

Guide to the Science of Climate Change in the 21st Century

> Chapter 17 Climate Models

David H. Manz PhD., P. Eng., AOE, FCAE 2020

Table of Contents

Chapter 17	Climate Models
	17.1 Introduction
	17.2 Climate models
	17.3 Data available for climate models
	17.4 Climate models
	17.4.1 Atmosphere-ocean general circulation models
	(AOGCM)
	17.4.2 Earth system models (ESM)
	17.4.3 Regional climate models
	17.4.4 Coupled model intercomparison project, CMIP5
	17.5 Model prediction of surface temperature change compared
	to observed
	17.6 Assessment of model predictions
	17.7 Information support

List of Figures

Figure 17.1 Subsystems included in climate models. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/

Figure 17.2 Modelling concept used in atmosphere-ocean general circulation climate models, AOGCMs.

https://www.climate.gov/maps-data/primer/climate-models https://soccom.princeton.edu/content/what-earth-system-model-esm

Figure 17.3 Concept used in climate models showing vertical column extending into the oceans.

Figure 17.4 Comparison of grids used in climate models since they were first being developed for use in IPCC Assessment Report 1 to Assessment Report 5. <u>https://scied.ucar.edu/longcontent/climate-modeling</u> <u>https://eo.ucar.edu/staff/rrussell/climate/modeling/climate_model_resolution.html</u>

Figure 17.5 Computational elements used in climate models.

December 12, 2020 – Fifth Anniversary of the Paris Agreement Guide to the Science of Climate Change https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/

Figure 17.6 Increase in climate model complexity since the 1970's. <u>https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/</u>

Figure 17.7 NASA Earth Observatory global maps. <u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/global-maps?utm_campaign=nav20&utm_source=topnav&utm_medium=globalmaps</u>

Figure 17.8 Assessment of global vegetative biomass capable of converting CO₂ to plant tissue using satellite carbon dioxide data. <u>https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2436/co2-is-making-earth-greenerfor-now/</u>

Figure 17.9 Ocean chlorophyl concentrations. <u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/global-maps/MY1DMM_CHLORA</u>

Figure 17.10 Land use including vegetation and type of vegetative cover. https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/LandCover/land_cover_3.php

Figure 17.11 Ice thickness. <u>https://icesat-2.gsfc.nasa.gov/</u>

Figure 17.12 Space weather satellite. https://www.spaceweatherlive.com/en/news/view/399/20191209-welcome-goes-16.html

Figure 17.13 GEDI instrument showing lasers, optical paths, detectors and digitizers. <u>https://gedi.umd.edu/instrument/instrument-overview/</u>

Figure 17.14 GEDI, shown in gold, as mounted on the International Space Station.

List of Tables

 Table 17.1
 Comparison of AOGMs and ESMs, CMIP5. https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html and and https://pcm

 Table 17.2
 Comparison of AOGMs and ESMs, CMIP3. https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html and and https://pcm

 Table 17.3 Comparison of EMICs. https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html and https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5 Chapter09 FINAL.pdf

 Table 17.4 Confidence terminology used in IPCC reports.

 https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5_Uncertainty_Guidance_Note.pdf

Table 17.5 Agreement-evidence scale used in IPCC reports to aid in use of confidence descriptors.

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5 Uncertainty Guidance Note.pdf

Table 17.6 Likelihood terminology used in IPCC reports.

Table 17.7 Method for IPCC usage of calibrated language.

Chapter 17.0 Climate Models

17.1 Introduction

Computer simulation models of global climate exist. They are providing the ability to assess the potential impacts of climate change and guide adaptation and mitigation efforts. A recent NASA report, by Alan Buis, January 9, 2020, titled 'Study Confirms Climate Models are Getting Future Warming Projections Right' emphasizes this conclusion.

Computer models are the only approach to synthesizing the science of climate change as discussed in previous chapters to generate actionable projections. The models and the computers that run them have been under development for more than thirty years and have provided input to the First Assessment Report on Climate Change prepared by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1990 (See

<u>https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ipcc_far_wg_l_full_report.pdf</u>.) Considerable progress has been made since then as reported in the Fifth Assessment Report in 2013 (See <u>https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/</u>.) The Sixth Assessment Report is in final stages of preparation.

