



AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

Journal of Climate

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/JCLI-D-12-00505.1

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 citation:

ROEHRIG, R., D. Bouniol, F. Guichard, F. Hourdin, and J. Redelsperger, 2013: The present and future of the West African monsoon: a process-oriented assessment of CMIP5 simulations along the AMMA transect.. J. Climate. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00505.1, in press.



1 The present and future of the West African monsoon: a
2 process-oriented assessment of CMIP5 simulations along the
3 AMMA transect.

4 ROMAIN ROEHRIG * DOMINIQUE BOUNIOL, FRANCOISE GUICHARD

CNRM-GAME, Toulouse, France

5 FRÉDÉRIC HOURDIN

LMD, IPSL, Paris, France

6 JEAN-LUC REDELSPERGER

LPO, Brest, France

* *Corresponding author address:* Romain Roehrig, Météo-France, CNRM-GAME/GMGEC/EAC, 42 avenue G. Coriolis, 31057 Toulouse Cedex, France.

E-mail: romain.roehrig@meteo.fr

ABSTRACT

The present assessment of the West African monsoon in the models of the fifth phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP5) indicates little evolution since CMIP3 in terms of both biases in present-day climate and climate projections.

The outlook for precipitation in twenty-first-century coupled simulations exhibits opposite response between the westernmost and eastern Sahel. The spread in the trend amplitude remains however large in both regions. Besides, although all models predict a spring and summer warming of the Sahel, 10 to 50% larger than the global warming, their temperature response ranges from 0 to 7 K.

CMIP5 coupled models underestimate the monsoon decadal variability, but SST-imposed simulations succeed in capturing the recent partial recovery of monsoon rainfall. Coupled models still display major SST biases in the equatorial Atlantic, inducing a systematic southward shift of the monsoon. Because of these strong biases, the monsoon is further evaluated in SST-imposed simulations along the 10°W–10°E AMMA transect, across a range of timescales ranging from seasonal, intraseasonal and diurnal fluctuations.

The comprehensive set of observational data now available allows an in-depth evaluation of the monsoon across those scales, especially through the use of high-frequency outputs provided by some CMIP5 models at selected sites along the AMMA transect. Most models capture many features of the African monsoon with varying degrees of accuracy. In particular, the simulation of the top-of-atmosphere and surface energy balances, in relation with the cloud cover, and the intermittence and diurnal cycle of precipitation, demand further work to achieve a reasonable realism.

1. Introduction

During the second half of the twentieth century, Africa witnessed one of the largest interdecadal climate signal of the recent observational records. The severe drying of the Sahel, which culminated in the devastating drought of 1984, plagued the region from the 70's to the 80's (e.g., Nicholson 1980; Nicholson et al. 2000; Held et al. 2005). In the recent decade, the Sahel transitioned to a period with somewhat more abundant rainfall, suggesting a possible shift to a more favorable climate regime over the coming decades (Paeth and Hense 2004). However, at the same time, global mean temperature is increasing in response to increasing atmospheric greenhouse gases, so that predicting the evolution of Sahel rainfall from a range of a few decades to the end of the twenty-first century becomes urgently needed for developing adaptation strategies.

Such climate projections, as well as our physical understanding of the Sahel rainfall variability, mostly rely on general circulation models, characterized by a wide variety of complexity, from atmosphere-only models to the most recent Earth System Models (ESMs). The regional response to global warming was uncertain in the models of the third phase of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP3 – Meehl et al. 2007) used for the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which even disagree on the sign of future rainfall anomalies over the Sahel (e.g., Biasutti and Gnanini 2006; Lau et al. 2006). This disagreement remains even among models that reasonably simulate the twentieth-century West African climate (Cook and Vizzy 2006).

In fact, many of the previous generation climate models failed in capturing major features of the West African climatology and variability, damping our confidence in their climate projection. One of the reason is likely linked to the high spatial and temporal heterogeneities of the rainfall distribution across West Africa. In the Sahel, which lies at the northernmost extent of the West African monsoon (WAM), between 10°N and 20°N, precipitation is highly sensitive to the InterTropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) latitudinal mean position during summer. There, rainfall is mainly supplied by mesoscale convective systems, often organized

56 within synoptic disturbances such as African easterly waves (e.g., Kiladis et al. 2006).

57 Several studies emphasized the inability of current coupled or atmospheric models to
58 correctly handle the main WAM characteristics. Cook and Vizzy (2006) show that one third
59 of CMIP3 models do not simulate a WAM system, i.e. they do not capture properly the
60 summer northward migration of the ITCZ over the continent. Atmospheric regional and
61 global models, forced by observed Sea Surface Temperatures (SSTs), analyzed within the
62 framework of the AMMA-MIP¹, WAMME² and CORDEX³-Africa projects are generally
63 more skillful, even though large biases in rainfall and the meridional circulation remain
64 (Hourdin et al. 2010; Xue et al. 2010; Boone et al. 2010).

65 In the framework of the fifth phase of CMIP (CMIP5), a new ensemble of state-of-the-art
66 climate models is now available (Taylor et al. 2012), and this raises several questions. Do
67 they agree more on Sahel rainfall projections? Do they capture the partial rainfall recovery
68 observed over the last decades? How well are they able to reproduce the main features of
69 the WAM? In the following, the CMIP5 ensemble is used to address these questions, assess
70 the results of the modeling community efforts and emphasize the challenges that remain for
71 simulating the WAM. Our analysis indicates that over West Africa, CMIP5 models have
72 not reached yet a degree of maturity which makes it possible to directly rely on them to
73 anticipate climate changes and their impacts, especially with regards to rainfall.

74 The present study is also motivated by the recent progresses done in the observation
75 and understanding of the WAM, thanks to the AMMA program (Redelsperger et al. 2006).
76 The AMMA observational strategy (Lebel et al. 2010) documented a meridional transect
77 extending from the Gulf of Guinea to the Sahara desert, along the Greenwich meridian.
78 Three preexisting surface-observing super-sites along this transect were reinforced: the Upper
79 Ouémé Valley, Niamey and Gourma AMMA-CATCH sites (e.g., Lebel et al. 2009). This

¹The African Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analyses (AMMA) Model Intercomparison Project (Hourdin et al. 2010).

²West African Monsoon Modeling and Evaluation (Xue et al. 2010).

³the Coordinated Regional climate Downscaling Experiment (Jones et al. 2011; Nikulin et al. 2012)

transect was used within the AMMA-MIP framework to evaluate regional and global models (Hourdin et al. 2010).

As part of the Cloud Feedback Model Intercomparison Project (CFMIP) component of CMIP5, participating centers also provided output at very high frequency (30 min or model time step) on a series of 119 grid points around the world, in order to better understand the climate model behaviors and their dependence on model formulation (Bony et al. 2011). Among these sites, eleven were defined in coordination with the AMMA community along the AMMA transect, three of them corresponding to the super-sites mentioned above. In addition, the availability of new space borne measurements from active sensors as part of the A-train opens the path for the establishment of global climatologies of the three-dimensional distribution of clouds (e.g., Bouniol et al. 2012). The availability of these new datasets, new outputs at selected sites from CMIP5, as well as the better understanding of some key processes at work in the WAM system provides a unique opportunity to evaluate more in depth the WAM representation by climate models. In the present work, we seek to capitalize on this AMMA legacy, and to provide a process-oriented analysis of CMIP5 simulations.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 describes the datasets used for the CMIP5 model evaluation. In section 3, the long-term variability of the WAM is assessed from CMIP3 to CMIP5 models. Section 4 evaluates the representation of the WAM mean state and seasonal evolution in both coupled and SST-forced simulations. Section 5 addresses a more physical evaluation of monsoon processes, with an emphasis on the intraseasonal and diurnal scales of the water cycle. Finally, conclusions are given in section 6.

2. Datasets

a. Climate models from CMIP3 and CMIP5

In the present work, we consider a wide range of output from climate models which participated to CMIP3 and CMIP5. Climate change scenarios of CMIP3 (SRES⁴ A2) and of CMIP5 (RCP⁵4.5 and RCP8.5), in comparison with historical simulations (20C3M for CMIP3, Historical for CMIP5) are used to assess the West African monsoon response to an increase of the CO₂ atmospheric concentration. SST-imposed or AMIP⁶-type simulations are used to further analyze the representation of the WAM in the state-of-the-art models of the CMIP5 archive. Pre-industrial control runs (PiControl) with constant forcing are used for some CMIP5 models, to infer the decadal and interannual variability of Sahel precipitation.

A full description of the CMIP3 framework and a comprehensive assessment of the models can be found in Meehl et al. (2007). Integrations of 18 CMIP3 models are used here. They were made available to the community by the Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI) through their website (www-pcmdi.llnl.gov/ipcc/model_documentation/ipcc_model_documentation.php), where a detailed description of the models can be found.

The simulations performed as part of CMIP5 and used in the present study are listed in Table 1. They were made available on the Earth System Grid (ESG, <http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/cmip5/index.html>) data archive. The different types of integrations of the CMIP5 framework are described in Taylor et al. (2012). As we provide hereafter a more detailed evaluation of the CMIP5 AMIP simulations, Table 2 reports grid information of the atmospheric component of the models which provided this experiment.

⁴Special Report on Emissions Scenarios

⁵Representative Concentration Pathway

⁶Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project

b. Observational datasets

The present paper assesses several timescales in CMIP5 models, from the multidecadal variability to the diurnal cycle. Therefore a wide number of datasets for each targeted variable is used to account for these scales and for the uncertainty of observations. Their main characteristics are described in Table 3.

3. Long-term variability of the WAM from CMIP3 to CMIP5

a. Climate projection of temperature and precipitation over the Sahel

The CMIP3 exercise confirmed the high probability of a significant global warming at global scale, as a consequence of the anthropic greenhouse gases emissions (e.g., Meehl and Coauthors 2007). Some robust features in the spatial distribution of the associated climate changes were also highlighted: a stronger warming over continents than over oceans, a stronger warming in high latitudes than in the tropics and, in general, a tendency to reinforcement of rainfall contrasts in the tropics, the ITCZ becoming more rainy and the sub-tropical subsiding anticyclonic belts drier (e.g., Chou et al. 2009). However, a major issue was raised as models did not achieve any consensus for regional rainfall changes, in particular over the Sahel (Cook 2008).

Hereafter, we give a brief outlook of the changes over the Sahel as simulated by the new CMIP5 ensemble (Fig. 1). Similarly to the CMIP3 ensemble mean under the SRES A2 scenario (Fig. 1.a), the CMIP5 ensemble mean (Fig. 1.d) predicts under the RCP8.5 scenario a warming with a marked meridional gradient, the warming being higher over the Sahara than near the Guinean Coast. This gradient is positioned over the Sahel, between 10°N and 18°N, and corresponds to a large inter-model standard deviation, indicating a large uncertainty in the Sahel temperature increase. Associated with this warming, a drying is

147 predicted by the ensemble mean over the Sahel west of 5°W whereas a wetting is predicted
 148 east of 5°W. The precipitation response remain qualitatively the same between CMIP3 and
 149 CMIP5, with a slight positive offset at the regional scale in the CMIP5 RCP8.5 scenario
 150 compared to CMIP3 SRES A2 scenario. Note that these two scenarios are distinct, so that
 151 the response amplitude in temperature and precipitation cannot be quantitatively compared.
 152 The inter-model standard deviation of the precipitation mean changes among the models is
 153 generally as large as the precipitation changes themselves.

154 The consensus on the westernmost Sahel ([15°W–5°W]) drying is relatively high, with
 155 about 80% of CMIP5 models agreeing on the sign of the change (Fig. 1.f). It was similar in
 156 the CMIP3 ensemble (Fig. 1.c). The drying remains moderate for most of the models, lower
 157 than 20% (Fig. 2.a). In contrast, the consensus on the wetting over the eastern West Sahel
 158 ([0°–10°E]) has been slightly reduced from CMIP3 to CMIP5 (Figs. 1.c, 1.e and 2.b), while it
 159 has clearly increased over the central/eastern Sahel ([10°E–35°E]), with now more than 75%
 160 of the CMIP5 models agreeing on the positive sign of precipitation changes (Figs. 1.c, 1.e
 161 and 2.c). The apparent low sign agreement in the transition region between the westernmost
 162 Sahel and the eastern West Sahel is likely related to the weak projected precipitation changes
 163 there. Note that the choice of the three averaging domains (Fig. 2) was conveyed by the
 164 sign agreement of the precipitation changes (Fig. 1) and some previous works that defined
 165 homogeneous regions over the Sahel at interannual to multidecadal timescales (e.g., Ward
 166 1998; Lebel and Ali 2009). For some models, it might not be the most appropriate, in
 167 particular for those that do not capture the right position of the summer ITCZ (see section
 168 4). A more detailed analysis of the projections is required but remains out of the scope of
 169 the present study.

170 East of 0°E, the CMIP5 ensemble mean precipitation response is partly dominated by
 171 about 4-5 models that simulates a strong increase of precipitation, greater than 60%. Those
 172 models also predict a relatively weak warming over the Sahel, and even some cooling for
 173 one of them over the eastern Sahel. In the RCP8.5 scenario, their JAS values of (ΔT_{2m} ,

$\Delta Pr/Pr$) over the central/eastern Sahel are (2.9 K, 62%) for MIROC5, (0.2 K, 86%) for BNU-ESM, (0.2 K, 103%) for FGOALS-g2, (-1.0 K, 103%) for MIROC-ESM and (2.7 K, 109%) for MIROC-ESM-CHEM, while the values of all other models range in $(4.5 \pm 1.5$ K, $0 \pm 30\%$). Most projections thus indicate moderate changes in the pessimistic scenario, to be compared with the 40% decrease observed between the 50-60's and 70-80's, and the +20% rainfall recovery in recent years over parts of the Sahel (Lebel and Ali 2009).

