



# AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

*Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*

## **EARLY ONLINE RELEASE**


This is a preliminary PDF of the author-produced manuscript that has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. Since it is being posted so soon after acceptance, it has not yet been copyedited, formatted, or processed by AMS Publications. This preliminary version of the manuscript may be downloaded, distributed, and cited, but please be aware that there will be visual differences and possibly some content differences between this version and the final published version.

The DOI for this manuscript is doi: 10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00121.1

The final published version of this manuscript will replace the preliminary version at the above DOI once it is available.

If you would like to cite this EOR in a separate work, please use the following full

[View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk](http://core.ac.uk)

brought to you by  CORE

provided by Electronic Publication Information Center

Jung, T., F. Doblas-Reyes, H. Goessling, V. Guemas, C. Bitz, C. Buontempo, R. Caballero, E. Jakobson, J. Jungclaus, M. Karcher, T. Koenig, D. Matei, J. Overland, T. Spengler, and S. Yang, 2015: Polar-lower latitude linkages and their role in weather and climate prediction. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.* doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00121.1, in press.



1 **Polar-lower latitude linkages and their role in weather and climate**  
2 **prediction**

3 Thomas Jung\*, Francisco Doblas-Reyes, Helge Goessling, Virginie Guemas, Cecilia Bitz, Carlo  
4 Buontempo, Rodrigo Caballero, Erko Jakobson, Johann Jungclaus, Michael Karcher, Torben  
5 Koenigk, Daniela Matei, James Overland, Thomas Spengler, Shuting Yang

6 *AWI, Bremerhaven, Germany*

7 Francisco Doblas-Reyes

8 *ICREA, IC3, and BSC, Barcelona, Spain*

9 Helge Goessling

10 *AWI, Bremerhaven, Germany*

11 Virginie Guemas

12 *IC3, Barcelona, Spain, and CNRM, Toulouse, France*

13 Cecilia Bitz

14 *Atmospheric Sciences Department, University of Washington, Seattle, USA*

15 Carlo Buontempo

16 *MetOffice, Exeter, UK*

17 Rodrigo Caballero

18 *Meteorological Institute, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden*

19 Erko Jakobson

20 *Tartu Observatory, Travere, Estonia*

21 Johann Jungclaus

22 *MPI for Meteorology, Hamburg, Germany*

23 Michael Karcher

24 *AWI, Bremerhaven, Germany*

25 Torben Koenigk

26 *SMHI, Norrkoeping, Sweden*

27 Daniela Matei

28 *MPI for Meteorology, Hamburg, Germany*

29 James Overland

30 *NOAA/PMEL, Seattle, USA*

31 Thomas Spengler

32 *Geophysical Institute, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway*

33 Shuting Yang

34 *DMI, Copenhagen, Denmark*

<sup>35</sup> \**Corresponding author address:* Alfred Wegener Institute, Helmholtz Centre for Polar and Marine

<sup>36</sup> Research, Bussestrasse 24, D-27570 Bremerhaven, Germany.

<sup>37</sup> E-mail: [Thomas.Jung@awi.de](mailto:Thomas.Jung@awi.de)

## ABSTRACT

38 International Workshop on Polar-lower Latitude Linkages in Weather and

39 Climate Prediction

40 What: Eighty experts from twenty different countries met to assess recent

41 progress in, and new directions for, our understanding of the mechanisms

42 governing polar-lower latitude linkages and their role in weather and climate

43 prediction including services.

44 When: 10–12 December 2014

45 Where: Barcelona, Spain

46

47 From 10–12 December 2014 the International workshop on Polar-lower latitude linkages and  
48 their role in weather and climate prediction was hosted by the Institut Català de Ciències del  
49 Clima (IC3) in Barcelona, Spain. The workshop, which was attended by 80 participants from 20  
50 countries including early career scientists, was motivated by the fact that the polar regions are an-  
51 ticipated to undergo rapid changes in a warming world. These changes may have impacts for the  
52 weather and climate elsewhere on the planet that are not sufficiently well understood. Presentations  
53 and discussions took into account atmospheric and oceanic teleconnections in both hemispheres.  
54 A unique aspect of the Barcelona workshop was that polar-lower latitude linkages were also dis-  
55 cussed from a prediction and services perspective. Weather and climate forecasting capacity in  
56 the polar regions is limited due to poor observational coverage and understanding of atmosphere-  
57 ocean-sea ice interaction, that hamper forecast quality in lower latitudes. The prediction aspect  
58 brings socio-economic relevance to the polar-lower latitude linkages theme with benefits for the  
59 development of weather and climate services.