There are many intense ongoing efforts to improve climate models as the science is better understood and more and higher quality data is being collected to support the science. With improved science comes growing complexity, the need for better computational methods, need for improved data management and strategies to use the ever more powerful computers.

17.2 Climate models

The utility of the climate models is more than just their ability to forecast. They:

- 1. Advance the understanding of complex systems,
- 2. Guide future research theoretical and physical,
- 3. Guide development of data collection systems, and
- 4. Improve interpretation of data.

Climate models are always improving. There are several organizations around the world which have developed their own models using their own approach. They each have advantages and disadvantages but tend to be complimentary. Most of the climate models are used.

The objectives of all models are to determine how natural and man-made forcings might influence temperature and precipitation.

Some of the steps in the development and use of computer models include:

- 1. System identification. Identify all of the elements that might affect the behavior of the system. (Energy budget, carbon cycle, hydrological cycle, atmosphere circulation, ocean current, biosphere and anything else that is relevant.)
- 2. Collection and development of relevant science.

- 3. Collection and identification of data requirements for input to model and required to calibrate and test models.
- 4. Develop computer programs.
- 5. Calibrate model and modify model as required. (May also require additional data.)
- 6. Test model against different data sets.
- 7. Use model:
 - 1. With 'real' data.
 - 2. With generated data that reflects 'chaos' or statistical characteristics of real data.

Figure 17.1 provides guidance on the type of information that is required to run the climate models. Satellites are meeting this need.





Figures 17.2 and 17.3 illustrate how the surface of the Earth is divided into a grid and how the grid is extended into the atmosphere and ocean to produce a 3-D model of the type that would be used in atmosphere-land surface-ocean and sea ice models used in IPCC Assessment Report 5.

Figure 17.4 shows how the amount of detail in climate models has increased in recent years, largely because of the calculation power provided by newer supercomputers. In the 1990s, high-resolution *global climate models* operated on the T42 resolution scheme (upper left). At this resolution, temperature, moisture, and other features were tracked in grid boxes that each spanned about 200 by 300 kilometers at midlatitudes. In the modelling that led up to the 2007 IPCC Working Group I report, the NCAR-based Community Climate System Model (CCSM) routinely operated at T85 resolution (upper right), with midlatitude grid points of about 100 by 150 km (60 x 90 miles). The finest grid, T340, is now routinely used by climate models.

Figure 17.5 show how the surface grids extend vertically in the ocean. It is apparent that decreasing horizontal and vertical dimensions by fifty per cent would increase the number of computational elements by a factor of eight and the computational power would need to increase by at least this amount.



equations that describe the materials in it and the way energy moves through it. The advanced equations are based on the fundamental laws of physics, fluid motion, and chemistry. To "run" a model, scientists specify the climate forcing (for instance, setting variables to represent the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere) and have powerful computers solve the equations in each cell. Results from each grid cell are passed to neighboring cells, and the equations are solved again. Repeating the process through many time steps represents the passage of time. Image source: NOAA.

Figure 17.2 Modelling concept used in atmosphere-ocean general circulation climate models, AOGCM's and earth system models, ESM's.

<u>https://www.climate.gov/maps-data/primer/climate-models</u> https://soccom.princeton.edu/content/what-earth-system-model-esm



Figure 17.3 Concept used in climate models showing vertical column extending into the oceans.



Resolution:

- 1. T42 200 x 300 km
- 2. T85 100 x 150 km
- 3. T170 and T340 regional models much finer resolution interpolation techniques.
- 4. Today 87.5 km x 87.5 km and 30 km x 30 km

Figure 17.4 Comparison of grids used in climate models since they were first being developed for use in IPCC Assessment Report 1 to Assessment Report 5.

https://scied.ucar.edu/longcontent/climate-modeling

https://eo.ucar.edu/staff/rrussell/climate/modeling/climate_model_resolution.html





Figure 17.7 illustrates how climate models have increased in complexity since the 1970's. The most complete climate models used in AR5 include:

- Atmosphere
- Land surface
- Ocean and sea ice
- Aerosols
- Carbon cycle
- Dynamic vegetation (consider how the vegetation changes with climate)
- Atmospheric chemistry, and
- Land ice.

