Answer to Referee 1

Daniel Rieger[1*], Andrea Steiner[2], Vanessa Bachmann[2], Philipp Gasch[1], Jochen Förstner[2], Konrad Deetz[1], Bernhard Vogel[1], and Heike Vogel[1]

[1]Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Hermann-von-Helmholtz-Platz 1, 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany
[2]Deutscher Wetterdienst, Frankfurter Str. 135, 63067 Offenbach, Germany
[*]Now at: Deutscher Wetterdienst, Frankfurter Str. 135, 63067 Offenbach, Germany

Correspondence to: Daniel Rieger (daniel.rieger@dwd.de)

Dear Referee 1,

we thank you for your comments on our manuscript. Below we present our answers to your comments (italics) accompanied by the changes we performed in the manuscript (blue color).

On behalf of the authors

5   Daniel Rieger

1) The fact to explicitly diagnose mineral dust emissions and transport is not new, but it seems this was not the case in the German weather forecast model. This is thus a large improvement even if it is not a new scientific research. Many models are calculating all aerosols able to modify the radiation properties, including in forecast, as, for example, for the COPERNICUS CAMS daily forecast. Please improve the bibliography about forecast in Europe. For analysis or regional forecast, some of

10   *them are already online to account for the direct and indirect effects of aerosols (see papers by A.Baklanov in ACP, among others).*

A literature review on dust forecasts and impacts on solar power production has been included in the paper:

Driven by the growth of renewable energy shares in electricity production, the accuracy of solar NWP and power forecasts has to meet increasing standards. Thus, also the literature in this field of application is growing, even if still being a young area

15   of research.

Current operational NWP models are unable to account for the effect of mineral dust during such episodes as they are relying on aerosol climatologies. Nikitidou et al. (2014) investigated the spatial and temporal variability of aerosols over Europe and stress the necessity for near real-time forecasts of aerosol loads instead of climatological values. In areas of high desert-dust intrusions or intense anthropogenic activities, the reduction of direct normal irradiance (DNI) was found to reach values of up

20   to 35 % and 45 %, corresponding to 4 and 6 $\mathrm{kW\,h\,m^{-2}}$ per day. Recently, Casado-Rubio et al. (2017) showed that considering prognostic dust aerosol considerably improves DNI forecasts in Spain and the Canary Islands which is of great importance for concentrating solar power (CSP). These findings are supported by the study of Schroedter-Homscheidt et al. (2016) who apply an interactive aerosol scheme for clear sky cases. Gleeson et al. (2016) highlight the importance of using accurate aerosol concentration, optical properties and an accurate vertical distribution of aerosols in NWP forecasts of shortwave radiative fluxes

in case of a wildfire. Concerning mineral dust, Bangert et al. (2012) have shown a significant potential to improve the surface temperature forecasts during a strong Saharan dust event over southern Germany if dust as well as direct and indirect effects are considered in the NWP system COSMO-ART (COnsortium for Small-scale MOdeling - Aerosol and Reactive Trace gases).

5 Since recent research has shown the importance of meteorology and aerosol or chemistry feedback in many research areas, many online coupled mesoscale meteorology atmospheric chemistry models have been developed. Baklanov et al. (2014) gives an extensive overview of such models in Europe. Considering prognostic aerosols and the interactions with the atmosphere in NWP models is costly in terms of computing time. However, thanks to the increase in computer power, there are several modelling systems worldwide providing daily forecasts of mineral dust distributions. Table 1 provides an overview on current operational mineral dust forecasting models. A more detailed description of available daily mineral dust forecasts and activities

10 in this research area can be found at the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Sand and Dust Storm Warning Advisory and Assessment System (SDS-WAS) (2017).

Table 1. Overview on operational mineral dust forecasting models.

Model name	Institution	References
BSC-DREAM8b	Barcelona Supercomputing Center	Pérez et al. (2006); Basart et al. (2012)
NMMB/BSC-Dust	Barcelona Supercomputing Center	Pérez et al. (2011); Haustein et al. (2012)
DREAM8-NMME-MACC	South East European Virtual Climate Change Center	Nickovic et al. (2001); Pérez et al. (2006)
LOTOS-EUROS	The Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research	Manders-Groot et al. (2016); Manders et al. (2017)
SKIRON	University of Athens	Spyrou et al. (2010)
CAMS	European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts	Morcrette et al. (2009); Benedetti et al. (2009)
Met Office UM	UK Met Office	Woodward (2001, 2011)
NGAC	National Centers for Environmental Prediction	Lu et al. (2016)
GEOS-5	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Nowottnick et al. (2011)

A quantitative example of solar energy reduction due to mineral dust is given by Calinoiu et al. (2013). For 5 dust episodes in Romania, a reduction in collectable PV power of 6.5 % to 17.5 % was reported. Perry and Troccoli (2015) investigated a controlled fire burn in Canberra, Australia, and indicated an overall PV power reduction of 7 % during the study period and a

15 peak reduction of 27 %. Besides a more accurate radiation forecast, operational dust forecasts also provide the possibility to account for the deposition of dust on PV panels and for better maintenance planning. For a review on energy yield losses by dust deposition see Sayyah et al. (2014).

