Glacier recession and water resources in Peru’s Cordillera Blanca
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ABSTRACT

The tropical glaciers of the Cordillera Blanca, Peru, are rapidly retreating, resulting in complex impacts on the hydrology of the upper Rio Santa watershed. The effect of this retreat on water resources is evaluated by analyzing historical and recent time series of daily discharge at nine measurement points. Using the Mann-Kendall non-parametric statistical test, the significance of trends in three hydrograph parameters was studied. Results are interpreted by using synthetic time series generated from a hydrologic model that calculates hydrographs based on glacier retreat sequences. The results suggest that seven of the nine study watersheds have probably crossed a critical transition point, and now exhibit decreasing dry season discharge. Our results suggest also that once the glaciers completely melt, annual discharge will be lower than present by 2% to 30% depending of the watershed. The retreat influence on discharge will be more pronounced during the dry season than at other periods of the year. At La Balsa, which measures discharge from the upper Rio Santa, the glacier retreat could lead to a decrease in dry season average discharge of 30%.
Introduction

In a context of a resource under pressure, the retreat of mountain glaciers in response to ongoing climate change is expected to have a major impact on alpine environments globally (Huss and others, 2010). Many studies predict detrimental societal, ecological and economic impacts due to glacier retreat-related hydrological changes (Braun and others, 2000; Jansson and others, 2003; Hannah and others, 2007; Vergara and others, 2007; Brown and others, 2010; Kistin and others, 2010; Uehlinger and others, 2010). In the Cordillera Blanca, Peru, coupled natural-human studies have shown that, in the context of an increasing regional population, the vulnerability of Andean society is tied directly to water availability (Mark and others, 2010; Bury and others, 2011).

However, evaluating the influence of melt water runoff on large river basin flows in different environments remains a major scientific challenge (Milner and others, 2009; Kaser and others, 2010). This challenge is often amplified by logistical difficulties in gathering long-term, reliable measurements like those faced in high-elevation tropical environments (Hofer and others, 2010).

In conditions of continuous retreat, glaciers generate a transitory increase in runoff as they lose mass (Mark and McKenzie, 2007). This increase is limited in time as the amount of frozen water that is stored in the glaciers decreases (Mark and others, 2005). As a consequence, the reduction in ice volume will yield a significant increase in annual runoff for only a few decades, followed by a decrease in runoff (Huss and others, 2008). This trend will be even more pronounced during the season of low flow, a period of the year when the relative contribution of glacier melt water is at its maximum (Stahl and Moore, 2006; Nolin and others, 2010). Year-to-year variability of runoff from a glacierized mountain basin is moderated by the interaction of temperature and precipitation (Collins and Taylor, 1990). This buffering effect is greatest in basins that have moderate glacier cover while variation in runoff is greatest in heavily glacierized and unglacierized watersheds. For example, Hagg and Braun (2005) suggest that the minimum year-to-year variations are found where the percentage of glacierized area is between 20 and 50%.

Glaciers, which are vulnerable to predicted future warming, buffer stream discharge from highly seasonal precipitation (Bradley and others, 2006; Vuille and others, 2008a). Kaser and others (2003) describe the response of Cordillera Blanca glaciers to recent climatic fluctuations in a comprehensive analysis of glacier mass balances based on discharge and precipitation data. The use of historical hydrologic observations for predictive modeling has not always lead to consistent conclusions about the future contribution of glacial melt water to stream flow. For example, Juen and others (2007) and Vuille and others (2008b) showed that reduced glacier size leads to decreased volume of glacier melt. This decrease is compensated by an increase in direct runoff. Thus, the mean annual total runoff remains almost unchanged but the seasonality is considerably amplified. On the other hand, other studies suggest that water supply will peak after several decades of continually increasing as a result of net glacier loss, followed by a sudden decrease (Pouyaud and others, 2005).
In this context, accurate predictions of both societal adaptive capacity and water resource availability require sustained measurements and more quantitative assessments of glacier retreat impacts at the watershed scale.

The objective of the present study is to evaluate the influence of recent and ongoing glacier recession on the hydrological regime for different watersheds of the Cordillera Blanca. In particular, it aims to evaluate the impact of glacial retreat on changes to historical trends in watershed discharge characteristics. To reach these objectives we apply the Mann-Kendall method in analyzing trends in daily average historical discharge records from nine glacierized watersheds. We present a new water-balance model that synthesizes hydrographs for different basin parameters and glacier retreat scenarios. This model, validated to trends in the historical field data, allows us to refine the theoretical curves of glacier retreat influence on hydrological regimes and to anticipate how these regimes will continue to change in the future.

**Study Site**

The upper Rio Santa watershed in northern Peru captures runoff from the Cordillera Negra to the west, with a dry climate and no glaciers (Mark and McKenzie, 2007; Suarez and others, 2008) and the Cordillera Blanca to the east, which receives more precipitation and is Earth’s most glacierized tropical mountain range. The glacier coverage of the Cordillera Blanca has declined from 800-850 km² in 1930 to slightly less than 600 km² at the end of the 20th century (Georges, 2004). The majority of glaciers terminate in watersheds that are drained by the Rio Santa to the Pacific Ocean (Fig. 1). In the Rio Santa, melt water provides 10 to 20% of the total annual discharge, and may exceed 40% in the dry season (Mark and Seltzer, 2003). The region has a strong precipitation seasonality, which is typical of the outer tropics where more than 80% of precipitation falls between October and May, and the austral winter receives almost no precipitation. In addition, the average annual air temperature is less variable than daily temperature. Glacial ablation occurs continually through the year, although sublimation reduces the melt rate during the dry season to some extent. Accumulation, on the other hand, occurs mainly during the wet season, and only on the higher elevation portions of the glaciers (Kaser and others, 2003).

The Cañon del Pato 50 MW hydroelectric generation plant located at Huallanca on the Rio Santa defines the outflow of a 5,000 km² watershed that captures runoff from the majority of the glacierized valleys of the Cordillera Blanca. Starting when the dam was put into operation, the watershed’s stream flow has been carefully monitored. As a result, many of the glacierized Santa tributaries were equipped with stream stage and precipitation gauges starting in the 1950s. Regrettably, the long-standing gauge network fell into disrepair at the end of the 20th century in the midst of reforms that privatized hydroelectric generation (Carey, 2010). By the beginning of the 21st century, only three of the stream stage stations - La Balsa (situated just upstream of the
power plant), Paron and Llanganuco - remained in operation or had been reactivated after an interruption of several years.

Methodology

Data acquisition and screening

In 2008, Ohio State University, McGill University, the French Institut de Recherche pour le Developpement (IRD) and the Peruvian glaciology unit of the Autoridad Nacional del Agua (ANA) launched a joint project to improve the stream gauging station network throughout the Cordillera Blanca. Of a total of 13 stations put into operation in 2008 and 2009, five were at historical network measurement points (Figure 1): Chancos, La Recreta, Pachacoto, Querococha and Miraflores (not used in this study).

The stations that are presented in this study are equipped with two Solinst 3001 Levelogger series pressure transducers. One transducer is placed into the water at a depth that ensures constant immersion and a second transducer is placed above the maximum water level to measure atmospheric pressure. The water level is calculated by subtracting the atmospheric pressure from the total pressure measured by the submerged transducer. Both sensors record the pressure at synchronous 15-minute intervals and, for the purpose of this study, records are averaged to daily values. Water levels are converted to discharges using standard hydrological techniques (Dingman, 2002).

