Rainfall interception and the coupled surface water and energy balance

Albert I. J. M. van Dijk^{1*}, John H. Gash², Eva van Gorsel³, Peter D. Blanken⁴, Alessandro Cescatti⁵,
Carmen Emmel⁶, Bert Gielen⁷, Ian Harman³, Gerard Kiely⁸, Lutz Merbold⁷, Leonardo Montagnani⁹,
Eddy Moors¹⁰, Marilyn Roland⁶, Matteo Sottocornola¹¹, Andrej Varlagin¹², Christopher A. Williams¹³,
Georg Wohlfahrt¹⁴

¹ Fenner School for Environment & Society, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

* corresponding author: postal address: Linnaeus way, 0200 Canberra, ACT, Australia. E-mail: albert.vandijk@anu.edu.au. Telephone: (+61 02) 612 52197;

² Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, UK

³ CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere Flagship, Canberra, Australia

⁴ Department of Geography, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA

⁵ European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Institute for Environment and Sustainability, Ispra, Italy

⁶ Department of Environmental Systems Science, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

⁷ University of Antwerp, Wilrijk, Belgium

⁸ Civil and Environmental Engineering Dept., and Environmental Research Institute, University College Cork, Ireland

⁹ Faculty of Science and Technology, Free University of Bolzano, and Forest Services, Autonomous Province of Bolzano, Bolzano, Italy

¹⁰ Alterra Wageningen UR, Netherlands

¹¹ Department of Science, Waterford Institute of Technology, Waterford, Ireland

¹² A.N. Severtsov Institute of Ecology and Evolution, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

¹³ Graduate School of Geography, Clark University, Worcester, USA

¹⁴ Institute of Ecology, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

9 **Abstract**

10 Evaporation from wet canopies (E) can return up to half of incident rainfall back into the atmosphere
11 and is a major cause of the difference in water use between forests and short vegetation. Canopy water
12 budget measurements often suggest values of E during rainfall that are several times greater than
13 those predicted from Penman-Monteith theory. Our literature review identified potential issues with
14 both estimation approaches, producing several hypotheses that were tested using micrometeorological
15 observations from 128 FLUXNET sites world-wide. The analysis shows that FLUXNET eddy-
16 covariance measurements tend to provide unreliable measurements of E during rainfall. However, the
17 other micrometeorological FLUXNET observations do provide clues as to why conventional Penman-
18 Monteith applications underestimate E . Aerodynamic exchange rather than radiation often drives E
19 during rainfall, and hence errors in air humidity measurement and aerodynamic conductance
20 calculation have considerable impact. Furthermore, evaporative cooling promotes a downwards heat
21 flux from the air aloft as well as from the biomass and soil; energy sources that are not always
22 considered. Accounting for these factors leads to E estimates and modelled interception losses that are
23 considerably higher. On the other hand, canopy water budget measurements can lead to overestimates
24 of E due to spatial sampling errors in throughfall and stemflow, underestimation of canopy rainfall
25 storage capacity, and incorrect calculation of rainfall duration. There are remaining questions relating
26 to horizontal advection from nearby dry areas, infrequent large-scale turbulence under stable
27 atmospheric conditions, and the possible mechanical removal of splash droplets by such eddies. These
28 questions have implications for catchment hydrology, rainfall recycling, land surface modelling, and
29 the interpretation of eddy-covariance measurements.

30

31 Keywords: rainfall interception; wet canopy evaporation; FLUXNET; water use; evapotranspiration;
32 Penman-Monteith theory

33

34

35 1. Introduction

36 Rainfall interception is the fraction of rain that falls onto vegetation but never reaches the ground,
37 instead evaporating from the wet canopy. The most direct way to measure rainfall interception
38 evaporation is through the construction of weighing lysimeters, which is a major undertaking for
39 forests (Dunin et al., 1988). Therefore interception loss (the amount of rainfall lost to wet canopy
40 evaporation) has usually been derived as the residual between event gross rainfall measured above the
41 canopy or in a nearby clearing, and net rainfall, the latter calculated as the sum of separately measured
42 throughfall and stemflow below the canopy. In his pioneering paper, Horton (1919) recognised that (i)
43 the fractions of rainfall becoming throughfall and stemflow both vary as a function of storm size and
44 canopy characteristics, (ii) canopy water storage capacity, storm duration and the rate of wet canopy
45 evaporation (E in mm h^{-1}) during rainfall are the important variables determining interception loss;
46 (iii) the interception process can be conceptualised to consist of two components: wet canopy
47 evaporation during rainfall followed by drying of the canopy once rainfall has stopped; (iv) wind can
48 shed water from the canopy, but equally can increase E ; and (v) in the absence of snow, the fractional
49 interception loss from evergreen vegetation appears stable throughout the year, suggesting that, at
50 least for Horton's site in New York state, USA, event-average rainfall rate (R in mm h^{-1}) and E both
51 increase in summer in approximate proportion. Research since has generally confirmed and refined
52 these observations (see benchmark papers reprinted in Gash and Shuttleworth, 2007). Law (1957)
53 combined throughfall and stemflow measurements with lysimeter drainage measurements to establish
54 a water budget for spruce and pasture. He concluded that the forests had substantially higher rainfall
55 interception losses and, as a consequence, produced less drainage and streamflow.

56 Nearly a century of further water budget measurements have emphasised the role of vegetation type in
57 determining the magnitude of rainfall interception. Forests typically intercept 10–30% (but sometimes
58 up to half) of the rainfall and rapidly return it to the atmosphere, whereas short vegetation intercepts
59 less rainfall (e.g., Crockford and Richardson, 2000; Horton, 1919; Leyton et al., 1967; Roberts, 1999).
60 This difference goes far in explaining why forest establishment is commonly observed to decrease
61 (and removal increase) streamflow, at least in small catchment experiments (e.g., Van Dijk et al.,
62 2012). However, the physical processes and atmospheric conditions that allow such a large fraction of
63 rainfall to be returned to the atmosphere are poorly understood. In simulation models, rainfall
64 interception is usually estimated in one of two ways (Muzylo et al., 2009): many conceptual
65 hydrological models assume a fixed ratio between 'net' and 'gross' rainfall, without any attempt to
66 reconcile the evaporation rate implied by the water budget (E_{WB}) with the constraint of balancing the
67 energy budget. Alternatively, more detailed process hydrology and land surface models may include a
68 canopy water balance model following the concepts originally introduced by Rutter et al. (1971).
69 These latter models are coupled to the energy balance if they use evaporation rates based on Penman-
70 Monteith theory (E_{PM}).

71 Numerous studies have combined field measurements of the canopy water budget with sub-daily or
72 event-based interception modelling. By comparing gross and net rainfall for a series of storm events,
73 one can use graphical or regression approaches to derive an ‘effective’ $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ ratio (i.e., of event-
74 average E and R ; cf. Gash, 1979) for multiple events and a mean canopy rainfall storage capacity, S
75 (in mm), where S is defined as the minimum depth of water needed to saturate the canopy.
76 Alternatively, these parameters can be found by fitting the interception model against gross and net
77 rainfall measurements per event (Gash et al., 1995) or time step (Rutter et al., 1971). Less commonly,
78 interception has been estimated by comparing rainfall inputs to changes in total water storage in a
79 column of soil with trees (Dunin et al., 1988). More often than not, the different methods produce
80 results that are difficult to explain in terms of the energy balance, in that inferred E exceeds E_{PM} by a
81 factor of two or more (Holwerda et al., 2012; Schellekens et al., 1999). In other words, the
82 observations cannot be reconciled within a coupled water and energy balance.

83 The objective of this study is to better understand the reasons for the discrepancy between energy and
84 water balance approaches in determining interception loss. This discrepancy is reflected in the
85 uncertainty of flux estimates; in fact, commonly rainfall interception is not even considered as a
86 separate process in the estimation of evapotranspiration by flux tower eddy covariance measurements,
87 remote sensing and modelling methods alike. Better understanding the coupled water and energy
88 balance during rainfall may also have important ramifications for land-use management and water
89 policies, and for our understanding of the role of forests in the climate system (Bonan, 2008). For
90 example, if the rate of vapour return and the rate of energy withdrawal from the boundary layer are
91 greater than current land surface models predict, this may affect the rainfall generation downwind
92 predicted by weather and climate models (Blyth et al., 1994). This in turn would suggest that the
93 implications of vegetation change for rainfall and water resources availability downwind might need
94 to be reconsidered. Conversely, if the true evaporative flux is much lower than estimated from field
95 measurements, it might require a revision of currently held assumptions about the impact of land-
96 cover change on the catchment water balance.

97 Several hypotheses have been proposed to explain the discrepancy between water budget and energy
98 balance methods, but to the best of our knowledge they have not been systematically assessed or
99 tested. This was the primary motivation for this study.

100 This article is structured as follows. The theoretical framework to analyse the energy balance theory
101 during rainfall is provided in Section 2. The global FLUXNET ‘La Thuile’ database (Baldocchi,
102 2008; Baldocchi et al., 2001) provided unique opportunities to test several of the hypotheses. Details
103 on data selection and the list of 128 sites are provided in Annex A, whereas methodological
104 challenges in measurement and data processing are discussed in Section 3. The proposed causes for
105 the discrepancy in estimated wet canopy evaporation rates are identified in Section 4, and
106 subsequently tested in the following sections. Specifically, issues in applying Penman-Monteith

theory are investigated in Section 5, whereas issues in the application of rainfall interception models are examined in Section 6. Finally, we summarise our main conclusions in Section 7. Each hypothesis tested required its own data analysis with a varying level of methodological complexity.

To maintain readability we described the data analysis methods and results together, and relegated some more intricate aspects of the methodology to appendices B (canopy heat flux estimation) and C (simplified rainfall interception model).

2. Theory

Rutter (1967) was the first to apply the Penman (1952) equation to rainfall interception. With later modifications introduced by Monteith (1981), the Penman-Monteith equation can be used to estimate latent heat flux, λE (W m^{-2}) as:

$$\lambda E_{PM} = \frac{\Delta}{\Delta + \gamma'} A + \frac{\rho c_p}{\Delta + \gamma'} g_a (e_s - e) \quad (1a)$$

with

$$\gamma' = \gamma (1 + g_a / g_s). \quad (1b)$$

where Δ (Pa K^{-1}) is the slope of the saturation water vapour pressure curve at air temperature T (K), γ' and γ (Pa K^{-1}) are the adjusted and original psychrometric constants, A (W m^{-2}) is the available energy, ρ (kg m^{-3}) the specific density of air, c_p ($\text{J kg}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$) the specific heat of air at constant temperature, g_a and g_s (m s^{-1}) the aerodynamic and surface conductances, respectively, while the difference between saturation vapour pressure at ambient temperature e_s (Pa) and the actual vapour pressure e (Pa) is the vapour pressure deficit or VPD. Rutter (1967) pointed out that for a wet canopy, the latent heat flux is no longer limited by stomatal conductance. Therefore g_s should approach infinity and γ' becomes numerically equal to γ . It is noted that in a partially wet but poorly ventilated canopy, surface conductance may still be finite, as found for Amazonian rainforest by Czikowsky and Fitzjarrald (2009). The available energy A is given by (all in W m^{-2}):

$$A = R_n - G - Q \quad (2)$$

where R_n is net all-wave radiation, G is the ground heat flux and Q is the sum of all minor energy sources and sinks, including any change in heat storage in the canopy air, Q_a , and in the biomass, Q_v , as well as energy used for photosynthesis and produced by other metabolic processes. The last two terms are ignored in the present context, but the fluxes Q_v and Q_a may not be negligible, as will be discussed.

