Mapping groundwater resiliency under climate change scenarios: A case study of Kathmandu Valley, Nepal
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ABSTRACT

Groundwater resources of Kathmandu Valley in Nepal are under immense pressure from multiple stresses, including climate change. Due to over-extraction, groundwater resources are depleting, leading to social, environmental and economic problems. Climate change might add additional pressure by altering groundwater recharge rates and availability of groundwater. Mapping groundwater resilience to climate change can aid in understanding the dynamics of groundwater systems, facilitating the development of strategies for sustainable groundwater management. Therefore, this study aims to analyse the impact of climate change on groundwater resources and mapping the groundwater resiliency of Kathmandu Valley under different climate change scenarios. The future climate projected using the climate data of RCM's namely ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM, CNRM-CM5-CSIRO-CCAM and MPI-ESM-LR-CSIRO-CCAM for three future periods: near future (2010–2039), mid future (2040–2069) and far future (2070–2099) under RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios were bias corrected and fed into the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), a hydrological model, to estimate future groundwater recharge. The results showed a decrease in groundwater recharge in future ranging from 3.3 to 50.7 mm/yr under RCP 4.5 and 19–102.1 mm/yr under RCP 8.5 scenario. The GMS-MODFLOW model was employed to estimate the future groundwater level of Kathmandu Valley. The model revealed that the groundwater level is expected to decrease in future. Based on the results, a groundwater resiliency map of Kathmandu Valley was developed. The results suggest that groundwater in the northern and southern area of the valley are highly resilient to climate change compared to the central area. The results will be very useful in the formulation and implementation of adaptation strategies to offset the negative impacts of climate change on the groundwater resources of Kathmandu Valley.

1. Introduction

Groundwater is depicted as the world’s hidden treasure, constituting 94% of its freshwater resources (Koundouri and Groom, 2010). Groundwater is the most preferable source of water supply since it is of good quality and requires less treatment than surface water. In addition, the availability of groundwater is high in dry seasons than surface water and requires less investment for extraction, while its quality remains almost the same throughout the year (UK-GWF, 2018). Therefore, two billion people depend on groundwater for their daily water supply (Kemper, 2004). Groundwater resources, however, are under serious threat due to over-extraction, population growth and subsequent urbanisation, pollution and climate change/variability. It is therefore important to understand the response of the groundwater system to the aforementioned stresses to facilitate its effective management (Foster and MacDonald, 2014). Mapping groundwater resiliency, defined as the capacity of the groundwater system to withstand either long-term shocks (e.g., climate change) or short-term shocks (e.g., drought) (NGWA, 2016), can be an effective tool for understanding the groundwater system, ultimately aiding the management of groundwater resources. The term resiliency involves two main aspects of an ecosystem: the ability to resist long-term damage, and the recovery time following a disturbance (Gunderson, 2000). Resilience is often discussed in the context of climate change as the ability of a system to absorb disturbances while retaining the same basic structure and ways of functioning, and the capacity to adapt to stress and change (IPCC, 2007). Thus, groundwater resiliency is the capacity of the aquifer to absorb variable pumping stress while retaining the same basic functionality in the context of variable surface water availability and recharge, in an interrelated system. Peters et al. (2004) defined
resilience as “how quickly a system is likely to recover once a failure has occurred, while vulnerability is the severity of the failure”. Sharma and Sharma (2006) defined groundwater resilience as the “ability of the system to maintain groundwater reserves despite major disturbances”.

The groundwater resources of Kathmandu Valley in central Nepal play a very important role in socio-economic development: providing water for domestic, agriculture and industrial purposes and the main water supply source for more than half of the population (Gautam and Prajapati, 2014). However, groundwater is under immense pressure (Pandey and Kazama, 2014) due to over-abstraction, resulting from population growth, rapid urbanisation (Pandey et al., 2010) and climate change. The global climate is changing, impacting on various sectors at different scales (Vijaya et al., 2012). The Kathmandu Valley, therefore, may not be an exception. As reported by Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2013), the global temperature has risen by 0.3–0.6 °C and is likely to rise between 1.4 and 5.8 °C by 2100 relative to 1900. Under these circumstances, the hydrological cycle experiences significant impacts, with erratic changes in precipitation and evaporation. As this trend continues, it will seriously impact on surface and groundwater resources.

The climate change impact on groundwater depends directly on the variation in volume of its storage and circulation (Zektser and Loaiciga, 1993). Consequently, an accurate prediction of climate variables and proper estimation of groundwater recharge is essential for determining the influence of climate change in groundwater recharge. Results from various research across the globe provide sufficient evidence concerning the vulnerability of groundwater resources to climate change and consequent effects on society and ecosystems; and such studies have adopted the modelling approach to assess the impact of climate change on groundwater resources (Bates et al., 2008; Yang et al., 2010; Ali et al., 2012; Erturk et al., 2014; Shrestha et al., 2016; Pholkern et al., 2018).

