

# Undercatch corrected gridded precipitation data to improve hydrological modeling in high-alpine orography

Philipp Maier<sup>1,\*</sup>, Caroline Ehrendorfer<sup>2,\*</sup>, Sophie Lücking<sup>2</sup>, Thomas Pulka<sup>2,3</sup>, Fabian Lehner<sup>4</sup>, Mathew Herrnegger<sup>2</sup>, Herbert Formayer<sup>1</sup>, and Franziska Koch<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Meteorology and Climatology, BOKU-University, Gregor-Mendel-Straße 33, 1180 Vienna

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Hydrology and Water Management, BOKU-University, Muthgasse 18, 1190 Vienna

<sup>3</sup>Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California Berkeley, 130 Mulford Hall, 94720 Berkeley, CA

<sup>4</sup>Department for Climate Impact Research, GeoSphere Austria, Hohe Warte 38, 1190 Vienna

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

**Correspondence:** Philipp Maier (philipp.maier@boku.ac.at) and Caroline Ehrendorfer (caroline.ehrendorfer@boku.ac.at)

**Abstract.** Stationary precipitation measurements are frequently affected by undercatch errors, which are particularly pronounced in cold and alpine regions with strong winds. Since gridded precipitation products used in land surface modeling are often derived from spatial interpolation of meteorological station data, these measurement errors propagate directly into gridded datasets. In this study, we train monthly Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) using undercatch corrected station observations, with geographical exposure and terrain elevation as predictors, achieving  $R^2$  values above 0.76 in Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation. We apply these models to generate monthly undercatch correction factors for Austria and  combined with an exposed terrain penalty  use them to adjust existing station-based gridded precipitation products. We validate the undercatch correction using the conceptual rainfall-runoff model COSERO across Austria and in two high-alpine reservoir catchments: Kölnbrein and Schlegeis. Our results demonstrate that retrospectively corrected precipitation reduces runoff simulation biases across Austria, especially in catchments above 1500 m elevation, and closes the water balance in both alpine study regions where uncorrected data showed runoff deficits exceeding 20 %. Biases in snow depth simulations  assessed using the physically-based snowpack model Alpine3D and validated against stereo-satellite observations  decrease from a median difference of -0.87 m to +0.15 m. Additionally, undercatch-corrected precipitation enables more realistic simulations of snow covered area during the melting season and long-term glacier volume changes. The proposed method shows promising results in both alpine case study catchments and across Austria, highlighting the importance of accounting for undercatch errors in high-alpine terrain and indicating the need for further research into their magnitude at high elevations.

*Copyright statement.* CC BY 4.0

## 1 Introduction

Globally, precipitation measurements from gauging networks and their spatial interpolation provide essential data for water resource management, hydrological and climate modeling, flood forecasting, hydropower operations, agricultural planning, ecosystem assessments, and infrastructure design. In mountainous regions, steep slopes and complex terrain influence the spatial variability of precipitation (Gnann et al., 2025) and challenge measurement accuracy. Simultaneously, water resources management in these regions faces increasing pressure from climate change impacts on alpine temperatures, snow dynamics, and glacier mass balance (Ohmura, 2012; Zekollari et al., 2019). As global temperatures rise, reliable precipitation estimates become increasingly critical for predicting shifts in snow melt timing, changes in water availability (Ford et al., 2020), and impacts on hydropower generation in alpine regions (Formayer et al., 2023)(Wasti et al., 2022).

Stationary precipitation measurements are affected by undercatch, since airflow around the gauge and the instrument geometry itself deflect falling hydrometeors away from the inlet (Sevruk et al., 1991). The magnitude of this effect depends on wind speed (Kochendorfer et al., 2017b; Wolff et al., 2015), precipitation phase, size and density (Thériault et al., 2012; Judson and Doesken, 2000) and thus temperature as well as precipitation intensity (Colli et al., 2020), and gauge and shielding design (Colli et al., 2015). Atmospheric conditions in cold or high-alpine regions with complex orography produce particularly significant undercatch due to low temperatures and high wind speeds. The quantification of undercatch measurement errors and the derivation of suitable transfer functions to mitigate them have been extensively studied in various international meteorological field campaigns (Goodison et al., 1998; Smith et al., 2020; Kochendorfer et al., 2020). While transfer functions for undercatch correction have been developed and validated in various settings (Kochendorfer et al., 2017b, 2018), their applicability in high-alpine, complex terrain remains limited, since uncertainties in precipitation measurements are particularly pronounced (Gampe and Ludwig, 2017) and not all mechanisms are fully understood in complex orography (Kochendorfer et al., 2018) (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a). This is reflected in the difficulty of reliably constraining high-elevation precipitation gradients, although additional data sources such as snow course measurements have been shown to substantially improve lapse-rate estimates (Avanzi et al., 2021)(Avanzi et al., 2021). Furthermore, precipitation measurements in mountainous regions are often both quantitatively inaccurate and spatially unrepresentative (Bica et al., 2011; Gampe and Ludwig, 2017; Lu et al., 2019; Weber et al., 2020) (Bica et al., 2011; Lu et al., 2019; Weber et al., 2020; Gentilucci et al., 2021), with point-scale gauge observations often deviating significantly from actual areal precipitation (Bohnenstengel et al., 2011; Tang et al., 2018). These limitations are compounded by the fact that precipitation gauges in mountainous regions are predominantly installed at accessible valley floor locations, rather than at higher elevations with typically more severe undercatch effects (Ebert et al., 2007)(Ebert et al., 2007; Frei and Schär, 1998). Consequently, substantial precipitation adjustments are required in snow-dominated, wind-exposed regions, where undercatch-related uncertainties are greatest (Pierre et al., 2019).

Gridded precipitation products like e.g. E-OBS (Cornes et al., 2018) or WorldClim 2 (Fick and Hijmans, 2017) are frequently based on spatially interpolated or adjusted to meteorological station data, which suffer from the aforementioned undercatch errors in addition to other uncertainties caused by different databases and methods used to create the gridded products (Filippucci et al., 2025). The (Gampe and Ludwig, 2017; Filippucci et al., 2025). Some data sets address this problem

by explicitly accounting for undercatch and representing complex terrain through model-based reference fields (Lussana et al., 2019), while others represent precipitation patterns through terrain-informed principal component approaches (Isotta et al., 2019). However, the ideal solution for tackling undercatch errors ~~would be to generate~~ generating gridded precipitation data using undercatch corrected stations ~~, which~~ is not common practice. Consequently, the measurement errors at station level are propagated into these gridded datasets. Retrospectively correcting the gridded precipitation data with full accuracy would require perfect information about the atmospheric conditions at the station level and the interpolation process, which is typically neither available nor practical for users and impact scientists. The resulting biases in gridded precipitation products lead to systematic errors in water balance calculations, underestimation of water resources (Pulka et al., 2024; Ward et al., 2011) (Pulka et al., 2024; Immerzeel et al., 2015), and unreliable predictions of future water availability under climate change scenarios (Arjdal et al., 2023; Viviroli et al., 2011; Wu et al., 2024) (Viviroli et al., 2011; Pepin et al., 2022), with direct consequences for hydropower planning, flood risk management, and ecosystem conservation. As these biases increase with elevation and vary seasonally (Herrnegger et al., 2018; Henn et al., 2018), they pose a particular challenge for countries with high-alpine terrain and require retrospective correction after the gridded precipitation data have been created.

Several approaches have been developed to evaluate undercatch in gridded precipitation products. Independent in-situ precipitation measurements are used to assess biases (Rasmussen et al., 2012) and adjust spatial precipitation products (Rasmussen et al., 2012) (Livneh et al., 2014; Sun and Su, 2020; Schauwecker et al., 2021). While weather radars provide valuable information on the spatial structure of precipitation (Khanal et al., 2019), they are costly and have limited applicability in complex terrain due to ground clutter effects, observing geometry, and sub-grid-scale heterogeneity of precipitation systems (Goudenhoofdt and Delobbe, 2009; Kaltenboeck and Steinheimer, 2015; Barros and Arulraj, 2020). Furthermore, quantitative precipitation estimates from weather radars rely on calibration with ground-based gauge measurements, which in mountainous regions are subject to the aforementioned limitations of undercatch and lack of representative stations. Streamflow measurements can function as an indirect assessment for precipitation evaluation at the catchment scale when combining water balance modeling with evapotranspiration estimates (Kirchner, 2009; Herrnegger et al., 2015a; Immerzeel et al., 2015; Wortmann et al., 2018).

In combination with snow-hydrological modeling, ground-based, airborne, and satellite remote sensing can provide insights into the spatio-temporal distribution of snow (Hedrick et al., 2018; Shaw et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2022; Alonso-González et al., 2023; Girotto et al., 2024; Premier et al., 2023; Ferrarin et al., 2025), thereby enabling quantitative estimates of solid precipitation distribution and undercatch errors (Vögeli et al., 2016; Pulka et al., 2024). Various approaches for correcting orographic precipitation effects across regional and global scales and for different hydrological processes have been proposed (Herrnegger et al., 2018; Lu et al., 2019; Adam et al., 2006). However, existing, widely used gridded precipitation products continue to require a systematic, transferable method for correcting ~~undercatch~~ regional errors in high-alpine terrain (Zandler et al., 2019).

Austria provides an ideal study region for investigating precipitation undercatch due to its complex alpine terrain, dense observational network, and high reliance on hydropower production. Hydropower accounts for more than 60 % of Austria's domestically produced electricity (Urbantschitsch and Haber, 2024), making accurate precipitation estimates particularly important for water resources management and energy production (Wesemann et al., 2018). In high-alpine catchments, runoff is

additionally influenced by glacier melt contributions (Koboltschnig and Schöner, 2011; Koch et al., 2011; Weber et al., 2010). Austria's complex orography, combined with a dense network of stationary precipitation measurements (Fig. 1a), enables the evaluation of precipitation undercatch across a wide range of elevation bands. The terrain spans elevations from approximately 115 m.a.s.l. to 3 800 m.a.s.l., resulting in pronounced gradients in precipitation, hydrological processes, and discharge regimes. In higher-elevation catchments, where precipitation rates exceed evapotranspiration (Gnann et al., 2025), hydrology is strongly controlled by snow accumulation and melt processes, both of which exhibit marked seasonal variability (Kling et al., 2006). These characteristics allow for a systematic assessment of precipitation undercatch across diverse elevations, exposure conditions, and hydrological regimes.

In this study, we apply a precipitation undercatch correction developed at the weather station scale (~~Kochendorfer et al., 2017b~~) (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a) to gridded precipitation data to generate a retrospective, gridded undercatch correction method for Austria. We quantify monthly undercatch correction factors at 261 individual weather stations using transfer functions from ~~Kochendorfer et al. (2017b)~~ Kochendorfer et al. (2017a) and train Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) to spatially extend these corrections across Austria using geographical exposure and terrain elevation as predictors. The resulting correction factors are subsequently applied to the gridded precipitation dataset SPARTACUS (Hiebl and Frei, 2018). ~~To~~ We further introduce an additional exposure-dependent penalty to account for remaining uncertainties in highly exposed terrain, ~~an additional exposure-dependent penalty is introduced to mitigate remaining uncertainties~~ (~~Kochendorfer et al., 2017a; Hiebl and Frei, 2018; Gnann et al., 2025~~) stemming from different sources like the use of the undercatch transfer function in complex orography (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a), totalizers in the gridded base precipitation data (Hiebl and Frei, 2018) and potential plateauing of precipitation lapse rates through flow blocking and moisture depletion (Jiang, 2003; Houze, 2012; Gnann et al., 2025). The performance of the undercatch-corrected precipitation is first evaluated through runoff simulations in selected Austrian catchments using the conceptual rainfall-runoff model COSERO (Herrnegger et al., 2015b). Further validation is carried out in two high-alpine reservoir catchments (Kölnbrein and Schlegeis) using both COSERO and the physically based snowpack model Alpine3D (Lehning et al., 2006). Model results are compared against observations and/or reference data of runoff, glacier volume change, snow depth, and the evolution of the snow covered area in the melting period. This multi-model, multi-variable evaluation across different spatial scales enables a comprehensive assessment of the proposed undercatch correction method and provides insights into its robustness and remaining sources of uncertainty.

The results of this interdisciplinary study provide three key contributions: (1) publicly available monthly undercatch factors and associated metadata for 261 stations in Austria, (2) publicly available maps of undercatch correction factors for Austria at a 1-km resolution, both available under Maier et al. (2025), and (3) a validated approach for improving precipitation estimates and mitigating undercatch errors, evaluated with a conceptual hydrological and a physically-based snowpack model across Austria and two high-alpine study regions. We propose that the methods and results are ~~transferrable~~ transferable to other mountainous regions with similar characteristics and can directly support water resources management, hydropower operations, and climate change impact assessments in alpine environments.




**2.1 Study Region**

The study region comprises Austria and adjacent headwater catchments, as depicted in Fig. 1a. Approximately 60 % of Austria's national territory is covered by the Alps, a region that is particularly sensitive to climate change (Haeberli and Beniston, 1998; Viviroli et al., 2011; Matiu et al., 2021). Austria's geography and climate are therefore strongly shaped by its complex orography, with the Alps covering the west and south and the comparatively drier and flatter alpine forelands and lowlands in the north and east. Due to its central European location, the Austrian climate is influenced by both the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, while also exhibiting continental climatic influences (Bozzoli et al., 2024).

In addition to modeling the whole of Austria, two high-alpine study regions were selected to validate the precipitation correction at high elevations: the reservoir catchments of Kölnbrein (50 km<sup>2</sup>; Fig. 1b) and Schlegeis (110 km<sup>2</sup>; Fig. 1c). Both are partially glaciated (11 % for Kölnbrein and 22 % for Schlegeis in 2003 (RGI Consortium, 2017)) and have similar mean elevations (2430 m for Kölnbrein and 2540 m for Schlegeis). Despite these similarities, the two regions are subject to different atmospheric conditions: Schlegeis is located north of the Alpine main ridge and is predominantly influenced by the Atlantic, whereas Kölnbrein lies south of the Alpine main ridge and is more strongly affected by Mediterranean conditions (Bozzoli et al., 2024).

