

# Bayesian approach to Spatio-temporally Consistent Simulation of Daily Monsoon Rainfall over India

Adway Mitra

International Center for Theoretical Sciences (ICTS-TIFR)

Bangalore, India

adway.cse@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Simulation of rainfall over a region for long time-sequences can be very useful for planning and policy-making, especially in India where the economy is heavily reliant on monsoon rainfall. However, such simulations should be able to preserve the known spatial and temporal characteristics of rainfall over India. General Circulation Models (GCMs) are unable to do so, and various rainfall generators designed by hydrologists using stochastic processes like Gaussian Processes are also difficult to apply over the vast and highly diverse landscape of India. In this paper, we explore a series of Bayesian models based on conditional distributions of latent variables that describe weather conditions at specific locations and over the whole country. During parameter estimation from observed data, we use spatio-temporal smoothing using Markov Random Field so that the parameters learnt are spatially and temporally coherent. Also, we use a nonparametric spatial clustering based on Chinese Restaurant Process to identify homogeneous regions, which are utilized by some of the proposed models to improve spatial correlations of the simulated rainfall. The models are able to simulate daily rainfall across India for years, and can also utilize contextual information for conditional simulation. We use two datasets of different spatial resolutions over India, and focus on the period 2000-2015. We propose a large number of metrics to study the spatio-temporal properties of the simulations by the models, and compare them with the observed data to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the models.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Applied computing** → *Earth and atmospheric sciences; Environmental sciences;*

## KEYWORDS

Climate Informatics, Stochastic Simulation, Generative Models, Spatio-temporal patterns, Markov Random Field, Chinese Restaurant Process

## ACM Reference format:

Adway Mitra. 2017. Bayesian approach to Spatio-temporally Consistent Simulation of Daily Monsoon Rainfall over India. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGSPATIAL, Los Angeles, California, USA, November 2017 (SIGSPATIAL '17)*, 10 pages.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

SIGSPATIAL '17, Los Angeles, California, USA

© 2017 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00  
DOI: 10.1145/nmnnnmm.nnnnnmm

DOI: 10.1145/nmnnnmm.nnnnnmm

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Climate conditions are central to the well-being of people, as well as their socio-economic activities. Rainfall is an important aspect of climate, whose importance is enormous in certain parts of the world such as India. Here agriculture is strongly dependent on rainfall as the primary source of irrigation. Various large-scale infrastructures such as dams, reservoirs, roads, bridges etc are also affected by rainfall. So, for planning any agricultural policy or development project, it is important to carry out impact assessment and feasibility studies, using future rainfall as input. Process models, like biophysical crop models and hydrological models for reservoirs require weather data as input. Since actual rainfall data in the future is not available, it is necessary to have simulations of rainfall. However, such simulations must be accurate, and preserve as many of the characteristics of the real rainfall data as possible. But India is a very vast and diverse country, and rainfall over India is quite diverse spatio-temporally. In fact, study of the Indian monsoon is an active research topic in Climate Sciences [2].

A large number of climate models of varying levels of complexity have been developed by climate scientists, to simulate meteorological variables worldwide. These are coupled models, which take into account the interactions between many climatic systems and sub-systems, using differential equations. A class of such models called General Circulation Models (GCMs) are quite popular, and they provide simulations of rainfall over India, conditioned on simulated climatic conditions all over the world. Some of them have been found to be reasonably accurate in preserving certain properties of Indian Monsoon rainfall, such as inter-annual and intra-seasonal variability [3]. However, most of the models have been found to be inadequate in capturing other aspects of Indian monsoon, such as its dependence on the Indian Ocean Dipole (IOD). In this work, we find that most of these models are unable to preserve spatio-temporal properties of Indian monsoon rainfall in their simulations.

Due to the inability of GCMs, we now look into another approach: Stochastic Rainfall Generators. Introduced by C.W. Richardson [19], they model rainfall occurrence, rainfall volume and sometimes other climatic variables like temperature using conditional probability distributions (as in a Bayesian Network), conditioned on rainfall occurrence. Due to the use of distributions, these methods are capable of simulating the deviation from climatological means. Most of these stochastic simulators follow the general approach of using the training dataset to fit various parameters of these distributions, and then long temporal sequences of meteorological variables are simulated by sampling repeatedly from these distributions. Next, various statistics of interest are computed from this simulated data,

and they are compared with the corresponding statistics from the observed data. This is the general approach prescribed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) [15] for Stochastic Weather Generators, in which rainfall simulation is the most important step.

Most of the stochastic rainfall generators simulate daily rainfall occurrence (binary) and rainfall volume (real-valued) separately. This is achieved using a latent variable, such as in [7]. Temporal coherence is maintained while simulating the rainfall occurrence variable, using Markovian or Semi-Markovian([16]) approach where the lengths of wet or dry spells are explicitly simulated. Originally location-specific point processes were studied [6], but they were unable to capture spatial correlations between neighboring locations, so multi-site processes were introduced [8]. Most of the recently developed stochastic simulators like [5, 17, 18] achieve spatial correlations by using Gaussian Processes to generate rainfall volume. This approach allows them to make simulations in locations where past data is not available, assuming spatial smoothness over the region. To use Gaussian Process, they need to choose suitable mean and covariance functions. A concise but comprehensive survey on stochastic daily rainfall generators is available in [1].

These stochastic rainfall simulations have been used in various parts of the world, such as Argentina [17], Sweden [18], USA [16], and various countries in Africa [10, 11]. However, not too much work has been done for India, except some attempts like [9]. Simulating Indian monsoon rainfall is highly important and impactful, but also very challenging. Most of the places within the geopolitical boundaries of India receive almost 80% of their total annual rainfall from the South Asian monsoon during June-September. However, some locations such as the south-eastern part of the peninsula remains relatively dry during this period, and receives most of their annual rainfall in the post-monsoon season (October-December). Even among the other locations, the climatological mean rainfall varies quite significantly. There are the dry desert areas in the North-Western part which have only 10-15 days of significant rainfall across the 4 months. On the other hand, the Western coast along Arabian Sea, and some parts of North-eastern India receive heavy rainfall on most of the days. Apart from such spatial diversity, there are also significant intraseasonal daily variations. The first couple of weeks on June are relatively dry, as monsoon onset may not have happened in many of the locations. During the core monsoon months of July, August and September, there are some short sequences of days called "active spells" when most locations in the country simultaneously receive more rain than their respective means, and other sequences called "break spells" when most locations in the country are dry. However, during the active spells the North-Eastern areas are usually dry, and during break spells these areas, as well as Northern foothills of the Himalayas and South-eastern parts of the peninsula receive good rainfall. Finally, it is not uncommon that some locations have extremely high rainfall, while some other locations suffer a drought at the same time. Also, the days on which spatial aggregate rainfall across India is maximum, are not necessarily same as the days on which maximum number of locations receive more rainfall than their respective means. A systematic study of all these variabilities is presented in [2].

In this work, we aim to build stochastic rainfall simulation models for daily Indian monsoon rainfall, based on latent variables and

conditional distributions. However, our approach is quite different from those discussed above. We use binary variables at each spatio-temporal location not to indicate rainfall occurrence or non-occurrence, but to indicate one of two modes corresponding to weather conditions. These modes are associated with heavy rain or light rain, but they may overlap. These variables are expected to be spatio-temporally coherent, as weather type over an area (covering several gridpoints) persists over several days, even though the precipitation amount may vary significantly. The Distributions on these variables are learnt from training data, ensuring their spatio-temporal coherence through a Markov Random Field. We also use a variable which indicates the all-India condition (such as active spells, break spells, and normal spells). We do not use Gaussian process to simulate rainfall volumes at locations, because the covariance function is difficult to construct over the heterogeneous landmass. Most covariance functions used for Gaussian Processes imply that correlations between rainfall volumes at two locations are strongly correlated to their geographical (Euclidean) distance. However, this is not the case in India, where locations on the western and eastern slopes of the Western Ghats mountain range (that runs along the western coast) are less than 100 Km away, but their rainfall characteristics are completely different as the mountain range creates a rain shadow zone. Instead, we attempt to demarcate the landmass into a suitable number of homogeneous zones where all locations are in the same mode (as mentioned earlier) on most of the days of the training period. Some of our models take account of these zones to ensure spatial coherence.

