Dear Thomas Wild,

Thank you very much for handling our manuscript. Below, we respond to the two reviewers' feedback. As a result, we have improved the manuscript in multiple ways:

- We clarified the motivation of our sector and the community aspect of the creation of the sector.
- We expanded on possible challenges in the conclusions.
- We expanded the discussion of interlinkages to other sectors and improved Figure 4.
- And we improved on the discussion of the results and conclusions we drew.

In the spirit of a community project, we also added two additional authors: Wim Thiery and Tanjila Akhter, because they contributed to the conceptualization of the sector in previous workshops and this revision. Moreover, they are committed to providing model outputs to the ISIMIP Groundwater sector, utilizing the CLM model in their respective groups.

Below, we provide our responses to the comments in blue. To ensure a more streamlined integration of feedback from both reviewers, we chose to address reviewer 2's feedback first, followed by reviewer 1's.

On behalf of all authors,

Robert Reinecke

Reviewer 2

This paper provides an overview of the recently established groundwater sector within the Inter Sectoral Impact Modeling Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). The paper is quite succinct, and for the most part, strikes a good balance of keeping the presentation high level while still being informative. A small amount of analysis is provided in Section 4 to offer an initial glimpse at notable differences in model outputs for water table depth and recharge, but the aim of this paper is to introduce the motivation for groundwater ISIMIP sector, some background on the participating models, and the sector's short to medium term vision. Overall, I think this paper provides a very approachable and well-presented overview of the new groundwater sector. I have some minor comments that could improve the manuscript, but no major criticisms that need to be addressed.

We thank the reviewer for taking the time to read our manuscript and appreciate the constructive feedback.

Minor comments:

- Section 6 could be improved by adding a few sentences about some potential challenges, technical, logistical, monetary (funding), for realizing the goals of new Groundwater MIP sector.

We have expanded section 6 with the following (line 384):

"In summary, the ISIMIP Groundwater sector aims to enhance our understanding of the impacts of climate change and direct human impacts on groundwater and a range of related sectors. To realize this goal, the new ISIMIP Groundwater sector will address numerous challenges. For instance, core simulated variables, such as water table depth and recharge, are highly uncertain and difficult to compare with observations. Further, tracing down explanations for inter-model differences will require the joint development and application of new evaluation methods (Eyring et al., 2016b) and protocols. Currently, models of the Groundwater sector operate at different spatial resolutions, and compared to other sectors, they often run at relatively high spatial resolutions, which will need to be addressed in evaluation and analysis approaches. Furthermore, depending on the model, executing single-model simulations already requires substantial amounts of computation time, and running all impact scenarios may be infeasible for some modeling groups. Lastly, running simulations for ISIMIP requires not only computational resources but also human resources, which might not be feasible for all groups. This has always been the case with ISIMIP, and it is an issue that other sectors have faced as well. Still, we are confident that the groundwater sector will enhance our understanding of groundwater within the Earth system and help to promote dialogue and synthesis in the research community. With its various connections to other sectors, the Groundwater sector can be a catalyst for developing new holistic cross-sector modelling efforts that account for the multitude of interconnections between the water cycle and social, economic, and ecological systems."

- Something not touched on is that certain models could perform better in specific regions on for specific output variables. There could be value in more directly stating that the Groundwater ISIMIP sector could inform region-specific model recommendations for specific outputs.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have added this aspect to section 6.

Line 364 now reads:

"Model intercomparison and validation may also help identify models that perform better in specific regions or for specific output variables, thus enabling the provision of region- or variable-specific recommendations and uncertainty assessments to subsequent data users."

- L 135: could the authors expand slightly on "functional relationships"?

We agree that the current explanation may be too brief. We have expanded on this as requested.

Line 155 now reads:

"We aim to utilize these simulations for an in-depth model comparison, including a comparison to observational data such as time series of groundwater table depth (e.g., Jasechko et al. (2024)) and by utilizing so-called functional relationships (Reinecke et al., 2024; Gnann et al. 2023). Functional relationships can be defined as covariations of variables across space and/or time, and they are a key aspect of our theoretical knowledge of Earth's functioning. Examples include relationships between precipitation and groundwater recharge (Gnann et al. 2023; Berghuijs et al. 2024) or between topographic slope and water table depth (Reinecke et al., 2024)."

- L 136-138 Groundwater is new to ISIMIP, but are there any notable previous groundwater model intercomparison efforts worth mentioning, even if not global in scale?

We are not aware of an intercomparison project that utilizes multiple groundwater models, especially for large-scale analyses. There are examples of benchmarking experiments that use different groundwater modeling approaches for the same problem or run the same model for different scenarios, but we are not aware of an effort, even on regional scales, that has approached such an intercomparison. We have added this discussion to the introduction and also added a reference to GroMoPo as requested by Reviewer 1.

Line 106 in the introduction now reads:

"[...] *The new Groundwater sector is a separate but complementary sector to the existing global water sector. To our knowledge, there are currently no long-term community efforts for a structured model intercomparison project for groundwater models. While studies have benchmarked different model approaches (e.g., Maxwell et al. 2014), or compared model outputs (Reinecke et al., 2021; 2024), or collected information on where and how we model groundwater (Telteu et al., 2021; Zipper et al., 2023; Zamrsky et al., 2025), no effort yet aims at forcing different groundwater models with the same climate and human forcings for different scenarios.*"

- L179-189: In addition to using the same forcing data, are there plans to run these models at the same resolution or are outputs going to be scaled to the same resolution as a post-processing step?

In the short term, there are no plans to run the models at the same resolutions, as this might require substantial changes in some models or may not even be possible for others because of computation time and resource limitations. Model outputs are scaled to the same resolution as a post-processing step, which makes it more feasible to conduct model intercomparisons. In this way, more groundwater models are likely to participate. However, some of the models already run on the same resolution or are flexible in running on multiple spatial and temporal resolutions – it would be worth investigating the differences in scale sensitivity.

As the sector further develops in the future, it may become possible and desirable to harmonize spatial resolution for improved inter-comparability of model outputs.

We now clarify this in section 3 (line 190):

"The current sector protocol defines a targeted spatial resolution of 5 arcmin, as this represents not only the resolution achievable by most global models but also the coarsest resolution at which meaningful representation of groundwater dynamics, particularly lateral groundwater flows and water table depths, can still be captured (Gleeson et al., 2021). ISIMIP3 also specifies experiments with different spatial resolutions, but whether this is achievable with a sub-ensemble of the presented models remains unclear, as it depends on the available computational time, flexibility of model setups, and data availability. To ensure consistency and comparability, the model outputs are currently post-processed by the modeling groups to aggregate their outputs to the protocol-specified spatial and temporal resolutions."

- Figure 1 & Lines 195-196: "This difference in ensemble WTD points to conceptual differences between the models, which should be investigated further." Given the authors on this paper have expertise with these models, could there be a couple

sentences offered positing as to why there could be such stark differences in the water depth for G3M & CLM compared to WBM and VIC-wur?

We agree that a more in-depth discussion of these differences is necessary, which is a key motivation for future research. However, it is also challenging to pinpoint precisely why the presented models differ so much without a much more thorough analysis. To provide better guidance for subsequent studies, we tried to expand on this aspect as much as possible. Line 234 now read:

"This difference in ensemble WTD points to conceptual differences between the models. G^{3}M and CLM both use the relatively shallow WTD estimates of Fan et al. (2013) as initial state or spin-up, which could explain the overall shallow water table depth. The difference between G^{3}M and VIC-wur is consistent with the findings in Reinecke et al. (2024), which showed a deeper water table simulated by the de Graaf et al. (2017) groundwater model, which developed an aquifer parameterization adapted and conceptually similar to VIC-wur and WBM. This difference may be linked to the implementation of groundwater drainage/surface water infiltration or transmissivity parameterizations (Reinecke et al., 2024) as well as differences in groundwater recharge (Reinecke et al., 2021). Furthermore, the models are not yet driven by the same climatic and human forcings, thereby possibly causing different model responses. The newly initiated ISIMIP Groundwater sector offers an opportunity to investigate these differences much more systematically in future studies, for example, by ruling out forcing as a driver of the model differences and by exploring spatial and temporal relationships with key groundwater drivers such as topography (e.g., Reinecke et al., 2024). In addition, the ISIMIP Groundwater sector provides a platform for using the modelling team's expertise on their model implementations (e.g., model structures and parameter fields) to better understand the origins of these differences."

- Figures 2 and 3: It is my understanding that for this initial comparison the groundwater recharge model results have different forcings (Table A1). I think it would be good to remind the audience of this because the rest of the paper is focused on the forthcoming efforts using the *same* forcings for the MIP.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have added the following sentence to all figures: "Models shown are not yet driven by the same meteorological forcing (see also table A1)."

Minor spelling comments:

- Spelling L150: "and surface water exchange fluxes as upper boundary conditionals without later fluxes": Later**al** missing "al"

Thank you for spotting this, we corrected it.

- Line 275: ISMIP missing I, ISIMIP

Thank you for spotting this, we corrected it.

Reviewer 1

I appreciate the efforts of Reinecke et al, and support the effort to better represent groundwater in ISIMIP - this is a much needed, and long called for effort. But overall this manuscript feels a

thin, uncritical, non-exhaustive and somewhat repetitive. This may strongly worded, but it feels more like a paper written quickly after a great workshop rather than a deep effort with longer rumination and iteration. The manuscript seems thin in that each section seems quick and brief rather than deeply insightful or critical. I think a number of the ideas could be expanded upon with more critique and reflection. For example, when I look at the models in Table 2 compared to the linkages in Figure 4, I was struck by the limited capacity of most models to simulate outputs that would be useful for other sectors. At a basic level, if water use is not even in a model, how is it useful to assess water resources? And nothing to do with groundwater quality or contamination is mentioned in Table 1 so how can this effort be useful for water quality?

Deciding on a multi-model intercomparison protocol is not a trivial task. We thank the reviewer for the thoughtful feedback and for taking the time to read our manuscript.[1] However, we would also like to point out that the assessment of the paper quality stands in contrast to the evaluation of Reviewer 2: *"This paper provides an overview of the recently established groundwater sector within the Inter Sectoral Impact Modeling Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP). The paper is quite succinct, and for the most part, strikes a good balance of keeping the presentation high level while still being informative."*

We appreciate that the reviewer recognizes the success of our workshops; however, we would like to clarify that the paper is the outcome of multiple in-person workshops, held in Potsdam (2022, 2025), Prague (2023), Mainz (2024), as well as a EGU splinter meeting (2024) and numerous uncounted online meetings.

We believe that some of the comments stem from a lack of explanation for the motivation behind ISIMIP and the newly created sector. The critical comments thus helped to improve the manuscript. To improve our manuscript, we have in particular clarified the motivation behind our sector and the community aspect of its creation, expanded the discussion of interlinkages to other sectors, improved Figure 4, and expanded on the discussion of model differences.

To specifically address "if water use is not even in a model, how is it useful to assess water resources? And nothing to do with groundwater quality or contamination is mentioned in Table 1 so how can this effort be useful for water quality?"

Water uses are included in some models but not in all models. Furthermore, to better understand water resources, it is essential to comprehend the processes and interactions within the water cycle.[2] This better understanding does not necessarily involve only the 'scenario' of water uses. ISIMIP also defines scenarios of "naturalized" conditions without human intervention. Some models can simulate multiple scenarios, while others may not.

[3] Water quality is omitted here because global groundwater quality data remain sparse. Even surface water quality studies at this scale are nascent, prompting initiatives like ISIMIP's new water quality sector (see https://www.isimip.org/about/#sectors-and-contacts) to address this gap (with currently a paper on its protocol in the second round of review with ERL-Water).

We, however, acknowledge that scientists less familiar with or not involved in the ISIMIP setup may need further explanation on how community decision-making informs the creation of a sector and potential connections to other sectors. We have also expanded the description of ISIMIP to clarify the independence of sectors and models.

Line 139 now reads:

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Comment on Text   Date: 11/21/25, 11:46:56 AM

Weak argument. Best not to base scientific arguments on 'whataboutisms'.

Number: 2 Author: Subject: Comment on Text   Date: 11/24/25, 11:17:20 AM

Models without human forcings (mainly pumping) tend to be radically different than models including it, except in basins with small human demand for groundwater. In that case, there is the danger of blythly comparing apples and oranges.

Number: 3 Author: Subject: Comment on Text   Date: 11/21/25, 11:55:52 AM

Yes, but I would also add that the first step toward groundwater quality modeling is groundwater quantity (and flux) modeling. So the advocated work can be viewed as one step in that direction.

"The creation of a new ISIMIP Groundwater sector is not linked to any funding and is a community-driven effort that includes all modeling groups that wish to participate. During the creation process, multiple groups and institutions were contacted to participate, and additional modeling groups are welcome to join the sector in the future. Models participating in the sectors do not need to be able to model all variables and scenarios defined in the protocol. ISIMIP sectors can be linked to broader thematic concepts, such as Agriculture, or can focus on specific components of the Earth system, such as Lakes or Groundwater. We would like to note that groundwater is not an isolated system, but rather part of the water cycle and the Earth system as a whole. Focusing on it within a dedicated sector aligns well with the existing models and is useful for studying groundwater systems in a thematically focused way. Collaboration (and perhaps integration) with sectors like the Global Water sector is possible and desirable in the future. We discuss possible future synergies with other existing ISIMIP sectors in Section 5."

We also clarified that the usage of outputs for other sectors depends on the scientific question and specified how the quality sector might use outputs from the Groundwater sector in the future in section 5 (line 314):

"Furthermore, the relevance of groundwater for water quality assessments is widely recognized (e.g., for phosphorous transport from groundwater to surface water (Holman et al., 2008), or for salinization (Kretschmer et al., 2025), or as a link between warming groundwater and stream temperatures (Benz et al., 2024). And the community effort of Friends of Groundwater called for a global assessment of groundwater quality (Misstear et al., 2021). The Water Quality sector could incorporate model outputs from the Groundwater sector as input to improve, for example, their estimates of groundwater contributions to surface water quantity or leakage of surface water to groundwater. On the other hand, the Groundwater sector can utilize estimates of the Water Quality sector to better assess water availability by incorporating water quality criteria. Ultimately, this may also result in advanced groundwater models in the Groundwater sector that account for quality-related processes directly, which can then be integrated into a future modeling protocol. One of the models (G^3M; see Table 1) is already capable of simulating salinization processes.