**2.2 Weather Station Data**

This study utilized 10-minute measurements of temperature, wind speed, and precipitation from semi-automated weather stations, provided by Geosphere Austria (GeoSphere Austria, 2024). ~~The stations are densely distributed across Austria, as shown in Fig. 1a.~~ Austria's federal institute for geology, geophysics, climatology, and meteorology (GeoSphere Austria, 2024). All meteorological variables required in this study are recorded automatically, while some (unused) parametrizations like cloud type, as well as downstream quality control are performed by experts. Precipitation is predominantly measured using tipping-bucket gauges, although the number of weighing gauges has increased in recent years (Haslinger et al., 2025). To ensure data quality, stations were required to provide at least ten years of measurement records for every month and to exhibit plausible average precipitation values. Stations were not required to cover a common overlapping period, which reduces the influence of decadal variability on the derived correction factors; the full period from which station data were drawn is 1995-2024. The stations are densely distributed across Austria, as shown in Fig. 1a. Austria's two highest stations, located at elevations of 2864 m and 3109 m, were excluded from the station ensemble since they would otherwise place disproportionate weight on elevation bands with low station density. This process resulted in a final set of 261 stations, with the highest remaining station located at 2327 m and the majority of stations being located below 1500 m (see Fig 7 for the elevation distribution). As the catch efficiency transfer function utilized in this study (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a) was derived using 30-minute measurements, the 10-minute data were aggregated to 30-minute temporal means for wind speed and temperature and 30-minute sums for precipitation.



**Figure 1.** Topography of a) Austria and adjacent headwater catchments of the Inn, Rhine, Danube and Morava, and the high-alpine reservoir catchments b) Kölnbrein (K) and c) Schlegeis (S) in m.a.s.l. The blue crosses in panel a) mark the weather stations used to derive the undercatch functions. "S" and "K" mark the location of the two study regions. In panel b) and c) hydrological subcatchments are shown in black lines, glaciated areas in gray, reservoirs in blue and waterlines in red. The thick black line in panel c) displays Austria's border.

### 2.3 Historical Climate Data

Temperature and precipitation data were assembled from multiple [pre-existing](#) gridded climate products ([Lehner et al., 2025](#)), prepared by [Lehner et al. \(2025\)](#), as described in more detail below. For Austria and the Swiss Engadin, the GeoSphere Austria SPARTACUS dataset was used (Hiebl and Frei, 2016, 2018). [SPARTACUS provides daily meteorological information intended for climatological applications. The station observations incorporated in this data set originate from long-term, homogenized weather stations in and around Austria, including totalizers in some high-alpine regions to reduce measurement errors \(Hiebl and Frei, 2018\). Consequently, the stations used in this study for undercatch correction only partly overlap with those included in the gridded data set.](#) For the neighboring regions of the Bavarian Danube and Czech CHELSA (Karger et al., 2023) and WorldClim 2 (Fick and Hijmans, 2017) were used. ~~The~~ [We smoothed the](#) transitions between the data sets ~~were smoothed~~ using a 10 km feather-blending zone. The resulting ~~dataset~~ [data set](#) consists of daily values for the period 1961-2023 with a spatial resolution of 1 km. The geographical predictors used in GAM training were derived from the same topographic data used in the SPARTACUS product. After applying the undercatch correction [in this study](#), both the raw and corrected precipitation data were patch-interpolated ([Jiawei Zhuang et al., 2025](#)) to the study regions ([Jiawei Zhuang et al., 2025](#)), [which is an artifact-reducing, smoother, higher-order regridding method compared to bilinear interpolation.](#) For the two study regions Kölnbrein and Schlegeis, additional meteorological variables at 250 m spatial resolution [— originating from different data sets](#)

— were required to run the snowpack model Alpine3D (Lehning et al., 2006). Global radiation data was obtained from the GeoSphere Austria APOLIS product (GeoSphere Austria, 2013) and is crucial for accurately representing snow hydrological processes (Weber et al., 2021). Relative humidity was derived from downscaled SPARTACUS temperature and a station-based dew-point interpolation (Lehner et al., 2024). Wind speed was estimated using a station-based Ridge regression (Klisho et al., 2024). Potential evapotranspiration was calculated using the Penman-Monteith equation (Allen, 2000). Because wind directions are not realistic at 250 m resolution in complex terrain, dummy wind directions were ~~used~~calculated in this study. These consist of average hourly wind directions for precipitation and non-precipitation days, respectively, derived from the INCA dataset (Haiden et al., 2011). ~~All~~ Further, all six meteorological variables ~~—~~ along with the patch-interpolated precipitation ~~—~~ were temporally disaggregated to hourly time steps within the two high-alpine study regions. Temporal disaggregation followed methods from Förster et al. (2016) and statistical approaches that relate daily means to hourly patterns from the ERA5 (Hersbach et al., 2020) or INCA dataset (Haiden et al., 2011), as documented in Formayer et al. (2023).

## 2.4 Undercatch Transfer Function


The catch efficiency CE transfer function used in this study is defined as

$$180 \quad CE = e^{-aU(1-\tan^{-1}(bT)+c)}, \quad (1)$$

with the constants  ~~$a=0.6023$~~  $a=0.0623$ ,  $b=0.776$  and  $c=0.431$ .  $U$  denotes the 10-m-wind-speed in  $\text{ms}^{-1}$ , capped at a maximum threshold of  $U_{\text{threshold}} = 9\text{ms}^{-1}$  and  $T$  denotes the air temperature in  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a). This transfer function was developed for unshielded ~~tipping-bucket-gauges-and-weighing-gauges using~~ wind speed measurements at 10 m mast height, ~~both of which are typically used in Austrian weather stations.~~ Although tipping buckets are still the predominant gauge type in the GeoSphere Austria network, weighing gauges have been increasingly installed since the early 2000s (Haslinger et al., 2025). A similar transfer function for tipping buckets was proposed by Kochendorfer et al. (2020); however, we use the weighing-gauge formulation for our high-alpine application. This choice is motivated by the absence of an explicit temperature term in the tipping-bucket function and by its comparatively strong wind-speed correction, including corrections of around 30 % for  $T < 2^{\circ}\text{C}$  and  $U = 0\text{ms}^{-1}$ , which would have been difficult to implement in high-alpine regions as wind speeds are typically considerably higher at peaks (Graf et al., 2019). Figure 2 shows the CE as a function of wind speed for different temperatures. It highlights that CE exhibits an approximately linear behavior at temperatures above the freezing point, while temperatures below freezing lead to increasingly non-linear behavior (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a). Under pronounced cold and windy conditions, CE can drop to as low as 20 %. The corrected precipitation is calculated as

$$195 \quad \text{pr}_{\text{corr}} = \frac{\text{pr}}{\text{CE}}, \quad (2)$$

and subsequently aggregated to monthly values. Monthly correction factors are then obtained by relating  $\text{pr}_{\text{corr}}$  to the uncorrected precipitation  $\text{pr}$ , resulting in one climatological correction factor per station and month. While this aggregation leads to some loss of information and may oversimplify individual events, it does not introduce a systematic bias for climatological time frames, which are the focus of this study (see Figure S1 in the Supplement) and is easily transferable for future studies. These station-based factors subsequently served as target variables in the GAM training.



**Figure 2.** Catch efficiency in percent as a function of temperature and 10m-wind-speed as suggested by Kochendorfer et al. (2017a).

## 200 2.5 GAM Training

A comprehensive overview of Generalized Additive Models (GAMs) can be found in Wood (2017); with the key elements briefly recited here. A GAM is a generalized linear model that predicts the response variable  $y$  as a sum of smooth functions of predictor variables  $x_p$ , constructed using  $N$  splines of the form

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \Phi\left(\sum_{p=1}^N \phi_p(x_p)\right), \quad (3)$$

205 with a monotonic function  $\Phi$ . Under the assumption that the response variable follows a distribution from the exponential family  $E$  (e.g. normal or Poisson), it is linked to the smooth functions with a link function  $g$  as

$$g(E(y)) = \theta_0 + f_1(x_1) + f_2(x_2) + \dots + f_m(x_m), \quad (4)$$

where  $\theta_0$  is the intercept and  $f_i$  are the smooth functions of the  $m$  predictors  $x_i$ . The smooth functions are then fitted so that a measurement of error (e.g. the Akaike information criterion (AIC) or the  $R^2$ -value) is minimized. To control model  
210 complexity and prevent over-fitting, an additional smoothness parameter  $\lambda$  is introduced, which penalizes smooth functions with high curvature ("wiggleness"). GAMs were chosen over potentially higher-performing machine learning techniques (e.g., random forests) because they allow for better and more direct physical understanding of the underlying process. Although constraining the maximum number of splines  $N$  and minimum smoothness parameter  $\lambda$  may reduce predictive power, the resulting smoother curves with low curvature further improved interpretability.

215 In this study, the response variable  $y$  — the station-based monthly undercatch factors — were approximately normally distributed after subtracting 1 and applying a logarithmic link function  $g = \log$ . The predictor selection was based on concavity analysis (Kovács, 2024), utilizing a HSIC-Lasso algorithm (Yamada et al., 2014; Climente-González et al., 2019), and an

untuned random forest model (Breiman, 2001). The complete pool of possible geographical predictors is given in Supplement A. Both the HSIC-Lasso algorithm and the random forest model indicated high correlation between the geographical predictors, allowing the number of predictors to be significantly reduced.

The following three predictors  $x_i$  were identified as the most influential:

- terrain elevation, serving as a proxy for temperature, wind speed and precipitation amount,
- exposure (defined as the difference of topography on a 1 km grid to a smoothed topography) based on a 5-km smoothed topography, as a proxy for local climatological conditions and orographic complexity, and
- exposure based on a 51-km smoothed topography, as a proxy for synoptic wind exposure.

A graphical representation of these three predictors is provided in Supplement A.


For each month, the optimal GAM configuration was determined by performing a hyperparameter grid search over the number of splines  $N$  and the smoothing parameter  $\lambda$ , evaluated using a Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation (LOOCV) across the 261 stations. Model performance was assessed using the mean  $R^2$ -value, with stations above and below 1200 m elevation given equal total weight to improve performance in higher elevations. The model configuration with the highest weighted  $R^2$ -value was selected for each month and subsequently applied to the gridded geographical predictors. Predictor values were capped at the minimum and maximum values observed in the training data to avoid extrapolation beyond the calibrated range.

## 2.6 Exposed Terrain Penalty

To mitigate the known uncertainties of undercatch transfer functions in complex terrain (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a, 2018), undercatch corrected precipitation in alpine regions was evaluated iteratively using catchment-scale hydrological observations for validation. Initial iterations revealed that, even with suitable GAM training scores, undercatch was substantially overestimated in high-alpine terrain and at exposed peaks. To address this, the maximum GAM-predicted monthly undercatch factor was capped at the maximum observed monthly station factor. Further, an exposed terrain penalty of the form

$$ETP = (1 - \alpha \cdot \frac{EX_{51,>0}}{\max(EX_{51,>0})}), \quad (5)$$

was introduced.  $EX_{51,>0}$  denotes the normalized, non-negative exposure derived from a 51-km smoothed topography. The penalty reduces  $pr_{corr}$  in mountainous regions, with a lower bound equal to the uncorrected precipitation  $pr$ . The penalty strength  $\alpha = 2/3$  was iteratively determined using hydrological modeling. The ETP aims to (1) reduce the overestimation of the undercatch magnitude in high-alpine terrain (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a, 2018), (2) account for the use of gauge totalizers in the gridded precipitation data set (Hiebl and Frei, 2018), which generally exhibit lower measurement errors, and (3) accounts for potential plateauing of precipitation lapse rates at ridges above 3000 m (Jiang, 2003; Wolff et al., 2015; Gnann et al., 2025) near high ridges, where flow blocking and moisture depletion can reduce orographic enhancement (Jiang, 2003; Gnann et al., 2025). Figure 3 displays the resulting ETP, showing the strongest reductions along the Alpine main ridge and for isolated high-elevation peaks.




**Figure 3.** Color-coded exposed terrain penalty ETP for the full domain. Maximum, mean and minimum values are given in the text box.

## 2.7 Setup of Hydrological and Snowpack Models

Two models were used to validate the undercatch corrected precipitation data: the conceptual, semi-distributed rainfall-runoff model COSERO (Herrnegger et al., 2015b) and the physically-based, spatially distributed snowpack model Alpine3D (Lehning et al., 2006).

COSERO was used to validate the overall water balance in both the case study regions and across Austria. It is a HBV-style model (Bergström, 1992) that has been widely applied in hydrological and climate change impact studies across a range of spatial scales (Nachtebel et al., 1993; Stanzel and Kling, 2018; Wesemann et al., 2018; Zeitfogel et al., 2025). All major runoff processes including snow and glacier melt, evapotranspiration, and runoff routing are simulated at the subcatchment scale, at an hourly resolution in the case study regions and a daily resolution for the whole of Austria. A schematic overview of the model structure is shown in Fig. 4. For the case-study basins, COSERO was set up with a spatial resolution of 100 m in glaciated areas and 250 m resolution in the remaining area. The Austrian-wide model was spatially discretized on a 1 km grid. The COSERO model domain includes some outlying headwater catchments, such as the Upper Inn in Switzerland (see Fig. 15). Due to computational constraints, the Upper Danube, Morava, and Inn in Germany were not modeled explicitly. Instead, observed runoff at the corresponding gauging stations was added to the model to close the water balance (see *Q<sub>addinflow</sub>* in Fig. 4). Model calibration was performed against observed runoff using the Shuffled Complex Evolution algorithm (Duan et al., 1992, 1993) and the logarithmic Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970) as the objective function. All basins were calibrated simultaneously to ensure seamless and spatially consistent parameter fields, with equal weighting in the objective function. Details on the initial parameter field for Austria can be found in Zeitfogel et al. (2025). The case study basins used the same initial information, except for a finer digital elevation model (DEM) with a 10 m resolution (Geoland.at, 2021). Calibration periods were 2015–2022 for the Kölnbrein catchment, 2012–2022 for the Schlegeis catchment, and 2001–2020 for the Austrian-wide model. The Austrian-wide model was independently validated for the period 1980–2000. For the high-alpine case study regions, the full available observed runoff time series was used for calibration; therefore, no separate validation period was defined. In the Austrian-wide model, only a subset of catchments with low to medium anthropogenic influence (see Klingler et al. (2021) for definition) was included in the model calibration. An overview of all catchments,



**Figure 4.** Schematic overview of the rainfall-runoff model COSERO, including model parameters, system states and fluxes (adapted from: [Herrnegger et al., 2015b](#)).

the calibration subset, added fluxes, gauging station information, and initial parameter fields can be found for the Austrian-wide model in Zeitfogel et al. (2025). Freely available discharge data from the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Climate- and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management (BMLUK, 2025), as well as time series from the LamaH dataset (Klingler et al., 2021), were used for model calibration in Austria. Reservoir inflow data for the Kölnbrein and Schlegeis catchments were provided by the Verbund Energy4Business GmbH.