Finally, we discuss evaluation criteria for the simulation models while comparing the statistics from the simulated data to those of the observed data. We lay special emphasis on how well spatio-temporal properties of the observed data are preserved in the simulation. We study the mean correlation of the daily rainfall at each location with those at its neighboring locations, and also the spatial distribution of rainfall across the locations. We study the mean correlation of rainfall amounts at all locations on pairs of successive days, and also the mean lengths of dry and wet spells at all locations. Finally, we also evaluate the mean and standard deviation of daily rainfall for each location, and also for the all-India spatial aggregate. We evaluate our proposed models by generating simulation data from them conditioned on some input, like rainfall observations at a few random locations on random days, or the all-India aggregate rainfall per day. We also evaluate many General Circulation Models (listed in [3]) with these criteria, and point out their glaring weaknesses.

The main contributions of this work, relative to the existing literature on stochastic daily rainfall generators are as follows: 1) We build simulators for a vast and diverse spatial field like India, unlike most simulators that are built for relatively small and homogeneous regions, 2) We make use of Markov Random Fields to ensure spatio-temporal coherence while learning location-specific distribution parameters for the latent variables, 3) We model country-wide broad weather type (like active/break spells) and their relations with individual locations, 4) We use a nonparametric clustering approach to identify homogeneous sets of locations where local weather conditions are same on most days, 5) We study different ways of incorporating supervisions to improve our simulations, 6) We come up with many novel measures to quantify and compare

spatio-temporal properties of the simulations, and finally 7) Instead of a single model, we make a series of models and show their relative merits and demerits with respect to these measures. We even evaluate simulations by GCMs using these measures.

## 2 DATASETS, VARIABLES AND PARAMETERS

For this work, we use two datasets, both compiled and released by Indian Meteorological Department (IMD). In the first dataset, daily rainfall data from 1901 to 2011 is available over 357 grid-points all over India, each grid-point of size 100Km-by-100Km. In the second dataset, daily rainfall data is available for the months April-November, from 1901 to 2014, over 4964 grid-points all over India, each of which is of size 25Km-by-25Km. Since most of the places in India receive almost 80% of their annual rainfall from the Indian monsoon (June-September), in this work we use only these four months for our simulation. However, during this period the south-eastern parts of the peninsula remains relatively dry. Also, we focus on the period 2000-2014 instead of the entire duration since 1900, because climate change has resulted in various changes in Indian monsoon characteristics across this period, and so the parameters cannot be considered as constant.


For modelling purposes, we now introduce the notations and variables. Suppose there are  $S$  locations, and the total number of days is  $T$ . Any location  $s$  has a set of neighboring locations  $NB(s)$ , according to the grid coordinates. Only locations lying on Indian geo-political landmass are considered. At each location  $s$  and day  $t$ ,  $X(s, t)$  denotes the volume of rainfall received, while  $Y(t)$  denotes the aggregate rainfall received by the entire country on that day. When these variables are measured from the dataset, we denote them as  $X^{DATA}(s, t)$  and  $Y^{DATA}(t)$ . When we consider simulation outputs by a model  $M$ , they are denoted as  $X^M(s, t)$  and  $Y^M(t)$ .

Now, we introduce two latent variables that indicate the rainfall conditions. Each state of binary variable  $Z(s, t)$  represents a distribution over the rainfall volume at location  $s$  and day  $t$ , one state ( $Z = 1$ ) peaked at higher value and the other ( $Z = 2$ ) close to 0. In other words,

$$X(s, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{skt}, \beta_{skt}) \text{ where } k = Z(s, t) \quad (1)$$

where  $(\alpha, \beta)$  are the parameters of a Gamma distribution dependent on  $Z$ , and potentially varying across locations and time. However, in this work we drop the time-dependence of these parameters to improve model complexity. This is somewhat similar to the rainfall occurrence variable considered by most stochastic rainfall generators such as [7, 17], but not exactly same.  $Z_{st}$  actually corresponds to the weather condition at location  $s$  and day  $t$ , that is expected to be spatio-temporally coherent. Ideally,  $Z$  should be based not only on rainfall but also other meteorological variables such as cloud cover that influence rainfall. At each location  $s$ , we use a distribution  $\text{prob}(Z(s, t) = k | Z(s, t-1) = l) = \tau_{slk}$  that quantifies the temporal coherence of  $Z$ .

We also consider a variable  $U(t)$  that takes 3 values and indicates the rainfall conditions over the entire country.  $U = 1$  is associated with active spells [2], and signifies that most of the  $S$  locations are in state  $Z = 1$ . But  $U = 2$  is associated with the pre-onset and break spells [2], and signifies that most of the  $S$  locations are in state  $Z = 2$ .  $U = 3$  signifies normal conditions.  $U$  is also expected to be temporally coherent. For each location  $s$ , its relation to the all-India



**Figure 1: Markov Random Field as mentioned above. The horizontal edges are temporal edges, vertical edges are spatial edges, diagonal edges are data edges. All the  $Z$ -variables each day are linked to the  $U$  variable of that day.**

condition is encoded by a distribution  $\text{prob}(Z(s, t) = k | U(t) = l) = \theta_{slk}$ . For most locations,  $U = 1$  implies higher chance of  $Z = 1$  than  $Z = 2$ , but for some locations mostly in the north-eastern parts of the country and parts of the eastern coast, it is the reverse [2].

## 3 PARAMETER LEARNING BY MARKOV RANDOM FIELDS

Clearly, for simulation we need to learn the parameters  $\alpha, \beta, \theta$  and  $\tau$ , for which we must know the latent variables  $Z$  and  $U$ . In the model training phase, we infer these state variables. The naive way to do so is to consider the rainfall time-series at each location independently, and use Expectation-Maximization approach to fit a 2-state Hidden Markov Model with Gamma emission distribution, and assign  $Z$ -variables accordingly. However, this does not account for spatial coherence of the  $Z$ -variables. Also, it is less easy to do this for  $U$  variables, since each value of  $U(t)$  has a bearing on the number of locations that are in state  $Z = 1$  on day  $t$ , and it is difficult to fit a distribution on this number. So, we make use of a Markov Random Field to find the best assignment of  $Z$  and  $U$  variables that fits the observations  $X$  and also preserves spatio-temporal coherence.

In the Markov Random Field, we have two nodes ( $Z(s, t), X(s, t)$ ) for each spatio-temporal location  $(s, t)$  where  $s \in \{1, S\}$  and  $t \in \{1, T\}$ , and  $T$  is the length of the training sequences. We also have the all-India state node  $U(t)$  for each day. Each  $Z(s, t)$  node is connected by *temporal edges* to  $Z(s, t+1)$  and  $Z(s, t-1)$ , and by *spatial edges* to  $Z(s', t)$  where  $s'$  is a spatial neighbor of  $s$ , i.e.  $s' \in NB(s)$ .  $Z(s, t)$  is also connected to  $U(t)$  by *scale edge* and to  $X(s, t)$  by *data edge*. Each  $U(t)$  is also connected to  $Y(t)$  by data edges, and to  $U(t+1), U(t-1)$  by temporal edges. The graphical model is shown in Figure 1. On each of these edges, we define *potential functions*  $\Psi^e$ . For any spatial, temporal or scale edge  $e$ , we define the function such that it takes a high value  $a^e$  if the nodes connected by it take same value, and low value  $b^e$  if they take different values. For spatial edges between any pair of neighboring locations  $(s, s')$ , we set  $a^e$  equal to the correlation between  $X^{DATA}(s)$  and  $X^{DATA}(s')$  across the temporal duration  $T$  of the training sequence, and  $b^e$  is