[1] *Leveraging such connections between sectors will provide valuable insights beyond groundwater itself. The outputs and models that can be used for intersectoral assessments depend on the research question and may necessitate the use of only a subset of models from an ensemble. Specifically, considering groundwater quality, a collaboration between both sectors could be achieved in multiple aspects. Integrating groundwater availability with water quality helps ensure sufficient and safe drinking and irrigation water. Focusing on aquifer storage levels and pollutant loads can help maintain groundwater resilience, safeguard food security, and protect public health under changing climate and socioeconomic conditions. Further, integrating groundwater quantity data with pollution source mapping helps prioritize remediation efforts where aquifers are most vulnerable, ensuring both water availability and quality. Concerning observational data, a unified approach to collecting and developing shared databases for groundwater levels and water quality measurements across multiple agencies reduces bureaucratic hurdles and ensures consistent, comparable data. Using standardized procedures for dealing with observational uncertainties, such as data gaps, scaling issues, and measurement inconsistencies, would support collaborative research further."*

OK, but the authors do not seem to be aware of the especially stubborn challenges of modeling regional groundwater quality -- a task that dramatically more difficult than modeling regional groundwater quantity. See for example:

Fogg, G. E., & LaBolle, E. M. (2006). Motivation of synthesis, with an example on groundwater quality sustainability: MOTIVATION OF SYNTHESIS. *Water Resources Research*, *42*(3). https://doi.org/10.1029/2005WR004372

Section 4 about unstructured experiments seemed repetitive to other recent articles on uncertainty in the water table depth and recharge including those of co-authors. It also felt thin and preliminary, and frankly uninspiring (in that the models seem to show little consistency) and unsurprising (due to overlap with previous articles).

We thank the reviewer for this comment. It is true that this section provides only limited new insights, but this was not the primary aim here, as stated in the original text: *"We opted for a straightforward initial comparison due to the various data formats, model resolutions, and forcings that complicate a more thorough examination of a specific scientific inquiry. Thus, this descriptive analysis serves as an introductory overview that highlights the present state of the art and identifies model discrepancies warranting further investigation."*

To clarify this further, we added "One of our goals in the Groundwater sector is to conduct extensive analysis to better illustrate and understand the model differences. The analysis presented here is intended solely as an introductory overview to provide a sense of the rationale behind our initiative."

In response to Reviewer 2, we also improved the discussion of the model differences.

Line 234 now read:

"This difference in ensemble WTD points to conceptual differences between the models. G^3M and CLM both use the relatively shallow WTD estimates of Fan et al. (2013) as initial state or spin-up, which could explain the overall shallow water table depth. The difference between G^3M and VIC-wur is consistent with the findings in Reinecke et al. (2024), which showed a deeper water table simulated by the de Graaf et al. (2017) groundwater model, which developed an aquifer parameterization adapted and conceptually similar to VIC-wur and WBM. This difference may be linked to the implementation of groundwater drainage/surface water infiltration or transmissivity parameterizations (Reinecke et al., 2024) as well as differences in groundwater recharge (Reinecke et al., 2021). The newly initiated ISIMIP Groundwater sector offers an opportunity to investigate these differences much more systematically in future studies, for example, by ruling out forcing as a driver of the model differences and by exploring spatial and temporal relationships with key groundwater drivers such as topography (e.g., Reinecke et al., 2024). In addition, the ISIMIP Groundwater sector provides a platform for using the modelling team's expertise on their model implementations (e.g., model structures and parameter fields) to better understand the origins of these differences."

In addition, we would like to highlight two novel aspects that differ from the previously published results of the co-authors. Here, we present a different set of models involved compared to Reinecke et al. (2024) (specifically WBM and CLM, and in part also VIC-Wur even if it is conceptually similar to the de Graaf model discussed in Reinecke et al. 2024), and we include models that specifically incorporate processes not included in previous assessments by Reinecke et al., such as karst. We thus also added the following statement in line 219:

"Some overlap with recent model comparison studies naturally exists (e.g., Gnann et al., 2023; Reinecke et al., 2024, Reinecke et al. 2021), even though this brief analysis contains a different ensemble of models and thus provides new insights."

Examples of it not being exhaustive is that it does not even mention the recent GroMoPo effort that a number of the authors have been involved with (Zipper et al. 2023; Zamrsky et al., 2025).

This initiative has compiled hundreds of regional scale model even though line 98 claims to 'integrate currently available groundwater models that operate at regional scale'.

We thank the reviewer for the suggestion to cite the GroMoPo project. Importantly, while GroMoPo collected information about groundwater models, it did not collect the models themselves or any knowledge about how to operate them. Thus, they do not provide any basis for being used in a model ensemble. The ISIMIP sector, of course, is open to any modeling groups that would still like to join the intercomparison initiative. We agree, however, that the phrasing in line 98 can be misleading, as the current sector integrates models of modeling teams that decided to commit their time to joint experiments.

We now cite GroMoPo in the introduction and specify why it is not directly helpful for the creation of this sector. Line 107 now reads:

"To our knowledge, there are currently no long-term community efforts for a structured model intercomparison project for groundwater models. While studies have benchmarked different modeling approaches (e.g., Maxwell et al. 2014), compared model outputs (Reinecke et al., 2021; 2024), or collected information on where and how we model groundwater (Telteu et al., 2021; Zipper et al., 2023; Zamrsky et al., 2025), no effort yet aims at forcing different groundwater models with the same climate and human forcings for different scenarios."

And we have rephrased the initial sentence of the paragraph to be more specific:

Line 100 now reads:

"Here, we present a new sector in ISIMIP called the ISIMIP Groundwater Sector, which integrates models of the groundwater community that operate at regional (at least multiple km^2 (Gleeson and Paszkowski, 2014)) to global scales and are committed to providing model simulations to this new sector."

Also missing are any mention of linking with global groundwater quality and contamination efforts such as Friends of Groundwater which seems important for the groundwater quality linkage.

Thank you for this suggestion. We are now citing the Friends of Groundwater initiative in line 317:

"Furthermore, the relevance of groundwater for water quality assessments is widely recognized (e.g., for phosphorous transport from groundwater to surface water (Holman et al., 2008), or for salinization (Kretschmer et al., 2025), or as a link between warming groundwater and stream temperatures (Benz et al., 2024). And the community effort of Friends of Groundwater called for a global assessment of groundwater quality (Misstear et al., 2021). The Water Quality sector could incorporate model outputs from the Groundwater sector as input to improve, for example, their estimates of groundwater contributions to surface water quantity or leakage of surface water to groundwater."

Finally, I was a recent reviewer of this manuscript by Huggins et al. (again with some of the same coauthors) and am struck that many of the linkages to other sectors would be much better created by taking a more holistic, social-ecological systems approach or at least bringing in insights and data from this approach than the narrow hydrologic approach outline in the manuscript. I strongly implore the authors consider and describe the synergies with these other ongoing efforts so that all these efforts are supported and elevated.

Thank you very much for highlighting the connection to the social-ecological systems approach. We already cited the original publication of Huggins et al. (2023) in Groundwater that outlined the underlying ideas of the follow-up article that you are referring to. "Groundwater is connected to the water cycle and social, economic, and ecological systems (Huggins et al., 2023)." The ERL article that the reviewer is referring to is currently still under review, but we are happy to include it here and iterate on concrete data products if it is published in time.

Again, we would like to emphasize that interlinkages with other sectors are portrayed as an opportunity and a reason why the Groundwater sector contributes an important component to the ISIMIP experiments; however, these interlinkages are not the primary focus of the sector, especially not in the early phase of establishing a new sector.

Still, we see this comment as an opportunity to highlight that the Groundwater sector can be a catalyst for holistic cross-sectoral modeling and added this last sentence to the end of the paper: "With its various connections to other sectors, the Groundwater sector can be a catalyst for developing new holistic cross-sector modelling efforts that account for the multitude of interconnections between the water cycle and social, economic, and ecological systems."

Overall, I am unsure it makes sense to consider or brand this effort as an ISIMIP 'sector'. My understanding is that in the context of ISIMIP, a "sector" refers to a thematic area of climate impact modeling that groups together models and research focused on a particular domain of human or natural systems affected by climate change. These sectors are broad like Agriculture and Forestry and not really specific components of the water cycle like 'groundwater'. I suggest the authors consider this framing and whether it is consistent with ISIMIP more broadly. Should groundwater really be treated as a sub-component or cross-sectoral area?

We thank the reviewer for this critical comment, as this points to longstanding issues at the core of model intercomparisons. The reason modeling groups chose to focus on different compartments or scales is that the scientific area of "Water" is too broad to be adequately assessed with a single model (equally, Agriculture and Forestry could also be part of a Land cover or Plant sector). Ultimately, we hope to develop a holistic understanding of the water cycle, but this may necessitate building models along the way that address specific research questions and are "simple" enough to be understood (e.g., "parsimonious" to a certain extent). In the end, from the perspective of a model intercomparison, it boils down to having models that can be compared, i.e., having models that can handle the same forcings and can produce the same output variables. This non-trivial selection process then also governs which groups of modeling teams agree on a set of experiments they are willing to conduct to compare model outputs. While others in the community have also expressed that Groundwater, Quality, Global and Regional water, along with Lakes, could be considered one sector, the differences between models are too significant to permit a joint sector.

Thus, the ISIMIP sectors can be broad, such as in "Agriculture", but also more specific, as in the "Regional Forests" or "Lake" sector. This is also the reason why the Groundwater Sector is already accepted by ISIMIP as a separate sector: https://www.isimip.org/about/#sectors-and-contacts. As coordinators of ISIMIP are part of the author team, we know that our sector aligns well with the scope of ISIMIP.

To ensure it is transparent to the reader that the creation of this sector is consistent with other sectors and is driven by the existence of different models, we added additional description to

section 2. We also agree that groundwater is not isolated and that there is overlap with the (global) water sector. But this point can be made (to a more or lesser extent) for all components of the Earth system, which are never truly isolated. We still often decide to focus on subcomponents for practical and scientific purposes. We explain our reasoning in some more detail in our revised manuscript.

Line 143 now reads:

"The creation of a new ISIMIP Groundwater sector is not linked to any funding and is a community-driven effort that includes all modeling groups that wish to participate. During the creation process, multiple groups and institutions were contacted to participate, and additional modeling groups are welcome to join the sector in the future. Models participating in the sectors do not need to be able to model all variables and scenarios defined in the protocol. ISIMIP sectors can be linked to broader thematic concepts, such as Agriculture, or can focus on specific components of the Earth system, such as Lakes or Groundwater (see also https://www.isimip.org/about/#sectors-and-contacts). The separation into these sectors is driven by the availability of models that can be integrated into a model-intercomparison framework, which is based on the same climatic and human forcings and produces a set of comparable output variables. We would like to note that groundwater is not an isolated system, but rather part of the water cycle and the Earth system as a whole. Focusing on it within a dedicated sector aligns well with the existing models and is useful for studying groundwater systems in a thematically focused way. Collaboration (and perhaps integration) with sectors like the Global Water sector is possible and desirable in the future. We discuss possible future synergies with other existing ISIMIP sectors in Section 5."

On a related note, I was also confused about what all the things around the outside of Figure 4 are... Is agro-economic modeling really a sector in ISIMIP?

Yes, please refer to https://www.isimip.org/about/#sectors-and-contacts for a full list and description of sectors. We also added this link to the sector description in section 2.

I think the authors could do much more work to make Figure 4 more useful... what are the linkages that are really? how would they be developed? what models would you use? how could this be improved by better incorporating the initiatives mentioned above?

The interlinkages between Groundwater and other sectors within ISIMIP are potentially very large and are not only limited by our process understanding (i.e., where groundwater matters), but also by the models that participate in the sectors and their capability to utilize an output variable from another sector as input (i.e., because greater model modifications are necessary and groups lack the resources to implement that change). While papers that outline the interconnection of groundwater help support pursuing these interconnections, the realization will depend significantly on the availability of resources to develop protocols through joint workshops and model implementation changes.

Thus, the actual realization of the interlinkage potential may differ significantly between sectors and within sectors between models. Therefore, at this point, we can only highlight the potential that shows the impact the Groundwater sector can have for a more holistic integration of sectors within ISIMIP. To provide a tangible pathway forward, we have selected a subset of sectors with whom we aim to target closer collaboration in the short term to develop interconnections more closely (green and orange arrows in the previous version of the manuscript).

To improve our figure, we added concrete variables that could be transferred between sectors as a more concrete starting point for future model development:


Figure 4: The Groundwater sector provides the potential for multiple interlinkages between different sectors within ISIMIP. In the coming years, we will focus on links to three sectors (green and orange): Water (global), Water (regional), and Water Quality. Other cross-sectoral linkages between non-Groundwater sectors (i.e., linkages between the outer circle) are not shown. Sectors that are currently under development or have not yet have data or outputs that could be shared or used for cross-sectoral assessments are shown in gray. Interactions between sectors are annotated with example processes, key variables, or datasets that can be shared between sectors.

I was also surprised to see that PCR GLOB-WB was not mentioned or included eventhough it has been important to a number of global groundwater studies. I would clarify the recent for this.

The modeling group was approached, but did not find the time to participate in the sector yet. They can always join later if they wish to do so. However, the work of the VIC-Wur model by Inge de Graaf (co-author and one of the coordinators of the Groundwater sector) is closely related to the PCR model, as it is based on her earlier work in implementing the groundwater model in PCR.

Based on the review criteria of GMD....