Net radiation R_n is typically small during rainfall, because of cloud cover during the day and because rain can equally occur during the night. Rutter (1967) found that wet canopy evaporation could be about four times greater than transpiration rates would have been under the same atmospheric conditions. Importantly, he recognised that the latent heat flux associated with evaporation on days with rain exceeded A and concluded that “*energy is obtained from the air*”; in other words, there is a downwards sensible heat flux (H) and/or cooling of the ambient air. This situation is also predicted by the Penman-Monteith equation if the aerodynamic component of λE_{PM} (the second term) is greater than the radiation component (the first term), since the energy balance $A=H+\lambda E$ demands that (cf. Eq. (1a)):

$$H_{PM} = A - \lambda E = \frac{\gamma'}{\Delta + \gamma'} A - \frac{\rho c_p}{\Delta + \gamma'} g_a (e_s - e) \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, using the bulk aerodynamic approach of Eq. (1a), H is also given by (cf. Penman, 1952):

$$H = \rho c_p g_a (T_s - T) \quad (4)$$

where T_s (K) is the temperature of the surface (e.g., the canopy). A downward sensible heat flux requires that the surface is cooler than the air (Eq. (4)). Pereira et al. (2009) demonstrated that, at least under conditions of low irradiance, the wet crowns of isolated trees cool to temperatures very close to wet bulb temperature, implying that the effective g_s is indeed very high (cf. Eqs. (1a and b)). Rutter (1967) measured that wet leaves were up to 1 K cooler than the air above. In turn, the air above the wet canopy was itself on average 1K cooler than at a reference climate station nearby, suggesting that the greater aerodynamic roughness of the forest led to greater evaporative cooling. This was initially dismissed as a forest edge effect, until Stewart (1977) presented measurements over an extensive forest area that also showed a negative H of up to about 50 W m^{-2} . The FLUXNET database also bears this out. Table 1 lists average values of H reported for a wide range of sites in the FLUXNET data base, measured by three-dimensional anemometers. Although reported H values during rain events need to be interpreted with some caution (see Section 3), the average H for all periods with rainfall was negative for 80% of sites ($N=108$), with an average H of $-12 \pm 16 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for sites with tall vegetation ($>3 \text{ m}$, $N=59$) and $-6 \pm 8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for sites with short vegetation ($>1.5 \text{ m}$, $N=49$; Table 1). The greatest negative H (-31 W m^{-2}) was determined also for the tallest forest (AU-Wac, 70 m tall).

[TABLE 1 HERE]

Because of the typically negative H , Stewart (1977) suggested that large-scale advection must occur, which he argued could have been supplied from adjoining land areas with a dry canopy. Alternatively, Shuttleworth and Calder (1979) argued that the lack of surface control and the strong atmospheric coupling of a wet forest canopy means that high E can be sustained by “*the considerable sensible heat already stored, or presently being released by the precipitation process, in the lower levels of the atmosphere*”. They also commented that sensible heat advection will be common under such conditions, and point out that when there is little radiation, the mere fact that saturation deficits in and near the wet canopy are greater than zero *in itself* provides proof that sensible heat is supplied. Finally, they argue that the occurrence of cloud formation and rainfall is necessarily associated with vertical air mass movement and associated advection.

Since the 1970s, some of these important insights appear to have faded from the collective conscience. For example, the majority of land surface models use conventional Penman-Monteith theory in a way that tends to predict rainfall interception losses that are lower than field experimental knowledge suggests, with unknown consequences for weather and climate modelling. Similarly, methods to estimate total evapotranspiration from remote sensing usually appear to ignore the unresolved wet canopy energy balance problem, and indeed frequently ignore rainfall interception loss altogether; Guerschman et al. (2009) and Miralles et al. (2010) are exceptions.

3. Eddy-covariance measurement during rainfall

In the last few decades, eddy-covariance techniques have provided increasingly sophisticated and widespread measurements of ecosystem-level land surface-atmosphere fluxes, including λE and H . The theory underpinning eddy-covariance analysis can be found elsewhere (e.g., Aubinet et al., 2012) but, essentially, it relies on analysing the covariance between high-frequency observed vertical air movement and scalar concentration. Measurements are made with sonic three-dimensional anemometers co-located with open- or closed-path infrared gas analysers. In theory, eddy-covariance measurements could be used to independently verify E . However, there does not appear to be consensus, or indeed much published research at all, on the validity of standard eddy-covariance measurement and analysis techniques during rainfall, or methods to detect and/or correct the affected flux data. This is perhaps surprising, given the likelihood of erroneous measurements by at least some of the instruments and given that standard data analysis and gap-filling methods and protocols have been developed to deal with a variety of other measurement issues (e.g., Moffat et al., 2007). The lack of such a standard approach may also explain why it is easy to find examples of analyses that either accept latent heat flux measurements during rainfall without question, or replace these using gap-filling strategies that interpolate the data, essentially assuming that flux behaviour is similar to that under dry canopy conditions. Both assumptions introduce potentially very large errors in ET

estimates, a particular concern if the resulting longer-term estimates are reported without caveats or even are used to evaluate model ET estimates (Van Dijk and Warren, 2010).

There are good reasons why FLUXNET eddy-covariance measurements may be of questionable validity during rainfall. While many models of sonic anemometers employ hydrophobic material on the sensors and automatic spike removal, water on the sensor surfaces and raindrops falling through the sensor path still affect instrument readings. Mizutani et al. (1997) tested the performance of sonic anemometers in laboratory conditions and found that up to 2.5 mm depth on the sonic sensor head caused wind speed and sensible heat flux measurement errors within 1%. Simulated rainfall intensities less than 10 mm h⁻¹ also did not appear to affect measurements much, although higher intensities did. Similar results have been obtained for other sonic anemometer instruments (Cabral et al., 2010; Gash et al., 1999). By contrast, open path gas analysers do not appear to function at all well for water vapour during rainfall. Burba et al. (2010) found that 75% of open path gas analyser data were lost during rainfall conditions. Closed-path analysers with long unheated intake tubes suffer from other measurement errors due to condensation and re-evaporation in the intake tube (so-called frequency loss). The resulting underestimation of latent heat flux can be large and increases exponentially with humidity (Fratini et al., 2012; Ibrom et al., 2007; Mammarella et al., 2009). Czikowsky and Fitzjarrald (2009) used closed-path measurements during and after rainfall over a tropical rainforest, but did not report on the accuracy of the measurements. Measurement errors during rainfall may also explain why a recent synthesis of global FLUXNET eddy-covariance data found that total ET from forests is less than from grasslands under similar climate conditions (Williams et al., 2012), in contrast with catchment studies.

The quality of eddy-covariance heat flux estimates is commonly assessed by calculating the energy balance ratio (EBR), i.e. the sum of λE and H divided by A , for a selected period (Stoy et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2002). This method does not necessarily work well for wet canopy conditions, as it was shown that λE and H will often have opposite signs (i.e., an upwards latent and downwards sensible heat flux). Temporarily assuming $Q=0$ (i.e., $A=R_n-G$; cf. Eq. (2)), energy balance calculations for the FLUXNET sites suggest an average ‘missing’ energy loss under dry conditions of $16 \pm 13 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for tall and $11 \pm 13 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for short vegetation, producing mean EBR values of 80% and 86%, respectively (Table 1). However, during wet conditions, the situation degrades with missing fluxes of $28 \pm 20 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for tall and $18 \pm 17 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for short vegetation, producing respective EBR values of -37% (note the negative sign) and 36%. These numbers get considerably worse if Q is accounted for (see Section 5.2), suggesting that λE derived from FLUXNET eddy-covariance measurements during and shortly after rainfall are too low.

Alternatively, some studies have avoided gas analyser measurements *during rainfall* by calculating λE as the energy balance residual, i.e., $\lambda E=A-H$. Following this approach, Herbst et al. (2008) calculated E that could be reconciled with E_{PM} as well as with E_{WB} . However, Van der Tol et al. (2003) did not

find good agreement. We calculated λE as the energy balance residual for the FLUXNET data, again temporarily ignoring Q . For sites with tall vegetation, this produced an average value of $45 \pm 18 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ instead of the $17 \pm 15 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ listed in Table 1. For short vegetation, the average latent flux was $35 \pm 17 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ instead of the reported $17 \pm 14 \text{ W m}^{-2}$. However, it is not clear if it is appropriate to assume that all energy balance errors simply can be attributed to λE to produce a reliable estimate (Foken, 2008). In particular, the importance of low frequency turbulence in the commonly stable atmospheric conditions during rainfall is unknown. The influence of low frequency flux contributions in eddy-covariance data processing can be problematic. The measured covariance is usually split into the product of means (interpreted as the advection term) and the fluctuations (the eddy fluxes) by ‘block time averaging’, commonly for 30 minute intervals (Finnigan et al., 2003). However, Sakai et al. (2001) found that eddies with a return interval of more than 40 minutes can contribute to up to 40% of surface fluxes during light wind conditions around midday over a temperate forest. This means that 30-minute time block-averaging can introduce substantial errors and lead to underestimates of H . This in turn would mean that the ‘real’ energy balance residual, and therefore λE , would be greater than calculated. Overall, therefore, FLUXNET eddy-covariance flux data during rainfall and shortly thereafter need to be treated as suspect.

4. Proposed causes for the discrepancy in estimated wet canopy evaporation rates

The most common way to determine E is via a canopy water budget, where rainfall is measured above the canopy, and throughfall and stemflow beneath it. Gross rainfall measurements can be affected by the influence of the gauge itself on the wind field; Sevruk (2006) suggests a typical systematic under-catch of ca. 2-10%, depending on height above the surface or canopy. However, an over-catch in gross rainfall measurement would be needed to explain the inferred high rainfall interception rates. This may occur where gauges are placed in sheltered locations, e.g., in a gap within a forest (see Sevruk, 2006 for further discussion).

Spatial throughfall and stemflow sampling errors can lead to overestimation, but more commonly, underestimation of throughfall and stemflow, depending on the vegetation structure and the way it affects the occurrence of drip points and funnelling of excess water from the canopy (Holwerda et al., 2006; Lloyd and Marques, 1988). In some experimental studies, stemflow has been ignored altogether. Stemflow usually represents less than 2% of the canopy water balance, but in extreme cases it can amount to more than 10% of total rainfall (Levia and Frost, 2003; Llorens and Domingo, 2007). Experimental design and sampling issues can explain some of the high rainfall interception rates inferred, and will usually lead to an overestimation of interception. However, carefully designed water budget studies with a large number of roving throughfall gauges and measurements of stemflow

still tend to find higher interception rates than predicted from E_{PM} (e.g., Holwerda et al., 2006). Thus, such water budget errors can only provide a partial explanation.

Other hypotheses can be categorised in different ways. Several hypotheses question the validity of the E_{PM} estimates, or at least the assumptions made or data used, if not Penman-Monteith theory itself. Others address possible errors arising from the explicit or implicit assumptions in the rainfall interception models (Table 2). These are discussed in the next two sections.

[TABLE 2 HERE]

5. Errors in applying Penman-Monteith theory

The Penman-Monteith theory invokes a number of assumptions. Predominantly these are that (1) all transport terms (of energy and water) are accounted for; (2) the site can be considered horizontally homogeneous; and (3) that the flow is statistically horizontally homogeneous and stationary. These three assumptions allow evaporation to be modelled as a one-dimensional system and ensure consistency through time of the relationships between the measurable meteorological variables, the fluxes of interest and the model coefficients, especially with the aerodynamic conductance. Each assumption, however, can be challenged by the specifics of the site and the rainfall event.

5.1. Unaccounted energy advection

Shuttleworth and Calder (1979) observed that unexpectedly high E appeared to occur mainly at maritime sites, whereas interception measured at locations further inland were more in line with E_{PM} . This led to the hypothesis that horizontal advection of sensible heat from the ocean could provide a source of additional energy not accounted for in the conventional use of the Penman-Monteith model. Further evidence of a maritime influence was later found by Schellekens et al. (1999). Advection of energy from the ocean requires an onshore wind that brings in air with a higher temperature and/or VPD, or both. Roberts et al. (2005) suggested that such a process is unlikely for most locations as it would require a horizontal temperature gradient of several K per 100 m (although they did not present the calculation). Moreover, a locally generated ‘sea breeze’ would normally bring in cooler and moister air rather than warmer and drier air, and therefore a large-scale synoptic mechanism would be required. However, advected energy does not need to come from the ocean: particularly under convective conditions there will be warmer and drier air available from nearby areas without rain (Stewart, 1977). Energy advection does not invalidate Penman-Monteith theory, but energy advected horizontally *below* the level of (vertical) energy balance measurement would be unaccounted for. This normally occurs only on the edges between contrasting surfaces, although strong convective storm

cells may also draw in air laterally. On the other hand, vertical energy advection from the higher boundary layer should still be measured as a negative H and reflected in air temperature and humidity. Alternatively, Holwerda et al. (2012) argued that the previously postulated maritime-continental contrast may have been misinterpreted and that high E may in fact be a feature of enhanced topographic roughness and exposure in complex, mountainous terrain, which happened to coincide with proximity to the ocean in previous studies. The increased relief enhances boundary-layer mixing compared to flat terrain and creates local variations in wind speed depending on wind direction and, potentially, lateral advection of energy below the eddy covariance instruments. Numerical and theoretical studies demonstrate that the deviations in air flow and turbulence in the boundary layer, as it responds to even minor topography, challenge many of the assumptions underpinning both Penman-Monteith and eddy covariance theory (e.g., Raupach and Finnigan 1997, Huntingford et al. 1998, Finnigan 2004). These issues are even more severe where there is a tall canopy, which generates multiple interactions between the turbulence and the terrain-induced circulation (Finnigan and Belcher 2004, Belcher et al. 2008, 2012, Ross 2014). The impacts of these processes are contingent on the specifics of the site and the rain event, and therefore in conclusion, it would seem unlikely that advection alone can explain why E_{PM} estimates should be systematically too low.

