



On the ability of
RegCM4 to simulate
surface solar
radiation patterns
over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in ACP if available.

On the ability of RegCM4 regional climate model to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe: an assessment using satellite-based observations

G. Alexandri^{1,2}, A. K. Georgoulas^{3,4,5}, P. Zanis³, E. Katragkou³, A. Tsikerdekis³, K. Kourtidis², and C. Meleti¹

¹Laboratory of Atmospheric Physics, Physics Department, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124, Thessaloniki, Greece

²Laboratory of Atmospheric Pollution and Pollution Control Engineering of Atmospheric Pollutants, School of Engineering, Democritus University of Thrace, 67100, Xanthi, Greece

³Department of Meteorology and Climatology, School of Geology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, 54124, Greece

⁴Multiphase Chemistry Department, Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, 55128, Mainz, Germany

⁵Energy, Environment and Water Research Center, The Cyprus Institute, Nicosia, Cyprus

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Received: 18 May 2015 – Accepted: 15 June 2015 – Published: 08 July 2015

Correspondence to: G. Alexandri (alexang@auth.gr)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

ACPD

15, 18487–18535, 2015

**On the ability of
RegCM4 to simulate
surface solar
radiation patterns
over Europe**

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Abstract

In this work, we assess the ability of RegCM4 regional climate model to simulate surface solar radiation (SSR) patterns over Europe. A decadal RegCM4 run (2000–2009) was implemented and evaluated against satellite-based observations from the Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring (CM SAF) showing that the model simulates adequately the SSR patterns over the region. The bias between RegCM4 and CM SAF is +1.54 % for MFG (Meteosat First Generation) and +3.34 % for MSG (Meteosat Second Generation) observations. The relative contribution of parameters that determine the transmission of solar radiation within the atmosphere to the deviation appearing between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR is also examined. Cloud macrophysical and microphysical properties such as cloud fractional cover (CFC), cloud optical thickness (COT) and cloud effective radius (Re) from RegCM4 are evaluated against data from CM SAF. The same procedure is repeated for aerosol optical properties such as aerosol optical depth (AOD), asymmetry factor (ASY) and single scattering albedo (SSA), as well as other parameters including surface broadband albedo (ALB) and water vapor amount (WV) using data from MACv1 aerosol climatology, from CERES satellite sensors and from ERA-Interim reanalysis. It is shown here that the good agreement between RegCM4 and satellite-based SSR observations can be partially attributed to counteracting effects among the above mentioned parameters. The contribution of each parameter to the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations is estimated with the combined use of the aforementioned data and a radiative transfer model (SBDART). CFC, COT and AOD are the major determinants of these deviations; however, the other parameters also play an important role for specific regions and seasons.

1 Introduction

Modeling climate on a regional scale is essential for assessing the impact of climate change on society, economy and natural resources. Regional climate models are

ACPD

15, 18487–18535, 2015

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

limited-area models that simulate climate processes being often used to downscale dynamically global model simulations or global reanalysis data for specific regions in order to provide more detailed results (Laprise, 2008; Rummukainen, 2010). Several studies suggest that we can benefit from the use of regional climate models, especially due to the higher resolution of stationary features like topography, coastlines and from the improved representation of small-scale processes such as convective precipitation (see Flato et al., 2013, and references therein). Usually, regional climate models are evaluated and “tuned” according to their ability to simulate temperature and precipitation (e.g. Giorgi et al., 2012; Vautard et al., 2013; Kotlarski et al., 2014). However, as discussed in Katragkou et al. (2015), the role of other climatological parameters should be included in the evaluation procedure of regional climate models.

For example, the ability of regional climate models to assess surface solar radiation (SSR) patterns has not received so much attention despite the fact that SSR plays a core role in various climatic processes and parameters such as: (1) evapotranspiration (e.g. Teuling et al., 2009), (2) hydrological cycle (e.g. Allen and Ingram, 2002; Ramanathan et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2010; Wild and Liepert, 2010), (3) photosynthesis (e.g. Gu et al., 2002; Mercado et al., 2009), (4) oceanic heat budget (e.g. Lewis et al., 1990; Webster et al., 1996; Bodas-Salcedo et al., 2014), (5) global energy balance (e.g. Kim and Ramanathan, 2008; Stephens et al., 2012; Trenberth et al., 2009; Wild et al., 2013) and solar energy production (Hammer et al., 2003) and largely affects temperature and precipitation. The same stands for the parameters that drive SSR levels, such as cloud macrophysical and microphysical properties (cloud fractional cover CFC, cloud optical thickness COT and cloud effective radius R_e), aerosol optical properties (aerosol optical depth AOD, asymmetry factor ASY and single scattering albedo SSA), surface broadband albedo (ALB) and atmospheric water vapor amount (WV). However, during the last years, there were a few regional climate model studies focusing on the SSR levels or the net surface shortwave radiation, either to examine the dimming/brightening effect (e.g. Zubler et al., 2011; Chiacchio et al., 2015) or to evaluate the models (e.g. Jaeger et al., 2008; Markovic et al., 2008; Kothe and Ahrens, 2010;

Kothe et al., 2011, 2014; Güttler et al., 2014). These studies highlight the dominating effect of cloud cover and surface albedo.

In this work, we go a step further, proceeding to a detailed evaluation of the ability of RegCM4 regional climate model to simulate SSR patterns over Europe taking into account not only CFC and ALB but also COT, Re, AOD, ASY and WV. First a decadal simulation is implemented with the model and the output is evaluated against satellite-based observations from the geostationary satellites of CM SAF. These data are characterized by a high spatial ($\sim 3\text{--}5$ km) and temporal resolution (15–30 min) and have been validated in the past, constituting a well-established product. In Sect. 2.1, the basic features of the model are described along with the simulation setup and the way various parameters are calculated by the model. In Sects. 2.2 and 2.3, a description of the satellite data from CM SAF and the other data which are used for the evaluation of RegCM4 is given, while, in Sect. 2.4, we discuss the methodology followed in this manuscript. Section 3.1 includes the evaluation of RegCM4 SSR, Sects. 3.2 and 3.3 the evaluation of CFC, COT and Re, Sect. 3.4 the comparison of RegCM4 AOD, ASY and SSA with data from MACv1 aerosol climatology and Sect. 3.5 the comparison of RegCM4 WV and ALB with data from ERA-Interim reanalysis and CERES satellite sensors, respectively. The potential contribution of various parameters to the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR differences is estimated with the combined use of the data mentioned above and a radiative transfer model. The results are presented in Sect. 3.6, while the main findings of this manuscript are summarized in Sect. 4.

2 Model description, data and methods

2.1 RegCM4 description and simulation setup

In this work, a decadal (2000–2009) simulation was implemented with RegCM4.4 (hereafter denoted as RegCM4 or RegCM) for the greater European region with an horizontal resolution of 50 km. The model's domain extends from 65° W to 65° E and 15

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

to 75° N including the largest part of the Sahara Desert and part of Middle East (see Fig. S1 in the Supplement of this manuscript). RegCM is a hydrostatic, sigma-p regional climate model with a dynamical core based on the hydrostatic version of NCAR-PSU's Mesoscale Model version 5 (MM5) (Grell et al., 1994). Specifically, RegCM4 is a substantially improved version of the model compared to its predecessor RegCM3 (Pal et al., 2007) by means of software code and physics (e.g. radiative transfer, planetary boundary layer, convection schemes over land and ocean, land types and surface processes, ocean-air exchanges). Details on the historical evolution of RegCM from the late 1980s until today and a full description of RegCM4's basic features are given in Giorgi et al. (2012).

Data from ECMWF's ERA-Interim reanalysis were used as lateral boundary conditions. RegCM4 through a simplified aerosol scheme accounts for anthropogenic SO₂, sulfates, organic and black carbon (Solmon et al., 2006). The emissions of these anthropogenic aerosols are based on monthly historical emissions from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) (Lamarque et al., 2010) with one year spin up time (1999). This inventory is used by a number of climate models in support of the most recent report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC, 2013). The model also accounts for maritime particles through a 2-bin sea salt scheme (Zakey et al., 2008) and for dust through a 4-bin approach (Zakey et al., 2006). For our simulation, the MIT-Emanuel scheme (Emanuel, 1991; Emanuel and Zivkovic-Rothman, 1999) was used. Zanis et al. (2009) reported for RegCM3 that the low stratiform clouds are systematically denser and more persistent with the use of the Grell (Grell, 1993) convective scheme than with the Emanuel scheme, a result with major importance for the cloud- radiation feedback. The boundary layer scheme of Holtslag et al. (1990) was utilized while the Subgrid Explicit Moisture Scheme (SUBEX) handles large-scale cloud and precipitation computations. The ocean flux scheme was taken from Zeng et al. (1998) with the Biosphere–Atmosphere Transfer Scheme (BATS) (Dickinson et al., 1993) accounting for land surface processes.