Scientific significance: Fair (3)

Scientific quality: Poor (4)

Scientific reproducibility: N/A

Presentation quality: Fair (3)

Overall, I think I would focus the article on the idea of the ISIMIP groundwater 'sector' and drop section 4 since it seems scientifically inadequate as is, and significantly deepen the discussion and analysis.

We thank the reviewer for the critical comments, which motivated us to clarify several aspects in our manuscript. We have clarified the motivation for the ISIMIP Groundwater sector and the setup of ISIMIP. Due to the positive comments of Reviewer 2 and their request to expand this section, we chose to keep section 4 and deepen the discussion, thereby also addressing the concerns of Reviewer 1. Even if it is only an exploratory picture of the sector and not a comprehensive analysis, it provides ensemble outputs that have never been combined before and offers an important overview of what the sector can produce in the future. We clarified this in a revised version of our manuscript and also improved on this section as requested by Reviewer 2.

References:

Huggins, X., Gleeson, T., Famiglietti, J.S. (in review). The open data landscape to study groundwater dynamics in social-ecological systems: A scoping review of global datasets and an aspirational future outlook. In review at Environmental Research Letters. https://eartharxiv.org/repository/view/8503/

Reinecke, R., Müller Schmied, H., Trautmann, T., Andersen, L. S., Burek, P., Flörke, M., ... & Döll, P. (2021). Uncertainty of simulated groundwater recharge at different global warming levels: a global-scale multi-model ensemble study. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, *25*(2), 787-810.

Telteu, C. E., Müller Schmied, H., Thiery, W., Leng, G., Burek, P., Liu, X., ... & Herz, F. (2021). Understanding each other's models: an introduction and a standard representation of 16 global water models to support intercomparison, improvement, and communication. *Geoscientific Model Development*, *14*(6), 3843-3878.

Zamrsky, D., Ruzzante, S., Compare, K., Kretschmer, D., Zipper, S., Befus, K. M., ... & Bierkens, M. F. (2025). Current trends and biases in groundwater modelling using the community-driven groundwater model portal (GroMoPo). *Hydrogeology Journal*, *33*(2), 355-366.

Zipper, S. C., Befus, K. M., Reinecke, R., Zamrsky, D., Gleeson, T., Ruzzante, S., ... & Bierkens, M. F. (2023, December). GroMoPo: A Groundwater Model Portal to enable Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (FAIR) groundwater modeling. In *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts* (Vol. 2023, No. 1985, pp. H41P-1985).

The ISIMIP Groundwater Sector: A Framework for Ensemble Modeling of Global Change Impacts on Groundwater

Robert Reinecke[1], Tanjila Akhter[2], Annemarie Bäthge[1], Ricarda Dietrich[1], Sebastian Gnann[32], Simon N. Gosling[43], Danielle Grogan[54], Andreas Hartmann[65], Stefan Kollet[76], Rohini Kumar[87], Richard Lammers[54], Sida Liu[98], Yan Liu[76], Nils Moosdorf[109,110], Bibi Naz[76], Sara Nazari[109], Chibuike Orazulike[65], Yadu Pokhrel[211], Jacob Schewe[12], Mikhail Smilovic[13,14], Maryna Strokal[8], Wim Thiery[15], Yoshihide Wada[165], Shan Zuidema[4], Inge de Graaf[8]

Correspondence to: Robert Reinecke (reinecke@uni-mainz.de)

[1]Institute of Geography, Johannes Gutenberg-University, Mainz, Mainz, Germany

[211]Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA

[32]Chair of Hydrology, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany

[43]School of Geography, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom

[54]Institute for the Study of Earth, Oceans, and Space, University of New Hapshire, Durham, New Hampshire, USA

[65]Institute of Groundwater Management, TU Dresden, Dresden, Germany

[76]Agrosphere (IBG-3), Institute for Bio- and Geosciences, Research Centre Juelich, Juelich, Germany

[87]Department Computational Hydrosystems, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research GmbH - UFZ, Leipzig

[98]Earth Systems and Global Change Group, Wageningen University and Research, Wageningen, the Netherlands

[109]Leibniz Centre for Tropical Marine Research (ZMT), Bremen, Germany

[110]Institute of Geosciences, Kiel University, Kiel, Germany

[11]Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA

[12]Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Member of the Leibniz Association, Potsdam, Germany

[13]Water Security Research Group, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria

[14]Chair of Hydrology and Water Resources, ETH Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland

[15]Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Department of Water and Climate, Brussels, Belgium

[165]Biological and Environmental Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Groundwater serves as a crucial freshwater resource for people and ecosystems, ~~vital~~ playing a vital role in adapting to climate change. Yet, its availability and dynamics are affected by climate variations, changes in land use, and excessive extraction. Despite its importance, our understanding of how global change will influence groundwater in the future remains limited. Multi-model ensembles are powerful tools for impact assessments; compared to single-model studies, they provide a more comprehensive understanding of uncertainties and enhance

the robustness of projections by capturing a range of possible outcomes. However, to ~~this point~~date, no ensemble of groundwater models has been ~~was~~ available. Here, we present the new ~~G~~groundwater sector within ISIMIP, which combines multiple global, continental, and regional-scale groundwater models. We describe the rationale for the sector, present the sectoral output variables, and show ~~first~~the initial~~first~~ results of a model comparison. We further~~, and~~ outline the synergies with other existing ISIMIP sectors, such as the global water sector and the water quality sector. Currently, eight models are participating in this sector, ranging from gradient-based groundwater models to specialized karst recharge models, each producing up to 19 out of 23 modeling protocol-defined output variables. Utilizing available model outputs for a subset of participating models, we find that the arithmetic mean global water table depth varies substantially between models (6 - 127 m) and shows a shallower water table compared to other recent studies. Groundwater recharge also differs greatly in the global mean (78 - 228 mm/y), which is consistent with recent studies on the uncertainty of groundwater recharge, but with different spatial patterns. Groundwater recharge changes between 2001 and 2006 show plausible patterns that align with droughts in Spain and Portugal during this period. The simplified comparison highlights the value of a structured model intercomparison project, which will help to better understand the impacts of climate change on the world's largest accessible freshwater store – groundwater.

1 Introduction

Groundwater is the world's largest accessible freshwater resource, vital for human and environmental well-being (Huggins et al., 2023; Scanlon et al., 2023), serving as a critical buffer against water scarcity and surface water pollution (Foster and Chilton, 2003; Schwartz and Ibaraki, 2011). It supports irrigated agriculture, which supports 17% of global cropland and 40% of food production (Döll and Siebert, 2002; Perez et al., 2024; United Nations, 2022; Rodella et al., 2023). However, unsustainable extraction in many regions has led to declining groundwater levels, the drying of rivers, lakes and wells, land subsidence, seawater intrusion, and aquifer depletion (e.g., Bierkens and Wada (2019); de Graaf et al. (2019); Rodell et al. (2009)).

The pressure on groundwater systems intensifies due to the combined effects of population growth, socioeconomic development, agricultural intensification, and climate change, e.g., through a change in groundwater recharge (Taylor et al., 2013; Reinecke et al., 2021). Rising temperatures and altered precipitation patterns are already reshaping water availability and demand, with significant implications for groundwater use. For instance, changing aridity is expected to influence groundwater recharge rates (Berghuijs et al., 2024), yet the consequences for groundwater level~~s~~ dynamics remain limited (Moeck et al., 2024; Cuthbert et al., 2019). It is further unclear how these shifts will affect groundwater's role in sustaining ecosystems, agriculture, and human water supplies.

Understanding the impacts of climate change and the globalized economy on groundwater systems requires a large-scale perspective (Haqiqi et al., 2023; Konar et al., 2013; Dalin et al., 2017). While groundwater management is traditionally ~~occurs~~conducted at local or regional scales, aquifers often span administrative boundaries, and over-extraction in one area can have far-reaching effects not captured by a local model. Moreover, groundwater plays a critical role in the global hydrological cycle, influencing surface energy distribution, soil moisture, and evapotranspiration through processes such as capillary rise (Condon and Maxwell,

2

Number: 1 Author: **Subject: Inserted Text** **Date: 11/24/25, 11:51:49 AM**
observed? [do you mean the effects have been apparently minimal, or there have not been enough observations?]

2019; Maxwell et al., 2016) and supplying surface waters with baseflow (Winter, 2007; Xie et al., 2024). These interactions underscore the importance of groundwater in buffering climate dynamics over extended temporal and spatial scales (Keune et al., 2018) and ~~require~~underscore the need for a global perspective o~~f~~n the water-climate cycle. While large-scale climate-groundwater interactions are starting to become understood (Cuthbert et al., 2019), current global water and climate models may not always capture these feedbacks as most either do not consider groundwater at all or only include a simplified storage bucket, limiting our understanding of how climate change will affect the water cycle as a whole.

The inclusion of groundwater dynamics in global hydrological models remains a considerable challenge due to data limitations and computational demands (Gleeson et al., 2021). Simplified representations, e.g., linear reservoir (Telteu et al., 2021), often fail to capture the complexity of groundwater-surface water interactions, lateral flows at local or regional scales, or the feedback between groundwater pumping and streamflow (de Graaf et al., 2017; Reinecke et al., 2019). These processes are crucial for evaluating water availability, particularly in regions heavily dependent on groundwater. For instance, lateral flows sustain downstream river baseflows and groundwater availability, which, in turn, impact~~ing~~ water quality and ecological health (Schaller and Fan, 2009; Liu et al., 2020). N~~ and n~~ot including head dynamics may lead to overestimation of groundwater depletion (Bierkens and Wada, 2019). Multiple continental to global-scale groundwater models have been developed in recent years to represent these critical processes (for an overview, see also Condon et al. (2021) and~~;~~ Gleeson et al. (2021).

While current model ensembles of global water assessments have not yet ~~included~~incorporated gradient-based groundwater processes, they have already significantly advanced our ~~large-scale~~ understanding of the large-scale groundwater system. The Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP), analogous to the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) for climate models (Eyring et al., 2016a), is a well-established community project to carry out model ensemble experiments for climate impact assessments (Frieler et al., 2017; 2024; 2025). The current generation of models in the Global Water Sector of ISIMIP often represents groundwater as a simplified storage that receives recharge, releases baseflow, and can be pumped (Telteu et al., 2021). Still, it lacks lateral connectivity and head-based surface-groundwater fluxes. Nevertheless, the ISIMIP water sector provided important insights on, for example, future changes and hotspots in global terrestrial water storage (Pokhrel et al., 2021), environmental flows (Thompson et al., 2021), the planetary boundary for freshwater change (Porkka et al., 2024), uncertainties in the calculation of groundwater recharge (Reinecke et al., 2021), and the development of methodological frameworks to compare model ensembles (Gnann et al., 2023).

Here, we present a new sector in ISIMIP called the ISIMIP Groundwater Sector, which integrates models of the groundwater community ~~currently available groundwater models~~ that operate at regional (at least multiple km² (Gleeson and Paszkowski, 2014)) to global scales and are committed to providing model simulations to this new sector. The G~~g~~roundwater sector aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state of groundwater representation in large-scale models, identify groundwater-related uncertainties, enhance the robustness of predictions regarding the impact of global change on groundwater and connected systems through model ensembles, and provide insight into how to most reliably and efficiently model groundwater on regional to global scales. The new G~~g~~roundwater sector is a separate but complementary sector to the existing G~~g~~lobal

3

Wwater sector. To our knowledge, there are currently no long-term community efforts for a structured model intercomparison project for groundwater models. While studies have benchmarked different modeling approaches (e.g., Maxwell et al. 2014), or compared model outputs (Reinecke et al., 2021; 2024), or collected information on where and how we model groundwater (Telteu et al., 2021; Zipper et al., 2023; Zamrsky et al., 2025), no effort yet aims at forcing different groundwater models with the same climate and human forcings for different scenarios.

Specifically, the ISIMIP Ggroundwater sector will compile a model ensemble that enables us to assess the impact of global change on various groundwater-related variables and quantify model and scenario-related uncertainties. These insights can then be used to quantify the impacts of global change on, for examplee.g., water availability and in relation to other sectors impacted by changes in groundwater. The ISIMIP Ggroundwater sector has natural linkages with other ISIMIP sectors, such as Gglobal Wwater, Wwater Qquality, Rregional Wwater, and Aagriculture. This paper will highlight the connections between groundwater and these otherdifferent ISIMIP sectors, providing an opportunity to improveenhance our understanding of how modeling choices affect groundwater simulation dynamics.

2 The ISIMIP framework

ISIMIP aims to provide a framework for consistent climate impact data across sectors and scales. It facilitates model evaluation and improvement, enables climate change impact assessments across sectors, and provides robust projections of climate change impacts under different socioeconomic scenarios. ISIMIP uses a subset of bias-adjusted climate models from the CMIP6 ensemble. The subset is selected to represent the broader CMIP6 ensemble while maintaining computational feasibility for impact studies (Lange, 2021).

ISIMIP has undergone multiple phases, with the current phase being ISIMIP3. The simulation rounds consist of two main components: ISIMIP3a and ISIMIP3b, each serving distinct purposes. ISIMIP3a focuses on model evaluation and the attribution of observed climate impacts, covering the historical period up to 2021. It utilizes observational climate and socioeconomic data and includes a counterfactual "no climate change baseline" using detrended climate data for impact attribution. Additionally, ISIMIP3a includes sensitivity experiments with high-resolution historical climate forcing. In contrast, ISIMIP3b aims to quantify climate-related risks under various future scenarios, covering pre-industrial, historical, and future projections. ISIMIP3b is divided into three groups: Group I for pre-industrial and historical periods, Group II for future projections with fixed 2015 direct human forcing, and Group III for future projections with changing socioeconomic conditions and representation of adaptation. Despite their differences in focus, time periods, and data sources, both ISIMIP3a and ISIMIP3b require the use of the same impact model version to ensure consistent interpretation of output data, thereby contributing to ISIMIP's overall goal of providing a framework for consistent climate impact data across sectors and scales.

