

Bias Correction and Downscaling of future RCM Precipitation Projections using a MOS-Analog Technique

M. Turco^{1,2}, M.C. Llasat¹, S. Herrera³ and J.M. Gutiérrez⁴

Corresponding author: M. Turco

UB, Barcelona, Spain

Email: turco.mrc@gmail.com

¹University of Barcelona (UB),

Department of Applied Physics, Barcelona,
Spain.

²Barcelona Supercomputing Center

(BSC), Barcelona, Spain.

³Meteorology Group, Department of

Applied Mathematics and Computer

Science, Universidad de Cantabria,

Santander, Spain.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/2016JD025724

Abstract. In this study we assess the suitability of a recently introduced analog-based Model Output Statistics (MOS) downscaling method (referred to as MOS-Analog, *Turco et al.*, 2011) for climate change studies, and compare the results with a quantile mapping bias correction method. To this aim, we focus on Spain and consider daily precipitation output from an ensemble of Regional Climate Models provided by the ENSEMBLES project. The reanalysis-driven RCM data provide the historical data (with day-to-day correspondence with observations induced by the forcing boundary conditions) to conduct the analog search of the control (20C3M) and future (A1B) GCM-driven RCM values. First, we show that the MOS-Analog method outperforms the raw RCM output in the control 20C3M scenario (period 1971-2000) for all considered regions and precipitation indices, although for the worst-performing models the method is less effective. Second, we show that the MOS-Analog method broadly preserves the original RCM climate change signal for different future periods (2011-2040, 2041-2070, 2071-2100), except for those indices related to extreme precipitation. This could be explained by the limitation of the analog method to extrapolate unobserved precipitation records. These results suggest that the MOS-Analog is a spatially consistent alter-

⁴Meteorology Group, Instituto de Física
de Cantabria, CSIC-Universidad de
Cantabria, Santander, Spain.

native to standard bias correction methods, although the limitation for extreme values should be taken with caution in cases where this aspect is relevant for the problem.

Keypoints:

- We assess the analog-based Model Output Statistics (MOS) downscaling method for climate change studies.
- The MOS-Analog downscaling method is a spatially consistent alternative to standard bias correction methods.
- The downscaled results broadly preserve the original RCM climate change signal, except for extreme precipitation indices.

Accepted Article

1. Introduction

Precipitation is a challenging variable which is crucial in several sectors, such as agriculture [see, e.g. *Ceglar et al.*, 2016] and hydrology [see, e.g. *Llasat et al.*, 2016], particularly in the context of climate change and/or in applications involving extreme events [*Foley*, 2010; *Rummukainen*, 2010]. The coarse resolution (generally few hundred kilometres) and the systematic biases of Global Climate Models (GCMs) prevents the direct application of global climate projections at a regional scale (generally few kilometres) for impact studies. Therefore, dynamical and/or statistical downscaling techniques are typically applied to bridge this gap in order to obtain plausible regional climate change projections of precipitation (see *Fowler et al.*, 2007; *Maraun et al.*, 2010, and references therein). During the last decade, downscaling has become an strategic topic in national and international climate programs (see, e.g. the WCRP–endorsed CORDEX initiative, *Giorgi et al.*, 2009, or the EU–funded COST Action VALUE, *Maraun et al.*, 2015).

The dynamical downscaling approach is based on Regional Climate Models (RCMs) — with typical resolutions of tens of kilometres— running over limited geographical domains with boundary conditions given by the GCM to be downscaled [*Giorgi and Mearns*, 1991]. These RCMs explicitly solve mesoscale atmospheric processes and provide spatially and physically consistent outputs. However, they still have considerable biases [*Christensen et al.*, 2008; *Herrera et al.*, 2010; *Turco et al.*, 2013] which are typically adjusted in practical applications using a variety of Model Output Statistics (MOS) methods. Formally, in the MOS downscaling approach, the target variable (e.g. precipitation) simulated by the

RCM is directly corrected against the available local-scale observations using appropriate statistical techniques [Marzban *et al.*, 2006; Maraun *et al.*, 2010; Ruiz-Ramos *et al.*, 2016].

The most popular MOS techniques for climate change studies are distribution-wise, that is, the correction function is derived from the observed and simulated distributions.

This approach is usually referred to as (*distributional*) *bias correction* and includes several variants of the quantile mapping (QQM hereinafter) as the most popular techniques [see Teutschbein and Seibert, 2012; Gutjahr and Heinemann, 2013; Sunyer Pinya *et al.*, 2015, for a review]. However a number of limitations have been recently reported for these methods. One important drawback of QQM is that it can modify the raw climate change signal [Hagemann *et al.*, 2011; Pierce *et al.*, 2013; Maraun, 2013; Maurer and Pierce, 2014; Cannon *et al.*, 2015; Dosio, 2016]. Also QQM is not able to correct for biases related to model error in large-scale circulation [Eden *et al.*, 2012; Addor *et al.*, 2016] or heterogeneous biases in space [Maraun and Widmann, 2015], and, importantly, QQM is not effective in cases where the observations and RCM outputs have different spatial resolutions, i.e. when downscaling is also required [White and Toumi, 2013; Maraun, 2013; Teutschbein and Seibert, 2013].

As an alternative to these popular techniques, a number of event-wise MOS methods which use the temporal correspondence between simulations and observations have been recently developed, e.g. conditioning the distribution-wise methods to different weather types [Wetterhall *et al.*, 2012], or considering RCM simulations nudged to (or driven by) reanalysis data to train the statistical methods using the temporal correspondence (between simulations and observations) existing in this case [Turco *et al.*, 2011; Eden *et al.*, 2014]. Although the temporal correspondence is weaker for reanalysis-driven RCM

climate simulations (driven only at the boundaries of the simulation domain) than for the (grid or spectral) nudged ones, the former simulations are those currently available in most of the international downscaling initiatives —such as ENSEMBLES [*van der Linden and Mitchell, 2009*], NARCAP [*Mearns et al., 2012*], and CORDEX [*Giorgi et al., 2009; Jacob et al., 2014*]— and, therefore, they can be more widely applied in practise.

Turco et al. [2011] introduced a MOS downscaling method based on the application of the analog technique to the reanalysis (ERA40)-driven RCM outputs from the ENSEMBLES project. They showed that the application of this methodology (hereafter referred to as MOS-Analog) improves the representation of the mean regimes, the seasonal cycle, the frequency and the extremes of precipitation for all the RCMs. It is worth noting that the main advantages of the analog methodology are that (i) it is conceptually simple and easy to implement with low computational cost, (ii) is able to reproduce nonlinear relationship between predictors and predictands, and (iii) can reproduce realistic and spatially coherent precipitation patterns. The main drawback is that it cannot simulate unobserved weather patterns and this limitation should be cautiously taken into account for climate change studies [see, e.g. *Gutiérrez et al., 2013*].