A study on a small Mediterranean basin in Turkey (Erturk et al., 2014) revealed a decrease in groundwater availability as a result of climate change, indicating that water management should be treated as a primary climate change adaptation plan to address likely future water scarcity. Another study in Mekong Delta aquifers (Shrestha et al., 2016) examined the influence of climate change on groundwater resources using a hydrological model (WETSPASS), groundwater model (MODFLOW) and five Global Circulation Models (GCMs) under two Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5), reporting a projected decrease in groundwater recharge as well as storage. Similarly, a study by Ali et al. (2012) focused on South-Western Australia, revealing that a decrease in rainfall in addition to groundwater over-extraction are the main reasons for declining groundwater levels and dependent ecosystems. They further found that all components of water balance like evapotranspiration, surface runoff, percolation are affected by climate change, further impacting on extractable water from both confined and unconfined aquifers. Yang et al. (2010) used rainfall-runoff model (SWAT) to estimate groundwater recharge in the Tong Zhou District, China, finding that groundwater in this region faces significant risk due to over-extraction and low rainfall. Emmanuel (2008) investigated the impact of climate change on groundwater recharge in the White Volta River Basin, Africa, revealing that shallow groundwater recharge is likely to increase remarkably under future climate change scenarios.

The aforementioned studies clearly reveal that climate change is likely to add immense pressure on groundwater resources by affecting the percolation rate and changing the availability of groundwater. However, limited studies have been conducted on groundwater in the context of climate change scenarios in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal, and none focuses on estimating groundwater resiliency to climate change. Therefore, this research focuses on modelling and investigating the impact of climate change on groundwater resources and mapping shallow groundwater resiliency under climate change scenarios in the valley. Mapping groundwater resiliency under climate change of Kathmandu Valley can be the effective tools to identify the area where the preventive measures are urgent and to understand the behavior of groundwater system under climate change which ultimately helps in the protection and management of groundwater resources. Furthermore, it can be the effective and sustainable way to prevent the groundwater degradation by controlling over abstraction, protection of groundwater recharge area, wetlands, forest and make people understand how groundwater respond to climate change/variability.
2. Study area and data collection

2.1. Study area

Kathmandu Valley encompasses main urban cities of Nepal and situated in central Nepal (Fig. 1). The valley’s watershed has an area of 656 km² and is enclosed within the Mahabharata hills from all sides. The groundwater basin of the valley includes three main cities: Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur with a total catchment area of 327 km². It is a closed basin with a mild slope towards the centre, and groundwater flow is presumed to be slow, mainly in the deeper aquifer (Pathak et al., 2009). The valley is surrounded by hills where the elevation is more than 2000 m a.s.l, with the part central consisting of flat land and small hills with an elevation of 1300–1400 m a.s.l. The valley has a subtropical and temperate climate with four distinct seasons: pre-monsoon (March–May), monsoon (June–September), post-monsoon (October–November) and winter (December–February). The average annual rainfall (1976–2005) in the valley is 1778 mm, the majority of which occurs during the monsoon period (June–September). The average maximum and minimum temperature (1976–2005) of the valley is 23.8 °C and 11.4 °C respectively. Bagmati, Bishnumati, Manohara, Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur with a total catchment area of 327 km².

The data used in this study includes the physical characteristics of catchment (elevation, soil and land use), time series observations (climate, hydrology, groundwater level, groundwater abstraction), hydrogeologic properties of aquifers (hydraulic conductivity \( K_x, K_y \)), specific storage \( S_s \), specific yield \( S_y \)) and future climate projection from climate models (Table 1).

2.2. Data collection

The data used in this study includes the physical characteristics of catchment (elevation, soil and land use), time series observations (climate, hydrology, groundwater level, groundwater abstraction), hydrogeologic properties of aquifers (hydraulic conductivity \( K_x, K_y \)), specific storage \( S_s \), specific yield \( S_y \)) and future climate projection from climate models (Table 1).

2.2.1. Historical and future climate scenarios

Historical observed climate data (1976–2005) was collected from the Department of Hydrology and Meteorology (DHM) of the Government of Nepal. Future climate projections were based on a selection of Regional Climate Models (RCMs). The selection of RCMs was based on the analysis of the relationship between observed climate data and raw climate data of RCMs. In the study, these climate data of the following RCMs were used: ACCESS-CISIRO-CCAM, MPI-ESM-LR-CISIRO-CCAM and CNRM-CMS-CISIRO-CCAM (Table 1) under RCP 4.5 and 8.5 scenarios from the South Asia CORDEX data portal (http://cccr.tropmet.res.in/home/index.jsp) were used to derive the climate of the region in the near future (2010–2039), mid future (2040–2069) and far future (2070–2099). Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs) scenarios depend on radiative forcing and this scenario mainly focuses on providing the concentration of greenhouse gases and radiative forcing with respect to time. Overall, there were four RCP scenarios: RCP 2.6, RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0 and RCP 8.5 (Table 2). The main goal of the RCP scenarios is to identify future uncertainties without predicting them. These scenarios are developed using different socioeconomic hypotheses (Moss et al., 2010; Rogelj et al., 2012).