The creation of a new ISIMIP Groundwater sector is not linked to any funding and is a community-driven effort that includes all modeling groups that wish to participate. During the creation process, multiple groups and institutions were contacted to participate, and additional modeling groups are welcome to join the sector in the future. Models participating in the sectors do not need to be able to model all variables and scenarios defined in

,

the protocol. ISIMIP sectors can be linked to broader thematic concepts, such as Agriculture, or can focus on specific components of the Earth system, such as Lakes or Groundwater (see also https://www.isimip.org/about/#sectors-and-contacts). The separation into these sectors is driven by the availability of models that can be integrated into a model-intercomparison framework, which is based on the same climatic and human forcings and produces a set of comparable output variables. We would like to note that groundwater is not an isolated system, but rather part of the water cycle and the Earth system as a whole. Still, fFocusing on it within a dedicated sector aligns well with the existing models and is useful for studying groundwater systems in a thematically focused way. Collaboration (and perhaps integration) with sectors like the Global Water sector is possible and also desirable in the future. While intersectoral collaboration is desirable, it is not a necessity; wWe discuss possible future synergies with other existing ISIMIP sectors in Section 5.

In the short term, the Ggroundwater sector will focus on the historical period from 1901 to -2019 in ISIMIP3a (https://protocol.isimip.org/#/ISIMIP3a/water_global/groundwater), utilizing [1] with the climate-related forcing based on observational data (obsclim) and the direct human forcing based on historical data (histsoc). We aim to usetilize these simulations for an in-depth model comparison, including a comparison to observational data such as time series of [3] roundwater table depth (e.g., Jasechko et al. -, (2024)) and by utilizing so-called functional relationships (Reinecke et al., 2024; Gnann et al., 2023). Functional relationships can be defined as covariations of variables across space and/or time, and they are a key aspect of our theoretical knowledge of Earth's functioning. Examples include relationships between precipitation and groundwater recharge (Gnann et al. 2023; Berghuijs et al. 2024) or between topographic slope and water table depth (Reinecke et al., 2024). We aim to utilize these simulations for an in-depth model comparison, including a comparison to observational data such as time series of groundwater table depth (e.g., Jasechko et al. (2024)) and by utilizing functional relationships (Reinecke et al., 2024).

[4]his will yield a new understanding of how these models differ, what the reasons for these differences are, and how they could be improved. In addition, it will provide a basis for implementing impact analyses with ensemble runs based on future scenarios using ISIMIP3b inputs.

3 The current generation of groundwater models in the sector

Many large-scale groundwater models are already participating in the sector (Table 1), and we expect it to expand further. The current models are mainly global-scale, with some having a particular regional focus, and primarily using daily timesteps.

While the mainprima[5]y modeling purpose of most models is to simulate parts of the terrestrial water cycle, they all focus on different aspects (such as karst recharge or sea-water intrusion), most investigate interactions between groundwater and land surface processes, and account for human water uses. Two models (V2KARST and GGR) have distinct purposes in modeling groundwater recharge and do not model any head-based groundwater fluxes. Conceptually, the models may be classified according to Condon et al. (2021) into five categories: lumped models with static groundwater configurations of long-term mass balance[6]), saturated groundwater flow with recharge,

5

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Inserted Text   Date: 11/24/25, 12:41:16 PM
using [every occurrence of "utilize" or "utilizing" in the paper can be replaced with "use" or "using".]

Number: 2 Author: Subject: Cross-Out   Date: 11/24/25, 12:41:42 PM

Number: 3 Author: Subject: Highlight   Date: 11/24/25, 12:43:01 PM
Replace very "groundwater table" with "water table", which is the correct scientific term.

Number: 4 Author: Subject: Highlight   Date: 11/24/25, 12:45:01 PM
No new paragraph. Or, replace "this" with whatever you are referring to.

Number: 5 Author: Subject: Cross-Out   Date: 11/24/25, 12:45:29 PM

Number: 6 Author: Subject: Highlight   Date: 11/24/25, 12:50:20 PM
Would be clearer to put these parentheticals at the beginning of each respective clause.

and surface water exchange fluxes as upper boundary conditions without lateral fluxes (b), quasi 3D models with variably saturated flow in the soil column and a dynamic water table as a lower boundary condition (c), saturated flow models solving mainly the Darcy equation (d), and variably saturated flow which is calculated as three-dimensional flow throughout the entire subsurface below and above the water table (e). See Condon et al. (2021) and also Gleeson et al. (2021) for a more detailed overview and discussion of approaches. Half of the models (Table 1) simulate a saturated subsurface flux (d), while V2KARST and GGR mainly use a 1D vertical approach (b), and others simulate a combination of multiple approaches (ParFlow, Table 1) or can switch between different approaches (CWatM, Table 1).

The sector protocol is defined at https://protocol.isimip.org/#/ISIMIP3a/groundwater and will be updated over time. We have defined multiple joint outputs for this sector (23 variables in total), but not all models can yet provide all outputs (Table 2). Models can provide 1-19 outputs (11 on average), and multiple models have further additional outputs that are currently under development. The global water sector also contains groundwater-related variables (Table A2), enabling groundwater-related analysis. We list them here to show their close connection to the global water sector and facilitate an overview of future groundwater-related studies.

The current sector protocol defines a targeted spatial resolution of 5 arcmin, as this represents not only the resolution achievable by most global models but also the coarsest resolution at which meaningful representation of groundwater dynamics, particularly lateral groundwater flows and water table depths, can still be captured (Gleeson et al., 2021). ISIMIP3 also specifies experiments with different spatial resolutions, but whether this is achievable with a sub-ensemble of the presented models remains unclear, as it depends on the available computational time, flexibility of model setups, and data availability. To ensure consistency and comparability, the model outputs are currently post-processed by the modeling groups to aggregate their outputs to the protocol-specified spatial and temporal resolutions.

Table 1: Summary of all models participating in the ISIMIP Ge groundwater sector. This table lists only models that add new variables to the ISIMIP protocol. Models already part of the global water sector and providing other groundwater-related variables are not listed here. (GMD discussion formatting requires a portrait instead of a landscape table)

Model name	Main model purpose	Coupling with other models	Spatial domain and resolution	Temporal resolution	Hydrogeological configuration, e.g. number of layers	Conceptual model according to Condon et al.	Calibrated	Representation of groundwater use	Main Reference
Water Balance Model (WBM)	Representation of the terrestrial hydrologic cycle, including	-	Global and regional. Spatial resolution defined by the input	Sub-daily, Daily, Multi-day	1 soil layer, 2 groundwater layers	d.	Globally: no, regional: yes (NE, US)	Through calculated abstractions from groundwater.	Grogan et al. (2022) With groundwater methods based on

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Highlight Date: 11/24/25, 1:42:34 PM

Missing from this list is any mention of shallow and deep groundwater phenomena. See Condon et al. 2021 for several important descriptions of why both shallow and deep (e.g., semi-confined and confined systems, where groundwater levels and interplay with surface processes tend to be completely different than the water table) groundwater phenomena and their connections can also be important for adequately representing groundwater storage and impact processes.

	human interactions.		river network.						de Graaf et al. (2015); de Graaf et al. (2017).
Community Land Model (CLM)	To simulate surface and sub-surface hydrologic processes, including crop growth, irrigation, and groundwater withdrawal.	Community Earth System Model (CESM)	Global and regional (0.05 (regional), 0.1, 0.25, and 0.5 degree (global))	Sub-Daily	20 soil layers extending up to 8.5 m; 1 aquifer layer, unconfined	c.	No	Yes	Felfelani et al. (2021) Lawrence et al. (2019)
Community Water Model (CWatM)	To reproduce main hydrologic processes, including water management on regional to global scales.	MODFLOW (optional)	Global, regional, subbasin (30 arcseconds, 1 km, 1 arc-min, 5 arc-min, 30 arc-min)	Daily	Standard: 1 with MODFLOW: variable	Standard: a./b. With MODFLOW: d.	Globally: yes (with discharge), regional: tailored	Yes	Guillaumot et al. (2022); Burek et al. (2020)
Global Gradient-based Groundwater Model (G³M)	Understanding of surface water, coastal, and ecosystem interaction with groundwater.	WaterGAP (Müller Schmied et al., 2016)	Global (5 arc minutes)	Daily, monthly, or yearly	2 layers, second layer with a reduced hydraulic conductivity	d.	No	Through calculated net abstractions from groundwater of WaterGAP	Reinecke et al. (2019); Kretschmer et al. (2025)
VIC-WUR-MODFLO	Grid-based macro-	WOFOST (WOrld FOod	Regionally and globally:	Sub-daily to monthly	3 soil layers (variable	d.	Globally: no,	Through calculated demands	Liu et al in prep.;

W (VIC-wur)	scale hydrological model that solves both the surface energy balance and water balance equations.	STudies) (Droppers et al 2021)	5 arcminutes		thickness), 2 groundwater layers (variable thickness, confined/unconfined systems.		regional: yes	and allocation to surface water/ groundwater.	Droppers et al. 2020.; Liang et al. (1994)
V2KARST	A grid-based vegetation –recharge model for the global karst areas.	-	Globally: 0.25 arc degree	Daily	three soil layers and one epikarst layer	b.	Yes, based on global karst landscapes	no	Sarrazin et al. (2018)
Global Groundwater Rain-fed Recharge (GGR) GGR	A grid-based three-layer water balance model to estimate the daily global rain-fed groundwater recharge	-	180.0°W to 180.0°E longitudes and 60.0°N to 60.0°S latitudes, 0.1 degree	Daily	2 soil layers and 1 groundwater layer of variable thickness	b.	No	No	Nazari et al. (2025)
ParFlow	3D continuum simulations of variably saturated groundwater-surface water and land surface processes.	Common Land Model, CLM (Maxwell and Miller, 2005; Kollet and Maxwell, 2008), Terrestrial Systems Modeling Platform	Regionally and globally, $10^0 – 10^1$km	Variable	Variable	a. - e.	Yes, in engineering applications	Yes	Kuffour et al. (2020)

		(Gasper et al., 2014), WRF (Maxwell et al., 2011)							

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

Table 2: List of output variables in the ISIMIP3a ~~global G~~groundwater sector. The spatial resolution is five arcminutes (even if some models simulate at a higher or coarser resolution), and the temporal resolution is monthly. Most models also simulate daily timesteps, but as most groundwater movement happens across longer time scales, we unified the unit to months. A "*" indicates that a model is able to produce the necessary output. A "+" indicates that this output is currently under development. (GMD discussion formatting requires a portrait instead of a landscape table)

Groundwater sector output variables		Unit	WBM	CLM	CWatM	GM	VIC-wur	V2KARST	GGR	ParFlow
Name	**Description**									
Capillary rise	Upward flux from groundwater to soil (leaving aquifer = negative value).	m3 m-2 month-1		*	*		*			*
Diffuse groundwater recharge	Downwards flux from soil to groundwater (entering aquifer = positive value). The unit kg m^{-2} s^{-1} is equal to mm s^{-1}. Unit is kept equal to the global water sector.	kg m-2 s-1	*	*	*		*	*	*	*
Groundwater abstractions	Groundwater pumped from the aquifer.	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*	*		+		+	
Groundwater abstractions (domestic)	*Groundwater abstractions* that are intended for domestic water use.	m3 m-2 month-1	*		*		+		+	

9

Groundwater abstractions (industries)	*Groundwater abstractions* that are intended for industrial water use.	m3 m-2 month-1	*		*		+		+	
Groundwater abstractions (irrigation)	*Groundwater abstractions* that are intended for irrigational water use.	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*	*		+		+	
Groundwater abstractions (livestock)	*Groundwater abstractions* that are intended for livestock water use.	m3 m-2 month-1	*		*		+			
Groundwater demands	Gross water demand	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*	*		+			
Groundwater depletion	Long-term losses from groundwater storage	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*		*	+			*
Groundwater drainage/surface water capture	Exchange flux between groundwater and surface water. Groundwater leaving the aquifer = negative value; entering the aquifer = positive value	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*	*	*	*			*
Groundwater drainage/surface water capture from lakes	Exchange flux between groundwater and surface water (lakes); if available, additional to the sum of exchange fluxes (Groundwater drainage/surface water capture) also separate components can be provided/ Leaving the aquifer = negative values; entering the aquifer = positive value.	m3 m-2 month-1				*	*			*
Groundwater drainage/surface water capture from rivers	Exchange flux between groundwater and surface water (rivers); if available, additional to the sum of exchange fluxes (Groundwater drainage/surface water capture) also separate components can be provided/ Leaving the aquifer = negative values; entering the aquifer = positive value.	m3 m-2 month-1	*			*	*			*
Groundwater drainage/surface water capture from springs	Exchange flux between groundwater and surface water (springs); if available, additional to the sum of exchange fluxes (Groundwater drainage/surface water capture) also separate components can be provided/ Leaving the aquifer = negative	m3 m-2 month-1				*	*			*

Name	Description	Unit								
	values; entering the aquifer = positive value.									
Groundwater drainage/surface water capture from wetlands	Exchange flux between groundwater and surface water (wetlands); if available, additional to the sum of exchange fluxes (Groundwater drainage/surface water capture) also separate components can be provided/ Leaving the aquifer = negative values; entering the aquifer = positive value.	m3 m-2 month-1				*	*			*
Groundwater return flow	Return flow of abstracted groundwater (not yet separated into different sources).	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*		.			.	*
Groundwater storage	Mean monthly water storage in groundwater layer in kg m⁻². The spatial resolution is 0.5° grid.	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*		*	*			*
Hydraulic head	Head above sea level in m. If more than one aquifer layer is simulated, report the heads on the top productive aquifer (confined or unconfined).	m	*			*	*			*
Lateral groundwater flux (front face)	Cell-by-cell flow (front)	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*		*	*			*
Lateral groundwater flux (right face)	Cell-by-cell flow (right)	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*		*	*			*
Lateral groundwater flux (net)	Net cell-by-cell flow	m3 m-2 month-1	*	*		*	*			*
Lateral groundwater flux (lower face)	Cell-by-cell flow (lower) when more than 1 groundwater layer is simulated.	m3 m-2 month-1	*			*	*			*
Submarine groundwater discharge	Flow of groundwater into oceans. The definition may vary by model. But in principle also models without density driven flow can submit this variable.	m3 m-2 month-1	*			*				*
Water table depth	Depth to the water table below land surface (digital elevation mode, DEM) in m.	m	*	*		*	*			*
Number of groundwater output	Counting only currently available		**19**	**13**	**9**	**14**	**14**	**1**	**1**	**17**

variables in model											

222

223

4 Unstructured experiments point out model differences that should be explored further

225 The ISIMIP groundwater sector is in an early development stage, and we hope that an ensemble of groundwater
226 models driven by the same meteorological data will be available soon. Yet, to provide first insights into the
227 models, their outputs, and how these can be compared, we collected existing outputs from the participating models
228 (see Table A1 for an overview). We opted for a straightforward initial comparison due to the various data formats,
229 model resolutions, and forcings that complicate a more thorough examination of a specific scientific inquiry. One
230 of our goals in the Groundwater sector is to conduct extensive analysis to better illustrate and understand the
231 model differences. The analysis presented here is intended solely as an introductory overview to provide a sense
232 of the rationale behind our initiative. Some overlap with recent model comparison studies naturally exists (e.g.,
233 Gnann et al., 2023; Reinecke et al., 2024, Reinecke et al. 2021); however, even though this brief the
234 presentedcurrent work analysis contains a different ensemble of models, and thus thus providess some new
235 insights. ThusHence, this descriptive analysis serves as an introductory overview that highlights the present state
236 of the art and identifies model discrepancies warranting further investigation. In addition, relevant output data are
237 not yet available for all models. We focused on the two variables with the largest available ensemble: water table
238 depth (G³M, CLM, WBM, and VIC-wur; Table 1) and groundwater recharge (CLM, CWatM, GGR, VIC-wur,
239 V2KARST, WBM; Table 1), only on historical periods rather than future projections.

