Regional-scale analysis of carbon and water cycles on managed grassland systems

Shaoxiu Ma, Romain Lardy, Anne-Isabelle Graux, Haythem Ben Touhami, Katja Klumpp, Raphaël Martin, Gianni Bellocchi

► To cite this version:

Shaoxiu Ma, Romain Lardy, Anne-Isabelle Graux, Haythem Ben Touhami, Katja Klumpp, et al.. Regional-scale analysis of carbon and water cycles on managed grassland systems. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 2015, 72, 10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.03.007 . hal-01210951

HAL Id: hal-01210951

<https://hal.science/hal-01210951>

Submitted on 28 May 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Regional-scale analysis of carbon and water cycles on**
2
3
4
5
6
7 **managed grassland systems**

8
9
10
11
12
13 Shaoxiu Ma¹, Romain Lardy^{2,3}, Anne-Isabelle Graux⁴, Haythem Ben Touhami¹, Katja
14 Klumpp¹, Raphaël Martin¹, Gianni Bellocchi¹
15
16
17
18

19 ¹INRA, UR0874 Grassland Ecosystem Research, F-63039 Clermont-Ferrand, France
20

21 ² UMR 5505 IRIT, CNRS, University of Toulouse, France
22

23 ³ UMR 1248 AGIR, INRA-INPT, Castanet-Tolosan, France
24

25 ⁴ INRA – Agrocampus Ouest, UMR 1348 PEGASE, Domaine de la Prise, 35590
26
27 Saint-Gilles, France
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Abstract:

Predicting regional and global carbon (C) and water dynamics on grasslands has become of major interest, as grasslands are one of the most widespread vegetation types worldwide, providing a number of ecosystem services (such as forage production and C storage). The present study is a contribution to a regional-scale analysis of the C and water cycles on managed grasslands. The mechanistic biogeochemical model PaSim (Pasture Simulation model) was evaluated at 12 grassland sites in Europe. A new parameterization was obtained on a common set of eco-physiological parameters, which represented an improvement of previous parameterization schemes (essentially obtained via calibration at specific sites). We found that C and water fluxes estimated with the parameter set are in good agreement with observations. The model with the new parameters estimated that European grassland are a sink of C with $213 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, which is close to the observed net ecosystem exchange (NEE) flux of the studied sites ($185 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ on average). The estimated yearly average gross primary productivity (GPP) and ecosystem respiration (RECO) for all of the study sites are 1220 and $1006 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, respectively, in agreement with observed average GPP ($1230 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and RECO ($1046 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). For both variables aggregated on a weekly basis, the root mean square error (RMSE) was $\sim 5\text{-}16 \text{ g C week}^{-1}$ across the study sites, while the goodness of fit (R^2) was $\sim 0.4\text{-}0.9$. For evapotranspiration (ET), the average value of simulated ET (415 mm yr^{-1}) for all sites and years is close to the average value of the observed ET (451 mm yr^{-1}) by flux towers (on a weekly basis, $\text{RMSE} \sim 2\text{-}8 \text{ mm week}^{-1}$;

1
2
3
4
5 37 $R^2=0.3-0.9$). However, further model development is needed to better represent soil
6
7
8 38 water dynamics under dry conditions and soil temperature in winter. A quantification
9
10 39 of the uncertainties introduced by spatially generalized parameter values in C and
11
12 40 water exchange estimates is also necessary. In addition, some uncertainties in the
13
14
15 41 input management data call for the need to improve the quality of the observational
16
17
18 42 system.

19
20 43

21
22 44

23
24 45

25
26
27
28 **Key word:**

29
30 47 Carbon flux, eddy flux measurements, model evaluation, Pasture Simulation model
31
32
33 48 (PaSim), water balance
34
35 49

Software availability

Name of Software: Pasture Simulation model (PaSim)
Developer: INRA, UR0874 initiative; contact: Raphaël Martin
Contact Address: INRA, UR0874 Grassland Ecosystem Research, 63039
Clermont-Ferrand, France
Telephone: +33-4-73624872
E-mail: raphael.martin@clermont.inra.fr
Availability: On request to the authors
Cost: free for no-profit use
Program language: Fortran

1. Introduction

Accurate quantification of ecosystem carbon (C) and water fluxes over regions, continents, or the globe is essential for understanding the feedbacks between the terrestrial biosphere and the atmosphere in the context of global change and climate policy-making (Xiao et al., 2012; Ciais et al., 2013). In the last decades, significant progresses have been made in quantifying regional to global C and water fluxes by using ecosystem modelling (Jung et al., 2007; Xiao et al., 2009), atmospheric inverse modelling (Butler et al., 2010) and upscaling of flux observations from eddy covariance towers (Jung et al., 2011). In particular, integrated environmental modelling (Laniak et al., 2013) provides effective tools for studying C and water cycles in agricultural and natural systems. Ecosystem models have been intensively developed and used to estimate C and water exchanges between the atmosphere and biosphere (Bondeau et al., 1999; Churkina et al., 1999; Huntzinger et al., 2012; Warszawski et al., 2014). They represent the key processes (such as plant photosynthesis, ecosystem respiration and evapotranspiration) and climatic and management drivers (e.g. grazing, cutting and fertilization) that regulate energy and matter exchanges. However, most of the modelling efforts have focussed on forests (Bondeau et al., 1999; Schaefer et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2012) and croplands (Palosuo et al., 2011; Roetter et al., 2012; Wattenbach et al., 2010), while lesser attention was given to grasslands (Ciais et al., 2010).

Grasslands are a widespread vegetation type worldwide, covering nearly one-fifth of the world's land surface (24 million km²) (Suttie et al., 2005) and playing a significant

1
2
3
4
5 84 role in the global C cycle (Scurlock and Hall, 1998; Ciais et al., 2010). At global scale,
6
7 85 grasslands were estimated to be a net C sink of about 0.5 Pg C per year (Scurlock and
8
9
10 86 Hall, 1998), but with high spatial heterogeneity and considerable uncertainty on the
11
12 87 estimate of C exchange. Janssens et al. (2005) estimated that grasslands provide a C
13
14
15 88 sink of $66 \pm 90 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ over Europe. From an extensive network of flux towers,
16
17
18 89 Schulze et al. (2009) inferred a net C sink: net biome production (NBP) in European
19
20 90 grasslands of $57 \pm 34 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. However, grassland ecosystems are the most
21
22 91 uncertain components of the Europe-wide C balance in comparison to forests and
23
24 92 croplands because only few data and grassland-specific models are available (Ciais et
25
26
27 93 al., 2010). As a consequence, it is urgent to improve and evaluate grassland models
28
29 94 based on recently-available eddy flux data.
30
31

32
33
34 95 Over the last decades, grassland models were developed with different research foci.
35
36 96 CENTURY model was developed to simulate soil C, N, P, and S dynamics on a
37
38 97 monthly time step (Parton, 1988), with an updated version (DayCent) working on a
39
40 98 daily basis (Parton et al., 2007). The Grassland Ecosystem Model (GEM) (Chen et al.,
41
42 99 1996) linked biochemical, biophysical and ecosystem processes in a hierarchical
43
44
45 100 approach to simulate C and N cycles, with focus on natural grasslands. The LINGRA
46
47 101 model (Schapendonk et al., 1998) has been extensively applied to simulate growth of
48
49 102 grasses, including perennial ryegrass (Rodriguez et al., 1999) and timothy (van Oijen
50
51 103 et al., 2005) under northern and western European conditions. The Hurley Pasture
52
53 104 Model (Thornley, 1998) describes the fluxes of C, N and water in a grazed
54
55 105 soil-pasture-atmosphere system. DairyMod was designed to simulate not only
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 106 biophysical, but also dairy management options (Johnson et al., 2008). Several
6
7 107 integrated or whole farm system models were also available to simulate the
8
9 108 biogeochemical processes and also include decision support system, such as Whole
10
11 109 Farm Model (Bright et al., 2000), GP-FARM (Ascough et al., 2007), Integrated Farm
12
13 110 System Model (<http://www.ars.usda.gov/Main/docs.htm?docid=8519>) and FASSET
14
15 111 (Chirinda et al., 2011). An overview of the state of the art and the developments
16
17 112 needed for process-based modelling of grazed agricultural systems were addressed by
18
19 113 Snow et al. (2014).
20
21
22
23
24 114 Recently, attempts have also been made to introduce management options into global
25
26 115 dynamic vegetation and crop models in order to extend functionalities for grasslands
27
28 116 on regional and global scales. Biome and global dynamic vegetation models such as
29
30 117 LPJmL (Bondeau et al., 2007), Biome-BGC (Hidy et al., 2012), ORCHIDEE (Krinner
31
32 118 et al., 2005) and CARAIB (Warnant et al., 1994) were improved with mowing and
33
34 119 grazing options. At the same time, widely used crop models, such as STICS (Brisson
35
36 120 et al., 2003; Ruget et al., 2009), EPIC (Williams et al., 1989), CropSyst (Stöckle et al.,
37
38 121 2003), DNDC (Rafique et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2012), DSSAT (Giraldo et al., 1999)
39
40 122 and the APSIM platform (Holzworth et al., 2014) have also been adapted to simulate
41
42 123 grasslands. These efforts have made great contributions to the overall development of
43
44 124 grassland models (yet with a different detail in representing processes). However,
45
46 125 model evaluation was limited in scope to specific goals (e.g. not all grassland models
47
48 126 simulate biogeochemical cycles). A detailed evaluation of model performance against
49
50 127 observational flux data from a variety of grassland sites is therefore desirable. In
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 128 particular, for a process-based model representing in detail the mechanisms driving
6
7 129 the functioning of grassland systems, evaluation is needed with extended datasets,
8
9
10 130 which include different grassland observational sites with a diversity of climatic,
11
12 131 management and soil conditions.

13
14
15 132 The process-based biogeochemical Pasture Simulation model (PaSim) is the focus of
16
17 133 this study. It was originally developed by Riedo et al. (1998), based on the Hurley
18
19 134 Pasture Model (Thornley, 1998), to simulate managed grasslands (clover-ryegrass
20
21 135 swards). PaSim includes both grazing and cutting management options and is able to
22
23 136 simulate a variety of temperate grassland ecosystems. Over the last decade, the model
24
25 137 has been continuously improved to simulate C, water and N cycles. New approaches
26
27 138 were integrated into the modelling structure to simulate, for instance, nitrous oxide
28
29 139 (N_2O) emissions from soils (Schmid et al., 2001a) and methane (CH_4) emissions from
30
31 140 animals (Vuichard et al., 2007a) as well as the performances (i.e. milk and meat
32
33 141 production) of grazing animals (Graux et al., 2011). The model has been used in the
34
35 142 climate-change impact studies (Graux et al., 2013; Vital et al., 2013), including an
36
37 143 assessment of the contribution of forage-based systems to the global warming (Graux
38
39 144 et al., 2012) with focus on France. However, PaSim has only been evaluated against a
40
41 145 few European grassland sites using short periods of observed C fluxes and biomass
42
43 146 production data, and based on limited parameterization (Vuichard et al., 2007a;
44
45 147 Calanca et al., 2007). A full documentation and an extended evaluation of the model
46
47 148 over a large number of sites are required.

48
49
50 149 A monitoring network consisting of a total of 12 grassland sites was established in
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

2002 and eddy-covariance flux measurements were made on this network within the European projects of the 5th, 6th and 7th framework programs, such as GREENGRASS (Soussana et al., 2007b), CARBOMONT (Bahn et al., 2008; Wohlfahrt et al., 2008), CarboEurope (Gilmanov et al., 2010) and CARBO-Extreme (Reichstein et al., 2013). This dataset provides a good opportunity to evaluate grassland model performances because these sites cover a variety of grassland types with contrasting management practices and representing different climate conditions. The present study assesses the ability of PaSim to reproduce C and water fluxes of a number of European long-term eddy flux measurement sites. To do so, three sets of eco-physiological vegetation parameters (i.e. from permanent grassland, sown grassland, and an adjusted set, which is the calibrated parameter values based on flux measurements data and their plausible ranges) were applied in order to test whether a common set of vegetation parameters is appropriate to represent model outputs at European scale (regardless of the possible physiological dissimilarities among grasslands species in different places in Europe). Model calibration was not applied separately to each observational site. This did not make it possible to explore the spatial variability of model parameters. Testing such a scenario appeared beyond the scope of this paper since it implied too strong a deviation from the initial hypothesis of this regional study. Rather, we calibrated the model simultaneously on all datasets to find parameter values that would be applicable at regional scale. Multi-site calibration can be characterized by lower uncertainty than site-specific calibration, because more data are involved in the calibration process (e.g. Minunno et al., 2014).

1
2
3
4
5 172 The availability of a variety of detailed flux data from multiple sites offers the
6
7
8 173 possibility of a genuine multi-location calibration of the model, holding to the
9
10 174 assumption that a uniform calibration across sites is appropriate under these
11
12 175 conditions. The results are discussed with respect to the strengths and weaknesses of
13
14
15 176 the model in estimating C and water balances in Europe before presenting conclusions
16
17
18 177 and avenues for future research.
19
20 178
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Study sites and climate data

Twelve grassland sites with long-term eddy flux measurements were included in the study to evaluate model performances. The study sites cover a broad gradient of geographic and climatic conditions (Table 1) as well as a variety of soil types and management practices (Table 2). The sites are located in Central and Western Europe (Fig. 1, left), distributed over a range of latitudes from United Kingdom (Easter Bush) to Portugal (Mitra), of longitudes from Ireland (Dripsey) to Hungary (Bugac-Puszt), and of elevations from sea level up to mountain sites located at about 1800 m a.s.l. (Table 1). Along these ranges, the mean annual temperature varies from 5.2 (Monte Bondone, Italy) to 14.3 °C (Mitra, Portugal) with mean annual precipitation rates from 520 (Bugac-Puszt, Hungary) to 1271 mm (Dripsey, Ireland). With respect to management, the dataset covers the gradient from semi-natural to intensively managed mixed grass species swards (in the presence of clover) and essentially includes vegetation types representative of the zone. Semi-natural grasslands are typified by extensive systems either grazed (with a stocking rate of ~0.5-1.0 LSU ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹) or not grazed (where forage production is limited to one cutting per year). Otherwise, the other sites are intensively managed by grazing and/or cutting and are supplied with relative large amounts of N fertilizer (>200 kg N ha⁻¹). It should be noted that the distinction between extensive and intensive grasslands may not be clear-cut. For instance, the unfertilized site of Ampler, grazed by a limited number of livestock units (0.5 LSU ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹), qualifies as an intensive production system because

1
2
3
4
5 202 it is grazed for a long period of time in the year (200 days), with intensive utilization
6
7 203 of the sward and gain of N from returns by animals. At Easter Bush, the low impact of
8
9
10 204 grazing pressure (in number of animals and duration) is instead compatible with an
11
12 205 extensive system because the N fertilization treatment does not exceed the threshold
13
14
15 206 ($>200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$) conventionally set for intensively managed grasslands (e.g. Bos et
16
17 207 al., 2005).

18
19
20 208 Monthly and yearly summaries for the average temperature and total precipitation
21
22 209 were obtained from the hourly weather data available for each site. The yearly
23
24
25 210 reference evapotranspiration (ET_0 , mm) was also calculated, using the
26
27 211 Penman–Monteith method, which uses an hourly time step (Allen, 2005). These
28
29 212 weather summaries were the basis for calculating two bioclimatic indicators.

