#### **REVIEW ARTICLE**



# **Hydrological modeling of water and soil resources in the basin upstream of the Allal El Fassi dam (Upper Sebou watershed, Morocco)**

**M'hamed Boufala[1](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4464-580X) · Abdellah El Hmaidi<sup>1</sup> · Khalid Chadli2 · Ali Essahlaoui1 · Abdelhadi El Ouali<sup>1</sup> · Soufane Taia3**

Received: 4 April 2019 / Accepted: 23 July 2019 / Published online: 8 August 2019 © Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019

#### **Abstract**

The main objective of this work is to develop a hydrological model of the Upper Sebou watershed located in northwest of Morocco, by applying the agro-hydrological model SWAT (Soil and Water Assessment Tool). The modeling was carried out on a period of 14 years including 2 years as warm-up period, 5 years for calibration and 7 years for validation. The results indicated that  $R^2$  was 0.69 and NS was 0.70 in calibration period (2002–2006), while  $R^2$  was 0.61 and NS was 0.62 in validation period (2007–2013) which means this study showed a good agreement between simulated and observed monthly fow. The results obtained helped frstly to establish and understand the water balance at its diferent spatio-temporal scales, whose average annual precipitation during the study period is of the order of 431 mm, of which 69.3% is lost by evapotranspiration  $(298.7 \text{ mm})$ . Surface runoff is approximately 37 mm, or 8.58% of the precipitation. As for the total flow in the river, it is of the order of 99.8 mm. And on other hand, this model helped to identify areas where soil loss is very high. This degradation is in fact closely related to the physical basin properties. However, the soil loss can reach a maximum value (more than 12.11 t/ha/year) upstream of the basin and a minimum value (less than 4 t/ha/year). The siltation rate of the retention dam was estimated at 2.12 Mm<sup>3</sup>/year.

**Keywords** Model · Swat · Water resources · Erosion · Allal EL Fassi Dam

 $\boxtimes$  M'hamed Boufala simoboufala@gmail.com

> Abdellah El Hmaidi elhmaidi@yahoo.fr

Khalid Chadli chadl\_khalid@hotmail.com

Ali Essahlaoui a.essahlaoui@fs-umi.ac.ma

Abdelhadi El Ouali a.elouali@fs-umi.ac.ma

Soufane Taia soufane.taia@uit.ac.ma

- <sup>1</sup> Water Science and Environmental Engineering Team, Laboratory of Geoengineering and Environment, Department of Geology, Faculty of Science, Moulay Ismail university, BP 11202, Zitoune, Meknes, Morocco
- <sup>2</sup> Department of Geography, Faculty of Letters and Human Sciences, Moulay Ismail University, BP 11202, Zitoune, Meknes, Morocco
- Laboratory Geosciences of Natural Resources, Hydroinformatic Section, Department of Geology, Faculty of Science, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

# **Introduction**

Since the beginning of the eighties of the last century, Morocco has been experiencing a situation of water stress characterized by a frequency and signifcant amplitude of the droughts. Morocco's renewable water resource is currently estimated at 700 m<sup>3</sup>/inhab/year, less than the internationally recognized water poverty threshold of 1000 m<sup>3</sup>/inhab/year.

Population growth in the Sebou basin is putting increasing pressure on land and water resources. Ongoing changes in land use and management are altering the overall water balance, resulting in the increased runoff, peak flows, soil erosion, and sedimentation of downstream reservoirs, thereby reducing the availability of water in the watershed. Floods and pollution have been reported as the main problems in the Sebou Basin (Terink et al. [2011\)](#page-14-0).

Water resources in Morocco are overexploited and are approaching the limit of the sustainable ecological removal of groundwater and surface water (Chadli [2017\)](#page-14-1). Also, the storage capacity lost due to the siltation of dam reservoirs is estimated at 75 million  $m^3$ /year which is equivalent to the loss of an average dam every 2 years (ABHS [2005](#page-13-0)).

This situation may be further accentuated by the increased degradation of soils and vegetation cover which will lead to the erosion aggravation.

