep aquifer recharge for each SWAT sub-basin as opposed to the available streamflow, 3) CMIP3 scenarios were used as opposed to CMIP5 RCP scenarios.

The results of decreasing streamflow in the Senqu river basin agrees with previous SWAT studies that evaluate the effect of climate change on mountainous streamflow. The mountainous regions which show an overall decrease to mean streamflow include India (Reshmidevi et al., 2017), the western United States (Burke William and Ficklin Darren, 2017), Portugal (Carvalho-Santos et al., 2017), and the south western Balkans (Papadaki et al., 2016). Study sites which saw an increase in streamflow are Canada (Shrestha et al., 2017), and Nepal (Omani et al., 2016). Other studies reported both increases and decreases throughout the year as between spring and winter months (Bharati et al., 2016, Ficklin et al., 2016, Xu et al., 2016). It is evident that an increase or decrease in overall streamflow will vary depending on location of the study area and the climate of the region. For example, mountainous watersheds that are heavily influenced by glacier melt in studies were shown as having an increase in streamflow as temperatures rose (Ficklin et al., 2016, Omani et al., 2016, Schwank et al., 2014, Shrestha et al., 2017). In regions not influenced by glacier runoff, temperature rise can have the opposite effect. In areas such as Lesotho not influenced by glacier runoff, an increase in mean temperature is a major factor in increasing evapotranspiration and as a result decreases streamflow (Salmoral et al., 2015).

This study is important as while SWAT output has been used with the blue water footprint to measure existing blue water scarcity, it has not been used to measure future blue water scarcity using CMIP5 RCPs and the water footprint. It is also important because it uses
the methodology to evaluate the potential blue water scarcity of Lesotho, which is a region that has not been largely studied in this regard. The Senqu river is a major source of water for the people of Lesotho and knowing how climate change will impact the blue water availability can help with water resource management decisions.

This study has limitations which should be considered when evaluating the results. Scenario 3 adjusted the water footprint for projected population growth but did not adjust for Lesotho’s potential industrialization. Scenario 3 also evaluated the water scarcity across the entirety of Lesotho with respect to population growth, without considering water sources outside of the Senqu river basin. The land use within Lesotho will also change in the future which was not considered. While there are currently two dams, Katse and Mohale, along the Senqu River, three more are scheduled to be built and one of those three, the Polihali dam is currently being designed in Mokhotlong (Burger, 2018). The goal of these dams is to transfer water to South Africa. Once completed a total of 70 cms (2208 million m$^3$y$^{-1}$) will be transferred. Currently the Katse and Mohale transfer a total of 30 cms (950 million m$^3$y$^{-1}$) (LHWP, 2008). This water transfer was not captured in this model. This model only evaluated the water available at the SG3 outlet streamflow gauge station which had an average flow of 30000 million m$^3$y$^{-1}$. The current water transfer of 30 cms does not have a noticeable impact at SG3. This is shown by the results of the Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration. However, these future dams are likely to have a significant impact on the water available in the Senqu river. The Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration results showed the Senqu river was significantly impacted at the SG5 and SG17 gauge stations directly downstream of the Katse and Mohale dam respectively. Basotho who live near these streamflow gauging stations are more likely to have less water available to them as opposed to living further downstream.
With proper SWAT input data of the Katse and Mohale dams, the water available at these upstream locations can be modeled in the future along with the water transferred out of Lesotho, and a better picture of the water available throughout the river basin can be elucidated as opposed to just the basin outlet.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research expanded the framework developed by Rodrigues et al. (2014) by incorporating climate change impacts to measure future potential blue water scarcity of a river basin. Climate change affects hydrological cycles and streamflow of rivers and has the potential to affect the amount of water available for use within a country. Thus, the ability to evaluate the potential blue water scarcity caused by climate change is important to help adequately plan for future water resource management. The addition of measuring blue water scarcity with respect to climate change is an important step in this direction. The framework developed in this thesis was applied to the Senqu river basin within Lesotho under three different scenarios. The results showed an overall decrease in available streamflow of the Senqu river. Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 used the national water footprint to measure water scarcity of Lesotho and within the basin respectively and did not indicate future water scarcity. Scenario 3 adjusted the future national water footprint to account for projected population demand, indicating several years between 2020 and 2100 that would experience some form of water scarcity. The MIROC RCM produced the most cases of water scarcity within scenario 3. Within RCP 4.5 it produced 56 years of low water scarcity, 21 years of moderate water scarcity, and 6 years of significant water scarcity from 2020-2100. In RCP 8.5 MIROC produced 59 years of low water scarcity, 17 years of moderate water scarcity, 4 years of significant water scarcity and 1 year of severe water scarcity from 2020-2100. The most extreme water scarcity event produced by the MIROC RCM occurred in 2088 with a severe water scarcity score of 209%.
It is important to remember the limitations within this study and therefore its results should only be used carefully to inform future policy and water resource decisions. Future work could improve on the methodology developed in this research to better understand water scarcity within Lesotho. The overall model prediction could be improved by incorporating SWAT input data on the dams to investigate the impacts of the dams on water scarcity. This would allow the change in streamflow and water scarcity throughout the basin to be measured providing more insight into potential areas that would experience greater water scarcity than others. The LHWP plans on constructing a total of five dams on the Senqu River. Incorporating the water transfer of the dams to South Africa will elucidate the loss of available water within the Senqu River basin. The current water transfer of 30 cms does not significantly impact the water available at SG3, however it does impact the water available at SG5 and SG17 as shown by the results of the Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration analysis. The ability to model the impact of climate change on water availability throughout the river basin will be important for water resource allocation of those who depend on the Senqu River for livelihood. Currently Lesotho lacks infrastructure to transfer water sources throughout villages in the river basin (The World Bank, 2016). Evaluating blue water scarcity on a monthly scale as was done by Hoekstra et al. (2012) rather than an annual scale will also elucidate on the potential for greater water scarcity concern during the dry and wet seasons.
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