set to 0. For any scale edge from location  $s$ ,  $a^e$  is set to exponential of the correlation between  $X(s)$  and  $Y$  across the  $T$  time-points, and  $b^e$  is 1. For all temporal edges on  $Z$ -variables of a location  $s$ , ( $a^e, b^e$ ) are constants, and we set to their ratio to 99. This corresponds to the prior distribution of  $\text{prob}(Z(s, t) = Z(s, t - 1)) = 0.99$ . For data edges between  $Z(s, t)$  and  $X(s, t)$ , we define the potential function according to Equation 1, i.e. PDF at  $X(s, t)$  of the Gamma distribution whose parameters are specified by  $Z(s, t)$ . For data edges between  $U(t)$  and  $Y(t)$ , we set the potential function equal to the PDF at  $Y(t)$  of a Gaussian distribution whose parameters ( $\mu, \sigma$ ) are specified by  $U(t)$ . The likelihood of the assignment of latent variables ( $Z, U$ ) and the parameters ( $\alpha, \beta, \mu, \sigma$ ) conditioned on  $X$  and  $Y$  is the product of all these potential functions. Mathematically, for  $Z$  the distribution is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(Z, U, \alpha, \beta, \mu, \sigma | X^{DATA}) &\propto \prod_{s,t} \prod_{s' \in NB(s)} \Psi^{spatial}(Z(s, t), Z(s', t)) \\ &\times \prod_{s,t} \Psi^{temporal}(Z(s, t), Z(s, t - 1)) \times \prod_t \Psi^{temporal}(U(t), U(t - 1)) \\ &\times \prod_t \Psi^{data}(U(t), Y^{DATA}(t)) \times \prod_{s,t} \Psi^{data}(Z(s, t), X^{DATA}(s, t)) \\ &\times \prod_{s,t} \Psi^{scale}(Z(s, t), U(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Note that the use of exponential on the potential functions of scale edges ensures that the all-India weather state  $U(t)$  depends on local weather states  $Z(s, t)$  at all the locations on each day, without defining any conditional distribution. It also depends on the aggregate all-India rainfall  $Y(t)$ .

The next task is to estimate these unknown quantities such that this likelihood function is maximized. Clearly, the spatial, temporal and scale potential functions encourage the  $Z$  and  $U$  variables to match their spatio-temporal neighbors, though they also need to fit the data, thereby requiring a compromise. For an initial estimate, we neglect all spatial, temporal and scale edges, and independently estimate the unknown variables and parameters using Expectation Maximization. Clearly, such an estimate is not spatio-temporally coherent. To achieve that end, we now consider the full graph structure again, and carry out inference using Gibbs Sampling, where in each step we sample one  $Z(s, t)$  or one  $U(t)$  variable conditioned on all the remaining  $Z$  and  $U$  values. The parameters ( $\alpha, \beta, \mu, \sigma$ ) are also updated accordingly. Gibbs Sampling is relatively straightforward, since each  $Z(s, t)$  is conditionally independent of all  $Z$  and  $U$  given its neighboring vertices (a key property of MRF).

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{pr}(Z(s, t) = k | Z, U, X^{DATA}, Y^{DATA}) \\ &= \text{pr}(Z(s, t) = k | Z(s, t + \delta), Z(s', t), U(t), X^{DATA}(s, t)) \\ &\propto \text{pr}(Z(s, t) = k, Z(s, t + \delta), Z(s', t), U(t), X^{DATA}(s, t)) \\ &= \prod_{\delta \in (-1, 1)} \Psi^{temporal}(Z(s, t) = k, Z(s, t + \delta)) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{s' \in NB(s)} \Psi^{spatial}(Z(s, t) = k, Z(s', t)) \\ &\times \Psi^{scale}(Z(s, t) = k, U(t)) \times \Psi^{data}(Z(s, t) = k, X^{DATA}(s, t)) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(U(t) = k | Z, U, X^{DATA}, Y^{DATA}) &\propto \text{pr}(U(t) = k, U(t + \delta), Z(t), Y^{DATA}(t)) \\ &= \prod_{\delta \in (-1, 1)} \Psi^{temporal}(U(t) = k, U(t + \delta)) \\ &\times \prod_s \Psi^{scale}(Z(s, t), U(t) = k) \times \Psi^{data}(U(t) = k, Y^{DATA}(t)) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

After performing these samplings iteratively and collecting samples at regular intervals, we find the mode of  $(Z, U)$ , along with updated estimates of the parameters ( $\alpha, \beta, \mu, \sigma$ ). This estimate of  $Z^{MRF}$  and  $U^{MRF}$  also allow us to make MAP estimate of the parameters  $\tau$  and  $\lambda$  (state transition distributions of  $Z$  at each location, and  $U$ ) and  $\theta$  (distribution of  $Z$  at each location, conditioned on  $U$ ). As  $Z^{MRF}$  and  $U^{MRF}$  estimated by the MRF are spatio-temporally coherent, the posterior estimate of the parameters too reflect this property. We also estimate a posterior distribution on  $U$ .

## 4 SIMPLE SIMULATION MODELS

The training process is completed using the MRF-based MAP estimation of the parameters ( $\alpha, \beta, \tau, \theta$ ), and an estimation of the latent variables ( $Z, U$ ) which we can use as ‘‘ground truth’’ for evaluating our simulations. Now, we are ready to build the models for simulation. In this section, we will introduce four simple models, two of which are single-site models, while the other two make use of interaction between local and all-India weather states. Although these models are simplistic compared to the state-of-the-art models, they are important for the comparison of properties that will follow.

### 4.1 Model 1

The first model is a simple single-site model, along the lines of [6]. Here, each  $Z^{M1}(s, t)$  is sampled independently, followed by  $X^{M1}(s, t)$ . Mathematically,

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{M1}(s, t) &\sim \text{Bernoulli}(\hat{\tau}_s); X^{M1}(s, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{sk}, \beta_{sk}) \\ &\text{where } k = Z^{M1}(s, t); \forall s \in \{1, S\}, t \in \{1, T\} \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\hat{\tau}$  is the marginal distribution of the states computed from the state-transition distribution  $\tau$ .

This model requires 5 parameters  $\alpha_{s1}, \beta_{s1}, \alpha_{s2}, \beta_{s2}, \hat{\tau}_s$  for each location, i.e. totally 5S parameters.

### 4.2 Model 2

The second model is also single-site, but this time we consider the temporal dynamics of  $Z^{M2}(s, t)$  as a Markov process. Mathematically,

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{M2}(s, 1) &\sim \hat{\tau}_s; X^{M2}(s, 1) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{sk}, \beta_{sk}) \\ Z^{M2}(s, t) &\sim \tau_{sl}; X^{M2}(s, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{sk}, \beta_{sk}) \\ &\text{where } l = Z^{M2}(s, t - 1); k = Z^{M2}(s, t); \forall s \in \{1, S\}, t \in \{2, T\} \end{aligned}$$

This model requires 6 parameters  $\alpha_{s1}, \beta_{s1}, \alpha_{s2}, \beta_{s2}, \tau_{s1}, \tau_{s2}$  for each location, i.e. totally 6S parameters.

Clearly, the use of Markov process will make the simulations from this model temporally coherent, and dry/wet spells can be simulated with their lengths following geometric distribution. Some stochastic generators such as [16] have done away with the Markov approach of achieving this and used a semi-Markov approach where the lengths of these spells are modelled explicitly as Poisson distribution with parameters specific to locations and states. But we

could not use this approach since the distribution of lengths of such spells are so different in different locations over India that no single type of distribution can be used. Using different types of distributions in different locations will make the model too ugly, which we wanted to avoid.