240 The arithmetic mean (not weighted by cell area) global water table depth varies substantially (6 m – 127 m)
241 between the models at the start of the simulation (1980 or steady-state) (Fig. 1a). On average, the water table of
242 G³M (28 m) and CLM (6 m) are shallower than WBM (127 m) and VIC-wur (81 m), whereas the latter two also
243 show a larger standard deviation (WBM: 133 m, VIC-wur: 105 m) than the other two models (G³M: 49 m, CLM:
244 3 m). The consistently shallower WTD of CLM impacts the ensemble mean WTD (Fig. 1b), which is shallower
245 compared to other model ensembles (5.67 m WTD as global mean here compared to 7.03 m in Reinecke et al.
246 (2024)).

247 -This difference in ensemble WTD points to conceptual differences between the models. G³M and CLM both use
248 the relatively shallow WTD estimates of Fan et al. (2013) as initial state or spin-up, which could explain the
249 overall shallow water table depth. The difference between G³M and VIC-wur is consistent with the findings in
250 Reinecke et al. (2024), which showed a deeper water table simulated by the de Graaf et al. (2017) groundwater
251 model, which developed an aquifer parameterization adapted and conceptually similar to VIC-wur and WBM.
252 This difference may be linked to the implementation of groundwater drainage/surface water infiltration or
253 transmissivity parameterizations (Reinecke et al., 2024) as well as differences in groundwater recharge (Reinecke
254 et al., 2021). Furthermore, the models are not yet driven by the same climatic and human forcings, thereby possibly
255 causing different model responses. The newly initiated ISIMIP Groundwater sector offers an opportunity to
256 investigate these differences much more systematically in future studies, for example, by ruling out forcing as a
257 driver of the model differences and by exploring spatial and temporal relationships with key groundwater drivers
258 such as topography (e.g., Reinecke et al., 2024). In addition, the ISIMIP Groundwater sector provides a platform
259 for using the modelling team's expertise on their model implementations (e.g., model structures and parameter
260 fields) to better understand the origins of these differencesThis difference in ensemble WTD points to conceptual

265

266

Figure 1: Global water table depth (WTD) at simulation start (1980) or the used steady-state. The simplified
boxplot (a) shows the arithmetic model mean as a colored dot and the median as a black line. Whiskers indicate
the 25th and 75th percentiles, respectively. The global map (b) shows the arithmetic mean of the model ensemble.
Models shown are not yet driven by the same meteorological forcing (see also table A1).

Similarly, the global arithmetic mean groundwater recharge (not weighted by cell area) differs by 332 mm/y
between models (150 mm/y excluding V2KARST since it calculates recharge in karst regions only) (Fig. 2a). This
difference in recharge is more pronounced spatially (Fig. 2b) than differences in WTD shown before (Fig. 1b).
Especially in drier regions such as in the southern Africa, central Australia, and the northern latitudes show
coefficient of variation of 1 or greater (white areas). In extremely dry areas such as the east Sahara and southern
Australia, the model spread is close to 0 (dark green). While the agreement is higher in Europe and western South
America, the global map differs slightly from other recent publications (e.g., compared to Fig. 1b in Gnann et al.
(2023)). In light of other publications, highlighting model uncertainty in groundwater recharge (Reinecke et al.,
2021, Kumar et al., 2025) and the possible impacts of long-term aridity changes on groundwater recharge
(Berghuijs et al., 2024), an extended combined ensemble of the global water sector and the new Groundwater
sector could yield valuable insights.

282

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Comment on Text Date: 11/24/25, 2:41:57 PM
The map would be much more informative if there was more color contrast in the 0 to 5 m range. Suggest using a different color gradation.

283

Figure 2: Global groundwater recharge (GWR) in 2001 or at steady-state (only VIC-wur). The simplified boxplot
(a) shows the arithmetic model mean as a colored dot and the median as a black line. Whiskers indicate the 25th
and 75th percentiles, respectively. The global map (b) shows the coefficient of variation of the model ensemble
without V2KARST. Models shown are not yet driven by the same meteorological forcing (see also table A1).

We further calculated relative changes in groundwater recharge between 2001 and 2006 (Fig. 3) with an ensemble
of 7 models (CLM, CWatM, GGR, VIC-wur, V2KARST, WBM, and ParFlow). The ensemble includes two
models that only simulate specific regions (V2KARST: regions of karstifiable rock, ParFlow: Euro CORDEX
domain). This result shows a potential analysis that should be repeated within the new Geroundwater sector.
Intentionally, we do not investigate model agreement on the sign of change or compare them with observed data.
The ensemble still highlights plausible regions of groundwater recharge changes, such as in Spain and Portugal,
which aligns with droughts in the investigated period (Paneque Salgado and Vargas Molina, 2015; Coll et al.,
2017; Trullenque-Blanco et al., 2024). Relative increases in groundwater recharge are mainly shown for arid
regions in the Sahara, the Middle East, Australia, and Mexico. However, it is likely that because we investigate
relative changes, this might be related to the already low recharge rates in these regions.

15

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Comment on Text   Date: 11/24/25, 2:49:07 PM

The units are clearly wrong. Perhaps it should be "m/yr"? But even that would not look consistent with the ordinate axis units in (a).

a)

b)

Mean relative GWR change 2001 - 2006

-40%   -20%   0   +20%   +40%

299

Figure 3: Mean relative percentage change of yearly groundwater recharge between 2001 and 2006 for Europe
(a), and all continents except Antarctica (b). The ensemble consists of all models that provided data for the years
2001 and 2006 (CLM, CWatM, GGR, VIC-wur, V2KARST, WBM, and ParFlow). V2KARST (only karst) and
ParFlow (only Euro CORDEX domain) were only accounted for in regions where data is available. Models shown
are not yet driven by the same meteorological forcing (see also table A1).

5 Groundwater as a linking sector in ISIMIP

ISIMIP encompasses a wide variety of sectors. Currently, 18 sectors are part of the impact assessment effort. The
Ggroundwater sector offers a new and unique opportunity to enhance cross-sectoral activities within ISIMIP,
foster interlinkages within ISIMIP, and thus deliver interdisciplinary assessments of climate change impacts.

16

Figure 4: The ~~Gg~~roundwater sector provides the potential for multiple interlinkages between different sectors within ISIMIP. In the coming years, we will focus on links to three sectors (green and orange): ~~Ww~~ater (global), ~~Ww~~ater (regional), and ~~Ww~~ater ~~Qq~~uality. Other cross-sectoral linkages between non-~~Gg~~roundwater sectors (i.e.~~,~~ linkages between the outer circle) are not shown. Sectors that are currently under development or have not yet have data or outputs that could be shared or used for cross-sectoral assessments are shown in gray. Interactions between sectors are annotated with example processes, key variables, or datasets that can be shared between sectors.

Some links with other sectors within ISIMIP are more evident than others with regard to existing scientific community overlaps or existing scientific questions (Fig. 4). The examples of variables and data that can be shared among sectors shown in Fig. 4 provide a non-exhaustive description of current variables that the sectors already describe in their protocols. Whether cross-sectoral assessments will utilize this available data is up to the modeling teams that contribute to the sectors. ~~–~~For example, the new ~~Gg~~roundwater sector will focus on large-scale groundwater models, some of which are already part of global water models participating in the ~~Gg~~lobal ~~Ww~~ater ~~Ss~~ector or using outputs (such as groundwater recharge) from the ~~Gg~~lobal ~~Ww~~ater ~~Ss~~ector (see also existing

17

groundwater variables in the global water sector Table A2). However, the Ggroundwater sector will also feature non-global representations of groundwater. Thus, collaborating with the Rregional Wwater sector could provide opportunities to share outputs and pursue common assessments. For example, the outputs of the groundwater model ensemble, such as water table depth variations or surface water groundwater interactions, could be used as input for some regional models that consider groundwater only as a lumped groundwater storage. Conversely, global and continental groundwater models can learn from validated regional hydrological models, which may provide insights into local runoff generation processes and benefit from validated regional hydrological models, which may provide valuable insights into local runoff generation processes and the impacts of water management.

Furthermore, the relevance of groundwater for water quality assessments is widely recognized (e.g., for phosphorous transport from groundwater to surface water (Holman et al., 2008), or for salinization (Kretschmer et al., 2025)), or as a link between warming groundwater and stream temperatures (Benz et al., 2024). And the community effort of Friends of Groundwater called for a global assessment of groundwater quality (Misstear et al., 2021). The Water Quality sector could incorporate model outputs from the Groundwater sector as input to improve, for example, their estimates of groundwater contributions to surface water quantity or leakage of surface water to groundwater. On the other hand, the Groundwater sector can utilize estimates of the Water Quality sector to better assess water availability by incorporating water quality criteria. Ultimately, this may also result in advanced groundwater models in the Groundwater sector that account for quality-related processes directly, which can then be integrated into a future modeling protocol. One of the models (G³M; see Table 1) is already capable of simulating salinization processes.

Leveraging such connections between sectors will provide valuable insights beyond groundwater itself. The outputs and models that can be used for intersectoral assessments depend on the research question and may necessitate the use of only a subset of models from an ensemble. Leveraging such connections will provide valuable insights beyond groundwater itself.

Specifically, considering groundwater quality, a collaboration between both sectors could be achieved in multiple aspects. Integrating groundwater availability with water quality helps ensure sufficient and safe drinking and irrigation water. Focusing on aquifer storage levels and pollutant loads can help maintain groundwater resilience, safeguard food security, and protect public health under changing climate and socioeconomic conditions. Further, integrating groundwater quantity data with pollution source mapping helps prioritize remediation efforts where aquifers are most vulnerable, ensuring both water availability and quality. Concerning observational data, a unified approach to collecting and developing shared databases for groundwater levels and water quality measurements across multiple agencies reduces bureaucratic hurdles and ensures consistent, comparable data. Using standardized procedures for dealing with observational uncertainties such as data gaps, scaling issues, and measurement inconsistencies, such as data gaps, scaling issues, and measurement inconsistencies, would support collaborative research further.

Research opportunities arise in other sectors as well. Groundwater is connected to the water cycle and social, economic, and ecological systems (Huggins et al., 2023). For example, health impacts (such as water- and vector-borne diseases) are closely related to water quantity and quality (e.g. Smith et al. (2024)), and the roles of groundwater for forest resilience (regional forest sector, (Costa et al., 2023; Esteban et al., 2021)) and forest fires

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Comment on Text Date: 11/24/25, 2:57:53 PM

It seems to me that the biggest benefit of the higher fidelity regional groundwater models is to provide 'test beds' for how to upscale processes in the global or continental scale groundwater models. The latter will necessarily neglect or upscale processes in the former, and there should be comparison studies exploring how to adequately represent regional phenomema in the global/continental models.

363 (fire sector) under climate change are yet to be explored (Fig. 4). To prioritize our efforts and set a research agenda

364 for the groundwater ISIMIP sector, we will first focus on existing and more straightforward connections to the

365 global water sector, regional water sector, and the water quality sector and then expand to collaboration with other

366 sectors (Fig. 4).

367

6 A vision for the ISIMIP groundwater sector

369 Given groundwater's importance in the Earth system and for society, it is imperative to expand our knowledge of

370 groundwater and (1) how it is impacted by global climate change and other human forcings and 1) how, in turn,

371 this will affect other systems connected to groundwater. This enhanced understanding is essential to equip us with

372 the knowledge needed to address future challenges effectively. The ISIMIP Ggroundwater sector serves as a

373 foundation for examining and measuring the effects of global change on groundwater systems worldwide. It

374 facilitates cross-sector investigations, such as those concerning water quality, examines the influence of various

375 model structures on groundwater dynamics simulations, and supports the collaborative creation of new datasets

376 for model parameterization and assessment.

