EMS Annual Meeting Abstracts
Vol. 20, EMS2023-300, 2023, updated on 04 Sep 2023
https://doi.org/10.5194/ems2023-300
EMS Annual Meeting 2023

Assessing cloud representation of two global atmospheric models using multiple overpasses of CloudSat-CALIPSO over the same Arctic cyclone

Meryl Wimmer[1,2], Clémantyne Aubry[3,4], Gwendal Rivière[1], Julien Delanoë[3], Eric Bazile[5], Etienne Vignon[1], and Lukas Hofmann[6]

[1]Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique, Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, ENS, Université PSL, École Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Paris, France

[2]Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales, Paris, France

[3]LATMOS, Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, Université Versailles Saint-Quentin, Université Paris-Saclay, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Guyancourt, France

[4]Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre, Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt DLR, Oberpfaffenhofen, Germany

[5]Centre National de Recherches Météorologiques, University of Toulouse, Météo-France, CNRS, Toulouse, France

[6]Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique et aux énergies renouvelables, Université Grenoble Alpes, DES, Institut de technico-économie des systèmes énergétiques, Grenoble, France

Mixed-phase clouds are common in Arctic cyclones, but their representation in global atmospheric models is still challenging. The aim of the study is to evaluate and improve the ratio of ice and liquid water within mixed-phase clouds simulated by two general circulation models (GCM): ARPEGE (operational at Météo-France) and LMDZ (the atmospheric component of the IPSL-CM Earth System Model). For that evaluation, we consider ERA5 reanalysis for the overall dynamics, and for the cloud representation, DARDAR satellite products which provide the ice water content (IWC) as well as categorization masks along CloudSat-CALIPSO tracks. This work focuses on an Arctic cyclone that occurred in May 2019 near Svalbard and has been sampled several times by the two satellites CloudSat and CALIPSO.

Compared to satellite observations, LMDZ simulations provide quite realistic IWC while ARPEGE underestimates this quantity. However, by comparing liquid and ice occurrences between models and observations, both GCMs clearly miss occurrences of liquid phase at temperature lower than -30°C but they all overestimate the liquid occurrence in the whole negative temperature range between 0°C and -30°C.

In order to improve such liquid and ice occurrences, different liquid/ice partition functions are tested in the two models. In particular, different shapes and extensions to lower temperatures are considered. This helps to improve the occurrence of liquid water at the lowest temperatures but does not correct the overestimated occurrences between 0°C and -30°C. As temperature does not discriminate liquid-ice partition properly, different other predictors are tested and distance from the cloud top appears to be the most relevant.