The temperature and precipitation changes are likely related. Reinforced rainfall should moderate the temperature increase in summer, through an increase of surface latent heat flux. Figures 2.e and f are consistent with this interpretation. In the dry March-April-May season, the Sahel warming reflects mostly an amplification of the global warming response by $30 \pm 20\%$. In contrast, the projected summer Sahelian warming displays much more spread than the global warming, emphasizing a coupling with the rainfall response. Three models, which predict a significant increase of Sahel rainfall, also predict a much weaker JAS warming than the global value.

b. Decadal and interannual rainfall variability over the Sahel

The Sahelian rainfall exhibits a large variability at decadal and interannual timescales. In order to address these scales, the time series of the Sahel precipitation P was decomposed into a decadal component $\bar{P}^9$ and an interannual fluctuation δP , such as $P = \bar{P}^9 + \delta P$. $\bar{P}^9$ is defined as the 9-year running mean of the raw series. Fig. 3.a illustrates the observed raw and filtered time series of precipitation averaged over $[10^\circ\text{N}-18^\circ\text{N}, 0^\circ-10^\circ\text{E}]$, for both the CRU and CMAP datasets (see Table 3). The Sahelian drought is clearly identified after 1973, with a partial recovery in the recent years. Although this recovery is not homogeneous over the entire Sahelian belt, Lebel and Ali (2009) show a clear signal over this central Sahel domain.

The skill of CMIP5 models to reproduce this recent recovery is addressed in AMIP simulations through the computation of precipitation mean difference between the periods

2000-2008 (wetter) and 1979-1987 (drier – Fig. 3.b, dots). The relative change between these two periods ranges between 10% in the CRU dataset and 24% in the CMAP dataset. Despite a large dispersion, one half of the models capture the tendency to rainfall recovery. Five have a tendency close to zero and three even simulate a significant negative tendency. This might be partly due to internal variability as illustrated with the five members of the IPSL-CM5A-LR AMIP ensemble (Fig. 3.b), which predicts a recovery, ranging from +6% to +21%.

The reasonable skill of the AMIP simulations is probably related to the monsoon response to the change of SSTs, consistently with the success of several atmospheric models to reproduce the main outlines of the twentieth century Sahel rainfall (e.g., Tippett and Giannini 2006; Hoerling et al. 2006).

The standard deviation of $\overline{P}^9$ in the PiControl and Historical experiments can be used to assess the skill of coupled atmosphere-ocean models to reproduce the observed decadal variability (Fig. 3.b). In CRU observations, the standard deviation over the twentieth century reaches almost 10%. Most models underestimate this amplitude, often by a factor of two, in both types of experiments, with the notable exceptions of IPSL-CM5B-LR, which significantly overestimates the amplitude of the decadal variability, and of BCC-CSM1.1, which has an amplitude slightly higher than the observed one. It is also remarkable that the amplitude of decadal variability is highly consistent for each model across the two experiments, suggesting that decadal fluctuations in Historical runs are not forced by greenhouse gases, aerosols or land-use (for models including land-use changes).

Interannual variability of CMIP5 models is investigated based on the standard deviation of the interannual fluctuations δP (Fig. 3.c). The observed value of 12% is consistent in CMAP and CRU observations. In the Historical and PiControl simulations, all models lie between 8% and 17%, except ACCESS1.3 (22%), BCC-CSM1.1 (30%), CMCC-CM (22%), FGOALS-s2 (22%), IPSL-CM5B-LR (38%), and MRI-CGCM3 (20%) which overestimate interannual variability. The large amplitude of decadal variability in BCC-CSM1.1 and

IPSL-CM5B-LR may be a consequence of this excessive year-to-year variability.

4. The representation of the West African monsoon mean state from CMIP3 to CMIP5

Most of the following analysis is based on the 10°W–10°E AMMA transect, promoted by the AMMA observing strategy (Lebel et al. 2010) and the AMMA-MIP framework (Hourdin et al. 2010). Due to the little zonal variations in surface field meridional structure between 10°W and 10°E, this transect approach is well suited to analyze the WAM climatological structure. As a consequence, the term “Sahel” will be used hereafter in a *limited meaning* for the 10°–18°N, 10°W–10°E region. As shown above, such a framework is not as appropriate to study the WAM interannual-to-long-term variability.

a. Precipitation bias in historical simulations and its relationship with surface air temperature

The sensitivity of the Sahelian rainfall to SSTs has important consequences on the skill of climate models to simulate properly the present-day mean state of the monsoon system. All coupled models suffer from significant and robust SST biases with respect to their AMIP version (Fig. 4). Most of them systematically display strong warm biases (of several K) over upwelling regions, on the eastern side of tropical oceanic basins, especially in the south Atlantic. The only exception is CSIRO-Mk3.6.0, which has a global cold bias over the ocean.

The CMIP5 ensemble mean warm bias (CMIP5–ENSEMBLE in Fig. 4) peaks at more than +3 K in the equatorial eastern Atlantic, contrasting with a cold bias of about -1 K in the North Atlantic. This systematic bias structure is remarkably similar to the CMIP3 ensemble mean (CMIP3–ENSEMBLE in Fig. 4).

This warm bias in the equatorial Atlantic has been shown to be partly responsible for

the systematic southward shift of the ITCZ in coupled models (Richter and Xie 2008). It is associated with a strong reinforcement of rainfall over the Guinean coast and often a reduction over the Sahel, as illustrated in Fig. 4. Consistently, CSIRO-Mk3.6.0 shows an opposite signal, with slightly less rainfall over the Guinean coast.

The latitudinal position of the ITCZ over West Africa is, to some extent, related to the intensity of the north-south temperature gradient, which is partly driven by the SSTs in the equatorial Atlantic (Fig. 5). The correlation coefficient reaches 0.4 in Historical CMIP5 simulations. AMIP simulations exhibit a similar relationship, with a smaller spread in the ITCZ position. The temperature over the Sahara is thus expected to play an important role too in the summer monsoon position. It will be further evaluated in section 4.b.2.

To summarize, both CMIP3 and CMIP5 coupled models exhibit large biases in the mean position of the west African monsoon, which is likely associated with the warm SST bias in the equatorial Atlantic. This first-order, robust and quasi-systematic bias prevents any further insight into the representation of key features and processes of the monsoon in coupled simulations. Therefore, we now focus on AMIP simulations, which display a weaker dispersion in the ITCZ summer position over West Africa (Fig. 5).

b. The WAM mean state in AMIP simulations

1) PRECIPITATION

Figure 6 shows JAS precipitation averaged from 1979 to 2008 between 10°W and 10°E for each model and observational dataset introduced in section 2. Even though the GPCP and TRMM datasets do not cover the same period, they provide similar results along this transect, the sensitivity to the exact chosen period being much smaller than the typical model biases (not shown). Following the previous section and Fig. 5, models have been separated into two subsets according to their mean temperature over the Sahara: the warm (Fig. 6.a) and the cold (Fig. 6.b) models. Overall, models capture the large-scale precipitation

maximum over the continent near 10-11°N. About one third of the models (BCC-CSM1.1, FGOALS-s2, GISS-E2-R, HadGEM2-A, INM-CM4, the three IPSL-CM5 models and MRI-CGCM3) locate their ITCZ a bit too much to the south, near 7-8°N. In contrast, only a few models reproduce the maximum amount of precipitation along the transect (8 mm day⁻¹). Five models overestimate this maximum by 1.5 to 4 mm day⁻¹ (CSIRO-Mk3.6.0, GFDL-HIRAM-C180, GFDL-HIRAM-C360, IPSL-CM5A-MR and MIROC5). Seven models underestimate it by 1 to 5 mm day⁻¹. Thus, only half of CMIP5 models are in qualitative agreement with observations. About one half of the models underestimate the rainfall over the Sahel, i.e. north of 12°N, and most of these “too dry” models are also among the colder ones.

The high-resolution runs of GFDL-HIRAM (see Table 2) capture the monsoon latitudinal structure, but exhibit similar skills to other models in reproducing the amplitude of precipitation. Besides, little sensitivity to the passage from a 0.5° (GFDL-HIRAM-C180) to a 0.25° (GFDL-HIRAM-C360) resolution is noticed. Enhanced vertical resolution from MPI-ESM-LR (47) to MPI-ESM-MR (95) results in a very similar ITCZ. In contrast, the modification of the physical packages from IPSL-CM5A-LR to IPSL-CM5B-LR indicates a clear dependence on the formulation of the model physics, especially north of 10°N, where rainfall is decreased by almost a factor of two in IPSL-CM5B-LR.

2) TEMPERATURE AT 2 M AND THE SAHARAN HEAT LOW

The spread described in the previous section can be partly related to the meridional large-scale temperature gradient (section 4.a, Fig. 5). In AMIP simulations, this gradient is driven at first order by the temperature in the Saharan heat low region, which is a key feature of the west African monsoon at the seasonal (Lavaysse et al. 2009) and intraseasonal (Chauvin et al. 2010) timescales. During the summer, a heat low establishes a low pressure system over the Sahara desert, and acts to reinforce the moist monsoon flow over the Sahel. The Saharan heat low is also key in the maintenance of the African easterly jet in the

mid troposphere (Thorncroft and Blackburn 1999). The associated temperature gradient is a source of baroclinic energy for African easterly waves, which affects rainfall at various timescales (e.g. Fink and Reiner 2003; Kiladis et al. 2006; Thorncroft and Rowell 1998). In particular, Ruti and Dell’Aquila (2010) showed that models characterized by a weak meridional temperature gradient are unable to feed these synoptic disturbances. A strong gradient is however not a necessary condition for arising waves.

Over the Sahara, the near-surface temperature in CMIP5 models exhibit a large spread, which reaches almost 7 K near 25°N (Fig. 7). This spread starts to develop in the southern Sahel, around 10°N, and extends up to the northern coast of Africa at 35°N. Unfortunately the dispersion is as large as in observational datasets and reanalyses. This reflects the sparse coverage of in-situ observations over the Sahara, and precludes detailed model evaluation there. The surface energy budget over the Sahara discussed at the end of this section provides further insight into the origin of this spread within the CMIP5 ensemble. Up to 15°N, observations and reanalyses are in better agreement and the spread among models is weaker, although about one third of CMIP5 models are still too cold by 2-3 K (BNU-ESM, CCSM4, CESM1(CAM5), CNRM-CM5, EC-EARTH, GFDL-HIRAM-C180 and -C360, MRI-AGCM3.2S, NorESM1-M), and one too warm by 2-3 K (MRI-CGCM3).

3) CLOUDS AND THEIR RADIATIVE EFFECT

Bouniol et al. (2012) analyzed the cloud cover mean properties over the Sahel with the AMF data of Niamey. They identified four cloud categories: cloud associated with convective systems, and low-, mid- and high-level clouds, in agreement with Slingo (1980). Using CloudSat and CALIPSO, they also documented their seasonal cycle at the regional scale over West Africa, characterized by: a northward migration of deep convective clouds associated with the ITCZ, low-level shallow clouds over the Sahel in summer and the ubiquitous presence of mid-level and cirrus clouds. In addition, a 2-km-deep layer of stratocumulus is observed over the Gulf of Guinea. Figure 8 (first panel) presents the JAS climatological latitude/altitude

cross-section of the mean cloud fraction, built from five years of CloudSat-CALIPSO data. Note that the precipitating water phase was discarded in the observations.

All the models capture to some extent the observed cloud structure (Fig. 8). The maximum in cloud fraction related to the deep convective systems is collocated with the mean ITCZ position (Fig. 6), although some models do not reproduce the observed vertical extent of cloud fraction. Most models include in their cloud fraction only non-precipitating condensed water, whereas in the observational dataset, the computed cloud fraction also accounts for precipitating particles, especially above the freezing level. Even dense aggregates found in convective anvils need about 50 minutes to fall down from the 8-km altitude to the freezing level at a 1 m s^{-1} fall speed (Bouniol et al. 2010). The apparent underestimation of cloud fraction in the mid-troposphere, in ACCESS1.3 or IPSL-CM5A-LR, may thus partly originate from the lack of consideration given to precipitating ice as making part of the cloud (Waliser et al. 2011).

The high amount of mid-level clouds between 15°N and 30°N is a specificity of the region. However, none of the models manage to reproduce the observed amount, even if some of them (CanAM4, IPSL-CM5B-LR, MIROC5) partly capture their occurrence. The stratocumulus over the Gulf of Guinea are also challenging most of the models. They are often not deep enough when they occur, and CNRM-CM5 and CanAM4 completely miss this cloud type.

The proper representation of these different cloud types is important for the regional energy budget and associated cloud feedbacks. Figure 9 shows the cloud radiative effect (CRE) at the top of the atmosphere. The longwave CRE is strongly shaped by the convective cloud cover amount and vertical structure, and the latitudinal shift of its maximum is clearly explained by the spread of the ITCZ JAS location (Fig. 6).

The shortwave CRE displays two minima associated with the stratocumulus clouds over the ocean and the ITCZ over the continent. The CRE spread across the simulations is larger in the shortwave than in the longwave. Most models overestimate this shortwave CRE over the ocean, except CNRM-CM5 due to a lack of stratocumulus clouds there (Fig. 8). Further

north, within the ITCZ, the two IPSL models and HadGEM2-A underestimate the CRE, and IPSL-CM5A-LR shows little response to the cloud cover increase with latitude.