The implemented model in this study is the Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), which is based on a physical design rather than a statistically based design (Arnold et al. [2012b](#page-14-2)). This ensures more reliability and better performance especially in basins where there is a lack of gauging stations, which is an essential element for a study of this scale (Neitsch et al. [2005](#page-14-3)). This model makes it possible to establish the water budget and to estimate the sediment and transport rate in the study area.

The emergence of remote sensing and geographic information systems (GIS) technologies is a signifcant solution for solving both the problem of data access and the implementation of spatialized models. Space-based remote sensing offers new horizons for the collection of spatial data and the measurement of model parameters; so, the researchers believe that the great evolution of watershed modeling in the future will be the result of the development data collection by satellites (Abbaspour [2011\)](#page-13-1).

The overall objective of this work is the modeling of the Upper Sebou watershed through a spatialized approach by simulating the infux of water and sediments produced at the level of diferent basin units and transferred through the hydrographic network to the basin outlet which is the dam Allal El Fassi.

# **Materials and methods**

## **Study area**

The Upper Sebou watershed is part of the Sebou basin, upstream of the Allal El Fassi dam, drained by the river with the same name, which originates in the region of Aguelmane Sidi Ali in about 2078 m above sea level. On its way, the Sebou river receives several tributaries (Guigou,



<span id="page-1-0"></span>**Fig. 1** The geographic location of the study area (Upper Sebou)

<span id="page-2-0"></span>watershed



Zloul, Maaser, etc.). It covers an area of  $5495 \text{ km}^2$ , and it is located in the northern Middle Atlas between latitudes 33° and 34° north and longitudes 4°:03′ and 5°:20′ west; it is exposed to humid westerly dominant fows (Fig. [1](#page-1-0)), and whose altitudes exceed 3000 m. It generally presents a sub-tabular and faulted geological structure (Martin [1981](#page-14-4)). The lithology consists mainly of dolomitic limestones of the Lower Jurassic (lower and medium Lias), which overcome the series consisting of Triassic red shale and basalt.

The lower Jurassic consists of carbonate rocks that were deposited on an extended platform (Martin [1981\)](#page-14-4).

## **SWAT model signifcance**

The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) is an agro-hydrological model, developed by USDA's Agricultural Research Service (United States Department of Agriculture). It simulates the main watershed processes

<span id="page-3-0"></span>



such as hydrology, sedimentation, nutrient transfer, crop growth, environment and climate change for a daily time step (Arnold et al. [1998](#page-13-2)). The purpose of this model is to describe the physical functioning of these diferent components and their interactions in a way that is as simple and realistic as possible through conceptual equations and the use of available input data to make it useful in planning and decision-making for watershed management (Ogden et al. [2001\)](#page-14-5).

elevation model (DEM), data of climate and gauging stations, hydrographic network, land use and soil map in grid or polygon, as inputs to the model. In addition, it facilitates the extraction of output parameters and visualizes the results (Di Luzio et al. [2002](#page-14-6)).

Texas A&M University has developed a graphical and visual interface of SWAT, ArcSWAT, that uses the digital

According to Neitsch et al. ([2005\)](#page-14-3), the processes involved in assessing water quantity by SWAT include

<span id="page-4-0"></span>



precipitation, evapotranspiration, surface runoff, sub-surface or lateral flow, and subsurface flow. Simulation of the terrestrial phase, according to a daily time step, is based on the following water balance:

$$
SW_t = SW_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} (R_{day} - Q_{surf} - E_a - W_{sep} - Q_{gw})_i, \quad (1)
$$

where: SWt: the fnal soil water content (mm) SW0: the initial soil water content (mm)  $R_{\text{day}}$ : the amount of precipitation on day  $i$  (mm)  $Q_{\text{surf}}$ : the amount of surface runoff on day  $i$ (mm)  $E_a$ : the amount of evapotranspiration on day *i* (mm) *W*seep: the amount of water entering the vadose zone from the soil profile on day  $i$  (mm)  $Q_{gw}$ : the amount of return flow on day *i* (mm) *t*: Time [day].