30
31
32 213 The aridity pattern (Fig. 1, right) is characterized by semi-arid to humid conditions,
33
34
35 214 with the average value of De Martonne-Gottmann index (b) ranging from 10-20 at
36
37 215 Mitra (Portugal) and Bugac-Puszt (Hungary) to 45 at Dripsey (Ireland). The climate
38
39 216 of Mitra is typically warm and dry for a large part of the year, with hot summers.
40
41 217 Bugac-Puszt represents a continental climate, with hot summers, rain showers and
42
43 218 mildly cold winters. The site is characterized by annual water deficit, as well as the
44
45 219 Mediterranean upland site of Ampler (Central Italy). The other sites are mostly
46
47 220 humid, with values of the aridity index around 30-50.

48
49
50
51
52
53
54 221

55 222 **2.2 Flux measurements**

56
57
58
59 223 Each study site was equipped with an eddy covariance system to determine the net
60
61

ecosystem exchange (NEE) of CO₂. For each site, details of the materials and software used are provided by published papers (Table 1). The eddy covariance system consisted of a fast response 3D sonic anemometer coupled with fast CO₂-H₂O analyzers measuring fluxes of CO₂, latent and sensible heat, and momentum fluxes every 30 minutes. The flux data used in this study were downloaded from the European Fluxes Database Cluster (<http://www.europe-fluxdata.eu>). These data, previously filtered (quality checking and gap-filling) using methods based on friction velocity (u^* filtering), contain inherent uncertainty (as detected by bootstrapping approach, after Reichstein et al., 2005 and Papale et al., 2006). We acknowledge that the random and systematic errors of eddy flux measurements could induce uncertainty and affect interpretation of data when eddy flux data were used for model calibration and validation (Lasslop et al., 2008). Random errors caused by poor measurement and sampling variability can be quite large at half-hourly time resolution, while systematic errors (biases) can be corrected (Aubinet et al., 2012). It is known that the correction can be insufficient to avoid propagation of uncertainties in the gap-filling procedure and in the partitioning of C exchanges into assimilation and respiration (Richardson et al., 2012). However, the absolute uncertainty in half-hourly measurements is reduced (down to ~10%) with daily or higher (monthly to annual) timescales and often equals the inter-annual variability of the measured fluxes (Hagen et al., 2006; Desai et al., 2008; Kroon et al., 2009).

2.3 Model description

246 The Pasture Simulation model (PaSim, version 5.3,
 247 <https://www1.clermont.inra.fr/urep/modeles/pasim.htm>) simulates C and N cycling in
 248 grassland ecosystems (mixed swards) at a sub-daily time step. The model has evolved
 249 over time, starting as a simulator of dry matter production and associated flows of C,
 250 N and water in productive pastures (Riedo et al., 1998). The biological N fixation by
 251 clover is simulated by assuming that clover fraction in the sward is fixed for the
 252 specific location (after Riedo et al., 1998). PaSim was later improved by Schmid et al.
 253 (2001b) with respect to the production and diffusion of N₂O (Riedo et al., 2002) the
 254 exchange of NH₃ with the atmosphere by Vuichard et al. (2007a, b), the animal
 255 herbage selection and intake, and the effects of diet quality on the emissions of CH₄
 256 from grazing animals. More recently, Graux et al. (2011) further improved
 257 functionalities to estimate the forage production and dry matter intake taking into
 258 account selective grazing between vegetation compartments and the effect of high
 259 temperatures on animals, while also simulating ruminant performance and enteric
 260 CH₄ emissions during grazing according to the energy content of the intake. The
 261 livestock system considers change in body weight of the grazing livestock and
 262 simulates the level of milk and meat production with heifers, dairy and suckler cows
 263 during the grazing period.
 264 The model consists of five interacting modules: microclimate, soil, vegetation,
 265 herbivores and management. The soil biophysical module simulates soil temperature
 266 and moisture profiles for different soil layers based on soil physical properties and
 267 hourly weather inputs and simulated plant water use. The soil biogeochemical module,

1
2
3
4
5 268 adapted by monthly time-step CENTURY's organic decomposition approach (Parton,
6
7 269 1988), evenly distributes litter into the whole soil profile. The litter is segregated into
8
9
10 270 its structural and substrate components, respectively supplying the structural and
11
12 271 metabolic soil pools. In addition, the soil organic matter is further separated into three
13
14
15 272 compartments (active, slow and passive) according to different decomposition rates.
16
17 273 Soil pools are interlinked to represent C and N first-order kinetics. The N cycle
18
19 274 considers N inputs to the soil via atmospheric deposition, fertilizer addition, symbiotic
20
21 275 fixation by legumes and animal faeces and urine. The inorganic soil N is available for
22
23 276 root uptake and is lost through the processes (leaching, volatilization and
24
25 277 nitrification/denitrification) leading to N₂O and N₂ emissions to the atmosphere. The
26
27 278 vegetation module estimates the assimilated C by photosynthesis and allocates it
28
29 279 dynamically to one root and three shoot compartments, each of which consisting of
30
31 280 four age classes. The transition from one age category to the next is done using
32
33 281 threshold time values to calculate the age of biomass in a compartment from the input
34
35 282 of younger material and the loss of older material. C losses from the system are
36
37 283 through animal milking, enteric CH₄ emissions and from animal returns, and
38
39 284 ecosystem respiration. Accumulated aboveground biomass is either cut or grazed, or
40
41 285 enters a pool after senescing. Herbivores are considered during the time they were at
42
43 286 pasture (not during indoor periods). Management includes organic and mineral N
44
45 287 fertilizations, mowing and grazing, setting by the user or optimized within the model
46
47 288 to achieve some objectives.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 289

2.4 Parameterization and Simulation

2.4.1 Parameterization strategies

In previous studies (Calanca et al., 2007; Vuichard et al., 2007b), PaSim was evaluated for a temporary grassland at Oensingen (Switzerland) and an upland permanent grassland at Laqueuille (France) based on a set of 26 parameters (Table 3). We assumed that a common set of eco-physiological model parameters can be established to simulate C₃ grasslands (including grasses, forbs and legumes) under contrasting climate and management regimes in Europe, while site-specific climate and management conditions provide supplementary factors driving the actual production of grasslands. Based on the set of parameters given in Table 3 and sensitivity analysis results (Ben Touhami et al., 2013), the following two steps were carried out to explore the parameter space and identify a common set of eco-physiological model parameters for PaSim. First, the model was run at all sites with two sets of default parameter values: temporary sown grassland (P_temp) and upland permanent grassland (P_perm). Second, manual calibration was carried out for these parameters, which were identified as influential parameters by Ben Touhami et al. (2013). The values of some of these parameters were modified within their plausible ranges (as from the published literature, documented by Graux, 2011) to ensure realistic representation of a variety of outputs. The calibration work was performed at all study sites together through a trial-and-error process comparing the model predictions with observational data. The solutions obtained constitute a

satisfactory performance for all output variables according to the metrics of Table 4. Even though optimization methods are available (Trudinger et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2009), the manual calibration is useful for modellers to get a reference parameter set reflecting expert knowledge and simple adjustment strategies. It was proven that optimization methods may be problematic in confronting the interaction between parameters of complex models (Hollinger and Richardson, 2005; Richardson et al., 2010). The model performance was evaluated for each site separately and with all sites combined, by comparing the simulated C and water fluxes with data from eddy flux towers.

2.4.2 Model simulation and evaluation

For each site, simulations were carried out with three sets of parameter values described above for all available years in each site. PaSim was initialized via a spin-up process using the current weather input. In particular, soil C pools were initialized to steady-state by running the model over 100 years by looping the available meteorology at each site following Lardy et al. (2011). The results of the spin-up process matched the supplied soil C measurements with a relative error of about 10% on average ($\pm \sim 2\%$ standard error). The agreement of model outputs against the following five plant and soil variables was examined, gross primary productivity (GPP, $\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$), ecosystem respiration (RECO, $\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$), net ecosystem exchange (NEE, $\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$), soil water content ($\text{m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$) and actual evapotranspiration (ET, mm d^{-1}). Ecosystem respiration (RECO)

1
2
3
4
5 334 plays an important role in estimating global C balances of terrestrial ecosystems, and
6
7 335 its knowledge is required to assess the GPP of such ecosystem (as a sum of NEE, and
8
9
10 336 RECO, equations in appendixes A, B, C and D). Soil water content (SWC) and soil
11
12 337 temperature (ST) were estimated for each of the six layers that make up the soil
13
14
15 338 profile in PaSim (equations in appendixes E and F).
16
17 339 Different performance indices and threshold criteria (Bennett et al., 2013) were used
18
19
20 340 to evaluate the model (Table 4). In particular, the goodness-of-fit R^2 (coefficient of
21
22 341 determination) was calculated to assess the linear dependence between modelled and
23
24
25 342 observed data and the variance explained by the model. The modelling efficiency
26
27
28 343 (ME), the index of agreement (IA) and the root mean square error (RMSE) were
29
30 344 derived to assess quantitative differences. The mean bias (MB) is a measure of the
31
32
33 345 overall tendency of the model to under- or over-estimate (the systematic error) the
34
35
36 346 observations. The performance of the model was assessed on daily, weekly and
37
38 347 monthly time scales.
39
40 348

3. Results

This section first describes the study sites. Then, the comparison between PaSim results obtained with three sets of parameter values (two previously established and one established in this study) and observed C and water fluxes is illustrated. The model improvement gained with the new parameterization is presented. As well, the impact of both site-specific characteristics and management options on model performances is illustrated, followed by a detailed analysis of the model performances with focus on C and water balances. Only exemplary results (selected output variables and sites) are reported graphically and the main outcomes discussed hereafter, while the full set of results is provided online supplementary material.

3.1 The improvement of the model performance with the redefined parameter values

The adjusted parameters (denoted P_{new}) essentially reflect that previously used at the permanent grassland site of Laqueuille (P_{perm}) (Table 3). This indicates that Laqueuille site resembles the European grasslands used in this study, with the exception of four parameters: light-saturated leaf photosynthetic rate for reproductive stage, light-saturated leaf photosynthetic rate for vegetative stage, maximum specific leaf area, and temperature dependence factor of the soil respiration. Even though a formal sensitivity analysis was not undertaken in this study, these parameters had a significant impact on model outputs in a previous study (Ben Touhami et al., 2013). For three parameters, the new values lie between those in the previous studies. For the

parameter governing soil respiration, previous modelling studies supported a default value equal to 2, which was substantially decreased (down to 0.7) to obtain simulated respiration values closer to observations. Given its impact on the modelled RECO, characterization of this parameter will require further studies.

The estimation of GPP and RECO was improved (Fig. 2) with the redefined common set of eco-physiological parameters (Table 3). GPP was overestimated at all sites using the P_temp parameter set with the exception of Oensingen (the site where that parameter set was originally derived) and, to a lesser extent, of Amplerro. Using P_perm parameter set (permanent grassland), the bias of GPP was reduced at seven out of 12 sites. Applying the redefined P_redif parameter set (Table 3), the bias of GPP was further reduced for most of the sites except Oensingen, Bugac-Puszt and Amplerro (Fig. 2).

With both P_temp and P_perm parameter sets, RECO was overestimated for most of the sites, with the exception of Oensingen and Amplerro (Fig. 2). With P_perm, a slight underestimation was also obtained at intensively-managed Laqueuille (Fig. 2). When the redefined parameter set was used, the bias of RECO was reduced at all sites but Oensingen and Amplerro. Overall, the estimated ET has a good agreement with the observed values with no real improvement with the redefined parameter values (Fig. 2 and Fig. A1).

3.2 The site variability of model performances with the redefined parameter values

Model performance in predicting GPP, RECO and ET (data aggregated on a weekly basis) is closely linked with site-specific conditions such as soil moisture (e.g. dry sandy soils versus humid soils). The model simulated well GPP and RECO for nine out of 12 sites. The exceptions were the sites of Amplero, Mitra and Bugac-Puszt (Fig. 3, Fig. 4 and Table 5), which are characterized by drier conditions than the other sites. The R^2 for the estimated versus observed GPP was greater than 0.8 for most of the sites and was lower than 0.5 at Amplero only ($R^2=0.40$) (Fig. 3). Similar results were found when other indices, such as the slope of the regression, IA, ME and RMSE were taken into account (Table. 5). Compared with GPP estimations, similar model performances were found for RECO across sites, but R^2 values for RECO were relatively lower than those obtained when simulating GPP. For RECO, R^2 values were generally greater than 0.7 for most of the sites, but lower than 0.5 at Amplero ($R^2=0.39$) and Mitra ($R^2=0.46$) (Fig. 4). At Oensingen, the model underestimated RECO during winter time and there were also periods (e.g. 2007) when summer modelled RECO was below of that measured (Fig. 5). However, winter RECO underestimation was common to most of the sites (online supplementary material). The model performance was satisfactory for predicting ET at most of the sites. Exceptions were dry sites such as Amplero, Bugac-Puszt and Mitra (Fig. A1).

3.3 The impact of site characteristics and management practices

Site characteristics and management practices were observed to have an important impact on the model ability to estimate RECO (Fig. 6), but they were less important

when predicting GPP, NEE, ET, and soil temperature (data not shown). Concerning management practices, the model tended to underestimate or overestimate RECO, respectively for intensively and extensively managed grasslands (Fig. 6). The occurrence of cutting or grazing had no significant impact on the model performance in predicting RECO. The model tended to slightly underestimate RECO for temporary-sown grasslands, while simulations of permanent grasslands were in good agreement with measured data (Fig. 6). Concerning site-specific conditions, RECO was underestimated for non-montane grasslands (<800 m a.s.l.) and overestimated for mountain sites (Fig. 6).

An analysis of the normalized residuals (where each residual is the difference between the predicted and observed values divided by the standard deviation) showed seasonal patterns, which differed by site (Fig. 7). On average, the model slightly underestimated weekly-aggregated RECO in winter in most sites, but significantly overestimated it in summer time on Laqueuille extensive, Monte Bondone, Alinya, Bugac-Pushta, and Cabauw (Fig. 7). However, most of the residuals fall within the upper limit of the 95% confidence interval.

3.4 C and water balances

The mean annual C fluxes (NEE, GPP and RECO) are meant as a synthesis and a complement to the model performances of PaSim presented in this study. They showed a good agreement with observations using the redefined parameter set (Fig. 8). With these parameter values, the estimated NEE flux was on average $213 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, which indicates a sink of C approaching the average NEE flux observed at the studied

1
2
3
4
5 437 sites ($185 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) (Fig. 8). The estimated yearly average values of GPP (1220 g
6
7 438 $\text{C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and RECO ($1006 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) are in agreement with the observed mean
8
9
10 439 values ($1230 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for GPP and $1046 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for RECO) across all sites
11
12 440 (Fig. 8). As a consequence, the model overestimated the C sink by 15%. This is
13
14
15 441 mainly due to RECO, which is underestimated while GPP is in good agreement with
16
17 442 observations. The average value of simulated ET (415 mm yr^{-1}) for all sites and years
18
19
20 443 was close to the average value of the observations (451 mm yr^{-1}), which corresponded
21
22
23 444 to an underestimation by 8% (Fig. 9).
24
25
26 445

4. Discussion

4.1 Model performance over European grasslands

By evaluating PaSim at a variety of European sites, an improvement of model performances was obtained with using a common set of parameter values to estimate C and water fluxes at weekly and yearly time scales (Fig. 2, Fig. 8 and Table 3). The discrepancy between the observed and estimated GPP and RECO values was reduced compared with previous studies making use of parameter values obtained at specific conditions (Calanca et al., 2007; Ciais et al., 2010). For instance, Calanca et al. (2007) overestimated GPP of about 50% at Laqueuille (France).