Even though shortwave and longwave CRE partly compensate each other, they have a distinct latitudinal structure. The longwave CRE maximum is shifted 5° -northward compared to the shortwave CRE minimum. As a result, the observed net CRE is negative south of the ITCZ, where the shortwave component is dominant, and turns to slightly positive values north of the ITCZ, where the longwave component dominates. Over most of the Sahel and Sahara, mid-level and convective clouds have a positive net CRE. Thus the CRE provides locally more favorable conditions for the development of convection in the Sahel than further south during the monsoon (Chou and Neelin 2003). Only one half of the models capture the Sahelian band of positive net CRE, but no model reproduces accurately its meridional structure, with the right balance between the shortwave and longwave components. North of the ITCZ, the CRE is generally too small, and to the south the spread is very large.

4) INCOMING RADIATION AT THE SURFACE

Incoming radiative fluxes at the surface are important components of the surface energy budget, with the advantage that they can be reasonably evaluated with a joint utilization of in-situ AMMA measurements and satellite products. Their understanding is complex as they undergo the influence of the whole troposphere thermodynamical state, the vertical distribution of cloud properties, and the aerosol loading. During the monsoon season, the latter is expected to impact less the ITCZ region as aerosols are scavenged by precipitation. However they strongly affect the Sahara region (Knippertz and Todd 2012).

At the surface, the JAS shortwave incoming flux meridional gradient is large, reaching more than 100 W m^{-2} from the Guinean coast to the Sahara (Fig. 10), and involving a strong CRE. These variations are not accurately simulated, with JAS-mean departures from observations larger than several tens of W m^{-2} . Over the Guinea coast, more than one half of models underestimate the incoming surface shortwave flux in response to a too thin

and reflective cloud layer. Within the ITCZ, the IPSL models and HadGEM2-A strongly overestimate this radiative flux. As it will be shown in section 5.b.2, these two models display a reasonable cloud frequency of occurrence, but they both systematically underestimate the cloud fraction (Fig. 18) . Over the Sahara, most of the models overestimates the incoming surface shortwave flux, in particular the colder ones (Fig. 10.b). Figure 8 pointed there a clear deficit of mid-level cloudiness, which has a strong impact in the shortwave (Bouniol et al. 2012). The representation of aerosols may also explain a large part of the spread.

Meridional fluctuations of the longwave incoming radiation at the surface are weaker. It increases from the more humid and cloudier Gulf of Guinea to the drier Sahara at 20°N by 10-20 W m⁻². Note however that the atmosphere warms and loads with aerosols along this direction. Several models simulate this weak gradient, with departures less than 20 W m⁻². Further north, biases in the longwave incoming surface radiation increase significantly and reach the same order of magnitude as in the shortwave, especially in the colder models (Fig. 10.d). The lack of mid-level clouds may partly explain the underestimation. Further investigations are needed to better understand the origin of the spread.

Over this dry region, feedbacks with surface air temperature is investigated in models in Fig. 11. Opposite behaviors are noted with increase (decrease) in the temperature as the longwave (shortwave) increases with a higher correlation in the longwave domain. Figure 11.c shows that the higher the incoming shortwave, the lower the incoming longwave. Since most models simulate a cloud free troposphere in a relative dry environment, this suggests important roles of the surface albedo and of the aerosol loading (Kothe and Ahrens 2010) in the spread over the Sahara. Radiative transfer calculations would help in better identifying the sources of discrepancies between models over the region.

c. The seasonal cycle of the WAM

At the seasonal timescale, the West African monsoon is characterized by a northward migration of the ITCZ with an abrupt climatological shift in early summer (Sultan and Janicot

2000, 2003), culminating in August, and by a smoother southward withdrawal of the rainfall band in September and October. The monsoon onset time is consistent in the two observational datasets (Fig. 12.a and b). It is well marked by a transition between a maximum of precipitation along the Guinean coast in May-June and a second one centered near 12°N in August. In-between, a minimum of rainfall occurs over the whole region as the ITCZ moves northward. Presumably because the monsoon is primarily forced by the annual excursion of the sun, most of models capture the ITCZ summer migration, however with varying degrees of accuracy. Four models do not reproduce the spring precipitation maximum near the Guinea coast (FGOALS-g2, INM-CM4, IPSL-CM5A-LR and -MR), while six overestimate it (CNRM-CM5, CSIRO-Mk3.6.0, GFDL-HIRAM-C180 and C360, MPI-ESM-LR and MR). The monsoon is almost inexistent in BCC-CSM1.1, very weak in FGOALS-s2 and rather weak in HadGEM2-A, IPSL-CM5B-LR, MPI-ESM-LR and MR and MRI-CGCM3, consistently with Fig. 6. When simulated, the onset occurs at approximately the correct time of the year, as in CNRM-CM5, CSIRO-Mk3.6.0, the two versions of GFDL-HIRAM, the two versions of MPI-ESM, and NorESM1-M. For three models (CNRM-CM5, CSIRO-Mk3.6.0 and FGOALS-g2), the 1-mm isoyet reaches latitudes above 20°N, which is observed neither in TRMM nor in GPCP. On the opposite, four models simulate rain over the Gulf of Guinea south of 0°N during the summer (INM-CM4, IPSL-CM5A-LR, IPSL-CM5A-MR and IPSL-CM5B-LR).

The annual cycle of temperature over West Africa is also characterized by a northward migration of the temperature maximum during spring and summer and a southward retreat at the end of August (Ramel et al. 2006). Two annual maxima can be identified (Fig. 13.a). The first one occurs over the Sahel during May-June, prior to the monsoon rainfall onset, when the soil is still very dry, and typically at the time of the establishment of a humid low-level monsoon flow in the Sahel (Slingo et al. 2009; Guichard et al. 2009). Then, the summer rainfall over the Sahel leads to enhanced surface evapotranspiration (Timouk et al. 2009) and to an overall cooling at the surface. The second maximum occur over the Sahara,

near 27-28°N at the end of July, one month after the insolation maximum.

The annual cycle depicted by the CRU, ERA-Interim and MERRA (not shown) datasets is very consistent. It is noticeable that the NCEP-CFSR reanalysis is generally colder by 2 K over the Sahel (not shown). This perhaps surprising result is nevertheless fully consistent with recent comparisons performed over land (Wang et al. 2011; Bao and Zhang 2012).

Very large spread is found among AMIP simulations all year long. They are particularly pronounced outside of the monsoon summer season. Although most of the models simulate the northward displacement of maximum temperature from winter to summer, the spread over the Sahel reaches up to 6 K in winter and none of them captures the spring maximum over the Sahel, except to some extent BNU-ESM and HadGEM2-A. In half of the models, the amplitude of the temperature annual cycle is lower than in CRU. Some models such as BCC-CSM1.1, HadGEM2-A, INM-CM4, IPSL-CM5 models, MRI-CGCM3 do not form a strong heat low over the Sahara, which is consistent with an ITCZ that fails in migrating northward during the summer (Fig. 12).

5. Towards a physical evaluation of the WAM in AMIP simulations

The previous section addressed basic large-scale features of the west African monsoon. Higher-frequency fluctuations and finer-scale processes are now evaluated. These scales are indeed crucial to improve food management and disaster mitigation in the region (e.g., Sultan et al. 2005), and their evolution in the climate change perspective is key for adaptation policies. Their representation by state-of-the-art climate models is a major target if they are to be trustworthy for simulating either present-day climate or the impact of global warming over West Africa.

a. Intraseasonal variability of precipitation

Rainfall over West Africa is highly intermittent in space and time. The rainy season is punctuated by dry and wet periods occurring at various intraseasonal timescales (Janicot et al. 2011). Three preferred timescales have been highlighted: around 40 days, probably involving the Madden-Julian Oscillation (Mathews 2004, Janicot et al. 2009), approximately 15 days with two main regional modes (Mounier and Janicot 2004; Mounier et al. 2008; Janicot et al. 2010; Roehrig et al. 2011), and in the 3-10-day range with the well-known African Easterly Waves (AEWs – e.g., Kiladis et al. 2006). In the present study, we do not address specifically each of these intraseasonal scales. In contrast, we give a brief overview of the main properties of convection at intraseasonal timescales, which, from this perspective, makes West Africa a unique place in the world.

Figure 14 indicates the variance of OLR filtered in the 1-90-day range. OLR is preferred to precipitation here because precipitation variance is closely related to its mean value, so that differences in precipitation variance in models are mainly attributed to bias in precipitation mean state. A zonally-elongated maximum of OLR variance ($> 1000 \text{ W}^2 \text{ m}^{-4}$) is observed over the Sahel, along the northern side of the ITCZ. When reaching the Atlantic ocean, the band moves southward, up to 10°N . Intraseasonal variance is slightly weaker ($900 \text{ W}^2 \text{ m}^{-4}$) over the eastern Sahel and Central Africa. Very few models capture the observed structure and amplitude over the Sahel. GFDL-HIRAM-C180 and C360, MRI-CGCM3 and NorESM1-M overestimate the amount of intraseasonal variability, with a maximum rather collocated within the ITCZ. The southward slope in the east-west direction is generally reproduced. However, about one half of CMIP5 models underestimate the intraseasonal variability of deep convection. Some of them have a variance reaching one third of that observed, when averaged over the domain $[5\text{N}-20, 10\text{W}-10\text{E}]$ (Fig. 15.a). These results are very similar to those obtained with the CMIP3 models (Roehrig 2010).

The observed distribution of the OLR intraseasonal variance is captured by none of the models (Fig. 15.b). The 10-90-day scale (black bars) explains 20% of the intraseasonal vari-

ability in only four models (GFDL-HIRAM-C180 and C360, FGOALS-g2 and MIROC5), while it is overestimated by more than 10% in the others. Overall, models with underestimation of OLR intraseasonal variance put too much weight in long timescales. The 3-10-day synoptic timescale (white bars) corresponds to about 50% of the observed intraseasonal variance. All models reproduce this amount at an accuracy of $\pm 10\%$, indicating that they are likely able to simulate AEW-like variability (Ruti and Dell'Aquila 2010). However, even though convection can be organized at the synoptic or intraseasonal scales, most of summer rainfall over West Africa is provided by a very few heavily-precipitating mesoscale convective systems (Mathon et al. 2002). As a consequence, precipitation is highly intermittent from day to day and has very little persistence over the Sahel. Consistently with the fact that models have difficulties to represent such convective systems (see also section 5.b.1), none of them capture the very high-frequency (1–3 days, grey bars) proportion of almost 30%. Even the high-resolutions GFDL-HIRAM-C180 and C360 runs reach only 20% in this band.

This notion of persistence can be quantitatively characterized by the autocorrelation function of precipitation. Using it, Lin et al. (2006) showed that the Madden-Julian Oscillation variance in most of CMIP3 models comes from an overreddened spectrum, associated with too strong persistence of equatorial precipitation. In that regard, rainfall over Africa has relatively unique properties. There, precipitation at the $2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$ grid-point scale is very similar to a white noise, with a 1-day lag autocorrelation even slightly negative in some places (Fig. 16.a). There is no persistence at all at the local scale. No region around the world behaves similarly, either in boreal summer (Fig. 16.a) or in boreal winter (Fig. 16.b), except to some extent the northern part of South America. Fig. 16.c confirms that such a property of the west African monsoon remains a challenge for most of state-of-the-art models. GFDL-HIRAM-C360 reaches the closest value to zero (0.06), and is closely followed by GFDL-HIRAM-C180 (0.09), FGOALS-g2 (0.09) and MIROC5 (0.12).

The relative success of the GFDL-HIRAM models might be partly attributed to their high spatial resolution. The correct behavior of MIROC5 is possibly related to the effort

undertaken to make the convective scheme more sensitive to dry air in the free troposphere (Chikira and Sugiyama 2010), and which eliminates the artificial triggering function⁷ for deep convection used in the previous version (CMIP3) of the MIROC model and based on the work of Emori et al. (2001). In CMIP3, miroc3.2(medres) and miroc3.2(hires) had a similar behavior to MIROC5 with regards to this diagnostic (Roehrig 2010). The CMIP3 MRI model (mri_cgcm2.3.2a) which was sharing the same convective parameterization (Pan and Randall 1998), except for this artificial triggering, produced too much persistence of precipitation over West Africa.

b. The diurnal cycle at selected AMMA sites

The CMIP5 archive contains for a few AMIP simulations a large set of diagnostics at high-temporal frequency, for ten grid-points along the west African transect. These high-frequency output allow to evaluate fine-scale processes.

1) PRECIPITATION

Rain over West Africa is mainly of convective origin (Mathon et al. 2002). Convective system properties (size, lifecycle, organization) strongly depend on latitude leading to different characteristics of the diurnal cycle of precipitation. Figure 17 illustrates such differences between two sites distant from less than 500 km in the North-South direction: the Ouémé site (9.5°N), just along the southern fringe of the ITCZ, and the Niamey site (13.5°N). The southernmost site presents a bimodal diurnal cycle with a first peak around 1800 UTC and a smaller one between 0300 and 0600 UTC. Further north, only the morning peak remains. Over Niamey, about 80% of the annual rainfall is produced by westward propagating systems (Dhonneur 1981), initiated in the afternoon over the elevated terrain of northeastern Niger

⁷The triggering of deep convection occurred only when the relative humidity averaged over the vertical went over a given threshold ($\sim 80\%$)

located several hundreds of kilometers eastwards and reaching the Niamey region in the early morning (Rickenbach et al. 2009). South of the ITCZ, the contribution of propagating systems decreases to 50% (Fink et al. 2002; Depraetere et al. 2009), and a more common late afternoon peak arises. This bimodal structure observed here is consistent with the secondary nighttime peak emerging from global datasets (Yang et al. 2008).

To our knowledge, no model explicitly includes a proper representation of propagating mesoscale convective systems such as squall lines, so that they are not expected to capture the diurnal cycle of precipitation over Niamey. Indeed, Figure 17 illustrates that the precipitation distribution of the models is qualitatively very similar between the two sites. The variations between the two sites are related to a more seldom occurrence of rain events at higher latitudes. This accounts for the differences in the distribution of the two IPSL models. As a consequence, the use of the Ouémé site as a reference appears more suitable for evaluating the diurnal cycle of rainfall over West Africa (Fig. 17), at least until models can properly represent propagating convective systems.

