Stratospheric Temperature Trends Our Evolving Understanding

Dian Seidel

NOAA Air Resources Laboratory – College Park, Maryland, USA

with contributions from many colleagues, particularly SPARC Temperature Trends Activity (SPARC Stratospheric Temperature Trends Assessment Panel)

SPARC General Assembly, Queenstown NZ, 12 January 2014



Objectives

- Review 4 decades of research, 2 decades of SPARC contributions
- Emphasize observations
- Summarize the evolution of our understanding
- Highlight current areas of uncertainty

Focus

- Global T changes
- Radiosonde and MSU observations of lower strat. T
- SSU observations of upper strat. T
- Post-Pinatubo stratospheric T evolution
- Reanalyses
- Emerging global observational datasets
- <u>Not</u> focusing on
 - Spotty observations (rocketsonde, lidar)
 - Modeling developments and intercomparisons
 - Causes of trends (GHG, O₃, H₂O, aerosols, ...)
 - Relation to dynamical changes (overturning circulation)
 - Seasonal or 3-D structure of trends
 - Interannual signals (solar, QBO, ENSO, ...)

Two Pioneering Model Studies



- Manabe and Wetherald (JAS, 1967)
- Increasing CO₂ cools stratosphere in 1D RCM
- Also addressed: Ozone, Solar variations, Water vapor

- *Ramanathan et al.* (JAS, 1976)
- O₃ loss cools stratosphere in 1D RCM
- Discussed tropical tropopause cooling effect on stratospheric water vapor

Early Radiosonde Study – Lower Stratosphere



- Angell and Korshover (MWR, 1978)
- 42-station radiosonde network, 20-yr record
- Identified volcanic warming, QBO signal, ENSO signal, solar signal, <u>cooling trend</u>, sampling uncertainties

Trend Uncertainties in 1990s and 2000s



- All data points are PUBLISHED trend estimates
- Large spurious cooling in early radiosonde estimates
- Adjusted radiosonde data show less cooling
- Spread among trends comparable to trend magnitudes
- Seidel et al. (WIREs Climate Change 2011)

Current Radiosonde Analyses



- 55-yr record ... and continuing
- Time-varying biases removed in data from several teams
- Different approaches help quantify structural uncertainty
- ~ 2K cooling since 1958; Little change since 1995
- Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc. supplement (2012)

"Early" Satellite Observations



Trend Uncertainties in 1990s and 2000s



- MSU shows less cooling than radiosondes for the same periods
- Different versions of UAH dataset have different trends
- Spread among trends comparable to trend magnitudes, as with raobs
- Seidel et al. (WIREs Climate Change 2011)

Current MSU Analyses global T anomalies



Stratospheric Sounding Unit (SSU) on NOAA Polar Orbiters 1979-2005



"Raw" brightness temperatures from multiple SSUs

SSU Status circa 2000

SPARC Stratospheric Temperature Trends Assessment Panel

- One dataset from UK Met Office (*Nash and Forster* Adv. Space Res. 1986)
- 3 channels, plus synthetic channels using off-nadir obs
- "While the adjustment process succeeds in resolving one major uncertainty ... there may be residual uncertainties du to other factors that necessitate continued analysis of this data." (*Ramaswamy et al.* Rev. Geophys. 2001)



SSU research in 21st century

- SSU record ended in 2005
- SPARC activity remains interested in unique data record
- Effect of atmospheric CO₂ increase on weighting function
 - Recognized (WMO 1988, Brindley et al. J. Climate 1999)
 - Reconsidered (Shine et al. GRL 2008)
 - Removed (Randel et al. JGR 2009)
- Concern about X channels (*Randel et al.* 2009) and vertical consistency (*Seidel et al.* 2011)
- NOAA team creates second SSU dataset, different merging and adjustment methods (*Wang et al. J. Climate 2012*) supercedes *Liu and Weng* (2009)
- Differences between of NOAA and UKMO datasets deemed a "mystery" (*Thompson et al.* Nature 2012)
- Re-examination by both NOAA and UKMO. New versions, and papers, forthcoming in 2014.

Lower Stratosphere: SSU and MSU



Lower Stratosphere: SSU and MSU







- Differences between SSU versions inconsistent among 3 channels
- Volcanic warming greater in models than observed
- Differences between SSU versions, and with models, in long-term T change

Reanalyses





0.5

8(C)

T Anomalies in 7 Reanalyses 1979 - 2012

> Temperature scale: -8 to +8 K 1000 - 300 hPa

Figure courtesy of Craig Long (S-RIP)

Reanalyses















T Anomalies in 7 Reanalyses 1979 – 2012

Temperature scale: -8 to +8 K 1000 hPa - top Figure courtesy of Craig Long (S-RIP)

19

21st C. Observations from Polar Orbiters



Figure courtesy of A. Simmons

20



Other 21st C. Observations

- Satellite:
 - GNSS-RO: Global Navigational Satellite System Radio Occultation
 - SABER: Sounding of the Atmosphere using Broadband Emission Radiometry (NASA)
 - GOMOS: Global Ozone Monitoring by Occultation of Stars (ESA)
- Ground-Based
 - NDACC Lidars
 - GCOS Reference Upper-Air Network

Other 21st C. Observations

	GNSS-RO	SABER	GOMOS
Principle	Refractivity- dependent time delay of radio transmission	Broadband radiometry; CO2 emissions	Chromatic refractivity; scintillation measurements
Altitude Range (km)	8-25	20-100	15-30
Vertical Resolution (m)	200	2000	200
Period of Obs.	~2006-present	2001-present	2002-2012
Maturity of analysis effort	High	low	low

GNSS-RO: Global Navigational Satellite System Radio Occultation SABER: Sounding of the Atmosphere using Broadband Emission Radiometry (NASA) GOMOS: Global Ozone Monitoring by Occultation of Stars (ESA)

SABER T Anomalies (50°N-S)



Unpublished data, courtesy of Bill Randel

Take-home Messages

- Models have long predicted large stratospheric T changes.
 - Stratospheric T should remain a priority for climate change detection.
 - Discrepancies between models and obs need better explanations.
- Observations for detecting changes are not ideal.
 - Progress has been slow.
 - Large uncertainties remain and need to be better quantified.
- Post-volcanic warming is the dominant signal in the lower stratosphere.
- Observations suggest long-term cooling, but
 - Cooling is not monotonic or linear
 - On global-average, there has been little change since 1995.
- Maybe we should stop talking about stratospheric T changes as trends.

