

Control of radiation and evaporation on temperature variability in a WRF regional climate simulation: comparison with colocated long term ground based observations near Paris

Sophie Bastin, Marjolaine Chiriaco, Philippe Drobinski

▶ To cite this version:

Sophie Bastin, Marjolaine Chiriaco, Philippe Drobinski. Control of radiation and evaporation on temperature variability in a WRF regional climate simulation: comparison with colocated long term ground based observations near Paris. Climate Dynamics, 2018, 51 (3), pp.985-1003. 10.1007/s00382-016-2974-1. insu-01282710

HAL Id: insu-01282710 https://insu.hal.science/insu-01282710

Submitted on 22 Mar 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Click here to view linked References

1	Control of radiation and evaporation on temperature variability in a WRF regional climate			
2	simulation: comparison with colocated long term ground based observations near Paris			
3				
4	Bastin S. ^{(1)*} , Chiriaco M. ⁽¹⁾ , Drobinski P. ⁽²⁾			
5				
6	(1) Université Versailles St-Quentin, Université Paris-Saclay; Sorbonne			
7	Universités, UPMC Univ. Paris 06 ; CNRS/INSU, LATMOS-IPSL, 11 bd d'Alembert,			
8	78280 Guyancourt, France.			
9	(2) Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique, Ecole Polytechnique,			
10	Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ. Paris 06 ; CNRS/INSU, 91128 Palaiseau, France			
11				
12				
13				
14				
15	* Corresponding author: sophie.bastin@latmos.ipsl.fr; +33180285232			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20	Acknowledgments This work is a contribution to the HyMeX program (HYdrological cycle in			
21	The Mediterranean EXperiment) through INSU-MISTRALS support and the MEDCORDEX			
22	program (COordinated Regional climate Downscaling EXperiment - Mediterranean region).			
23	This research has received funding from the French National Research Agency (ANR)			
24	projects REMEMBER (grant ANR-12-SENV-001). It was supported by the IPSL group for			
25	regional climate and environmental studies, with granted access to the HPC resources of			
26	GENCI/IDRIS (under allocation i2011010227). The SIRTA-ReOBS effort also benefited			
27	from the support of the L-IPSL funded by ANR under the "Programme d'Investissements			
28	d'Avenir (grant ANR-10-LABX-0018) and by the EUCLIPSE project funded by the European			
29	Commission under the Seventh Framework Program (grant n°244067). We would like to			
30	ackowledge the SIRTA and Climserv teams at IPSL for collecting and providing data and			
31	computing ressources; Cindy Lebeaupin-Brossier and Marc Stefanon for providing simulation			
32	outputs; the CNES (Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales) for partially funded M. Chiriaco			
33	research.			
34				

ŧ

35 Abstract:

36 The objective of this paper is to understand how large-scale processes, cloud cover and 37 surface fluxes affect the temperature variability over the SIRTA site, near Paris, and in a regional climate simulation performed in the frame of HyMeX/Med-CORDEX programs. 38 39 This site is located in a climatic transitional area where models usually show strong 40 dispersions despite the significant influence of large scale on interannual variability due to its 41 western location. At seasonal time scale, the temperature is mainly controlled by surface 42 fluxes. In the model, the transition from radiation to soil moisture limited regime occurs 43 earlier than in observations leading to an overestimate of summertime temperature. An overestimate of shortwave radiation (SW), consistent with a lack of low clouds, enhances the 44 45 soil dryness. A simulation with a wet soil is used to better analyse the relationship between 46 dry soil and clouds but while the wetter soil leads to colder temperature, the cloud cover 47 during daytime is not increased due to the atmossheric stability.

At shorter time scales, the control of surface radiation becomes higher. In the simulation, higher temperatures are associated with higher SW. A wet soil mitigates the effect of radiation due to modulation by evaporation. In observations, the variability of clouds and their effect on SW is stronger leading to a nearly constant mean SW when sorted by temperature quantile but a stronger impact of cloud cover on day-to-day temperature variability. Impact of cloud albedo effect on precipitation is also compared.

54

55

56

Key-words: Hymex, CORDEX, temperature variability, SIRTA-ReOBS, surface and
radiative fluxes, lidar simulator, cloud radiative effects, land surface-atmosphere interactions.

- 59
- 60

62 1. Introduction:

63

64 In the context of climate change, the European mean temperature and its summer variability 65 are predicted to increase compared to the present-day conditions (Giorgi et al., 2006; Fisher 66 and Schär, 2009), and this would increase the probability of occurrence of extreme events 67 similar to the heat wave of summer 2003 (Schär et al., 2004; Nogaj et al., 2006), but also their intensity and duration (Gao et al., 2006; Della-Marta et al., 2007). However, despite extreme 68 69 events are of particular scientific interest due to their brutal societal and environmental 70 impacts (e.g Vautard et al., 2007; Fink et al., 2004), the temperature variability at all time 71 scales (decadal, inter-annual, seasonal, diurnal) also influences human society in numerous 72 sectors of activity including energy production, health, agriculture and more generally 73 economy and ecology. A good characterization and predictability of the temperature 74 variability then helps the population and stakeholders to anticipate and adapt to extreme 75 events and future climate, and helps to estimate air quality (Vautard et al., 2011; Menut, 76 2003), energy production and eco and agro-systems evolution.

77

78 Temperature variability over Europe is influenced by combined effects of i) large scale 79 dynamics which determine the advection of air masses from Atlantique, North-Africa, 80 Artic/Scandinavia or continental Asia (e.g Xoplaki et al., 2004), and ii) regional scale 81 processes including land surface-atmosphere interactions, cloud-radiation feedbacks and 82 boundary layer processes. The leading drivers of temperature variability are specific for each 83 season and depend on the considered time scale (e.g Vautard and Yiou, 2009; Ionita et al., 84 2012a,b, 2015; Cattiaux et al., 2011). European climate is particularly sensitive to the 85 interactions between cloud-radiation and surface-atmosphere feedbacks which cause large 86 uncertainty in the prediction of future climate (Hawkins and Sutton, 2009; Cheruy et al., 87 2014). Over southern areas (Mediterranean surrounding areas), evapotranspiration is limited 88 and controlled by soil dryness (Seneviratne et al., 2010): this is the soil-moisture limited 89 regime, where a positive feedback loop can be generated, drier soils leading to warmer and 90 drier air, which may prevent clouds to form thus enhancing shortwave radiation at surface 91 which causes even more drying of the soil. Over northern countries (Scandinavia), where the 92 soil is wetter, the solar radiation is reduced due to high latitudes leading to the limitation of 93 evapotranspiration by energy availability (Teuling et al., 2009): an increase of solar radiation 94 under anticyclonic conditions will be used to evaporate water which damps the temperature 95 increase and may increase cloudiness, thus generating negative feedback loop. Between both,

96 it is a transition area where the regime will evolve from radiative limited (where high 97 temperatures are more likely damped by water release from the soil) to soil-moisture limited 98 (where high temperature are more likely enhanced by the positive feedback loop) in the 99 course of the seasonal cycle. The transition timing will depend on latitude and year (more or 100 less preceeding precipitation...). Figure 1 shows the spatial variability of soil moisture and 101 shortwave surface net radiation and their evolution between May and June extracted from a 102 simulation to evidence this transition from southern to northern Europe.

103 These processes are not the only ones that will determine temperature variability: the stability 104 and the thermodynamical properties of the free troposphere can block these feedback loops by 105 modifying the relative humidity of boundary layer top due to the air entrainement (Gentine et 106 al. 2013; Stefanon et al., 2014). The modeling of such climate with accuracy is thus very 107 difficult due to the possible rapid enhancement of initially small departures from observations 108 by these positive and negative feedback loops. This explains why future projections are 109 strongly related with the way models represent present-day variability (Boé and Terray, 110 2014).

111

112 However, model uncertainty is potentially reducible by using specific observations of the 113 current climate because it helps identifying model errors. To evaluate models, previous 114 studies mostly used gridded surface datasets for temperature and precipitation e.g E-OBS 115 (Haylock et al., 2008), or satellite products such as Global Precipitation Climayology Project 116 (Huffman et al., 1997) and sometimes other observations of cloudiness or/and radiative 117 fluxes, e.g Chakroun et al. (under review), Tang et al., (2012) or Betts et al. (2007). This 118 helped in pointing out the difficulties of climate models to reproduce present climate 119 variability and possible sources of errors using correlations. But they did not allow to evaluate 120 the full representation of water and energy cycles and complex interactions between large 121 scale, clouds, land surface, boundary layer, and precipitation because of the different 122 colocalisation, time and spatial resolutions of these climate time scales observations. Now, 123 new long-term observational datasets including standard observations of pressure, 124 temperature, humidity and precipitation colocalized with observations of clouds, surface and 125 radiative fluxes emerge and allow to cross a new border in our understanding of such complex 126 system. Among these datasets, the Canadian Paririe data used by Betts et al. (2014; 2015) 127 really improved the knowledge in the land-surface-cloud-atmosphere coupling over northern 128 part of North America thanks to the use of synergy of observations. However, the sensitivity 129 of climate variability to the different components of this complex coupling depends on the

studied area: for instance, according to the study of Van den Hurk et al. (2012), Europe is lesssensible than the United States to soil moisture.