3. Methodology

The overall methodological framework adopted in this study is depicted in Fig. 2. The modelling approach was used to project future climate, groundwater recharge and groundwater level. Future climate was projected using RCMs’ climate data and fed into the SWAT model to simulate future groundwater recharge. The calibrated groundwater model, MODFLOW from the GMS (Groundwater Modelling System) was developed to estimate the groundwater level of the study area. Finally, the groundwater resiliency indicator was estimated based on the predicted results which in turn, was used to develop a groundwater resilience map of the study area.

DEM is a digital elevation model; LULC is land use/cover; P is precipitation; T is Temperature; RH is Relative Humidity; WS is Wind Speed; SR is Solar Radiation; Qobs is Observed River Discharge; Cal is Calibration; Val is Validation; GWLobs is Observed Groundwater Level; GW is Groundwater; RCM is a Regional Climate Model; GwRe is the groundwater resiliency; GwR is groundwater recharge; GwL is groundwater level; and n is the base year.

3.1. Future climate projection

Future climate data of RCP4.5 and 8.5 scenarios was taken from RCMs as discussed in section 2.2.1. Bias correction of climate data is usually needed because climate models often provide biased representations of observed times series due to systematic model errors which is caused by imperfect conceptualization, discretization and spatial averaging within grid cells (Teutschbein and Seibert, 2010). Meaningful bias correction is essential to avoid doubt in modelling climate change effects. According to Shrestha et al. (2017a, 2017b, 2017c), the linear scaling approach with monthly correction values based on the difference between measured and current-day computed value is sufficiently efficient to correct errors from RCM outputs on a daily time scale compared to the quintile mapping method. Hence, the linear scaling technique was selected for this study since it is simple and has been applied in several studies (Shrestha et al., 2017a, 2017b, 2017c).

RCMs precipitation was corrected based on the proportion of long-term mean observed and control data as given in equations (1) and (2). RCMs temperature was corrected using an additive term obtained from the difference between the measured long-term monthly mean and control data as given in equations (3) and (4).

\[
P_{\text{his}}(d)^* = P_{\text{his}}(d)\left[1 + \frac{P_{\text{obs}}(d)}{P_{\text{his}}(d)}\right]
\]

\[
P_{\text{sim}}(d)^* = P_{\text{sim}}(d)\left[1 + \frac{P_{\text{obs}}(d)}{P_{\text{his}}(d)}\right]
\]

\[
T_{\text{his}}(d)^* = T_{\text{his}}(d) + \left[\frac{T_{\text{obs}}(d) - T_{\text{his}}(d)}{\mu_{\text{obs}}}ight]
\]

\[
T_{\text{sim}}(d)^* = T_{\text{sim}}(d) + \left[\frac{T_{\text{obs}}(d) - T_{\text{his}}(d)}{\mu_{\text{obs}}}ight]
\]

where, \( P \) is precipitation, \( T \) is temperature, \( \mu \) is daily, \( \mu_{\text{obs}} \) is is the long-term monthly mean, (*) represents bias corrected, \( \mu_{\text{obs}} \) refers to historical raw RCM data, \( obs \) refers to observed data and \( sim \) is the raw RCM future data.

The bias-corrected future time series was then used to analyse projected future climate change w.r.t. baseline in terms of long-term average, seasonal variations in change, changes across different future periods, and variation in changes with RCM scenarios.

3.2. Hydrological model development

The hydrological model for the Kathmandu Valley watershed was developed using the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), which is a physically based, semi-distributed hydrological model used extensively for studying different water quality and hydrological problems in various watersheds under different management practices (Luo et al., 2008). The SWAT model is also considered to be a classic instrument in...
the amount of precipitation on day $i$ (mm water), $Q_{surf}$ is the amount of surface runoff on day $i$ (mm water), $E_a$ is the amount of evapotranspiration on day $i$ (mm water), $W_{seep}$ is the amount of water entering the vadose zone from the soil profile on day $i$ (mm water), $Q_{gw}$ is the amount of base flow from the shallow aquifer on day $i$ (mm water). The SWAT model for this study was set up by discretising the Kathmandu Valley watershed into 29 sub-basins and 220 hydrological response units (HRUs) based on drainage density. As the computational blocks of the SWAT model, HRUs are located in the sub-watershed and respond similarly to the given inputs such as temperature and rainfall. The HRUs in the SWAT are classified according to land cover, soil type and slope. The slope of the basin was classified into four classes; 0–22%, 22–48%, 48–80% and 80–99% with the HRUs developed by fixing a 5% threshold for each land use percentage over the sub-basin area, soil class percentage over the land use area and slope class percentage over the soil area. Six years (1996–2001) of flow data for the Bagmati River at Khokhana station (550.5) (Fig. 1) was used for calibration and four years (2002–2005) of flow data for validation. The model was calibrated and validated for daily time scale. The model performance was evaluated by visually comparing observed and simulated hydrographs with values calculated using Nash-Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE), Percent Bias (PBIAS) and Coefficient of Determination ($R^2$). In equations, $Q_m$ is the modelled discharge ($m^3$/s); $Q_o$ - observed discharge ($m^3$/s); $N$ or $T$ is number of data points.

