



Benchmarking climate model top-ofatmosphere (TOA) radiance in the 9.6µm ozone band compared to TES and IASI observations

> Helen Worden, Andrew Conley, Jean-François Lamarque, Steve Massie (NCAR), Kevin Bowman (JPL), Drew Shindell, Greg Faluvegi (Duke Univ.) Cathy Clerbaux, (LATMOS), Pierre-François Coheur, Stamatia Doniki (ULB), William Collins (UCB), Andrew Lacis (GISS)

Outline



- Flux, IRK (instantaneous radiative kernel) and LWRE (long-wave radiative effect) definitions
- Research goals of benchmarking TOA ozone band flux and flux sensitivity
- Relevance to IPCC O₃ radiative forcing
- Initial model comparisons
 O₃ radiative coupling
 to H₂O
 Conclusions



Satellite IR O₃ observations







O₃ band TOA Flux





6.0×10⁻

2.0×10

950

1000

1050

1100

1150

 This is a fundamental quantity, predicted by climate models, but never tested against observations.

Seasonal Patterns in IRK, LWRE

NASA





Long wave radiative effect (LWRE) in W/m²





This research addresses two primary questions:

- 1) What is the bias in IPCC climate model predictions of present day top-of-atmosphere (TOA) flux in the 9.6μm ozone band?
- 1) What is the impact of an ozone band TOA flux bias on present day tropospheric ozone flux sensitivity and preindustrial to present day ozone radiative forcing estimates?

The models we will test are GISS RT, CAM-chem with CAM-RT and with RRTMG using TES and IASI TOA flux and IRKs (Instantaneous Radiative Kernels)

IPCC AR5 Radiative Forcing Definitions





Trade-offs for air-quality controls and climate benefits

NASA





FAQ 8.2, Figure 1 | Schematic diagram of the impact of pollution controls on specific emissions and climate impact. Solid black line indicates known impact; dashed line indicates uncertain impact.

Need accurate measurements and model assessments for informed policy decisions

Initial Results: O₃ band TOA Flux





O₃ band flux comparison for atmospheres specified from TES retrievals

Thanks to A. Conley (NCAR)

Known issues:

• RRTMG band is 980-1080; TES band is 985-1080 (~1.1 to 1.7 W/m²)



Initial Results: O₃ IRKs



Model-TES IRK comparison



GISS RTM for TES retrieved atmospheric state TES IRK with single-angle integration for flux (known low magnitude bias)



Initial Results: Tropos. O₃ LWRE





- Same atmosphere and surface conditions
- Large model-model differences for both clear and all-sky cases

Initial Results: Tropos. O₃ LWRE



IASI Tropospheric LWRE for 15 April, 2011

TES Tropospheric LWRE for MAM 2005-2009



Thanks to S. Doniki, ULB, Brussels

H_2O and O_3 are radiatively coupled









Potential Feedbacks to O_3 RF from H_2O





Understanding the feedback of water vapor on ozone RF (more water = less O_3 RF) due to changes in the hydrological cycle from climate change will require the long-term measurements of IASI (A,B,C-2016) and IASI-NG (2021,2028,2035)

Conclusions



- TOA flux from the IR Ozone band is a fundamental quantity in climate models that has not been compared to measurements. Potential ECVs?
- Continuing the TES record with IASI data is critical for understanding present day to future changes in O₃ radiative forcing, such as cloud coverage and water vapor feedback.
- Initial results show differences for both flux and flux sensitivity between models and data that need to be reconciled.



Backup



Spectral sensitivity of TOA flux to ozone and water vapor





Role of ozone in chemistry-carbon-climate coupling







Direct effect: Preindustrial-to-present day: .35 [.25, .65] W/m²

Preindustrial through 21st century: .89 W/m²

But O_3 RF is also coupled to changes in H_2O

Indirect effects: Suppression of carbon uptake by ozone damage to plants could lead to additional 0.62 to 1.09 W/m² CO₂ radiative forcing

Sitch et al,(2007), Nature



H_2O and O_3 are radiatively coupled



Tropospheric ozone LWRE has a strong dependence on water vapor in the tropics.



Model-TES Δ LWRE comparison



- Zonal averages: GISS RTM TOA flux sensitivity and TES IRKs applied to same model differences
- Dry bias in UT at mid-latitudes for GISS









ANISOTROPY ESTIMATE



R cloud OD dependence R spectral dependence 1.3 200 1,25 Worden et al., JGR, 2011 1.20 **TES Anisotropy** band anisotropy 1.2 150 1,15 Obs 1.10 Number 100 .1 1.05 1.00 980 1000 1020 1040 1060 1080 °, 50 1.0 0.010 0.008 0.006 0.004 0.002 0.002 0.9 0 980 1020 1040 1000 1060 1080 -4 -2 0 log₁₀ (Effective Cloud OD) -6 2





$$R_{\nu}(\theta=0) = \frac{\pi L_{\nu}(0)}{F_{\nu}} = \frac{\pi L_{\nu}(0)}{\int_{0}^{2\pi} \int_{0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} L_{\nu}(\theta) \cos\theta \sin\theta d\theta d\phi} = \frac{L_{\nu}(0)}{2\int_{0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} L_{\nu}(\theta) \cos\theta \sin\theta d\theta}$$

R = anisotropy, F = flux, L = radiance, θ =nadir angle, v=frequency (assumes azimuthal symmetry)

Let
$$x = \sin \theta$$
, then $dx = \cos \theta d\theta$

$$\int_{0}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} L_{\nu}(\theta) \cos \theta \sin \theta d\theta = \int_{0}^{1} L(\sin^{-1}x) x dx = \int_{0}^{1} x^{k} f(x) dx \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} f(x_{i})$$
using Gaussian integration of moments. From Abramowitz & Stegun
for n=1, k=1: $x_{i} = 0.6666667$ and $w_{i} = 0.50$

$$R_{\nu}(\theta = 0) = \frac{L_{\nu}(0)}{2*[0.5L_{\nu}(41.8^{\circ})]} = \frac{L_{\nu}(0)}{L_{\nu}(41.8^{\circ})]}$$