377 Already in the short term, the creation of the Ggroundwater sector has substantial potential to enhance large-scale

378 groundwater research by developing better modeling frameworks for reproducible research (running the multitude

379 of experiments targeted in ISIMIP requires an automated modeling pipeline) and forge a community that can

380 critically examine current modeling practices. The simple model comparison presented here sparks first raises

381 initial questions onas to why models differ and invites us to explore model differences in moregreater depth. Such

382 model intercomparison studies will enable us to quantify uncertainties and identify hotspots for model

383 improvement. They will also allowallow us us to assess the impact of climate and land use change on

384 variousdifferent groundwater-related variables, such as groundwater recharge and water table depth, and

385 enableallow ensemble-based impact assessments ofin future water availability. Model intercomparison and

386 validation may also help identify models that perform better in specific regions or for specific output variables,

387 thus allowingenabling the provision of region- or variable-specific recommendations and uncertainty assessments

388 to subsequent data users.

389 In the long term, the sector will enable us to jointly reflect on processes that we currently do not model or that

390 requireneed improvement, possibly also through new modeling approaches such as hybrid machine-learning

391 models tailored to the large-scale representation of groundwater. These model developments will be

392 incorporatedluded into the groundwater sector's contributions to upcoming ISIMIP simulation rounds, such as

393 ISIMIP4–, which is scheduledet to commencestart in 2026. Since groundwater is connected to many socio-

394 ecological systems, groundwater models could also emerge as a modular coupling tool that can be integrated into

395 multiple sectors. The newly establishedfounded groundwater sector already provides a first step in that direction

396 by standardizing output names and units. If models are modular enough and define a standardized Application

397 Programming Interface (API), they could also serve as a valuable tool for other science communities.

398 The lack of a community-wide coordinated effort to simulate the effects of climate change on groundwater at

399 regional to global scale has precluded the comprehensive consideration of climate change impacts on groundwater

Number: 1 Author: Subject: Cross-Out   Date: 11/24/25, 3:17:04 PM

Number: 2 Author: Subject: Inserted Text   Date: 11/24/25, 3:17:30 PM

,

Number: 3 Author: Subject: Inserted Text   Date: 11/24/25, 3:17:38 PM

,

Number: 4 Author: Subject: Inserted Text   Date: 11/24/25, 3:16:27 PM

in order to determine how

in policy relevant reports, such as the European Climate risk assessment (EUCRA, 2024) or the Assessment Reports developed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (e.g. Lee~~IPCC~~, 2024~~3~~). The anticipated groundwater sector contributions to ISIMIP3 and ISIMIP4, as described here, will address this gap by serving as scientific evidence in the second EUCRA round and ~~in~~ the upcoming IPCC seventh assessment cycle. As such, the anticipated outcomes of the new sector will pave the way for groundwater simulations to play an increasingly important role in international climate mitigation and adaptation policy.

In summary, the ISIMIP Groundwater sector aims to enhance our understanding of the impacts of climate change and direct human impacts on groundwater and a range of related sectors. To realize this goal, the new ISIMIP Groundwater sector will address numerous challenges. For instance, core simulated variables, such as water table depth and recharge, are highly uncertain and difficult to compare with observations. Further, tracing down explanations for inter-model differences will require the joint development and application of new evaluation methods (Eyring et al., 2016b) and protocols. Currently, models of the Groundwater sector operate at different spatial resolutions, and compared to other sectors, they often run at relatively high spatial resolutions, which will need to be addressed in evaluation and analysis approaches. Furthermore, depending on the model, executing single-model simulations already requires substantial amounts of computation time, and running all impact scenarios may be infeasible for some modeling groups. Lastly, running simulations for ISIMIP requires not only computational resources but also human resources, which might not be feasible for all groups. This has always been the case with ISIMIP, and it is an issue that other sectors have faced as well. Still, we are confident that the groundwater sector will ~~improve~~enhance our understanding of groundwater within the Earth system and help to promote dialogue and synthesis in the research community. With its various connections to other sectors, the Groundwater sector can be a catalyst for developing new holistic cross-sector modelling efforts that account for the multitude of interconnections between the water cycle and social, economic, and ecological systems.~~In summary, the ISIMIP groundwater sector aims to enhance our understanding of the impacts of climate change and direct human impacts on groundwater resources and a range of related sectors.~~

~~In summary, the ISIMIP groundwater sector aims to enhance our understanding of the impacts of climate change and direct human impacts on groundwater resources and a range of related sectors.~~

Data availability

The ensemble mean WTD and groundwater recharge trends are available at Reinecke (2025). For the original model data publications, see Table A1.

Author contribution

RR led the writing and analysis of the manuscript. RR and IG conceived the idea. All authors reviewed the manuscript and provided suggestions on text and figures.

436 **Competing interests**

437 None.

438

439 **Appendix**

440 **Table A1**: Original publications that describe the model outputs used in section 4.

Model	Simulation setup and used forcings	Reference
G³M	Steady-state model of WTD on 5 arcmin without any groundwater pumping, forced with WaterGAP 2.2d (Müller Schmied et al., 2021) groundwater recharge mean between 1901-2001.	Reinecke et al. (2019)
V2KARST	Global karst recharge model at 15 arcmin, forced with the MSWEP V2 (Beck et al., 2019) precipitation and GLDAS (Li et al., 2018) air temperature, shortwave and longwave radiation, specific humidity and wind speed for the period of 1990-2020	Sarrazin et al. (2018)
GGR	Global ~~Gg~~roundwater rain-fed ~~Rr~~echarge model, A grid-based three-layer water balance model to estimate the daily global rain-fed groundwater recharge (2001-2020)	Nazari et al. (2025)
WBM	Time series simulation from 1980 to 2019 at 15 arc minutes, using the MERIT digital flow direction dataset (Yamazaki et al., 2019) including domestic, industrial, livestock, and irrigation water withdrawals. Forcings and key inputs: Climate: ERA5 (Prusevich et al., 2024), Reservoirs: GRanD v1.1 (Lehner et al., 2011), Inter-basin transfers (Lammers, 2022), Glaciers (Rounce et al., 2022), Impervious surfaces (Hansen and Toftemann Thomsen, 2020), Population density (Lloyd et al., 2019), Domestic and industrial water per capita demand: FAO AQUASTAT, Livestock density and water demand (Gilbert et al., 2018), Cropland: LUH2 (Hurtt et al., 2020), Aquifer properties (de Graaf et al., 2017) aquifer depth gap-filled with terrain slope data from Yamazaki et al. 2019, Soil	Multiple, see left column.

	available water capacity: FAO soil map, Root depth (Yang et al., 2016)	
VIC-wur	Global Hydrological model simulating the GWR and streamflow from 1970-2014 in natural condition. The mean GWR and streamflow were used to simulate the GWT in steady-state MODFLOW model in 5 arcmin. The model is forced by: GFDL-ESM4 climate model (Dunne et al., 2020), Aquifer properties (de Graaf et al., 2017).	Droppers et al. (2020)
CLM	The model was spun up for 1979 and subsequently simulated from 1979 to 2013 using the GSWPv3 atmospheric forcing dataset at a 0.1-degree resolution. Recharge, capillary rise, drainage, irrigation pumping and cell-to-cell lateral flow were simulated within the model.	Akhter et al. (2024) (under review in WRR)
ParFlow	The data provided here are based on Naz et al. (2023). In version 2 of the data, we provide variables including water table depth and groundwater recharge for time period of 1997-2006 at monthly time scale.	Naz et al. (2023)
CWatM	Community Water Model at 5 arcmin. Climate forcing with chelsa-W5E5v1.0 (5 arcmin) for temperature (average, maximum, minimum), precipitation, and shortwave radiation, and GSWP3-W5E5 (30 arcmin spline downscaled to 5 arcmin) for longwave radiation, wind speed, and specific humidity. Updates to Burek et al. (2020) include river network based on MERIT Hydro and upscaling with Eilander et al. (2021).	Burek et al. (2020)

441

Table A2: List of groundwater related output variables in the ISIMIP3a global water sector (https://protocol.isimip.org/#/ISIMIP3a/water_global). The unit of all variables is kg m^{-2} s^{-1}, the spatial resolution is 0.5° grid and the temporal resolution is monthly.

Groundwater-related output variable of the Global Water Sector	Description
Groundwater runoff	Water that leaves the groundwater layer. In case seepage is simulated but no groundwater layer is present, report seepage as *Total groundwater recharge* and *Groundwater Runoff*.
Total groundwater recharge	For models that consider both diffuse and focused/localised recharge this should be the sum of both; other models should submit the groundwater recharge component that the model simulates. See also the descriptions in *Focused/localised groundwater recharge* and *Diffuse groundwater recharge*.
Focused/localised groundwater recharge	Water that directly flows from a surface water body into the groundwater layer below. Only submit if the model separates focused/localised recharge from diffuse recharge.
Potential irrigation water withdrawal (assuming unlimited water supply) from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Industrial Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual irrigation water withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Irrigation Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential Irrigation Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Irrigation Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Irrigation Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Irrigation Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential Domestic Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Domestic Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Domestic Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Domestic Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources
Potential Domestic Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Domestic Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.

Actual Domestic Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Domestic Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential Manufacturing Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Manufacturing Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Manufacturing Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Manufacturing Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential manufacturing Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential manufacturing Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Manufacturing Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Manufacturing Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential electricity Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential electricity Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Electricity Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Electricity Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential electricity Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential electricity Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Electricity Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Electricity Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential Industrial Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Industrial Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Industrial Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Industrial Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.

Potential Industrial Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential Industrial Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Industrial Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Industrial Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential livestock Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential livestock Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual Livestock Water Withdrawal from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual Livestock Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Potential livestock Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Potential livestock Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Actual livestock Water Consumption from groundwater resources	Part of *Actual livestock Water Consumption* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Total Potential Water Withdrawal (all sectors) from groundwater resources	Part of *Total Potential Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.
Total Actual Water Withdrawal (all sectors) from groundwater resources	Part of *Total Actual Water Withdrawal* that is extracted from groundwater resources.

442

References

Beck, H. E., Wood, E. F., Pan, M., Fisher, C. K., Miralles, D. G., van Dijk, A. I. J. M., McVicar, T. R., and Adler, R. F.: MSWEP V2 Global 3-Hourly 0.1° Precipitation: Methodology and Quantitative Assessment, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 100, 473–500, https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-17-0138.1, 2019.

Benz, S. A., Irvine, D. J., Rau, G. C., Bayer, P., Menberg, K., Blum, P., Jamieson, R. C., Griebler, C., and Kurylyk, B. L.: Global groundwater warming due to climate change, Nature Geosci, 17, 545–551, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-024-01453-x, 2024.

Berghuijs, W. R., Collenteur, R. A., Jasechko, S., Jaramillo, F., Luijendijk, E., Moeck, C., van der Velde, Y., and Allen, S. T.: Groundwater recharge is sensitive to changing long-term aridity, Nature Clim Change, 14, 357–363, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-024-01953-z, 2024.

Bierkens, M. and Wada, Y.: Non-renewable groundwater use and groundwater depletion: a review, Environ. Res. Lett., 14, 63002, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab1a5f, 2019.

456   Burek, P., Satoh, Y., Kahil, T., Tang, T., Greve, P., Smilovic, M., Guillaumot, L., Zhao, F., and Wada, Y.:

457   Development of the Community Water Model (CWatM v1.04) – a high-resolution hydrological model

458   for global and regional assessment of integrated water resources management, Geosci. Model Dev.,

459   13, 3267–3298, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-3267-2020, 2020.

460   Condon, L. E. and Maxwell, R. M.: Simulating the sensitivity of evapotranspiration and streamflow to

461   large-scale groundwater depletion, Science advances, 5, eaav4574,

462   https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aav4574, 2019.

463   Condon, L. E., Kollet, S., Bierkens, M. F. P., Fogg, G. E., Maxwell, R. M., Hill, M. C., Fransen, H.-J. H.,

464   Verhoef, A., van Loon, A. F., Sulis, M., and Abesser, C.: Global Groundwater Modeling and Monitoring:

465   Opportunities and Challenges, Water Resources Research, 57,

466   https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR029500, 2021.

467   Costa, F. R. C., Schietti, J., Stark, S. C., and Smith, M. N.: The other side of tropical forest drought: do

468   shallow water table regions of Amazonia act as large-scale hydrological refugia from drought?, The

469   New phytologist, 237, 714–733, https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17914, 2023.

470   Coll, J. R., Aguilar, E., and Ashcroft, L.: Drought variability and change across the Iberian Peninsula.

471   *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, *130*(3–4), 901–916. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-016-1926-

472   3, 2017.

473   Cuthbert, M. O., Gleeson, T., Moosdorf, N., Befus, K. M., Schneider, A., Hartmann, J., and Lehner, B.:

474   Global patterns and dynamics of climate-groundwater interactions, Nature Clim Change, 9, 137–141,

475   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0386-4, 2019.

476   Dalin, C., Wada, Y., Kastner, T., and Puma, M. J.: Groundwater depletion embedded in international food

477   trade, Nature, 543, 700–704, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21403, 2017.

478   de Graaf, I. E. M., Sutanudjaja, E. H., van Beek, L. P. H., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: A high-resolution global-

479   scale groundwater model, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 19, 823–837, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-

480   823-2015, available at: https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/19/823/2015/, 2015.

481   de Graaf, I., Rens L.P.H. van Beek, Tom Gleeson, Nils Moosdorf, Oliver Schmitz, Edwin H. Sutanudjaja,

482   and Marc F.P. Bierkens: A global-scale two-layer transient groundwater model: Development and

483   application to groundwater depletion, Advances in Water Resources, 102, 53–67,

484   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2017.01.011, 2017.

485   de Graaf, I. E. M., Gleeson, T., van Rens Beek, L. P. H., Sutanudjaja, E. H., and Bierkens, M. F. P.:

486   Environmental flow limits to global groundwater pumping, Nature, 574, 90–94,

487   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1594-4, 2019.

488   Döll, P. and Siebert, S.: Global modeling of irrigation water requirements, Water Resources Research, 38,

489   https://doi.org/10.1029/2001WR000355, 2002.

490   Droppers, B., Franssen, W. H. P., van Vliet, M. T. H., Nijssen, B., and Ludwig, F.: Simulating human

491   impacts on global water resources using VIC-5, Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 5029–5052,

492   https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-5029-2020, 2020.