In this paper we analyse the application of the MOS-Analog method to downscale future RCM projections. To this aim, we consider the different GCM-RCM combinations available from the ENSEMBLES projects for both the historical (20C3M) and future (A1B) emission scenarios, together with the corresponding reanalysis driven RCM simulations. Firstly, we evaluate the performance of the method in a control historical period, showing that it can satisfactorily reproduce the observed spatial and temporal climate patterns of mean and extreme precipitation. Secondly, we analyse the downscaled climate change

signal as compared with that corresponding to the direct RCM output for different future periods (2011-2040, 2041-2070, 2071-2100). Overall, similar regional climate change signals are observed, particularly in cases with a strong signal agreement among members.

The domain of study is the Spanish Iberian Peninsula, which is geographically complex and heterogeneous, and it is characterized by large climate variability due to the influences of different climatological regimes. This is a challenging area for the statistical and dynamical downscaling, since they must be able to simulate very different climates in a relatively small area with notable orographic complexity. *Herrera et al.* [2010] analysed the performance of the ERA40-driven RCM simulations in this region, showing that they can capture the annual cycle of precipitation in the different river basins. However they also indicated that some of these models have strong biases and exhibit a poor performance as they overestimate the frequency of rainfall. Moreover, they deficiently represent extreme events. Generally, the MOS-Analog method is able to reduce the biases of these models [*Turco et al.*, 2011]. On the other hand, *Turco et al.* [2013] analysed the GCM-driven control runs (20C3M scenario) and found large biases for some RCM-GCM combinations attributable to RCM in-house coupling problems with some particular GCMs. Importantly, these biases are shown to distort the corresponding climate change signal. The lessons learnt in these previous studies set the basis for the present work.

The study is organized as follows. After this introduction, Section 2 describes the RCMs and observational datasets used; Section 3 presents the downscaling method and Section 4 analyses the validation results in a control period. Finally, Section 5 analyses the projection results and Section 6 synthesizes the main results of this study.

2. Observed and Simulated Data

2.1. ENSEMBLES RCM dataset

The EU-funded project ENSEMBLES [*van der Linden and Mitchell, 2009*] was a collaborative effort of different European institutions focused on the generation of climate change scenarios over Europe. Regional simulations were produced with the latest-generation RCMs at that time over a common area covering the entire continental European region with a common resolution of 25 km. The resulting dataset is publicly available for research activities (<http://ensemblesrt3.dmi.dk>).

A first experiment was carried out using the ERA40 reanalyses from the European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF, *Uppala et al., 2005*) as boundary conditions for the RCMs. All RCMs were run over a common period of 40 years 1961-2000.

A second experiment for climate change studies was done using different GCM simulations over two periods: A control one using the 20C3M scenario (1961-2000), i.e. with observed greenhouse gasses, and a future one based on the A1B scenario (2001-2100), which is consistent with the emission trend over recent decades [*Peters et al., 2012*].

For this study we consider the ten RCMs available in the ENSEMBLES archive that cover the period until 2100 (Table 1). For practical reasons, the daily outputs of the RCMs were bilinearly interpolated from their original resolution (25 km) to the grid defined by *Spain02* (20 km approximately) described in the next section.

2.2. Observed data

The observed data is the high-resolution ($0.2^\circ \times 0.2^\circ$, 20 km \times 20 km approx.) gridded dataset *Spain02* [*Herrera et al., 2012, 2016*] of daily precipitation over Spain.

This recently developed dataset —which is publicly available for research activities

at <http://www.meteo.unican.es/datasets/spain02>,— was produced using data from 2756 quality-controlled stations from the Spanish Meteorological Agency (AEMET), covering the Spanish Iberian Peninsula and the Balearic Islands over the period 1950-2008 (see Figure 1).

An analysis of upper percentiles and extreme indicators revealed the capability of *Spain02* to reproduce the intensity and spatial variability of extremes [Herrera *et al.*, 2012]. The high quality of this dataset has been confirmed also by Turco and Llasat [2011] and it has been used to validate [Herrera *et al.*, 2010; Gómez-Navarro *et al.*, 2012], post process [Turco *et al.*, 2011] and apply [Turco *et al.*, 2014] the ENSEMBLES RCMs described in the Section 2.1.

3. Methodology

3.1. MOS based on Analogs: MOS-Analog

The analog method [Lorenz, 1963, 1969] is based on the hypothesis that “analog” atmospheric patterns (predictors) should cause “analog” local effects (predictands). This is one of the most popular downscaling techniques and has been used in many applications [see, e.g. Zorita *et al.*, 1995; Matulla *et al.*, 2008; Gutiérrez *et al.*, 2012; Radanovics *et al.*, 2013].

The predictand used in this paper is the interpolated 0.2° observed precipitation over the Iberian Peninsula given by Spain02, whereas the RCM simulated precipitation field is used as predictor. Note that this variable is one of the most informative variable for precipitation downscaling purposes [Eden *et al.*, 2012], but generally it is avoided in perfect prognosis downscaling studies (e.g. precipitation is not used per se as predictor) since it is very model dependent [see, e.g. Jerez *et al.*, 2013] and, thus, there may be significant

differences between the reanalysis and the GCMs. This problem does not exist in the MOS setting. Indeed, the RCM precipitation is used both for training (considering the ERA40-driven simulations) and for test or future periods (considering the GCM-driven simulations), allowing us to define a simple and parsimonious method. Therefore, the predictor pattern considered in this paper is defined by the RCM precipitation in a 0.2° grid covering the Iberian Peninsula (see *Turco et al.*, 2011 or more details on the sensitivity of the method to different configurations).

The MOS-Analog downscaling consists of two main steps, which are repeated for each day to be downscaled (see Figure 2):

1. For each daily precipitation pattern $A(t)$ from the GCM-driven RCM simulation (from a control or future scenario run), the closest precipitation pattern of the ERA40-driven simulation $B(t')$ in the historical period is obtained based on the Euclidean distance between both fields.
2. Then, the precipitation $b(t')$ observed during this analog historical date t' is assigned as the downscaled value $a(t)$ for the GCM-driven RCM.

Note that, as result of this process, the method can only generate values which have been observed in the historical period and, therefore, this limitation can affect its extrapolation capability in future climate change simulations, particularly for extreme values [*Gutiérrez et al.*, 2013].

3.2. Quantile Mapping Method: QQM

We use the popular parametric quantile mapping method introduced by *Piani et al.*, 2010, including the frequency adaptation proposed by *Thiemeßl et al* [2012] (hereafter QQM). This method assumes that both observed and simulated precipitation intensity

distributions are well approximated by the gamma distribution. For the sake of the comparability with the MOS-Analog method, the transfer function has been adjusted considering the ERA40-driven simulation and applied to calibrate the GCM-driven simulation for both the historical 20C3M (1961-2000) and future A1B (2001-2100) scenarios as follows:

$$X_{GCM}^* = F_{Obs}^{-1}(F_{ERA40}(X_{GCM})), \quad (1)$$

where X_{GCM} and X_{GCM}^* are the original and corrected values of the GCM-driven simulation, and F_{Obs} and F_{ERA40} the adjusted Gamma distribution of the observations and the ERA40-driven simulation. Note that, in the standard application of these techniques, the adjustment is done considering the historical GCM driven simulations.