5.2. Underestimation of biomass and ground heat release

Release of thermal energy stored in the forest, both in the vegetation biomass (Q_v) and in the air below the measurement level (Q_a), may also provide an additional source of energy for evaporation (Moors, 2012). These heat fluxes can be estimated by considering the pre-storm air temperature, the structure and dimensions of the biomass elements and their surface temperature, which for a wet canopy may be assumed to be intermediate between air temperature and wet bulb temperature, depending on ventilation. Michiles and Gielow (2008) measured forest heat storage changes in an Amazonian rain forest and found that it could contribute as much as 200 W m^{-2} due to rapid cooling of the forest. Such a high heat flux is presumably limited to the beginning of a storm and unlikely to be sustained for a prolonged period. Where forest heat storage has been estimated, it typically represents a very small flux over the duration of an entire storm (Gash et al., 1999; Pereira et al., 2009). Q can be simulated using physical models that require detailed knowledge of forest structure, biomass and physical properties (Haverd et al., 2007; Kobayashi et al., 2012). We did not have access to such observations for the numerous sites, and therefore used a simplified method to obtain an order of magnitude estimate of Q (see Appendix B). The resulting estimates of Q are an average release of $29 \pm 31 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ during rainfall periods for sites with tall vegetation ($>3 \text{ m}$, $N=59$), and a (negligible) $0.8 \pm 1.3 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for sites with short vegetation ($<1.5 \text{ m}$, $N=49$). For tall vegetation, this means that Q is typically larger than H ($-12 \pm 16 \text{ W m}^{-2}$) and of similar magnitude to R_n ($31 \pm 22 \text{ W m}^{-2}$). In other words, it is an

important source of evaporative energy. The biomass heat flux Q_v is responsible for an average 93% of total Q across sites, primarily because Q_a is the net result of the counteracting effects of cooling air temperature and increasing moisture content (Eq. (A.1)). The overall Q was largely explained by the estimated rate of biomass temperature change (-1.6 K h^{-1} on average) and the height of the vegetation; their product explained 99% of the variance in total Q (cf. Eq. (B.2)). The site with the highest average Q during rainfall periods (222 W m^{-2}) was also the tallest forest in the database (AU-Wac). Unfortunately, the accuracy of Q estimates could not be tested. Given the assumptions about surface temperature, it probably represents an upper estimate. Accounting for Q resulted in an increase in λE_{PM} for tall vegetation from $82 \pm 86 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ to $108 \pm 102 \text{ W m}^{-2}$; i.e. a modest increase of 17%.

An upward ground heat flux (G) may also be expected during rainfall. In theory, this could add energy to the canopy air and so potentially help increase evaporation. Values of G reported in the FLUXNET database suggest an average upward heat flux of $2 \pm 8 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ for tall vegetation, representing 8% of R_n . For short vegetation, the average upward heat flux is $6 \pm 11 \text{ W m}^{-2}$, equivalent to 28% of R_n . (It is noted that G reported in the FLUXNET database is often derived from heat flux plates and may not always account for heat storage in the soil above the flux plate). It follows that G might be a modest but arguably non-negligible source of evaporative energy during rainfall.

5.3. Errors in air humidity measurement

Calculating E_{PM} requires observations of VPD during rainfall. In the FLUXNET data, this is most commonly calculated from relative humidity (RH) measured by capacitor sensors, but these are not sensitive in humid air and can be affected by rain splash and condensation on the radiation shields. This can have considerable influence on E_{PM} estimates through Eq. (1). For example, Wallace and McJannet (2006) calculated that a 2% RH reduction can increase E_{PM} by 31%. The reported mean RH during rainfall was $90 \pm 5\%$ across the FLUXNET sites compared to $72 \pm 11\%$ during dry periods. To assess the influence of RH errors, E_{PM} was calculated using the observed RH as well as with RH reduced by 2%, simulating the effect of a systematic bias. Reducing relative humidity by 2% inevitably increased estimated λE_{PM} , by an average $34 \pm 23 \%$ across sites, or from an average 72 ± 78 to $92 \pm 76 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ across all sites ($N=108$). The variation was large, however, with a maximum relative increase of 2.3 times for one site (US-FPe), from 7 to 19 W m^{-2} . We cannot assess whether there might be a systematic bias in the RH values reported in the FLUXNET database; systematic evaluation against a more accurate sensor during rainfall would be required (e.g., using a cooled mirror dew point hygrometer; cf. Schmidt et al., 2012). An apparent drift in annual maximum relative humidity of a few percent over several years has been observed for some FLUXNET sites, suggesting that such errors are certainly conceivable (Dr. M. Sottocornola, pers. comm.).

5.4. Underestimation of aerodynamic conductance

Vertical air exchange is important during wet canopy conditions, as E is driven by aerodynamic energy and the associated downward H . Dunin et al. (1988) analysed forest water storage changes measured by a weighing lysimeter and hypothesised that updrafts during storms might be responsible for the high E they inferred from the lysimeter water budget. Particularly before the onset and during the early stages of a thunderstorm, strong updrafts can occur depending on the convective power of the storm. Complex terrain typically enhances boundary-layer mixing compared to flat terrain and imposes terrain-scale variation to the aerodynamic conductance (e.g. Raupach and Finnigan 1997). Other researchers also highlight the importance of site exposure to wind (e.g., Van Dijk and Bruijnzeel, 2001b). Both convective and orographic updrafts would seem potentially efficient mechanisms to transport moisture and enhance E by drawing in drier and/or warmer air, laterally or from higher up in the atmosphere, or both. They also challenge the assumption of consistency in the bulk-aerodynamic relationship, however.

All the above processes may enhance vertical air exchange, and hence increase the aerodynamic conductance, beyond that predicted by Monin-Obukhov similarity theory (MOST) (Holwerda et al., 2012). This is a potentially important source of error in E_{PM} calculations, as the usual method to quantify the aerodynamic conductance, and that taken here, assumes a logarithmic wind speed profile based on MOST (Thom, 1975). This estimate of the aerodynamic conductance g_{aT} is determined from the (horizontal) wind speed measured at a reference height as (e.g., Shuttleworth, 2012):

$$g_{aT} = \frac{ku_*}{\ln\left(\frac{z-d}{z_{0s}}\right) - \psi_s} \quad (7)$$

with

$$u_* = \frac{ku_z}{\ln\left(\frac{z-d}{z_{0m}}\right) - \psi_m} \quad (8)$$

where k (0.40) is von Kármán's constant, d (m) the zero displacement length, z_{0m} and z_{0s} (m) the roughness lengths for the transfer of momentum and scalars (i.e., heat and water vapour density), respectively, and ψ_m and ψ_s the stability corrections for momentum and scalar transfer, respectively. The latter are sometimes calculated, but often assumed negligible. The values of d and z_{0m} cannot be determined without wind profile measurements. Following Rutter et al. (1971), it is usually assumed that $d=0.75h$ and $z_0=0.1h$, where h is the canopy height (but see Gash et al., 1999, for an observation-based approach). (Commonly reported values of z_{0s}/z_{0m} are 1/12 to 1/2. Testing showed that the actual value chosen had little influence and so here we used an intermediate ratio of 1/7.) Furthermore, the

adoption of a single z_{0s} for heat and vapour transport implies that they have the same plane of origin and that this origin is fixed, which may not always be the case (Moors, 2012). Errors in any of these assumptions may be particularly important during rainfall: when the surface has a finite surface conductance, g_a will occur both in the numerator and the denominator of the aerodynamic term of the Penman-Monteith equation (Eq (1)) and therefore errors in g_a may not have a large effect, particularly if $g_a \gg g_s$. However under wet canopy conditions g_a disappears from the denominator and hence errors in its estimation have more influence.

As three-dimensional wind speed measurements are made at the FLUXNET sites, errors in the application of the above approach may be deduced from a comparison of g_{aT} and g_{aU} . Site values for h and z to calculate g_{aT} were obtained from the primary references (Appendix A), from the site investigators, and from multi-site studies listing these variables (Amiro et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2009; Curtis et al., 2002; Rebmann et al., 2005; Richardson et al., 2006; Stoy et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2008; Wilson et al., 2002). Friction velocity (u_*) can be derived directly from sonic wind speed measurements (Gash et al., 1999) and used to calculate aerodynamic conductance (g_{aU}) with:

$$g_{aU} = \frac{u_*}{\frac{u_z}{u_*} + \frac{1}{k} \ln \left(\frac{z_{0m}}{z_{0s}} \right) - \frac{\psi_s}{k}} \quad (9)$$

The resulting mean g_{aU} and g_{aT} values across all sites are similar, but the relationship between the two is poor ($r^2=0.26$, Figure 1). This emphasises the assumptions underpinning the two respective methods, and the challenge in predicting the wind speed profile in the case of g_{aT} . The λE_{PM} values calculated with g_{aU} were not systematically higher or lower than those calculated with g_{aT} ; on average the former was 1.05 ± 0.37 times greater than the latter. Including the stability correction (following Paulson, 1970) increased g_{aU} by 1.5% on average but increases and decreases both occurred, depending on the dominant sign of H , and changes were small, with extremes of -4% and +6%. It follows that assumptions in the calculation of g_a following Thom (1975) can certainly introduce large errors, but underestimates of λE_{PM} appear about as likely as overestimates.

[FIGURE 1 HERE]

Both approaches to calculate g_a still require MOST to be valid. In addition to the issues raised above and the possibility of systematic advection raised (Section 5.1), there are other reasons why this may not be the case. MOST invokes assumptions concerning the scales characterising the turbulent flow;

specifically, that u_* is the only important velocity scale, and that height $(z-d)$ and the Obukhov length are the important length scales. At several FLUXNET sites, especially those with tall canopies, observations may be taken in the roughness sub-layer. In this layer the turbulence is also characterised by length scales related to the surface. For example, over tall canopies the mixing layer instability that occurs at canopy top (e.g., Raupach et al. 1996) implies that a length scale linked to canopy density needs to be included in the analysis. Typically, the mixing layer instability leads to enhanced turbulent mixing and, correspondingly, g_{aU} and g_{aT} would be expected to underestimate the true aerodynamic conductance. Corrections to MOST for this tall canopy effect have been developed for dry conditions (e.g., Harman and Finnigan, 2007, 2008) but require calibration against site data for accuracy. Furthermore, turbulence during rainfall is additionally impacted through two other processes: the presence of rain droplets provides a large surface area for viscous dissipation, and falling rain imposes a drag on the atmosphere. Both processes add further length scales to the problem, and an appropriate correction method is yet to be developed and demonstrated.

Finally, wind speed u_z needs to be correctly measured. Errors can occur if wind speeds are not measured directly above the canopy, but at a site with less exposure, e.g., in a forest gap or at a less exposed airport or climate station nearby, as is quite common in canopy water budget studies. The wind speed may also be underestimated if the event-average wind speed is assumed equal to daytime or daily average wind speeds on the day, or on dry days, as is a common practice.

In summary, the errors in the estimation of g_a are easily made, can be of considerable magnitude, and have an important influence on E_{PM} estimates.

