

We thank the reviewer for their comments. Each comment is addressed below with the original review in italics, our responses in normal font and changes to the manuscript in **bold**.

*General comments:*

*This paper try to analyze the impact of changing the MOSES land surface scheme by the CABLE land surface model in the ACCESS climate model. The introduction is very short and any references/discussion about land/atmosphere coupling processes (c.f. Betts et al. 1996; Betts 2009) were done. Only 2 references on previous works analyzing land surface-atmosphere interactions were done without any discussion.*

We will provided extra detail in the introduction especially around the Betts 2009 paper and recent work by Hirsch et al (**p1, L23 – p2, L17**).

*In the section 2, differences between the both land surface modules are relatively well described even if some details are missing.*

As requested by reviewer 2 we now include a table of differences including some further details about the snow scheme (**p4, L3, new Table 1, p23**).

*The section 3 presents the experimental design of the study. There is only two sentences that present the observations used to evaluate the model, that underline the poor scientific quality of this study. ERA Interim reanalysis alone cannot be used as observations. There is many “real” observations available to evaluate the model.*

The main purpose of this paper was a comparative study of simulations with different land surface schemes. For this reason most of the results presented are model-model comparisons (and a process understanding of these model differences) rather than model-obs comparisons. Where we show zonal mean cloud and precipitation we will add an observational dataset and will now show land only zonal means to be compatible with the GPCC dataset (**p25, fig 3**). We understand the limitation of only using ERA interim reanalysis but have now checked our model simulations against CRU temperatures as well. This will be noted in our comments on the relative bias of each model temperature compared to ERA Interim/obs (**[p9, L8-20], [p10, L3-9]**).

*The section 4 presents the main results. The text is very descriptive and generally boring even if the fact to use off-line runs to explain some in-line behaviours is a very good idea.*

We will revise **section 4** to remove some unnecessary detail and to try to make it easier to read.

*Any tests of significance is done for all differences model versus observations and model versus model shown in this manuscript.*

See reply below about significance testing (**p9, L26 - p10, L11**).

*The conclusion is well written and brings into focus the qualities and the defaults of this study. After having hesitated for a long time between rejected this paper or reconsidered it after major revisions, I think that this paper must be largely improved and it deserves a chance.*

We will endeavour to address both reviewer comments, noting that at times they had substantially different views on the relative importance of different parts of the paper and how it might be

improved. We believe that our changes will deal with all critical issues and will result in an improved manuscript.

*Specific comments:*

*P.1-2: The introduction did not give the readers a sense of the state of the art, e.g., what are the land/atmosphere coupling processes, and which ones are important or not? Did anyone else in the community attempt to analyze land/atmosphere coupling for global climate simulations? Only one sentence to sum up the work of Koster (2004) or Seneviratne et al. (2010) is not enough.*

As our response above we will extend the introduction to give more information about the cited work and to add some other relevant literature (**p1, L23 – p2, L17**).

*P.1, l.16: I am not sure that LSM is a “key” component of a climate model, it is an important component but the key component is the atmospheric model (or the oceanic model).*

Sentence will be modified to note that LSM is one of the key components (**p1, L19**).

*P.3, l.25: What is the value for Cs or how it is computed?*

Cs is a volumetric heat capacity calculated as the weighted sum of the heat capacity of dry soil, liquid and ice ( $\text{JK}^{-1}\text{m}^{-2}$ ) and this will be added to the manuscript (**p4, L13**).

*P.3, l.27: What is the value for fr or how it is computed?*

Fr is  $1-e^{\text{LAI}/2}$  and this will be added to the manuscript (**p4, L18**).

*P.4, l.19: What is the value for c in the exponential or how it is computed?*

C is an extinction coefficient for beam radiation and black leaves and this will be added to the manuscript (**p5, L10**).

*P.4, l.20 and l.30: Are you sure that CABLE “has a more complex representation” of canopy or displacement height than many LSMs? If so, prove it and explain the main differences with “many other LSMs”.*

Most other LSM use conventional rough wall boundary layer theory and canopy parameters, e.g. displacement height, that are a constant fraction of canopy height. CABLE more complex representation is based on Raupach 1989, 1994 which are referenced in the paper. We will note in the text the simpler methods used by most other models (**[p5, L12-13], [p5, L23-24]**) but do not feel it is necessary to repeat all the detail on the canopy turbulent transport described in the Raupach references.

*P.5, l.17: “MOSES does account for this heat exchange.” These sentences are not clear to me.*

This will be clarified - Moses calculates the advection of heat by moisture fluxes within the soil column (**p6, L13**).


*P.5, l.31 : The description of snow modules are very short while in the paper you access that “Warmer winter temperatures simulated by ACCESS1.1 over the snow covered areas of mid and high latitudes are attributed to differences in the snow parameterization in CABLE compared with MOSES.” Please*

provide more details. Does CABLE “has a more complex representation” of snow processes than many other LSMs?

Differences in the snow parameterisation will now be captured in the new table of CABLE-MOSES model differences which was requested by reviewer 2 (p4, L3, new Table 1, p23).

P.6, l.27: LAI data are not the same for MOSES and CABLE. How you can be sure that most of the impacts in summer are not due directly to this difference rather than in the differences in land surface physics? This fact must be addressed in order to improve the scientific quality of this paper. Normally, in this paper, the same LAI should be used in both models, perhaps by introducing an intermediate simulation (MOSES with LAI from CABLE or inversely).

We have now performed a simulation in which ACCESS1.0 (MOSES) is run with ACCESS1.1 (CABLE’s) LAI (p8, L19-21). The change in LAI has very little impact on the simulation. The figure below shows the difference between the sensitivity test and the original A1.0 and should be compared with Fig 4 e/f from the paper. The very small differences shown do not explain the A1.1-A1.0 differences from Fig 4. Appropriate comments will be added to the manuscript when explaining the temperature differences found for the Northern continent in summer (p10, L34 - p11, L4) and winter (p13, L25-32).




P.7, l.: This is the most important negative point of this work. Any “real” observation was used. For continental precipitation, there is product: GPCP (certainly the best), GPCP, TRIMM (over tropics), etc. Try to use these products in your comparison. The same is true for temperature or cloud: CRU data gives Tasmín/Tasmax/Tasmean that allow to evaluate the diurnal cycle; CERES, MODIS, etc. for cloud (see Pincus et al. 2012)

As noted above we will add some extra comparisons with other observational products where the paper currently focusses on model differences from observations (Fig 3 & 4 a-d) (p8, L5-11) (ISCCP/GPCP -[p9, L8-20], CRU-[p10, L3-9]). The rest of the paper focusses on model-model differences and a process understanding of these differences and hence additional comparisons to observations are less relevant for that analysis.

P.8 and after: The result and figure part are too descriptive and not enough scientific.

Tests of significance (for example T-Test) must be done on the differences model vs obs as well as for model vs model. On figure, generally, the pattern where the differences are significant is shown with dotted panel. Without that, this article cannot be accepted. Please only comment where the differences are significant statistically.

Original Author Response, 13 May 2016: In general significance testing shows that model-model differences are significant almost everywhere (see figure below for seasonal mean temperature) while the significance of model-obs differences is both seasonally and model dependent. Model-obs significance testing is consequently useful for determining if one model better simulates observations than the other model. Testing against both CRU and ERA Interim temperatures suggests that the models can't be differentiated in DJF but that A1.1 (CABLE) produces the better simulation of temperature in JJA (p9, L26 - p10, L11). T-test stippling will be added to Fig 4 a-d (p26) but we will not add stippling to the other figures of model-model differences since it would be required almost everywhere and tends to obscure important features of these figures.



Additional Author Response, 2 June 2016: To follow-up the request from reviewer 1 for significance testing, we have now also explored the use of the modified t-test (Zwiers and von Storch, 1995). This accounts for temporal correlation and the relatively small sample size which we have available (~20 years). Compared to the standard t-test, the modified t-test generally gives less widespread areas of significance, particularly for the model-model differences in northern winter. Based on this new testing, we propose showing significance stippling for both the model-ERAi temperature biases and the model-model differences in Fig 4, as these are the critical results that we are trying to explain.

Since the model-model differences shown in the remainder of the paper are primarily for explaining the temperature differences, we feel that it is not important to include the t-test stippling on those figures.

Zwiers, F. W. and von Storch, H.: Taking Serial Correlation in Account in Tests of the Mean, *J. Climate*, 8, 336-351, 1995.

We thank the reviewer for their comments. Each comment is addressed below with the original review in italics, our responses in normal font and changes to the manuscript in **bold**.

*The paper describes the impact of using CABLE rather than MOSES (the default LSM) within the ACCESS model system. This is a highly relevant paper as ACCESS is a widely used model within the Australian climate science community. The paper is well written, and the physical mechanisms behind the changes are very well explored and explained. The description of the model differences between CABLE and MOSES is also very valuable. Hence the paper is suitable for final publication in GMD with minor revisions. The following comments may help improve the manuscript.*

Major comments:

*Title: Suggest changing to “The impact of changing the land surface scheme in ACCESS (v1.0/1.1) on the surface climatology” – Reads better*

We will revise the title so it is easier to read (**p1, title**).

Abstract:

*It is mentioned that CABLE results in a warmer winter and cooler summer in the NH, but no mention is made if this improves or degrades the bias?*

Significance testing as requested by reviewer 1 suggests that A1.1 (CABLE) has smaller bias in summer than A1.0 (MOSES) while the relative model performance cannot be distinguished in winter. This will now be noted in the abstract (**p1, L6-7**).

*The abstract should have a sentence or two, describing the overall effect of replacing MOSES with CABLE. The dynamics are very well explained, but it would leave a non-expert reader wondering: “was it worth the effort to replace MOSES with CABLE?” Although this is not the aim of this paper, an ACCESS user who is not an LSM-expert should be able to use the abstract as a guide to decide if they want to use CABLE versus MOSES. A few sentences could make this clearer.*

A summary statement will be added to the end of the abstract indicating how the extra complexity in CABLE benefits the ACCESS simulation (**p1, L14-16**).

*Section 2.1: It is mentioned that subsurface tiling is used in CABLE. Would be useful to provide information if the maximum number of tiles per grid-cell is user-specified, or automatically computed?*

We will add this information in section 3.1, paragraph 4 (**p7, line 19-20**).

*In the same section, would it be possible to tabulate the differences between CABLE and MOSES in table format? That would be a useful summary for ACCESS users to be able to refer to.*

We now will include a table referenced from section 2.2 (**p4, L3**) to summarise the differences including further details about the snow scheme as requested by reviewer 1.

*Section 3.3: It is fine that you are using the offline simulations to focus on model behaviour rather than reproduce the online results, but a reader would be left wondering why you did not use same versions for the offline simulations.*

Earlier versions of the code were not setup to easily switch between offline and online simulations. This information will be added in section 3.3 (p8, L26).

*In the same section, line 21, provide a CABLE version, and perhaps state the UM version with the different atmospheric physics.*

We will add the versions and appropriate reference in manuscript (p8, L21-23).

*Figure 4: The improved bias during JJA with ACCESS1.1 (CABLE) as compared to 1.0 (MOSES) over NA and northern Europe could be mentioned in the abstract.*

As noted above this finding will be added to the abstract (p1, L6-7).

*The discussion of the physical mechanisms behind the differences between CABLE and MOSES in ACCESS is very thorough and convincing. The conclusion could use a few sentences on “what this all means”. It seems to me that CABLE in ACCESS, with its more realistic method of energy partitioning etc, is an important step forwards in ACCESS development. I suggest a paragraph, aimed at a non-LSM experts, which paints the broader picture.*

We agree that the paper would benefit from an additional paragraph in the conclusions as suggested by the reviewer. We will focus on how the unique features of CABLE contribute to ACCESS development (p16, L25-34).

*There should be some rationale for the use of Era-Interim. This has been raised by the first reviewer. Perhaps the authors should clarify that they use ERA-Interim such that they can investigate L-A feedbacks in a consistent manner? i.e., one can make inferences about temp, precip, cloud feedbacks using Era-Interim, but this is harder to do using pure observational data-sets. The aim here is to investigate the feedbacks, and the use of Era-Interim seems appropriate to me.*

As suggested by reviewer 1 we have now confirmed our model-obs comparisons against other datasets than just Era Interim, noting also that much of the paper focuses on model-model comparisons for which observations are not relevant. The manuscript will be updated accordingly particularly section 3.2 (p8, L5-11) and discussion of fig 3 and 4 a-d (p9, L25-p10, L11).

*The first reviewer has also commented on the lack of statistics used in this paper. I do not think the use of statistical significance testing would add much to this paper. The aim is to investigate the physical mechanisms, as the authors have carried out. So, I would disagree with the first reviewer on this point.*

We have now performed significance testing for model-model and model-obs differences. The model-model differences are significant almost everywhere and we agree with the reviewer that this would not add much to the paper. The significance of model-obs differences may be helpful for commenting on whether one model or the other gives smaller biases compared to obs/reanalysis.

As per our additional author comment to reviewer 1 (2 June 2016) using the modified t-test generally gives reduced regions of significance. Consequently we have decided to include significance stippling on all panels of Figure 4 but don't think it necessary to show on the other model-model difference plots as their primary purpose is for explaining the temperature differences as suggested by this reviewer.

*Editorial comments:*

*Page 1, line 8, replace “placement of canopy” with “placement of the canopy”.*

We will change this in the manuscript **(p1, L8)**.

*Page 1, line 11, replace “lowers diurnally” with “lowers the diurnally”*

We will change this in the manuscript **(p1, L11)**.