Alpine3D was used to indirectly validate solid precipitation amounts in the two high-alpine case study regions by (1) comparing the modeled snow depth to satellite observations, (2) comparing the snow covered area (SCA) to satellite observations, and (3) evaluating glacier volume changes against data from Hugonnet et al. (2021). The model setup required hourly meteorological input data for precipitation, air temperature, relative air humidity, incoming solar radiation, wind speed and wind direction following the settings presented in Koch et al. (2024). The same DEM and land cover information as in the COSERO setup were used. Glacier grid cells were initialized using glacier area and height maps from the Randolph Glacier Inventory (RGI)




2003 (RGI Consortium, 2017). Alpine3D was run at an hourly resolution, with a spatial resolution of 100 m for the smaller  
285 Kölnbrein catchment and 250 m for the larger Schlegeis catchment. Snowfall redistribution in Alpine3D was based on snow  
depth patterns derived from a WorldView-2 stereo satellite image. This map was provided by the VERBUND Energy4Business  
GmbH and was generated by subtracting the snow-on DEM stereo-satellite image, taken on May 10<sup>th</sup> 2021, from a snow-  
free airborne LiDAR DEM (taken in September 2020). The glaciated areas were omitted in the snow depth map to avoid  
potential offsets in snow depth due to glacier melt between autumn 2020 and spring 2021. Previous studies have shown that  
290 snow distribution patterns are generally consistent between years (Pflug and Lundquist, 2020; Bührle et al., 2023) and can  
therefore be inferred from a single satellite image taken close to the timing of peak snow water equivalent (Vögeli et al.,  
2016). To evaluate the SCA exemplarily during the snow melt period of 2021 in the Kölnbrein catchment, Sentinel-2-derived  
SCA (Gascoin et al., 2019) were used for all cloud-free observations (cloud cover < 5 %) between May and July. Finally,  
modeled glacier volume changes were compared to global estimates of glacier volume change between 2000 and 2019 derived  
295 from satellite observations Hugonnet et al. (2021), providing an additional, indirect constraint on simulated solid precipitation  
amounts.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Undercatch Factors

Figure 5a shows the monthly undercatch factors derived for wind, temperature, and precipitation station data as a function of station elevation, revealing a pronounced seasonal dependence of precipitation undercatch. The highest undercatch factors occur in winter, with a maximum in January, as shown spatially in Fig. 5b. Between May and September, all undercatch factors remain below 2.0, with minima in July and August, when factors are generally close to 1. While not all high-elevation stations show strong undercatch — indicated by the color-coding of the data points — all undercatch factors exceeding 2.5 are associated with stations with an elevation above 1300 m. These undercatch factors, along with associated station meta data, are publicly available (Maier et al., 2025).



**Figure 5.** a) Station-derived monthly undercatch factors. The color-coding refers to the station elevation of the data entries in [m.a.s.l.], where green colors show stations with low and brown and yellow colors stations with high elevation. b) Spatial distribution of January undercatch factors (color-coded) across Austria.

The undercatch factors in Fig. 5a increase with elevation as expected, reflecting the typical increase in wind speed and decrease in temperature with elevation, as well as the increased fraction of solid precipitation during winter months. As elevation is the dominant influence, temperature appears to be the main driver of undercatch. Further, as Fig. 5b suggests, no clear spatial structure is apparent in the undercatch factor distribution besides the tendency of increasing undercatch towards Austria's west, where highly-elevated stations are located.

Despite extensive quality control of the 261 stations, residual uncertainty is expected at high-alpine sites. This uncertainty ~~arises-could arise~~ from local installation constraints, where precipitation gauges and wind sensors are not always co-located. Nevertheless, the station-based undercatch analysis yields physically plausible results, justifying the use of the derived undercatch factors as target variables for GAM training.

### 315 3.2 GAM Smooth Functions and Scores

The results of the monthly GAM hyperparameter grid search with LOOCV, with an emphasis on interpretability over maximum predictive performance, are summarized in Table 1. The first column shows the month corresponding to the undercatch factors used for the GAM training. The second column shows the weighted  $R^2$ -value of the LOOCV, where stations above and below 1200 m were assigned equal total weight. The average  $R^2$ -value across all months is 0.826, with the lowest performance in  
320 January (0.769) and the highest in May (0.904). The third and fourth columns show the selected hyperparameters, namely the smoothing parameter  $\lambda$  and the number of splines  $N$ . The models tend to select either high  $\lambda$  combined with small  $N$ , resulting in very smooth response functions, or the opposite configuration, allowing increased curvature. This behavior is also visible in Fig. 6). Overall, the winter half-year tends to have smoother curves, which indicates more explainable behavior in colder conditions. A comparison of the maximum predicted factors ( $y_{\text{pred,max}}$ ; fifth column) and the true maximum station-  
325 based factors ( $y_{\text{true,max}}$ ; last column) indicates a tendency towards overestimation during the winter half-year and slight underestimations during summer. Since the application of GAM-derived factors on the gridded data set is capped at  $y_{\text{true,max}}$ , the overestimation in winter has a limited impact on the final gridded results. Higher uncertainty at highly exposed stations can also be seen in the individual GAM plots provided in Supplement A. Figure 6 presents all twelve smooth functions from the individually trained GAMs. ~~It shows~~ The curves show the exponentially back-transformed relationships between the undercatch factors and the individual predictors, ~~where-with~~ where-with the undercatch factor ~~is~~ is calculated as the product of the individual ~~spline-values~~ spline values. ~~The dominant relationship is terrain~~ Terrain elevation (Fig. 6a) ~~where summer months show the steepest slopes, typically starting emerges as the dominant predictor, with contributions that can exceed those of the two exposure metrics (Fig. 6b,c) by up to one order of magnitude, particularly in summer~~ at higher elevations. ~~The exposure measures~~ Although this may appear counterintuitive, the pronounced seasonal dependence of the intercept factor in Fig. 6d is  
335 key to understanding this behavior. The large summer values in panel a are multiplied with intercept factors close to zero in panel d. Thus, the steep slopes of the elevation functions are required to accurately represent the onset of snowlines, while still predicting undercatch factors at the highest peaks. Since undercatch is generally more pronounced in winter, this behavior is not suggested by the GAMs during the winter months, when the smooth function contributions are multiplied by a larger intercept factor. The exposure predictors (Fig. 6b-cb,c) tend to capture finer-scale behavior and are characterized by higher curvature.  
340 ~~The pronounced seasonal dependence is reflected in the intercept factor (stronger curvature. In Fig. 6b, the particularly strong response in March (purple) is notable and is likely attributable to concurvity among the predictors: the simultaneous decrease of both 51-km exposure and elevation contributions in that month is compensated by a strong increase in the 5-km exposure smooth function. We therefore interpret this feature as a model artifact. In Fig. 6d)c, a clear seasonal distinction is visible:~~

winter months show increasing undercatch with positive exposure values, whereas this response saturates or even reverses in summer, when the steep elevation smooth functions dominate the correlation at high elevations.


**Table 1.** Monthly GAM LOOCV hyperparameter grid search results and maximum predictions.

| month | R <sup>2</sup> (weighted) | λ    | N  | y <sub>pred,max</sub> | y <sub>true,max</sub> |
|-------|---------------------------|------|----|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Jan   | 0.769                     | 5000 | 5  | 5.08                  | 3.86                  |
| Feb   | 0.792                     | 5000 | 5  | 5.25                  | 3.70                  |
| Mar   | 0.809                     | 1    | 20 | 3.50                  | 3.45                  |
| Apr   | 0.819                     | 1    | 20 | 2.57                  | 2.83                  |
| May   | 0.904                     | 5000 | 5  | 1.98                  | 1.89                  |
| Jun   | 0.847                     | 1    | 20 | 1.19                  | 1.25                  |
| Jul   | 0.824                     | 1    | 20 | 1.07                  | 1.11                  |
| Aug   | 0.852                     | 1    | 20 | 1.11                  | 1.11                  |
| Sep   | 0.862                     | 10   | 20 | 1.45                  | 1.59                  |
| Oct   | 0.864                     | 1    | 20 | 1.96                  | 2.12                  |
| Nov   | 0.783                     | 5000 | 5  | 3.19                  | 2.74                  |
| Dec   | 0.785                     | 1    | 20 | 3.24                  | 3.44                  |

Figure 7 shows the relative monthly GAM error, averaged over all months for each station. The error generally increases with elevation ~~, as does the undercatch uncertainty (Pierre et al., 2019)~~(with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.61), following undercatch transfer-function uncertainty inferred from colder temperatures and higher wind speeds (Pierre et al., 2019; Kochendorfer et al., . The relative error for the 18 stations above 1500 m averages to 0.15 as compared to the average error of 0.02 for the stations below this elevation. The highest relative errors tend to occur at stations with ~~high~~-positive exposure values, as indicated by the colorbar, which is also visible in the individual GAM smooth functions in Supplement A.

The twelve trained GAMs show robust performance with small relative errors at low-elevation/low-exposure stations, but increasingly struggle to predict undercatch factors at highly-elevated and exposed stations. This confirms the conclusions drawn in Kochendorfer et al. (2017a) ~~and Kochendorfer et al. (2018)~~ that the applied ~~transfer-function does not capture all relevant processes affecting undercatch~~ transfer function is prone to uncertainty at highly-elevated, exposed stations with ~~high-wind speeds~~complex wind fields. While the ~~GAMS~~ GAMs achieve suitable weighted R<sup>2</sup> values of approximately 0.8, they tend to overestimate undercatch at these stations (Table 1), resulting in unrealistically high precipitation amounts in exposed, high-alpine terrain. Figure 7 and A further illustrate that capping the GAM-predicted undercatch factors at the observed station factors (both shown in Table 1) is a crucial step to prevent excessive extrapolation at high elevations. This is particularly important given the sparse station network at high elevations where the GAMs must extrapolate beyond well-constrained training data.

The feature selection highlighted terrain elevation and geographical exposure (based on a 5 km and 51 km smoothed topography) as dominant predictors. Although exposure exhibits concavity with elevation at high altitudes, it primarily




**Figure 6.** GAM smooth functions, color-coded for every month. Panel a)-c) show the back-transformed multiplier to the undercatch factors, dependent on the three selected geographical features elevation, exposure (5 km) and exposure (51 km). Panel d) shows the constant intercept, which varies per month.

captures small-scale variability, resulting in smooth functions with higher curvature (Fig. 6). Terrain elevation emerges as the primary descriptor of undercatch, exhibiting a near-exponential relationship with undercatch factors (Fig. 6 and S3); ~~consistent with findings from previous studies (Avanzi et al., 2021; Herrnegger et al., 2018; Pulka et al., 2024).~~ In contrast, neither exposure predictor shows a simple monotonic relationship with undercatch.

The absence of spatial predictors such as latitude, longitude, or distance to the Alpine main ridge suggests that horizontal proximity alone is insufficient for representing undercatch variability. This suggests that methodologies like ~~Kriging are not~~ feasible-ordinary Kriging are impractical to extrapolate undercatch errors.

We conclude that the GAMs produce physically plausible smooth functions that realistically capture the seasonal and elevation-dependent structure of precipitation undercatch, ~~and are in line with findings from other studies (Avanzi et al., 2021; Herrnegger et al., 2018; Pulka et al., 2024).~~ -This supports supporting the application of the GAM-derived-derived factors to gridded precipitation data. While some model artifacts attributable to predictor concurvity remain, the overall form of the smooth functions, their seasonal variation, and the dominant dependence on terrain elevation are consistent with findings from previous studies (Avanzi et al., 2021; Herrnegger et al., 2018; Pulka et al., 2024). Importantly, unlike these studies — which derived elevation-dependent corrections from additional in situ or satellite snow




**Figure 7.** Relative monthly error of the GAM predictions at the stations, averaged over all months. The vertical axis shows elevation in m.a.s.l., the color-coding the exposure in m based on a 51-km smoothed topography.

depth observations or from rainfall–runoff modeling — our approach relies solely on correcting existing meteorological station data, yet arrives at similar conclusions. Our methodology extends previous work in two key aspects: first, by replacing stepwise linear (Pulka et al., 2024; Herrnegger et al., 2018) or exponential fits (Avanzi et al., 2021) with more flexible smooth functions that better capture nonlinear relationships; and second, by providing a more detailed representation of seasonal variability through monthly correction functions, rather than a simple separation into summer and winter conditions (Herrnegger et al., 2018)

### 3.3 Precipitation Climatologies

Figure 8 shows the precipitation climatologies for 1991-2020 without undercatch correction (Fig. 8a) and with (Fig. 8b) undercatch correction, their absolute difference (Fig. 8c), all in mm/year, and their ratio (Fig. 8d). Undercatch correction leads to a domain-wide increase in precipitation, with a mean increase of 110.5 mm/year across the full domain. The largest absolute increases occur in the alpine regions of western Austria, where precipitation increases locally exceed 1500 mm/year, corresponding to a correction factor of 1.9. The maximum undercatch corrected annual precipitation exceeds 4000 mm/year, representing an increase of approximately 47 % compared to the uncorrected maximum of 2726.9 mm/year.