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

The Community Climate Model version 3 (CCM3) (Kiehl et al., 1996) radiative package handles radiative transfer within RegCM4. The CCM3 scheme employs the δ -Eddington approximation following its predecessor (CCM2) (Briegleb, 1992). Especially for the shortwave radiation, the radiative transfer model takes into account the effect of atmospheric water vapor and greenhouse gasses, aerosol amount and optical properties (e.g. aerosol optical thickness, asymmetry factor, single scattering albedo) as well as cloud macrophysical (e.g. cloud fractional cover) and microphysical properties (e.g. effective droplet radius, liquid water path, cloud optical thickness) and land surface properties (surface albedo). The radiative transfer equation is solved for 18 discrete spectral intervals from 0.2 to $5 \mu\text{m}$ for the 18 RegCM vertical sigma layers from 50 hPa to the surface.

The effect of clouds on shortwave radiation is manifested by CFC, cloud droplet size and cloud water path (CWP) which is based on the prognostically calculated parameter of cloud water amount (Giorgi et al., 2012). Within the model, the effective droplet radius for liquid clouds (Re_l) is considered constant ($10 \mu\text{m}$) over the ocean while over land it is given as a function of temperature (Kiehl et al., 1998; Collins et al., 2004). On the other hand, the ice particle effective radius (Re_i) is given as a function of normalized pressure, starting from $10 \mu\text{m}$. The equations used for the calculation of Re_l and Re_i are given below.

$$Re_l = \begin{cases} 5 \mu\text{m} & T > -10^\circ\text{C} \\ 5 - 5 \left(\frac{T+10}{20} \right) \mu\text{m} & -30^\circ\text{C} \leq T \leq -10^\circ\text{C} \\ Re_i & T < -30^\circ\text{C} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$$Re_i = \begin{cases} Re_{i_{\min}} & p/p_s > p_i^{\text{high}} \\ Re_{i_{\min}} - (Re_{i_{\max}} - Re_{i_{\min}}) \left[\frac{(p/p_s) - p_i^{\text{high}}}{p_i^{\text{high}} - p_i^{\text{low}}} \right] \mu\text{m} & p/p_s \leq p_i^{\text{high}} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $Rei_{\max} = 30 \mu\text{m}$, $Rei_{\min} = 10 \mu\text{m}$, $p_i^{\text{high}} = 0.4$ and $p_i^{\text{low}} = 0.0$.

$$f_{\text{ice}} = \begin{cases} 0 & T > -10^\circ\text{C} \\ -0.05(T + 10) & -30^\circ\text{C} \leq T \leq -10^\circ\text{C} \\ 1 & T < -30^\circ\text{C} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Then, the radiative properties of liquid and ice clouds in the shortwave spectral region are given by the following parameterizations, originally found in Slingo (1989) and revisited by Briegleb et al. (1992).

$$COT_{\text{ph}}^\lambda = CWP \left[a_{\text{ph}}^\lambda + \frac{b_{\text{ph}}^\lambda}{Re_{\text{ph}}} \right] f_{\text{ph}} \quad (4)$$

$$\omega_{\text{ph}}^\lambda = 1 - c_{\text{ph}}^\lambda - d_{\text{ph}}^\lambda Re_{\text{ph}} \quad (5)$$

$$g_{\text{ph}}^\lambda = e_{\text{ph}}^\lambda + f_{\text{ph}}^\lambda Re_{\text{ph}} \quad (6)$$

$$\phi_{\text{ph}}^\lambda = \left(g_{\text{ph}}^\lambda \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

where superscript λ denotes the spectral interval and subscript ph denotes the phase (liquid/ice). Also, ω is the single scattering albedo, g is the asymmetry factor and ϕ is the phase function of clouds. It has to be highlighted here that all the equations presented above are given in Kiehl et al. (1998) and Collins et al. (2004) with a slightly different annotation. The coefficients a – f for liquid clouds are given in Slingo (1989), while for ice clouds in Ebert and Curry (1992) for the four pseudo-spectral intervals (0.25–0.69, 0.69–1.19, 1.19–2.38 and 2.38–4.00 μm) employed in the radiative scheme of RegCM. Especially for COT, in this paper we calculated it for the spectral interval 0.25–0.69 μm for both liquid and ice clouds so as to be comparable to the CM SAF satellite retrieved COT at 0.6 μm (see Sect. 2.2). Following the approach of Cess (1985), to derive the bulk COT for the whole atmospheric column, the COTs calculated for each

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



resolution of ~ 2.5 km (at the sub-satellite point). The data are afterwards re-gridded at a $0.03^\circ \times 0.03^\circ$ regular grid.

The MagicSol–Heliosat algorithm, used for the derivation of the SSR data analyzed in this work, has been extensively described in several papers (see Posselt et al., 2011a, b, 2012, 2014; Mueller et al., 2011; Sanchez-Lorenzo et al., 2013). The algorithm includes a modified version of the original Heliosat method (Beyer et al., 1996; Cano et al., 1986). Heliosat utilizes the digital counts obtained from the visible channel to calculate the so-called effective cloud albedo. The modified version incorporates the determination of the monthly maximum normalized digital count (for each MVIRI sensor) that serves as a self-calibration parameter. To derive the clear-sky background reflection, a 7 day running average of the minimum normalized digital counts is used instead of fixed monthly mean values. This method minimizes changes appearing in the radiance data recorded by different MVIRI sensors due to the transition from the one Meteosat satellite to the other, ensuring an as much as possible homogeneous dataset. Then, the clear-sky irradiances are derived using the look-up-table based clear-sky model MAGIC (Mueller et al., 2009) and finally SSR is retrieved by combining them with the effective cloud albedo.

On the other hand, MSG satellites carry the Spinning Enhanced Visible and Infrared Imager (SEVIRI), a radiometer taking measurements at 12 spectral bands (from visible to infrared) every 15 min with a spatial resolution of ~ 3 km (at the sub-satellite point). The data used here are available at a $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ regular grid. The SEVIRI broadband high-resolution visible channel (HRV) which is very close to MVIRI's broadband visible channel cannot be used for the continuation of the SSR dataset, since, unlike MVIRI, it does not cover the full earth's disk. On the other hand, the use of one of the SEVIRI's narrow band visible channels directly in the same algorithm as MVIRI (MagicSol) is not feasible, first of all, because of the spectral differences with MVIRI's broadband visible channel, and second, because of the sensitivity of cloud albedo to spectral differences of the land surfaces below the clouds (especially for vegetated areas) (see Posselt et al., 2011a, 2014). In this case, an artificial SEVIRI broadband

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Discussion Paper | Discussion Paper | Discussion Paper | Discussion Paper | Discussion Paper

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



visible channel that corresponds to MVIRI's broadband visible channel is simulated following the approach of Cros et al. (2006). SEVIRI's two narrow band visible channel (0.6 and 0.8 μm) and MVIRI's broadband channel spectral characteristics are used to establish a simple linear model. This model is afterwards applied to SEVIRI's 0.6 and 0.8 μm radiance measurements to calculate the broadband visible channel radiance (see Posselt et al., 2014, for more details).

The CM SAF SSR satellite-based product is characterized by a threshold accuracy of 15 W m^{-2} for monthly mean data and 25 W m^{-2} for daily data (Mueller et al., 2011; Posselt et al., 2012, 2014; Sanchez-Lorenzo et al., 2013). Posselt et al. (2012) evaluated CM SAF SSR data on a daily and monthly basis against ground-based observations from 12 BSRN (Baseline Surface Radiation Network) stations around the world, showing that both daily and monthly CM SAF data are below the target accuracy for $\sim 90\%$ of the stations. Specifically for Europe, Sanchez-Lorenzo et al. (2013) using monthly SSR data from 47 GEBA (Global Energy Balance Archive) ground stations proceeded to a detailed validation of the CM SAF SSR dataset for the period 1983–2005. They found that CM SAF slightly overestimates SSR by 5.20 W m^{-2} (4.4 % in relative values). Also, the mean absolute bias was found to be 8.2 W m^{-2} which is below the accuracy threshold of 15 W m^{-2} (10 W m^{-2} for the CM SAF retrieval accuracy and 5 W m^{-2} for the surface measurements uncertainties). Applying the Standard Normal Homogeneity Test (SNHT) Sanchez-Lorenzo et al. (2013) revealed that the MFG SSR data can be considered homogeneous for the period 1994–2005. Recently, Posselt et al. (2014) verified the results of the previous two studies by using a combined MFG-MSG SSR dataset spanning from 1983 to 2010. They found that the monthly mean dataset exhibits a mean absolute bias of 8.15 W m^{-2} compared to BSRN which is again below the accuracy threshold of CM SAF. Also, the dataset was found to be homogeneous for the period 1994–2010 in most of the investigated regions except for Africa.

