

Fast and slow timescales of the tropical low-cloud response to increasing CO₂ in two climate models

Masahiro Watanabe¹

with Hideo Shiogama², Masakazu Yoshimori¹, Tomoo Ogura², Tokuta Yokohata², Hajime Okamoto³, Seita Emori^{1,2,4}, and Masahide Kimoto¹

AORI, The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Japan
 NIES, Tsukuba, Japan
 Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan
 JAMSTEC, Yokohama, Japan

submitted to Clim Dyn

Outline

MIROC description for CMIP5

Climate sensitivity, feedback, and low-cloud response in 4xCO₂ runs

Implication for CFMIP2 analyses

	MIROC updates after AR4 MIROC3.2 (for AR4) MIROC5 (for AR5)					
	Atmos.	Dynamical core	Spectral+semi-Lagrangian (Lin & Rood 1996)	Spectral+semi-Lagrangian (Lin & Rood 1996)		
		V. Coordinate	Sigma	Eta (hybrid sigma-p)		
		Radiation	2-stream DOM 37ch (Nakajima et al. 1986)	2-stream DOM 111ch (Sekiguchi et al. 2008)		
		Cloud	Diagnostic (LeTreut & Li 1991) + Simple water/ice partition	Prognostic PDF (Watanabe et al. 2009) + Ice microphysics (Wilson & Ballard 1999)		
		Turbulence	M-Y Level 2.0 (Mellor & Yamada 1982)	MYNN Level 2.5 (Nakanishi & Niino 2004)		
		Convection	Prognostic A-S + critical RH (Pan & Randall 1998, Emori et al. 2001)	Prognostic AS-type, but original scheme (Chikira & Sugiyama 2010)		
		Aerosols	simplified SPRINTARS (Takemura et al. 2002)	SPRINTARS + prognostic CCN (Takemura et al. 2009)		
	Land/ River		MATSIRO+fixed riv flow	new MATSIRO+variable riv flow		
	Ocean		COCO3.4	COCO4.5		
	Sea-ice		Single-category EVP	Multi-category EVP		

Mean climatology

Annual mean precipitation CMAP

Taylor skill score (Taylor, 2001)

 $S = 4(1+R)^4 / (SDR+1 / SDR)^2$









Improvements in ENSO simulation





MIROC₅ reveals smaller equilibrium sensitivity, probably due to a weak negative cloud-shortwave feedback

Global warming patterns







Fast response of low clouds

4xCO2 runs (20y ensemble)

Regime composite of low cloud (Bony et al. 2004)



Thermodynamic driving

$$\Delta \tilde{C}_{l} \simeq \int \Delta P_{\omega} C_{l}^{CTL}(\omega) d\omega + \int P_{\omega}^{CTL} \Delta C_{l}(\omega) d\omega$$

C_l decrease/increase over the subsidence/ascent region

Fast response of low clouds

4xCO2 runs (20y ensemble)

Regime composite of low cloud



Thermodynamic driving $\Delta \tilde{C}_{l} \simeq \int \Delta P_{s} C_{l}^{CTL}(s) ds + \int P_{s}^{CTL} \Delta C_{l}(s) ds$

Large/small Shift of the PDF for LTS in MIROC5/MIROC3



Summary

Opposite SWcld feedback -> high/low clim sensitivity in MIROC
 Three timescales of the low-cloud response in 4xCO2 exps.
 Tropospheric adjustment / Fast response / Slow response

The slow response can be constrained by observations using ENSO-related variability

But, fast response was critical in MIROC, which may not be constrained by the natural variability



The fast response determined thru a subtle residual of the regional low-cloud changes
 Dominant thermodynamic driving of low-cloud response
 Change in LTS is robust among CFMIP1 models

Would like to clarify in CFMIP2 : Divergence of the fast response using Exp. 6.3

Robustness of the LTS change (incl. issue of its constraint)

□ Mechanism for lower-tropospheric warming degree of the LTS increase

Cloud change at a given LTS (non-thermodynamic response)



Remark

What are the processes making diff between two MIROC models?

✓ MIROC3.2 PPE (N=32)

(e.g. Yokohata et al. 2010 JC)

✓ MIROC5 PPE (N=32) (ongoing, cf. talk by Tomoo Ogura)

Need to systematically explore the structural differences of the model's physics



Japan Uncertainty Modelling Project

Equilibrium climate

backup



Property of MIROC5 215 hPa cloud ice



Property of MIROC5

✓ prognostic PDF cloud scheme

 prognostic ice microphysics better representation of cloud and cloud-radiative feedback how to validate?