4.2 The spatial variability of the model performance

The agreement between the observed and estimated GPP on arid sites (Bugac-Puszt, Amplero) is not as good as on other sites (Fig. 3). The mismatch between observed and estimated GPP values on these dry sites can be partially attributed to the fact that the model did not simulate soil water content fluctuations during summer time well (see effect of drought conditions for Bugac-Puszt, Fig. 2A and Amplero, Italy, Fig A3). Previous studies confirmed that extreme drought events may have a significant effect on C and water cycles (Ciais et al., 2005; Hussain et al., 2011). With all the slope coefficients less than 1, the range of the simulated soil water content was smaller than the observed range, while the intercept was well above 0 (Fig. A4), indicating that the model overestimated the soil water content during dry periods and

underestimated it the rest of time. As a consequence, the overestimated soil water content during drought periods could explain the slight overestimation of GPP (Fig. A2). In contrast, at Mitra (Portugal), the underestimated GPP can be partially attributed to the underestimated soil water content during the growing season (Fig. A5) as water is the limitation factor of plant growth in arid regions. Underestimation of GPP was also obtained at Amplero (Italy), but the incomplete information available for this site (Fig. A3) about starting and ending dates of grazing (constant dates were used) makes interpretation of results difficult.

Comparing with GPP, a similar model performance for RECO was found, but R^2 for RECO is relatively lower than GPP (Fig. 3). The lower R^2 for RECO on most of the sites is mainly due to the underestimated RECO during winter as, for instance, at Bugac-Pusztá (Fig. 7, A2). On one hand the underestimated RECO during winter can be attributed to underestimation of soil temperature in the same period as soil respiration is sensitive to temperature. Soil respiration, one of the main components of RECO, depends on soil moisture, clay content, soil organic matter and C assimilation (Bahn et al., 2008; Balogh et al., 2011; Migliavacca et al., 2011) and these are also the drivers of PaSim. On another hand, the overestimated RECO at Bugac-Pusztá is partially due to overestimated GPP as more C substrate is available. A third reason might be that the model overestimated soil moisture content (Fig. A2 and Fig. A5) since soil moisture is one of the most important limiting factors of soil respiration especially in arid and semi-arid regions (Balogh et al., 2011). At Amplero and Mitra, RECO underestimation follows GPP underestimation (Fig. A3 and Fig. A5). Indeed,

RECO is intimately related to C supply (Bahn et al., 2008; Migliavacca et al., 2011).

491

4.3 Effect of site-specific conditions and management practices

Management practices affect grassland production and greenhouse gas emissions from grassland systems (Schmitt et al., 2010; Zeeman et al., 2010; Luo et al., 2012; Peichl et al., 2012). In this study, PaSim underestimated RECO for intensively-managed grasslands such as Oensingen and Amplero and overestimated it for extensively-managed grasslands (Fig. 6, 7). It is known that intensive management practices can introduce pronounced changes to soil physical structure, which in turn impact the soil water transport processes and the soil heterotrophic respiration (Moyano et al., 2012; Ball, 2013). It is the case for the present study as PaSim did not simulate adequately soil water fluctuations (Fig. 5, Fig. A2 and Fig. A3). At Oensingen (Switzerland), the model did not represent well the soil temperature (Fig. 5). This can be mainly attributed to the disturbance of management, which changed the soil structure when converting cropland into grassland at Oensingen in 2001, considering that tillage changes soil physical structure and, in turn, water and energy transport processes (Acharya et al., 2012). The human management could also modify microbial component and diversity (Cantarel et al., 2012), which significantly impacts on the soil respiration (Allison et al., 2010; Wieder et al., 2013). Moreover, the possibility to introduce more uncertainties is high due to imprecise input management information such as grazing, cutting, and fertilization rate and timing.

511

4.4 Limitations and further improvement

Referring to the model performance discussed above, certain modules of PaSim were identified as worthy of further development. One is the soil energy balance module because the model underestimated soil temperature when air temperature was high in summer (Fig. A5) and overestimated soil temperature in winter when air temperature is low (Fig. 5, Fig. A2, Fig. A3 and Fig. A5). The soil water transport module is also critical because soil water fluctuations were not well captured by the model (Fig. 5, Fig. A2, Fig. A3 and Fig. A5), especially on arid and semi-arid grasslands. Moreover, the effect of standing biomass on the energy balance (with shading and albedo) has not been investigated.

The choice of eco-physiological parameters used and calibrated manually in this study also requires a formal quantification of the parameter uncertainties introduced in regional studies. The interaction between model parameters is also an issue. For example, specific leaf area (*sla*), which depends on the maximum value set for it (*slam*), interacts in PaSim with C allocation-parameters across different organs of the plant. A higher *sla* could induce a lower allocation of assimilated C to leaf, which may be not the case in reality.

530 5. Conclusions and perspectives

531

532 5.1 Summary of findings of the regional-scale analysis

533 A regional-scale analysis of C and water cycles was performed on a variety of
534 European grassland sites using a process-based model (PaSim) with a single set of
535 eco-physiological parameters. It was shown that: 1) variables of C and water cycles
536 (mainly GPP, RECO and ET) can be reasonably simulated by PaSim at European
537 scale using a common set of parameter values; 2) better model performances are
538 obtained at more humid sites; 3) RECO tends to be underestimated in
539 intensively-managed grasslands and overestimated at sites when extensive
540 management practices are adopted.

541 The parameterization for mechanistic simulation of grasslands (with biogeochemical
542 capabilities) is a general way to facing regional studies. We have pursued in this study
543 the question of to what extent calibration can improve the parameterization of a
544 complex grassland model for regional-scale simulations in Europe. Acting upon the
545 most influential parameters of PaSim, we have derived a set of parameter values of
546 general validity in Europe. Even if for specific purposes process-based models need to
547 be parameterized on a site-specific basis, our multi-dataset procedure demonstrates
548 that it is possible to find global estimates for those parameters that encompass a wide
549 range of conditions. The accurate estimation of C and water fluxes relies on the
550 mechanistic representation of key ecosystem processes, with parameters that can be
551 related to physical quantities, thus the perspective of using a regionally calibrated
552 model regulating energy and matter exchanges is more interesting than applying

1
2
3
4
5 553 statistical models (Laniak et al., 2013). In addition, statistical model estimations may
6
7 554 involve significant levels of collinearity among predictor variables such as
8
9
10 555 temperature and precipitation. They also rely on the assumption of stationarity (e.g.
11
12 556 assuming that past relationships will hold in the future, even if factors such as climate
13
14
15 557 and management evolve) and are subject to problems of low signal-to-noise ratios in
16
17
18 558 yield or weather records in many locations (Lobell and Burke, 2010). The main
19
20 559 finding is that the satisfactory performance obtained over contrasting climate
21
22 560 conditions and management options justify the use of PaSim in regional studies on C
23
24
25 561 and water fluxes in Europe. In C-water flux studies, this is especially relevant when
26
27
28 562 daily-resolution outputs are mainly analysed in temporally-aggregated form - that is,
29
30 563 the interest is in weekly, monthly or higher timeframes (e.g. Wallach and Thorburn,
31
32 564 2014).

33 34 35 36 37 38 566 **5.2 Future work on grassland modelling**

39
40
41 567 Our results indicate further model development is needed to address specific needs
42
43 568 and this is critical under the pressure of a changing climate and related extreme
44
45
46 569 weather events, potentially altering the C cycles at different scales (Field et al., 2011).
47
48
49 570 A first issue is that heat waves and dry spells have (favouring conditions of aridity) a
50
51 571 direct effect on CO₂ fluxes because warmer temperatures and soil moisture shortage
52
53 572 affect both photosynthesis and respiration. Moreover, as changes in seasonal water
54
55 573 availability have pronounced effects on individual species, a prominent role is
56
57
58 574 suggested for species interactions in ecosystem responses to climate changes (Suttle et

1
2
3
4
5 575 al., 2007). Adaptation and functional biodiversity would dampen down the effect of
6
7 576 climate extremes on the C cycle, but the bases for biological adaptation and the role of
8
9 577 biodiversity are still unclear (Reichstein et al., 2013b). The use of functional traits of
10
11 578 plants, for which plant species are classified into functional types based on vegetative
12
13 579 and reproductive traits, proposed by Cruz et al. (2002) can be a promising avenue for
14
15 580 future research (Duru et al., 2013). But the level of detail of this study is too low to
16
17 581 draw conclusions about the relationship between model parameters and phenotypic
18
19 582 traits.

20
21
22
23
24
25 583 To obtain reliable estimates of the sign (source or sink) and magnitude of C-cycle
26
27 584 feedbacks, future research should provide a mechanistic basis for inferring effects of
28
29 585 extreme meteorological events on the C cycle. This would also help capturing the
30
31 586 impacts of drought events on grasslands because drought avoidance of grassland
32
33 587 plants mainly depends on rooting depth and soil water reserves. Concepts by Baker et
34
35 588 al. (2008) and Sheikh et al. (2009), which consider root access to the stored water in
36
37 589 the deep soil water during the drought season, could be integrated into PaSim.

38
39
40
41
42
43 590 The soil temperature module is another area of the model to be improved to better
44
45 591 predict soil temperature over winter. This is especially critical for high-altitude
46
47 592 grasslands, where vegetative growth restarts at snowmelt. This would also improve
48
49 593 the estimation of soil respiration, for which soil temperature is a key driver.

50
51
52
53 594 Moreover, we acknowledge that the dynamics of aboveground biomass accumulation
54
55 595 (either cut for yield production or grazed by animals) were not considered in the study
56
57 596 design. Biomass data are mostly discontinuously measured and rather large
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4
5 597 uncertainties on biomass measurements (mainly owing to spatial heterogeneity) may
6
7 598 hinder model evaluation (Vuichard, 2007b). A better model performance (yet
8
9 599 integrating biomass measurements) could be attained by optimizing model parameters
10
11
12 600 through model-data fusion methods such as Bayesian calibration (van Oijen et al.,
13
14
15 601 2011). Studies of this type are underway on PaSim (Ben Touhami et al., 2012a, b)
16
17 602 with attention given to the interaction among parameters.
18
19
20 603 The improvements of PaSim also include the development of scalable solutions with
21
22 604 fundamental plant science research (a broad range of basic impact processes, open to
23
24 605 a wide range of plant types) and transition of software engineering technology into
25
26 606 modelling practice (Martin et al., 2011; Lardy et al., 2014), while addressing
27
28 607 re-usability issues and inter-linking of model components (Donatelli et al., 2012).
29
30
31 608 For managed grasslands, complete management information is often unavailable for
32
33 609 regional studies. High-quality grassland management data are needed to better
34
35 610 understand their effects on the soil physical structure and C storage (Flechard et al.,
36
37 611 2007; Schmitt et al., 2010; Chang et al., 2013).
38
39
40 612 The model improvement actions are ongoing under the guidance and conditions laid
41
42 613 down by a number of international projects and initiatives (e.g. AgMIP,
43
44 614 <http://www.agmip.org>), and will be expanded by the EU-FP7 project
45
46 615 MODEXTREME (<http://modextreme.org>).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 617 **Acknowledgments**
6

7 618 The results of this research were obtained within an international research project
8
9 619 named “FACCE MACSUR – Modelling European Agriculture with Climate Change
10
11 620 for Food Security, a FACCE JPI knowledge hub”. The data used were obtained with
12
13 621 the support of EU projects CarboEurope-IP (FP6 GOCE-CT-2003-505572) and
14
15 622 CARBO-Extreme (FP7-ENV-2008-1-226701). We thank Partner Institutions for
16
17 623 providing grassland data. We also acknowledge technical support from the European
18
19 624 Fluxes Database Cluster (<http://www.europe-fluxdata.eu>). Several reviewers and the
20
21 625 editors helped considerably in improving the manuscript.
22
23 626

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Primary production

Gross primary production (GPP) is the rate at which the plant captures and stores a given amount of chemical energy as biomass in a given length of time. Some fraction of this fixed energy is used for cellular respiration and maintenance of existing tissues (growth respiration and maintenance respiration). The remaining fixed energy (as mass of photosynthate) is referred to as net primary production (NPP):

$$NPP = GPP - R_{pl,tot} \quad (1)$$

where $R_{pl,tot}$ is the total plant respiration (autotrophic).

Plant residues deposited to the soil are subject to biological degradation. During this process, soil organic C is respired to CO_2 while providing energy to the decomposers (microorganisms and soil fauna). Heterotrophic C fluxes can also include respiratory losses of CO_2 by grazing ruminants. The combined autotrophic and heterotrophic ecosystem respiration (RECO) is the CO_2 release from the plants ($R_{pl,tot}$), soil (R_{soil}) and animals (R_{an}). The ensemble of instantaneous inward and outward flows of C within the ecosystem is the Net Ecosystem Exchange (NEE), given by:

$$NEE = RECO - GPP \quad (2)$$

with positive values indicating the system is a source of C losses, and negative values indicating that the system sequesters C from the atmosphere.

Appendix B - Total plant respiration

A single process of respiration is associated with growth (Thornley, 1998). A component of this respiratory flux is deemed to be maintenance respiration (generally associated with the re-synthesis of degrading tissue), while also taking into account the energy required for mineral uptake. The dependence of respiratory components on C substrate supply is represented by separating C substrate from structure and coupling the respiration flux to photosynthesis. This allows simulating variation in the fractions of total plant respiration associated with different processes during plant development.

Total plant respiration, $R_{pl,tot}$ ($kg\ C\ m^{-2}\ d^{-1}$), is given by:

$$R_{pl,tot} = R_{m,rt} + R_{m,sh} + R_{G,rt} + R_{G,sh} + R_N \quad (3)$$

R_G and R_m stand for growth and maintenance respiration, respectively, referred to shoot (index *sh*) and root (index *rt*). R_N is the respiratory flux associated with uptake of N from the soil solution. The terms $R_{m,rt}$, $R_{G,rt}$ and R_N are soil respiratory fluxes from the biological activity of roots (autotrophic soil respiration).

Growth respiration rates

The two respiration fluxes needed to produce energy for the growth of shoots and roots, $R_{G,sh}$ and $R_{G,rt}$ (kg C m⁻² d⁻¹), respectively, are calculated as:

$$R_{G,sh} = I_{C,G_{sh}} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{Y_{G,pl}} - 1 \right) \quad (4)$$

$$R_{G,rt} = I_{C,G_{rt}} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{Y_{G,pl}} - 1 \right) \quad (5)$$

The term $1/Y_{G,pl}$ is an efficiency measure representing the kg of C required to create 1 kg of structural C, $Y_{G,pl}$ being the photosynthetically-assimilated C initially allocated to substrate C reserves and then used for growth and maintenance of tissues. For the fraction required for growth, growth rates (kg C m⁻² d⁻¹) are calculated for aboveground ($I_{C,G_{sh}}$) and belowground ($I_{C,G_{rt}}$) biomass, based on allocation values occurring during the vegetative stage ($I_{C,G_{sh,veg}}$ and $I_{C,G_{rt,veg}}$, kg C m⁻² d⁻¹), modified in favour of aboveground biomass during the reproductive stage. The coefficient $Y_{G,pl}$ is set equal to 0.75 to represent plant growth efficiency (kg C (kg C)⁻¹).