<span id="page-5-0"></span>



#### **SWAT‑CUP**

SWAT-CUP (SWAT Calibration and Uncertainty Proce-dures) developed by Abbaspour et al. ([2007](#page-13-3)) offers a range of more extensive and richer functions and interfaces for parameterization and calibration of the model. This tool integrates the algorithm SUFI-2, which is a method widely used for the calibration of the SWAT model at large scales. It has ease of implementation and a reduced number of simulations necessary for better results (Yang et al. [2008](#page-14-7)). This stochastic method uses Latin Hypercube sampling to discretize the range of parameter variation and defne their optimal values (Abbaspour [2011](#page-13-1)). The processing of the SWAT-CUP tool is based on the use of the output fles generated in the SWAT model (Abbaspour [2011\)](#page-13-1).



<span id="page-6-0"></span>**Fig. 6** Correlation between observed rainfall and CFSR data at the Azzaba meteorological station for the period 2007–2013

#### **Database required**

SWAT model uses a large spatial database including the digital elevation model, land use, soil layers characteristics, to subdivide the basin into hydrologic response units (HRUs). In addition to that, the model requires daily meteorological.

#### **DEM**

The GDEM-ASTER data (Global Digital Elevation Model from the ASTER sensor) have been used as the relief representation for this study, which is characterized by a spatial resolution of 30  $m \times 30$  m. It is widely used in hydrological modeling of watersheds (Hirt et al. [2010](#page-14-8)). The relief was integrated into the SWAT model as a raster of elevations. And it will be used for the delineation of sub-basins and stream generation using the D8 algorithm (Jenson and Domingue [1988](#page-14-9)). The operating principle of the D8 algorithm is to evaluate slopes to create a matrix of fow directions, which makes it possible to identify the convergence points of the water and thus to extract the hydrographic network (Arnold et al. [2012a\)](#page-13-4). To delineate the watershed, we choose Allal El Fassi dam which is the point of the watershed outlet for our study. The D8 algorithm then proceeds from upstream to downstream, including cells that converge to the outlet according to the matrix of flow directions Figs. [2](#page-2-0) and [3.](#page-3-0)

#### **Landuse database**

Land use is one of the fundamental elements of hydrological modeling. It has a decisive role in the functioning of hydrological processes. In the SWAT model, land use is used to divide the basin into elementary units for erosion rate estimation, and surface fow. The map obtained by SWAT fnally resulted in a land cover map (Fig. [4](#page-4-0)), with six classes: urban areas (0.27%), forests (20.87%), agricultural land (21.84%),

matorral (40.86%), rangeland (14.50%), bare soils (1.66%) (Fig. [4\)](#page-4-0).

#### **Soil database**

In addition to the soil map, the SWAT model requires a dataset describing the physicochemical characteristics of each soil type, including the texture, depth, soil water availability (AWC), hydraulic conductivity (Ksat). For that, we used the soil database HWSD (Harmonized World Soil Database) produced by FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization) (Fig. [5\)](#page-5-0).

#### **Weather data**

Weather data are the basic components of the water balance (Arnold et al. [2012b\)](#page-14-2). For that, SWAT requires daily precipitation, maximum and minimum temperature, solar radiation, wind speed and relative humidity (Neitsch et al. [2005](#page-14-3)). In this context, the Upper Sebou is covered by a network of dense climatic stations managed by the ABHS (Sebou Basin Hydraulic Agency), which allowed us to obtain data on rainfall, while other climatic variables were obtained from Climate Forecast System Reanalysis "CFSR", with a resolution of 38 km. Our choice of rainfall data was based on the result of the comparison of CFSR data and the observed precipitation in the Azzaba station (Fig. [6](#page-6-0)) for the period 2009–2013). The results of this comparison reveal a satisfactory correlation between the two sources of data. Since the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.67, we finally decided to adopt the data observed at the stations of the Upper Sebou as inputs of the model.