Figure 9 shows the local precipitation lapse rates of the undercatch corrected precipitation climatology on a 9 km x 9 km basis in % per 100 m elevation gain. These lapse rates serve as a plausibility check of the corrected data. Grid cells shown in white were masked because the local elevation range was insufficient for a meaningful calculation (less than 500 m), or because fewer than half of the 81 grid cells within the window contained valid data. Figure 9 highlights that the highest



**Figure 8.** Precipitation climatologies (1991-2020) of a) uncorrected b) undercatch corrected and precipitation amounts. Panel c) shows their absolute difference and d) their fraction. The first three panels are given in mm/year, the last is dimensionless. The mean, maximum and minimum values per panel are given in the text boxes.

lapse rates, reaching up to 11.3 %/At the highest elevations, lapse rates plateau and locally decrease (yellow colors), which is a direct consequence of the exposed terrain penalty. The mean precipitation increase across Austrian stations is approximately 33 mm per 100 m, corresponding to around 3 % per 100 m when normalized by the mean precipitation of our study domain (Fig. 8a). This is slightly lower than the mean lapse rate of 4.0 % per 100 m ,occur in the shown in Fig. 9, but remains within a plausible range when taking into account the strong corrections in the alpine regions. Since precipitation lapse rates are spatially diverse and vary across the Alpine region due to slope and shielding effects modifying the precipitation-elevation relationship (Frei and Schär, 1998; Dura et al., 2024), individual grid cells are difficult to verify directly. Enhanced lapse rates in regions of strong orographic lifting north of the Alpine main ridge, including the area where the maximum value occurs, appear plausible. However, the high values found in the comparatively dry deep valleys of western Austria. At the highest elevations, lapse rates plateau and locally decrease (yellow colors, ranging between 7 and 10 % per 100 m, may indicate local overestimation. This interpretation is supported by comparing these values with the lapse rates between the stations Innsbruck Flughafen and Patscherkofel (see Fig. A in the Supplement), which is a direct consequence of the exposed terrain penalty are located in close proximity to each other at a valley floor and a mountain crest. Based on transfer-function undercatch-corrected mean annual precipitation, this station pair yields an average annual lapse rate of 4.1 % per 100 m, considerably lower than the highest local values in the gridded field.






**Figure 9.** Local precipitation lapse rates of the undercatch corrected precipitation climatology in %/100 m on a 9 x 9 km basis. Gray areas mark no or too little surrounding data, whereas white areas show too flat regions for reasonable calculations (less than 500 m elevation range). Mean, maximum and minimum values are given in the text box.

The monthly climatologies, averaged for the full domain and the study regions (see Fig. 1), are shown in Fig. 10a. Undercatch  
 410 corrected precipitation is displayed as solid lines, while uncorrected data ~~is~~ shown as dashed lines. Fig. 10b shows the fraction  
 of corrected and uncorrected monthly precipitation. The strongest relative increase occurs during the winter months. Both high-  
 alpine study regions exhibit a similar annual precipitation increase of approximately 29 %, reflecting their comparable elevation  
 distributions, while the domain-wide mean increase amounts to 10.6 %. A pronounced peak is visible in November in the case  
 study climatology, even though the correction factor of approximately 1.6 is similar to the December value. This peak is caused  
 415 by individual strong months in the precipitation climatology, especially November 2019 with values of 520 mm/month (280  
 mm/month) in Kölnbrein (Schlegeis), compared to the climatological average of 139 mm/month (106 mm/month). The summer  
 months are only marginally corrected in all cases. ~~It is notable that the seasonality~~ Most notably, the correction substantially  
alters the seasonal structure of precipitation in the two high-alpine study regions ~~is heavily altered~~. While the uncorrected data  
~~shows a clear~~ exhibits a clear summer precipitation peak in ~~summer for~~ both regions, which is generally in line with findings  
 420 in alpine regions (Frei and Schär, 1998), the corrected data shows a ~~similar or even comparable or~~ higher precipitation peak in  
 winter, ~~while with~~ spring and autumn ~~show the lowest precipitation.~~

receiving the least precipitation. Analogous seasonality shifts driven by severe undercatch have been reported at wind-prone  
sites in the Rocky Mountains (Pan et al., 2016), and high-alpine hydrological studies in the Alps have reached similar conclusions (Pulka et al.  
. However, a reversal of the dominant summer precipitation peak in Alpine catchments represents a novel finding of this study,  
 425 making the plausibility of the corrected winter precipitation a central focus of the hydrological validation in the following  
section.

After initial hydrological validations showed an overestimation of runoff and snow depth likely caused by a too high  
 precipitation correction, an exposed terrain penalty (ETP) is introduced to reduce the precipitation in exposed orography (Fig.  
 3). The application of the GAM-derived factors and the ETP produces the undercatch corrected precipitation climatologies  
 430 in Fig. 8. The ETP ~~tackles-addresses~~ multiple uncertainties at once: ~~we reduce the it reduces the potential~~ over-correction  
 of the undercatch transfer function ~~as stated by Kochendorfer et al. (2017a), while simultaneously mitigating and mitigates~~



**Figure 10.** a) Monthly precipitation climatologies (1991-2020) for the full domain (red) and the study regions Kölnbrein (green) and Schlegeis (blue), both undercatch corrected (solid) and uncorrected (dashed) in mm/year and b) their fraction. Yearly average precipitation sums are given in the legend.

the influence of ~~totalizers, which generally have different precipitation measurement errors and dominate the totalizers~~ in the base precipitation data, which dominate interpolation results in ~~the high-alpine terrain in the base precipitation data~~ (Hiebl and Frei, 2018) (Hiebl and Frei, 2018) but generally exhibit lower precipitation measurement errors (Grossi et al., 2017).

435 . The precipitation lapse rates (Fig. 9) consequently show the steepest increase starting at slopes close to valley floors and plateau at the highest peaks, mimicking ~~a behavior described in literature (Jiang, 2003; Wolff et al., 2015; Gnann et al., 2025)~~ potential flow blocking and moisture depletion (Jiang, 2003; Houze, 2012; Gnann et al., 2025). However, this indicates that some processes in high-alpine, ~~wind-exposed terrains are not captured well~~ wind-exposed terrain are not fully captured by the transfer function ~~and highlight the requirement for further research especially targeting complex terrain, either because~~

440 ~~the proposed relationship for the change in catch efficiency is modified by the complex, turbulence-inducing terrain, or the wind speed measurement is not representative of the conditions at the gauge orifice~~. We therefore conclude that the undercatch correction ~~shows~~ carries the greatest uncertainty at the highest peaks ~~and that further research specifically targeting precipitation undercatch processes in complex terrain is needed~~.


### 3.4 Hydrological Validation

445 In the following section, the hydrological validation of the undercatch corrected precipitation across different processes and spatial scales is presented. We first evaluate the high-alpine case study regions, where the undercatch errors are expected to be more pronounced and the discrepancies between observed and simulated water balance components (reservoir inflow, snow pack accumulation, glacier mass changes) are especially high. Then the Austrian wide COSERO results will be examined with a focus on runoff quantities.

450 Fig. 11 shows the COSERO simulation results for the two high-alpine reservoir basins Kölnbrein (Fig. 11a, period 2015-2022) and Schlegeis (Fig. 11b, period 2012-2022) as long-term cumulative water balances. The individual components are displayed for simulations using uncorrected (dashed) and undercatch corrected (solid) precipitation input and compared against the observed reservoir inflow (black solid line). Both study regions show substantial improvements in closing the water balance when using the undercatch corrected precipitation. The runoff deficits of 24 % in Kölnbrein (2082 mm/year observed runoff) and 20 % in Schlegeis (1926 mm/year observed runoff) are reduced to less than 1 % for both study regions (2102 mm/year simulated for Kölnbrein and 1988 mm/year simulated for Schlegeis), while glacier melt and evapotranspiration are not altered considerably and remain within realistic magnitudes. Runoff is only displayed for days with valid runoff records, since the observed timeseries contain missing values. The total simulated runoff is slightly higher (2121 mm/year for Kölnbrein and 2189 mm/year for Schlegeis). The average monthly water balance components are provided in Supplement A and highlight the

455 and 20 % in Schlegeis (1926 mm/year observed runoff) are reduced to less than 1 % for both study regions (2102 mm/year simulated for Kölnbrein and 1988 mm/year simulated for Schlegeis), while glacier melt and evapotranspiration are not altered considerably and remain within realistic magnitudes. Runoff is only displayed for days with valid runoff records, since the observed timeseries contain missing values. The total simulated runoff is slightly higher (2121 mm/year for Kölnbrein and 2189 mm/year for Schlegeis). The average monthly water balance components are provided in Supplement A and highlight the

460 improved runoff simulation in the summer months.




**Figure 11.** COSERO runoff simulation results, as well as observed runoff, displayed as the cumulative water balance for the high-alpine study regions a) Kölnbrein and b) Schlegeis. Solid lines refer to the simulation results using undercatch corrected data, while dashed lines refer to results using uncorrected precipitation input. \*The runoff is only considered for timesteps with valid runoff observations.

Next, we present the validation of snowpack and glacier mass balance modeling with Alpine3D in the two high-alpine case study areas. Figure 12 compares snow depth on May 10<sup>th</sup> 2021 derived from the WorldView-2 stereo satellite (Fig. 12c) with the simulated snow depth by Alpine3D using uncorrected (Fig. 12a) and undercatch corrected (Fig. 12b) input data. Figure 12d displays the snow depth distribution of individual grid cells as boxplots. The modeled snow depth on May 10<sup>th</sup> 2021 is

465 severely underestimated when using uncorrected precipitation data, with a median (mean) bias of -0.87 m (-0.78 m). The use of corrected precipitation data leads to a lower, positive bias of 0.15 m (0.30 m). While the median (mean) simulated and


observed snow depths are similar, the range of simulated values (Fig. 12d) shows a larger spread and includes higher values. However, the overall pattern is captured well with a clear elevation-dependent distribution of snow depths, particularly for the undercatch corrected variant.



**Figure 12.** Comparison of satellite-derived and modeled snow depths on May 10<sup>th</sup> 2021 in the Kölnbrein study region. Displayed is the snow depth in m from Alpine3D modeling results using a) uncorrected precipitation and b) undercatch corrected input data and c) derived from the WorldView-2 stereo satellite image. Spatial mean and median are given in the text boxes. Shaded reliefs are used as background. The violet (orange) area shows the grid cells covered by glaciers (the reservoir). Panel d) shows a comparison of the spatial variability. The whiskers correspond to the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentile. Outliers are displayed as dots.

470 Additionally, the SCA in the Kölnbrein catchment is analyzed during the melting period at different timestamps in 2021. The percentage of SCA based on Sentinel-2 images is compared to the Alpine3D simulations with corrected and uncorrected precipitation input data, as visible in Fig. 13. The SCA of the uncorrected (red) simulation consistently underestimates the SCA observed by Sentinel-2 (black), indicating a too early melt out, i.e. an underestimation of snow amounts. While the undercatch corrected (blue) simulation is closer to the observation throughout all dates, it slightly overestimated the satellite

475 SCA, indicating a too late melt-out in some grid cells, i.e. an overestimation of snow amounts. However, this temporal SCA analysis shows that applying the undercatch corrected precipitation data for the snowpack simulation overall leads to more realistic snow accumulation and melting behavior in 2021. A spatial representation of snow-cover at all four dates, as well as detailed performance metrics, are given in Supplement A.




**Figure 13.** Comparison of SCA (%) in the Kölnbrein catchment derived from Sentinel-2 satellite observations and Alpine3D simulations for different dates in the snow-melting period 2021. Compared are Sentinel satellite observations (black), undercatch corrected simulations (blue) and uncorrected simulations (red).

These validations show that the uncorrected precipitation product leads to insufficient snow amounts in the Kölnbrein catchment, as shown exemplarily for 2021 by the underestimation of snow height on May 10<sup>th</sup> and underestimated SCAs during the melting period. Hence, by undercatch correcting the precipitation (especially in winter months), the simulation of snow melt timing is improved, which in turn leads to an improved fit between simulated and observed runoff (see Supplement A). The amount of snow and the timing of snow melt subsequently affect the glacier mass balance by determining the date when bare ice first appears and starts to melt. Fig. 14 shows the glacier volume change of all glaciers with a surface area greater than 1 km<sup>2</sup> located in the more heavily glaciated Schlegeis study region for the period 2000-2023 (for details on the selected glaciers see Supplement A). The Alpine3D simulations are compared to the average volume change (black line) of the same glaciers between 2000 and 2019 derived by Hugonnet et al. (2021), which amounts to a loss of -0.21 km<sup>3</sup> (or -0.011 km<sup>3</sup>/year). The undercatch corrected data (blue line) shows good agreement with the reference data, while the uncorrected precipitation data (red line) leads to too high volume loss. This indicates that an insufficient amount of solid precipitation is covering the glaciers, resulting in a too early onset of ice melt.

After examining the effects of using the undercatch corrected precipitation data in the case study regions, the product is examined across Austria. Figure 15 shows the calibration results of the COSERO simulations across Austria. Displayed is the bias

$$\beta = \frac{\overline{Q}_{\text{sim}}}{\overline{Q}_{\text{obs}}}, \quad (6)$$



**Figure 14.** Simulated total glacier volume change for glaciers with a surface area above  $1 \text{ km}^2$  in the Schlegeis study region in  $\text{km}^3$  from 2000-2023. The undercatch corrected (blue) and uncorrected (red) Alpine3D simulation is compared to the average volume change of the selected glaciers between 2000-2019 as published by Hugonnet et al. (2021), which amounts to a loss of  $-0.011 \text{ km}^3/\text{year}$  between 2000 and 2019.


495 which is the fraction of the long-term simulated and observed mean runoff in the calibration period. The two upper panels display  $\beta$  for simulations using uncorrected (Fig. 15a) and undercatch corrected (Fig. 15b) precipitation input. The uncorrected simulation shows distinct spatial heterogeneities, with the expected runoff underestimation in catchments along the Alpine main ridge. An overestimation can be seen in low-lying catchments in the south, east and north-east. After applying the undercatch correction (Fig. 15b), especially the catchments along the Alpine main ridge are improved, indicated by  $\beta \approx 1$ ,  
500 while catchments that already show values of  $\beta > 1$  for uncorrected precipitation naturally show similar biases when applying the undercatch correction. The water balance in these catchments is characterized by high evapotranspiration rates and low precipitation amounts, leading to low annual runoff sums of only a few 100 mm per year or even less. This means that already slight deviations from the observed values lead to poor goodness-of-fit measures, and in this case an overestimation in  $\beta$ . This can also be seen in Fig. 15c, where  $\beta$  is displayed across different elevation bands. The catchments in elevations below 1000  
505 m show median  $\beta$  values above 1 both before and after the correction, and show the overall highest  $\beta$  outliers with values above 4. On the other hand, a significant improvement can be seen for the 39 catchments above 2000 m, where  $\beta$  values are notably below 1 before the correction. Median  $\beta$  values in catchments between 1500 and 2000 m increase from slightly below 1 to slightly above 1. For the entire modeling domain, the median  $\beta$  improves from 1.13 to 1.09 when using the undercatch corrected precipitation input. At first glance, this may appear counterintuitive, as increasing precipitation inputs would be  
510 expected to increase simulated runoff and thus  $\beta$ . This behavior stems from the simultaneous calibration approach: when optimizing a single objective function (runoff) across the spatially heterogeneous domain with uncorrected inputs, the algorithm compensates for precipitation deficits in alpine catchments by reducing evapotranspiration rates. While this compensation

improves fit in alpine regions, it also exacerbates runoff overestimation in low-lying basins where precipitation deficits are less pronounced. The undercatch correction eliminates this artificial compensation mechanism, yielding more physically consistent water balance estimates and parameter sets across the elevation bands.