In addition to the new discharge data, we analyzed the original historical discharge dataset which begins in 1952 and includes times series for 17 stations. A quality control analysis of the time series was used to prevent interpretation errors. Suspect drops, peaks or plateaus disqualified portions of a station’s record. Missing data and interruptions in records were evaluated for possible interpolation in order to avoid the losses of valuable data which arise from the outright rejection of years with gaps. At the same time, the following rules were developed to prevent filling data gaps inappropriately: (1) gaps of less than seven days were systematically filled using linear interpolation between the two points delimiting the gap, (2) for gaps greater than seven days, a decision was made case by case, with linear or polynomial interpolation applied where there was no risk of corrupting the time series, (3) years that had remaining gaps were systematically rejected, and (4) time series for which more than 12 years were rejected were not considered for the study. Of the 17 stations, only nine were found suitable for the trend analysis based on these criteria. About 6,000 (less than 5%) of the 132,000 daily discharge values are derived from interpolation (Table 1). A total of 66 years of data were rejected due to potentially insufficient data quality. Despite the efforts and major discarding made during the data screening, it remains possible that the interpolation could affect the quality of the datasets. This risk, characteristic of historical data research, has to be considered when interpreting the study results though by following our strict criterion these problems should be minimized.
In the historical dataset, Paron represents a special case. Beginning in the mid-1980s after several years of civil engineering work, the level of Lake Paron was regulated by a drainage tunnel. So, even though the discharge at the lake outlet continued to be monitored, making use of these records for the purpose of the present study was inappropriate.

Precipitation records originally included times series for 36 measurement points, with the oldest starting in the late 1940s and the most recent ending in the early 2000s. Pouyaud and others (2003) made a detailed analysis of this dataset. As the original data quality differs from location to location, they selected a group of seven measurement points for which they have performed a critical review and a homogenization of measurements that lead to reconstituted time series for 1954 to 1999 (Pouyaud and others, 2005). In the present study, we make use of these seven time series (Paron, Llanganuco, Chancos, Huaraz, Querococha, Pachacoto and La Recreta) to study precipitation trends for the Cordillera Blanca region (Figure 1).

**Trend analysis**

The impact of glacier retreat on medium to large watersheds includes changes in annual discharge, dry season discharge and flow variability (e.g. Braun and others, 2000; Jansson and others, 2003; Barnett and others, 2005; Hagg and Braun, 2005; Stahl and Moore, 2006; Collins, 2008; Moore and others, 2009). Therefore, when there is sustained glacier retreat it should be possible to quantify the influence of glacier retreat on watershed hydrology by identifying trends in these discharge characteristics.

In the present study three discharge characteristics were used to quantify change in: (1) the mean annual discharge ($Q$), (2) the dry season discharge, and (3) the yearly coefficient of variation in daily discharge ($Cv$). As the timing of the dry season may vary slightly from one year to another, we used two values for dry season discharge: the dry season average ($Q_d$) and the lowest, ten consecutive day average for a given year ($Q_{min}$). $Q_d$ is computed by averaging daily discharge from July and August, the lowest discharge months at La Balsa.

The Mann-Kendall test (Mann, 1945), a non-parametric distribution-free method, is used to identify significant trends in $Q$, $Q_d$, $Q_{min}$ and $Cv$ time series and to differentiate between significant evolution of annual parameters and random variations. This test is used in numerous hydrological studies (e.g. Hirsch and Slack, 1984; Marengo, 1995; Kundzewicz and others, 2005; Xu and others, 2010), and is justified by its high efficiency even with non-normal, incomplete time series (Yue and Pilon, 2004). The sign of the standard normal statistic (e.g. Xu and others, 2010) indicates the slope of the trend. A positive slope denotes an increase with time, whereas a negative slope indicates a decrease. The tested significance levels ($\alpha$) are 0.001, 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1.

Mann-Kendall tests were performed on all historical time series that were found acceptable through the quality control described above. The new discharge measurements were considered
in the trend analysis where the number of years between the end of the historical record and the
station rehabilitation time was considered as not susceptible to bias the trend analysis. As a
consequence, for datasets that present more than 50% of years with missing data over the 1989-
2009 period, the recent measurements are given for information only and are not integrated into
the historical time series used for the trend analysis. This criterion, although not 100% selective,
was used to ensure the trend analysis quality while keeping time series as long as possible. If
significant bias were to still arise from these minor temporal gaps, it would be detected at the
model validation stage (below).

Mann-Kendall tests were applied at two levels. At the first level the overall time series trend was
evaluated by considering the complete period of the accepted records. For stations that had a
change in the trend, a linear trend characterization would misrepresent the true rate of parameter
change with time. Therefore trends on subsets of the complete time series segments were
analyzed. Possible minima or maxima in the complete time series were identified where the
derivative of the quadratic regression equation (for the different parameters of interest) was zero.
A second level of Mann-Kendall linear trend analysis was then applied to sub-periods
corresponding to the time before and after the year of trend change. The same procedure is
applied to yearly precipitation amounts.

**Trend interpretation model**

We relate detected measured trends to changes in glacial hydrological influence by the use of a
simple model of water-balance. This model generates synthetic hydrographs from the watershed
area, the glacierized surfaces, and the annual rate of loss in ice area. The glacierized coverage of
a watershed is a critical parameter that generates disparities among basins in hydrological
response to glacial retreat (Birsan and others, 2005; Lambrecht and Mayer, 2009; Alford and
Armstrong, 2010; Koboltschnig and Schoner, 2010; Viviroli and others, 2010). However, just the
percentage of glacier area is often insufficient to describe glacial influence on stream discharge
for a given watershed. The melt component of basin discharge is primarily dependent on the
energy balance of snow and ice with different characteristics such as hypsometry, orientation, or
density (Ohmura, 2001). These factors vary from basin to basin, creating differences in
hydrological response to glacier retreat. We here account for these variations by using the annual
rate of ice area loss, $\gamma$.

The following water balance equation is used with yearly average values for studied watersheds:

$$ Q = \Delta S + PP + GW_{in} - GW_{out} - ET $$ (1)

where $Q$ is the stream’s outflow, $\Delta S$ is the change in water storage over the same period, $PP$ is
the yearly volume of precipitation entering the watershed, $ET$ is basin-wide evapotranspiration
and $GW_{in}$ and $GW_{out}$ are the groundwater fluxes entering and leaving the watersheds respectively.

Considering that all watersheds studied are situated in mountainous environments, we
hypothesize that the net watershed groundwater exchange, $GW_{in} - GW_{out}$, is very small compared
to the other components of the water balance and can be ignored. The evapotranspiration term includes evaporation from rivers and lakes \((ET_{rl})\), evaporation from bare soil, vegetative surfaces \((ET_{ngl})\) and sublimation from ice and snow surfaces \((Sub)\) (adapted from Dingman, 2002).

Substituting, Equation (1) is then:

\[
Q = \Delta S + PP - ET_{rl} - ET_{ngl} - Sub
\]  

(2)

For time series that are several decades long, we consider that the change of water storage is only dependent on glacier volume changes, with other storage variations balancing over decadal time periods. \(\Delta S\) is therefore assumed to be equivalent to the annual change in glacier volume expressed in water equivalent. To account for the amount of sublimated volume as a factor, the \(PP\) term is split into precipitation that falls on a glacierized area and that which reaches the ground in non-glacierized areas:

\[
Q = (\Delta V_{gl} + pp \times A_{gl}) \cdot d_{melt} + (A_T - A_{gl}) \cdot (pp - et_{ngl}) - ET_{rl} \]  

(3)

where \(\Delta V_{gl}\) is the inter-annual change in glacier volume expressed in water equivalent, \(pp\) and \(et_{ngl}\) are the average depth of precipitation received and the non-glacierized evapotranspiration per unit area respectively, \(d_{melt}\) represents the fraction of annually ablated ice (or snow or firn) that is not lost by sublimation and \(A_{gl}\) and \(A_T\) represent the glacierized areas and total watershed areas respectively.

To simplify Equation (3), we introduce \(\beta\), a factor that relates \(V_{gl}\) to the glacierized area \(A_{gl}\).

Assuming \(\beta\) is constant over time, we can consider:

\[
\beta = \frac{\Delta V_{gl}}{\Delta A_{gl}^2} = \frac{V_{gl0}}{A_{gl0}^2} \]  

(4)

where \(V_{gl0}\) and \(A_{gl0}\) are the initial ice volume and glacier area respectively.