CloudSAT and CALIPSO

* launched in April, 2006
* 3D cloud property w/ rader/ lidar measurements



Latitude - temperature cross section of the ratio of cloud particle type

Sep-Nov 2006, CloudSAT/CALIPSO

Sep-Nov climatology, MIROC4.5



Natural low-cloud variability

Obs/CTL runs





Fast response of low clouds

Change in PBL depth





Fast response of low clouds Cloud regime diagram from 4xCO2 / 2xCO2 runs in CFMIP1



Mean states

Feedback analysis



Courtesy of Masa Yoshimori



GEWEX cloud data Annual-mean clim. Cl ISCCP MISR CALIPSO MODIS-CE PATMOSX POLDER 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 [%] Period Nino3 SST anomaly & tropical CI anomaly Data 2 Nino₃ SST Merged Cl Jul2006-Nov2008 CALIPSO **ISCCP-D1** Jan1984-Dec2007 **MISR** Jan2001-Dec2008 -2 **MODIS-CE** Jan2003-Aug2007 JAN APR JUL OCT JAN APR JUL OCT JAN APR JUL OCT 2006 2007 2008 PATMOSX Jan1982-Dec2007 - CALIPSO - ISCCP — MISR - MODIS-CE - PATMOS - POLDER POLDER Jan2006-Dec2008

Courtesy of T Kubota (JAXA)



FIG. 4. Climate sensitivity parameter λ vs Δ CRF/*G* for all configurations of both GCMs; black symbols represent the tropically averaged values. The symbols correspond to abbreviations of each configuration, where the large letter gives the GCM being used (G = GFDL AM, N = NCAR CAM), the subscript is the SST configuration (S for standard, A–C for aquaplanets), and a superscript "+" denotes the T85 version of the NCAR CAM. The two nearly overlain symbols are the T85 versions of the standard and aquaplanet B configurations. Gray symbols denote the globally averaged values from the standard configurations.

Medeiros et al. (2008)

Relative humidity diff.





FIG. 4. Climate sensitivity parameter λ vs Δ CRF/*G* for all configurations of both GCMs; black symbols represent the tropically averaged values. The symbols correspond to abbreviations of each configuration, where the large letter gives the GCM being used (G = GFDL AM, N = NCAR CAM), the subscript is the SST configuration (S for standard, A–C for aquaplanets), and a superscript "+" denotes the T85 version of the NCAR CAM. The two nearly overlain symbols are the T85 versions of the standard and aquaplanet B configurations. Gray symbols denote the globally averaged values from the standard configurations.

Medeiros et al. (2008)



Aquaplanet exp.

SST+2/control diff

"climate sensitivity"



FIG. 4. Climate sensitivity parameter λ vs Δ CRF/*G* for all configurations of both GCMs; black symbols represent the tropically averaged values. The symbols correspond to abbreviations of each configuration, where the large letter gives the GCM being used (G = GFDL AM, N = NCAR CAM), the subscript is the SST configuration (S for standard, A–C for aquaplanets), and a superscript "+" denotes the T85 version of the NCAR CAM. The two nearly overlain symbols are the T85 versions of the standard and aquaplanet B configurations. Gray symbols denote the globally averaged values from the standard configurations.

Medeiros et al. (2008)

Preliminary arguments
 ✓ Different non-convective cloud scheme is of importance
 ✓ But, coupling between the sub-grid processes is also a major source for
) different climate sensitivity (cf. Zhang & Bretherton 2008)

GEWEX cloud data

Data	Period	
AIRS	Jan2003-Dec2009	
ATSR	Jan2002-Dec2009	
CALIPSO	Jul2006-Nov2008	
ISCCP-D1	Jan1984-Dec2007	
MISR	Jan2001-Dec2008	
MODIS-CE	Jan2003-Aug2007	
PATMOSX	Jan1982-Dec2007	
POLDER	Jan2006-Dec2008	
TOVSB	Jan1987-Dec1990	

Mean Cl

Annual-mean clim.



MODIS-CE



PATMOSX



POLDER



MIROC3











10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 [%]

What determines the Cl trend?