Similar figures for two other measures of goodness-of-fit, the Kling–Gupta Efficiency (Gupta et al., 2009) and the Nash–Sutcliffe Efficiency (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970), can be found in Supplement A. Both metrics show not only improved median performance (NSE: from 0.50 to 0.54, KGE: from 0.55 to 0.62), but also substantial reduction in the lower tail of the performance distribution, indicating fewer poorly performing catchments. Precipitation and evapotranspiration per elevation band for both model runs are provided in Supplement A. The undercatch correction increases precipitation inputs in all elevation bands above 1000 m, while precipitation below 1000 m remains largely unchanged. Correspondingly, actual evapotranspiration increases across all elevation zones when using corrected precipitation, reflecting the elimination of artificial ET suppression that previously compensated for input deficits during calibration.

The Austrian-wide COSERO model was independently validated for the period 1980–2000. Using undercatch-corrected precipitation results in slightly improved median performance, with  $\beta$  values of 1.08 (uncorrected) and 1.07 (corrected), NSE values of 0.52 and 0.54, and KGE values of 0.60 and 0.65, respectively. Elevation-dependent validation metrics are provided in Supplement A. Consistent with the calibration results, improvements are most pronounced in high-elevation catchments, where NSE and KGE distributions shift towards higher values and fewer poorly performing basins are observed.

Overall, the hydrological validation across Austria (Fig. 15) shows an improvement in model biases in alpine catchments when using the undercatch corrected precipitation input. This is demonstrated in the two case study regions by (1) closing the long-term water balance (Fig. 11), (2) improving severe negative mean and median biases in snow depth modeling (Fig. 12), (3) improved representation of snow melt out behavior (Fig. 13), and (4) more realistic glacier volume changes (Fig. 14). The Austrian-wide COSERO simulations show the same elevation-dependent results, with the undercatch correction leading to improved simulation in catchments above 2000 m (Fig. 15 ). Poor model performance is evident in both the uncorrected and corrected runs for lower-elevation catchments in the south, east, and north-east. This issue could be attributed to: (1) inaccurate precipitation in the base data set (Hiebl and Frei, 2018), (2) shortcomings in the hydrological model and/or its calibration, or (3) shortcomings in the observed runoff data. We assume that the uncertainties related to (3) are on average low, since the data is quality controlled. Therefore, the observed runoff data likely provides reliable information on catchment processes and can be used to diagnose the remaining potential sources of error, namely the model structure/calibration (2) or the precipitation input (1). Runoff overestimation occurs in two distinct regions. First, in southern Austria along the Gail and Drau (Drava) rivers and their tributaries, which exhibit pluvial-nival regimes with spring maxima (April) and secondary winter peaks (November). This spatial bias cannot be attributed to regime type alone, as the model performs well for catchments with similar regimes in the northern Alpine foothills (e.g., Danube tributaries Ybbs, Erlauf, and Pielach). The overestimation in the south likely reflects either regional biases in the base gridded precipitation dataset (Hiebl and Frei, 2018), unresolved spatial processes during GAM training, or distinct weather regimes affecting northern versus southern Austria (Haslinger et al., 2025) (Bozzoli et al., 2024; Haslinger et al., 2025). Signed distance to the Alpine main ridge was not selected as a predictor during model development, which suggests that the north-south differences may stem from atmospheric processes that cannot be



**Figure 15.** Runoff bias  $\beta$  for the calibrated subcatchments of the Austrian-wide COSERO model, for simulations using a) uncorrected and b) undercatch corrected precipitation, as well as c) separated into elevation bands. The black outline in panel a) and b) shows the subcatchment borders. Numbers in parentheses in panel c) indicate the number of catchments within each elevation band. Whiskers represent 1.5 times the interquartile range, and outliers are shown as dots.

adequately represented by topographic variables alone. The second region with systematic runoff overestimation covers the eastern and northeastern catchments along the Raab and Thaya rivers and their tributaries. These lowland areas exhibit pluvial regimes with a single runoff peak in early spring (March), low annual runoff totals, high air temperatures, and consequently high evapotranspiration rates. The poor model performance in these catchments likely stems from multiple compounding factors: (i) the simultaneous domain-wide calibration strategy inadequately captures the distinct hydrological behavior of these



low-gradient systems, particularly their flashy response characteristics and actual evapotranspiration; and (iii) observational uncertainty is highest in these catchments due to measurement challenges at low flow volumes, potentially providing unreliable calibration targets. Runoff underestimation is evident in basins located in the central regions of Austria, north of the Alpine main ridge. This is plausible given that these are karstic regions where orographic catchment boundaries do not necessarily coincide with hydrological catchment boundaries, and underground flow paths may be neglected in the model. Additionally, natural or anthropogenic diversions may not be adequately represented in the model structure despite careful consideration, potentially causing discrepancies between observed and modeled runoff.

Two further sources of overall uncertainty merit discussion. First, actual evapotranspiration (ETA) is difficult to validate due to the scarcity of measurements, particularly at the regional scale. COSERO estimates potential evapotranspiration (ETP) using the Thornthwaite method (Thornthwaite and Mather, 1957) and calculates actual evapotranspiration from interception and soil storage, as well as snow sublimation. In the calibration process, ETA is not constrained, meaning it may be adjusted to close the water balance and improve the objective function, potentially resulting in implausible values. While we verified that spatial patterns and approximate quantities fall within a plausible range, uncertainties remain. Future research could address this by constraining ETA using satellite-derived products such as the Global Land Evaporation Amsterdam Model (GLEAM, Miralles et al., 2011). Second, the strong topographic and hydrological heterogeneities across Austria likely prevent a simultaneous, all-in-one calibration routine from identifying optimal parameters for every region, potentially leading to poor performance in some catchments. Using an optimization routine that relates model parameters to landscape properties, thereby retaining physical process realism (e.g. Samaniego et al. (2017); Feigl et al. (2022)), could be a topic for further research.

### 3.5 Limitations

Overall, the proposed methodology for generating undercatch-corrected gridded precipitation performs well across Austria. Nevertheless, several limitations remain and should be considered when interpreting the results:

- The undercatch transfer function from Kochendorfer et al. (2017a) showed reduced accuracy in precipitation measurement at the only high-alpine calibration station in their study. This indicates limited applicability of the catch efficiency function in Austria's high-alpine complex orography. This necessitated the introduction of the exposed terrain penalty in our study and highlights the need for further research to better understand processes influencing precipitation undercatch in high-alpine terrain.
- Several snow-related processes are not explicitly considered at the 250 m or 1000 m grid resolution, including wind-driven snow redistribution and ablation (Mott et al., 2018), blowing snow sublimation (Vionnet et al., 2014; Sigmund et al., 2025), and canopy-snow interactions (Hedstrom and Pomeroy, 1998). While these processes may contribute to precipitation uncertainty, they are neglected in this study.
- The base precipitation dataset combines measurements from tipping buckets and ~~totalizers~~ totalizers (Hiebl and Frei, 2018), which exhibit different undercatch characteristics. Since ~~totalizers show less undercatch~~ totalizers show smaller measurement errors than tipping buckets (Grossi et al., 2017), regions with high ~~totalizer~~ totalizer weights in the spatial

interpolation receive inflated precipitation values after undercatch correction, resulting in localized overestimations. This affects the dataset used in this study and manifests as maximum values exceeding 4000 mm/year in individual grid cells.

- The hydrological validation revealed potential limitations and inaccuracies in the base precipitation data (Hiebl and Frei, 2018), particularly in southern Austria near the border. Future versions of this data set may benefit from including these findings for specific regions with larger offsets.
- The methodology is suitable for climate model data only if it was bias-adjusted using uncorrected station-based historical data. Through bias adjustment, the undercatch errors of the observations are propagated into future projections, allowing the use of the same undercatch corrections derived in this study. These correction factors should consequently not be applied to raw climate projection data.
- Beyond precipitation uncertainty, additional sources of error include other meteorological driver data, potential model structural errors in both COSERO and Alpine3D, and uncertainties in the reference datasets used for validation. While results demonstrate clear improvements from undercatch correction, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility of obtaining correct results through compensating errors, particularly in high-alpine catchments.

## 4 Conclusions

In this study, we demonstrate that retrospective correction of commonly used gridded precipitation data for undercatch errors is essential for accurate hydrological modeling in high-alpine regions. We present a reproducible methodology that combines meteorological station observations, an established undercatch transfer function, and Generalized Additive Models informed by terrain characteristics. This approach resulted in publicly available undercatch correction factors (Maier et al., 2025), which were subsequently used to derive a novel precipitation climatology for Austria and adjacent headwater catchments that explicitly accounts for precipitation undercatch at the station level. The undercatch corrected precipitation data was extensively validated using hydrological and snowpack simulations across a range of spatial and temporal scales, hydrological processes, and elevation bands. The results show that undercatch correction is particularly critical for snow-hydrological modeling and other applications in high-alpine terrain, where uncorrected precipitation leads to systematic biases and reduced agreement with observations. Incorporating undercatch correction substantially improves the consistency between simulated and observed runoff, snow cover, and glacier mass changes. Despite these improvements, remaining uncertainties — especially in wind-exposed and highly complex mountain terrain — highlight the need for further research into precipitation undercatch processes.

~~We~~

The framework presented here is generalizable and can be reproduced in other mountain regions, provided that the following requirements are met: i) comparable (high-elevation) station coverage, ii) sufficient observation quality, and iii) DEM and gridded precipitation data that adequately resolve the spatial scale of the underlying orography. The latter requirement is particularly important, as strongly smoothed DEMs can fail to represent small-scale topographic characteristics and may affect elevation-dependent precipitation estimates in complex high-alpine terrain (Weber et al., 2021). Where these conditions are

fulfilled, we encourage the application of the proposed methodology to other mountain regions and gridded precipitation datasets to advance the understanding of undercatch errors across diverse climatological and topographic settings. Future work should focus on evaluating alternative undercatch correction approaches systematically, in a similar structure as proposed by Aubry et al. (2025), for example by considering correction methods that rely on snowfall intensity rather than on air temperature. Further, greater emphasis should be placed on improving the physical representation of undercatch, for example, This could be achieved through advanced modeling approaches that couple Lagrangian precipitation frameworks models (e.g. Bakels et al., 2024) and moisture and precipitation tracking frameworks (e.g. Sodemann et al., 2008) with high-resolution snowpack simulations, as well as through enhanced experimental observations at high-elevation and exposed sites. Such developments are essential to further reduce uncertainty in alpine precipitation estimates and to improve the reliability of hydrological projections in a changing climate.

*Code availability.* The code for generating the plots, training the GAMs and applying the undercatch correction is available upon request.

630 *Data availability.* The station undercatch factors as well as the meta information of the stations, along with the monthly maps of undercatch factors and the complex orography penalty map is available publicly under Maier et al. (2025).

*Author contributions.* All authors contributed to conceptualization, methodology and validation of results; PM and CE wrote the manuscript draft and are responsible for data curation; PM, SL and CE ran the models, developed the software and carried out the data analysis; PM did the visualization; SL, TP, HF, FL, MH and FK reviewed and edited the manuscript; HF, MH and FK supervised the project and were responsible for funding acquisition.

635 *Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

*Acknowledgements.* The authors want to thank the Austrian Climate and Energy Fond for funding (funding number KR21KB0K00001), as well as the remaining team of the research project HyMELT-CC, from which this study originated. We further want to thank Sergi González Herrero for scientific input regarding undercatch transfer functions and Verbund AG for kindly providing the WorldView-2 stereo-satellite-derived snow depth image and runoff data in the case study areas. We further want to acknowledge, that we used AI tools to improve  
640 readability of the manuscript, find additional literature, and streamline the software development process.