132

133 Recently, efforts have been made to create the SIRTA-ReOBS dataset (Cheruy et al., 2013; 134 Chiriaco et al., 2014), which is a reanalysis of observations collected since 2003 at SIRTA 135 (Site Instrumental de Recherche en Télédetection Active; Haeffelin et al., 2005), a site located 136 at about 20 km southwestern of Paris, France (Fig. 1). It includes standard observations, 137 remote-sensing observations of clouds, aerosols, radiative and surface fluxes among others. 138 The aim of this study is to evaluate one simulation performed in the framework of the 139 HYdrological cycle in Mediterranean EXperiment (HyMeX; Drobinski et al., 2014) and the 140 MED-CORDEX (COordinated Regional climate Downscaling EXperiment; Giorgi et al. 141 2009. MED-CORDEX is the Mediterranean focus of CORDEX; Ruti et al., 2015) programs 142 against high quality data of SIRTA-ReOBS. It is a first step to improve the ability of models 143 to reproduce temperature variability over the european transitional climatic area discussed 144 above where the spread of models is generally strong (Boé and Terray, 2014), even if this step is just dedicated to one model at one site. However, this site is of particularly interest since it 145 146 is located in the suburbs of Paris, an area concentrating several million of inhabitants and lots 147 of human activity, thus very vulnerable to climate variability.

148

The next section describes the different datasets used in this study, namely SIRTA-ReOBS and the HyMeX/MED-CORDEX simulations, and the way we compare them. Section 3 deals with the seasonal cycle of temperature which presents a strong bias in summer. The sensitivity of this bias to water availability and clouds is investigated. Section 4 discusses the temperature variability at interannual time scales and focusses on the control of clouds and evaporation during summertime. Section 5 concludes and proposes some perspectives to this work.

156

157 2. Datasets

158 159

160

2.1 SIRTA reanalysis: SIRTA-ReOBS

This study is mainly based on observations collected at the SIRTA atmospheric observatory, located 20-km South West of Paris (2.2°E/48.7°N – 160 m of altitude; red star on Fig.1), from 2003 to 2013 (Haeffelin et al., 2005). This observatory has collected many observations, which are now synthesized into the so-called "SIRTA Re-OBS dataset" as described in 165 Cheruy et al. (2013) and Chiriaco et al., (2014). After many steps of data quality control and 166 harmonization, the "SIRTA Re-OBS" file contains hourly averages of more than 40 variables 167 at this site. The availability of the variables used in this study is shown in Figure 2. Most of 168 the data used here are well sampled over the period of the study, excepted for the latent heat 169 flux and the lidar profiles so caution is necessary to interpret results using them.

170 The lidar profiles allow defining cloud products based on Scattering Ratio (SR) values, which 171 highlight the contribution of particles to the lidar signal (Annex 1, eq3). SR (z) is equal to 1 in 172 absence of clouds and aerosols. Cloud detection for each profile and at each vertical layer is 173 based on the SR thresholds that have been used in Chepfer et al. (2008, 2010) as 174 following: $0.01 < SR(z) \le 1$ clear, 1.2 < SR(z) < 5 unclassified (existence of particles, 175 could be optically thin clouds or aerosols). The threshold of cloud detection without 176 ambiguity is set to 5 ($SR(z) \ge 5$). When the lidar signal is fully attenuated by optically thick 177 clouds, the layers above are obscured and the SR values are very low. Hence a ground-based 178 lidar is better suited to evaluate low clouds occurrence than high clouds.

179

180 By comparing SIRTA's meteorological data with Meteo-France operational ground stations 181 selected for their potential influence on spatial averages within the grid mesh of their model 182 containing the SIRTA site, Cheruy et al. (2013) showed that monthly means of relative 183 humidity and surface temperature at SIRTA were always between the minimum and 184 maximum values observed around. Differences between min and max can reach 10% for 185 relative humidity and 2°C for temperature (even more during the heatwave of 2003) but the 186 covered area is much larger than the size of the grid cell of the simulation used in this study. 187 Champollion et al. (2009) compared observed data at urban and rural sites in May-June 2004 188 over this same area and showed that the nighttime temperature difference can reach several 189 degrees while the daytime temperature is quite similar. For specific humidity, the diurnal 190 cycle is more complex but the difference is less than 1g kg⁻¹. Thus, we should keep in mind 191 that the amplitude of the model biases could be different using another surface station but the 192 biases can not be attributed to a specific effect of the SIRTA site.

- 193
- 194 195

2.2 HyMeX/MED-CORDEX simulations

196 Two 20-year simulations were performed over the Mediterranean basin in the framework of 197 MED-CORDEX (Giorgi et al. 2009; Ruti et al., 2015) and the HyMeX programs (Drobinski 198 et al., 2014). These simulations perform a dynamical downscaling of the ERA-interim data 199 (Simons et al. 2007) at 20 km horizontal resolution over the domain shown on Fig.1.

200 Indiscriminate nudging towards ERA-interim reanalysis is used to constrain the fields above the planetary boundary layer with a coefficient of 5×10^{-5} s⁻¹ for temperature, humidity and 201 202 velocity components. This reduces the internal variability of the different simulations and 203 allows us to consider that the differences come mostly from the distinct forcings at the surface 204 (Salameh et al., 2010; Omrani et al., 2013, 2015). Both simulations use the same set of 205 parameterizations, except for the surface scheme. This set of parameterizations includes the 206 Single-Moment 5-class microphysical scheme (Hong et al. 2004), the new Kain-Fritsch 207 convection scheme (Kain 2004), the Yonsei University (YSU) planetary boundary layer 208 (PBL) scheme (Noh et al. 2003) and a parameterization based on the similarity theory (Monin 209 and Obukhov 1954) for the turbulent fluxes. The radiative scheme is based on the Rapid 210 Radiative Transfer Model (RRTM) (Mlawer et al. 1997) and the Dudhia (1989) 211 parameterization for the longwaves and shortwaves radiation, respectively. The lower 212 boundary conditions of WRF are provided by two different land-surface schemes. In CTRL, 213 soil moisture can evolve freely by using the sophisticated Rapid Update Cycle land-surface 214 model (RUC: Smirnova et al., 1997 and 2000). In the second simulation, called SURF, the 215 soil moisture availability is prescribed and set to climatological wintertime value preventing 216 any soil moisture deficit condition. This simulation is also at 20 km and was not performed 217 specifically for this study (otherwise we would have applied a seasonal cycle of soil moisture) 218 but helps in interpreting the impact of surface on the results. This sensitivity simulation SURF 219 covers the period January 1989- December 2008, while the CTRL simulation ends in 220 November 2011. Outputs are available every 3 hours. In the following, the CTRL simulation 221 is used by default as it is physically more realistic and covers a longer period. These 222 companion simulations have already been used to understand the impact of soil moistureatmosphere feedbacks on heat waves over France (Stefanon et al., 2014). 223

224 Since the horizontal resolution of the simulations is 20 km, we can wonder how much the 225 previous results can be affected by the extraction of model data at the closest grid point of 226 SIRTA coordinates. A comparison between the values at the SIRTA grid point and the grid 227 points around (not shown) suggested that the spatial variability in the model impacts the 228 seasonal cycle of temperature by about 0.5°, with urban grid points being warmer during 229 nighttime in summer, in agreement with observations (Champollion et al., 2009). However, 230 this difference between the grid points is small in comparison with the observed variability at 231 different local stations over this area (Cheruy et al., 2013) and we conclude that using a more 232 complex interpolation procedure than just extracting model data at the closest grid point 233 would not modify the results. Note that the simulation doesn't use a urban module but the soil

type of Paris and near suburbs grid points correspond to urban area (less evapotranspiration).
However, the difference that can be linked to heat storage in urban areas during winter is not
taken into account.

237 238

2.3 Lidar simulator and computation of cloud occurrence

239 To compare consistently the clouds observed by the 532-nm lidar and those simulated by the 240 model, we used a lidar simulator as done in Chiriaco et al. (2006). For this, we have adapted 241 the COSP lidar simulator (Chepfer et al., 2008; 2010) to the WSM5 microphysics 242 parameterization (Hong and Lim, 2006) used in these simulations, and to a ground based lidar 243 (instead of spaceborne lidar). We first vertically interpolated the profiles of cloud properties 244 over a common vertical grid and we computed the vertical profiles of the Scattering Ratio 245 (SR) using the lidar equation (see Annex 1). The properties (size distribution and effective 246 radius) of particles needed to compute SR are not direct diagnostics of the model and are 247 obtained by using the same equations and hypotheses than those used in the WSM5 scheme.

SIRTA-ReOBS provides a distribution of SR values observed by the lidar for each hour with available data. Using these SR distributions every 3 hours(to be consistent with simulation), we've computed the seasonal cycle of the vertical profile of cloud occurrence as the number of SR values greater than 5 at each level over the number of SR values greater than 0.01 at the correponding level (i.e only the profiles that are not fully attenuated). For the simulation we have one instantaneous vertical profile of SR every 3 hours, and we use the same diagnostic for cloud occurrence.

To go further in details and provide detailed vertical information on cloud optical and physical properties, SR histograms can be built following Chepfer et al. (2010). For each level, and each SR bin (14 bins between 0.01 and >80), we compute the number of SR values which fall into the bin over the total number of SR values >= 0.01 (we still only consider the profiles that are not fully attenuated). The sum of all bins at each level is then equal to 1. It is represented in log for better readibility.

261

262 2.4 Monthly mean datasets.

To compare CTRL simulation with SIRTA-ReOBS, we computed the different monthly mean values over exactly the same days and hours, i.e for all 3-hr time steps between 1st January 2003 to 30th of November 2011 but when an observed data is lacking for a time step, we remove the corresponding simulated data before averaging. This first dataset is called d1. Note that the number of time steps taken into account depends on the parameters (see Fig.2). However, except for lidar data for which a large part of missing data is due to a weather situation (no observations when precipitation occur), this study shows that missing data do not influence that much the results (at the scales considered here).