5.5. Mechanical water transport

Even more difficult to evaluate is the effect of rain splash on the return of water to the atmosphere. Dunin et al. (1988) (see Dunkerley, 2009) and later Murakami (2006) point out that drops falling onto the canopy produce small impact droplets that can remain suspended in the air for long enough to partially or wholly evaporate before reaching the ground. For example, Murakami (2006) calculated that droplets of $<50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ diameter are likely to completely or largely evaporate when falling from a tall forest canopy. Ghadiri and Payne (1988) measured the size distribution of impact droplets formed by a 6 mm diameter drop hitting different surfaces; from the data they tabulate it can be calculated that drops of $<1\text{ mm}$ diameter represent at least 10% of the total volume of impacting droplets.

Measurements by Bassette and Bussière (2008) show that considerably more than half the volume of a large drop can be scattered in splash droplets when hitting a leaf. The largest number of droplets are produced when large drops are sliced, e.g., on leaf edges or petioles, and while large drops are relatively few in natural rainfall, they are ubiquitous in throughfall dripping through successive layers of the canopy (Dunkerley, 2009). However, the associated increase of the evaporating surface does

not necessarily increase the latent heat flux, as surface conductance is already assumed to be infinitely large, whereas the aerodynamic conductance of the canopy should not be affected by the presence of splash droplets. In other words, E is ultimately controlled by the ability of the turbulent boundary layer to transport water vapour away from the surface, rather than by the area of the evaporating surface.

The observation that (i) rainfall onto a canopy can produce many small droplets and (ii) strong vertical updrafts can occur during rainfall, suggests that updrafts can potentially also play a role in enhancing rainfall evaporation rates. The upwards vertical air movement may slow down sufficiently small impact droplets, or even transport them back into the atmosphere above the rainfall measurement level. This could create further opportunities for the droplets to evaporate, or to be swept up by falling raindrops and return to the surface, to be measured once again as rainfall. The mechanics appear to be feasible, as drops of 0.5 and 1 mm diameter have a maximum fall velocity of only 2 and 4 m s⁻¹, respectively (Gunn and Kinzer, 1949), and updrafts of this strength (equivalent to a gentle breeze) occur frequently in the turbulent conditions associated with thunderstorms, at least above the canopy. Detecting this process may be possible using disdrometer measurements above the canopy, recording water droplet sizes and fluxes in both upward and downward motions down to the scale of fine-scale droplets that can be suspended by eddy motions. The existence of this process would not invalidate E_{PM} , but would add an additional mechanical vertical transport flux. It would go towards explaining the greater difference between rainfall above and below a tall and rough canopy, when compared to shorter vegetation.

5.6 Summary

Based on the foregoing analysis, we can predict the energy balance during rainfall using the Penman-Monteith equation to estimate λE_{PM} and H_{PM} (Eqs. (1–3)), and accounting for Q and G , as well as using measured g_{aU} . The resulting average λE_{PM} is not hugely different from ‘conventional’ Penman-Monteith based estimates (λE_{PMo}), but both are several times larger than the results of eddy-covariance measurements (λE_{EC}) (Table 3). It is noted that downward H_{PM} predicted by Penman-Monteith theory is considerably greater than that derived from the eddy-covariance measurements (Table 3). Moreover, these estimates do not account for several of the identified potential issues, such as humidity measurement errors, horizontal advection below the measurement level, problems using MOST, the influence of infrequent eddies, and mechanical transport.

[TABLE 3 HERE]

6. Errors in applying rainfall interception models

6.1. Underestimation of canopy rainfall storage

When estimating E by fitting an interception model to event-total values of interception loss, there can be a degree of functional equivalence (or 'parameter equifinality'; Beven, 1993) between E during rainfall and canopy rainfall storage capacity (S), from which evaporation may continue after rainfall has ceased. Therefore, underestimation of S *a priori* is likely to be compensated by overestimation of E . Because event-total throughfall and stemflow can be measured more easily and cheaply than their instantaneous rates, the event-based analytical rainfall interception model (Gash, 1979; Gash et al., 1995) has been applied more commonly than the dynamic model from which it was derived (Rutter et al., 1971). The event-based analytical rainfall interception model has two particularly important parameters that need to be estimated, S and ratio $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$, and due to functional equivalence, an error in one can lead to a compensating error in the other. For example, the graphical envelope method of Leyton et al. (1967) to derive S from event gross and net rainfall measurements inevitably leads to underestimates.

Field methods to estimate S also have their issues, however. Some have pointed at the large rainfall storage capacity of tree bark and epiphytes (Herwitz, 1985; Wallace and McJannet, 2006), although study of the water balance of epiphyte mosses by Hölscher et al. (2004) demonstrated that their effectiveness in increasing interception losses is limited by the degree to which they dry out in between storms. Similar arguments can be made for other water-retaining materials in the canopy. The implication is that S is likely overestimated if the total amount of water that such materials will hold is assumed to evaporate. The importance of assumptions about S is revisited in Section 6.3.

6.2. Overestimation of rainfall rate

The correct estimation of E_{WB} from the ratio $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ is contingent on accurate specification of R , and thus an overestimate of R could explain why E_{WB} might be overestimated. The Gash model is based on the assumption that the canopy has dried out between events. If the time interval adopted to separate successive storms is too short for this to be true, then effective storm duration will be underestimated and hence R and E will be overestimated (Wallace and McJannet, 2006). Furthermore, R is normally measured with tipping bucket rain gauges that have discrete 0.1–0.5 mm accumulation increments. If R per time step is less than this increment, then the instrument will not register rainfall during every time interval and errors in estimated storm duration can result. Storm duration errors can change R estimates by more than 50%, given that storm separation times used in the literature can vary from 2

to 6 hours (Wallace and McJannet, 2006). This effect was calculated for all FLUXNET sites with rainfall data. Half hours with rainfall in excess of 0.25 mm were clustered together in one event if they were separated between 0.5 and 24 hours. The overall average rainfall intensity R was calculated as the total rainfall divided by the total duration of all events, including the intra-storm intervals without rainfall (Figure 3a). The reduction in R with increased separation time was similar for all sites; R for 1 hour separation time (R_1) was on average 1.46 times greater than for 6 hour separation time (R_6), varying from 1.14 (US-Wrc) to 2.04 (CA-Obs) times. It follows that assumptions about the time required for the canopy to dry up can indeed have a considerable influence on R . The impact of assuming shorter canopy drying times on estimates of total interception loss is mitigated by the fact that the reduction in evaporation during the event can be partially compensated by an increase in evaporation after the event, as the total number of events will increase if the separation time is shortened (Figure 2b). Underestimating canopy drying time will however still lead to an overestimation of E during rainfall and so can partially explain the discrepancy with E_{PM} estimates.

[FIGURE 2 HERE]

6.3. Insights from rainfall interception modelling

We used a simplified version of the Rutter et al. (1971) model (described in Appendix C) at half-hourly time step to simulate event-based rainfall interception losses for each site. We do not claim that the derived estimates accurately reflect rainfall interception losses for individual sites, as we needed to make assumptions about S and about the canopy cover fraction. Rather, the objective of this exercise was to further investigate the effect of assumed S on simulated interception losses and to investigate the order of magnitude of interception losses obtained when using our best estimate λE_{PM} values. Figure 3 shows the relationship between assumed S and the range of simulated values for interception loss expressed as a percentage of rainfall. This shows that the estimated interception loss is sensitive to the choice of S ; interception loss increased approximately proportional to S to the power 0.3 (Figure 3).

[FIGURE 3 HERE]

Values of the minimum amount of water needed to saturate the canopy (S) reported in the literature are typically on the order of 0.5 to 2 mm (e.g., Wallace et al., 2013), but even within this range the choice of value is quite influential. Interception loss estimates for this narrower S range are in the order of 10–50% with an average of ca. 20–30%. These numbers are in fact surprisingly close to

interception fractions observed by water budget methods. Of several vegetation and weather variables tested, characteristics related to rainfall event size and intensity were the best predictors of interception loss (in terms of r^2 , data not shown), for any assumed value of S . Figure 4 illustrates this using the average depth of rain per rain-day (P_d , i.e. the ratio of annual rainfall over number of days with rain, chosen because it is straightforward to calculate). The scatter in Figure 4 can be attributed mainly to site-to-site variability in E (hence the difference between short and tall vegetation) and to differences in the temporal scaling behaviour of rainfall (e.g., the site US-Wrc represents tall coniferous forest that experiences large storms in terms of total volume but falling with low R). The lowest simulated interception loss was 4–26% (range for different S) for a grassland in Mississippi, USA (US-Goo), experiencing high R (average 3.8 mm h⁻¹) and average E (0.10 mm h⁻¹) during rainfall. The highest simulated interception loss was 27–59% for an evergreen forest in Italy (IT-Ren) experiencing low R (0.45 mm h⁻¹) and average E (0.11 mm h⁻¹).

[FIGURE 4 HERE]

For $S=1$ mm, the resulting R averaged over the entire event is considerably less than the R calculated for half hours with rainfall only (Table 4). This re-emphasises the point made earlier that event-averaged R will decrease when considering intra-storm periods without rain during which the canopy does not fully dry (Valente et al., 1997). On the other hand, event-average $\bar{E}$ was not significantly different from E during rainfall intervals only (Table 4). The resulting ratios of mean E over mean R were on average 2.05 ± 0.63 times greater than values calculated on the basis of half-hours with rainfall only (range 1.13–4.20). Finally, E during the drying out phase was considerably higher than that during the event, by an average 2.02 ± 0.69 times, although values varied considerably between sites (range 0.61–4.64 times). The corresponding average drying time for $S=1$ mm was simulated to be 3.9 ± 1.9 hours, but varied as a function of E (1.2–12.2 hours).

[TABLE 4 HERE]

Incidentally, the best predictor of event-average E was VPD ($r^2=0.53$, $N=82$), whereas multiplying VPD with g_{aU} or g_{aT} (cf. Eq. (1a)) further increased r^2 to 0.74. This further emphasises the importance of the aerodynamic term of E_{PM} . The contribution of the aerodynamic term in Eq. (1a) can also be calculated directly and contributed an average 61 ± 18 % to total E_{PM} during rainfall periods ($N=108$). As another aside, the model results presented here can also be used to examine one of the assumptions of the analytical interception model, namely, that the ratio $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ can be assumed constant over all

events. Although this assumption can be argued against on conceptual grounds (greater storms might be presumed to have greater rainfall rates), it generally does not appear to affect model performance negatively. We examined the relationship between storm size P (mm) and $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ for all individual sites with more than 20 events in excess of 5 mm ($N=74$). For all but one site, $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ in fact did decrease with increasing storm size, but more so for small storms (e.g., <5 mm) than for larger ones. Overall, correlation was typically not strong, with an average r^2 of -0.23 ± 0.08 . Further examination showed that this was partly because E slightly increased with increasing P , but mainly because R was just not strongly related to P . This explains why the assumption of constant $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ often still produces good agreement with canopy water budget observations.

7. Conclusions

In this study, we investigated why canopy water budget measurements of rainfall interception almost always suggest wet canopy evaporation rates (E_{WB}) that are several times higher than those predicted from Penman-Monteith theory (E_{PM}). We examined several proposed explanations for this discrepancy by reviewing the literature and examining the FLUXNET database. We summarise our main findings as follows:

[1] Relatively high E can be sustained during rainfall by a combination of radiation, a downward sensible heat flux, and heat release from the soil and canopy. Biomass heat release can be an important source of energy for tall, dense forests experiencing a rapid drop in surface temperature due to evaporative cooling. Accounting for it increased E_{PM} for forest by 17%. While lateral advection of energy from nearby (dry) areas is plausible, large-scale lateral advection from a warmer ocean does not need to be invoked to explain a downward heat flux. It is not obvious how the magnitude of the downward heat flux during rainfall might be predicted, but it would likely require more explicit consideration of boundary layer dynamics.

[2] The aerodynamic component of E_{PM} is typically larger than the radiation component. Correspondingly, E_{PM} estimates are particularly sensitive to errors in air humidity and aerodynamic conductance. Small measurement errors in air humidity are plausible and important: reducing measured values by only 2% RH increased E_{PM} by an average 34%. It follows that accurately measuring RH may be particularly critical under wet conditions. Errors in the estimation of aerodynamic conductance following conventional theory were large, but did not suggest a systematic bias.