Consistently with previous studies (Betts and Jakob 2002; Guichard et al. 2004), the distribution of precipitation in CMIP5 models peaks in afternoon. A first group of models (CanAM4, CNRM-CM5, IPSL-CM5A-LR, HadGEM2-A and MPI-ESM-LR) display a too early peak of precipitation, between 1200 and 1500 UTC, roughly in phase with insolation. More recently, Nikulin et al. (2012) showed that the same issue affects regional climate models of the CORDEX-Africa experiments, despite their finer resolution (around 50 km). This incorrect timing of rainfall impacts on the surface water and energy budgets in various ways (Del Genio 2011).

In the two remaining models (IPSL-CM5B-LR and MRI-CGCM3), the precipitation maximum occurs later, between 1500 and 1800 UTC, more in phase with observations. The difference between IPSL-CM5A-LR and IPSL-CM5B-LR in particular attests of recent progress on this long-standing issue. Rio et al. (2012) and Sane et al. (2012) discussed this improved behavior of IPSL-CM5B-LR, which they attributed to a more realistic description

of thermal plumes in the boundary layer (Rio and Hourdin 2008), the introduction of a parameterization of convective cold pools (Grandpeix and Lafore 2010) and an improved closure and triggering for convection (Rio et al. 2012).

There is also a large spread in the amplitude and intensity of this afternoon maximum, hence affecting the distribution of rain intensity (Fig. 17). Most models present a maximum frequency of occurrence for an intensity near 1 mm h^{-1} , reaching even larger values in MPI-ESM-LR. In the remaining part of the diurnal cycle, rain intensity decreases by one to two orders of magnitude in IPSL-CM5A-LR, IPSL-CM5B-LR, HadGEM2-A or MPI-ESM-LR, and by less than one in CanAM4, CNRM-CM5 or MRI-CGCM3. These three models simulate a substantial amount of precipitation during most of the day. In particular, rain-free periods⁸ cover less than 8% of the time in CanAM4, 30% in CNRM-CM5 and 39% in MRI-CGCM3, compared to 89% in observations.

Despite the lack of organized convective systems in models and the differences in the rain distribution at the diurnal scale, models overall agree with observations on the JAS mean rate (Fig. 6). It can thus be argued that the climatological average arises from compensating errors similar to those stressed in Stephens et al. (2010): precipitation occurs approximately twice as often as in observations, but at rates far too weak.

2) FINE-SCALE PROPERTIES OF CLOUD COVER

The diurnal cycle of cloud cover impacts the water cycle, but also the surface energy balance, through the surface incoming shortwave flux in particular. Bouniol et al. (2012) highlighted that all cloud types present a well-marked diurnal cycle in the Sahel (Fig. 18). Two peaks of convective cloud occurrence can be identified (around 0900 and 1500 UTC), consistently with the arrival of propagating convective systems and locally-initiated convection. Low-level clouds associated with the daytime growth of the boundary layer increase

⁸Rain-free periods are defined as precipitation intensity lower than $2.10^{-3} \text{ mm h}^{-1}$, since some models do not generate rain rates that exactly equal to zero.

between 0900 and 1600 UTC. The maximum in mid-level cloud cover occurs between 0300 and 0600 UTC. Cirrus cloud cover decreases between 1200 and 1500 UTC. The distribution of cloud fraction, also displayed in Fig. 18, highlights the distinct cloud fractions associated with each cloud type: low-level and cirrus clouds are relatively broken, while mid-level and convective clouds are associated with high cloud fractions.

Consistently with the diurnal cycle of precipitation, clouds associated with convection are shifted towards midday in CanAM4, CNRM-CM5, HadGEM2-A, IPSL-CM5A-LR and MPI-ESM-LR, which induces a too early minimum high-level cloud cover. It is generally followed by a strong occurrence of deep clouds resulting from condensates detrained from convective updraft and treated in most models as a passive stratiform cloud (Del Genio 2011). However the results are contrasted, as models overestimating rain frequency of occurrence are not necessarily those that overestimates the cloud frequency at high levels (e.g., CanAM4 and MRI-CGM3).

IPSL-CM5B-LR and MRI-CGCM3 show to some extent an improved timing of mid-level cloud occurrence, but with inaccurate frequencies of occurrence. The diurnal cycle of low-level clouds is properly represented in CNRM-CM5 and CanAM4 even if the growth of the boundary layer seems to be slightly underestimated. HadGEM2-A and MRI-CGCM3 have a very low occurrence of these clouds, and they appear much too early. MPI-ESM-LR misses this type of clouds. IPSL-CM5A-LR and IPSL-CM5B-LR also miss them at Niamey, due to an ITCZ located too much southward. Both models capture them more to the south, with however a too early triggering in IPSL-CM5A-LR.

The statistics of cloud fraction associated with the various cloud types are very different from one model to another. IPSL-CM5A-LR, IPSL-CM5B-LR and HadGEM2 simulate only broken clouds for deep and mid-level clouds, whereas only high cloud fraction values occur in MPI-ESM-LR. CNRM-CM5 has a bimodal distribution, but with an unphysical peak at 65% for the deep cloud fraction. Finally, CanAM4 and MRI-CGCM3 also present a bimodal structure, with weak cloud fraction values for low-level clouds and high cloud fraction values

in the upper levels.

6. Summary and conclusions

In this paper, we present a comprehensive analysis of the representation of the West African monsoon in the recently available CMIP5 simulations of both present-day and future climates. The model behavior over the Sahel region is examined across a range of timescales, going from climate change projections, multi-decadal and interannual variability to the intraseasonal and diurnal fluctuations. A specific emphasis is put on the use of a comprehensive set of observational data now available (in particular AMMA and satellite data) to evaluate the WAM representation across those scales.

CMIP5 climate change projections in surface air temperature and precipitation are found to be very similar to those of CMIP3. A robust tendency to warming over the Sahel is noticed (about 4 K on average in the RCP8.5 scenario), larger by 10 to 50% compared to the global warming. As in CMIP3, the spread of model projections remains very large for both temperature and precipitation. 80% of models agree on a modest drying around 20% over the westernmost Sahel (15°W–5°W), while about 75% of models agree on an increase of precipitation over the Sahel between 0° and 30°E, with a large spread on the amplitude. This relatively high agreement might however involve the deficiencies that coupled models have in simulating the Atlantic SSTs (Vizy et al. 2013). Overall, the precipitation response tends to be lower than the observed decadal variability in the second half of the twentieth century. Five outliers⁹ predict a rainfall increase greater than 70%, which cancels part of the Sahel warming during the summer monsoon. In contrast, two CMIP3 models predict a strong drying of the Sahel, around 40%. Further investigation on the rainfall response mechanisms in those models should help to assess their credibility. It should be noted that temperature changes also remain very uncertain and that their consequences might be as

⁹The term “outlier” indicates here models that simulate a rather different response to the main stream.

dramatic as those associated with precipitation.

CMIP5 coupled models still suffer of major SST biases in the equatorial Atlantic, which induce a systematic southward shift of the ITCZ during the summer in most models, when they are compared to their AMIP counterpart. The similarity between these biases in CMIP3 and CMIP5 appeals to revisit the current strategy in climate modeling research programs.

The ability of coupled models to simulate the multi-decadal and interannual variability is assessed with AMIP, historical and pre-industrial control runs. The decadal variability of the twentieth century is underestimated in most of the last two types of experiments. In AMIP simulations, most models capture the partial recovery of monsoon rainfall of the recent decades, consistently with the role of SSTs in forcing Sahel precipitation (Giannini et al. 2003; Biasutti et al. 2008). The AMIP time sequence is however too short to get rid of internal variability, and ensemble AMIP simulations should be useful for further analysis.

Because of these strong biases in coupled experiments, further evaluation is performed in SST-imposed CMIP5 simulations using the 10°W–10°E AMMA transect. Almost all of them capture the broad features of a monsoon, but with various degree of accuracy:

- The averaged Sahel rainfall exhibits a large spread ($\pm 50\%$).
- The dispersion in surface air temperature is large over the Sahel and Sahara, and the simulation of the Saharan heat low and monsoon latitudinal position appear to be linked. The representation of the radiative aerosol properties and surface albedo in this arid region may explain part of this spread.
- The meridional structure of cloud cover, and its radiative impact, are tough challenges for CMIP5 models. This leads to large biases in the surface energy balance, which are likely to feedback on the monsoon at larger scales.
- The annual cycle of temperature exhibits a wide dispersion. This points to the importance of physical processes in the seasonal dynamics of temperature, and questions

some conclusions that could be drawn from models about the climate sensitivity of the phase and amplitude of the temperature annual cycle over the Sahel.

- The intermittence of precipitation over West Africa is large and only a few models reproduce it and more broadly the main features of intraseasonal variability of convection there. Results from the GFDL-HIRAM models suggest that intraseasonal variability is improved with higher resolution but not necessarily the WAM mean state.

The fine-scale properties of rainfall and clouds are further evaluated at selected sites, for which high-frequency physical diagnostics were provided by some CMIP5 models. It appears that the wrong phasing of the diurnal cycle of precipitation remains an issue, even though some major improvements can be noticed in two models. However, most of the precipitation over the Sahel is provided by large mesoscale propagating systems, whose representation is still a challenge.

To summarize, even if most CMIP5 models capture many features of the west African monsoon, they have not reached yet a degree of maturity which directly makes them trustable to anticipate climate changes and their impacts, especially with regards to rainfall. Though encouraging progresses have been achieved, many systematic and robust biases of the coupled and atmospheric models have not improved from CMIP3 to CMIP5. This weakens our confidence in climate projection over West Africa, and even beyond over remote regions such as the Pacific (e.g., Ding et al. 2012). A large program aiming to address these systematic biases needs to be designed by the research community, under the umbrella of international programs. The observational datasets, acquired with AMMA and more recent programs such as FENNEC (Washington et al. 2012), should be a backbone of these efforts.

The results of the present study point to the need to separate as much as possible the issues related to slow and fast physical processes. Many systematic errors appear rapidly and could be addressed with numerous short-duration numerical experiments based on observed case studies and high resolution modeling results. An example of such an approach is the Transpose-AMIP protocol, which appears as a promising tool to understand the physics of

systematic atmospheric model biases (Williams et al. 2012, and reference therein). The analysis of short-term initialized coupled simulations may also provide an interesting framework to better understand SST biases in the tropical Atlantic (Huang et al. 2007; Vannière et al. 2013). For issues related to slow physics, it is further necessary to distinguish those related to remote and regional mechanisms. Regional models and regionally nudged global models seem to be the best tool to separate them (Joly and Voldoire 2009; Pohl and Douville 2011). Large surface radiative biases in arid and semi-arid regions are a major issue in current simulations. They lead to departure from the observed radiative balance. The surface albedo and the representation of aerosols and their radiative properties request dedicated numerical sensitivity experiments with common protocols.

The present study not only focuses on the West African monsoon basic state in CMIP5 simulations (e.g., the precipitation seasonal amount), but also contributes to the evaluation of the rainfall distribution along the summer season (e.g., intraseasonal variability). The good representation of this rainfall distribution is crucial for the analysis of agricultural yields, biomass and water resources. There is a need to further evaluate the ability of current models to represent and predict rainfall properties at these short time (and space) scales, including the monsoon onset and retreat, as well as dry and wet spells.

Acknowledgments.

Based on a French initiative, AMMA was built by an international scientific group and is currently funded by a large number of agencies, especially from France, UK, US and Africa, and by an EU program. Detailed information on scientific coordination and funding is available on the AMMA International web site <http://www.amma-international.org>.

We wish particularly to thank the Principal Investigators who make the various AMMA-CATCH ground-based measurements data sets available to the AMMA data base: S. Galle, C. Lloyd, B. Cappelaere, F. Timouk and L. Kergoat for the surface radiation measurements, T. Vischel, M. Gosset, G. Quantin and E. Mougin for the rain gauge network measurements.

712 The Pirata buoy measurements were provided by TAO Project Office of NOAA/PMEL.

713 The Niamey AMF data were obtained from the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement
714 (ARM) Program Archive of the US Department of Energy. CloudSat data were obtained
715 from CIRA of Colorado State University. ICARE and NASA gave access to the CALIOP
716 data. The SRB and CERES data were obtained from the NASA Langley Research Cen-
717 ter Atmospheric Sciences Data Center. CMAP Precipitation and Interpolated OLR data
718 were provided by the NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD, Boulder, Colorado, USA, from their Web
719 site at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/>. The CRU dataset was provided by the British
720 Atmospheric Data Centre (BADC), from their Web site at <http://badc.nerc.ac.uk>. The
721 GPCP 1DD and TRMM 3B42 data were provided by the NASA/Goddard Space Flight
722 Center’s Mesoscale Atmospheric Processes Laboratory, which develops and computes the
723 1DD as a contribution to the GEWEX Global Precipitation Climatology Project and the
724 3B42 as a contribution to TRMM. The CFSR data were developed by NOAA’s National
725 Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) and were obtained from the NOAA’s Na-
726 tional Operational Model Archive and Distribution System (NOMADS) which is maintained
727 at NOAA’s National Climatic Data Center (NCDC). The MERRA data were acquired
728 from the Goddard Earth Sciences (GES) Data and Information Services Center (DISC,
729 <http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov>). ERA-Interim data were obtained from the ECMWF
730 Data Server.

731 We acknowledge the World Climate Research Programme’s Working Group on Coupled
732 Modelling, which is responsible for CMIP, and we thank the climate modeling groups (listed
733 in Table 1 of this paper) for producing and making available their model output. For CMIP,
734 the U.S. Department of Energy’s Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison
735 provides coordinating support and led development of software infrastructure in partnership
736 with the Global Organization for Earth System Science Portals.

