

1 An issue in the climate mode of the Chemistry Transport Model CHIMERE was unveiled on
2 14/03/2013, just after the publication of manuscript acp-2013-64 in ACPD. The problem
3 regards handling of precipitations that were overestimated, especially when using the climate
4 model. This overestimation has mainly an impact on particulate matter although wet
5 scavenging also bears upon some ozone precursors.

6 All the simulations were repeated in the course of March 2013 and the revised results confirm
7 that scavenging of particulate matter was indeed highly overestimated while the impact on O₃
8 is limited. However, none of the main findings of the paper are changed since our focus was on
9 a sensitivity analysis investigating the relative changes brought about by various scenarios. The
10 only noteworthy change regards the discrepancy between the results obtained with the
11 meteorological reanalysis and with the climate model. While in the previous version we
12 pointed out differences for both O₃ and PM_{2.5}, in this revised version only the differences for
13 O₃ are maintained while the underestimation of PM_{2.5} when using the climate model vanishes.

14 The following pages contain the revised manuscript with all changes in the text highlighted and
15 some of the figures updated.

16 We thank in advance the readers for their understanding.

17 Augustin Colette, on behalf of the co-authors, April 8th, 2013.

18

1 **European atmosphere in 2050, a regional air quality and climate perspective under CMIP5**
2 **scenarios**

3 **A. Colette (1,*), B. Bessagnet (1), R. Vautard (2), S. Szopa (2), S. Rao (3), S. Schucht (1), Z.**
4 **Klimont (3), L. Menut (4), G. Clain (2, now at 5), F. Meleux (1), L. Rouïl (1)**

- 5 1. INERIS, [*]: augustin.colette@ineris.fr
6 2. LSCE/IPSL/CEA/CNRS/UVSQ
7 3. IIASA
8 4. LMD/IPSL/ CNRS/Ecole Polytechnique/UPMC
9 5. Now at LATMOS/IPSL/CNRS/UPMC/UVSQ

10 **Abstract**

11 To quantify changes in air pollution in Europe at the 2050 horizon, we designed a
12 comprehensive modelling system that captures the external factors considered to be most
13 relevant and relies on up-to-date and consistent sets of air pollution and climate policy
14 scenarios. Global and regional climate as well as global chemistry simulations are based on the
15 recent Representative Concentrations Pathways (RCP) produced for the Fifth Assessment
16 Report (AR5) of IPCC whereas regional air quality modelling is based on the updated emissions
17 scenarios produced in the framework of the Global Energy Assessment. We explored two
18 diverse scenarios: a reference scenario where climate policies are absent and a mitigation
19 scenario which limits global temperature rise to within 2°C by the end of this century.

20 This first assessment of projected air quality and climate at the regional scale based on CMIP5
21 (5th Climate Model Intercomparison Project) climate simulations is in line with the existing
22 literature using CMIP3. The discrepancy between air quality simulations obtained with a
23 climate model or with meteorological reanalyses is pointed out. Sensitivity simulations show

1 that the main factor driving future air quality projections is air pollutant emissions, rather than
2 climate change or long range transport. Whereas the well documented “climate penalty”
3 bearing upon ozone over Europe is confirmed, other features appear less robust compared to
4 the literature: such as the impact of climate on PM_{2.5}. The quantitative disentangling of each
5 contributing factor shows that the magnitude of the ozone climate penalty has been
6 overstated in the past while on the contrary the contribution of the global ozone burden is
7 overlooked in the literature.

8 **1 Introduction**

9 Air quality and climate are closely inter-related in their mitigation, their functioning, and their
10 impacts (Jacob and Winner, 2009). Climate policies imply energy efficiency and other technical
11 measures that have an impact on a wide range of human activities and, in turn, on air quality.
12 Reciprocally, air quality mitigation measures may also have an impact on greenhouse gases
13 emissions. In addition, air quality is sensitive to climate change (which affects physical and
14 chemical properties of the atmosphere and therefore drives the frequency of weather events
15 yielding favourable conditions to the build up of pollution). Last, many air pollutants (both
16 gaseous and particulate) have direct and indirect impacts on climate through the radiative
17 balance of the atmosphere.

18 The combined and sometimes competing role of these interlinkages calls for integrated
19 assessment frameworks (EEA, 2004). Integration of technical mitigation measures, their costs
20 and their impact on air quality have been successfully implemented over the past decades to
21 investigate relatively short time periods (Cohan and Napelenok, 2011). In Europe, the GAINS
22 (Greenhouse Gas - Air Pollution Interactions and Synergies) modelling framework (Amann et
23 al., 2011; Amann and Lutz, 2000) is used extensively to support the design of cost-effective
24 emission reduction strategies. The optimisation core of GAINS is based on a number of source-
25 receptor sensitivity simulations with the EMEP chemistry-transport model (Simpson et al.,

1 2012) designed to explore the impact on air quality of incremental changes in European
2 emissions over the next couple of decades. However the robustness of these optimisation
3 tools for longer term projections is challenged by externalities such as the global burden of
4 pollution and the climate penalty (Wu et al., 2008).

5 Full frame atmospheric chemistry and climate models can contribute to better quantifying
6 these externalities. The most established approach to tackle such issues consists in relying on
7 ensemble of models exploring a range of likely futures in order to derive an envelope of
8 projections, as being done in the widely documented IPCC framework (IPCC, 2007). When it
9 comes to atmospheric chemistry there is still a gap between research communities working on
10 global and regional scales. Global chemistry-transport modelling teams are closely aligned with
11 the climate modelling intercomparison project (CMIP) (Taylor et al., 2012). A dedicated
12 atmospheric composition change model intercomparison project (ACCMIP) (Lamarque et al.,
13 2012) was recently tailored to produce a consistent envelope of atmospheric composition
14 projections accounting for climate impacts. Such global modelling initiatives often include
15 sophisticated handling of coupling and feedbacks (esp. with regards to the radiative impact of
16 short-lived climate forcers (Shindell et al., 2012)). However they suffer of a lack of refinement
17 over given regional areas and many of these tools include simplified formulation of chemical
18 processes, especially with regards to secondary aerosol formation.

19 Regional air quality and climate modelling systems can fill these knowledge gaps. However,
20 robust quantification of regional AQ externalities is still suffering from a lack of coordinated
21 multi-model initiatives that would cover the whole range of processes involved. Over the past
22 few years, there has been a growing body of literature on the ozone climate penalty over
23 Europe (Andersson and Engardt, 2010; Hedegaard et al., 2008; Hedegaard et al., 2012;
24 Katragkou et al., 2011; Langner et al., 2012a; Langner et al., 2012b; Manders et al., 2012;
25 Meleux et al., 2007), amongst which only (Langner et al., 2012b) offers a multi-model

1 perspective. This climate penalty is however rarely compared to other influential factors
2 whereas the latest evidences suggested that reductions in air pollutant emissions would
3 largely compensate the climate penalty (Hedegaard et al., 2012; Langner et al., 2012a). The
4 role of long range transport is also somewhat overlooked in the literature apart from the
5 sensitivity studies of (Langner et al., 2012a) and the assessment of (Szopa et al., 2006). It
6 should also be noted that the vast majority of the regional air quality literature is devoted to
7 ozone with very few studies focusing on particulate matter (Hedegaard et al., 2012; Manders
8 et al., 2012).

9 We intend to quantify the penalty/benefit brought about by the externalities constituted by
10 climate change and global pollution burden bearing upon ozone and particulate pollution over
11 Europe. Four models are involved: a coupled ocean-atmosphere global circulation model
12 (AOGCM), a global chemistry transport model (GCTM), a regional climate model (RCM) and a
13 regional chemistry transport model (RCTM). Based on this approach, we can cover global and
14 regional scales for both transport and chemistry.

15 For the global climate and chemistry modelling, we use the Representative Concentrations
16 Pathways scenarios (van Vuuren et al., 2011) developed for the CMIP5 project (Taylor et al.,
17 2012). While the RCPs also include detailed estimates of chemically active anthropogenic
18 pollutants and precursors, the scenarios were designed solely with respect to long-term
19 radiative forcing and each developed by different integrated assessment models. Hence they
20 do not provide consistent scenarios to analyse climate and air pollution policy interactions (see
21 also (Butler et al., 2012; Fiore et al., 2012) for discussion). Given our goal of looking closer at
22 regional air quality issues, we selected air pollution scenarios from the more recent Global
23 Energy Assessment (GEA¹) (Riahi et al., 2012). The GEA scenarios while being consistent with
24 the RCPs - identical long-term radiative forcing levels - also include a detailed representation of

¹ http://www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/ENE/GEA/index_gea.html

1 air quality policies. To our knowledge, this study is the first to address future air quality over
2 Europe under the hypotheses of the recent Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP)
3 whereas there are a number of global or hemispheric assessments (Hedegaard et al., 2012;
4 Shindell et al., 2012; Young et al., 2012).

5 This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the chosen emission scenarios for
6 greenhouse gases and chemically active pollutants. The models constituting the regional
7 climate and air quality modelling system are presented in Section 3. The modelling results are
8 discussed in Section 4.1 for the regional climate projection and Section 4.2 for the air quality
9 projection. The sensitivity simulations designed to quantify the respective contribution of
10 climate, long range transport and regional air pollutant emission changes is conducted in
11 Section 4.3.

