




# Max-Planck-Institut für Meteorologie

## REPORT No. 122



### INCONSISTENCIES AT THE INTERFACE OF CLIMATE IMPACT STUDIES AND GLOBAL CLIMATE RESEARCH

by

HANS VON STORCH

HAMBURG, JANUARY 1994

**AUTHOR:**

**Hans von Storch**

**Max-Planck-Institut  
für Meteorologie**

**MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT  
FÜR METEOROLOGIE  
BUNDESSTRASSE 55  
D-20146 Hamburg  
F.R. GERMANY**

**Tel.: +49-(0)40-4 11 73-0  
Telemail: MPI.METEOROLOGY  
Telefax: +49-(0)40-4 11 73-298**

ISSN 0937-1060

# Inconsistencies at the Interface of Climate Impact Studies and Global Climate Research\*

Hans von Storch, Max-Planck-Institut für Meteorologie  
Hamburg, Germany

September 10, 1993

## Abstract

Most climate impacts studies, whether they deal with, for instance, terrestrial or marine ecosystems, coastal morphodynamics, storm surges and damages, or socio-economic aspects, utilize "scenarios" of possible future climate. Such scenarios are always based on the output of complex mathematical climate models, whenever they are in any sense detailed. Unfortunately, the user community of such scenarios usually is not well informed about the limitations and potentials of such models. On the other hand, the climate modeller community is not sufficiently aware of the demands on the side of the "users".

The state of the art of climate models is reviewed and the principal limitations concerning the spatial/time resolution and the accuracy of simulated data are discussed. The need for a "downscaling strategy" on the climate modeller side and for an "upscaling" strategy on the user side is demonstrated. Examples for successful exercises in downscaling seasonal mean precipitation and daily rainfall sequences are shown.

---

\*Paper presented at the 13th International Congress of Biometeorology, Calgary, Canada, September 12-18, 1993

## 1 Introduction

The notion that the ongoing increase of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere will ultimately change the climate on Earth has become widely accepted in the public after having circulated in physics and meteorology for seven decades since the first hypothesis by Arrhenius in 1898. In consistence with the enhanced public awareness many scientific programs have been launched on the details of the expected climate change. Because of the separation of science in many almost independent "science states" the interaction between different disciplines, such as climatology and coastal dynamics, hydrology and ecology, is often insufficient. This insufficient communication causes methodical errors in the evaluation of possible impacts of climate change. One error refers to the spatial scales. On the side of climate modelling *large* scales are of the order of several thousand kilometers; on the "user" side often spatial scales of hundred or less kilometers are regarded as being "large scale". Climate people deliver (potentially reliable) information on *their* large scale and "users" request large-scale information on *their* large scale. Unfortunately, the meaning of "large scale" deviates significantly on the two sides, with the effect that the output/input scales do not match. This contribution deals with the clarification of this mismatch and with a possible cure, named "downscaling", to deal with it.

## 2 Data Requirements for Climate Impact Studies

Climate Impact studies usually require detailed information on present or future climate with high resolution and accuracy (Robinson and Finkelstein, 1991). For instance, hydrologists ask for daily data with a spatial resolu-

tion corresponding to a catchment. Coastal engineers want information on the sea level rise and the frequency and intensity of storms, and the resulting extreme value statistics for high- and low waters, for such "small" areas like the Netherlands or the Southern Baltic coast. Insurance companies need to assess the frequency distributions of the strength of maximum gusts. The oil industry asks for changes in the extreme wave heights in order to guarantee the safety standards of their offshore structures. Ecologists who are studying the dynamics and responses of forests in mountainous terrain need information of monthly mean rainfall and temperature with a spatial resolution of a few kilometers (Gyalistras and Fischlin, 1993). The modelling of the population of red deer requires information on monthly snow height; agroecosystem models or insect population models need daily data as input (after Gyalistras et al., 1993; see also Parry, 1990). Sometimes quite detailed information is required. An example is an agroecosystem model simulating the potential yield of a wheat field as a response to climate forcing functions, which loses most of its skill when forced with observed meteorological data from the same time interval but from a weather station about 100 km away (Nonhebel, 1993).