### 4.3 Model 3

In the third model, we consider the relations between all-India weather state variable  $U$  and the local weather state variable  $Z$ . For each day, first the  $U$  variables are sampled. This can be done according to a state transition distribution  $\lambda$  for  $U$ , learnt from  $U^{MRF}$ . But they can also be estimated from supervision information, which allows us to perform conditional simulation based on coarse external information that acts as a driver (like [17]).

$$\begin{aligned} U^{M3}(1) &\sim \hat{\lambda}; U^{M3}(t) \sim \lambda_n \text{ where } n = U^{M3}(t-1) \\ Z^{M3}(s, t) &\sim \theta_{s1}; X^{M3}(s, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{sk}, \beta_{sk}) \\ \text{where } l &= U^{M3}(t); k = Z^{M3}(s, t); \forall s \in \{1, S\}, t \in \{1, T\} \end{aligned}$$

This model requires 7 parameters  $\alpha_{s1}, \beta_{s1}, \alpha_{s2}, \beta_{s2}, \theta_{s1}, \theta_{s2}, \theta_{s3}$  for each location, and additionally 6 parameters for  $\lambda$  i.e. totally  $7S + 6$  parameters.

Since the MRF-based parameter estimation has ensured that the parameters are spatially correlated, we can expect to see an increased spatial coherence of  $Z^{M3}$  and spatial correlation of  $X^{M3}$  under the driving effect of  $U$ .

### 4.4 Model 4

Finally, in model 4 we combine models 2 and 3 together, by defining conditional distributions  $\pi_s$  that denote  $\text{prob}(Z^{M4}(s, t) = k | Z^{M4}(s, t-1) = l, U^{M4}(t) = m) = \pi_{slmk}$ . These are also learnt a-posteriori using  $Z^{MRF}$  and  $U^{MRF}$ . The model is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{M4}(1) &\sim \hat{\lambda}; U^{M4}(t) \sim \lambda_n \text{ where } n = U^{M4}(t-1) \\ Z^{M4}(s, t) &\sim \pi_{slm}; X^{M4}(s, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{sk}, \beta_{sk}) \\ \text{where } m &= U^{M4}(t); l = Z^{M4}(s, t-1); k = Z^{M4}(s, t); \\ &\forall s \in \{1, S\}, t \in \{1, T\} \end{aligned}$$

This model requires 10 parameters  $\alpha_{s1}, \beta_{s1}, \alpha_{s2}, \beta_{s2}, \pi_{s11}, \pi_{s12}, \pi_{s13}, \pi_{s21}, \pi_{s22}, \pi_{s23}$  for each location, and additionally 6 parameters for  $\lambda$  i.e.  $10S + 6$  parameters totally.

This model hopes to achieve temporal coherence by conditioning on  $Z(s, t-1)$  and spatial coherence by conditioning on  $U(t)$ .

## 5 IDENTIFICATION OF COHERENT ZONES

To reduce the parameter complexity, as well as improve spatial coherence, we now attempt to partition the landmass into coherent zones, so that some of the model variables such as  $Z$  can be made specific to zones rather than to locations. In the literature, various attempts at regionalization of the Indian landmass has been made based on rainfall characteristics [20], but these are mostly with respect to annual statistics. In this work, we are more interested in identifying sets of locations where each of them can be assigned the same value of  $Z$  every day. For this purpose we use the  $Z^{MRF}$  assignments into the framework of spatial clustering. The  $T$ -dimensional binary vector  $Z_s^{MRF}$  from each location  $s$  serves as the set of feature vectors. However, since we do not know the

number of clusters, i.e. coherent zones to be formed, we cannot use approaches like Spectral Clustering. Instead, we make use of Nonparametric approaches based on Chinese Restaurant Process. Such methods have been used for spatial clustering, in context of image segmentation [13, 14].

Consider each locations  $s$  is assigned to a coherent zone  $H(s)$ . Also consider a set  $V$  of canonical binary vectors  $\{V_1, V_2, \dots\}$  of dimension  $T$ , each of which corresponds to the  $Z$ -vectors for a coherent zone. The  $Z$ -vector of each location is a somewhat corrupted version of  $V_{H(s)}$ , where an expected fraction  $p$  of the binary entries are flipped, i.e. on an expected number  $Tp$  of all the  $T$  days, the local weather state at any location is different from the weather state of its corresponding zone. The number of zones to be created clearly depends on  $p$ , let this number be  $K_p$ .

Now, we introduce the generative model based on Spatially Coherent Chinese Restaurant Process (SC-CRP) on this setting. For each location  $s$ , we assign to it a zone id  $H(s)$ , which can be among the zones assigned to the neighboring locations, or a separate zone. This ensures that all the zones are spatially coherent; no location is assigned to a zone unless at least one of its neighboring locations is also assigned to that zone, or it is a single-point zone. As with normal Chinese Restaurant Process, if we consider the assignment process sequentially, the probability of assigning any location  $s$  to a zone  $k$  is proportional to the number of locations  $n_k$  already assigned to it, and that of assigning  $s$  to a new coherent zone is proportional to a constant  $\alpha$ . Once this has been done, the binary  $Z$ -vector for that location  $s$  is generated by flipping each of the elements of  $V_{H(s)}$  with a probability  $p$ . The generative model based on SC-CRP can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{prob}(H(s) = k | H(1, \dots, s-1)) &\propto n_k \text{ if } \exists s' \in NB(s) \text{ s.t. } H(s') = k \\ &\propto \alpha \text{ if } \nexists s' \text{ s.t. } H(s') = k \\ &= 0 \text{ otherwise} \\ Z(s, t) &\sim \text{Ber}(V(z, t), p) \text{ where } z = H(s), t \in \{1, T\}, s \in \{1, S\} \end{aligned}$$

However we know only realizations of  $Z$ , in the form of  $Z^{MRF}$ , and not  $H$  and  $V$ . So, we use Gibbs Sampling to perform the inference on  $H$ , with  $V$  re-estimated with each iteration. Finally we get  $K_p$  coherent zones, which depends on  $p$ . Naturally, if  $p = 1$  then  $K_p = S$ . We find that for the low-resolution dataset with  $S = 357$ , the number of zones is 129 for  $p = 0.9$ , while for the high-resolution dataset with  $S = 4964$ , we have  $K_{0.9} = 248$ .

## 6 MODELS FOR SPATIALLY COHERENT SIMULATION

In this section we propose our remaining two models, which are along the lines of the previous models but use the spatially coherent zones identified above. This allows us to gain additional spatial coherence of  $Z$ .

### 6.1 Model 5

This model is along the lines of Model 4, but using an additional variable  $C$  for weather state at zone  $z$ . The  $\pi$  distributions are now defined over these zones instead of locations. Once the zonal weather states  $C$  have been simulated according to  $\pi$ , the local

weather states  $Z(s, t)$  are selected by setting them equal to the corresponding zonal state  $C(H(s), t)$  with probability  $p$ , and the reverse of the zonal state with probability  $(1 - p)$ . This is done according to the Chinese Restaurant Process model of spatial clustering discussed above. The model is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{M5}(1) &\sim \hat{\lambda}; U^{M5}(t) \sim \lambda_n \text{ where } n = U^{M5}(t-1) \\ C^{M5}(z, t) &\sim \pi_{zlm}; \forall z \in \{1, K_p\}, t \in \{1, T\} \\ &\text{where } m = U^{M5}(t); l = C^{M5}(z, t-1); \\ Z^{M5}(s, t) &\sim \text{Ber}(c, p); X^{M5}(s, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{sk}, \beta_{sk}) \\ &\text{where } c = C^{M5}(H(s), t); k = Z^{M5}(s, t); \forall s \in \{1, S\}, t \in \{1, T\} \end{aligned}$$

In this model, each location  $s$  requires 5 parameters  $\alpha_{s1}, \beta_{s1}, \alpha_{s2}, \beta_{s2}, H(s)$  while each zone  $z$  requires 6 parameters  $\pi_{z11}, \pi_{z12}, \pi_{z13}, \pi_{z21}, \pi_{z22}, \pi_{z23}$ , 6 parameters for  $\lambda$  and finally there is  $p$ . So totally there are  $5S + 6K_p + 7$  parameters.

