

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATMOSPHERIC GENERAL CIRCULATION MODELS

Complexity, Synthesis, and Computation

Over the last fifty years, models that predict the state of the atmosphere have evolved from conceptual frameworks to advanced computational tools for short- and medium-range weather prediction and climate simulation. This book presents a comprehensive discussion of general circulation models of the atmosphere – covering their historical and contemporary development, their societal context, and current efforts to integrate these models into wider Earth system models. Leading researchers provide unique perspectives on the scientific breakthroughs, overarching themes, critical applications, and future prospects for atmospheric general circulation models. Key interdisciplinary links to other subject areas such as chemistry, oceanography, and ecology are also highlighted.

This book is a core reference for academic researchers and professionals involved in atmospheric physics, meteorology, and climate science, and can be used as a resource for graduate-level courses in climate modeling and numerical weather prediction. Given the critical role that atmospheric general circulation models are playing in the intense public discourse on climate change, it is also a valuable resource for policymakers and all those concerned with the scientific basis for the ongoing public-policy debate.

LEO DONNER received his Ph.D. in Geophysical Sciences from the University of Chicago in 1983. His research focuses on atmospheric general circulation modeling, especially the treatment of clouds and convective processes. He has served as the science chair of the Global Atmospheric Model Development Team at NOAA's Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory at Princeton University and a co-chair of the Atmospheric Model Working Group for the Community Atmosphere Model at NCAR in Boulder, Colorado. These models are often regarded as the two leading atmospheric general circulation models for climate studies in the United States. Leo Donner is also a lecturer in the Program in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences at Princeton University. He serves on the advisory board for the journal *Tellus* and has been an editor of the *Journal of Climate*.

WAYNE SCHUBERT received his Ph.D. in Atmospheric Science from UCLA in 1973, and then went on to join the faculty of the Department of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University, where he presently teaches graduate-level atmospheric dynamics. His research covers tropical meteorology, atmospheric dynamics, and numerical weather prediction. Professor Schubert is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society and has served as Co-Chief Editor of the *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* and as the AMS Publications Commissioner. He presently serves as an Editor of the *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*.

RICHARD SOMERVILLE is Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego. He received his Ph.D. in Meteorology from New York University in 1966 and has been a professor at Scripps since 1979. He is a theoretical meteorologist and an expert on climate change – he is a Coordinating Lead Author of the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Professor Somerville has received awards from the American Meteorological Society for his research and is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and of the American Meteorological Society.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-44569-6 — The Development of Atmospheric General Circulation Models

Edited by Leo Donner , Wayne Schubert , Richard Somerville

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATMOSPHERIC GENERAL CIRCULATION MODELS

Complexity, Synthesis, and Computation

Edited by

LEO DONNER

NOAA, Princeton University, New Jersey, USA

WAYNE SCHUBERT

Colorado State University, USA

RICHARD SOMERVILLE

Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, USA



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-44569-6 — The Development of Atmospheric General Circulation Models

Edited by Leo Donner, Wayne Schubert, Richard Somerville

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

4843/24, 2nd Floor, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, Delhi - 110002, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108445696

© Cambridge University Press 2011

Sections of this work are retained under copyright of the US Government.

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

First paperback edition 2017

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data

The development of atmospheric general circulation models : complexity, synthesis, and computation / edited by Leo Donner, Richard Somerville, Wayne Schubert.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-19006-0

1. Atmospheric circulation – Mathematical models. I. Donner, Leo Joseph, 1956–

II. Schubert, Wayne H. III. Somerville, Richard.

QC880.4.A8D48 2011

551.51'7–dc22

2010037289

ISBN 978-0-521-19006-0 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-44569-6 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>Contributors</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>Foreword</i>	xi
<i>Isaac M. Held</i>	
1 Introduction	1
<i>Leo Donner, Wayne Schubert, and Richard C. J. Somerville</i>	
Acknowledgments	2
2 From Richardson to early numerical weather prediction	3
<i>Peter Lynch</i>	
2.1 Pioneers of scientific forecasting	3
2.2 Pre-computer forecasting	6
2.3 Key developments, 1920–1950	8
2.4 The ENIAC integrations	9
2.5 Advancing computer technology	11
2.6 Climate modeling	13
2.7 Uncertainty and probability	14
2.8 Dreams fulfilled	15
References	16
3 The evolution and future research goals for general circulation models	18
<i>Warren M. Washington and Akira Kasahara</i>	
3.1 Introduction	18
3.2 Evolution of general circulation modeling efforts	23
3.3 Future goals for climate and Earth system modeling	36
Acknowledgments	42
References	42
Appendix	46