C allocation fluxes into roots ($I_{C,G_{rt}}$) and aboveground ($I_{C,G_{sh}}$) plant parts are as follows:

$$I_{C,G_{rt}} = I_{C,G_{rt,veg}} - f_{devstage} \cdot I_{C,G_{rt,veg}} \quad (6)$$

$$I_{C,G_{sh}} = I_{C,G_{sh,veg}} + f_{devstage} \cdot I_{C,G_{rt,veg}} \quad (7)$$

Where $f_{devstage}$ is a factor depending on the plant development stage.

The terms $I_{C,G_{sh,veg}}$ and $I_{C,G_{rt,veg}}$ are calculated on a constant growth rate at 20 °C ($I_{C,G20}$, usually set equal to 150 kg² (kg C)⁻¹ (kg N)⁻¹), applied to the cumulative structural biomass of roots and shoots (W_{sh} , W_{rt} , kg DM m⁻²) and modulated by factors of

temperature ($f_{T,G}$) and substrate C and N concentrations in shoots and roots (C_{sh} , C_{rt} , kg C (kg DM)⁻¹; N_{sh} , N_{rt} , kg N (kg DM)⁻¹), as follows:

$$I_{C,G_{sh},veg} = I_{C,G20} \cdot f_{T,G} \cdot C_{sh} \cdot N_{sh} \cdot W_{sh} \quad (8)$$

$$I_{C,G_{rt},veg} = I_{C,G20} \cdot f_{T,G} \cdot C_{rt} \cdot N_{rt} \cdot W_{rt} \quad (9)$$

Maintenance respiration rates

The respiration fluxes to maintain metabolic processes (those that do not result in a net increase in plant dry matter) of roots ($R_{m,rt}$) and shoots ($R_{m,sh}$) are a function of substrate C concentration (C , kg C kg DM⁻¹), structural biomass ($W_{sh} \cdot f_{C,sh}$, $W_{rt} \cdot f_{C,rt}$) and a temperature-dependent stress factor (Table 3):

$$R_{m,sh} = \frac{C}{C + K_{C,mai}} \cdot R_{m,sh,temp} \quad (10)$$

$$R_{m,rt} = \frac{C}{C + K_{C,mai}} \cdot R_{m,rt,temp} \quad (11)$$

where $K_{C,mai}$ is a maintenance respiration parameter, set equal to 0.03 kg substrate C (kg structural DM)⁻¹ d⁻¹. The terms $R_{m,sh,temp}$ and $R_{m,rt,temp}$ are temporary shoot and root maintenance respiration, respectively, as follows:

$$R_{m,sh,temp} = f_{T,sh} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^4 k_{mai,j,20} \cdot W_{sh,j} \cdot f_{C,sh} \quad (12)$$

$$R_{m,rt,temp} = f_{T,rt} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^4 k_{mai,j,20} \cdot W_{rt,j} \cdot f_{C,rt} \quad (13)$$

These maintenance respiration factors are transient in nature since they apply to temporary values. Both shoot and root biomasses are indeed divided into four state variables representing four age categories ($j=1, \dots, 4$), for which the following values are given for the maintenance respiration parameter at 20 °C, $k_{mai,j,20}$ (kg C kg⁻¹ structural C d⁻¹): 0.020 ($j=1$), 0.020 ($j=2$), 0.015 ($j=3$), 0.010 ($j=4$).

The terms $f_{C,sh}$ and $f_{C,rt}$ (kg C kg⁻¹ DM) are fractional C content in shoot and root structural dry matter, respectively (reference values are 0.50 and 0.39, respectively).

N uptake respiration rate

The respiration flux associated with N uptake (R_N , kg C m⁻² d⁻¹) is:

$$R_N = k_N \cdot IN_{soil,rt} \quad (14)$$

where $IN_{soil,rt}$ (kg Nm⁻²) is the mineral N (NO₃⁻-N and NH₄⁺-N) uptake by the sward,

and k_N is the respiratory cost of N uptake (the reference value being $0.45 \text{ kg C kg}^{-1} \text{ N}$).

Appendix C – Heterotrophic soil respiration

Apart the biological activity of roots and associated micro-organisms, the flux of CO_2 from the soil to the atmosphere is the result of the production of CO_2 from the activity of heterotrophic bacteria and fungi living on litter and in the root-free soil (after Parton, 1988). The soil organic carbon (SOC) pool is divided into five pools with different turnover times ranging from 0.5 to 1500 years. An additional component is given by the amount of C released as exudates (*exu*) from roots into the soil, estimated as a fraction of plant substrate C. The litter in decomposition over the total soil depth splits into its structural and substrate components, supplying the structural (*str*) and metabolic (*met*) soil pools respectively. Other three compartments with different decomposition rates include active (*act*), slow (*slo*) and passive (*pas*) pools of SOC, consisting of the microbial biomass, refractory components of litter and highly humified organic compounds respectively.

Total heterotrophic soil respiration, R_{SOC} ($\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$), is given by:

$$R_{SOC} = R_{str} + R_{met} + R_{exu} + R_{act} + R_{slo} + R_{pas} \quad (15)$$

Soil respiration from structural organic matter

The respiration flux associated with structural SOC (R_{str} , $\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) is:

$$R_{str} = (1 - f_{lig,str}) \cdot f_{r,str} \cdot f_{C,str} + f_{lig,str} \cdot f_{r,str,lig} \cdot f_{C,str} \quad (16)$$

The microbial respiration parameter for the decomposition of the structural pool, $f_{r,str}$, and of lignin, $f_{r,str,lig}$, are set equal to 0.55 and 0.3, respectively. The term $f_{lig,str}$ is the fraction of lignin in structural soil organic matter. The fraction of C in the structural plant residue, $f_{C,str}$, is as follows:

$$f_{C,str} = k_{str} \cdot W_{C,str} \quad (17)$$

where k_{str} ($\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) is the decomposition rate for the structural pool and $W_{C,str}$ (kg C m^{-2}) is the C content in structural fraction of plant residue (depending on temperature, lignin, texture and water content).

743 *Soil respiration from metabolic organic matter*

744 The respiration flux associated with metabolic SOC (R_{met} , kg C m⁻²d⁻¹) is:

745
$$R_{met} = f_{r,met} \cdot f_{C,met} \quad (18)$$

746 The microbial respiration parameter for the decomposition of the metabolic pool, $f_{r,met}$,
747 is set equal to 0.55. The fraction of C in metabolic pool, $f_{C,met}$ (kg C m⁻²), is calculated
748 assuming linear kinetics.

749

750 *Soil respiration from exudates*

751 The respiration flux associated with root exudates (R_{exu} , kg C m⁻² d⁻¹) is:

752
$$R_{exu} = f_{r,exu} \cdot f_{C,exu} \quad (19)$$

753 The parameter $f_{r,exu}$ is set equal to 0.75. The term $f_{C,exu}$ (kg C m⁻²) is C substrate output
754 for root exudation.

755

756 *Soil respiration from active organic matter*

757 The respiration flux associated with active SOC (R_{act} , kg C m⁻²d⁻¹) is:

758
$$R_{act} = f_{r,act} \cdot f_{C,act} \quad (20)$$

759 The fraction of C in active pool, $f_{C,act}$ (kg C m⁻²), is calculated as follows:

760
$$f_{r,act} = 0.85 - 0.68 \cdot (f_{clay,ah} + f_{silt,ah}) \quad (21)$$

761 where f_{clay} and f_{silt} are fractions of clay and silt, respectively.

762

763 *Soil respiration from slow organic matter*

764 The respiration flux associated with slow SOC (R_{slo} , kg C m⁻²d⁻¹) is:

765
$$R_{slo} = f_{r,slo} \cdot f_{C,slo} \quad (22)$$

766 The microbial respiration parameter for the decomposition of the slow pool, $f_{r,slo}$, is set
767 equal to 0.55. The fraction of C in slow fraction, $f_{C,met}$ (kg C m⁻²), is calculated as
768 follows.

769
$$f_{r,slo} = k_{slo} \cdot W_{C,slo} \quad (23)$$

770
$$k_{slo} = k_{slo,20} \cdot k_{dec,t} \cdot k_{dec,\theta} \quad (24)$$

771 $W_{C,slo}$ (kg C m⁻²) is the C content in slow pool (depending on temperature, lignin,
772 texture and water content). The term $k_{slo,20}$ (d⁻¹) is the turnover rate for slow C pool at

20 °C, equal to 0.00027. The terms $k_{dec,t}$ and $k_{dec,\theta}$ are factor activities of soil organic matter for temperature and water content, respectively.

Soil respiration from passive organic matter

The respiration flux associated with active SOC (R_{pas} , kg C m⁻²d⁻¹) is:

$$R_{pas} = f_{r,pas} \cdot f_{c,pas} \quad (25)$$

The microbial respiration parameter for the decomposition of the passive pool, $f_{r,pas}$, is set equal to 0.55. The fraction of C in passive pool, $f_{c,pas}$ (kg C m⁻²), is calculated assuming linear kinetics.

Appendix D - Respiration from grazing animals

Half of the C in plant material consumed by grazing animals ($I_{C,veg \rightarrow ani}$, kg C m⁻² d⁻¹) is assumed to be respired (R_{ani} , kg C m⁻²d⁻¹):

$$R_{ani} = 0.5 \cdot I_{C,veg \rightarrow ani} \quad (26)$$

The amount of ingested C is estimated as follows:

$$I_{C,veg \rightarrow ani} = (f_{c,sh} + C) \cdot \frac{W_{sh}}{W_{sh,tot}} \cdot I_{veg \rightarrow ani} \quad (27)$$

where ($I_{veg \rightarrow ani}$, kg DM m⁻² d⁻¹) is the amount of ingested dry matter, which increases with the aboveground plant biomass ($W_{sh,tot}$, kg DM m⁻²) available for the animals (W_{sh} , kg DM m⁻², is the cumulative structural aboveground biomass), limited by the maximum ingestion capacity the animal is able to maintain (I_{max} , whose reference value is 16 kg DM d⁻¹ animal⁻¹).

Appendix E - Soil temperature

The calculation of temperature in each soil layer is based on the energy balance equations for the different soil layers (Campbell, 1985; Monteith, 1965; Shuttleworth and Wallace, 1985):

$$T_s^*(h) = 0.6 \cdot T_s(h) + (1 - 0.6) \cdot T_s'(h) \quad (28)$$

Where $T_s(h)$ (K) is the soil temperature at the midpoint of the i^{th} layer in the present time step, $T_s'(h)$ (K) is soil temperature in the same layer but one time step in the past, and $T_s^*(h)$ (K) is temperature in the i^{th} layer at some time between the two time steps.

Appendix F - Soil water balance

The water content in the different soil layers determines photosynthesis and stomatal conductance, soil evaporation, and rates of soil biological processes, and is used to calculate soil temperature in the different layers, which influences belowground plant processes, soil heat flux, and soil biological processes. Values of the soil matrix potential in soil layer h , $\psi(h)$ (m), is related to the water content in the same layer, $\theta_s(h)$ ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$) by the soil moisture characteristic (Campbell, 1985):

$$\theta_s(h) = \theta_{s,sat}(h) \cdot \left[\frac{\psi_e(h)}{\psi(h)} \right]^{\frac{1}{b(h)}} \quad (29)$$

where $\theta_{s,sat}(h)$ ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$) is the saturation soil water content in soil layer h , $\psi_e(h)$ is the air entry water potential (m) in soil layer h , $b(h)$ is a physical parameter for soil layer h .

References

- Acharya, B.S., Rasmussen, J., Eriksen, J., 2012. Grassland carbon sequestration and emissions following cultivation in a mixed crop rotation. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 153, 33–39. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2012.03.001
- Addiscott, T.M., Whitmore, A.P., 1987. Computer simulation of changes in soil mineral nitrogen and crop nitrogen during autumn, winter and spring. *The Journal of Agricultural Science* 109, 141–157. doi:10.1017/S0021859600081089
- Aires, L.M.I., Pio, C.A., Pereira, J.S., 2008. Carbon dioxide exchange above a Mediterranean C3/C4 grassland during two climatologically contrasting years. *Global Change Biology* 14, 539–555. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01507.x
- Allen, R.G., Walter, I.A., Elliot, R.L., Howell, T.A., Itenfisu, D., Jensen, M.E., Snyder, R., 2005. The ASCE standardized reference evapotranspiration equation. American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston.
- Allison, S.D., Wallenstein, M.D., Bradford, M.A., 2010. Soil-carbon response to warming dependent on microbial physiology. *Nature Geoscience* 3, 336–340. doi:10.1038/ngeo846
- Ammann, C., Flechard, C.R., Leifeld, J., Neftel, A., Fuhrer, J., 2007. The carbon budget of newly established temperate grassland depends on management intensity. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 121, 5–20. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2006.12.002
- Ascoug, J.C., McMaster, G.S., Andales, A.A., Hansen, N.C., Sherrod, L.A., 2007. Evaluating GPFARM crop growth, soil water and soil nitrogen components for Colorado dryland locations. *Transactions of the ASABE* 50, 1565–1578.
- Aubinet, M., Vesala, T., Papale, D., 2012. Eddy covariance: A practical guide to measurement and data analysis. Springer, Dordrecht.
- Bahn, M., Rodeghiero, M., Anderson-Dunn, M., Dore, S., Gimeno, C., Droesler, M., Williams, M., Ammann, C., Berninger, F., Flechard, C., Jones, S., Balzarolo, M., Kumar, S., Newesely, C., Priwitzer, T., Raschi, A., Siegwolf, R., Susiluoto, S., Tenhunen, J., Wohlfahrt, G., Cernusca, A., 2008. Soil respiration in European grasslands in relation to climate and assimilate supply. *Ecosystems* 11, 1352–1367. doi:10.1007/s10021-008-9198-0
- Baker, I.T., Prihodko, L., Denning, A.S., Goulden, M., Miller, S., da Rocha, H.R., 2008. Seasonal drought stress in the Amazon: Reconciling models and observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 113, G00B01. doi:10.1029/2007JG000644
- Ball, B.C., 2013. Soil structure and greenhouse gas emissions: a synthesis of 20 years of experimentation. *European Journal of Soil Science* 64, 357–373. doi:10.1111/ejss.12013
- Balogh, J., Pintér, K., Fóti, S., Cserhalmi, D., Papp, M., Nagy, Z., 2011. Dependence of soil respiration on soil moisture, clay content, soil organic matter, and CO₂ uptake in dry grasslands. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 43, 1006–1013. doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2011.01.017
- Ben Touhami, H., Lardy, R., Barra, V., 2012a. Bayesian calibration of the Pasture Simulation Model (PaSim) to simulate European grasslands under climate extremes: case study at Stubai (Austria). 11th PSAM & ESREL Conference, 25–29 June, Helsinki, Finland, 1, 567–577.
- Ben Touhami, H., Lardy, R., Gilgen, A., Buchmann, N., Bellocchi, G., 2012b. Bayesian calibration of the Pasture Simulation Model (PaSim) to simulate Swiss grasslands under climate extremes. 12th Congress of the European Society for Agronomy, 20–24 August, Helsinki,