## 3 The Standard Approach in Impact Studies

Many studies of systems, which are suspected to be sensitive to climate change, such as the physics or the biology of the North Sea, the hydrology of a river or a lake, or ecosystems in an Alpine valley, make use of statistical or dynamical models. These models run with internal parameters which have been tuned to describe the influence of the present day climatic environment. Sometimes the value

of these parameters is inferred from field experiments under controlled external conditions and from observed climate data of high accuracy and high spatial and temporal resolution. For present day climate this approach is adequate since the atmospheric (oceanic) forcing functions are indeed known with high accuracy and resolution.

Within this approach the response of the system to climate change is derived by running the model with the new forcing functions that are expected in the new climate. Frequently these forcing functions are taken directly from the output of *General Circulation Model* (GCM) experiments. To infer the response of the considered system to future climate change, then, the maps of climate model output are taken as forcing functions. Usually these maps represent the difference  $\Delta$  between the simulated future climate and the simulated present climate. Then the present days climate  $C$  plus the "signal"  $\Delta$  together are used as forcing function. The motivation for this approach is the believe that climate models would correctly simulate the deviations from the normal in climate change experiments.

$\Delta$  is given on a grid because the numerical models integrate the discretized differential equations of the thermo- and hydrodynamics of the atmosphere and of the ocean on a grid (examples of horizontal grids are given in Figure 1A-C). In climate impact studies, however, the output of climate models is often implicitly considered as a continuous field. Then, the gridding is just a convenient way to store the output economically; the information resolved by the grid is reliable and the sub-grid scale information may be recovered from the gridded data simply by spatial interpolation.

With such a concept in mind it is fully consistent to use the output of the GISS model, which operates on a  $7.5^0 \times 10^0$  latitude  $\times$  longitude grid (see Figure 1B), and to try to infer the details of possible climate change on

the northern and southern slopes of the Alps (Ozenda and Borel, 1990). Obviously such an approach is simply wrong.

Some models of suitability to grow certain crops or to host tourists, require as input the annual cycles of monthly mean temperature and precipitation (for instance CLIMAPS, CRU and ERL (1992) or Leemans and Solomon (1993)). Nicely coloured diagrams are produced which show the response of these models to a changed climate  $C + \Delta$  on a resolution of  $50 \times 50 \text{ km}^2$ . All information on this scale comes of course from  $C$  since the grid scale of  $\Delta$  is typically of the order of  $500 \times 500 \text{ km}^2$ .




Figure 2: Present day potential distribution of pulses and scenario for the year 2050 calculated from a climate model. From Leemans and Solomon (1993).

As an example we show in Figure 2 the potential distribution of (non-irrigated) pulses as




Figure 1: January mean precipitation in the Mackenzie Valley, Canada, as given by the often used output of three climate models (A: GFDL, B: GISS and C: OSU) and as given from point observations (D). Units: equivalent millimetres of water. From Stuart and Judge (1991).

derived by Leemans and Solomon (1993) from present day conditions and from the climate change associated with a doubling of  $CO_2$  as calculated by the GFDL model (the same from which Figure 1A is derived).

## 4 The Skill of Climate Models

### 4.1 The Failure of Climate Models on the Regional Scale

Present-day climate models are GCMs. As such these models are designed to simulate the large scale state of the climate. The larger the scale the more reliable is the simulation of a feature. At the lowest end of the spatial resolution, with scales of one or a few

European part of the land-sea mask for different T-model resolutions




Figure 3: *Spatial discretization of Europe in a climate model with "T21", "T42", "T63" and "T106" resolution.*

grid distances, the climate models have little or no skill (Grotch and MacCracken, 1991). Mean annual cycles of precipitation or near-surface temperature at grid points deviate in part strongly from respective observed annual cycles (von Storch et al., 1993). The ECHAM T21 model was found to simulate the annual cycle of Central European rainfall being 180° out-of-phase with respect to observations (Urbanowicz et al., 1992). Figure 1 shows the failure of three frequently used climate models to simulate the intensity and pattern of the January mean precipitation in the Mackenzie Valley (Stuart and Judge, 1991).