4	Beyond prediction to climate modeling and climate control: New perspectives from the papers of Harry Wexler, 1945–1962	51
	<i>James Rodger Fleming</i>	
4.1	On the possibilities of climate control	51
4.2	Computers and meteorology, 1945–1946	52
4.3	Fantasies of control	60
4.4	Computers and meteorology, 1947–1948	62
4.5	Wexler's key contributions in other areas	63
4.6	Climate change and the general circulation	66
4.7	Gilbert Plass and CO ₂ modeling	66
4.8	Harry Wexler's article and final lectures on climate control	68
4.9	Conclusion	71
	References	72
5	Synergies between numerical weather prediction and general circulation climate models	76
	<i>Catherine A. Senior, Alberto Arribas, Andrew R. Brown, Michael J. P. Cullen, Timothy C. Johns, Gillian M. Martin, Sean F. Milton, Stuart Webster and Keith D. Williams</i>	
5.1	Background and motivation	76
5.2	Seamless prediction across a range of space scales	81
5.3	Seamless prediction across a range of time scales	89
5.4	Benefits of shared development	98
5.5	Conclusion and future exploitation	106
	Acknowledgments	107
	References	108
6	Contributions of observational studies to the evaluation and diagnosis of atmospheric GCM simulations	117
	<i>Ngar-Cheung Lau</i>	
6.1	Introduction	117
6.2	The early years – energy cycle, zonal-mean circulation, and regional climatology	118
6.3	Shift of attention to longitudinal and frequency dependence of atmospheric variability	122
6.4	Diagnoses of local interactions between transient eddies and the time-mean circulation	131
6.5	Experimentations on interactions with SST conditions at various sites	135
6.6	Discussion and future prospects	141
	Acknowledgments	143
	References	144

Contents

vii

7	Coupling atmospheric general circulation to oceans	148
	<i>Kirk Bryan</i>	
7.1	Introduction	148
7.2	Ocean models	149
7.3	Coupled models compared to observations	153
7.4	Paleoclimate	157
7.5	El Niño	158
7.6	Multi-decadal climate variability	162
7.7	Future challenges and opportunities for coupled models	171
	Acknowledgments	172
	References	172
8	Coupling atmospheric circulation models to biophysical, biochemical, and biological processes at the land surface	177
	<i>Robert E. Dickinson</i>	
8.1	Beginnings of modeling the land surface as a component of GCMs	177
8.2	Land's role in climate variability and change	179
8.3	The introduction of dynamic vegetation	184
8.4	Coupling to the carbon cycle	185
8.5	Concluding discussion	193
	References	194
9	The evolution of complexity in general circulation models	202
	<i>David Randall</i>	
9.1	Introduction	202
9.2	In the beginning	203
9.3	Numerics	206
9.4	Parameterizations	208
9.5	From academia to enterprise: a loss of innocence	212
9.6	Peta-flops and giga-grids	214
9.7	Conclusions	220
	Acknowledgments	221
	References	221
10	The co-evolution of climate models and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change	225
	<i>Richard C. J. Somerville</i>	
10.1	Historical development of global climate models in the IPCC context	225
10.2	The beginnings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)	229
10.3	The First Assessment Report (FAR) of the IPCC (1990)	230

viii	<i>Contents</i>	
10.4	The Second Assessment Report (SAR) and Third Assessment Report (TAR)	233
10.5	IPCC and the policy debate regarding human effects on climate change	234
10.6	The IPCC process	236
10.7	An example of model evolution in the IPCC context: cloud processes	240
10.8	Coupled models	242
10.9	The Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) and the future of the IPCC	244
	References	251
	<i>Index</i>	253
	Color plates between p. 144 and p. 145	

Contributors

Alberto Arribas

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Andrew R. Brown

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Kirk Bryan

Princeton University, Princeton, New
Jersey, USA

Michael J. P. Cullen

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Robert E. Dickinson

Jackson School of Geosciences,
University of Texas, Austin, USA

Leo Donner

Geophysical Fluid Dynamics
Laboratory/NOAA, Princeton
University Forrestal Campus,
Princeton, New Jersey, USA

James Rodger Fleming

Science, Technology, and Society
Program, Colby College, Waterville,
Maine, USA

Isaac M. Held

Geophysical Fluid Dynamics
Laboratory/NOAA, Princeton
University, Princeton, New Jersey,
USA

Timothy C. Johns

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Akira Kasahara

National Center for
Atmospheric Research,
Boulder, Colorado, USA

Ngar-Cheung Lau

NOAA/Geophysical Fluid
Dynamics Laboratory, Princeton
University, Princeton, New Jersey,
USA

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-44569-6 — The Development of Atmospheric General Circulation Models