Within this paper, the focus is on the beginning of April 2014, when Central Europe was influenced by an intensive Saharan dust outbreak.

2) This model improvement is applied for a specific application, the photovoltaic power production. This aspect is more new and more related to the ACP topics. The study present two different topic: the improvement of the model and the impact of the improved mineral dust calculations on PV production. But there is no validation of the improved model, on the specific test case (only one day). However, many measurements exist and could give a larger confidence on the quantification of the impact.

We focus on 4 April 2016 and provide some measures for 3 April and 5 April 2016 as well in table 5 for the reason, that this was one of the most severe Saharan dust events with respect to the economic loss for the PV power sector. A disadvantage of focusing on this episode is that most of the time the target region is covered by clouds. Hence, only very few remote sensing measurements for very short time ranges are available. We now included measurements where available and appropriate as you will see in the answers to question 6.

We agree that a much larger time range is necessary to validate the mineral dust forecasts. For this reason, daily mineral dust forecasts are performed as part of the PerduS project since October 2016. The results of these forecasts are continuously validated during Saharan dust outbreaks. The results so far are promising and it is planned to publish an in-depth validation of the mineral dust forecasts at a later stage of the PerduS project.

3) The section 2 is very complete about the model description. Many details are provided, but, if this is not new for this paper, some references would be enough.

The mineral dust emission scheme and the aerosol-cloud interaction that are incorporated into ICON-ART are not described consistently in another publication so far. We think that the details we provide in section 2 are absolutely necessary for the readers to have access to the underlying equations and methods. From our own experience, we know how frustrating it can be to search for this information distributed amongst several publications and sometimes even grey literature.

4) 2.2 Radiation: We agree that the complex refractive index is probably one of the sensitivie parameter for this kind of study. Please provide more precisely the values used (a figure for example). Did you already made sensitivity tests to have the range of uncertainty of your results?

We have conducted a literature review in order to put the refractive indices used into perspective. The studies used are shown in Tab. 2 and the values for the real part of the refractive index in Fig. 1 and for the imaginary part in Fig. 2. The specific studies and the influence of the mineralogical composition of the mineral dust are discussed in detail in Gasch (2016, pp. 55), Stanelle (2008) and Stanelle et al. (2010). Due to this existing discussion and as our values of the refractive index are the same ones as used for COSMO-ART we would like to limit the discussion in this publication.

It is beyond the scope of our study to investigate the uncertainties in our results due to the radiative properties of mineral dust, as many factors can contribute.

First, the usage of Mie calculations assumes sphericity for the mineral dust particles, an assumption which is generally not fulfilled for single particles, but introduces negligible errors for flux related quantities and albedo (Mishchenko et al., 1995, 1997). Second, the mineralogical composition of the dust is assumed to be spatially homogeneous, an assumption which is generally also not fulfilled (Petzold et al., 2009) and presents a great uncertainty in mineral dust radiative forcing (Myhre and Stordal, 2001). A problem prevents a more detailed description for our study: The variation in the refractive index within source regions can be considerable (Petzold et al., 2009) and we are not aware of spatially highly resolved observations from our source region. Third, the optical properties of mineral dust can change during transport, e.g. due to transport processes or coating with other materials, a mechanism which is not included in ICON-ART so far. Nevertheless, we can achieve a good representation of the mineral dust radiative properties, as the influence of differences in the refractive indices is small compared to the influence of a varying size distribution (Myhre and Stordal, 2001). The latter effect is represented in ICON-ART due to the newly implemented size-dependent parametrization of the optical properties.

In order to validate the above statement, we conducted Mie calculations for the refractive indices differing most from ours (Fig. 3), namely that of Volz (1972) and Köpke et al. (1997) , as well as for varying median diameters (Fig. 4). The results clearly show that changes in the size distribution lead to a stronger signal than changes in the refractive index. The effect of the size-dependent parametrization of optical properties is discussed in more detail in Gasch (2016, p. 94).

Please note, that as part of the review process in Gasch et al. (2017) we have added a more detailed discussion on the assumption of spatially homogeneous mineral dust mineralogical composition there.

In summary, as the change of the mineral dust radiative properties can be caused by various processes, we think that further research is necessary before the uncertainties of the results can be answered quantitatively. A better description of the radiative properties of mineral dust can yield further improvements of the impact on photovoltaic power generation.

Table 2. Overview of studies determining mineral dust refractive indices.

Publication	Characterisation	Source	Collection	Waveband	Acronym
Petzold et al. (2009)	SAMUM	Sahara	Aircraft	SW	SAM
Helmert et al. (2007)	Compilation	Various	-	SW, LW	HEL
Fouquart et al. (1987)	ECLATS	Sahara	Niamey, Niger	LW	FOU
Köpke et al. (1997)	GOADS Comp.	Various	-	SW, LW	KOE
Volz (1973)		Sahara	Barbados	LW	SVO
Volz (1972)	Rain-out Dust	Various	USA	SW, LW	DVO
Dubovik et al. (2002)	AERONET	Various	Worldwide	SW	DUB

5) 4 Model setup: the two possible ways are explained: 1. Compare the NWP with the climatology and the really resolved dust emissions. 2. Use only the really resolved model to quantify the impact of dust on PV production, The authors stated that only the 2nd approach is useful for their study. Why not the two? The approach 1 will provide the benefit to have a better

methodology for dust and to quantify the confidence is the future results about PV. The 2 will provide the impact on PV. The two are complementary.