737 F. Favot and S. Tyteca are greatly acknowledged for their support. We also acknowl-
738 edge the support of the IPSL data center CICLAD and the IPSL distribution platform

739 PRODIGUER for providing us access to their computing resources and data.

740 Finally, we acknowledge the thoughtful comments of Edward Vizzy and one anonymous
741 reviewer, which clearly helped to clarify and improve the manuscript.

742 R. Roehrig acknowledge financial support from the European Commission’s 7th Frame-
743 work Programme, under Grant Agreement n°282672, EMBRACE project. D. Bouniol and
744 F. Guichard were financially supported by CNES and the EUCLIPSE project from the Eu-
745 ropean Union, Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013) under grant agreement
746 n°244067. F. Guichard and F. Hourdin acknowledge financial support from the ESCAPE
747 program (ANR-10-CEPL-005).

REFERENCES

- 750 Bao, X. and F. Zhang, 2012: Evaluation of NCEP/CFSR, NCEP/NCAR, ERA-Interim and
 751 ERA-40 reanalysis datasets against independent sounding observations over the Tibetan
 752 Plateau. *J. Climate*, **26**, 206–214, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00056.1.
- 753 Betts, A. and C. Jakob, 2002: Study of diurnal cycle of convective precipitation over
 754 Amazonia using a single column model. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **107** (D23), D23, doi:
 755 10.1029/2002JD002264.
- 756 Biasutti, M. and A. Giannini, 2006: Robust Sahel drying in response to late 20th century
 757 forcings. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **33**, L11706, doi:10.1029/2006GL026067.
- 758 Biasutti, M., I. M. Held, A. H. Sobel, and A. Giannini, 2008: SST forcings and Sahel
 759 rainfall variability in simulations of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. *J. Climate*,
 760 **21**, 3471–3486.
- 761 Bony, S., M. Webb, C. Bretherton, S. Klein, P. Siebesma, G. Tselioudis, and M. Zhang, 2011:
 762 CFMIP: towards a better evaluation and understanding of clouds and cloud feedbacks in
 763 CMIP5 models. *CLIVAR Exchanges No 56*, **16** (2), 20–24.
- 764 Boone, A. A., I. Poccard-Leclercq, Y. Xue, J. Feng, and P. de Rosnay, 2010: Evaluation
 765 of the WAMME model surface fluxes using results from de AMMA land-surface model
 766 intercomparison project. *Clim. Dyn.*, **35**, 127–142, doi:10.1007/s00382-009-0653-1.
- 767 Bouniol, D., F. Couvreur, P.-H. Kamsu-Tamo, M. Leplay, F. Guichard, F. Favot, and
 768 E. O’Connor, 2012: Diurnal and seasonal cycles of cloud occurrences, types and ra-
 769 diative impact over West Africa. *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.*, **51**, 534–553, doi:10.1175/
 770 JAMC-D-11-051.1.

771 Bouniol, D., J. Delanoë, C. Duroure, A. Protat, V. Giraud, and G. Penide, 2010: Microphys-
772 ical characterisation of west African MCS anvils. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **136** (s1),
773 323–344, doi:10.1002/qj557.

774 Chauvin, F., R. Roehrig, and J.-P. Lafore, 2010: Intraseasonal variability of the Saharan
775 Heat Low and its link with mid-latitudes. *J. Climate*, **23**, 2544–2561.

776 Chikira, M. and M. Sugiyama, 2010: A cumulus parameterization with state-dependent
777 entrainment rate. Part I: description and sensitivity to temperature and humidity profiles.
778 *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **67**, 2171–2193.

779 Chou, C. and J. D. Neelin, 2003: Mechanisms limiting the northward extent of the northern
780 summer monsoons over North America, Asia, and Africa. *J. Climate*, **16**, 406–425.

781 Chou, C., J. D. Neelin, C.-A. Chen, and J.-Y. Tu, 2009: Evaluating the rich-get-recher
782 mechanism in tropical precipitation change under global warming. *J. Climate*, **22**, 1982–
783 2005.

784 Collins, W. J., et al., 2008: Evaluation of the HadGEM2 model. Technical note 74, Meteo-
785 rological Office Hadley Centre, Exeter, England. URL [http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/](http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/publications/HCTN/HCTN_74.pdf)
786 [publications/HCTN/HCTN_74.pdf](http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/publications/HCTN/HCTN_74.pdf).

787 Cook, K. H., 2008: Climate science: The mysteries of Sahel droughts. *Nat. Geosci.*, **1.**,
788 647–648.

789 Cook, K. H. and E. K. Vizy, 2006: Coupled model simulations of the West African monsoon
790 system: twentieth- and twenty-first-century simulations. *J. Climate*, **19**, 3681–3703.

791 Del Genio, A. D., 2011: Representing the sensitivity of convective cloud systems to tro-
792 pospheric humidity in general circulation models. *Surveys in Geophysics*, doi:10.1007/
793 s10712-011-9148-9.

- Depraetere, C., M. Gosse, S. Ploix, and H. Laurent, 2009: The organization and kinematics of tropical rainfall systems ground tracked at mesoscale with gages: first results from the campaign 1999–2006 on the Upper Ouémé Valley (Benin). *J. Hydrol.*, **375** (1-2), 143–160, doi:10.1016/j.hydrol.2009.01.011.
- Dhonneur, G., 1981: Les amas nuageux mobiles: principale composante de la météorologie du Sahel. *La Météorologie*, **27**, 75–82.
- Ding, H., N. S. Keenlyside, and M. Latif, 2012: Impact of the Equatorial Atlantic on the El Niño Southern Oscillation. *Clim. Dyn.*, **38** (9), 1965–1972, doi:10.1007/s00382-011-1097-y.
- Donner, L. J., et al., 2011: The dynamical core, physical parameterizations, and basic simulation characteristics of the atmospheric component of the GFDL global coupled model CM3. *J. Climate*, **24**, 3484–3518.
- Dufresne, J.-L., et al., 2012: Climate change projections using the IPSL-CM5 Earth system model: from CMIP3 to CMIP5. *Clim. Dyn.*, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1636-1.
- Emori, S., T. Nozawa, A. Numaguti, and I. Uno, 2001: Importance of cumulus parameterization for precipitation simulation over East Asia in June. *J. Meteor. Soc. Japan*, **79**, 939–947.
- Fink, A. and A. Reiner, 2003: Spatio-temporal variability of the relation between African easterly waves and West African squall lines in 1998–1999. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **108** (D11), 4332, doi:10.1029/2002JD002816.
- Fink, A. H., D. G. Vincent, and V. Emert, 2002: Rainfall types in the West African Sudanian zone during the summer monsoon 2002. *Mon. Wea. Rev.*, **134**, 2143–2164, doi:10.1175/MWR3182.1.

817 Gent, P. R., et al., 2011: The Community Climate System Model Version 4. *J. Climate*,
818 **24 (19)**, 4973–4991.

819 Giannini, A., R. Saravanan, and P. Chang, 2003: Oceanic forcing of Sahel rainfall on inter-
820 annual to interdecadal timescales. *Science*, **302**, 1027–1030.

821 Giorgetta, M. A., et al., 2012: The atmospheric general circulation model ECHAM6: model
822 description. Tech. rep., Max Plank Institut für Meteorologie, Hamburg, Germany. URL
823 <http://www.mpimet.mpg.de/en/science/models/echam.html>.

824 Grandpeix, J.-Y. and J.-P. Lafore, 2010: A density current parameterization coupled with
825 Emanuel’s convection scheme. Part I: the models. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **67 (4)**, 881–897.

826 Guichard, F., L. Kergoat, E. Mougin, F. Timouk, F. Baup, P. Hiernaux, and F. Lavenu,
827 2009: Surface thermodynamics and radiative budget in the Sahelian Gourma: seasonal
828 and diurnal cycles. *J. Hydrol.*, **375 (1-2)**, 161–177.

829 Guichard, F. et al., 2004: Modeling the diurnal cycle of deep precipitating convection over
830 land with cloud-resolving models and single-column models. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*,
831 **130**, 3139–3172.

832 Hazeleger, W., et al., 2010: EC-Earth: a seamless Earth system prediction approach in
833 action. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **91**, 1357–1363, doi:10.1175/2010BAMS2877.1.

834 Held, I. M., T. L. Delworth, J. Lu, K. L. Findell, and T. R. Knutson, 2005: Simulation
835 of Sahel drought in the 20th and 21th centuries. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, **102**,
836 17 891–17 896.

837 Hoerling, M., J. Hurrell, J. Eischeid, and A. Phillips, 2006: Detection and attribution of
838 twentieth-century northern and southern African rainfall change. *J. Climate*, **19**, 3989–
839 4008.

- Hourdin, F., et al., 2010: AMMA-Model Intercomparison Project. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **91** (1), 95–104.
- Hourdin, F., et al., 2012: LMDZ5B: the atmospheric component of the IPSL climate model with revisited parameterizations for clouds and convection. *Clim. Dyn.*, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1343-y.
- Huang, B., Z.-Z. Hu, and B. Jha, 2007: Evolution of model systematic errors in the Tropical Atlantic Basin from coupled climate hindcasts. *Clim. Dyn.*, **28**, 661–682, doi:10.1007/s00382-006-0223-8.
- Huffman, G. J., R. F. Adler, M. M. Morrissey, D. T. Bolvin, S. Curtis, R. Joyce, B. Mc-Gavock, and J. Susskind, 2001: Global precipitation of one-degree daily resolution from multisatellite observations. *J. Hydrometeor.*, **2**, 36–50.
- Huffman, G. J., D. T. Bolvin, E. J. Nelkin, D. B. Wolff, G. Gu, Y. Hong, K. P. Bowman, and E. F. Stocker, 2007: The TRMM Multisatellite Precipitation Analysis (TMPA): Quasi-global, multiyear, combined-sensor precipitation estimates at fine scales. *J. Hydrometeor.*, **8** (1), 38–55.
- Janicot, S., F. Mounier, S. Gervois, B. Sultan, and G. Kiladis, 2010: The dynamics of the West African monsoon. Part V: The detection and role of the dominant modes of convectively coupled equatorial Rossby waves. *J. Climate*, **23**, 4005–4024.
- Janicot, S., et al., 2011: Intraseasonal variability of the West African monsoon. *Atmos. Sci. Let.*, **12** (1), 58–66, doi:10.1002/asl.280.
- Joly, M. and A. Voldoire, 2009: Influence of ENSO on the West African monsoon: temporal aspects and atmospheric processes. *J. Climate*, **22**, 3193–3210.
- Jones, C. G., F. Giorgi, and G. Asrar, 2011: The Coordinated Regional Downscaling Exper-

iment: CORDEX. An international downscaling link to CMIP5. *CLIVAR Exchanges No*
56, **16 (2)**, 34–400.

Kiladis, G. N., C. D. Thorncroft, and N. M. J. Hall, 2006: Three-dimensional structure and
dynamics of African easterly waves. Part I: Obsevation. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **63**, 2212–2230.

Kirkevåg, A., T. Iversen, O. Seland, J. B. Debernard, T. Storelvmo, and J. E. Kristjánsson,
2008: Aerosol-cloud-climate interactions in the climate model CAM-Oslo. *Tellus*, **60A**,
492–512.

Knippertz, P. and M. C. Todd, 2012: Mineral dust aerosols over the Sahara: meteorological
controls on emission and transport and implications for modeling. *Rev. Geophys.*, **50**,
RG1007, doi:10.1029/2011RG000362.

Kothe, S. and B. Ahrens, 2010: On the radiation budget in regional climate simulations of
West Africa. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **115**, D23120, doi:10.1029/2010JD014331.

Lau, K. M., S. S. P. Shen, K.-M. Kim, and H. Wang, 2006: A multimodel study of the
twentieth-century simulations of Sahel drought from the 1970s to 1990s. *J. Geophys. Res.*,
111, D07111, doi:10.1029/2005JD006281.

Lavaysse, C., C. Flamant, S. Janicot, D. J. Parker, J.-P. Lafore, B. Sultan, and J. Pelon,
2009: Seasonal evolution of the West African heat low: a climatological perspective. *Clim.*
Dyn., **33 (2-3)**, 313–330, doi:10.1007/s00382-009-0553-4.

Le Lay, M. and S. Galle, 2005: Seasonal cycle and interannual variability of rainfall at hy-
drological scales. The West African monsoon in a Sudanese climate. *Hydrological Sciences*
Journal, **50**, 3509–3524.

Lebel, T. and A. Ali, 2009: Recent trends in the Central and Western Sahel rainfall regime
(1990–2007). *J. Hydrol.*, **375 (1–2)**, 52–64.

- 886 Lebel, T., et al., 2009: AMMA-CATCH studies in the Sahelian region of West-Africa: An
887 overview. *J. Hydrol.*, **375** (1–2), 3–13, doi:10.1016.j.hydrol.2009.03.020.
- 888 Lebel, T., et al., 2010: The AMMA field campaigns: Multiscale and multidisciplinary obser-
889 vations in the West African region. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **136** (s1), 8–33.
- 890 Liebmann, B. and C. A. Smith, 1996: Description of a complete (interpolated) outgoing
891 longwave radiation dataset. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **77**, 1275–1277.
- 892 Lin, J.-L. et al., 2006: Tropical intraseasonal variability in 14 IPCC AR4 climate models.
893 Part I: Convective signals. *J. Climate*, **19**, 2665–2690.
- 894 Loeb, N. G., B. A. Wielicki, D. R. Doelling, G. L. Smith, D. F. Keyes, S. Kato, N. Manalo-
895 Smith, and T. Wong, 2009: Towards optimal closure of the Earth’s top-of-atmosphere
896 radiation budget. *J. Climate*, **22**, 748–766, doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2637.1.
- 897 Mathon, V., H. Laurent, and T. Lebel, 2002: Mesoscale convective system rainfall in the
898 Sahel. *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, **41**, 1081–1092.
- 899 Meehl, G. and Coauthors, 2007: Global Climate Projection. *Climate Change 2007: The*
900 *Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Re-*
901 *port of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning,
902 Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K. B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H. L. Miller, Eds., Cambridge Uni-
903 versity Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 747–846.
- 904 Meehl, G. A., C. Covey, T. Delworth, M. Latif, B. McAvaney, J. F. B. Mitchell, R. J.
905 Stouffer, and K. E. Taylor, 2007: The WCRP CMIP3 multimodel dataset: A new era in
906 climate change research. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **88**, 1383–1394.
- 907 Miller, M. A. and A. Slingo, 2007: The ARM Mobile Facility and its first international
908 deployment: measuring flux divergence in West Africa. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **88**,
909 1229–1244, doi:10.1175/BAMS-88-8-1229.

910 Mitchell, T. D. and P. D. Jones, 2005: An improved method of constructing a database
 911 of monthly climate observations and associated high-resolution grids. *Int. J. Climatol.*,
 912 **25** (6), 673–712, doi:10.1002/joc.1181.

913 Mizuta, R., et al., 2012: Climate simulations using MRI-AGCM3.2 with 20-km grid. *J.*
 914 *Meteor. Soc. Japan*, **90A**, 233–258.

915 Mounier, F. and S. Janicot, 2004: Evidence of two independant modes of convection at
 916 intraseasonal timescale in the West African summer monsoon. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **31**,
 917 L16116, doi:10.1029/2004GL020665.

918 Mounier, F., S. Janicot, and G. N. Kiladis, 2008: The West African monsoon dynamics.
 919 Part III: The quasi-biweekly zonal dipole. *J. Climate*, **21**, 1911–1928.

920 Neale, R. B., et al., 2010a: Description of the NCAR Community Atmospheric Model
 921 (CAM4.0). Technical note NCAR/TN-485+STR, National Center for Atmospheric Re-
 922 search, Boulder, Colorado, USA. URL [http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/ccsm4.0/](http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/ccsm4.0/cam/docs/description/cam4_desc.pdf)
 923 [cam/docs/description/cam4_desc.pdf](http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/models/ccsm4.0/cam/docs/description/cam4_desc.pdf).

924 Neale, R. B., et al., 2010b: Description of the NCAR Community Atmospheric Model
 925 (CAM5.0). Technical note NCAR/TN-486+STR, National Center for Atmospheric Re-
 926 search, Boulder, Colorado, USA.

927 Nicholson, S., 1980: The nature of rainfall fluctuations in subtropical West Africa. *Mon.*
 928 *Wea. Rev.*, **108**, 473–487.

929 Nicholson, S. E., B. Some, and B. Kone, 2000: An analysis of recent rainfall conditions in
 930 West Africa, including the rainy seasons if the 1997 El Niño and the 1998 La Niña years.
 931 *J. Climate*, **13** (14), 2628–2640.

932 Nikulin, G., et al., 2012: Precipitation climatology in an esemble of CORDEX-Africa regional
 933 climate simulations. *J. Climate*, **25**, 6057–6078, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00375.1.

934 Paeth, H. and A. Hense, 2004: SST versus climate change signals in West African rainfall:
935 20th-century variations and future projections. *Climatic Change*, **65**, 179–208.

936 Pan, D.-M. and D. A. Randall, 1998: A cumulus parameterization with prognostic closure.
937 *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **124**, 949–981.

938 Pohl, B. and H. Douville, 2011: Diagnosing GCM errors over West Africa using relaxation
939 experiments. Part I: summer monsoon climatology and interannual variability. *Clim. Dyn.*,
940 **37**, 1293–1312, doi:10.1007/s00382-010-0911-2.

941 Ramel, R., H. Gallée, and C. Messenger, 2006: On the northward shift of the West African
942 monsoon. *Clim. Dyn.*, **26** (4), 429–440, doi:10.1007/s00382-005-0093-5.

943 Redelsperger, J.-L., C. D. Thorncroft, A. Diedhiou, T. Lebel, D. J. Parker, and J. Polcher,
944 2006: African Monsoon Multidisciplinary Analysis: an international research project and
945 field campaign. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **87**, 1739–1746.

946 Richter, I. and S.-P. Xie, 2008: On the origin of equatorial Atlantic biases in coupled general
947 circulation models. *Clim. Dyn.*, **31** (5), 587–598, doi:10.1007/s00382-008-0364-z.

948 Rickenbach, T., R. N. Ferreira, N. Guy, and E. Williams, 2009: Radar-observed squall line
949 propagation and the diurnal cycle of convection in Niamey, Niger, during the 2006 African
950 Monsoon and Multidisciplinary Analyses Intensive Observing Period. *J. Geophys. Res.*,
951 **114**, D03107, doi:10.1029/2008JD010871.

952 Rienecker, M. M., et al., 2011: MERRA - NASA’s Modern-Era Retrospective Analysis for
953 Research and Applications. *J. Climate*, **24**, 3624–3648, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-11-00015.1.

954 Rio, C. and F. Hourdin, 2008: A thermal plume model for convective boundary layer:
955 representation of cumulus clouds. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, **65**, 407–425.

956 Rio, C., et al., 2012: Control of deep convection by sub-cloud lifting processes: the

ALP closure in the LMDZ5B general circulation model. *Clim. Dyn.*, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1506-x.

Roehrig, R., 2010: Variabilité intrasaisonnière de la mousson africaine : Caractérisation et Modélisation (Intraseasonal variability of the West African monsoon : Characterization and modeling). Ph.D. thesis, Paris-Est University.

Roehrig, R., F. Chauvin, and J.-P. Lafore, 2011: 10-25-day intraseasonal variability of convection over the Sahel: a role of the Saharan heat low and midlatitudes. *J. Climate*, **24**, 5863–5878, doi:10.1175/2011JCLI3960.1.

Rotstayn, L., M. Collier, M. Dix, Y. Feng, H. Gordon, S. O’Farrell, I. Smith, and J. Syktus, 2010: Improved simulation of Australian climate and ENSO-related climate variability in a GCM with interactive aerosol treatment. *Int. J. Climatol*, **30** (7), 1067–1088, doi:10.1002/joc.1952.

Ruti, P. M. and A. Dell’Aquila, 2010: The twentieth century African easterly waves in reanalysis systems and IPCC simulations, from intra-seasonal to inter-annual variability. *Clim. Dyn.*, **35**, 1099–1117, doi:10.1007/s00382-010-0894-z.

Saha, S., et al., 2010: The NCEP climate forecast system reanalysis. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **91**, 1015–1057, doi:10.1175/2010BAMS2001.1.

Sane, Y., et al., 2012: Analysis of the diurnal cycle of precipitation over Dakar using local rain-gauge data and a general circulation model. *Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, **138** (669), 2182–2195, doi:10.1002/qj.1932.

Simmons, A., S. Uppala, D. Dee, and S. Kobayashi, 2007: ERA-Interim: New ECMWF reanalysis products from 1989 onwards. *ECMWF Newsletter*, **110**.

Slingo, A., H. E. White, N. A. Bharmal, and G. J. Robinson, 2009: Overview of observations

- p>from the RADAGAST experiment in Niamey, Niger: 2. radiative fluxes and divergences.
-
- J. Geophys. Res.*
- ,
- 114**
- , D00E04, doi:10.1029/2008JD010497.
p>Slingo, J., 1980: A cloud parameterization scheme derived from GATE data for use with a
-
- numerical model.
- Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*
- ,
- 106**
- , 747–770.
p>Stackhouse, P. W., Jr., S. K. Gupta, S. J. Cox, J. C. Mikořitz, T. Zhang, and L. M.
-
- Hinkelman, 2011: The NASA/GEWEX Surface Radiation Budget Release 3.0: 24.5-year
-
- dataset.
- GEWEX News*
- ,
- 21**
- (1), 10–12.
p>Stephens, G. L., et al., 2010: Dreary state of precipitation in global models.
- J. Geophys.*
-
- Res.*
- ,
- 115**
- , D24211, doi:10.1029/2010JD014532.
p>Sultan, B., C. Baron, M. Dingkuhn, and S. Janicot, 2005: Agricultural impacts of large-
-
- scale variability of the West African monsoon.
- Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
- ,
- 128**
- ,
-
- 93–110.
p>Sultan, B. and S. Janicot, 2000: Abrupt shift of the ITCZ over West Africa and intra-seasonal
-
- variability.
- Geophys. Res. Lett.*
- ,
- 27**
- , 3353–3356.
p>Sultan, B. and S. Janicot, 2003: The West African monsoon dynamics. Part II: The “preon-
-
- set” and “onset” of the summer monsoon.
- J. Climate*
- ,
- 16**
- , 3407–3427.
p>Taylor, K. E., R. J. Stouffer, and G. A. Meehl, 2012: An overview of CMIP5 and the experi-
-
- ment design.
- Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*
- ,
- 93**
- (4), 485–498, doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-11-00094.
-
1.
p>Thorncroft, C. D. and M. Blackburn, 1999: Maintenance of the African easterly jet.
- Quart.*
-
- J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*
- ,
- 125**
- , 763–786.
p>Thorncroft, C. D. and D. P. Rowell, 1998: Interannual variability of African wave activity
-
- in a general circulation model.
- Int. J. Climatol.*
- ,
- 18**
- , 1305–1323.

1003 Timouk, F., L. Kergoat, E. Mougin, C. Lloyd, E. Ceschia, P. de Rosnay, P. Hiernaux,
1004 and V. Demarez, 2009: Response of sensible heat flux to water regime and vegetation
1005 development in a central Sahelian landscape. *J. Hydrol.*, **375**, 178–189.

1006 Tippett, M. and A. Giannini, 2006: Potentially predictable components of African summer
1007 rainfall in a SST-forced GCM simulation. *J. Climate*, **19**, 3133–3144.

1008 Vannière, B., E. Guilyardi, G. Madec, Doblas-Reyes, F. J., and S. Woolnough, 2013: Using
1009 seasonal hindcasts to understand the origin of the equatorial cold tongue bias in CGCMs
1010 and its impact on ENSO. *Clim. Dyn.*, **40** (3–4), 963–981, doi:10.1007/s00382-012-1429-6.

1011 Vizzy, E. K., K. H. Cook, J. Crétat, and N. Neupane, 2013: Projections of a wetter Sahel in
1012 the 21st century from global and regional models. *Submitted to J. Climate*.

1013 Voldoire, A., et al., 2012: The CNRM-CM5.1 global climate model: description and basic
1014 evaluation. *Clim. Dyn.*, doi:10.1007/s00382-011-1259-y.

1015 Volodin, E. M., N. A. Diansky, and A. V. Gusev, 2010: Simulating present-day climate
1016 with the INMCM4.0 coupled model of the atmospheric and oceanic general circulations.
1017 *Atmospheric and Oceanic Physics*, **46**, 414–431.

1018 Waliser, D. E., J.-L. Li, T. L’Ecuyer, and W.-T. Chen, 2011: The impact of precipitating
1019 ice and snow on the radiation balance in global climate models. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **38**,
1020 L06802, doi:10.1029/2010GL046478.

1021 Wang, W., P. Xie, S.-H. Yoo, Y. Xue, A. Kumar, and X. Wu, 2011: An assesment of
1022 the surface climate in the NCEP climate forecast system reanalysis. *Clim. Dyn.*, **37** (7),
1023 1601–1620, doi:10.1007/s00382-010-0935-7.

1024 Ward, M. N., 1998: Diagnosis and short-lead prediction of summer rainfall in tropical North
1025 Africa at interannual and multidecadal timescales. *J. Climate*, **11**, 3167–3191.

1026 Washington, R., et al., 2012: Fennec: the Saharan climate system. *4th international AMMA*
1027 *Conference, 2-6 July 2012, Toulouse, France.*

1028 Watanabe, M., et al., 2010: Improved climate simulation by MIROC5: mean states, vari-
1029 ability, and climate sensitivity. *J. Climate*, **23**, 6312–6335, doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3679.1.

1030 Wielicki, B. A., B. R. Barkstrom, E. F. Harrison, R. B. Lee III, G. L. Smith, and J. E. Cooper,
1031 1996: Clouds and the Earth’s Radiant Energy System (CERES): An Earth observing
1032 system experiment. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **77**, 853–868.

1033 Williams, K. D., et al., 2012: The Transpose-AMIP II experiment and its application to
1034 the understanding of Southern Ocean cloud biases in climate models. *J. Climate*, doi:
1035 10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00429.1.

1036 Wu, T., et al., 2010: The Beijing Climate Center for Atmospheric General Circulation
1037 Model (BCC-AGCM2.0.1: description and its performance for the present-day climate.
1038 *Clim. Dyn.*, **34**, 123–147.

1039 Xie, P. and P. A. Arkin, 1997: Global precipitation: a 17-year monthly analysis based on
1040 gauge observation, satellite estimates, and numerical model outputs. *Bull. Amer. Meteor.*
1041 *Soc.*, **78**, 2539–2558.

1042 Xue, Y., et al., 2010: Intercomparison and analyses of the climatology of the West African
1043 Monsoon in the West African Monsoon Modeling and Evaluation project (WAMME) first
1044 model intercomparison experiment. *Clim. Dyn.*, **35**, 3–28, doi:10.1007/s00382-010-0778-2.

1045 Yang, S., K.-S. Kuo, and E. A. Smith, 2008: Persistent nature of secondary diurnal modes
1046 of precipitation over oceanic and continental regimes. *J. Climate*, **21** (16), 4115–4131.