The objective is to accurately represent the energy budget, carbon cycle, hydrological cycle, atmospheric circulation, ocean water circulation, and any relevant biochemical reactions and dynamic physical phenomena (such as deforestation due to wildfires, melting permafrost and others).



Figure 1.13 | The development of climate models over the last 35 years showing how the different components were coupled into comprehensive climate models over time. In each aspect (e.g., the atmosphere, which comprises a wide range of atmospheric processes) the complexity and range of processes has increased over time (illustrated by growing cylinders). Note that during the same time the horizontal and vertical resolution has increased considerably e.g., for spectral models from T21L9 (roughly 500 km horizontal resolution and 9 vertical levels) at present, and that now ensembles with at least three independent experiments can be considered as standard.

Figure 17.6 Increase in climate model complexity since the 1970's. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg1/

17.3 Data available for climate models

Most of the data needs required by climate models is obtained by satellites. Land, sea and airborne instrumentation provide data that is used for calibrating (also known as ground truthing) satellite scanners and to obtain data that can't as yet be obtained by satellites such as ocean bottom morphology, biology and chemistry. An example of the extent of satellite acquired information, by NASA alone, is illustrated in Figure 17.7. NASA has an extensive fleet of space-based platforms as shown in Figure 14.12. There are many more satellites and space-based platforms operated by other agencies in the United States and many more operated by several agencies around the world (European Union, Japan, Canada, China and others). Most of this information is shared on a cost-recovery basis. Satellite technology has become sufficiently affordable that the private sector is providing data acquisition services and competing with or complimenting government agencies.



Figure 17.7 NASA Earth Observatory global maps. <u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/global-maps?utm_campaign=nav20&utm_source=topnav&utm_medium=globalmaps</u>

Another good example of the data acquisition utility of satellites is their ability to supply data that can be used to accurately map global vegetation including ocean plankton. Figure 17.8 shows a map of global vegetative biomass capable of converting CO_2 to plant tissue. Figure 17.9 shows ocean chlorophyl concentrations. Figure 17.9 shows land use including vegetative cover (available for fifty years).

This information is being enhanced with additional space-based platforms that are capable of mapping ice cover, Figure 17.11, space weather, Figure 17.12 and the Global Ecosystem Dynamics Investigation instrument (GEDI) that is mounted on the International Space Station. GEDI produces the first high resolution laser ranging observations of the 3D structure of the Earth. It makes precise measurements of forest canopy height, canopy

vertical structure, and surface elevation. GEDI radically improves our ability to characterize important carbon and water cycling processes, biodiversity, and habitat.



Figure 17.8 Assessment of global vegetative biomass capable of converting CO₂ to plant tissue using satellite carbon dioxide data. <u>https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2436/co2-is-making-earth-greenerfor-now/</u>



Figure 17.9 Ocean chlorophyl concentrations. <u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/global-maps/MY1DMM_CHLORA</u>

December 12, 2020 – Fifth Anniversary of the Paris Agreement Guide to the Science of Climate Change



Normalized Differential Vegetation Index, Sept. 21– 31, 1992 This is one of the simplest types of land cover classification maps, showing only the amount of green vegetation. Heavily vegetated areas are dark green, moderate vegetation is light green, sand, rock, snow, and ice are shown as tan and white.

Figure 17.10 Land use including vegetation and type of vegetative cover. https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/features/LandCover/land_cover_3.php



Figure 17.11 Ice thickness. <u>https://icesat-2.gsfc.nasa.gov/</u>

December 12, 2020 – Fifth Anniversary of the Paris Agreement Guide to the Science of Climate Change



Figure 17.12 Space weather satellite. https://www.spaceweatherlive.com/en/news/view/399/20191209-welcome-goes-16.html

GEDI's data on surface structure are also of immense value for weather forecasting, forest management, glacier and snowpack monitoring, and the generation of more accurate digital elevation models. GEDI provides the missing piece – 3D structure – in NASA's observational assets which enables us to better understand how the Earth behaves as a system, and guides the actions we can take to sustain critical resources.