The annual rate of ice area loss, \(\gamma\), is the inter-annual change in glacial area \(\Delta A_{gl}\) divided by the glacial area, \(A_{gl}\), of the previous year. In a time series context, applying simple algebra to this definition for a given year, \(n\), makes it possible to relate \(\gamma\) to \(\Delta(A_{gl}^2)\) and the glacierized area, \(A_{gl0}\) to the initial glacier cover \(A_{gl0}\) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta(A_{gl}^2) &= ((1 - \gamma_n)^2 - 1) \cdot A_{gl_{n-1}}^2 \\
A_{gl_n} &= A_{gl0} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^{n} (1 - \gamma_i)
\end{align*}
\]  

(5)

Combining Equations (3), (4), and (5) leads to the following expression of the annual discharge for a given year, \(n\):
With Equation (6) it is possible to estimate the annual average discharge using data on precipitation and glacial retreat, as well as the watershed and initial glacierized surfaces. This assumes that the evapotranspiration terms, \( ET_{nl} \) and \( ET_{ngl} \), and the sublimation factor, \((1-d_{melt})\), do not vary significantly during the study period.

When focusing on the dry season, a distinction is made between fast-flow and slow-flow for the non-glacierized area of the watershed. Fast flow is defined here as the portion of precipitation that reaches the watershed outlet within a few days of falling, and assumes no loss due to evapotranspiration. Slow flow is defined as water that is released from the watershed over a time span longer than a few days, and is assumed to be mainly groundwater based. Considering that the Cordillera Blanca receives almost no precipitation between June and September, it is assumed that the fast-flow component for the dry season is negligible. The dry-season slow-flow discharge, \( q_{ngl} \), accounts for the water released from groundwater minus the specific evapotranspiration, \( ET_{ngl} \), from non-glacierized areas.

Focusing on the dry season requires accounting for the seasonality of the glacier melt rates. During the dry season, the specific humidity is low, and the vertical water vapour pressure gradient over the glacier surface is generally positive downward, making conditions favourable for sublimation to occur and decreasing the amount of energy available for total ablation (Winkler and others, 2009). We introduce \( \alpha \), defined as the fraction of annual ablation that occurs during July and August, and use \( d'_{melt} \) instead of \( d_{melt} \) to adapt Equation (6) for dry season discharge:

\[
Q_n = d_{melt} \cdot \left( \beta \cdot A_{gl_0}^2 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - \gamma_i)^2 \cdot ((1 - \gamma_n)^2 - 1) + pp_n \cdot A_{gl_0} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^{n} (1 - \gamma_i) \right) + \left( pp_n - et_{ngl} \right) \cdot \left( A_T - A_{gl_0} \cdot \prod_{i=2}^{n} (1 - \gamma_i) \right) - ET_{rl}
\]  

(6)

Again it is possible to estimate the average discharge of the dry season using precipitation and the rate of glacial retreat time series, as well as the watershed and initial glacierized surfaces. This assumes that \( ET_{rl} \), \( q_{ngl} \), and the sublimation factor, \((1-d_{melt})\), do not vary significantly over the study period.

The yearly coefficient of variation of discharge, \( Cv \), is:

\[
Cv = \frac{\sigma}{Q} = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma_{melt}^2 + \sigma_{slow}^2 + \sigma_{fast}^2 + \Sigma_{cov}}}{Q_{melt} + Q_{slow} + Q_{fast}}
\]

(8)

where \( Q_{melt}, Q_{slow}, Q_{fast} \) are the melt, slow-flow and fast-flow components of the yearly average discharge respectively, \( \sigma_{melt}, \sigma_{slow} \) and \( \sigma_{fast} \) are the melt, slow-flow and fast-flow standard deviations and \( \Sigma_{cov} \) describes the sum of flow types pairs covariance. If we consider the
individual coefficient of variation for the three flow components as being constant over the years, the equation is:

\[
C_v = \sqrt{\left(\frac{C_{v_{melt}} \cdot Q_{melt}}{Q}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{C_{v_{slow}} \cdot Q_{slow}}{Q}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{C_{v_{fast}} \cdot Q_{fast}}{Q}\right)^2 + \Sigma_{cov}}
\] (9)

Based on Equations (6), (7) and (9), the model generates annual average discharge, dry season discharge and discharge coefficient of variation for periods greater than ten years. Due to the diverse assumptions made in the model design, it is expected that the trends in modeled parameters, as well as the final (for \(A_{gl} = 0\)) versus initial discharge ratios, will be most accurately reproduced.

**Assessing influence of precipitation on discharge trends**

Equations (1) to (6) indicate it is possible to estimate the annual average discharge using only precipitation and glacial retreat data if we assume that the evaporation and sublimation related terms do not vary significantly during the study period. This means that characterising the impact of glacier retreat on discharge first requires characterizing the influence of precipitation.

A correlation study between the seven precipitation time series at Paron, Llanganuco, Chancos, Huaraz, Querococha, Pachacoto and La Recreta (Pouyaud and others, 2005) is used to assess the spatial homogeneity of precipitation across the region. A trend analysis (described earlier) is also performed on each time series, and the results of both analyses are used to further explore the regional variability and possible regional patterns of yearly precipitation values. We then statistically compare discharge parameters from all studied watersheds to regional precipitation records. When a “minimal correlation” (\(R^2 \geq 0.2\) and p-value \(\leq 0.1\)) is not obtained between \(Q\), \(Q_{d}\), \(Q_{min}\) or \(C_v\) and the yearly amount of precipitation of the closest measurement points, it is considered that discharge variability cannot be explained by precipitation changes. For all cases where a minimal correlation is detected, a new trend analysis is performed with the precipitation time series using the same time periods as the corresponding discharge parameter. In cases where significant trends of similar sign (i.e. positive or negative) are detected both in precipitation records and in discharge parameter values, the discharge parameter trend is excluded from the result interpretation.

In addition, to avoid identifying trends related to temporary climatic phenomena that could arise from shortening time series, the discharge dataset are screened for generalized common patterns in measurements. If such a case is detected, corresponding datasets are similarly excluded.

**Estimation of glacier coverage**
The published data on glacierized areas by watershed that we considered in the present study cover different time periods: (1) 1963-1970 and 1997 (Mark and Seltzer, 2003), (2) 1990-1991 (Kaser and others, 2003), (3) 1930, 1970 and 1990 (Georges, 2004), and (4) 1948, 1962 and 1973 (for the Yanamarey glacier only) (Hastenrath and Ames, 1995). Combining these published data required occasional adjustments to ensure consistent definitions of watershed areas. There are only minor differences in watershed areas between the two first studies, so that the calculation of watershed glacial cover was considered comparable for publications one and two. However, the extensive dataset in Georges (2004) features a format that presents glacierized areas by mountain group, rather than by watershed. To accurately compare formats, we first evaluated the proportion of glaciers in the mountain groups of publication (3) that drain into the watersheds of publications (1) and (2), and weighted the published glacierized areas accordingly to derive watershed-based glacier coverage for the same years 1930, 1970 and 1990. The same procedure was applied for the computation of the Querococha watershed glacierized area with publication (4). Overlaps between studies were used to fine-tune the weighted average factors.

ASTER satellite imagery was used for recent estimates of glacier area. Despite the lower resolution of ASTER imagery compared to other sources, it has provided an important multi-temporal data product to map glacier changes as part of the Global Land Ice Measurement from Space (GLIMS) project, and the Cordillera Blanca has been featured as a specific case example of the GLIMS application (Racoviteanu and others, 2008; Raup and others, 2008). We selected images from 2001-2003 and 2009-2010 with available images that spanned the entire mountain range. This necessitated compilations of multiple images to obtain cloud-free coverage. For each time period, we computed the amount of glacierized coverage by digitizing glacier boundaries with GIS software. The lower termini were used to evaluate changes in area. Individual glacier boundary uncertainties are largest at the upper reaches of the watersheds, and make more difference for individual glaciers. We did consider relative glacier changes aggregated by watershed, so these issues are less critical. We did not apply ASTER resolution (15 m panchromatic) to define individual glaciers, but rather the changes in total glacier coverage between periods.

We calculated the watershed areas using 1:100,000 digitized contour lines and lakes and rivers from Instituto Geographico National, Peru. The glacierized area of each watershed was calculated based on the method and recommendations formulated by Racoviteanu and others (2009).