- Finland, 441-5.
- Ben Touhami, H.B., Lardy, R., Barra, V., Bellocchi, G., 2013. Screening parameters in the Pasture Simulation model using the Morris method. *Ecological Modelling* 266, 42–57. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.07.005
- Bennett, N.D., Croke, B.F.W., Guariso, G., Guillaume, J.H.A., Hamilton, S.H., Jakeman, A.J., Marsili-Libelli, S., Newham, L.T.H., Norton, J.P., Perrin, C., Pierce, S.A., Robson, B., Seppelt, R., Voinov, A.A., Fath, B.D., Andreassian, V., 2013. Characterising performance of environmental models. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 40, 1–20. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.09.011
- Bondeau, A., Kicklighter, D.W., Kaduk, J., The Participants of the Potsdam NdP Model intercomparison, 1999. Comparing global models of terrestrial net primary productivity (NPP): importance of vegetation structure on seasonal NPP estimates. *Global Change Biology* 5, 35–45. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.1999.00005.x
- Bondeau, A., Smith, P.C., Zaehle, S., Schaphoff, S., Lucht, W., Cramer, W., Gerten, D., 2007. Modelling the role of agriculture for the 20th century global terrestrial carbon balance. *Global Change Biology* 13, 679–706. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01305.x
- Bos, J.F.F., Pflimlin, A., Aarts, H.F.M., Vertès, F., 2005. Nutrient management at farm scale. How to attain policy objectives in regions with intensive dairy farming? *Plant Research International Report* 83, Plant Research International, Wageningen, 260 pp.
- Bright, K.P., Sherlock, R.A., Lile, J., Wastney, M.E., 2000. Development and use of a whole farm model for dairying. In: Halloy, S., Williams, T. (Eds.), *Applied complexity - from neural nets to managed landscapes*. NZ Institute for Crop and Food Research, Christchurch, pp. 382-389.
- Brisson, N., Gary, C., Justes, E., Roche, R., Mary, B., Ripoche, D., Zimmer, D., Sierra, J., Bertuzzi, P., Burger, P., 2003. An overview of the crop model STICS. *European Journal of Agronomy* 18, 309–332. doi:10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00110-7
- Butler, M.P., Davis, K.J., Denning, A.S., Kawa, S.R., 2010. Using continental observations in global atmospheric inversions of CO₂: North American carbon sources and sinks. *Tellus B* 62, 550–572. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2010.00501.x
- Byrne, K.A., Kiely, G., 2006. Partitioning of Respiration in an Intensively Managed Grassland. *Plant and Soil* 282, 281–289. doi:10.1007/s11104-005-6065-z
- Calanca, P., Vuichard, N., Campbell, C., Viovy, N., Cozic, A., Fuhrer, J., Soussana, J.F., 2007. Simulating the fluxes of CO₂ and N₂O in European grasslands with the Pasture Simulation Model (PaSim). *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* 121, 164–174. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2006.12.010
- Campbell, G.S., 1985. *Soil physics with BASIC: transport models for soil-plant systems*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Cantarel, A.A.M., Bloor, J.M.G., Pommier, T., Guillaumaud, N., Moirrot, C., Soussana, J.-F., Poly, F., 2012. Four years of experimental climate change modifies the microbial drivers of N₂O fluxes in an upland grassland ecosystem. *Global Change Biology* 18, 2520–2531. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2012.02692.x
- Chang, J., Viovy, N., Vuichard, N., Ciais, P., Wang, T., Cozic, A., Lardy, R., Graux, A.-I., Klumpp, K., Martin, R., Soussana, J.-F., 2013. Incorporating grassland management in a global vegetation model: model description and evaluation at 11 eddy-covariance sites in

- Europe. Geoscientific Model Development Discussions 6, 2769–2812. doi:10.5194/gmdd-6-2769-2013
- Chen, D.-X., Hunt, H.W., Morgan, J.A., 1996. Responses of a C3 and C4 perennial grass to CO₂ enrichment and climate change: Comparison between model predictions and experimental data. *Ecological Modelling* 87, 11–27. doi:10.1016/0304-3800(94)00199-5
- Chirinda, N., Kracher, D., Lægdsmand, M., Porter, J.R., Olesen, J.E., Petersen, B.M., Doltra, J., Kiese, R., Butterbach-Bahl, K., 2011. Simulating soil N₂O emissions and heterotrophic CO₂ respiration in arable systems using FASSET and MoBiLE-DNDC. *Plant and Soil* 343, 139–160. doi:10.1007/s11104-010-0596-7
- Churkina, G., Running, S.W., Schloss, A.L., The Participants of the Potsdam NdP Model intercomparison, 1999. Comparing global models of terrestrial net primary productivity (NPP): the importance of water availability. *Global Change Biology* 5, 46–55. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.1999.00006.x
- Ciais, P., Reichstein, M., Viovy, N., Granier, A., Ogée, J., Allard, V., Aubinet, M., Buchmann, N., Bernhofer, C., Carrara, A., Chevallier, F., De Noblet, N., Friend, A.D., Friedlingstein, P., Grünwald, T., Heinesch, B., Keronen, P., Knohl, A., Krinner, G., Loustau, D., Manca, G., Matteucci, G., Miglietta, F., Ourcival, J.M., Papale, D., Pilegaard, K., Rambal, S., Seufert, G., Soussana, J.F., Sanz, M.J., Schulze, E.D., Vesala, T., Valentini, R., 2005. Europe-wide reduction in primary productivity caused by the heat and drought in 2003. *Nature* 437, 529–533. doi:10.1038/nature03972
- Ciais, P., Sabine, C., Bala, G., Bopp, L., Brovkin, V., Canadell, J., Chhabra, A., DeFries, R., Galloway, J., Heimann, M., Jones, C., Le Quéré, C., Myneni, R.B., Piao S., Thornton, P., 2013. Carbon and other biogeochemical cycles. In: Stocker, T.F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S.K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., Midgley, P.M. (Eds.), *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 465-570. <<http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1>>
- Ciais, P., Soussana, J.F., Vuichard, N., Luyssaert, S., Don, A., Janssens, I.A., Piao, S.L., Dechow, R., Lathiére, J., Maignan, F., Wattenbach, M., Smith, P., Ammann, C., Freibauer, A., Schulze, E.D., the CARBOEUROPE Synthesis Team, 2010. The greenhouse gas balance of European grasslands. *Biogeosciences Discussions* 7, 5997–6050. doi:10.5194/bgd-7-5997-2010
- De Jager, J.M., 1994. Accuracy of vegetation evaporation ratio formulae for estimating final wheat yield. *Water SA* 20, 307–314.
- De Martonne, E., 1942. Nouvelle carte mondiale de l'indice d'aridité. *Annales de Géographie* 51, 242-250 (in French).
- Desai, A.R., Richardson, A.D., Moffat, A.M., Kattge, J., Hollinger, D.Y., Barr, A., Falge, E., Noormets, A., Papale, D., Reichstein, M., Stauch, V.J., 2008. Cross-site evaluation of eddy covariance GPP and RE decomposition techniques. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 148, 821-838. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2007.11.012
- Diodato, N., Ceccarelli, M., 2004. Multivariate indicator Kriging approach using a GIS to classify soil degradation for Mediterranean agricultural lands. *Ecological Indicators* 4, 177–187. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2004.03.002
- Donatelli, M., Cerrani, I., Fanchini, D., Fumagalli, D., Rizzoli, A.E., 2012. Enhancing model reuse via

- component-centered modeling frameworks: the vision and example realizations. In: Seppelt, R., Voinov, A.A., Lange, S., Bankamp, D. (Eds.), Proceedings of International Congress on Environmental Modelling and Software Managing Resources of a Limited Planet, Sixth Biennial Meeting, Leipzig, Germany, pp. 1185–1192.
- Duru, M., Jouany, C., Le Roux, X., Navas, M.L., Cruz, P., 2013. From a conceptual framework to an operational approach for managing grassland functional diversity to obtain targeted ecosystem services: Case studies from French mountains. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* 23, 239–254. doi:10.1017/S1742170513000306
- EC, 2008. Regulation (EC) No 1166/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 November 2008 on farm structure surveys and the survey on agricultural production methods and repealing Council Regulation (EEC). Official Journal of the European Union, Brussels.
- Flechard, C.R., Ambus, P., Skiba, U., Rees, R.M., Hensen, A., van Amstel, A., Dasselaar, A. van den P., Soussana, J.F., Jones, M., Clifton-Brown, J., Raschi, A., Horvath, L., Neftel, A., Jocher, M., Ammann, C., Leifeld, J., Fuhrer, J., Calanca, P., Thalman, E., Pilegaard, K., Di Marco, C., Campbell, C., Nemitz, E., Hargreaves, K.J., Levy, P.E., Ball, B.C., Jones, S.K., van de Bulk, W.C.M., Groot, T., Blom, M., Domingues, R., Kasper, G., Allard, V., Ceschia, E., Cellier, P., Laville, P., Henault, C., Bizouard, F., Abdalla, M., Williams, M., Baronti, S., Berretti, F., Grosz, B., 2007. Effects of climate and management intensity on nitrous oxide emissions in grassland systems across Europe. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 121, 135–152. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2006.12.024
- Fox, D.G., 1981. Judging air quality model performance. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 62, 599–609. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(1981)062<0599:JAQMP>2.0.CO;2
- Gilmanov, T.G., Aires, L., Barcza, Z., Baron, V.S., Belelli, L., Beringer, J., Billesbach, D., Bonal, D., Bradford, J., Ceschia, E., Cook, D., Corradi, C., Frank, A., Gianelle, D., Gimeno, C., Gruenwald, T., Guo, H., Hanan, N., Haszpra, L., Heilman, J., Jacobs, A., Jones, M.B., Johnson, D.A., Kiely, G., Li, S., Magliulo, V., Moors, E., Nagy, Z., Nasyrov, M., Owensby, C., Pinter, K., Pio, C., Reichstein, M., Sanz, M.J., Scott, R., Soussana, J.F., Stoy, P.C., Svejcar, T., Tuba, Z., Zhou, G., 2010. Productivity, respiration, and light-response parameters of world grassland and agroecosystems derived from flux-tower measurements. *Rangeland Ecology & Management* 63, 16–39. doi:10.2111/REM-D-09-00072.1
- Giraldo, L.M., Lizcano, L.J., Gijsman, A.J., Rivera, B., Franco, L.H., 1999. Adapting the CROPGRO model of DSSAT to simulate the growth of *Brachiaria decumbens*. In: Proceedings of The Third International Symposium on Systems Approaches for Agricultural Development. Lima, Peru, pp. 1–10.
- Graux, A.-I., Bellocchi, G., Lardy, R., Soussana, J.-F., 2013. Ensemble modelling of climate change risks and opportunities for managed grasslands in France. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 170, 114–131. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.06.010
- Graux, A.I., Gaurut, M., Agabriel, J., Baumont, R., Delagarde, R., Delaby, L., Soussana, J.F., 2011. Development of the Pasture Simulation Model for assessing livestock production under climate change. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 144, 69–91. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2011.07.001
- Graux, A.-I., Lardy, R., Bellocchi, G., Soussana, J.-F., 2012. Global warming potential of French

- grassland-based dairy livestock systems under climate change. *Regional Environmental Change* 12, 751–763. doi:10.1007/s10113-012-0289-2
- Hagen, S.C., Braswell, B.H., Linder, E., Frolking, S., Richardson, A.D., Hollinger, D.Y., 2006. Statistical uncertainty of eddy flux-based estimates of gross ecosystem carbon exchange at Howland Forest, Maine. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 111, D08S03. doi:10.1029/2005JD006154.
- Hidy, D., Barcza, Z., Haszpra, L., Churkina, G., Pintér, K., Nagy, Z., 2012. Development of the Biome-BGC model for simulation of managed herbaceous ecosystems. *Ecological Modelling* 226, 99–119. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.11.008
- Hollinger, D.Y., Richardson, A.D., 2005. Uncertainty in eddy covariance measurements and its application to physiological models. *Tree Physiology* 25, 873–885. doi:10.1093/treephys/25.7.873
- Holzworth, D.P., Huth, N.I., deVoil, P.G., Zurcher, E.J., Herrmann, N.I., McLean, G., Chenu, K., van Oosterom, E., Snow, V.O., Murphy, C., Moore, A.D., Brown, H.E., Whish, J.P.M., Verrall, S., Fainges, J., L.W., B., Peake, A.S., Poulton, P.L., Hochman, Z., Thorburn, P.J., Gaydon, D.S., Dalgliesh, N.P., Rodriguez, D., Cox, H., Chapman, S., Doherty, A., Teixeira, E., Sharp, J., Cichota, R., Vogeler, I., Li, F.Y., Wang, E., Hammer, G.L., Robertson, M.J., Dimes, J., Carberry, P.S., Hargreaves, J.N.G., MacLeod, N., McDonald, C., Harsdorf, J., Wedgwood, S., Keating, B.A., 2014. APSIM - Evolution towards a new generation of agricultural systems simulation. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, in press. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.07.009
- Huntzinger, D.N., Post, W.M., Wei, Y., Michalak, A.M., West, T.O., Jacobson, A.R., Baker, I.T., Chen, J.M., Davis, K.J., Hayes, D.J., Hoffman, F.M., Jain, A.K., Liu, S., McGuire, A.D., Neilson, R.P., Potter, C., Poulter, B., Price, D., Raczka, B.M., Tian, H.Q., Thornton, P., Tomelleri, E., Viovy, N., Xiao, J., Yuan, W., Zeng, N., Zhao, M., Cook, R., 2012. North American Carbon Program (NACP) regional interim synthesis: Terrestrial biospheric model intercomparison. *Ecological Modelling* 232, 144–157. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.02.004
- Hussain, M.Z., Gruenwald, T., Tenhunen, J.D., Li, Y.L., Mirzae, H., Bernhofer, C., Otieno, D., Dinh, N.Q., Schmidt, M., Waringer, M., Owen, K., 2011. Summer drought influence on CO₂ and water fluxes of extensively managed grassland in Germany. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 141, 67–76. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2011.02.013
- Jacobs, C.M.J., Jacobs, A.F.G., Bosveld, F.C., Hendriks, D.M.D., Hensen, A., Kroon, P.S., Moors, E.J., Nol, L., Schrier-Uijl, A., Veenendaal, E.M., 2007. Variability of annual CO₂ exchange from Dutch grasslands. *Biogeosciences* 4, 803–816. doi:10.5194/bg-4-803-2007
- Janssens, I.A., Freibauer, A., Schlamadinger, B., Ceulemans, R., Ciais, P., Dolman, A.J., Heimann, M., Nabuurs, G.-J., Smith, P., Valentini, R., 2005. The carbon budget of terrestrial ecosystems at country-scale – a European case study. *Biogeosciences* 2, 15–26. doi:10.5194/bg-2-15-2005
- Johnson, I.R., Chapman, D.F., Snow, V.O., Eckard, R.J., Parsons, A.J., Lambert, M.G., Cullen, B.R., 2008. DairyMod and EcoMod: biophysical pasture-simulation models for Australia and New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 48, 621–631. doi:10.1071/EA07133
- Jung, M., Reichstein, M., Margolis, H.A., Cescatti, A., Richardson, A.D., Arain, M.A., Arneth, A., Bernhofer, C., Bonal, D., Chen, J., Gianelle, D., Gobron, N., Kiely, G., Kutsch, W., Lasslop,