To investigate the differences appearing between the RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR fields we also use CFC, COT and Re CM SAF observations from MSG satellites for the period 2004–2009. A description of this cloud optical properties product, also known as

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



CLAAS (CLOUD property dAtAset using SEVIRI), can be found in Stengel et al. (2014). The MSG NWC software package v2010 is used for the detection of cloudy pixels, the determination of their type (liquid/ice) and their vertical placement (Derrien and Le Gléau, 2005; NWCSAF, 2010). The detection of cloudy pixels is based on a multi-spectral threshold method incorporating parameters such as illumination (e.g. daytime, twilight, night-time, sunglint) and type of surface. According to Kniffka et al. (2014), the CM SAF Cloud Mask accuracy is $\sim 90\%$ (successful detection of cloudy pixels for $\sim 90\%$ of the cases) when evaluated against satellite data from CALIOP/CALIPSO and CPR/CloudSat. The bias of the CFC product was found to be 2 and 3% when compared to ground-based data from SYNOP (lidar-radar measurements) and satellite-based data from MODIS, respectively (Stengel et al., 2014). The Cloud Physical Properties (CPP) algorithm (Roebeling et al., 2006; Meirink et al., 2013) is used to retrieve COT at $0.6\ \mu\text{m}$, Re and CWP. The algorithm is based on the use of SEVIRI's spectral measurements at the visible ($0.64\ \mu\text{m}$) and near infrared ($1.63\ \mu\text{m}$) (Nakajima and King, 1990). First, COT and Re are retrieved for the cloudy pixels and then CWP is given by the following equation:

$$\text{CWP}_{\text{ph}} = 2/3 \rho_{\text{ph}} \text{Re}_{\text{ph}} \text{COT}_{\text{ph}} \quad (8)$$

where ph stands for the clouds' phase (liquid/ice) and ρ is the density of water. According to Stengel et al. (2014), the CM SAF COT bias was estimated at -9.9% compared to MODIS observations. The corresponding bias for CWP is -0.3% for liquid phase clouds and -6.2% for ice phase clouds. COT and CWP data are available from CM SAF at a spatial resolution of $0.05^\circ \times 0.05^\circ$ on a daily basis. In this work, Re values were calculated from the COT and CWP CM SAF available data using Eq. (8).

2.3 Other data

In addition to the CM SAF SSR and cloud optical properties data used for the evaluation of RegCM4, we also use ancillary data from other sources, namely, AOD, ASY and SSA at 550 nm monthly climatological values from the MACv1 climatology (Kinne

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

where σ_{RegCM} and σ_{CMSAF} are the standard deviations of RegCM4 and CM SAF total means. When $|t|$ is greater than a critical value that depends on the degrees of freedom (here $2n - 1$) the bias is considered statistically significant. In addition to the whole European region (EU), the land covered (LA) and ocean covered (OC) part of Europe, seven other sub-regions are defined for the generalization of our results: Northern Europe (NE), Central Europe (CE), Eastern Europe (EE), Iberian Peninsula (IP), Central Mediterranean (CM), Eastern Mediterranean (EM) and Northern Africa (NA) (see Figs. 1a and S1). The bias on an annual and seasonal basis is calculated per region. Apart from bias, other statistical metrics (correlation coefficient R , normalized standard deviation NSD, modified normalized mean bias MNMB, root mean square error RMSE) are also calculated and presented in the Supplement of this manuscript. The latitudinal variability of model and satellite-based SSR is examined by means of seasonal plots. Finally, the seasonal variability of SSR from RegCM4 and CM SAF and their differences is investigated for each of the 10 regions mentioned above. The same procedure is done separately for MFG data (2000–2005) and MSG data (2006–2009) to see if the two datasets lead to similar results. Our results are mostly focused on MSG satellite-based observations, since CFC and cloud optical properties data are only available from MSG SEVIRI.

In order to interpret the observed differences between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR, the same detailed procedure is repeated for CFC and COT for the period 2004–2009. CFC and COT are the two major determinants of the transmission of shortwave radiation through clouds (Gupta et al., 1993) and along with AOD constitute the major controllers of SSR (Kawamoto and Hayasaka, 2008). Therefore, we also proceed to a detailed comparison of RegCM4 AOD at 550 nm (AOD_{550}) against MACv1 climatological data. However, other cloud (Re) and aerosol (ASY, SSA) related parameters also play a significant role. Here, RegCM4 Re is evaluated against observational data from CM SAF while RegCM4 ASY and SSA are compared against climatological data from MACv1 (see Supplement). Specifically, the comparison of RegCM4 data with MACv1 does not constitute an evaluation of the RegCM4 aerosol-related param-

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



ters, like in the case of the cloud-related parameters above, since, MACv1 data (Kinne et al., 2013) are climatological (based on a combination of models and observations) and not pure observational data. However, a similar climatology (Kinne et al., 2006) is used for the production of CM SAF SSR (Trentmann et al., 2013). In addition, Mueller et al. (2014) showed that the use of MACv1 aerosol climatology instead of the Kinne et al. (2006) climatology does not affect significantly the CM SAF SSR product. Hence, this comparison allows us to reach useful conclusions about the effect of aerosol representation within RegCM4 on the simulated SSR fields by the model. The same stands for the comparison of RegCM4 ALB data with climatological data from CERES satellite sensors and RegCM4 WV data with WV data from ERA-Interim reanalysis (see Supplement). The CERES ALB 14 year climatology is temporally constant, similar to the CERES climatology used for the production of CM SAF SSR (Trentmann et al., 2013). Finally, the ERA-Interim WV data used here are the same with the WV data incorporated by the radiative scheme of CM SAF. Unlike the RegCM4 evaluation results, the comparison results discussed in this paragraph are presented in the Supplement.

Apart from a qualitative approach, we also proceed to a quantitative study of the reasons that lead to deviations between the RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR. Using data from RegCM4 and CM SAF and the Santa Barbara DISORT Atmospheric Radiative Transfer (SBDART) model (Ricchiazzi et al., 1998), we estimate the potential relative contribution of the parameters CFC, COT, Re, AOD, ASY, SSA, ALB and WV to the percent RegCM4-CM SAF SSR difference (ΔSSR), over the 7 sub-regions mentioned above. ΔSSR is given by Eq. (11), expressing the percentage of SSR deviation caused by the observed difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF for each parameter (ρ). First, a SBDART simulation is implemented with a 3 h timestep for the 15th day of each month (Ming et al., 2005) using monthly mean RegCM4 data as input (control run) for each region. The average of all the timesteps per month expresses the monthly SSR flux (SSR_{control}). The SSR fields simulated with SBDART are almost identical to the RegCM4 SSR fields. This indicates that SBDART indeed can be used to study the sensitivity of RegCM4's radiative scheme to various parameters. Then, several

SBDART simulations are implemented in the same way, replacing each time only one of the aforementioned input parameters with corresponding values from CM SAF, MACv1 or ERA-Interim ($SSR(\rho)$). SSR_{control} and $SSR(\rho)$ are then used in Eq. (11) to calculate ΔSSR for each month (i) and parameter (ρ).

$$\Delta SSR^i(\rho) = 100 \left(SSR_{\text{control}}^i - SSR^i(\rho) \right) / SSR_{\text{control}}^i \quad (11)$$

The results of this analysis are presented by means of bar plots for each sub-region. In addition, a method like the one introduced by Kawamoto and Hayasaka (2008, 2010, 2011), which is based on the calculation of the sensitivities of SSR on CFC, COT, AOD and WV, was also implemented with similar results (not shown here).

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Surface solar radiation

As discussed above, first, we examine the CM SAF and RegCM4 bias patterns for the MFG (2000–2005) and MSG (2006–2009) periods, separately. This work focuses on the MSG dataset, since, cloud properties data which are used in order to investigate the reasons of the observed bias between CM SAF and RegCM4 at a later stage, are only available from MSG. However, we investigate both periods to examine if the observed biases are valid for the whole simulation period and ensure that there are no differences when using the one or the other dataset. As shown in Fig. S2a and b, the annual bias patterns are similar for both MFG-RegCM4 and MSG-RegCM4. The main feature is a low negative bias over land and a low positive bias over ocean. Overall, the RegCM4 simulations slightly overestimate SSR compared to CM SAF over Europe with a bias of +1.54% in the case of MFG and +3.34% in the case of MSG, while SSR from RegCM4 is much closer to SSR from CM SAF over land (bias of -1.59% for MFG and +0.66% for MSG) than over ocean (bias of +7.20% for MFG and +8.07%

for MSG). These values can be found in Table 1 for the RegCM4-MSG period along with the corresponding values for the 7 sub-regions of interest appearing in Fig. 1a while the same values for the RegCM4-MFG period can be found in Table S1 of the Supplement. It has to be highlighted, that hereafter, only results for the MSG CM SAF SSR dataset are presented within the paper while the results for the MFG dataset are included in the Supplement.

