

## **Developing a set of simple metrics to evaluate high-top models for different purposes**

Daniele Visioni (<u>dv224@cornell.edu</u>), Ilaria Quaglia

**Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University** 

CESM meeting June 2024



- At a glance, can help determine (relative) skill of different models (or different generations of one model)
- Can integrate observations (and/or reanalyses)
- David Lawrence asked ;-)

#### **CMIP6 example**

1.1

0.9

0.8

0.7

0.6

0.5

0.4

0.3

0.2

0.1



CMIP6 global land 1981–2000



-GC31-

ž

GOALS-

CCESS-

GFDL-

ESM1-2

MIROC

SM1-

VorESM2 FSM2-

CMIP6-

Plenty of examples in the literature (i.e. Kim <u>et al., 2020</u>)

$$\mathrm{RMSE}_{XY} = \sqrt{\left\langle (X-Y)^2 \right\rangle}$$

#### **Can we replicate it for stratospheric variables?**



### Can we replicate it for stratospheric variables?



- What do we pick will depend on the purpose of our evaluation:
  - **o** stratospheric dynamics
  - stratospheric aerosols
  - higher up?



- What do we pick will depend on the purpose of our evaluation:
  - **o** stratospheric dynamics
  - stratospheric aerosols
  - higher up?
- It will also depend on availability of measurements/reanalyses (and other models, possibly!)
  - Can eventually lead to a new diagnostic package?



#### JAMES Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems\*

Research Article 🔂 Open Access 💿 💮 🔄

#### Climate, Variability, and Climate Sensitivity of "Middle Atmosphere" Chemistry Configurations of the Community Earth System Model Version 2, Whole Atmosphere Community Climate Model Version 6 (CESM2(WACCM6))

N. A. Davis 🔀, D. Visioni, R. R. Garcia, D. E. Kinnison, D. R. Marsh, M. Mills, J. H. Richter, S. Tilmes, C. G. Bardeen, A. Gettelman, A. A. Glanville, D. G. MacMartin, A. K. Smith, F. Vitt

First published: 04 September 2023 | https://doi.org/10.1029/2022MS003579 | Citations: 4

#### What have we done so far for WACCM



#### What have we done so far for WACCM





6

#### What have we done so far for WACCM









# Interactive stratospheric aerosol models' response to different amounts and altitudes of SO<sub>2</sub> injection during the 1991 Pinatubo eruption

Ilaria Quaglia ⊠, Claudia Timmreck, Ulrike Niemeier, Daniele Visioni, Giovanni Pitari, Christina Brodowsky, Christoph Brühl, Sandip S. Dhomse, Henning Franke, Anton Laakso, Graham W. Mann, Eugene Rozanov, and Timofei Sukhodolov









0.1

0.2

0.3

0.4

0.5



1991

0.7

0.8

0.6

Med-18-25km







#### Adding CESM1 and 2 Not exactly the same simulation protocol, but what can we do...





$$VRMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i} (X_{\{model,i\}} - X_{\{observations,i\}})^2 \cdot \omega_i}{N}}$$

$$\omega_i = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\{obs,i\}}^2}$$







Low



9

#### **Can we expand this to CMIP6?**



from Davis et al. (2023), updated. Thanks to Thomas Aubrey for UKESM data





from Davis et al. (2023), updated. Thanks to Thomas Aubrey for UKESM data

11

- We've come up with "simple" metrics to evaluate models skills for at least one stratospheric feature (volcanic aerosols)
- They might allow for a quick comparison across models versions and inter-model differences
- Can we expand this to other metrics for stratospheric/high atmospheric values of interest? Chime in with what you think!