## 6.2 Model 6

Finally, we come to our final model, which is an extension of Model 5, but with the express purpose of scaling up spatial correlation of local rainfall volume  $X(s, t)$  with its neighbors. Unlike all the previous models, here the rainfall amount sampled as Gamma distribution is not specific to locations but to the coherent zones, conditioned on the zonal weather state  $C$  as in Model 5, and denoted by  $W(z, t)$ . This rainfall volume is distributed among the constituent locations of each zone, according to a distribution  $\phi(z)$ , learnt from the training dataset.

$$\begin{aligned} U^{M6}(1) &\sim \hat{\lambda}; U^{M6}(t) \sim \lambda_n \text{ where } n = U^{M6}(t-1) \\ C^{M6}(z, t) &\sim \pi_{zlm}; W^{M6}(z, t) \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_{zk}^C, \beta_{zk}^C) \\ &\text{where } m = U^{M6}(t); l = C^{M6}(z, t-1); k = C^{M6}(z, t); \\ &\forall z \in \{1, K_p\}, t \in \{1, T\} \\ X^{M6}(s, t) &= \phi(H(s), s)W^{M6}(H(s), t) \forall s \in \{1, S\}, t \in \{1, T\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $Z(s, t)$  is not separately assigned in this model. For evaluation purposes in the next section, we will consider  $Z^{M6}(s, t) = C^{M6}(H(s), t)$ .

In this model, each zone requires 10 parameters  $\alpha_{z1}, \beta_{z1}, \alpha_{z2}, \beta_{z2}, \pi_{z11}, \pi_{z12}, \pi_{z13}, \pi_{z21}, \pi_{z22}, \pi_{z23}$ , while each location needs two parameters  $(H(s), \phi(H(s), s))$ , 6 parameters for  $\lambda$  and additionally there is  $p$ . Totally there are  $10K_p + 2S + 7$  parameters. Although  $K_p$  depends on the choice of  $p$ , for all practical purposes this is the most concise model.

Use of the distribution  $\phi(z)$  implies that proportion of rainfall received by the locations within a zone is the same on all days. This is unrealistic. A small trick to prevent it is to sample an uniform Dirichlet-distributed PMF  $\gamma(z, t) \sim \text{Dir}(r)$  for each day, and use it to corrupt  $\phi(z)$  as  $\hat{\phi}(z, t) = q\phi(z) + (1 - q)\gamma(z, t)$ , where  $q$  is a suitably chosen value, probably in the range  $(0.7 - 0.9)$ . This  $\hat{\phi}(z, t)$  can be used in Model 6 now.

## 7 CONDITIONAL SIMULATION

Now that the models are ready, we consider various settings for the simulations to run. One possibility is for the simulations to run unconditionally, i.e. without any external input apart from the

parameters. In case of such a simulation, all the latent variables are simulated according to the models as described above. Such a simulation can give us an estimate for the future as it runs fully independently, and hence it is useful for impact assessment etc. However, since it has no link with the actual conditions of a specific year, a comparison with the data (once it becomes available) or across different models for their evaluation is almost meaningless. The only way to evaluate unconditional simulations is to let them run long enough and compare the long-term statistical properties of such simulations with those of the data (when it become available).

The other alternative is *conditional simulation*, like [17], which runs conditioned on some information about the days or years being simulated. Usually, this information is quite coarse level, but we may use them to estimate some of the random variables, and this estimation has an impact on the simulation of the other variables. We consider two types of conditions in this work: the daily all-India rainfall; and local rainfall at a random set of locations and days.

In the first case, the total rainfall over India, i.e.  $Y(t)$  is known for every day. We use this information to infer  $U(t)$ , and this is in turn used as input to the models. Models 1 and 2 cannot make use of it, but Models 3-6 are benefitted from it. The inference of  $U$  is done by considering a Hidden Markov Model with 3 states having Gaussian emission with parameters  $\{\mu_k, \sigma_k\}_{k=1}^3$  and state transition distribution  $\lambda$  - all estimated from  $U^{MRF}$  and  $Y^{DATA}$ .

In the second case, the local rainfall  $X$  in each of the total  $ST$  spatio-temporal locations, is made known with a probability  $p$ , i.e.  $X$  is known in about  $pST$  spatio-temporal locations. Based on these, we make an estimate of all  $Z$ -variables and then the  $U$ -variables. In each of the locations say  $s$ , an estimate of the  $Z$ -variables in each of the ‘‘observed’’ days (i.e. where  $X^{DATA}(s, t)$  is known) is made, using  $(\alpha, \beta)$  parameters. After this, the  $Z$ -variables for location  $s$  are estimated in the remaining days as well, using  $\tau$  by an iterative process. In each step of the iteration,  $Z$  is estimated for any day  $t$  if at least one of  $Z(s, t-1)$  and  $Z(s, t+1)$  has already been estimated in the previous iterations. This process continues till  $Z$ -estimates have propagated to all days, for those locations that have at least one observation. Once an estimate of  $Z$  is made in all the locations and days, an estimate of  $U$  for all the days are made, using  $\theta$ . These  $U$ -estimates are then used to drive the models once again, as in the previous case. Note that Model 1 cannot benefit from this supervision (as all the spatio-temporal locations are independent for it), while Model 2 makes use of the estimates of  $Z$ . Obviously, the simulation will be closer to the true data for higher values of  $p$ .

## 8 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Now, we discuss the measures by which we compare the simulation results to the data. This step is most essential to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each model. We compare both location-specific properties, and spatio-temporal patterns. There are two categories of evaluation measures: for latent variables  $(Z, U)$  and for observed variables  $(X, Y)$ .

### 8.1 Properties of Latent Variables

When the MRF is run for a particular duration, say a year, and the learnt parameters are used to simulate the same year, we should compare the simulated latent variables for model verification. For

this purpose, we set certain criteria based on these variables to evaluate the simulations. First of all we have *state bias ZZ1*. i.e. the number of spatio-temporal locations (out of  $ST$ ) having  $Z = 1$ . This helps to understand if the model is biased towards any state. Next we have *spatial coherence Scoh*: on each day, the mean fraction of neighbors of any location  $s$  that have the same  $Z$ -value as  $s$ . The mean is also taken across all days. Similarly, we evaluate *temporal coherence Tcoh*: for any location, the mean fraction of days that it has same  $Z$ -value as the previous day. The mean is also taken across all locations. Note that this is related to  $\tau$  and  $\pi$  parameters.

The Indian landmass has a lot of spatial diversity of daily rainfall - even if the daily spatial aggregate rainfall is very high on a given day, not all locations may have significant rainfall on that day. Some locations receive very high rainfall during the break phases, while some locations remain dry during the active phases [2]. We measure this *spatial diversity* using three indices: *SpDiv* - the correlation between daily all-India rainfall  $Y$  and the number of locations in state  $Z = 1$  in each day;  $nZ1U1$  - the mean number of locations in state 1 on days when  $U = 1$ , and  $nZ1U2$  - the mean number of locations in state 1 on days when  $U = 2$ . Note that these are related to  $\theta$  and  $\pi$  parameters.

## 8.2 Properties of Observed Variables

The latent variables are important for the models, but from an application point of view, the observed variables  $X$  and  $Y$  are of prime importance. So we now set criteria to evaluate simulations based on these variables. First of all, we standardize the values of  $X$  and  $Y$  in all models with respect to the mean of all local  $X$ -variables. This is not necessary for our proposed models, but important for the GCMs since some of them produce transformed values.