- G., Law, B.E., Lindroth, A., Merbold, L., Montagnani, L., Moors, E.J., Papale, D., Sottocornola, M., Vaccari, F., Williams, C., 2011. Global patterns of land-atmosphere fluxes of carbon dioxide, latent heat, and sensible heat derived from eddy covariance, satellite, and meteorological observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 116, G00J07. doi:10.1029/2010JG001566
- Jung, M., Vetter, M., Herold, M., Churkina, G., Reichstein, M., Zaehle, S., Ciais, P., Viovy, N., Bondeau, A., Chen, Y., Trusilova, K., Feser, F., Heimann, M., 2007. Uncertainties of modeling gross primary productivity over Europe: A systematic study on the effects of using different drivers and terrestrial biosphere models. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 21, GB4021. doi:10.1029/2006GB002915
- Klumpp, K., Tallec, T., Guix, N., Soussana, J.-F., 2011. Long-term impacts of agricultural practices and climatic variability on carbon storage in a permanent pasture. *Global Change Biology* 17, 3534–3545. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02490.x
- Krinner, G., Viovy, N., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Ogée, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Sitch, S., Prentice, I.C., 2005. A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled atmosphere-biosphere system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 19, GB1015. doi:10.1029/2003GB002199
- Kroon, P.S., Hensen, A., Jonker, H.J.J., Ouwersloot, H.G., Vermeulen, A.T., Bosveld, F.C., 2009. Uncertainties in eddy covariance flux measurements assessed from CH₄ and N₂O observations. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 150, 806-816. doi: 10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.08.008
- Laniak, G.F., Olchin, G., Goodall, J., Voinov, A., Hill, M., Glynn, P., Whelan, G., Geller, G., Quinn, N., Blind, M., Peckham, S., Reaney, S., Gaber, N., Kennedy, R., Hughes, A., 2013. Integrated environmental modeling: A vision and roadmap for the future. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 39, 3–23. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.09.006
- Lardy, R., Bachelet, B., Bellocchi, G., Hill, D.R.C., 2014. Towards vulnerability minimization of grassland soil organic matter using metamodels. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 52, 38–50. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.10.015
- Lasslop, G., Reichstein, M., Kattge, J., Papale, D., 2008. Influences of observation errors in eddy flux data on inverse model parameter estimation. *Biogeosciences* 5, 1311-1324. doi:doi:10.5194/bg-5-1311-2008
- Liu, M., He, H., Yu, G., Sun, X., Zhang, L., Han, S., Wang, H., Zhou, G., 2012. Uncertainty analysis in data processing on the estimation of net carbon exchanges at different forest ecosystems in China. *Journal of Forest Research* 17, 312–322. doi:10.1007/s10310-011-0323-0
- Luo, G., Han, Q., Zhou, D., Li, L., Chen, X., Li, Y., Hu, Y., Li, B.L., 2012. Moderate grazing can promote aboveground primary production of grassland under water stress. *Ecological Complexity* 11, 126–136. doi:10.1016/j.ecocom.2012.04.004
- Lobell, D.B., Burke, M.B., 2010. On the use of statistical models to predict crop yield responses to climate change. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 150, 1443–1452. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.07.008
- Martin, G., Martin-Clouaire, R., Rellier, J.P., Duru, M., 2011. A simulation framework for the design of grassland-based beef-cattle farms. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 26, 371–385. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.10.002
- Migliavacca, M., Reichstein, M., Richardson, A.D., Colombo, R., Sutton, M.A., Lasslop, G.,

- 1
2
3
4 1079 Tomelleri, E., Wohlfahrt, G., Carvalhais, N., Cescatti, A., Mahecha, M.D., Montagnani, L.,
5 1080 Papale, D., Zaehle, S., Arain, A., Arneth, A., Black, T.A., Carrara, A., Dore, S., Gianelle, D.,
6 1081 Helfter, C., Hollinger, D., Kutsch, W.L., Lafleur, P.M., Nouvellon, Y., Rebmann, C., Da
7 1082 ROCHA, H.R., Rodeghiero, M., Rouspard, O., Sebastià, M.-T., Seufert, G., Soussana, J.-F.,
8 1083 Van Der MOLEN, M.K., 2011. Semiempirical modeling of abiotic and biotic factors
9 1084 controlling ecosystem respiration across eddy covariance sites. *Global Change Biology* 17,
10 1085 390–409. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02243.x
11 1086 Minunno, F., Peltoniemi, M., Launiainen, S., Mäkelä, A., 2014. Integrating ecosystems
12 1087 measurements from multiple eddy-covariance sites to a simple model of ecosystem
13 1088 process - Are there possibilities for a uniform model calibration? *Geophysical Research*
14 1089 *Abstracts* 16, EGU2014-10706-3.
15 1090 Monteith, J., 1965. Evaporation and environment. *Symposium of the Society for Experimental*
16 1091 *Biology* 19, 205–234.
17 1092 Moriasi, D., Arnold, J., Van Liew, M., Bingner, R., Harmel, R., Veith, T., 2007. Model evaluation
18 1093 guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations.
19 1094 *Transactions of the ASABE* 50, 885–900.
20 1095 Moyano, F.E., Vasilyeva, N., Bouckaert, L., Cook, F., Craine, J., Curiel Yuste, J., Don, A., Epron, D.,
21 1096 Formanek, P., Franzluebbers, A., Ilstedt, U., Kätterer, T., Orchard, V., Reichstein, M., Rey,
22 1097 A., Ruamps, L., Subke, J.-A., Thomsen, I.K., Chenu, C., 2012. The moisture response of soil
23 1098 heterotrophic respiration: interaction with soil properties. *Biogeosciences* 9, 1173–1182.
24 1099 doi:10.5194/bg-9-1173-2012
25 1100 Nash, J.E., Sutcliffe, J.V., 1970. River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I — A
26 1101 discussion of principles. *Journal of Hydrology* 10, 282–290.
27 1102 doi:10.1016/0022-1694(70)90255-6
28 1103 Palosuo, T., Kersebaum, K.C., Angulo, C., Hlavinka, P., Moriondo, M., Olesen, J.E., Patil, R.H., Ruget,
29 1104 F., Rumbaur, C., Takac, J., Trnka, M., Bindi, M., caldag, B., Ewert, F., Ferrise, R., Mirschel,
30 1105 W., Saylan, L., Siska, B., Roeter, R., 2011. Simulation of winter wheat yield and its
31 1106 variability in different climates of Europe: A comparison of eight crop growth models.
32 1107 *European Journal of Agronomy* 35, 103–114. doi: 10.1016/j.eja.2011.05.001
33 1108 Papale, D., Reichstein, M., Aubinet, M., Canfora, E., Bernhofer, C., Longdoz, B., Kutsch, W., Rambal,
34 1109 S., Valentini, R., Vesala, T., Yakir, D., 2006. Towards a standardized processing of net
35 1110 ecosystem exchange measured with eddy covariance technique: algorithms and
36 1111 uncertainty estimation. *Biogeosciences* 3, 571–583. doi:10.5194/bg-3-571-2006
37 1112 Parton, W.J., 1988. Dynamics of C, N, P and S in grassland soils: a model. *Biogeochemistry* 5,
38 1113 109–131. doi:10.1007/BF02180320
39 1114 Parton, W.J., Morgan, J.A., Wang, G., Del Grosso, S., 2007. Projected ecosystem impact of the
40 1115 Prairie Heating and CO₂ Enrichment experiment. *New Phytologist* 174, 823–834.
41 1116 doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.02052.x
42 1117 Peichl, M., Carton, O., Kiely, G., 2012. Management and climate effects on carbon dioxide and
43 1118 energy exchanges in a maritime grassland. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 158,
44 1119 132–146. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2012.06.001
45 1120 Pintér, K., Barcza, Z., Balogh, J., Czóbel, S., Csintalan, Z., Tuba, Z., Nagy, Z., 2008. Interannual
46 1121 variability of grasslands' carbon balance depends on soil type. *Community Ecology* 9,
47 1122 43–48. doi:10.1556/ComEc.9.2008.S.7

- 1
2
3
4 1123 Prescher, A.-K., Grünwald, T., Bernhofer, C., 2010. Land use regulates carbon budgets in eastern
5 1124 Germany: From NEE to NBP. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 150, 1016–1025.
6 1125 doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.03.008
7
8 1126 Rafique, R., Peichl, M., Hennessy, D., Kiely, G., 2011. Evaluating management effects on nitrous
9 1127 oxide emissions from grasslands using the process-based DeNitrification–DeComposition
10 1128 (DNDC) model. *Atmospheric Environment* 45, 6029–6039.
11 1129 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.07.046
12
13 1130 Refsgaard, J.C., van der Sluijs, J.P., Højberg, A.L., Vanrolleghem, P.A., 2007. Uncertainty in the
14 1131 environmental modelling process – A framework and guidance. *Environmental Modelling*
15 1132 & Software 22, 1543–1556. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2007.02.004
16
17 1133 Reichstein, M., Bahn, M., Ciais, P., Frank, D., Mahecha, M.D., Seneviratne, S.I., Zscheischler, J.,
18 1134 Beer, C., Buchmann, N., Frank, D.C., Papale, D., Rammig, A., Smith, P., Thonicke, K., van
19 1135 der Velde, M., Vicca, S., Walz, A., Wattenbach, M., 2013. Climate extremes and the
20 1136 carbon cycle. *Nature* 500, 287–295. doi:10.1038/nature12350
21
22 1137 Reichstein, M., Falge, E., Baldocchi, D., Papale, D., Aubinet, M., Berbigier, P., Bernhofer, C.,
23 1138 Buchmann, N., Gilmanov, T., Granier, A., Grünwald, T., Havrankova, K., Ilvesniemi, H.,
24 1139 Janous, D., Knohl, A., Laurila, T., Lohila, A., Loustau, D., Matteucci, G., Meyers, T.,
25 1140 Miglietta, F., Ourcival, J.-M., Pumpanen, J., Rambal, S., Rotenberg, E., Sanz, M., Tenhunen,
26 1141 J., Seufert, G., Vaccari, F., Vesala, T., Yakir, D., Valentini, R., 2005. On the separation of net
27 1142 ecosystem exchange into assimilation and ecosystem respiration: review and improved
28 1143 algorithm. *Global Change Biology* 11, 1424–1439.
29 1144 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2005.001002.x
30
31 1145 Richardson, A.D., Aubinet, M., Barr, A.G., Hollinger, D.Y., Ibrom, A., Lasslop, G., Reichstein, M.,
32 1146 2012, Uncertainty quantification. In: Aubinet, M., Vesala, T., Papale, D. (Eds.), *Eddy*
33 1147 *covariance - A practical guide to measurement and data analysis*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp.
34 1148 173–209.
35
36 1149 Richardson, A.D., Williams, M., Hollinger, D.Y., Moore, D.J.P., Dail, D.B., Davidson, E.A., Scott, N.A.,
37 1150 Evans, R.S., Hughes, H., Lee, J.T., Rodrigues, C., Savage, K., 2010. Estimating parameters of
38 1151 a forest ecosystem C model with measurements of stocks and fluxes as joint constraints.
39 1152 *Oecologia* 164, 25–40. doi:10.1007/s00442-010-1628-y
40
41 1153 Riedo, M., Grub, A., Rosset, M., Fuhrer, J., 1998. A pasture simulation model for dry matter
42 1154 production, and fluxes of carbon, nitrogen, water and energy. *Ecological Modelling* 105,
43 1155 141–183. doi:10.1016/S0304-3800(97)00110-5
44
45 1156 Riedo, M., Milford, C., Schmid, M., Sutton, M.A., 2002. Coupling soil-plant-atmosphere exchange
46 1157 of ammonia with ecosystem functioning in grasslands. *Ecological Modelling* 158, 83–110.
47 1158 doi:10.1016/S0304-3800(02)00169-2
48
49 1159 Rodriguez, D., Van Oijen, M., Schapendonk, A., 1999. LINGRA-CC: a sink–source model to
50 1160 simulate the impact of climate change and management on grassland productivity. *New*
51 1161 *Phytologist* 144, 359–368. doi:10.1046/j.1469-8137.1999.00521.x
52
53 1162 Rötter, R.P., Palosuo, T., Kersebaum, K.C., Angulo, C., Bindi, M., Ewert, F., Ferrise, R., Hlavinka, P.,
54 1163 Moriondo, M., Nendel, C., Olesen, J.E., Patil, R.H., Ruget, F., Takac, J., Trnka, M., 2012.
55 1164 Simulation of spring barley yield in different climatic zones of Northern and Central
56 1165 Europe: A comparison of nine crop models. *Field Crops Research* 133, 23–36.
57 1166 doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2012.03.016
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 1167 Ruget, F., Satger, S., Volaire, F., Lelièvre, F., 2009. Modeling tiller density, growth, and yield of
5 1168 Mediterranean perennial grasslands with STICS. *Crop Science* 49, 2379–2385.
6 1169 doi:doi:10.2135/cropsci2009.06.0323
7
8 1170 Schaefer, K., Schwalm, C.R., Williams, C., Arain, M.A., Barr, A., Chen, J.M., Davis, K.J., Dimitrov, D.,
9 1171 Hilton, T.W., Hollinger, D.Y., Humphreys, E., Poulter, B., Raczka, B.M., Richardson, A.D.,
10 1172 Sahoo, A., Thornton, P., Vargas, R., Verbeeck, H., Anderson, R., Baker, I., Black, T.A.,
11 1173 Bolstad, P., Chen, J., Curtis, P.S., Desai, A.R., Dietze, M., Dragoni, D., Gough, C., Grant, R.F.,
12 1174 Gu, L., Jain, A., Kucharik, C., Law, B., Liu, S., Lokipitiya, E., Margolis, H.A., Matamala, R.,
13 1175 McCaughey, J.H., Monson, R., Munger, J.W., Oechel, W., Peng, C., Price, D.T., Ricciuto, D.,
14 1176 Riley, W.J., Roulet, N., Tian, H., Tonitto, C., Torn, M., Weng, E., Zhou, X., 2012. A
15 1177 model-data comparison of gross primary productivity: Results from the North American
16 1178 Carbon Program site synthesis. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 117, G03010.
17 1179 doi:10.1029/2012JG001960
18
19 1180 Schapendonk, A.H.C.M., Stol, W., van Kraalingen, D.W.G., Bouman, B.A.M., 1998. LINGRA, a
20 1181 sink/source model to simulate grassland productivity in Europe. *European Journal of*
21 1182 *Agronomy* 9, 87–100. doi:10.1016/S1161-0301(98)00027-6
22
23 1183 Schmid, M., Fuhrer, J., Neftel, A., 2001a. Nitrous oxide concentrations in the soil of a mown
24 1184 grassland: comparison of model results with soil profile measurements. *Water, Air, & Soil*
25 1185 *Pollution: Focus* 1, 437–446. doi:10.1023/A:1013158028103
26
27 1186 Schmid, M., Neftel, A., Riedo, M., Fuhrer, J., 2001b. Process-based modelling of nitrous oxide
28 1187 emissions from different nitrogen sources in mown grassland. *Nutrient Cycling in*
29 1188 *Agroecosystems* 60, 177–187. doi:10.1023/a:1012694218748
30
31 1189 Schmitt, M., Bahn, M., Wohlfahrt, G., Tappeiner, U., Cernusca, A., 2010. Land use affects the net
32 1190 ecosystem CO₂ exchange and its components in mountain grasslands. *Biogeosciences* 7,
33 1191 2297–2309. doi:10.5194/bg-7-2297-2010
34
35 1192 Schulze, E.D., Luyssaert, S., Ciais, P., Freibauer, A., Al, I.A.J. et, Schulze, E.D., Soussana, J.F., Smith,
36 1193 P., Grace, J., Levin, I., Thiruchittampalam, B., Heimann, M., Dolman, A.J., Valentini, R.,
37 1194 Bousquet, P., Peylin, P., Peters, W., Rödenbeck, C., Etiope, G., Vuichard, N., Wattenbach,
38 1195 M., Nabuurs, G.J., Poussi, Z., Nieschulze, J., Gash, J.H., Schulze, E.D., Soussana, J.F., Smith,
39 1196 P., Grace, J., Levin, I., Thiruchittampalam, B., Heimann, M., Dolman, A.J., Valentini, R.,
40 1197 Bousquet, P., Peylin, P., Peters, W., Rödenbeck, C., Etiope, G., Vuichard, N., Wattenbach,
41 1198 M., Nabuurs, G.J., Poussi, Z., Nieschulze, J., Gash, J.H., 2009. Importance of methane and
42 1199 nitrous oxide for Europe's terrestrial greenhouse-gas balance. *Nature Geoscience* 2,
43 1200 842–850. doi:10.1038/ngeo686
44
45 1201 Scurlock, J.M.O., Hall, D.O., 1998. The global carbon sink: a grassland perspective. *Global Change*
46 1202 *Biology* 4, 229–233. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2486.1998.00151.x
47
48 1203 Sheikh, V., Visser, S., Stroosnijder, L., 2009. A simple model to predict soil moisture: Bridging
49 1204 Event and Continuous Hydrological (BEACH) modelling. *Environmental Modelling &*
50 1205 *Software* 24, 542–556. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2008.10.005
51
52 1206 Shuttleworth, W.J., Wallace, J.S., 1985. Evaporation from sparse crops-an energy combination
53 1207 theory. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 111, 839–855.
54 1208 doi:10.1002/qj.49711146910
55
56 1209 Snow, V.O., Rotz, C.A., Moore, A.D., Martin-Clouaire, R., Johnson, I.R., Hutchings, N.J., Eckard, R.J.,
57 1210 2014. The challenges – and some solutions – to process-based modelling of grazed