Figure 17.13 GEDI instrument showing lasers, optical paths, detectors and digitizers. <u>https://gedi.umd.edu/instrument/instrument-overview/</u>



THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION [TOP] AND THE JAPANESE EXPERIMENT MODULE – EXPOSED FACILITY [BOTTOM] WHERE GEDI, HIGHLIGHTED IN GOLD, IS INSTALLED.

Figure 17.14 GEDI, shown in gold, as mounted on the International Space Station.

17.4 Climate models

There are basically three classes of models:

- 1. General circulation (atmosphere ocean) models, AOGCM's or GCM's used in AR4 and also AR5.
- 2. AR5 also uses Earth System Models or ESMs that include various biochemical cycles, (carbon, sulphur, ozone).
- 3. Regional climate change (circulation) models or RCM's.

A very good description is provided by IPCC fifth assessment report, AR5, Chapter 9, Working Group 1 (scientific basis). Each of these model classes are important on their own, require different resources to run and meet different modelling needs.

17.4.1 Atmosphere-ocean general circulation models (AOGCM)

Atmosphere-ocean general circulation models (AOGCM) combine atmospheric general circulation models (AGCM) discussed in Chapter 7 and ocean general circulation models

(OGCM) discussed in Chapter 8. Sub-models to consider other hydrological elements such as sea ice, evapotranspiration discussed in Chapter 6 and other elements of the energy budget (such as GHG emissions, clouds, etc.) discussed in Chapter 4 to provide full climate models. See Figures 17.2 and 17.3.

17.4.2 Earth System Models (ESM)

An Earth System Model (ESM) is a coupled climate model that also models the movement of carbon (and other substances) through the earth system. They are the current state-of-the-art models. They may expand on AOGCMs to include the carbon cycle, aerosols, methane cycle and permafrost, global vegetation and wildfires, effects of land use, chemistry-climate interactions, land ice sheets, penetration of solar radiation into the ocean (phytoplankton) and more. Figure 17.15 illustrates the relationship between AOGCMs and ESMs. These models challenge computational resources. This issue is partly resolved using Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMICs) which reduce computational demands by using lower resolution, coarser computational grid.



Figure 17.15 Comparison between a climate model and an earth system model https://soccom.princeton.edu/content/what-earth-system-model-esm

17.4.3 Regional climate models

Regional climate models (RCMs) are limited-area models. These models are used to downscale the global model simulations for a particular geographical region of interest to provide more detailed information (higher resolution) on climate variation throughout the region. The global model simulations provide the boundary conditions for the RCMs.

For example, an RCM might want to use more detailed topographic information to be able to consider the effects of mountains. T340 may be considered too coarse a resolution (30km by 30km grid) and an RCM might try to take this down to 5km by 5km or less to provide a better idea as to how climate varies at the local level.

17.4.4 Coupled model intercomparison project, CMIP5

The IPCC reports evaluations of several climate models developed and supported by organizations around the world that were used to assess impacts of future climate change. <u>https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter09_FINAL.pdf</u>. The models used in AR5, CMIP5, are listed in Table 17.1. The models used in AR4, CMIP3, are listed in Table 17.2. This table shows the features of each model and the resolution with which each feature is considered. Further details may be found in <u>https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html</u>.

Table 17.3 lists and describes several EMICs which were also compared. The results of these comparisons are detailed in the report.

As one might expect the various models demonstrated different strengths and weaknesses. This information is relevant when selecting a model or models for a particular study. Table 9.1 | Main features of the Atmosphere–Ocean General Circulation Models (AOGCMs) and Earth System Models (ESMs) participating in Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5), and a comparison with Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 3 (CMIP3), including components and resolution of the atmosphere and the ocean models. Detailed CMIP5 model description can be found in Table 9.A.1 (* refers to Table 9.A.1 for more details). Official CMIP model names are used. HT stands for High-Top atmosphere, which has a fully resolved stratosphere with a model top above the stratopause. AMIP stands for models with atmosphere and land surface only, using observed sea surface temperature and sea ice extent. A component is coloured when it includes at least a physically based prognostic equation and at least a two-way coupling with another component, allowing climate feedbacks. For aerosols, lighter shading means 'semi-interactive' and darker shading means 'fully interactive'. The resolution of the land surface usually follows that of the atmosphere, and the resolution of the sea ice follows that of the ocean. In moving from CMIP3 to CMIP5, note the increased complexity and resolution as well as the absence of artificial flux correction (FC) used in some CMIP3 models.