$$NSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_{m,t} - Q_{o,t})^2}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_{o,t} - \bar{Q}_o)^2}$$

(6)

$$PBIAS = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} Q_{m,t} - Q_{o,t}}{\sum_{t=1}^{T} Q_{o,t}}$$

(7)

$$R^2 = \left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_{m,t} - \bar{Q}_o)(Q_{m,t} - \bar{Q}_m)}{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_{m,t} - \bar{Q}_m)^2} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{T} (Q_{o,t} - \bar{Q}_o)^2}}\right)^2$$

(8)

3.3. Groundwater flow model development

The groundwater model, MODFLOW from the GMS, was used to simulate the groundwater level in the valley’s aquifers. The MODFLOW model is one of the most widely used groundwater model across the globe and a flexible groundwater modelling tool for examining the dynamics of groundwater systems and interpreting flow patterns.

### Table 1
Data used in this study and corresponding sources of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source/Developer</th>
<th>Spatial/Temporal Resolution</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elevation</td>
<td>ASTER GDEM</td>
<td>30 m/</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>SOTER, Nepal</td>
<td>30 m/</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>ICIMOD, Nepal</td>
<td>30 m/</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Groundwater Abstraction</td>
<td>GWRDB, Nepal</td>
<td>Point/Yearly</td>
<td>2001 and 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
Brief description of RCP scenarios (Source: Moss et al., 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCP</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CO₂ Equivalence (ppm)</th>
<th>Temperature Anomaly (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Peak in radiative forcing at ~ 3 W/m² before 2100 and decline</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Stabilisation without overshoot pathways to 6 W/m² at stabilisation after 2100</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Stabilisation without overshoot pathways to 6 W/m² at stabilisation after 2100</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Rising radiative forcing pathways leading to 8.5 W/m² in 2100</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: RCP is the Representative Concentration Pathway.
Furthermore, this model is also used as a tool for estimating recharge, aquifer storage processes, discharge as well as enumerating sustainable yield (Zhou and Li, 2011). In addition, the MODFLOW model has been extensively used by many researchers and hydrogeologists to simulate the flow of groundwater through the aquifers (Yang et al., 2010; Ali et al., 2012; Lachaal et al., 2012; Cheng et al., 2013; Maheswaran et al., 2016).

The three-dimensional groundwater flow through the porous medium is governed by the following equation:

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( K_x \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left( K_y \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( K_z \frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left( S_x \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - W \right) \tag{9}
\]

where, \(K_x, K_y, K_z\) are the values of hydraulic conductivity along x, y and z axes [LT\(^{-1}\)], \(h\) is the hydraulic head [L], \(W\) is flux per unit volume, representing sink and/or sources of water [T\(^{-1}\)], \(S_x\) is the specific storage of the aquifer [L\(^{-1}\)].

Equation (9) describes the transient flow when combined with both the initial and boundary conditions and steady state, while the term in the right side of the equation is assumed to be zero. Flow area in the MODFLOW is represented by grids and layers. Each grid and layer is expected to have consistent properties and Equation (9) is used to calculate the head of the layer. For confined layers, the head can rise above the top elevation while the simulated head remains below the surface of the unconfined layer.

The GMS-MODFLOW model was set up by discretising a groundwater basin of 327 km\(^2\) into 52 rows and 58 columns with a cell size of 500 m \(\times\) 500 m enclosed in modified UTM coordinates of 618810.4 m–646528 m east and 3051038 m to 3076021 m north. The inside grid of the groundwater border was set as an active area and the outside grid an indolent or inactive area. Vertically, the grids are alienated into three layers; the shallow aquifer (unconfined aquifer) as the topmost layer, aquitard (non-simulated layer) as the middle layer and the deep aquifer (confined aquifer) as the lowermost layer. Model inputs include the elevation of each layer, hydrogeological properties, boundary conditions, initial groundwater levels, recharge and discharge. Kathmandu Valley is separated by a rock surface on all sides and was, therefore, assumed to be a no-flow boundary, meaning that groundwater fluxes across the boundary will not occur. The groundwater level data for 18 observation wells and pumping data for 258 Kathmandu Upratya Khanepani Limited (KUKL) pumping wells were used in the model. The total groundwater abstraction was reported to be 21.26 million cubic metres (MCM) in 1999 and 25.52 MCM in 2009 (Pandey and Kazama, 2014). However, there is no exact number for pumping wells in operation. It is observed that most of the pumping wells in Kathmandu Valley are distributed in the central area. Groundwater level data for 18 observation wells in 2001 was used for model calibration with 2008 used for model validation. The model simulation was conducted in the steady-state condition to obtain future groundwater levels. The hydraulic properties of the Kathmandu aquifer system are summarised in Table 3.