- agricultural systems. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 62, 420-436. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.03.009
- Soussana, J.-F., Fuhrer, J., Jones, M., Van Amstel, A., 2007. The greenhouse gas balance of grasslands in Europe. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 121, 1–4. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2006.12.001
- Stöckle, C.O., Donatelli, M., Nelson, R., 2003. CropSyst, a cropping systems simulation model. *European Journal of Agronomy* 18, 289–307. doi:10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00109-0
- Suttie, J.M., Reynolds, S.G., Batello, C., 2005. Grasslands of the world. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- Suttle, K.B., Thomsen, M.A., Power, M.E., 2007. Species interactions reverse grassland responses to changing climate. *Science* 315, 640–642. doi:10.1126/science.1136401
- Thornley, J.H.M., 1998. Dynamic model of leaf photosynthesis with acclimation to light and nitrogen. *Annals of Botany* 81, 421–430. doi:10.1006/anbo.1997.0575
- Trudinger, C.M., Raupach, M.R., Rayner, P.J., Kattge, J., Liu, Q., Pak, B., Reichstein, M., Renzullo, L., Richardson, A.D., Roxburgh, S.H., Styles, J., Wang, Y.P., Briggs, P., Barrett, D., Nikolova, S., 2007. OptIC project: An intercomparison of optimization techniques for parameter estimation in terrestrial biogeochemical models. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 112. doi:10.1029/2006JG000367
- Van Oijen, M., Cameron, D.R., Butterbach-Bahl, K., Farahbakhshazad, N., Jansson, P.-E., Kiese, R., Rahn, K.-H., Werner, C., Yeluripati, J.B., 2011. A Bayesian framework for model calibration, comparison and analysis: Application to four models for the biogeochemistry of a Norway spruce forest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* 151, 1609–1621. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2011.06.017
- Van Oijen, M., Höglind, M., Hanslin, H.M., Caldwell, N., 2005. Process-based modeling of timothy regrowth. *Agronomy Journal* 97, 1295-1303. doi:10.2134/agronj2004.0251
- Vital, J.-A., Gaurut, M., Lardy, R., Viovy, N., Soussana, J.-F., Bellocchi, G., Martin, R., 2013. High-performance computing for climate change impact studies with the Pasture Simulation model. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 98, 131–135. doi:10.1016/j.compag.2013.08.004
- Vuichard, N., Ciais, P., Viovy, N., Calanca, P., Soussana, J.-F., 2007a. Estimating the greenhouse gas fluxes of European grasslands with a process-based model: 2. Simulations at the continental level. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 21, GB1005. doi:10.1029/2005gb002612
- Vuichard, N., Soussana, J.-F., Ciais, P., Viovy, N., Ammann, C., Calanca, P., Clifton-Brown, J., Fuhrer, J., Jones, M., Martin, C., 2007b. Estimating the greenhouse gas fluxes of European grasslands with a process-based model: 1. Model evaluation from in situ measurements. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 21, GB1004. doi:10.1029/2005gb002611
- Wallach, D., Thorburn, P.J., 2014. The error in agricultural systems model prediction depends on the variable being predicted. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 62, 487-494. doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.08.001
- Wang, J., Cardenas, L.M., Misselbrook, T.H., Cuttle, S., Thorman, R.E., Li, C., 2012. Modelling nitrous oxide emissions from grazed grassland systems. *Environmental Pollution* 162, 223–233. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2011.11.027
- Wang, Y.-P., Trudinger, C.M., Enting, I.G., 2009. A review of applications of model–data fusion to studies of terrestrial carbon fluxes at different scales. *Agricultural and Forest*

- 1
2
3
4 1255 Meteorology 149, 1829–1842. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2009.07.009
5 1256 Warmink, J.J., Janssen, J.A.E.B., Booij, M.J., Krol, M.S., 2010. Identification and classification of
6 1257 uncertainties in the application of environmental models. Environmental Modelling &
7 1258 Software 25, 1518–1527. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2010.04.011
8
9 1259 Warnant, P., François, L., Strivay, D., Gérard, J.C., 1994. CARAIB: A global model of terrestrial
10 1260 biological productivity. Global Biogeochemical Cycles 8, 255–270.
11 1261 doi:10.1029/94gb00850
12
13 1262 Warszawski, L., Frieler, K., Huber, V., Piontek, F., Serdeczny, O., Schewe, J., 2014. The Inter-Sectoral
14 1263 Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISI-MIP): Project framework. Proceedings of the
15 1264 National Academy of Sciences 111, 3228–3232. doi:10.1073/pnas.1312330110
16
17 1265 Wattenbach, M., Sus, O., Vuichard, N., Lehuger, S., Gottschalk, P., Li, L., Leip, A., Williams, M.,
18 1266 Tomelleri, E., Kutsch, W.L., Buchmann, N., Eugster, W., Dietiker, D., Aubinet, M., Ceschia,
19 1267 E., Béziat, P., Grünwald, T., Hastings, A., Osborne, B., Ciais, P., Cellier, P., Smith, P., 2010.
20 1268 The carbon balance of European croplands: A cross-site comparison of simulation
21 1269 models. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 139,
22 1270 419–453. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2010.08.004
23
24 1271 Wieder, W.R., Bonan, G.B., Allison, S.D., 2013. Global soil carbon projections are improved by
25 1272 modelling microbial processes. Nature Climate Change 3, 909–912.
26 1273 doi:10.1038/nclimate1951
27
28 1274 Williams, J.R., Jones, C.A., Kiniry, J.R., Spanel, D.A., 1989. The EPIC crop growth model.
29 1275 Transactions of the ASAE 32, 497–511. doi:10.13031/2013.31032
30
31 1276 Willmott, C.J., Wicks, D.E., 1980. An Empirical Method for the Spatial Interpolation of Monthly
32 1277 Precipitation within California. Physical Geography 1, 59–73.
33 1278 doi:10.1080/02723646.1980.10642189
34
35 1279 Wohlfahrt, G., Anderson-Dunn, M., Bahn, M., Balzarolo, M., Berninger, F., Campbell, C., Carrara,
36 1280 A., Cescatti, A., Christensen, T., Dore, S., Eugster, W., Friborg, T., Furger, M., Gianelle, D.,
37 1281 Gimeno, C., Hargreaves, K., Hari, P., Haslwanter, A., Johansson, T., Marcolla, B., Milford, C.,
38 1282 Nagy, Z., Nemitz, E., Rogiers, N., Sanz, M.J., Siegwolf, R.T.W., Susiluoto, S., Sutton, M.,
39 1283 Tuba, Z., Ugolini, F., Valentini, R., Zorer, R., Cernusca, A., 2008. Biotic, abiotic, and
40 1284 management controls on the net ecosystem CO₂ exchange of European mountain
41 1285 grassland ecosystems. Ecosystems 11, 1338–1351. doi:10.1007/s10021-008-9196-2
42
43 1286 Wu, J., van der Linden, L., Lasslop, G., Carvalhais, N., Pilegaard, K., Beier, C., Ibrom, A., 2012.
44 1287 Effects of climate variability and functional changes on the interannual variation of the
45 1288 carbon balance in a temperate deciduous forest. Biogeosciences 9, 13–28.
46 1289 doi:10.5194/bg-9-13-2012
47
48 1290 Xiao, J., Chen, J., Davis, K.J., Reichstein, M., 2012. Advances in upscaling of eddy covariance
49 1291 measurements of carbon and water fluxes. Journal of Geophysical Research 117, G00J01.
50 1292 doi:10.1029/2011JG001889
51
52 1293 Xiao, J., Zhuang, Q., Liang, E., Shao, X., McGuire, A.D., Moody, A., Kicklighter, D.W., Melillo, J.M.,
53 1294 2009. Twentieth-century droughts and their impacts on terrestrial carbon cycling in
54 1295 China. Earth Interactions 13, 1–31. doi:10.1175/2009EI275.1
55
56 1296 Zeeman, M.J., Hiller, R., Gilgen, A.K., Michna, P., Plüss, P., Buchmann, N., Eugster, W., 2010.
57 1297 Management and climate impacts on net CO₂ fluxes and carbon budgets of three
58 1298 grasslands along an elevational gradient in Switzerland. Agricultural and Forest

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1299 Meteorology 150, 519–530. doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.01.011
1300

Tables

Table 1. Location, climate and management of the grassland study sites.

Country	Site	ID	Years	Geographical settings			Climate		Source
				Latitude	Longitude	Elevation(m a.s.l.)	Mean air temperature (°C)	Precipitation total (mm yr ⁻¹)	
France	Laqueuille	FRLaq1	2004-2010	45° 38' N	02° 44' E	1040	7.8	1072	Klumpp et al. (2011)
		FRLaq2	2004-2010						
Germany	Grillenbourg	DEGri	2004-2008	50° 57' N	13° 30' E	375	8.5	946	Prescher et al. (2010)
Hungary	Bugac-Puszt	HUBug	2003-2008	46° 41' N	19° 36' E	140	10.2	520	Pintér et al. (2008)
Ireland	Dripsey	IEDri	2003-2005	51° 59' N	08° 45' W	195	9.6	1271	Byrne and Kiely (2006)
Italy	Amplero	ITAmp	2003-2007	41° 52' N	13° 38' E	884	9.4	781	Wohlfahrt et al. (2008)
	Monte Bondone	ITMbo	2003-2007	46° 00' N	11° 02' E	1550	5.2	1003	Wohlfahrt et al. (2008)
	Mitra	PTMi2	2005-2007	38° 32' N	08° 00' W	190	14.3	627	Aires et al. (2008)
Portugal									
Spain	Vall d'Alinya	ESVDA	2004-2008	42° 12' N	01° 26' W	1770	6.2	908	Wohlfahrt et al. (2008)
	Oensing	CHOe1	2002-2009	47° 17' N	07° 44' E	450	9.3	1197	Ammann et al. (2007)
The Netherlands	Cabauw	NLCa1	2004-2007	51° 57' N	04° 54' W	0.7	10	800	Jacobs et al. (2007)
United Kingdom	Easter Bush	UKEBu	2002-2008	55° 52' N	03° 02' W	190	9.0	956	Soussana et al. (2007a)

Table 2. Soil properties and management of the grassland study sites (ID as in Table 1)

ID	Management (average)					Soil properties for the whole soil profile ¹				
	Utilization ² (yr ⁻¹)	Cuts (yr ⁻¹)	Nitrogen fertilization		Grazing		Soil depth (m)	Soil texture		
			Events (yr ⁻¹)	Total amount (kg N ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	Stocking rate (LSU ³ ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	Duration (d yr ⁻¹)		Sand (%)	Silt (%)	Clay (%)
FRLaq1	Intensive	-	3	210	1.10	160				
FRLaq2	Extensive	-	-	-	0.60	160	0.12	0.7	27	53
DEGri	Intensive	2-3	-	-	-	-	0.20	0.7	13	79
BUG	Extensive	-	-	-	0.30	180	0.10	0.6	85	6
IEDri	Intensive	-	3	280	0.72	150	0.17	0.7	52	27
ITAmp	Intensive	-	-	-	0.50	200	0.20	0.7	12	33
ITMbo	Extensive	1	-	-	-	-	0.20	0.7	44	39
PTMi2	Extensive	-	-	-	1.46	70	0.00	0.7	55	35
ESVDA	Extensive	-	-	-	0.18	120	0.10	0.6	15	50
OEN	Intensive	3-4	4	214	-	-	0.25	1.0	24	33
UKEBu	Extensive	-	4	200	0.65	160	0.00	0.7	12	24
NLCa1	Intensive	-	3	225	0.60	180	0.00	0.7	45	25

¹ Soil properties were obtained as the mean of six layers. Simulations make use of basic information for each layer.

² The classification into “extensive” or “intensive” grasslands was based on fertilizing intensity, the number of cuts, cattle density and/or grazing duration, which reflect the socio-economic environment in each country.

³ Livestock Standard Unit: standard measurement unit allowing the aggregation of various categories of livestock (species, sex and age) in order to enable them to be compared, related to the animals' feed requirements, using as a reference unit (=1 LSU) a dairy cow producing 3000 kg of milk annually, without additional concentrated feedstuffs (EC, 2008).

Table 3. Summary of the PaSim eco-physiological parameters considered in this study. For each parameter, three sets of values are reported: two from the calibration obtained in previous studies (P_temp, Oensingen and P_perm, Laqueuille, after Calanca et al., 2007 and Vuichard et al., 2007b) and one from the calibration performed in this study (P_redef). Greyed areas indicate the recalibrated parameters.