As presented in Fig. 1, some differences appear in the seasonal bias patterns. A strong positive bias is observed during winter over Northern Europe. For the rest of the regions the winter patterns are very close to the spring and the annual patterns. Contrary to the annual patterns, in summer, the positive bias extends over Europe until the latitudinal zone of 50° N, while in autumn the bias patterns are pretty similar with the annual ones. In winter, the RegCM4 simulations overestimate SSR compared to CM SAF for the whole European domain, the bias being $+3.92\%$. Over land the bias is nearly zero ($+0.14\%$) while over ocean there is a significant bias of $+11.32\%$. As shown in Fig. 1a, NE is by far the sub-region with the strongest bias ($+52.44\%$). The seasonal and annual model and satellite-derived values with the corresponding biases and their statistical significance at the 95 % confidence level according to a two independent sample t test appear in Table 1. The latitudinal variability of RegCM4 SSR, CM SAF SSR and their difference is presented in Fig. 2a. Overall, RegCM4 slightly overestimates SSR at latitudes lower than $\sim 40^{\circ}$ N, then a negligible difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF is observed until the latitudinal zone of $\sim 52^{\circ}$ N, while, a significant difference is observed for higher latitudes. In spring, a zero bias is observed between the model and CM SAF for Europe. When discriminating between land and ocean covered regions a negative bias is observed over land (-2.90%) and a positive over ocean ($+5.18\%$). The regions with the highest negative bias are NE (-14.21%), EE (-13.45%) and CE (-9.14%), while the regions with the highest positive bias are NA ($+8.42\%$), CM ($+7.88\%$) and EM ($+6.72\%$) (see Table 1). This is also reflected in Fig. 2b where RegCM4 clearly overestimates SSR for latitudes less than $\sim 44^{\circ}$ N, significantly underestimating SSR thereafter. In summer, a positive bias of $+6.19\%$

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

is calculated for the whole European domain, the bias being +4.36% over land and +9.37% over ocean. As seen in Table 1, the bias is positive for all the sub-regions ranging from +2.31% (EE) to +10.44% (CM) except for NE (−9.43%). RegCM4 clearly overestimates SSR for latitudes less than $\sim 55^\circ$ N and underestimates SSR for higher latitudes (Fig. 2c). A positive bias of +2.40% is found for Europe in autumn with the corresponding values being −0.94% over land and +8.44% over ocean covered regions. EE (−9.79%) and CE (−7.19%) are the regions with the strongest negative bias while the regions with the strongest positive bias are the ones at the south, namely, NA (+5.54%), CM (+5.27%) and EM (+4.98) (see also Table 1). This is also seen in Fig. 2d where RegCM4 overestimates SSR for latitudes less than $\sim 42^\circ$ N.

The seasonal variability of RegCM4 SSR, CM SAF SSR and their difference for the whole European domain, for the land and ocean covered part of Europe as well as for the 7 sub-regions of interest are presented in Fig. 3a–j. For Europe as a whole, the largest difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR is observed in summer, July being the month with the highest RegCM4–CM SAF difference (20.30 W m^{-2}). Over land, the difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR is nearly zero for winter and autumn months. During spring, in March and April, RegCM4 underestimates SSR while in summer SSR is overestimated, especially in July. On the contrary, over ocean, SSR is overestimated by RegCM4 for the total of the months. The highest RegCM4–CM SAF differences are observed during the warm period (May–September). Over NE, RegCM4 underestimates SSR for the months from March to September and overestimates SSR during the winter months. The seasonal variability of the difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF is pretty similar over CE and EE. The simulations underestimate SSR in spring (especially during April) and autumn and overestimate SSR in summer. Over IP, SSR is overestimated again in May and during the summer and underestimated in February, March, November and December. For CM and EM, the seasonal variability of the difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF is almost identical. RegCM4 significantly overestimates SSR from April to October while for the rest of the months the difference is nearly zero. Finally, over NA, the seasonal variability of the difference

is close to the one appearing over CM and EM, but here, SSR is overestimated by RegCM4 also in March.

3.2 Cloud fractional cover

CFC plays a determinant role for the SSR levels. Therefore, we compare the CFC patterns simulated with RegCM4 against CFC patterns from MSG CM SAF for the common period 2004–2009. Overall, CFC is underestimated by RegCM4 over Europe by 24.34 % on annual basis (13.74 % over land and 38.41 % over ocean) despite the fact that over specific regions (e.g. within IP and NA) CFC is overestimated (see Table 2). Underestimation is observed for the total of the four seasons, NA being the only region with a bias of +8.12 % in winter and a bias of +13.14 % in autumn (see Table S3). As shown in Fig. 4a–d, the underestimation of CFC from RegCM4 is stronger over ocean especially in summer, while strong overestimation is observed over regions in western NA in winter and spring, eastern NA in summer and the whole NA during autumn. The latitudinal variability of RegCM4 CFC, CM SAF CFC and their difference is presented in Fig. 5. A clear, strong underestimation of CFC from RegCM4 is observed for all the latitudinal bands and seasons apart from latitudes around 30° N where CFC is slightly overestimated in autumn. The seasonal variability of RegCM4 CFC, CM SAF CFC and their difference for the whole European domain, for the land and ocean covered part of Europe and for the 7 sub-regions of interest are presented in Fig. 6a–j. CFC is underestimated steadily by RegCM4 throughout a year, the underestimation being much stronger over the ocean than over land (see Fig. 6b and c). This underestimation is observed for all the sub-regions except for NA where CFC is underestimated from April to September and overestimated for the rest of the months.

Generally, lower CFCs would lead to higher SSR levels. However, a comparison of the SSR bias patterns appearing in Fig. 1a–d with the CFC bias patterns appearing in Fig. 4a–d and also of the biases appearing in Tables 1 and S3 reveals that for some areas and seasons the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations cannot be explained through the corresponding CFC deviations (e.g. land covered regions during spring

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



and autumn). This is in line with the findings of Katragkou et al. (2015) where the WRF-
ISCCP SSR deviations could not always be attributed to CFC deviations. As discussed
there the role of microphysical cloud properties should also be taken into account.
Following this, in the next paragraph we go a step further, taking into account the effect
of COT.

3.3 Cloud microphysical properties

3.3.1 Cloud optical thickness

COT is a measure of the transparency of clouds and along with CFC determines the
transmission of shortwave radiation through clouds (Gupta et al., 1993). In this para-
graph, the RegCM4 COT patterns are compared against COT patterns from MSG CM
SAF for the common period 2004–2009. Overall, COT is overestimated by RegCM4
over Europe by 4.29 % on annual basis, the bias being positive over land (+7.29 %) but
negative over ocean (−2.46 %) (see Table 2). In addition, COT bias varies with seasons,
being positive in spring and autumn and negative in winter and summer (see Table S5).
As shown in Fig. 7a–d, positive biases are mostly observed over land covered regions
of CE, EE and NE and negative biases over NA and the regions around the Mediter-
ranean Sea. In fact, there is a strong latitudinal variability of the RegCM4-CM SAF COT
difference for all the seasons as presented in Fig. 8a–d. RegCM4 underestimates COT
for latitudes below $\sim 45^\circ$ N in winter, spring and autumn and for latitudes below $\sim 50^\circ$ N
in summer. The seasonal variability of RegCM4 COT, CM SAF COT and their difference
for the whole European domain, for the land and ocean covered part of Europe and for
the 7 sub-regions of interest are presented in Fig. 9a–j. In general, the RegCM4-CM
SAF COT difference is not steadily positive or negative but varies from month to month
over both land and ocean. RegCM4 steadily overestimates COT throughout a year only
over NE and underestimates COT over CM and NA. It has to be highlighted that there
are no COT retrievals over NE for December and January due to a limited illumination

**On the ability of
RegCM4 to simulate
surface solar
radiation patterns
over Europe**

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



at that latitudes during this period of the year. This is also the reason for the missing grid cells appearing in the top-right corner of Fig. 7a–d.

A comparison of the SSR bias patterns appearing in Fig. 1a–d with the CFC (Fig. 4a–d) and the COT (Fig. 7a–d) bias patterns reveals that COT could explain part of the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations that could not be explained through CFC (e.g. NE, CE, EE). The same conclusions can be reached by comparing the seasonal variability of SSR, CFC and COT over the region of interest (see Figs. 3, 6 and 9). However, other parameters are expected to be responsible for the remaining unexplained RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviation.