				AOC	бСМ		1		ES	M	
	Model name		Atmos	Land Surface	Ocean	Sea-Ice	FC	Aerosol	Atmos Chem	Land Carbon	Ocean BGC
	ACCESS1.0, ACCESS1.3	Australia					77				
	BCC-CSM1.1, BCC-CSM1.1(m)	China					1				
	BNU-ESM	China									
	CanCM4	Canada									
	CanESM2	Canada					1				
	CCSM4										
	CESM1 (BGC)										
	CESM1 (WACCM)	USA	HT								
	CESM1 (FASTCHEM)						14				
	CESM1 (CAM5)										
	CESM1 (CAM5.1-FV2)	USA					11				
	CMCC-CM, CMCC-CMS	the bar	HT								
	CMCC-CESM	rcary	HT								
	CNRM-CM5	France									
	CSIRO-Mk3.6.0	Australia					11				
	EC-EARTH	Europe									
	FGOALS-g2	e1.1-									
-	FGOALS-s2	China					1				
	FIO-ESM v1.0	China									
	GFDL-ESM2M, GFDL-ESM2G						11				
	GFDL-CM2.1	USA									
	GFDL-CM3		HT				11				
	GISS-E2-R, GISS-E2-H		HT				11	p2,p3*	p2, p3*		
	GISS-E2-R-CC, GISS-E2-H-CC	USA	HT				11	p2,p3*	p2, p3*		
	HadGEM2-ES						11				
	HadGEM2-CC	UK	HT				12				
	HadCM3										
	HadGEM2-AO	Korea					11				
	INM-CM4	Russia									
	IPSL-CM5A-LR / -CM5A-MR / -CM5B-LR	France	HT								
	MIROC4h, MIROC5		HT								
	MIROC-ESM	Japan	HT								
	MIROC-ESM-CHEM		HT								
	MPI-ESM-LR / -ESM-MR / -ESM-P	Germany	HT				11				
	MRI-ESM1		HT				1				
	MRI-CGCM3	Japan	HT				11				
	NCEP-CFSv2	USA					11				
	NorESM1-M						11				
	NorESM1-ME	Norway					1				
	GFDL-HIRAM C180 / -HIRAM C360	USA									
ΠP	MRI-AGCM3.25 / -AGCM3.2H	Japan									

Table 17.1 Comparison of AOGMs and ESMs, CMIP5. <u>https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html</u> and https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter09_FINAL.pdf

BCC-CM1	China				FC		
BCCR-BCM2.0	Norway						
CCSM3	USA						
CGCM3.1(T47)	Canada				FC	_	
CGCMILI(163)			_		the second	-	-
LNRM-CMS	France						
CSIRO-MK3.0, CSIRO-MK3.5	Australia					-	
ECHAM5/MP1-OM	Germany		_	_	12-	_	
ECHO-G	D/Korea				FC		
FGDALS-g1.0	China			_		_	
GFDL-CM2.0	USA			_	VA-	_	
GFDL-CM2.1	740,40			_			
GISS-AOM						_	
GISS-EH	USA			_		_	
GISS-ER	and a second second		_			_	-
INGV-ECHAM4	Italy		1.0			_	
INM-CM3.0	Russia				FC	_	
IPSL-CM4	France	100				_	
MIROC3.2(hires) MIROC3.2(medres)	Japan	HT		_			-
MRI-CGCM2.3.2	Japan				FC		
NCAR-PCM	USA				1/4		
UKMO-HadCM3							
UKMO-HadGEM1	UK						
			li	ncreasing	complex	iity	
reating resolution Atmos	here / Ocean						
reasing resolution Atmosp	mere / Ocean						

Table 17.2 Comparison of AOGMs and ESMs, CMIP3. <u>https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html</u> and <u>https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter09_FINAL.pdf</u>

Table 9.2 | Main features of the EMICs assessed in the ARS, including components and complexity of the models. Model complexity for four components is indicated by colour shading. Further detailed descriptions of the models are contained in Table 9.A.2.

