Evaluation of Arctic sea ice thickness simulated by AOMIP models
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Abstract

We compare results from six AOMIP model simulations with estimates of sea ice thickness obtained from ICESat, moored and submarine-based upward looking sensors, airborne electromagnetic measurements and drill holes. Our goal is to find patterns of model performance to guide model improvement. The satellite data is pan-arctic from 2004–2008, ice-draft data is from moored instruments in Fram Strait, the Greenland Sea and the Beaufort Sea from 1992–2008 and from submarines from 1975-2000. The drill hole data are from the Laptev and East Siberian marginal seas from 1982–1986 and from coastal stations from 1998-2009. While there are important caveats when comparing modeled results with measurements from different platforms and time periods such as these, the models agree well with moored ULS data. In general, the AOMIP models underestimate the thickness of measured ice thicker than about 2 m and overestimate thickness of ice thinner than 2 m. The simulated results are poor over the fast ice and marginal seas of the Siberian shelves. Averaging over all observational data sets, the better correlations and smaller differences from observed thickness are from the ECCO2 and UW models.

1. Introduction

Dramatic decreases in Arctic sea ice are predicted by some climate models to the degree that multiyear ice may be lost during this century. Critical to the accuracy and reliability of high latitude climate forecasts and a better understanding of sea ice dynamics and thermodynamics is the proper simulation of sea ice and its responses to atmospheric forcing across a range of temporal and spatial scales. Assessment of model performance regarding sea ice would include, at least, comparisons with observations of the interrelated sea ice characteristics of motion, strain, deformation, concentration, age, and thickness. Evaluation of modeled sea ice behavior,
however, is limited by incomplete observational data across the scales that characterize sea ice
growth, melt, motion, and divergence.

With the beginning of the satellite record in the late 1970s, sea ice concentration became
widely available as a product derived from passive microwave brightness temperatures
[Gloersen et al., 1992]. However, estimating sea ice thickness is not straightforward although
procedures for estimating thickness as well as velocity from the satellite record have been
developed [Laxon et al., 2003; Kwok et al., 2004]. Thickness is important to estimates of sea ice
survival probability over the melt season [Untersteiner, 1961] and its distribution appears to be
undergoing rapid changes [Wadhams, 1990; Rothrock et al., 1999; Wadhams and Davis, 2000].

The focus of this paper is on the ability of six coupled Arctic Ocean Model Intercomparison
Project (AOMIP) models to simulate sea ice thickness and to identify trends and differences
among the AOMIP model ice thickness results by comparing them with the broad range of
observed sea ice thickness data that is now available. The observational data include a) gridded
ice thickness derived from the ICESat satellite for ten campaigns from fall and winter 2004
through 2008, b) ice thickness transect data from electromagnetic airborne measurements (2001-
2009), c) ice draft from 24 moored instruments equipped with upward looking sonars (ULS) and
ice profiling sonars (IPS) from 1992 through 2008 from the Beaufort Sea, Fram Strait and the
Greenland Sea, d) ice draft from submarines equipped with upward-looking sonar (1975-2000),
e) ice thickness in drill-holes through sea ice from 187 sites taken in spring from 1982 through
1986 across the Siberian marginal seas, and f) fast ice thickness from 51 Russian coastal stations
(1998-2009). As described below, all ice-draft data were converted to ice thickness.

For this paper a range of thickness measurements is important to assess model performance.

When and where ice is thin and/or in low concentration there is potential for high speed drift that
may lead to dynamically driven increases in thickness via deformation while at the same time provide the potential for ice growth thermodynamically. Therefore, it is important to know whether specific models perform differently when simulating “thin” versus “thick” sea ice. Because of differences among model forcing, processes, and parameterizations even within a coordinated modeling project such as AOMIP, our goal here is to identify the agreement between modeled sea ice and observations in order to provide a foundation for model improvement. However, the complexity of isolating specific model attributes from among the full suite of parameterizations, forcing, and boundary conditions is beyond the scope of this paper. In the end, the utility of comparisons such as those done here may be assessed by the rate of model improvement.

2. Summary of previous work

Bourke and Garrett [1987] first reported on the mean ice thickness distribution in the Arctic Ocean from data taken between 1960 and 1982. Rothrock et al. [1999] showed that that the mean ice draft in most of the central portion of the Arctic Ocean had declined from 3.1 m in 1958–1976 to 1.8 m in the 1990s (a 40% decrease). The submarine ice draft data in the data release area (DRA) were fit with multiple linear regression expressions of location, time and season by Rothrock et al. [2008] for the period 1975-2000. They found the annual mean ice draft declined from a peak of 3.42 m in 1980 to a minimum of 2.29 m in 2000. ICESat ice thickness estimates for 2003–2008 for the same area of the Arctic Ocean as represented by the regression equations match well with the earlier submarine records [Kwok and Rothrock, 2009] and show a continued decline to less than 1.0 m in the DRA in the fall of 2007. Wadhams and Davis [2000] also found a decline in the ice draft at the pole of 43% from 1976 to 1996. Winsor [2001], however, found no trend in six cruises between the pole and the Beaufort Sea from the 1990’s.
Airborne EM surveys by Haas et al. [2009] showed a thinning of 20% in the region of the North Pole between 1991 and 2004, with a sharp drop to only 0.9 m in the summer of 2007 related to the replacement of old ice by first-year ice.

Direct comparison of model results to observed sea ice thickness has been limited because pan-Arctic sea ice thickness data were not widely available at useful resolutions. The lack of observational data was carefully circumvented by Gerdes and Koberle [2007] who compared results from several IPCC modeled outputs against sea ice thickness from a hindcast model (AWI1) positively evaluated against other AOMIP models. They concluded that differences among the IPCC models were likely due to the different effective wind stress forcing and the coupling methodologies with the ocean, a conclusion consistent with studies showing that atmospheric forcing fields essentially drive the results of sea ice simulations [Walsh and Crane, 1992; Bitz et al., 2002; Hunke and Holland, 2007] more so than the details of the sea ice model itself [Flato et al., 2004].

For sea ice concentration, satellite-derived values were compared with several AOMIP models to show that they reproduced winter-time observations reasonably well when ice concentration was near 100% but underestimated the September ice concentration minimum [Johnson et al., 2007]. The variability among model results exceeded the variability among four satellite-derived observational data sets suggesting the need to further constrain model performance or reduce sensitivity to prescribed forcing.