12 **2 Emission scenarios**

13 We use the RCP8.5 and RCP2.6 climate scenarios from the CMIP5 set that cover the highest
14 and lowest ranges in terms of radiative forcing explored by the RCP scenarios. The
15 corresponding emissions of short lived species are used in the global chemistry model that will
16 be used to constrain the regional air quality model at its boundaries. The RCP2.6 is designed to
17 keep global warming below 2°C by the end of the century whereas RCP8.5 does not include
18 any specific climate mitigation policy and thus leads to a high radiative forcing of 8.5 W/m² by
19 2100. We focused on the two scenarios from the GEA set that include an identical
20 representation of all current air quality legislation in Europe but differ in terms of policies on
21 climate change and energy access. The Reference scenario (also called CLE1) assumes no
22 specific climate policy and has a climate response almost identical to the RCP8.5 while the
23 mitigation scenario (CLE2) includes climate policies leading to a stabilisation of global warming
24 (hence resembling the RCP2.6). These scenarios are based on modelling with MESSAGE (Model
25 for Energy Supply Strategy Alternatives and their General Environmental Impact) for the

1 energy system (Messner and Strubegger, 1995; Riahi et al., 2007). MESSAGE distinguishes 11
2 world regions, including Western Europe and Central & Eastern Europe². The emissions (CH₄,
3 SO₂, NO_x (nitrogen oxides), CO, NMVOC (non-methane volatile organic compounds), Black and
4 Organic Carbon, PPM (fine primary particulate matter)) are subsequently spatialised on a 0.5
5 degree geographical grid using ACCMIP emission data for the year 2000 (Lamarque et al.,
6 2010). Further details of the GEA air pollution modelling framework are available in (Rao et al.,
7 2012).

8 The main strength of the GEA scenarios lies in the use of an explicit representation of all
9 currently legislated air quality policies until 2030 based on detailed information from the
10 GAINS model (Amann et al., 2011) . For OECD Countries in particular, this includes a wide
11 variety of pollution measures including Directives on the sulphur content in liquid fuels,
12 emission controls for vehicles and off-road sources up to the EURO-IV/ EURO-V standards;
13 emission standards for new combustion plants and emission ceilings as well as the revised
14 MARPOL VI legislations for international shipping. The inclusion of detailed AQ policies in the
15 2005-2030 period has a significant impact on the emissions of pollutants in the GEA scenarios
16 so that, compared to the RCPs, larger co-benefits of climate policies for air pollution can be
17 expected as detailed in (Colette et al., 2012b). After 2030, the GEA scenarios implicitly assume
18 through decline in emission factors, continued air quality legislation given a defined level of
19 economic growth. Further details are provided in (Riahi et al., 2012).

20 The total emissions of the main anthropogenic pollutants or precursors thereof are given in
21 Table 1. The Reference or CLE1 scenario in absence of climate policy already shows a decline
22 by 2050 of about 35-45% (depending on the constituent) of the current level of emissions
23 emphasizing the efficiency of current legislation with regards to air pollutant emissions in
24 Europe. The decrease is even larger when climate policy is implemented as in the CLE2

² <http://www.iiasa.ac.at/web/home/research/researchPrograms/Energy/MESSAGE-model-regions.en.html>

1 scenario. NO_x and VOC decrease to 14-22% of current level, indicating a 50% co-benefit of
2 climate policy for air quality.

3 Using this combination of RCP and GEA scenarios offers the possibility to take into account
4 explicit AQ policies that were not the scope of the RCPs. The only shortcoming of this option
5 regards the inconsistency of chemically active emissions used in the global and regional
6 models, given that the first prescribes boundary conditions of the second. A higher consistency
7 could be achieved either by using GEA data to drive the global models or RCPs to drive the
8 regional AQ model. The first option was ruled out because we preferred to use existing
9 simulations of well established international model intercomparison projects. The second
10 option would have led to ignore the added value of the consistent representation of air quality
11 policies in the GEA pathways (Butler et al., 2012; Colette et al., 2012a; Colette et al., 2012b;
12 Fiore et al., 2012).

13 **3 Modelling Framework**

14 The present assessment builds upon a suite of models covering various compartments of the
15 atmospheric system. A global coupled atmosphere-ocean general circulation model and a
16 global chemistry transport model address projected climate change and its impact on global
17 chemistry. The global climate and chemistry fields are then downscaled with regional models.
18 The individual tools of this modelling suite are briefly described here.

19 **3.1 Global Circulation Model**

20 The large scale atmosphere-ocean global circulation model (AOGCM) is the IPSL-CM5A-MR
21 (Institut Pierre Simon Laplace Coupled Model) (Dufresne et al., 2013; Marti et al., 2010). It
22 includes the LMDz meteorological model (Hourdin et al., 2006), the ORCHIDEE land surface
23 model (Krinner et al., 2005), the oceanic NEMO model (Madec et al., 1997) and the LIM sea-ice

1 model (Fichefet and Morales-Maqueda, 1999). The external forcing in terms of anthropogenic
2 radiative forcing is prescribed by the RCPs (Section 2). The medium-resolution version of the
3 model is used (2.5 x 1.25 degrees in the horizontal and 39 vertical levels).

4 Switching the meteorological forcing from reanalyses to a climate model is a prerequisite to
5 explore future projections. The difference between the two settings is that the climate model
6 attempts to capture a climate that is representative of present conditions, whereas the
7 reanalysis consists in the actual realisation of the past few years. Considering that significant
8 impact on air quality projections have been reported before (Katragkou et al., 2011; Manders
9 et al., 2012; Menut et al., 2012b; Zanis et al., 2011), we decided to investigate here both a
10 historical scenario (based on the climate model) and a hindcast (using the ERA-interim
11 reanalyses (Dee et al., 2011)).

12 **3.2 Regional Climate Model**

13 The Weather Research and Forecasting (Skamarock et al., 2008) (version 3.3.1) mesoscale
14 model is used as a regional climate model (RCM) for the dynamical downscaling of the IPSL-
15 CM5A-MR global fields. The spatial resolution is 50km and the domain covers the whole of
16 Europe with 119x116 grid points. The setup of the RCM is the same as that of (Menut et al.,
17 2012b) which presents a detailed evaluation of the performances of the IPSL-CM5-LR/WRF
18 regional climate modelling suite for air quality modelling purpose. However, we use here an
19 updated, higher resolution version of the AOGCM (IPSL-CM5A-MR) which exhibits a smaller
20 cold bias over the North Atlantic (Hourdin et al., 2012). A somewhat similar setup is used for
21 the IPSL-INERIS contribution (Vautard et al., 2012) to the forthcoming Coordinated Regional
22 Climate Modelling Experiment (CORDEX, (Giorgi et al., 2009)). The main differences compared
23 to (Vautard et al., 2012) include: using 11 years time slices instead of transient simulations, a
24 slight spectral nudging in the upper layer of the atmosphere, and a lower resolution of 50km.

1 **3.3 Global Chemistry Transport Model**

2 In order to provide boundary conditions to the regional chemistry transport model and assess
3 the role of global atmospheric chemistry changes on regional air quality we use the LMDz-OR-
4 INCA chemistry-climate model (Folberth et al., 2006; Hauglustaine et al., 2004). The model is
5 run with a horizontal resolution of 3.75° in longitude and 2.5° in latitude and uses 19 vertical
6 levels extending from the surface to 3 hPa. Further details on the model setup can be found in
7 (Szopa et al., 2012).

8 The three dimensional fields of 13 gases (including ozone, methane, carbon monoxide, PAN,
9 HNO₃, etc.) as well as various particulate matter compounds (dust, sulphate, black and organic
10 carbon) are then used as boundary conditions for the regional AQ model. Given that we focus
11 on background changes, monthly mean fields averaged over a 10 year period are used. It
12 should be noted that these background changes combine the impact of distant air pollutant
13 emissions and global climate change since they are based on climate-chemistry simulations.

14 **3.4 Regional Chemistry Transport Model**

15 The CHIMERE³ model (Bessagnet et al., 2008; Menut et al., 2012a) is used to compute regional
16 air quality. The model is used by a number of institutions in Europe and beyond for event
17 analysis (Vautard et al., 2005), policy scenarios studies for the French Ministry of Ecology, the
18 European Commission and the European Environment Agency, operational forecasts (Honoré
19 et al., 2008; Rouil et al., 2009; Zyryanov et al., 2011), model intercomparison exercises (Solazzo
20 et al., 2012a; Solazzo et al., 2012b; van Loon et al., 2007; Vautard et al., 2007), long term
21 hindcasts (Colette et al., 2011) and projections (Colette et al., 2012a; Meleux et al., 2007;
22 Szopa et al., 2006).

³ www.lmd.polytechnique.fr/chimere

1 In the present study, the model is used with 8 vertical levels extending from about 997hPa to
2 500hPa and a horizontal resolution of 0.5 degrees. The relatively coarse horizontal resolution
3 compared to recent model intercomparison initiatives is a necessary trade-off for long-term
4 simulations required for air-quality and climate simulations.

5 **4 Results**

6 The results of the integrated air quality and climate simulations are discussed in this section.
7 Four scenarios are investigated. The present-day conditions are covered with both hindcast
8 and historical simulations and two possible futures are investigated for 2050: one of them
9 (reference) assuming no implementation of any specific climate policy while the second
10 (mitigation) aims at keeping global warming below 2°C by the end of the century. Table 2
11 proposes a synthetic view of the modelling experiments. The basic experiments that combine
12 all factors (climate, long range transport and emissions) are discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2
13 while the sensitivity simulations are the focus of Section 4.3.

14 In each case, the simulation covers 10 years in order to gain statistical significance and
15 minimise the effect of climate interannual variability. This choice of a relatively short time
16 period was made as a compromise between computer time resources and length required to
17 obtain a detectable signal.

18 **4.1 Regional Climate Projections**

19 Even if the focus of the present paper is on impacts for air quality rather than regional climate
20 itself, we describe in this section the main features of the regional climate fields since they will
21 have a critical impact on the modelled air quality.

1 **4.1.1 General circulation**

2 The 10 year seasonal mean sea level pressure for winter and summer is provided in Figure 1
3 for the present day conditions as depicted in the climate model (historical simulation) and the
4 reanalysis (hindcast). In both seasons, important differences are found between the two
5 representations of the climate of the early 21st century. In winter the historical simulations
6 exhibit a much more zonal flow with a deeper Icelandic low pressure system yielding stronger
7 average Westerlies. In summer the differences are not that large. Nevertheless the Azores high
8 pressure system is deeper yet smaller in size, so that average mean sea level pressure over
9 Western Europe is lower than in the reanalysis.