To compare the different simulations, we also defined two other datasets by reducing the period from 1st of January 2003 to 31st of December, 2008: one (hereafter called d2) in which all 3-hr time steps are considered, that is used to compare CTRL with SURF; the other one in which the time steps without observations are removed (hereafter called d3).

A last dataset (d4) is used that covers the longer period 2003-2011 with all 3-hr time steps.
Table 1 summarizes the available datasets.

277

278 3. Seasonal cycle: a positive feedback enhancing summertime temperature bias?

279

280

3.1 Seasonal cycle of surface atmospheric parameters.

281

282 We used the SIRTA-ReOBS dataset to evaluate the seasonal cycle of several parameters in 283 CTRL simulation. Figure 3 clearly indicates an overestimate of 2m-temperature (tas) during 284 summertime which reaches 2-3°C while wintertime tas is quite well simulated. This 285 summertime overestimate of surface temperature is consistent with a bad partitioning between 286 sensible and latent heat fluxes and an underestimation of evaporative fraction (EF), as already 287 demonstrated for CMIP5 models over mid-latitudes (Cheruy et al., 2013; 2014). Indeed, we 288 compared the sensible and latent heat fluxes (hfss and hfls respectively) over the available 289 period of these parameters (i.e few for latent heat flux but CTRLd1 and CTRLd2 remain quite 290 similar) (Fig.3e et f). We can see that the simulated sensible heat flux (solid red line) is 291 significantly too strong from spring to fall, while latent heat flux is strongly underestimated. 292 However, compared to the values of heat fluxes averaged over Europe and presented in 293 Stegehuis et al. (2012), the latent heat flux at SIRTA seems stronger than elsewhere, while the 294 sensible heat flux is only slightly weaker than the averaged surrounding fluxes. It is likely due 295 to the fact that the soil type at SIRTA is specific and not represented in the model, thus partly 296 explaining the difference of latent heat flux, but not all. Note also that the maximum value of 297 the latent heat flux appears earlier in the simulation (around May) than in observations (June, 298 in agreement with the averaged fluxes over Europe), decreasing the EF value and reaching a 299 soil-moisture limited regime starting in spring (EF $< \sim 30\%$). Since there are only few data of 300 heat flux, another way to check how much surface fluxes may impact the boundary layer 301 (PBL) characteristics is to plot the seasonal and diurnal cycles of the relationship between tas 302 and humidity at 2 m (huss). We can see on Fig. 4 that the observations show more or less a 303 linear relationship between tas and huss whatever the season and the time of the day, 304 indicating radiation control of surface fluxes. On the contrary, the simulated relationship 305 indicates a soil-moisture limited regime, since the moisture feeding of PBL is not sufficient in 306 spring and summer during the afternoon, due to weaker latent heat flux, probably due to a 307 lack of moisture availability into the soil. It generates warmer and drier low layers during 308 daytime in spring and summer (Fig.4) and deeper PBL (not shown because this parameter has 309 not yet been reanalysed over this period). The underestimate of precipitation amount in 310 summer (Fig.3b) amplifies the soil dryness and the increase of sensible heat flux but the soil 311 moisture deficit can also be explained by larger incoming solar radiation (Fig. 3c).

312 The overestimate of downwards shortwave flux at surface (SW) (about 60 W m⁻², Fig. 3c) is also consistent with the summertime overestimate of temperature. Several studies using WRF 313 314 over the United States have pointed out this overestimate of SW (e.g. Otte et al., 2012; 315 Herwehe et al. 2014) but the consequence was an overestimate of summertime (convective) 316 precipitation due to excess of latent heat flux. Katraglou et al. (2015) also pointed out a 317 positive bias of shortwave radiation in summer over southern Europe using WRF, and suggest 318 that this is induced by Kain-Fristch and Betts-Miller-Janjic convective schemes. Note that 319 downwards longwave flux is slightly underestimated but with a nearly constant bias during 320 the whole year (Fig.3d) so the reasons of the bias are likely not related.

321 To determine if this overestimate of SW is due to inaccurate radiative impacts of clouds or 322 also by a lack of clouds, we use the lidar data and compare observed (OBSd3) and simulated 323 (CTRLd3) cloud occurrences as explained in section 2.3. Fig. 5a and b show that non-324 precipitating low clouds are missing in the simulation in spring and summer, which is 325 consistent with the overestimate of SW. To go further in details and have an idea about the 326 physical properties of the missing clouds, SR histograms are built (see section 2.3). The 327 comparison of SR histograms (Fig.6) shows that while lidar observations suggest that there 328 are only small differences between winter and summer for non-precipitating clouds (the lidar 329 is switched off when it rains), except they occur at lower levels in winter, the CTRL 330 simulation indicates a strong seasonal cycle of low clouds with a nearly total absence of low 331 clouds of weak SR values during summertime. It means that only the optically thick low clouds (SR>=40) are simulated by the model, while observations show a high number of 332 333 optically thin low clouds (5<SR<20) in summer. These clouds mainly correspond to fair 334 weather cumulus (Chepfer et al., 2013). Note that very thick clouds (SR>=80) are also 335 missing in the simulation.

336 Hence CTRL simulation suggests the existence of a positive feedback: from spring, the soil 337 dryness induces too weak evaporation fraction, that generates warmer, drier (and likely 338 deeper) PBL during early summer. These conditions are not favorable to low clouds 339 formation, increasing the shortwave surface fluxes arriving at surface and hence enhancing 340 surface fluxes: the available soil moisture is then quickly evaporated (earlier than 341 observations), favoring drier and drier soil in summer and high sensible heat flux, increasing 342 again favorable conditions to warming. This hypothesis is consistent with previous studies 343 (e.g Cheruy et al., 2013; 2014; Fischer et al., 2012).

- 344
- 345

3.2 Impact of water avaibility: importance of diurnal cycle

346

To better understand the origin of biases and test the impact of water avaibility on the CTRL biases, we use the SURF simulation in which soil moisture is always available. We used dataset d2 to compare SURFd2 with CTRLd2 since SURF is not available with dataset d1 (see Tab.1). The seasonal cycle of each parameter is represented by dashed blue line in Fig. 3. As shown by this figure, CTRLd1 and CTRLd2 present very similar seasonal cycles, which implies that i) missing data in observations do not influence the results that much in that case; ii) we can directly compare SURFd2 and CTRLd2 with OBSd1.

354 We can see that when soil moisture is available (SURF), the evaporation fraction increases 355 (sensible heat flux (Fig.3e) is reduced to become comparable with observations, and the latent 356 heat flux (Fig.3f) is increased, still not enough comparing to observations, but significantly). 357 The maximum of latent heat flux occurs in July, as in the observations, meaning that the 358 regime becomes radiative limited, and the surface temperature is strongly decreased. The air 359 mass becomes even colder than observations in summer. Figure 4 shows that the boundary 360 layer also becomes wetter than observations, which can explain the weaker latent heat flux 361 since it is related to the humidity gradient between the surface and the lower atmosphere. 362 Such impact of soil moisture on seasonal temperature, also presented in Stefanon et al. (2014) 363 with the same simulations for heat waves, is in agreement with Van den Hurk et al. (2012).

However, the monthly means of radiative fluxes are not modified significantly in summer (they are slightly reduced in fall) in SURFd2, as already shown by Stefanon et al. (2014). In terms of clouds, Figures 5b and c show light differences between CTRLd3 and SURFd3 in summer with a bit more very low clouds in summer in SURFd3 and less clouds around 5 km, and more pronounced differences in fall at low levels. Figure 6f confirms the existence of very low clouds of moderate (20<SR<30) and strong SR (SR>60) in SURFd3 but the 370 difference is not important. The number of attenuated profiles at low levels is also enhanced 371 in SURFd3 (not shown). To better compare the two simulations with the same number of 372 profiles, we thus computed the vertical profiles of cloud occurrence without the lidar 373 simulator (i.e from the condensed water mixing ratio) focusing in summer (JJA) using 374 CTRLd2 and SURFd2 (i.e also including nighttime time steps and precipitating days). The 375 interannual variability is shown in Fig.7a and b and reveals a significant modification of the 376 vertical distribution of clouds below 8 km in summer between the two simulations, more 377 pronounced than when using dataset d3 which is reduced to non-precipitating days and 378 daytime and when using the lidar simulator because of the problem of fully attenuated 379 profiles. We can thus wonder why these differences do not affect the monthly mean of 380 shortwave radiative fluxes.