*Page 2, line 11, replace “while (Kowalczyk et al. 2013)” with “while Kowalczyk et al. (2013)”.*

We will change this in the manuscript **(p2, L31)**.

*Page 2, line 24, the “HadGEM2 Development Team: et al. (2011)” reference seems strange?*

We believe this follows GMD style guidelines **(p3, L9)**.

*Page 2, line 28, suggest to add/provide some references after “interpret the results from ACCESS1.3”.*

We will add references to Bi et al 2013 and Kowalczyk et al 2013 **(p3, L13)**.

*Page 3, line 15, replace “structural placing” with “the structural placement”.*

We will change this in the manuscript **(p4, L2)**.

*Figure 1 caption: provide descriptions of H, Hv, Hs, sigma\_v etc.*

We will change this in the manuscript **(p24)**.

*Page 3, line 24, L does not appear in Eq. 1*

L is in equation 1 as a part of LE. This will be made clearer in the definition of the variables in the equation **(p4, L12-13)**.

*Page 4, line 2, Fig. 2 should be in brackets? Or “as shown in Fig. 2”, and elsewhere in the manuscript, e.g., line 4.*

We will change this in the manuscript **([p4, L22], [p4, L24], [p12, L14], [p14, L12], [p14, L27], [p14, L31], [p15, L12])**.

*Page 4, line 4, what “many other LSMs”, should provide references. Are you referring to CLM, NOAH, ORCHIDEE etc? or is this a broad statement?*

This is a broad statement which we now clarify by noting that these other LSMs tend to use conventional rough wall boundary theory, with parameters that are a constant fraction of canopy height **([p5, L12-13], [p5, L23-24])**.

*Page4, line 8 – Should note that it is possible to parameterize snow-free albedo in CABLE as described in Kala et al. (2014) ([www.geosci-modeldev.net/7/2121/2014/](http://www.geosci-modeldev.net/7/2121/2014/)), but this is yet to be tested coupled to ACCESS and not usually activated.*

We will add this information in section 2.2 **(p6, L2-4)**.

*Page 9, line 1, replace “In boreal summer” with “During the Boreal summer”.*

We have decided to change this in the manuscript to “In JJA” to explicitly link the figure and text **(p10, L26)**.

*Page 10, line 12, replace “giving lower surface albedo” with “simulating lower surface albedo”. The phrase “CABLE gives....” is use a lot through the manuscript. Suggest to use “simulates” instead.*

We will change this in the manuscript **(p10, L27)**.

*Page 9, last line, impacts “the” overall*

We will add this in the manuscript **(p11, L20)**.

*Page 10, line 29, “The” Boreas grid-cell*

We will add this in the manuscript **(p12, L13)**.

*Page 15, last line. Recent work would suggest that stomatal opening to CO2 is equally important: Kala et al. (2015): <http://www.nature.com/articles/srep23418>*

We will add this in the manuscript **(p16, L23-24)**.

# The impact ~~on the surface climatology from of~~ changing the land surface scheme in ~~the ACCESS(v1.0/1.1) climate model on the~~ surface climatology

Eva A. Kowalczyk<sup>1</sup>, Lauren E. Stevens<sup>1</sup>, Rachel M. Law<sup>1</sup>, Ian N. Harman<sup>2</sup>, Martin Dix<sup>1</sup>, Charmaine N. Franklin<sup>1</sup>, and Ying-Ping Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Aspendale, Victoria 3195, Australia

<sup>2</sup>CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, Yarralumla, ACT, 2600, Australia

*Correspondence to:* Eva Kowalczyk (eva.kowalczyk@csiro.au)

**Abstract.** The Community Atmosphere Biosphere Land Exchange (CABLE) model has been coupled to the UK Met Office Unified Model (UM) within the existing framework of the Australian Community Climate and Earth System Simulator (ACCESS), replacing the Met Office Surface Exchange Scheme (MOSES). Here we investigate how features of the CABLE model impact on present day surface climate using ACCESS atmosphere-only simulations. The main differences attributed to CABLE

5 include a warmer winter and a cooler summer in the Northern Hemisphere (NH), earlier NH spring runoff from snowmelt, and smaller seasonal and diurnal temperature ranges. ~~Cooler-~~The cooler NH summer temperatures in canopy covered ~~areas-are~~ regions are more consistent with observations and are attributed to two factors. Firstly CABLE accounts for aerodynamic and radiative interactions between the canopy and the ground below; this placement of the canopy above the ground eliminates the need for a separate bare ground tile in canopy covered areas. Secondly, CABLE ~~produces-~~simulates larger evapotranspiration

10 fluxes and slightly larger daytime cloud cover fraction. Warmer NH winter temperatures result from the parameterization of cold climate processes in CABLE in snow covered areas. In particular prognostic snow density increases through the winter and lowers the diurnally resolved snow albedo; variable snow thermal conductivity prevents early winter heat loss but allows more heat to enter the ground as the snow season progresses; liquid precipitation freezing within the snowpack delays the building of the snow pack in autumn and accelerates snow melting in spring. Overall we find that the ACCESS simulation of

15 surface air temperature benefits from the specific representation of the turbulent transport within and just above the canopy in the roughness sublayer as well as the more complex snow scheme in CABLE relative to MOSES.

## 1 Introduction

One of the main issues in climate modelling is understanding the dependence of climate on the interaction between clouds, radiation, precipitation and the land surface processes. A land surface model (LSM) is ~~a key component~~one of the key components

20 of a climate model, providing information on surface exchange processes. The LSM includes a representation of the turbulent transport of momentum, heat and water between the land surface, canopy and the atmospheric boundary layer, as well as descriptions of thermal and hydrological processes in the soil and snow. A number of studies have been conducted to understand

land-atmosphere interactions, ~~in particular the~~. Betts (2009) synthesised 15 years of his published work discussing the basic physical processes involved in the land-surface-atmosphere interactions as well as their relationships from the modelling and observational perspective. The paper discussed the role of the surface and cloud albedo on radiation and surface fluxes, the role of soil water availability and clouds on the partitioning of the surface energy and the diurnal cycle of temperature, the role of soil moisture in evaporation-precipitation feedback, and the role of surface and atmospheric processes in determining Boundary Layer equilibrium. Betts (2009) examined systematic features of the seasonal and diurnal cycles as well as the coupling of processes and compared their observable relationships with their model simulations. The feedbacks between soil moisture and meteorology (e.g. Koster et al., 2004; Seneviratne et al., 2010). climate was examined in Koster et al. (2004) where multimodel experiment identified/estimated regions where precipitation is affected by soil moisture anomalies during Northern Hemisphere summer. The interaction between soil moisture and precipitation is complex as it has direct and indirect effects. Direct effect such as moisture recycling is described in Eltahir and Bras (1996). Indirect effects including the influence of soil moisture on boundary layer and clouds are investigated in Ek and Holtslag (2004) and Taylor et al. (2011). The effect of land surface processes on extreme events was described in Seneviratne et al. (2010). Fischer et al. (2007) shows that more than half of the summer heat waves in Europe have contributions from soil moisture and temperature interactions. The effect of dry soils in southern Europe on summertime heat waves and drought were described in Vautard et al. (2007) and Zampieri et al. (2009). Hirsch et al. (2014) identified that soil moisture-temperature feedbacks were affecting daily maximum temperature in Australia. Feedbacks from climate change that generate variations in soil moisture are described in Seneviratne et al. (2013), Berg et al. (2016) and Lorenz et al. (2016). Berg et al. (2016) showed that the aridity response is amplified by land-atmosphere feedbacks under global warming.

With rapidly increasing changes in land management and land use producing complex feedbacks between the biosphere and climate, LSMs have become increasingly complex. The performance of different LSMs has been compared using prescribed meteorological forcing (e.g. Slater et al., 2001; Luo et al., 2003; Abramowitz et al., 2008; Best et al., 2015) and benchmarking systems for land surface models are being developed (Abramowitz, 2012; Kumar et al., 2012; Luo et al., 2012). Comparisons of different land surface models within a single atmospheric model are less common, due to the coupling work involved, although tools are being developed to provide a standard coupling interface (e.g. NASA's Land Information System, <http://lis.gsfc.nasa.gov/>, Kumar et al., 2006). Here we explore the impact on the simulated climate ~~from by~~ changing the LSM in an atmospheric model (the UM) from the original scheme that was developed with the model (MOSES) to an alternate LSM (CABLE).

The comparison of these LSMs is part of the development of ACCESS, used for both numerical weather prediction (NWP) (Puri et al., 2013) and climate modelling (Bi et al., 2013), with the LSM evaluation currently focussed on the climate timescale with evaluations at NWP timescales to follow. Two ACCESS versions contributed to the 5th Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) using the two different LSMs, MOSES and CABLE. However evaluation of the impact of the LSM was complicated by other differences in the atmospheric settings and cloud scheme between the two versions. Thus while ~~(Kowalczyk et al., 2013)~~ Kowalczyk et al. (2013), (hereafter referred to as K2013), noted significant differences in the simulated seasonal and diurnal temperature ranges and in timing of runoff from snowmelt in the Northern Hemisphere from the

different ACCESS versions, these could not be attributed solely to the LSM used. Hence we aim to clarify that attribution by performing present-day atmosphere-only simulations with model versions that only differ in their choice of LSM. A second aim is to explore which processes within the LSMs are driving the differences and where differences in process representation (Sec. 2.2) between the LSMs appears to be important.

- 5 We investigate the diurnal cycle as well as mean seasonal and annual time scales of near surface meteorological variables. Simulation of the phase and amplitude of the diurnal cycle of the near surface variables allows the testing of the model representation of the interaction between the surface, boundary layer and the atmosphere above. A focus on summer (Sec. 4.2) and winter (Sec. 4.3) separately highlights the different processes that are important in different seasons.

## 2 The ACCESS model

- 10 The atmospheric component of ACCESS (Bi et al., 2013) used in these simulations is the UK Met Office UM with HadGEM2(r1.1) atmospheric physics as described in Davies et al. (2005) and The HadGEM2 Development Team: et al. (2011). Two versions of ACCESS are used here: ACCESS1.0 uses the original UM LSM, MOSES, and was one of the ACCESS versions submitted to CMIP5, ACCESS1.1 replaces MOSES with CABLE v1.8 (Kowalczyk et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2011) but otherwise leaves the atmospheric model unchanged. This study will focus on the comparison between ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1. The evaluation  
15 will, however help interpret results from ACCESS1.3 ([Bi et al., 2013](#); [Kowalczyk et al., 2013](#)), the alternate ACCESS version used for CMIP5 which used CABLE and different atmospheric settings ~~and was analysed by K2013~~.

### 2.1 Land surface model descriptions

- Land surface models CABLE and MOSES include mechanistic formulations of the physical, biophysical and biogeochemical processes that control the exchange of momentum, radiation, heat, water and carbon fluxes between the land surface and the  
20 atmosphere. Both models use tiles to represent land cover types in each grid-cell and calculate a separate energy balance for each tile to provide area-weighted grid mean fluxes and temperatures.

- A basic configuration of MOSES version 2.2 was used in the ACCESS1.0 simulation (Cox et al., 1999; Essery et al., 2001) and is also used for ACCESS numerical weather prediction. The MOSES code formed the scientific core of the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES) (Best et al., 2011), which has both stand-alone and Unified Model (UM) implementations and  
25 has had ongoing development since the version of MOSES used here. In MOSES, the canopy is modelled as one big leaf model and is represented in the surface energy balance equation through the coupling to the soil underneath. The soil underneath is not tiled and hence a homogenous soil moisture and temperature is common to all tiles within a grid cell. Subsurface tiling is used in CABLE.

- The CABLE model (v1.8) has been coupled to the UM and is used in ACCESS1.1 simulations. CABLE is a one layer  
30 two-leaf canopy model, as described in Wang and Leuning (1998) and was formulated on the basis of the multilayer model of Leuning (1995). CABLEv1.8 is derived from CABLEv1.4b (Kowalczyk et al., 2006; Wang et al., 2011) with the changes for CABLEv1.8 detailed in K2013.

## 2.2 Differences between CABLE and MOSES

The main difference between CABLE and MOSES is the representation of the canopy processes including structural-placing-the structural placement of the canopy above the bare ground; there are also significant differences in snow submodels (Table 1).

In MOSES a “two-patch” approach is used in which the canopy is modelled by conceptually placing it beside bare ground and calculating entirely separate energy balances for bare ground and vegetation, hence neglecting radiative and aerodynamic interaction between the two systems and their mediation of each others microclimate. Figure 1a gives an example of a mean grid-cell flux density calculation i.e. sensible heat flux is calculated from the weighted fraction of the vegetation fraction tile ( $\sigma$ ) and the bare ground tile ( $1 - \sigma$ ).

Surface temperature,  $T_r$  (K), in MOSES is interpreted as a surface skin temperature (Essery et al., 2001) and is obtained for both vegetation and bare ground tile from the surface energy balance calculated as

$$C_s \frac{dT_r}{dt} = R_n - H - LE - G_0 \quad (1)$$

where  $R_n$  is surface net radiation ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ),  $H$ ,  $LE$  are surface heat fluxes is the sensible heat flux ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ),  $LE$  is the latent heat flux ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ), where  $L$  is the latent heat of vaporization ( $\text{Jkg}^{-1}$ ) and  $E$  is the evaporation ( $\text{kg m}^{-2}$ ).  $C_s$  is a surface heat coefficient volumetric heat capacity calculated as the weighted sum of the heat capacity of dry soil, liquid and ice ( $\text{JK}^{-1}\text{m}^{-2}$ ) and  $G_0$  is the heat flux ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ) into the ground parameterised as

$$G_0 = f_r(\sigma T_r^4 - \sigma T_s^4) + (1 - f_r) \frac{2c}{\Delta z_s} (T_r - T_s) \quad (2)$$

where  $\Delta z_s$  and  $T_s$  are the thickness (m) and temperature (K) of the top soil layer respectively,  $f_r$  is a radiative canopy fraction ( $f_r = 1 - e^{-LAI/2}$ ),  $\sigma = 5.67 \times 10^{-8} \text{ Wm}^{-2}\text{K}^{-4}$  is the Stefan Boltzmann constant and  $c$  is the thermal conductivity ( $\text{Wm}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$ ). Components of net radiation ( $R_n$ ): incoming long wave ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ) and the net short wave ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ) are calculated outside of the LSM by the UM atmospheric radiation model. The heat diffusion equation is solved to calculate the soil temperature,  $T_s$  (K).