SPARC T Trends Activity References

- Ramaswamy, V., M.-L. Chanin, J. Angell, J. Barnett, D. Gaffen, M. Gelman, P. Kekhut, Y. Koshelkov, K. Labitzke, J.-J. R. Lin, A. O'Neill, J. Nash, W. Randel, R. Rood, K. Shine, M. Shiotani, and R. Swinbank, 2001: Stratospheric temperature trends: Observations and model simulations. *Rev. Geophys.*, 39, 71-122.
- Shine, K.P., M.S. Bourqui, P.M.de F. Forster, S.H.E. Hare, U. Langematz, P. Braesicke, V. Grewe, C. Schnadt, C.A. Smith, J.D. Haigh, J. Austin, N. Buchart, D. Shindell, W.J. Randel, T. Nagashima, R.W. Portman, S. Solomon, D.J. Seidel, J. Lanzante, S. Klein, V. Ramaswamy, M.D. Schwarzkopf, 2003: A comparison of model-predicted trends in stratospheric temperatures. *Quart. J. Royal. Meteor. Soc.*, 129, 1565-1588. doi: 10.1256/qj.02.186.
- Randel, W.J., K.P. Shine, J. Austin, J. Barnett, C. Claud, N.P. Gillett, P. Keckhut, U. Langematz, R. Lin, C. Long, C. Mears, A. Miller, J. Nash, D.J. Seidel, D.W.J. Thompson, F. Wu and S. Yoden, 2009: An update of observed stratospheric temperature trends. J. Geophys. Res., 114, D02107, doi:10.1029/2008JD010421.
- Seidel, D.J., N.P. Gillett, J.R. Lanzante, K.P. Shine, P.W. Thorne 2011: **Stratospheric temperature trends: Our evolving understanding.** Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 2, 592-616, DOI: 10.1002/wcc.125
- Thompson, D.W.J., D.J. Seidel, W.J. Randel, C.-Z. Zou, A. H. Butler, R. Lin, C. Long, C. Mears, A. Osso, 2012: **The mystery of recent stratospheric temperature trends**. Nature, 491,692-697, doi:10.1038/nature11579.

GNSS radio occultation satellite missions: past, current, planned...

Figure courtesy of Andrea Steiner



Status of the Global Observing System for Radio Occultation (Update 2013), IROWG/DOC/2013/02

www.irowg.org/workshops.html

SSU time series comparisons



Seidel et al. (2011)

Courtesy K. Shine

Temperature Trend Comparisons



29

SSU Issues

- Pressure cell leakage effects
- "Synthetic" channels (X channels) using off-nadir data
- Tidal effects
- Dataset nomenclature confusion
- Interpretation of radiance changes vs T changes importance of weighting function
- Complete uncertainty budget analyses
- SSU / AMSU merging
- Utility of early satellite data (Nimbus PMR, VTPR, SAMS, ISAMS) not much investigated

Atmospheric CO₂ increase affects SSU

- Effective elevation of SSU weighting functions
- Apparent warming trends
 ~0.3 K/decade



AMSU weighting functions



Carl Mears

AMSU series from channels 11-14



NOAA 15 NOAA 16 NOAA 18 METOP A NOAA 19 Carl Mears

AMSU LECTs - Channel 13 Carl Mears 24ı Local Equator Crossing Time (Hours) **METOP-A** 22 20 NOAA-15 18 16

NOAA-18

2005 Years

NOAA-19

2010

NOAA-16

2000

AQUA

14

12^I



Roger Saunders

Sealing problem of SSU pressure modulator cell



Time series for "effective" cell pressures deduced from the frequency of oscillation of the modulator cell Values are adjusted to best fit to the Met Office's 6-monthly estimates.

A sealing problem caused cell pressures to increase during storage on the ground and then to decrease after launch.

Viktoria Sofieva

GOMOS temperature measurements: data updates



Envisat: 2002 - 2012

Viktoria Sofieva

High Resolution Temperature Profiles

- Unique experiment
 - Based on chromatic refraction
 - Uses scintillation measurements by GOMOS fast photometers
- New reprocessed dataset (with IPF 6.0) is available and under validation
- Main parameters
 - vertical resolution ~200 m
 - precision ~1-2 K

• Valid altitude range ~15-30 km





Bill Randel

SABER data details

- Limb emission viewing geometry
- Broadband radiometry, T(p) derived from CO₂ emissions
- Data since late 2001
- Coverage: 50° S 80° N / 80° S 50° N (60-day yaw cycles)
- Altitudes ~20-100 km; Vertical resolution ~2 km







Bill Randel

SABER data details

- Limb emission viewing geometry
- Broadband radiometry, T(p) derived from CO₂ emissions
- Data since late 2001
- Coverage: 50° S 80° N / 80° S 50° N (60-day yaw cycles)
- Altitudes ~20-100 km; Vertical resolution ~2 km