10 Whereas it is meaningless to compare the future climate projections to the past reanalysis, we
11 can mention that these two main features (the strong zonal circulation in winter and the
12 relatively low pressures over Europe in summer) are maintained in both future scenarios (not
13 shown).

14 **4.1.2 Temperature and precipitations**

15 The higher end of the temperature distribution also differs strongly when changing the large
16 scale forcing. As shown in Figure 2, the historical climate model is much colder than the
17 reanalysed hindcast. This statement is true for both annual mean temperature (-0.88K in
18 winter and -1.46K in summer) and the 95th percentile of summer daily mean temperature (left
19 panels of Figure 2) with an average bias over Western Europe (5W, 15E, 40N, 55N: see area on
20 Figure 7) of -1.57K. This average bias is partly compensated by an opposite bias over sea
21 surfaces. Over continental areas the temperature bias can reach values as high as 5K. It is
22 noteworthy to emphasize that the 95th percentile of temperature in the 2050 projections is
23 respectively 1.91K (for the RCP8.5) and 0.51K (RCP2.6) warmer than the historical climate,

1 showing that the absolute differences between current and future climate are actually smaller
2 than temperature biases in the present climate.

3 Differences in daily precipitations are also shown (right panels of Figure 2). Precipitations are a
4 key variable for air quality because they drive wet scavenging which is an important sink for
5 airborne particulate matter. The second line of Figure 2 shows that the historical climate
6 simulation is too wet compared to the reanalysis throughout Europe. For precipitations, the
7 difference between the current and projected climate is also clearly lower than the differences
8 of the two realisations of current climate.

9 **4.1.3 Summary**

10 At this stage we exhibited important differences between the reanalysed and climate
11 simulations that will be used to drive the air quality modelling performed in the remainder of
12 the study. We anticipate some of these features to have a detrimental impact on the
13 simulation of air pollutant events.

14 It is not the purpose of this study to assess where such differences come from. In a nutshell we
15 can point towards (1) the global climate model, (2) the dynamical regional climate
16 downscaling, or (3) the choice of the time period. The IPSL-CM5-MR model is known to exhibit
17 a cold bias of sea surface temperature over the North Atlantic as a result of a strong
18 underestimation of the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation (Hourdin et al., 2012). The
19 dynamical downscaling has been demonstrated to contribute to an additional cooling (Colette
20 et al., 2012c; Menut et al., 2012b). These discrepancies could also be an artefact of the
21 relatively short time period (10 years) that could be influenced by an unfavourable climate
22 mode (of the North Atlantic Oscillation for instance). The importance of using long times series
23 has been repeatedly emphasized in climate studies and this factor should be taken into

1 account in future air quality and climate assessments when the computing resources are
2 sufficient (Langner et al., 2012a).

3 Before concluding this section devoted to the climate projection it is important to keep in mind
4 that it is not because the climate model exhibits a bias compared to a reanalysed hindcast that
5 its projections are not robust. An over-fitted climate would perform ideally for the past, yet
6 being very poor for future projections. That is why, in the vast majority of climate literature,
7 model variability is investigated rather than absolute differences. When it comes to climate
8 impact modelling the perspective changes however; and the absolute differences do matter,
9 hence raising new challenges. We will discuss in more details in the remainder of the paper
10 how such differences bear upon our confidence in air quality projections.

11 **4.2 Projected changes in air quality concentration**

12 Figure 3 and Figure 4 display the historical, hindcast and projections for ozone and total PM_{2.5}
13 (including secondary aerosols) concentration fields. Absolute values are given for the historical
14 simulation while differences relative to the historical simulation are provided for the remaining
15 configurations. Such differences are only plotted where found to be statistically significant
16 with a student t-test at the 95% confidence level (the difference being set to zero where un-
17 significant). A qualitative discussion is given in the present subsection. This discussion remains
18 descriptive since the results introduced here combine the impacts of emission projections,
19 climate change and long range transport. The investigation will be further quantified in the
20 Section 4.3 regarding the attribution analysis.

21 **4.2.1 Ozone**

22 Projected ozone changes are discussed on the basis of two different metrics in Figure 3. The
23 average summertime daily maxima (based on 8-hr running means) of ozone (O_3^{\max}) is provided

1 since it can be readily compared with the literature. However, in order to perform an
2 exposure-based assessment we also focus on SOMO35, an indicator designed to capture
3 detrimental impacts of ozone on human health and defined as the annual sum of daily
4 maximum over 35ppbv based on 8-hr running means (expressed in $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}\cdot\text{day}$).

5 The average situation for the historical (2005) simulation resembles the usual picture (e.g.
6 (Colette et al., 2011)): a sharp latitudinal gradient with the exception of pollution hotspots
7 over Europe. The difference between the historical and hindcast simulation provided on the
8 second row confirms that the climate model is less favourable to ozone build-up than the
9 actual meteorology over the recent past, as anticipated in Section 4.1.2.

10 A closer look into the frequency of stagnation episodes suggests a limited responsibility of
11 unfavourable weather regimes in the climate model. Even if (Manders et al., 2012) pointed out
12 this factor, in our case the historical simulation is actually more conducive to stagnant
13 summertime episodes than the hindcast with a frequency of calm days (average wind speed
14 below 3.5m s^{-1}) of 31% and 23%, respectively, and a mean duration of calm spells of 2.45 and
15 2.16 days (see the similar findings of (Menuet et al., 2012b; Vautard et al., 2012)).

16 The differences in summertime temperature and incoming short wave radiation can also lead
17 to an underestimation of biogenic emissions of ozone precursors. In particular, we found that
18 isoprene emissions were 68% higher in the hindcast than in the historical simulation. By
19 looking at the range of correction factors of the biogenic emission model (Curci, 2006;
20 Guenther et al., 2006) for the corresponding range of temperature and incoming short wave
21 radiation, we found that the sensitivity to the radiation was twice as large as the sensitivity to
22 the temperature bias, suggesting that minimizing biases in cloud coverage in the climate model
23 would help to reduce the ozone bias.

1 Last, we can mention that temperature, incoming radiation, or even specific humidity can also
2 play a direct role onto atmospheric chemistry, although these factors are much more difficult
3 to isolate (Menut, 2003).

4 Both projections for 2050 indicate a decrease of daily maximum ozone compared to the
5 historical climate simulation, but the magnitude of this decrease is moderate for the reference
6 scenario. The situation is however more complex under the reference scenario for the ozone
7 human health exposure index, since SOMO35 actually increases over a significant part of
8 Europe. The mitigation scenario achieves a much higher degree of emission reduction. As a
9 result, SOMO35 decreases sharply, especially in the Mediterranean area where the levels were
10 highest. On a more quantitative basis, in order to emphasize the projected changes in high-
11 exposure areas, we apply a weighting function to the SOMO35 fields depending on the
12 population density. We find that the population-weighted SOMO35 increases by ~~7.48.8%~~ (
13 standard deviation ~~$\pm 5.45.2$~~) in the reference scenario whereas it decreases by ~~80.479.6%~~ (± 2.1)
14 in the mitigation case.

15 **4.2.2 Particulate matter**

16 The average fields of fine particles ($PM_{2.5}$) in Figure 4 for the historical (2005) simulation
17 display local maxima over the main air pollution hotspots besides the large influx at the
18 southern boundary of the domain (desert dust). The ~~large~~ bias towards too high precipitations
19 (Figure 2) in the historical climate simulation ~~has a limited impact on leads to an overestimated~~
20 ~~scavenging and~~ the average load of $PM_{2.5}$ over Western Europe ~~that is is only $12.145.5 \mu g m^{-3}$~~
21 ~~and instead of $12.119.1 \mu g m^{-3}$ in the historical and reanalysis simulations, respectively when~~
22 ~~using the reanalysis. This bias cannot be attributed to a discrepancy of the frequencies of~~
23 ~~stagnation events that are very similar on an annual basis: 12.9% and 12.3% for the historical~~
24 ~~and hindcast simulations, respectively.~~

1 The decrease by 2050 is very large, with PM_{2.5} concentrations dropping down ~~to 4.1 and~~
2 ~~2.3~~ below 2 µg m⁻³ over ~~Western Europe continental~~ areas in ~~the reference and mitigation both~~
3 ~~future~~ scenarios, ~~respectively~~. As far as secondary inorganic aerosols are concerned it is worth
4 mentioning that the small increase of NH₃ emissions in the GEA projections (Colette et al.,
5 2012b) is not reflected in the projected formation of particulate NH₄⁺. Whereas NH₃ emissions
6 increase by 22% and 21% for the reference and mitigation scenario, respectively, between
7 2005 and 2050, we find that NH₄⁺ decreases from ~~4.050-68~~ µg m⁻³ in the historical 2005
8 simulation to ~~1.430-12~~ µg m⁻³ and ~~0.4902~~ µg m⁻³ in the reference and mitigation projection,
9 respectively. This feature emphasises the probable limiting role of NO_x emissions through the
10 availability of HNO₃ in rural areas (Hamaoui-Laguel et al., 2012) that do exhibit a strong
11 decrease in the future. The reason why such behaviour is not reported in coarse global
12 chemistry transport model projections deserves further investigation (Fiore et al., 2012;
13 Shindell et al., 2012).

14 In terms of exposure, we find that population-weighted PM_{2.5} decreases by ~~61.859.7%~~
15 (~~±3.12.1~~) and ~~78.01.4%~~ (~~±1.83~~) in the reference and mitigation scenarios, respectively. It
16 appears that air quality legislation (that is identical in both scenarios) somewhat dominates the
17 relative change in exposure to PM_{2.5}, the impact of the climate policy (that differs in both
18 scenarios) is not as large as observed for the exposure to ozone.

19 **4.3 Disentangling the driving factors**

20 The projected exposure to air pollution discussed in Section 4.2 takes into account the whole
21 range of processes playing a role in the future evolution of air quality: global and regional
22 climate, chemical background changes as well as air quality mitigation measures. This
23 modelling system also offers the opportunity to isolate the contribution of each driving factor
24 to the overall projected change in the basic simulations discussed in Section 4.2.

