# Exploring ice sheet model sensitivity to thermal forcing using CISM



Gunter Leguy Bill Lipscomb



Nathan Urban

Brookhaven National Laboratory

CESM Workshop June 2022

#### Motivation

You can achieve a similar spun-up state with different sensitivities to ocean warming The Cryosphere, 15, 633–661, 2021 https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-633-2021 © Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

#### and the second second second

The Cryosphere

EGU

#### ISMIP6-based projections of ocean-forced Antarctic Ice Sheet evolution using the Community Ice Sheet Model

William H. Lipscomb<sup>1</sup>, Gunter R. Leguy<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas C. Jourdain<sup>2</sup>, Xylar Asay-Davis<sup>3</sup>, Hélène Seroussi<sup>4</sup>, and Sophie Nowicki<sup>5,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Climate and Global Dynamics Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA
 <sup>2</sup>Univ. Grenoble Alpes/CNRS/IRD/G-INP, IGE, Grenoble, France
 <sup>3</sup>Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, USA
 <sup>4</sup>Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA
 <sup>5</sup>NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA
 <sup>6</sup>University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, USA

Correspondence: William H. Lipscomb (lipscomb@ucar.edu)



### You can achieve a similar spun-up state with different sensitivities to ocean warming

Nudge toward observed thickness during spin-up by adjusting  $C_p$  (empirical coefficient in basal friction law) and delT (TF correction factor).

### You can achieve a similar spun-up state with different sensitivities to ocean warming



Nudge toward observed thickness during spin-up by adjusting C<sub>p</sub> (empirical coefficient in basal friction law) and delT (TF correction factor).

Lipscomb et al., 2021

There are a couple of parameters that have been found to be very important in the sensitivity of the ice sheet

• γ (a constant in the thermal forcing parameterization that describes how much melt occurs per ocean warming forcing) (ie. sensitivity to warming)

There are a couple of parameters that have been found to be very important in the sensitivity of the ice sheet

• γ (a constant in the thermal forcing parameterization that describes how much melt occurs per ocean warming forcing) (ie. sensitivity to warming)

• p (impacts the basal slipperiness, particularly in marine-based ice)

### We ran a 25-member ensemble of spin-ups (10 - 20 ka) with the following combinations of p and $\gamma$



More slippery bed

- The weighting strategy for p is stronger toward p=1.
   p ∈ [0:1]
- The weighting strategy for  $\Upsilon$  is stronger toward the lower end of the range .  $\Upsilon \in [1.47e6 : 1e7]$

Less slippery bed

#### We force each CISM spin-up with thermal forcing anomalies derived from 13 CMIP6 models



### Final SLR after 500 years show large spread depending on forcing and on p & $\gamma$ choice





Generally, continent-wide mass loss is more strongly controlled by **γ** than by p.



Sea level contributions
can only become
significant under a certain
parameter space:
p>0.6 and γ > 5x10<sup>6</sup>

When p>0.6, the effective pressure is large enough to reduce the impact of the applied thermal forcing

When  $\gamma > 5 \times 10^6$ , melt rates become high enough to drive rapid mass loss Regional analysis shows that the majority of mass loss in these experiments occurs in the Ross and Ronne-Filchner, little in the Amundsen



#### Regional break-down shows that the majority of mass loss in these experiments occurs in the Ross and Ronne-Filchner, little in the Amundsen



## Up to 2m sea level rise difference within 500 years by choosing a different p & $\gamma$





Synthetic Amundsen-focused experiments reveal a combined temperature threshold, and parameter space that results in large mass loss

- Synthetic Thermal Forcing in just the Amundsen of 1°C, 1.5°C and 2°C
- Similar parameter thresholds are discovered as in the CMIP6-forced runs: Significant mass loss occurs only when p>0.6 and γ>5x10<sup>6</sup>.
- When TF anomalies between 1.5-2°C, mass loss can really take off because topographic pinning points can be overcome.



#### Key take-home messages

- Significant mass loss under the following conditions:
  - Low basal friction near the grounding line (p>0.6)
  - High sensitivity of melt rates to thermal forcing ( $\gamma$ >5X10<sup>5</sup>)
  - Sufficient thermal forcing anomalies
- The choice of p and  $\gamma$  alone can impact multi-century sea level predictions by up to 2m.
- Under CMIP6 forcing, Ross and Ronne-Filchner dominate continental mass loss.
- Large-scale Amundsen exhibits mix of ocean, ice and temperature thresholds that together determine the sensitivity of the sector.