

Examining wheat yield sensitivity to temperature and precipitation changes for a large ensemble of crop models using impact response surfaces

Nina Pirttioja¹, Stefan Fronzek¹, Marco Bindi², Timothy Carter¹, Holger Hoffmann³, Taru Palosuo⁴, Margarita Ruiz-Ramos⁵, Miroslav Trnka⁶, Marco Acutis⁷, Senthold Asseng⁸, Piotr Baranowski⁹, Bruno Basso¹⁰, Per Bodin¹¹, Samuel Buis¹², Davide Cammarano⁸, Paola Deligios¹³, Marie-France Destain¹⁴, Luca Doro¹³, Benjamin Dumont¹⁴, Frank Ewert³, Roberto Ferrise², Louis François¹⁴, Thomas Gaiser³, Petr Hlavinka⁶, Christian Kersebaum¹⁵, Chris Kollas¹⁵, Jaromir Krzyszczak⁹, Ignacio Lorite Torres¹⁶, Julien Minet¹⁴, M. Ines Minguez⁵, Manuel Montesino¹⁷, Marco Moriondo¹⁸, Claas Nendel¹⁵, Isik Öztürk¹⁹, Alessia Perego⁷, Françoise Ruget¹², Alfredo Rodríguez²⁰, Mattia Sanna⁷, Mikhail Semenov²¹, Cezary Slawinski⁹, Pierre Stratonovitch²¹, Iwan Supit²², Fulu Tao⁴, Lianhai Wu²¹, Reimund Rötter⁴

¹*Finnish Environment Institute*

(SYKE), FI, nina.pirttioja@ymparisto.fi, stefan.fronzek@ymparisto.fi, tim.carter@ymparisto.fi

²*University of Florence, IT, marco.bindi@unifi.it, ferrise@unifi.it*

³*University of Bonn, DE, hoffmann@uni-bonn.de, frank.ewert@uni-bonn.de, tgaiser@uni-bonn.de*

⁴*MTT Agrifood Research Finland, FI, taru.palosuo@mtt.fi, fulu.tao@mtt.fi, reimund.rotter@mtt.fi*

⁵*Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ES, margarita.ruiz.ramos@upm.es, ines.minguez@upm.es*

⁶*Mendel University in Brno, CZ, mirek_trnka@yahoo.com, hlavinka.peta@gmail.com*

⁷*University of Milan, IT, marco.acutis@unimi.it, alessia.perego@unimi.it, mattia.sanna@unimi.it*

⁸*University of Florida, US, sasseng@ufl.edu, davide.cammarano@ufl.edu*

⁹*Polish Academy of Sciences, PL, pbaranow@ipan.lublin.pl, j.krzyszczak@ipan.lublin.pl, cslawin@ipan.lublin.pl*

¹⁰*Michigan State University, US, basso@msu.edu*

¹¹*Lund University, SE, per.e.bodin@gmail.com*

¹²*INRA EMMAH, FR, samuel.buis@avignon.inra.fr, ruget@avignon.inra.fr*

¹³*University of Sassari, IT, pdeli@uniss.it, ldoro@uniss.it*

¹⁴*Université de*

Liège, BE, mdestain@ulg.ac.be, benjamin.dumont@ulg.ac.be, louis.francois@ulg.ac.be, julien.minet@ulg.ac.be

¹⁵*Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research*

(ZALF), DE, ckersebaum@zalf.de, chris.kollas@zalf.de, nendel@zalf.de

¹⁶*IFAPA Junta de Andalucía, ES, ignacioj.lorite@juntadeandalucia.es*

¹⁷*University of Copenhagen, DK, manuelmontesino@life.ku.dk*

¹⁸*CNR-IBIMET, IT, marco.moriondo@cnr.it*

¹⁹*Aarhus University, DK, isik.ozturk@agrsci.dk*

²⁰*Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, ES, alfre2ky@gmail.com*

²¹*Rothamsted*

Research, GB, mikhail.semenov@rothamsted.ac.uk, pierre.stratonovitch@rothamsted.ac.uk, wu@rothamsted.ac.uk

²²*Wageningen University, NL, iwan.supit@wur.nl*

Impact response surfaces (IRs) depict the response of an impact variable to changes in two explanatory variables as a plotted surface. Here, IRs of spring and winter wheat yields were constructed from a 25-member ensemble of process-based crop simulation models. Twenty-one models were calibrated by different groups using a common set of calibration data, with calibrations applied independently to the same models in three cases. The sensitivity of modelled yield to changes in temperature and precipitation was tested by systematically modifying values of 1981-2010 baseline weather data to span the range of

changes projected for the late 21st century at three locations in Europe: Finland (northern, mainly temperature-limited), Spain (southern, mainly precipitation-limited) and Germany (central, high current suitability). Only a baseline CO₂ level was considered and simplified assumptions made about soils and management with an aim to distinguish differences in model response attributable to climate.

The patterns of responses depicted in the IRS plots can be used to compare model behaviour under a range of climates, evaluate model robustness, locate thresholds, and identify possible model deficiencies while searching for their causes. Preliminary results indicate that while simulated absolute yield levels vary considerably between models, inter-annual relative yield variability for baseline conditions is remarkably consistent across models, especially for spring wheat. Results are sensitive to calibration method, as the same models calibrated by different groups exhibited contrasting behaviour. Further work will examine other responses (e.g. CO₂ and adaptation options) and combine IRSs with probabilistic climate to evaluate risks of yield shortfall.