Assessment of model performance using sea ice drift and deformation derived from satellite data indicates little agreement between modeled patterns of sea-ice deformation fields and the linear features produced from the RADARSAT Geophysical Processor System (RGPS) at days to seasons and from kilometers to near basin scale [Kwok, et al., 2008]. Compared to the RGPS
products, specific model shortcomings included slow ice drift along coastal Alaska and Siberia, poor temporal rates of regional ice cover divergence, and low deformation-related ice volume production.

Assessment of the ice age-thickness relationship using model results shows that for northern hemisphere–wide averages the notion of thicker ice being older is reasonable at decadal scales, but for specific years and at scales less than hundreds of kilometers, ice age is not a good proxy for ice thickness [Hunke and Bitz, 2009]. At interannual time scales, the northern hemisphere averaged ice age is not well correlated with any of the three common ice descriptors: thickness, area or volume.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the six different AOMIP models followed by a review of the data sets against which they are compared. A section on the methods used to prepare the model and observational data follow. Comparison between models and data use a Taylor diagram modified to retain units of ice thickness residuals and model-data correlations, and also examines the linear regressions between the model and observed data. The paper concludes with a discussion of options for model improvement and a summary.

3. **Models**

The AOMIP project and its models were described previously in Holland et al. [2007] with considerable detail to be found on the AOMIP web site [http://www.whoi.edu/projects/AOMIP]. The six models used are from the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), Jet Propulsion Laboratory (Estimating the Circulation and Climate of the Ocean, Phase II -- ECCO2), Institute of Numerical Mathematics Ocean Model (INMOM) Russian Academy of Science, the National Oceanography Centre Southampton (ORCA), the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) Arctic
Modeling Effort (NAME), and the University of Washington (UW). Specific sea ice parameters for these models are shown in Table 1.

3.1 GSFC

The GSFC model is based on the generalized Princeton Ocean Model (POM) which can accommodate sigma-coordinates (the original POM), but also z-levels and a mixture of sigma and z-levels, as the vertical coordinate [Blumberg and Mellor, 1987; Mellor et al. 2002]. The results presented here are from a version which uses only z-levels. The vertical mixing coefficients are determined from 2.5 layer turbulence closure (Mellor and Yamada, 1974) which requires computation of the kinetic energy and kinetic energy times mixing length as additional prognostic quantities. The ocean model is coupled to a two-layer dynamic-thermodynamic snow-ice model where the sea ice is described as a generalized viscous medium [Mellor and Kantha, 1989; Hakkinen and Mellor, 1992; Hakkinen and Geiger, 2000]. Ice-ocean momentum, heat and salt exchange is described by a flow over a rough surface based on the theory of Yaglom and Kader [1974]. The solar radiation can penetrate below the ocean surface to distribute short-wave solar heating.

The model domain covers the Arctic Ocean and the North Atlantic and extending to 15°S, with a horizontal resolution of 0.35-0.45 degrees. Vertical resolution is 26 levels ranging from 6m to 500m layer depths. Transport at the open boundaries is defined by an inflow of 0.8 Sv through Bering Strait, which equals the amount that exits through the model’s southern boundary at approximately 15°S. The monthly T and S are restored at the open boundary buffer zones, but no other restoring is used in the GSFC model.

The specifications for AOMIP coordinated model run forcing are adopted except the following: P-E from Rasmusson and Mo [1996], and the Sellers formula as in Parkinson and
Washington [1979] for short wave radiation instead of AOMIP recommendations; the model uses NCEP wind stress instead of AOMIP recommended wind forcing. The GSFC model results are from a cold start at January 1948 using daily NCEP Reanalysis data.

3.2 ECCO2

The Arctic domain of ECCO2 uses a regional configuration of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology general circulation model (MITgcm, [Marshall et al., 1997; Losch et al., 2010, Nguyen et al., 2011]. The domain has southern boundaries at ~ 55°N in the Atlantic and Pacific sectors. The grid is locally orthogonal with horizontal grid spacing of approximately 18 km. There are 50 vertical levels ranging in thickness from 10 m near the surface to approximately 450 m at a maximum model depth of 6150 m. The model employs the rescaled vertical coordinate “z*” of Adcroft and Campin [2004] and the partial-cell formulation of Adcroft et al. [1997], which permits accurate representation of the bathymetry. Bathymetry is from the S2004 (W. Smith, unpublished) blend of the Smith and Sandwell [1997] and the General Bathymetric Charts of the Oceans (GEBCO) one arc-minute bathymetric grid. The non-linear equation of state of Jackett and McDougall [1995] is used. Vertical mixing follows Large et al. [1994]. A 7th-order monotonicity-preserving advection scheme [Daru and Tenaud, 2004] is employed and there is no explicit horizontal diffusivity. Horizontal viscosity follows Leith [1996] but is modified to sense the divergent flow [Fox-Kemper and Menemenlis, 2008].

The ocean model is coupled to the MITgcm sea ice model described in Losch et al. [2010]. Ice mechanics follow a viscous-plastic rheology and the ice momentum equations are solved numerically using the line-successive-over-relaxation (LSOR) solver of Zhang and Hibler [1997]. Ice thermodynamics are represented using a zero-heat-capacity formulation and seven thickness categories. Salt rejection during sea-ice formation is explicitly treated with a subgrid
salt plume parameterization [Nguyen et al., 2009]. The model includes prognostic variables for
snow thickness and for sea ice salinity. Boundary conditions are monthly and taken from the
global optimized ECCO2 solution [Menemenlis et al., 2008]. Initial conditions are from the
World Ocean Atlas 2005 [Antonov et al., 2006; Locarnini et al., 2006]. Atmospheric boundary
conditions are from the Japanese 25-year Reanalysis Project (JRA25, [Onogi et al., 2007]. The
integration period is from 1992-2008. A comprehensive assessment of the solution used in this
study can be found in Nguyen et al. [2011] where the model solution is parameter optimized
from 1992 to 2004 using ice thickness data from submarine and mooring ULS, sea ice
concentration and velocity, and ocean hydrography.