The resulting glacier coverage data were used to compute the annual rate of ice loss, \( \gamma \), for each studied watershed. Linear extrapolations were used between the discrete years of published or estimated glacierized areas to estimate the annual values required for the model. The glacier coverage data are used to generate synthetic datasets for model calibration and were limited to the years matching those used for the discharge data trend analysis.
Model parameterization and validation

The initial parameterization of the model was based on published parameter values (Table 2). When directly applicable parameters were not available, specific parameters were developed to estimate them such as the factor $\beta$ that relates the watershed glacierized area, $A_{gl}$, to its volume $V_{gl}$ (see Equation (4)). We use the glacier volume-area power relationship (Bahr, 1997; Bahr and others, 1997) to determine the relationship between the volume of a single glacier and its surface area in the Cordillera Blanca. As tropical glaciers are generally thinner than alpine glaciers due to their relatively high inclination (Kaser and Ostmaston, 2002), the scaling factor of the power equation is computed based on published local volumes and areas. We use published glacier volumes or mass balances for glaciers situated in the tropical Andes in Bolivia (Ramirez and others, 2001; Rabatel and others, 2006; Soruco and others, 2009) and in Peru (Hastenrath and Ames, 1995; Ames and Hastenrath, 1996). Using the scaling exponent of 1.375 suggested by Bahr (1997), the best non-linear regression result ($R^2 = 0.94$; Root Mean Square Error = 0.008 km) was obtained with a scaling factor of 0.04088 (Figure 2).

While valid for individual glaciers, the resulting power relationship is not directly applicable to the model which requires watershed glacierized area. For watersheds with an area of less than one square kilometer, the ice-volume estimation would remain valid; but it would be overestimated for larger glacierized areas that are usually a combination of several individual glaciers. To establish a relation between individual glaciers and watershed glacierized area thicknesses we use a simplified version (using three bins) of the area-frequency distribution of the 485 glaciers of the Cordillera Blanca that was established by Racoviteanu and others (2008). We calculate the initial watershed glacierized volumes $V_{gl0}$, as follows:

$$V_{gl0} = \beta . A_{gl0}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} n_i . V_{ui}$$ (10)

where $i$ is the repartition bin number, $n_i$ is the number of glaciers for bin $i$, $V_{ui}$ is the corresponding glacier volume area of the bin compiled from Racoviteanu and others (2008). The $\beta$ factor is determined from a watershed’s initial conditions using Equation (10) and remains constant during the simulation. The relation between $V_{gl0}$ and $A_{gl0}$ that results from the Equation (10) is plotted on Figure 2.

The initial values of other parameters and the sources used to estimate them are given in Table 2. A limited number of initial parameters (Table 2) were adjusted to obtain the best possible fit between projected and measured variables at the study watersheds. The model’s ability to reproduce trends was assessed by comparing model output to the Mann-Kendall results of the
measured discharge data. Evaluating the model’s ability to situate the final ($Q_{end}$) versus the
initial ($Q_0$) discharges ratio was not achievable directly as none of the observed discharge time
series covers the complete disappearance of the glaciers. Therefore, we used the stream’s yearly
discharge in the last year of the time series ($Q_n$) instead of $Q_{end}$. The error associated with $Q_n/Q_0$
ratio estimation is therefore considered greater than those related to $Q_{end}/Q_0$.

**Model sensitivity to glacier retreat scenarios**

Once calibrated, the model is used for a sensitivity analysis to determine how the key model
parameters affect the simulated trend of discharge-related parameters under different scenarios of
glacier retreat. Annual precipitation is kept constant across the entire simulation period, based on
results of the precipitation trend analysis shown below.

A “median” scenario is defined, based on a quasi-exponential increase of $\gamma_n$ and on studied
watershed characteristics. Sensitivity analysis is done by comparing this median simulation
(scenario a) with five “variant” scenario outputs (b to f, Table 3), each differing from the median
scenario in one parameter only. Because of the numerous ways in which $\gamma_n$ can vary with $n$, two
variants of the $\gamma_n$ function are tested: scenario “e” has a continuous glacial retreat scenario
(linear) while scenario “f” involves more complexity (an oscillating function with periodic
negative recession phases and a positive average in the period studied). Simulations are run until
the glacier area approaches zero and the yearly average discharge stabilizes.

The median scenario is also used to explore the notion of phases of glacier retreat as a function
of watershed parameters, a useful prognostic used in other studies (e.g. Collins, 2008; Milner and
others, 2009; Moore and others, 2009). Four different phases are defined on the basis of
significant trend changes that occur in model outputs while the glacier coverage decreases. This
classification is subsequently used to categorize the nine different studied watersheds.

**Potential future hydrologic impacts of glacier retreat**

To determine how glacier retreat will affect future hydrological regimes, the model is run in a
“rapid retreat simulation” with a hypothetical extreme rate of glacier retreat. The rapid retreat
initial conditions are comparable to those of our study watersheds in 2009 as opposed to decades
ago. The “median” retreat scenario (scenario a, Table 3) is used as a starting point and more than
2000 $Q_n$ values are calculated based on combinations of percentage of initial glacierized area
cover $A_{gh0}$ and annual rate of ice area loss, $\gamma_0$. $A_{gh0}$ ranges from 0.1% to 50%, $\gamma_0$ from 0 to 0.04,
and watershed area was constant at 200 km$^2$. For each of the initial condition combinations, the
annual rate of ice area loss, $\gamma$, is increased by one percent of glacier area per year until the glacier
is completely melted, which is almost 50 times faster than the average $\gamma$ increase observed at the
nine studied watersheds between 1930 and 2009. This hypothetical retreat would generate a melt
water release and a subsequent discharge increase for at least the first simulation year regardless
of the initial condition. The magnitude and duration of this simulated increase reflects the
capacity of glaciers to further increase the watershed flows. To evaluate this capacity $\int Q^+$, a
dimensionless parameter that represents how much the perturbed discharge $Q_i$ exceeds initial
discharge $Q_0$ is used, and is computed as follows:

$$\int Q^+ = \sum \frac{(Q_i - Q_0)}{Q_0} \text{ for years } i \text{ where } Q_i > Q_0 \quad (13)$$

Simultaneously, the impact on the watershed annual discharge of a glacier completely melting is
evaluated by computing $Q_{\text{end}}/Q_0$, the final versus initial mean annual discharges ratio. This ratio
provides a direct indication of how much the annual discharge will decrease once the glacier
disappears compared with that calculated based on initial conditions.

In addition to annual discharges, the rapid retreat simulations are used to compute $\int Q^+$ and
$Q_{\text{end}}/Q_0$ for dry season discharge.

We estimate of the $\int Q^+$ and $Q_{\text{end}}/Q_0$ values for the studied watershed by comparing watershed $A_{gl}$
and $\gamma$ values calculated for 2009 with the rapid retreat simulation results. This method of
interpretation of simulated results makes it possible to qualitatively describe potential future
hydrologic impacts of glacier retreat on the studied watersheds.

Results and discussion

Changes in glacierized area

The studied watersheds have a wide range of percent glacierized area (Table 4). With 39% in
2009, Paron is the most highly glacierized watershed while La Recreta is the least glacierized
with 1% the same year. The percent glacierized area within every watershed decreases from
1930 to 2009. This is confirmed by the $\gamma_{\text{period}}$ values (the annual rate of ice area loss from 1930
to 2009; Table 4) which are all positive for the period studied. The La Balsa watershed, which
drains the entire upper Rio Santa, has an average of 0.61% area loss per year which is the median
for the nine studied watersheds. The Llanganuco and Querococha watersheds exhibit the fastest
glacial area reduction and have an average loss of 1 and 1.1 % respectively. Los Cedros has the
lowest $\gamma_{\text{period}}$ with an average percent loss of 0.38 % per year. Except for Colcas, Los Cedros and
Paron, there is a clear acceleration in glacierized area reduction across the studied watersheds
over the past two decades. The average $\gamma$ values for the period of 1990-2009 was double that for
the period of 1930-2009 at Chancos, La Recreta, Pachacoto, and Querococha, indicating a
probable exponential rate of depletion. La Balsa figures confirm this acceleration. The 1990-
2009 annual percentage of glacier area loss reaches 0.81, which is roughly 30 % greater than
what was measured during the 1930-2009 period.