We compute the mean and standard deviation of  $X$  at all locations, and also  $Y$ . We compare  $SY$  - the standard deviation of daily all-India rainfall (mean all-India rainfall is similar for most models after the standardization). Since we cannot tabulate the location-specific statistics of all locations, we instead compute  $dMX$  and  $dSX$ : the mean relative error in these quantities, i.e.  $dMX = \text{mean}_s \frac{|mn_s^{MODEL}(X) - mn_s^{DATA}(X)|}{mn_s^{DATA}(X)}$  where  $mn_s(X)$  is the mean of  $X$  at location  $s$  across all the days, and  $dSX = \text{mean}_s \frac{|sd_s^{MODEL}(X) - sd_s^{DATA}(X)|}{sd_s^{DATA}(X)}$  where  $sd_s(X)$  is the standard deviation of  $X$  at location  $s$  across all the days. Also, to see how well *local extreme rainfall* are simulated, we also measure  $X100$ : the total number of times that any location has received over 100mm of rainfall on any day.

Next, we come to mean lengths of wet spells *wetln*, the mean number of successive days that a location receives over 10mm of rainfall. Once again, the mean is taken across all locations. Then we have three measures based on correlations. First, we have *daily correlation dcr* - the correlation between  $Y^{DATA}$  and  $Y^{MODEL}$  across all the days in the simulated period. We evaluate *scr - mean spatial correlation* - of each location with its neighboring locations on same day. The mean is computed across locations and days. Next we have *correlations of spatial patterns* -  $S$ -dimensional vector of rainfall volume at each location. We compute this pattern each day and compute its correlation with the pattern of the previous day, and the mean correlation across all days is evaluated as *trc*. Again, we compute the mean spatial pattern across all the days for

Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	dcr	trc	spatcr
DATA	0	0	1230	1300	1.9	1	0.37	1
MIROC5	0.34	0.38	923	598	2.7	0.3	0.64	0.71
CCSM4	0.48	0.21	1054	498	2.6	0.2	0.53	0.69
BCC	0.23	0.41	1710	2459	2.1	0.15	0.41	0.5
BNU-ESM	0.32	0.48	1045	9	3.8	0.28	0.8	0.5
CESM-BGC	0.35	0.3	1026	696	2.4	0.23	0.58	0.68
CESM-CAM5	0.22	0.46	853	539	3.9	0.35	0.62	0.65
CMCCM5	0.65	0.55	1524	854	1.8	0.11	0.62	0.66
CNRMCM5	0.27	0.49	1314	1376	3.4	0.16	0.64	0.69
GFDLCM3	0.54	0.4	997	144	5	0.1	0.72	0.44
GFDLESM2G	0.65	0.67	980	543	2.8	0.17	0.78	0.56
HADCM3	0.53	0.59	1768	171	4	0	0.81	0.6
HADGEM2	0.78	0.69	1385	1831	2.3	0	0.75	0.48
IPSL-CM5	0.38	0.52	1573	1203	3.1	0.04	0.72	0.33
MIROC-ESM	0.55	0.32	1401	35	6.6	0.02	0.65	0.51
MPI-ESM	0.52	0.42	1391	802	2	0.25	0.66	0.64
NorESM	0.36	0.37	1234	203	3.8	0.25	0.69	0.58

**Table 1: Comparison of the simulation of rainfall at local and all-India scale by different GCMs for the period 2000-2005**

both the data and the simulation, and evaluate their correlation as *spatcr*.

## 9 EVALUATION OF GCMs

Before evaluating the proposed models, we first present our evaluations for various General Circulation Models. In particular, we focus on the ones identified by [3] as reasonably successful in simulating certain aspects of Indian monsoon rainfall. Since for most models we have data only till 2005, we focus on the period 2000-2005. Also, most of these models operate at coarser resolution than 100KM - 100KM, which is the resolution of our low-resolution dataset with  $S = 357$  locations. So we downscaled the GCM observations to the same grid with  $S = 357$  locations. The evaluation criteria for observed variables as discussed above are used for this evaluation. However, we do not evaluate spatial correlation because of the spatial smoothing done.

The results are shown in Table 1. Clearly, we see that most GCMs are not able to represent these characteristics satisfactorily. Most of the models fail to simulate even the mean spatial pattern, as the *spatcr* is quite low. The standard deviation  $SY$  is either overestimated or underestimated by most models, except CNRM-CM5 and Nor-ESM. Only 2 models: CNRM-CM5 and IPSL-CM5 have  $X100$  - the number of rain-events above 100mm - close to the true value, while most other models severely underestimate this quantity, though a few overestimate it severely as well. The mean length of wet spells is overestimated by most models, except CMCC-CM5 and MPI-ESM. The temporal correlation of spatial patterns is also highly overestimated by all the models. Most models have very little correlation of daily rainfall with the true values, with the exception of CESM-CAM5, for whom this correlation is 0.35. Overall, it can be said that GCMs are quite incapable of preserving the spatio-temporal properties of the process.

## 10 MODEL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Now, we come to our main section - the evaluation of our proposed models. For this we consider three settings, as follows.

### 10.1 Evaluation of Latent Variables

In the first setting, we use data for two specific years - 2006 and 2007, and learn the MRF model for these years, over the months June-September. This gives us both the estimate of model parameters like  $\alpha, \beta, \mu, \sigma, \tau, \theta, \pi, \lambda$ , but also the estimated latent variables  $Z^{MRF}$  and  $U^{MRF}$ . Using the  $U^{MRF}$  of these years as the condition for conditional simulation, we now simulate the  $Z$ -variables for these two years, using the 6 models (Model 1 and Model 2 do not use  $U$ ). This process is repeated for both the low-resolution and the high-resolution datasets. The results are shown in Tables 2-5.

The Tables carry a few broad messages. None of the models are able to achieve the desired level of spatial coherence, but Models 5 and 6 are better than the others (since they utilize the coherent zones). Model 2, which uses location-specific Markov models on  $Z$ -s is able to achieve perfect temporal coherence, but all other models fall short. The spatial diversity is under-estimated by models 1 and 2, and overestimated by models 3, 4 and 5, while Model 6 is the best in this regard. Models 3 and 6 are closer than the rest to the conditional distribution of local active states, based on the all-India state. However, most models overestimate the number of local active states when the all-India state is 2 ( $nZ1U2$ ). Also, Models 3-6 overestimate the number of local positive states ( $ZZ1$ ).

### 10.2 Conditional Simulation with Daily all-India Rainfall

We next consider conditional simulation, where the model's evaluation period is beyond its training period. The model parameters are learnt using the Markov Random Fields for 6 years- every even year in 2000-2011, for both the high-resolution and low-resolution datasets. Using these parameters, we simulate daily monsoon rainfall for the period 2000-2011 for low-resolution dataset, and 2000-2015 for high-resolution dataset, for the months June-September each year. The simulations are conditioned on all-India rainfall each day, as discussed in Section 7. Clearly, in this case there is no possibility of evaluating the simulated latent variables  $Z$  (as they are known only in the training years), so instead we evaluate the simulated  $X$  and  $Y$  variables, using the criteria discussed in Section 8. The results are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Once again, the tables reveal some broad patterns of results. First of all, we note that for all the 6 models, the mean and standard deviation parameters of the simulated  $X$ -variables are much better those of the GCMs presented in Table 1, as their errors compared to the ground truth are much smaller ( $dMX, dSX$ ). Also, all these models are able to perfectly replicate the spatial pattern, due to which the *spatcr* value is over 0.95 for all models (not shown in tables). However, all models underestimate the standard deviation of  $Y$ , i.e. the daily total rainfall. Model 6 is grossly underestimates the number of local extreme events which is understandable, as its model construction forces every local  $X$  to a fraction of the total rainfall in its zone. The other models are able to simulate this property reasonably. The mean length of wet spells is underestimated by all models except Model 6, which matches the true value on the