3.3. Comparison measures

Three main approaches have been applied to evaluate the applicability of the MOS-Analog approach. Firstly, we compare the simulated (both RCM outputs and MOS down-scaled ones) and observed climatologies (spatial patterns) for the precipitation indices shown in Table 2 computed from daily data and characterizing total precipitation, dry and wet spells, and extreme precipitation, as defined by the joint CCI/CLIVAR/JCOMM Expert Team on Climate Change Detection and Indices (ETCCDI indices; *WMO*, 2009; *Zhang et al.*, 2011). The comparisons between the simulated and observed climatologies are summarized using Taylor diagrams [*Taylor*, 2001]. This diagram synthesizes three spatial measures —standard deviation (S), centred root-mean-square difference (R) and correlation (C)— in a single bidimensional plot. Two variations from the standard Taylor diagram have been applied in this study:

• The measures S and R are normalized, dividing them by the standard deviation of the observations. In this way it is possible to compare the different indices.

• Information about spatial average of the bias (M) has been introduced (using colours) for each point in the Taylor diagram. In particular we use the difference between the simulated and observed mean, normalized by the observed mean.

Secondly, in order to assess the correspondence of the simulated and observed annual cycles, we analyse the performance of the method in the different river basins (according to Figure 1) at a monthly scale. To this aim, we calculated several monthly indices spatially averaged for each river basin. These standard measures (both regarding the spatial patterns of the precipitation climatologies and considering the annual cycle) have been calculated over the period 1971-2000, which is later used to estimate the climate change signal (i.e. the difference between the downscaled values for the future A1B period and the control 20C3M ones).

Finally, we analyse how well the MOS-Analog downscaled results preserve the climate change signal of the RCMs (see Section 5 for more details). In order to assess this consistency, and for the sake of comparison with standard bias correction techniques, we compare the results of the MOS-Analog method with those resulting from the popular bias correction quantile mapping technique describe in Section 3.2.

In order to graphically show both the climate change signal and the ensemble agreement, we have adopted the technique used in *Hemming et al.* [2010], in which the map combines the ensemble mean scenario, with different colours, and the percentage agreement in the direction of change among the ensemble members, with different intensity of colours [*Kaye et al.*, 2012].

4. Validation Results in the Control Period

In this section we analyse the results obtained when downscaling the historical (20C3M) GCM-driven RCMs in the control period 1971-2000.

4.1. Maps of mean and extreme climates

As an illustrative example, and for the sake of brevity, in Figure 3 we show the comparison maps for the KNMI model and the corresponding MOS-Analog values; note that this RCM has been chosen since it is one of the most skilful for precipitation in this region [Herrera *et al.*, 2010], thus could be more challenging for the MOS method to improve it.

The panels in this figure show the annual values of the indices (averaged over the common period 1971-2000) for the observations (*Spain02*, first column), the regional KNMI simulations (second column), and the corresponding MOS-Analog downscaled values (third column); the numbers below the panels in this figure indicate the bias (or mean error, M), the relative standard deviation (S), the centred root-mean-square (R) and the correlation (C). These metrics are then used to produce a Taylor diagram summarizing this information. This figure shows that the MOS-Analog downscaled values clearly outperform the raw RCM outputs. The Taylor diagrams shown in Figure 4 summarize the verification results for all the models and indices in the control period (1971-2000).

These figures show that, overall, the MOS-Analog method improves considerably the RCM results for all the indices (less evident for the *CDD* index, as already noticed by Turco *et al.*, 2011), with larger spatial correlation values and standard deviation closer to the observed ones. In terms of errors, the MOS-Analog downscaling method also improves the RCMs results for the bias (M) and the centred root mean square error (R).

In particular, the MOS-Analog clearly reduces their overestimation of rainfall frequency,

common on the RCMs as they tend to drizzle [Gutowski *et al.*, 2003], correcting partially their underestimation of *CDD* while the bias for *CWD* shifts from RCM positive values to MOS-Analog positive or negative values depending on the RCM. Finally, although the MOS-Analog is able to reduce the overestimation of *R20*, *R1* and *PRCPTOT* given by the RCMs, there is yet a positive bias for these indicators which could affect the future climate change signal. These results are generally confirmed also repeating this analysis for each sub regions of Figure 1 (Figures S1-S7).

Overall, the MOS-Analog method is able to improve the above-considered scores for different indices for all RCMs, although for the worst-performing models the downscaling is less effective. Note that three GCM-driven RCMs (3. DMI-BCM; 4. DMI-ECHAM5; 10. SMHI-BCM) show significantly worse performance than the other simulations. This result confirms the study of Turco *et al.* [2013], which analysed a greater ensemble of RCMs from ENSEMBLES containing the 15 models with data up to 2050. They found large biases for some RCM-GCM combinations and these biases are shown to distort the corresponding climate change signal. Therefore, it is not advisable ignoring the performance of the RCM-GCM runs in the control period and the side effects of large biases. Thus, hereafter we consider the ensemble of the best seven models (highlighted with an asterisk in Table 1).

4.2. Seasonal cycle

In this section, we analyse the ability of the RCMs and the MOS-Analog downscaled results to reproduce the strong seasonal cycle of rainfall, which differs considerably among the different river basins (according to Figure 1). Here we focus on a seven-member ensemble formed by the best performing RCMs identified in the previous section. We

consider the seasonal cycle of the number of precipitation days ($R1$; Figure 5) and the monthly maximum ($RX1DAY$; Figure 6). Similar results have been found for the total precipitation (Figure S8).

Despite of the differences in values, the three indices have a similar cycle among the basins, with two maximum periods in the Mediterranean basin, the major one in autumn and the secondary in spring, and, for the remaining basins, a maximum in winter and a minimum in summer. The performance of the RCMs and the MOS-Analog method to reproduce the observed seasonal cycles of the indices, in the different basins, is quite remarkable, with generally a reduced spread (smaller uncertainty) in the latter case (see also Tables S1-S3 for a quantification of the error for each index and each river basin). In particular, as pointed out in the previous section, the RCMs clearly overestimate the $R1$ index and the MOS-Analog is able to correct this problem (Figure 5). Also, it is worth noting the good performance of both the RCMs and the MOS-Analog method to reproduce the observed seasonal cycle of the $RX1DAY$ index (Figure 6). Finally, note that the greater error are generally found for the Mediterranean basins (panels (g)-(k) in Figures 5 and 6, and basins “Segura”, “Levante”, “Ebro”, “Catalana” and “Balears” in Tables S1-S3), as also found by *Herrera et al.* [2010] and *Turco et al.* [2011] considering the ERA40-driven RCMs.

5. Future Scenarios

In this section we analyse the regional climate change signals for different future periods (2011-2040, 2041-2070, 2071-2100), obtained as the ratio (expressed as percentage of change) of the mean values for the corresponding A1B GCM-driven RCM simulations and the 20C3M control ones in the baseline (1971-2000) period. For the sake of comparison

with standard bias correction techniques, in addition to the MOS-Analog method, this analysis also includes the results corresponding to the Piani quantile mapping method (QQM).