3.3 INMOM

The INMOM is a “terrain following” sigma-coordinate ocean model [Moshonkin et al., 2011].
The global version of the INMOM with low spatial resolution is used as the oceanic component
of the IPCC climate model INMOM [Volodin et al., 2010] presented in the IPCC Fourth
Assessment Report [2007]. The present version of the model covers the North Atlantic (open
boundary at approximately 20°S), Arctic Ocean, and Bering Sea regions including
Mediterranean and Black Seas. A rotation of the model grid avoids the problem of converging
meridians over the Arctic Ocean. The model North Pole is located at the geographical equator,
120°W. The 1/4° horizontal eddy-permitting resolution is used. There are 27 unevenly spaced
vertical sigma-levels. A Laplacian operator along the geopotential surface is used for the lateral
diffusion on the tracers and a bilaplacian operator along sigma-surface is used for the lateral
viscosity on momentum. The vertical viscosity and diffusion coefficients are calculated by
(EVP) dynamic - thermodynamic sea ice model [Hunke, 2001; Yakovlev, 2009] is coupled to the
ocean model. Surface forcing is from the CORE forcing dataset [Large and Yeager, 2004]. The surfac
turbulent fluxes are calculated using the bulk formulae. A climatological monthly runoff from CORE is applied along the coasts. Surface salinity is restored towards monthly climatology with a relaxation scale of approximately 12 days both for the open ocean and under sea-ice. Temperature and salinity restoring towards monthly climatology is used at the open boundaries.

3.4 ORCA

The ORCA model is a global z-level OGCM based on the NEMO ocean code [Madec, 2006] and uses the global tri-polar ORCA grid at $1^\circ$ horizontal resolution. The effective resolution is $\sim 27.75$ km at the equator increasing to 6-12 km in zonal and $\sim 3$ km in meridional directions in the Arctic Ocean, thus the model resolves large eddies in the Arctic Ocean and “permits” smaller ones. The configuration was developed by the DRAKKAR project and is described by Barnier et al. [2006] as the ORCA025-G70 configuration. The version of the model used here has a higher vertical resolution (64 vertical levels) than the ORCA025-G70, with thicknesses of the model levels ranging from $\sim 6$ m near the surface to $\sim 204$ m at 6000 m. The ‘partial step’ topography [Adcroft et al., 1997, Pacanowski & Gnanadesikan, 1998] is used, whereby the bottom cell is variable and more able to represent small topographic slopes near the Arctic shelves, resulting in the more realistic along-shelf flow [e.g., Barnier et al., 2006; Penduff et al., 2007]. The ocean model is coupled asynchronously to the sea ice model every five oceanic time steps through a non-linear quadratic drag law [Timmermann et al., 2005].

The sea-ice model LIM2 [Fichefet et al., 1997] is based on the Viscous-Plastic (VP) rheology with an elliptic yield curve [Hibler, 1979] and Semtner’s 2-layer ice, 1-layer snow thermodynamics [Semtner, 1976]. The latter is updated with sea ice thickness distribution [Fichefet et al., 1997]. Other features of the model are the positive-definite, second order, second
moments conserving advection scheme [Prather, 1986], ice-thickness dependent albedo [Payne, 1972], lateral ice thermodynamics and a simple snow-ice formation mechanism due to hydrostatic imbalance [Fichefet et al., 1997]. Sea ice salinity is taken equal to 4, the average value of sea ice salinity in the Central Arctic Ocean. Heat exchange between the ocean and sea ice is calculated as a product from the departure of surface temperature from the salinity-dependent freezing point and friction velocity at the ice-ocean interface. Solar radiation penetrates snowless ice, increasing latent heat storage in brine pockets [Fichefet et al., 1997].

Surface forcing is provided by the DRAKKAR Forcing Set 3 [Brodeau et al., 2001]. This dataset is a combination of precipitation and downward longwave and shortwave radiation fields from the CORE forcing dataset [Large and Yeager, 2004] and 10-m wind, 2-m air temperature and 2-m specific humidity from the ECMWF ERA40 re-analysis product. The turbulent air/sea and air/ice fluxes are calculated by the model using the bulk formulae [Large and Yeager, 2004]. A climatological monthly runoff [Dai and Trenberth, 2002] is applied along the coasts. Surface salinity is restored towards monthly climatology with a relaxation scale of 180 days for the open ocean and 12 days under sea-ice.

3.5 Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) Arctic Modeling Effort (NAME)

The NPS pan-Arctic coupled ice-ocean model used in this study consists of a Hibler-type sea ice model (Zhang and Hibler, 1997) coupled to a regional adaptation of the Parallel Ocean Program (POP) [Smith et al., 1992; Smith and Gent, 2002]. The sea ice model employs a viscous-plastic rheology, two ice thickness categories (mean ice thickness and open water), the zero-layer approximation of heat conduction through ice and a simplified surface energy budget (Zhang et al., 1999; Maslowski et al., 2000). The ice strength is parameterized in this model as a function of the mean grid-cell ice thickness, which tends to underestimate ice drift and
deformation [Maslowski and Lipscomb, 2003; Kwok et al., 2008]. The ocean model is a z-
coordinate ocean model with an implicit free surface and 45 vertical levels, with layer thickness
ranging from 5 m near the surface to 300 m at depth.

The model domain includes all sea-ice covered oceans and marginal seas of the northern
hemisphere. It includes the Arctic Ocean, sub-Arctic seas and extends to ~30°N in the North
Pacific and to ~45°N in the North Atlantic. Both components of the coupled model use identical
horizontal grid configured at 1/12° (~9 km) in a rotated spherical coordinate system to eliminate
the North Pole singularity. The model lateral boundaries are solid and no mass flux is allowed
through them however a virtual annual cycle salt flux is prescribed for most major rivers as a
function of river run-off. Surface layer (0-5 m) temperature and salinity are restored toward
monthly climatology [PHC; Steele et al., 2001]) on timescales of 365 and 120 days, respectively.

The model was forced with daily-average atmospheric fields (downward longwave and
shortwave radiation, surface air temperature, specific humidity, wind velocity and stress) from
the European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) 1979–1993 reanalysis and
1994-2004 operational products. Additional details of model configuration, initialization and
integrations can be found in Maslowski et al. [2004, 2008].