By contrast, in CABLE the canopy is placed conceptually above the ground (Fig. 1b) hence removing a need for a separate bare ground tile in canopy covered areas (Fig. 2). A combined energy balance for the soil-vegetation system is calculated allowing for the aerodynamic and radiative interaction between the canopy and the ground (Kowalczyk et al., 2006). The mean grid flux density is a sum of the soil flux and the canopy flux (Fig. 1b). When solving the combined energy balance, the calculation of surface fluxes depends on stability and the surface temperature and simultaneously the surface temperature depends on the stability and fluxes. Therefore, an iterative procedure is used to allow for the simultaneous calculation of all the required variables. We first calculate the radiation absorbed by the canopy, differentiating between sunlit and shaded leaves. We iterate for the thermal stability parameter and soil heat fluxes simultaneously with the solution of the coupled model of stomatal conductance calculating photosynthesis, heat fluxes, leaf ( $T_l$ ) and vegetation temperatures,  $T_v$  (K). At this stage the

soil surface temperature from the previous time step is being used in the iteration. Having obtained canopy/soil fluxes and canopy temperature, the heat flux into the ground is obtained by

$$G_0 = S_{abs} + L_{in} + (1 - \tau)\epsilon_l\sigma T_v^4 - \epsilon_s\sigma T_s^4 - H_s - LE_s \quad (3)$$

5 where  $S_{abs}$  is net short wave at the soil surface ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ),  $L_{in}$  is incoming long wave ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ) which includes terrestrial and canopy irradiances.  $T_s$  (K) is the soil surface temperature which in CABLE is the temperature of the top thin soil layer of 0.022 m. The heat diffusion equation is solved to calculate the soil temperature profile.  $\epsilon_l$  and  $\epsilon_s$  are leaf and soil emissivity and  $H_s$  and  $LE_s$  are soil heat fluxes ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ). The surface radiative temperature ( $T_r$ ) is obtained from vegetation  $T_v$  (K) and soil surface temperatures;

$$T_r = ((1 - \tau)T_v^4 + \tau T_s^4)^{1/4} \quad (4)$$

10 where  $\tau$  is a canopy transmission  $\tau = \exp(-c \text{LAI})$ ,  $c$  is ~~a function of the plant function type and LAI is leaf area index~~ an extinction coefficient for beam radiation and black leaves (Wang and Leuning, 1998, Eq. B6).

CABLE has a more complex representation of canopy turbulent transport than many other land surface models which use conventional rough wall boundary theory. In particular, features of the canopy representation in CABLE that are not present in MOSES are:

- 15 – Turbulent transport within the canopy based on Localised Near-Field theory, (Raupach, 1989) and transport just above the canopy in the roughness sublayer (RSL) is simulated. The inclusion of a representation of the RSL is critical to the performance of CABLE.
- The model differentiates between sunlit and shaded leaves for the calculation of canopy radiation, photosynthesis, stomatal conductance and leaf temperature (Wang and Leuning, 1998).
- 20 – The canopy albedo is resolved diurnally as a function of beam fraction, the sun angle, canopy leaf area index, leaf angle distribution and the transmittance and reflectance of the leaves.

In CABLE the two main canopy parameters affecting turbulent exchange i.e. the displacement height,  $d$ , and the roughness length for momentum,  $z0_c$ , have more complex representation than many other LSMs where these parameters are a constant fraction of canopy height. The displacement height, which describes the mean level of momentum absorption by the canopy, 25 is a function of canopy height and leaf area index as given in Raupach (1994) (Eq. 8). The canopy roughness length,  $z0_c$ , is determined by matching the mean wind speed profiles within and above the canopy as described in Raupach (1994). In MOSES, a more conventional rough wall boundary theory is used, with roughness length being a constant fraction of the canopy height ( $h$ ) i.e.  $z0_c = h/20$  for trees and  $h/10$  for other vegetation types. Displacement height is not explicitly included in its formulation, with the result being that the reference level for wind is the height above the displacement height for each tile and consequently

the ground surface is uneven. Both models use the same prescribed value of soil roughness length,  $z_{0_{soil}} = 3 \times 10^{-4}$ , as well as a common geographically explicit snow free soil albedo dataset. [A more recent version of CABLE than used here allows soil albedo to be calculated from soil moisture and colour \(Kala et al., 2014\) but has only been applied to offline CABLE simulations of the Australian continent.](#)

5 Both LSMs use multiple surface types in each grid-cell, but with different numbers of vegetated and non-vegetated types (Sec. 3.1). Subsurface tiling is used in CABLE, where each surface tile has a corresponding soil tile for the calculation of soil temperature, moisture and runoff, while in MOSES the soil is common to all tiles within a grid cell. Soil processes are modelled similarly in both models but with different vertical resolution. Soil temperature and moisture are calculated for four soil layers to a depth of 3.0m in MOSES and six layers to a depth of 4.6m in CABLE. In both models soil moisture is calculated using  
10 Richards' equation. The evolution of soil moisture depends on the rates of infiltration, plant transpiration, soil evaporation and deep drainage. The heat diffusion equation, including an explicit freeze-thaw scheme, is solved to calculate the soil temperature profile. In CABLE soil water is assumed to be at the ground temperature so there is no heat exchange between the soil moisture and the soil due to vertical movement of water. MOSES ~~does account for this heat exchange~~[calculates the advection of heat by moisture fluxes.](#)

15 There are also significant differences between snow model components used in ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 simulations. In both models snow cover evolution is based on the mass budget between the snowfall, sublimation and the snowmelt. The amount of snow deposited on the surface depends on the amount of solid/liquid precipitation which in the UM is computed by the cloud microphysics parameterizations. Both models accumulate solid fraction at the snowpack surface but the treatment of liquid fraction is different. In CABLE rain falling on snow freezes within the snowpack while MOSES diverts the rainfall  
20 straight to runoff.

The total surface albedo is calculated from the contribution from vegetation, snow and bare ground, the last one being the same in both models. In the version of MOSES used here the albedo for soil, vegetation, ice and snow are specified as single values for all radiation bands. The snow albedo in MOSES remains constant when the surface air temperature is below  $-2^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and undergoes an aging process decreasing its value above  $-2^{\circ}\text{C}$ , see Essery et al. (2001). In CABLE only snow free soil  
25 albedo is prescribed. The canopy albedo is resolved diurnally while the snow albedo depends on snow depth, a spectral mix of the incident solar radiation, soot loading, snow melting/freezing and snow age, which is parameterized as a function of snow density, see Dickinson et al. (1993).

In CABLE, the snow metamorphism and the bulk snow properties are accounted for through changes in snow density, see Gordon et al. (2002). In CABLE the density of the fresh snow is  $120 \text{ kg/m}^3$ , and with time it may increase to  $400 \text{ kg/m}^3$   
30 while in MOSES it remains constant at  $250 \text{ kg/m}^3$ . Snow density affects the temperature of the snow through its effects on the snow albedo and thermal conductivity. In CABLE, thermal conductivity for new snow is  $0.2 \text{ Wm}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}$  and increases with snow density up to  $0.5 \text{ Wm}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}$  while in MOSES it remains constant at  $0.265 \text{ Wm}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}$ .

### 3 Data and model setup

#### 3.1 Model Datasets

The simulation results of MOSES and CABLE also depend on the values of their parameters, with some vegetation or soil type dependent, and others having an explicit geographical distribution. Both models use a number of surface datasets to derive the distributions of vegetation and soil types as well as some of the parameters required for the vegetation and soil, see K2013.

Both ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 use the IGBP (Global Soil Data Task Group, 2000) soil data. The hydraulic properties are determined from information on soil texture based on empirical relationships (Jones, 2008). Each soil type is described by the following hydraulic characteristics: volumetric water content at saturation, wilting point, field capacity, hydraulic conductivity and matrix potential at saturation. These properties define soil water holding capacity and control the rate of water infiltration through the soil. Soil thermal conductivity and heat capacity depend on soil moisture and ice content.

Both CABLE and MOSES use the same spatially varying snow free soil albedo data set which was obtained by blending soil albedo from Wilson and Henderson-Sellers (1985) with MODIS-derived albedo as described in Houldcroft et al. (2009), for details see Jones (2008).

ACCESS1.0 with MOSES uses five vegetated surface types (broadleaf trees, needleleaf trees, C3 grass, C4 grass and shrubs) and four non-vegetated types (urban, inland water, bare soil and ice). The spatial distribution of surface types is derived from  $0.5^\circ$  by  $0.5^\circ$  International Geosphere Biosphere Program (IGBP) data (Loveland et al., 2000). The implementation of CABLE in ACCESS1.1 uses ten vegetated surface types and three non-vegetated types. A dataset prepared for the Common Land Model 4 (CLM4) (Lawrence et al., 2012) at  $0.5^\circ$  by  $0.5^\circ$  resolution was mapped to CABLE vegetated types; and wetlands, lakes and permanent ice were taken from IGBP and do not change in time ~~see K2013. (K2013).~~ Here we use a maximum of 5 tiles per grid cell but CABLE is flexible in the number of tiles used. The vegetation distribution used for both models in this study is for present-day conditions, i.e. 2005. Figure 2 in K2013 shows the differences in vegetation fractions. In general the distributions are broadly similar for both models. The main difference is in the representation of bare ground underneath a canopy, shown here in Fig. 2. ~~CABLEs~~ CABLE's vegetation is above the ground hence there are many grids-cells in CABLE without bare ground tile (Fig. 2b). By contrast, MOSES' vegetation is placed beside bare ground, and hence every grid-cell is allocated a separate bare ground tile to account for bare ground under a canopy (Fig. 2a). The vertical placement of the vegetation above the ground also has implications on the calculation of the surface albedo and roughness length which in CABLE are the integral part of the model.

The key parameters for each CABLE surface type used in the simulation are given in K2013. A description of vegetation parameters used by MOSES can be found in Cox et al. (1999), Cox (2001) and Jones (2008). MOSES uses prescribed monthly varying Leaf Area Index (LAI) which depends on vegetation type and canopy height. In the ACCESS1.1 simulations described here, LAI is prescribed from MODIS satellite estimates (Yang et al., 2006). However, unlike MOSES, a constant value is used across all tiles within a grid-cell. This consequently limits the differentiation of vegetated surfaces within a grid-cell, a limitation that needs to be addressed in future implementations of CABLE in ACCESS.

Both MOSES and CABLE are able to predict canopy LAI when coupled to appropriate submodels that simulate plant growth: TRIFFID (Cox, 2001) for MOSES, CASA-CNP (Wang et al., 2010) for CABLE. However these submodels are not used in the ACCESS simulations described here.

### 3.2 Observations

- 5 ~~Two~~ Both global and site-based datasets have been used to provide an observational context to the comparison between model versions: . For evaluating regional to continental scale model differences, we use the ERA Interim Reanalysis (~~ERAi, Dee et al., 2011~~) and product (ERAi, Dee et al., 2011), the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre (GPCC) monthly version 7 precipitation dataset (Becker et al., 2013; Schneider et al., 2015), the International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP) D2 data product (<http://isccp.giss.nasa.gov/products/onlineData.html> Rossow and Schiffer, 1991; Rossow et al., 1996), and the CRU3.22 near-surface
- 10 land temperature dataset (University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit et al., 2014). FLUXNET flux station data (Baldocchi et al., 2001) ~~-ERAi has been used to evaluate model differences at regional to continental scale while the flux station data allow a more detailed analysis~~ are used for more detailed site-based analyses, to help identify which processes contribute to generating ~~those differences~~ regional differences in the model simulations.

### 3.3 Model setup

- 15 We perform atmosphere-only simulations following the Atmosphere Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP) experimental design with prescribed sea surface temperature and sea-ice to constrain the climatology and aid in interpreting the differences between ACCESS1.0 (MOSES) and ACCESS1.1 (CABLE) simulations. We run both models for 20 years for the period 1979-1998 at a resolution of  $1.875^\circ \times 1.25^\circ$  (N96). The same atmospheric model and cloud scheme are used in ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1. Similar to a previous study by K2013, both simulations use initial conditions from a pre-industrial simulation.
- 20 Global atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is also prescribed, increasing from 337 ppm in 1979 to 379 ~~ppm in 2005. We also~~ ppm in 2005, although this increase is not passed to CABLE (in ACCESS1.1), which uses a constant 370 ppm in this implementation. An additional sensitivity experiment (ACCESS1.0L) was also performed, using ACCESS1.0 (MOSES) but with LAI taken from the ACCESS1.1 (CABLE) case and, as in ACCESS1.1, using the same LAI for all tiles within a grid-cell. We also make reference to the 27 year (1979-2005) ACCESS1.3 AMIP simulation submitted to CMIP5, which employed CABLE1.8 but
- 25 with additional changes to the atmospheric physics parameterisations (configuration similar to Hewitt et al. (2011), Appendix A).