Figure 7 shows the regional climate change signal for all indices shown in Table 2 for the future period 2071-2100 for the seven-member (see Table 1) RCM ensemble (ENS), together with results for the MOS-Analog downscaling method (MOS) and the quantile mapping method (QQM). High agreement for the RCM climate change signals appear in most of the Iberian Peninsula for the indices *PRCPTOT*, *R1*, and *CWD* (with negative changes), and for the index *CDD* (with positive changes, larger than +25%). Instead, the other indices display more heterogeneous signals (with large areas either positive or negative) and more disagreement between the models. For instance, for the *SDII* and *RX1DAY* indices, large part of the maps show no agreement among the RCMs.

Overall, the RCM regional climate change signal for the different indices is preserved by the QQM, with the exception of *SDII*, where the QQM exhibits a larger region with positive signal. These differences are probably due to the use of the reanalysis-driven RCM outputs to calibrate the bias correction method —for the sake of comparability with the MOS-Analog method, — and are induced by the difference of rain frequencies in the reanalysis- and control-driven simulations. Note that the standard application of the QQM method (using the control simulations for calibration) could reduce this disagreement. On the other hand, the MOS-Analog method broadly preserves the climate change signal for non-extreme indices, but exhibits large differences for *R20* and *RX1DAY*, particularly for those regions with positive signals. This could be a result of the limitation of the analog method to extrapolate unobserved values, particularly for the *RX1DAY* results. Overall,

similar conclusions are obtained for the climate change signals relative to the different periods 2011-2040 and 2041-2070 (see Figures S9 and S10, respectively), although with lower values of changes (in absolute value) and lower level of agreement between the models compared to the pattern shown for the end of the century (Figure 7).

We also explored the seasonal projections for some representative indices for three future A1B periods. Figure 8 shows the seasonal climate change signal for the total precipitation (*PRCPTOT* index). These projections indicate regional changes in the range from -25% to -5% with greater agreement in spring, summer and autumn (MAM, JJA and SON respectively), mostly in the West of the region, for the end of the century. Interestingly, in the Mediterranean coast the agreement in JJA is small even for the last period. The winter (DJF) projections show large fluctuations in the direction of change, from mainly negative in the first period, 2011-2040, to mainly positive in 2041-2070, and again negative in 2071-2100. This is also the season with large areas of the maps with no agreement on the sign of the changes.

Figure 9 considers the *RX1DAY* index and shows a quite heterogeneous pattern, with low level of agreement, although there are some areas with consistent pattern of positive changes (between 5% and 25%) in DJF, and negative (between -25% and -5%) in the other seasons, mainly in summer (with changes even lower than $< -25\%$). Generally, higher agreement is found for the end of the century.

Finally, Figure 10 suggests a high agreement in the increase in the *CDD* index (i.e. longer periods without rain), especially for the period 2071-2100, with most of the area agree on more than 25% of change, regardless the considered season. It is worth noting that for the period 2041-2070, both the QQM and the MOS-Analog methods show a

negative change over most of the domain, while ENS displays low level of agreement among the RCMs.

6. Summary and Conclusions

The present study has investigated (i) the potential of the recently introduced MOS-Analog downscaling method for climate change projections when applied to RCM precipitation outputs and (ii) how well the method preserves the RCM climate change signal for a set of precipitation indices. The analysis focuses on precipitation over Spain and, besides the MOS-Analog method, a standard distributional-based quantile mapping approach is also considered for comparison purposes.

The validation against the observed gridded data *Spain02* shows that the MOS-Analog method clearly outperforms the raw RCM outputs in the control period (20C3M scenario). Specifically, the MOS-Analog downscaling method improves considerably the RCM results for all the indices considered, although for the worst-performing models (DMI-BCM, DMI-ECHAM5 and SMHI-BCM) the downscaling method is less effective. These RCMs have very large biases and can be considered outliers/errors of the ensemble [*Turco et al.*, 2013].

The projected changes are quite consistent among the RCMs for total precipitation, wet-day frequency and spell indices. High level of consistency in the geographical patterns are found for all the seasons, except for winter towards the end of the century. In particular, the higher agreement between models in the later period could be due to a relative smaller influence of natural variability towards the end of the century. The main drivers of these projections are probably the synoptic structures that drive the decreasing precipitation (e.g. persistence of anticyclones; *Sumner et al.*, 2003; *García-Valero et al.*, 2012; *Cortesi et al.*, 2014) and the land-surface atmosphere interactions (e.g. soil moisture feedbacks;

Seneviratne et al., 2010; Jerez et al., 2012). Our confidence in the physical mechanism and the model results, give some credibility to the increasing drought risk in the Mediterranean region [*Orlowsky and Seneviratne, 2011; Dai, 2011*]. In spite of the agreement of the projected changes for total precipitation, wet-day frequency and spell indices, the overall uncertainties in heavy rainfall climate projections remain quite large, even for the end of the century. Indeed, due to the importance of the convective process for intense rainfall in this region [*Llasat, 2001; Llasat et al., 2014*] and the common weakness of the models to simulate these processes [*Hohenegger et al., 2008; Rowell, 2011*], the heavy rainfall projections should be taken with caution [*Kendon et al., 2014*]. There is also a large uncertainty for extreme indices (*R20* and *RX1DAY*) with large regions with negative and positive signals.

The RCM climate change signal is broadly preserved by the distributional-based quantile mapping method, with some differences mainly for *SDII* due to the procedure used to calibrate the model (using reanalysis-driven RCM data, for the sake of comparability with MOS-Analog results) and to the different wet-day frequencies of the reanalysis- and control-driven RCM simulations. The MOS-Analog method also broadly preserves the climate change signal with the exception of extreme indices (*R20* and *RX1DAY* in this work). This is probably due to the limitation of the MOS-Analog method to simulate unobserved records. This could make this method unsuitable to downscale climate change projections for those applications where extreme values are important. However, it is worth noting that this method can produce accumulated values or frequencies over several days larger (or smaller) than the historical values and, therefore, can extrapolate non-observed values for these types of indices. Finally, it must be noted that standard bias

correction methods are not intended to correct climate trends [Maraun, 2016] and methods that deliberately constrain the climate change signals based on process understanding are rare [Collins *et al.*, 2012; Walton *et al.*, 2015]. In this study, the cases where the MOS-Analog method modifies the RCM climate signals (for extreme indices) could be simply explained by the limitation of the method to extrapolate unobserved values (e.g. higher extremes simulated by the RCM for a future period), and not by a merit of the method to introduce plausible changes in the regional climate change signal—which could be the case in other situations, since the MOS-Analog can potentially introduce extra regional information in the downscaling process.—

In the case of the MOS-Analog method, since the analog search is performed at a national level, the downscaled values preserve the spatial coherence of the observed fields. Therefore, this method can be considered a spatially consistent alternative for distributional bias correction methods. Moreover, it could be easily extended to a multi-variable consistent framework by defining joint patterns (e.g. precipitation-temperature) for the analog search.