#### **Observed fows data**

Observed flows on the Upper Sebou watershed are recorded at several permanent hydrological stations, installed downstream of the sub-basins, Therefore, our study will be based on the data of the Allal El Fassi station situated at the outlet of the watershed, at the dam level whose coordinates are  $X = 569,693$  m, and  $Y = 368,778$  m; it has been in service since 1991. It allows the recording of fow rates and weather parameters such as precipitations and temperature. It controls an area of  $5495 \text{ km}^2$ . Also, the main tributaries, Guigou, Maaser, and Zloul, are also equipped with hydrological stations. The monthly flow data used in this study are provided by the ABHS. These are the data recorded from 2000 to 2013 at the Allal El Fassi hydrometric station since it controls all sub-basins belonging to the Upper Sebou (Fig. [7](#page-7-0)).

<span id="page-7-0"></span>

<span id="page-7-1"></span>**Table 1** Monthly performance evaluation grid (Moriasi et al. [2007](#page-14-10))



<span id="page-8-0"></span>



# **Results and discussions**

#### **Model simulation**

The simulation period is defned over 14 years and is subdivided into:

- Two years as a warm-up period (January 2000–December 2001) recommended to optimize calibration, this period aims to let the model do these frst two complete hydrological cycles;
- Calibration period (Jan 2002–Dec 2006);
- Validation period (Jan 2007–Dec 2013).

#### **Model performance**

The calibration is based on the comparison between the outputs simulated by the model with observation data. The evaluation and the adequacy between the two datasets (simulated and observed) is done through statistical indicators like the Nash–Sutcliffe measure of efficiency (NSE), the root-meansquare error observations SD ratio (RSR), which is derived from the root-mean-square error (RMSE), and the percent bias (PBIAS) described by the following Eqs. ([2](#page-9-0)), ([3](#page-9-1)) and ([4\)](#page-9-2)



<span id="page-8-1"></span>**Fig. 8** Hydrograph of observed and simulated fows during the calibration period (Jan. 2002–Dec. 2006) at the Allal El Fassi station



<span id="page-8-2"></span>**Fig. 9** Correlation between observed and simulated fow

<span id="page-9-3"></span>

<span id="page-9-4"></span>**Fig. 11** Hydrograph of observed and simulated fows during the validation period (Jan 2007–Dec 2013) at the Allal El Fassi station

$$
NSE = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Q_{\text{obs}}^{i} - Q_{\text{sim}}^{i})2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Q_{\text{obs}}^{i} - Q_{\text{obs}}^{\text{mean}})2}
$$
(2)

$$
RSR = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Q_{\text{obs}}^{i} - Q_{\text{sim}}^{i})2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Q_{\text{obs}}^{i} - Q_{\text{mean}})2}}
$$
(3)

$$
PBIAS = \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Q_{obs}^{i} - Q_{sim}^{i}) \times 100}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (Q_{obs}^{i})}\right].
$$
 (4)

The percentage of BIAS measures the average trend of the simulated data to be higher or lower than the observed data. An optimal value of the percentage of BIAS is zero; it indicates a perfect simulation of the model. A percentage of positive BIAS indicates an underestimation of the model while a negative percentage demonstrates overestimation of the model (Moriasi et al. [2007](#page-14-10)). A model is never perfect; it is always tainted with an imprecision associated with the complexity of watershed, and sometimes with the structure <span id="page-9-0"></span>of the model. Based on the statistical criteria obtained by Moriasi et al. ([2007\)](#page-14-10), Table [1](#page-7-1) establishes a monthly performance evaluation grid.

# **Calibration of the SWAT model**

<span id="page-9-1"></span>The model is calibrated over 5 years (Jan 2002–Dec 2006) using the SUFI2 optimization method integrated into the SWAT-CUP tool. The sensitivity analysis is the process of determining the rate of change in model output with respect to changes in model inputs (parameters). It is necessary to identify key parameters and the parameter precision required for calibration (Andrade et al. [2000\)](#page-13-5). In our study, the optimal values for these parameters are shown in the following Table [2](#page-8-0):

<span id="page-9-2"></span>The Nash coefficient obtained is of the order of 0.69 and that of determination is 0.70. These values indicate a good performance of the model at the calibration phase according to the evaluation criteria of the performance of the recommended model for a monthly time step (Moriasi et al. [2007](#page-14-10)). The monthly flows observed and those simulated by the model at the basin outlet (Allal El Fassi station) for this



<span id="page-10-0"></span>**Fig. 12** Water balance of Upper Sebou

calibration period, are illustrated in Fig. [8,](#page-8-1) and showing that the fow simulation is generally faithful to reality.