[3] FLUXNET eddy-covariance measurements of E during rainfall were questionable. In addition, rainfall is often associated with a downward heat flux, which promotes stable conditions and suppresses turbulence. Our results suggest that eddy-covariance flux measurement during rainfall requires special scrutiny, and may require more flexible protocols for the analysis of raw high

frequency data. Standard FLUXNET gap-filling procedures are not appropriate under these conditions. Alternative latent heat flux estimates may be obtained from Penman-Monteith theory, but this has its own uncertainties.

[4] In addition to the various reasons why E_{PM} may be underestimated, applying rainfall interception models to canopy water budget observations can also lead to overestimates of E_{WB} . In interpreting event-based measurements, underestimation of canopy rainfall storage capacity S and overestimation of event-average rainfall rate R can lead to overestimates of E due to parameter equivalence within the rainfall interception model. The impact of assumed canopy drying time needs to be considered carefully when determining the number of storm events and their duration from rainfall rate measurements.

[5] A Rutter-type time step rainfall interception model was applied with adjusted E_{PM} estimates and assumed vegetation properties. This produced hypothetical estimates that appeared to agree surprisingly well with the magnitude of interception losses observed in field studies. Overall, therefore, careful treatment and interpretation of observations may often already be sufficient to reconcile canopy water budget measurements within a coupled water and energy balance framework. Simultaneous measurements of rainfall, throughfall and meteorology within events are likely to be helpful in this regard.

[6] Our limited understanding of boundary-layer dynamics during rainfall leaves important questions unanswered. This includes the controls on the downward heat flux, local horizontal advection, infrequent large-scale turbulence, possible upwards transport of small splash droplets, and the influence of rainfall recycling on rainfall generation downwind. These uncertainties can have important implications for coupled land surface - atmosphere modelling as well as water management, and therefore merit further study.

Acknowledgements

A.v.D. designed the methodology based on discussion with J.G., performed the analysis and wrote the first draft. J.G. and E.v.G. suggested major improvements to the argument and structure of the first draft. The other authors offered improvements to later manuscript versions.

This work used eddy-covariance data acquired by the FLUXNET community and in particular by the following networks: AmeriFlux (U.S. Department of Energy, Biological and Environmental Research, Terrestrial Carbon Program (DE-FG02-04ER63917 and DE-FG02-04ER63911), AfriFlux, AsiaFlux, CarboAfrica, CarboEuropeIP, CarboItaly, CarboMont, ChinaFlux, Fluxnet-Canada (supported by CFCAS, NSERC, BIOCAP, Environment Canada, and NRCan), GreenGrass, KoFlux, LBA, NECC, OzFlux, TCOS-Siberia, USCCC. We acknowledge the financial support to the eddy-covariance data harmonization provided by CarboEuropeIP, FAO-GTOS-TCO, iLEAPS, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, National Science Foundation, University of Tuscia, Université Laval, Environment Canada and US Department of Energy and the database development and technical support from Berkeley Water Center, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Microsoft Research eScience, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, University of California – Berkeley and the University of Virginia. We thank Dr Beverly Law and other FLUXNET members for allowing the use of their data, and for their encouragement and useful suggestions along the way. We also thank an anonymous referee and Dr David Fitzjarrald for their constructive reviews.

Appendix A. FLUXNET sites used in the analysis

We used only original (i.e. not gap-filled) half-hourly data. For each analysis we only included sites with the equivalent of more than a year of data that included observations during rainfall. The 128 FLUXNET sites with the following codes were used in some or all of the energy balance and latent heat flux analyses and/or interception modelling (primary reference between brackets, where available):

AT-Neu (Wohlfahrt et al., 2008), AU-Fog, AU-How (Beringer et al., 2011), AU-Tum (Leuning et al., 2005), AU-Wac (Kilinc et al., 2012), BE-Bra, BE-Lon, BE-Vie, BW-Ma1, CA-Ca1 (Brümmer et al., 2012), CA-Ca2 (Jassal et al., 2009), CA-Ca3 (Humphreys et al., 2006), CA-Gro (McCaughey et al., 2006), CA-Let (Flanagan and Adkinson, 2011), CA-Man (Dunn et al., 2007), CA-Mer (Lafleur et al., 2003), CA-Oas (Zha et al., 2010), CA-Obs (Krishnan et al., 2008), CA-Ojp (Kljun et al., 2006), CA-Qcu (Giasson et al., 2006), CA-Qfo (Bergeron et al., 2007), CA-SF1, -SF2 and -SF3 (Mkhabela et al., 2009), CA-TP4 (Arain and Restrepo-Coupe, 2005), CH-Oe1 (Ammann et al., 2007), CN-Du1 and -Du2 (Yan et al., 2008), CN-HaM, CN-Xfs, CN-Xi2, CZ-BK1, DE-Bay (Staudt and Foken, 2007), DE-Geb, DE-Gri, DE-Hai (Knobl et al., 2003), DE-Har, DE-Meh, DE-Tha, DE-Wet, DK-Sor (Pilegaard et al., 2011), ES-ES1, ES-VDA, FI-Hyy, FI-Kaa, FI-Sod, FR-Gri (Loubet et al., 2011), FR-Hes, FR-LBr (Berbigier et al., 2001), FR-Lq1, FR-Lq2, FR-Pue, HU-Bug (Nagy et al., 2007), HU-Mat (Pintér et al., 2010), IE-Ca1, IE-Dri (Peichl et al., 2011), IL-Yat (Rotenberg and Yakir, 2010), IS-Gun, IT-Amp, IT-BCi, IT-Col, IT-Cpz (Garbulsky et al., 2008), IT-Lav, IT-MBo (Marcolla et al., 2011), IT-Mal, IT-Non, IT-PT1 (Migliavacca et al., 2009), IT-Ren (Montagnani et al., 2009), IT-Ro1 (Rey et al., 2002), IT-Ro2 (Tedeschi et al., 2006), IT-SRo, JP-Mas, JP-Tom, KR-Hnm, NL-Ca1 (Jacobs et al., 2007), NL-Hor (Hendriks et al., 2007), NL-Loo (Moors, 2012), PT-Mi2 (Pereira et al., 2007), RU-Fyo (Milyukova et al., 2002), RU-Zot, SE-Faj (Lund et al., 2007), SE-Fla (Lindroth et al., 2008), SE-Nor (Lindroth et al., 1998), UK-ESa, UK-Gri, UK-Ham, US-ARM, US-Atq, US-Aud, US-Bkg, US-Blo, US-Bo1, US-Bo2, US-Brw, US-CaV, US-Dk1, US-Dk3, US-FPe, US-Goo, US-Ha1 (Urbanski et al., 2007), US-Ho1, US-IB1, US-IB2, US-Ivo, US-KS2, US-MMS, US-MOz, US-Me2 (Thomas et al., 2009), US-NC1 (Noormets et al., 2012), US-NC2 (Noormets et al., 2010), US-NR1, US-Ne1, US-Ne2, US-Ne3, US-SO2, US-SO3, US-SO4, US-SP2, US-SP3, US-SRM (Scott et al., 2009), US-Syv, US-Ton (Ma et al., 2007), US-UMB (Maurer et al., 2013), US-Var (Ma et al., 2007), US-WCr, US-Wi4 (Noormets et al., 2007), US-Wkg (Scott et al., 2010), and US-Wrc.

Appendix B. Canopy heat flux estimation

Michiles and Gielow (2008) found that the following approximation produced good results for Q_a (cf. McCaughey, 1985):

$$Q_a = \rho (c_p \Delta \bar{T} + \lambda \Delta \bar{q}) \frac{\Delta z}{\Delta t} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\Delta \bar{T}$ (K) and $\Delta \bar{q}$ (kg kg⁻¹) are the change in mean air temperature and specific humidity, respectively, Δz (m) the height of the air column considered and Δt (s) the time between two measurements. A similar equation describes Q_v (McCaughey, 1985; Oliphant et al., 2004; Thom, 1975; Wilson and Baldocchi, 2000):

$$Q_v = m_v c_v \frac{\Delta T_v}{\Delta t} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where m_v (kg m⁻²) is the amount of fresh biomass per unit area, c_v (J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹) the average specific heat, and ΔT_v (K) the average change in biomass temperature. An unknown variable in this study is T_v , given the lagged temperature changes in bulky biomass elements such as trunks and branches (e.g., Lindroth et al., 2010; Oliphant et al., 2004). Gradient methods have been developed to estimate heat storage changes in tree trunks (Meesters and Vugts, 1996) but require detailed information on the vegetation and hence were not feasible here. Alternatively, Michiles and Gielow (2008) proposed an approach that empirically estimates biomass temperature as a delayed and attenuated function of air temperature. However, it is not clear if this empirical function, developed for dry and wet, and day and night periods alike, is suitable during rainfall, when biomass surface cooling may be rapid. Instead, as a first approximation, we estimated the magnitude of biomass heat flux by applying Eq (B.2) assuming that T_v equals air temperature for intervals without rainfall, and wet bulb temperature for intervals with rainfall calculated following Stull (2011). Failure to account for the gradual release of heat may lead to overestimation of biomass heat release during the early stages of a storm, but it will to some extent be compensated by corresponding underestimation during later stages of the storm. On the other hand, biomass temperature before the storm may exceed air temperature, in which case the energy available for release will be underestimated. For c_v , values of 2466–3340 J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹ have been reported (Michiles and Gielow, 2008; Oliphant et al., 2004). We did not have detailed heat capacity or biomass data for each site, and therefore had to make assumptions. For an Amazonian forest, Michiles and Gielow (2008) estimated a total heat capacity of 70450 J m⁻² K⁻¹. Dividing this by the forest height (23.5 m) suggests a biomass heat capacity per unit forest volume (i.e., biomass plus air) of 2998 J m⁻³ K⁻¹. Applying the same calculation to data presented by Kilinc et al. (2012) for an 80 m Australian mountain ash forest suggests a heat capacity of 3939 J m⁻³ K⁻¹. Based on these numbers, we estimated the product $m_v c_v$ as 3500 J m⁻² K⁻¹ per metre vegetation height. Values for

752 these were sourced from publications or the web sites of FLUXNET and its contributing regional
753 networks.

754

755

Appendix C. Simplified rainfall interception model

We applied the Rutter et al. (1971) rainfall interception model with four simplifying assumptions: (1) the canopy has full cover; (2) drainage of water in excess of rainfall storage capacity occurs sufficiently rapidly and therefore its influence on interception losses can be ignored at half-hourly time step, (3) the trunks behave as an integral part of the vegetation and therefore their water balance does not need to be considered separately, and (4) wet canopy evaporation is limited by the amount of water on the canopy surface (C in mm), but does not linearly scale with it. With these assumptions $C(t)$ at the end of period t is predicted as (Rutter et al., 1971; Rutter, 1975):

$$C(t) = C(t-1) + P'(t) - E'(t) \quad (\text{C.1})$$

with limitations $C(t) \leq S$ and $E'(t) \leq C(t-1) + P'(t)$, where P' and E' are rainfall and total wet canopy evaporation (mm) during time interval t . E' was estimated from λE_{PM} and missing values during and after rainfall were estimated as the mean λE_{PM} for all time intervals with and without rainfall, respectively. Different values of S between 0.1 and 5 mm were tested, covering a realistic range of values reported in the literature. A brief discussion of the simplifying assumptions follows.

- Assumption (1) was made to avoid mathematical inconsistencies in the model and to keep the model simple, rather than resort to partial canopy models, which require more assumptions and input data and are more cumbersome to interpret (Gash et al., 1995; Valente et al., 1997; Van Dijk and Bruijnzeel, 2001a). Canopy cover is close to unity for many of the FLUXNET sites and for those cases the impact will be minor. However, for sites with partial or seasonally varying canopy cover (e.g. open forests, crop sites) the resulting interception estimates should be considered unrealistic.
- Assumption (2) will have little influence on the results, as the rate of drainage is normally high and because rainfall storage in excess of S does not lead to greater E in the original model (Rutter et al., 1971). It is also consistent with the derivation of the event-based model by Gash (1979), who assumed that drainage from the saturated canopy would become negligible within 20 to 30 min after the end of a storm.
- Assumption (3) has a sound conceptual basis but in any case will also not substantially affect the simulated interception losses as the stemflow fraction is normally very small (Van Dijk and Bruijnzeel, 2001a; Wallace et al., 2013).
- Assumption (4) is potentially more influential. In the original model formulation E scales linearly with the ratio C/S . We did not adhere to this formulation because it would prevent the canopy from ever drying completely between storms. Moreover there is in fact little empirical support to suggest that wet canopy evaporation is linearly proportional to rainfall storage on the canopy (but see Shuttleworth, 1976; Shuttleworth, 1977). It is noted that this assumption has no effect when R

790 exceeds E , which generally will be the case during rainfall. To test the influence of this
791 assumption, the model was also applied in its original form. This produced interception estimates
792 that were only 4–5% smaller and the values were highly correlated ($r^2 > 0.99$) with values of S .

