

Regional Climate Downscaling: What's the Point?

PAGES 52–53

Dynamical and statistical downscaling of multidecadal global climate models provides finer spatial resolution information for climate impact assessments [Wilby and Fowler, 2010]. Increasingly, some scientists are using the language of “prediction” with respect to future regional climate change and impacts [e.g., Hurrell *et al.*, 2009; Shapiro *et al.*, 2010], yet others note serious reservations about the capability of downscaling to provide detailed, accurate predictions [see Kerr, 2011].

Dynamic downscaling is based on regional climate models (usually just the atmospheric part) that have finer horizontal grid resolution of surface features such as terrain [Castro *et al.*, 2005]. Statistical downscaling uses transfer functions (e.g., regression relationships) representing observed relationships between larger-scale atmospheric variables and local quantities such as daily precipitation and/or temperature [Wilby and Fowler, 2010]. These approaches have been successful in improving the skill of numerical weather prediction. Statistical downscaling can also be used as the benchmark (the control) against which dynamic downscaling skill is judged [Landsea and Knaff, 2000].

Castro *et al.* [2005] categorized downscaling into four types (see also Table 1).

Type 1 downscaling is used for short-term, numerical weather prediction. In dynamic type 1 downscaling the regional model includes initial conditions from observations. In type 1 statistical downscaling the regression relationships are developed from observed data and the type 1 dynamic model predictions.

Type 2 dynamic downscaling refers to regional weather (or climate) simulations [e.g., Feser *et al.*, 2011] in which the regional model's initial atmospheric conditions are forgotten (i.e., the predictions do not depend on the specific initial conditions) but results still depend on the lateral boundary conditions from a global numerical weather prediction where initial observed atmospheric conditions are not yet forgotten or are from a global reanalysis. Type 2 statistical downscaling uses the regression relationships developed for type 1 statistical downscaling except that the input variables are from the type 2 weather (or climate) simulation. Downscaling from reanalysis products (type 2 downscaling) defines the maximum forecast skill that is achievable with type 3 and type 4 downscaling.

Type 3 dynamic downscaling takes lateral boundary conditions from a global model prediction forced by specified real-world surface boundary conditions such

as seasonal weather predictions based on observed sea surface temperatures, but the initial observed atmospheric conditions in the global model are forgotten [e.g., Castro *et al.*, 2007]. Type 3 statistical downscaling uses the regression relationships developed for type 1 statistical downscaling except using the variables from the global model prediction forced by specified real-world surface boundary conditions.

Type 4 dynamic downscaling takes lateral boundary conditions from an Earth system model in which coupled interactions among the atmosphere, ocean, biosphere, and cryosphere are predicted [e.g., Solomon *et al.*, 2007]. Other than terrain, all other components of the climate system are calculated by the model except for human forcings, including greenhouse gas emissions scenarios, which are prescribed. Type 4 dynamic downscaling is widely used to provide policy makers with impacts from climate decades into the future. Type 4 statistical downscaling uses transfer functions developed for the present climate, fed with large-scale atmospheric information taken from Earth system models representing future climate conditions. It is assumed that statistical relationships between real-world surface observations and large-scale weather patterns will not change. Type 4 downscaling has practical value but with the very important caveat that it should be used for model sensitivity experiments and not as predictions [e.g., Pielke, 2002; Prudhomme *et al.*, 2010].

Because real-world observational constraints diminish from type 1 to type 4 downscaling, uncertainty grows as more climate variables must be predicted by models rather than obtained from observations. Pielke *et al.* [2012] assert that type 4 dynamic downscaling fails to improve accuracy beyond what could be achieved by interpolating global model predictions onto

a finer-scale terrain or landscape map. This position is based on several reasons:

First, as a necessary condition for an accurate prediction, multidecadal global climate model simulations must include all first-order climate forcings and feedbacks. However, they do not.

Second, current global multidecadal predictions are unable to skillfully simulate regional forcing by major atmospheric circulation features such as from El Niño and La Niña and the South Asian monsoon [e.g., Annamalai *et al.*, 2007; Paeth *et al.*, 2008].

