Geoscientific

Model Development

Open Access

Discussions

EGU

Interactive comment on "Biogeochemical protocols and diagnostics for the CMIP6 Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP)" *by* James C. Orr et al.

James C. Orr et al.

james.orr@lsce.ipsl.fr

Received and published: 29 November 2016

Response to Comment from Anonymous Referee #2

The suggestions from Referee #2 will prove valuable to improve the OMIP-BGC manuscript. They are repeated below in gray, while our responses are given in black.

This manuscript presents a plan for simulations and diagnostics of biogeochemical tracers during the CMIP6 simulations, including carbon cycle and biological tracers. Model intercomparison projects are somewhat unwieldy beasts, when comparing

models it is often difficult to know what to say beyond "the models differ". Reasons for this include subtle differences in model construction and parameter values as well as more fundamental issues about which processes are represented. Ideally, model intercomparison projects will try to keep as many things as similar as possible, so as to narrow down the range of possible differences between simulations. The strategy taken in this version of CMIP seems to be to make sure the different models all use the same gas exchange, atmospheric concentration, gas chemistry and carbon chemistry parameters, while using different ecosystem models. This seems a very sensible approach to me.

We agree. Physical forcing of the ocean only model simulations will also be identical.

It would be good at the end of the introduction for the authors to define what the principal scientific goals are. Right now it appears that a principal goal is to quantify the change in ocean carbon inventory under global warming and to attribute this uptake to passive uptake by a changing circulation vs. changes in the natural storage of carbon by biology. It would be good to say a little more about why this is challenging, in particular that the long equilibration time for carbon dioxide means that the (poorly known) disequilibrium component of anthropogenic CO_2 is the same size as the actual signal we are trying to detect. As a result, different estimates of anthropogenic CO_2 differ by large amounts. Combining C14 with SF6 and CFC12 tracers offers us a way of not only testing the models, but of narrowing the observational uncertainty on anthropogenic CO_2. However, doing this right requires not only getting inventories but fluxes right, which in turn requires standardizing carbon chemistry (the recent paper by Lovenduski et al in Global Biogeochemical Cycles would be a good one to reference here as it shows that systematic model bias dominates regional carbon fluxes). This would motivate the discussion later in the paper.

In the revised manuscript, the main scientific goals of the project will be better detailed as also requested in the short comment from the CMIP Panel. Referee #2 provides valuable suggestions, including the interesting reference to the work by Lovenduski et al. (2016), which we plan to address in the revised manuscript.

Additionally however, biogeochemical tracers can serve as useful constraints on ocean circulation, in particular the ventilation of the deep ocean, as they average over long periods of time and exhibit strong contrasts between different regions of deep water formation. A great example of this is Broecker et al. (JGR-Oceans) use of C14 and PO4* to derive ventilation rates for Antarctic Bottom Water and North Atlantic Deep Water—the former of which is likely still better than anything that physical oceanographers have been able to quantify directly. Radiocarbon is also useful for getting at upwelling pathways, as different overturning schemas can produce vastly different distributions of surface radiocarbon with very similar overall hydrography (see Gnanadesikan et al., GBC, 2004 for an example of this).

The utility of the tracers that will be modeled in the OMIP-BGC simulations to help constrain ocean circulation, particularly in the deep ocean, will be brought forward in the Introduction to help emphasize these objectives. The publications suggested by Referee #2 (Broecker et al., 1998; Gnanadesikan et al., 2004) are excellent examples that we will consider mentioning in the revised Introduction.

Finally, though, there's the issue of biological variability under climate change. This will be an important area going forward and I do not feel that the diagnostics for it have been properly prioritized. One of the main "consumers" of this work are going to be marine ecologists looking for changes in community structure and ecology. Because of this I would strongly recommend prioritizing monthly 100m-integrated biomass measurements for as many classes as exist in the model as a top priority. I disagree

with the reviewer who worried about having too many diagnostics- frankly the field as a whole suffers from having too few diagnostics saved out to actually understand differences. In the current version of CMIP5, for example, many of the models save out minimum oxygen rather than the three-dimensional fields. In analysing this my group is finding that this limits the signals of changes in climate to convective zones, rather than allowing them to be tracked more broadly.

Agreed. The requested monthly fields will be valuable contributions that OMIP and CMIP6 can provide to help offer a better understanding of biological and chemical variability and potential changes under climate change and rising levels of CO_2.

I have only one other quibble about the standards. The OCMIP2 standards for carbon and radiocarbon were generally for models that did not have interannual variability but were being forced towards a mean climate. When climate variability is included (and as noted by de Lavergne et al., 2015 this variability can have large amplitude) one can easily see variability accounting for differences of 5 GtC over the course of a century. I strongly recommend that the authors either raise the threshold for carbon trends or soften the requirement in some way.

We are not sure that we fully understand the meaning of this comment nor the exact publication that is being referred to. The OMIP-BGC models will account for climate variability, either when forced by reanalysis data or when coupled within an Earth System Model framework. The boundary condition for atmospheric CO_2 does include interannual variability, being based on annual-mean observations. The same may be said for the atmospheric $^{14}C/C$ ratio. Furthermore given the corresponding air-sea equilibration times (1 yr and 10 yr, respectively) it is not clear to us that the atmospheric records that are to be used to force the OMIP-BGC simulations are inadequate to study interannual variability. More clarification from Referee #2 on the

nuanced meaning of this comment would be most welcome.

References

Broecker, W., Peacock, S., Walker, S., Weiss, R., Fahrbach, E., Schröder, M., Mikolajewicz, U., Heinze, C., Key, R., Peng, T.-H., et al.: How much deep water is formed in the Southern Ocean?, Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 103, 15 833–15 843, 1998.

Gnanadesikan, A., Dunne, J. P., Key, R. M., Matsumoto, K., Sarmiento, J. L., Slater, R. D., and Swathi, P.: Oceanic ventilation and biogeochemical cycling: Understanding the physical mechanisms that produce realistic distributions of tracers and productivity, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 18, doi:10.1029/2003GB002 097, 1944–9224, 2004.

Lovenduski, N. S., McKinley, G. A., Fay, A. R., Lindsay, K., and Long, M. C.: Partitioning uncertainty in ocean carbon uptake projections: Internal variability, emission scenario, and model structure, Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 30, doi:10.1002/2016GB005 426, 1276–1287, 2016.