There are several reasons for the failure of the models on the regional scale which we define here as several mesh sizes of the model's grid (with the implication that the 1000 km

scale must be attributed to regional scales in a "T21" model but to the large scales in a "T106" model):

- The spatial resolution provides an inadequate description of the structure of the earth's surface. The land-sea distribution is heavily smeared out. Most climate models in the past have operated with a "T21" resolution, many models still do so in these days and the upcoming generation of models is integrated with a "T42" resolution. Figure 3 visualizes the spatial resolution for Europe for these two resolutions. (The "T63" and "T106" resolutions are also shown - models with such a resolution will not be available for long-term experiments in the near future; shorter experiments may be

done occasionally.) The mountains appear as broad flat hills. A clear example for the limitations of climate models is provided by the complex variations of the annual cycle of precipitation in the Alps: in the northern side a summer rainfall maximum is observed, somewhat further south a semi-annual component becomes dominant, and even further south, in the mediterranean climate, a winter maximum prevails (Fliri, 1974). Present-day climate models are not able to reproduce this fact, let alone to predict its changes in a new climate.


- The hydrodynamics of the atmosphere are non-linear and the energy, which is fed into the system on the cyclonic scale, is cascaded to smallest scales through non-linear interactions. Because of the numerical truncation this cascade is interrupted and the flow to smallest scales is parameterized. This parameterization affects the smallest resolved scales most strongly (see Roeckner and von Storch, 1980).
- Sub-grid scale processes in the models are parameterized. These parameterizations have been fitted globally and might not be equally adequate for different parts of the world.

## 4.2 The Success of Climate Models on the Large Scale

The comparison of simulated global mean maps with observed ones yields that the models are quite powerful in the reproduction of large-scale features (e.g. Hadley cell, extratropical storm tracks) but that there are considerable differences on the regional scale (Houghton et al., 1990). As an example we show in Figure 5 the latitude-height cross-section of the zonally averaged zonal wind as

derived from observations and as simulated by a GCM. Also, the models are capable to reproduce the planetary scale EOFs (Empirical Orthogonal Functions) as dominant modes of large-scale variability (Zorita et al., 1992, von Storch et al, 1993; Zorita et al., 1993). We already mentioned above that a scale might be “large” in a high resolution model but “regional” in a low-resolution model.

Figure 5: Latitude-height (in deg and hPa) cross-section of the zonally averaged zonal component of the wind in winter (December-January-February) calculated from analyses (of operational observations) and from the output of a GCM. Units: m/sec. From Roeckner et al. (1992).






Figure 4: Concept of statistical downscaling.

The fact that the models do a credible job on the global scale and fail on the regional scale seems to be a contradiction. But this is not the case. The global climate is the response to the large-scale structure of the earth's surface (land-sea distribution, topography) and to the differential heating. The regional climates, on the other hand, represent the result of an interaction of the global climate and regional details. Therefore, it is possible to simulate the global climate adequately even though none of the regional climates is simulated realistically in its details.

## 5 Synthesis: Downscaling Procedures

The spatial scale gap between climate research and climate impact studies has to be bridged by "downscaling" on the side of the climate research and "upscaling"<sup>1</sup> on the side of the climate impact research. Here, downscaling means to use information from the climate model output which is considered to be modelled reliably and to relate this information

<sup>1</sup>With the expression "upscaling" we refer to the process of desensitise an impact model such that it can produce useful responses even if forced with somewhat uncertain climatological input. Possibly, the expression has been coined with another meaning earlier in other disciplines.

by means of dynamical or statistical models to regional or local parameters which are not adequately modelled by the climate models. In general, the larger the scale the larger the chances to simulate the parameter reliably. Upscaling means to modify the impact models in such a manner that they can be run with forcing functions with the considerable uncertainty that is to be expected from general circulation models.