The recession rate results provide an internally consistent comparison of changes over time. Our
protocol to generate $\gamma$ time series invokes a level of uncertainty, estimated at around five percent
based upon our inclusion of historical estimates of glacierized areas from different sources and
comprising different interpretations of glacier areas by different methods (Table 4). Despite these
unavoidable limitations, the generated \( \gamma \) time series was considered to be adequate for the
purpose of this study because the model simulations generated from these time series are used to
compute trend analyses only and the results obtained from these simulations are compared to
observed discharges for model validation.

**Trends in discharge parameters**

The dry season average discharge time series are used to illustrate how the studied watersheds
evolve hydrologically over time (Figure 3). Overall, the data show a dominant decrease in dry
season average discharge during the studied period. An increase in dry season average is
observed with the Paron dataset, a particularity that could be related to the length of the study
period for this watershed. No trend is detected in the Llanganuco dry season throughout the
entire study period. There is a decrease in dry season stream discharge between the 1950s and
1990s for the seven other watersheds. This regionally dominant pattern is also observed in the La
Balsa time series which has lost more than 10 % of its average dry season discharge in little more
than half a century. This decrease cannot be attributed fully to the change in glacial cover as
other factors, such as changes in land use, agricultural practices or population density, also might
have affected regional river discharge regimes. However, high elevation watersheds like
Querococha or Pachacoto, where there is low human impact, also present an overall dry-season
discharge decrease, suggesting that the change in glacial cover explains, at least partly, the
observed dry season discharge decrease at La Balsa. Four of the watersheds feature a local
maximum in polynomial regression curves and four a minimum. No maximum or minimum is
detected at Llanganuco. The timing of minima or maxima in polynomial regression curves vary
from 1958 for Paron to 1994 for La Balsa. These differences in curve profiles suggest that it is
unlikely that trends related to short inter-annual climatic phenomenon would be detected by the
Mann-Kendall test.

For Mann-Kendall tests with significance values of 0.1 or lower, the random origin of trends can
be excluded, allowing further refinement of the trend analyses (Table 5). With the exception of
Paron, all significant discharge trends indicate a decrease in discharge throughout the total period
and/or during the second sub-period. On no occasion were contradicting indications observed
between \( Q, Q_d \) and \( Q_{\text{min}} \). At Chancos, Los Cedros, and Querococha, the decrease in discharge
was preceded by an increase in at least one of the three discharge parameters. This phase ended
much earlier (around 1962) at Los Cedros than at the two others locations (1980 and 1975,
respectively). On five occasions, \( C_v \) presented significant trends. At La Balsa and La Recreta, the
results indicate an increase in variability with time, either for the full period of record or at least
for one of the sub-periods. The only watersheds where significant decreases in yearly discharge
variability were detected are Paron (across the full time series) and Colcas (in the first sub-
period). The results show that an increase in discharge is systematically associated with a decrease in variability and vice versa.

For the precipitation records, the trend analysis shows a more heterogeneous situation. Of the seven time series we studied, three exhibit a negative trend and four a positive trend during the 1954-1999 period. Chancos and Huaraz both have positive, statistically significant trends. The same disparity is observed for trends analysed using sub-periods: three (one significant) of the seven time series show a negative trend during the first sub-period and two (one significant) on the second sub-period. Years of minimum or maximum values differ widely between measurement locations. These results suggest the absence of a clear region-wide trend in precipitation over the studied period. This spatial disparity is confirmed by the correlation study performed on the seven precipitation data sets (Table 6). Significant $R^2$ vary from only 0.09 between Paron and Chancos, to 0.54 between Pachacoto and La Recreta. Most of the $R^2$ values are around 0.3, corresponding to a low level of linear correlation. These results are in line with previously published studies that describe unclear trends in regional precipitation data or in projections (Urrutia and Vuille, 2009; Chevallier and others, 2010). Vuille and others (2008a) also describe the lack of a clear trend in precipitation for the Cordillera Blanca area. They report a difference in tendency between regions situated south (a possible decrease) and north (a possible increase) of about 11°S. Situated between 8°38’S and 10°02’S, the Cordillera Blanca lies near the boundary of these two regions. Therefore, since using a single precipitation time series to represent a regional tendency is not possible, time series from the three nearest measurement points are used for comparison to each watershed’s discharge parameters.

**Precipitation influence on discharge trends**

Results of the correlation study between precipitation records and discharge parameters are reported in Table 7. First, we note that the degree of influence (number and magnitude of detected “minimal correlations”) vary from watershed to watershed. Broadly, the watersheds that present the lowest relative glacierized areas (Table 4) have discharge parameters more correlated to annual precipitation. The degree of influence of precipitation on discharge parameter variation also differs from parameter to parameter. With only one exception ($Q_d$ at La Recreta), $Q_d$ and $Q_{min}$ do not correlate or correlate weakly with the precipitation. Correlation with $Q$ and $Cv$ is more established but still weak as less than 50% of the calculated $R^2$ values do not reach the minimal correlation level and 75% of those that do are below 0.5. As a general pattern the influence of precipitation on discharge parameter variations is small (Table 7), and mainly affects the less glacierized watersheds. Based on this correlation study, trends in all studied discharge parameters at Colcas and Paron are considered to be free of the influence of precipitation while at the other watersheds only $Q_d$ and $Q_{min}$ are independent of precipitation ($Q_{min}$ only at La Recreta).

The lack of a regional trend in yearly precipitation amounts, as well as the weak level of correlation that exists between discharge parameters and yearly precipitation, makes it difficult...
to justify using a precipitation trend to force the model. We therefore fix watershed-specific yearly precipitation values in all model simulations.

### Model validation

Modeled discharge trends were compared with measured discharge trends by counting how often a significant trend detected in measured discharge was reproduced by the model. The results in Table 8 are reported as the percentage of times that both trends were similar for both linear and quadratic regressions. Of the 37 significant trends detected using the Mann-Kendall test, 36 were correctly reproduced by the model for an overall match value of 97%. Despite the uncertainty related to the glacierized area evaluation and the hydro-climatic datasets, the model reproduced the trend of the four different parameters used in the study very satisfactorily. The model performance in estimating the $Q_{end}/Q_0$ ratios is poorer than in reproducing trends but its mean absolute error, less than 0.17, is acceptable for the purpose of the study. Evaluating the $Q_n/Q_0$ ratios correctly is not explicitly required as the simpler $Q_{end}/Q_0$ ratio only is used. This validation step did not highlight any deviation that would characterize bias in dataset related to gaps in the historical data. This supports the assumption made earlier that these gaps did not generate miss estimation of the trends.

### Model simulations

To test the model sensitivity, six synthetic sets of time series were generated. The median scenario (Figure 4a) visually conforms to the expected hydrologic progression (see Methodology references). While the glacier area is continually decreasing, both the annual average discharge and the dry season discharge experience a period of increase followed by a period of decrease and then a period of stabilization below the initial levels. The ending dry season discharge is approximately 50% lower than at the beginning, while the ending annual average discharge declines by no more than 10% of its initial level. The maximum dry season discharge occurs approximately 10 years before the maximum annual average discharge. The period of increasing discharge is shorter than the decreasing and stabilization periods combined. In contrast to what was observed for average discharge, the coefficient of variation first decreased slightly for more than 50 years and then increased rapidly until it stabilized at a value that is ~50% higher.

When the same simulation is run with a higher initial glacierized area (Figure 4b), we see an important change in the amplitude of the output parameters’ variation. The variation tempo remains similar to that obtained by using scenario a, but all of the minimums are lower and the maximum is higher with scenario b. This is visually evident in the case of the coefficient of variation whose final value is approximately 150% that of scenario a. The difference in scenario c (Figure 4c) is less pronounced. Although a change in amplitude is observed, it is minor if we consider that the watershed area is five times that of scenario a. Starting with an initial annual glacier area loss of 0.5% instead of 0 (Figure 4d) leads to a much greater difference. None of the discharge values show a period of increase, while the coefficient of variation increases...
continuously. End values are different than those achieved with scenario a as mean annual and
dry season discharges end lower, while the coefficient of variation is higher.