## References

- Adam, J. C., Clark, E. A., Lettenmaier, D. P., and Wood, E. F.: Correction of Global Precipitation Products for Orographic Effects, *Journal of Climate*, 19, 15–38, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI3604.1>, 2006.
- Allen, R. G., ed.: Crop evapotranspiration: guidelines for computing crop water requirements, no. 56 in FAO irrigation and drainage paper, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, repr edn., 2000.
- Alonso-González, E., Aalstad, K., Pirk, N., Mazzolini, M., Treichler, D., Leclercq, P., Westermann, S., López-Moreno, J. I., and Gascoin, S.: Spatio-temporal information propagation using sparse observations in hyper-resolution ensemble-based snow data assimilation, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 27, 4637–4659, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-27-4637-2023>, 2023.
- Arjdal, K., Driouech, F., Vignon, É., Chérut, F., Manzanar, R., Drobinski, P., Chehbouni, A., and Idelkadi, A.: Future of land surface water availability over the Mediterranean basin and North Africa: Analysis and synthesis from the CMIP6 exercise, *Atmospheric Science Letters*, 24, e1180, <https://doi.org/10.1002/asl.1180>, 2023.
- Aubry, C., Bélair, S., Thériault, J. M., Mekis, E., Feng, P.-N., Lespinas, F., Khedhaouiria, D., and Beaudry, F.: Impacts of Adjusting Solid Precipitation Amounts in the Canadian Precipitation Analysis System, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 64, 745–760, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-24-0083.1>, 2025.
- Avanzi, F., Ercolani, G., Gabellani, S., Cremonese, E., Pogliotti, P., Filippa, G., Morra Di Cella, U., Ratto, S., Stevenin, H., Cauduro, M., and Juglair, S.: Learning about precipitation lapse rates from snow course data improves water balance modeling, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 25, 2109–2131, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-2109-2021>, 2021.
- Bakels, L., Tatsii, D., Tipka, A., Thompson, R., Dütsch, M., Blaschek, M., Seibert, P., Baier, K., Bucci, S., Cassiani, M., Eckhardt, S., Groot Zwaafink, C., Henne, S., Kaufmann, P., Lechner, V., Maurer, C., Mulder, M. D., Pisso, I., Plach, A., Subramanian, R., Vojta, M., and Stohl, A.: FLEXPART version 11: improved accuracy, efficiency, and flexibility, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 17, 7595–7627, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-17-7595-2024>, 2024.
- Barros, A. P. and Arulraj, M.: Remote Sensing of Orographic Precipitation, in: *Satellite Precipitation Measurement*, edited by Levizzani, V., Kidd, C., Kirschbaum, D. B., Kummerow, C. D., Nakamura, K., and Turk, F. J., vol. 69, pp. 559–582, Springer International Publishing, Cham, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35798-6\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35798-6_6), 2020.
- Bergström, S.: The HBV model, in: Singh, V.P. (Ed.): *Computer Models of Watershed Hydrology*, pp. 443–476, Water Resources Publications, Highland Ranch CO, USA, 1992.
- Bica, B., Herrnegger, M., Kann, A., and Nachtnebel, H. P.: HYDROCAST – Enhanced estimation of areal rainfall by combining a meteorological nowcasting system with a hydrological model, Final Report, Austrian Academy of Science, Vienna, 2011.
- BMLUK: eHYD, <https://ehyd.gv.at/>, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Climate and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management, 2025.
- Bohnenstengel, S. I., Schlünzen, K., and Beyrich, F.: Representativity of in situ precipitation measurements – A case study for the LITFASS area in North-Eastern Germany, *Journal of Hydrology*, 400, 387–395, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2011.01.052>, 2011.
- Bozzoli, M., Crespi, A., Matiu, M., Majone, B., Giovannini, L., Zardi, D., Brugnara, Y., Bozzo, A., Berro, D. C., Mercalli, L., and Bertoldi, G.: Long-term snowfall trends and variability in the Alps, *International Journal of Climatology*, 44, 4571–4591, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.8597>, 2024.
- Breiman, L.: Random Forests, *Machine Learning*, 45, 5–32, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>, 2001.

- Bührlé, L. J., Marty, M., Eberhard, L. A., Stoffel, A., Hafner, E. D., and Bühler, Y.: Spatially continuous snow depth mapping by aeroplane photogrammetry for annual peak of winter from 2017 to 2021 in open areas, *The Cryosphere*, 17, 3383–3408, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-17-3383-2023>, 2023.
- 680 Climente-González, H., Azencott, C.-A., Kaski, S., and Yamada, M.: Block HSIC Lasso: model-free biomarker detection for ultra-high dimensional data, *Bioinformatics*, 35, i427–i435, <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz333>, 2019.
- Colli, M., Rasmussen, R., Thériault, J. M., Lanza, L. G., Baker, C. B., and Kochendorfer, J.: An Improved Trajectory Model to Evaluate the Collection Performance of Snow Gauges, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 54, 1826–1836, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-15-0035.1>, 2015.
- 685 Colli, M., Stagnaro, M., Lanza, L. G., Rasmussen, R., and Thériault, J. M.: Adjustments for Wind-Induced Undercatch in Snowfall Measurements Based on Precipitation Intensity, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 21, 1039–1050, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-19-0222.1>, 2020.
- Cornes, R. C., Van Der Schrier, G., Van Den Besselaar, E. J. M., and Jones, P. D.: An Ensemble Version of the E-OBS Temperature and Precipitation Data Sets, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 123, 9391–9409, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2017JD028200>, 2018.
- 690 Duan, Q., Sorooshian, S., and Gupta, V.: Effective and efficient global optimization for conceptual rainfall-runoff models, *Water Resources Research*, 28, 1015–1031, <https://doi.org/10.1029/91WR02985>, 1992.
- Duan, Q. Y., Gupta, V. K., and Sorooshian, S.: Shuffled complex evolution approach for effective and efficient global minimization, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 76, 501–521, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00939380>, 1993.
- Dura, V., Evin, G., Favre, A.-C., and Penot, D.: Spatial variability in the seasonal precipitation lapse rates in complex topographical regions – application in France, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 28, 2579–2601, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-28-2579-2024>, 2024.
- 695 Ebert, E. E., Janowiak, J. E., and Kidd, C.: Comparison of Near-Real-Time Precipitation Estimates from Satellite Observations and Numerical Models, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 88, 47–64, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-88-1-47>, 2007.
- European Environment Agency: CORINE Land Cover 2018 (raster 100 m), Europe, 6-yearly - version 2020\_20u1, May 2020, <https://doi.org/10.2909/960998C1-1870-4E82-8051-6485205EBBAC>, 2019.
- 700 Feigl, M., Thober, S., Schwappe, R., Herrnegger, M., Samaniego, L., and Schulz, K.: Automatic Regionalization of Model Parameters for Hydrological Models, *Water Resources Research*, 58, e2022WR031966, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022WR031966>, 2022.
- Ferrarin, L., Schulz, K., Bocchiola, D., and Koch, F.: Enhancing snow depth estimation with snow cover geometrical descriptors, *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 13, <https://doi.org/doi:10.3389/feart.2025.1672558>, accepted, 2025.
- Fick, S. E. and Hijmans, R. J.: WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas, *International Journal of*
- 705 *Climatology*, 37, 4302–4315, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.5086>, 2017.
- Filippucci, P., Brocca, L., Ciabatta, L., Mosaffa, H., Avanzi, F., and Massari, C.: Development of HYPER-P: HYdroclimatic PERFORMANCE-enhanced Precipitation at 1 km/daily over the Europe-Mediterranean region from 2007 to 2022, *Earth System Science Data*, 17, 5221–5258, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-17-5221-2025>, 2025.
- Ford, C. M., Kendall, A. D., and Hyndman, D. W.: Effects of shifting snowmelt regimes on the hydrology of non-alpine temperate landscapes, *Journal of Hydrology*, 590, 125517, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125517>, 2020.
- 710 Formayer, H., Nadeem, I., Leidinger, D., Maier, P., Schöniger, F., Suna, D., Resch, G., Totschnig, G., and Lehner, F.: SECURES-Met: A European meteorological data set suitable for electricity modelling applications, *Scientific Data*, 10, 590, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02494-4>, 2023.

- Frei, C. and Schär, C.: A precipitation climatology of the Alps from high-resolution rain-gauge observations, *International Journal of Climatology*, 18, 873–900, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0088\(19980630\)18:8<873::AID-JOC255>3.0.CO;2-9](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0088(19980630)18:8<873::AID-JOC255>3.0.CO;2-9), 1998.
- Förster, K., Hanzer, F., Winter, B., Marke, T., and Strasser, U.: An open-source MEteoroLOgical observation time series DISaggregation Tool (MELODIST v0.1.1), *Geoscientific Model Development*, 9, 2315–2333, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-9-2315-2016>, 2016.
- Gampe, D. and Ludwig, R.: Evaluation of Gridded Precipitation Data Products for Hydrological Applications in Complex Topography, *Hydrology*, 4, 53, <https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology4040053>, 2017.
- Gascoin, S., Grizonnet, M., Bouchet, M., Salgues, G., and Hagolle, O.: Theia Snow collection: high-resolution operational snow cover maps from Sentinel-2 and Landsat-8 data, *Earth System Science Data*, 11, 493–514, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-493-2019>, 2019.
- Gentilucci, M., Bufalini, M., D’Aprile, F., Materazzi, M., and Pambianchi, G.: Comparison of Data from Rain Gauges and the IMERG Product to Analyse Precipitation in Mountain Areas of Central Italy, *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 10, 795, <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi10120795>, 2021.
- Geoland.at: Digitales Geländemodell (DGM) Österreich, <https://www.data.gv.at/datasets/d88a1246-9684-480b-a480-ff63286b35b7>, 2021.
- GeoSphere Austria: APOLIS, <https://www.zamg.ac.at/cms/de/forschung/klima/klimatografien/apolis>, 2013.
- GeoSphere Austria: Messstationen Zehnminutendaten v2, <https://doi.org/10.60669/8FYA-7X87>, 2024.
- Giroto, M., Formetta, G., Azimi, S., Bachand, C., Cowherd, M., De Lannoy, G., Lievens, H., Modanesi, S., Raleigh, M. S., Rigon, R., and Massari, C.: Identifying snowfall elevation patterns by assimilating satellite-based snow depth retrievals, *Science of The Total Environment*, 906, 167 312, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.167312>, 2024.
- Gnann, S., Baldwin, J. W., Cuthbert, M. O., Gleeson, T., Schwanghart, W., and Wagener, T.: The Influence of Topography on the Global Terrestrial Water Cycle, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 63, e2023RG000 810, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023RG000810>, 2025.
- Goodison, B. E., Louie, P. Y. T., and Yang, D.: WMO Solid Precipitation Measurement Intercomparison, Tech. Rep. 872, WMO/TD, <https://globalcryospherewatch.org/bestpractices/docs/WMOtd872.pdf>, 1998.
- Goudenhoofdt, E. and Delobbe, L.: Evaluation of radar-gauge merging methods for quantitative precipitation estimates, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 13, 195–203, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-13-195-2009>, 2009.
- Graf, M., Scherrer, S. C., Schwierz, C., Begert, M., Martius, O., Raible, C. C., and Brönnimann, S.: Near-surface mean wind in Switzerland: Climatology, climate model evaluation and future scenarios, *International Journal of Climatology*, 39, 4798–4810, <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6108>, 2019.
- Grossi, G., Lendvai, A., Peretti, G., and Ranzi, R.: Snow Precipitation Measured by Gauges: Systematic Error Estimation and Data Series Correction in the Central Italian Alps, *Water*, 9, 461, <https://doi.org/10.3390/w9070461>, 2017.
- Gupta, H. V., Kling, H., Yilmaz, K. K., and Martinez, G. F.: Decomposition of the mean squared error and NSE performance criteria: Implications for improving hydrological modelling, *Journal of Hydrology*, 377, 80–91, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.08.003>, 2009.
- Haeberli, W. and Beniston, M.: Climate Change and Its Impacts on Glaciers and Permafrost in the Alps, *Ambio*, 27, 258–265, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4314732>, 1998.
- Haiden, T., Kann, A., Wittmann, C., Pistotnik, G., Bica, B., and Gruber, C.: The Integrated Nowcasting through Comprehensive Analysis (INCA) System and Its Validation over the Eastern Alpine Region, *Weather and Forecasting*, 26, 166–183, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2010WAF2222451.1>, 2011.
- Haslinger, K., Breinl, K., Pavlin, L., Pistotnik, G., Bertola, M., Olefs, M., Greilinger, M., Schöner, W., and Blöschl, G.: Increasing hourly heavy rainfall in Austria reflected in flood changes, *Nature*, 639, 667–672, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-08647-2>, 2025.

- Hedrick, A. R., Marks, D., Havens, S., Robertson, M., Johnson, M., Sandusky, M., Marshall, H., Kormos, P. R., Bormann, K. J., and Painter, T. H.: Direct Insertion of NASA Airborne Snow Observatory-Derived Snow Depth Time Series Into the *iSnobal* Energy Balance Snow Model, *Water Resources Research*, 54, 8045–8063, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023190>, 2018.
- 755 Hedstrom, N. R. and Pomeroy, J. W.: Measurements and modelling of snow interception in the boreal forest, *Hydrological Processes*, 12, 1611–1625, [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1085\(199808/09\)12:10<1611::AID-HYP684>3.0.CO;2-4](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1085(199808/09)12:10<1611::AID-HYP684>3.0.CO;2-4), 1998.
- Henn, B., Newman, A. J., Livneh, B., Daly, C., and Lundquist, J. D.: An assessment of differences in gridded precipitation datasets in complex terrain, *Journal of Hydrology*, 556, 1205–1219, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2017.03.008>, 2018.
- Herrnegger, M., Nachtnebel, H. P., and Schulz, K.: From runoff to rainfall: inverse rainfall–runoff modelling in a high temporal resolution, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19, 4619–4639, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-4619-2015>, 2015a.
- 760 Herrnegger, M., Senoner, T., Klotz, D., Wesemann, J., Nachtnebel, H. P., and Schulz, K.: Rainfall-Runoff-Model COSERO Handbook, Tech. rep., BOKU University, Vienna, 2015b.
- Herrnegger, M., Senoner, T., and Nachtnebel, H.-P.: Adjustment of spatio-temporal precipitation patterns in a high Alpine environment, *Journal of Hydrology*, 556, 913–921, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.04.068>, 2018.
- 765 Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E., Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, G., De Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamborg, F., Villaume, S., and Thépaut, J.: The ERA5 global reanalysis, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146, 1999–2049, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>, 2020.
- 770 Hiebl, J. and Frei, C.: Daily temperature grids for Austria since 1961—concept, creation and applicability, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 124, 161–178, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-015-1411-4>, 2016.
- Hiebl, J. and Frei, C.: Daily precipitation grids for Austria since 1961—development and evaluation of a spatial dataset for hydroclimatic monitoring and modelling, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 132, 327–345, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-017-2093-x>, 2018.
- 775 Houze, R. A.: Orographic effects on precipitating clouds, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 50, 2011RG000365, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011RG000365>, 2012.
- Hugonnet, R., McNabb, R., Berthier, E., Menounos, B., Nuth, C., Girod, L., Farinotti, D., Huss, M., Dussaillant, I., Brun, F., and Kääb, A.: Accelerated global glacier mass loss in the early twenty-first century, *Nature*, 592, 726–731, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03436-z>, 2021.
- 780 Immerzeel, W. W., Wanders, N., Lutz, A. F., Shea, J. M., and Bierkens, M. F. P.: Reconciling high-altitude precipitation in the upper Indus basin with glacier mass balances and runoff, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19, 4673–4687, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-4673-2015>, 2015.
- Isotta, F. A., Begert, M., and Frei, C.: Long-Term Consistent Monthly Temperature and Precipitation Grid Data Sets for Switzerland Over the Past 150 Years, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124, 3783–3799, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD029910>, 2019.
- 785 Jiang, Q.: Moist dynamics and orographic precipitation, *Tellus A: Dynamic Meteorology and Oceanography*, 55, 301, <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusa.v55i4.14577>, 2003.
- Jiawei Zhuang, raphael dussin, David Huard, Pascal Bourgault, Anderson Banihirwe, Stephane Raynaud, Brewster Malevich, Martin Schupfner, Filipe, Charles Gauthier, Sam Levang, André Jüling, Mattia Almansì, RichardScottOZ, RondeauG, Stephan Rasp, Trevor



