# Global Aerosol Model Tested Against Surface Observations : Revisit of model validations

Sarah Guibert<sup>1</sup>, Michael Schulz<sup>1</sup>, Christiane Textor<sup>1</sup>, Stefan Kinne<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Laboratoire des Sciences du climat et de l'Environnement, Gif-sur Yvette, France <sup>2</sup>Max-Planck-Institut für Meteorologie, Hamburg, Germany

4th AeroCom workshop, Oslo, June 15-17, 2005

### SURFOBS web interface

#### http://nansen.ipsl.jussieu.fr/AEROCOM/DATA/surfobs.html



### Types of graph producted



### Post-processing of model output

#### Horizontal interpolation :

Model output interpolated to stations locations

#### Daily filtration :

Daily data => Model data filtering according to observations

If at least 8 days in a month with data => Monthly mean (use for timeseries and scatterplots)

If at least 3 months in a year with data => Yearly mean (use for Map anf Fieldcompa)

#### Rejection of « mountain » sites for surface comparison

-> some mountains remain in the comparison if models put ground level at the correct altitude exemple :

# Features (1)

#### SERIES : time series at each station



SCONCD : use of surface daily concentration => Daily filtration + no mountain sites

CONC3D : use of 3D monthly concentration => interpolation of modeled data to the grid box containing the altitude of the station

#### MAP : comparison model/obs at each station





Yearly mean values

# Features (2)

#### SCAT : scatterplot between model and obs



Use of the monthly mean values at each station

# FIELDCOMPA: FIELD + superposition of obs value at each station



Yearly mean value

Model output + data at surface

Exists for each month + seasonal average

# Features (3)

#### Synthesis graphs

#### on http://nansen.ipsl.jussieu.fr/AEROCOM/DATA/synthesis.html



SURFOBS : comparison of mean model/data values



# SCATCOEF : comparison of slope and regression coef

### $SO_4$ concentration (1)

#### Experiment A







BE CAREFUL WITH THE VALUE OF THE SLOPE !!







#### **Experiment** A

### $SO_4$ concentration (2)



Overestimation over Europe and North America

## $SO_4$ concentration (3)

### Experiment A





### $SO_4$ concentration (4)

#### **Experiment** A

#### Comparison of precipitation in (mm/day)



#### Lack of precipitation => too much sulfate concentration

### $SO_4$ concentration (5)



#### For all models, decrease of CONC 3D\_SO4



### $SO_4$ concentration (6)

Decrease of concentration over Europe, during the summer



### Sea Salt concentration (1)

6666

#### **Experiment** A



#### Overestimation by all models for 2000 (except MOZGN)



# Sea Salt concentration (2)

#### Experiment A



Too few stations, on the continent => Bias when comparison to data

Overestimation by all models → partially due to cut off size in the measurements models with larger particles





### Sea Salt concentration (3)



#### Larger overestimation with expB



Clim, year 9999

### Sea Salt concentration (4)





### OC concentration (1)

2000

year

Nudged,

6666

year

Clim,

#### Experiment A



Underestimation by all models except GOCART, MPI\_HAM (agreement) and KYU, MOZGN and ULAQ (overestimation)



#### Experiment A







#### All stations in North America (IMPROVE)



### OC concentration (3)

#### Experiment A



### OC concentration (4)



#### Better agreement for expB except clim models

Clim, year 9999



### OC concentration (5)



POM emissions decrease with expB  $\Rightarrow$  concentrations decrease ???

see exemple of KYU (and MOZGN)



For other models, conc decrease around the world but increase in AMN

### OC concentration (6)





Decrease in Europe explain fewer agreement for clim models

### DUST concentration (1)

#### **Experiment** A

Only clim comparison : clim models + average of nudged models over the available years (+ year 2000 for MPI\_HAM, CAM, UMI, UIO\_CTM)





Slope values can't be considered : big range of data with lots of small values and some very large values

## DUST concentration (2)

#### Experiment A









## **DUST** concentration (3)

#### Experiment A



UIO\_CTM transports DUST much more than KYU (EMI located over AFN for both)

# DUST concentration (4)





Decrease of all mean and median values except MATCH and UMI

# OD550 (1)

#### Experiment A



Variability not so large between all models (except clim) / Specific problems Smaller correlation values for clim models

![](_page_27_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

0.005

0.000

-180.