3.4. Climate change impact assessment

To assess the climate change impact, SWAT model and GMS-MODFLOW inputs were analysed according to the projected future climate. Any changes in recharge areas and groundwater levels through
3.5. Population projection and future groundwater abstraction estimation

The population of the valley has already come to saturation points because the hill surrounding it acts as a fence against further increment. Hence, the logistic curve method was used for forecasting the population of Kathmandu Valley (Shrestha et al., 2017). This method accepts input changes, with respect to the baseline values, were taken as impacts of climate change. Baseline values for groundwater recharge and its spatial distribution were estimated from the calibrated/validated SWAT model. Similarly, the baseline value of the groundwater level was estimated from the calibrated/validated GMS-MODFLOW.

\[ b = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{P_0(P_{sat} - P_t)}{P_t(P_{sat} - P_0)} \]  

where, \( P_0, P_1, P_2 = \) population at time period 1991, 2001 and 2011 respectively (CBS, 1991, 2001, 2011), \( P_{sat} = \) population at saturation level, \( \Delta t = \) number of years after base year, \( a, b = \) data constants, \( n = \) time interval between successive years.

To calculate future groundwater abstraction, the following three scenarios were analysed:

- Scenario 1 (S1): 20% of the total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction
- Scenario 2 (S2): 35% of the total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction
- Scenario 3 (S3): 50% of the total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction

Different studies reveal that groundwater is the main source of water supply in Kathmandu valley, Nepal (Gautam and Prajapati, 2014). Kathmandu Upatyaka Khanepani Limited (KUKL) is the only water supply operator providing water supply services in the urban and rural areas of the valley (Shrestha, 2012). In total, KUKL supplies 22.5% of the total water demand in the driest month and up to a maximum of 37.8% in the wettest month (KUKL, 2011). The portion of groundwater contribution is 35% in dry season and 11% in wet season with a yearly average of 19% in 2011 (KUKL, 2011).

The scenario 1 (S1) in this study assumes 20% of total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction and is the optimistic scenario which designate the reduction in groundwater abstraction for the implementation of policies to prevent groundwater abstraction or trans boundary water diversion from different river basin.

In our study, groundwater abstraction data for 258 KUKL operated pumping wells of year 2001 and 2008 were used. Since there were no exact numbers of private wells for commercial, industrial, agricultural and household purposes, we assumed that 35% of the total water demand is fulfilled from groundwater abstraction (19% from KUKL well and 16% from private wells for commercial, industrial, agricultural and household purposes).

Therefore, scenario 2 (S2) assumes that 35% of the total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction as in business as usual scenario.

The scenario 3 (S3) assumes that 50% of the total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction and is the pessimistic scenario where the groundwater abstraction further increases in future.

Table 3
Hydraulic properties of the Kathmandu aquifer system (Source: Pandey and Kazama, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. N</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Shallow Aquifer</th>
<th>Deep Aquifer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Surface Area, A (km²)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transmissivity, T (m²/day)</td>
<td>163.2-1056.6</td>
<td>22.6-737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hydraulic Conductivity, K (m/day)</td>
<td>12.5-44.9</td>
<td>0.3-8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Permeability, k (m²)</td>
<td>1.48E-11 to 5.32E-11</td>
<td>3.74E-13 to 1.04E-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Storage Coefficient, S</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.00023-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Aquifer Volume (MCM)</td>
<td>726.17</td>
<td>5641.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Per capita demand (lpcd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic demand</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public demand (water demand for public utility purposes, such as the washing of public parks and roads, gardening, public fountains)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial demand</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial demand</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire demand</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss and waste</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6. Groundwater resiliency mapping

Groundwater resiliency to climate change in this study is defined as the percentage recovery to the total depletion of groundwater level at a given time and can be described as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groundwater Resiliency (GwRe) Value (%)</th>
<th>Resiliency Class</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>Not resilient</td>
<td>Less groundwater recharge, higher reduction of groundwater level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>Fairly resilient</td>
<td>Less groundwater recharge, fair reduction of groundwater level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>Moderately resilient</td>
<td>Moderate groundwater recharge, moderate reduction of groundwater level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 8</td>
<td>Highly resilient</td>
<td>Higher groundwater recharge, less reduction of groundwater level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8</td>
<td>Very highly resilient</td>
<td>Higher groundwater recharge and very less reduction of groundwater level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where, $n$ represents the base year, GwRe is groundwater resiliency, GwR is groundwater recharge and GwL is groundwater level.