Changing the annual rate of glacier area loss to a linear function (Figure 4e) does not affect the
end values. For this case the rate of change is affected, with maximum discharge values
(minimum for $C_v$) occurring earlier than in scenario a. These extreme values are of slightly
higher amplitude as well. Similarly, the last tested scenario (Figure 4f) preserves the end values
computed with scenarios a, c and e but amplifies the intermediate fluctuation. The amplification,
which is caused by an extreme glacier area loss applied to the first 30 years of the simulation, is
the largest observed among the six datasets. The strong model response to the first $\gamma_n$ increase
wave is not replicated in the second and third waves. Peaks in the discharge average and
coefficient of variation are of low amplitude in the second wave and not detectable in the third
one.

Overall, the sensitivity analysis shows that the watershed area has the least effect on the
simulations. It supports the hypothesis that not only is $A_{gh}$ critical to determining how glaciers
influence a watershed’s hydrology, but also that $\gamma$, the rate of glacier area loss, is critical.
Regardless of scenario, the complete disappearance of glaciers always led to a decrease in annual
discharge, an even greater decrease in dry season discharge and an increase in variability. The
sequence of a single increase followed by a decrease in discharge is for continuous retreat
scenarios. With a fluctuating glacier area (scenario f), local minima and maxima are simulated
but the hydrological response decreases and approaches zero as the glacier area decreases.

We used the “median” scenario, which is based on a quasi-exponential increase of $\gamma_n$ and on the
studied watersheds’ characteristics, to depict typical hydrological impact phases (Figure 5). The
evolution of hydrological parameters under the “median” glacier retreat scenario enables us to
distinguish four impact phases. Phase one, the early stages of deglaciation, is characterised by a
smooth increase in dry season and yearly average discharge due to a smooth initial deglaciation
and ends when the coefficient of variation reaches its minimum. In phase two the increase in
annual average discharge slows until it reaches its maximum while the dry season discharge
increases and then declines and the coefficient of variation begins to increase. Phase three starts
from the maximum average annual discharge and covers the pronounced decline in discharges
and the corresponding increase in the coefficient of variation. Phase four includes the end of the
glacier influence on outflows when changes in discharges are progressively less pronounced,
asymptotically reaching a non-glacierized basin state.

This sequence of four phases is based on a continuously increasing rate of ice area loss. As
observed in the sensitivity analysis, deviations from this path may change the phase sequence.
However, the probability of this occurring decreases as we move away from highly glacierized
conditions. Returning to a phase two from a late phase three or a phase four would necessitate
either extremely high rates of deglaciation or a new long-term glacial expansion. The likelihood
of this happening is not supported by recent climate change projections (Urrutia and Vuille, 2009).

Each watershed is interpreted individually by comparing the significant trends in measured discharge to the definition of the impact phase (Table 9). This interpretation applies to the final year of observations used in the trend analysis. Significant trends in discharge parameters that show possible influence from precipitation data (three in total) are excluded from the phase allocation exercise (described above in the “Possible precipitation influence” section). Results from the phase determination suggest that seven of the nine studied watersheds are in impact phase three. One watershed, La Recreta, shows characteristics of phase four and another, Paron, is still in phase one at the end of the studied discharge time series. With an overall linear regression-based decrease in dry season discharge, La Balsa exhibits watershed characteristics of phase three. A transition from phase two possibly occurred around 1970, the year in which the increase in \( C_v \) becomes significant based on the quadratic regression-based analysis, although this possibility is not confirmed by other parameters. The fact that, on the second sub-period, an increase in \( C_v \) is measured in parallel to the dry season discharge reduction is an indication that glacial factors are at least partially the cause for the measured decrease in discharge.

None of the 38 measured significant trends used in this study contradicted each other in phase allocation, confirming the model’s ability to simulate the impact of long-term glacier retreat on regional stream discharge trends.

**Glaciers’ potential to further influence hydrological regimes**

The “rapid retreat simulation” results relate \( \int Q^+ \) and \( Q_{end}/Q_0 \) values to initial \( A_{gl} \) and \( \gamma_0 \) conditions (Figure 6). \( \int Q^+ \) values are relative as the highest values represent a high potential for generating further increase in discharge and the lowest values a low potential. \( \int Q^+ \) values vary from 0 to 18. The lowest values (0 to 1) represent an almost negligible capacity of a glacierized area to generate a significant flow increase even under the extreme retreat rates used in this set of simulations. In contrast, the highest values characterize watersheds where discharge parameters are highly sensitive to changes in glacier retreat path. \( Q_{end}/Q_0 \) values vary from 0.1 to 1. The lowest values, obtained for the dry season, represent drastic stream discharge reductions while values above 0.9 will have a low impact on water resources.

The results show the critical role of \( \gamma_0 \) in a glacierized watershed’s response to glacial retreat, especially for glacial cover greater than 5.0%. A watershed that has a 25% glacierized area, for example, shows annual \( \int Q^+ \) values that range from almost 0 to 10, depending on the value of \( \gamma_0 \), and is even more pronounced when only the dry season is considered. The same situation is observed with the \( Q_{end}/Q_0 \) ratio where changes in \( \gamma_0 \) can decrease the projected loss in discharge once the glacier is melted by more than 40%.
We estimate the studied watersheds’ $\hat{Q}^+$ and $Q_{end}/Q_{0}$ values by comparing their characteristics to the rapid retreat scenarios (Figure 6). With the lowest $\hat{Q}^+$ values, La Recreta’s and Querococha’s discharge should not experience a glacierized area loss-related measurable increase in annual or dry season discharge. Once the glaciers have completely disappeared, the discharge at La Recreta should remain almost unchanged compared to the present level, while Querococha should exhibit a slight dry season decline.

Future glacier influence should be slightly greater for Pachacoto, even if there is a low probability of an increase in melt-related average discharge. The main difference between Querococha and Pachacoto is in their dry season $Q_{end}/Q_{0}$ ratios, which are about 0.8 and 0.6 respectively.

In the long-term, Paron is the watershed that should experience the most drastic glacier retreat impact. Not only do its glaciers present the highest potential to generate retreat related discharge increases at yearly and dry season levels, but with complete glaciers disappearance the dry season discharge could decline to less than 40% of its present level. Yearly discharge averages would also decrease but to about 70% of its present level.

Colcas and Los Cedros have almost the same glacierized area percentage and annual rates of ice area loss. These two watersheds have $\hat{Q}^+$ values that are among the highest although their $Q_{end}/Q_{0}$ ratios are close to the average. These characteristics suggest that the potential for an increase in discharge is among the highest, but that the drop in flows after the glaciers have receded will be less drastic than for Chancos or Llanganuco, the latter being predicted to decrease by more than 60% compared with the actual dry season regime. Plots of La Balsa $\hat{Q}^+$ values and $Q_{end}/Q_{0}$ ratios vary between extremes. When a full year is considered, the potential to further increase discharge due to glacier retreat acceleration is very low. Similarly, the $Q_{end}/Q_{0}$ ratio remains high, around 0.9, for the full year average. The dry season situation is different as the $\hat{Q}^+$ value for La Balsa is average while the $Q_{end}/Q_{0}$ ratio is approximately 0.7. A loss of 30% of the dry season discharge at that station would not be without consequences, especially when considering that, on some occasions, the Rio Santa almost dries up before it reaches the Pacific Ocean.

Conclusion

Glaciers are major components of the hydrological system in many tropical Andean watersheds, making their ongoing retreat a threat to water resources. Predicting the exact consequences of glacial retreat is difficult due to the complexity and scales of the processes involved. Our ASTER-based measurements of recent glacier changes indicate that glacier recession is accelerating in the Rio Santa upper watershed, with the overall glacierized area decreasing annually by 0.81% between 1990 and 2009.
To assess past and present influences of glaciers on stream discharge, we reanalyzed historical and modern discharge data from the Cordillera Blanca. Using a combination of regression and trend analyses, we found statistically significant indications that these systems have crossed a critical threshold, and now exhibit decreasing annual and dry season discharge. La Balsa station, which measures discharge from the upper Rio Santa, is undergoing a decline in dry season flow that probably began during the 1970s. The weak correlation that exists between the discharge parameters and precipitation supports the hypothesis that these trends are driven by the glacier retreat measured during the same period.