20C runs

Zonal-mean cloud water budgets in MIROC5



MIROC5-MIROC3, 20C experiment



Courtesy of T Yokohata

What determines the Cl trend?

20C runs

Spatial cor. for 30S-30N trend patterns

	∆CI	$\Delta\omega_{500}$	∆LTS	∆SST				
∆CI		0.62	0.40	-0.54				
$\Delta\omega_{500}$	0.38		0.23	-0.50	MIR			
∆LTS	0.73	0.40		-0.75	DC5			
∆SST	-0.68	-0.52	-0.86					
MIROC ₃								

How uniform SST increase works?

Aquaplanet runs (SST+2K minus CTL) Δ Cf MIROC3: Equatorial decrease > Subtropical increase MIROC5: Equatorial decrease < Subtropical increase



 ΔQI Subtropical increase MIROC₃ ~ MIROC₅

How uniform SST increase works?

Aquaplanet runs



✓ In MIROC₅, more Cf change is required for the same amount of change in QI



Low-cloud changes in 4xCO2 Regression between Δ SST & $\langle \Delta$ Cl $\rangle_{tropics}$ MIROC₅ MIROC₃ (b) Reg(Δ CI tropics, Δ SST) 150y Reg(\triangle Cl tropics, \triangle SST) 150y a MIROC3 MIROC5 90N 90N 60N 60N 30N 30N EQ EQ 30S 30S 60S 60S 90S · 90S -60E 120E 180 120W 60W 60E 120E 180 120W 60W 0 0 0

In general, mean SST increases -> tropical low cloud decreases

Initial evolution





Initial evolution

 ΔT_{o} along EQ in MIROC₅ (5yx12)



Fast response of low clouds



$$\Delta \tilde{C}_{l} \int \Delta P_{\omega} C_{l}^{CTL}(\omega) d\omega + \int P_{\omega}^{CTL} \Delta C_{l}(\omega) d\omega$$

 ΔCI primarily determined by $\Delta CI(\omega)$ with fixed P ω Change in P ω can be negligible

Implication to 20th century trend 20C runs MIROC₅ (3 mem) MIROC₃ (10 mem) (d) (a) CI linear trend for 1901-2005 MIROC5 Cl linear trend for 1901-1999 40N 40N Cl trend 20N 20N EQ EQ (%/100y) 205 20S 40S 40S 60E 120E 180 120W 60W 60E 120E 180 120W 60W 0.5 -0.5 0 1.5 2.5 3 [%/100y] -15 2 (e) (b) SST linear trend for 1901-2005 MIROC 40N 40N 20N 20N SST trend EQ EQ (K/100y) 20S 20S 40S 40S 120E 120W 60W 60E 120E 180 120W 60W 0 60E 180 0 0 -0.8 -0.6 -0.4 -0.2 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 1.2 [K/100y] 1.4 22<mark>(C)</mark> 36 (f) CI 30S-30N, trend=-0.28%/100y, MIROC3 CI 30S-30N, trend=+0.47%/100y, MIROC5 Decrease (-0.28%/100y) Increase (+0.47%/100y) 35 Tropical CI (30S-30N) [%] [%] 34

year
 ✓ Likely due to fast response (but change is much slower)
 ✓ τ(CO2 increase; abrupt vs gradual) -> τ(fast response)?

1960

1980

2000

1940

1860

1880

1900

1920

33

1860

1880

1900

1920

1940

1960

1980

2000

What determines the Cl trend?

20C runs (Δ : linear trend)

- $\checkmark \Delta CI$ is highly coherent with ΔSST *relative to* its tropical mean
- ✓ Two direct constraints to Δ Cl:
- ✓ $\Delta \omega$ (at 500 hPa): cannot be uniform because of the conservation of mass -> important for the regional feature of ΔCI
- ΔLTS (lower-tropospheric stability) may be free from dynamical constraints
 -> important for the tropical-mean ΔCl



Implication to 20th century trend

20C assimilations MIROC3

MIROC₅



LTS trend: positive or negative?

20C runs

reanalysis (aft 1979)



Too large LTS trends in reanalysis data (period? noise? error?)
 Spatial patterns quite different among the products

APRP Cloud SW Analysis: MIROC3.2 vs. MIROC5.0



APRP Sfc. Albedo Analysis: MIROC3.2 vs. MIROC5.0