Three strategies for downscaling have been proposed:

- *Statistical Models* relate large-scale information to regional climates (von Storch et al., 1993). The models are fitted to observed data. A meaningful downscaling strategy is obtained by the procedure outlined in Figure 4. In the following sections we will deal exclusively with this approach. The merits of the statistical downscaling concept are demonstrated by two hydrological examples.
- In the *Combined Analogue - Dynamical Modelling Approach* all possible large-scale situations are categorized into a finite set of characteristic situations, for instance *Grosswetterlagen*. For each of these characteristic situations a detailed integration with a mesoscale climate model is run. The climate change scenario is then determined through the changed frequency of the characteristic situations. An examples of this approach has been put forward by Frey-Buness et al. (1993).
- A powerful alternative approach is the use of dynamical *Limited Area Models* (LAMs) which are forced with large-scale information from a climate model. The feasibility of this approach has convincingly been demonstrated by Giorgi et al. (1991). However, one has to keep in mind

that the principal limitations of dynamical models, which arise from the limited spatial resolution, also hold for LAMs - on a smaller scale.

## 6 Example: Seasonal Mean Rainfall on the Iberian Peninsula

In this example, winter (DJF) mean precipitation from a number of rain gauges on the Iberian Peninsula are related to the air pressure field over the North Atlantic (for details, see von Storch et al., 1993). Through a *Canonical Correlation Analysis* a couple of spatial patterns  $\vec{P}$  and  $\vec{Q}$  and of time coefficients  $\alpha(t)$  and  $\beta(t)$  are identified such that  $\alpha(t)\vec{P}$  represents a significant part of the Iberian rainfall variance in winter and  $\beta(t)\vec{Q}$  monitors the large-scale state of the atmospheric circulation over the North Atlantic. Moreover, the time series  $\alpha(t)$  and  $\beta(t)$  are optimally correlated so that the information given by  $L(t) = \beta(t)\vec{Q}$  may be regressed on  $R(t) = \alpha(t)\vec{P}$ .

The parameters of this regression model are fitted to data from 1950 to 1980. The scheme is tested with independent data from 1901 to 1949. The resulting mean rainfall, averaged over all stations, derived indirectly from the air pressure distribution as well as given by local measurements are shown in Figure 6. The overall upward trend as well as low-frequency variations are reproduced by the "downscaling model" indicating the usefulness of the technique as well as the reality of both the trend and the variations in the Iberian winter precipitation.





Figure 6: Winter mean rainfall averaged for Iberian rain gauges - calculated from local measurements and derived indirectly from variations of the North Atlantic air-pressure field. From von Storch et al. (1993).

Figure 7: Downscaled and grid point response of Iberian precipitation in a  $2 \times CO_2$  experiment". Units: mm/month. From von Storch et al. (1993).



We have applied the downscaling model to a  $2 \times CO_2$  experiment" performed with a "T21" climate model (Cubasch et al., 1992) and compare in Figure 7 the "downscaled" response with the gridpoint response of precipitation. The grid point information indicates a marked decrease over most of the Peninsula whereas the downscaled response is weakly positive.


## 7 Example: Daily Rainfall Sequences

With an analog technique realistic sequences of wet and dry days can be specified if the large-scale air pressure distribution is known (for details, see Zorita et al., 1993). The large scale information  $L$  is located in the 25-dimensional phase space spanned by the coefficients of the first 5 Empirical Orthogonal Functions (EOFs) at day  $t$ ,  $t - 1 \dots t - 4$  of the large-scale sea-level air-pressure distribution surrounding the location of interest.

In the analog technique, the local rainfall  $R(t)$  at some time  $t$  is specified as follows. The coordinates  $\vec{\gamma}(t)$  in the 25-dimensional phase space are determined and then, in the set of all historical cases that time  $t^*$  is searched which minimizes  $\|\vec{\gamma}(t) - \vec{\gamma}(t^*)\|$ . Then the rainfall observed at time  $t^*$  is used to estimate the rainfall at time  $t$ :  $R(t) = R(t^*)$ .