The link between glacial retreat and water resources is analyzed by the use of a simple water balance model. It simulates how glacier retreat can influence the annual and dry season discharge, as well as the annual discharge variability, and reveals four impact phases of the resulting hydrological changes. Examining historical records and fitting them to these phases suggests a declining contribution of melt water to the studied watershed outflows. At some watersheds, like Querococha, La Recreta, Pachacoto and La Balsa, the decline in discharge is likely not reversible. The decrease in the dry season discharge should therefore continue for many decades as the watersheds enter an asymptotic decrease phase prior to the glaciers’ complete loss of influence on hydrologic regimes. Once the glaciers are completely melted, the discharge will likely be lower than today. In particular, dry season discharge may decrease more than 60% from present for Paron and Llanganuco. At La Balsa, dry season average discharge should decline to 70% of current levels.

The model sensitivity analysis confirms that the initial glacierized area is a major driver of glacier influence on hydrology. It also shows that, unlike the total watershed area, annual rate of ice area loss is as important as the initial glacierized area.

Although the upper Rio Santa watershed still has, and should maintain, abundant water resources when annual total discharge is considered, the dry season situation is clearly different. A decline in dry season surface water availability has probably already begun and should continue. Considering the vulnerability of the local population to climate change and declining water resources (Bury and other, 2011), our results can represent a future social, ecological and economic concern.

Despite the overall consistency of the results of the present research, it must be recognized that they may possibly be influenced by uncertainty related to data interpolation and glacierized area estimation. The method we used is promising and could potentially be applied to other regions of the world. However, the findings that result from its application to the Cordillera Blanca need to be confirmed by other means. In addition, the method’s accuracy should be further tested through future studies.
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Table 1. A description of discharge measurement points, drainage basins, the discharge time series and the made interpolations. The ‘Number of years available’ is the number of years with recorded data that were screened for quality control. The number in brackets, where shown, is the number of these years of data from the new rehabilitated stations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Stream</th>
<th>Basin area (km²)</th>
<th>Period of records</th>
<th>Number of years available</th>
<th>Number of years selected</th>
<th>Number of years with interpolations</th>
<th>Linear interpolation (%)</th>
<th>Polynomial interpolation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancos</td>
<td>Marcara</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1953-2009</td>
<td>48 (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas</td>
<td>Colcas</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa</td>
<td>Rio Santa</td>
<td>4768</td>
<td>1954-2008</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreta</td>
<td>Rio Santa</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1952-2009</td>
<td>48 (2)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco</td>
<td>Llanganuco</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1954-2009</td>
<td>55 (1)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros</td>
<td>Los Cedros</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1952-1999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1953-2009</td>
<td>46 (2)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1953-2009</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1953-2009</td>
<td>47 (1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Initial parameters for the hydrological model. The “Range” column indicates the parameter range used for the model application to different watersheds. No range means that the parameter is constant regardless of watershed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d_{melt}$</td>
<td>Portion of yearly ablated ice not sublimated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Winkler and others, 2009)</td>
<td>After adjustment to dry season definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{melt}'$</td>
<td>Portion of dry season ablated ice not sublimated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Winkler and others, 2009)</td>
<td>After adjustment to dry season definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_{ngl}$</td>
<td>Non-glacierized area specific evapotranspiration</td>
<td>mm/year</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>300-640</td>
<td>(Kalthoff and others, 2006)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{T_{rl}}$</td>
<td>Evaporation from rivers and lakes</td>
<td>m³/(day)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0-50,000</td>
<td>(Baraer and others, 2009b)</td>
<td>Value given for the Querococha lake only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Dry season part of the annual ablation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Kaser and Georges, 1999)</td>
<td>Approximation based on qualitative descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q_{ngl}$</td>
<td>Net slow flow dry season specific discharge</td>
<td>mm/year</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120-200</td>
<td>(Baraer and others, 2009a)</td>
<td>Watershed-dependant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{v_{melt}}$</td>
<td>Melt component coefficient of variation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Baraer and others, 2007)</td>
<td>Calculated from hydrograph separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{v_{slow}}$</td>
<td>Slow flow coefficient of variation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Deducted from sensibility analysis realized with Equation (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{v_{fast}}$</td>
<td>Fast flow coefficient of variation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Baraer and others, 2009b)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma_{cov}$</td>
<td>Sum of covariances</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Based on calibration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Parameter values and formulas used in the sensitivity analysis scenarios. The “Median” scenario (a) represents the reference scenario. Other letters in parenthesis, (b) to (f), refer to the parameter changed for a given scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>( A_{gl0} (%) )</th>
<th>( A_T (km^2) )</th>
<th>( \gamma_0 )</th>
<th>( \gamma_n ) with ( n \in {1,2,\ldots,200} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Median” scenario (a)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>( \gamma_n = \gamma_{n-1} + 3.5 \times 10^{-6} \times n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variants</td>
<td>50 (b)</td>
<td>1000 (c)</td>
<td>0.005 (d)</td>
<td>( \gamma_n = \gamma_0 + 0.00024 \times n ) (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma_n = \gamma_0 + \sin\left(\frac{n}{11} - 0.99\right)/30 ) (f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Glacierized percentage of watershed areas. Years in italics are derived from publications (Kaser and others, 2003; Mark and Seltzer, 2003; Georges, 2004). The others (2002 and 2009) were computed using ASTER satellite imagery. The specific acquisition dates for selected ASTER images were August 1, 2001, May 25, 2002, June 17, 2002, July 13, 2003, May 28, 2009, June 11, 2009, July 13, 2009, July 29, 2009, August 7, 2009, and May 29, 2010. The historical values for Querococha are from Hastenrath and Hames (1995) and cover slightly different time periods indicated in parentheses. $\gamma_{\text{period}}$ and $\gamma_{90-09}$ represent the average rate of ice area loss for the 1930-2009 period and the 1990-2009 period respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>$\gamma_{\text{period}}$</th>
<th>$\gamma_{90-09}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancos</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.0108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0.0043</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreta</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.0161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>0.0078</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>4.6(1948)</td>
<td>3.9(1973)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5: Results of Mann-Kendall trend analysis. The “α” columns describe the level of significance of the reported trends. Statistically significant trends are in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Linear regression</th>
<th>Quadratic regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancos</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1956-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1956-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1956-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1956-1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreta</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llananuco</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1954-1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1954-1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1954-1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1954-1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1953-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qd</td>
<td>1953-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qmin</td>
<td>1953-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1953-1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancos</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huaraz</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>1954-1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and statistical significance (p-value) calculated for the seven precipitation time series. $R^2$ values appear below the oblique line, p-values above. $R^2$ values equal to or over 0.2 associated with a p-value under 0.1 are in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R^2 \ p-value</th>
<th>Paron</th>
<th>Llanganuco</th>
<th>Chancos</th>
<th>Huaraz</th>
<th>Querococha</th>
<th>Pachacoto</th>
<th>La Recreta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td>0.0142</td>
<td>0.0434</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancos</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huaraz</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreta</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and their associated statistical significance (p-value) calculated between the precipitation records from the three closest measurement points and the discharge parameters of each gauging station. $R^2$ values equal to or over 0.2 associated to a p-value above 0.1 are in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>precipitation measurement point</th>
<th>$Q$ R² p-value</th>
<th>$Q_d$ R² p-value</th>
<th>$Q_{min}$ R² p-value</th>
<th>$Cv$ R² p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancos Llanganuco</td>
<td>0.00 0.9491</td>
<td>0.01 0.661</td>
<td>0.01 0.5929</td>
<td>0.06 0.1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancos Huaraz</td>
<td>0.10 0.0589</td>
<td>0.00 0.9826</td>
<td>0.00 0.8997</td>
<td>0.07 0.1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancos Huaraz</td>
<td>0.15 0.0183</td>
<td>0.00 0.8897</td>
<td>0.02 0.3476</td>
<td>0.17 0.0106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas Paron</td>
<td>0.02 0.4537</td>
<td>0.04 0.2788</td>
<td>0.03 0.2895</td>
<td><strong>0.22 0.005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas Llanganuco</td>
<td>0.00 0.751</td>
<td>0.01 0.4965</td>
<td>0.04 0.2447</td>
<td>0.19 0.0082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas Chancos</td>
<td>0.06 0.1547</td>
<td>0.04 0.2678</td>
<td>0.00 0.8953</td>
<td>0.00 0.9736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa Chancos</td>
<td><strong>0.24 0.001</strong></td>
<td>0.01 0.6441</td>
<td>0.00 0.7952</td>
<td>0.18 0.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa Huaraz</td>
<td>0.32 <strong>2E-04</strong></td>
<td>0.00 0.9639</td>
<td>0.00 0.9126</td>
<td><strong>0.33 1E-04</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa Querococha</td>
<td>0.09 0.0584</td>
<td>0.00 0.7185</td>
<td>0.01 0.5549</td>
<td>0.08 0.0748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreata Querococha</td>
<td><strong>0.39 0</strong></td>
<td>0.13 0.0261</td>
<td>0.02 0.347</td>
<td>0.17 0.0091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreata Pachacoto</td>
<td><strong>0.61 0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.39 0</strong></td>
<td>0.13 0.0263</td>
<td>0.15 0.0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreata La Recreata</td>
<td><strong>0.67 0</strong></td>
<td>0.37 0</td>
<td>0.13 0.0219</td>
<td>0.05 0.1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco Paron</td>
<td>0.05 0.2007</td>
<td>0.03 0.3251</td>
<td>0.01 0.5263</td>
<td>0.13 0.0238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco Chancos</td>
<td>0.01 0.4672</td>
<td>0.03 0.3265</td>
<td>0.08 0.0871</td>
<td><strong>0.33 2E-04</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco Huaraz</td>
<td>0.11 0.0397</td>
<td>0.01 0.5515</td>
<td>0.00 0.7421</td>
<td>0.11 0.0414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros Paron</td>
<td>0.03 0.2572</td>
<td>0.00 0.7115</td>
<td>0.00 0.8282</td>
<td>0.07 0.0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros Llanganuco</td>
<td><strong>0.33 1E-04</strong></td>
<td>0.07 0.0981</td>
<td>0.02 0.341</td>
<td><strong>0.23 0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros Chancos</td>
<td>0.19 0.005</td>
<td>0.05 0.1857</td>
<td>0.00 0.9562</td>
<td><strong>0.45 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto Querococha</td>
<td><strong>0.32 2E-04</strong></td>
<td>0.02 0.4479</td>
<td>0.01 0.5795</td>
<td>0.10 0.0528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto Pachacoto</td>
<td>0.51 0</td>
<td>0.02 0.346</td>
<td>0.03 0.3189</td>
<td><strong>0.23 0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto La Recreata</td>
<td><strong>0.55 0</strong></td>
<td>0.03 0.3048</td>
<td>0.03 0.2737</td>
<td>0.16 0.0131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron Querococha</td>
<td>0.17 0.0287</td>
<td>0.16 0.0378</td>
<td>0.19 0.0216</td>
<td>0.10 0.1018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron Llanganuco</td>
<td>0.04 0.3303</td>
<td>0.12 0.0738</td>
<td>0.13 0.0592</td>
<td>0.17 0.0272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron Chancos</td>
<td>0.10 0.1051</td>
<td>0.05 0.2697</td>
<td>0.04 0.3013</td>
<td>0.03 0.3557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha Huaraz</td>
<td>0.40 0</td>
<td>0.04 0.2344</td>
<td>0.17 0.0075</td>
<td>0.13 0.0217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha Querococha</td>
<td>0.68 0</td>
<td>0.04 0.2301</td>
<td>0.13 0.0199</td>
<td><strong>0.26 7E-04</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha Pachacoto</td>
<td>0.49 0</td>
<td>0.02 0.3719</td>
<td>0.00 0.7775</td>
<td><strong>0.23 0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Model performance evaluation. The “Linear trends” and “Quad. trends” columns provide a comparison of the number of observed (Obs.) significant trends in the time series and the number of matching trends in the modeled results (Mod.) for linear and quadratic regressions respectively. The "\( Q_n/Q_0 \)" column shows the error calculation components for the \( Q_n/Q_0 \) ratios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Linear trends Obs.</th>
<th>Linear trends Mod.</th>
<th>Quad. trends Obs.</th>
<th>Quad. trends Mod.</th>
<th>( Q_n/Q_0 ) Obs.</th>
<th>( Q_n/Q_0 ) Mod.</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** MAE**