Model	ZZ1	SCoh	TCoh	SpDiv	nZ1U1	nZ1U2
MRF-DATA	13059	0.89	0.92	0.78	169	60
Model1	13067	0.69	0.66	0.42	107	107
Model2	12727	0.7	0.93	0.58	106	105
Model3	13429	0.72	0.7	0.95	167	66
Model4	13754	0.71	0.88	0.9	164	80
Model5	14795	0.77	0.88	0.91	169	82
Model6	14723	0.77	0.87	0.81	171	82

**Table 2: Evaluation of the latent variables simulated by different models with respect to the MRF for the year 2006 on the low-resolution dataset**

Model	ZZ1	SCoh	TCoh	SpDiv	nZ1U1	nZ1U2
MRF-DATA	10729	0.87	0.89	0.86	130	36
Model1	10924	0.68	0.64	0.54	88	86
Model2	10914	0.68	0.89	0.74	93	76
Model3	11422	0.68	0.63	0.91	133	49
Model4	11908	0.67	0.85	0.89	126	62
Model5	13397	0.75	0.85	0.89	136	63
Model6	13234	0.75	0.85	0.79	134	66

**Table 3: Evaluation of the latent variables simulated by different models with respect to the MRF for the year 2007 on the low-resolution dataset**

Model	ZZ1	SCoh	TCoh	SpDiv	nZ1U1	nZ1U2
MRF-DATA	152535	0.91	0.91	0.84	1965	766
Model1	152620	0.65	0.63	0.51	1247	1247
Model2	150080	0.66	0.91	0.7	1243	1220
Model3	159380	0.67	0.65	0.99	1898	963
Model4	163910	0.66	0.87	0.97	1892	1009
Model5	160480	0.85	0.88	0.98	1862	967
Model6	160271	0.85	0.88	0.88	1951	855

**Table 4: Evaluation of the latent variables simulated by different models with respect to the MRF for the year 2006 on the high-resolution dataset**

Model	ZZ1	SCoh	TCoh	SpDiv	nZ1U1	nZ1U2
MRF-DATA	149109	0.9	0.9	0.85	1748	558
Model1	149245	0.65	0.64	0.61	1221	1211
Model2	147650	0.65	0.9	0.96	1228	1088
Model3	156320	0.66	0.64	0.99	1761	817
Model4	162350	0.65	0.66	0.99	1633	896
Model5	152980	0.84	0.86	0.95	1622	798
Model6	152460	0.84	0.86	0.79	1667	791

**Table 5: Evaluation of the latent variables simulated by different models with respect to the MRF for the year 2007 on the high-resolution dataset**

low-resolution dataset, but falls short on the high-resolution one. The spatial correlation is low for all models compared to the data, though Models 5 and 6 are somewhat better than the other models in this respect. The temporal correlation is best for Model 6. The models 3-6 also show reasonably good daily correlation, which is



Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	dcr	scr	tcr
DATA	0	0	1212	2542	1.9	1	0.58	0.37
Model1	0.08	0.1	302	2595	1.3	0	0.13	0.08
Model2	0.1	0.11	309	2598	1.8	0	0.13	0.28
Model3	0.23	0.17	843	2648	1.4	0.8	0.16	0.1
Model4	0.11	0.11	775	2667	1.8	0.72	0.15	0.27
Model5	0.16	0.13	849	2838	1.8	0.7	0.23	0.26
Model6	0.1	0.17	823	1776	1.9	0.63	0.4	0.3

**Table 6: Evaluation of rainfall simulated by different models, conditioned on daily all-India rainfall for the period 2000-2011, on the low-resolution dataset**

Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	dcr	scr	tcr
DATA	0	0	1529	38831	2.7	1	0.69	0.38
Model1	0.14	0.11	104	37046	1.3	0	0.04	0.1
Model2	0.15	0.12	131	36767	1.8	0	0.04	0.3
Model3	0.14	0.11	1014	38171	1.4	0.7	0.07	0.11
Model4	0.15	0.13	935	38089	1.8	0.69	0.07	0.28
Model5	0.21	0.16	1030	37851	1.8	0.65	0.23	0.28
Model6	0.14	0.34	979	15817	1.9	0.61	0.58	0.36

**Table 7: Evaluation of rainfall simulated by different models, conditioned on daily all-India rainfall for the period 2000-2015, on the high-resolution dataset**

expected since they are all linked to the actual days by  $Y$ . However, this correlation is best for Models 3 and 4.

### 10.3 Conditional Simulation with local Rainfall

Next, we come to the second kind of conditional simulation as discussed in Section 7. The  $X$ -value at a fraction  $p$  of all the  $S*T$  spatio-temporal locations are uncovered. Two settings are considered-  $p = 0.25$  and  $p = 0.5$ . As in the previous case, the model parameters are learnt using MRF using the June-September period of every even year in 2000-2011., while the simulation is done for these months in all the 12 years of this period. The revealed information is utilized as described in Section 7, followed by simulation by the models. The spatio-temporal locations where the  $X$ -values are known are excluded from the simulation. The results are shown in Tables 8 and 9. Note that for Model 1 this makes no difference (as all locations are independent for it), while Model 6 is same as Model 5, so these two models are not evaluated.

This setting clearly benefits Model 2, as it is now able to get some input in form of the  $Z$ -variables. Clearly this improves its performance with respect to daily correlation and spatial correlation. Daily correlation for all models are found to increase. The tables clearly show that increasing the number of observations from  $p = 0.25$  to  $p = 0.5$  improves the performances of all models. Local information with  $p = 0.25$  gives a somewhat poorer performance with respect to local statistics ( $dMX$ ,  $dSX$ ) compared to daily all-India rainfall, but with  $p = 0.5$  these are improved.

Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	dcr	scr	tcr
DATA	0	0	1212	2542	1.9	1	0.58	0.37
Model2	0.29	0.17	702	2803	1.9	0.83	0.18	0.24
Model3	0.2	0.18	463	3465	1.4	0.66	0.15	0.11
Model4	0.3	0.17	726	2813	1.9	0.83	0.18	0.23
Model5	0.24	0.15	956	2953	1.7	0.86	0.27	0.2

**Table 8: Evaluation of rainfall simulated by different models, conditioned on 25% of the spatio-temporal locations for the period 2000-2011, on the low-resolution dataset**

Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	dcr	scr	tcr
DATA	0	0	1212	2542	1.9	1	0.58	0.37
Model2	0.15	0.11	921	2803	1.9	0.93	0.27	0.26
Model3	0.15	0.14	677	3465	1.4	0.89	0.22	0.14
Model4	0.15	0.11	944	2813	1.9	0.93	0.27	0.25
Model5	0.19	0.13	1084	2953	1.7	0.94	0.34	0.21

**Table 9: Evaluation of rainfall simulated by different models, conditioned on 50% of the spatio-temporal locations for the period 2000-2011, on the low-resolution dataset**

### 10.4 Unconditional Simulation

Finally, we carry out our last experiment- where the models are run without any contextual information. As before we learn the model parameters from every even year in 2000-2011, and run them for 12 years without any input. The results for the low-resolution and high-resolution data are shown in Tables 10 and 11. Since daily correlation is irrelevant in this case (as there is no connection with the actual days) we drop that criteria from these tables. It can be seen that the figures are hardly different from those in case of conditional simulations. in Tables 6-9. This shows that our models can achieve decent simulation performance without any external supervision.

