# Recent Advances in Understanding Cloud Feedbacks



#### Steven Sherwood





CLIMATE SYSTEM SCIENCE

Sunday, 12 January 14

#### Climate sensitivity estimates from CMIP3 GCMs participating in the IPCC AR4 :



#### [IPCC 2007, Chapter 8]

Spread in climate sensitivity and TCR : a concern for many aspects of climate change research (assessment of climate extremes and impacts, the design of mitigation scenarios, etc)

Origin of the spread : radiative forcing ? climate feedbacks ? ocean heat uptake ?

### Decomposition of the Transient Climate Response (TCR) simulated by CMIP3/AR4 OAGCMs :



Sunday, 12 January 14



IPCC AR5 Working Group I Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON Climate change

ipcc

WMO



WMO UNEP

Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis

- = positive feedback contribution
- = ambiguous feedback contribution



Fig. 7.11

IPCC AR5 Working Group I Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis



- = positive feedback contribution
- = ambiguous feedback contribution



What could be missing?

- low cloud feedback remains highly variable in models

Fig. 7.11

- cirrus cloud amount/thickness feedback might also be possible

IPCC AR5 Working Group I Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis

Sunday, 12 January 14

Greenhouse Warming	<section-header><section-header></section-header></section-header>	<section-header></section-header>
Cloud Response	High clouds rise as troposphere deepens, increasing difference between cloud top and surface temperature.	Reduction in mid- and low-level cloudiness (left). Shift of cloudy storm tracks poleward into regions with less sunlight (right).
Feedback Mechanism	High clouds more effectively trap infrared radiation, increasing surface warming.	Less sunlight reflected by clouds back to space, increasing surface warming.

#### DRAFT Fig. FAQ 7.1

IPCC AR5 Working Group I Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis

![](_page_7_Picture_3.jpeg)

Greenhouse Warming	Tropics	<section-header></section-header>
Cloud Response	High clouds rise as troposphere deepens, increasing difference between cloud top and surface temperature.	Reduction in mid- and low-level cloudiness (left). Shift of cloudy storm tracks poleward into regions with less sunlight (right).
Feedback Mechanism	High clouds more effectively trap infrared radiation, increasing surface warming.	Less sunlight reflected by clouds back to space, increasing surface warming.

These mechanisms are tied to large-scale circulation changes that are robust and relatively well understood.

DRAFT Fig. FAQ 7.1

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

IPCC AR5 Working Group I Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis

## Robust features

Rise in elevation of deep clouds as explained by "Fixed Anvil Temperature" hypothesis (Hartmann and Larson 2002; Zelinka and Hartmann 2009). Positive feedback ~0.4 W m<sup>-2</sup>K<sup>-1</sup>.

Poleward shift of clouds along with storm tracks and tropical edge appears to cause strong positive feedback but hard to quantify (Bender et al. 2012)

Most models also lose low clouds, especially in the subtropics, and have less cloud cover globally on average (Zelinka et al. 2011) also a positive feedback.

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

FAT/PHAT mechanism: clouds always peak around 220K regardless of climate, due to radiation+circulation constraint

 Explicit cloud-resolving simulations of radiativeconvective equilibrium (e.g., Kuang and Hartmann 2007) confirm FAT. Also consistent with observations (e.g., Eitzen et al. 2009, 2011)

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

Clouds moving poleward in both hemispheres (Bender et al. 2012)

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

Data from Zelinka et al. (2012,2013); Soden and Vecchi (2011); Held and Soden (2008)

Note: CFMIP = Cloud Feedback Model Intercomparison Project

# Summary 2013

- There are robust, positive cloud feedback mechanisms seen in GCMs and confirmed in observations and/or process models.
- There are non-robust changes in low clouds; that happen to add more positive feedback in most GCMs, but we don't know why.
- Divergent low cloud responses are the main reason GCMs have different climate sensitivities (especially in CMIP3).

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Shallow / nonprecipitating convection

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

•*Empirically*: inversion strength correlates with low-cloud amount, in regions of subsidence  $\rightarrow$  focus on  $\Delta \theta$ . But this really does not explain GCM spread (and there is a lot of low cloud in ascent regions).

• Physically: low cloud amount very sensitive to  $q_{\rm l}$ .

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

- In warmer climate, water vapour increases 6%/K or more.
- Deep circulation coupled tightly to radiation, slows down to compensate for the increased H<sub>2</sub>O density.
- LT-mixing is not coupled; variations can affect mean relative humidity (Sherwood and Meyer 2006). What happens to it?

### I. Small-scale component

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

Parameterized convective transport out of PBL increases by ~6%/K in IPSL, <2%/K in PCM.

### Small-scale lower-trop mixing index

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

Averaged over lowest quartile of  $\omega$  at 500 hPa (roughly, the Indo-Pacific warm pool ascent region)

Strong small-scale LT-mixing brings each air property at 700 hPa closer to that in the PBL (high correlation between  $\Delta R$ and  $\Delta T!$ ) ...characterise LT-mixing with index S.

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

Sunday, 12 January 14

With warming, convective drying of PBL increases more in models with higher S

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

### 2. Large-scale component

![](_page_21_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Large-scale LT-mixing moisture transport and index

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Results

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

### MILC (Mixing-Induced Low Cloud) feedback

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

- In warmer climate, water vapour transport by LT-mixing increases 6%/K or more, but surface evaporation increases by only 2%/K.
- Amount of LT-mixing varies by factor of ~4 among GCMs.
- Increased dehydration of PBL as climate warms, depending on amount of LT-mixing in the base state, causes loss of low cloud in most GCMs.

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Conclusions

Known cloud feedback mechanisms in GCMs arise from dynamical and thermodynamic controls on clouds

- New MILC mechanism
  - can explain half the variance in ECS among GCMs (and implies ECS > 3°C)
  - implies "remote control" of low-cloud properties
    by behaviour in deep convective regions
  - This requires new multiscale approaches

# Remaining questions

What controls strengh of lower-trop mixing?

- How does the warmer system reestablish water balance?
- What explains the rest of the ECS variance?
- Do clouds respond as faithfully to the dynamical/ thermodynamic controls in reality as in GCMs?
- If ECS>3°C, why isn't the world warming faster?
  - Other "dark feedbacks" that are negative?
  - Aerosols cooling more than we think?

### Role for SPARC

Oynamical and strat/TTL roles in cloud control

Orrus feedbacks remain a "wild card" that needs more attention – TTL again

Traditional dynamical approaches need to incorporate condensational heating to be truly useful – a "grand challenge"

#### Low Sensitivity

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

# $S \equiv \frac{\Delta R}{100\%} - \frac{\Delta T}{9 \mathrm{K}}$

### Enhanced small-scale mixing is quasi-global

800-500 hPa

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)