Groundwater resiliency (GwRe) was further divided into five different classes to develop a groundwater resiliency map of Kathmandu Valley (Table 5). Equation (16) shows that, groundwater resiliency for the particular year depends directly on the groundwater recharge of that year and inversely to the change in groundwater level between that year and the baseline period (1976–2005) under RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios.
particular year and base year. Higher the percentage of recovery over total depletion, higher will be the groundwater resiliency.

Groundwater system is very highly resilient, if the groundwater level increases in future. Also, for higher groundwater recharge and lesser reduction in groundwater level, groundwater system is be highly resilient (decrease in groundwater level is less than 20 times the groundwater recharge). Similarly, for lesser groundwater recharge and higher reduction in groundwater level, groundwater system is not resilient (decrease in groundwater level is greater than 100 times the groundwater recharge).

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Projected future climate of Kathmandu Valley

Future climate is described by change in temperature ($T_{\text{max}}, T_{\text{min}}$) and precipitation using RCM (CSIRO-CCAM), but driven by three different GCMs; ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM, MPI-ESM-LR-CSIRO-CCAM and CNRM-CM5-CSIRO-CCAM under two emission scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5) for the near future (2010–2039) mid future (2040–2069) and far future (2070–2099). This includes comparing the baseline (1976–2005) climate datasets with bias-corrected climate datasets. The linear scaling method was used to remove bias from the climate model outputs. The $R^2$, RMSE and standard deviation (SD) values were also
calculated to check the accuracy of the bias corrected data. The results reveal the betterment in $R^2$ and minimisation of SD and RMSE values after bias correction (Table S1). Supplementary Table S1 shows the summary statistics for the performance of ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM. However, performance of the other RCMs was also similar.

The annual average baseline precipitation, $T_{\text{max}}$, and $T_{\text{min}}$ of Kathmandu Valley was 1778 mm, 23.8, and 11.4 °C, respectively. All RCMs and both RCP scenarios indicated that $T_{\text{max}}$ and $T_{\text{min}}$ are projected to increase in the future. The projected increase in $T_{\text{max}}$ ranges from 0.4 to 2.2 °C in RCP 4.5 scenario and 0.5–3.8 °C in RCP 8.5. Similarly, the projected increase in $T_{\text{min}}$ ranges from 0.5 to 2.4 °C in RCP 4.5 scenario and 0.6–4.4 °C in RCP 8.5. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM projected maximum increases in future maximum and minimum temperatures in the near, mid and far future for both RCPs scenarios. The increase in $T_{\text{min}}$ was found to be considerably higher than that of $T_{\text{max}}$ (Vose et al., 2005; Kharin et al., 2013). Fig. 3 (top and middle) shows the absolute change in temperature with respect to the baseline period.

Fig. 5. Relative change in groundwater recharge for the Kathmandu Valley during three future periods: NF (2010–2039), MF (2040–2069), FF (2070–2099) under RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios in respect to baseline recharge (1996–2005).

Fig. 6. Relationship between observed head (masl) and simulated head (masl) in the steady-state condition for calibration period (a) and validation period (b).
Precipitation is projected to vary throughout the future. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM shows that precipitation during the future period is expected to decrease in both RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM projected a maximum decrease in future precipitation of 114.28 mm in the mid future under RCP 8.5 scenario, while CNRM-CM5-CSIRO-CCAM shows a maximum decrease in future precipitation of 123.09 mm in the near future under RCP 4.5. The MPI-ESM-LR-CSIRO-CCAM RCM projected a maximum increase in future precipitation of 59.69 mm in the far future under RCP 4.5 scenario and 189.02 mm in the mid future under RCP 8.5. Average precipitation during the post-monsoon, pre-monsoon and winter seasons is expected to increase by a certain amount, whereas the result shows a significant decrease during the monsoon period for both climate change scenarios. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM, the other two RCMs project future precipitation with respect to the baseline period. With the exception of ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM, the precipitation in a random manner without a clear increasing or decreasing pattern in the projected precipitation values. This somehow explains the uncertainty which could potentially arise from these inputs in terms of hydrological simulation for future conditions. This is the main reason for selecting data on more than one RCM to assess the impact of climate change scenarios.