3.6 University of Washington (UW)

The UW model is the coupled pan-arctic ice–ocean modeling and assimilation system
(PIOMAS), a regional version of the global Parallel Ocean and Ice Model (POIM) [Zhang and
Rothrock, 2003]. The sea ice model is the multi-category thickness and enthalpy distribution
(TED) sea ice model [Zhang and Rothrock, 2001; Hibler, 1980]. It employs a teardrop plastic
rheology [Zhang and Rothrock, 2005], a mechanical redistribution function for ice ridging
[Thorndike et al., 1975; Hibler, 1980], and a LSR (line successive relaxation) dynamics model to
solve the ice momentum equation [Zhang and Hibler, 1997]. The TED ice model also includes a snow thickness distribution model following Flato and Hibler [1995]. The ocean model is based on the Parallel Ocean Program (POP) developed at Los Alamos National Laboratory [Smith et al., 1992]. The model domain of PIOMAS covers the northern hemisphere north of 48ºN. The POP ocean model has been modified to incorporate open boundary conditions [Zhang and Steele, 2007] so that PIOMAS is able to be one-way nested to a global POIM [Zhang, 2005] with open boundary conditions along 49ºN. The PIOMAS finite-difference grid is based on a generalized orthogonal curvilinear coordinate system with the “north pole” of the model grid placed in Greenland. The model horizontal resolution ranges from 6 to 75 km with a mean resolution of 22 km for the Arctic, Barents, and GIN (Greenland-Iceland-Norwegian) seas, and Baffin Bay. The TED sea ice model has 12 categories each for ice thickness, ice enthalpy, and snow depth. The centers of the 12 ice thickness categories are 0, 0.26, 0.71, 1.46, 2.61, 4.23, 6.39, 9.10, 12.39, 16.24, 20.62, and 25.49 m. The POP ocean model has 30 vertical levels of varying thicknesses to resolve surface layers and bottom topography. The first 13 levels are in the upper 100 m and the upper six levels are each 5 m thick. The model bathymetry is obtained by merging the IBCAO (International Bathymetric Chart of the Arctic Ocean) dataset and the ETOPO5 (Earth Topography Five Minute Gridded Elevation Data Set) dataset [see Holland, 2000]. PIOMAS is forced by daily NCEP/NCAR reanalysis [Kalnay et al., 1996] surface forcing fields, i.e., 10 m surface winds, 2 m surface air temperature (SAT), specific humidity, precipitation, evaporation, downwelling longwave radiation, sea level pressure, and cloud fraction. Cloud fraction and SAT are used to calculate downwelling shortwave radiation following Parkinson and Washington [1979]. Model forcing also includes river runoff of freshwater in the Arctic Ocean. Climatological river runoff (i.e., no interannual variability) is provided as in the work of Hibler
The calculations of surface momentum and radiation fluxes follow Zhang and Rothrock [2003] and differ from the specifications for the AOMIP coordinated runs. No climate restoring is allowed. No data assimilation is performed for this study, although PIOMAS is able to assimilate ice concentration and sea surface temperature data.

4. Observational data

Ice thickness from models is compared with observed thickness, ice draft or freeboard that has been converted to thickness. Conversion for undeformed ice without snow or melt ponds is straightforward. Assuming ice is in hydrostatic equilibrium with seawater, ice thickness is the draft times the ratio of seawater density to sea-ice density. Snow cover, melt ponds and deformed ice provide sources of error. Still, it is not uncommon to use thickness as the product of draft and some constant. We use 1.115 [Bourke and Paquette, 1989] to convert draft to thickness.

Much of the data used in this study is available from the new Unified Sea Ice Thickness Climate Data Record [Lindsay, 2010]. This archive has summary statistics for moorings, submarines, aircraft, and satellite measurements of ice draft and ice thickness. The summary statistics include mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation of the measurement as well as the full probability density distribution. There are currently over 3000 samples in the archive which can be accessed along with documentation and metadata at http://psc.apl.washington.edu/sea_ice_cdr.

4.1 ICESat campaigns

Gridded Arctic Ocean sea ice thickness fields with resolution of 25 km × 25 km (Figure 1a) from 2004 through 2008 have been created from five fall and five winter ICESat campaigns [Kwok et al., 2009]. There is typically a three to four month separation between the fall and winter campaigns. The duration, start and end dates of the fall and winter campaigns, shown in
Table 2, are variable. The five fall campaigns start between September 24\textsuperscript{th} and October 25\textsuperscript{th} and end between November 8\textsuperscript{th} and November 27\textsuperscript{th}. Winter campaigns start between February 17\textsuperscript{th} and March 12\textsuperscript{th} and end between March 21 and April 14\textsuperscript{th}. We expect these shifts in the individual satellite campaign timing to introduce seasonal and interannual variability within the dataset, although it may not be particularly large as thicknesses represent near maximum end-of-winter and minimum end-of-summer data.

The ICESat thickness data are derived from freeboard (distance above the water line to top of the snow cover) obtained from the Geoscience Laser Altimeter System (GLAS). The methodology for determining freeboard, snow depth, and ice thickness from the 70 m footprint for ICESat is given by Kwok \textit{et al.} [2007] and Kwok \textit{et al.} [2009]. The empirical relationship between thickness and freeboard for the first year (FY) ice in late winter is discussed in Alexandrov \textit{et al.} [2010].

Satellite grid point values were computed and a 50-km Gaussian smoothing applied. The satellite hole is filled using an interpolation procedure described in Kwok \textit{et al.} [2009]. ICESat estimates [Kwok \textit{et al.}, 2009] of ice drafts are consistently within 0.5 m (one standard deviation) of profiles from a submarine cruise in mid-November of 2005, and four years of ice draft from moorings (BGEP-WHOI and AIM-IOS) in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. The gridded ICESat ice thickness estimates are available at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at http://rkwok.jpl.nasa.gov/icesat/index.html. The error variance of the ICESat thickness data is (0.37 m\textsuperscript{2}) [Kwok and Rothrock, 2009]. The ICESat measurements, when converted to drafts, are smaller on average by 0.1±0.42 m than adjusted ULS submarine drafts (see Section 4.4) and by 0.14±0.51 m than ULS moored drafts [Kwok \textit{et al.}, 2009].

4.2 \textbf{Electromagnetic airborne soundings}
Thickness data were obtained using electromagnetic (EM) induction sounding that computes the distance to the ice/water-interface by evaluating the amplitude and phase of a secondary EM field induced by eddy currents in the seawater. With airborne measurements, the height of the EM instrument above the air-snow surface is measured with a laser altimeter. Ice thickness is then obtained from the difference of the EM distance measurement to the ice/water-interface and the laser height of the snow [Haas et al., 2009], hence ice thickness from the EM measurements includes snow thickness.