- We also perform single-site offline simulations to explain some of the implications of different processes between models. Note that the offline models are not identical to that used in the ACCESS simulations (for MOSES we use JULES v3.0 and for CABLE we use v2.1.2) ~~but the,~~ as earlier versions of the code were not setup to easily switch between offline and online
- 30 simulations. However, the core science parameterisations are essentially the same between the online and offline versions of the model used in this study. Hence the aim is not to exactly reproduce the online behaviour but rather to characterise differences in model behaviour when using common meteorological forcing. ~~We also make reference to the 27 year (1979-2005) ACCESS1.3~~

~~AMIP simulation submitted to CMIP5, which employed CABLE but with additional changes to the atmospheric physics parameterisations.~~

## 4 Model results

We focus our assessment of the land surface climatology on the seasonal means of screen level temperature ~~and precipitation~~ for present-day conditions. We calculate means for December-January-February (DJF) and June-July-August (JJA) for 1979-1998 ~~and plot the biases between modelled and reanalysis fields from ERAi. We also present components of the water and energy balance over all the land area in comparison with various other estimates.~~ After a brief comparison with observations and ERAi reanalysis, we seek a process-based understanding of the differences in NH land temperature between the two model simulations.

### 4.1 Mean climate

Modelling climate over the land is critically dependent on the interaction between clouds and the surface. Clouds are precursors of precipitation, reflect solar radiation and absorb outgoing long-wave radiation affecting the surface energy balance. Figure 3a shows the zonally averaged simulated total cloud cover fraction over land in comparison with ERAi derived cloud fraction ~~and ISCCP observations. Both ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 produced much smaller produce much smaller cloud~~ fractions than ACCESS1.3, especially in the tropics and the polar regions, illustrating the large impact of changing the atmospheric physics settings and cloud scheme in ACCESS1.3 (K2013). In comparison with ACCESS1.0, ACCESS1.1 ~~produced slightly larger simulates slightly larger cloud~~ fractions around the equator, in mid-high latitudes in the Northern hemisphere and in the southern polar regions. However, in comparison with ERAi ~~, the simulated fraction was significantly lower, particularly and~~ ISCCP, both ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 underestimate cloud fraction in the tropics and southern hemisphere by up to 15% and in the northern polar regions by up to 20%. This underestimation of the cloud cover impacts the latitudinal distribution of cloud forcing that will strongly affect the surface energy budget. (while ACCESS1.3 is a better fit to the observations and reanalysis). Around 30° N and S, ERAi and ISCCP tend to span the model simulations while in polar regions ACCESS1.0/1.1 are closer to the reanalysis and observations than ACCESS1.3.

Zonally averaged ~~mean precipitation shown in land-only mean precipitation~~ (Fig. 3b ~~was~~) is similar in ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 and ~~significantly lower than in lower than~~ ACCESS1.3 ~~, again showing the impact of the new physics and the cloud scheme in~~ in the tropics. Consistent with the cloud cover, land precipitation in the tropics is underestimated in ACCESS1.3. In comparison to ERAi it was overestimated by up to 0.5 mm/day across the mid-latitudes. In the mid-latitudes of the southern hemisphere the precipitation was overestimated despite the underestimation of the total cloud cover. 0 and ACCESS1.1 compared with both ERAi and GPCP. By contrast, in the northern mid-latitudes, the simulations give slightly more precipitation than observed. Table 2 presents model computed and ‘observed/estimated’ components of the water balance over the global land area. The estimates come from Baumgartner and Reichel (1975) and Legates and Willmott (1990). Globally, both ACCESS1.1 and ACCESS1.0 produced similar means for precipitation and evapotranspiration but larger dif-

ferences are found for boreal summer over the Northern mid-high latitudes (Table 3). This is consistent with the larger cloud fraction simulated in these areas by ACCESS1.1 (Fig. 3a).

~~Patterns and signs of the precipitation biases are similar in Mean screen temperature biases relative to ERAi (Fig. 4) are similar for ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 as well as in ACCESS1.3 over most of the land areas, (not shown). Common strong dry biases occur in the Amazon and equatorial Africa in both seasons, weak dry biases occur in central Europe and the eastern part of North America in JJA. There are also common strong biases in the equatorial ocean area and wet biases in the south eastern part of Africa in DJF and, at least across the tropics and more generally in DJF. The significance of these biases (indicated by shading in Fig. 4) has been assessed using a modified t-test (Zwiers and von Storch, 1995) with a significance level of 0.05; this test accounts for auto-correlation and we use the look up table method to allow for the relatively small sample size. The tropical biases tend to be significant while in the central part of South America in JJA. Weak wet biases occur in northern mid-high latitudes the significance varies with season, region and model. In DJF significant cold biases cover a larger fraction of the northern mid-high latitudes in ACCESS1.0 than ACCESS1.1 but not, while ACCESS1.0 over North Asia in JJA. In both simulations the Indian monsoon is severely under-predicted resulting in insufficient evapotranspiration in JJA (K2013). Many GCMs including HadGEM, which also uses the UM for its atmospheric component, show systematic biases in their simulation of monsoonal rainfall and dynamics.~~

~~As for precipitation, there is a similarity in the pattern and sign of the mean screen temperature biases especially in the tropics (Fig. 4). 1 shows small regions of significant positive bias. In JJA common (though larger and regionally more significant in ACCESS1.0) warm biases occur across central Europe and the Great Plains of North America. These are, coincident with the underestimation of precipitation in these regions ; however in ACCESS1.0 the biases are larger than in ACCESS1.1 (not shown but very similar to K2013, Fig. 4b). Likewise, the underestimation in rainfall seen in both simulations in significant warm temperature biases in the Indian peninsula, equatorial Africa and part of the Amazon induces the warm temperature biases which are also result from the underestimation in rainfall, enhanced further by a positive feedback between the decrease in evapotranspiration and increased solar radiation due to a deficit in cloud cover fraction (Fig. 3a). We note, however that these warm biases are smaller and significant less often when compared with the CRU temperatures rather than ERAi (not shown), especially for the Amazon region. The warm biases which are specific to ACCESS1.0 include those in the high and mid latitudes of Asia and high latitudes of North America in JJA and unexpectedly, a strong bias over Antarctica in DJF. The ACCESS1.1 simulation tends to have a warm bias in some mountainous snow covered regions. For example, in East Siberia (in DJF in DJF (and larger relative to CRU than ERAi) and Antarctica (in JJA); where the mean winter temperature drops below  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ , ACCESS1.1 overestimates the daily temperature by up to  $5^{\circ}\text{C}$  over areas of high topography. There are also common and significant cold biases occurring over arid areas of North Africa and the Middle East, with the biases generally slightly larger for ACCESS1.1. Overall, for the northern mid-latitudes, ACCESS1.1 gives smaller biases relative to ERAi than ACCESS1.0 while in DJF it is not clear that one simulation is less biased than the other.~~

Table 2 summarises annual mean, minimum and maximum temperature for all land and excluding Antarctica, and energy budget components with estimates from Henning (1989), Budyko (1978) and Smith et al. (2008). ~~With an exclusion of Excluding~~ the Antarctic continent, where the largest temperature differences occur, ACCESS1.1 ~~model produced simulates~~

a cooler mean screen temperature by  $0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ , ~~and in particular the maximum temperature was dominated by the difference in maximum temperature~~ (lower by  $0.86^{\circ}\text{C}$  ~~and~~) with the minimum temperature ~~higher slightly higher~~ (by  $0.09^{\circ}\text{C}$ . ~~Over the Northern hemisphere above  $30^{\circ}$~~ ). ~~Over Northern land ( $30\text{--}90^{\circ}$  N latitude)~~ (Table 3), ACCESS1.1 is cooler by about  $0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  ~~and the~~, with mean maximum temperature ~~was~~ cooler by about  $1.3^{\circ}\text{C}$  and the minimum ~~temperatures~~ temperature warmer by  $0.4^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

5 ~~The largest differences are in seasonal temperatures for the land above  $30^{\circ}$  N latitude. In~~ Seasonal temperature differences are larger; in boreal winter the ACCESS1.1 minimum temperature was warmer by  $1.7^{\circ}\text{C}$  ~~and in summer in while in summer the~~ ACCESS1.1 ~~the~~ maximum temperature was cooler by  $2.7^{\circ}\text{C}$ .

In the comparison below we will focus on the Northern hemisphere, where the surface air temperature shows significant differences between both simulations (Fig. 4) ~~e,f~~. ACCESS1.1 is generally warmer than ACCESS1.0 in DJF but the significant differences are mostly confined to the high altitude regions of Asia. In JJA ACCESS1.1 is cooler than ACCESS1.0 and the significant differences are more widespread. We separately discuss boreal summer and winter, as the cold season with surface snow has a mostly stable boundary layer in contrast to the warm season which has an unstable daytime boundary layer.

10

## 4.2 Boreal summer

In ~~boreal summer in the Northern Hemispheres canopy covered areas JJA~~, Northern Hemisphere canopy-covered areas show mean screen level temperatures ~~that~~ are lower in CABLE (ACCESS1.1 (with CABLE) by up to several degrees (Fig. 4f) ~~despite CABLE giving~~, ~~despite ACCESS1.1 simulating~~ lower surface albedo (Fig. 5b). The ~~maximum temperature is significantly cooler in most areas while the minimum temperatures are slightly lower in canopy covered areas as shown in Figs~~ relative cooling is larger and more widespread for maximum temperature than minimum temperatures (Fig. 6b ~~and~~ 6d). The  $2.1^{\circ}\text{C}$  difference in northern continental JJA temperature between model simulations (Table 3) is larger than the interannual variability in either simulation (standard deviation= $0.4\text{--}0.5^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), with the interannual variability being moderately well correlated between the two simulations ( $R^2=0.7$ ). This suggests the JJA temperature difference between ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 is robust. There are two main reasons for these differences: the first one is each ~~models~~ model's approach to canopy representation i.e. the "two-patch" approach conceptually placing canopy beside bare ground in MOSES compared to above the ground in CABLE (Fig. 1). The second are feedbacks enhancing the precipitation due to larger evaporation fluxes. Differences in LAI

25 ~~between ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 do not make a major contribution to the differences in temperature. The LAI sensitivity simulation (ACCESS1.0L) gives northern continental JJA temperature (mean = 19.22) much closer to ACCESS1.0 (root mean square difference of 0.4 K) than to ACCESS1.1 (RMS difference of 2.7 K), indicating that a change in LAI has not significantly changed the ACCESS1.0 simulation of the northern continent in summer.~~

To illustrate the ~~first difference~~ impact of canopy representation, we show an offline simulation for a single location, a ~~15m~~  $15\text{ m}$  tall Scots pine forest at Hyytiälä ( $61.85^{\circ}\text{N}$ ,  $24.3^{\circ}\text{E}$ ) for 2002–2005. This site is represented in CABLE as a single tile with evergreen ~~needle leaf~~ ~~needleleaf~~ vegetation above the ground while in JULES (based on MOSES) the site is represented with two tiles; a ~~needle leaf~~ ~~needleleaf~~ canopy (tile fraction of 0.8) and bare ground (0.2); ~~see Fig 1~~. JULES's calculated midday net radiation ( $320\text{ W m}^{-2}$ ) is similar for both tiles with ~~needle leaf tile having the needleleaf tile having a~~ slightly larger value due to ~~the~~ lower vegetation albedo. However, in CABLE, net radiation for ~~the~~ canopy reaches a midday value of  $290\text{ W m}^{-2}$

30

with 90 ~~for~~  $\text{W m}^{-2}$  ~~for the~~ bare ground underneath, adding to a total grid maximum flux around midday of  $380 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ . The canopy temperature in CABLE and canopy tile temperature in JULES have similar diurnal variation and amplitudes; however the midday ground surface temperature in CABLE is  $6^\circ \text{C}$  cooler than the bare ground tile temperature in JULES (Fig. 7) since ~~CABLEs~~ ~~CABLE's~~ soil is shaded by the canopy while JULES' bare ground tile is exposed to the full atmospheric forcing. In July LAI is about 2.4 at this site resulting in a low canopy transmission coefficient and a mean grid radiative temperature in CABLE (Eq. 4) that is close to the canopy temperature, with only a slight reduction in midday temperature due to the lower soil temperature. By contrast, the averaging of bare ground and vegetated tiles in JULES leads to a midday grid temperature slightly higher than that obtained for the vegetated tile alone. The consequence is that JULES is warmer by up to  $1.5^\circ \text{C}$  at midday. In ACCESS1.1 large areas of the globe do not have a bare ground tile while in ACCESS1.0 up to 20% of the grid-cell fraction in ~~the canopy covered area is designated for bare ground tile, see~~ canopy covered areas is designated as bare ground (Fig. 2). This representation impacts the overall calculation of the grid surface temperature. In particular, it is well ~~know~~ known that seasonal depletion of soil moisture over ~~the~~ bare ground is larger than in ~~the canopy covered~~ canopy covered areas due to an absence of plant physiological control over the evapotranspiration fluxes.