381 By considering the diurnal cycle of the differences between the two simulations, we can see 382 that most low clouds in SURFd2 appear during nightime and early morning (fog-like) (Fig.7c 383 and d), generating a decrease of SW in the morning in comparison with CTRLd2 (Fig.7e). 384 This decrease of SW in the morning is almost compensated by an increase in the afternoon 385 due to a difference of cloud occurrence in early afternoon at about 5 km (Fig.7c and d). This 386 can be explained by the atmospheric stability: despite greater relative humidity at surface, the 387 influence of important soil moisture can lead to unfavorable conditions to cloud formation in 388 the afternoon, depending on the large scale conditions that prevail (Boe et al., 2013) and the 389 thermodynamic conditions of free tropospheric air which is entrained into the boundary layer 390 (Gentine et al., 2013). Stefanon et al. (2014) have shown that during heat waves, in the SURF 391 simulation, the probability that the PBL is higher than the level of free convection (LFC) at 392 1500 UTC is zero over France, except over the Alps. We have checked that in general, during 393 daytime, the atmospheric stability is smaller in CTRL than in SURF over this site in summer. 394 Indeed, following the work of Boé et al. (2003) who have shown the strong link between the 395 Total Totals Index (TTI) and precipitation over France, we used this index to test the stability 396 of atmosphere. It is defined by:

397

TTI = Td850-Ta500+Ta850-Ta500

398 where Ta850 (Ta500) is the atmopsheric temperature at 850 (500) hPa, Td850 is the dew 399 point temperature at 850 hPa, and Ta850-Ta500 is the Vertical Totals Index and Td850-Ta500 400 is the Cross Totals Index. Higher the TTI, smaller the stability of the atmosphere. We have 401 computed the mean values and standard deviation of TTI over 2003-2008 during JJA. Table 2 402 shows that SURF has lower mean value of TTI, and also higher occurrence of values under 40 403 which corresponds to very low likely convection.

However, both simulations have difficulties to simulate the non-precipitating clouds. It is possible that the set of parameterizations which is common to the two simulations produces inaccurate eddy diffusivity profiles thus preventing the boundary layer cumuli to form. Microphysics processes can also be involved through the production of raindrops and the surface scheme in the redistribution of energy and moisture. Testing other sets of parameterisation may improve the results as already shown by several authors (e.g Guttler et al., 2013; Garcia-Diez et al., 2012; Jousse et al., 2015). It will be done in a future work.

412

413 So, the surface temperature bias is strongly related to the surface regime (soil-moisture or 414 radiative limited). The RUC soil scheme associated with these boundary layer (YSU) and 415 convective (KF) parameterizations presents an unbalanced hydrological cycle that is returning 416 moisture from land to the atmosphere too quickly, favoring the switch from radiative to soil-417 moisture regime too early in the seasonal cycle. We saw that wet soil strongly impacts the 418 mean surface temperature. However it does not impact much the monthly mean values of 419 shortwave radiative fluxes but modifies both the vertical distribution of clouds and their 420 diurnal cycle. The year-to-year differences between wet and dry soils are also important as 421 shown by Fig.7a and b. In the next section, despite the strong summer bias, we investigate the 422 relative role of clouds and surface fluxes on the variability of temperature, at interannual and 423 daily time scales, mainly focusing on summer.

424

425 4. Temperature variability: impact of large-scale dynamics, evaporation and clouds

- 426
- 427

4.1 Interannual variability of local temperature and extremes

428

It is of high importance to evaluate both the ability of the model to represent the temperature variability at present-day and the influences explaining this variability since several studies argue that the climate change signals will depend on the quality of present-day representation (Boé and Terray, 2014; Fischer et al., 2012).

Figure 8 shows that the interannual variability of monthly mean temperature is very well captured by CTRL simulation for all months, even during summertime despite the bias. We also plotted the monthly mean temperature of the reanalysis ERA-interim which nudges the CTRL simulation, except within the boundary layer. The fact that CTRL simulation and ERA-interim perform very well confirms that at this scale and this location, the variability of 438 monthly means is mainly controled by the influence of synoptic circulation, as already439 suggested by Cattiaux et al. (2011).

440 The interquartile range (IQR) (between the 25% and 75% quantiles of all mean daily 441 temperature of each month) is considered to quantify the variability. It is represented by 442 dashed lines on each suplot of Fig.8. It shows that the distribution of mean daily temperature 443 is predicted with high accuracy by CTRL, even in summer. As analysed in CRU data by 444 Lenderink et al. (2007) over the period 1961-1990, IQR is higher in June and July than in 445 August, and values of IQR are similar despite the different period of analysis. Such good 446 accurary of IQR by the simulation was not completely expected due to the biases discussed in 447 previous section and the fact that the european climate is strongly dependent on the water and 448 energy budgets (e.g Lenderink et al., 2007; Fisher et al., 2012; Vidale et al., 2007). Different 449 aspects can explain this: i) the western location of this site where the large-scale dynamics 450 strongly influence the interannual variability and modulate the land-surface-cloud-atmosphere 451 feedbacks at interannual time scale (Boe et al., 2013); ii) the fact that neither observations, 452 neither CTRL simulation are in an intermediate state concerning evaporation fraction: the 453 strong soil moisture depletion for all the considered summers in CTRL leads to small year to 454 year variations in evaporative fraction while in the observations, the soil stays wet most of the 455 time due to specific soil conditions. This leads to the same weak variability. It does not mean 456 that surface state does not influence the interannual variability, but its influence is reduced 457 compared to other sites/other models.

However, when considering the maximum and minimum values for each year/each month, some discrepancies appear (dash-dotted lines on Fig.8), suggesting that at shorter time scales and for extreme events, the influence of clouds and evaporative fraction becomes more important.

- 462
- 463

4.2 Control of surface parameters by radiation and evaporation in summer (MJJAS)

464

465 4.2.1 Relationship between temperature and shortwave net radiation and466 evaporation.

467

To analyse how much the summer temperature is influenced by radiative and surface fluxes, we sorted the daily maximum values of temperature from May to September (Fig.9a) and used it as sorting criterion for evaporation and daily mean of net shortwave radiation (SWnet) (Figs.9b and c respectively). We also did it for each month separatly but results are similar in 472 average, except that in August, evaporation is lower thus reducing the variability of 473 temperature. Several datasets are used (see Table 1): dataset d1 for temperature and radiative 474 fluxes; and dataset d4 (model only) for evaporation. Figure 10a compares the annual 475 distribution of the daily observed and simulated SWnet and shows that the spread of values is 476 important in summer, and that simulated values are in the range of observed ones except that 477 very low values of SWnet during summer are missing, in agreement with the lack of clouds 478 discussed in previous section.

- 479 Figure 9a shows the quantile plots of sorted maximum temperature. Datasets d1 and d3 (see 480 legend on Figure for details) are plotted so that the sensitivity of the results to the length of 481 the datasets can be assessed but the conclusion is that results are not that much affected by the 482 lack of data. This figure shows that: i) CTRL simulation does not tend to overestimate 483 extreme values more than median values since the slopes of evolution of T from the 5th 484 quantile up to the 95th quantile are similar; ii) the slopes in SURF are weaker than for OBS 485 and CTRL, showing similar values than OBS for the lower quantiles and lower values for 486 higher quantiles. This can be explained by the influence of evaporation: indeed, the 487 relationship between temperature and evaporation (Fig.9b) shows nearly constant values of 488 evaporation for CTRL whatever the temperature quantile, while in SURF, evaporation 489 increases with temperature quantiles. As explained by Stefanon et al. (2012), the more intense 490 evaporation damps the warmer temperature and then reduces the temperature variability and 491 the maximum values of temperature. The soil moisture availability in SURF thus strongly 492 contributes to reduce the slope on Fig.10a. In CTRL, the values of evaporation are too weak 493 to exert a control on temperature variability at this daily scale. This suggests a dominant effect 494 of shortwave radiation on the day-to-day temperature variability in CTRL simulation.
- 495

496 When considering the influence of shortwave (Fig. 10c), CTRL shows a linear relationship between SW and daily maximum temperature quantile up to the 75th quantile, with a 497 498 difference of about 100 W m⁻² between the value at the 75th quantile and the one at the 5th 499 quantile (hereafter called Δ SW). In SURF, SW goes on increasing at the higher temperatures. 500 Stronger SW favors stronger evaporation when soil moisture is available and thus explains the 501 evaporation-temperature relationship in SURF. The observations present a weaker Δ SW, 502 close to zero, indicating that the short wave radiation contributes stronger to the day-to-day temperature variability in the model. In the model, for quantiles up to the 75th one, the 503 504 temperature is controlled by the synoptic situation that prevails and which induces strong 505 variations of SW depending on the dominant cloud cover. For the higher temperatures, the averaged value of SW stays the same. The temperature of the day will then likely depend on
the variability of SW within a bin (due to the cloud cover) and the heat storage in the
boundary layer during the preceeding days (Miralles et al., 2014).

- 509
- 510

4.2.2 Role of clouds on temperature variability and bias

511 The shortwave downwards and net radiations depend on the presence, altitude, optical 512 thickness and properties of clouds and on the solar zenith angle and surface albedo. To better 513 consider the role of clouds and to reduce the effect of the change in solar zenith angle 514 between May and end of September, we thus use the effective cloud albedo (α_{cloud}) as defined 515 by Betts (2007):

516

 $\alpha_{cloud} = -SWCRE/SW_{clear}$

517 where

518 $SWCRE = SW-SW_{clear}$

519 is the cloud radiative effect (CRE) on shortwave. The effective cloud albedo represents the 520 fraction of the clear sky flux reflected by the cloud field. Figure 10 shows a comparison 521 between the observed short-wave fluxes, cloud radiative effect and cloud albedo and the 522 simulated ones in CTRLd1.