References

- Amiro, B.D. et al., 2006. Carbon, energy and water fluxes at mature and disturbed forest sites, Saskatchewan, Canada. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 136(3–4): 237-251.
- Ammann, C., Flechard, C., Leifeld, J., Neftel, A. and Fuhrer, J., 2007. The carbon budget of newly established temperate grassland depends on management intensity. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 121(1): 5-20.
- Arain, M.A. and Restrepo-Coupe, N., 2005. Net ecosystem production in a temperate pine plantation in southeastern Canada. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 128(3–4): 223-241.
- Aubinet, M., Vesala, T. and Papale, D., 2012. *Eddy covariance: a practical guide to measurement and data analysis*. Springer.
- Baldocchi, D., 2008. Turner Review No. 15: 'Breathing' of the terrestrial biosphere: lessons learned from a global network of carbon dioxide flux measurement systems. *Australian Journal of Botany*, 56(1): 26.
- Baldocchi, D. et al., 2001. FLUXNET: A New Tool to Study the Temporal and Spatial Variability of Ecosystem–Scale Carbon Dioxide, Water Vapor, and Energy Flux Densities. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 82(11): 2415-2434.
- Bassette, C. and Bussière, F., 2008. Partitioning of splash and storage during raindrop impacts on banana leaves. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 148(6): 991-1004.
- Belcher, S. E., Finnigan, J. J., and Harman, I. N., 2008. Flows through forest canopies in complex terrain. *Ecological Applications*, 18: 1436–1453.
- Belcher, S. E., Harman, I. N., and Finnigan, J. J., 2012. The wind in the willows: Flows in forest canopies in complex terrain. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*, 44: 479–504.
- Berbigier, P., Bonnefond, J.-M. and Mellmann, P., 2001. CO₂ and water vapour fluxes for 2 years above Euroflux forest site. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 108(3): 183-197.
- Bergeron, O. et al., 2007. Comparison of carbon dioxide fluxes over three boreal black spruce forests in Canada. *Global Change Biology*, 13(1): 89-107.
- Beringer, J. et al., 2011. SPECIAL—Savanna Patterns of Energy and Carbon Integrated across the Landscape. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 92(11): 1467-1485.
- Beven, K., 1993. Prophecy, reality and uncertainty in distributed hydrological modelling. *Advances in Water Resources*, 16: 41-41.
- Blyth, E.M., Dolman, A.J. and Noilhan, J., 1994. The effect of forest on mesoscale rainfall: an example from HAPEX-MOBILHY. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 33(4): 445-454.
- Bonan, G.B., 2008. Forests and Climate Change: Forcings, Feedbacks, and the Climate Benefits of Forests. *Science*, 320(5882): 1444-1449.

827 Brümmer, C. et al., 2012. How climate and vegetation type influence evapotranspiration and water
828 use efficiency in Canadian forest, peatland and grassland ecosystems. *Agricultural and Forest*
829 *Meteorology*, 153: 14-30.

830 Burba, G.G., McDermitt, D.K., Anderson, D.J., Furtaw, M.D. and Eckles, R.D., 2010. Novel design
831 of an enclosed CO₂/H₂O gas analyser for eddy covariance flux measurements. *Tellus B*,
832 62(5): 743-748.

833 Cabral, O.M.R. et al., 2010. The energy and water balance of a Eucalyptus plantation in southeast
834 Brazil. *Journal of Hydrology*, 388(3-4): 208-216.

835 Chen, S. et al., 2009. Energy balance and partition in Inner Mongolia steppe ecosystems with different
836 land use types. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 149(11): 1800-1809.

837 Crockford, R.H. and Richardson, D.P., 2000. Partitioning of rainfall into throughfall, stemflow and
838 interception: effect of forest type, ground cover and climate. *Hydrological Processes*, 14(16-
839 17): 2903-2920.

840 Curtis, P.S. et al., 2002. Biometric and eddy-covariance based estimates of annual carbon storage in
841 five eastern North American deciduous forests. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 113(1-
842 4): 3-19.

843 Czikowsky, M.J. and Fitzjarrald, D.R., 2009. Detecting rainfall interception in an Amazonian rain
844 forest with eddy flux measurements. *Journal of Hydrology*, 377(1-2): 92-105.

845 Dunin, F., O'Loughlin, E. and Reyenga, W., 1988. Interception loss from eucalypt forest: lysimeter
846 determination of hourly rates for long term evaluation. *Hydrological Processes*, 2(4): 315-
847 329.

848 Dunkerley, D.L., 2009. Evaporation of impact water droplets in interception processes: Historical
849 precedence of the hypothesis and a brief literature overview. *Journal of Hydrology*, 376(3):
850 599-604.

851 Dunn, A.L., Barford, C.C., Wofsy, S.C., Goulden, M.L. and Daube, B.C., 2007. A long-term record of
852 carbon exchange in a boreal black spruce forest: means, responses to interannual variability,
853 and decadal trends. *Global Change Biology*, 13(3): 577-590.

854 Finnigan, J.J., Clement, R., Malhi, Y., Leuning, R. and Cleugh, H.A., 2003. A Re-Evaluation of
855 Long-Term Flux Measurement Techniques Part I: Averaging and Coordinate Rotation.
856 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 107(1): 1-48.

857 Finnigan, J.J., 2004. Advection and modelling. In: Lee, X., Massman, W., Law, B. (Eds.), *Handbook*
858 *of Micrometeorology: A Guide for Surface Flux Measurements*, Kluwer Academic
859 Publishers, p. 209-241.

860 Flanagan, L.B. and Adkinson, A.C., 2011. Interacting controls on productivity in a northern Great
861 Plains grassland and implications for response to ENSO events. *Global Change Biology*,
862 17(11): 3293-3311.

863 Foken, T., 2008. The energy balance closure problem: an overview. *Ecological Applications*, 18(6):
864 1351-1367.

865 Fratini, G., Ibrom, A., Arriga, N., Burba, G. and Papale, D., 2012. Relative humidity effects on water
866 vapour fluxes measured with closed-path eddy-covariance systems with short sampling lines.
867 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 165(0): 53-63.

868 Garbulsky, M.F., Peñuelas, J., Papale, D. and Filella, I., 2008. Remote estimation of carbon dioxide
869 uptake by a Mediterranean forest. *Global Change Biology*, 14(12): 2860-2867.

870 Gash, J.H.C., 1979. An analytical model of rainfall interception by forests. *Quarterly Journal of the*
871 *Royal Meteorological Society*, 105: 43-55.

872 Gash, J.H.C., Lloyd, C.R. and Lachaud, G., 1995. Estimating sparse forest rainfall interception with
873 an analytical model. *Journal of Hydrology*, 170(1-4): 79-86.

874 Gash, J.H.C. and Shuttleworth, W.J. (Editors), 2007. *Evaporation. Benchmark papers in hydrology*, 2,
875 521 pp.

876 Gash, J.H.C., Valente, F. and David, J.S., 1999. Estimates and measurements of evaporation from
877 wet, sparse pine forest in Portugal. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 94(2): 149-158.

878 Ghadiri, H. and Payne, D., 1988. The formation and characteristics of splash following raindrop
879 impact on soil. *Journal of Soil Science*, 39(4): 563-575.

880 Giasson, M.-A., Coursolle, C. and Margolis, H.A., 2006. Ecosystem-level CO₂ fluxes from a boreal
881 cutover in eastern Canada before and after scarification. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,
882 140(1-4): 23-40.

883 Guerschman, J.P. et al., 2009. Scaling of potential evapotranspiration with MODIS data reproduces
884 flux observations and catchment water balance observations across Australia. *Journal of*
885 *Hydrology*, 369(1-2): 107-119.

886 Gunn, R. and Kinzer, G.D., 1949. The terminal velocity of fall for water droplets on stagnant air.
887 *Journal of Meteorology*, 6(4): 243-248.

888 Harman, I. N., Finnigan, J. J., 2008. Scalar concentration profiles in the canopy and roughness
889 sublayer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 129(3):323-351.

890 Haverd, V., Cuntz, M., Leuning, R. and Keith, H., 2007. Air and biomass heat storage fluxes in a
891 forest canopy: calculation within a soil vegetation atmosphere transfer model. *Agricultural*
892 *and forest meteorology*, 147(3): 125-139.

893 Hendriks, D.M.D., van Huissteden, J., Dolman, A.J. and van der Molen, M.K., 2007. The full
894 greenhouse gas balance of an abandoned peat meadow. *Biogeosciences*, 4(3): 411-424.

895 Herbst, M., Rosier, P.T., McNeil, D.D., Harding, R.J. and Gowing, D.J., 2008. Seasonal variability of
896 interception evaporation from the canopy of a mixed deciduous forest. *Agricultural and forest*
897 *meteorology*, 148(11): 1655-1667.

898 Herwitz, S.R., 1985. Interception storage capacities of tropical rainforest canopy trees. *Journal of*
899 *Hydrology*, 77(1): 237-252.

900 Hölscher, D., Kohler, L., van Dijk, A. and Bruijnzeel, L., 2004. The importance of epiphytes to total
901 rainfall interception by a tropical montane rain forest in Costa Rica. *Journal of Hydrology*,
902 292(1-4): 308-322.

903 Holwerda, F., Bruijnzeel, L., Scatena, F., Vugts, H. and Meesters, A., 2012. Wet canopy evaporation
904 from a Puerto Rican lower montane rain forest: The importance of realistically estimated
905 aerodynamic conductance. *Journal of Hydrology*, 414: 1-15.

906 Holwerda, F., Scatena, F. and Bruijnzeel, L., 2006. Throughfall in a Puerto Rican lower montane rain
907 forest: a comparison of sampling strategies. *Journal of Hydrology*, 327(3): 592-602.

908 Horton, R.E., 1919. Rainfall interception. *Monthly Weather Review*, 47(9): 603-623.

909 Humphreys, E.R. et al., 2006. Carbon dioxide fluxes in coastal Douglas-fir stands at different stages
910 of development after clearcut harvesting. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 140(1): 6-22.

911 Huntingford, C., Blyth, E.M., Wood, N., Hewe, F.E., Grant, A., 1998. The effect of topography on
912 evaporation. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 86(3): 487-504.

913 Ibrom, A., Dellwik, E., Flyvbjerg, H., Jensen, N.O. and Pilegaard, K., 2007. Strong low-pass filtering
914 effects on water vapour flux measurements with closed-path eddy correlation systems.
915 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 147(3-4): 140-156.

916 Jacobs, C.M.J. et al., 2007. Variability of annual CO₂ exchange from Dutch grasslands.
917 *Biogeosciences*, 4(5): 803-816.

918 Jassal, R.S., Black, T.A., Spittlehouse, D.L., Brümmer, C. and Nesic, Z., 2009. Evapotranspiration
919 and water use efficiency in different-aged Pacific Northwest Douglas-fir stands. *Agricultural*
920 *and Forest Meteorology*, 149(6): 1168-1178.

921 Kilinc, M., Beringer, J., Hutley, L.B., Haverd, V. and Tapper, N., 2012. An analysis of the surface
922 energy budget above the world's tallest angiosperm forest. *Agricultural and Forest*
923 *Meteorology*, 166: 23-31.

924 Kljun, N. et al., 2006. Response of net ecosystem productivity of three boreal forest stands to drought.
925 *Ecosystems*, 9(7): 1128-1144.