Edited by Leo Donner, Wayne Schubert, Richard Somerville

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

x

Contributors

Peter Lynch

Meteorology & Climate Centre,
School of Mathematical Sciences,
University College Dublin, Ireland

Gillian M. Martin

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Sean F. Milton

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

David Randall

Department of Atmospheric Science,
Colorado State University, Fort Collins,
Colorado, USA

Wayne Schubert

Department of Atmospheric Science,
Colorado State University, Fort Collins,
Colorado, USA

Catherine A. Senior

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Richard C. J. Somerville

Scripps Institution of Oceanography
University of California
San Diego, USA

Warren M. Washington

National Center for
Atmospheric Research, Boulder,
Colorado, USA

Stuart Webster

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Keith D. Williams

United Kingdom Meteorological
Office, Exeter, UK

Foreword

It has become a commonplace to state that we are in the midst of performing a profound, albeit inadvertent, experiment on the Earth's climate. The need for a virtual Earth upon which we can perform experiments to determine how climate responds to emissions of carbon dioxide and other agents of climate change, to inform mitigation and adaptation decisions, is acknowledged as one of the great challenges to science. This collection of essays provides diverse perspectives on the evolution over time of models that have been developed for climate simulation, what they are capable of today, and what some of the challenges are for the future.

Numerical weather prediction provided the starting point for this evolution, with the realization immediately following the invention of computers that weather prediction was a perfect application for this new technology. Atmospheric models evolved rapidly with practical impetus from the needs of weather prediction. Atmospheric general circulation models then evolved from this base as it was realized that one could integrate these systems for arbitrarily long time intervals, gathering statistics of the weather thereby generated, producing simulation of our climate.

From this starting point, focused on the fluid dynamics of the atmosphere, climate models have steadily grown in comprehensiveness and complexity. Ocean models developed later than their atmospheric counterparts, and have presented many distinctive challenges for simulations, most fundamentally due to the sparseness of observations but also because the energy-containing scales of motion are smaller in the oceans, creating an especially challenging computational problem. Ocean models have taken on the added complexity of the cycling of carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, and other elements needed to understand how oceanic biology, and the uptake of carbon by the oceans, will evolve in the future. Land models have more recently increased in realism driven by the need to estimate how the uptake of carbon by land vegetation will evolve and how

the hydrological cycle over land responds to climate change. Models of the cryosphere initially tackled the problem of modeling sea ice in the Arctic and Antarctic, and are now focusing on the challenging problem of incorporating the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets into comprehensive models. Meanwhile atmospheric models have taken on the task of simulating atmospheric chemistry, both in the stratosphere, where a key interest is the distribution of ozone, and the troposphere, with a focus on the ability to simulate the species of relevance to air quality. Modeling particulates in the atmosphere, diverse in their composition, chemistry, and sources, has taken on a special urgency due to the potential for aerosol pollution to mask the effects of increasing greenhouse gases, and for the importance of aerosol/cloud interactions. Simultaneously with this evolution towards greater comprehensiveness, all of these components of our “Earth system models” are evolving towards finer resolution as fast as computational resources allow.

Our climate models have suggested and refined many of the basic tenets on which our understanding of climate change and variability are built. These include: the inability of internal variability to explain the observed twentieth century warming; the existence of a robust and strong water vapor feedback; the increase in precipitation in subpolar latitudes and decrease in the subtropics as the climate warms; and the manner in which the deep oceans take up heat and delay the full equilibration of climate to a perturbation for centuries, even millennia. Ongoing research is making progress on difficult questions such as how changes in the stratosphere affect the tropospheric circulation, how phenomena such as El Niño, Atlantic hurricanes, or the dynamic pole-to-pole circulation in the Atlantic Ocean will react to warming. There are other crucial questions, such as how the cloud cover will respond to warming, how the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets will respond, how rainfall will change on the small scales of most relevance to agriculture and water resources, and how the uptake of carbon by the land surface will change, for which compelling projections remain elusive. The credibility of climate simulations is steadily increasing. By normal standards, this performance would be considered exemplary, but in our present predicament more is required.

Given the dramatic increase in complexity of climate models, and the pressures that exist to improve simulations rapidly, it should come as no surprise that there is uncertainty within the climate modeling community concerning the best course for the future. I mention a few of these concerns here, which the reader may wish to keep in mind when studying these essays.

The climate modeling enterprise today is dominated by a few large groups with substantial computational resources at their disposal. The rise in complexity has encouraged this trend towards “big science”, in that a diverse range of expertise is clearly needed to incorporate many diverse processes into these models.