Finally, we underline that bias correction remains a provisional solution until better models will be available (see Ehret *et al.*, 2012; Pielke and Wilby, 2012; Maraun, 2016, and references therein for a critical review on the bias-correction techniques). It is worth noting that a newer generation of climate models are now available (developed in the framework of the CORDEX program), with up-to-date RCMs, but still affected by biases [Kotlarski *et al.*, 2014; Jerez *et al.*, 2015]. The application of the MOS-Analog method to these RCMs remains to be done.

To sum up, the results shown in this paper suggest that the increasing dryness could be considered a robust result and indicate the urgency to apply adaptation and mitigation strategies, according to the Spanish National Climate Change Adaptation Plan (www.magrama.gob.es/es/cambio-climatico/temas/impactos-vulnerabilidad-y-adaptacion/), also considering that, already at present, many areas in Spain suffer from problems related to water resources [*Quiroga et al.*, 2011]. The MOS downscaled data are freely available for research purposes by applying to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments. This work was partially supported by the strategic action for energy and climate change by the Spanish R+D 2008-2011 Program ESTCENA (code 200800050084078), the project MULTI-SDM (CGL2015-66583-R, MINECO/FEDER), the Italian project of Interest NextData of the Italian Ministry for Education, University and Research, and by the European Science Foundation within the framework of COST ES1102 (Validating and integrating downscaling methods for climate change research). This paper has been also written under the framework of the International HYMEX project and the Spanish HOPE (CGL2014-52571-R) project. We also acknowledge the ENSEMBLES project (funded by the European Commission's 6th Framework Programme through contract GOCE-CT-2003-505539) for the RCM data used in this work (<http://ensemblesrt3.dmi.dk/>). The authors thank AEMET and UC for the data provided for this work (*Spain02* gridded precipitation data set, www.meteo.unican.es/es/datasets/spain02). Special thanks to the authors of the MeteoLab-Toolbox (www.meteo.unican.es/software/meteolab) which helped us to post-process the data and to validate the method. Finally, we thank the anonymous referees for their useful comments.

References

- Addor, N., M. Rohrer, R. Furrer, and J. Seibert (2016), Propagation of biases in climate models from the synoptic to the regional scale: Implications for bias adjustment, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*.
- Cannon, A. J., S. R. Sobie, and T. Q. Murdock (2015), Bias correction of gcm precipitation by quantile mapping: How well do methods preserve changes in quantiles and extremes?, *Journal of Climate*, 28(17), 6938–6959.
- Ceglar, A., A. Toreti, R. Lecerf, M. Van der Velde, and F. Dentener (2016), Impact of meteorological drivers on regional inter-annual crop yield variability in france, *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 216, 58–67.
- Christensen, J. H., F. Boberg, O. B. Christensen, and P. Lucas-Picher (2008), On the need for bias correction of regional climate change projections of temperature and precipitation, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 35(20).
- Christensen, O., M. Drews, J. Christensen, K. Dethloff, K. Ketelsen, I. Hebestadt, and R. A. (2008), The hirham regional climate model version 5, *Tech. Rep. Technical Report 06-17*, DMI, <http://www.dmi.dk/dmi/en/print/tr06-17.pdf>.
- Collins, M., R. E. Chandler, P. M. Cox, J. M. Huthnance, J. Rougier, and D. B. Stephenson (2012), Quantifying future climate change, *Nature Climate Change*, 2(6), 403–409.
- Cortesi, N., J. C. Gonzalez-Hidalgo, R. M. Trigo, and A. M. Ramos (2014), Weather types and spatial variability of precipitation in the iberian peninsula, *International Journal of Climatology*, 34(8), 2661–2677.
- Dai, A. (2011), Drought under global warming: a review, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 2(1), 45–65.

Dosio, A. (2016), Projections of climate change indices of temperature and precipitation from an ensemble of bias-adjusted high-resolution euro-cordex regional climate models, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*.

Eden, J. M., M. Widmann, D. Grawe, and S. Rast (2012), Skill, Correction, and Downscaling of GCM-Simulated Precipitation, *Journal of Climate*, 25(11), 3970–3984.

Eden, J. M., M. Widmann, D. Maraun, and M. Vrac (2014), Comparison of gcm- and rcm-simulated precipitation following stochastic postprocessing, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 119(19), 11,040–11,053.

Ehret, U., E. Zehe, V. Wulfmeyer, K. Warrach-Sagi, and J. Liebert (2012), Hess opinions” should we apply bias correction to global and regional climate model data?”, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 16(9), 3391–3404.

Fernandez, J., and J. Saenz (2003), Improved field reconstruction with the analog method: searching the CCA space, *Climate Research*, 24(3), 199–213.

Foley, A. M. (2010), Uncertainty in regional climate modelling: A review, *Progress in Physical Geography*, 34(5), 647–670.

Fowler, H. J., S. Blenkinsop, and C. Tebaldi (2007), Linking climate change modelling to impacts studies: Recent advances in downscaling techniques for hydrological modelling, *International Journal of Climatology*, 27(12), 1547–1578, General Assembly of the European-Geosciences-Union, Vienna, AUSTRIA, APR, 2006.

García-Valero, J. A., J. P. Montavez, S. Jerez, J. J. Gómez-Navarro, R. Lorente-Plazas, and P. Jiménez-Guerrero (2012), A seasonal study of the atmospheric dynamics over the iberian peninsula based on circulation types, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 110(1-2), 291–310.

Giorgi, F., and L. Mearns (1991), Approaches to the Simulation of Regional Climate Change - A review, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 29(2), 191–216.

Giorgi, F., C. Jones, and G. Asrar (2009), Addressing climate information needs at the regional level: the CORDEX framework, *WMO Bulletin*, 58(3), 175–183.

Gómez-Navarro, J., J. Montávez, S. Jerez, P. Jiménez-Guerrero, and E. Zorita (2012), What is the role of the observational dataset in the evaluation and scoring of climate models?, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 39(24).

Gutiérrez, J., D. San-Martín, S. Brands, R. Manzananas, and S. Herrera (2012), Reassessing statistical downscaling techniques for their robust application under climate change conditions., *Journal of Climate*.

Gutiérrez, J. M., D. San-Martín, S. Brands, R. Manzananas, and S. Herrera (2013), Re-assessing statistical downscaling techniques for their robust application under climate change conditions, *Journal of Climate*, 26(1), 171–188.

Gutjahr, O., and G. Heinemann (2013), Comparing precipitation bias correction methods for high-resolution regional climate simulations using cosmo-clm, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 114(3-4), 511–529.

Gutowski, W. J., S. G. Decker, R. A. Donavon, Z. Pan, R. W. Arritt, and E. S. Takle (2003), Temporalspatial scales of observed and simulated precipitation in central u.s. climate, *Journal of Climate*, 16(22), 3841–3847.