Third, while regional climate downscaling yields higher spatial resolution, the downscaling is strongly dependent on the lateral boundary conditions and the methods used to constrain the regional climate model variables to the coarser spatial scale information from the parent global models. Large-scale climate errors in the global models are retained and could even be amplified by the higher-spatial-resolution regional models. If the global multidecadal climate model predictions do not accurately predict large-scale circulation features, for instance, they cannot provide accurate lateral boundary conditions and interior nudging to regional climate models.

Fourth, apart from variable grid approaches, regional models do not have the domain scale (or two-way interaction between the regional and global models) to improve predictions of the larger-scale atmospheric features. This means that if the regional model significantly alters the atmospheric and/or ocean circulations, there is no way for this information to affect larger-scale circulation features that are being fed into the regional model through the lateral boundary conditions and nudging. For example, recent research indicates that terrestrial evaporation from the Eurasian continent contributes 80% of China's water resources [van der Ent *et al.*, 2010]. In this case, the regional model domain has to be large enough to include areas that are connected by soil moisture feedbacks.

Last, the lateral boundary conditions for input to regional downscaling require regional-scale information from a global forecast model. However the global model does not have this regional-scale information due to its limited spatial resolution. This

Table 1. A Typology of Downscaling Applications

Type	Purpose	Inputs to the Regional Downscaling
1	short-term numerical weather prediction	global analysis of observed data plus observed regional initial conditions
2	regional climate simulation	atmosphere information from global or regional reanalyses in which the regional initial conditions are forgotten
3	seasonal prediction	global atmospheric model prediction with prescribed observed surface conditions (e.g., sea surface temperatures)
4	climate prediction	multidecadal global climate model prediction based on prescribed radiative forcing

is, however, a logical paradox because the regional model needs something that can be acquired only by a regional model (or regional observations). Therefore, the acquisition of lateral boundary conditions with the needed spatial resolution becomes logically impossible. Thus, even with the higher-resolution analyses of terrain and land use in the regional domain, the errors and uncertainty from the larger model still persist, rendering the added simulated spatial details inaccurate.

There is also an assumption that although global climate models cannot predict future climate change as an initial value problem, they can predict future climate statistics as a boundary value problem [Palmer *et al.*, 2008]. However, for regional downscaling (and global) models to add value (beyond what is available to the impacts community via the historical, recent paleorecord and a worst-case sequence of days), they must be able to skillfully predict changes in regional weather statistics in response to human climate forcings. This is a greater challenge than even skillfully simulating current weather statistics.

It is therefore inappropriate to present type 4 results to the impacts community as reflecting more than a subset of possible future climate risks.

Alongside the special uses of type 4 downscaling (noted above), we favor a bottom-up, resource-based vulnerability approach to assess the climate and other environmental and societal threats to critical assets [Wilby and Dessai, 2010; Kabat *et al.*, 2004]. This framework considers the coping conditions and critical thresholds of natural and human environments beyond which external pressures (including climate change) cause harm to water resources, food, energy, human health, and ecosystem function. Such an approach could assist policy makers in developing more holistic mitigation and adaptation strategies that deal with the complex spectrum of social

and environmental drivers over coming decades, beyond carbon dioxide and a few other greenhouse gases.