Model n	ame	Atmos	Ocean	Land Surface	Sea Ice	Coupling	Biosphere	lce Sheets	Sediment & Weathering
Bern3D	Switzerland								
CLIMBER2	Germany								
CLIMBER3	Germany								
DCESS	Denmark								
FAMOUS	UK								
GENIE	UK								
IAP RAS CM	Russia								
IGSM2	USA								
LOVECLIM1.2	Netherlands								
MESMO	USA								
MIROC-lite	Japan								
MIROC-lite-LCM	Japan								
SPEEDO	Netherlands								
UMD	USA								
Uvic	Canada								
			In	creasing Complex	ity (light	to dark)			
		EMBM	2-Box	NST/NSM			None		
		SD	Q-flux ML	LST/NSM			BO		
		QG	FG	LST/BSM			BO,BT		
		PE	PE	LST/CSM			BO,BT,BV		

 Table 17.3 Comparison of EMICs.
 https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html and

 https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5
 Chapter09
 FINAL.pdf

17.5 Model predictions of surface temperature change compared to observed

The only data set that is available with which to evaluate model predictions is the temperature data between 1850 to present, the instrumental period. Several comparisons are made.

Both CMIP3 and CMIP5 models were compared to observed global temperature as shown in Figure 17.16 (a), (b) and (c). The observed global temperature set used for comparison is an average of three data sets shown in the small graph in the upper left corner of Figure 17.16 (b) similar to that shown in Figure 14.1. When both anthropogenic forcing and natural forcings were used, Figure 17.16 (a), model results compare reasonably to observed temperature. When only natural forcings were used, Figure 17.16 (b) model results did not match observed temperature. Uhen only anthropogenic forcings were used, Figure 17.16 (c), model results did not match observed temperature. Clearly, both anthropogenic and natural forcings must be considered for models to predict observed global temperature which they do quite well.

Figure 17.17 shows a comparison of model predictions using natural forcings only and using both natural and anthropogenic forcings to observed temperature on each of the continents and oceans. The agreement between model predictions and observed temperatures is very good when both natural and anthropogenic forcings are used.

Figure 17.18 shows a comparison of model predictions using natural forcings only and using both natural and anthropogenic forcings to observed global ocean, land, and land and ocean temperature. The agreement between model predictions and observed temperatures is very good when both natural and anthropogenic forcings are used. A similar comparison was made on prediction of ocean heat content which again demonstrated very good agreement between model predictions and observed agreement between

Chapter 10 of AR5 provides an extensive discussion on detection and attribution of a wide variety of climate features of interest and the confidence that climate models can be used to assess them. <u>https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter10_FINAL.pdf</u>

The results shown in Figures 17.16, 17.17 and 17.18 provide considerable confidence, at the intuitive level, that the climate models used by IPCC are predicting PAST changes well enough to be used for <u>PREDICATION PURPOSES</u>.

- 1. Impacts (possible/probable).
- 2. Adaptation (if desired).
- 3. Mitigation (if desired).



Figure 17.16 Estimates of global mean surface temperature (GMST) using averages of CMIP3(blue) and CMIP5(yellow) models using (a) both anthropogenic and natural forcings; (b) only natural forcings; and (c) only anthropogenic forcings compared to observed temperatures from 1850 to present. The red line is an average of CMIP5 predictions. CMIP3 models were not available for (c).

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5 Chapter10 FINAL.pdf



Figure 17.17 Comparison of model predictions to observed temperature on each of the continents.

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5 Chapter10 FINAL.pdf



Figure 17.18 Comparison of model results when performed with only natural forcings and using both natural and anthropogenic forcings to observed global temperature of the ocean, land, ocean and land and ocean heat content.

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5 Chapter10 FINAL.pdf

17.6 Assessment of model predictions

Predictions using climate models, of any type, are assessed using qualitative descriptors.

Table 17.4 lists the meaning of confidence terms.