Hagemann, S., C. Chen, J. O. Haerter, J. Heinke, D. Gerten, and C. Piani (2011), Impact of a statistical bias correction on the projected hydrological changes obtained from three gcms and two hydrology models, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 12(4), 556–578.

Haugen, J., and H. Haakensatd (2005), Validation of hirham version 2 with 50km and 25km resolution, *Tech. Rep. General Technical report 9*, RegClim, <http://regclim.met.no/results/gtr9.pdf>.

Hemming, D., C. Buontempo, E. Burke, M. Collins, and N. Kaye (2010), How uncertain are climate model projections of water availability indicators across the Middle East?, *Philosophical transactions. Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences*, *368*(1931), 5117–35.

Herrera, S., J. Gutiérrez, R. Ancell, M. Pons, M. Frías, and J. Fernández (2012), Development and analysis of a 50-year high-resolution daily gridded precipitation dataset over spain (spain02), *International Journal of Climatology*, *32*(1), 74–85.

Herrera, S., J. Fernández, and J. Gutiérrez (2016), Update of the spain02 gridded observational dataset for euro-cordex evaluation: assessing the effect of the interpolation methodology, *International Journal of Climatology*, *36*(2), 900–908.

Herrera, S., L. Fita, J. Fernandez, and J. M. Gutierrez (2010), Evaluation of the mean and extreme precipitation regimes from the ENSEMBLES regional climate multimodel simulations over Spain, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres*, *115*.

Hohenegger, C., P. Brockhaus, and C. Schaer (2008), Towards climate simulations at cloud-resolving scales, *Meteorologische Zeitschrift*, *17*(4, Sp. Iss. SI), 383–394.

Jacob, D. (2001), A note to the simulation of the annual and inter-annual variability of the water budget over the Baltic Sea drainage basin, *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics*, *77*(1-4), 61–73.

Jacob, D., J. Petersen, B. Eggert, A. Alias, O. Christensen, L. Bouwer, A. Braun, A. Collette, M. Dqu, G. Georgievski, E. Georgopoulou, A. Gobiet, L. Menut, G. Nikulin,

A. Haensler, N. Hempelmann, C. Jones, K. Keuler, S. Kovats, N. Krner, S. Kotlarski, A. Kriegsmann, E. Martin, E. van Meijgaard, C. Moseley, S. Pfeifer, S. Preuschmann, C. Radermacher, K. Radtke, D. Rechid, M. Rounsevell, P. Samuelsson, S. Somot, J.-F. Soussana, C. Teichmann, R. Valentini, R. Vautard, B. Weber, and P. Yiou (2014), Euro-cordex: new high-resolution climate change projections for european impact research, *Regional Environmental Change*, *14*(2), 563–578.

Jerez, S., J. Montavez, J. Gomez-Navarro, P. Jimenez, P. Jimenez-Guerrero, R. Lorente, and J. F. Gonzalez-Rouco (2012), The role of the land-surface model for climate change projections over the iberian peninsula, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *117*(D1).

Jerez, S., J. P. Montavez, P. Jimenez-Guerrero, J. J. Gomez-Navarro, R. Lorente-Plazas, and E. Zorita (2013), A multi-physics ensemble of present-day climate regional simulations over the iberian peninsula, *Climate dynamics*, *40*(11-12), 3023–3046.

Jerez, S., I. Tobin, R. Vautard, J. P. Montávez, J. M. López-Romero, F. Thais, B. Bartok, O. B. Christensen, A. Colette, M. Déqué, et al. (2015), The impact of climate change on photovoltaic power generation in europe, *Nature communications*, *6*.

Kaye, N. R., A. Hartley, and D. Hemming (2012), Mapping the climate: guidance on appropriate techniques to map climate variables and their uncertainty, *Geoscientific Model Development*, *5*(1), 245–256.

Kendon, E. J., N. M. Roberts, H. J. Fowler, M. J. Roberts, S. C. Chan, and C. A. Senior (2014), Heavier summer downpours with climate change revealed by weather forecast resolution model, *Nature Climate Change*, *4*(7), 570–576.

Kotlarski, S., K. Keuler, O. B. Christensen, A. Colette, M. Déqué, A. Gobiet, K. Goergen, D. Jacob, D. Lüthi, E. van Meijgaard, et al. (2014), Regional climate modeling on european scales: a joint standard evaluation of the euro-cordex rcm ensemble, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 7(4), 1297–1333.

Llasat, M. C. (2001), An objective classification of rainfall events on the basis of their convective features: application to rainfall intensity in the northeast of spain, *International Journal of Climatology*, 21(11), 1385–1400.

Llasat, M. C., R. Marcos, M. Llasat-Botija, J. Gilabert, M. Turco, and P. Quintana-Seguí (2014), Flash flood evolution in north-western mediterranean, *Atmospheric Research*, 149, 230–243.

Llasat, M. C., R. Marcos, M. Turco, J. Gilabert, and M. Llasat-Botija (2016), Trends in flash flood events versus convective precipitation in the mediterranean region: The case of catalonia, *Journal of Hydrology*.

Lorenz, E. (1963), Deterministic nonperiodic flow, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 20(), 130–141.

Lorenz, E. (1969), Atmospheric Predictability as Revealed by Naturally Occurring Analogues, *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 26(4), 636–646.

Maraun, D. (2013), Bias Correction, Quantile Mapping, and Downscaling: Revisiting the Inflation Issue, *Journal of Climate*, 26(6), 2137–2143.

Maraun, D. (2016), Bias correcting climate change simulations-a critical review, *Current Climate Change Reports*, 2(4), 211–220.

Maraun, D., and M. Widmann (2015), The representation of location by a regional climate model in complex terrain, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19(8), 3449–3456, doi:

10.5194/hess-19-3449-2015.

Maraun, D., M. Widmann, J. M. Gutiérrez, S. Kotlarski, R. E. Chandler, E. Hertig, J. Wibig, R. Huth, and R. A. Wilcke (2015), Value: A framework to validate downscaling approaches for climate change studies, *Earth's Future*, pp. n/a–n/a.

Maraun, D., F. Wetterhall, A. M. Ireson, R. E. Chandler, E. J. Kendon, M. Widmann, S. Brienen, H. W. Rust, T. Sauter, M. Themessl, V. K. C. Venema, K. P. Chun, C. M. Goodess, R. G. Jones, C. Onof, M. Vrac, and I. Thiele-Eich (2010), Precipitation Downscaling under Climate Change: Recent Developments to Bridge the Gap Between Dynamical Downscaling Models and the End User, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 48.

Marzban, C., S. Sandgathe, and E. Kalnay (2006), MOS, perfect prog, and reanalysis, *Monthly Weather Review*, 134(2), 657–663.

Matulla, C., X. Zhang, X. L. Wang, J. Wang, E. Zorita, S. Wagner, and H. von Storch (2008), Influence of similarity measures on the performance of the analog method for downscaling daily precipitation, *Climate Dynamics*, 30(2-3), 133–144.