523 The absence of low clouds (Figs.5 and 6) induces an underestimate of cloud radiative effect 524 (cloud albedo), as shown by Figs.10b and c. Indeed, Figure 10c shows the seasonal cycle of 525 α_{cloud} from monthly means at 12 UTC and its interannual variability. It shows that the bias 526 between CTRL (red) and OBS (black) is significant, especially in summer, although the 527 spread of daily values is important (Fig. 10b). The black and red dashed lines which represent 528 the monthly means of the surface albedo for observations and simulation respectively, 529 indicate that despite the resolution of the model and the fact we compare at one single site, the 530 surface albedo is very well simulated in average and can not explain differences in net fluxes. 531 The cloud albedo bias is partly due to an underestimate of strong negative values of SWCRE 532 (Fig.10b) but all categories of clouds contribute to this underestimate as indicated by Fig.10d. 533 Indeed, for all values of simulated α_{cloud} except very opaque simulated clouds, most values are 534 negatively biased. Figure 10f indicates that while the number of α_{cloud} values in summer 535 shows a decreasing linear trend from 20% of values for the first bin ($\alpha_{cloud} < 0.1$) to 0% for the 536 last bin ($\alpha_{cloud}=1$) in observations, more than 50% of simulated α_{cloud} values correspond to 537 very low values (<0.1). It confirms what has been analysed with the lidar (Fig.6). Note that 538 the linear trend for the other bins is quite similar. In winter (Fig.10e), the distribution is

different with a peak at 0.7-0.8, which is represented by the model, although a little bitunderestimated (also note the higher number of low values as in summer).

Following Betts' methodology (e.g. Betts et al., 2006; Betts, 2009), Figure 11a stratifies temperature anomaly in summer (MJJAS) by cloud albedo. Temperature anomaly is chosen here instead of temperature since we are interested in the effect of clouds on the temperature variability. Temperature anomaly is computed as the difference between the temperature of the day and the average temperature of this julian day over the 9 years (2003-2011) and then stratified by α_{cloud} with 50 samples in each bin.

547 Figure 11a confirms that while the amplitude of seasonal cycle of temperature is dominated 548 by surface fluxes (Fig.3), the cloud cover influences the surface temperature variability. It is 549 in agreement with Fig. 9c, but, by using effective cloud albedo instead of SWnet and 550 temperature anomaly instead of temperature quantile, it removes the effect of seasonal cycle 551 of SWnet that likely contributes to the relationship in Fig.9c. It thus allows to detect finer 552 scale of variability. In average, the stronger the cloud albedo is, the stronger the cooling is 553 important in summer, but the dispersion is important, even more for values of α_{cloud} less than 554 0.5. Most cloudy free days ($\alpha_{cloud} < 0.1$) correspond to a positive anomaly of temperature, 555 while about 70% of anomalies are negative for $\alpha_{cloud} > 0.5$. The model tends to underestimate 556 the effect of warming of clouds of weak albedo ($\alpha_{cloud} < 0.3$), as shown by Fig.11b. The effect 557 of clouds on temperature variability is modified over wet soils as shown by Fig. 11b: SURF 558 underestimates warming of optically thin clouds more than CTRL (warmer temperature are 559 damped by evaporation) and overestimates cooling of clouds more than CTRL (more fog in 560 the morning). The interpretation of Figs.9c and 11a, b is that in observations, clouds often 561 exist whatever the synoptic situation, which induces the same average values of SW in each 562 bin of temperature (mainly driven by synoptic situation as shown previously). However, 563 inside a bin, the variability of SW values is high and days without clouds tends to enhance the 564 maximum temperature. On the contrary, in the model, fair weather low clouds are not 565 simulated, and then, high temperature are associated with high SW values with lower 566 variability inside each bin. Positive temperature anomalies associated with absence of clouds 567 is then not enhanced (Fig.11b).

The daytime precipitation (between 09 and 18 UTC) stratified by cloud albedo (Fig.11c) shows that the probability of occurrence of rain increases for cloud albedo greater than 0.4 for simulations and observations but the mean rain rate does not significantly increase, except in OBS for the highest values of cloud albedo (Fig. 11d). Higher than 0.4, the probability of rain increases a bit more quickly for SURF and CTRL than for OBS. The occurrence reaches 50%

for simulations while only 35% in observations for opaque clouds. However, Fig.11d shows 573 that it rains very lightly in SURF during daytime (even the 80th percentile is around 1 574 575 mm/3hr). CTRL and OBS have similar values of rain rate for median (around 1 mm/3hr) and 576 even up to 80th percentile (around 2-3 mm/3hr, except for the highest values of cloud albedo which reach 5 mm/3hr in OBS), but extreme values (95th percentile) are significantly stronger 577 578 in OBS than CTRL (reaching 20 mm/3hr in OBS and less than 10 in CTRL; not shown), 579 which is expected when comparing a local rain rate with a 20x20 km² grid cell (Chen and 580 Knutson, 2008).

581

582

584

583 5. Conclusion

The objective of this paper is to understand how cloud cover and surface fluxes control the temperature variability over the SIRTA site and in the model. This is of particular importance since this site is located in a climatic transitional area where models usually show strong dispersions. A schematic diagram showing the temperature range of observations and simulations as a function of surface conditions and surface net radiation summarizes the study (Fig.12). The main results of the study are:

- The large scale conditions have a strong impact on the interannual variability of
 temperature: this can be explained by the north-western location of the site, thus
 directly under the influence of air masses from the Atlantic. It is likely that this control
 is reduced over Central Europe.
- 595 • The soil moisture exerts a strong control on the seasonal cycle of the temperature. The 596 transition from radiation to soil moisture limited regime that occurs earlier in 597 simulations than in observations leads to an overestimate of summertime temperature 598 in CTRL simulation. Bullock (2014) already observed this unbalanced hydrological 599 cycle with NOAH surface scheme. The role of the surface scheme is not demonstrated 600 here. Indeed, the soil dryness is associated with an overestimate of shortwave 601 radiation. Consequently, the soil dryness can be attributed either to the excessive 602 energy arriving at surface or to an unbalanced hydrologycal cycle or both. The 603 overestimate of SW is consistent with a lack of low clouds in the simulation. 604 However, it couldn't be demonstrated the feedback between the dryness of the soil and 605 the lack of low clouds. Indeed, a wetter soil produces colder and wetter low 606 atmospheric layers but also more stable atmosphere during daytime preventing the 607 formation of low clouds. We would need to test other set of parameterizations to

608 improve our understanding of the model behavior and test what happens when the 609 radiative limited regime dominates until July and when clouds exist. This work is 610 underway. Also, Herwehe et al. (2014) and Alapaty et al. (2012) demonstrated that 611 introducing subgrid-scale cloud-radiation feedbacks in regional climate simulations 612 significantly decreases the summertime overestimate of SW. It is not sure that the 613 absence of subgrid scale cloud-radiation feedbacks plays such important role in our 614 simulation since it seems that convective clouds are not so numerous in the simulation 615 due to the too dry atmosphere but it will be investigated using WRF version 3.7 in the 616 next future.

- 617 At shorter time scales, the control of surface radiation becomes higher. In CTRL (dry • 618 soil and no clouds), higher temperatures are linearly associated with higher SW, the 619 main driver being presence/absence of clouds depending on the synoptic situation. A 620 wet soil (SURF) mitigates the effect of radiation due to modulation by evaporation. 621 Observations show a stronger variability of cloud cover in summertime, and then a 622 stronger impact of cloud cover on temperature variability within each range of temperature but no relationship between mean SW and temperature quantile. The 623 624 effect of clouds on temperature variability in CTRL also exists, even if more lightly.
- Both in observations and simulations, clouds with albedo less than 0.4 are non precipitating clouds and for higher albedo effects, occurrence of precipitation
 increases but not the average rain rate. However, clouds with very high albedo effects
 are particularly missing in simulations, generating lighter strong precipitation events.
- 629

In a future study, the quantification of warming by clouds will be adressed in more details.
Other models participating to HyMeX/MED-CORDEX programs will also be evaluated
against SIRTA-ReOBS to better explain the diagnosed spread. This study should be extended
to other french sites which produce similar reanalysis of observations in a context of french
and european concertations.

637 <u>References:</u>

638 Alapaty, K., Herwehe, J.A., Otte, T.L., Nolte, C.G., Bullock, O.R., Mallard, M.S., 639 Kain, J.S. and Dudhia, J. (2012). Introducing subgrid-scale cloud feedbacks to radiation for 640 regional meteorological and climate modeling. Geophysical Research Letters 39: doi: 641 10.1029/2012GL054031. issn: 0094-8276. 642 Betts A.K., 2009: Land surface atmosphere coupling in observations and models. J. 643 Adv. Model Earth Syst., 1, art#4, 18pp. doi:10.3894/JAMES.2009.1.4 644 Betts, A. K. (2007), Coupling of water vapor convergence, clouds, precipitation, and 645 land-surface processes, J. Geophys. Res., 112, D10108, doi:10.1029/2006JD008191. Betts, A.K., R. Desjardins, A.C.M. Beljaars and A. Tawfik (2015). Observational 646 647 study of land-surface-cloud-atmosphere coupling on daily timescales. Front. Earth Sci. 3:13. 648 doi: 10.3389/feart.2015.00013 649 Betts, A.K., R. Desjardins, D. Worth and B. Beckage (2014), Climate coupling 650 between temperature, humidity, precipitation and cloud cover over the Canadian Prairies. J. 651 Geophys. Res. Atmos., 119, 13305-13326, doi:10.1002/2014JD022511. 652 Boé J. and L. Terray, 2014: Land-sea contrast, soil-atmosphere and cloud-temperature 653 interactions: interplays and roles in future summer European climate change. Clim. Dyn. 654 **42**:683–699 DOI 10.1007/s00382-013-1868-8 655 Boé and Terray, 2008: Uncertainties in summer evapotranspiration changes over 656 Europe and implications for regional climate change. Geophysical Research Letters, 35, 657 L05702, doi:10.1029/2007GL032417 658 Boé J., 2013: Modulation of soil moisture-precipitation interactions over France by 659 large scale circulation. Climate Dynamics, 40(3-4), 875-892

Bullock, O. R., Jr., K. Alapaty, J. A. Herwehe, M. S. Mallard, T. L. Otte, R. C.
Gilliam, C. G. Nolte, 2014: An observation-based investigation of nudging in WRF for
downscaling surface climate information to 12-km grid spacing. J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.,
53, 20-33.