References

- Annamalai, H., K. Hamilton, and K. R. Sperber (2007), The South Asian summer monsoon and its relationship with ENSO in the IPCC AR4 simulations, *J. Clim.*, *20*(6), 1071–1092.
- Castro, C. L., R. A. Pielke Sr., and G. Leoncini (2005), Dynamical downscaling: Assessment of value retained and added using the Regional Atmospheric Modeling System (RAMS), *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*, D05108, doi:10.1029/2004JD004721.
- Castro, C. L., R. A. Pielke Sr., J. Adegok, S. D. Schubert, and P. J. Pegion (2007), Investigation of the summer climate of the contiguous United States and Mexico using the Regional Atmospheric Modeling System (RAMS): Part II. Model climate variability, *J. Clim.*, *20*(15), 3866–3887.
- Feser, F., B. Rockel, H. von Storch, J. Winterfeldt, and M. Zahn (2011), Regional climate models add value to global model data—A review and selected examples, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, *92*, 1181–1192, doi:10.1175/2011BAMS3061.1.
- Hurrell, J., G. A. Meehl, D. Bader, T. L. Delworth, B. Kirtman, and B. Wielicki (2009), A unified modeling approach to climate system prediction, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, *90*, 1819–1832, doi:10.1175/2009BAMS2752.1.
- Kabat, P., M. Claussen, P. A. Dirmeyer, J. H. C. Gash, L. Bravo de Guenni, M. Meybeck, R. A. Pielke Sr., C. J. Vörösmarty, R. W. A. Hutjes, and S. Lütke-meier (Eds.) (2004), *Vegetation, Water, Humans and the Climate: A New Perspective on an Interactive System*, 566 pp., Springer, Berlin.
- Kerr, R. A. (2011), Vital details of global warming are eluding forecasters, *Science*, *334*(6053), 173–174, doi:10.1126/science.334.6053.173.
- Landsea, C., and J. Knaff (2000), How much skill was there in forecasting the very strong 1997–1998 El Niño?, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, *81*, 2107–2119, doi:10.1175/1520-0477(2000)081<2107:HMSWTI>2.3.CO;2.
- Paeth, H., A. Scholten, P. Friederichs, and A. Hense (2008), Uncertainties in climate change prediction: El Niño–Southern Oscillation and monsoons, *Global Planet. Change*, *60*(3–4), 265–288, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2007.03.002.
- Palmer, T. N., F. J. Doblas-Reyes, A. Weisheimer, and M. J. Rodwell (2008), Toward seamless prediction: Calibration of climate change projections using seasonal forecasts, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, *89*, 459–470, doi:10.1175/BAMS-89-4-459.
- Pielke, R. A., Sr., (2002), Overlooked issues in the U.S. national climate and IPCC assessments, *Clim. Change*, *52*(1–2), 1–11, doi:10.1023/A:1017473207687.
- Pielke, R. A., Sr., R. Wilby, D. Niyogi, F. Hossain, K. Dairuku, J. Adegok, G. Kallos, T. Seastedt, and K. Suding (2012), Dealing with complexity and extreme events using a bottom-up, resource-based vulnerability perspective, in *Complexity and Extreme Events in Geosciences, Geophys. Monogr. Ser.*, edited by A. S. Sharma *et al.*, AGU, Washington, D. C., in press.
- Prudhomme, C., R. L. Wilby, S. Crooks, A. L. Kay, and N. S. Reynard (2010), Scenario-neutral approach to climate change impact studies: Application to flood risk, *J. Hydrol.*, *390*, 198–209, doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.06.043.
- Shapiro, M., *et al.* (2010), An Earth-system prediction initiative for the twenty-first century, *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, *91*(10), 1377–1388, doi:10.1175/2010BAMS2944.1.
- Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller (Eds.) (2007), *Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, 2007*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U. K.
- van der Ent, R. J., H. H. G. Savenije, B. Scheffli, and S. C. Steele-Dunne (2010), Origin and fate of atmospheric moisture over continents, *Water Resour. Res.*, *46*, W09525, doi:10.1029/2010WR009127.
- Wilby, R. L., and S. Dessai (2010), Robust adaptation to climate change, *Weather*, *65*(7), 180–185, doi:10.1002/wea543.
- Wilby, R. L., and H. J. Fowler (2010), Regional climate downscaling, in *Modelling the Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources*, edited by C. F. Fung, A. Lopez, and M. New, chap. 3, pp. 34–85, Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, U. K.

—ROGER A. PIELKE SR., Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences (CIRES), University of Colorado at Boulder; E-mail: pielkesr@cires.colorado.edu; and ROBERT L. WILBY, Department of Geography, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK