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NorESM components and interactions
Climate stability

Annual means for years 700-1200 of NorESM piControl.

- +0.086 Wm$^{-2}$
- +0.122 Wm$^{-2}$
- +0.039 K/500yr
- +0.031 K/500yr
- +0.126 K/500yr
- −6.29 Sv/500yr
- −3.14 $10^{-4}$ g kg$^{-1}$/500yr
- −0.6 Sv/500yr
Northern and Southern Hemispheric sea-ice extent ($10^6$ km$^2$) for March and September in piControl.

Black lines: piControl;
Red lines: OBS-data, annual mean and ±2std for the years 1979–2005 (data from NSIDC, Fetterer et al., 2009).
Climate stability

Clouds and fresh water budget,
No significant trends.

SW cloud-forcing: $-54.83\, \text{Wm}^{-2}$
LW cloud-forcing: $+30.91\, \text{Wm}^{-2}$

SW net-rad: $+232.43\, \text{Wm}^{-2}$
LW net-rad: $-232.33\, \text{Wm}^{-2}$

- Oceanic Evaporation: 
  $\sim 4\%$ too large

- $(E-P)_{ocean}$: $\sim 8\%$ too large.

- Recycling oceanic water,
  $(P/E)_{ocean}$:
  $\sim 0.4\%$ under-estimated.
Equilibrium Climate Sensitivity for CO2 doubling
Comparisons (Andrews et al, 2012)

$\Delta T_{\text{Gregory}}$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{eq}$ K</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{eff}$ K</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{reg}$ K</th>
<th>$R_{f_{reg}}$ Wm$^{-2}$</th>
<th>$\lambda_{reg}$ Wm$^{-2}$K$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{TCR}$ K</th>
<th>$\Delta T_{TCR,eff}$ K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NorESM1-M 2 deg</td>
<td>not calc.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSM4, 1 deg.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta T_{reg} = 2.87$ K  
CCSM4: 2.80 K

$\Delta T_{TCR} = 1.39$ K  
CCSM4: 1.72 K
NorESM1-M:
RCP scenario projections
Compared to 15 CMIP5 models

Global

Land Only

RCP2.6

RCP8.5
**NorESM1-M:** RCP scenario projections

\[(P-E)\_\text{Land} = (E-P)\_\text{Ocean}\]

- \(P\_\text{Land}\) increases
- \(E\_\text{Land} = \text{const (approx)}\)

Max AMOC, 26.5 deg N

\[(P-E)\_\text{Ocean}\]

\(E\_\text{Ocean}\)

NH sea-ice ext

SH sea-ice ext
El Niño-Southern Oscillation

Time series of detrended monthly SST anomalies of the NINO3.4 region.
Spatial patterns of the standard deviations of the first EOF mode for CP ENSO and EP ENSO calculated from observations (ERSST) and 20 CMIP5 models.

Madden-Julian oscillation

November-April wavenumber-frequency spectra of

10°S-10°N averaged daily zonal 850 hPa winds of (a) NCEP (1979-2008) and (b) NorESM (1976-2005),

and daily OLR fields of (c) NOAA satellite OLR (1979-2008) and (d) NorESM (1976-2005).
NorESM1-M:
RCP scenario projections: Storminess and blocking
NorESM1-M:

However: Too zonal, and too few Atlantic blocking
Concluding Remarks

- Many aspects of NorESM1-M is related to CCSM4.
- AMOC is probably too strong
- Cloudiness is under-estimated and liquid water over-estimated
- Too cold climate; Artic sea-ice is too thick.
- ENSO and MJO have favorable properties
- NH cyclone activity is too zonal and Euro-Atlantic blocking under-estimated
- RCP-scenarios imply structural changes in precipitation over land: High intensity incidents increase, dry spells increase
- AMOC is reduced with up to 1/3 for RCP8.5
- NH Storminess is displaced polewards
- Eur-Asian blocking frequency increases in spring and summer

BUT: their simulation quality is highly uncertain,
(2 degrees is too low resolution?)
What’s next?
Atmospheric part of NorESM2 based on CAM5 (or later)?