The accuracy of the EM method is ±0.1 m over level ice under typical summer conditions [Haas et al., 1997; Pfaffling et al., 2007] with only small effects from melt ponds [Haas et al., 1997; Eicken et al., 2001]. The horizontal extent of induced eddy currents results in a measurement footprint area of up to 3.7 times the instrument height above the water [Reid et al., 2006]. The measured, unconsolidated ridge thickness can be less than 50% of its “true” thickness [e.g., Haas and Jochmann, 2003], although the magnitude of this underestimate is uncertain. The EM thickness distributions are most accurate with respect to modal thickness, while mean thickness can still be used for relative comparisons between regions and years. Surveys were performed with helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft using a towed sensor (“EM-Bird”) from icebreakers and land bases in various regions of the eastern and western Arctic [Haas et al., 2006; Haas et al., 2008; Haas et al., 2009; Haas et al., 2010]. Surveys have generally been performed in the April/May and August/September periods and data locations used in this paper are shown in Figure 2.

4.3 Upward looking sonar and ice profiling sensors from moorings

Eleven moorings with upward looking sonars (ULS) deployed in Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea (Figure 1b) by the Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research,
Bremerhaven, Germany acquired almost 25 station-years of data between 2002 and 2004 as a contribution to the World Climate Research Programme’s Arctic Climate System Study/Climate and Cryosphere (ACSYS/CliC) Project. The ice draft data are available from the Unified Sea Ice Thickness Climate Data Record as well as the National Snow and Ice Data Center web site with data descriptions Witte and Fahrbach [2005].

Sea ice draft data are available on the continental shelf of the Eastern Beaufort Sea for the period April 1990 through September 2003 from Ice Profiling Sonar (IPS) instruments deployed by H. Melling at the Institute for Ocean Sciences (IOS), Canada. Data are described in Melling and Riedel [2008] and references therein. Sea ice draft data in the central Beaufort Sea for the period 2003-2008 were acquired through the Beaufort Gyre Exploration Project (BGEP, A. Proshutinsky, PI). The point data are available at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute web site (http://www.whoi.edu/beaufortgyre/data.html).

Melling and Riedel [2004] estimate for their data an accuracy of ±0.05 m draft for level ice. Draft will be overestimated on average in rough ice. The ACSYS/CliC Workshop [Steffen, 2004] on sea-ice thickness requires an accuracy of ±0.05 m for draft for ULS and IPS and we use that figure here for all ULS data. We acknowledge that NSIDC has been alerted to an error in the way the bias correction was applied for the AWI data, but pending further clarification these data are used assuming the above accuracy.

4.4 **Upward Looking Sonar measurements from submarines**

Submarines have traversed the Arctic regularly since 1958 measuring the draft of the overhead sea ice using upward looking sonar (ULS). The processed and publicly available data (archived at NSIDC and available as 50-km averages at the Unified Sea Ice Thickness Climate Data Record) include 42 cruises from 1975 to 2000 covering 120,000 km of data. The cruises
took place between April and November, although most of the data were collected in late spring (April-May) and in late summer-fall (August-October) [Rothrock and Wensnahan, 2007].

The draft data are produced for periods when the submarine was traveling in a straight line at constant speed and depth. The basic data product is ice draft along the cruise track (Figure 2). The data typically have a spacing of 1-8 m with a footprint size of 2-7 m depending on the submarine depth. Data segments vary in length from a few to several hundred kilometers.

Rothrock and Wensnahan [2007] identify the following submarine ice draft measurement errors: precision error; error in identifying open water (ice of zero draft); sound speed error; error caused by sonar footprint size variations; error from uncontrolled gain and thresholds; error due to vessel trim. There are also differences between analog versus digitally recorded data with paper charts biased toward thicker ice by over 0.30 m due to their coarser temporal resolution. The drafts are obtained from the "first return" or from the depth of the deepest ice within the footprint. They estimated the overall bias due to this effect of the submarine ULS data from the actual draft as +0.29 m with a standard deviation of ±0.25 m. A recent paper [Rodrigues, 2010] finds a bias based on the sonar beam width and ice roughness larger than that found by Rothrock and Wensnahan [2007]. For this study we have corrected for the submarine draft bias of +0.29 m described in Rothrock and Wensnahan [2007].

4.5 Pack-ice and fast-ice measurements from drill holes

Konstantinov and Grachev, 2000]. The data set is derived from as few as 7 landings (1937) to nearly pan-arctic coverage in the 1970s. The data set contains measurements of 23 parameters, including a) ice thickness and snow depth on the runway and surrounding area, b) ridge, hummock, and sastrugi dimensions and areal coverage and c) snow density. The data used in this paper are a subset of those used to create the atlas “Morphometric Characteristics of Ice and Snow in the Arctic Basin” (self-published by Ilya P. Romanov in 1993 and republished by Backbone Publishing Company in 1995). Romanov provided these data to NSIDC in 1994 (see http://nsidc.org/data/g02140.html for full description and data in ASCII format). In this paper we use ice thickness data in the Spring from 1982 through 1986 (Figure 1b). The data were obtained at sites adjacent to the aircraft landing areas (undisturbed ice).

We also use data from 51 coastal stations where sea ice thickness was measured monthly through drill holes. The data represent thicknesses of the fast sea ice in the vicinity of the coastal station, mostly first-year ice, undeformed by ridging or rafting. Monthly data are available for 1998-2009. The data were provided by the Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia. Although these data and the data from the Romanov Atlas are unique, and the accuracy of such direct measurements is likely less than 0.05 m, we cannot make a formal statement regarding position error and accuracy.

5. Methods

All ice-draft data were converted to thickness as described above. In the following discussion, model minus observed thickness values are referred to as residuals, and thus the residuals are positive when the model overestimates the observed thickness. The observed data were monthly averaged except for the ICESat data which are provided as ~2-month averages. Where model results temporally overlapped the observed data, model ice thickness was extracted from the
nearest model grid point and averaged into monthly means. We recognize that the observational
data have very different spatial resolutions; moored instruments and drill holes produce point
data, while the ICESat data were processed using a 50-km Gaussian smoothing, and the Unified
Sea Ice Thickness Climate Data Record provides the statistical mean ice thickness at 50 km
intervals for the submarine ULS data. We chose to compare the observed data with the nearest
model grid point, an approach perhaps advantageous to models with finer resolution. For models
with coarse resolution, a 50-km weighted average, which is used by Rothrock and Wensnahan
[2007] might be advantageous. In this paper, we used the nearest model grid point to the
observed data, formed monthly averages of model and observational data (~2 months for
ICESat), and then computed residuals and correlations. This approach leads to consistent results,
described below, across data sets and models.