This approach has been tested for several locations, among others *Highstown* in New Jersey. Rainfall amount histograms calculated from local observations as well as derived with the analog technique from observed air pressure distributions (labelled NMC) and from control runs with climate models (labelled MPI and GFDL) as well as from one  $2 \times CO_2$  experiment" are shown in Figure 8. The local information is well reproduced by the large-scale information available in the analyses and in the models; the impact of a changed atmo-

Figure 8: Histogram of rainfall amount in Highstown, New Jersey, in winter - calculated from local observations and derived from large-scale air-pressure information provided by operational analyses (NMC), by control runs with two climate models (MPI and GFDL) and by a "2×CO<sub>2</sub>" experiment. From Zorita et al. (1993).



spheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is small.

A more tricky parameter is the distribution of the *storm interarrival time* which is the time between two rainy days. The cumulative distribution functions, obtained from local observations as well as through analog downscaling, are shown in Figure 9. The analog technique works well and also the models do a credible job; the climate change signal is negligible.

## 8 Concluding Remarks

**Statistical Downscaling versus Limited Area Models.** From the presentation and brief discussion of the examples it is clear that there is no universal downscaling method valid for all variables and all regions. Instead statistical downscaling requires the design of statistical models on a case-by-case basis. This should not be too large a disadvantage for the

investigator interested in a single region but it is certainly impracticable for an assessment of climate change on a detailed regional basis. In this respect Limited Area Models (LAMs) are more suitable.

On the other hand, statistical models should be in most cases easy to develop and test. If they are able to reproduce the observed low-frequency variability of the regional climate, they will likely correctly estimate regional climate changes (provided that the GCMs correctly simulate the large-scale climate changes). LAMs are much more difficult to test. They require high quality large-scale forcing fields which are normally available for no more than a couple of decades. This means that one cannot be sure if they can simulate regional climates other than the present one. Statistical methods can be of some help in this respect: LAMs *must* be able to represent the statistical relationship between the




Figure 9: Survivor functions of the storm interarrival times at Highstown, New Jersey, in winter - calculated from local observations (heavy line) and derived through the analog technique from large-scale air-pressure information available from operational analyses (dotted), from control runs with climate models (light line and dashed) and from a "2xCO<sub>2</sub> experiment" (dash-dotted). From Zorita et al. (1993).

large-scale fields and the regional climate. A study of these relationships as simulated by the LAM can be helpful in improving the dynamical model itself.

**Daily Weather Sequences.** The daily weather sequences discussed above can be used sensibly only if the required forcing function, the daily large-scale weather stream simulated in the climate models, is realistically simulated by these models. Whether this assumption is really valid has hardly been checked so far so

that a certain reservation in this respect is recommended for the time being.

## 9 References

- Bardossy A. and E.J. Plate, 1991:** Space time modeling for daily rainfall using atmospheric circulation patterns. *Water Resources Res.* 28, 1247-1259
- CRU and ERL, 1992:** A scientific description of the ESCAPE model, Version 1.1. Commission of the European Communities, Directorate General for Environment, Nuclear Safety and Civil Protection
- Cubasch, U., K. Hasselmann, H. Höck, E. Maier-Reimer, U. Mikolajewicz, B.D. Santer and R. Sausen, 1992:** Time-dependent greenhouse warming computations with a coupled ocean-atmosphere model. *Clim. Dyn.* 8, 55-69
- Frey-Buness, A., D. Heimann, R. Sausen and U. Schumann, 1993:** Calculation of the climate change for the Alpine region. *Research Activities in Atmospheric and Oceanic Modelling* (G. Boer, ed.) Report 18, WMO/TD 533, 7.40-41
- Fliri, F., 1974:** Niederschlag und Lufttemperatur im Alpenraum. *Wissenschaftl. Alpenvereinshefte* 24, 111
- Giorgi F., 1990:** Simulations of regional climate using limited-models nested in a general circulation models. *J. Climate* 3, 941-963
- Grotch, S.L. and M.C. MacCracken, 1991:** The use of general circulation models to predict regional climate change. *J. Climate* 4, 286-303
- Gyalistras, D., H. von Storch, A. Fischlin and M. Beniston, 1993:** Linking GCM simulated climatic changes to ecosystem models. Case studies of statistical downscaling in the Alps. Submitted to *Clim. Res.* (also available as Report 17 of Systemökologie ETHZ, Zürich)

