Aquaplanet sensitivity in CAM 4&5

Brian Medeiros

brianpm@ucar.edu

with help from: D. Coleman, R. Neale, D. Williamson

The Point

Extend previous efforts

Examine CAM4/CAM5 cloud response

Develop strategies/expectations for upcoming CMIP/CFMIP experiments

The Review (I)



APE SST profiles and conventions

"Cess-type" experiments.

Compare Earth v. Aquaplanet results

CAM5 Aquaplanet

The Review (2)



The Review (2)



The Experiments

Do newer versions of CAM (i.e., "v4" & "v5") show the same pattern of response?

- Use CAM4 & CAM5, SST±2K experiments
- Both Earth-like and one Aquaplanet ("qobs")

CAM5: how to deal with the aerosol model?

 Try the most naive thing first: prescribe zonal average emissions



The Results

CAM 4 similar to CAM 3 in λ and $\Delta CRF/G$

- Global & Tropics
- Earth & Aquaplanet

CAM 5 Earth more sensitive, weaker cloud effect

CAM 5 Aquaplanet is the outlier...

- stronger cloud response than Earth-config
- lower sensitivity



The Results

CAM 4 similar to CAM 3 in λ and $\Delta CRF/G$

- Global & Tropics
- Earth & Aquaplanet

CAM 5 Earth more sensitive, weaker cloud effect

CAM 5 Aquaplanet is the outlier...

- stronger cloud response than Earth-config
- lower sensitivity



The Results

CAM 4 similar to CAM 3 in λ and $\Delta CRF/G$

- Global & Tropics
- Earth & Aquaplanet

CAM 5 Earth more sensitive, weaker cloud effect

CAM 5 Aquaplanet is the outlier...

- stronger cloud response than Earth-config
- lower sensitivity



Clear-sky effects



TOA Components



Contour lines show λ and λ_{clr}

Tropical Cloud Response



ω₅₀₀ Regimes, Net Cloud Forcing



Size of markers is frequency of occurrence (i.e., statistical weight).

Conclusions?

CAM4 sensitivity and cloud response largely like CAM3

CAM5 aquaplanet has smaller $\lambda,\,\lambda_{clr}$ than Earth-like configuration

Appears to be influenced by clear-sky fluxes

- affects clear-sky sensitivity AND cloud radiative forcing, by construction
- Not all bad news: change in CRF is partitioned similarly by circulation regimes

Some possible directions:

- Investigate role of aerosol in this result (i.e., our naive experiment is probably naive)
- Turn off the aerosol model (in the works, and is probably the right way to do this)