* The linear negative trend in the coefficient of variability of discharge for the Paron dataset was incorrectly replicated.

** Mean absolute error.
Table 9. Trends associated with the “typical” glacier retreat model compared to measured trends. The symbols used for trend description are “+” for an increase, “−” for a decrease, “+,-” for an increase followed by a decrease, and “−,0” for a decrease followed by parameter stabilization. The “Phases” lines summarize phase definitions. Reproduced watershed data are indicated for statistically significant trends only (Table 5). In case of trends that were split by quadratic regression, the year separating the two sub-periods is given into brackets. Trends excluded from the phase allocation due to possible precipitation influence are in grey. The cause of rejection is presented in the “possible precipitation influence” column. The watershed names are followed by the year to which the interpretation statement applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>$Q$</th>
<th>$Q_d$</th>
<th>$Q_{min}$</th>
<th>$C_v$</th>
<th>Possible precipitation influence</th>
<th>Phases #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+,-</td>
<td>+,-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>+,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancos (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>+ (1980)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>- (1980)</td>
<td>- (1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colcas (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>- (1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>- (1972)</td>
<td>- (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Balsa (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>- (1994)</td>
<td>- (1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Recreta (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>- (1980)</td>
<td>- (1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$Q_d$ / La Receta</td>
<td>3 and possibly 4 from 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llanganuco (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>+ (1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>- (1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cedros (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>- (1962)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>+ (1962)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pachacoto (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>+ (1962)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>+ (1962)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paron (1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>+ (1962)</td>
<td>+ (1958)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>+ (1962)</td>
<td>+ (1958)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Querococha (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear quad.1</td>
<td>+ (1975)</td>
<td>+ (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$Q$ / Querococha</td>
<td>2 until 1976 then 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quad.2</td>
<td>+ (1975)</td>
<td>- (1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. The Cordillera Blanca and locations of the precipitation measurement stations (circles) and discharge measurement stations (squares) considered for the study.

Figure 2. Ice volume versus glacier area for tropical glaciers of the Andes. Black dots represent measured values from Ramirez and others (2001), Rabatel and others (2006), Soruco and others (2009), Hastenrath and others (1995) and Ames and Hastenrath (1996). The blue line plots the Bahr and others (1997) equation which slope is adjusted to fit the measured values. The dashed portion of the blue line corresponds to the projection of the trend outside the regression range. The red curve represents the ice volume evaluated for the glacierized area of a watershed.

Figure 3: Dry season average discharge calculated from daily data (full blue line). Linear and quadratic regressions lines (curves) calculated from datasets are drawn in black dashed lines and full black curves respectively.

Figure 4. Results of sensitivity analysis simulation. The thick black lines and the blue lines are the mean annual and dry season discharge respectively, the yellow dashed line is the annual discharge coefficient of variation, the red dotted line is the glacierized area and the green dash dotted line is the applied annual rate of glacier area loss. All parameters are given relative to year zero values. Graph (a) presents the “Median” scenario output, while the five others are variants described in Table 3: b) $A_{g0}$ increase; (c) $A_T$ increase; (d) $\gamma_0$ increase; (e) linear $\gamma_n$ increase and (f) oscillating $\gamma_n$.

Figure 5. “Typical” glacier retreat hydrological impact phases (delimited and labelled in red). The thick black line and the blue line represent the mean annual and dry season discharge respectively and the yellow dashed line corresponds to the annual discharge coefficient of variation. As the phases are conceptual, axes are kept unit-free.

Figure 6. Variations of $\int Q^+$ (top graphs) and $Q_{end}/Q_0$ (bottom graphs) for the “rapid retreat simulations”, as a function of percentage of glacierized area and the annual rate of ice area loss. Colors represent values of $\int Q^+$ (indicator of the glaciers capacity to further increase the watershed flows) and of $Q_{end}/Q_0$ (starting and ending simulated discharge ratio). Full year simulations appear on the left and dry season ones are reported at the right. All parameters are dimensionless.