



2210-19

MedCLIVAR Workshop on: "Scenarios of Mediterranean Climate Change under Increased Radiative Active Gas Concentration and the Role of Aerosols

23 - 25 September 2010

XXI Century Marine Climate Scenarios for the Mediterranean Sea

JORDA Gabriel Institut Mediterrani d-Estudis Avancats UIB CSIC c Miquel Marques 21, 07010 Esporles SPAIN XXI century marine climate scenarios for the Mediterranean Sea The VANIMEDAT-2 and ESCENARIOS projects

<u>G. Jordà</u>, F. M. Calafat, M. Marcos, D. Gomis IMEDEA

E. Álvarez, R. Aznar, M. Gómez, M. G. Sotillo, B. Pérez

Puertos del Estado

S. Somot (Météo-France), M.Tsimplis (NOC),



Main objective: describe the marine climate of the Med Sea and a sector of the NE Atlantic Ocean under different GHG scenarios for the 21st century

Namely, we intend to answer why, where and how large will be the eventual changes in...

- the hydrodynamics (temperature, salinity and circulation)
- total sea level and its different components
- the wave field

 \rightarrow We focus on both, <u>mean regimes</u> and <u>extreme events</u>

→ Determination of uncertainties as important as the projections themselves !



Framework: the 'VANIMEDAT-2' and 'ESCENARIOS' projects

- <u>VANIMEDAT-2</u> is funded by the Spanish Marine Science and Technology Program and focuses on the <u>scientific issues</u> of the projections such as the impact of model configurations or the physical processes underlying the projected changes.
- <u>ESCENARIOS</u> is funded by the Spanish Met Office (AEMET) and focuses on <u>products</u>: marine scenarios obtained under specific atmospheric projections and the associated uncertainties.
- Temporal framework: 1.1.2010 31.12.2012







Outline

- Barotropic Sea Level
- Assessing uncertainties in Mediterranean baroclinic models





Methodology

PLANNED SIMULATIONS (~2012)

Number of planned runs		Reanalysis	Control	B1	A1b	A2
Wave model	West Med	8 (1)	8 (1)	1 <i>(1)</i>	8 (1)	2 (1)
	Atlantic	2	2	-	2	-
Storm surge		8 (1)	8 (1)	1 <i>(1)</i>	8 (1)	2 (1)
3D model		2(1)	3(1)	1	3	1 <i>(1)</i>

(*) In parenthesis the runs already finished

Reanalysis <u>~</u> Hindcast

IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)

Different combinations of RCM's at different resolutions forced by different AOGCM's

- HAMSOM model implemented at 1/6° x 1/4° in the whole Mediterranean and a NE Atlantic sector (*same than HIPOCAS*)
- Forced by ARPEGE model (~50km over the Mediterranean) with 6h frequency
- Runs: Reanalysis (1958-2001), Control (1950-2000) and scenarios B1, A1b and A2 (2001-2100)
- Output > 1h sea level

Comparison of reanalysis with tide gauges lead to a rms of 3.2 cm and averaged correlation 0.8







Validation of Control Run (present climate)







Jordà et al., 2010



Scenarios Results

Seasonal Trends



Winter decrease (up to 8 cm at the end of the century in the Adriatic) and summer slight increase.

Larger GHGs concentrations induce larger trends





IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)

TEDEA



Reduction in the frequency of moderate and strong events (up to ~50% under A2 scenario)



IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)

Scenarios Results

50 year Return Level difference respect to present



Reduction in the RL of positive surges 6-10% Increase in the RL of negative surges of 15% Uncertainties are as important as changes !

IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)

Positive



Conclusions

•The atmospheric contribution to sea level would induce a decrease up to 8 cm during winter and a slight increase during summer.

•This would be due to the increase of the positive phases of the NAO, which is a robust result among different RCM's

•The number of extreme events would decrease up to 50% for negative events and increase for positive events.

•The return levels would change consistenly but with smaller relative changes. However, the uncertainties are large and no strong consensus among different models is reached (link to the number of cyclones).



Wave simulations lead to similar conclusions with general decrease in the Western Mediterranean of Hs and extreme events

Before discussing the projections from 3D models we should feel confident about them. The main questions are:

-Are the estimates of sea level from models adequate?

-Which are the sources of uncertainty?





ORCA

(Barnier et al., 2006) NEMO model Free Surface Global model (1/4°) <u>Forced</u> with ERA40 <u>Climatological river runoff</u> <u>Real variability in the Atlantic</u> SSS relaxation

> OM8 (Somot et al., 2006) OPA model Rigid lid Regional model (1/8°) Forced with ARPEGE (~50km) Climatological river runoff Climatology in the Atlantic box Zero net flow at Gibraltar No SSS relaxation

PROTHEUS

(Artale et al., 2009) MITgcm model Free surface Regional model (1/8°)+Local model at Gibraltar <u>Coupled</u> to RegCM (~30km) <u>Interactive river scheme</u> <u>Climatology in the Atlantic box</u> Natural SSS Bound. Cond.





No agreement with data at any depth

Warming deeper layers by all models, especially in the West Med.

Changes in the vertical estratification



T/S detrended time series at different layers in the W Med



Good correlation in Temperature up to 500 m but it worsens below > Good surface heat flux but wrong vertical transfer of heat. Impact of Gibraltar outflow seems of 2nd order



БĀ

IMED

Salinity performs worse. Only MITgcm model reproduces some of the features

> Probably due to wrong E-P-R balance

Dense water formation enhance vertical heat transfer and also impacts on sea level

Deep Water Formation

Intermediate Water Formation



•ORCA rates are very small (due to low resolution in model and forcings)



•MITgcm production rates are larger than the others especially in the Aegean > Role of freshwater treatment. Also coupling??





Only MITgcm captures the EMT > *Role of River Scheme* Weaker signals are, in general, not captured by any model

Long term Sea Level Trends (1960-2001)





Long term basin averaged Sea Level Trends (1960-2001)



Except for ORCA, the trends would seem acceptable but not the interannual variability

However ...



Long term basin averaged Sea Level Trends (1960-2001)

Sea level variability = Steric component + Mass component

But Regional models doesn't account for mass component estimated to be 1.2<u>+</u>0.2 mm/year (Mir-Calafat et al. 2009) !!



Data includes the mass component and models the spurious warming in deep layers!!



Conclusions

•Regional models can reproduce T variability for z<500m. High resolution seems a key element as well as good quality heat fluxes. S is more problematic due to uncertainties in the E-P-R budget

•Atypical events as the EMT can be approximated with proper schemes (PROTHEUS system, role of interannual variability of rivers runoff). Maybe coupling also plays a role.

•All models lack in reproducing the deep layers evolution. This maybe due to a problem in the mechanisms transfering heat from the surface to deep layers. This has negative impact on the sea level evolution (trends in the western Med are doubled!)

•Concerning sea level, models fail in reproducing large part of interannual variability and trends at regional and basin scale.



IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)

Thanks for your attention ...





IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)