

Low-level marine tropical clouds in six CMIO6 models are too few, too bright but also too compact and too homogenous

Dimitra Konsta, Jean-Louis Dufresne, Hélène Chepfer, Jessica Vial, T. Koshiro, H. Kawai, A. Bodas-Salcedo, Romain Roehrig, M. Watanabe, T.

Ogura

▶ To cite this version:

Dimitra Konsta, Jean-Louis Dufresne, Hélène Chepfer, Jessica Vial, T. Koshiro, et al.. Low-level marine tropical clouds in six CMIO6 models are too few, too bright but also too compact and too homogenous. 2022 CFMIP Meeting on Clouds, Precipitation, Circulation and Climate Sensitivity, Jul 2022, Seattle, United States. hal-04776750

HAL Id: hal-04776750 https://hal.science/hal-04776750v1

Submitted on 11 Nov 2024 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Low-level marine tropical clouds in six CMIO6 models are too few, too bright but also too compact and too homogenous ⁽¹⁾



Abstract

Several studies have shown that most climate models underestimate cloud cover and overestimate cloud cover and overestimate cloud reflectivity, particularly for the tropical low-level clouds. Here we analyze the characteristics of low-level tropical marine clouds simulated by six climate models, which provided COSP output within the CMIP6 project. CALIPSO lidar observations and PARASOL mono-directional reflectance are used for model evaluation. It is found that the 'too few, too bright' bias is still present for these models. The reflectance is particularly overestimated when cloud cover is low. Models do not simulate any optically thin clouds. They fail to reproduce the increasing cloud optical depth with increasing lower tropospheric stability as observed. These results suggest that most models do not sufficiently account for the effect of the small-scale spatial heterogeneity in cloud properties or the variety of cloud types at the grid scale that is observed.

Methodology of evaluating clouds in climate models





CMIP6 models :

IPSL-CM6A

- CNRM-CM6

+ COSP simulator

- HadGEM3

- MIROC6

- GFDL

- MRI

The too few too bright bias in CMIP6 models



Radiometer PARASOL

 \rightarrow Cloud Optical Depth (cloud reflectance 6km, in 1 constant direction: $\theta v=30^{\circ}$, $\phi v=320^{\circ}$)

Lidar CALIPSO – GOCCP⁽¹⁾

 \rightarrow Cloud Fraction (330m), Cloud Vertical Distribution (30m)

Objective

 \rightarrow is the too few too bright bias still present in CMIP6 models ? \rightarrow is there a common origin of this bias?

Variables under study ^(2,3) Cloud Cover and Cloud Reflectance (a proxy of Cloud Albedo)

Region of study Tropical Oceans $(30^{\circ} \text{ S} - 30^{\circ} \text{ N})$

Situations of dominant low-level clouds Criterion : CClow > 0.9 * CC

Temporal resolution Daily (the highest possible giving a view of models' parameterization)

4 years climatology (2007 – 2010)



Variation with the environment



CLOUD COVER



Relationship between low cloud cover and brightness



Obs

 \rightarrow two clouds populations: cumulus and stratocumulus type clouds \rightarrow cloud reflectance increases with increasing cloud cover

Models

- \rightarrow inability to simulate the two distinct cloud populations \rightarrow difficulty to simulate the increase on cloud
- reflectance with cloud cover



CLOUD COVER

 \rightarrow difficulties of models to simulate the clouds vertical distribution \rightarrow models show a much stronger dependence of CR on cloud top altitude

CLOUD COVER

Conclusions

\Rightarrow The too few too bright bias is still present in CMIP6 models for low level clouds

Biases in the simulation of cloud properties:

- Stratocumulus clouds on the eastern coast of the oceans are absent or underestimated in many models
- CR decreases with CC in obs, models show inverse or no dependence
- CR increases with LTS in obs but not in models
- CTH is too low for optically thin clouds and increases with CR much faster in models than in obs

\Rightarrow Can we infer some common orign of this bias among the different climate models? Hypotheses:

- Models simulate too often small cumulus clouds (low CC and high CR) and lack of a variety of low-level cloud types.
- Lack of taking into account the sub-grid heterogeneity of cloud properties in the models.

References:

(1) Konsta, D., J-L. Dufresne, H. Chepfer, J. Vial, T. Koshiro, H. Kawai, A. Bodas-Salcedo, R. Roehrig, M. Watanabe, T. Ogura, 2022: Low-level marine tropical clouds in six CMIP6 models are too few, too bright but also too compact and too homogenous, Geophys. Res. Lett. (Accepted)

(2) Chepfer, H., et al., 2010: The GCM Oriented CALIPSO Cloud Product (CALIPSO-GOCCP), J. Geophys. Res., 115, D00H16, doi:10.1029/2009JD012251.

(3) Konsta D., et al., 2012 : A process oriented characterization of tropical oceanic clouds for climate model evaluation, based on a statistical analysis of daytime A-train observations. Clim Dyn, 39, 2091–2108, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1533-7.

(4) Konsta, D., J-L. Dufresne, H. Chepfer, A. Idelkadi and G. Cesana, 2016 : Use of A-train satellite observations (CALIPSO-PARASOL) to evaluate tropical cloud properties in the LMDZ5 GCM, Clim Dyn, 47: 1263-1284, doi:10.1007/s00382-015-2900-y.