1047 Yokimoto, S., et al., 2011: Meteorological Research Institute-Earth System Model v1 (MRI-
1048 ESM1) - Model Description. Technical report 64, Meteorological Research Institute, Japan.

1049 List of Tables

1050	1	CMIP5 simulations used in the present study.	44
1051	2	Characteristics of AMIP simulation models used in the present study.	45
1052	3	Observational datasets.	46

TABLE 1. CMIP5 simulations used in the present study.

Centers	Models	Simulations
BCC (China)	BCC-CSM1.1 BCC-CSM1.1(m)	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5
CCCma (Canada)	CanAM4 CanCM4 CanESM2	amip [*] † hist hist, rcp4.5
CMCC (Italy)	CMCC-CM CMCC-CMS CMCC-CESM	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 hist, rcp8.5
CNRM-CERFACS (France)	CNRM-CM5	amip [*] †, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
CSIRO-BOM (Australia)	ACCESS1.0 ACCESS1.3	amip, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol amip, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
CSIRO-QCCE (Australia)	CSIRO-Mk3.6.0	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
FIO (China)	FIO-ESM	hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5
GCESS (China)	BNU-ESM	amip [*] , hist, rcp8.5, picontrol
ICHEC	EC-EARTH	amip [*] , hist, picontrol
INM (Russia)	INM-CM4	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
IPSL (France)	IPSL-CM5A-LR IPSL-CM5A-MR IPSL-CM5B-LR	amip [*] †, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol amip [*] †, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
LASG-CES (China)	FGOALS-g2	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
LASG-IAP (China)	FGOALS-s2	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
MIROC (Japan)	MIROC4h MIROC5 MIROC-ESM MIROC-ESM-CHEM	hist amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5
MOHC (England)	HadCM3 HadGEM2-A HadGEM2-CC HadGEM2-ES	hist amip [*] † hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5
MPI-M (Germany)	MPI-ESM-LR MPI-ESM-MR MPI-ESM-P	amip [*] †, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist
MRI (Japan)	MRI-AGCM3.2H MRI-AGCM3.2S MRI-CGCM3	amip [*] amip [*] amip [*] †, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol
NASA-GISS (USA)	GISS-E2-H GISS-E2-R GISS-E2-H-CC GISS-E2-R-CC	hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 amip, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist, rcp4.5 hist, rcp4.5
NCAR (USA)	CCSM4	amip, hist, rcp8.5, picontrol
NCC (Norway)	NorESM1-M NorESM1-ME	amip [*] , hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5
NIMR-KMA (South Korea)	HadGEM2-AO	hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5
NOAA-GFDL (USA)	GFDL-CM2p1 GFDL-CM3 GFDL-ESM2G GFDL-ESM2M GFDL-HIRAM-C180 GFDL-HIRAM-C360	hist hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 amip [*] amip [*]
NSF-DOE-NCAR (USA)	CESM1(BGC) CESM1(CAM5) CESM1(FASTCHEM) CESM1(WACCM)	hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5 amip, hist, rcp4.5, rcp8.5, picontrol hist hist

* Daily outputs are available for these simulations.

† High-frequency output are used at selected sites.

TABLE 2. Characteristics of AMIP simulation models used in the present study.

Models	Reference	Horizontal Grid	Number of Vertical level
ACCESS1.0 ACCESS1.3	http://wiki.csiro.au/confluence/display/ACCESS/	1.875°x1.25°	38
BCC-CSM1.1	Wu et al. (2010)	T42 (2.8°x2.8°)	26
BNU-ESM	http://esg.bnu.edu.cn/BNU_ESM_webs/htmls/index.html	T42 (2.8°x2.8°)	26
CanAM4	http://www.ec.gc.ca/ccmac-cccma/	T63 (1.875°x1.875°)	35
CCSM4	Neale et al. (2010a); Gent et al. (2011)	0.9°x1.25°	26
CESM1(CAM5)	Neale et al. (2010b)	0.5°x1.25°	30
CMCC-CM	http://www.cmcc.it/data-models/models	0.75°x0.75°	31
CNRM-CM5	Voldoire et al. (2012)	T127 (1.4°x1.4°)	31
CSIRO-Mk3.6.0	Rotstayn et al. (2010)	T63 (1.875°x1.875°)	18
EC-EARTH	Hazeleger et al. (2010)	T159 (1.125°x 1.125°)	62
FGOALS-g2	http://www.lasg.ac.cn/FGOALS/CMIP5	2.8°x2.8°	26
FGOALS-s2	http://www.lasg.ac.cn/FGOALS/CMIP5	1.7°x2.8°	26
GFDL-HIRAM-C180 GFDL-HIRAM-C360	Donner et al. (2011)	0.5°x0.5° 0.25°x0.25°	32
GISS-E2-R	http://data.giss.nasa.gov/modelE/ar5	2°x2.5°	40
HadGEM2-A	Collins et al. (2008)	1.25°x1.875°	38
INM-CM4	Volodin et al. (2010)	1.5°x2.5°	21
IPSL-CM5A-LR IPSL-CM5A-MR IPSL-CM5B-LR	Dufresne et al. (2012) Hourdin et al. (2012)	1.895°x3.75° 1.25°x2.5° 1.895°x3.75°	39
MIROC5	Watanabe et al. (2010)	T85 (1.4°x1.4°)	40
MPI-ESM-LR MPI-ESM-MR	Giorgetta et al. (2012)	T63 (1.875°x1.875°)	47 95
MRI-AGCM3.2H MRI-AGCM3.2S MRI-CGCM3	Mizuta et al. (2012) Yokimoto et al. (2011)	T319 (0.56°x0.56°) T959 (0.19°x0.19°) T159 (1.125°x 1.125°)	64 48
NorESM1-M	Kirkevåg et al. (2008)	1.9°x2.5°	26

TABLE 3. Observational datasets.

Variables	Dataset	References	Resolution	Frequency	Period covered
Rainfall	GRU version 3.1	Mitchell and Jones (2005)	$0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$	monthly	1901–2008
	CMAP	Xie and Arkin (1997)	$2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$	monthly	1979–2008
	GPCP	Huffman et al. (2001)	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	daily	1997–2008
Convection	TRMM-3B42	Huffman et al. (2007)	$0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$	daily	1998–2008
	Ouémé rain gauges (2°E – 9.5°N)	Le Lay and Galle (2005); Depraetere et al. (2009)	site ^a	5/30 minutes	1999–2011
	Niamey rain gauges (2.2°E – 13.5°N)	Lebel et al. (2010)	site ^a	5/30 minutes	1990–2011
Clouds	NOAA OLR	Liebmann and Smith (1996)	$2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$	daily	1979–2008
	CloudSat/CALIPSO	Bouniol et al. (2012)	AMMA transect ^b	monthly	2006–2010
	ARM Mobile Facility (AMF)	Miller and Slingo (2007); Bouniol et al. (2012)	Niamey site	30 minutes	2006
Radiation	CERES-EBAF ^c Edition 2.6	Wielicki et al. (1996); Loeb et al. (2009)	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	monthly	2000–2010
	NASA/GEWEX SRB release 3.0 (pr/qc) ^d	Stackhouse et al. (2011)	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	monthly	1983–2007
	Transsect sites ^e	Lebel et al. (2009); http://www.amma.catch.org	sites	JAS average	
2-m temperature	GRU version 3.1	Mitchell and Jones (2005)	$0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$	monthly	1979–2008
	NCEP CFSR	Saha et al. (2010)	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	monthly/daily	1979–2008
	NASA-MERRA	Rienecker et al. (2011)	$1^\circ \times 1^\circ$	monthly/daily	1979–2008
	ERA-Interim	Simmons et al. (2007)	$0.75^\circ \times 0.75^\circ$	monthly/daily	1979–2008

^a The number and density of gauges vary from year to year. To match the 30-min model output resolutions extracted at these selected sites, and not oversample any particular region, the data were re-sampled and spatially homogenized in $0.2^\circ \times 0.2^\circ$ domain within $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ area around both sites.

^b Each satellite track within a 10°W – 10°E domain is assumed representative of the Greenwich latitude, leading to at least two sampling per day along this transect.

^c The Clouds and Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) Energy Balanced and Filled (EBAF) Edition 2.6 product consists of top-of-atmosphere and surface radiative fluxes (<http://ceres.larc.nasa.gov>).

^d The NASA/GEWEX Surface Radiation Budget (SRB) consists of top-of-atmosphere and surface radiative fluxes. Two sets of surface radiative flux estimations are available, based on different algorithms, known as primary (SRB3pr) and Langley parameterized algorithms (SRB3qc). More information on these two datasets are available at <http://gewex-srb.larc.nasa.gov/index.php>.

^e Bamba (17.1°N – 1.4°E , 2004–2007), Agoufou (15.34°N – 1.48°E , 2002–2008), Wankama (13.67°N – 2.65°E , 2005–2006), Bira (9.82°N – 1.71°E , 2006), Naholou (9.73°N – 1.60°E , 2006) and PIRATA Buoy (0° – 0° , 2006, only incoming shortwave at surface).

List of Figures

1 a) Climate projections of 2-meter temperature (colors in K) plotted as the difference between the periods 2071–2100 and 1971–2000 for the JAS season, for the CMIP3 SRES A2 ensemble mean. The CMIP3 inter-model standard deviation is indicated in contours, with one contour every 0.2 K, beginning at 1.0 K. b) Same as a) but for precipitation (in mm day⁻¹). The standard deviation is indicated in contours, with one contour every 0.3 mm day⁻¹, beginning at 1.0 mm day⁻¹. c) Percentage of models of the CMIP3 ensemble that agree on the sign of the CMIP3 ensemble mean precipitation changes. d), e), and f) same as a), b) and c) respectively, but for the CMIP5 RCP8.5 model ensemble.

53

2 a) Climate projections of precipitation (in %) plotted against those of 2-meter temperature (in K) averaged over a westernmost Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 15°W-5°W], indicated on Fig. 1.a. The differences are computed between the periods 2071–2100 and 1971–2000, for the JAS season, for CMIP3 SRESA2 scenario and for CMIP5 RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios. b) Same as a), but for a eastern West Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 0°-10°E]. c) Same as a) but for a central/eastern Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 10°E-35°E]. d) Climate projections of global 2-meter temperature plotted against those of 2-meter temperature averaged over a Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 15°W-35°E]. Open markers indicate projections for which precipitation change is greater than 25% over the whole Sahel domain. e) Same as d), but for the MAM season.

54

- 3 a) Time evolution of raw (thin line with dots) precipitation in mm day^{-1} averaged over $[10^{\circ}\text{N}-18^{\circ}\text{N}, 0^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\text{E}]$ and of its decadal component $\overline{P}^9$ (thick solid line), computed as the 9-year running mean of the raw index. CRU data is indicated by the thick black line and CMAP by the thin black line. b) Precipitation difference (in %) between the 9-year periods 2000–2008 and 1979–1987 for AMIP simulations (dots), and standard deviation of $\overline{P}^9$ in historical (open squares) and pre-industrial control (grey filled squares) experiments. The standard deviations (in %) are computed on the full period (1850–2008) for historical simulations and on the available length for pre-industrial simulations, which ranges from 250 to 1000 years depending on the model. The standard deviation has been normalized by the mean $\overline{P}^9$. For observations, the square corresponds to the normalized standard deviation of CRU $\overline{P}^9$ while the two black circles correspond to the precipitation difference (in %) between the periods 2000–2008 and 1979–1987 in the CRU and CMAP observations. c) Standard deviation of interannual fluctuation $\delta P = P - \overline{P}^9$ as a fraction of the mean precipitation (in %), in pre-industrial control (grey filled squares) and historical (open squares) experiments. 55
- 4 Difference between historical and AMIP simulations for precipitation (shaded, mm day^{-1}) and 2-meter temperature (one contour every 1 K, the zero contour being omitted), averaged over the JAS seasons of the 1979–2008 period. The CMIP3 and CMIP5 ensemble means are shown in the bottom row, as well as the CMIP5 ensemble mean biases of historical and AMIP simulations against the CRU datasets. 56

1098	5	Scatterplot of the ITCZ position against the meridional temperature gradient	
1099		between the Gulf of Guinea and the Sahara desert. The ITCZ latitude cor-	
1100		responds to the JAS position of maximum precipitation averaged over 10°W-	
1101		10°E. The JAS temperature gradient is computed as the difference between	
1102		the domains [20°N-30°N, 10°W-10°E] and [5°S-5°N, 10°W-10°E].	57
1103	6	Precipitation (in mm day ⁻¹) averaged over 10°W-10°E, for the JAS period of	
1104		the years 1979-2008 for CMIP5 simulations, and 1997-2008 for GPCP, 1998-	
1105		2008 for TRMM, 1979-2008 for CRU and 1979-2008 for CMAP datasets.	
1106		Each dataset is displayed using its own horizontal resolution. The left (right)	
1107		panel corresponds to the warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N-30°N,	
1108		10°W-10°E].	58
1109	7	2-meter temperature (in K) averaged over 10°W-10°E, for the JAS period of	
1110		the years 1979-2008 for CMIP5 simulations, reanalyses and CRU. Each dataset	
1111		is displayed using its own horizontal resolution. The left (right) panel corre-	
1112		sponds to the warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N-30°N, 10°W-10°E].	59
1113	8	Latitude-height diagrams of the cloud fraction averaged between 10°W-10°E,	
1114		for the period JAS of the years 2006-2010 for the CloudSat-CALIPSO data	
1115		set and 1979-2008 for the models. Models are organized from the warmest	
1116		one over the Sahara [20°N-30°N, 10°W-10°E] (top left after the observation	
1117		panel) to the coldest one (bottom right).	60
1118	9	a) and b) Cloud radiative effect (in W m ⁻²) at the top of the atmosphere	
1119		in the SW (negative values) and LW (positive values) bands, averaged over	
1120		10°W-10°E, for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008. The left (right) panel	
1121		corresponds to warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N-30°N, 10°W-	
1122		10°E]. c) and d) As in a) and b) respectively, but for the net CRE at the top	
1123		of the atmosphere.	61