- 664 Cattiaux, J., and P. Yiou (2012), Contribution of atmospheric circulation to
 665 remarkable European temperatures of 2011, in « Explaining Extreme Events of 2011 from a
 666 Climate Perspective », Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 93, 1041-1067.
 667 doi:10.1175/BAMSD-12-00021.1
- Chakroun M., Bastin S., Chiriaco M., Chepfer H.: Characterization of vertical cloud
 variability over Europe using spatial lidar observations and regional simulation. Sub. to Clim.
 Dyn (special issue Med-Cordex).

- 671 Champollion C., Drobinski P., Haeffelin M., Bock O., Tarniewicz J., Bouin M.N.,
- Vautard R., 2009: Water Vapor Variability Induced by Urban/Rural Heterogeneities during
 Convective Conditions. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteorol. Soc.*, 135, 1266-1276
- 674 Chen C.-T., and Knuston T., 2008: On the verification and comparison of extreme 675 rainfall indices from climate models. J. of Clim., **21**, 1605-1621.
- Chepfer H., S. Bony, D. M. Winker, M. Chiriaco, J.-L. Dufresne, and G. Seze, 2008:
 Use of CALIPSO lidar observations to evaluate the cloudiness simulated by a climate model. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L20804, doi: 10.1029/2012GL053385.
- 679 Chepfer H., S.Bony, D. M. Winker, G. Cesana, JL. Dufresne, P. Minnis, C.J.
 680 Stubenrauch, and S. Zeng, 2010: The GCM Oriented CALIPSO Cloud Product (CALIPSO681 GOCCP), *J.of Geophys. Res.*, 105, D00H16, doi: 10.1029/2009JD012251.
- Chepfer H., G. Cesana, D. Winker, B. Getzewich, M. Vaughan, And Z. Liu, 2013:
 Comparison of Two Different Cloud Climatologies Derived from CALIOP-Attenuated
 Backscattered Measurements (Level 1): The CALIPSO-ST and the CALIPSO-GOCCP. *American Meteorological Society*, **30**, 725-744. DOI: 10.1175/JTECH-D-12-00057.1
- Cheruy F., A. Campoy, J.-C. Dupont, A. Ducharne, F. Hourdin, M. Haeffelin, M.
 Chiriaco, A. Idelkadi, 2013: Combined influence of atmospheric physics and soil hydrology
 on the simulated meteorology at the SIRTA atmospheric observatory. *Clim. Dyn.* 40, 2251–
 2269, doi: 101007/s00382-012-1469-y
- 690 Cheruy F., J. L. Dufresne, F. Hourdin, and A. Ducharne, 2014: Role of clouds and
 691 land-atmosphere coupling in midlatitude continental summer warm biases and climate change
 692 amplification in CMIP5 simulations. Geophysical Research Letters, 41:6493-6500
- Chiriaco M., R. Vautard, H. Chepfer, M. Haeffelin, J. Dudhia, Y. Wanherdrick, Y.
 Morille and A. Protat, 2006: The ability of MM5 to simulate ice clouds: systematic
 comparison between simulated and measured fluxes and lidar/radar profiles at the SIRTA
 atmospheric observatory. *American Meteorological Society*, **134**, 897-918
- 697 Chiriaco M., S. Bastin, P. Yiou, M. Haeffelin, J.-C. Dupont, M. Stéfanon, 2014:
 698 European heatwave in July 2006: observations and modeling showing how local processes
 699 amplify conducive large-scale conditions, Geo. Res. Let., 41, 5644–5652,
 700 doi:10.1002/2014GL060205
- Dee D, Uppala S, Simmons A, Berrisford P, Poli P, Kobayashi S, Andrae U,
 Balmaseda M, Balsamo G, Bauer P, Bechtold P, Beljaars A C M, van de Berg L, Bidlot J,
 Bormann N., Delsol C, Dragani R, Fuentes M, Geer A J, Haimberger L, Healy S B, Hersbach
 H, Hólm E V, Isaksen L, Kållberg P, Köhler M, Matricardi M, McNally A P, Monge-Sanz B

- 705 M, Morcrette J J, Park B K, Peubey C, de Rosnay P, Tavolato C, Thépaut J N and Vitart F
- 2011 The era-interim reanalysis: Configuration and performance of the data assimilationsystem. Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 137, 553–97.
- Della-Marta P. M., J. Luterbacher, H. von Weissenfluh, E. Xoplaki, M. Brunet, and H.
 Waner, 2007: Summer heat waves over western Europe 1880-2003, their relationship to large-
- scale forcings and predictability. *Clim. Dyn.*, **29**, 251 275.
- Drobinski P., V. Ducrocq, P. Alpert, E. Anagnostou, K. Béranger, M. Borga, I. Braud,
 A. Chanzy, S. Davolio, G. Delrieu, C. Estournel, N. Filali Boubrahmi, J. Font, V. Grubišić, S.
 Gualdi, V. Homar, B. Ivančan-Picek, C. Kottmeier, V. Kotroni, K. Lagouvardos, P. Lionello,
- 714 M. C. Llasat, W. Ludwig, C. Lutoff, A. Mariotti, E. Richard, R. Romero, R. Rotunno, O.
- 715 Roussot, I. Ruin, S. Somot, I. Taupier-Letage, J. Tintore, R. Uijlenhoet, and H. Wernli, 2014:
- 716 HyMeX: A 10-Year Multidisciplinary Program on the Mediterranean Water Cycle. Bull.
- 717 Amer. Meteor. Soc., 95, 1063–1082. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-12-00242.1
- Dudhia J., 1989: Numerical Study of Convection Observed during the Winter
 Monsoon Experiment Using a Mesoscale Two-Dimensional Model. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 46, 3077–
 3107. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(1989)046<3077:NSOCOD>2.0.CO;2
- Fink A.H. and co-authors, 2004: The 2003 European summer heatwaves and drought –
 synoptic diagnosis and impacts. *Weather*, **59**, 209–216.
- Fischer, E.M. and C. Schär, 2010: Consistent geographical patterns of changes in
 high-impact European heatwaves. Nature Geoscience,
- Fischer E. M., J. Rajczak, and C. Schär, 2012: Changes in European summer
 temperature variability revisited. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **39**, L19702.
- Gao X., Pal J.S., Giorgi F., 2006: Projected changes in mean and extreme precipitation
 over the Mediterranean region from high resolution double nested RCM simulation. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L03706
- García-Díez, M., J. Fernández, L. Fita, and C. Yagüe (2013), Seasonal dependence of
 WRF model biases and sensitivity to PBL schemes over Europe, Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.,
 139(671), 501-514,doi:10.1002/qj.1976
- 733 Gentine, P., A. A. M. Holtslag, F. D'Andrea, and M. Ek 734 Surface and atmospheric controls on the onset of moist convection over land, J 735 Hydrometeorol, 130211131121003, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-12-0137.1.
- Giorgi F., Jones C., Asrar R. G., 2009: Addressing climate information needs at the
 regional level: the CORDEX framework, WMO Bulletin 58 (3) July 2009, p183

- Giorgi, F. (2006), Climate change hot-spots, Geophys. Res. Lett., 33, L08707, *doi*:10.1029/2006GL025734.
- Güttler I, Č Branković, TA O'Brien, E Coppola, B Grisogono, F Giorgi, 2014:
 Sensitivity of the regional climate model RegCM4.2 to planetary boundary layer
 parameterisation. Clim. Dyn., 43(7), 1753-1772
- 743 Haeffelin, M., L. Barthes, O. Bock, C. Boitel, S. Bony, D. Bouniol, H. Chepfer, M.
- 744 Chiriaco, J. Cuesta, J. Delano"e, P. Drobinski, J.-L. Dufresne, C. Flamant, M. Grall, A.
- 745 Hodzic, F. Hourdin, F. Lapouge, Y. Lemaitre, A. Mathieu, Y. Morille, C. Naud, V. No[•]el, B.
- 746 OHirok, J. Pelon, C. Pietras, A. Protat, B. Romand, G. Scialom, and R. Vautard, 2005:
- 747 SIRTA, a ground-based atmospheric observatory for cloud and aerosol research. *Annales*748 *Geophysicae*, 23, 253–275.
- Hawkins E. and R. Stutton, 2009: The potential to narrow uncertainty in regional
 climate predictions. *American Meteorological Society*. 1095-1107
- Haylock MR, Hofstra N, Klein Tank AMG, Klok EJ, Jones PD, NewM (2008) A
 European daily high-resolution gridded data set of surface temperature and precipitation for
 1950–2006. J Geophys Res 113:D20119
- Herwehe, J. A., K. Alapaty, T. L. Spero, and C. G. Nolte, 2014: Increasing the
 credibility of regional climate simulations by introducing subgrid-scale cloud-radiation
 interactions. J. Geophys. Res. Atmos., 119, 5317–5330, doi:10.1002/2014JD021504.
- Hong, S.Y., J. Dudhia, and S.H. Chen 2004: A revised approach to ice microphysical
 processes for the bulk parameterization of clouds and precipitation, Mon. *Weather Rev.*, 132,
 103–120.
- Huffman, George J., Robert F. Adler, Philip Arkin, Alfred Chang, Ralph Ferraro,
 Arnold Gruber, John Janowiak, Alan McNab, Bruno Rudolf, Udo Schneider, 1997: The
 Global Precipitation Climatology Project (GPCP) Combined Precipitation Dataset. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*: Vol. 78, No. 1, pp. 5-20.
- Ionita M, Lohmann G, Rimbu N, Scholz P (2012a) Dominant modes of Diurnal
 Temperature Range variability over Europe and their relationships with large-scale
 atmospheric circulation and sea surface temperature anomaly patterns. J Geophys Res. doi:10.
 1029/2011JD01666
- Ionita M, Lohmann G, Rimbu N, Chelcea S, Dima M (2012b) Inter-annual to decadal
 summer drought variability over Europe and its relationship to global sea surface temperature.
 Clim Dyn., 38(1–2):363–377

- Ionita M., Boroneant C., Chelcea S., 2015: Seasonal modes of dryness and wetness
 variability over Europe and their connections with large-scale atmospheric circulation and
 global sea surface temperature. Clim. Dyn., DOI 10.1007/s00382-015-2508-2
- Jousse A., Hall A., Sun F., Teixeira J., 2015: Causes of WRF surface energy fluxes
 biases in a stratocumuls region. Clim. Dyn., doi 10.1007/s00382-015-2599-9.