As proposed, we repeated our case study using the outlined approach 1. Therefore, a setup was chosen that mimics the operational system as close as possible. In this case, which is titled FF_{clim}, the bulk-microphysics scheme (Doms et al., 2011; Seifert, 2006) together with the accompanying calculation of the ice effective radii used in operational NWP and the aerosol climatology by Tegen et al. (1997) are used. The corresponding results are given in the following.

The first row in Figure 5 is identical to Figure 6 in the paper. It shows the horizontal distribution of SIS for the simulations TT and FF, and for the satellite product SARAH-2 at 4 April 2014, 12:30 UTC. In addition, the horizontal distribution of SIS for the simulation FF_{clim} is plotted in the second row. Figure 6 (cf. Figure 9 in the paper) shows the results of forecasted SIS and normalized PV power at four locations for the FF_{clim}, FF and TT cases in comparison to surface observations. Additionally, Table 3 (cf. Table 5 in the paper) gives the statistical measures for all 26 pyranometer stations. A clear improvement with respect to the default setup FF_{clim} can be observed in all three evaluations. The partially large differences between the FF_{clim} and the FF or TT case are the cumulative result of the described changes in the setup (bulk-microphysics, ice effective radii, aerosol climatology) and would not allow to quantify the improvement due to prognostic mineral dust and dust atmosphere interactions. Thus, we decided to present this additional evaluation in the answer to the reviewer only.

6+7) Specifically, because there is no real validation of the test case with measurements in the paper. Before to quantify the impact of dust on PV, it is necessary to prove that your simulation has correct order of magnitude and variability of AOD and surface PM2.5 and PM10. A lot of measurements exist in Europe and could be used for that (AERONET, EMEP).

5.1 Simulated mineral dust distribution: The Figure 6 (originally 5) presents comparisons between the model and measurements. It is necessary to done the same with the Figure 4 for AOD, by using AERONET stations for example. If you consider there is no enough stations in your nested domain, you can present, at least, a comparison with the largest one. As you are studying only one day, this would be also interesting to see model validation for the days before, in order to better understand if the mineral dust plume is well transported or not.

We thank the reviewer for the suggestion to add additional comparisons with measurements to our paper. We decided to include a comparison with AERONET stations. Additionally, we outline our evaluation strategy in the following:

For evaluating our modelling results we have thoroughly explored different types of available measurements. As a first step, we qualitatively compared our results to satellite, ceilometer, lidar and AERONET observations. The spatial distribution and temporal evolution of mineral dust as simulated over Europe is in good agreement with the available measurements. Unfortunately, these observations of mineral dust are hampered by the presence of clouds. The areas with high mineral dust loads coincide also with cloudy conditions and only few observation time steps within the period of interest are available for a quantitative comparisons. Nevertheless, in Figure 7 and Figure 8 we show mineral dust aerosol optical depth (AOD) as forecasted by with 20 km grid spacing in case TT and on top of that AERONET observations in filled circles (Figure 8 only due to the number of available measurements in the domain). The observations are averaged within a time interval of 1

Table 3. Statistical measures describing the quality of the simulated PV power values using data of all 26 pyranometer stations for different lead times. Values are given for the root mean square error (RMSE), the mean absolute error (MAE), the bias (BIAS), the standard deviation of errors (STD) as well as the minimum and maximum error (E_{min}, E_{max}) in W m^{-2}. Bold values mark the better simulation.

20140403 (lead time 0-23h)						
	RMSE	MAE	BIAS	STD	E_{min}	E_{max}
FF$_{clim}$	0.113	0.053	0.041	0.106	**-0.336**	0.603
FF	0.099	0.049	0.013	0.099	-0.534	**0.554**
TT	**0.092**	**0.044**	**0.006**	**0 092**	-0.542	0.563

20140404 (lead time 24-47h)						
	RMSE	MAE	BIAS	STD	E_{min}	E_{max}
FF$_{clim}$	0.152	0.079	0.057	0.141	**-0.605**	0.568
FF	0.124	0.059	0.009	0.123	-0.660	0.546
TT	**0.103**	**0.048**	**-0.004**	**0.103**	-0.672	**0.442**

20140405 (lead time 48-72h)						
	RMSE	MAE	BIAS	STD	E_{min}	E_{max}
FF$_{clim}$	0.156	0.082	0.067	0.141	-0.437	0.629
FF	0.110	0.054	0.029	0.106	**-0.405**	0.577
TT	**0.079**	**0.040**	**0.003**	**0.079**	-0.418	**0.418**