- Gyalistras, D. and A. Fischlin, 1993:** Derivation of climatic change scenarios for mountainous ecosystems: A GCM based method and the case study of Valais, Switzerland. Proc. International Conference on Mountain Environments in Changing Climates, Davos Switzerland October 11-16, 1992
- Houghton, J.L., G.J. Jenkins, and J.J. Ephraums (eds), 1990:** Climate Change. The IPCC scientific assessment. Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, J.P., D.P. Lettenmaier and P. Guttorp, 1993:** A stochastic approach for assessing the effect of changes in regional circulation patterns on local precipitation. Water Resources Res. (in press)
- Leemans, R. and A.M. Solomon, 1993:** Modelling the potential change in yield and distribution of the earth's crops under a warming climate. Clim. Res. 3, 79-96
- Nonhebel, S, 1993:** Inaccuracies in weather data and their effects on crop growth simulation results. Clim. Res. (in press)
- Ozenda, P. and J.-L. Borel, 1990:** The possible responses of vegetation to a global climate change. Scenarios for Western Europe, with special reference to the Alps. In M. Boer and R.S. de Groot (eds): Landscape-ecological impact of climate change. Proceedings of a European Conference, Luntern, The Netherlands, 3-7 December 1989; IOS Press Amsterdam, Washington, Tokio, 221-249
- Parry M., 1990:** Climate change and agriculture. Earthscan Publications Ltd, London
- Robinson, P.J. and P.L. Finkelstein, 1991:** The development of impact-oriented scenarios. Bull. Amer. Met. Soc. 4, 481-490
- Roeckner, E. and H. von Storch, 1980:** On the efficiency of horizontal diffusion and numerical filtering in an Arakawa-type model. Atmosphere-Ocean 18, 239 - 253
- Roeckner, E., K. Arpe, L. Bengtsson, S. Brinkop, L. Dümenil, M. Esch, E. Kirk, F. Lunkeit, M. Ponater, B. Rockel, R. Sausen, U. Schlese, S. Schubert, M. Windelband, 1992:** Simulation of the present-day climate with the ECHAM model: Impact of model physics and resolution. Max-Planck-Institut für Meteorologie-Report 93
- Stuart, R.A. and A.S. Judge, 1991:** On the applicability of GCM estimates to scenarios of global warming in the Mackenzie Valley area. Climatological Bulletin 25, 147-169
- Urbanowicz, A., H. von Storch and E. Zorita, 1992:** Analysis of a global general circulation model output in Poland. Research Activities in Atmospheric and Oceanic Modelling Report 17 (G. Boer, ed), 7.43-46
- von Storch, H., E. Zorita and U. Cubasch, 1993:** Downscaling of climate change estimates to regional scales: an application to Iberian rainfall in winter time. J. Climate 6, 1161 - 1171
- Zorita, E., V. Kharin and H. von Storch, 1992:** The atmospheric circulation and sea surface temperature in the North Atlantic in winter. Their interaction and relevance for Iberian rainfall. J. Climate 5, 1097-1108
- Zorita, E., J. Hughes, D. Lettenmaier, and H. von Storch, 1993:** Stochastic downscaling of regional circulation patterns for climate model diagnosis and estimation of local precipitation. Submitted to J. Climate, (Preprint available as Max-Planck-Institut für Meteorologie-Report 109).