1 4.3.1 Methodology

2 We quantify the respective role of each process from sensitivity experiments consisting in
3 replicating the decadal simulations with all things kept equal except one of the driving factors.

4 In order to optimise the number of numerical experiments, we decide to focus primarily on the
5 respective contribution of projected chemically active AP emissions and climate. Excluding
6 chemical boundary conditions from the sensitivity analysis allows decreasing substantively the
7 number of sensitivity experiments.

8 The list of experiments is synthesised in Table 2 where we find the four basic simulations, and
9 the six additional sensitivity simulations for each scenario (reference and mitigation). The
10 overall impact of climate, boundary conditions and AP emissions is obtained from the basic
11 simulations by withdrawing (H) from (R) or (M). In order to investigate the regional effects of
12 climate change, the first step consists in using constant present-day AP emission and boundary
13 conditions and then change the climate forcing (R1-H and M1-H). However, in order to explore
14 the climate response under gradually changing AP emissions – yet avoiding performing
15 transient simulation – the sensitivity to regional climate change is also tested with future AP
16 emissions (R3-R4 and M3–M4). Symmetrically, the impact of emissions under constant climate
17 and boundary conditions is explored for the present climate (R2-H and M2-H) and the future
18 climate (R3-R5 and M3-M5). Last, the impact of boundary conditions is derived from the
19 differences R6-H and M6-H. We decided to ignore the impact of gradually changing climate
20 and emissions on the role of the boundary conditions, in order to avoid increasing the
21 dimension of the sensitivity matrix to be explored.

22 The results are provided in Figure 5 and Figure 6 as boxplots whose colour match the key
23 provided in the last column of Table 2. Each sensitivity simulation is decadal. Instead of giving
24 the difference of the temporal averages (such as on the maps in the previous figures), we first
25 aggregate spatially by taking the mean over Western Europe (5W, 15E, 40N, 55N) and then we

1 compute the distribution of differences between the two sets of decadal simulations: that is 55
2 independent combinations of individual years. These distributions of 55 differences are
3 presented here as box and whisker plots where the boxes provide the three inner quartiles
4 and the whiskers provide the extremes of the distribution. A cross is given where the
5 distribution of difference is statistically significantly different from zero (student t-test with a
6 95% confidence interval).

7 Multi-annual sensitivity experiments are common practice in climate studies, but annual
8 simulations are often used in atmospheric chemistry studies to investigate the impact of
9 emission changes or boundary conditions. However, the spread of the distributions obtained
10 here demonstrate the need to use multi-annual sensitivity simulations in order to provide a
11 quantitative perspective of the uncertainty whereas the qualitative conclusions would be
12 unchanged.

13 The differences between the sensitivity experiments performed under present-day or future
14 conditions (the two shades of orange and blue) also emphasize the need to explore the impact
15 of regional climate change and AP emissions under gradually changing conditions. Whereas
16 the relevance of transient approaches are often pointed out in base-case projections (Langner
17 et al., 2012a), it is not common practice in sensitivity experiments addressing the disentangling
18 of various contributions (Hedegaard et al., 2012; Manders et al., 2012).

19 **4.3.2 Results**

20 Ozone

21 Ozone is presented here (Figure 5), as in Section 4.2, as the average summertime daily
22 maximum as well as SOMO35 and we find again that the overall projection (including all
23 factors: white boxes) consists in a decrease by 2050 for both scenarios for O_3^{\max} and for the

1 mitigation scenario for SOMO35 while a small increase is found under the reference scenario
2 for SOMO35. In all cases the changes are statistically significant.

3 We find that the role of AP emissions change (boxes in blue shadings) dominates over the
4 impact of regional climate change (boxes in orange shadings). For SOMO35, the relative
5 change attributed to climate ranges from 3% (± 8) to 5% (± 10), while the response when
6 changing emissions ranges from -24% (± 10) to -43% (± 7). Recent studies on ozone
7 projections relying on air pollutant emissions prescribed by the RCPs also reported that
8 anthropogenic emission changes dominate over the effect of climate (Fiore et al., 2012;
9 Hedegaard et al., 2012; Katragkou et al., 2011; Langner et al., 2012a; Langner et al., 2012b; Lei
10 et al., 2012; Manders et al., 2012). The fact that we use air pollutant emission projections
11 based on explicit mitigation policies adds robustness to this finding.

12 Regional climate is found to constitute a significant penalty under present-day emissions (dark
13 orange box) according to all metrics and scenarios. However, the response is not that large:
14 below about $1\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for O_3^{max} . This moderate impact is not surprising compared to the figures
15 reported elsewhere where differences rarely exceed a few ppb (Andersson and Engardt, 2010;
16 Katragkou et al., 2011; Langner et al., 2012a; Langner et al., 2012b), only (Manders et al., 2012)
17 found increases that could reach 5-10 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. A more innovative finding lies in the assessment
18 of the climate penalty under future AP emission (light orange box). We find that the penalty
19 will decrease in magnitude and even become a net benefit for O_3^{max} under the mitigation
20 scenario. The fact that projected climate change can contribute to decrease ozone levels was
21 never reported before and highlights the need to account for the AQ policies when addressing
22 the climate penalty. Whereas there are examples in the literature of assessments including
23 combined climate and emission changes, sensitivity attribution studies are systematically
24 performed under present-day conditions. We show here that the future context must be
25 accounted for, even in the sensitivity analysis.

1 Ozone projections in Western Europe are actually more sensitive to background
2 concentrations changes than to the penalty/benefit brought about by regional climate change.
3 The tropospheric background ozone change constitutes a penalty under the reference scenario
4 and a benefit under the mitigation case. These opposite trends stem from the joint evolution
5 of global emissions and global climate and were also reported in the global chemistry climate
6 projections for these scenarios (Szopa et al., 2012; Young et al., 2012). It is worth emphasising
7 that in the global CTM, chemistry and climate are addressed jointly, it is therefore not possible
8 to isolate to what extent these opposite trends are a result of AP emission changes in distant
9 areas or a result of global climate on chemistry. In the mitigation scenario the decreasing
10 background ozone burden contributes to increasing the benefit already obtained thanks to the
11 reduction of AP emissions. But in the reference scenario, the compensation between a lower
12 magnitude of AP emission changes, and a penalty brought about by the increasing ozone
13 background yields the penalty seen for SOMO35 in the net response.

14 As mentioned in the introduction, regional climate change acts on ozone through several
15 pathways: (1) it favours the emission of important precursors such as biogenic volatile organic
16 compounds, (2) it has an impact on both chemical kinetics (through temperature and water
17 vapour availability) as well as photochemical processes (through the incoming short wave
18 radiation) and (3) it drives the frequency of weather patterns favourable for the build-up of
19 pollutants and the turbulent mixing in the planetary boundary layer.

20 (Katrakou et al., 2010) demonstrated, on the basis of sensitivity simulations, that biogenic
21 emission, temperature and radiation have a comparable contribution to simulated changes.
22 With regards to biogenic emissions, isoprene is a major factor (Meleux et al., 2007). Here we
23 found isoprene emissions increases by 2050 of 15% and 34% for the mitigation and reference
24 scenario, respectively. These numbers are moderate compared to existing estimates of end-of-
25 the-century changes reaching 100% (Andersson and Engardt, 2010; Katrakou et al., 2011;

1 Meleux et al., 2007) but they are in line with the 20 to 25% increase in 2050 compared to 2000
2 for the RCP4.5 in (Langner et al., 2012b). The sensitivity study of (Andersson and Engardt, 2010;
3 Katragkou et al., 2011) reports an increased production of O₃ of 1-2µg m⁻³ for a 30% increase
4 of biogenic emissions. While we cannot give comparable estimates without performing a
5 dedicated sensitivity study, we can infer from existing studies that biogenic emission constitute
6 probably a significant fraction of the O₃^{max} change attributed to climate change.

7 A last important feature of Figure 5 regards the role of the meteorological driver. We pointed
8 out in Section 4.2 that switching from a reanalysis to a climate simulation had a strong impact
9 on modelled air quality. The brown boxes in Figure 5 give a more quantitative view of this
10 sensitivity where we find that SOMO35 is 282% (±124) higher when using reanalyses compared
11 to a historical regional climate model. Such behaviour was not unexpected: similar findings
12 were mentioned in the few studies that proceeded to a similar comparison (Katragkou et al.,
13 2011; Manders et al., 2012). Nevertheless this bias raises serious concern on the uncertainty of
14 such assessments.

15 Particulate matter

16 The same framework is applied to disentangle the different driving factors in the projections of
17 particulate matter (Figure 6).

18 Again, the contribution of AP emissions is found to largely dominate over the regional climate
19 signal, in agreement with (Hedegaard et al., 2012). This feature is even more pronounced than
20 for ozone and the net decrease for PM_{2.5} attributed to AP emission reaches -6056% (±76) and -
21 7565% (±76) for the reference and mitigation scenarios, respectively, out of a net change (all
22 factors considered) of -6569% (±85) and -7969% (±75). The contribution of long range
23 transport for PM_{2.5} is small because of their shorter lifetime but not negligible for the
24 mitigation scenarios.

1 With the present set of climate forcing, we find that regional climate change constitutes a
2 slight benefit for PM_{2.5} concentrations. The increase in precipitations in the future (Figure 2)
3 certainly participates to this trend. But the magnitude of this benefit will decrease gradually in
4 the future ~~down to becoming non-significant for the mitigation scenario.~~

5 This climate benefit for PM_{2.5} is contradictory compared to the penalty reported in previous
6 studies (Hedegaard et al., 2012; Manders et al., 2012; Nyiri et al., 2010) The lack of robustness
7 regarding the impact of climate on PM_{2.5} was pointed out for the U.S. by (Jacob and Winner,
8 2009; Tai et al., 2012). The spread of precipitation projections in regional climate models
9 (Christensen and Christensen, 2007) constitutes a major challenge in narrowing the
10 uncertainty of the impact of climate on particulate matter.