20140403-20140405 (lead time 0-72h)						
	RMSE	MAE	BIAS	STD	E_{min}	E_{max}
FF$_{clim}$	0.141	0.071	0.055	0.130	**-0.605**	0.629
FF	0.111	0.054	0.017	0.110	-0.660	0.577
TT	**0.092**	**0.044**	**0.001**	**0.092**	-0.672	**0.563**

hour before target time and represent level 2 coarse mode AOD at 500 nm (derived with Direct Sun Algorithm (DSA) Version 2, see also https://aeronet.gsfc.nasa.gov/version2_table.pdf and Spectral Deconvolution Algorithm (SDA) Version 4.1, see https://aeronet.gsfc.nasa.gov/new_web/PDF/tauf_tauc_technical_memo.pdf). The arrival of the dust cloud in eastern Germany is observed by the station Lindenberg. There is only a small spatial discrepancy with the forecasted location of the dust cloud.

5 Note, that the region with rapid increase of mineral dust concentration also visualizes the weak frontal zone spanning from the North Sea over eastern Germany to the south-east of Europe (cf. section 3 in the paper). The magnitude of predicted AOD values in the closer surrounding match the observation well. The arrival of the dust cloud in Hohenpeissenberg (south Germany) is observed on the preceding day. The arrival is a little bit too late, but the temporal increase in dust load seems to be captured very well (not shown as only 14 observation points are available). The disadvantage and reason, why we did not

10 evaluate against ground based PM2.5 and PM10 measurements is that they are not able to give a selective information about

the mineral dust concentration. And for high-mountain stations, which may be less influenced by local emissions, there is in general a big difference between real and model altitude.

For the paper however we decided to show ground based observations of radiation due to their many advantages: dense spatial coverage, high temporal resolution, approved data quality. Ground based radiation measurements and related observation difficulties and influences are also best comparable with those of PV panels, where our objective is laid on. We also explained why satellite observations have to be treated with caution (see section 5.2). Not shown in the paper are evaluations against SYNOP observations of other meteorological parameters as they did not provide additional insight. As the reviewer proposed, we now included also the above mentioned comparison with AERONET stations in the paper in section 5.1:

A qualitative comparison to satellite, ceilometer and lidar observations shows that the spatial distribution and temporal evolution of mineral dust as simulated over Europe is in good agreement with the available measurements. Unfortunately, these observations of mineral dust are hampered by the presence of clouds. The areas with high mineral dust loads coincide also with cloudy conditions and only few observation time steps within the period of interest are available for a quantitative comparisons. In Figure 5 the mineral dust aerosol optical depth as forecasted at 20 km grid spacing for case TT is shown for 4 April 2014. On top of that, filled circles provide the corresponding AERONET measurements. The observations are averaged within a time interval of 1 hour before target time and represent level 2 coarse mode AOD at 500 nm (derived with Direct Sun Algorithm (DSA) Version 2 and Spectral Deconvolution Algorithm (SDA) Version 4.1). The arrival of the dust cloud in eastern Germany is observed by the station Lindenberg. There is only a small spatial discrepancy with the forecasted location of the dust cloud. Note, that the region with rapid increase of mineral dust concentration also visualizes the weak frontal zone spanning from the North Sea over eastern Germany to the south-east of Europe (cf. section 3).

8) What about local resuspension? The problem with mineral dust is not only the plume above the PV unit but also the deposition. The deposition is not only dry or wet, but there is also mainly very local emissions, due to resuspension and directly on the PV units.

For local resuspension of mineral dust we would have to account for the deposited amount. The availability of dust for resuspension out of this reservoir most likely also has to be parameterized with respect to the prevailing meteorological conditions since deposition. So far we do not have the capability to simulate the resuspension of mineral dust with ICON-ART. We believe that this process is of minor importance for our target region Germany. Therefore it is not in the focus of the current study.

However, it is a working package in our project PerduS, to parameterize the pollution of the PV panels due to dry and wet deposition as well as the cleaning effect of subsequent precipitation events. To be able to do this, one ingredient is to implement the aforementioned bookkeeping of the deposited mineral dust.

9) Some typos to check and correct (not all, just examples): p.2, l25: its influcence p.6, l.6: kinetic energye

The transport of mineral dust and its influence on atmospheric composition and radiation are not explicitly considered within conventional numerical weather prediction.

These percentages of kinetic energy are chosen such that particles in the largest mode are emitted first when the threshold friction velocity is exceeded.

Figure 1. Real part of refractive indices according to studies listed in Tab. 2 and as used in ICON-ART (B_{USE}). The borders of the RRTM radiation scheme wavebands are adumbrated as light grey lines in the background. The filled grey band represents the waveband present both in the longwave and shortwave part of the RRTM. Taken from Gasch (2016).

Figure 2. Same as Fig. 1, but for the imaginary part of refractive indices. Taken from Gasch (2016).

Figure 3. Influence of differences in refractive indices on optical properties for mode A. Taken from Gasch (2016).

Figure 4. Influence of varying median diameter on optical properties for mode A. Taken from Gasch (2016).