Maurer, E. P., and D. W. Pierce (2014), Bias correction can modify climate model simulated precipitation changes without adverse effect on the ensemble mean, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 18(3), 915–925, doi:10.5194/hess-18-915-2014.

Mearns, L. O., R. Arritt, S. Biner, M. S. Bukovsky, S. McGinnis, S. Sain, D. Caya, J. Correia, D. Flory, W. Gutowski, E. S. Takle, R. Jones, R. Leung, W. Moufouma-Okia, L. McDaniel, A. M. B. Nunes, Y. Qian, J. Roads, L. Sloan, and M. Snyder (2012), The north american regional climate change assessment program: Overview of phase i results, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93(9), 1337–1362.

Orlowsky, B., and S. I. Seneviratne (2011), Global changes in extreme events: regional and seasonal dimension, *Climatic Change*, 110(3-4), 669–696.

Pal, J. S., F. Giorgi, X. Bi, N. Elguindi, F. Solmon, X. Gao, S. A. Rauscher, R. Francisco, A. Zakey, J. Winter, M. Ashfaq, F. S. Syed, J. L. Bell, N. S. Diffenbaugh, J. Kar-macharya, A. Konare, D. Martinez, R. P. da Rocha, L. C. Sloan, and A. L. Steiner (2007), Regional climate modeling for the developing world - The ICTP RegCM3 and RegCNET, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 88(9), 1395–1409.

Peters, G. P., R. M. Andrew, T. Boden, J. G. Canadell, P. Ciais, C. Le Quéré, G. Marland, M. R. Raupach, and C. Wilson (2012), The challenge to keep global warming below 2 °C, *Nature Climate Change*, 3(1), 4–6.

Piani, C., J. Haerter, and E. Coppola (2010), Statistical bias correction for daily precip-itation in regional climate models over Europe, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 99(1-2), 187–192.

Pielke, R. A., and R. L. Wilby (2012), Regional climate downscaling: What’s the point?, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 93(5), 52–53.

Pierce, D. W., D. R. Cayan, T. Das, E. P. Maurer, N. L. Miller, Y. Bao, M. Kanamitsu, K. Yoshimura, M. A. Snyder, L. C. Sloan, et al. (2013), The key role of heavy precipi-tation events in climate model disagreements of future annual precipitation changes in california, *Journal of Climate*, 26(16), 5879–5896.

Quiroga, S., L. Garrote, A. Iglesias, Z. Fernández-Haddad, J. Schlickenrieder, B. de Lama, C. Mosso, and A. Sánchez-Arcilla (2011), The economic value of drought information for water management under climate change: a case study in the ebro basin, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 11(3), 643–657.

Radanovics, S., J.-P. Vidal, E. Sauquet, A. Ben Daoud, and G. Bontron (2013), Optimising predictor domains for spatially coherent precipitation downscaling, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17(10), 4189–4208.

Radu, R., M. Deque, and S. Somot (2008), Spectral nudging in a spectral regional climate model, *Tellus Series A - Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography*, 60(5), 898–910.

Rowell, D. (2011), Sources of uncertainty in future changes in local precipitation, *Climate Dynamics*, pp. 1–22.

Ruiz-Ramos, M., A. Rodríguez, A. Dosio, C. Goodess, C. Harpham, M. Mínguez, and E. Sánchez (2016), Comparing correction methods of rcm outputs for improving crop impact projections in the iberian peninsula for 21st century, *Climatic Change*, 134(1-2), 283–297.

Rummukainen, M. (2010), State-of-the-art with regional climate models, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 1(1), 82–96.

Rummukainen, M. (2012), Changes in climate and weather extremes in the 21st century, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 3(2), 115–129.

Samuelsson, P., C. G. Jones, U. Willén, A. Ullerstig, S. Gollvik, U. Hansson, C. Jansson, E. Kjellström, G. Nikulin, and K. Wyser (2011), The Rossby Centre Regional Climate model RCA3: model description and performance, *Tellus A*, 63(1), 4–23.

Seneviratne, S. I., T. Corti, E. L. Davin, M. Hirschi, E. B. Jaeger, I. Lehner, B. Orlowsky, and A. J. Teuling (2010), Investigating soil moisture-climate interactions in a changing climate: A review, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 99(34), 125 – 161.

Sumner, G., R. Romero, V. Homar, C. Ramis, S. Alonso, and E. Zorita (2003), An estimate of the effects of climate change on the rainfall of mediterranean spain by the

late twenty first century, *Climate Dynamics*, 20(7-8), 789–805.

Sunyer Pinya, M. A., Y. Hundedcha, D. Lawrence, H. Madsen, P. Willems, M. Martinkova, K. Vormoor, G. Bürger, M. Hanel, J. Kriaučiuniene, et al. (2015), Inter-comparison of statistical downscaling methods for projection of extreme precipitation in europe, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19(4), 1827–1847.

Taylor, K. E. (2001), Summarizing multiple aspects of model performance in a single diagram, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106(D7), 7183–7192.

Teutschbein, C., and J. Seibert (2012), Bias correction of regional climate model simulations for hydrological climate-change impact studies: Review and evaluation of different methods, *Journal of Hydrology*, 456-457, 12 – 29.

Teutschbein, C., and J. Seibert (2013), Is bias correction of regional climate model (rcm) simulations possible for non-stationary conditions?, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 17(12), 5061–5077.

Themeßl MJ, Gobiet A, Heinrich G (2012), Empirical-statistical downscaling and error correction of regional climate models and its impact on the climate change signal, *Climatic Change*, 112(2), 449–468, doi:10.1007/s10584-011-0224-4.

Turco, M., and M. C. Llasat (2011), Trends in indices of daily precipitation extremes in catalonia (ne spain), 19512003, *Natural Hazards and Earth System Science*, 11(12), 3213–3226.

Turco, M., P. Quintana-Seguí, M. C. Llasat, S. Herrera, and J. M. Gutiérrez (2011), Testing mos precipitation downscaling for ensembles regional climate models over spain, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 116(D18), 1–14.

Turco, M., A. Sanna, S. Herrera, M.-C. Llasat, and J. M. Gutiérrez (2013), Large biases and inconsistent climate change signals in ENSEMBLES regional projections, *Climatic Change*, 120(4), 859–869.

Turco, M., M.-C. Llasat, J. von Hardenberg, and A. Provenzale (2014), Climate change impacts on wildfires in a mediterranean environment, *Climatic change*, 125(3-4), 369–380.