1. Reduce complexity, increased resolution and improved transport?
   • Requires further aerosol simplifications?

2. Increased complexity,
   Missing components and processes
   – Nitrates and anthropogenic SOA,
   – On-line oxidant chemistry,
   – Nucleation of new particles
   – Prognostic, non-SS oceanic emissions (DMS, OM)
   – Prognostic aerosols in cloud droplets / ice
   – Interactions with microphysics in convective clouds
   – Missing soil dust sources, prognostic dust emissions
   – Aerosol – ice & mixed-phase clouds interactions,
Scientific documentation

Special NorESM-issue of Geoscientific Model Developments

- Kirkevåg et al. [2012, GMDD]: Aerosol-climate interactions in the Norwegian Earth System Model NorESM
  - Published in GMD

- Bentsen et al. [2012, GMDD]: The Norwegian Earth System Model, NorESM1-M – Part 1: Description and basic evaluation
  - Minor review for GMD

- Iversen et al. [2012, GMDD]: The Norwegian Earth System Model, NorESM1-M – Part 2: Climate response and scenario projections
  - Accepted and in print for GMD

- Tjiputra et al. [2012, GMDD]: Evaluation of the carbon cycle components in the Norwegian Earth System Model (NorESM)
  - Under review for GMD

Low-resolution, paleo-version without interactive aerosols:

- Zhang et al. [2012, GMD]: Pre-industrial and mid-Pliocene simulations with NorESM-L

- Zhang and Yan [2012, GMD]: Pre-industrial and mid-Pliocene simulations with NorESM-L: AGCM simulations
Thank You!
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Extra Slides
Aerosol Life-cycling

- 20 mass tracers, 11 emitted/produced, 9 transformed
  - Tabulations for optics and CCN-activation
  - IN-activation not estimated from aerosols
  - details in CCWG-talks by Alf Kirkevåg and Dirk Olivié

InDRF at TOA

CTRL: -1.20 W/m²

CTRL: -1.20 W/m²
NorESM1-M:

RCP scenario projections
Power spectra of the NINO3.4 index (the SST anomalies of previous figure normalized with the standard deviation) using a multitaper method.
Scatter plots of maximum standard deviation from CMIP5. The blue dashed lines indicate the lower limit of the 95% significance interval of the observed ENSO intensities based on an F-test.

CNRM-CM5, GFDL-ESM-208 2G, GFDL-ESM2M, HadGEM2-CC, HADGEM2-ES, MPI-ESM-LR, and Nor-ESM1-M produce strong EP and CP ENSOs.

The “best model ensemble” for projecting the response of the two types of ENSO to the ongoing and possible future global warming.
Coherence squared (colors) and phase lag (vectors) between zonal winds at 850 hPa and OLR are shown for (a) NCEP winds and NOAA satellite OLR, (b) NorESM, and (c) CCSM4 (Subramanian et al, J. Cli. 2011).
NH Annular modes

NAM:
Leading EOF of winter (DJFM) monthly mean sea level pressure anomalies).

SAM:
Leading EOF of monthly mean 850 hPa geopotential height anomalies (m)
NorESM1-M:
RCP scenario projections: Flow regimes
Iversen et al., 2013 in press
NorESM1-M:
RCP scenario projections: Global numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RCP8.5 – Historic1</th>
<th>RCP6.0 – Historic1</th>
<th>RCP4.5 – Historic1</th>
<th>RCP2.6 – Historic1</th>
<th>Historic1 1976-2005</th>
<th>Historic1 – piControl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_{2m}$ / K</td>
<td>+3.07</td>
<td>+1.86</td>
<td>+1.65</td>
<td>+0.94</td>
<td>286.78</td>
<td>+0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST / K</td>
<td>+1.76</td>
<td>+1.06</td>
<td>+0.95</td>
<td>+0.59</td>
<td>282.92</td>
<td>+0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{AREA}_{\text{SeaIce}} / 10^6\text{km}^2$</td>
<td>-6.24</td>
<td>-3.48</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{GLOBAL}} / 1000\text{km}^3\text{yr}^{-1}$</td>
<td>+27</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{OCEANS}} / 1000\text{km}^3\text{yr}^{-1}$</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>+15</td>
<td>+14</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(E-P)_{\text{OCEANS}} / 1000\text{km}^3\text{yr}^{-1}$</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{OCEANS}}^* / 1000\text{km}^3\text{yr}^{-1}$</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+11</td>
<td>+12</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{\text{LAND}}^* / 1000\text{km}^3\text{yr}^{-1}$</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{LAND}}^* / 1000\text{km}^3\text{yr}^{-1}$</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>