493   Dunne, J. P., Horowitz, L. W., Adcroft, A. J., Ginoux, P., Held, I. M., John, J. G., Krasting, J. P., Malyshev, S.,

494   Naik, V., Paulot, F., Shevliakova, E., Stock, C. A., Zadeh, N., Balaji, V., Blanton, C., Dunne, K. A.,

495   Dupuis, C., Durachta, J., Dussin, R., Gauthier, P. P. G., Griffies, S. M., Guo, H., Hallberg, R. W.,

496   Harrison, M., He, J., Hurlin, W., McHugh, C., Menzel, R., Milly, P. C. D., Nikonov, S., Paynter, D. J.,

497   Ploshay, J., Radhakrishnan, A., Rand, K., Reichl, B. G., Robinson, T., Schwarzkopf, D. M., Sentman, L.

498   T., Underwood, S., Vahlenkamp, H., Winton, M., Wittenberg, A. T., Wyman, B., Zeng, Y. and Zhao, M.:

499   The GFDL Earth System Model Version 4.1 (GFDL-ESM 4.1): Overall Coupled Model Description and

500   Simulation Characteristics. *J Adv Model Earth Syst*, *12* (11), e2019MS002015.

501   https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS002015, 2020.Eilander, D., van Verseveld, W., Yamazaki, D., Weerts,

502   A., Winsemius, H. C., and Ward, P. J.: A hydrography upscaling method for scale-invariant

503   parametrization of distributed hydrological models, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 25, 5287–5313,

504   https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-5287-2021, 2021.

505   Esteban, E. J. L., Castilho, C. V., Melgaço, K. L., and Costa, F. R. C.: The other side of droughts: wet

506   extremes and topography as buffers of negative drought effects in an Amazonian forest, The New

507   phytologist, 229, 1995–2006, https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17005, 2021.

508   European Environment Agency, *European climate risk assessment*, Publications Office of the European

509   Union, https://doi.org/10.2800/8671471, 2024.

510   Eyring, V., Bony, S., Meehl, G. A., Senior, C. A., Stevens, B., Stouffer, R. J., and Taylor, K. E.: Overview of

511   the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) experimental design and organization,

512   Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 1937–1958, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1937-2016, 2016a.

513   Eyring, V., Righi, M., Lauer, A., Evaldsson, M., Wenzel, S., Jones, C., Anav, A., Andrews, O., Cionni, I.,

514   Davin, E. L., Deser, C., Ehbrecht, C., Friedlingstein, P., Gleckler, P., Gottschaldt, K.-D., Hagemann,

515   S., Juckes, M., Kindermann, S., Krasting, J., Kunert, D., Levine, R., Loew, A., Mäkelä, J., Martin, G.,

516   Mason, E., Phillips, A. S., Read, S., Rio, C., Roehrig, R., Senftleben, D., Sterl, A., van Ulft, L. H.,

517   Walton, J., Wang, S., and Williams, K. D.: ESMValTool (v1.0) – a community diagnostic and

518   performance metrics tool for routine evaluation of Earth system models in CMIP, Geosci. Model Dev.,

519   9, 1747–1802, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-1747-2016, 2016b.

520   Felfelani, F., Lawrence, D. M., and Pokhrel, Y.: Representing Intercell Lateral Groundwater Flow and

521   Aquifer Pumping in the Community Land Model, Water Resources Research, 57,

522   https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027531, 2021.

523   Foster, S. S. D. and Chilton, P. J.: Groundwater: the processes and global significance of aquifer

524   degradation, Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological

525   sciences, 358, 1957–1972, https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2003.1380, 2003.

526   Frieler, K., Lange, S., Piontek, F., Reyer, C. P. O., Schewe, J., Warszawski, L., Zhao, F., Chini, L., Denvil, S.,

527   Emanuel, K., Geiger, T., Halladay, K., Hurtt, G., Mengel, M., Murakami, D., Ostberg, S., Popp, A., Riva,

528   R., Stevanovic, M., Suzuki, T., Volkholz, J., Burke, E., Ciais, P., Ebi, K., Eddy, T. D., Elliott, J., Galbraith,

529   E., Gosling, S. N., Hattermann, F., Hickler, T., Hinkel, J., Hof, C., Huber, V., Jägermeyr, J., Krysanova,

530   V., Marcé, R., Müller Schmied, H., Mouratiadou, I., Pierson, D., Tittensor, D. P., Vautard, R., van Vliet,

M., Biber, M. F., Betts, R. A., Bodirsky, B. L., Deryng, D., Frolking, S., Jones, C. D., Lotze, H. K., Lotze-Campen, H., Sahajpal, R., Thonicke, K., Tian, H., and Yamagata, Y.: Assessing the impacts of 1.5\,\degree C global warming - simulation protocol of the Inter-Sectoral Impact Model Intercomparison Project (ISIMIP2b), Geosci. Model Dev., 10, 4321–4345, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-10-4321-2017, 2017.

Gasper, F., Goergen, K., Shrestha, P., Sulis, M., Rihani, J., Geimer, M., and Kollet, S.: Implementation and scaling of the fully coupled Terrestrial Systems Modeling Platform (TerrSysMP v1.0) in a massively parallel supercomputing environment – a case study on JUQUEEN (IBM Blue Gene/Q), Geosci. Model Dev., 7, 2531–2543, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-2531-2014, 2014.

Gilbert, M., Nicolas, G., Cinardi, G., van Boeckel, T. P., Vanwambeke, S. O., Wint, G. R. W., and Robinson, T. P.: Global distribution data for cattle, buffaloes, horses, sheep, goats, pigs, chickens and ducks in 2010, Scientific data, 5, 180227, https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.227, 2018.

Gleeson, T. and Paszkowski, D.: Perceptions of scale in hydrology: what do you mean by regional scale?, Hydrological Sciences Journal, 59, 99–107, https://doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2013.797581, 2014.

Gleeson, T., Wagener, T., Döll, P., Zipper, S. C., West, C., Wada, Y., Taylor, R., Scanlon, B., Rosolem, R., Rahman, S., Oshinlaja, N., Maxwell, R., Lo, M.-H., Kim, H., Hill, M., Hartmann, A., Fogg, G., Famiglietti, J. S., Ducharne, A., Graaf, I. de, Cuthbert, M., Condon, L., Bresciani, E., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: GMD perspective: The quest to improve the evaluation of groundwater representation in continental- to global-scale models, Geosci. Model Dev., 14, 7545–7571, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-7545-2021, 2021.

Gnann, S., Reinecke, R., Stein, L., Wada, Y., Thiery, W., Müller Schmied, H., Satoh, Y., Pokhrel, Y., Ostberg, S., Koutroulis, A., Hanasaki, N., Grillakis, M., Gosling, S., Burek, P., Bierkens, M., and Wagener, T.: Functional relationships reveal differences in the water cycle representation of global water models, 1079–1090, https://doi.org/10.1038/s44221-023-00160-y, 2023.

Grogan, D. S., Zuidema, S., Prusevich, A., Wollheim, W. M., Glidden, S., and Lammers, R. B.: Water balance model (WBM) v.1.0.0: a scalable gridded global hydrologic model with water-tracking functionality, Geosci. Model Dev., 15, 7287–7323, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-7287-2022, 2022.

Guillaumot, L., Smilovic, M., Burek, P., Bruijn, J. de, Greve, P., Kahil, T., and Wada, Y.: Coupling a large-scale hydrological model (CWatM v1.1) with a high-resolution groundwater flow model (MODFLOW 6) to assess the impact of irrigation at regional scale, Geosci. Model Dev., 15, 7099–7120, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-7099-2022, 2022.

Hansen, M. and Toftemann Thomsen, C.: An integrated public information system for geology, groundwater and drinking water in Denmark, GEUS Bulletin, 38, 69–72, https://doi.org/10.34194/geusb.v38.4423, 2020.

Haqiqi, I., Bowling, L., Jame, S., Baldos, U., Liu, J., and Hertel, T.: Global drivers of local water stresses and global responses to local water policies in the United States, Environmental research letters ERL, 18, 65007, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/acd269, 2023.

568 Holman, I. P., Whelan, M. J., Howden, N. J. K., Bellamy, P. H., Willby, N. J., Rivas-Casado, M., and

569 McConvey, P.: Phosphorus in groundwater—an overlooked contributor to eutrophication?, Hydrol.

570 Process., 22, 5121–5127, https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.7198, 2008.

571 Huggins, X., Gleeson, T., Castilla-Rho, J., Holley, C., Re, V., and Famiglietti, J. S.: Groundwater

572 Connections and Sustainability in Social-Ecological Systems, Ground water, 61, 463–478,

573 https://doi.org/10.1111/gwat.13305, 2023.

574 Hurtt, G. C., Chini, L., Sahajpal, R., Frolking, S., Bodirsky, B. L., Calvin, K., Doelman, J. C., Fisk, J.,

575 Fujimori, S., Klein Goldewijk, K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Heinimann, A., Humpenöder, F., Jungclaus,

576 J., Kaplan, J. O., Kennedy, J., Krisztin, T., Lawrence, D., Lawrence, P., Ma, L., Mertz, O., Pongratz, J.,

577 Popp, A., Poulter, B., Riahi, K., Shevliakova, E., Stehfest, E., Thornton, P., Tubiello, F. N., van Vuuren,

578 D. P., and Zhang, X.: Harmonization of global land use change and management for the period 850–

579 2100 (LUH2) for CMIP6, Geosci. Model Dev., 13, 5425–5464, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-5425-

580 2020, 2020.

581 Jasechko, S., Seybold, H., Perrone, D., Fan, Y., Shamsudduha, M., Taylor, R. G., Fallatah, O., and

582 Kirchner, J. W.: Rapid groundwater decline and some cases of recovery in aquifers globally, Nature,

583 625, 715–721, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06879-8, 2024.

584 Keune, J., Sulis, M., Kollet, S., Siebert, S., and Wada, Y.: Human Water Use Impacts on the Strength of the

585 Continental Sink for Atmospheric Water, Geophys. Res. Lett., 45, 4068–4076,

586 https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL077621, 2018.

587 Kollet, S. J. and Maxwell, R. M.: Capturing the influence of groundwater dynamics on land surface

588 processes using an integrated, distributed watershed model, Water Resources Research, 44,

589 https://doi.org/10.1029/2007WR006004, 2008.

590 Konar, M., Hussein, Z., Hanasaki, N., Mauzerall, D. L., and Rodriguez-Iturbe, I.: Virtual water trade flows

591 and savings under climate change, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 17, 3219–3234,

592 https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-17-3219-2013, 2013.

593 Kretschmer, D. V., Michael, H., Moosdorf, N., Essink, G. O., Bierkens, M. F. P., Wagener, T., and

594 Reinecke, R.: Controls on coastal saline groundwater across North America, Environmental research

595 letters, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ada973, 2025.

596 Kuffour, B. N. O., Engdahl, N. B., Woodward, C. S., Condon, L. E., Kollet, S., and Maxwell, R. M.:

597 Simulating coupled surface–subsurface flows with ParFlow v3.5.0: capabilities, applications, and

598 ongoing development of an open-source, massively parallel, integrated hydrologic model, Geosci.

599 Model Dev., 13, 1373–1397, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1373-2020, 2020.

600 Kumar, R., Samaniego, L., Thober, S., Rakovec, O., Marx, A., Wanders, N., Pan, M., Hesse, F. and Attinger,

601 S., Multi-model assessment of groundwater recharge across Europe under warming climate. Earth's

602 Future, 13(1), p.e2024EF005020. https://doi.org/10.1029/2024EF005020, 2025.

603 Lammers, R. B.: Global Inter-Basin Hydrological Transfer Database, 2022.

604 Lange, S.: Bias-correction fact sheet, https://www.isimip.org/gettingstarted/isimip3b-bias-adjustment/,

605 last access: 2 March 2025, 2021.

Lawrence, D. M., Fisher, R. A., Koven, C. D., Oleson, K. W., Swenson, S. C., Bonan, G., Collier, N., Ghimire, B., van Kampenhout, L., Kennedy, D., Kluzek, E., Lawrence, P. J., Li, F., Li, H., Lombardozzi, D., Riley, W. J., Sacks, W. J., Shi, M., Vertenstein, M., Wieder, W. R., Xu, C., Ali, A. A., Badger, A. M., Bisht, G., van den Broeke, M., Brunke, M. A., Burns, S. P., Buzan, J., Clark, M., Craig, A., Dahlin, K., Drewniak, B., Fisher, J. B., Flanner, M., Fox, A. M., Gentine, P., Hoffman, F., Keppel-Aleks, G., Knox, R., Kumar, S., Lenaerts, J., Leung, L. R., Lipscomb, W. H., Lu, Y., Pandey, A., Pelletier, J. D., Perket, J., Randerson, J. T., Ricciuto, D. M., Sanderson, B. M., Slater, A., Subin, Z. M., Tang, J., Thomas, R. Q., Val Martin, M., and Zeng, X.: The Community Land Model Version 5: Description of New Features, Benchmarking, and Impact of Forcing Uncertainty, J Adv Model Earth Syst, 11, 4245–4287, https://doi.org/10.1029/2018MS001583, 2019.

IPCC, Lee, H., Calvin, K., Dasgupta, D., Krinner, G., Mukherji, A., Thorne, P., ... & Ruane, A. C. Climate change 2023 synthesis report summary for policymakers. CLIMATE CHANGE 2023 Synthesis Report: Summary for Policymakers, 2024.

Lehner, B., Liermann, C. R., Revenga, C., Vörösmarty, C., Fekete, B., Crouzet, P., Döll, P., Endejan, M., Frenken, K., Magome, J., Nilsson, C., Robertson, J. C., Rödel, R., Sindorf, N., and Wisser, D.: High-resolution mapping of the world's reservoirs and dams for sustainable river-flow management, Frontiers in Ecol & Environ, 9, 494–502, https://doi.org/10.1890/100125, 2011.

Li, B., Rodell, M., and Beaudoing, H.: GLDAS Catchment Land Surface Model L4 daily 0.25 x 0.25 degree, Version 2.0, 2018.