4.2. SWAT model calibration and validation

Calibration and validation of the SWAT model was conducted for daily streamflow at the basin outlet at Khokana station (550.5). Six years (1996–2001) of flow data was used for calibration and four years (2002–2005) for validation. For auto calibration, SWAT-CUP was used. The calibration process includes identifying sensitive parameters. The sensitivity analysis of the parameters was carried out to analyse the effect of an incremental change in input parameters on the corresponding change in output values. About 31 parameters were used for sensitivity analysis which are GWQMN.gw, SOL_ALB().sol, GW_REVAP.gw, SURLAG.bsn, CH_S1.sub, ESCO.hru, GW_SPRYLD.gw, LAT_TIME.hru, GDRAIN.mgt, CH_N1.sub, EPCO.hru, SOL_BD().sol, CANMX.hru, REVAPMN.gw, CH_K2.rte, ICN.bsn, SOL_K().sol, SHALLST.gw, DEEPST.gw, SLSOIL.hru, SOL_AWC().sol, CNCOEF.bsn, OV_N.hru, SLSUBBSN.hru, CH_K1.sub, ALPHA_BF.gw, GW_DELAY.gw, CN2.mgt, RHRHP_DP.gw, CH_W1.sub and CH_L1.sub. Out of 31 parameters, 23 parameters are selected for model calibration which are listed in Supplementary Table S2 with their sensitivity rank. The accuracy of the model was tested by checking the fitness of the observed and simulated flow values (Fig. 4). In addition, statistical performance indicators such as NSE, PBIAS and R² were calculated for both calibration and validation periods. The NSE was used as the objective function and the threshold value was set at 0.5. The NSE, R² and PBIAS values for calibration were 0.75, 0.76 and –5.49, respectively, and 0.83, 0.84 and –9.53 for validation. This shows that the prediction performance of the model is reasonably good, thus, the validated model can realistically be used for future predictions. The performance of the model is good in daily time-steps for calibration and validation periods (Moriasi et al., 2007).

4.3. Impact of climate change on groundwater recharge

Groundwater recharge for the three future periods: near future (2010–2039) mid future (2040–2069) and far future (2070–2099) and the two RCPs scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5) were compared with the baseline (1996–2005) groundwater recharge of 587.03 mm/year. In similarity to the precipitation pattern, groundwater recharge is projected to be highly erratic throughout the future for almost all RCMs. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM projected a maximum decrease in groundwater recharge of 8.6% in the far future under RCP 4.5 scenario and 17.4% for the far future under RCP 8.5. The MPI-ESM-LR-CSIRO-CCAM RCM shows a maximum increase in groundwater recharge of 7.6% in the mid future under RCP 8.5 scenario while CNRM-CM5-CSIRO-CCAM RCM projected a maximum increase in groundwater recharge of 1.6% in the mid future under RCP 4.5. The average groundwater recharge during post-monsoon, pre-monsoon and winter seasons is projected to increase by a certain amount with respect to precipitation. However, the compelling results show a projected decrease in groundwater recharge during the monsoon season. The decrease in monsoon groundwater recharge ranges from 1.05 to 16.38% in RCP 4.5 scenario and 0.23–20.29% in RCP 8.5. Since more than 80% of the precipitation in Kathmandu Valley occurs during the monsoon season, the decrease in monsoon groundwater recharge is more significant. Fig. 5 shows the change in groundwater recharge relative to the baseline. The projected change in groundwater recharge under climate change scenarios is shown in Supplementary Table S3.

4.4. Calibration and validation of groundwater model

A steady-state groundwater model was developed for 2001. To achieve good agreement between the simulated and observed hydraulic heads, the values of hydraulic conductivities in each layer were
Model calibration was conducted by the trial and error method, and after several runs, the values of hydraulic conductivities in different layers were adjusted until a good match was achieved between observed and simulated heads. In addition, adjustments were also made to the river conductance and depth for model calibration. Hydraulic conductivity was found to be 40 m/day, 40 m/day and 4 m/day in x, y and z direction respectively for the shallow aquifer, 3 m/day, 3 m/day and 0.3 m/day in x, y and z direction respectively for the deep aquifer and 0.006048 m/day, 0.006048 m/day and 0.0006048 m/day in x, y and z direction respectively for the aquitard. The average river depth of 0.4 m used for calibration. The model was validated for 2008, keeping the same calibration parameter and only changing the input data such as groundwater recharge, groundwater abstraction and observed groundwater levels. The model performance was evaluated using R² as a statistical measure. The R² value for the calibration period was found to be 0.73 with 0.68 for the validation period. This suggests that the overall performance of the model is fairly good. The relationship between observed and simulated heads for both calibration and validation periods are shown in Fig. 6. The model results for observed and simulated heads in the steady-state condition, calibration period (2001) and validation period (2008) are shown in Supplementary Table S4.

4.5. Impact of climate change on the groundwater level

The impact of climate change on the groundwater level was

![Fig. 8. Change in future groundwater level with respect to the observed baseline groundwater level (2001) for three different time periods: 2031, 2061 and 2091 with S1, S2 and S3 in respect of ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM and RCPs 4.5 and 8.5 scenarios.](image)
projected for three future periods: 2031, 2061 and 2091 under two RCPs scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5) after comparison with the baseline (2001). Three pumping scenarios were also analysed to calculate future groundwater abstraction, and subsequently used to calculate future groundwater levels. Pumping scenarios S1, S2 and S3 indicate that 20, 35 and 50% of the total water demand is fulfilled by groundwater abstraction, respectively.