926 Knohl, A., Schulze, E.-D., Kolle, O. and Buchmann, N., 2003. Large carbon uptake by an unmanaged
927 250-year-old deciduous forest in Central Germany. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,
928 118(3): 151-167.

929 Kobayashi, H. et al., 2012. Modeling energy and carbon fluxes in a heterogeneous oak woodland: A
930 three-dimensional approach. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 152(0): 83-100.

931 Krishnan, P. et al., 2008. Factors controlling the interannual variability in the carbon balance of a
932 southern boreal black spruce forest. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* (1984–
933 2012), 113(D9).

934 Lafleur, P.M., Roulet, N.T., Bubier, J.L., Froking, S. and Moore, T.R., 2003. Interannual variability
935 in the peatland-atmosphere carbon dioxide exchange at an ombrotrophic bog. *Global*
936 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 17(2): 1036.

937 Law, F., 1957. Measurement of rainfall, interception and evaporation losses in a plantation of Sitka
938 spruce trees. IAHS Publication no, 44: 397-411.

939 Leuning, R., Cleugh, H.A., Zegelin, S.J. and Hughes, D., 2005. Carbon and water fluxes over a
940 temperate Eucalyptus forest and a tropical wet/dry savanna in Australia: measurements and
941 comparison with MODIS remote sensing estimates. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,
942 129(3-4): 151–173.

943 Levia, D.F. and Frost, E.E., 2003. A review and evaluation of stemflow literature in the hydrologic
944 and biogeochemical cycles of forested and agricultural ecosystems. *Journal of Hydrology*,
945 274(1-4): 1-29.

946 Leyton, L., Reynolds, E.R.C. and Thompson, F.B., 1967. Rainfall interception in forest and moorland.
947 In: W.E. Sopper and H.W. Lull (Editors), *Forest Hydrology*. Pergamon, New York, NY, pp.
948 163–178.

949 Lindroth, A., Grelle, A. and Morén, A.-S., 1998. Long-term measurements of boreal forest carbon
950 balance reveal large temperature sensitivity. *Global Change Biology*, 4(4): 443-450.

951 Lindroth, A., Klemetsson, L., Grelle, A., Weslien, P. and Langvall, O., 2008. Measurement of net
952 ecosystem exchange, productivity and respiration in three spruce forests in Sweden shows
953 unexpectedly large soil carbon losses. *Biogeochemistry*, 89(1): 43-60.

954 Lindroth, A., Mölder, M. and Lagergren, F., 2010. Heat storage in forest biomass improves energy
955 balance closure. *Biogeosciences*, 7(1): 301-313.

956 Llorens, P. and Domingo, F., 2007. Rainfall partitioning by vegetation under Mediterranean
957 conditions. A review of studies in Europe. *Journal of Hydrology*, 335(1-2): 37-54.

958 Lloyd, C.R. and Marques, A., 1988. Spatial variability of throughfall and stemflow measurements in
959 Amazonian rainforest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 42(1): 63-73.

960 Loubet, B. et al., 2011. Carbon, nitrogen and Greenhouse gases budgets over a four years crop
961 rotation in northern France. *Plant and Soil*, 343(1-2): 109-137.

962 Lund, M., Lindroth, A., Christensen, T.R. and Ström, L., 2007. Annual CO₂ balance of a temperate
963 bog. *Tellus B*, 59(5): 804-811.

964 Ma, S., Baldocchi, D.D., Xu, L. and Hehn, T., 2007. Inter-annual variability in carbon dioxide
965 exchange of an oak/grass savanna and open grassland in California. *Agricultural and Forest*
966 *Meteorology*, 147(3): 157-171.

967 Marcolla, B. et al., 2011. Climatic controls and ecosystem responses drive the inter-annual variability
968 of the net ecosystem exchange of an alpine meadow. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
969 151(9): 1233-1243.

970 Mammarella, I. et al., 2009. Relative Humidity Effect on the High-Frequency Attenuation of Water
971 Vapor Flux Measured by a Closed-Path Eddy Covariance System. *Journal of Atmospheric*
972 *and Oceanic Technology*, 26(9): 1856-1866.

973 Maurer, K.D., Hardiman, B.S., Vogel, C.S. and Bohrer, G., 2013. Canopy-structure effects on surface
974 roughness parameters: Observations in a Great Lakes mixed-deciduous forest. *Agricultural*
975 *and Forest Meteorology*, 177(0): 24-34.

976 McCaughey, J., 1985. Energy balance storage terms in a mature mixed forest at Petawawa, Ontario—
977 a case study. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 31(1): 89-101.

978 McCaughey, J., Pejam, M., Arain, M. and Cameron, D., 2006. Carbon dioxide and energy fluxes from
979 a boreal mixedwood forest ecosystem in Ontario, Canada. *Agricultural and Forest*
980 *Meteorology*, 140(1): 79-96.

981 Meesters, A. and Vugts, H., 1996. Calculation of heat storage in stems. *Agricultural and Forest*
982 *Meteorology*, 78(3): 181-202.

983 Michiles, A.A.d.S. and Gielow, R., 2008. Above-ground thermal energy storage rates, trunk heat
984 fluxes and surface energy balance in a central Amazonian rainforest. *Agricultural and Forest*
985 *Meteorology*, 148(6-7): 917-930.

986 Migliavacca, M. et al., 2009. Seasonal and interannual patterns of carbon and water fluxes of a poplar
987 plantation under peculiar eco-climatic conditions. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*,
988 149(9): 1460-1476.

989 Milyukova, I.M. et al., 2002. Carbon balance of a southern taiga spruce stand in European Russia.
990 *Tellus B*, 54(5): 429-442.

991 Miralles, D.G., Gash, J.H., Holmes, T.R.H., de Jeu, R.A.M. and Dolman, A., 2010. Global canopy
992 interception from satellite observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 115(D16): D16122.

993 Mizutani, K., Yamanoi, K., Ikeda, T. and Watanabe, T., 1997. Applicability of the eddy correlation
994 method to measure sensible heat transfer to forest under rainfall conditions. *Agricultural and*
995 *forest meteorology*, 86(3): 193-203.

996 Mkhabela, M.S. et al., 2009. Comparison of carbon dynamics and water use efficiency following fire
997 and harvesting in Canadian boreal forests. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 149(5): 783-
998 794.

999 Moffat, A.M. et al., 2007. Comprehensive comparison of gap-filling techniques for eddy covariance
1000 net carbon fluxes. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 147(3-4): 209-232.

1001 Montagnani, L. et al., 2009. A new mass conservation approach to the study of CO₂ advection in an
1002 alpine forest. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* (1984–2012), 114(D7).

1003 Monteith, J.L., 1981. Evaporation and surface temperature. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal*
1004 *Meteorological Society*, 107(451): 1-27.

1005 Moors, E.J., 2012. Water use of forests in the Netherlands. PhD Thesis,. VU University Amsterdam,
1006 Amsterdam.

1007 Murakami, S., 2006. A proposal for a new forest canopy interception mechanism: Splash droplet
1008 evaporation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 319(1-4): 72-82.

1009 Muzylo, A. et al., 2009. A review of rainfall interception modelling. *Journal of Hydrology*, 370(1-4):
1010 191-206.

1011 Nagy, Z. et al., 2007. The carbon budget of semi-arid grassland in a wet and a dry year in Hungary.
1012 *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 121(1): 21-29.

1013 Noormets, A., Chen, J. and Crow, T., 2007. Age-Dependent Changes in Ecosystem Carbon Fluxes in
1014 Managed Forests in Northern Wisconsin, USA. *Ecosystems*, 10(2): 187-203.

1015 Noormets, A. et al., 2010. Response of carbon fluxes to drought in a coastal plain loblolly pine forest.
1016 *Global Change Biology*, 16(1): 272-287.

1017 Noormets, A. et al., 2012. The role of harvest residue in rotation cycle carbon balance in loblolly pine
1018 plantations. Respiration partitioning approach. *Global Change Biology*, 18(10): 3186-3201.

1019 Oliphant, A. et al., 2004. Heat storage and energy balance fluxes for a temperate deciduous forest.
1020 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 126(3): 185-201.

1021 Paulson, C.A., 1970. The mathematical representation of wind speed and temperature profiles in the
1022 unstable atmospheric surface layer. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 9(6): 857-861.

1023 Peichl, M., Leahy, P. and Kiely, G., 2011. Six-year Stable Annual Uptake of Carbon Dioxide in
1024 Intensively Managed Humid Temperate Grassland. *Ecosystems*, 14(1): 112-126.

1025 Penman, H., 1952. The physical bases of irrigation control, 13th International hort. Congress. London.

1026 Pereira, F., Gash, J., David, J. and Valente, F., 2009. Evaporation of intercepted rainfall from isolated
1027 evergreen oak trees: Do the crowns behave as wet bulbs? *Agricultural and Forest*
1028 *Meteorology*, 149(3): 667-679.

1029 Pereira, J.S. et al., 2007. Net ecosystem carbon exchange in three contrasting Mediterranean
1030 ecosystems – the effect of drought. *Biogeosciences*, 4(5): 791-802.

1031 Pilegaard, K., Ibrom, A., Courtney, M.S., Hummelshøj, P. and Jensen, N.O., 2011. Increasing net CO₂
1032 uptake by a Danish beech forest during the period from 1996 to 2009. *Agricultural and Forest*
1033 *Meteorology*, 151(7): 934-946.

1034 Pintér, K., Balogh, J. and Nagy, Z., 2010. Ecosystem scale carbon dioxide balance of two grasslands
1035 in Hungary under different weather conditions. *Acta Biologica Hungarica*, 61: 130-135.

1036 Raupach, M.R., Weng, W.S., Carruthers, D.J., Hunt, J.C.R., 1992. Temperature and humidity fields
1037 and fluxes over low hills. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 118(504),
1038 191-225.

1039 Raupach, M. R., Finnigan, J. J., and Brunet, Y., 1996. Coherent eddies and turbulence in vegetation
1040 canopies: the mixing length analogy. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 78:351–382.

1041 Raupach, M.R., Finnigan, J.J., 1997. The influence of topography on meteorology variables and
1042 surface-atmosphere interactions. *Journal of Hydrology*, 190, 182–213.

1043 Rebmann, C. et al., 2005. Quality analysis applied on eddy covariance measurements at complex
1044 forest sites using footprint modelling. *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, 80(2-4): 121-
1045 141.

1046 Rey, A. et al., 2002. Annual variation in soil respiration and its components in a coppice oak forest in
1047 Central Italy. *Global Change Biology*, 8(9): 851-866.

1048 Richardson, A.D. et al., 2006. A multi-site analysis of random error in tower-based measurements of
1049 carbon and energy fluxes. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 136(1–2): 1-18.

1050 Roberts, J., 1999. *Plants and water in forests and woodlands*, Ecohydrology. Routledge, London, UK.

1051 Roberts, J.M., Gash, J.H.C., Tani, M. and Bruijnzeel, L.A., 2005. Controls on evaporation in lowland
1052 tropical rainforest. In: M. Bonell and L.A. Bruijnzeel (Editors), *Forests, Water and People in
1053 the Humid Tropics: Past, Present and Future Hydrological Research for Integrated Land and
1054 Water Management*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 287-313.

1055 Ross, A.N., 2011. Scalar transport over forested hills. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 141:179–199.

1056 Rotenberg, E. and Yakir, D., 2010. Contribution of Semi-Arid Forests to the Climate System. *Science*,
1057 327(5964): 451-454.

1058 Rutter, A., Kershaw, K., Robins, P. and Morton, A., 1971. A predictive model of rainfall interception
1059 in forests, 1. Derivation of the model from observations in a plantation of Corsican pine.
1060 *Agricultural Meteorology*, 9: 367-384.

1061 Rutter, A.J. (Editor), 1967. An analysis of evaporation from a stand of Scots pine. *International
1062 Symposium on Forest Hydrology*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK, 403-416 pp.

1063 Rutter, A.J., 1975. The hydrological cycle in vegetation. In: J.L. Monteith (Editor), *Vegetation and the
1064 atmosphere: Volume 1, Principles*. Academic Press: London, pp. 111–154.

1065 Sakai, R.K., Fitzjarrald, D.R. and Moore, K.E., 2001. Importance of Low-Frequency Contributions to
1066 Eddy Fluxes Observed over Rough Surfaces. *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 40(12): 2178-
1067 2192.