3.3.2 Cloud effective radius

Re is a microphysical optical property expressing the size of cloud droplets in the case of liquid clouds and the size of ice crystals in the case of ice clouds. Re of liquid (Rel) and ice (Rei) clouds plays a critical role in the calculation of the optical thickness of clouds as well as their albedo (see Eqs. 4–7 in Sect. 2.1). The evaluation of RegCM4 Rel and Rei against observational data from CM SAF reveals a significant underestimation over the whole European domain (bias of -36.06% for Rel and -28.25% for Rei). In the case of ice clouds, the biases over land and ocean do not differ significantly. On the contrary, for liquid clouds, the bias over land is more than double the bias over ocean (see Table 2). This is due to the very low RegCM4 Rel values appearing over land while the CM SAF dataset does not exhibit such a land-ocean difference. A possible explanation for this could be the fact that for liquid clouds a different approach is used over land (constant Rel of $10\ \mu\text{m}$) and ocean (Eq. 1) while for ice clouds the parameterization is the same for land and ocean (Eq. 2). The fact that the average Rel value over land ($5.65 \pm 1.06\ \mu\text{m}$) is very close to the lowest Rel boundary ($5\ \mu\text{m}$) according to Eq. (1), possibly points towards an underestimation of the liquid cloud height and vertical development. Also, this Rel land-ocean difference is in charge of the COT land-ocean difference (see Table 2) according to Eq. (4). In general, the underestimation of Re would result into more reflective clouds and hence into underestimated SSR

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



levels. It has to be mentioned here that the monthly variability of RegCM4 Rel and Rei, CM SAF Rel and Rei and their difference for the whole European domain, for the land and ocean covered part of Europe and for the 7 sub-regions are presented in the Supplement of this manuscript.

3.4 Aerosol optical properties

As discussed in Sect. 2.4, AOD along with CFC and COT constitute the major controllers of SSR. A comparison of the RegCM4 AOD₅₅₀ seasonal patterns with climatological AOD₅₅₀ values from MACv1 is presented in Fig. S10a–d. On an annual basis, RegCM4 overestimates AOD over the region of NA (bias of +25.01%) (see Table 2). The overestimation is very strong during winter being much weaker in spring and autumn (see Table S9). This overestimation over regions affected by dust emission has been discussed comprehensively in Nabat et al. (2012) and has to do with the dust particle size distribution schemes utilized by RegCM4 (Alfaro and Gomes, 2001; Kok, 2011). Nabat et al. (2012) showed that the implementation of Kok (2011) scheme generally reduces the dust AOD overestimation in RegCM4 over the Mediterranean basin. However, a first climatological comparison of RegCM4 dust AODs with data from CALIOP/CALIPSO (A. Tsikerdekis, personal communication, 2015) has shown that both schemes overestimate dust AOD over Europe and therefore the selection of a specific dust scheme is not expected to change drastically our results. On the contrary, AOD is significantly underestimated over the rest of the domain. This should be expected as RegCM does not account for several types of aerosols, anthropogenic (e.g. nitrates, ammonium and secondary organic aerosols, industrial dust) and natural (e.g. biogenic aerosols) which potentially play an important role (Kanakidou et al., 2005; Zanis et al., 2012). This overestimation/underestimation dipole in winter, spring and autumn is also reflected in Fig. S11. RegCM4 overestimates AOD for latitudes below $\sim 40^\circ$ N in winter, for latitudes below $\sim 35^\circ$ N in spring and for a narrow latitudinal band ($\sim 30\text{--}33^\circ$ N) in autumn. In summer, RegCM4 steadily underestimates AOD compared to MACv1. The seasonal variability of RegCM4 AOD₅₅₀, MACv1 AOD₅₅₀ and

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



their difference for the whole European domain, for the land and ocean covered part of Europe and for the 7 sub-regions of interest are presented in Fig. S12a–j. In general, RegCM4 clearly underestimates AOD throughout a year over regions that are not affected heavily by Sahara dust transport. This underestimation would cause an overestimation of SSR if all the other parameters were kept constant. The opposite stands for the region of NA where AOD, except for summer, is significantly overestimated.

As in the case of COT and Re, in order to fully assess the contribution of aerosols to the observed RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations, one has to take into account ASY and SSA apart from AOD. A comparison of RegCM4 ASY and SSA with climatological values from MACv1 reveals a small underestimation from RegCM4 over Europe (bias of -1.07 and -4.23% respectively). While SSA is underestimated for the total of the investigated sub-regions, in some cases ASY is slightly overestimated (see Table 2).

3.5 Other parameters

Apart from the major (CFC, COT, AOD) and minor (Re, ASY, SSA) SSR determinants which are discussed above in detail, there are also a number of other parameters that could impact the simulation skills of RegCM4 compared to CM SAF, since these parameters are used as input within the radiative scheme of the model.

As it was previously discussed, WV is another parameter that affects the transmission of solar radiation within the atmosphere. RegCM4 is found here to overestimate WV compared to ERA-Interim reanalysis all over Europe with a bias of $\sim 12\%$. This becomes more than obvious when looking into the seasonal and latitudinal variability of the two datasets (see Figs. S17 and S18).

In line with the study of Gütler et al. (2014), RegCM4 exhibits a significant underestimation of ALB over CE, EE and NA (see Table 2) compared to climatological data from CERES (see Sect. 2.3). In general, there is a striking difference between land and ocean covered regions (Figs. S19 and S20). Over land RegCM4 underestimates ALB by 28.27% while over ocean ALB is strongly overestimated by 131% . As it was previously highlighted, the comparisons of RegCM4 with non-observational data presented

estimation of SSR, that ranges from -1.06% (July) to -2.51% (February). All the other parameters play a minor role, generally leading to an underestimation of SSR.

Over IP, despite the fact that the dominant parameters are CFC and COT, for some months AOD, SSA and Re contribute substantially in ΔSSR (Fig. 10c). CFC leads to an overestimation of SSR, January/September being the month with the highest/lowest overestimation of SSR ($+9.06/+1.06\%$). COT causes an important overestimation of SSR from April to October (e.g. $+3.65\%$ in June) and a significant underestimation during March (-2.76%). On the other hand, Re leads to an underestimation of SSR that ranges from -1.27% in April to -0.30% in August. The same stands for SSA with an average annual SSR underestimation of -1.20% , while AOD exhibits a mixed behavior leading to either underestimation (a maximum of -6.14% in December) or overestimation (a maximum of $+4.93\%$ in March).

As seen in Fig. 10d, ΔSSR over CM is mostly determined by CFC, COT, AOD and SSA. CFC causes a significant overestimation of SSR ranging from $+3.23\%$ (July) to $+11.91\%$ (December). COT leads to an overestimation of SSR on an annual basis, October being the month with the highest overestimation ($+4.60\%$). AOD causes an overestimation of SSR over CM for the period from March to October (average ΔSSR of $+2.21\%$) and an underestimation during winter (average ΔSSR of -2.31%). SSA on the other hand, causes an underestimation of SSR on an annual basis ranging from -0.54% (July) to -1.88% (December).

ΔSSR over EM is dominated by the relative contribution of CFC, AOD and COT (see Fig. 10e). CFC causes an overestimation of SSR on an annual basis ranging from $+1.70\%$ (August) to $+12.16\%$ (December). Apart from February, AOD causes a significant overestimation ranging from $+0.53\%$ (March) to $+5.99\%$ (September). Apart from March, COT leads to an overestimation of SSR, February being the month with the highest overestimation ($+4.27\%$). SSA also plays a role, in some cases comparable in magnitude to that of COT or AOD (e.g. January, March).

Over NA ΔSSR is largely determined by AOD, SSA and COT (Fig. 10f). AOD causes a significant underestimation of SSR during the period from November to April (a maxi-

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

mum of -15.29% for February) and an overestimation from June to September (a maximum of $+3.87\%$ for July). COT leads to a significant SSR overestimation on an annual basis ranging from $+1.31\%$ (June) to $+4.81\%$ (September). SSA leads to a significant underestimation of SSR, January being the month with the highest underestimation (Δ SSR of -3.70%). Important is the contribution of ALB which also causes an SSR underestimation on annual basis (average Δ SSR of -1.04%). It has to be highlighted here, that due to the high insolation levels over the region of NA, the Δ SSR values correspond to higher absolute RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations than in regions at higher latitudes. Also, the low cloud coverage in the region leads to an update of the role of aerosol related parameters as shown in Fig. 10f.

4 Conclusions

In the present study, a decadal simulation (2000–2009) with the regional climate model RegCM4 is implemented in order to assess the model's ability to represent the SSR patterns over Europe. The RegCM4 SSR fields are evaluated against satellite-based observations from CM SAF. These observations come from MFG MVIRI and MSG SE-VIRI satellite sensors. In order to investigate the reasons of the deviation appearing between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR we proceeded to an evaluation of cloud macrophysical and microphysical properties (CFC, COT, Re) simulated by the model using corresponding data from CM SAF. The same procedure was repeated for aerosol optical properties (AOD, ASY, SSA), surface albedo (ALB) and water vapor amount (WV). These data come from MACv1 aerosol climatology, from CERES satellite sensors and from ERA-Interim reanalysis, respectively, being similar to the ones used as input in the retrieval of CM SAF SSR. The comparison of RegCM4's CFC, COT, Re, AOD, ASY, SSA, ALB and WV against the data discussed above, constitutes a qualitative approach to understand the differences between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR. However, it is also shown here, that the potential contribution of various parameters to the RegCM4-CM

SAF SSR differences can be estimated with the combined use of the aforementioned data and a radiative transfer model (SBDART).