Record-length correlation coefficients and residuals were computed from the monthly time
series for each of the moored ULS and the 51 coastal stations data. Annual correlation
coefficients and residuals were computed for the each of the ICESat, airborne EM, Romanov
Atlas, and submarine data sets by averaging all data in the given year. Grand mean correlation
coefficients and residuals for each observational platform were computed by averaging all 25
ULS time series and from all 51 Coastal Station time series, and averaging all years for the
ICESat, airborne EM, Romanov Atlas, and submarine data. These differences should be kept in
mind in the following discussion.

To show the correlation coefficients and residuals, a modified Taylor Diagram [Taylor, 2001]
is used. In this diagram, the radial distance from the origin is the correlation coefficient (r=1 falls
on the unit circle) and the rotation angle (θ) is proportional to residuals with ±π corresponding
to residuals of ±2 m (Figure 3).
A quantitative evaluation arises from the modified Taylor diagram where model performance is proportional to the area swept by the radial “tip” \((1 - r)\) rotated from zero to the residual \((\theta)\). The result, \(\sqrt{(1 - r)^2} + \theta\) is used to rank the model performance.

Linear regressions are used to obtain relationships between the observed and modeled time series means and monthly means from the spatial data. We used annually averaged thickness for ICESat and Romanov Atlas, monthly averages using the multiple locations for the airborne EM and submarine ULS data, record-length means from the time series from moored ULS and the 51 Coastal Stations. Our purpose is to identify systematic biases in the simulations as a function of observed thickness. Statistical differences among the correlations and residuals are not discussed considering the different platforms, seasons, and instrument types. Our goal, rather, is to find patterns of performance among the different models to guide model improvement.

6. **Comparisons between Observations and Model results**

6.1 **Drill holes from coastal stations and Romanov Atlas.**

The residuals from the Romanov drill hole data were averaged from 1982 through 1986 and contoured using a color bar defined so that zero is white (Figure 4). All models, except for the GSFC model, show positive residuals, typically larger in the eastern Siberian marginal seas (East-Siberian and Chukchi Seas) than in the western seas (Kara and Laptev Seas).

6.2 **ICESat**

The residuals and correlations show that the models have a large scatter (Figure 5a). The UW, ECCO2, and NPS models are correlated with data above 0.6 and have residuals less than +0.30 m. For GSFC, the correlation is larger than 0.6 and the residual is negative, less than -0.40 m. The INMOM correlation is less than 0.5 and residual exceeds 0.40 m. (Post 2001 results from the ORCA model were not available at the time of our analysis.)
6.3 **Airborne EM**

The model and EM correlations are all less than 0.5. All models underestimate ice thickness except ECCO2 which has positive residuals (Figure 5b). Three models (GSFC, UW and NPS) demonstrate clustering of the results and have almost identical residuals, approximately -0.50 m. The negative residual occurs perhaps because the EM measurements include snow depth with the ice thickness although they underestimate maximum ridge thickness.

6.4 **Moored ULS**

All six models have similarly moderate correlations with residuals less than 0.25 m (Figure 5c). ECCO2, UW and GSFC have higher correlations with the data, near 0.6, while INMOM, NPS, and ORCA correlations are weaker. Of the six models, ECCO2 demonstrates the best agreement with the moored ULS data. Three models, INMOM, NPS and ORCA, show similar positive residuals. Two models, GSFC and UW, have negative, almost identical residuals.

6.5 **Submarine ULS**

ECCO2 has the highest correlation of ~0.7 in the suite of models with a residual of about +0.17 m (Figure 5d). UW, ECCO2 and GSFC models have similar correlations of about ~ 0.7. INMOM and NPS have positive residuals less than +0.70 m and correlations less than 0.6. ORCA has the weakest correlation (0.48) and a negative residual of approximately -0.30 m.

6.6 **Coastal stations and Romanov Atlas**

All models overestimate thickness at the coastal stations except for GSFC (Figure 5e). The residuals are larger and more positive for the Romanov Atlas (symbols with squares in Figure 5e) except for GSFC which has a near zero residual for the station data and moderately negative residual for the Romanov Atlas data. NPS has the highest correlation with both the datasets.
although the residual for the Romanov Atlas data is large. GSFC shows the lowest correlation for
the station data, whereas ORCA has the weakest for the Romanov Atlas data.

7. **Basin-wide and regional model performance**

We focus on model performance with respect to the ULS data because of (i) their broad
spatial and temporal coverage, (ii) accuracy and biases of the measurements are relatively well
understood, and (iii), like model grid-points, ULS measurements are values at a point sampled
over time. The ULS data used here extend from 1990 through 2008 and cover the Beaufort Sea,
Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea.

Figure 6 portrays correlations and residuals for the data from each model and from the
individual moored ULS instruments. UW and ECCO2 show the smallest scatter of residuals
(Figure 6 a,b). Residuals for GSFC and NPS are larger (Figure 6 c,d). The largest absolute
residuals are from INMOM and ORCA with values approaching 2m (Figure 6 e,f). All models
exhibit large scatter of the correlations; there is no apparent relationship between the scatter of
the residuals and the correlations.

From Figure 6, the model performance clearly varies regionally. We next focus the analysis
on Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea and on the Beaufort Sea. Figure 7 combines correlations
and residuals for Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea (AWI moorings) and the Beaufort Sea (IOS
and BGEP moorings) for all models. The pattern exhibits a broader range of residuals for the
data acquired in Fram Strait/Greenland Sea compared to the Beaufort Sea. Typically the
residuals for the Beaufort Gyre are more positive and higher than these for the periphery of the
Beaufort Sea (Figure 7).

8. **Linear relationships**
The linear fit for the models and observations is shown in Figure 8 for a) satellite, b) airborne EM, c) moored ULS, d) submarine ULS, e) Coastal Stations and f) Romanov Atlas. Grey shading along the $y=x$ line indicates the accuracy of the measurements. In all but four cases, the $y$-intercepts are greater than zero indicating positive residuals for thin ice. In all but three cases the regression slopes are less than one. The regression lines cross $y=x$ at variable locations with a mean of 2.2 m. For the satellite data (Figure 8a), INMOM, ECCO2, UW, and GSFC overestimate thickness where it is measured less than 1m. INMOM, ECCO2 and UW overestimate ice thinner than 2.0 - 2.5 m. NAME overlapped the satellite record only for 2004 and is omitted. For the airborne EM thicknesses (Figure 8b), all models strongly underestimate thickness when the ice is thicker than 3.5 m. ORCA is omitted as it does not have enough data for a meaningful comparison. For the moored ULS data (Figure 8c), GSFC strongly underestimates ice thinner than 2m and NPS, GSFC, and UW overestimate thin ice. All models except INMOM underestimate thick ice. For submarine ULS data (Figure 8d), all models overestimate thickness when measurements are less than 2 to 3 m. All models underestimate ice measured to be thicker than 4 m compared to submarine ULS.