Kain J.S., 2004: The Kain–Fritsch Convective Parameterization: An Update. *Journal of Applied meteorology*, 43, 170-181

- Katragkou et al., 2015: Regional climate hindcast simulations within EUROCORDEX: evaluation of a WRF multi-physics ensemble. *Geosci. Model. Dev.*, 8, 603-618.
- Lenderink G., A. van Ulden, B. van den Hurk and E. van Meijgaard, 2007:
 Summertime inter-annual temperature variability in an ensemble of regional model
 simulations: analysis of the surface energy budget. *Clim. Change.* 81: 1,233-274. DOI
 10.1007/s10584-006-9229-9
- Menut L., 2003, Adjoint modelling for atmospheric pollution processes sensitivity at
 regional scale during the ESQUIF IOP2, *Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres*,
 108, D17
- Miralles, D. G., Teuling A. J., van Heerwaarden, C. C., de Arellano, J. V-G., 2014:
 Mega-heatwave temperatures due to combined soil desiccation and atmospheric heat
 accumulation. *Nature Geosci.* 7, 345–349.
- Mlawer J. E., Taubma J. S., Brown D. P., Iancono M. J., Clough A. S., 1997:
 Radiative transfer for inhomogeneous atmospheres: RRTM, a validated correlated-k model
 for the longwave, *J. Geophys. Res*, 102, Issue D14, 16663–16682, DOI: 10.1029/97JD00237
- Monin A. S. and Obukhov, 1954: A. M. Basic laws of turbulent mixing in the surface
 layer of the atmosphere. Tr. Akad. Nauk SSSR Geophiz. Inst. 24(151):163-187
- Noh Y., W. G. Cheon and S. Y. Hong, 2003: Improvement of the k-profile model for
 the planetary boundary layer based on large eddy simulation data. *Boundary-layer meteorology*, **107**, 401-427
- Nogaj M., P. Yiou, S. Parey, F. Malek, and P. Naveau, 2006: Amplitude and
 frequency of temperature extremes over the North Atlantic region. Geophys. Res. Let., 33,
 issue 10, L10801, doi:10.1029/2005GL024251.
- 801 Omrani H, Drobinski P, Dubos T (2015) Using nudging to improve global-regional
 802 dynamic consistency in limited-area climate modeling: What should we nudge? Clim. Dyn.
 803 44:1627--1644

- 804 Omrani H, Drobinski P, Dubos T (2013) Optimal nudging strategies in regional
 805 climate modelling: Investigation in a Big-Brother Experiment over the European and
 806 Mediterranean regions. Clim. Dyn. 41:2451--2470
- 807 Otte, T. L., C. G. Nolte, M. J. Otte, J. H. Bowden, 2012: Does nudging squelch the 808 extremes in regional climate modeling? J. Climate, 25, 7046-7066.
- Ruty P., Somot S., et al., 2015: Med-CORDEX initiative for Mediterranean climate
 studies. In revision *to BAMS*
- Salameh T, Drobinski P, Dubos T. 2010. The effect of indiscriminate nudging time on
 large and small scales in regional climate modelling: Application to the Mediterranean basin.
 Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc. 136: 170–182, doi:10.1002/qj.518.
- Schär, C., P.L. Vidale, D. Lüthi, C. Frei, C. Häberli, M. Liniger and C. Appenzeller,
 2004: The role of increasing temperature variability in European summer heat waves. *Nature*,427, 332-336
- 817 Seneviratne, S.I., T. Corti, E.L. Davin, M. Hirschi, E.B. Jaeger, I. Lehner, B. 818 Orlowsky, and A.J. Teuling, 2010: Investigating soil moisture-climate interactions in a 819 99. 3-4. changing climate: А review. *Earth-Science* Reviews. 125-161. 820 doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2010.02.004.
- 821 Skamarock W. C. and J. B. Klemp, 2008: A time-split nonhydrostatic atmospheric
 822 model for weather research and forecasting applications. *Journal of Computational Physics*823 227:7, 3465-3485. Online publication date: 1-Mar-2008.
- Smirnova T. G., Brown John M., B. Stanley G., 1997: Performance of Different Soil
 Model Configurations in Simulating Ground Surface Temperature and Surface Fluxes. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **125**, 1870–1884. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/15200493(1997)125<1870:PODSMC>2.0.CO;2
- Smirnova, T. G., J. M. Brown, S. G. Benjamin, and D. Kim (2000), Parameterization
 of cold-season processes in the MAPS land-surface scheme, J. Geophys. Res., 105(D3),
 4077–4086, doi:10.1029/1999JD901047.
- Stefanon M., Drobinski P., D'Andrea F., Lebeaupin-Brossier C., Bastin S., 2014: Soil
 moisture-temperature feedbacks at meso-scale during summer heat waves over western
 Europe. Climate Dynamics, 42 (5-6), 1309-1324, DOI : 10.1007/s00382-013-1794-9.
- Stéfanon, M., P. Drobinski, F. D'Andrea, *and* N. deNoblet-Ducoudré (2012), Effects
 of interactive vegetation phenology on the 2003 summer heat waves, J. Geophys. Res., 117, *D24103, doi:*10.1029/2012JD018187.

- 837 Stegehuis, A., R. Teuling, P. Ciais, R. Vautard and M. Jung, 2013b: Future European
 838 temperature change uncertainties reduced by using land heat flux observations. Geophys. Res.
 839 Letters, 40 (10), 2242-2245. DOI: 10.1002/grl.50404
- Stegehuis, A., R. Vautard, P. Ciais, R Teuling, M. Jung, and P. Yiou, 2013a: Summer
 temperatures in Europe and land heat fluxes in observation-based data and regional climate
 model simulations. Climate Dynamics, 41, 455-477.
- Tang Q., Guoyong Leng and Pavel Ya. Groisman, 2012: European Hot Summers
 Associated with a Reduction of Cloudiness. J. Climate, 25, 3637–3644. doi:
 http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00040.1
- Teuling, A. J., et al. (2009), A regional perspective on trends in continental
- evaporation, Geophys. Res. Lett., 36, L02404, doi:10.1029/2008GL036584
- Van den Hurk B., Doblas-Reyes F., Balsamo G., Koster R.D., Seneviratne S.I.
 Camargo H. Jr, 2012: Soil moisture effects on seasonal temperature and precipitation forecast
 scores in Europe. Clim. Dyn., 38, 349-362.
- 851 Vautard R. and co-authors, 2007: Summertime European heat and drought waves
 852 induced by wintertime mediterranean rainfall deficit. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L07711
- Vautard, R., Moran, M. D., Solazzo, E., Gilliam, R. C., Matthias, V., Bianconi, R.,
 Chemel, C., Ferreira, J., Geyer, B., Hansen, A. B., Jericevic, A., Prank, M., Segers, A.,
 Silver, J. D., Werhahn, J., Wolke, R., Rao, S. T., and S. Galmarini, 2012, Evaluation of the
 meteorological forcing used for the Air Quality Model Evaluation International Initiative
 (AQMEII) air quality simulations. Atmos. Environ., doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.10.065.
- 858 Vautard, R. and P. Yiou, 2009, Control of recent European surface climate change by
 859 atmospheric flow, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L22702, 10.1029/2009GL040480
- Vautard, R., A. Gobiet, D. Jacob, M. Belda, A. Colette, M. Déqué, J. Fernández, M.
 García-Díez, K. Goergen, I. Güttler, T. Halenka, T. Karakostas, E. Katragkou, K. Keuler, S.
 Kotlarski, S. Mayer, E. van Meijgaard, G. Nikulin, M. Patarčić, J. Scinocca, S. Sobolowski,
 M. Suklitsch, C. Teichmann, K. Warrach-Sagi, V. Wulfmeyer, P. Yiou, 2012 : The simulation
 of European heat waves from an ensemble of 1 regional climate models within the EUROCORDEX project. Climate Dynamics, 41, 2555-2575.
- Vidale P. L., D. Lüthi, R. Wegmann, C. Schär., 2007: European summer climate
 variability in a heterogeneous multi-model ensemble. Clim. Change, 81, 209-232. doi
 10.1007/s10584-006-9218-z

Xoplaki E., J. F. Gonzalez-Rouco, J. Luterbacher and H. Wanner, 2004: Wet season
Mediterranean precipitation variability: influence of large-scale dynamics and trends. *Clim. Dyn.* 23: 63–78, DOI 10.1007/s00382-004-0422-0

period and	2003-2011	2003-2008	2003-2008	2003-2011
frequency	observations	all days, every	observations	all days, every
	sampling only	3hr	sampling only	3hr
OBS	OBSd1	-	OBSd3	
CTRL	CTRLd1	CTRLd2	CTRLd3	CTRLd4
SURF	-	SURFd2	SURFd3	

Table 1: list of datasets used.