11 ~~The uncertainty brought about when switching from a reanalysis to a regional climate model~~
12 ~~was already a concern for ozone, but this feature is more prominent for particulate matter:~~
13 ~~PM_{2.5} concentrations are 60% (±10) higher when using reanalyses as a meteorological driver. It~~
14 ~~thus competes in magnitude with all the other factors, which was not systematically the case~~
15 ~~for ozone. This increased sensitivity was also reported by (Manders et al., 2012).~~

16 The attribution analysis for individual particulate components (not shown) is in line with the
17 main findings for PM_{2.5}: a domination of AP emissions, moderate contribution of boundary
18 conditions and benefit of climate change. The only feature that is worth mentioning is a
19 stronger impact of climate for nitrate and ammonia: from -5% (±11~~2~~) to ~~-9~~14% (±15~~9~~)
20 depending on the scenarios, as compared to sulphates: from ~~-2~~1% (±8~~5~~) to ~~-2~~3% (±9~~5~~). This
21 sensitivity highlights that beyond precipitations and the related washout (that do not
22 discriminate particulate components) other climate factors (temperature, relative humidity)
23 play a role in the formation of secondary aerosol species. If a significant sensitivity to climate
24 was expected for sulphate (through water vapour changes and subsequent availability of the
25 OH radical) (Hedegaard et al., 2008), our results show that ammonium nitrate is also affected

1 by climate change (through the temperature dependence of its formation process) (Bessagnet
2 et al., 2004).

3 **4.3.3 Mapping the indicator of the climate penalty / benefit**

4 The isolated contribution of regional climate change to the net projected air pollution change
5 is given for both scenarios as maps in Figure 7. These maps are a composite of the differences
6 obtained when comparing the decadal experiments under future and current climate, with
7 future and current emissions, i.e. an average of the orange boxes in Figure 5 and Figure 6. The
8 indicator is coloured in red (blue) to indicate the penalty (benefit) brought about by climate
9 change when it leads to increasing (decreasing) air pollutant concentrations.

10 In this figure, we only discuss SOMO35 since its response is very similar to O_3^{\max} . A penalty
11 dominates over continental Europe with the largest increases found over southern Europe,
12 while more modest increases are found over Northern Europe, even leading to decreases over
13 the British Isles, corroborating the findings of (Andersson and Engardt, 2010; Langner et al.,
14 2012b). The largest changes are not systematically located over areas exhibiting high ozone
15 levels such as the Mediterranean, emphasising the role of biogenic precursors (Meleux et al.,
16 2007).

17 For $PM_{2.5}$, regional climate change constitutes mostly a benefit by decreasing the
18 concentrations. Over Morocco a penalty is found, which can be related to the decrease of
19 precipitation in this area (Figure 2). The penalty over the North Atlantic under the mitigation
20 scenario is likely attributed to sea-salts since significant increases of surface wind speed are
21 found in this area in winter and spring under the RCP2.6. ~~Amongst all constituents contributing
22 to the total $PM_{2.5}$, only ammonia appeared correlated with the slight penalty over Germany
23 indicating an exacerbated sensitivity of the ammonia formation process to climate parameters
24 in this area.~~

1 5 Conclusion

2 We presented an analysis of combined projections of air quality and climate impact at the
3 regional scale over Europe under the latest CMIP5 climate scenarios produced for the Fifth
4 Assessment Report of IPCC. The regional modelling system includes global and regional climate
5 as well as global and regional chemistry. The global fields are those delivered in the context of
6 well established international exercises (CMIP5 for the climate and ACCMIP for the chemistry).
7 Emissions of trace species follow the recent Representative Concentration Pathways for the
8 global models while an update is used over Europe by using the scenarios developed for the
9 Global Energy Assessment.

10 The use of recent emissions and consistent suite of models offers the opportunity to confront
11 our findings with the literature and identify robust features in the overall projections of air
12 quality and possible penalty and benefits brought about by climate change. The present setup
13 also allows performing sensitivity simulations in order to disentangle the respective
14 contribution of climate, air quality mitigation and background changes.

15 An important approximation in the design of the modelling chain is that we used an offline
16 regional air quality model, hence neglecting feedbacks of chemistry onto climate at the
17 regional scale. The whole issue of short lived climate forcers is thus excluded from the present
18 assessment (Grell and Baklanov, 2011; Löndahl et al., 2010; UNEP, 2011).

19 The first prerequisite when using an air quality model to investigate the impact of climate
20 consists in switching the meteorological driver from reanalyses or forecast to a climate model.

21 This step has ~~critical-significant~~ consequences on the impact model. The climate fields that we
22 used in the present study suffer from a cold and wet bias, as a result of a flaw in the North
23 Atlantic oceanic circulation. When using climate fields instead of reanalyses, daily mean
24 summertime ozone decreases from ~~89.690.5~~ to ~~84.18~~ $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ~~and annual mean PM_{2.5} decrease~~

1 | ~~from 9.1 to 5.5~~ $\mu\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$. Similar biases were reported before (Katragkou et al., 2011; Manders et
2 | al., 2012), but this feature is of course sensitive to the climate model selected and others had
3 | more satisfactory results (Hedegaard et al., 2008).

4 | Using an ensemble of climate models (such as the forthcoming CORDEX ensemble of regional
5 | projections) would allow minimizing the biases attributed to the climate model. Whereas it is
6 | common practice in climate impact studies, it raises a significant computing challenge for air
7 | quality projections that are often as demanding as the climate modelling itself. Alternatively,
8 | emerging initiatives proposing statistical adjustments of the climate model could be
9 | contemplated (Colette et al., 2012c).

10 | Our air quality and climate projections indicate that exposure to air pollution will decrease
11 | substantively by 2050 according to the mitigation pathway (that aims at keeping global
12 | warming below 2°C by the end of the century) where exposure weighted SOMO35 and PM_{2.5}
13 | will be reduced by ~~80.479.6%~~ and ~~78.071.4%~~, respectively. For the reference scenario (ignoring
14 | any climate policy) the perspective is more balanced with a slight increase of SOMO35
15 | (~~7.48.8%~~) while PM_{2.5} nevertheless decreases (by ~~61.859.7%~~).

16 | As far as the impact of climate alone on the net projected change is concerned, some of the
17 | features obtained with this new modelling suite appear robust when compared to the
18 | literature (Hedegaard et al., 2008; Hedegaard et al., 2012; Katragkou et al., 2011; Langner et
19 | al., 2012a; Langner et al., 2012b; Manders et al., 2012; Meleux et al., 2007; Szopa et al., 2006).

20 | The geographical patterns of projected impact of climate on ozone indicate an increase over
21 | Southern continental Europe and a decrease over Northern Europe and the British Isles. The
22 | decrease in the North Western part of the domain is a very robust feature. As pointed out in
23 | (Langner et al., 2012b), the increase over the southern part of the domain is more sensitive as
24 | it shifts from the continental surfaces (Hedegaard et al., 2012; Manders et al., 2012; Meleux et

1 al., 2007) to a maximum over the Mediterranean (Andersson and Engardt, 2010). Our results
2 are somewhat half-way between the two options.

3 The geographical patterns of the impact of climate on particulate matter appear much less
4 robust, as emphasized by (Tai et al., 2012). With the set of climate forcing used here, we
5 obtain a benefit for PM_{2.5} whereas penalties were reported by (Hedegaard et al., 2012;
6 Manders et al., 2012). This lack of robustness must be related to the spread of precipitation
7 projections in regional climate models (Christensen and Christensen, 2007).

8 A quantitative comparison of the driving factors has been conducted. The climate penalty is
9 compensated by the projected changes in precursor emissions and to a lesser extent by long-
10 range transport. Whereas the first studies on the sole impact of climate on ozone pointed
11 toward a strong penalty brought about by climate change, more recent assessments including
12 air pollutant emission projections already emphasized the larger role of the latter (Hedegaard
13 et al., 2012; Langner et al., 2012a). As far as long range transport is concerned, a significant
14 contribution was already envisaged by (Langner et al., 2012a; Szopa et al., 2006).

15 We conclude that the overall climate penalty bearing upon ozone is confirmed, and its
16 geographical patterns present some degree of robustness. At the same time, its importance
17 should not be overstated. On a quantitative basis, we find that the air quality legislation being
18 envisaged today should be able to counterbalance the climate penalty. On the contrary, the
19 sensitivity to background changes (resulting from both long range transport and the impact of
20 global climate change on the ozone burden) was overlooked in the literature, whereas its
21 impact competes even more than the climate penalty with the beneficial air quality legislation.

22 For particulate matter, the small benefit brought about by climate change is largely dominated
23 by the response attributed to changes in air pollutant emissions, while the contribution of
24 boundary conditions is moderate. We note however that there is no consensus whether

1 climate change constitutes a penalty or a benefit for particulate matter (Jacob and Winner,
2 2009). At the same time a considerable attention is devoted to the investigation of direct and
3 indirect impact of aerosols on climate. Increasing the robustness of the anticipated impact of
4 climate change on particulate matter should become a key research priority in the coming
5 years.

6 At this stage, our evaluation of uncertainty remains limited since the results are confined to a
7 comprehensive and up-to-date but *individual* suite of models and scenarios. Our study calls
8 for a more coordinated approach using an ensemble of models for both climate and air quality.
9 While such a coordinated exercise has been conducted before at global scale (e.g. ACCMIP),
10 there is no equivalent at the regional scale.

11 Would such an experiment be implemented in the future, there are good chances that the
12 modelling community could provide more quantitative inputs in terms of climate
13 penalty/benefit for ozone over Europe. It remains difficult to give an estimate of the level of
14 understanding of the contribution of distant sources because of the lack of significant coverage
15 in the literature devoted to regional air quality projections. However, this contribution is
16 expected to be significant for ozone, perhaps even more so than the impact of regional climate
17 change. The issue of particulate matter is much less mature, if the contribution of long range
18 transport is probably limited, the impact of climate is uncertain.