SWAT-CUP also has other criteria to quantify the strength and uncertainties of the calibration analysis. In this study, the *P* factor and the *R* factor of the iteration were also noted. *P* factor represents the percentage of simulated data covered by the 95% uncertainty band (95PPU) and it ranges from 0 to 1 (Li et al. [2009\)](#page-14-11). The *P* factor value of this study is 0.75 which entails that more than 75% of the simulated data are acceptable. *R* factor, on the other hand, estimates the strength of the calibration by dividing the average thickness of the 95PPU band with the standard deviation of the measured data. The range of *R* factor starts from 0 to infnity; high and low *R* factor values correspond to a thicker and thinner 95 PPU bands, respectively. A *P* factor of 1 and an *R* factor of 0 mean a perfect simulation of the observed data (Li et al. [2009\)](#page-14-11). To fnd the best ft of the model, the *R* factor is minimized to 1.57 at its best.

In the hydrograph comparing the observed and simulated flow for the calibration period (Fig.  $9$ ), a good simulation is distinguished for the majority of flows. Concerning the year 2003, the fow recorded in December is 42.73 m<sup>3</sup>/s, and that simulated by the model is 37.87 m<sup>3</sup>/s. On the other hand, the model underestimated the fows in January 2003 and March 2005. In general, the model underestimated the cumulative simulation of calibration with a deficit of about 0.48% compared to observations.

#### **Validation of the model**

The validation phase is the most decisive step in the simulation of water resources management at a watershed level. Once the performance of the calibration model is satisfactory, as is the case in our work, the model is simulated with the optimal parameters derived from the calibration, for another period called the validation period (Arnold et al. [2012b](#page-14-2)). This step was performed on ArcSWAT, replacing the values of the initial parameters with the optimal ones, using a manual calibration tool integrated into ArcSWAT. Subsequently, the model was simulated for 7 years of validation, from January

<span id="page-11-0"></span>



2007 to December 2013. The statistical indices for this period showed values ranging from satisfactory to very good (Fig. [10\)](#page-9-3), which means a satisfactory correlation between the simulated fow rates and those observed. The percentage of BIAS is 1.82 which indicates a very good estimate of the flows simulated by the model during this period.

These statistical criteria used to determine the performance of the model showed that the flows observed at the validation period level correspond better to those simulated. In Fig. [11,](#page-9-4) we can notice that the peak of March 2009 is

<sup>2</sup> Springer

overestimated by the model. On the other hand, the peak of February 2010 is consistent with the model estimation. Overall, the model underestimates the total flow by 1.82%. However, the SWAT model has approximately reproduced the flows for this period. The uncertainties at the peaks could be linked frstly to the use of weather data measured by the agents of the ABHS whose working conditions are lacking, and secondly to the complexity of the natural components of the watershed that can play an important role in the slight imperfection of the model.

#### **Water balance**

Over the entire watershed, the average annual precipitations during the study period are of the order of 431 mm; 69.3% of this amount is eliminated by evapotranspiration (298.7 mm) (Fig.  $12$ ), Surface runoff is approximately 37 mm, or 8.58% of the precipitation, and the total fow is about 99.8 mm. This can be explained essentially by a recharge from the water table given the presence of a permeable substrate in the Upper Sebou watershed. The percolation value is 73.15 mm with a percentage of the order of 16.94%.

#### **Erosion yield**

Erosion is estimated using the modifed universal soil loss equation (MUSLE) [5]:



where Sed is the sediment yield on a given day [*t*] *Q*\_surf is the surface runoff volume  $[mm/ha]$   $q$  peak is the peak runoff rate  $[m^3/s]$  area\_hru is the area of an HRU [ha]  $K$  (USLE) is the USLE soil erodibility factor *C* (USLE) is the USLE soil cover factor *P* (USLE) is the USLE support practice factor LS (USLE) is the terrain shape factor (slope and length of a slope) CFRG is the coarse fragment factor.