Figure 5. SIS of TT (left), FF (middle), SARAH-2 dataset by CM SAF (right) and FF$_{clim}$ (second line) on 4 April 2014 at 12:30 UTC in Germany. Dots: SIS at SYNOP (thin circle lines) and pyranometer stations (thicker circle lines).

Figure 6. Comparison of observed (black, by pyranometer) and simulated (TT in green, FF in red and FF_{clim} in dashed red) surface incoming shortwave irradiance (SIS, a-d) and the resulting computed normalized PV power (e-h) for the stations Mannheim, Meiningen, Trier and Weihenstephan on 4 April 2014, respectively. The normalization is done with respect to peak power.

Figure 7. Mineral dust optical depth at 500 nm over Germany on 4 April 2014 at 00 UTC, 06 UTC, 12 UTC and 18 UTC (TT case). Note the saw-tooth shape in the northern part which marks the margin of the high resolution (5 km) domain and must not be confused with mineral dust-free conditions.

Figure 8. Mineral dust optical depth at 500 nm over Europe on 4 April 2014 at 09 UTC, 12 UTC, 15 UTC and 18 UTC (TT case) at 20 km grid spacing. The filled circles represent observations from AERONET stations. Note the saw-tooth shape next to the boarders which marks the margin of nest R2B07 and must not be confused with mineral dust-free conditions.

References

Baklanov, A., Schlünzen, K., Suppan, P., Baldasano, J., Brunner, D., Aksoyoglu, S., Carmichael, G., Douros, J., Flemming, J., Forkel, R., Galmarini, S., Gauss, M., Grell, G., Hirtl, M., Joffre, S., Jorba, O., Kaas, E., Kaasik, M., Kallos, G., Kong, X., Korsholm, U., Kurganskiy, A., Kushta, J., Lohmann, U., Mahura, A., Manders-Groot, A., Maurizi, A., Moussiopoulos, N., Rao, S. T., Savage, N., Seigneur, C., Sokhi, R. S., Solazzo, E., Solomos, S., Sørensen, B., Tsegas, G., Vignati, E., Vogel, B., and Zhang, Y.: Online coupled regional meteorology chemistry models in Europe: current status and prospects, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14, 317–398, doi:10.5194/acp-14-317-2014, 2014.

Bangert, M., Nenes, A., Vogel, B., Vogel, H., Barahona, D., Karydis, V. A., Kumar, P., Kottmeier, C., and Blahak, U.: Saharan dust event impacts on cloud formation and radiation over Western Europe, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 4045–4063, https://dx.doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-4045-2012, 2012.

Basart, S., Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Cuevas, E., and Baldasano, J.: Development and evaluation of the BSC-DREAM8b dust regional model over Northern Africa, the Mediterranean and the Middle East, Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology, 64, 18 539, doi:10.3402/tellusb.v64i0.18539, https://doi.org/10.3402%2Ftellusb.v64i0.18539, 2012.

Benedetti, A., Morcrette, J.-J., Boucher, O., Dethof, A., Engelen, R. J., Fisher, M., Flentje, H., Huneeus, N., Jones, L., Kaiser, J. W., Kinne, S., Mangold, A., Razinger, M., Simmons, A. J., and Suttie, M.: Aerosol analysis and forecast in the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Integrated Forecast System: 2. Data assimilation, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 114, doi:10.1029/2008JD011115, http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011115, d13205, 2009.

Calinoiu, D., Paulescu, M., Ionel, I., Stefu, N., Pop, N., Boata, R., Pacurar, A., Gravila, P., Paulescu, E., and Trif-Tordai, G.: Influence of aerosols pollution on the amount of collectable solar energy, Energy Conversion and Management, 70, 76 – 82, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2013.02.012, 2013.

Casado-Rubio, J., Revuelta, M., Postigo, M., Martínez-Marco, I., and Yagüe, C.: A Postprocessing Methodology for Direct Normal Irradiance Forecasting Using Cloud Information and Aerosol Load Forecasts, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 56, 1595–1608, doi:10.1175/JAMC-D-16-0297.1, 2017.

Doms, G., Förstner, J., Heise, E., Herzog, H.-J., Mironov, D., Raschendorfer, M., Reinhardt, T., Ritter, B., Schrodin, R., Schulz, J.-P., and Vogel, G.: A Description of the Nonhydrostatic Regional COSMO Model. Part II: Physical Parameterization, Tech. rep., Consortium for Small-Scale Modelling, 2011.

Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, Thomas Fand Smirnov, A., Kaufman, Y. J., King, M. D., Tanré, D., and Slutsker, I.: Variability of absorption and optical properties of key aerosol types observed in worldwide locations, J. Atmos. Sci., 59, 590–608, doi:doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2002)059<0590:VOAAOP>2.0.CO;2, 2002.

Fouquart, Y., Bonnel, B., Brogniez, G., Buriez, J., Smith, L., Morcrette, J., and Cerf, A.: Observations of Saharan aerosols: Results of ECLATS field experiment. Part II: Broadband radiative characteristics of the aerosols and vertical radiative flux divergence, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 26, 38–52, 1987.