Table 17.5 provides guidance as to how to use confidence terms.

Table 17.6 lists the meaning likelihood terms used in old IPCC reports.

Table 17.7 summary of IPCC usage of calibrated language.

Confidence Terminology	Degree of confidence in being correct
Very high confidence	At least 9 out of 10 chance
High confidence	About 8 out of 10 chance
Medium confidence	About 5 out of 10 chance
Low confidence	About 2 out of 10 chance
Very low confidence	Less than 1 out of 10 chance

 Table 17.4 Confidence terminology used in IPCC reports.

 https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5_Uncertainty_Guidance_Note.pdf

1	High agreement Limited evidence	High agreement Medium evidence	High agreement Robust evidence	
ement -	Medium agreement Limited evidence	Medium agreement Medium evidence	Medium agreement Robust evidence	
Agre	Low agreement Limited evidence	Low agreement Medium evidence	Low agreement Robust evidence	Confidence Scale
	Evidence (type, a	mount, quality, con	sistency) 🗪	

Table 17.5 Agreement-evidence scale used in IPCC reports to aid in use of confidence descriptors.

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5 Uncertainty Guidance Note.pdf

Likelihood Terminology	Likelihood of the occurrence/ outcome
Virtually certain	> 99% probability
Extremely likely	> 95% probability
Very likely	> 90% probability
Likely	> 66% probability
More likely than not	> 50% probability
About as likely as not	33 to 66% probability
Unlikely	< 33% probability
Very unlikely	< 10% probability
Extremely unlikely	< 5% probability
Exceptionally unlikely	< 1% probability

Table 17.6 Likelihood terminology used in IPCC reports.

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5 Uncertainty Guidance Note.pdf

			dence and agree	onnonn		
Obs	servations	Theory ✓	Statistics	Models	Experiments	Process
5	Sufficient e	evidence a	and agreement to eva	aluate conf	idence?	
Ste	p 2: Evalu	uate cor	nfidence			
Agreement	High agre Limited ev (Emerg Medium ag Limited ev Low agre Limited ev (Limite	ement ridence ing) reement ridence ement ridence ed)	High agreement Medium evidence Medium agreement Medium evidence Low agreement Medium evidence	High agr Robust e (Rob Medium a Robust e Low agr Robust e (Diver	reement evidence ust) greement vidence reement evidence gent)	Confidence Language Very high High Medium Low Very low
Ste	Sufficient c	confidence uate sta	ount, quality, consiste and quantitative/pro tistical likelihood	ency) — obabilistic e	evidence to eva	luate likelihood?
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik La	confidence Jate sta relihood inguage	ount, quality, consiste and quantitative/pro tistical likelihood Statistical L (assessing ch	ency) <u>–</u> obabilistic e I evel ange)	vidence to eva Statistic (assessi	luate likelihood? al Range ng range)
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik Virtually	confidence uate sta relihood inguage	ount, quality, consiste e and quantitative/pro tistical likelihooc Statistical L (assessing ch >99%	ency) obabilistic e I evel ange)	evidence to eva Statistic (assessi	luate likelihood? al Range ng range)
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik Lik Virtually Extreme	confidence uate sta elihood inguage certain ly likely	ount, quality, consiste e and quantitative/pro tistical likelihood Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95%	ency) obabilistic e I evel ange)	vidence to eva Statistic (assessi	luate likelihood? al Range ng range)
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik Lik Virtually Extreme Vei	confidence uate sta relihood inguage certain ily likely ry likely	e and quantitative/pro tistical likelihood Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90%	ency) obabilistic e I evel ange)	Statistic (assessi 5–95%	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik La Virtually Extreme Vei	interstand interstand inguage interstand inguage interstand inguage interstand inguage interstand inguage interstand inte	e and quantitative/pro tistical likelihood Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90% >66%	ency) obabilistic e I evel ange)	Statistic (assessi 5–95% 17–83	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range % range
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik La Virtually Extreme Vei More likely t	iate sta iate sta ielihood inguage iv certain iy likely ry likely Likely than not	ount, quality, consiste e and quantitative/pro tistical likelihood Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90% >66% >50%	ency) obabilistic e I evel ange)	Statistic (assessi) 5–959 17–83 25–75	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range % range % range % range
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik Lik Virtually Extreme Vei More likely t bout as likely	intersta intersta intersta inguage interstain interstai	ount, quality, consiste e and quantitative/pro tistical likelihooc Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90% >66% >50% 33–66%	ency) obabilistic e l evel ange)	Statistic (assessi 5–959 17–83 25–75	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range % range % range
Step	Sufficient c Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik La Virtually Extreme Vei More likely t bout as likely	intersta int	ount, quality, consister and quantitative/pro- tistical likelihooc Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90% >66% >50% 33–66% <33%	ency) obabilistic e l evel ange)	Statistic (assessi 5–95% 17–83 25–75 <17% and >8	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range % range % range 3% (both tails)
Ste	Sufficient c p 3: Evalu Lik Lik Virtually Extreme Vei More likely t bout as likely Very	intersta inters	ount, quality, consiste and quantitative/pro- tistical likelihooc Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90% >66% >50% 33–66% <33% <10%	ency) obabilistic e l evel ange)	 Statistic (assessi 5–95% 17–83' 25–75' <17% and >8 <5% and >95 	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range % range % range 13% (both tails) 5% (both tails)
Ste	Sufficient c Sufficient c P 3: Evalu Lik La Virtually Extreme Ver More likely t bout as likely Very Extremely	intersta inters	ount, quality, consiste and quantitative/pro tistical likelihooc Statistical L (assessing ch >99% >95% >90% >66% >50% 33–66% <33% <10% <5%	ency) obabilistic e l evel ange)	 Statistic (assessi 5–95% 17–83 25–75 <17% and >8 <5% and >95 	luate likelihood? al Range ng range) 6 range % range % range 3% (both tails) 5% (both tails)