- James Smith, Ben Mares, Jemma Stachelek, Matthew Plough, Pierre, Ray Bell, Romain Caneill, and Xianxiang Li: pangeo-data/xESMF: v0.8.10, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4294774>, 2025.
- Judson, A. and Doesken, N.: Density of Freshly Fallen Snow in the Central Rocky Mountains, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 81, 1577–1587, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(2000\)081<1577:DOFFSI>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2000)081<1577:DOFFSI>2.3.CO;2), 2000.
- Kaltenboeck, R. and Steinheimer, M.: Radar-based severe storm climatology for Austrian complex orography related to vertical wind shear and atmospheric instability, *Atmospheric Research*, 158–159, 216–230, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2014.08.006>, 2015.
- 795 Karger, D. N., Lange, S., Hari, C., Reyer, C. P. O., Conrad, O., Zimmermann, N. E., and Frieler, K.: CHELSA-W5E5: daily 1 km meteorological forcing data for climate impact studies, *Earth System Science Data*, 15, 2445–2464, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-2445-2023>, 2023.
- Khanal, A. K., Delrieu, G., Cazenave, F., and Boudevillain, B.: Radar Remote Sensing of Precipitation in High Mountains: Detection and Characterization of Melting Layer in the Grenoble Valley, French Alps, *Atmosphere*, 10, 784, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos10120784>,  
800 2019.
- Kirchner, J. W.: Catchments as simple dynamical systems: Catchment characterization, rainfall-runoff modeling, and doing hydrology backward, *Water Resources Research*, 45, 2008WR006912, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008WR006912>, 2009.
- Kling, H., Fürst, J., and Nachtnebel, H. P.: Seasonal, spatially distributed modelling of accumulation and melting of snow for computing runoff in a long-term, large-basin water balance model, *Hydrological Processes*, 20, 2141–2156, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6203>, 2006.
- 805 Klingler, C., Schulz, K., and Herrnegger, M.: LamaH-CE: LARge-SaMPle DATA for Hydrology and Environmental Sciences for Central Europe, *Earth System Science Data*, 13, 4529–4565, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4529-2021>, 2021.
- Klisho, T., Laimighofer, J., Lehner, F., and Formayer, H.: High-resolution (250x250m) gridded daily mean wind speed dataset for Austria spanning from 1961 to 2023, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.13908273>, 2024.
- Koboltschnig, G. R. and Schöner, W.: The relevance of glacier melt in the water cycle of the Alps: the example of Austria, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 15, 2039–2048, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-15-2039-2011>, 2011.
- 810 Koch, F., Prasch, M., Bach, H., Mauser, W., Appel, F., and Weber, M.: How Will Hydroelectric Power Generation Develop under Climate Change Scenarios? A Case Study in the Upper Danube Basin, *Energies*, 4, 1508–1541, <https://doi.org/10.3390/en4101508>, 2011.
- Koch, F., Gascoin, S., Achmüller, K., Schattan, P., Wetzel, K., Deschamps-Berger, C., Lehning, M., Rehm, T., Schulz, K., and Voigt, C.: Superconducting Gravimeter Observations Show That a Satellite-Derived Snow Depth Image Improves the Simulation of the Snow Water Equivalent Evolution in a High Alpine Site, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 51, e2024GL112483, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024GL112483>,  
815 2024.
- Kochendorfer, J., Nitu, R., Wolff, M., Mekis, E., Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Earle, M. E., Reverdin, A., Wong, K., Smith, C. D., Yang, D., Roulet, Y.-A., Buisan, S., Laine, T., Lee, G., Aceituno, J. L. C., Alastrué, J., Isaksen, K., Meyers, T., Brækkan, R., Landolt, S., Jachcik, A., and Poikonen, A.: Analysis of single-Alter-shielded and unshielded measurements of mixed and solid precipitation from WMO-SPICE, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 21, 3525–3542, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-3525-2017>, 2017a.
- 820 Kochendorfer, J., Rasmussen, R., Wolff, M., Baker, B., Hall, M. E., Meyers, T., Landolt, S., Jachcik, A., Isaksen, K., Brækkan, R., and Leeper, R.: The quantification and correction of wind-induced precipitation measurement errors, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 21, 1973–1989, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-1973-2017>, 2017b.
- Kochendorfer, J., Nitu, R., Wolff, M., Mekis, E., Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Earle, M. E., Reverdin, A., Wong, K., Smith, C. D., Yang, D.,  
825 Roulet, Y.-A., Meyers, T., Buisan, S., Isaksen, K., Brækkan, R., Landolt, S., and Jachcik, A.: Testing and development of transfer functions

- for weighing precipitation gauges in WMO-SPICE, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 22, 1437–1452, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-22-1437-2018>, 2018.
- Kochendorfer, J., Earle, M. E., Hodyss, D., Reverdin, A., Roulet, Y.-A., Nitu, R., Rasmussen, R., Landolt, S., Buisán, S., and Laine, T.: Undercatch Adjustments for Tipping-Bucket Gauge Measurements of Solid Precipitation, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 21, 1193–1205, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-19-0256.1>, 2020.
- Kovács, L.: Feature selection algorithms in generalized additive models under concavity, *Computational Statistics*, 39, 461–493, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-022-01292-7>, 2024.
- Lehner, F., Klisho, T., and Formayer, H.: BioClim Austria: Gridded climate indicators for 1961-1990 and 1991-2020 at 250m resolution, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.10887293>, 2024.
- 835 Lehner, F., Maier, P., Klisho, T., and Formayer, H.: FORSITE-Clim Europe: European-wide climate indicators for historical periods and climate projections at high resolution, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14843328>, 2025.
- Lehning, M., Völksch, I., Gustafsson, D., Nguyen, T. A., Stähli, M., and Zappa, M.: ALPINE3D: a detailed model of mountain surface processes and its application to snow hydrology, *Hydrological Processes*, 20, 2111–2128, <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.6204>, 2006.
- Livneh, B., Deems, J. S., Schneider, D., Barsugli, J. J., and Molotch, N. P.: Filling in the gaps: Inferring spatially distributed precipitation from gauge observations over complex terrain, *Water Resources Research*, 50, 8589–8610, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014WR015442>, 2014.
- 840 Lu, X., Tang, G., Wang, X., Liu, Y., Jia, L., Xie, G., Li, S., and Zhang, Y.: Correcting GPM IMERG precipitation data over the Tianshan Mountains in China, *Journal of Hydrology*, 575, 1239–1252, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2019.06.019>, 2019.
- Lussana, C., Tveito, O. E., Dobler, A., and Tunheim, K.: seNorge\_2018, daily precipitation, and temperature datasets over Norway, *Earth System Science Data*, 11, 1531–1551, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-1531-2019>, 2019.
- 845 Maier, P., Ehrendorfer, C., Lücking, S., Pulka, T., Lehner, F., Koch, F., Formayer, H., and Herrnegger, M.: GAM-generated monthly precipitation undercatch factors for Austria and surrounding catchments and their station-based training data, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.16903753>, 2025.
- Matiu, M., Crespi, A., Bertoldi, G., Carmagnola, C. M., Marty, C., Morin, S., Schöner, W., Cat Berro, D., Chiogna, G., De Gregorio, L., Kotlarski, S., Majone, B., Resch, G., Terzago, S., Valt, M., Beozzo, W., Cianfarra, P., Gouttevin, I., Marcolini, G., Notarnicola, C., Petitta, M., Scherrer, S. C., Strasser, U., Winkler, M., Zebisch, M., Cicogna, A., Cremonini, R., Debernardi, A., Faletto, M., Gaddo, M., Giovannini, L., Mercalli, L., Soubeyroux, J.-M., Sušnik, A., Trenti, A., Urbani, S., and Weilguni, V.: Observed snow depth trends in the European Alps: 1971 to 2019, *The Cryosphere*, 15, 1343–1382, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-1343-2021>, 2021.
- 850 Miralles, D. G., Holmes, T. R. H., De Jeu, R. A. M., Gash, J. H., Meesters, A. G. C. A., and Dolman, A. J.: Global land-surface evaporation estimated from satellite-based observations, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 15, 453–469, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-15-453-2011>, 2011.
- 855 Mott, R., Vionnet, V., and Grünewald, T.: The Seasonal Snow Cover Dynamics: Review on Wind-Driven Coupling Processes, *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 6, 197, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2018.00197>, 2018.
- Nachtnebel, H. P., Baumung, S., and Lettl, W.: Abflußprognosemodell für das Einzugsgebiet der Enns und der Steyr, Tech. rep., Institute of Water Management, Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering, University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Vienna, 1993.
- 860 Nash, J. and Sutcliffe, J.: River flow forecasting through conceptual models part I — A discussion of principles, *Journal of Hydrology*, 10, 282–290, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694\(70\)90255-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1694(70)90255-6), 1970.
- Ohmura, A.: Enhanced temperature variability in high-altitude climate change, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 110, 499–508, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-012-0687-x>, 2012.

Pan, X., Yang, D., Li, Y., Barr, A., Helgason, W., Hayashi, M., Marsh, P., Pomeroy, J., and Janowicz, R. J.: Bias corrections of precipitation measurements across experimental sites in different ecoclimatic regions of western Canada, *The Cryosphere*, 10, 2347–2360, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-2347-2016>, 2016.

Pepin, N. C., Arnone, E., Gobiet, A., Haslinger, K., Kotlarski, S., Notarnicola, C., Palazzi, E., Seibert, P., Serafin, S., Schöner, W., Terzago, S., Thornton, J. M., Vuille, M., and Adler, C.: Climate Changes and Their Elevational Patterns in the Mountains of the World, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 60, e2020RG000730, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020RG000730>, 2022.

Pflug, J. M. and Lundquist, J. D.: Inferring Distributed Snow Depth by Leveraging Snow Pattern Repeatability: Investigation Using 47 Lidar Observations in the Tuolumne Watershed, Sierra Nevada, California, *Water Resources Research*, 56, e2020WR027243, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027243>, 2020.

Pierre, A., Jutras, S., Smith, C., Kochendorfer, J., Fortin, V., and Anctil, F.: Evaluation of Catch Efficiency Transfer Functions for Unshielded and Single-Alter-Shielded Solid Precipitation Measurements, *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 36, 865–881, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-18-0112.1>, 2019.

Premier, V., Marin, C., Bertoldi, G., Barella, R., Notarnicola, C., and Bruzzone, L.: Exploring the use of multi-source high-resolution satellite data for snow water equivalent reconstruction over mountainous catchments, *The Cryosphere*, 17, 2387–2407, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-17-2387-2023>, 2023.

Pulka, T., Herrnegger, M., Ehrendorfer, C., Lücking, S., Avanzi, F., Formayer, H., Schulz, K., and Koch, F.: Evaluating precipitation corrections to enhance high-alpine hydrological modeling, *Journal of Hydrology*, 645, 132–202, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2024.132202>, 2024.

Rasmussen, R., Baker, B., Kochendorfer, J., Meyers, T., Landolt, S., Fischer, A. P., Black, J., Thériault, J. M., Kucera, P., Gochis, D., Smith, C., Nitu, R., Hall, M., Ikeda, K., and Gutmann, E.: How Well Are We Measuring Snow: The NOAA/FAA/NCAR Winter Precipitation Test Bed, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 93, 811–829, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00052.1>, 2012.

RGI Consortium: Randolph Glacier Inventory - A Dataset of Global Glacier Outlines, Version 6, <https://doi.org/10.7265/4M1F-GD79>, 2017.

Samaniego, L., Kumar, R., Thober, S., Rakovec, O., Zink, M., Wanders, N., Eisner, S., Müller Schmied, H., Sutanudjaja, E. H., Warrach-Sagi, K., and Attinger, S.: Toward seamless hydrologic predictions across spatial scales, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 21, 4323–4346, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-21-4323-2017>, 2017.

Schauwecker, S., Schwarb, M., Rohrer, M., and Stoffel, M.: Heavy precipitation forecasts over Switzerland – An evaluation of bias-corrected ECMWF predictions, *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 34, 100372, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2021.100372>, 2021.

Sevruk, B., Hertig, J.-A., and Spiess, R.: The effect of a precipitation gauge orifice rim on the wind field deformation as investigated in a wind tunnel, *Atmospheric Environment. Part A. General Topics*, 25, 1173–1179, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686\(91\)90228-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0960-1686(91)90228-Y), 1991.

Shaw, T. E., Caro, A., Mendoza, P., Ayala, A., Pellicciotti, F., Gascoin, S., and McPhee, J.: The Utility of Optical Satellite Winter Snow Depths for Initializing a Glacio-Hydrological Model of a High-Elevation, Andean Catchment, *Water Resources Research*, 56, e2020WR027188, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020WR027188>, 2020.

Sigmund, A., Melo, D. B., Dujardin, J., Nishimura, K., and Lehning, M.: Parameterizing Snow Sublimation in Conditions of Drifting and Blowing Snow, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 17, e2024MS004332, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2024MS004332>, 2025.

Smith, C. D., Ross, A., Kochendorfer, J., Earle, M. E., Wolff, M., Buisán, S., Roulet, Y.-A., and Laine, T.: Evaluation of the WMO Solid Precipitation Intercomparison Experiment (SPICE) transfer functions for adjusting the wind bias in solid precipitation measurements, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 24, 4025–4043, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-4025-2020>, 2020.