Liang, X., Lettenmaier, D. P., Wood, E. F., and Burges, S. J.: A simple hydrologically based model of land surface water and energy fluxes for general circulation models. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, *99*(D7), 14415–14428. https://doi.org/10.1029/94JD00483, 1994.

Liu, Y., Wagener, T., Beck, H. E., and Hartmann, A.: What is the hydrologically effective area of a catchment?, Environmental research letters ERL, 15, 104024, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aba7e5, 2020.

Lloyd, C. T., Chamberlain, H., Kerr, D., Yetman, G., Pistolesi, L., Stevens, F. R., Gaughan, A. E., Nieves, J. J., Hornby, G., MacManus, K., Sinha, P., Bondarenko, M., Sorichetta, A., and Tatem, A. J.: Global spatio-temporally harmonised datasets for producing high-resolution gridded population distribution datasets, Big earth data, 3, 108–139, https://doi.org/10.1080/20964471.2019.1625151, 2019.

Maxwell, R. M. and Miller, N. L.: Development of a Coupled Land Surface and Groundwater Model, Journal of Hydrometeorology, 6, 233–247, https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM422.1, 2005.

Maxwell, R. M., Condon, L. E., Kollet, S. J., Maher, K., Haggerty, R., and Forrester, M. M.: The imprint of climate and geology on the residence times of groundwater, Geophys. Res. Lett., 43, 701–708, https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL066916, 2016.

Maxwell, R. M., Putti, M., Meyerhoff, S., Delfs, J.-O., Ferguson, I. M., Ivanov, V., Kim, J., Kolditz, O., Kollet, S. J., Kumar, M., Lopez, S., Niu, J., Paniconi, C., Park, Y.-J., Phanikumar, M. S., Shen, C., Sudicky, E. A., and Sulis, M.: Surface-subsurface model intercomparison: A first set of benchmark results to

643 diagnose integrated hydrology and feedbacks, Water Resources Research, 50, 1531–1549,

644 https://doi.org/10.1002/2013WR013725, 2014.

645 Maxwell, R. M., Lundquist, J. K., Mirocha, J. D., Smith, S. G., Woodward, C. S., and Tompson, A. F. B.:

646 Development of a Coupled Groundwater–Atmosphere Model, Monthly Weather Review, 139, 96–116,

647 https://doi.org/10.1175/2010MWR3392.1, 2011.

648 Misstear, B., Vargas, C.R., Lapworth, D. et al. A global perspective on assessing groundwater quality.

649 Hydrogeol J 31, 11–14, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-022-02461-0, 2023.

650 Moeck, C., Collenteur, R. A., Berghuijs, W. R., Luijendijk, E., and Gurdak, J. J.: A Global Assessment of

651 Groundwater Recharge Response to Infiltration Variability at Monthly to Decadal Timescales, Water

652 Resources Research, 60, https://doi.org/10.1029/2023WR035828, 2024.

653 Müller Schmied, H., Cáceres, D., Eisner, S., Flörke, M., Herbert, C., Niemann, C., Peiris, T. A., Popat, E.,

654 Portmann, F. T., Reinecke, R., Schumacher, M., Shadkam, S., Telteu, C.-E., Trautmann, T., and Döll,

655 P.: The global water resources and use model WaterGAP v2.2d: model description and evaluation,

656 Geosci. Model Dev., 14, 1037–1079, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-1037-2021, 2021.

657 Müller Schmied, H., Adam, L., Eisner, S., Fink, G., Flörke, M., Kim, H., Oki, T., Portmann, F. T., Reinecke,

658 R., Riedel, C., Song, Q., Zhang, J., and Döll, P.: Variations of global and continental water balance

659 components as impacted by climate forcing uncertainty and human water use, Hydrol. Earth Syst.

660 Sci., 20, 2877–2898, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-20-2877-2016, available at:

661 https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/20/2877/2016/, 2016.

662 Naz, B. S., Sharples, W., Ma, Y., Goergen, K., and Kollet, S.: Continental-scale evaluation of a fully

663 distributed coupled land surface and groundwater model, ParFlow-CLM (v3.6.0), over Europe,

664 Geosci. Model Dev., 16, 1617–1639, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-16-1617-2023, 2023.

665 Nazari, S., Kruse, I. L., and Moosdorf, N.: Spatiotemporal dynamics of global rain-fed groundwater

666 recharge from 2001 to 2020, Journal of Hydrology, 650, 132490,

667 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2024.132490, 2025.

668 Paneque Salgado, P., and Vargas Molina, J.: Drought, social agents and the construction of discourse in

669 Andalusia. Environmental Hazards, 14(3), 224–235.

670 https://doi.org/10.1080/17477891.2015.1058739, 2015.

671 Perez, N., Singh, V., Ringler, C., Xie, H., Zhu, T., Sutanudjaja, E. H., and Villholth, K. G.: Ending

672 groundwater overdraft without affecting food security, Nat Sustain, 7, 1007–1017,

673 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-024-01376-w, 2024.

674 Pokhrel, Y., Felfelani, F., Satoh, Y., Boulange, J., Burek, P., Gädeke, A., Gerten, D., Gosling, S. N.,

675 Grillakis, M., Gudmundsson, L., Hanasaki, N., Kim, H., Koutroulis, A., Liu, J., Papadimitriou, L.,

676 Schewe, J., Müller Schmied, H., Stacke, T., Telteu, C.-E., Thiery, W., Veldkamp, T., Zhao, F., and

677 Wada, Y.: Global terrestrial water storage and drought severity under climate change, Nature Clim

678 Change, 11, 226–233, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-020-00972-w, 2021.

679 Porkka, M., Virkki, V., Wang-Erlandsson, L., Gerten, D., Gleeson, T., Mohan, C., Fetzer, I., Jaramillo, F.,

680 Staal, A., te Wierik, S., Tobian, A., van der Ent, R., Döll, P., Flörke, M., Gosling, S. N., Hanasaki, N.,

681   Satoh, Y., Müller Schmied, H., Wanders, N., Famiglietti, J. S., Rockström, J., and Kummu, M.: Notable
682   shifts beyond pre-industrial streamflow and soil moisture conditions transgress the planetary
683   boundary for freshwater change, Nat Water, 2, 262–273, https://doi.org/10.1038/s44221-024-00208-
684   7, 2024.

685   Prusevich, A. A., Lammers, R. B., and Glidden, S. J.: Delineation of endorheic drainage basins in the
686   MERIT-Plus dataset for 5 and 15 minute upscaled river networks, Scientific data, 11, 61,
687   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02875-9, 2024.

688   Reinecke, R., Müller Schmied, H., Trautmann, T., Andersen, L. S., Burek, P., Flörke, M., Gosling, S. N.,
689   Grillakis, M., Hanasaki, N., Koutroulis, A., Pokhrel, Y., Thiery, W., Wada, Y., Yusuke, S., and Döll, P.:
690   Uncertainty of simulated groundwater recharge at different global warming levels: a global-scale
691   multi-model ensemble study, Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci., 25, 787–810, https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-
692   787-2021, available at: https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/25/787/2021/, 2021.

693   Reinecke, R., Foglia, L., Mehl, S., Trautmann, T., Cáceres, D., and Döll, P.: Challenges in developing a
694   global gradient-based groundwater model (G^3M v1.0) for the integration into a global hydrological
695   model, Geosci. Model Dev., 12, 2401–2418, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-2401-2019, 2019.

696   Reinecke, R., Gnann, S., Stein, L., Bierkens, M., Graaf, I. de, Gleeson, T., Essink, G. O., Sutanudjaja, E. H.,
697   Ruz Vargas, C., Verkaik, J., and Wagener, T.: Uncertainty in model estimates of global groundwater
698   depth, Environmental research letters ERL, 19, 114066, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ad8587,
699   2024.

700   Reinecke, R.: The ISIMIP Groundwater Sector: A Framework for Ensemble Modeling of Global Change
701   Impacts on Groundwater, Zenodo, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14962512, 2025.

702   Rodell, M., Velicogna, I., and Famiglietti, J. S.: Satellite-based estimates of groundwater depletion in
703   India, Nature, 460, 999–1002, https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08238, 2009.

704   Rodella, A.-S., Zaveri, E., and Bertone, F.: The Hidden Wealth of Nations: The Economics of Groundwater
705   in Times of Climate Change. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2023.

706   Rounce, D., Hock, R., and Maussion, F.: Global PyGEM-OGGM Glacier Projections with RCP and SSP
707   Scenarios, Version 1, 2022.

708   Sarrazin, F., Hartmann, A., Pianosi, F., Rosolem, R., and Wagener, T.: V2Karst V1.1: a parsimonious large-
709   scale integrated vegetation–recharge model to simulate the impact of climate and land cover change
710   in karst regions, Geosci. Model Dev., 11, 4933–4964, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-11-4933-2018,
711   2018.

712   Scanlon, B. R., Fakhreddine, S., Rateb, A., Graaf, I. de, Famiglietti, J., Gleeson, T., Grafton, R. Q., Jobbagy,
713   E., Kebede, S., Kolusu, S. R., Konikow, L. F., Di Long, Mekonnen, M., Schmied, H. M., Mukherjee, A.,
714   MacDonald, A., Reedy, R. C., Shamsudduha, M., Simmons, C. T., Sun, A., Taylor, R. G., Villholth, K.
715   G., Vörösmarty, C. J., and Zheng, C.: Global water resources and the role of groundwater in a resilient
716   water future, Nat Rev Earth Environ, 4, 87–101, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-022-00378-6, 2023.

717   Schaller, M. F. and Fan, Y.: River basins as groundwater exporters and importers: Implications for water
718   cycle and climate modeling, J. Geophys. Res., 114, https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010636, 2009.

Schwartz, F. W. and Ibaraki, M.: Groundwater: A Resource in Decline, Elements, 7, 175–179, https://doi.org/10.2113/gselements.7.3.175, 2011.

Smith, M. W., Willis, T., Mroz, E., James, W. H. M., Klaar, M. J., Gosling, S. N., and Thomas, C. J.: Future malaria environmental suitability in Africa is sensitive to hydrology, Science (New York, N.Y.), 384, 697–703, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adk8755, 2024.

Taylor, R. G., Scanlon, B., Döll, P., Rodell, M., van Beek, R., Wada, Y., Longuevergne, L., Leblanc, M., Famiglietti, J. S., Edmunds, M., Konikow, L., Green, T. R., Chen, J., Taniguchi, M., Bierkens, M. F. P., MacDonald, A., Fan, Y., Maxwell, R. M., Yechieli, Y., Gurdak, J. J., Allen, D. M., Shamsudduha, M., Hiscock, K., Yeh, P. J.-F., Holman, I., and Treidel, H.: Ground water and climate change, Nature Clim Change, 3, 322–329, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1744, 2013.

Telteu, C.-E., Müller Schmied, H., Thiery, W., Leng, G., Burek, P., Liu, X., Boulange, J. E. S., Andersen, L. S., Grillakis, M., Gosling, S. N., Satoh, Y., Rakovec, O., Stacke, T., Chang, J., Wanders, N., Shah, H. L., Trautmann, T., Mao, G., Hanasaki, N., Koutroulis, A., Pokhrel, Y., Samaniego, L., Wada, Y., Mishra, V., Liu, J., Döll, P., Zhao, F., Gädeke, A., Rabin, S. S., and Herz, F.: Understanding each other's models: an introduction and a standard representation of 16 global water models to support intercomparison, improvement, and communication, Geosci. Model Dev., 14, 3843–3878, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-3843-2021, 2021.

Thompson, J. R., Gosling, S. N., Zaherpour, J., and Laizé, C. L. R.: Increasing Risk of Ecological Change to Major Rivers of the World With Global Warming, Earth's Future, 9, https://doi.org/10.1029/2021EF002048, 2021.

Trullenque-Blanco, V., Beguería, S., Vicente-Serrano, S. M., Peña-Angulo, D., and González-Hidalgo, C.: Catalogue of drought events in peninsular Spanish along 1916–2020 period. Scientific Data, 11(1), 703. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-024-03484-w, 2024.

United Nations: The United Nations World Water Development Report 2022: groundwater: making the invisible visible, UNESCO, Paris, 2022.

Winter, T. C.: The Role of Ground Water in Generating Streamflow in Headwater Areas and in Maintaining Base Flow 1, J American Water Resour Assoc, 43, 15–25, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00003.x, 2007.

Xie, J., Liu, X., Jasechko, S., Berghuijs, W. R., Wang, K., Liu, C., Reichstein, M., Jung, M., and Koirala, S.: Majority of global river flow sustained by groundwater, Nature Geosci, 17, 770–777, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-024-01483-5, 2024.

Yamazaki, D., Ikeshima, D., Sosa, J., Bates, P. D., Allen, G. H., and Pavelsky, T. M.: MERIT Hydro: A High-Resolution Global Hydrography Map Based on Latest Topography Dataset, Water Resources Research, 55, 5053–5073, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019WR024873, 2019.

Yang, Y., Donohue, R. J., and McVicar, T. R.: Global estimation of effective plant rooting depth: Implications for hydrological modeling, Water Resources Research, 52, 8260–8276, https://doi.org/10.1002/2016WR019392, 2016.

756 Zamrsky, D., Ruzzante, S., Compare, K., Kretschmer, D., Zipper, S., Befus, K. M., Reinecke, R., Pasner, Y.,
757   Gleeson, T., Jordan, K., Cuthbert, M., Castronova, A. M., Wagener, T., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Current
758   trends and biases in groundwater modelling using the community-driven groundwater model portal
759   (GroMoPo), Hydrogeol J, 33, 355–366, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-025-02882-7, 2025.
760 Zipper, S., Befus, K. M., Reinecke, R., Zamrsky, D., Gleeson, T., Ruzzante, S., Jordan, K., Compare, K.,
761   Kretschmer, D., Cuthbert, M., Castronova, A. M., Wagener, T., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: GroMoPo: A
762   Groundwater Model Portal for Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable (FAIR) Modeling,
763   Ground water, https://doi.org/10.1111/gwat.13343, 2023.