19 **6 Acknowledgements**

20 The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union's Seventh
21 Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant agreement no. 282687 (ATOPICA). The
22 French Ministry in charge of Ecology also supported this activity in particular through its
23 Primequal Programme, together with ADEME (SALUT'AIR). The GIS climat-environnement-
24 société supported the ACHIA project. This investigation also benefited from helpful discussions

1 with partners of the Topic Centre on Air Quality and Climate Mitigation of the European
2 Environment Agency (Robert Koelemeijer - PBL, Rob Maas - RIVM, John von Aardenne - EEA).
3 Om Tripathi (now at Univ. Arizona) is acknowledged for his work with the IPSLcm5 downscaling
4 tools and Gabriele Curci provided insightful suggestions with regards to the biogenic emissions.
5

1 **7 Tables and Figures**

2

	GEA 2005	GEA CLE1/2050	GEA CLE2/2050
NOx	13.1	4.7	1.9
NMVOG	9.6	4.3	2.2
PPM	2.2	0.8	0.5


3 Table 1 : Total annual emissions (kt/yr) of NO_x (in NO₂ equivalent), non-methane VOCs and
 4 primary particulate matter (PPM, finer than 2.5µm in diameter) aggregated over the 27
 5 countries of the European Union in the gridded GEA emission projections for 2005 (historical
 6 year), and 2050 under the Reference (CLE1) and Mitigation (CLE2) scenarios.

	Climate	Boundary Conditions	AP Emissions	Key to Figure 5&6
Historical (H)	1995-2004	1996-2005	CLE 2005	
Hindcast (E)	1998-2007 (ERA-interim)	1996-2005	CLE 2005	E-H
Reference (R)	2045-2054 / RCP8.5	2045-2054 / RCP8.5	CLE1 2050	R-H
Mitigation (M)	2045-2054 / RCP2.6	2045-2054 / RCP2.6	CLE2 2050	M-H
R1	2045-2054 / RCP8.5	1996-2005	CLE 2005	R1-H
R2	1995-2004	1996-2005	CLE1 2050	R2-H
R3	2045-2054 / RCP8.5	1996-2005	CLE1 2050	R3-R4
R4	1995-2004	1996-2005	CLE1 2050	R3-R4
R5	2045-2054 / RCP8.5	1996-2005	CLE 2005	R3-R5
R6	1995-2004	2045-2054 / RCP8.5	CLE 2005	R6-H
M1	2045-2054 / RCP2.6	1996-2005	CLE 2005	M1-H
M2	1995-2004	1996-2005	CLE2 2050	M2-H
M3	2045-2054 / RCP2.6	1996-2005	CLE2 2050	M3-M4
M4	1995-2004	1996-2005	CLE2 2050	M3-M4
M5	2045-2054 / RCP2.6	1996-2005	CLE 2005	M3-M5
M6	1995-2004	2045-2054 / RCP2.6	CLE 2005	M6- H

7 Table 2 : Synthesis of the model setup for the basic simulations (H, E, R, M discussed in Section
 8 4.1 and 4.2) as well as for the sensitivity experiments (Section 4.3). The key to the legend of
 9 Figure 5 and Figure 6 is also given in the last column.


10

1



2 Figure 1: Mean sea level pressure in the regional climate model for winter (December-
3 January-February, DJF, left) and summer (June-July-August, JJA, right) and for the two
4 representations of current climate: historical (obtained with the climate simulation) and
5 hindcast (obtained with the reanalysis). For each panel, the average is over 10 years.

6



2 Figure 2 : Left column: summer time (JJA) high 2-m daily mean temperatures (95th quantile, K)
 3 and right column: annual mean precipitations (mm/day). On the first row we display the
 4 absolute results of the historical climate simulation and on the following row the differences
 5 compared to the later for the hindcast, the 2050 reference and the 2050 mitigation
 6 projections.

Commentaire [AC1]: only the right column has been updated




Figure 3: Top row (from left to right): average fields of O_3 as summertime average of the daily maxima (O_3^{\max} , $\mu g m^{-3}$), and SOMO35 ($\mu g m^{-3} day$) in the control (2005) simulation (averaged over 10 years corresponding to the current climate). Following rows: difference between the

Commentaire [AC2]: the whole figure has been updated

simulations for the reanalysed hindcast and then for the reference and mitigation 2050 projections taken with respect to the historical climate simulation (2005). The differences are only displayed where significant given the interannual variability of ten years.







Figure 4 : Same as Figure 3, for PM_{2.5} (annual mean, µg m⁻³)

Commentaire [AC3]: the whole figure has been updated




Figure 5: Contribution of the background air pollution (violet), regional emissions (blue shadings), and climate change (orange shadings) to the total projected changes (white) in O_3 concentration as summer average of the daily max (O_3^{max}), and SOMO35 averaged over Western Europe in 2050 according to the reference (left) and mitigation (right) scenarios. In each case, we display net differences compared to a control selected to isolate one of the factor. A colour key to the scenario is given in Table 2. The sensitivity to the meteorological driver (either historical climate or reanalyses) is also given (brown). The sensitivity to emission and climate is investigated for both present and future conditions, hence the duplicate blue and orange boxes. A cross is marked when the distribution is significantly different from zero. The bottom axis provides the absolute difference and the relative difference with regards to the historical simulation is given as percentages on the top axis.

Commentaire [AC4]: the whole figure has been updated




Figure 6: Same as Figure 5 for PM_{2.5}.

Commentaire [AC5]: the whole figure has been updated




Figure 7: Map of the contribution of the regional climate to the projected change in air quality (from top to bottom: SOMO35, and PM_{2.5}) for the reference (left) and mitigation (right) scenarios. A positive sign (red/yellow) indicates a climate penalty (increase air pollutant concentrations), whereas a negative sign (blue/violet) shows that future climate tends to reduce detrimental air pollution levels.

Commentaire [AC6]: the whole figure has been updated

8 References

- Amann, M., Bertok, I., Borken-Kleefeld, J., Cofala, J., Heyes, C., Höglund-Isaksson, L., Klimont, Z., Nguyen, B., Posch, M., Rafaj, P., Sandler, R., Schöpp, W., Wagner, F., Winiwarter, W., 2011. Cost-effective control of air quality and greenhouse gases in Europe: Modeling and policy applications. *Environmental Modelling and Software* 26, 1489-1501.
- Amann, M., Lutz, M., 2000. The revision of the air quality legislation in the European Union related to ground-level ozone. *Journal of Hazardous Materials* 78, 41-62.
- Andersson, C., Engardt, M., 2010. European ozone in a future climate: Importance of changes in dry deposition and isoprene emissions. *J. Geophys. Res.* 115, D02303.
- Bessagnet, B., Hodzic, A., Vautard, R., Beekmann, M., Cheinet, S., Honore, C., Liousse, C., Rouil, L., 2004. Aerosol modeling with CHIMERE - preliminary evaluation at the continental scale. *Atmospheric Environment* 38, 2803-2817.
- Bessagnet, B., Menut, L., Curci, G., Hodzic, A., Guillaume, B., Liousse, C., Moukhtar, S., Pun, B., Seigneur, C., Schulz, M., 2008. Regional modeling of carbonaceous aerosols over Europe - focus on secondary organic aerosols. *Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry* 61, 175-202.
- Butler, T.M., Stock, Z.S., Russo, M.R., Denier van der Gon, H.A.C., Lawrence, M.G., 2012. Megacity ozone air quality under four alternative future scenarios. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 4413-4428.
- Christensen, J., Christensen, O., 2007. A summary of the PRUDENCE model projections of changes in European climate by the end of this century. *Climatic Change* 81, 7-30.
- Cohan, D.S., Napelenok, S.L., 2011. Air Quality Response Modeling for Decision Support. *Atmosphere* 2, 407-425.
- Colette, A., Granier, C., Hodnebrog, O., Jakobs, H., Maurizi, A., Nyiri, A., Bessagnet, B., D'Angiola, A., D'Isidoro, M., Gauss, M., Meleux, F., Memmesheimer, M., Mieville, A., Rouil, L., Russo, F., Solberg, S., Stordal, F., Tampieri, F., 2011. Air quality trends in Europe over the past decade: a first multi-model assessment. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 11, 11657-11678.

Colette, A., Granier, C., Hodnebrog, O., Jakobs, H., Maurizi, A., Nyiri, A., Rao, S., Amann, M., Bessagnet, B., D'Angiola, A., Gauss, M., Heyes, C., Klimont, Z., Meleux, F., Memmesheimer, M., Mieville, A., Rouil, L., Russo, F., Schucht, S., Simpson, D., Stordal, F., Tampieri, F., Vrac, M., 2012a. Future air quality in Europe: a multi-model assessment of projected exposure to ozone. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 10613-10630.

Colette, A., Koelemeijer, R., Mellios, G., Schucht, S., Péré, J.-C., Kouridis, C., Bessagnet, B., Eerens, H., Van Velze, K., Rouil, L., 2012b. Cobenefits of climate and air pollution regulations, The context of the European Commission Roadmap for moving to a low carbon economy in 2050, in: Agency, E.E. (Ed.), *Technical Report of the European Topic Centre on Air Quality and Climate Mitigation*. ETC/ACM - EEA, Copenhagen, p. 78.

Colette, A., Vautard, R., Vrac, M., 2012c. Regional climate downscaling with prior statistical correction of the global climate forcing. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 39, L13707.

Curci, G., 2006. *European Biogenic Isoprene Emissions Constrained by Satellite Observations of Formaldehyde*. Univ. of L'Aquila.

Dee, D.P., Uppala, S.M., Simmons, A.J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M.A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A.C.M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A.J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S.B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E.V., Isaksen, I., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A.P., Monge-Sanz, B.M., Morcrette, J.J., Park, B.K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.N., Vitart, F., 2011. The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 137, 553-597.