The quantity of sediments delivered by the diferent spatial units of the Upper Sebou watershed varies between 2.60 and 12.11 t/ha/year, with an average rate of around 6.51 t/ ha/year (Fig. [13](#page-11-0)). A study conducted by the ABHS and High Commission for Water and Forests and the fght against desertification (HCEFLD) to analyze erosion problems and identify areas at high risk of erosion shows an average erosion rate between 5 and 10 t/h/year in the Middle Atlas regions. This value is close to the value estimated by the SWAT model. However, this rate is low and indicates that the Upper Sebou watershed presents diferent areas where water erosion is less important.

#### **Sediment inputs to the reservoir**

<span id="page-12-0"></span>The mobilized elements, which account for most of the alluvial fow, are exported mainly to the dam. The simulation results of the quantity of solid transport for the period 2002–2013 are shown in Table [3.](#page-12-0) For this period, the siltation rate of the reservoir dam was estimated by the model at  $2.12 \text{ Mm}^3$ /year. This value was verified and validated by the bathymetric surveys of the Direction of Research and Water Plannifcation in 2017, which estimated average annual siltation rate approximately at  $2.15 \text{ Mm}^3/\text{year}$ .





<span id="page-13-6"></span>**Fig. 14** Monthly sediment loadings at the Allal El Fassi dam during the study period (2002–2013)

This evolution of the rate of siltation can be explained by the major foods experienced by Upper Sebou in the study period and especially in 2006/2007–2008/2009. Figure [14](#page-13-6) shows the variation in monthly sediment inputs in the dam during the study period. This variation shows that most of the sediment arrives at the reservoir during wet periods specifcally during foods.

# **Conclusion**

Spatialized modeling approach (SWAT) as a management tool for the simulation of water resources at the watershed scale was successfully calibrated in the Upper Sebou watershed. It has, therefore, reproduced the hydrological balance and erosion in diferent entities of the study area and also the model assessed the water and sediment inputs to the Allal El Fassi dam. These results were obtained after a long process of data preparation and structuring on a spatiotemporal scale using remote sensing and geographic information system (GIS) techniques.

Overall, the SWAT model has correctly reproduced the flows for the validation period. Flow varies closely with precipitation. As a result, the uncertainties in peaks can be linked on the one hand to the use of observed flow data, and on the other hand to the complexity of the natural components of the watershed, which can present an important role in the slight imperfection of the model. The evapotranspiration is predominant in the water balance components. Indeed, 69.3% of the annual precipitation is evaporated. The surface runoff is only 47.71 mm; whereas the total fow in the river is 99.80 mm. The quantity of sediments delivered by the diferent spatial units of the Upper Sebou watershed varies between 2.6 and 12.11 t/ha/ year, with an average rate of around 6.51 t/ha/year; also, the rate of siltation of the reservoir dam was estimated by the model at  $2.12 \text{ Mm}^3/\text{year}$ .

The specifc degradation of soil can reach a maximum value more than 12 t/ha/year upstream of the basin, particularly in the sub-basins controlled by the hydrometric stations of M'dez, Dar Lhamra and AinTimedrine characterized by bare soil and high altitudes. The presence of a dense canopy can reduce this rate. Indeed, the results obtained from this modeling show that the land covered by forests and matorrals are less afected by erosion. So, the reliability of SWAT modeling for Moroccan watersheds can be considered as an interesting tool for climate change studies, agricultural practices, and water resources allocation.