- Sodemann, H., Schwierz, C., and Wernli, H.: Interannual variability of Greenland winter precipitation sources: Lagrangian moisture diagnostic and North Atlantic Oscillation influence, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113, 2007JD008503, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD008503>, 2008.
- Stanzel, P. and Kling, H.: From ENSEMBLES to CORDEX: Evolving climate change projections for Upper Danube River flow, *Journal of Hydrology*, 563, 987–999, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.06.057>, 2018.
- Sun, H. and Su, F.: Precipitation correction and reconstruction for streamflow simulation based on 262 rain gauges in the upper Brahmaputra of southern Tibetan Plateau, *Journal of Hydrology*, 590, 125–148, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125484>, 2020.
- Tang, G., Behrangi, A., Long, D., Li, C., and Hong, Y.: Accounting for spatiotemporal errors of gauges: A critical step to evaluate gridded precipitation products, *Journal of Hydrology*, 559, 294–306, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2018.02.057>, 2018.
- Thornthwaite, C. W. and Mather, J. R.: Instructions and tables for computing potential evapotranspiration and the water balance, in: *Publications in Climatology*, vol. 10, pp. 185–243, Laboratory of Climatology, Centerton (New Jersey), 1957.
- Thériault, J. M., Rasmussen, R., Ikeda, K., and Landolt, S.: Dependence of Snow Gauge Collection Efficiency on Snowflake Characteristics, *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 51, 745–762, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JAMC-D-11-0116.1>, 2012.
- Urbantschitsch, W. and Haber, A.: Statistikbroschüre 2024, Brochure, E-Control, Vienna, Austria, <https://www.e-control.at/documents/1785851/1811582/Statistikbroschuere-barrierefrei2024.pdf/9fd3e833-991b-5e3d-42f4-e167c234c282?t=1731675266941>, 2024.
- Vionnet, V., Martin, E., Masson, V., Guyomarc'h, G., Naaim-Bouvet, F., Prokop, A., Durand, Y., and Lac, C.: Simulation of wind-induced snow transport and sublimation in alpine terrain using a fully coupled snowpack/atmosphere model, *The Cryosphere*, 8, 395–415, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-8-395-2014>, 2014.
- Viviroli, D., Archer, D. R., Buytaert, W., Fowler, H. J., Greenwood, G. B., Hamlet, A. F., Huang, Y., Koboltschnig, G., Litaor, M. I., López-Moreno, J. I., Lorentz, S., Schädler, B., Schreier, H., Schwaiger, K., Vuille, M., and Woods, R.: Climate change and mountain water resources: overview and recommendations for research, management and policy, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 15, 471–504, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-15-471-2011>, 2011.
- Vögeli, C., Lehning, M., Wever, N., and Bavay, M.: Scaling Precipitation Input to Spatially Distributed Hydrological Models by Measured Snow Distribution, *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 4, <https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2016.00108>, 2016.
- Ward, E., Buytaert, W., Peaver, L., and Wheeler, H.: Evaluation of precipitation products over complex mountainous terrain: A water resources perspective, *Advances in Water Resources*, 34, 1222–1231, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2011.05.007>, 2011.
- Wasti, A., Ray, P., Wi, S., Folch, C., Ubierna, M., and Karki, P.: Climate change and the hydropower sector: A global review, *WIREs Climate Change*, 13, e757, <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.757>, 2022.
- Weber, M., Braun, L., Mauser, W., and Prash, M.: Contribution of rain, snow- and icemelt in the upper Danube discharge today and in the future, *Geografia Fisica e Dinamica Quaternaria*, 33, 221–230, <https://www.gfdq.gi.aciologia.it/index.php/GFDQ/article/view/251>, 2010.
- Weber, M., Feigl, M., Schulz, K., and Bernhardt, M.: On the Ability of LIDAR Snow Depth Measurements to Determine or Evaluate the HRU Discretization in a Land Surface Model, *Hydrology*, 7, 20, <https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology7020020>, 2020.
- Weber, M., Koch, F., Bernhardt, M., and Schulz, K.: The evaluation of the potential of global data products for snow hydrological modelling in ungauged high-alpine catchments, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 25, 2869–2894, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-2869-2021>, 2021.
- Wesemann, J., Herrnegger, M., and Schulz, K.: Hydrological modelling in the anthroposphere: predicting local runoff in a heavily modified high-alpine catchment, *Journal of Mountain Science*, 15, 921–938, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11629-017-4587-5>, 2018.

- Wolff, M. A., Isaksen, K., Petersen-Øverleir, A., Ødemark, K., Reitan, T., and Brækkan, R.: Derivation of a new continuous adjustment function for correcting wind-induced loss of solid precipitation: results of a Norwegian field study, *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 19, 951–967, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-951-2015>, 2015.
- 940 Wood, S. N.: *Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2 edn., <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315370279>, 2017.
- Wortmann, M., Bolch, T., Menz, C., Tong, J., and Krysanova, V.: Comparison and Correction of High-Mountain Precipitation Data Based on Glacio-Hydrological Modeling in the Tarim River Headwaters (High Asia), *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 19, 777–801, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-17-0106.1>, 2018.
- 945 Wu, Y., Miao, C., Slater, L., Fan, X., Chai, Y., and Sorooshian, S.: Hydrological Projections under CMIP5 and CMIP6: Sources and Magnitudes of Uncertainty, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 105, E59–E74, <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-23-0104.1>, 2024.
- Yamada, M., Jitkrittum, W., Sigal, L., Xing, E. P., and Sugiyama, M.: High-Dimensional Feature Selection by Feature-Wise Kernelized Lasso, *Neural Computation*, 26, 185–207, [https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO\\_a\\_00537](https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00537), 2014.
- 950 Yang, K., Musselman, K. N., Rittger, K., Margulis, S. A., Painter, T. H., and Molotch, N. P.: Combining ground-based and remotely sensed snow data in a linear regression model for real-time estimation of snow water equivalent, *Advances in Water Resources*, 160, 104075, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.advwatres.2021.104075>, 2022.
- Zandler, H., Haag, I., and Samimi, C.: Evaluation needs and temporal performance differences of gridded precipitation products in peripheral mountain regions, *Scientific Reports*, 9, 15 118, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-51666-z>, 2019.
- 955 Zeitfogel, H., Herrnegger, M., and Schulz, K.: Regional-scale assessment of groundwater recharge and the water balance for Austria, *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 59, 102 297, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrh.2025.102297>, 2025.
- Zekollari, H., Huss, M., and Farinotti, D.: Modelling the future evolution of glaciers in the European Alps under the EURO-CORDEX RCM ensemble, *The Cryosphere*, 13, 1125–1146, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-13-1125-2019>, 2019.

Station Undercatch Corrections Across Different Timescales

Figure S1 compares the transfer-function undercatch correction (TF) proposed by Kochendorfer et al. (2017a) with our climatological factors (CFs), which were derived using the GAM methodology, across different time scales. It shows that individual events differ in their estimated precipitation correction: the event in Fig. S1c occurred under lower wind speeds than the CFs imply, whereas the event in Fig. S1d is underestimated. Note that the same event is displayed in panel a and d at two nearby stations, one located on the valley floor and the other on the summit, for which substantially different corrections are suggested.

At the scale of monthly sums, differences between the TF-based and CF-based correction already begin to decrease. On an annual timescale, no systematic bias is evident, and deviation in precipitation sums relative to the TF-corrected values remain in the lower single-digit percentage range or below. Since the transfer function includes a wind-speed cutoff (Kochendorfer et al., 2017a), and no systematic bias is visible, we conclude that extreme events are not over-represented.



**Figure S1.** Comparison of station precipitation in mm across different timescales for a-d) hourly, e-h) monthly and i-l) yearly sums. Shown is the uncorrected station (uncorr, black), transfer-function (TF, blue, Kochendorfer et al. 2017a) and climatological GAM-factor (CF, orange) corrected precipitation. Individual columns refer to different stations, whereas the elevation of the stations increases each column. Precipitation sums are given in the legend.


## Possible Geographical Predictors

The following geographical predictors were used in predictor selection on a 1-km grid basis:

- elevation
- exposure (based on a 3, 5, 11, 21 or 51 km smoothed topography)
- 975 – aspect
- slope
- latitude
- longitude
- distance to Alpine main ridge (assumed to be the highest grid cell, only in north-south direction)
- 980 – surface roughness, based on the CORINE dataset (European Environment Agency, 2019).

In the end, elevation and exposure on a 5 km and 51 km basis were selected based on an untuned random forest and a concurvity algorithm.


## Predictor Maps




**Figure S2.** Selected predictors for GAM training, all color-coded and given in m. Mean, maximum and minimum levels are given in the text box.



GAM Smooth Functions




**Figure S3.** GAM smooth functions for every month (rows) and for the three chosen features, all in m. The shaded areas indicate the 95 % confidence interval.



**Figure S4.** COSERO simulation results, as well as observed runoff, displayed as average monthly values for the high-alpine study regions a) Kölnbrein and b) Schlegeis. Solid lines refer to the simulation results using undercatch corrected data, while dashed lines refer to results using uncorrected precipitation input. \*The simulated runoff is only considered for days with valid runoff observations.

## Snow-Melting Comparison



**Figure S5.** Comparison of SCA of Sentinel-2 data (first column) compared to the snow representation of the undercatch corrected (second column) and uncorrected (third column) Alpine3D-simulations for four dates (rows) in 2021 with satellite image coverage with cloud cover less than 5 %. Shown are grid cells with snow (blue), no snow (gray) and a mask for the glacier (violet) and reservoir area (orange).

**Table 11.** Performance metrics for the four snow-melt dates in 2021, obtained by comparing Alpine3D simulations with Sentinel-2 data on a grid cell basis. Accuracy is the correct attribution of true positives (TP) and true negatives (TN) in relation to the full dataset. Precision is the relation of TP to the sum of all positives (true and false). Recall is the relation of TP to the sum of TP and false negatives (FN). The numbers for positives and negatives refer to the number of grid cells in the catchment (excluding glacier and reservoir grid cells).

| metric                           | undercatch corrected | uncorrected |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| accuracy                         | 0.885                | 0.847       |
| precision                        | 0.869                | 0.945       |
| recall                           | 0.906                | 0.738       |
| True positives (snow)            | 8652                 | 7045        |
| True negatives (no snow)         | 8242                 | 9135        |
| False positives (melt too late)  | 1304                 | 411         |
| False negatives (melt too early) | 894                  | 2501        |

**RGI Glacier IDs in the Schlegeis catchment**

**Table 12.** RGI Glacier IDs.

| RGI ID         | area [km <sup>2</sup> ] | catchment |
|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| RGI60-11.00476 | 2.0625                  | Schlegeis |
| RGI60-11.00434 | 1.3125                  | Schlegeis |
| RGI60-11.00459 | 2.25                    | Schlegeis |
| RGI60-11.00469 | 2.8125                  | Schlegeis |
| RGI60-11.00311 | 3.8125                  | Schlegeis |
| RGI60-11.00524 | 2.6875                  | Schlegeis |
| RGI60-11.00415 | 3.6875                  | Schlegeis |

## COSERO Calibration Performance Metrics

Figure S6 shows the Kling-Gupta Efficiency (KGE) of the Austrian-wide COSERO simulations, similar to Fig. 15. The KGE  
990 is defined as


$$\text{KGE} = 1 - \sqrt{(r - 1)^2 + (\alpha - 1)^2 + (\beta - 1)^2}, \quad (11)$$

where  $r$  is the Pearson correlation coefficient,  $\alpha = \frac{\sigma_{\text{sim}}}{\sigma_{\text{obs}}}$  is the fraction of the simulated and observed variance, and  $\beta = \frac{\bar{Q}_{\text{sim}}}{\bar{Q}_{\text{obs}}}$  is the mean runoff bias (Gupta et al., 2009).


Figure S7 shows the Nash–Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) of the Austrian-wide COSERO simulations, in the same structure as  
995 Fig. 15. The NSE is defined as

$$\text{NSE} = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T (Q_{\text{obs}}^t - Q_{\text{sim}}^t)^2}{\sum_{t=1}^T (Q_{\text{obs}}^t - \bar{Q}_{\text{obs}})^2}, \quad (12)$$

where  $Q_i^t$  are the observed and simulated runoff, respectively, at time  $t$  and  $\bar{Q}_{\text{obs}}$  is the mean observed discharge (Nash and Sutcliffe, 1970).




**Figure S6.** Kling-Gupta Efficiency (KGE) for the calibrated subcatchments of the Austrian-wide COSERO model, for simulations using a) uncorrected and b) undercatch corrected precipitation, as well as c) separated into elevation bands. The black outline in panel a) and b) shows the subcatchment borders. Numbers in parentheses in panel c) indicate the number of catchments within each elevation band. Whiskers represent 1.5 times the interquartile range, and outliers are shown as dots. The y-axis in panel c) is capped at -2 to improve legibility.




**Figure S7.** Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE) for the calibrated subcatchments of the Austrian-wide COSERO model, for simulations using a) uncorrected and b) undercatch corrected precipitation, as well as c) separated into elevation bands. The black outline in panel a) and b) shows the subcatchment borders. Numbers in parentheses in panel c) indicate the number of catchments within each elevation band. Whiskers represent 1.5 times the interquartile range, and outliers are shown as dots. The y-axis in panel c) is capped at -2 to improve legibility.

COSERO Water Balance Components



**Figure S8.** COSERO water balance components in [mm/year] of the calibrated subcatchments (n=424) in the Austrian-wide model. Displayed is the a) precipitation and b) actual evapotranspiration, separated into elevation bands. Numbers in parentheses in panel c) indicate the number of catchments within each elevation band. Whiskers represent 1.5 times the interquartile range, and outliers are shown as dots. Outliers are displayed as dots. As parts of some catchments (e.g. Upper Danube, Inn) are not explicitly modeled, runoff expressed in millimeters and normalized by the modeled area can exceed precipitation sums. The Danube runoff was excluded from panel c) for legibility.





**Figure S9.** Performance metrics of calibrated subcatchments\* the validation period (1980-2000) for the Austrian-wide COSERO model. Shown are a) the bias  $\beta$ , b) the Kling-Gupta Efficiency (KGE) and c) the Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE), evaluated using uncorrected and undercatch-corrected precipitation input for different elevation bands. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of catchments within each elevation band. Whiskers represent 1.5 times the interquartile range, and outliers are shown as dots. The y-axis in panels b) and c) is capped at -2 to improve legibility. \*For 25 catchments, runoff data are unavailable during the validation period; therefore, the total number of data points is lower than in the calibration analysis (399 vs. 424, respectively).