Dufresne, J.-L., Foujols, M.-A., Denvil, S., Caubel, A., Marti, O., Aumont, O., Balkanski, Y., Bekki, S., Bellenger, H., Benschila, R., Bony, S., Bopp, L., Braconnot, P., Brockmann, P., Cadule, P., Cheruy, F., Codron, F., Cozic, A., Cugnet, D., de Noblet, N., Duvel, J.-P., Ethé, C., Fairhead, L., Fichefet, T., Flavoni, S., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Guez, L., Guilyardi, E.,

- Hauglustaine, D., Hourdin, F., Idelkadi, A., Ghattas, J., Joussaume, S., Kageyama, M., Krinner, G., Labetoulle, S., Lahellec, A., Lefebvre, M.-P., Lefevre, F., Levy, C., Li, Z.X., Lloyd, J., Lott, F., Madec, G., Mancip, M., Marchand, M., Masson, S., Meurdesoif, Y., Mignot, J., Musat, I., Parouty, S., Polcher, J., Rio, C., Schulz, M., Swingedouw, D., Szopa, S., Talandier, C., Terray, P., Viovy, N., 2013. Climate change projections using the IPSL-CM5 Earth System Model: from CMIP3 to CMIP5 Climate Dynamics in press.
- EEA, 2004. Air pollution and climate change policies in Europe: exploring linkages and the added value of an integrated approach, EEA Technical report. European Environment Agency, Copenhagen.
- Fichefet, T., Morales-Maqueda, A., 1999. Modelling the influence of snow accumulation and snow-ice formation on the seasonal cycle of the Antarctic sea-ice cover. *Climate Dynamics* 15, 251-268.
- Fiore, A.M., Naik, V., Spracklen, D.V., Steiner, A., Unger, N., Prather, M., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P.J., Cionni, I., Collins, W.J., Dalsoren, S., Eyring, V., Folberth, G.A., Ginoux, P., Horowitz, L.W., Josse, B., Lamarque, J.-F., MacKenzie, I.A., Nagashima, T., O'Connor, F.M., Righi, M., Rumbold, S.T., Shindell, D.T., Skeie, R.B., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Takemura, T., Zeng, G., 2012. Global air quality and climate. *Chemical Society Reviews* 41, 6663-6683.
- Folberth, G.A., Hauglustaine, D.A., Lathièrè, J., Brocheton, F., 2006. Interactive chemistry in the Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique general circulation model: model description and impact analysis of biogenic hydrocarbons on tropospheric chemistry. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 6, 2273-2319.
- Giorgi, F., Jones, C., Asrar, G.R., 2009. Addressing climate information needs at the regional level: the CORDEX framework. *WMO Bulletin* 58, 175-183.
- Grell, G., Baklanov, A., 2011. Integrated modeling for forecasting weather and air quality: A call for fully coupled approaches. *Atmospheric Environment* 45, 6845-6851.

- Guenther, A., Karl, T., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Palmer, P.I., Geron, C., 2006. Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions using MEGAN (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature). *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 6, 3181-3210.
- Hamaoui-Lagué, L., Meleux, F., Beekmann, M., Bessagnet, B., Générumont, S., Cellier, P., Léinois, L., 2012. Improving ammonia emissions in air quality modelling for France. *Atmospheric Environment*.
- Hauglustaine, D.A., Hourdin, F., Jourdain, L., Filiberti, M.A., Walters, S., Lamarque, J.F., Holland, E.A., 2004. Interactive chemistry in the Laboratoire de Météorologie Dynamique general circulation model: Description and background tropospheric chemistry evaluation. *J. Geophys. Res.* 109, D04314.
- Hedegaard, G.B., Brandt, J., Christensen, J.H., Frohn, L.M., Geels, C., Hansen, K.M., Stendel, M., 2008. Impacts of climate change on air pollution levels in the Northern Hemisphere with special focus on Europe and the Arctic. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 8, 3337-3367.
- Hedegaard, G.B., Christensen, J.H., Brandt, J., 2012. The relative importance of impacts from climate change vs. emissions change on air pollution levels in the 21st century. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* 12, 24501-24530.
- Honoré, C., Rouil, L., Vautard, R., Beekmann, M., Bessagnet, B., Dufour, A., Elichegaray, C., Flaud, J.M., Malherbe, L., Meleux, F., Menut, L., Martin, D., Peuch, A., Peuch, V.H., Poisson, N., 2008. Predictability of European air quality: Assessment of 3 years of operational forecasts and analyses by the PREV'AIR system. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres* 113.
- Hourdin, F., Foujols, M.-A., Codron, F., Guemas, V., Dufresne, J.-L., Bony, S., Denvil, S., Guez, L., Lott, F., Ghattas, J., Braconnot, P., Marti, O., Meurdesoif, Y., Bopp, L., 2012. Impact of the LMDZ atmospheric grid configuration on the climate and sensitivity of the IPSL-CM5A coupled model. *Climate Dynamics*, 1-26.
- Hourdin, F., Musat, I., Bony, S., Braconnot, P., Codron, F., Dufresne, J.-L., Fairhead, L., Filiberti, M.-A., Friedlingstein, P., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Krinner, G., LeVan, P., Li, Z.-X., Lott, F., 2006. The

- LMDZ4 general circulation model: climate performance and sensitivity to parametrized physics with emphasis on tropical convection. *Climate Dynamics* 27, 787-813.
- IPCC, 2007. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in: Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K.B., Tignor, M., Miller, H.L. (Eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.
- Jacob, D.J., Winner, D.A., 2009. Effect of climate change on air quality. *Atmospheric Environment* 43, 51-63.
- Katragkou, E., Zanis, P., Kioutsioukis, I., Tegoulas, I., Melas, D., Krüger, B.C., Coppola, E., 2011. Future climate change impacts on summer surface ozone from regional climate-air quality simulations over Europe. *J. Geophys. Res.* 116, D22307.
- Katragkou, E., Zanis, P., Tegoulas, I., Melas, D., Kioutsioukis, I., Krüger, B.C., Huszar, P., Halenka, T., Rauscher, S., 2010. Decadal regional air quality simulations over Europe in present climate: near surface ozone sensitivity to external meteorological forcing. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 10, 11805-11821.
- Krinner, G., Viovy, N., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N., Ogee, J., Polcher, J., Friedlingstein, P., Ciais, P., Sitch, S., Prentice, I.C., 2005. A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled atmosphere-biosphere system. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 19, GB1015.
- Lamarque, J.-F., Bond, T.C., Eyring, V., Granier, C., Heil, A., Klimont, Z., Lee, D., Liousse, C., Mieville, A., Owen, B., Schultz, M.G., Shindell, D., Smith, S.J., Stehfest, E., Van Aardenne, J., Cooper, O.R., Kainuma, M., Mahowald, N., McConnell, J.R., Naik, V., Riahi, K., van Vuuren, D.P., 2010. Historical (1850–2000) gridded anthropogenic and biomass burning emissions of reactive gases and aerosols: methodology and application. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 10, 7017-7039.
- Lamarque, J.F., Shindell, D.T., Josse, B., Young, P.J., Cionni, I., Eyring, V., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P., Collins, W.J., Doherty, R., Dalsoren, S., Faluvegi, G., Folberth, G., Ghan, S.J.,

- Horowitz, L.W., Lee, Y.H., MacKenzie, I.A., Nagashima, T., Naik, V., Plummer, D., Righi, M., Rumbold, S., Schulz, M., Skeie, R.B., Stevenson, D.S., Strode, S., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Voulgarakis, A., Zeng, G., 2012. The Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP): overview and description of models, simulations and climate diagnostics. *Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss.* 5, 2445-2502.
- Langner, J., Engardt, M., Andersson, C., 2012a. European summer surface ozone 1990-2100. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 10097-10105.
- Langner, J., Engardt, M., Baklanov, A., Christensen, J.H., Gauss, M., Geels, C., Hedegaard, G.B., Nuterman, R., Simpson, D., Soares, J., Sofiev, M., Wind, P., Zakey, A., 2012b. A multi-model study of impacts of climate change on surface ozone in Europe. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 10423-10440.
- Lei, H., Wuebbles, D.J., Liang, X.-Z., 2012. Projected risk of high ozone episodes in 2050. *Atmospheric Environment* 59, 567-577.
- Löndahl, J., Swietlicki, E., Lindgren, E., Loft, S., 2010. Aerosol exposure versus aerosol cooling of climate: what is the optimal emission reduction strategy for human health? *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 10, 9441-9449.
- Madec, G., Delecluse, P., Imbard, M., Levy, C., 1997. Ocean general circulation model reference manual 3., Technical Report. LODYC, Paris, p. 91.
- Manders, A.M.M., van Meijgaard, E., Mues, A.C., Kranenburg, R., van Ulft, L.H., Schaap, M., 2012. The impact of differences in large-scale circulation output from climate models on the regional modeling of ozone and PM. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 9441-9458.
- Marti, O., Braconnot, P., Dufresne, J.L., Bellier, J., Benshila, R., Bony, S., Brockmann, P., Cadule, P., Caubel, A., Codron, F., de Noblet, N., Denvil, S., Fairhead, L., Fichefet, T., Foujols, M.A., Friedlingstein, P., Goosse, H., Grandpeix, J.Y., Guilyardi, E., Hourdin, F., Idelkadi, A., Kageyama, M., Krinner, G., Lévy, C., Madec, G., Mignot, J., Musat, I., Swingedouw, D.,

- Talandier, C., 2010. Key features of the IPSL ocean atmosphere model and its sensitivity to atmospheric resolution. *Climate Dynamics* 34, 1-26.
- Meleux, F., Solmon, F., Giorgi, F., 2007. Increase in summer European ozone amounts due to climate change. *Atmospheric Environment* 41, 7577-7587.
- Menut, L., 2003. Adjoint modeling for atmospheric pollution process sensitivity at regional scale. *J. Geophys. Res.* 108, 8562.
- Menut, L., Bessagnet, B., Khvorostiyannov, D., Beekmann, M., Colette, A., Coll, I., Gurci, G., Foret, G., Mailler, S., Monge, J.-L., Turquety, S., Valari, M., Vautard, R., Vivanco, M.G., 2012a. Regional atmospheric composition modeling with CHIMERE. *Geosci. Model Dev.* under review.
- Menut, L., Tripathi, O.P., Colette, A., Vautard, R., Flaounas, R., Bessagnet, B., 2012b. Evaluation of regional climate model forcing with an air quality perspective. *Climate Dynamics*.
- Messner, S., Strubegger, M., 1995. User's guide for MESSAGE III. , in: IIASA (Ed.), Report. IIASA, Laxenburg.
- Nyiri, A., Gauss, M., Tsyro, S., Wind, P., Haugen, J.E., 2010. Future Air Quality, including Climate Change in Transboundary Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground Level Ozone in Europe in 2008, EMEP Report. EMEP, Oslo.
- Rao, S., Chirkov, V., Dentener, F., Dingenen, R., Pachauri, S., Purohit, P., Amann, M., Heyes, C., Kinney, P., Kolp, P., Klimont, Z., Riahi, K., Schoepp, W., 2012. Environmental Modeling and Methods for Estimation of the Global Health Impacts of Air Pollution. *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*, 1-10.
- Riahi, K., Dentener, F., Gielen, D., Grubler, A., Jewell, J., Klimont, Z., Krey, V., McCollum, D., Pachauri, S., Rao, S., van Ruijven, B., van Vuuren, D.P., Wilson, C., 2012. Energy Pathways for Sustainable Development, in: Nakicenovic, N. (Ed.), *Global Energy Assessment: Toward a Sustainable Future*. IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria and Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY.