Uppala, S., P. Kallberg, A. Simmons, U. Andrae, V. Bechtold, M. Fiorino, J. Gibson, J. Haseler, A. Hernandez, G. Kelly, X. Li, K. Onogi, S. Saarinen, N. Sokka, R. Allan, E. Andersson, K. Arpe, M. Balmaseda, A. Beljaars, L. Van De Berg, J. Bidlot, N. Bormann, S. Caires, F. Chevallier, A. Dethof, M. Dragosavac, M. Fisher, M. Fuentes, S. Hagemann, E. Holm, B. Hoskins, L. Isaksen, P. Janssen, R. Jenne, A. McNally, J. Mahfouf, J. Morcrette, N. Rayner, R. Saunders, P. Simon, A. Sterl, K. Trenberth, A. Untch, D. Vasiljevic, P. Viterbo, and J. Woollen (2005), The ERA-40 re-analysis, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 131(612, Part B), 2961–3012.

van der Linden, P., and J. Mitchell (Eds.) (2009), *ENSEMBLES: Climate Change and its Impacts: Summary of research and results from the ENSEMBLES project*, 160pp pp., Met Office Hadley Centre, FitzRoy Road, Exeter EX1 3PB, UK.

Van Meijgaard, E., L. van Ulft, W. van de Berg, B. Bosveld, B. van der Hurk, G. Lenderik, and A. Siebesma (2008), The knmi regional atmospheric climate model racmo version 2.1., *Tech. Rep. 302*, KNMI, <http://www.knmi.nl/knmi-library/knmipubTR/TR302.pdf>.

Walton, D. B., F. Sun, A. Hall, and S. Capps (2015), A hybrid dynamical–statistical downscaling technique. part i: Development and validation of the technique, *Journal of*

Climate, 28(12), 4597–4617.

Wetterhall, F., F. Pappenberger, Y. He, J. Freer, and H. L. Cloke (2012), Conditioning model output statistics of regional climate model precipitation on circulation patterns,

Nonlin. Processes Geophys., 19(6), 623–633.

White, R. H., and R. Toumi (2013), The limitations of bias correcting regional climate model inputs, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(12), 29072912.

Wilby, R., S. Charles, E. Zorita, and B. Timbal (2004), Guidelines for use of climate scenarios developed from statistical downscaling methods, *Tech. rep.*, IPCC.

WMO (2009), Guidelines on analysis of extremes in a changing climate in support of informed decisions for adaptation, *Tech. Rep. WCDMP No. 72 WMO/TD-No. 1500*, WMO.

Zhang, X., L. Alexander, G. C. Hegerl, P. Jones, A. K. Tank, T. C. Peterson, B. Trewin, and F. W. Zwiers (2011), Indices for monitoring changes in extremes based on daily temperature and precipitation data, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 2(6), 851–870.

Zorita, E., J. Hughes, D. Lettemaier, and H. von Storch (1995), Stochastic Characterization of Regional Circulation Patterns for Climate Model Diagnosis and Estimation of Local Precipitation, *Journal of Climate*, 8(5, Part 1), 1023–1042.

Table 1. RCM simulations produced in the ENSEMBLES project used in this study with the corresponding driving GCM. The numbers are used to facilitate the reading of the Taylor diagrams presented later (see Sec. 4). The asterisks indicate the best performing models in this region according to previous studies [Herrera *et al.*, 2010; Turco *et al.*, 2013].

Number - Acronym	RCM	Driving GCM	Reference
1 - CNRM(*)	ALADIN	ARPEGE	<i>Radu et al.</i> [2008]
2 - DMI(*)	HIRHAM	ARPEGE	<i>Christensen et al.</i> [2008]
3 - DMI-BCM	HIRHAM	BCM	<i>Christensen et al.</i> [2008]
4 - DMI-ECHAM5	HIRHAM	ECHAM5-r3	<i>Christensen et al.</i> [2008]
5 - ICTP(*)	RegCM3	ECHAM5-r3	<i>Pal et al.</i> [2007]
6 - KNMI(*)	RACMO	ECHAM5-r3	<i>Van Meijgaard et al.</i> [2008]
7 - HC(*)	HadRM3Q0	HadCM3Q0	<i>Haugen and Haakensatd</i> [2005]
8 - MPI(*)	M-REMO	ECHAM5-r3	<i>Jacob</i> [2001]
9 - SMHI(*)	RCA	ECHAM5-r3	<i>Samuelsson et al.</i> [2011]
10 - SMHI-BCM	RCA	BCM	<i>Samuelsson et al.</i> [2011]

Table 2. Climatic mean and extreme ETCCDI indices for precipitation used in this work (see also <http://etccdi.pacificclimate.org>).

Label	Description	Units
PRCPTOT	total precipitation	mm
R1	number of days with precipitation over 1 mm/day	days
SDII	mean precipitation amount on a wet day ($> 1mm$)	mm
R20	number of days with precipitation over 20 mm/day	days
RX1DAY	maximum precipitation in 1 day	mm
CDD	consecutive dry days ($< 1mm$)	days
CWD	consecutive wet days ($> 1mm$)	days

Accepted Article




Figure 1. Topography of Spanish Iberian Peninsula and the Balearic Islands as represented by Spain02 at $0.2^\circ \times 0.2^\circ$, showing the main river basins: 0. Catalana, 1. Norte, 2. Duero, 3. Tajo, 4. Guadiana, 5. Guadalquivir, 6. Sur, 7. Segura, 8. Levante, 9. Ebro, B. Balears. The inset shows a geographical map at larger scale.




Figure 2. Schematic illustration of the MOS-Analog method (adapted from *Fernandez and Saenz, 2003*). See the text for details.




Figure 3. Spatial distribution of the observed (Spain02, left), RCM (central) and MOS-Analog (right) mean values (averaged over the baseline period 1971-2000) for some of the precipitation indices shown in Table 2. The spatial validation scores for the RCM and MOS-Analog simulated values are given below the corresponding panels: mean error M (in % w.r.t. the observed mean); the relative standard deviation S ; the centred root-mean-square R ; the correlation C .




Figure 4. Taylor diagrams for the GCM-driven RCMs for different ETCCDI indices (Table 2). The squares and the dots with the numbers indicate, respectively, the model output (as referred on Table 1) and the MOS-Analog applied to this model.




Figure 5. Seasonal cycle of the spatially averaged $R1$ index (in days) for each river basin (according to Fig. 1). The black line represents the observed (Spain02) climatology. The violet shaded band spans the values for the RCMs while the green one spans the respective MOS downscaled values.




Figure 6. As Fig. 5 but for $RX1DAY$ index (in mm/day).




Figure 7. Future climate change signals (expressed as percentage of change with regards the baseline control period 1971-2000) for the period 2071-2100 for the precipitation indices shown in Table 2. The different rows correspond to the results for the seven-member ensemble (ENS), the quantile mapping bias correction method (QQM), and the MOS-Analog downscaling method. The colour saturation level shows the percentage agreement in the direction of change among the ensemble members.




Figure 8. Seasonal changes of the precipitation index $PRCPTOT$ for different future periods (2011-2040, 2041-2070, 2071-2100). Values for MOS-Analog (MOS), the quantile mapping bias correction method (QQM) and RCMs (ENS) are expressed in percentage of change between the baseline (1971-2000) and future periods. The colour saturation level shows the percentage agreement in the direction of change among the ensembles.




Figure 9. The same as Fig. 8 but for $RX1DAY$ index.




Figure 10. The same as Fig. 8 but for *CDD* index.