60 The purpose of the workshop was to review current understanding of the workshop theme, iden-  
61 tify known and unknown issues, define ways forward for closing important knowledge gaps, en-  
62 hance cooperation, recommend specific activities for international programmes such as the Polar  
63 Prediction Project (PPP) and the Polar Climate Predictability Initiative (PCPI), and to provide re-  
64 search priorities for funding agencies. The workshop started by having keynote and challenger  
65 presentations; this was followed by several hours of breakout group discussions for the three dif-  
66 ferent themes: (1) atmospheric linkages, (2) oceanic linkages and (3) prediction and services;  
67 finally recommendations were presented and discussed in a plenary session. Those who were not  
68 able to come to Barcelona had the opportunity to follow most of the workshop activities online.

69 We provide a summary of the breakout group discussions followed by workshop recommenda-  
70 tions. Further useful information, including the presentations, are available from the following  
71 website: <http://polarprediction.net/linkages>.

## 72 **1. Atmospheric linkages**

73 The assessment of the potential for recent Arctic changes to influence broader hemispheric  
74 weather and climate now and in the future is a difficult and controversial topic. There is little  
75 agreement on problem formulation, methods, or robust mechanisms in the research community.  
76 The best that can be said is that the science is in a pre-consensus state (Cohen et al. 2014), not  
77 unlike where ENSO research was in the late 1970s–early 1980s. The workshop was important in  
78 advancing the topic of linkages both in terms of lack of large-scale changes in seasonal climate  
79 due to Arctic amplification of temperature changes, and positive evidence for shorter term dynamic  
80 mechanisms for linkages. Despite major uncertainties due to the short observational record, given  
81 that major Arctic changes began in the early 2000s, and a large chaotic component to weather  
82 systems relative to potential Arctic forcing, the topic is significant and represents major science  
83 challenge to the international community, as continued Arctic changes are an inevitable aspect of  
84 anthropogenic global change and is an opportunity for improved extended range forecasts at mid-  
85 latitudes. Advances will come from both an increased observational network and interdisciplinary  
86 understanding.

87 At the Barcelona workshop much discussion centered around three questions related to a possi-  
88 ble remote impact of Arctic amplification: "Can it? Has it? Will it?" (Barnes and Screen 2015)  
89 There was general consensus that the Arctic has the potential to modify mid-latitude weather and  
90 variability; the relative importance of different possible mechanisms, however, remains to be ex-  
91 plored. The issue "Has it?" is a continuing challenge. In this context the question why different

92 people come to different conclusions from the same data was discussed. Given the magnitude of  
93 natural variability and the limited observational record, one cannot expect to be able to reject the  
94 null hypothesis that recent cold winters are due to chance, even if there were a signal; failure to re-  
95 ject the null hypothesis does not prove the null hypothesis. Possibly, our null (or prior) hypothesis  
96 should be anthropogenic climate change, and Arctic amplification. As a result the community at  
97 present should consider a risk-based approach to the problem formulation that increased linkages  
98 are a possibility. The issue "Will it?" is also difficult as it depends on climate models that gener-  
99 ally lack skill in the representation of key features such as atmospheric boundary layers and, as a  
100 result, disagree in important aspects of the projected change. Further group discussion noted that  
101 there are multiple factors besides sea ice loss and snow cover which can influence atmospheric  
102 dynamics in the subarctic. A focus on surface fluxes and shifts in atmospheric dynamic patterns  
103 will provide improved insights and potential extended range forecast potential.

104 A main workshop conclusion is that the community must distinguish between influence on the  
105 net response and possibility of modulating the response. Hemispheric, seasonal average changes  
106 in cold surface temperatures, and dynamic features associated with them, relative to background  
107 global warming are not likely to be of large significance. However, Arctic linkages with mid-  
108 latitude weather events that are regional and episodic, lead to an increased occurrence of extreme  
109 events, and vary with the season, are possible. Multiple presentations showed that linkages are  
110 likely to relate to amplification of existing regional quasi-stationary waves associated with the  
111 Siberian High and Greenland blocking locations. Complexity is added due to interaction of mul-  
112 tiple time scales and source regions, where actual severe weather elements consist of propagation  
113 of wave trains of high/low pressure on the synoptic time scale into eastern Asia and eastern North  
114 America in early winter.