# **References**

- <span id="page-13-1"></span>Abbaspour KC (2011) User manual for SWAT-CUP, SWAT calibration, and uncertainty analysis programs. Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Eawag, p 103
- <span id="page-13-3"></span>Abbaspour K, Yang J, Maximov I, Siber R, Bogner K, Mieleitner J, Zobrist J, Srinivasan R (2007) Modeling hydrology and water quality in the pre-alpine/alpine Thur watershed using SWAT. J Hydrol 333:413–430
- <span id="page-13-0"></span>ABHS (2005) Study to update the management master plan integrates water resources in the Sebou watershed. In: Seboumission review, Kingdom of Morocco Sebou Hydraulic Basin Agency
- <span id="page-13-5"></span>Andrade MA et al (2000) Méthode basée sur l'homologie pour l'identifcation de répétitions de protéines en utilisant des estimations de signifcation statistique. J Mol Biol 298(3):521–537
- <span id="page-13-2"></span>Arnold JG, Srinivasan R, Muttiah RS, Williams JR (1998) Large area hydrologic modeling and assessment part 1: model development. J Am Water Resour Assoc 34(1):73–89
- <span id="page-13-4"></span>Arnold JG, Kiniry JR, Srinivasan R, Williams JR, Haney EB, Neitsch SL (2012a) Soil and Water Assessment Tool theoretical documentation, version 2012. In: Grassland, Soil and Water Research Laboratory—Agricultural Research Service.

Blackland Research Center—Texas Agricultural Experiment Station

- <span id="page-14-2"></span>Arnold JG, Moriasi DN, Gassman PW, Abbaspour KC, White MJ, Srinivasan R, Santhi C, Harmel RD, Van Griensven A, Van Liew MW, Kannan N (2012b) SWAT: model use, calibration, and validation. Trans ASABE 55(4):1491–1508
- <span id="page-14-1"></span>Chadli K (2017) Hydrological modeling of the Mikkés watershed (Morocco) using ARCSWAT model. Sustain Water Resour Manag. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40899-017-0145-0>
- <span id="page-14-6"></span>Di Luzio M, Srinivasan R, Arnold JG, Neitsch SL (2002) Soil and water assessment tool. ArcView GIS interface manual: version 2000. GSWRL Report 02-03, BRC Report 02-07. Published by Texas Water Resources Institute TR-193, College Station, TX, p 346
- <span id="page-14-8"></span>Hirt C, Filmer MS, Featherstone WE (2010) Comparison and validation of recent freely available ASTER-GDEM ver1, STRM ver4.1 and GEODATA DEM-9S ver3 digital elevation models over Australia. Aust J Earth Sci 57(3):337–347
- <span id="page-14-9"></span>Jenson SK, Domingue JO (1988) Extracting topographic structure from digital elevation data for geographic information system analysis. Photogramm Eng Remote Sens 54(11):1593–1600
- <span id="page-14-11"></span>Li Z, Xu Z, Shao Q, Yang J (2009) Parameter estimation and uncertainty analysis of the SWAT model in upper reaches of the Heihe river basin. Hydrol Process Int J 23:2744–2753
- <span id="page-14-4"></span>Martin J (1981) Central Middle Atlas: geomorphological study. In: Notes and memoirs of the geological service of Morocco, 258 bis, p 445
- <span id="page-14-10"></span>Moriasi DN, Arnold JG, Van Liew MW, Bingner RL, Harmel RD, Veith TL (2007) Model evaluation guidelines for systematic quantification of accuracy in watershed simulations. Trans ASABE 50(3):885–900
- <span id="page-14-3"></span>Neitsch SL, Arnold JG, Kiniry JR, William JR (2005) Soil and water assessment tool theoretical documentation, version 2005. In: Grassland, Soil and Water Research Laboratory—Agricultural Research Service. Blackland Research Center—Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, p 494
- <span id="page-14-5"></span>Ogden FL, Garbrecht J, DeBarry PA, Johnson LE (2001) GIS and distributed watershed models, II: modules, interfaces, and models. J Hydrol Eng 6(6):515–523
- <span id="page-14-0"></span>Terink W, Hunink J, Droogers P, Reuter H, Van Lynden G, Kaufman S (2011) Green water credits Morocco: inception phase. Impacts of land management options in the Sebou Basin: using the soil water and assessment tool—SWAT. In: Green Water Credits Report M1. Future Water Report 101
- <span id="page-14-7"></span>Yang J, Reichert P, Abbaspour KC, Xia J, Yang H (2008) Comparing uncertainty analysis techniques for a SWAT application to the Chaohe Basin in China. J Hydrol 358:1–23

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.