Gasch, P.: Numerical simulations of an exceptional dust event in the Eastern Mediterranean including the mineral dust radiative feedback, Master's thesis, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, http://www.imk-tro.edu/download/Masterarbeit_Philipp_Gasch.pdf, 1–125, 2016.

Gasch, P., Rieger, D., Walter, C., Khain, P., Levi, Y., Knippertz, P., and Vogel, B.: Revealing the meteorological drivers of the September 2015 severe dust event in the Eastern Mediterranean, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 2017, 1–37, doi:10.5194/acp-2017-11, https://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2017-11/, 2017.

Gleeson, E., Toll, V., Nielsen, K. P., Rontu, L., and Mašek, J.: Effects of aerosols on clear-sky solar radiation in the ALADIN-HIRLAM NWP system, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 16, 5933–5948, doi:10.5194/acp-16-5933-2016, 2016.

Haustein, K., Pérez, C., Baldasano, J. M., Jorba, O., Basart, S., Miller, R. L., Janjic, Z., Black, T., Nickovic, S., Todd, M. C., Washington, R., Müller, D., Tesche, M., Weinzierl, B., Esselborn, M., and Schladitz, A.: Atmospheric dust modeling from meso to global scales with the online NMMB/BSC-Dust model - Part 2: Experimental campaigns in Northern Africa, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 12, 2933–2958, doi:10.5194/acp-12-2933-2012, 2012.

Helmert, J., Heinold, B., Tegen, I., Hellmuth, O., and Wendisch, M.: On the direct and semidirect effects of Saharan dust over Europe: A modeling study, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 112, doi:10.1029/2006JD007444, D13208, 1–24, 2007.

Köpke, P., Hess, M., Schult, I., and Shettle, E.: Global aerosol data set, Tech. rep., Max-Planck-Institut für Meteorologie, Hamburg, 44 pp, 1997.

Lu, C.-H., da Silva, A., Wang, J., Moorthi, S., Chin, M., Colarco, P., Tang, Y., Bhattacharjee, P. S., Chen, S.-P., Chuang, H.-Y., Juang, H.-M. H., McQueen, J., and Iredell, M.: The implementation of NEMS GFS Aerosol Component (NGAC) Version 1.0 for global dust forecasting at NOAA/NCEP, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 1905–1919, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-1905-2016, 2016.

Manders, A. M. M., Builtjes, P. J. H., Curier, L., Denier van der Gon, H. A. C., Hendriks, C., Jonkers, S., Kranenburg, R., Kuenen, J., Segers, A. J., Timmermans, R. M. A., Visschedijk, A., Wichink Kruit, R. J., Van Pul, W. A. J., Sauter, F. J., van der Swaluw, E., Swart, D. P. J., Douros, J., Eskes, H., van Meijgaard, E., van Ulft, B., van Velthoven, P., Banzhaf, S., Mues, A., Stern, R., Fu, G., Lu, S., Heemink, A., van Velzen, N., and Schaap, M.: Curriculum Vitae of the LOTOS-EUROS (v2.0) chemistry transport model, Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 2017, 1–53, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-88, 2017.

Manders-Groot, A., Segers, A., and Jonkers, S.: LOTOS-EUROS v2.0 reference guide, TNO report, 2016.

Mishchenko, M., Lacis, A., Carlson, B., and Travis, L.: Nonsphericity of dust-like tropospheric aerosols: Implications for aerosol remote sensing and climate modeling, Geophys. Res. Lett., 22, 1077–1080, doi:10.1029/95GL00798, 1995.

Mishchenko, M. I., Travis, L. D., Kahn, R. A., and West, R. A.: Modeling phase functions for dustlike tropospheric aerosols using a shape mixture of randomly oriented polydisperse spheroids, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 102, 16 831–16 847, 1997.

Morcrette, J.-J., Boucher, O., Jones, L., Salmond, D., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A., Benedetti, A., Bonet, A., Kaiser, J. W., Razinger, M., Schulz, M., Serrar, S., Simmons, A. J., Sofiev, M., Suttie, M., Tompkins, A. M., and Untch, A.: Aerosol analysis and forecast in the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Integrated Forecast System: Forward modeling, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 114, 1–17, doi:10.1029/2008JD011235, 2009.

Myhre, G. and Stordal, F.: Global sensitivity experiments of the radiative forcing due to mineral aerosols, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 106, 18 193–18 204, 2001.

Nickovic, S., Kallos, G., Papadopoulos, A., and Kakaliagou, O.: A model for prediction of desert dust cycle in the atmosphere, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 106, 18 113–18 129, doi:10.1029/2000JD900794, 2001.

Nikitidou, E., Kazantzidis, A., and Salamalikis, V.: The aerosol effect on direct normal irradiance in Europe under clear skies, Renewable Energy, 68, 475 – 484, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2014.02.034, 2014.

Nowottnick, E., Colarco, P., da Silva, A., Hlavka, D., and McGill, M.: The fate of saharan dust across the atlantic and implications for a central american dust barrier, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 8415–8431, doi:10.5194/acp-11-8415-2011, 2011.

Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Baldasano, J. M., Sicard, M., Rocadenbosch, F., and Cachorro, V. E.: A long Saharan dust event over the western Mediterranean: Lidar, Sun photometer observations, and regional dust modeling, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 111, doi:10.1029/2005JD006579, 2006.

Pérez, C., Haustein, K., Janjic, Z., Jorba, O., Huneeus, N., Baldasano, J. M., Black, T., Basart, S., Nickovic, S., Miller, R. L., Perlwitz, J. P., Schulz, M., and Thomson, M.: Atmospheric dust modeling from meso to global scales with the online NMMB/BSC-Dust model - Part 1: Model description, annual simulations and evaluation, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 13 001–13 027, doi:10.5194/acp-11-13001-2011, 2011.

5   Perry, M. and Troccoli, A.: Impact of a fire burn on solar irradiance and PV power, Solar Energy, 114, 167 – 173, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2015.01.005, 2015.

Petzold, A., Rasp, K., Weinzierl, B., Esselborn, M., Hamburger, T., Dörnbrack, A., Kandler, K., Schütz, L., Knippertz, P., Fiebig, M., et al.: Saharan dust absorption and refractive index from aircraft-based observations during SAMUM 2006, Tellus B, 61, 118–130, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2008.00383.x, 2009.

10 Sayyah, A., Horenstein, M. N., and Mazumder, M. K.: Energy yield loss caused by dust deposition on photovoltaic panels, Solar Energy, 107, 576–604, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2014.05.030, 2014.

Schroedter-Homscheidt, M., Benedetti, A., and Killius, N.: Verification of ECMWF and ECMWF/MACC's global and direct irradiance forecasts with respect to solar electricity production forecasts, Meteorologische Zeitschrift, 26, 1–19, doi:10.1127/metz/2016/0676, 2016.

Seifert, A.: A revised cloud microphysical parameterization for COSMO-LME., COSMO News Letter No. 7, Proceedings from the 8th
15 COSMO General Meeting in Bucharest, pp. 25–28, 2006.

Spyrou, C., Mitsakou, C., Kallos, G., Louka, P., and Vlastou, G.: An improved limited area model for describing the dust cycle in the atmosphere, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 115, 1–19, doi:10.1029/2009JD013682, d17211, 2010.

Stanelle, T.: Wechselwirkungen von Mineralstaubpartikeln mit thermodynamischen und dynamischen Prozessen in der Atmosphäre über Westafrika, Wissenschaftliche Berichte des Instituts für Meteorologie und Klimaforschung des Karlsruher Instituts für Technologie; Band
20 48, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, 2008.

Stanelle, T., Vogel, B., Vogel, H., Bäumer, D., and Kottmeier, C.: Feedback between dust particles and atmospheric processes over West Africa during dust episodes in March 2006 and June 2007, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 10 771–10 788, doi:doi:10.5194/acp-10-10771-2010, 2010.

Tegen, I., Hollrig, P., Chin, M., Fung, I., Jacob, D., and Penner, J.: Contribution of different aerosol species to the global aerosol
25 extinction optical thickness: Estimates from model results, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 102, 23 895–23 915, doi:10.1029/97JD01864, 1997.

Volz, F. E.: Infrared refractive index of atmospheric aerosol substances, Appl. Opt., 11, 755–759, 1972.

Volz, F. E.: Infrared optical constants of ammonium sulfate, Sahara dust, volcanic pumice, and flyash, Appl. Opt., 12, 564–568, 1973.

Woodward, S.: Modeling the atmospheric life cycle and radiative impact of mineral dust in the Hadley Centre climate model, Journal of
30 Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 106, 18 155–18 166, doi:10.1029/2000JD900795, 2001.

Woodward, S.: Mineral Dust in HadGEM2, Met Office, Hadley Centre Technical Note 87, 2011.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Sand and Dust Storm Warning Advisory and Assessment System (SDS-WAS): The SDS-WAS programme at WMO, https://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/arep/wwrp/new/Sand_and_Dust_Storm.html, last accessed on 11 August 2017, 2017.

Answer to Referee 2

Daniel Rieger[1][*], Andrea Steiner[2], Vanessa Bachmann[2], Philipp Gasch[1], Jochen Förstner[2], Konrad Deetz[1], Bernhard Vogel[1], and Heike Vogel[1]

[1]Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Hermann-von-Helmholtz-Platz 1, 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany
[2]Deutscher Wetterdienst, Frankfurter Str. 135, 63067 Offenbach, Germany
[*]Now at: Deutscher Wetterdienst, Frankfurter Str. 135, 63067 Offenbach, Germany

Correspondence to: Daniel Rieger (daniel.rieger@dwd.de)

Dear Referee 2,

we thank you for your comments on our manuscript. Below we present our answers to your comments (italics) accompanied by the changes we performed in the manuscript (blue color).

On behalf of the authors

5 Daniel Rieger

1) How much would the deposition of dust on the solar panels contribute to discrepancies between forecast and obtained photovoltaic (PV) power production? Can this be estimated from modeled dust deposition?

