Observational Large Ensembles as tools to assess climate variability

Karen McKinnon 24 July 2019 US CLIVAR Large Ensembles workshop

@karalimck



50 year DJF temperature and SLP trends in the CESM1 Large Ensemble













stippling: observations and model are *not* significantly different using a False Discovery Rate of 0.1









Temperature, precipitation, (sea level pressure) = Forced component ($\beta_i F_t$) + Dependence on large-scale SST modes ($\sum_m \beta_{i,m} M_{t,m}$) + Residual variability ($\epsilon_{i,t}$)

Step 1: fit model parameters to observations (1920-2015)



Step 1: fit model parameters to observations (1920-2015)

Step 2: use model to create surrogate climate realizations

Creating surrogate climate data with phase randomization and bootstrapping



Creating surrogate climate data with phase randomization and bootstrapping



Temperature, precipitation, (sea level pressure) = Forced component ($\beta_i F_t$) + Dependence on large-scale SST modes ($\sum_m \beta_{i,m} M_{t,m}$) + Residual variability ($\epsilon_{i,t}$)

Step 1: fit model parameters to observations (1920-2015)

Step 2: use model to create surrogate climate realizations

Step 3: center the ensemble on an estimate of the forced component

result: the Observational Large Ensemble (Obs-LE)

Assumptions

- a) Stationarity in both the mode time series and the residual variability!
- b) We have sufficiently sampled the *relevant* range of variability

Evaluation

repeat exercise treating each member of the CESM1 Large Ensemble as the observations

Metric

spread in 50-year trends across each ensemble (CESM1-LE and Obs-LE)



Fractional error in reproducing spread in CESM1-LE using the Obs-LE method

temperature data from BEST

In most regions, larger differences between the CESM1-LE and Obs-LE



Fractional error in spread of 50-year trends ($\sigma_{CESM1-LE}$ vs σ_{Obs-LE}))

temperature data from BEST

Small errors in Obs-LE for precipitation because less autocorrelated



Fractional error in reproducing spread in CESM1-LE using the Obs-LE method

precipitation data from GPCC

CESM1-LE tends to be underly variable for DJF precipitation trends



Fractional error in spread of 50-year trends ($\sigma_{CESM1-LE}$ vs σ_{Obs-LE}))

precipitation data from GPCC

Obs-LE can inform us about the range of trends possible in the future, and what could have happened in the past



Obs-LE can inform us about the range of trends possible in the future, and what could have happened in the past



Improved modeling of SST modes to address variance biases and include seasonal cycle in ENSO variance.

Github repo with documented and modular code.

Testing for different assumptions about the forced trend.

Improved modeling of SST modes to address variance biases and include seasonal cycle in ENSO variance.

Github repo with documented and modular code.

Testing for different assumptions about the forced trend.

Relaxation of stationarity assumption.

Extension to daily timescales.

A more complete model for teleconnections:

- (1) Linking up with surrogate sea surface temperature fields produced from Linear Inverse Models
- (2) Incorporation of a spatial model in order to sample uncertainty

New metrics for model validation.

Internal variability can be a dominant source of uncertainty for trends at regional scales.

While climate model initial condition ensembles allow us to cleanly separate internal variability from the forced component, they may have large biases in their variability.

Here, we use century-long sets of observations to create a statistical ensemble whose spread results from different sampling of internal variability.

Much work remains, including improved estimates of the forced component from the observational record.

karen@stat.ucla.edu