The annual bias patterns of RegCM4-CM SAF are similar for both MFG and MSG observations. The model slightly overestimates SSR compared to CM SAF over Europe, the bias being +1.54 % for MFG and +3.34 % for MSG observations. Moreover, the bias is much lower over land than over ocean while some differences appear locally between the seasonal and annual bias patterns.

In general, CFC is underestimated by RegCM4 compared to CM SAF over Europe by 24.34 % on annual basis. The corresponding bias over land is +13.74 % while over ocean is +38.41 %. Only part of the bias between REGCM4 and CM SAF SSR can be explained through CFC with the underestimation of CFC leading to a clear overestimation of SSR. However, in line with previous studies, for several areas and seasons the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations cannot be attributed to CFC deviations suggesting that the microphysical properties of clouds also play an important role.

RegCM4 overestimates COT by 4.29 % compared to CM SAF on an annual basis. The bias is positive over land (+7.29 %) and negative over ocean (-2.46 %). Our results suggest that COT may explain part of the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations that could not be explained through CFC over specific regions. RegCM4 underestimates Rel and Rei compared to CM SAF over the whole European domain on an annual basis (bias of -36.06 % for Rel and -28.25 % for Rei). Contrary to ice clouds, the bias over land is more than double the bias over ocean in the case of liquid clouds, possibly as a result of the different approach followed by RegCM4 for the calculation of Rel over land and ocean.

A comparison of the RegCM4 AOD seasonal patterns with AOD values from the MACv1 aerosol climatology, which is used for the retrieval of CM SAF SSR, reveals that RegCM4 overestimates AOD over the region of NA and underestimates it for the rest of the European domain. To fully assess the contribution of aerosols to the observed RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations we also took into account ASY and SSA. A comparison of RegCM4 ASY and SSA with climatological values from MACv1 re-

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

veals a small underestimation from RegCM4 over Europe (bias of -1.07 and -4.23% respectively).

The comparison of RegCM4 WV against data from ERA-Interim reanalysis, which are used for the retrieval of CM SAF SSR, reveals a clear overestimation of $\sim 12\%$ over Europe. In line with previous studies, RegCM4 underestimates ALB significantly over CE, EE and NA compared to climatological data from CERES. A striking difference appears between land (bias of -28.27%) and ocean (bias of $+131\%$) covered regions.

The combined use of SBDART radiative transfer model with RegCM4, CM SAF, MACv1, CERES and ERA-Interim data shows that the difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR is mostly explained through CFC, COT and AOD deviations. In the majority of the regions, CFC leads to an overestimation of SSR by RegCM4, the maximum ΔSSR being 22.87% (EE during December). In some cases, COT leads to an underestimation of SSR by RegCM4 (CE and EE), the maximum ΔSSR being -15.78% (EE), while for the majority of the regions leads to an overestimation, the maximum ΔSSR being $+4.60\%$ (CM). Apart from NA, where AOD leads to a significant underestimation of RegCM4 SSR (maximum ΔSSR of -15.29%), AOD is generally responsible for the overestimation of SSR (maximum ΔSSR of $+12.30\%$ for EE). The other parameters (Re, ASY, SSA, WV, ALB) play a less significant role, except for NA where they have a significant impact on the RegCM4-CM SAF SSR deviations.

Overall, it is shown in this study that RegCM4 simulates adequately the SSR patterns over Europe. However, it is also shown that the model overestimates or underestimates significantly several parameters that determine the transmission of solar radiation in the atmosphere. The good agreement between RegCM4 and satellite-based SSR observations from CM SAF is actually a result of the contradicting effect of these parameters. Our results suggest that there should be a reassessment of the way these parameters are represented within the model so that SSR is not only well simulated but also for the right reasons. This would also allow for a safer investigation of the dimming/brightening effect since the SSR deviations would be safely dedicated to the one or the other pa-

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- Emanuel, K. A. and Zivkovic-Rothman, M.: Development and evaluation of a convection scheme for use in climate models, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 56, 1766–1782, 1999.
- Flato, G., Marotzke, J., Abiodun, B., Braconnot, P., Chou, S., Collins, W., Cox, P., Driouech, F., Emori, S., Eyring, V., Forest, C., Gleckler, P., Guilyardi, E., Jakob, C., Kattsov, V., Reason, C., and Rummukainen, M.: Evaluation of climate models, in: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, edited by: Stocker, T., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., and Midgley, P., chap. 6, 741–866, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2013.
- Giorgi, F., Coppola, E., Solmon, F., Mariotti, L., Sylla, M. B., Bi, X., Elguindi, N., Diro, G. T., Nair, V., Giuliani, G., Cozzini, S., Guettler, I., O'Brien, T. A., Tawfik, A. B., Shalaby, A., Zakey, A. S., Steiner, A. L., Stordal, F., Sloan, L. C., and Brankovic, C.: RegCM4: model description and preliminary tests over multiple CORDEX domains, *Clim. Res.*, 52, 7–29, doi:10.3354/cr01018, 2012.
- Grell, G.: Prognostic evaluation of assumptions used by cumulus parameterizations, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 121, 764–787, 1993.
- Grell, G. A., Dudhia, J., and Stauffer, D. R.: Description of the fifth generation Penn State/NCAR Mesoscale Model (MM5), Tech. Rep. NCAR/TN-398+STR, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA, 1–121, doi:10.5065/D60Z716B, 1994.
- Gu, L., Baldocchi, D., Verma, S., Black, T., Vesala, T., Falge, E., and Dowty, P.: Advantages of diffuse radiation for terrestrial ecosystem productivity, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, ACL2.1–ACL2.23, doi:10.1029/2001JD001242, 2002.
- Gupta, S. K., Staylor, W. F., Darnell, W. L., Wilber, A. C., and Ritchey, N. A.: Seasonal variation of surface and atmospheric cloud radiative forcing over the globe derived from satellite data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 20761–20778, doi:10.1029/93JD01533, 1993.
- Güttler, I., Brankovic, C., Srnec, L., and Patarcic, M.: The impact of boundary forcing on RegCM4.2 surface energy budget, *Climatic Change*, 125, 67–78, doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0995-x, 2014
- Hammer, A., Heinemann, D., Hoyer, C. R. K., Lorenz, E., Mueller, R., and Beyer, H.: Solar Energy assessment using remote sensing technologies, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 86, 423–432, doi:10.1016/S0034-4257(03)00083-X, 2003.

**On the ability of
RegCM4 to simulate
surface solar
radiation patterns
over Europe**

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- Holtslag, A. A. M., De Bruijn, E. I. F., and Pan, H.-L.: A high resolution air mass transformation model for short-range weather forecasting, *Mon. Weather Rev.*, 118, 1561–1575, 1990.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2013: the Physical Science Basis: Summary for Policymakers, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, New York, NY, USA, 2013.
- 5 Jaeger, E. B., Anders, I., Lüthi, D., Rockel, B., Schär, C., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Analysis of ERA40-driven CLM simulations for Europe, *Meteorol. Z.*, 17, 349–367, 2008.
- Kanakidou, M., Seinfeld, J. H., Pandis, S. N., Barnes, I., Dentener, F. J., Facchini, M. C., Van Dingenen, R., Ervens, B., Nenes, A., Nielsen, C. J., Swietlicki, E., Putaud, J. P., Balkanski, Y., Fuzzi, S., Horth, J., Moortgat, G. K., Winterhalter, R., Myhre, C. E. L., Tsigaridis, K., Vignati, E., Stephanou, E. G., and Wilson, J.: Organic aerosol and global climate modelling: a review, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 1053–1123, doi:10.5194/acp-5-1053-2005, 2005.
- 10 Kato, S., Loeb, N. G., Rose, F. G., Doelling, D. R., Rutan, D. A., Caldwell, T. E., Yu, L., and Weller, R. A.: Surface irradiances consistent with CERES-derived top-of-atmosphere shortwave and longwave irradiances, *J. Climate*, 26, 2719–2740, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00436.1, 2013.
- 15 Katragkou, E., García-Díez, M., Vautard, R., Sobolowski, S., Zanis, P., Alexandri, G., Cardoso, R. M., Colette, A., Fernandez, J., Gobiet, A., Goergen, K., Karacostas, T., Knist, S., Mayer, S., Soares, P. M. M., Pytharoulis, I., Tegoulis, I., Tsikerdekis, A., and Jacob, D.: Regional climate hindcast simulations within EURO-CORDEX: evaluation of a WRF multi-physics ensemble, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 8, 603–618, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-603-2015, 2015.
- 20 Kawamoto, K. and Hayasaka, T.: Relative contributions to surface shortwave irradiance over China: a new index of potential radiative forcing, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 35, L17809, doi:10.1029/2008GL035083, 2008.
- Kawamoto, K. and Hayasaka, T.: Geographical features of changes in surface shortwave irradiance in East Asia estimated using the potential radiative forcing index, *Atmos. Res.*, 96, 337–343, doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2009.09.016, 2010.
- 25 Kawamoto, K. and Hayasaka, T.: Cloud and aerosol contributions to variation in shortwave surface irradiance over East Asia in July during 2001 and 2007, *J. Quant. Spectros. Ra.*, 112, 329–337, doi:10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.08.002, 2012.
- 30 Kiehl, J. T., Hack, J. J., Bonan, G. B., Boville, B. A., Breigleb, B. P., Williamson, D., and Rasch, P.: Description of the NCAR community climate model (CCM3), Tech. Rep. NCAR/TN-420+STR, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colorado, USA, 1–159, doi:10.5065/D6FF3Q99, 1996.