In summer, in the mid and high latitudes, the weather and the climate are driven by large scale synoptic systems, and interactions between clouds, precipitation and the Atmospheric Boundary Layer (ABL). The land surface determines the partitioning of the available energy and provides the moisture and heat fluxes to the ABL. In these regions with relatively moist soils, the key contribution to the climate from the land surface is evapotranspiration ~~that,~~ which depends on soil moisture. Table 3 shows that north of  $30^\circ \text{N}$  summer mean evaporation and precipitation are larger in ACCESS1.1 by about  $0.2 \text{ mm day}^{-1}$ . Figure 8a shows that around  $60\text{--}70^\circ \text{N}$  where soil moisture is in abundance, ACCESS1.1 shows significantly larger cloud fraction over canopy covered areas. Total evapotranspiration (Fig. 8b) is also higher in at least half of these areas, ~~(Fig. 8b).~~ Increased evapotranspiration influences cloud formation and rainfall which in turn replenishes the soil moisture availability for evapotranspiration (Bierkens et al., 2008) (Fig. 8c, ~~8d~~). However we cannot separate cause and effect here i.e. whether higher evaporation fluxes induced higher cloud cover and precipitation or vice versa. Also, not all clouds produce precipitation as water droplets/ice crystals may remain suspended in the atmosphere until they are converted back into vapour. Also note, that most of the areas with the largest model differences in daily maximum temperature (Fig. 6d) coincide with the areas of largest differences in mean precipitation, (Fig. 8c).

The links between moisture and temperature presented in Figs. 6 and 8 are explored for a typical mid-latitude grid-cell; online simulations of the diurnal cycle of fluxes, temperatures, cloud cover and precipitation are compared with observations for the grid-cell closest to the Boreas flux tower site ( $55.88^\circ \text{N}$ ,  $98.48^\circ \text{W}$ ), in North America. Comparing a grid-cell from the model simulations with flux tower observations has limitations due to model resolution (grid area of about  $200\text{km} \times 140\text{km}$ ), and model errors in simulating the site meteorology but gives useful information on the overall model performance and differences between the models. In this grid ACCESS1.1 has 3 tiles; needleleaf trees (0.83), grass (0.07) and lakes (0.10) and ACCESS1.0 has 6 tiles; broadleaf and needleleaf trees (0.09, 0.50), grass (0.17), shrubs (0.02), lakes (0.10) and bare ground (0.12). In ACCESS1.1, the cloud cover fraction (Fig. 9a) is slightly larger than in ACCESS1.0 during the daytime and much larger at night, ~~(Fig. 9a).~~ The intense summer rainfall events are not reproduced with precipitation slightly larger for

ACCESS1.1 (Fig. 9b). The maximum daily net radiation in ACCESS1.1 (Fig. 9c) is lower by up to  $35 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  due to the larger cloud cover fraction while at night time the outgoing long wave flux is smaller up to  $40 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  due to significantly lower surface temperatures. Partitioning of the net radiation is different ~~with CABLE giving~~, with CABLE simulating larger latent than sensible heat (Fig. 9d, ~~9e~~) due to greater moisture availability. The Boreas grid-cell is located within an area where ACCESS1.1 ~~has~~ larger soil moisture and precipitation (~~up to 1mm/day~~ by up to 1  $\text{mm day}^{-1}$ ) than ACCESS1.0 (Fig. 8c, ~~8d~~). Smaller daytime net radiation, larger evapotranspiration and ~~larger fraction of grid~~ the larger grid fraction covered with trees shading the ground in CABLE ~~resulted~~ results in cooler diurnal screen level temperatures (Fig. 9f), with the difference in maximum temperature being larger than for the minimum temperature. However, for the Boreas grid-cell, the MOSES partitioning is closer to that observed at the flux station. This difference in partitioning is also seen when averaged across the northern continents (Table 3) with MOSES producing a sensible to latent heat ratio of 0.7 compared to 0.5 for CABLE.

The large cloud fraction overnight in ACCESS1.1 is due to the presence of fog, shown by the fraction of very low cloud, ~~< 1m~~ < 1.1 m, in Fig. 9a. The radiative cooling of the surface in the stable nocturnal boundary layer causes the overlying air to cool to the dew point temperature, generating saturation and cloud in the lowest model levels. The cooler surface temperatures simulated with CABLE require a smaller amount of radiative cooling before saturation of the overlying air is reached, compared to the case with MOSES. Once the fog has formed, longwave radiation cools the cloud top rather than the surface and drives the cloud layer through the generation of turbulence. The presence of fog increases the incoming longwave radiation at the surface, leading to an increase in the net surface radiation and the larger sensible heat fluxes seen in the early morning in ACCESS1.1 in Fig. 9d. The fog layer dissipates when the surface warms after sunrise. In much of the tundra and taiga regions high levels of humidity, fog and mist are observed in summer (Przybylak, 2003). This is captured well in the ACCESS1.1 simulation, with the occurrence of fog rapidly decreasing with latitude.

Over the desert and semi desert areas of the Middle East both models showed cold biases in the mean temperature (Fig. 4), but differ from each other in their diurnal range. Figure 6 showed that ACCESS1.1 ~~gives~~ simulates a warmer minimum and cooler maximum temperatures than ACCESS1.0. This is especially noticeable in large parts of Iran and Saudi Arabia in JJA. Most model grids in ACCESS1.1 in these areas are represented by one bare ground tile while ACCESS1.0 ~~there~~ may have two tiles ~~(bare ground tile and a small fraction canopy tile, see)~~ (Fig. 2, ~~Larger~~). For ACCESS1.1 the larger bare ground area results in a slightly higher surface albedo ~~in CABLE~~ (Fig. 65), which contributes to cooler daytime temperature. There is limited cloud cover and precipitation in these areas and the latent heat flux is small or negligible. The maximum daytime surface radiative temperatures in both models were similar but the night time temperatures were warmer in ACCESS1.1. The daytime maximum sensible heat flux in MOSES was slightly larger, cooling the surface and providing more heat to the atmosphere, resulting in warmer daytime air temperature. In CABLE smaller daytime sensible heat under similar radiative forcing allowed for larger ground heat flux, which combined with the deeper soil column (4.7 vs. ~~3m~~ 3 m), allowed a larger heat storage and thus modulating the daily temperature amplitude. In both models the diurnal pattern of sensible heat flux is phase shifted after local midday. This phase shift occurs in the deserts due to the diurnal radiative cycle being not in phase with the soil heat storage cycle.

### 4.3 Boreal winter

~~In boreal~~ During the Boreal winter ACCESS1.1 is warmer than ACCESS1.0 (Fig. 4e), with mean screen level temperature up to several degrees higher in most northern areas where snow occurs. The minimum temperatures are 1.7°C warmer and maximum temperatures 0.3°C warmer (Table 3). The interannual variability in each simulation is comparable to these differences with the standard deviation of annual minimum and maximum temperatures being around 0.8-1.2°C and the correlation between simulations being 0.4-0.5. Thus the winter temperature differences between simulations appear less robust than those in summer.

Snow constitutes a dominant part of the winter environment in mid and high latitudes. It strongly reduces the available energy at the surface through its high reflectivity of solar radiation. The insulating properties of the snow reduce the soil heat to the atmosphere, thus allowing the soil temperature to remain warmer. The surface energy, water budget and seasonal freezing and thawing of the ground are affected by snow processes. Processes of infiltration, soil water transfer and transpiration are suspended upon soil freezing and ~~resumed~~ resume with thawing. During winter LAI is significantly reduced by snow cover and the leaves senescence, and with plant metabolism slowed down vegetation enters a dormant phase. ~~At this phase vegetation impact on the~~ In this phase the impact of vegetation on surface temperature is reduced to an effect of lowering surface albedo in areas ~~with vegetation protruding where vegetation protrudes~~ through the snow cover. In these environments, the differences between ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 simulated winter temperatures are attributed to the different representation of the snow processes by the models; these include the parameterization of snow albedo, accumulation, density and thermal conductivity.

The calculated total surface albedo is significantly lower in ACCESS1.1 (Fig. 5a), with the exception of a band of higher albedo stretching from the northern parts of the Scandinavian Peninsula across Russia. ~~These areas have high grid fraction of needle-leaf trees /shrubs in both models~~ (This band occurs around the transition from trees to grass and shrubs. In ACCESS1.1 (CABLE), the influence of snow on surface albedo is dependent on LAI, whereas in ACCESS1.0 (MOSES) albedo is influenced by vegetation type. In this transition region, the prescribed LAI in ACCESS1.1 drops to around 0.5, increasing the albedo, while in ACCESS1.0 this region is tree-covered so the ACCESS1.0 albedo remains relatively low. North of this band, the predominant vegetation type is grass/shrubs (see Fig. 2, K2013), however causing the ACCESS1.0 has much larger value of LAI protruding through the snow which results in lower surface albedo albedo to become larger than that of ACCESS1.1. The sensitivity test, ACCESS1.0L, gives very similar albedo results to ACCESS1.0, confirming that the interaction of snow and vegetation in MOSES is driven by vegetation type rather than LAI. In ACCESS1.1 much lower surface albedo occurred in the areas of intermittent snow cover i.e. central USA and central Asia. This difference is due to the later onset of snow cover in autumn and earlier melting. Over the permanent ice, ~~CABLEs~~ CABLE's total surface albedo is higher than for MOSES due to a snow albedo refreshing process allowing that allows albedo to remain around its maximum value.

To illustrate how the snow processes differ between the two land surface models and the consequent impacts on the ACCESS simulations, we have performed offline simulations, forced with observed meteorology, for ~~a single location, for~~ the 2003-2004 snow season in Hyytiälä. In winter in Hyytiälä, LAI ~~decreased from~~ decreases from a summer maximum of 2.85 to 0.71. The widespread lower ACCESS1.1 albedo in winter is reproduced in the offline simulation. For both models the time evolution

of surface albedo reflects snowfall/melting events (Fig. 10a) and CABLE also represents the diurnal variation of snow and canopy albedo on cloud free days. ~~MOSES~~ The JULES (MOSES) albedo response to snowfall/snowmelt events is larger than in CABLE as its variation depends only on snow depth and melting temperature. In CABLE ~~the~~ albedo of the surface is affected by overlying canopy albedo as well as snow age and density. In early winter snow albedo in ~~MOSES~~ JULES increases more rapidly and remains higher through the rest of the season. During the melting period the surface albedo in ~~MOSES~~ oscillated JULES oscillates with the daily temperature variation around  $-2^{\circ}\text{C}$  while in CABLE the albedo decreased rapidly allowing for faster melting of the snow (Fig. 10b).

~~As in~~ In CABLE rain falling on snow freezes within the snowpack while JULES/MOSES diverts the rainfall straight to runoff; this results in a deeper snow cover (Fig. 10b) ~~at this site~~ and contributes to warmer snow temperatures (Fig. 10e). In early spring when liquid precipitation frequently occurs, warm rainfall falling on snow accelerates snow melting in CABLE, decreasing the snow albedo. In the ACCESS1.1 simulation there is slightly more snow in the northern part of the continent and less in the south (not shown). This is broadly consistent with more frequent occurrence of liquid precipitation in the south.

Parameterization of snow thermal conductivity and density contribute to a warmer surface temperature in CABLE. In early winter, the snow has low thermal conductivity (0.2) preventing heat loss from the underlying soil. With time, both snow thermal conductivity and density increase (Fig. 10c ~~and~~ 10d), allowing for more heat to be absorbed by the snow cover and the ground below. The differences in daily mean surface radiative temperatures between the offline simulations are shown in Fig. 10e. In early winter when the snow cover is shallow, the differences tend to be smaller and are related to snowfall/melting events but with time they increase, with maximum differences occurring as melting begins. Consistently, in the ~~A~~ ACCESS1.1 ~~simulation~~ variable thermal conductivity and density of snow contribute to warmer mean temperatures and in particular warmer minimum temperatures over the snow areas.

The warmer surface temperature in ACCESS1.1 occurs throughout the diurnal cycle, as can be seen for ~~a location, Boreas~~ ( $55.88^{\circ}\text{N}$ ,  $-98.48^{\circ}\text{E}$ ). ~~We present Boreas, a needleleaf forest site dominated by snow and frozen soil processes in winter. Figure 11 shows the 20 year mean diurnal cycle for January temperature, fluxes, precipitation and cloud cover fraction in Boreas, Fig. 11. The Boreas flux station with needle leaf forest is an example of a site dominated by snow and frozen soil processes in winter.~~ Both models underestimate the temperature in winter but ACCESS1.1 is warmer than ACCESS1.0 by approximately  $2^{\circ}\text{C}$ ; ~~see~~ (Fig. 11f). Also, the maximum daily screen level temperature occurs an hour or more later in ACCESS1.1 and is closer to the observed. The latent heat is negligible; sensible heat flux is small and underestimated in both models due to underestimated net radiation (Fig. 11d ~~and~~ 11e). Precipitation is overestimated in both models. ~~We did not have flux stations data for Siberia; however we investigated diurnal cycles at a number of grids between locations ( $58.6^{\circ}\text{N}$ ,  $49.7^{\circ}\text{E}$ ) and ( $61.3^{\circ}\text{N}$ ,  $110.6^{\circ}\text{E}$ ). In all of the investigated grids~~ Similar behaviour is also seen for grid-cells in Siberia, consistent with widespread warmer temperatures for ACCESS1.1 ~~has slightly warmer temperatures consistent with the results shown in~~ (Fig. 6a ~~and~~ 6c).

Parameterization of the cold climate processes in CABLE, which include liquid precipitation freezing within the snowpack, age dependant diurnally resolved snow albedo, prognostic snow density and variable snow thermal conductivity, resulted in warmer snow surface temperatures than compared to MOSES. ACCESS1.1 mean, maximum and minimum temperatures were warmer than in ACCESS1.0 (Fig. 4 and 6), with the largest difference of  $1.74^{\circ}\text{C}$  in the ~~mean~~ minimum temperature (Table 3).

~~The Northern continental~~ mean winter precipitation, evaporation, runoff and the heat fluxes were similar in both models while net radiation was only slightly larger in CABLE than is the case for MOSES.