1124	10	a) and b) Downward shortwave radiative flux at the surface (in W m^{-2}),	
1125		averaged over 10°W - 10°E , for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008. The left	
1126		(right) panel corresponds to warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N -	
1127		30°N , 10°W - 10°E]. Mean fluxes for the sites along the transect (Table 3)	
1128		together with their yearly minimum and maximum values are indicated. c)	
1129		and d) As in a) and b) respectively, but for the downward longwave radiative	
1130		flux at the surface.	62
1131	11	a) Scatterplot of the downward longwave radiative flux at the surface (in W	
1132		m^{-2}) against the 2-meter temperature (in K). Both variables are averaged over	
1133		[20°N - 30°N , 10°W - 10°E], for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008. A linear	
1134		regression was performed and its coefficient of determination is indicated in	
1135		the top-left corner. b) As in a), but for the downward shortwave radiative flux	
1136		at the surface against the 2-meter temperature. Note that the linear regression	
1137		was performed without the CNRM-CM5 data. c) as in b) but for the down-	
1138		ward longwave radiative flux at the surface against the downward shortwave	
1139		radiative flux at the surface (in W m^{-2}). The black square with error bars in-	
1140		dicates the mean obtained from observational datasets, i.e. SRB3pr, SRB3qc	
1141		and CERES-EBAF for radiative fluxes, and ERAI, MERRA and CFSR for	
1142		the 2-meter temperature. The warmer (colder) models are indicated with dots	
1143		(filled square).	63
1144	12	Annual cycle of precipitation (in mm day^{-1}) averaged over 10°W - 10°E . A 10-	
1145		day running mean was performed on each dataset. Models are organized from	
1146		the warmest one over the Sahara [20°N - 30°N , 10°W - 10°E] (top left after the	
1147		observation panel) to the coldest one (bottom right).	64
1148	13	Annual cycle of 2-meter temperature (in K) averaged over 10°W - 10°E . Models	
1149		are organized from the warmest one over the Sahara [20°N - 30°N , 10°W - 10°E]	
1150		(top left after the observation panel) to the coldest one (bottom right).	65

1151	14	Variance of OLR in the 1-90-day band, in $W^2 m^{-4}$ for the JAS periods from	
1152		1979 to 2008. Daily OLR of CMIP5 models was regridded on the NOAA OLR	
1153		grid ($2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$), before computing filtered anomalies and their variance.	66
1154	15	a) Variance of OLR in the 1-90-day band averaged over the domain $[5^\circ N-20^\circ N,$	
1155		$10^\circ W-10^\circ E]$, and for the JAS periods from 1979 to 2008. Values are normal-	
1156		ized by the NOAA OLR variance. b) Distribution of the OLR intraseasonal	
1157		variance (in %) across the 1-3-day (grey bars), 3-10-day (white bars) and	
1158		10-90-day (black bars) bands.	67
1159	16	a) Autocorrelation of a) JAS and b) DJF 1-90-day filtered precipitation at a 1-	
1160		day lag for the GPCP daily dataset. Only grid-point where mean precipitation	
1161		is greater than 1 mm day^{-1} are considered. c) Autocorrelation of 1-90-day	
1162		filtered precipitation at a 1-day lag for GPCP and CMIP5 models, averaged	
1163		over the domain $[5^\circ N-15^\circ N, 10^\circ W-10^\circ E]$. Autocorrelation is computed for each	
1164		JAS season of the period 1997-2008 for GPCP and 1979-2008 for CMIP5	
1165		model, and then averaged over all years. CMIP5 models and the GPCP	
1166		dataset were regridded on the NOAA OLR grid before any computation.	68
1167	17	Mean August diurnal cycle of precipitation intensity distribution (including	
1168		null value). 1979-2008 is the period used for the models, 1999-2011 for the	
1169		Ouémé site ($2^\circ E-9.5^\circ N$) and 1989-2011 for the Niamey site ($2.2^\circ E-13.5^\circ N$).	
1170		The distribution is based on 30-min samples. The mean diurnal cycle of	
1171		rainfall intensity is superimposed with the black line. Superimposed dashed	
1172		lines also indicates the diurnal cycle of precipitation intensity distribution,	
1173		but using 3-hourly samples for comparison with the CNRM-CM5 model.	69

18 As in Fig. 17 but for the August diurnal cycle of the cloud frequency of
occurrence derived at the Niamey site (2.2°E - 13.5°N). Observations comes
from the AMF data acquired in 2006. The period 1979-2008 is used for the
models. The vertical distribution of the cloud fraction is indicated on the
right sub-panels. It is normalized at each level by the total cloud frequency
of occurrence which is superimposed with the dashed line.

70




FIG. 1. a) Climate projections of 2-meter temperature (colors in K) plotted as the difference between the periods 2071–2100 and 1971–2000 for the JAS season, for the CMIP3 SRES A2 ensemble mean. The CMIP3 inter-model standard deviation is indicated in contours, with one contour every 0.2 K, beginning at 1.0 K. b) Same as a) but for precipitation (in mm day^{-1}). The standard deviation is indicated in contours, with one contour every 0.3 mm day^{-1} , beginning at 1.0 mm day^{-1} . c) Percentage of models of the CMIP3 ensemble that agree on the sign of the CMIP3 ensemble mean precipitation changes. d), e), and f) same as a), b) and c) respectively, but for the CMIP5 RCP8.5 model ensemble.




FIG. 2. a) Climate projections of precipitation (in %) plotted against those of 2-meter temperature (in K) averaged over a westernmost Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 15°W-5°W], indicated on Fig. 1.a. The differences are computed between the periods 2071–2100 and 1971–2000, for the JAS season, for CMIP3 SRESA2 scenario and for CMIP5 RCP4.5 and RCP8.5 scenarios. b) Same as a), but for a eastern West Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 0°-10°E]. c) Same as a) but for a central/eastern Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 10°E-35°E]. d) Climate projections of global 2-meter temperature plotted against those of 2-meter temperature averaged over a Sahel domain [10°N-18°N, 15°W-35°E]. Open markers indicate projections for which precipitation change is greater than 25% over the whole Sahel domain. e) Same as d), but for the MAM season.




FIG. 3. a) Time evolution of raw (thin line with dots) precipitation in mm day⁻¹ averaged over [10°N-18°N, 0°-10°E] and of its decadal component $\bar{P}^9$ (thick solid line), computed as the 9-year running mean of the raw index. CRU data is indicated by the thick black line and CMAP by the thin black line. b) Precipitation difference (in %) between the 9-year periods 2000–2008 and 1979–1987 for AMIP simulations (dots), and standard deviation of $\bar{P}^9$ in historical (open squares) and pre-industrial control (grey filled squares) experiments. The standard deviations (in %) are computed on the full period (1850–2008) for historical simulations and on the available length for pre-industrial simulations, which ranges from 250 to 1000 years depending on the model. The standard deviation has been normalized by the mean $\bar{P}^9$. For observations, the square corresponds to the normalized standard deviation of CRU $\bar{P}^9$ while the two black circles correspond to the precipitation difference (in %) between the periods 2000–2008 and 1979–1987 in the CRU and CMAP observations. c) Standard deviation of interannual fluctuation $\delta P = P - \bar{P}^9$ as a fraction of the mean precipitation (in %), in pre-industrial control (grey filled squares) and historical (open squares) experiments.




FIG. 4. Difference between historical and AMIP simulations for precipitation (shaded, mm day^{-1}) and 2-meter temperature (one contour every 1 K, the zero contour being omitted), averaged over the JAS seasons of the 1979–2008 period. The CMIP3 and CMIP5 ensemble means are shown in the bottom row, as well as the CMIP5 ensemble mean biases of historical and AMIP simulations against the CRU datasets.




FIG. 5. Scatterplot of the ITCZ position against the meridional temperature gradient between the Gulf of Guinea and the Sahara desert. The ITCZ latitude corresponds to the JAS position of maximum precipitation averaged over 10°W-10°E. The JAS temperature gradient is computed as the difference between the domains [20°N-30°N, 10°W-10°E] and [5°S-5°N, 10°W-10°E].




FIG. 6. Precipitation (in mm day^{-1}) averaged over 10°W - 10°E , for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008 for CMIP5 simulations, and 1997-2008 for GPCP, 1998-2008 for TRMM, 1979-2008 for CRU and 1979-2008 for CMAP datasets. Each dataset is displayed using its own horizontal resolution. The left (right) panel corresponds to the warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N - 30°N , 10°W - 10°E].




FIG. 7. 2-meter temperature (in K) averaged over 10°W-10°E, for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008 for CMIP5 simulations, reanalyses and CRU. Each dataset is displayed using its own horizontal resolution. The left (right) panel corresponds to the warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N-30°N, 10°W-10°E].




FIG. 8. Latitude-height diagrams of the cloud fraction averaged between 10°W - 10°E , for the period JAS of the years 2006-2010 for the CloudSat-CALIPSO data set and 1979-2008 for the models. Models are organized from the warmest one over the Sahara [20°N - 30°N , 10°W - 10°E] (top left after the observation panel) to the coldest one (bottom right).




FIG. 9. a) and b) Cloud radiative effect (in W m^{-2}) at the top of the atmosphere in the SW (negative values) and LW (positive values) bands, averaged over 10°W – 10°E , for the JAS period of the years 1979–2008. The left (right) panel corresponds to warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N – 30°N , 10°W – 10°E]. c) and d) As in a) and b) respectively, but for the net CRE at the top of the atmosphere.




FIG. 10. a) and b) Downward shortwave radiative flux at the surface (in W m^{-2}), averaged over 10°W - 10°E , for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008. The left (right) panel corresponds to warmer (colder) models over the Sahara [20°N - 30°N , 10°W - 10°E]. Mean fluxes for the sites along the transect (Table 3) together with their yearly minimum and maximum values are indicated. c) and d) As in a) and b) respectively, but for the downward longwave radiative flux at the surface.




FIG. 11. a) Scatterplot of the downward longwave radiative flux at the surface (in W m^{-2}) against the 2-meter temperature (in K). Both variables are averaged over [20°N-30°N, 10°W-10°E], for the JAS period of the years 1979-2008. A linear regression was performed and its coefficient of determination is indicated in the top-left corner. b) As in a), but for the downward shortwave radiative flux at the surface against the 2-meter temperature. Note that the linear regression was performed without the CNRM-CM5 data. c) as in b) but for the downward longwave radiative flux at the surface against the downward shortwave radiative flux at the surface (in W m^{-2}). The black square with error bars indicates the mean obtained from observational datasets, i.e. SRB3pr, SRB3qc and CERES-EBAF for radiative fluxes, and ERAI, MERRA and CFSR for the 2-meter temperature. The warmer (colder) models are indicated with dots (filled square).




FIG. 12. Annual cycle of precipitation (in mm day^{-1}) averaged over 10°W – 10°E . A 10-day running mean was performed on each dataset. Models are organized from the warmest one over the Sahara [20°N – 30°N , 10°W – 10°E] (top left after the observation panel) to the coldest one (bottom right).




FIG. 13. Annual cycle of 2-meter temperature (in K) averaged over 10°W–10°E. Models are organized from the warmest one over the Sahara [20°N–30°N, 10°W–10°E] (top left after the observation panel) to the coldest one (bottom right).




FIG. 14. Variance of OLR in the 1-90-day band, in $W^2 m^{-4}$ for the JAS periods from 1979 to 2008. Daily OLR of CMIP5 models was regridded on the NOAA OLR grid ($2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$), before computing filtered anomalies and their variance.




FIG. 15. a) Variance of OLR in the 1-90-day band averaged over the domain [5°N-20°N, 10°W-10°E], and for the JAS periods from 1979 to 2008. Values are normalized by the NOAA OLR variance. b) Distribution of the OLR intraseasonal variance (in %) across the 1-3-day (grey bars), 3-10-day (white bars) and 10-90-day (black bars) bands.




FIG. 16. a) Autocorrelation of a) JAS and b) DJF 1-90-day filtered precipitation at a 1-day lag for the GPCP daily dataset. Only grid-point where mean precipitation is greater than 1 mm day^{-1} are considered. c) Autocorrelation of 1-90-day filtered precipitation at a 1-day lag for GPCP and CMIP5 models, averaged over the domain $[5^{\circ}\text{N}-15^{\circ}\text{N}, 10^{\circ}\text{W}-10^{\circ}\text{E}]$. Autocorrelation is computed for each JAS season of the period 1997-2008 for GPCP and 1979-2008 for CMIP5 model, and then averaged over all years. CMIP5 models and the GPCP dataset were regridded on the NOAA OLR grid before any computation.




FIG. 17. Mean August diurnal cycle of precipitation intensity distribution (including null value). 1979–2008 is the period used for the models, 1999–2011 for the Ouémé site (2°E – 9.5°N) and 1989–2011 for the Niamey site (2.2°E – 13.5°N). The distribution is based on 30-min samples. The mean diurnal cycle of rainfall intensity is superimposed with the black line. Superimposed dashed lines also indicates the diurnal cycle of precipitation intensity distribution, but using 3-hourly samples for comparison with the CNRM-CM5 model.




FIG. 18. As in Fig. 17 but for the August diurnal cycle of the cloud frequency of occurrence derived at the Niamey site (2.2°E-13.5°N). Observations comes from the AMF data acquired in 2006. The period 1979-2008 is used for the models. The vertical distribution of the cloud fraction is indicated on the right sub-panels. It is normalized at each level by the total cloud frequency of occurrence which is superimposed with the dashed line.