**On the ability of
RegCM4 to simulate
surface solar
radiation patterns
over Europe**

G. Alexandri et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

standard evaluation of the EURO-CORDEX RCM ensemble, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7, 1297–1333, doi:10.5194/gmd-7-1297-2014, 2014.

Lamarque, J.-F., Bond, T. C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D., Liousse, C., Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M. G., Shindell, D., Smith, S. J., Stehfest, E., Van Aardenne, J., Cooper, O. R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J. R., Naik, V., Riahi, K., and van Vuuren, D. P.: Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: methodology and application, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 7017–7039, doi:10.5194/acp-10-7017-2010, 2010.

Laprise, R.: Regional climate modelling, *J. Comput. Phys.*, 227, 3641–3666, 2008.

Markovic, M., Jones, C. G., Vaillancourt, P. A., Paquin, D., Winger, K., and Paquin-Ricard, D.: An evaluation of the surface radiation budget over North America for a suite of regional climate models against surface station observations, *Clim. Dynam.*, 31, 779–794, doi:10.1007/s00382-008-0378-6, 2008.

Meirink, J. F., Roebeling, R. A., and Stammes, P.: Inter-calibration of polar imager solar channels using SEVIRI, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 2495–2508, doi:10.5194/amt-6-2495-2013, 2013.

Mercado, L. M., Bellouin, N., Sitch, S., Boucher, O., Huntingford, C., Wild, M., and Cox, P. M.: Impact of changes in diffuse radiation on the global land carbon sink, *Nature*, 458, 1014–1017, doi:10.1038/nature07949, 2009.

Ming, Y., Ramaswamy, V., Ginoux, P. A., and Horowitz, L. H.: Direct radiative forcing of anthropogenic organic aerosol, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D20208, doi:10.1029/2004JD005573, 2005.

Mueller, R. and Träger-Chatterjee, C.: Brief accuracy assessment of aerosol climatologies for the retrieval of solar surface radiation, *Atmosphere*, 5, 959–972, doi:10.3390/atmos5040959, 2014.

Mueller, R., Matsoukas, C., Gratzki, A., Hollmann, R., Behr, H.: The CM-SAF operational scheme for the satellite based retrieval of solar surface irradiance—a LUT based eigenvector hybrid approach, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 113, 1012–1022, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2009.01.012, 2009.

Mueller, R., Trentmann, J., Träger-Chatterjee, C., Posselt, R., and Stöckli, R.: The role of the effective cloud albedo for climate monitoring and analysis, *Remote Sens.*, 3, 2305–2320, doi:10.3390/rs3112305, 2011.

Nabat, P., Solmon, F., Mallet, M., Kok, J. F., and Somot, S.: Dust emission size distribution impact on aerosol budget and radiative forcing over the Mediterranean region: a regional cli-

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- on METEOSAT-8 and Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer (AVHRR) on NOAA-17, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 111, D20210, doi:10.1029/2005JD006990, 2006.
- Rummukainen, M.: State-of-the-art with regional climate models, *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.*, 1, 82–96, doi:10.1002/wcc.8, 2010.
- 5 Sanchez-Lorenzo, A., Wild, M., and Trentmann, J.: Validation and stability assessment of the monthly mean CM SAF surface solar radiation dataset over Europe against a homogenized surface dataset (1983–2005), *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 134 355–366, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2013.03.012, 2013.
- Solmon, F., Giorgi, F., and Liousse, C.: Aerosol modelling for regional climate studies: application to anthropogenic particles and evaluation over a European/African domain, *Tellus B*, 58, 51–72, doi:10.3402/tellusb.v58i1.16792, 2006.
- 10 Stengel, M., Kniffka, A., Meirink, J. F., Lockhoff, M., Tan, J., and Hollmann, R.: CLAAS: the CM SAF cloud property data set using SEVIRI, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 4297–4311, doi:10.5194/acp-14-4297-2014, 2014.
- 15 Stephens, G. L., Li, J., Wild, M., Clayson, C. A., Loeb, N., Kato, S., L'Ecuyer, T., Stackhouse, P. W., Lebsock, M., and Andrews, T.: An update on Earth's energy balance in light of the latest global observations, *Nat. Geosci.*, 5, 691–696, doi:10.1038/ngeo1580, 2012.
- Teuling, A. J., Hirschi, M., Ohmura, A., Wild, M., Reichstein, M., Ciais, P., Buchmann, N., Ammann, C., Montagnani, L., Richardson, A. D., Wohlfahrt, G., Seneviratne, S. I., Mauder, M., and Foken, T.: A regional perspective on trends in continental evaporation, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L02404, doi:10.1029/2008GL036584, 2009.
- 20 Trenberth, K. E., Fasullo, J. T., and Kiehl, J.: Earth's global energy budget, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 90, 311–323, doi:10.1175/2008bams2634.1, 2009.
- Trentmann, J., Müller, R., and Hollmann, R.: Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document, MSG Surface Radiation, Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring, available at: www.cmsaf.eu, doi:10.5676/EUMETSAT_SAF_CM/CLAAS/V001, 2013.
- 25 Vautard, R., Gobiet, A., Jacob, D., Belda, M., Colette, A., Deque, M., Fernandez, J., Garcia-Diez, M., Goergen, K., Guttler, I., Halenka, T., Karacostas, T., Katragkou, E., Keuler, K., Kotlarski, S., Mayer, S., van Meijgaard, E., Nikulin, G., Patarcic, M., Scinocca, J., Sobolowski, S., Suklitsch, M., Teichmann, C., Warrach-Sagi, K., Wulfmeyer, V., and Yiou, P.: The simulation of European heat waves from an ensemble of regional climate models within the EURO-CORDEX project, *Clim. Dynam.*, 41, 2555–2575, doi:10.1007/s00382-013-1714-z, 2013.
- 30

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Wang, K., Dickinson, R. E., Wild, M., and Liang, S.: Evidence for decadal variation in global terrestrial evapotranspiration between 1982 and 2002: 2. Results, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D20113, doi:10.1029/2010JD013847, 2010.

Wild, M. and Liepert, B.: The Earth radiation balance as driver of the global hydrological cycle, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 5, 025203, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/5/2/025203, 2010.

Wild, M., Folini, D., Schär, C., Loeb, N., Dutton, E. G., and Koning-Langlo, G.: The global energy balance from a surface perspective, *Clim. Dynam.*, 40, 3107–3134, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1569-8, 2013.

Zakey, A. S., Solmon, F., and Giorgi, F.: Implementation and testing of a desert dust module in a regional climate model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 4687–4704, doi:10.5194/acp-6-4687-2006, 2006.

Zakey, A. S., Giorgi, F., and Bi, X.: Modeling of sea salt in a regional climate model: fluxes and radiative forcing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D14221, doi:10.1029/2007JD009209, 2008.

Zanis, P., Douvis, C., Kapsomenakis, I., Kioutsioukis, I., Melas, D., and Pal, J. S.: A sensitivity study of the Regional Climate Model (RegCM3) to the convective scheme with emphasis in central eastern and southeastern Europe, *Theor. Appl. Climatol.*, 97, 327–337, doi:10.1007/s00704-008-0075-8, 2009.

Zanis, P., Ntogras, C., Zakey, A., Pytharoulis, I., and Karacostas, T.: Regional climate feedback of anthropogenic aerosols over Europe using RegCM3, *Clim. Res.*, 52, 267–278, doi:10.3354/cr01070, 2012.

Zeng, X., Zhao, M., and Dickinson, R. E.: Intercomparison of bulk aerodynamic algorithms for the computation of sea surface fluxes using toga coare and tao data, *J. Climate*, 11, 2628–2644, 1998.

Zubler, E. M., Folini, D., Lohmann, U., Lüthi, D., Schär, C., and Wild, M.: Simulation of dimming and brightening in Europe from 1958 to 2001 using a regional climate model, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D18205, doi:10.1029/2010JD015396, 2011.