One of the consequences of the seasonal temperature difference, between ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 in the Northern hemisphere high latitudes, is the timing of the calculated snowmelt and runoff. Spring snowmelt is an important source of water to replenish soil water reservoirs, with an excess of water diverted to runoff. In the high latitudes snowmelt is also a source of ~~the fresh water flux~~ fresh water to the Arctic sea. An earlier spring and snowmelt affects land-atmosphere carbon exchange, permafrost thaw and ecosystem carbon sequestration in high latitude tundra ecosystems (Li et al., 2014; Humphreys and Lafleur, 2011; Tang and Zhuang, 2011). Figure 12 shows the difference in mean monthly total runoff generated from the snowmelt. In ACCESS1.1 in spring, the soil moisture in these regions is close to saturation and thus snowmelt flows on the surface along topography as surface runoff. In ACCESS1.0 there is significantly less soil moisture ~~;~~ (Fig. 8d), so the snowmelt water enters partially unfrozen soil and seeps slowly through the soil column before emerging months later as drainage from the bottom layer. Hence a substantial amount of runoff is not generated in ACCESS1.0 until June. In ACCESS1.1 the main contribution to the total runoff in Fig. 12 comes from the surface runoff while in ACCESS1.0 it comes from the drainage. In high latitude regions soil moisture is high because the moisture evaporates slowly and the soil drainage conditions are poor because of the underlying permafrost. These processes are captured in the ACCESS1.1 simulation. Also, the timing of runoff as simulated in ACCESS1.1 is more consistent with the observations from the three main Siberian river watersheds (Yang et al., 2007) than in ACCESS1.0 confirming that the land surface scheme is the main driver of similar differences noted between ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.3 by K2013. Table 3 shows that in JJA the total runoff for ACCESS1.0 is almost twice as large as ACCESS1.1 due to ACCESS1.1 simulating surface runoff from the spring snowmelt in April and May.

## 20 5 Conclusions

Kowalczyk et al. (2013) highlighted differences in the present day land surface climatology of the two ACCESS submissions to CMIP5, but the impact of the different land surface model used in each simulation was difficult to determine due to other differences in atmospheric settings. The simulations presented here, using the same atmospheric settings, have allowed the impacts of the land surface model to be determined, with a focus on the processes driving those impacts. Differences found in K2013 that we can now largely attribute to the land surface processes and model configuration include smaller seasonal temperature amplitude manifested by a warmer winter and a cooler summer, and an earlier runoff from snowmelt in the Northern Hemisphere in ACCESS1.1 (CABLE). CABLE also ~~gives~~ simulates smaller mean diurnal temperature range in JJA and DJF in most of the areas including sparsely vegetated regions.

~~In boreal~~ During the Boreal summer in the Northern Hemisphere, in spite of the overall lower surface albedo in canopy areas, ACCESS1.1 is generally cooler over high latitudes. Cooler surface temperatures are attributed to two factors; the first one being the representation of the canopy in CABLE with the vertical placement of the vegetation above the ground which allows for radiative and aerodynamic interaction between the canopy and the ground below. An offline simulation showed that in CABLE the net available radiation flux at the ground surface below the canopy was much lower than for a separate

bare ground tile directly exposed to the atmospheric forcing in MOSES. Hence, the ground temperature in CABLE, being shaded by vegetation, was cooler than the vegetation temperature while in MOSES it is the opposite; day time bare ground tile temperature was significantly higher than canopy tile temperature. The MOSES configuration of land cover with a separation of the canopy covered grid into bare ground and canopy tile resulted in larger areas of bare ground surface as shown in Fig. 2.

5 A larger area of bare ground exposed directly to the atmosphere contributed to larger diurnal temperature amplitude with a tendency to dry out earlier due to an absence of physiological control over the evaporation flux. Cooler summer temperatures are also attributed to larger soil moisture, precipitation and day time cloud cover fraction in most of the areas in ACCESS1.1. In high latitudes the low level cloud cover fraction over the canopy covered area at night was higher in ACCESS1.1 due to the presence of fog.

10 ~~Warmer winter~~ In winter when vegetation is dormant, warmer temperatures simulated by ACCESS1.1 over the snow covered areas of mid and high latitudes are attributed to differences in the snow parameterization in CABLE compared with MOSES. In particular, CABLE accounts for liquid precipitation freezing within the snow pack, prognostic snow density and variable snow thermal conductivity. ~~These differences contribute to warmer winter temperatures.~~ Accounting for liquid precipitation freezing within the snowpack delays the build up of the snow pack in autumn and accelerates snow melting in spring. Snow

15 density is simulated to increase through the winter which lowers the snow albedo and allows for an increased absorption of solar radiation. Variable snow thermal conductivity increases over the snow season, initially preventing heat loss and later allowing more heat to enter the snow/ground.

One of the deficiencies of the modelled climate in both versions of ACCESS model was the overestimation of evapotranspiration. In some regions this is due to overestimated precipitation caused by continuous but low intensity events in lieu of

20 less frequent but more intense rainfall which would allow for an increase in the surface runoff and drier soil. The excessive evapotranspiration is a common problem for a number of other models, (Mueller and Seneviratne, 2014). The sensitivity of the parameterisation of stomata opening to the favourable moisture and energy conditions needs to be re-examined in LSMs such as CABLE and MOSES to restrain the evapotranspiration. An alternate parameterisation of stomatal conductance has also been tested in ACCESS (Kala et al., 2015) and tends to reduce evapotranspiration for parts of the northern continents in JJA.

25 CABLE has a long history of development, originally in CSIRO, and now as an Australian community model. CABLE is widely used in 'standalone' applications, forced with prescribed meteorology and it has also provided the land surface component of a number of Australian climate and air pollution models. With ACCESS now being the primary model in Australia for numerical weather prediction and climate modelling, it has been important to couple CABLE into ACCESS to enable Australian researchers to incorporate their local land surface development work into atmospheric modelling applications.

30 This study confirms that changing the land surface model in ACCESS from MOSES to CABLE has not degraded the simulation of the present-day seasonal climatology and has generally improved summer temperature biases. The improvement in summer temperatures is due, in part, to the more complex canopy representation in CABLE compared to many other land surface models. Thus ACCESS with CABLE can be confidently used for climate applications, while further work would be required for assessing the performance of ACCESS with CABLE for numerical weather prediction.

## Code availability

Code availability varies for different components of ACCESS. The UM is licensed by the UK Met Office and is not freely available. JULES is available from <https://jules.jchmr.org/software-and-documentation>. CABLE is available from <https://trac.nci.org.au/svn/cable/>. See <https://trac.nci.org.au/trac/cable/wiki/CableRegistration> for information on registering to use the CA-  
5 BLE repository.

*Acknowledgements.* This research was supported by the Australian Government Department of the Environment, the Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO through the Australian Climate Change Science Programme. This research was undertaken on the NCI National Facility in Canberra, Australia, which is supported by the Australian Commonwealth Government. This work used eddy covariance data acquired by the FLUXNET community and in particular by the following networks: AmeriFlux (U.S. Department of Energy, Biological and Environmental  
10 Research, Terrestrial Carbon Program (DE-FG02-04ER63917 and DE-FG02-04ER63911)), AfriFlux, AsiaFlux, CarboAfrica, ChinaFlux, Fluxnet-Canada (supported by CFCAS, NSERC, BIOCAP, Environment Canada, and NRCan), GreenGrass, KoFlux, LBA, NECC, OzFlux, TCOS-Siberia, USCCC. We acknowledge the financial support to the eddy covariance data harmonization provided by CarboEuropeIP, FAO-GTOS-TCO, iLEAPS, Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, National Science Foundation, University of Tuscia, Université Laval  
15 and Environment Canada and US Department of Energy and the database development and technical support from Berkeley Water Center, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Microsoft Research eScience, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, University of California - Berkeley, University of Virginia. [The GPCC Precipitation data provided by the NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD, Boulder, Colorado, USA, from their Web site at http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/.](http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/)

## References

- Abramowitz, G.: Towards a public, standardized, diagnostic benchmarking system for land surface models, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5, 819–827, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-819-2012, 2012.
- Abramowitz, G., Leuning, R., Clark, M., and Pitman, A.: Evaluating the Performance of Land Surface Models, *J. Climate*, 21, 5468–5481, 5 doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2378.1, 2008.
- Baldocchi, D., Falge, E., Gu, L., Olson, R., Hollinger, D., Running, S., Anthoni, P., Bernhofer, C., Davis, K., Evans, R., Fuentes, J., Goldstein, A., Katul, G., Law, B., Lee, X., Malhi, Y., Meyers, T., Munger, W., Oechel, W., Paw U, K. T., Pilegaard, K., Schmid, H. P., Valentini, R., Verma, S., Vesala, T., Wilson, K., and Wofsy, S.: FLUXNET: A New Tool to Study the Temporal and Spatial Variability of Ecosystem-Scale Carbon Dioxide, Water Vapor, and Energy Flux Densities, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 82, 2415–2434, 10 doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2001)082<2415:FANTTS>2.3.CO;2, 2001.
- Baumgartner, A. and Reichel, E.: *The World Water Balance, Mean Annual Global, Continental and Maritime Precipitation, Evaporation and Run-off*, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company, Amsterdam - Oxford - New York, 1975.
- Becker, A., Finger, P., Meyer-Christoffer, A., Rudolf, B., Schamm, K., Schneider, U., , and Ziese, M.: A description of the global land-surface precipitation data products of the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre with sample applications including centennial (trend) analysis 15 from 1901-present, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 5, 71–99, doi:10.5194/essd-5-71-2013, 2013.
- Berg, A., Findell, K., Lintner, B., Giannini, A., Seneviratne, S., van den Hurk, B., Lorenz, R., Pitman, A., Hagemann, S., Meier, A., Cheruy, F., Ducharne, A., Malyshev, S., and Milly, P. C. D.: Land-atmosphere feedbacks amplify aridity increase over land under global warming, *Nature Climate Change*, http://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3029, 2016.
- Best, M., Pryor, M., Clark, D., Rooney, G., Essery, R., Menard, C., Edwards, J., Hendry, M., Porson, A., Gedney, N., Mercado, L., Sitch, S., 20 Blyth, E., Boucher, O., Cox, P., Grimmond, C., and Harding, R.: The Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES), model description- Part 1: Energy and water fluxes, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4, 677–699, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-677-2011, 2011.
- Best, M., Abramowitz, G., Johnson, H., Pitman, A., Balsamo, G., Boone, A., Cuntz, M., Decharme, B., Dirmeyer, P., Dong, J., Ek, M., Guo, Z., Haverd, V., van den Hurk, B., Nearing, G., Pak, B., Peters-Lidard, C., Santanello, J., Stevens, L., and Vuichard, N.: The plumbing of 25 land surface models: benchmarking model performance, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 16, 1425–1442, doi:10.1175/JHM-D-14-0158.1, 2015.
- Betts, A. K.: Land-Surface-Atmosphere Coupling in Observations and Models, *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 1, n/a–n/a, doi:10.3894/JAMES.2009.1.4, http://dx.doi.org/10.3894/JAMES.2009.1.4, 4, 2009.
- Bi, D., Dix, M., Marsland, S. J., O’Farrell, S., Rashid, H. A., Uotila, P., Hirst, A. C., Kowalczyk, E., Golebiewski, M., Sullivan, A., Yan, H., Hannah, N., Franklin, C., Sun, Z., Vohralik, P., Watterson, I., Zhou, X., Fiedler, R., Collier, M., Ma, Y., Noonan, J., Stevens, L., Uhe, P., 30 Zhu, H., Griffies, S. M., Hill, R., Harris, C., and Puri, K.: The ACCESS coupled model: description, control climate and evaluation, *Aus. Meteor. Oceanogr. J.*, 63, 41–64, 2013.
- Bierkens, M. F., Dolman, A. J., and Troch, P. A.: *Climate and the hydrological cycle*, International Association of Hydrological Sciences (Special Publication 8), 2008.
- Budyko, M. I. a.: *The heat balance of the Earth*, Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Cox, P., Betts, R., Bunton, C., Essery, P., Rowntree, R., and Smith, J.: The impact of new land surface physics on the GCM simulation of 35 climate and climate sensitivity, *Climate Dynamics*, 15, 183–203, 1999.
- Cox, P. M.: Description of the TRIFFID dynamic global vegetation model, Tech. Rep. 24, Hadley Centre, 2001.