Table 17.7 Method for IPCC usage of calibrated language.

17.7 Information support

Key web sites:

- 1. Climate models. <u>https://www.climate.gov/maps-data/primer/climate-models</u>
- 2. Early climate modelers got global warming right. <u>https://news.berkeley.edu/2019/12/04/early-climate-modelers-got-global-</u> warming-right-new-report-finds/
- 3. Evaluating the performance of past climate model projections. https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2019GL085378
- 4. Study confirms climate models are getting future warming projections right. <u>https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2943/study-confirms-climate-models-are-getting-future-warming-projections-right/</u>
- 5. Global maps, NASA, Earth observatory. <u>https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/global-maps/MYD28M</u>
- 6. Climate model diagnosis and intercomparison. https://pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html
- 7. Evaluation of climate models. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter09_FINAL.pdf
- 8. Detection and attribution of climate change: global to regional. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter10_FINAL.pdf
- 9. Climate modelling. https://scied.ucar.edu/longcontent/climate-modeling
- 10. Resolution of climate models. <u>https://eo.ucar.edu/staff/rrussell/climate/modeling/climate_model_resolution.ht</u> <u>ml</u>
- 11. Use of models in detection and attribution of climate change. https://www.geos.ed.ac.uk/~ghegerl/assets/WIRES.pdf
- 12. Climate change, the IPCC scientific assessment. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ipcc_far_wg_l_full_report.pdf
- 13. NASA Global precipitation measurement mission, GPM. https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/GPM/overview/index.html

- 14. NASA CO2 is making Earth greener for now. https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2436/co2-is-making-earth-greenerfor-now/
- 15. NASA explore Earth. https://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/index.html
- 16. IPCC Chapter 1.

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ipcc_wg3_ar5_chapter1.pdf

- 17. Earth system model. <u>https://soccom.princeton.edu/content/what-earth-system-model-esm</u>
- 18. General circulation model. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General circulation model
- 19. Earth systems models of intermediate complexity. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth_systems_model_of_intermediate_complexity
- 20. Atmosphere-ocean general circulation models (AOGCMs). https://www.narccap.ucar.edu/about/aogcms.html
- 21. Evaluation of climate models. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WG1AR5_Chapter09_FINAL.pdf
- 22. Guide for treatment of uncertainties, IPCC. <u>https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2017/08/AR5_Uncertainty_Guidance_No_te.pdf</u>