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Table 1. Average RegCM4 SSR and CM SAF SSR (MSG SEVIRI) with their standard deviations ($\pm 1\sigma$) and the corresponding Normalized Mean Bias (NMB) per season and region. When the difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF SSR is statistically significant at the 95 % confidence level due to a two independent sample t test, the NMB values are marked with bold letters while in the opposite case they are marked with an asterisk. Positive NMBs are italic while negative NMBs are underlined. ANN corresponds to annual, DJF to winter, MAM to spring, JJA to summer and SON to autumn results while the regions are listed in alphabetical order.

	MOD	ANN SAT	bias	MOD	DJF SAT	bias	MOD	MAM SAT	bias
CE	134.52 ± 89.22	136.10 ± 83.09	-1.16	42.30 ± 20.78	42.75 ± 24.38	<i>-1.05*</i>	158.12 ± 55.58	174.03 ± 51.26	-9.14
CM	209.83 ± 98.64	195.12 ± 85.11	7.53	97.29 ± 29.07	96.68 ± 27.13	<i>0.63*</i>	243.68 ± 59.20	225.86 ± 46.23	7.88
EE	132.29 ± 91.96	139.54 ± 89.84	-5.19	37.53 ± 17.47	38.84 ± 22.10	-3.38	155.22 ± 61.16	179.35 ± 57.73	-13.45
EM	219.29 ± 101.61	205.61 ± 90.31	6.65	105.08 ± 36.84	101.76 ± 33.74	3.25	251.44 ± 68.77	235.6 ± 54.43	6.72
EU	174.99 ± 106.45	169.33 ± 96.69	3.34	77.08 ± 57.06	74.17 ± 57.20	3.92	206.76 ± 83.03	206.67 ± 67.03	<i>0.04*</i>
IP	197.88 ± 95.07	194.66 ± 84.41	1.65	91.71 ± 26.94	98.58 ± 27.47	-6.97	224.84 ± 56.48	223.98 ± 46.33	<i>0.38*</i>
LA	173.07 ± 106.88	171.92 ± 97.18	0.66	78.12 ± 60.95	78.01 ± 60.82	<i>0.14*</i>	202.65 ± 85.68	208.71 ± 68.55	-2.90
NA	261.83 ± 82.27	243.79 ± 69.53	7.40	164.74 ± 35.19	161.80 ± 31.87	1.81	303.81 ± 41.30	280.2 ± 33.73	8.42
NE	103.98 ± 81.16	113.69 ± 93.36	-8.54	19.31 ± 12.00	12.67 ± 16.78	52.44	137.62 ± 53.40	160.43 ± 60.82	-14.21
OC	178.24 ± 105.64	164.93 ± 95.68	8.07	75.32 ± 49.72	67.66 ± 49.81	11.32	213.75 ± 77.82	203.22 ± 64.23	5.18

	MOD	JJA SAT	bias	MOD	SON SAT	bias
CE	245.57 ± 47.93	228.91 ± 38.24	7.27	84.38 ± 46.83	90.92 ± 48.19	-7.19
CM	331.26 ± 27.32	299.93 ± 25.09	10.44	157.71 ± 53.54	149.8 ± 45.42	5.27
EE	248.43 ± 44.9	242.79 ± 36.54	2.31	80.07 ± 45.95	88.77 ± 48.76	-9.79
EM	339.32 ± 29.07	312.76 ± 28.12	8.49	171.81 ± 62.97	163.66 ± 55.85	4.98
EU	281.62 ± 70.56	265.18 ± 55.16	6.19	126.27 ± 77.38	123.31 ± 71.26	2.40
IP	317.51 ± 29.05	296.28 ± 32.29	7.16	148.61 ± 53.88	151.77 ± 50.36	-2.08
LA	278.63 ± 71.74	266.99 ± 55.01	4.36	124.87 ± 79.02	126.07 ± 72.78	-0.94
NA	353.48 ± 20.51	320.52 ± 21.65	10.28	217.2 ± 49.53	205.79 ± 39.71	5.54
NE	198.68 ± 45.53	219.39 ± 43.31	-9.43	52.88 ± 38.18	53.42 ± 44.28	<i>-0.99*</i>
OC	286.69 ± 68.21	262.11 ± 55.29	9.37	128.65 ± 74.47	118.63 ± 68.35	8.44

Title Page	
Abstract	Introduction
Conclusions	References
Tables	Figures
◀	▶
◀	▶
Back	Close
Full Screen / Esc	
Printer-friendly Version	
Interactive Discussion	

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.

Table 2. Annual Normalized Mean Bias (NMB) of RegCM4-CM SAF CFC, COT, Rel and Rei, RegCM4-MACv1 ASY and SSA, RegCM4-CERES ALB and RegCM4-ERA-Interim WV. When the difference between RegCM4 and CM SAF or CERES or ERA-Interim is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level due to a two independent sample t test, the NMB values are marked with bold letters while in the opposite case they are marked with an asterisk. Positive NMBs are italic while negative NMBs are underlined. The regions are listed in alphabetical order.

	CFC	COT	Rel	Rei	AOD	ASY	SSA	ALB	WV
CE	<u>-19.73</u>	24.09	<u>-45.05</u>	<u>-23.97</u>	<u>-63.59</u>	<i>0.03*</i>	<u>-5.88</u>	<u>-22.71</u>	14.02
CM	<u>-31.19</u>	<u>-30.74</u>	<u>-26.71</u>	<u>-27.57</u>	<u>-19.33</u>	<u>-0.74</u>	<u>-3.53</u>	85.92	10.42
EE	<u>-15.99</u>	30.85	<u>-44.55</u>	<u>-24.18</u>	<u>-64.58</u>	2.08	<u>-3.54</u>	<u>-40.68</u>	10.82
EM	<u>-28.83</u>	<u>-21.96</u>	<u>-29.25</u>	<u>-28.40</u>	<u>-34.19</u>	<u>-0.04</u>	<u>-2.32</u>	35.43	10.85
EU	<u>-24.34</u>	4.29	<u>-36.06</u>	<u>-28.25</u>	<u>-35.27</u>	<u>-1.07</u>	<u>-4.23</u>	1.58	11.98
IP	<u>-13.65</u>	<u>-13.85</u>	<u>-46.10</u>	<u>-27.29</u>	<u>-7.43</u>	<u>-1.52</u>	<u>-4.75</u>	<u>-3.76</u>	14.43
LA	<u>-13.74</u>	7.29	<u>-47.73</u>	<u>-26.38</u>	<u>-32.09</u>	<u>-1.78</u>	<u>-4.33</u>	<u>-28.27</u>	11.41
NA	<i>0.36*</i>	<u>-39.81</u>	<u>-47.31</u>	<u>-29.97</u>	25.01	<u>-7.87</u>	<u>-3.46</u>	<u>-26.38</u>	8.66
NE	<u>-20.34</u>	54.33	<u>-32.76</u>	<u>-31.26</u>	<u>-75.92</u>	1.03	<u>-5.57</u>	5.24	13.05
OC	<u>-38.41</u>	<u>-2.46</u>	<u>-18.33</u>	<u>-31.05</u>	<u>-41.95</u>	0.13	<u>-4.07</u>	131.07	12.81

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 1. Seasonal NMB patterns of RegCM4-CM SAF SSR over Europe for (a) winter (DJF), (b) spring (MAM), (c) summer (JJA) and (d) autumn (SON) from MSG SEVIRI observations. The 7 sub-regions used for the generalization of the results are marked in Fig. 1a: Northern Europe (NE), Central Europe (CE), Eastern Europe (EE), Iberian Peninsula (IP), Central Mediterranean (CM), Eastern Mediterranean (EM) and Northern Africa (NA).

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 2. Latitudinal variability of RegCM4 SSR (red), CM SAF SSR (blue) and their difference (orange) over Europe for (a) winter (DJF), (b) spring (MAM), (c) summer (JJA) and (d) autumn (SON) from MSG SEVIRI observations.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 3. Seasonal variability of RegCM4 SSR (red), CM SAF SSR (blue) and their difference (orange) over (a) the whole Europe, (b) Land, (c) Ocean, (d) NE, (e) CE, (f) EE, (g) IP, (h) CM, (i) EM, (j) NA from MSG SEVIRI observations.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 4. The same as Fig. 1 but for RegCM4 and CM SAF CFC.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 5. The same as Fig. 2 but for RegCM4 and CM SAF CFC.

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 6. The same as Fig. 3 but for RegCM4 and CM SAF CFC.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 7. The same as Fig. 1 but for RegCM4 and CM SAF COT.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 8. The same as Fig. 2 but for RegCM4 and CM SAF COT.

Title Page

Abstract Introduction

Conclusions References

Tables Figures

◀ ▶

◀ ▶

Back Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 9. The same as Fig. 3 but for RegCM4 and CM SAF COT.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

On the ability of RegCM4 to simulate surface solar radiation patterns over Europe

G. Alexandri et al.




Figure 10. ΔSSR (%) caused by CFC, COT, Re, AOD, ASY, SSA, WV and ALB for (a) CE, (b) EE, (c) IP, (d) CM, (e) EM and (f) NA.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