- Davies, T., Cullen, M. J. P., Malcolm, A. J., Mawson, M. H., Staniforth, A., White, A. A., and Wood, N.: A new dynamical core for the Met Office's global and regional modelling of the atmosphere, *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 131, 1759–1782, doi:10.1256/qj.04.101, 2005.
- Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E. V., Isaksen, I., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, *Q.J.R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 137, 553–597, doi:10.1002/qj.828, 2011.
- Dickinson, R. E., Henderson-Sellers, A., and Kennedy, P. J.: Biosphere-Atmosphere Transfer Scheme (BATS) version 1e as coupled to the NCAR Community Climate Model, Ncar technical note ncar/tn-387+str, NCAR, 1993.
- Ek, M. B. and Holtslag, A. A. M.: Influence of Soil Moisture on Boundary Layer Cloud Development, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 5, 86–99, doi:10.1175/1525-7541(2004)005<0086:IOSMOB>2.0.CO;2, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541\(2004\)005<0086:IOSMOB>2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541(2004)005<0086:IOSMOB>2.0.CO;2), 2004.
- Eltahir, E. A. B. and Bras, R. L.: Precipitation recycling, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 34, 367–378, doi:10.1029/96RG01927, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/96RG01927>, 1996.
- Essery, R., Best, M., and Cox, P.: MOSES 2.2 technical documentation, Hadley Centre technical note 30, Hadley Centre, 2001.
- Fischer, E. M., Seneviratne, S. I., Luthi, D., and Schar, C.: Contribution of land-atmosphere coupling to recent European summer heat waves, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2006GL029068, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2006GL029068>, 106707, 2007.
- Global Soil Data Task Group: doi:10.3334/ORNDAAC/569, Global Gridded Surfaces of Selected Soil Characteristics (IGBP-DIS). [Global Gridded Surfaces of Selected Soil Characteristics (International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme - Data and Information System)]. Data set. Available on-line [<http://www.daac.ornl.gov>] from Oak Ridge National Laboratory Distributed Active Archive Center, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, U.S.A. <http://daac.ornl.gov/SOILS/guides/igbp-surfaces.html>, 2000.
- Gordon, H. B., Rotstayn, L. D., McGregor, J. L., Dix, M. R., Kowalczyk, E. A., O'Farrell, S. P., Waterman, L. J., Hirst, A. C., Wilson, S. G., Collier, M. A., Watterson, I. G., and Elliott, T. I.: The CSIRO Mk3 Climate System Model, CSIRO Atmospheric Research technical paper 60, CSIRO, (electronic publication), 2002.
- Henning, D.: Atlas of the surface heat balance of the continents, Gebrüder Borntraeger, Berlin, 1989.
- Hewitt, H. T., Copsey, D., Culverwell, I. D., Harris, C. M., Hill, R. S. R., Keen, A. B., McLaren, A. J., and Hunke, E. C.: Design and implementation of the infrastructure of HadGEM3: the next-generation Met Office climate modelling system, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4, 223–253, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-223-2011, 2011.
- Hirsch, A. L., Pitman, A. J., Seneviratne, S. I., Evans, J. P., and Haverd, V.: Summertime maximum and minimum temperature coupling asymmetry over Australia determined using WRF, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 1546–1552, doi:10.1002/2013GL059055, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2013GL059055>, 2014.
- Houldcroft, C. J., Grey, W. M. F., Barnsley, M., Taylor, C. M., Los, S., and North, P. J.: New vegetation albedo parameters and global fields of soil background albedo derived from MODIS for use in a climate model, *J. Hydrometeorol.*, 10, 183–198, doi:10.1175/2008JHM1021.1, 2009.
- Humphreys, E. R. and Lafleur, P. M.: Does earlier snowmelt lead to greater CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration in two low Arctic tundra ecosystems?, *Geophys. Res. Letters*, 38, doi:10.1029/2011GL047339, 2011.
- Jones, C. P.: Specification of ancillary fields (Ancillary file data sources), Unified Model Documentation 70, Met. Office, 2008.

- Kala, J., Evans, J. P., Pitman, A. J., Schaaf, C. B., Decker, M., Carouge, C., Mocko, D., and Sun, Q.: Implementation of a soil albedo scheme in the CABLEv1.4b land surface model and evaluation against MODIS estimates over Australia, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7, 2121–2140, doi:10.5194/gmd-7-2121-2014, 2014.
- Kala, J., De Kauwe, M. G., Pitman, A. J., Medlyn, B. E., Wang, Y.-P., Lorenz, R., and Perkins-Kirkpatrick, S. E.: Impact of the representation of stomatal conductance on model projections of heatwave intensity, *Scientific Reports*, 6, doi:10.1038/srep23418, 2015.
- Koster, R. D., Dirmeyer, P. A., Guo, Z. C., Bonan, G. B., Chan, E., Cox, P., Gordon, C. T., Kanaes, S., Kowalczyk, E., Lawrence, D., Liu, P., Luo, C. H., Malyshev, S., McAvaney, B., Mitchell, K., Mocko, D., Oki, T., Oleson, K., Pitman, A., Sud, Y. C., Taylor, C. M., Verseghy, D., Vasic, R., Xue, Y. K., and Yamada, T.: Regions of strong coupling between soil moisture and precipitation, *Science*, 305, 1138–1140, doi:10.1126/science.1100217, 2004.
- 10 Kowalczyk, E. A., Wang, Y. P., Law, R. M., Davies, H. L., McGregor, J. L., and Abramowitz, G.: The CSIRO Atmosphere Biosphere Land Exchange (CABLE) model for use in climate models and as an offline model, CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research technical paper 13, CSIRO, 2006.
- Kowalczyk, E. A., Stevens, L., Law, R. M., Dix, M., Wang, Y. P., Harman, I. N., Haynes, K., Sribinovsky, J., Pak, B., and Ziehn, T.: The land surface model component of ACCESS: description and impact on the simulated surface climatology, *Aus. Meteor. Oceanogr. J.*, 63, 15 65–82, 2013.
- Kumar, S., Peters-Lidard, C., Tian, Y., Houser, P., Geiger, J., Olden, S., Lighty, L., Eastman, J., Doty, B., Dirmeyer, P., Adams, J., Mitchell, K., Wood, E. F., and Sheffield, J.: Land Information System - An Interoperable Framework for High Resolution Land Surface Modeling, *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 21, 1402–1415, doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2005.07.004, 2006.
- Kumar, S. V., Peters-Lidard, C. D., Santanello, J., Harrison, K., Liu, Y., and Shaw, M.: Land surface Verification Toolkit (LVT) - a generalized 20 framework for land surface model evaluation, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5, 869–886, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-869-2012, 2012.
- Lawrence, P. J., Feddesma, J. J., Bonan, G. B., Meehl, G. A., O'Neill, B. C., Oleson, K. W., Levis, S., Lawrence, D. M., Kluzek, E., Lindsay, K., and Thornton, P. E.: Simulating the Biogeochemical and Biogeophysical Impacts of Transient Land Cover Change and Wood Harvest in the Community Climate System Model (CCSM4) from 1850 to 2100, *J. Clim.*, 25, 3071–3095, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00256.1, 2012.
- Legates, D. and Willmott, C.: Mean seasonal and spatial variability in gauge-corrected, global precipitation, *International Journal of Climatology*, 10, 111–127, doi:10.1002/joc.3370100202, 1990.
- 25 Leuning, R.: A critical appraisal of a combined stomatal photosynthesis model for  $C_3$  plants, *Plant Cell Environ.*, 18, 339–355, doi:10.1111/j.1365-3040.1995.tb00370.x, 1995.
- Li, J., Luo, Y., Natali, S., Schuur, E., Xia, J., Kowalczyk, E., and Wang, Y.: Modeling permafrost thaw and ecosystem carbon cycle under annual and seasonal warming at a tundra site in Alaska, *J. Geophysical Research*, 119, 1129–1146, doi:10.1002/2013JG002569, 2014.
- 30 Lorenz, R., Argueso, D., Donat, M. G., Pitman, A. J., van den Hurk, B., Berg, A., Lawrence, D. M., Cheruy, F., Ducharne, A., Hagemann, S., Meier, A., Milly, P. C. D., and Seneviratne, S. I.: Influence of land-atmosphere feedbacks on temperature and precipitation extremes in the GLACE-CMIP5 ensemble, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121, 607–623, doi:10.1002/2015JD024053, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015JD024053>, 2015JD024053, 2016.
- Loveland, T., Reed, B., Brown, J., Ohlen, D., Zhu, Z., Yang, L., and Merchant, J.: Development of a global land cover characteristics database and IGBP DISCover from 1km AVHRR data, *Int. J. Remote Sensing*, 21, doi:10.1080/014311600210191, 2000.
- 35 Luo, L., Robock, A., Vinnikov, K., Schlosser, C., Slater, A., Boone, A., Braden, H., Cox, P., de Rosnay, P., Dickinson, R., Dai, Y., Duan, Q., Etchevers, P., Henderson-Sellers, A., Gedney, N., Gusev, Y., Habets, F., Kim, J., Kowalczyk, E., Mitchell, K., Nasonova, O., Noilhan, J., Pitman, A., Schaake, J., Shmakina, A., Smirnova, T., Wetzels, P., Xue, Y., Yang, Z., and Zeng, Q.: Effects of frozen soil on soil temperature,

- spring infiltration, and runoff: Results from the PILPS 2(d) experiment at Valdai, Russia, *J. Hydrometeor.*, 4, 334–351, doi:10.1175/1525-7541(2003)4<334:EOFSOS>2.0.CO;2, 2003.
- Luo, Y., Randerson, J., Abramowitz, G., Bacour, C., Blyth, E., Carvalhais, N., Ciais, P., Dalmonech, D., Fisher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Hibbard, K., Hoffman, F., Huntzinger, D., Jones, C., Koven, K., Lawrence, D., Li, D., Mahecha, M., Niu, S., Norby, R., Piao, S., Qi, X., Peylin, P., Prentice, I., Riley, I., Reichstein, M., Schwalm, C., Wang, Y., Xia, Y., Zaehle, S., and Zhou, X.: A framework of benchmarking land models, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 3857–3874, doi:10.5194/bg-9-3857-2012, 2012.
- Mueller, B. and Seneviratne, S.: Systematic land climate and evapotranspiration biases in CMIP5 simulations, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 128–134, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-723-2011, 2014.
- Przybylak, R.: *The climate of the Arctic*, vol. 26, Springer Science, doi:10.1007/978-94-017-0379-6, 2003.
- 10 Puri, K., Dietachmayer, G., Steinle, P., M, D., Rikus, L., Logan, L., Naughton, M., Tingwell, C., Xiao, Y., Barras, V., Bermous, I., Bowen, R., Deschamps, L., Franklin, C., Fraser, J., Glowacki, T., Harris, B., Lee, J., Le, T., Roff, G., Sulaiman, A., Sims, H., Sun, X., Sun, Z., Zhu, H., Chattopadhyay, M., and Engel, C.: Implementation of the initial ACCESS numerical weather prediction system, *Australian Meteor. Oceanog. J.*, 63, 265–284, 2013.
- Raupach, M. R.: Applying Lagrangian fluid-mechanics to infer scalar source distributions from concentration profiles in plant canopies, 15 *Agric. Forest Meteor.*, 47, 85–108, 1989.
- Raupach, M. R.: Simplified expressions for vegetation roughness length and zero-plane displacement as functions of canopy height and area index, *Boundary-Layer Meteor.*, 71, 211–216, 1994.
- Rossow, W. and Schiffer, R.: ISCCP Cloud Data Products, *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 71, 2–20, 1991.
- Rossow, W., Walker, A., Beuschel, D., and Roiter, M.: International Satellite Cloud Climatology Project (ISCCP) Documentation of New 20 Cloud Datasets, WMO/TD-No. 737, World Meteorological Organization, 1996.
- Schneider, U., Becker, A., Finger, P., Meyer-Christoffer, A., Rudolf, B., and Ziese, M.: GPCP Full Data Reanalysis Version 7.0 at 1.0°: Monthly Land-Surface Precipitation from Rain-Gauges built on GTS-based and Historic Data., doi:10.5676/DWD\_GPCC/FD\_M\_V7\_100, 2015.
- Seneviratne, S. I., Corti, T., Davin, E. L., Hirschi, M., Jaeger, E. B., Lehner, I., Orlowsky, B., and Teuling, A. J.: Investigating soil moisture-climate interactions in a changing climate: A review, *Earth-Sci. Rev.*, 99, 125–161, doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2010.02.004, 2010.
- 25 Seneviratne, S. I., Wilhelm, M., Stanelle, T., van den Hurk, B., Hagemann, S., Berg, A., Cheruy, F., Higgins, M. E., Meier, A., Brovkin, V., Claussen, M., Ducharne, A., Dufresne, J.-L., Findell, K. L., Ghattas, J., Lawrence, D. M., Malyshev, S., Rummukainen, M., and Smith, B.: Impact of soil moisture-climate feedbacks on CMIP5 projections: First results from the GLACE-CMIP5 experiment, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40, 5212–5217, doi:10.1002/grl.50956, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/grl.50956>, 2013GL057153, 2013.
- 30 Slater, A. G., Schlosser, C. A., Desborough, C. E., Pitman, A., Henderson-Sellers, A., Robock, A., Vinnikov, K. Y., Mitchell, K., Boone, A., Braden, H., Chen, F., Cox, P., de Rosnay, P., Dickinson, R. E., Dai, Y., Duan, Q., Entin, J., Etchevers, P., Gedney, N., Gusev, Y. M., Habets, F., Kim, J., Koren, V., Kowalczyk, E. A., Nasonova, O. N., Hoilhan, J., Schaake, S., Shmakin, A. B., Smirnova, T. G., Verseghy, D., Wetzell, P., Xue, Y., Yang, Z.-L., and Zeng, Q.: The Representation of Snow in Land Surface Schemes: Results from PILPS 2(d), *J. Hydrometeor.*, 2, 7–25, 2001.
- 35 Smith, T. M., Reynolds, R., Peterson, T. C., and Lawrimore, J.: Improvements to NOAA’s historical merged land-surface temperature analysis (1880–2006), *J. Climate*, 21, 2283–2296, doi:10.1175/2007JCLI2100.1, 2008.
- Tang, J. Y. and Zhuang, Q. L.: Modeling soil thermal and hydrological dynamics and changes of growing season in Alaskan terrestrial ecosystems, *Climatic Change*, 107, 481–510, 2011.