180.

UIO\_GCM, 9999

60.

120.

-120.

0.005

0.000

180.

UIO\_CTM, 2000

50.

120.

-180.

-120.

-50.

# OD550 (3)

#### **MODIS/MISR** versus Aeronet

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

Overestimation by MODIS over the continents Better correlation between AERONET and MODIS data

#### MISR

**Experiment** A

# OD550 (4)

#### Experiment A

#### MODIS/MISR

![](_page_30_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Figure_6.jpeg)

# OD550 (5) Exemple of LOA and LSCE Experiment A

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

Less agreement with AERONET for INCA : problematic regions seem to be AFN and tropical band

# OD550 (6) Exemple of LOA and LSCE

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

Experiment A

120.

# OD550 (7)

666

0

year

Clim

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### The spread of values decreases for each model with expB

![](_page_33_Figure_3.jpeg)

# OD550 (9) Exemple of UIO\_CTM and UMI

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

# OD550 (9)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

# OD550LT1 (1)

#### **Experiment** A

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

Small overestimation by all models, except PNNL. Clim models have smaller correlation coefficient.

![](_page_36_Figure_4.jpeg)

# OD550LT1 (2)

#### Experiment A

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_3.jpeg)

Only 3 months of data ⇒ not considered for yearly mean calculation and scatterplot

![](_page_37_Figure_5.jpeg)

# OD550LT1 (1)

![](_page_38_Figure_1.jpeg)

Decrease of OD550LT1D between expA and expB.

We see for OD550 that values decrease in Europe and in Asia : locations of small particules => OD550LT1D decrease

# OD550LT1 (1)

![](_page_39_Figure_1.jpeg)

0.

50.

120.

-50.

-120.

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Angström coefficient (1)

2000

year

Nudged

6666

year

Clim,

#### Experiment A

![](_page_40_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Underestimation by most models in 2000 + UMI & MOZGN : problems

![](_page_40_Figure_4.jpeg)

# Angström coefficient (2)

#### Experiment A

![](_page_41_Figure_2.jpeg)

hitoontomobility none soos

![](_page_41_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Figure_5.jpeg)

### Angström coefficient (3)

![](_page_42_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Angström coefficient (4)

![](_page_43_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Decrease of angstrom component in Europe, AMS, AFS

![](_page_44_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Conclusion

### Surface observations

Models / measurements comparisons : collection of observational data (from web sites) EMEP SS and SO4 conc Europe - until 2000 - 32 stations **IMPROVE** : BC, OC, SS and SO4 concentration North America - 1996 to 2002 - 26 stations GAW SS and SO4 concentrations 5 stations - 1996 AIRMON SO4 concentration 2 stations - 1996&1997 Paul Scherrer Institute : BC conc 3 stations - 96 to 2001 AERONET OD550 and Angstrom coefficient 98 stations - 1996 to 2001 (1998 to 2001 for Angstrom) model output to 166 station locations • analysis of time series, global maps, scatter plots and synthesis graphs

#### Experiment A

### **OD550**

![](_page_47_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### OD too small over land : especially AMN (during summer) and AMS (during winter)

![](_page_47_Figure_4.jpeg)

### BC concentration (1)

6666

Clim, year

#### Experiment A

![](_page_48_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Same as OC conc : underestimation by all models except KYU and MOZGN

![](_page_48_Figure_4.jpeg)

### **BC** concentration (4)

![](_page_49_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### In general, better agreement with expB

Clim, year 9999

![](_page_49_Figure_4.jpeg)