Figure 8e shows that all models but NPS and GSFC overestimate near-shore ice thickness when measured to be less than 1.5 m at the Coastal Stations (Figure 8e). GSFC is unable to reproduce the range of the observed fast-ice measurements.

For the marginal seas (Romanov Atlas), INMOM, NPS, UW, and ORCA overestimate where observed thickness is less than 3 m, and all models overestimate thickness where it is measured to be less than 1 m (Figure 8f). (ECCO2 simulated 1992-2009 and does not overlap the Romanov Atlas data.)

9. Discussion
The accuracy, systematic errors of the measurements and cross-platform biases discussed in Section 4 should be taken into account when interpreting model results. Nevertheless, there are consistent results among the models.

For all observational platforms, most model regressions have slopes less than one \((m = 0.7)\), positive y-intercepts \(\bar{b} = 0.9\), and cross the y=x line (perfect fit) at a mean observed thicknesses of 2.1 m. The regressions indicate that thin ice is overestimated and thick ice is underestimated although each model varies around the 2.1 m mean crossing point (range -3.4 to 7.7). Overestimating thin ice is particularly evident with respect to the satellite data (Figure 8a).

For the thickest ice (airborne EM and submarine ULS), which is generally the most deformed, all models underestimate thickness (Figure 8a, b, d). There is thus a consistent pattern across platforms and across models to overestimate thin ice and underestimate thick ice. Below we investigate possible reasons for this bias.

The correlations are computed from multiple data sets that include different seasonal and spatial variability. For example, correlations should always be higher if the seasonal cycle is included compared to the correlations for just one season. This may explain why the modified Taylor diagrams suggest that the models perform well compared to the moored ULS (Figure 5).

Model performance is a clearly geographically dependent. Figures 5 and 6 demonstrate that the models as a group perform better in the Beaufort Sea than in other areas of the Arctic Ocean. The comparison with the IOS and BGEP moorings shows a smaller range of residuals than the other datasets. Scatter of the residuals for ULS measurements in Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea is larger than in the Beaufort Sea and substantial (Figure 7). Ice conditions in Fram Strait depend on local forcing as well as on conditions “upstream” in the Arctic Ocean making predictions for Fram Strait ice export dependent on many factors. However, the fact that the
models do well in the central basin but not in Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea may suggest regional issues in Fram Strait are driving the poor performance there. The poorest correlations are with the ice measured from the Airborne EM and the Romanov Atlas for the marginal Siberian seas. The residuals for the Airborne EM dataset are mostly negative and for the Romanov Atlas mostly positive and are larger than for the other data (Figure 5).

The models demonstrate reasonably good agreement with the coastal station data, which partly overlap the area of the Romanov Atlas measurements (Figures 5 and 8). The residuals for the coastal data have moderate scatter, however there is a positive bias of ~50 cm (Figure 5e). The bias may be because the station data represent only level sea ice whereas the model data are the cell-averaged level and ridge ice thicknesses. Note that AOMIP models do not have fast ice (motionless ice).

There are three aspects of the model biases. First, the biases tend to be smaller for the data which include several complete seasonal cycles (moored ULS and station data) and larger for the data covering only part of the year (satellite, Airborne EM, submarine ULS and Romanov Atlas). Since the latter mostly cover the ice melting period (spring to fall), we speculate that this may be related to model deficiencies in the thermodynamics of ice melting. The ice thickness threshold of 2.1 m, which in our analysis discriminates the positive and negative model bias, is the commonly accepted thickness distinguishing undeformed first- and multi-year Arctic sea ice [WMO, 1985]. This may indicate insufficient melting of first-year and the excessive melting of multi-year ice in the models. In our study we did not find any systematic differences between models with Semtner and energy-conserving thermodynamics.
The mean residual we found after averaging the annual residuals for the submarine ULS (Figure 5d) is 0.12 m. Recall that the submarine data were corrected for the 0.29 m bias reported by Rothrock and Wensnahan [2007]. As a group, the AOMIP models do well, overestimating submarine ULS by 0.12 m. We note that the Louvain-la-Neuve (LIM3) model [Vancoppenolle et al., 2009a] underestimated submarine draft observations converted to thickness by -0.55±1.04. However, similar to our results, they obtained positive model bias for the thin ice and a negative bias for the thick ice. Vancoppenolle et al. [2009b] performed sensitivity study of ice thermodynamics to the sea ice salinity and demonstrated a 0.30 m reduction in the model bias when the salt evolution model is used instead of constant or prescribed varying salt profiles.

Second, the model biases indicate a regional dependency. Our analysis shows small residuals in the Beaufort Sea and the central Arctic Ocean (moored and submarine ULS data) and an increase of the positive residuals on the Siberian Shelf (station data and Romanov Atlas). Rothrock et al. [2003] and Vancoppenolle et al. [2009a], comparing model results with submarine ULS, obtained a persistent pattern of model biases with positive values in the Beaufort Sea, north of Greenland and towards the Alaskan and East-Siberian Shelves, and with negative values in the Arctic Transpolar Drift and towards Fram Strait. Wilchinsky et al. [2004] found a similar pattern in their simulations and demonstrated that using sliding friction in sea ice rheology can reduce the biases.

The third aspect is the interannual variability in the models and data. Given the errors in atmospheric temperature, humidity and radiation fields used to force the models, we would expect large model biases for individual years even though the overall long-term biases could be moderate. Most of the available Arctic ice thickness data represent a few “samples” per year when aggregated to a monthly time scale. This poses a large statistical uncertainty of the
analysis. In addition, since the periods of the data collection varied from year to year, this introduces aliasing in the time series, making interpretation of the interannual variability difficult.

10. **Summary**

Sea ice thickness from six AOMIP coupled models is compared with thickness across the Arctic basin from a) satellites, b) airborne EM, c) moored ULS in Fram Strait, Greenland Sea and the Beaufort Gyre (ULS, IPS), d) submarine ULS across the central basin, and e) drill holes through fast along coastal Siberia and within the ice pack. The linear relationship between models and the different data shows that all models generally overestimate ice thinner than 2.1 m and underestimate the ice thicker than 4.0 m. This is a systematic error consistent among the models and is likely problematic for forecasting open water as well as in long term forecasts where the role of multi-year ice is critical. We speculate that this error may be attributed to the deficiencies in simulating ice melting. We did not find any systematic error with respect to the type of ice thermodynamics used in the models.

