



1: Questions

Q1: What are the responses in the mean states and internal variability (noise) to increase in GHG concentrations?

Q2: Is there any change for internal variability (noise) patterns in global warming scenario?

Q3: What is the response of ENSO to increase in GHG concentrations?

Q4: What are differences in predictability in global warming scenario for different variables?

2: Model and Data

A: Model, CCSM3: T42L26 CAM fully coupled with ocean, land and sea ice (Collins et al. 2006). The ocean model is POP with a horizontal resolution of 1° (down to $1/2^{\circ}$ latitude in the equatorial tropics) and L40. No flux adjustments are used in CCSM3.

B: A1B Runs: forced by the SRES A1B scenario for the period Jan2000-Dec2061 with initial condition (IC) from a single simulation of 20th century climate (forced by a combination of anthropogenic and natural forcings in 20th century). The perturbations only in atmosphere from different days around Jan. 1, 2000 generate 30 ICs (see Teng and Branstator, 2010, Meehl et al. 2006, 2010 for more details).

C: Control Runs: also called commit runs, forced by the forcing fixed in the year 2000 level (Meehl et al. 2006). Others are similar to the A1B runs.

D: Available Data: Monthly mean surface temperature (TS), precipitation, and geopotential height at 200 hPa (H200) for period Jan2000-Dec2061. 30 members of A1B runs and 28 members of Control runs

3: SUMMARY

- A. Increase in GHG concentrations changes the mean states significantly, especially for TS and H200, but the internal variability (noise) does not change much in extra-tropics, and the leading modes of internal variability are almost identical for Control and A1B runs.
- B. Significant warming in the tropical Oceans. Superimposed on a warming trend, amplitude of internal variability in the Nino3.4 region is slightly suppressed in the A1B runs.
- C. Predictability (or signal-to-noise ratio) of the response to increase in GHG concentrations depends on variable, period, and location: The predictability increases with time for all variables, especially for H200. The predictability is the highest for H200, the lowest for precipitation, in between for TS, and it is higher in lower latitudes than in higher latitudes, particularly for H200 and TS. The predictability for precipitation does not vary much with latitudes. In addition, the TS response to the increase in GHG concentrations is largely linear, even for regional scale.

Citation: Hu, Z.-Z., A. Kumar, B. Jha, and B. Huang, 2011: An analysis of forced and internal variability in a warmer climate in CCSM3. J. Climate (revised)

<u>Contact Information:</u>E-mail: Zeng-Zhen.Hu@noaa.gov

Acknowledgements: The data used in this work are from the CCSM Climate Variability and Climate Change Working Groups "21st century CCSM3 Large Ensemble Project" (Grant Branstator, Clara Deser, Jerry Meehl, Haiyan Teng) and kindly provided by G. Meehl. We appreciate the comments and suggestions of Peitao Peng and Mingyue Chen. During analyzing the data, we eceived helps from Aixue Hu.

An Analysis of Forced and Internal Variability under Increasing CO₂ in CCSM3 Zeng-Zhen Hu¹, Arun Kumar¹, Bhaskar Jha¹, and Bohua Huang² 1. Climate Prediction Center, NCEP/NWS/NOAA, 5200 Auth Road, Camp Spring, MD 20746, USA 2. Department of Atmospheric, Oceanic, and Earth Sciences, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030 and COLA, Calverton, MD 20705 Increase of GHG concentration changes the mean states significantly, but the internal variability does not change much Superimposed on a warming trend, amplitude of internal variability of ENSO is slightly suppressed in the A1B runs **Predictability** (or signal-to-noise ratio) of the response to increase of GHG concentration depends on variable, forcing intensity, and geographical location