- Riahi, K., Grubler, A., Nakicenovic, N., 2007. Scenarios of long-term socio-economic and environmental development under climate stabilisation. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change* 74.
- Rouïl, L., Honore, C., Vautard, R., Beekmann, M., Bessagnet, B., Malherbe, L., Meleux, F., Dufour, A., Elichegaray, C., Flaud, J.M., Menut, L., Martin, D., Peuch, A., Peuch, V.H., Poisson, N., 2009. PREVAIR An Operational Forecasting and Mapping System for Air Quality in Europe. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 90, 73-83.
- Shindell, D.T., Lamarque, J.F., Schulz, M., Flanner, M., Jiao, C., Chin, M., Young, P., Lee, Y.H., Rotstayn, L., Milly, G., Faluvegi, G., Balkanski, Y., Collins, W.J., Conley, A.J., Dalsoren, S., Easter, R., Ghan, S., Horowitz, L., Liu, X., Myhre, G., Nagashima, T., Naik, V., Rumbold, S., Skeie, R., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Takemura, T., Voulgarakis, A., Yoon, J.H., 2012. Radiative forcing in the ACCMIP historical and future climate simulations. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* 12, 21105-21210.
- Simpson, D., Benedictow, A., Berge, H., Bergstrom, R., Emberson, L.D., Fagerli, H., Flechard, C.R., Hayman, G.D., Gauss, M., Jonson, J.E., Jenkin, M.E., Nyiri, A., Richter, C., Semeena, V.S., Tsyro, S., Tuovinen, J.P., Valdebenito, A., Wind, P., 2012. The EMEP MSC-W chemical transport model - technical description. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 7825-7865.
- Skamarock, W.C., Klemp, J.B., Dudhia, J., Gill, D.O., Barker, D.M., Duda, M.G., Huang, X.Y., Wang, W., Powers, J.G., 2008. A Description of the Advanced Research WRF Version 3, Technical Note, NCAR.
- Solazzo, E., Bianconi, R., Pirovano, G., Matthias, V., Vautard, R., Moran, M.D., Wyatt Appel, K., Bessagnet, B., Brandt, J., Christensen, J.H., Chemel, C., Coll, I., Ferreira, J., Forkel, R., Francis, X.V., Grell, G., Grossi, P., Hansen, A.B., Miranda, A.I., Nopmongkol, U., Prank, M., Sartelet, K.N., Schaap, M., Silver, J.D., Sokhi, R.S., Vira, J., Werhahn, J., Wolke, R., Yarwood, G., Zhang, J., Rao, S.T., Galmarini, S., 2012a. Operational model evaluation for particulate matter in Europe and North America in the context of AQMEII. *Atmospheric Environment* 53, 75-92.

- Solazzo, E., Bianconi, R., Vautard, R., Appel, K.W., Moran, M.D., Hogrefe, C., Bessagnet, B., Brandt, J.r., Christensen, J.H., Chemel, C., Coll, I., Denier van der Gon, H., Ferreira, J., Forkel, R., Francis, X.V., Grell, G., Grossi, P., Hansen, A.B., Jericevic, A., Kraljevic, L., Miranda, A.I., Nopmongcol, U., Pirovano, G., Prank, M., Riccio, A., Sartelet, K.N., Schaap, M., Silver, J.D., Sokhi, R.S., Vira, J., Werhahn, J., Wolke, R., Yarwood, G., Zhang, J., Rao, S.T., Galmarini, S., 2012b. Model evaluation and ensemble modelling of surface-level ozone in Europe and North America in the context of AQMEII. *Atmospheric Environment* 53, 60-74.
- Szopa, S., Balkanski, Y., Schulz, M., Bekki, S., Cugnet, D., Fortems-Cheiney, A., Turquety, S., Cozic, A., Déandris, C., Hauglustaine, D., Idelkadi, A., Lathièrè, J., Lefevre, F., Marchand, M., Vuolo, R., Yan, N., Dufresne, J.L., 2012. Aerosol and ozone changes as forcing for climate evolution between 1850 and 2100. *Climate Dynamics*, 1-28.
- Szopa, S., Hauglustaine, D.A., Vautard, R., Menut, L., 2006. Future global tropospheric ozone changes and impact on European air quality. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 33, L14805.
- Tai, A.P.K., Mickley, L.J., Jacob, D.J., 2012. Impact of 2000-2050 climate change on fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) air quality inferred from a multi-model analysis of meteorological modes. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 12, 11329-11337.
- Taylor, K.E., Stouffer, R.J., Meehl, G.A., 2012. An Overview of CMIP5 and the Experiment Design. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 93, 485-498.
- UNEP, 2011. *Integrated Assessment of Black Carbon and Tropospheric Ozone: Summary for Policy Makers*. UNEP.
- van Loon, M., Vautard, R., Schaap, M., Bergström, R., Bessagnet, B., Brandt, J., Builtjes, P.J.H., Christensen, J.H., Cuvelier, C., Graff, A., Jonson, J.E., Krol, M., Langner, J., Roberts, P., Rouil, L., Stern, R., Tarrasón, L., Thunis, P., Vignati, E., White, L., Wind, P., 2007. Evaluation of long-term ozone simulations from seven regional air quality models and their ensemble. *Atmospheric Environment* 41, 2083-2097.

- van Vuuren, D., Edmonds, J., Kainuma, M., Riahi, K., Thomson, A., Hibbard, K., Hurtt, G., Kram, T., Krey, V., Lamarque, J.-F., Masui, T., Meinshausen, M., Nakicenovic, N., Smith, S., Rose, S., 2011. The representative concentration pathways: an overview. *Climatic Change* 109, 5-31.
- Vautard, R., Brankovic, C., Colette, A., Deque, M., Fernandez, J., Gobiet, A., Goergen, K., Nikulin, G., Guettler, I., Keuler, K., Warrach-Sagi, K., Teichmann, C., Halenka, T., 2012. The simulation of European heat waves from an ensemble of regional climate models within the EURO-CORDEX project. *Climate Dynamics in revision*.
- Vautard, R., Builtjes, P.H.J., Thunis, P., Cuvelier, C., Bedogni, M., Bessagnet, B., Honore, C., Moussiopoulos, N., Pirovano, G., Schaap, M., Stern, R., Tarrason, L., Wind, P., 2007. Evaluation and intercomparison of Ozone and PM10 simulations by several chemistry transport models over four European cities within the CityDelta project. *Atmospheric Environment* 41, 173-188.
- Vautard, R., Honoré, C., Beekmann, M., Rouil, L., 2005. Simulation of ozone during the August 2003 heat wave and emission control scenarios. *Atmospheric Environment* 39, 2957-2967.
- Wu, S., Mickley, L.J., Leibensperger, E.M., Jacob, D.J., Rind, D., Streets, D.G., 2008. Effects of 2000–2050 global change on ozone air quality in the United States. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 113, n/a-n/a.
- Young, P.J., Archibald, A.T., Bowman, K.W., Lamarque, J.F., Naik, V., Stevenson, D.S., Tilmes, S., Voulgarakis, A., Wild, O., Bergmann, D., Cameron-Smith, P., Cionni, I., Collins, W.J., Dalsoren, S.B., Doherty, R.M., Eyring, V., Faluvegi, G., Horowitz, L.W., Josse, B., Lee, Y.H., MacKenzie, I.A., Nagashima, T., Plummer, D.A., Righi, M., Rumbold, S.T., Skeie, R.B., Shindell, D.T., Strode, S.A., Sudo, K., Szopa, S., Zeng, G., 2012. Pre-industrial to end 21st century projections of tropospheric ozone from the Atmospheric Chemistry and Climate Model Intercomparison Project (ACCMIP). *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* 12, 21615-21677.

Zanis, P., Katragkou, E., Tegoulas, I., Poupkou, A., Melas, D., Huszar, P., Giorgi, F., 2011. Evaluation of near surface ozone in air quality simulations forced by a regional climate model over Europe for the period 1991-2000. *Atmospheric Environment* 45, 6489-6500.

Zyryanov, D., Foret, G., Eremenko, M., Beekmann, M., Cammas, J.P., D'Isidoro, M., Elbern, H., Flemming, J., Friese, E., Kioutsioutkis, I., Maurizi, A., Melas, D., Meleux, F., Menut, L., Moinat, P., Peuch, V.H., Poupkou, A., Razinger, M., Schultz, M., Stein, O., Suttie, A.M., Valdebenito, A., Zerefos, C., Dufour, G., Bergametti, G., Flaud, J.M., 2011. 3-D evaluation of tropospheric ozone simulations by an ensemble of regional Chemistry Transport Model. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* 11, 28797-28849.