There is a significant scatter of the model biases with respect to the different observational platforms, which could be partly related to the observational systematic errors. The models agree best with the moored ULS data. The model skill in simulating sea ice thickness varies from region to region. Taken together, the models simulate the ice thickness in the Beaufort Gyre better than in Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea. Some of the observed scatter is also due to inconsistencies between different observational methods and data products. Averaging over all observational data sets, the correlations and smaller differences from observed thickness are better from the ECCO2 and UW models.
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**Figure Captions**

**Figure 1.** (a) ICESat data extent for the February-March and October-December 2004 – 2008 campaigns. (b) Locations of ULS in Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea (AWI, red), Beaufort Sea (BGEP, blue; IOS, green), Romanov (1995) landing data from subset of High-Latitude Airborne Annual (Sever) Expeditions (dark red dots), and 51 coastal fast ice stations (dark grey).

**Figure 2.** Locations of the airborne EM thickness data (dark) and submarine ULS ice draft data (light).
**Figure 3.** Taylor diagram modified so the correlation coefficient is the radial distance from the center. The rotation angle is proportional to the residual (model minus observed thickness) where ±2 m rotates to ±π with larger residuals rotated away from the positive x-axis. A correlation coefficient of 0.6 is marked by the dashed green circle and residuals of 30 and 75 cm are marked.

**Figure 4.** Residual sea ice thickness from the Romanov Atlas data (stations in Figure 1) from 1982 through 1986 for (a) UW, (b) NPS, (c) GSFC, (d) INMOM, and (e) ORCA. No ECCO2 model results overlap with the Romanov data. Blue color identifies where model overestimates thickness (UW, NPS, INMOM, ORCA) and red color denotes underestimate (GSFC).

**Figure 5.** Correlations and residuals for models and (a) ICESat, (b) airborne EM, (c) moored ULS (d) submarine ULS, (e) 51 coastal stations and Romanov Atlas (with squares).

**Figure 6.** Correlations and residuals for moored ULS data. UW and ECCO2 have smaller residuals compared to other models. GSFC and NPS have larger residuals. INMOM and ORCA have the largest residuals with some approaching 2 m. AWI instrument data are in red, IOS in green, and BGEP in blue.

**Figure 7.** Correlations and residuals for moored ULS data from (a) Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea (AWI) and (b) Beaufort Sea (IOS, BGEP). The models simulate better the data from the Beaufort Sea compared to Fram Strait and the Greenland Sea. Colors identifying each model are the same as in Figure 6.

**Figure 8.** Linear fit between observed and model thickness from (a) satellites, (b) airborne EM, (c) moored ULS, (d) submarine ULS, (e) coastal stations, and (f) Romanov Atlas. Each axis limit is set from the maximum observed using the particular platform. Measurement accuracy is shown by the width of the grey area behind the black $y = x$ line. A width of 10 cm is used for the coastal station data and Romanov Atlas.
### Table 1. Model Configuration and Selected Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GSFC</th>
<th>ECCO2</th>
<th>INMOM</th>
<th>NOCS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain Resolution</strong></td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ice $\Delta t$</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.35° - 045°</td>
<td>0.25°</td>
<td>3-6 km</td>
<td>9 km</td>
<td>6-75 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 s</td>
<td>720 s</td>
<td>3600 s</td>
<td>7200 s</td>
<td>2800s</td>
<td>1152 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical coordinate</strong></td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>$z$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical levels</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum depth</strong></td>
<td>25m</td>
<td>5m</td>
<td>5m</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bering Strait</strong></td>
<td>Restore</td>
<td>Not restored</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>Fully represented in global domain</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical</strong></td>
<td>MY2.5</td>
<td>KPP, no</td>
<td>Monin and TKE</td>
<td>Pacanowski</td>
<td>KPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing</td>
<td>double diffusion</td>
<td>Obukhov, (Kochergin, 1987)</td>
<td>(Gaspar et al.( 1990), Blanke &amp; Delecluse (1993))</td>
<td>i and Philander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Function of surface S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thickness categories</td>
<td>2: ice and no ice</td>
<td>8 (7 for ice and 1 for open water)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2: mean grid cell ice thickness</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advection</td>
<td>Centred mom.</td>
<td>Centered $2^{nd}$ order</td>
<td>MPDATA</td>
<td>Prather, $2^{nd}$ order, $2^{nd}$ moment conserving</td>
<td>Central diff.</td>
<td>Central diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td>Generalized viscous</td>
<td>Viscous plastic</td>
<td>EVP</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Viscous plastic</td>
<td>Teardrop plastic rheology, LSR solver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Albedos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Cold snow</th>
<th>$0.8085$</th>
<th>$0.7-0.8$ (surface temperature dependent)</th>
<th>$0.5-0.65$ (clear sky, snow thickness dependent)</th>
<th>$0.70$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cold ice</td>
<td>$0.74$</td>
<td>$0.7$</td>
<td>$0.1-0.65$ (ice thickness dependent)</td>
<td>$0.1-0.72$ (clear sky, ice thickness dependent)</td>
<td>$0.73$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Momentum Exchange Coefficients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melting ice</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7060</td>
<td>0.1-0.575</td>
<td>01.-0.5</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ice thickness and surface temperature dependent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1556</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface BL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Atmos.- ice\(^g\)                      | 1.4E-3 | 1.14 x 10^-3 | 2.75 x 10^-3 | 1.63 x 10^-3 | 1.1 x 10^-3 | Surface BL |
| Ice-Ocean BL model                      | 5.4 x 10^-3 | 5.5 x 10^-3 | 5.0 x 10^-3 | 5.5 x 10^-3 | Cw=0.005 |

\(^a\)See AOMIP web site for additional details (http://www.whoi.edu/AOMIP)
Table 2. ICESat campaign periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laser</th>
<th>Campaign year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Operational Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sep 24 – Nov 18</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Feb 17 – Mar 21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Oct 03 – Nov 08</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Feb 17 – Mar 24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Oct 21 – Nov 24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Feb 22 – Mar 27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Oct 25 – Nov 27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3h</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mar 12 – Apr 14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3i</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Oct 02 – Nov 05</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Feb 17 – Mar 21</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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