Additionally, both because of the heterogeneity of the land surface and because atmospheric and oceanic flows are turbulent with a wide range of relevant scales of motion, climate models typically improve as they move to finer spatial resolutions, encouraging the use of the largest computers in existence for these simulations. As a result of these tendencies, is the field of climate modeling becoming too monolithic, thereby stifling innovation? Should there be a greater effort to create frameworks within which a much larger community of researchers can contribute, perhaps patterned after the open-source movement in software development?

It is not uncommon for groups to organize their effort in a modular fashion, with sub-groups around the world contributing individual sub-components. But when one connects different sub-components together, there are invariably issues with the resulting simulation; otherwise the problem would effectively have been solved. Say, for example, that one finds that the simulation of the frequency or structure of El Niño events that emerges from the model is unrealistic. Is the problem in the treatment of small-scale atmospheric moist convection, the stratus cloud formulation, the mixing scheme used in the ocean model, the surface flux computation, the resolution of details of the ocean basin geometry controlling the flow of water from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean, or the way in which the solar flux absorbed in the upper ocean is affected by the transparency of the water as controlled by phytoplankton distributions? (There is literature on each of these processes affecting El Niño simulations.) It is more difficult to distribute model development broadly when it requires a holistic understanding that can only be developed by experimenting with the full system as opposed to individual components.

The increasing complexity of climate models creates problems in communication and education. The world is vitally interested in the results of these simulations, but few understand what a climate model is, or what the strengths and weaknesses of today's models are. Even students desiring to work with and develop climate models have difficulty getting their minds around the full complexity of these models. There is a clear pedagogical need for a hierarchy of models of increasing complexity, and there is much work along these lines. Indeed, it has been argued that such a hierarchy is fundamental to understanding the behavior of these complex models and that this understanding is crucial for creating an efficient model improvement process.

The analogy with biology is useful in this context. Evolution provides the biologist with a natural hierarchy of systems to study, ranging from the simplest bacteria to humans. We do not have a hierarchy of climates of increasing complexity handed to us by nature. Planetary atmospheres are too few and, as a result, too idiosyncratic. Laboratory simulations relevant for most issues in climate research are not possible. Climate scientists must create their own model hierarchies. Does the continuing development of models with more and more interactive components

eventually become untenable without the solid foundations provided by the careful analysis of a hierarchy of simpler models?

Should climate models try to build steadily on the unquestioned successes of numerical weather prediction, focusing, for example, on improving seasonal predictions of El Niño and then moving systematically on to prediction of decadal climate variations? Many nations have at least partially integrated their numerical weather prediction and climate modeling efforts. After all, it is the same system that is being simulated in both cases. Some convergence is natural, especially as climate modelers focus on shorter time-scales and prediction efforts move to longer time-scales.

But beyond a couple of decades, we no longer have the luxury of the time needed to accumulate a useful set of forecasts for model validation. Additionally, as time-scales lengthen the prediction problem becomes one of determining the forced response to external perturbations rather than the evolution of internal variability from specific initial conditions. If one is interested in how the El Niño phenomenon will change in the future, is one better off focusing on improving predictions of El Niño or on improving the climatological structure of El Niño variability? If one is close to the final answer, there should be no conflict between these two objectives. If, hypothetically, there is only one uncertain parameter that remains to be determined, with all other aspects of the model perfected, then the same value of this parameter will optimize any metric of interest. But if there is still substantial uncertainty concerning how best to encompass all of the factors that effect the El Niño phenomenon in models, one can easily envision a distinction between model settings that optimize seasonal predictions and settings that optimize long-term El Niño statistics.

The climate-change problem is also distinctive as compared to numerical weather prediction in the importance placed on the attribution of past changes. If one can extract the response to increasing greenhouse gases from observations of the recent past, one can test models of this forced response and, in the simplest case, extrapolate into the future. The attribution problem and the prediction problem then become effectively synonymous. This importance of attribution is not found in weather prediction. Simulations of paleoclimates also play a fundamental role in testing climate models in a way that has no counterpart in standard weather prediction. These are some of the reasons why weather prediction and climate models might diverge and why climate modeling and numerical weather prediction groups might require differing expertise.

Climate researchers face challenges in a host of research areas examining climate-relevant processes in the atmosphere, in the oceans, and on land. Climate modelers also face challenges on more holistic levels in understanding how these processes interact in all their complexity to create our climate and control its sensitivity. And

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-44569-6 — The Development of Atmospheric General Circulation Models

Edited by Leo Donner , Wayne Schubert , Richard Somerville

Frontmatter

[More Information](#)

Foreword

xv

there are challenges with regard to how nations, and the world, should structure their modeling efforts, and on how to communicate results and limitations most effectively with the public and policymakers. These are clearly exciting and challenging times for the climate modeling enterprise.

Isaac M. Held

*Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory/NOAA,
Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, USA*