All RCMs and both RCP scenarios project that, on average, the groundwater level will decrease in future for all three pumping scenarios: S1, S2 and S3 (Fig. 7). The average decrease in groundwater level was higher for scenario S3 than S2 and S1. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM projects a maximum decrease in the average groundwater level of 9.6 m for pumping scenario S1, 23.2 m in S2 and 37.4 m in S3 for RCP 4.5 scenario and 12 m for S1, 25.6 m for S2 and 39.9 m for S3 in RCP 8.5 by 2091. On average, the projected decrease in groundwater level is higher for the RCP 8.5 scenario than RCP 4.5.

The rate of decrease in groundwater level throughout the valley is not uniform. The decline in groundwater level in the centre of the valley is significant and much higher than the northern and southern areas. The result reveals that well H17 (Hotel Soaltee), in the central part of the valley, will experience the maximum decrease in groundwater level. The ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM projects a maximum decrease of 133.5 m in well H17 (Hotel Soaltee) for RCP 8.5 scenario and 128.5 m for RCP 4.5 by 2091 under pumping scenario S3. Fig. 8 shows the decrease in groundwater level with respect to the observed groundwater level (2001) for three different time periods: 2031, 2061 and 2091 with Scenarios S1, S2 and S3 for ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM and RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 scenarios.

4.6. Spatial variation in groundwater resiliency

The groundwater resiliency map of the Kathmandu Valley was developed based on the indicators described in Section 3.5.1 for all three pumping scenarios (S1, S2, S3) and three time periods (2031, 2061 and 2091) using three RCMs under both RCP scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5). The results show a projected decrease in the percentage of area under “very highly resilient” class and a projected increase in the “not resilient” class, towards the future periods. The decrease in the area classified as very highly resilient and an increase in the area under not resilient was significant and higher for pumping scenario S3 than S2 and S1. The maximum fluctuation in the percentage of area under five resiliency classes is shown by ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM. According to ACCESS-CSIRO-CCAM RCM for both RCP scenarios and pumping scenario S3, only 10.7% of the total area will be classified as very highly resilient by 2091. Under RCP 4.5 scenario and pumping scenario S3, 25.9% of the total area will be classified as not resilient by 2091. Likewise, for RCP 8.5 scenario and pumping scenario S3, 43.8% of the total area will be classified as not resilient class by 2091.

The result reveals that the majority of the area in central Kathmandu Valley is projected to fall under the “not resilient” and “fairly resilient” classes whereas the area in the southern and northern parts of the valley will be classified as “very highly resilient and “highly resilient” for all three RCMs, pumping scenarios and RCP scenarios. Fig. 9 shows the groundwater resiliency map of Kathmandu Valley for three different time periods: 2031, 2061 and 2091 with S1,
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5. Conclusions

The groundwater resiliency map of the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal was developed using the results from the hydrological model, groundwater model and three RCMs under RCP scenarios (RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5). The results showed a projected increase in the future temperature (T_{max}, T_{min}) of the basin. By the end of the twenty-first century, the average annual maximum temperature is projected to increase by 0.4–2.2 °C in RCP 4.5 and 0.5–3.8 °C in RCP 8.5 scenario. Likewise, the average annual minimum temperature is projected to increase by 0.5–2.4 °C in RCP 4.5 and 0.6–4.4 °C in RCP 8.5 scenario. As for precipitation, this is expected to decrease to the maximum level in the monsoon season (June–September) compared to the baseline period for all time horizons and both climate change scenarios. The decrease in precipitation ranges from 8.9 to 123 mm under RCP 4.5 and from 10.5 to 114.28 mm under the RCP 8.5 scenario.

The impact of climate change on groundwater recharge and groundwater level was also analysed. Future groundwater recharge is projected to decrease with the maximum decrease being in the monsoon season. The decrease in groundwater recharge ranges from 3.3 to 50.7 mm in the RCP 4.5 scenario and from 19 to 102.1 mm in RCP 8.5. The average groundwater level is projected to decrease in all threeumping scenarios (S1, S2 and S3) with a higher decrease for S3 than S2 and S1. The maximum decrease in average groundwater level ranges from 9.6 to 37.4 m for the RCP 4.5 scenario and 12–39.9 m for RCP 8.5. However, the decrease in groundwater level is uneven across the valley. The central part of the valley faces a higher decrease in groundwater level than the northern and southern areas. The area classified as “very highly resilient” is projected to decrease and that falling under the “not resilient” class is projected to increase in future under all pumping scenarios. Such decrease is projected to be more significant for S3 than scenario S2 and S1. The majority of the city area (centre) in the valley is projected to be “not resilient” and the northern and southern parts of the valley are likely to be “resilient” in all pumping scenarios.

Based on the results and variability in terms of climate change, it can be concluded that the groundwater resources in the valley are at risks due to climate change. Therefore, proper monitoring of the groundwater condition and development of adaptation is crucial for sustainable management of groundwater resources in the Kathmandu Valley.
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