Utilizing a FAMOS hierarchy of sea ice models to identify their physical limitations

What is the main goal of a coordinated FAMOS sea ice modeling effort:

- □ To improve synoptic to seasonal hindcasts and forecasts?
- To better understand limitations on longer term coupled simulations and projections?
- **I** To gain a better understanding of physics?

\Box All of the above

Constraints within a FAMOS sea ice model hierarchy Stand-alone regional ice-ocean model

Most constrained ice-ocean system



Constraints within a FAMOS sea ice model hierarchy Stand-alone global ice-ocean model

Most constrained ice-ocean system



Constraints within a FAMOS sea ice model hierarchy Coupled regional model

Most constrained ice-ocean system



Component models

Constraints within a FAMOS sea ice model hierarchy Coupled global model

Most constrained ice-ocean system



Utilizing a FAMOS hierarchy of sea ice models



evaluate individual extreme events

evaluate statistics of internal variability

full feedbacks of atmosphere-ice-ocean interaction

Some suggested physically-based metrics for which observations exist

In concert with a sparse set of metric on the basic performance of sea ice simulations, can we identify physically-based metrics meaningful across multiple model configurations, such as:

$\,\circ\,$ Melt timing and melt rate

The trajectory of sea ice thickness during the melt season



Some suggested physically-based metrics for which observations exist

In concert with a sparse set of metric on the basic performance of sea ice simulations, can we identify physically-based metrics meaningful across multiple model configurations, such as:

Melt timing and melt rate
Sea ice mechanics scaling
...

And should these consider atmospheric processes, e.g. radiation scheme?

What would the combined results from a FAMOS model hierarchy reveal using such metrics?