1068 Schellekens, J., Scatena, F.N., Bruijnzeel, L.A. and Wickel, A.J., 1999. Modelling rainfall
1069 interception by a lowland tropical rain forest in northeastern Puerto Rico. *Journal of
1070 Hydrology*, 225(3-4): 168-184.

1071 Schmidt, A., Hanson, C., Chan, W.S. and Law, B.E., 2012. Empirical assessment of uncertainties of
1072 meteorological parameters and turbulent fluxes in the AmeriFlux network. *Journal of
1073 Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 117(G4): G04014.

1074 Scott, R.L., Hamerlynck, E.P., Jenerette, G.D., Moran, M.S. and Barron-Gafford, G.A., 2010. Carbon
1075 dioxide exchange in a semidesert grassland through drought-induced vegetation change.
1076 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* (2005–2012), 115(G3).

1077 Scott, R.L., Jenerette, G.D., Potts, D.L. and Huxman, T.E., 2009. Effects of seasonal drought on net
1078 carbon dioxide exchange from a woody-plant-encroached semiarid grassland. *Journal of
1079 Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* (2005–2012), 114(G4).

1080 Sevruk, B., 2006. *Rainfall Measurement: Gauges*, Encyclopedia of Hydrological Sciences. John
1081 Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

1082 Shuttleworth, W.J., 1976. Experimental evidence for the failure of the Penman-Monteith equation in
1083 partially wet conditions. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 10(1): 91-94.

1084 Shuttleworth, W.J., 1977. Comments on 'resistance of a partially wet canopy: Whose equation fails?'.
1085 *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 12(3): 385-386.

1086 Shuttleworth, W.J., 2012. *Terrestrial hydrometeorology*. John Wiley & Sons.

1087 Shuttleworth, W.J. and Calder, I.R., 1979. Has the Priestley-Taylor equation any relevance to forest
1088 evaporation? *Journal of Applied Meteorology*, 18(5): 639-646.

1089 Staudt, K. and Foken, T., 2007. Documentation of reference data for the experimental areas of the
1090 Bayreuth Centre for Ecology and Environmental Research (BayCEER) at the Waldstein site.
1091 *Arbeitsergebnisse*, 35. Universität Bayreuth, Abt. Mikrometeorologie, ISSN 1614-8916,
1092 Bayreuth, Germany, 35 pp.

1093 Stewart, J.B., 1977. Evaporation from the wet canopy of a pine forest. *Water Resources Research*,
1094 13(6): 915-921.

1095 Stoy, P.C. et al., 2006. An evaluation of models for partitioning eddy covariance-measured net
1096 ecosystem exchange into photosynthesis and respiration. *Agricultural and Forest*
1097 *Meteorology*, 141(1): 2-18.

1098 Stoy, P.C. et al., 2013. A data-driven analysis of energy balance closure across FLUXNET research
1099 sites: The role of landscape scale heterogeneity. *Agricultural and forest meteorology*, 171:
1100 137-152.

1101 Stull, R., 2011. Wet-Bulb Temperature from Relative Humidity and Air Temperature. *Journal of*
1102 *Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 50(11): 2267-2269.

1103 Tedeschi, V. et al., 2006. Soil respiration in a Mediterranean oak forest at different developmental
1104 stages after coppicing. *Global Change Biology*, 12(1): 110-121.

1105 Thom, A.S., 1975. Momentum, Mass and Heat Exchange of Plant Communities. In: J.L. Monteith
1106 (Editor), *Vegetation and the Atmosphere*. Academic Press, London, pp. 57-109.

1107 Thomas, C.K. et al., 2009. Seasonal hydrology explains interannual and seasonal variation in carbon
1108 and water exchange in a semiarid mature ponderosa pine forest in central Oregon. *Journal of*
1109 *Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* (2005–2012), 114(G4).

1110 Urbanski, S. et al., 2007. Factors controlling CO₂ exchange on timescales from hourly to decadal at
1111 Harvard Forest. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* (2005–2012), 112(G2).

1112 Valente, F., David, J.S. and Gash, J.H.C., 1997. Modelling interception loss for two sparse eucalypt
1113 and pine forests in central Portugal using reformulated Rutter and Gash analytical models.
1114 *Journal of Hydrology*, 190(1–2): 141-162.

1115 Van der Tol, C., Gash, J.H.C., Grant, S.J., McNeil, D.D. and Robinson, M., 2003. Average wet
1116 canopy evaporation for a Sitka spruce forest derived using the eddy correlation-energy
1117 balance technique. *Journal of Hydrology*, 276(1-4): 12-19.

- Van Dijk, A.I.J.M. and Bruijnzeel, L.A., 2001a. Modelling rainfall interception by vegetation of variable density using an adapted analytical model. Part 1. Model description. *Journal of Hydrology*, 247(3-4): 230-238.
- Van Dijk, A.I.J.M. and Bruijnzeel, L.A., 2001b. Modelling rainfall interception by vegetation of variable density using an adapted analytical model. Part 2. Model validation for a tropical upland mixed cropping system. *Journal of Hydrology*, 247(3-4): 239-262.
- Van Dijk, A.I.J.M., Peña-Arancibia, J.L. and Bruijnzeel, L.A., 2012. Land cover and water yield: inference problems when comparing catchments with mixed land cover. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 16(9): 3461-3473.
- Van Dijk, A.I.J.M. and Warren, G.A., 2010. AWRA Technical Report 4. Evaluation Against Observations, WIRADA / CSIRO Water for a Healthy Country Flagship, Canberra.
- Wallace, J. et al., 2013. Evaluation of forest interception estimation in the continental scale Australian Water Resources Assessment–Landscape (AWRA-L) model. *Journal of Hydrology*, 499: 210-223.
- Wallace, J. and McJannet, D., 2006. On interception modelling of a lowland coastal rainforest in northern Queensland, Australia. *Journal of Hydrology*, 329(3): 477-488.
- Wang, W., Liang, S. and Meyers, T., 2008. Validating MODIS land surface temperature products using long-term nighttime ground measurements. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 112(3): 623-635.
- Williams, C.A. et al., 2012. Climate and vegetation controls on the surface water balance: Synthesis of evapotranspiration measured across a global network of flux towers. *Water Resources Research*, 48(6).
- Wilson, K. et al., 2002. Energy balance closure at FLUXNET sites. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 113(1-4): 223-243.
- Wilson, K.B. and Baldocchi, D.D., 2000. Seasonal and interannual variability of energy fluxes over a broadleaved temperate deciduous forest in North America. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 100(1): 1-18.
- Wohlfahrt, G. et al., 2008. Seasonal and inter-annual variability of the net ecosystem CO₂ exchange of a temperate mountain grassland: Effects of weather and management. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 113(D8): D08110.
- Yan, Y. et al., 2008. Closing the carbon budget of estuarine wetlands with tower-based measurements and MODIS time series. *Global Change Biology*, 14(7): 1690-1702.
- Zha, T. et al., 2010. Interannual variation of evapotranspiration from forest and grassland ecosystems in western Canada in relation to drought. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*, 150(11): 1476-1484.

Table 1. Measured energy balance for tall and short vegetation, during periods with and without rainfall, respectively. Listed are mean net radiation (R_n), ground heat flux (G), eddy-covariance derived sensible (H_{EC}) and latent heat flux (λE_{EC}), as well as the energy balance residual between the four terms and the energy balance ratio (EBR), the latter calculated as the ratio $(\lambda E + H) / (R_n - G)$. Heat storage in the canopy was not considered in this case. Mean values were calculated as the simple mean for half-hourly intervals with and without precipitation at each site (based on a 0.25 mm threshold). Numbers listed represent the mean and standard deviation across sites with tall vegetation (>3 m) and short vegetation (<1.5 m), respectively (20 out of 128 sites has intermediate vegetation height or lacked sufficient data and were not included). Positive and negative signs here follow FLUXNET conventions (i.e., upward and downward, respectively).

		R_n	G	H_{EC}	λE_{EC}	Residual	EBR
		W m ⁻²	W m ⁻²	W m ⁻²	W m ⁻²	W m ⁻²	-
tall vegetation	dry	89 ± 24	-1 ± 2	35 ± 21	37 ± 15	16 ± 13	0.80 ± 0.16
(>3 m, N=59)	rainfall	31 ± 21	2 ± 8	-12 ± 16	17 ± 15	28 ± 20	-0.37 ± 1.92
short vegetation	dry	70 ± 26	-1 ± 3	20 ± 17	38 ± 18	11 ± 13	0.86 ± 0.32
(<1.5 m, N=49)	rainfall	23 ± 18	6 ± 11	-6 ± 8	17 ± 14	18 ± 17	0.36 ± 0.56

Table 2. Proposed explanations for the discrepancy between wet canopy evaporation (E) inferred through the water budget method and conventional Penman-Monteith approach (E_{PM}). The implications for E_{PM} and water budget derived interception loss (I) are indicated.

Proposed explanation	Implication	
	E_{PM} correct	I correct
<i>Errors in applying Penman-Monteith theory</i>		
Energy advection not accounted for	unclear	yes
Biomass heat release underestimated	no	yes
Errors in air humidity measurement	no	yes
Aerodynamic conductance underestimated	no	yes
Mechanical transport not accounted for	yes	yes
<i>Errors in applying rainfall interception models</i>		
Canopy storage capacity underestimated	yes	yes
Rainfall rate overestimated	yes	yes

Table 3. Estimated energy balance during rainfall for tall and short vegetation. For comparison, eddy-covariance based values reported in the FLUXNET database are also listed. Values were calculated as in Table 1, but in addition to H and λE values reported in the FLUXNET database (subscript 'EC') were also calculated using the Penman-Monteith equation with best available inputs ('PM') and the more conventional application ('PMo'), both described in the text (all are in W m^{-2}). Meaning of symbols is as in Table 1, but positive and negative numbers here indicate incoming energy (gains) and outgoing energy (losses), respectively. The number of sites is slightly smaller than those used in Table 1 due to data availability.

	R_n	G	Q	H_{PM}	λE_{PM}	H_{EC}	λE_{EC}	λE_{PMo}
tall vegetation								
(>3 m, $N=57$)	31 ± 22	2 ± 8	29 ± 31	39 ± 40	-102 ± 94	12 ± 17	-17 ± 15	-93 ± 84
short vegetation								
(<1.5 m, $N=46$)	24 ± 18	7 ± 11	1 ± 1	17 ± 20	-48 ± 28	5 ± 9	-18 ± 14	-47 ± 26

1182

1183 Table 4. Mean wet canopy evaporation rate (E) and rainfall rate (R) and their ratio $\bar{E}/\bar{R}$ as calculated from the
1184 simulation results for 83 sites using an intermediate canopy rainfall storage capacity estimate of $S=1$ mm.

	<i>rainfall half-hours</i>	<i>event-average</i>	<i>drying out phase</i>
mean E (mm h ⁻¹)	0.15 ± 0.13	0.17 ± 0.11	0.33 ± 0.17
mean R (mm h ⁻¹)	1.62 ± 0.82	1.04 ± 0.63	
mean E / mean R	0.11 ± 0.11	0.19 ± 0.12	

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189 Figure 1. Comparison between aerodynamic conductance during rainfall calculated from measured friction
 1190 velocity (g_{aU}) and estimated following Thom (g_{aT}) for all vegetation types ($N=102$).

1191

Figure 2. Relationship between storm separation time and (a) mean event-average rainfall rate (R) and (b) number of rainfall events per year. Solid line represents mean of all sites, dotted lines show the 90% range ($N=184$).

1198

1199 Figure 3. Influence of canopy rainfall storage capacity (S) on interception loss (% of rainfall) simulated with the
 1200 simplified model of Rutter et al. (1971). Solid line and circle shows average for 82 sites; open dots and dashed
 1201 lines bound the 90% range.

1202

Figure 4. Relationship between the average precipitation per rain day (P_d) and model-simulated rainfall interception loss (% of rainfall) for 83 FLUXNET sites. Interception was simulated using a simplified version of the model of Rutter et al. (1971) by assuming a canopy storage capacity (S) of (a) 0.5 mm and (b) 2 mm. Open circles are for short vegetation (<1.5 m), solid circles for tall vegetation (>3 m).