- Taylor, C. M., Gounou, A., Guichard, F., Harris, P. P., Ellis, R. J., Couvreur, F., and De Kauwe, M.: Frequency of Sahelian storm initiation enhanced over mesoscale soil-moisture patterns, *Nature Geosci*, 4, doi:10.1038/ngeo1173, 2011.
- The HadGEM2 Development Team:, Martin, G. M., Bellouin, N., Collins, W. J., Culverwell, I. D., Halloran, P. R., Hardiman, S. C., Hinton, T. J., Jones, C. D., McDonald, R. E., McLaren, A. J., O'Connor, F. M., Roberts, M. J., Rodriguez, J. M., Woodward, S., Best, M. J., Brooks, M. E., Brown, A. R., Butchart, N., Dearden, C., Derbyshire, S. H., Dharssi, I., Doutriaux-Boucher, M., Edwards, J. M., Falloon, P. D., Gedney, N., Gray, L. J., Hewitt, H. T., Hobson, M., Huddleston, M. R., Hughes, J., Ineson, S., Ingram, W. J., James, P. M., Johns, T. C., Johnson, C. E., Jones, A., Jones, C. P., Joshi, M. M., Keen, A. B., Liddicoat, S., Lock, A. P., Maidens, A. V., Manners, J. C., Milton, S. F., Rae, J. G. L., Ridley, J. K., Sellar, A., Senior, C. A., Totterdell, I. J., Verhoef, A., Vidale, P. L., and Wiltshire, A.: The HadGEM2 family of Met Office Unified Model climate configurations, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 4, 723–757, doi:10.5194/gmd-4-723-2011, 2011.
- 5 University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit, Harris, I., and Jones, P. D.: CRU TS3.22: Climatic Research Unit (CRU) Time-Series (TS) Version 3.22 of High Resolution Gridded Data of Month-by-month Variation in Climate (Jan. 1901- Dec. 2013)., NCAS British Atmospheric Data Centre, doi:10.5285/18BE23F8-D252-482D-8AF9-5D6A2D40990C, 2014.
- Vautard, R., Yiou, P., D'Andrea, F., de Noblet, N., Viovy, N., Cassou, C., Polcher, J., Ciais, P., Kageyama, M., and Fan, Y.: Summer-time European heat and drought waves induced by wintertime Mediterranean rainfall deficit, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 34, n/a–n/a, doi:10.1029/2006GL028001, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2006GL028001>, 107711, 2007.
- 15 Wang, Y. P. and Leuning, R.: A two-leaf model for canopy conductance, photosynthesis and partitioning of available energy I. Model description and comparison with a multi-layered model, *Agric. Forest Meteorol.*, 91, 89–111, 1998.
- Wang, Y. P., Law, R. M., and Pak, B.: A global model of carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus cycles for the terrestrial biosphere, *Biogeosciences*, 7, 2261–2282, doi:10.5194/bg-7-2261-2010, 2010.
- 20 Wang, Y. P., Kowalczyk, E., Leuning, R., Abramowitz, G., Raupach, M. R., Pak, B., van Gorsel, E., and Luhar, A.: Diagnosing errors in a land surface model (CABLE) in the time and frequency domains, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, G01 034, doi:10.1029/2010JG001385, 2011.
- Wilson, M. F. and Henderson-Sellers, A.: A global archive of land cover and soil data for use in general circulation climate models, *J. Climatol.*, 5, 119–143, 1985.
- Yang, D., Zhao, Y., Armstrong, R., Robinson, D., and Brodzik, M.: Streamflow response to seasonal snow cover mass changes over large 25 Siberian watersheds, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, doi:10.1029/2006JF000518, 2007.
- Yang, W., Shabanov, N., Huang, D., Wang, W., Dickinson, R., Nemani, R., Knyazikhin, Y., and Myneni, R.: Analysis of leaf area index products from combination of MODIS Terra and Aqua data, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 104, 297–312, doi:10.1016/j.rse.2006.04.016, 2006.
- Zampieri, M., D'Andrea, F., Vautard, R., Ciais, P., de Noblet-Ducoudre, N., and Yiou, P.: Hot European Summers and the Role of Soil 30 Moisture in the Propagation of Mediterranean Drought, *Journal of Climate*, 22, 4747–4758, doi:10.1175/2009JCLI2568.1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/2009JCLI2568.1>, 2009.
- Zwiers, F. W. and von Storch, H.: Taking Serial Correlation into Account in Tests of the Mean, *Journal of Climate*, 8, 336–351, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1995)008<0336:TSCIAI>2.0.CO;2, [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(1995\)008<0336:TSCIAI>2.0.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(1995)008<0336:TSCIAI>2.0.CO;2), 1995.

**Table 1.** The list of major differences in structure and canopy, soil and snow components for MOSES as configured in ACCESS1.0 and CABLE as configured in ACCESS1.1.

Component	MOSES	CABLE
<u>Canopy</u>	<u>One big leaf model</u> <u>Canopy tile placed besides bare ground tile</u>  <u>Canopy albedo prescribed</u>	<u>Two leaf model (sunlit and shaded leaves)</u> <u>Canopy placed above the ground; no need for a separate bare ground tile in canopy areas</u>  <u>Canopy albedo resolved diurnally</u> <u>Turbulent transport within the canopy</u>
<u>Grid Tiles</u>	<u>9 surface types (5 vegetated) with up to 9 tiles used in each grid-cell</u>	<u>13 surface types (10 vegetated) with up to 5 tiles used in each grid-cell</u>
<u>Soil</u>	<u>4 layers, total depth 3m</u> <u>No subsurface tiling</u>	<u>6 layers, total depth of 4.6m</u> <u>Subsurface tiling</u>
<u>Snow</u>	<u>1 layer</u> <u>Liquid precip goes to runoff</u> <u>Constant density of 250 kg/m<sup>3</sup></u> <u>Constant conductivity of 0.265 Wm<sup>-2</sup>K<sup>-1</sup></u> <u>Constant snow albedo except when melting</u>	<u>1 layer for shallow snow, 3 layers for deep snow</u> <u>Freezes liquid precip within snowpack</u> <u>Prognostic snow density; ranges from 120-400 kg/m<sup>3</sup></u> <u>Variable snow conductivity; ranges from 0.2-0.5 Wm<sup>-2</sup>K<sup>-1</sup></u> <u>Snow albedo</u>


**Table 2.** Water and energy budget components, averaged over all land surfaces for ACCESS1.0 and ACCESS1.1 compared to estimates from other sources. (Values in parenthesis are for all land excluding Antarctica).

	ACCESS1.0	ACCESS1.1	Other Estimates
Precipitation (mm/day)	2.13 (2.30)	2.19 (2.36)	2.03 <sup>a</sup> , 2.05 <sup>b</sup>
Evaporation (mm/day)	1.50 (1.64)	1.54 (1.70)	1.31 <sup>a</sup>
Surface Runoff (mm/day)	0.21 (0.19)	0.15 (0.12)	0.73 <sup>a</sup>
Drainage (mm/day)	0.51 (0.56)	0.53 (0.59)	
Screen Temperature (°C)	8.63 (12.98)	8.08 (12.48)	8.5 <sup>c</sup>
- Maximum	13.33 (17.80)	12.44 (16.94)	
- Minimum	3.83 (8.08)	3.85 (8.17)	
Sensible Heat (Wm <sup>-2</sup> )	31.29 (36.18)	25.46 (29.75)	30.53 <sup>d</sup> , 37.31 <sup>e</sup>
Latent Heat (Wm <sup>-2</sup> )	43.33 (47.58)	44.61 (49.14)	35.86 <sup>d</sup> , 34.41 <sup>e</sup>
Net Radiation (Wm <sup>-2</sup> )	77.51 (86.88)	72.81 (81.96)	66.39 <sup>d</sup> , 72.20 <sup>e</sup>


<sup>a</sup>Baumgartner and Reichel (1975), <sup>b</sup>Legates and Willmott (1990), <sup>c</sup>Smith et al. (2008), <sup>d</sup>Henning (1989), <sup>e</sup>Budyko (1978)

**Table 3.** Water and energy budget components, averaged over all land surfaces above 30°N excluding Greenland - Annual, DJF and JJA.


	Annual		DJF		JJA	
	ACCESS1.0	ACCESS1.1	ACCESS1.0	ACCESS1.1	ACCESS1.0	ACCESS1.1
Precipitation (mm/day)	1.77	1.89	1.29	1.31	2.23	2.44
Evaporation (mm/day)	1.26	1.36	0.36	0.40	2.36	2.54
Surface Runoff (mm/day)	0.12	0.22	0.04	0.01	0.19	0.24
Drainage (mm/day)	0.52	0.31	0.23	0.24	0.89	0.35
Screen Temperature (°C)	2.96	2.43	-13.30	-12.19	19.02	16.95
- Maximum	7.37	6.02	-9.59	-9.27	24.11	21.36
- Minimum	-1.53	-1.16	-16.73	-14.99	13.40	12.30
Sensible Heat ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ )	23.27	17.35	1.74	2.31	48.18	35.16
Latent Heat ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ )	36.49	39.37	10.55	11.75	68.42	73.50
Net Radiation ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ )	61.67	59.14	-1.12	1.36	133.24	124.55




**Figure 1.** The representation of vegetation in (a) MOSES, where vegetation is beside bare ground and in (b) CABLE, where vegetation is above the ground. The mean grid heat flux,  $H$ , in MOSES is a weighted-sum of the tile-fluxes weighted by the tile fractions e.g. vegetation fraction,  $\sigma_v$ . In CABLE it,  $H$  is a sum of canopy,  $H_v$ , and soil fluxes,  $H_s$ . The vegetation, soil and radiative temperatures are  $T_v$ ,  $T_s$  and  $T_r$  respectively.




**Figure 2.** Percentage grid-cell coverage of the bare ground surface type for (a) ACCESS1.1 and (b) ACCESS1.0.




**Figure 3.** ~~Zonally-averaged~~ Zonal land-only average (a) total cloud fraction and (b) precipitation (~~mm/day~~  $\text{mm day}^{-1}$ ) for ISCCP (1984-2003)/GPCP(1979-1998), ERA-Interim (1979-1998), ACCESS1.0 (1979-1998), ACCESS1.1 (1979-1998) and ACCESS1.3 (CMIP5 AMIP-27 years 1979-2005).




**Figure 4.** Seasonal mean screen temperature biases ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) for ACCESS1.0 (a,b) and ACCESS1.1 (c,d) AMIP simulation evaluated against ERA-Interim analysis for DJF (left column) and JJA (right column). The model screen temperature difference, ACCESS1.1 minus ACCESS1.0, is shown in (e,f). [Areas of statistical significance based on the modified t-test are shown in all panels via stippling.](#)




**Figure 5.** Seasonal mean surface albedo difference between ACCESS1.1 and ACCESS1.0 for (a) DJF and (b) JJA.




**Figure 6.** Northern hemisphere seasonal minimum and maximum screen temperature (K) difference between ACCESS1.1 and ACCESS1.0 for DJF and JJA.




**Figure 7.** Offline simulation of Hyttiälä, 2002-2005. July mean diurnal cycles of net radiation and temperature ( $\text{W m}^{-2}$ ) for grid-cell, vegetation and soil for CABLE (a) and grid-cell, vegetation and bare ground tiles for JULES ; a(b) net radiation and temperature ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ K) for CABLE ; b(c) net radiation and JULES ( $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ d) for JULES grid-cell (black), evegetation (red) surface temperature and soil (Kblue) for CABLE and dgrid-cell (black) surface temperature-, vegetation (Kred) and bare ground (blue) tiles for JULES.




**Figure 8.** Seasonal mean difference in (a) total cloud fraction, (b) evaporation (mm/day), (c) precipitation (mm/day) and (d) 1 metre soil moisture ( $\text{m}^3/\text{m}^3$ ) between ACCESS1.1 and ACCESS1.0 for JJA. Boreas (Canada), East Siberia (Russia) and Hyytiälä (Finland) marked as yellow, green and red dots, respectively, in panel (a).




**Figure 9.** July diurnal cycles of (a) Total Cloud Fraction (solid) and (1yr average only) Very Low cloud Fraction (dash), (b) Precipitation (PPT, mm/day), (c) net radiation ( $R_{\text{net}}$ ,  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ), (d) sensible heat ( $\text{SH}$ ,  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ), (e) latent heat ( $\text{LH}$ ,  $\text{Wm}^{-2}$ ), and (f) Screen/Air Temperature ( $T_{\text{air}}$ , K) for Boreas. Observations in black, ACCESS1.0 in blue and ACCESS1.1 in red.



**Figure 10.** Offline simulation of 2003/2004 winter snow processes in Hyytiälä for CABLE (red) and JULES (black); (a) surface albedo, (b) snow water equivalent (SWE) in  $\text{kg/m}^2$ , (c) snow density in  $\text{kg/m}^3$ , (d) thermal conductivity in  $\text{Wm}^{-1}\text{K}^{-1}$  and (e) the mean daily temperature difference, CABLE minus JULES, in K.



**Figure 11.** January diurnal cycles of (a) Total Cloud Fraction (solid) and (1yr average only) Very Low cloud Fraction (dash), (b) Precipitation (PPT, mm/day), (c) net radiation ( $R_{net}$ ,  $Wm^{-2}$ ), (d) sensible heat ( $SH$ ,  $Wm^{-2}$ ), (e) latent heat ( $LH$ ,  $Wm^{-2}$ ), and (f) Screen/Air Temperature ( $T_{air}$ , K) for Boreas ([55.88°N, -98.48°E](#)). Observations in black, ACCESS1.0 in blue and ACCESS1.1 in red.



**Figure 12.** Monthly mean total runoff (mm/day) difference between ACCESS1.1 and ACCESS1.0 AMIP simulation for (a) March, (b) April, (c) May, and (d) June.