Parameters		Values			Description
Name	Unit	P_temp (Oensingen)	P_perm (Laqueuille)	P_redef	
Fractional C content of root structural dry matter ($f_{C,r}$)	kg C kg ⁻¹ DM	0.5	0.43	0.43	These parameters multiply the root and shoot growth rates, respectively, to obtain the C substrate variation.
Fractional C content of shoot structural dry matter ($f_{C,sh}$)	kg C kg ⁻¹ DM	0.39	0.435	0.435	
Parameter of the fractional N content of new plant structural dry matter ($f_{N,rep}$)	kg N kg ⁻¹ DM	0.022	0.018	0.018	This parameter is used to derive the nitrogen concentration of newly produced structural dry matter.
Maximum canopy height	m	0.35	0.707	0.707	It determines the canopy height to calculate the latent and sensible heat fluxes from the canopy and the soil surface.
Shoot turnover rate at 20 °C (γ)	d ⁻¹	0.03	0.012	0.012	They represent the leaf and root life-spans at a constant temperature, used to calculate the flow of plant residue.
Root turnover rate at 20 °C (γ)	d ⁻¹	0.05	0.048	0.048	
Fraction of fibres in ingested ears (NDF_{ear})	-	0.8	0.742	0.742	These parameters represent the proportion of fibre (NDF) in the ingested tissues (ear, lamina, sheath/stem).
Fraction of fibres in ingested blades (NDF_{lam})	-	0.6	0.542	0.542	
Fraction of fibres in ingested stems and sheaths (NDF_{stem})	-	0.7	0.642	0.642	
Maximum plant N concentration ($F_{N,max}$)	kg N kg ⁻¹ DM	0.045	0.03	0.03	This parameter limits N absorption by plant.

Digestible neutral detergent fibres of leaf blades - age 1 ($DNDF_{lam1}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.92	0.91	0.91	These parameters influence the daily amount of digestible neutral detergent fibre ($DNDF$) from different plant components (ear, lamina and sheath/stem) in the animal's intake, depending on the age of tissues (four classes).
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of leaf blades - age 2 ($DNDF_{lam2}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.82	0.77	0.77	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of leaf blades - age 3 ($DNDF_{lam3}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.76	0.63	0.63	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of leaf blades - age 4 ($DNDF_{lam4}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.74	0.35	0.35	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of stems and leaf sheaths - age 1 ($DNDF_{stem1}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.84	0.92	0.92	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of stems and leaf sheaths - age 2 ($DNDF_{stem2}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.65	0.79	0.79	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of stems and leaf sheaths - age 3 ($DNDF_{stem3}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.53	0.66	0.66	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of stems and leaf sheaths - age 4 ($DNDF_{stem4}$)	kg digestible fibres kg^{-1} fibres	0.5	0.4	0.4	

Digestible neutral detergent fibres of ears - age 1 (DNDF _{ears1})	kg digestible fibres kg ⁻¹ fibres	0.76	0.93	0.93	They represent the influence of developmental stage (the end of ear emergence marking the transition from the reproductive to the vegetative stage) on the light-saturated leaf photosynthetic rate (defined at standard conditions of temperature, atmospheric CO ₂ concentration and plant nitrogen concentration), which is a component of the rate of canopy photosynthesis.
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of ears - age 2 (DNDF _{ears2})	kg digestible fibres kg ⁻¹ fibres	0.48	0.68	0.68	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of ears - age 3 (DNDF _{ears3})	kg digestible fibres kg ⁻¹ fibres	0.3	0.44	0.44	
Digestible neutral detergent fibres of ears - age 4 (DNDF _{ears4})	kg digestible fibres kg ⁻¹ fibres	0.26	0.38	0.38	
Light-saturated leaf photosynthetic rate for reproductive stage (<i>pmco2rep</i>)	μmol C m ⁻² s ⁻¹	22.6666	16.723	19.723	This is the maximum value of specific leaf area, defined as the ratio of leaf area to dry weight, used to derive canopy leaf area from leaf biomass.
Light-saturated leaf photosynthetic rate for vegetative stage (<i>pmco2veg</i>)	μmol C m ⁻² s ⁻¹	15	11.099	13.099	
Maximum specific leaf area (<i>slam</i>)	m ² kg ⁻¹	33.5	25	29	It multiplies the temperature-dependent function ¹ to estimate soil respiration.
Temperature dependence factor of the soil respiration (<i>m_{IT}</i>)	-	2	2	0.7	

$$f(T_a) = \frac{(T_a - T_0)^{q_{fT}} \cdot (T_0' - T_a)}{(T_{ref} - T_0)^{q_{fT}} \cdot (T_0' - T_{ref})}, T_0 \leq T_a \leq T_0'$$

0 otherwise

where T_a (°C) is air temperature; T_0 (°C), T_0' (°C), T_{ref} (°C) are, respectively, the base air temperature, the ceiling air temperature at which

processes cease, and reference air temperature at which the maximum rate of respiration occurs; q_{rr} (unitless) is a shape parameter. Reference values for soil respiration are: $T_0=0$ °C, $T_0=45$ °C, $T_{ref}=20$ °C, $q_{rr}=2$.

Comment citer ce document :

Ma, S., Lardy, R., Graux, A.-I., Ben Touhami, H., Klumpp, K., Martin, R., Bellocchi, G. (2015). Regional-scale analysis of carbon and water cycles on managed grassland systems. Environmental Modelling and Software, 72, 356-371. DOI : 10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.03.007

Table 4. Model performance measurement indices.

Performance measure	Equation	Unit	Value range and purpose	Reliability	
				criterion	source
Coefficient of determination (R^2) of the linear regression estimates versus measurements (Addiscott and Whitmore, 1987)	$R^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - O_i) \cdot (O_i - \bar{O})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - \bar{P})^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (O_i - \bar{O})^2}}$	-	0 (absence of fit of the regression line) to 1 (perfect fit of the regression line): the closer the values are to 1, the better the model	>0.8	De Jager (1994)
IA, index of agreement (Willmott and Wicks, 1980)	$IA = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - O_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - \bar{O} + O_i - \bar{O})^2}$	-	0 (absence of agreement) to 1 (perfect agreement): the closer the values are to 1, the better the model	>0.8	De Jager (1994)
RMSE, root mean square error (Fox, 1981)	$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - O_i)^2}{n}}$	unit of the variable	0 (optimum) to positive infinity: the smaller RMSE, the better the model performance	-	-
MB, mean bias (Addiscott and Whitmore, 1987)	$MB = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - O_i)}{n}$	unit of the variable	negative infinity (underestimation) to positive infinity (overestimation): the closer the values are to 0, the better the model	-	-
ME, modelling efficiency (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970)	$ME = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (P_i - O_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (O_i - \bar{O})^2}$	-	negative infinity to 1 (optimum): the closer the values are to 1, the better the model	>0.5	Moriasi et al. (2007)

Table 5. Model performances across grassland sites (ID as in Table 1) based on different evaluation indices (as in Table 4) calculated on weekly aggregated data.

Site ID	GPP					RECO					ET				
	BIAS	RMSE	IA	ME	R ²	BIAS	RMSE	IA	ME	R ²	BIAS	RMSE	IA	ME	R ²
	g C week ⁻¹ .m ⁻²	g C week ⁻¹ .m ⁻²	-	-	-	g C week ⁻¹ .m ⁻²	g C week ⁻¹ .m ⁻²	-	-	-	mm week ⁻¹	mm week ⁻¹	-	-	-
CHOe1	-6.07	15.83	0.91	0.69	0.73	-10.35	12.90	0.88	0.58	0.88	-1.69	3.14	0.96	0.84	0.891
ITMbo	-2.22	10.89	0.96	0.85	0.86	0.89	12.22	0.93	0.59	0.86	-1.26	2.67	0.97	0.89	0.926
DEGri	-0.10	9.13	0.95	0.81	0.83	-1.53	11.74	0.88	0.44	0.63	1.23	3.45	0.92	0.60	0.827
UKEBu	-1.85	10.53	0.95	0.79	0.81	-2.88	10.44	0.91	0.68	0.72	0.66	3.95	0.82	0.37	0.465
IEDri	5.03	13.40	0.93	0.66	0.83	2.27	12.58	0.91	0.61	0.70	-1.84	2.65	0.94	0.76	0.887
HUBug	9.24	16.79	0.83	-0.02	0.64	7.95	15.12	0.80	-0.59	0.70	1.74	6.03	0.86	0.24	0.645
ITAmP	-9.06	16.18	0.74	0.10	0.40	-9.03	14.44	0.61	-0.07	0.39	-2.31	5.08	0.88	0.57	0.676
ESVDA	0.94	6.59	0.92	0.58	0.77	1.43	5.04	0.91	0.52	0.82	0.78	2.82	0.95	0.73	0.864
FRLq1	-2.94	10.07	0.96	0.85	0.87	-2.87	11.42	0.93	0.65	0.80	-4.12	5.93	0.86	0.47	0.728
FRLq2	5.35	14.84	0.93	0.59	0.85	4.51	13.66	0.90	0.35	0.84	-1.49	3.97	0.94	0.75	0.799
PTMi2	-3.89	11.21	0.82	0.47	0.53	-2.14	8.39	0.78	0.43	0.46	3.79	8.21	0.61	-2.04	0.316
NLCa1	4.27	14.04	0.92	0.57	0.80	6.55	16.23	0.88	0.27	0.76	-1.18	2.87	0.96	0.82	0.888
Site ID	NEE					SWC					SoiT				
	BIAS	RMSE	IA	ME	R ²	BIAS	RMSE	IA	ME	R ²	BIAS	RMSE	IA	ME	R ²
	g C week ⁻¹ .m ⁻²	g C week ⁻¹ .m ⁻²	-	-	-	%	%	-	-	-	°C	°C	-	-	-
CHOe1	-4.10	12.27	0.80	0.25	0.43	5.04	7.78	0.69	0.21	0.72	-3.19	4.06	0.91	0.71	0.91
ITMbo	3.11	17.13	0.48	-0.92	0.02	-15.84	16.89	0.41	-5.20	0.26	-0.80	3.88	0.94	0.64	0.89
DEGri	-1.43	7.72	0.83	0.44	0.50	-4.24	6.23	0.83	0.50	0.80	-3.63	4.35	0.92	0.55	0.94
UKEBu	-1.03	8.90	0.74	0.21	0.31	1.69	5.36	0.75	0.48	0.68	-3.06	4.00	0.87	0.34	0.82
IEDri	-2.76	8.03	0.81	0.25	0.47	-1.60	2.64	0.82	0.49	0.72	-1.24	1.73	0.94	0.71	0.93
HUBug	-1.29	6.27	0.84	0.45	0.52	7.10	8.44	0.55	-1.34	0.34	-0.93	2.06	0.98	0.92	0.96
ITAmP	0.19	9.81	0.72	0.14	0.27	3.52	7.55	0.70	0.21	0.38	-0.94	5.96	0.90	0.39	0.77
ESVDA	0.49	6.04	0.65	-0.81	0.19	4.47	6.05	0.68	-0.14	0.48	1.95	2.46	0.97	0.88	0.96

FRLq1	0.08	9.88	0.76	0.32	0.35	4.45	6.06	0.60	-0.57	0.29	-1.36	2.42	0.96	0.85	0.911
FRLq2	-0.83	9.34	0.76	0.34	0.37	5.03	7.69	0.60	-0.24	0.29	-1.75	2.53	0.95	0.79	0.905
PTMi2	1.75	7.90	0.68	-0.51	0.25	0.28	8.83	0.61	0.39	0.78	-1.45	2.86	0.97	0.91	0.944
NLCa1	2.29	10.68	0.68	-0.79	0.28	-16.50	19.98	0.49	-1.67	0.29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Figures:

Fig 1. Geographic location (left) and classification (right) of grassland sites (ID as in Table 1) with respect to two indices (climatic water balance and De Martonne-Gottmann aridity index) of water availability. For the aridity index b , (De Martonne, E, 1942), the following range limits discriminate between thermo-pluviometric conditions associated with aridity gradients: $b < 5$: extreme aridity; $5 \leq b \leq 14$: aridity; $15 \leq b \leq 19$: semi-aridity; $20 \leq b \leq 29$: sub-humid; $30 \leq b \leq 59$: humidity; $b > 59$: strong humidity (Diodato and Ceccarelli, 2004).

Fig 2. The mean bias of weekly values of GPP, RECO (g C m⁻² week⁻¹) and ET (mm week⁻¹), using three sets of parameter values: for temporary grasslands as established at Oensingen, Switzerland (P_temp, left), for permanent grasslands as established at Laqueuille, France (P_perm, middle), and the common set established in this study (P_redef, right).

Fig. 3. Scatter plots of simulated versus measured GPP weekly values. The dashed line is the 1:1 line. The solid red line represents the regression equation. The goodness-of-fit R^2 is the coefficient of determination of the regression equation.

Fig. 4. Scatter plots of simulated versus measured RECO weekly values. The dashed line is the 1:1 line. The solid red line represents the regression equation. The goodness-of-fit R^2 is the coefficient of determination of the regression equation.

Fig. 5. The variability of simulated GPP, RECO, soil temperature (ST) and soil water content (SWC) against the observed data for Oensingen (Switzerland) weekly values.

Fig. 6. Scatter plots of simulated with the redefined parameters versus measured RECO values (g C M⁻².week⁻¹) according to site characteristics and management practices. The goodness-of-fit R² is the coefficient of determination of the regression equation.

Fig. 7. Normalized residuals of RECO plotted versus day of year for each grassland site. Each point is the average of residuals for all years divided by the standard deviation. Horizontal lines represent the 95% confidence limits.

Fig. 8. Comparison of observed and simulated carbon fluxes (NEE, GPP, RECO; $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1}$) with different parameter values (default for Oensingen (P_temp) and Laqueuille (P_perm), and new parameter values (P_redef)). The values are averaged across all grassland sites.

Fig. 9. Comparison of observed and simulated water fluxes (mm yr⁻¹) with different parameter values (default for Oensingen (P_temp) and Laqueuille (P_perm), and new parameter values (P_redef)). The values are averaged across all grassland sites.

Appendix G: support figures

Fig. A1. Scatter plots of simulated versus measured ET weekly values.

Fig. A2. The variability of simulated GPP, RECO, soil temperature (ST) and soil water content (SWC) against the observed data for Bugac-Puszt (Hungary) weekly values.

Fig. A3. The variability of simulated GPP, RECO, soil temperature (ST) and soil water content (SWC) against the observed data for Amplero (Italy) weekly values.

Fig.A4. Scatter plots of simulated versus measured soil water content in the top 10 centimetres.

Fig. A5. The variability of simulated GPP, RECO, soil temperature (ST) and soil water content (SWC) against the observed data for Mitra (Portugal) weekly values.

Comment citer ce document :

Ma, S., Lardy, R., Graux, A.-I., Ben Touhami, H., Klumpp, K., Martin, R., Bellocchi, G. (2015).
Regional-scale analysis of carbon and water cycles on managed grassland systems. Environmental
Modelling and Software, 72, 356-371. DOI : 10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.03.007

Comment citer ce document :

Ma, S., Lardy, R., Graux, A.-I., Ben Touhami, H., Klumpp, K., Martin, R., Bellocchi, G. (2015).
Regional-scale analysis of carbon and water cycles on managed grassland systems. Environmental
Modelling and Software, 72, 356-371. DOI : 10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.03.007