	TTI mean value	TTI standard deviation	occurrence of
			values < 40
CTRL	43.5	2.3	35%
SURF	41.6	2.7	57%

Table 2: Total Totals Index (TTI) mean value and standard deviation for CTRL and SURF

879 simulations. The last column indicates the percentage of values under the threshold of 40.

882 List of Figures:

883

Fig.1 Domain of the simulation and location of SIRTA site (red star). Colormap presents
a) the soil moisture of May averaged over 2000-2009; (b) same as a) for June; c) the
shortwave surface net radiation of May averaged over 2000-2009; d) same as c) for
June.

888

889 Fig.2 Observations availability: Blue histograms indicate the number of days with 890 measurements (the maximum being 3256 over the period of the study) for each 891 parameter. Red bars indicate the average number of hours per day with measurements 892 (only considering 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21 UTC). rlds stands for 'radiative longwave 893 downwards at surface', rlus is the same but upwards, rsds and rsus are the same for 894 shortwave and rsdscs/rldscs are for clear sky fluxes. tas is for temperature at 2-m. hurs 895 and huss are respectively relative and specific humidity at 2-m, pr is for precipitation, 896 hfss and hfls are for sensible and latent heat fluxes respectively. SRlidar is for Scaterring 897 Ratio from lidar signal

898

Fig.3 Mean seasonal cycle of temperature (a), rain rate (4 lower lines, without circles)
and occurrence of precipitation (lines with circles) (b), downwards shortwave radiative

901 flux at the surface (c), downwards longwave radiative flux at the surface (d), sensible

- heat flux (e) and latent heat flux (f) averaged over period d1 (solid lines) and d2 (dashed
 lines). Black line is for observations, red is for CTRL and blue for SURF simulations (see
 legend for details). Vertical bars indicate one standard deviation for observations
- 905

Fig.4 Monthly mean of surface humidity as a function of monthly mean surface
temperature at 4 hours (03, 09, 15, 21 UTC). Colors represent the month of the year (see
correspondance on panel a). Each cross is for one month/one year from 2003-2008.
First row is for observations, second row for CTRL simulation, third row for SURF
simulation

911

Fig.5 Seasonal cycle of occurrence of clouds computed from SR values in OBSd3 (a),
CTRLd3 (b) and SURFd3 (c). The occurrence is the number of cloudy profiles (SR>=5)
over the number of profiles for which SR>=0.01;

915

Fig.6 SR histograms for lidar observations (first row) and simulated lidar profiles from
CTRL simulation (second row) and SURF simulation (third row) during winter (DJF-left
column) and summer (JJA-right column). The common dataset d3 is used. The white
vertical solid line indicates the limit between clouds (SR>=5) and clear or unclassified
atmopshere. The horizontal dashed lines indicate the low clouds layer.

921

Fig.7: a), b): Interannual variability of vertical profiles of cloud occurrence computed from condensed water mixing ratio values in JJA in CTRLd2 (a) and SURFd2 (b); c) and d): Diurnal cycle of vertical profiles of cloud occurrence computed from condensed water values averaged over JJA for CTRLd2 (c) and SURFd2 (d). e: Diurnal cycle of the difference between CTRLd2 and SURFd2 of the shortwave flux arriving at surface

927 averaged over JJA;

- Fig.8 :Interannual variability of monthly mean surface temperature anomaly at SIRTA
 (solid line). Red is for CTRLd1, black is for OBSd1 and blue is for ERAI extracted at
- 931 SIRTA grid point. Dashed lines indicate the inter-quantile range (between the 25% and
- 932 75% quantiles) of all data (all years) for each month. Dash-dotted lines indicate the
- 933 maximum and miminum anomalies for each month of each year
- 934
- Fig.9 Maximum temperature as a function of temperature quantile averaged over May
 to September. b) Same as a) for latent heat flux. c) Same as a) for downwards shortwave
- radiative flux at surface. The correspondance of the different lines is given by thelegend.
- 939
- 940 **Fig.10** a) Annual distribution of simulated total (red crosses) and clear sky (light blue 941 circles) shortwave net fluxes and observed (black crosses) total one. b) SW simulated 942 Net Cloud radiative effect (blue circles), downwards CRE (red crosses) and observed 943 downwards CRE (black crosses). c) Seasonal cycle of simulated effective surface cloud 944 albedo at 12 UTC in red solid line. Black solid line is for observed cloud albedo at 12UTC. 945 Shaded areas represents the interannual variability of the monthly mean values. Dashed lines are for the monthly means of surface albedo (red for CTRLd1 and black for OBSd1). 946 947 d) Simulated downwards α_{cloud} as a function of α_{cloud} bias (defined as simulated α_{cloud} 948 minus observed one). e) Distribution of values with a given effective cloud albedo in 949 winter. Black line is for observations, red line for simulation. f) same as e) in summer
- 950
- **Fig.11** a) Relationship between α_{cloud} and temperature anomaly of MJJAS from 2003 to 2011. Temperature anomaly is computed as the difference between the temperature of the day and the average temperature of this julian day over the 9 years and then stratified by α_{cloud} with 50 samples in each bin. The solid line corresponds to the 50th
- 954 quantile and the shaded area covers the values between the 20th and 80th quantile. Red 956 is for CTRLd1, black is for OBSd1. SURFd2 is in blue and the 20th and 80th are shown in 957 dashed blue lines instead of shaded area. b) Relationship between α_{cloud} and the 958 difference of temperature anomaly between simulation and observations. c) Probability
 - 959 of rain occurrence as a function of α_{cloud} . d) Relationship between rain rate (only wet 960 days) and α_{cloud}
 - 960 961
 - 962 **Fig. 12**: Evolution of temperature as a function of surface conditions and net radiation.
 - 963 Blue circles corresponds to the SURF behavior in January (J), May (M) and July (Ju).
 - Light green are for observations and Orange ones are for CTRL. The bigger the circle,
 - the enhanced variability. Min and max values of temperature and amplitude of these
 - values are mainly driven by large scale circulations.
 - 967

969 <u>Annex1: lidar equations</u>

970 ATB_{tot} and ATB_{mol} are respectively the attenuated backscattered signals for particles and 971 molecules (ATB_{tot}) and for molecules only (ATB_{mol}) and are given by (1) and (2):

972
$$ATB_{mol}(z) = \beta_{sca,mol}(z) \cdot e^{-2\eta \int_{z_{TOA}}^{z} \alpha_{sca,mol}(z) \cdot dz}$$
(1)

973
$$ATB_{tot}(z) = (\beta_{sca,part}(z) + \beta_{sca,mol}(z)) \cdot e^{-2\eta \int_{zTOA}^{z} (\alpha_{sca,part}(z) + \alpha_{sca,mol}(z)) \cdot dz}$$
(2)

Where $\beta_{sca,part}$, $\beta_{sca,mol}$ are lidar backscatter coefficients (m⁻¹ sr⁻¹) and $\alpha_{sca,part}$ and $\alpha_{sca,mol}$ attenuation coefficients (m⁻¹) for particles (clouds, aerosols) and molecules. η is a multiple scattering coefficient that depends both on lidar characteristics and size, shape and density of particles. It is about 0.7 for CALIPSO (Winker, 2003; Chepfer et al., 2008). The ATB_{mol} and ATB_{tot} products are averaged vertically to obtain SR over 40 layers (Chepfer et al. 2008 and 2010). SR is given by (3):

980
$$SR = \frac{ATB_{tot}}{ATB_{mol}}$$
 (3)

981







circles) and occurrence of precipitation (lines with circles) (b), downwards shortwave radiative flux at the surface (c), downwards longwave radiative flux at the surface (d), sensible heat flux (e) and latent heat flux (f) averaged over period d1 (solid lines) and d2 (dashed lines). Black line is for observations, red is for CTRL and blue for SURF simulations (see legend for details). Vertical bars indicate one standard deviation for observations.







unclassified atmopshere. The horizontal dashed lines indicate the low clouds layer.











as simulated α_{cloud} minus observed one). e) Distribution of values with a given effective

cloud albedo in winter. Black line is for observations, red line for simulation. f) same as e) in summer.



Figure 11: a) Relationship between α_{cloud} and temperature anomaly of MJJAS from 2003 to 2011. Temperature anomaly is computed as the difference between the temperature of the day and the average temperature of this julian day over the 9 years and then stratified by α_{cloud} with 50 samples in each bin. The solid line corresponds to the 50th quantile and the shaded area covers the values between the 20th and 80th quantile. Red is for CTRLd1, black is for OBSd1. SURFd2 is in blue and the 20th and 80th are shown in dashed blue lines instead of shaded area. b) Relationship between α_{cloud} and the difference of temperature anomaly between simulation and observations. c) Probability of rain occurrence as a function of α_{cloud} . d) Relationship between rain rate (only wet days) and α_{cloud} .



















-