## 115 **2. Oceanic linkages**

116 The science of Arctic influences on the circulation of the North Atlantic is much more mature  
117 than that for atmospheric linkages. Outflows from the Arctic Ocean at the surface and mid-depth  
118 reach the overflows and the deep-water formation sites in the sub-polar North Atlantic that feed  
119 into the meridional overturning circulation (MOC) and the sub-polar gyre (SPG) circulation. There  
120 has been consensus at the workshop that changes in the density of these outflows, for example due  
121 to freshwater or sea ice export from the Arctic or runoff from Greenland, affect the sub-polar  
122 North Atlantic in several ways: change of dense water formation in the Labrador Sea, change of  
123 the MOC strength, change of the SPG intensity. Great Salinities Anomalies observed during the  
124 second half of the 20th century are well-known examples for the Arctic-Atlantic interplay.

125 At the same time inflow changes of heat and salt from the sub-polar North Atlantic into the  
126 Arctic and Nordic Seas impact heat and freshwater storage of the northern basins, sea ice cover,  
127 ocean-atmosphere heat exchange and possibly even the atmospheric circulation.

128 It was highlighted at the workshop that both of these pathways are linked, suggesting that the  
129 Arctic-Atlantic interplay should be studied from a two-way perspective (Proshutinsky et al. 2009;  
130 Jungclaus et al. 2014). The strength of the MOC and the SPG, for example, modulate the north-  
131 ward heat and salt fluxes, while the Arctic Ocean freshwater storage and release dynamics regulate  
132 the sea ice and liquid freshwater exports. An important, but still largely open question is to what  
133 degree oceanic changes in the Arctic and North Atlantic impact the overlying atmosphere and  
134 hence the weather and climate over the adjacent continents, although the climate prediction com-  
135 munity is showing convincing examples of how it can affect phenomena with societal relevance  
136 such as the frequency of tropical cyclones.

137 While the existence of two-way linkages in the ocean is well established some fundamental ques-  
138 tions still remain, especially when it comes to exploiting the full potential of oceanic linkages for  
139 predictive purposes. It will be important, for example, to better understand the pathways and time  
140 scales on which the different processes such as freshwater storage, release and advection influence  
141 the lower latitudes. Given that models will be used to carry out predictions it will be important to  
142 first thoroughly evaluate their representation of the different key processes and then advance the  
143 models where necessary. Given that successful predictions also rely on good initial conditions,  
144 poor observational coverage of the Arctic Ocean remains a key challenge. Therefore, methods  
145 will need to be devised that can be used to develop a cost effective Arctic observing system that  
146 allows to exploit the predictive potential inherent to the system. In this context, investments in the  
147 development of coupled data assimilation systems are highly desirable.

### 148 **3. Prediction and services**

149 Sub-seasonal prediction experiments presented at the Barcelona workshop provide evidence that  
150 what happens at the poles does not stay at the poles, especially over the Northern Hemisphere (Jung  
151 et al. 2014). On sub-seasonal time scales the Arctic impact is strongest over the eastern sections of  
152 the Northern Hemisphere continents. Furthermore, case studies for the winter 2009/10 suggested  
153 an influence of snow on the Arctic Oscillation. When it comes to prediction, snow cover, sea ice,  
154 ocean heat content and the atmosphere, including the stratosphere, are all important.

155 For improving forecasts, an increased understanding of how best to initialize these fields is  
156 urgently needed. This includes determining which observations are needed and how they should  
157 be assimilated. Regarding the observations, the Year of Polar Prediction (YOPP) will provide  
158 a unique opportunity to fill the gaps of the global observing system in polar regions and to use  
159 those extra data to assess and optimize the observing system. YOPP should also increase the

160 quality of satellite retrieval of parameters such as snow and ice through the provision of high-  
161 quality observations for calibration purposes. Given the strong coupling of the different climate  
162 components in polar regions, future data assimilation will need to be done in a coupled framework.  
163 Furthermore, substantial effort should be invested in characterizing uncertainty.