### 10.5 Conclusions from the experiments

From the experiments discussed above, a few points are worth noting. First of all, we find that the GCMs perform poorly with respect to most of the criteria discussed here. Among the different models we considered here, there is no single model which can be considered as outstanding. Model 6 uses the least number of parameters and performs best with respect to spatial and temporal correlations, even though it falls short of the ground-truth. It also simulates the spatial diversity (SpDiv) better than other models. However, it greatly underestimates the number of extreme rainfall events. It is also unable to capture the local statistics very well, as  $dSX$  is high for it in all the settings. Also, models 5 and 6 tend to overestimate the number of locations in active state. Among other models, Model 2 works reasonably well for conditional simulation based on local information, and it is able to simulate the temporal coherence reasonably well. It also makes reasonable estimate of the local and all-India statistics ( $dMX$ ,  $dSX$ ,  $SY$ ). Model 3, on the other hand, works better for conditional simulation based on daily all-India rainfall, though it is unable to simulate the spatial and temporal correlations. Model 4 is aimed to be compromise between Model 2 and Model 3, and its simulation results show this. It can

Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	scr	tcr
DATA	0	0	1212	2542	1.9	0.58	0.37
Model1	0.08	0.1	302	2595	1.3	0.13	0.08
Model2	0.1	0.11	309	2598	1.8	0.13	0.28
Model3	0.24	0.16	846	2523	1.4	0.16	0.09
Model4	0.11	0.11	729	2472	1.8	0.15	0.28
Model5	0.16	0.13	819	2690	1.8	0.23	0.27
Model6	0.1	0.17	839	1961	1.8	0.41	0.3

**Table 10: Evaluation of rainfall simulated unconditionally by different models, for the period 2000-2011, on the low-resolution dataset**

Model	dMX	dSX	SY	X100	wetln	scr	tcr
DATA	0	0	1529	38831	2.7	0.69	0.38
Model1	0.14	0.11	104	37046	1.3	0.04	0.1
Model2	0.15	0.12	131	36767	1.8	0.04	0.3
Model3	0.15	0.12	1027	33742	1.4	0.08	0.12
Model4	0.17	0.13	936	33272	1.7	0.08	0.29
Model5	0.18	0.14	1036	32158	1.7	0.24	0.28
Model6	0.13	0.27	972	12885	1.8	0.58	0.37

**Table 11: Evaluation of rainfall simulated unconditionally by different models, for the period 2000-2015, on the high-resolution dataset**

simulate the temporal coherence well, and it has high daily correlations for both kinds of conditional simulation. However, this is compensated by its high parameter complexity, and it cannot simulate spatial correlation either. Note that Models 1-5 make a reasonable estimate of the number of local extreme rainfall events, though none of them is specially equipped to do so. Model 5 is intermediate in all respects as it simulates all the criteria to some extent, though not particularly well.

In short, the Indian monsoon rainfall is a very complex phenomena, so that it is very difficult to simulate all of its properties simultaneously. Simulating one set of properties well results in poor simulation of some other properties.

## 11 POSSIBLE EXTENSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we attempted to build stochastic rainfall generators for India, that can preserve the complex spatio-temporal characteristics of the phenomenon. Unlike other contemporary approaches to stochastic rainfall simulation, we made use of a Markov Random Field to estimate location-specific rainfall parameters to maintain spatial smoothness, and we also took a Bayesian non-parametric approach to demarcate the entire landmass into spatially coherent zones based on daily local conditions. Using these, we were able to partially achieve the spatial correlation of rainfall in our simulations. We proposed a large number of criteria to evaluate the models with respect to local statistics and spatio-temporal properties, and compared the merits and demerits of different models. We also showed that General Circulation Models are not at all satisfactory with respect to these properties. We concluded that preserving all these properties simultaneously in a simulation is quite challenging.

Finally, we also showed how our models can incorporate some external information to improve their simulations and perform conditional simulation.

There are a number of directions along which this work can be extended. In most stochastic weather generators, rainfall simulation is the most important step, but this is in turn used to simulate more climatic variables such as temperature, and we can also do so. Secondly, these simulators also attempt to simulate rainfall at very high resolutions- where no observed data is available. We will extend our models to achieve this, based on our capability of conditional simulation. Also, we aim to consider more sophisticated hierarchical approaches to improve spatial correlations and simulation of extreme events.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ailliot, Pierre and Allard, Denis and Monbet, Valérie and Naveau, Philippe, *Stochastic weather generators: an overview of weather type models*, Journal de la Société Française de Statistique, 2015, Vol 156(1), pp 101–113
- [2] S. Gadgil, *The Indian monsoon and its variability*, Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 2003, Vol. 31(1), pp 429–467
- [3] Jayasankar, CB and Surendran, Sajani and Rajendran, Kavirajan, *Robust signals of future projections of Indian summer monsoon rainfall by IPCC AR5 climate models: Role of seasonal cycle and interannual variability*, Geophysical Research Letters, 2015, Vol. 42(9), pp 3513–3520
- [4] Mendoza, Pablo A and Clark, Martyn P and Barlage, Michael and Rajagopalan, Balaji and Samaniego, Luis and Abramowitz, Gab and Gupta, Hoshin, *Are we unnecessarily constraining the agility of complex process-based models?*, Water Resources Research, 2015, Vol. 51(1), pp 716–728
- [5] Kleiber, William and Katz, Richard W and Rajagopalan, Balaji, *Daily spatiotemporal precipitation simulation using latent and transformed Gaussian processes*, Water Resources Research, 2012, Vol. 48(1)
- [6] Rodriguez-Iturbe, Ignacio and Cox, DR and Isham, Valerie, *A point process model for rainfall: further developments*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 1988, Vol. 417(1853), pp 283–298
- [7] Glasbey, CA and Nevison, IM, *Rainfall modelling using a latent Gaussian variable*, Modelling Longitudinal and Spatially Correlated Data (1997), pp 233–242
- [8] Wilks, DS, *Multisite generalization of a daily stochastic precipitation generation model*, Journal of Hydrology (1998), Vol 210(1), pp 178–191
- [9] Dabral, PP and Pandey, Ashish and Baithuri, N and Mal, BC, *Stochastic modelling of rainfall in humid region of NorthEast India*, Water Resources Management, 2008, Vol. 22(10), pp 1395–1407
- [10] Cowden, Joshua R and Watkins, David W and Mihelcic, James R, *Stochastic rainfall modeling in West Africa: parsimonious approaches for domestic rainwater harvesting assessment*, Journal of Hydrology (2008), Vol. 361(1), pp 64–77
- [11] Munang Tingem, Mike Rivington, Sayed Azam-Ali and Jeremy Colls, *Assessment of the ClimGen stochastic weather generator at Cameroon sites*, African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology, 2007, Vol. 1 (4), pp. 86–92
- [12] Q.Fu, A.Banerjee, S.Liess, and P.K.Snyder, *Drought detection of the last century: An MRF-based approach*, SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM), 2012, pp 24–34
- [13] Ghosh, Soumya and Ungureanu, Andrei B and Sudderth, Erik B and Blei, David M, *Spatial distance dependent Chinese restaurant processes for image segmentation*, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2011, pp 1476–1484
- [14] Socher, Richard and Manning, Christopher D, *A Gibbs Sampler for Spatial Clustering with the Distance-dependent Chinese Restaurant Process*, researchgate.net
- [15] [http://www.ipcc-data.org/guidelines/pages/weather\\_generators.html](http://www.ipcc-data.org/guidelines/pages/weather_generators.html)
- [16] Kim, Dongkyun and Kim, Jongho and Cho, Yong-Sik, *A poisson cluster stochastic rainfall generator that accounts for the interannual variability of rainfall statistics: validation at various geographic locations across the united states*, Journal of Applied Mathematics, 2014
- [17] Verdin, Andrew and Rajagopalan, Balaji and Kleiber, William and Podestá, Guillermo and Bert, Federico, *A conditional stochastic weather generator for seasonal to multi-decadal simulations*, Journal of Hydrology, 2015
- [18] Baxevani, Anastassia and Lennartsson, Jan, *A spatiotemporal precipitation generator based on a censored latent Gaussian field*, Water Resources Research, 2015, Vol 51(6), pp 4338–4358
- [19] C.W. Richardson, *Stochastic simulation of daily precipitation, temperature, and solar radiation*, Water Resour. Res., 1981, 17 (1), pp. 182f?190
- [20] Srinivas, VV, *Regionalization of Precipitation in India—A Review*, Journal of the Indian Institute of Science, 2013, Vol 93(2), pp 153–162