164 The services aspect of polar-lower latitude linkages was also discussed from a prediction per-  
165 spective. It was argued that users needs should not be second-guessed and that closer interaction  
166 with users might result in the formulation of existing research questions of direct socio-economic  
167 relevance. A list of principles to interact with users of climate information has been developed and  
168 climate scientists are encouraged to use them. At the same time user needs in the Arctic are not  
169 yet fully understood, and it might be beneficial to involve mediators in establishing and guiding  
170 an efficient dialogue.

#### 171 **4. Key recommendations**

- 172 • Improve understanding of the key processes in atmosphere, snow, sea ice and ocean respon-  
173 sible for linking the polar regions with the lower latitudes. Progress hinges on an improved  
174 observational base and on bringing expertise in high-latitude and middle-latitude dynamics  
175 together.
- 176 • Ensure that these key processes are well represented in models used to carry out weather and  
177 climate predictions. This task includes data assimilation, improved Arctic-centered model  
178 development and parameterizations, and thorough forecast assessments.
- 179 • Link the research performed for weather and climate forecasting with that carried out to  
180 project future climate to obtain the largest benefit from their synergies. This task should be  
181 planned well ahead of the CMIP6 exercise.

- 182 ● The community must distinguish between a potential Arctic influence on the net seasonal  
183 response and the possibility of regional episodic amplification of existing planetary wave  
184 patterns and related short-term weather events.
- 185 ● Carry out coordinated model experiments to thoroughly assess possible remote impacts of  
186 polar climate change. Emphasis should be put on both local and possible global consequences  
187 of Arctic amplification.
- 188 ● Explore the limits of predictability of polar weather and climate and their role for mid-latitude  
189 forecasting.
- 190 ● Determine the impacts of enhanced predictive capacity in the polar regions for mid-latitude  
191 forecasting by carrying out coordinated forecasting experiments (e.g. data denial and relax-  
192 ation experiments). Studying linkages from a sub-seasonal prediction perspective will allow  
193 better understanding of the prediction process and verification of polar-lower latitude path-  
194 ways.
- 195 ● Ensure that environmental prediction and model assessment requirements will have a high  
196 priority in the future development of the polar observing systems. The Year of Polar Predic-  
197 tion (YOPP), which will be held from mid-2017 to mid-2019, provides a unique opportunity  
198 for the international community to jointly advance our observational capacity.
- 199 ● Raise the profile of Antarctic research and its impact on the Southern Hemisphere climate,  
200 especially over land.
- 201 ● Create a working group to tackle the specificity of polar service provision. This working  
202 group could illustrate the benefits that stakeholders with interests at lower latitudes might  
203 have in improving polar predictions.

- 204 • Simplify the funding process for research collaboration on an international level.

205 *Acknowledgments.* We acknowledge Francois Massonnet for reading the summary and for ver-  
206 ifying the accuracy of the content. The report reflects ideas from a variety of workshop partic-  
207 ipants. The workshop was sponsored by the Polar Prediction Project (PPP) of WMOs World  
208 Weather Research Programme (WWRP), the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP), the  
209 Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS), the European Commission through the Seventh  
210 Framework Programme SPECS project, the European Climate Research Alliance (ECRA), and the  
211 European Geophysical Union (EGU), as well as IC3 and the Alfred Wegener Institute Helmholtz  
212 Centre for Polar and Marine Research (AWI).

## 213 **References**

- 214 Barnes, E., and J. Screen, 2015: The impact of Arctic warming on the midlatitude jet-stream: Can  
215 it? Has it? Will it? *WIREs Clim. Change*, doi:10.1002/wcc.337.
- 216 Cohen, J., and Coauthors, 2014: Recent Arctic amplification and extreme mid-latitude weather.  
217 *Nature Geosci.*, **7**, 627–637.
- 218 Jung, T., M. Kasper, T. Semmler, and S. Serrar, 2014: Arctic influence on subseasonal midlatitude  
219 prediction. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **41**, 3676–3680, doi:10.1002/2014GL059961.
- 220 Jungclaus, J., K. Lohmann, and D. Zanchettin, 2014: Enhanced 20th-century heat transfer to the  
221 Arctic simulated in the context of climate variations over the last millennium. *Clim. Past*, **10**,  
222 2201–2213, doi:10.5194/cp-10-2201-2014.
- 223 Proshutinsky, A., and Coauthors, 2009: Beaufort Gyre freshwater reservoir: State and variability  
224 from observation. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **114**, C00A10, doi:10.1029/2008JC005104.