This is a very good question. Indeed it is known from literature that soiling of solar panels leads to a degradation of their efficiency. Within the PerduS project we have currently started a measurement campaign to quantify the deposition of mineral dust
10 on solar panels and in parallel the self cleaning of the panels by precipitation. Based on these measurements, parameterizations will be derived and included into ICON-ART. This is ongoing research and subject of future publications.

2) Little information is given about existing studies evaluating the effect of improved dust forecasts on PV power production, also including areas other than Germany, and existing operational dust forecasts. I recommend adding a short review to the introduction.

15 A literature review on dust forecasts and impacts on PV power production has been included. For a detailed answer please see comment 1 to referee1.

3) How big is the effect of including dust in PV power forecasts for Germany compared to errors due to, for example, clouds (e.g. moist convection in summer)? As a perspective, this would be interesting to know, even if it may be small.

Forecast quality strongly depends on the weather situation, as you already suggested. There are different weather situations,
20 where NWP forecasts are afflicted with forecast uncertainties, which also propagate into power forecasts. For solar radiation and power forecasts Köhler et al. (2017) identifies NWP shortcomings concerning the correct representation of shallow cumulus behind cold fronts, Saharan dust outbreaks, and the spatial and temporal resolution of convection as well as low stratus. The question, which problem is the most pressing concerning PV power forecasts depends also on the scales you are interested in.

For a single PV farm, one missed convective event may be critical. In PV power forecasts for whole Germany, such an error would be averaged out or compensated by other errors. As in our example, mineral dust plumes can cover large areas. Mineral dust aerosol influences the atmosphere directly and indirectly and thereby governs not only the atmospheric transparency but also the formation and evolution of clouds and thus the amount of incoming radiation at the surface. A quantitative answer to your question can only be assessed by numerical simulations. Within the project PerduS we intend to investigate this question. Furthermore, the monetary value of PV power forecasts relying on NWP with online-coupled mineral dust aerosols will be assessed.

4) (P7, Lines 12-16) The authors use a tile approach to compute dust emission, but calculate the soil moisture correction for threshold friction velocity using only one value per grid, because the modeled soil moisture is only available per each grid cell. My impression is that it would have been more consistent to use a tile approach for moisture correction as well, i.e. using clay content and residual soil moisture for the soil type fractions together with the grid-scale soil moisture. Can the authors give an estimate of the difference/uncertainty related to either of the two approaches?

For a soil tile with lower-than-average residual soil moisture, the difference between the grid average soil moisture and the residual soil moisture is larger than it would be for a resolved soil moisture content. This leads to a higher soil moisture correction factor and, hence, reduced emissions in case of lower-than-average residual soil moisture and vice versa for higher-than-average residual soil moisture. In the end, the total emissions are calculated for each grid cell where underestimations from lower-than-average soil types and overestimations from higher-than-average soil types compensate each other to a certain degree. The error of this is difficult to quantify as it depends heavily on model resolution and source area. For source areas with rather uniform soil and a spatial extent much larger than the model grid cell area, the difference should be very small. Figure 1, figure 2 and figure 3 show the fractions of the most ubiquitous soil types in the Saharan region plotted on the original ICON grid. Generally, high fractions prevail. This underlines our point that the uncertainty related to the assumption of an average residual soil moisture content should be very low.

5) (P4, Line 23) The threshold friction velocity for particle entrainment is estimated based on the equilibrium of aerodynamic, cohesive, and gravitational forces; not only aerodynamic and cohesive forces (e.g. Marticorena and Bergametti, 1995; Shao and Lu, 2001).

We agree and modified the sentence according to the suggestion. We could not find a Shao and Lu (2001) publication and think you probably meant Shao and Lu (2000).

The threshold friction velocity is defined as the value of the friction velocity at an equilibrium of aerodynamic, cohesive, and gravitational forces (e.g. Marticorena and Bergametti, 1995; Shao and Lu, 2000).

6) (P4, Line 27) A soil density of 1500 kg m-3 seems to be rather small. More common is a value of 2650 kg m-3, which is also what was used by Shao and Lu (2000) in their derivation of u*t. Please give reasoning for using such a small value.

This is a mistake in the manuscript. We checked the code and in the code it is indeed $2650\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$. The value of $1500\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$ is the value of the bulk soil density which is used for a unit conversion of the soil water content. Thank you for pointing that out.

with $A_n = 0.0123$ and $\gamma_n = 3 \cdot 10^{-4}\,\mathrm{kg\,s^{-2}}$. $\rho_s = 2650\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$ is the density of the soil and g the gravitational acceleration.

5   *7) (P4, Line 29 "In contrast to Shao and Lu (2000)...") This sentence is misleading as it seems to suggest that the inclusion of correction factors for surface roughness and soil moisture are an improvement compared to the work of Shao and Lu (2000). The inclusion of such corrections is common in dust modeling and simply not within the scope of Shao and Lu's theoretical work. I therefore suggest rewording the sentence, for example, as: "For application in a regional model, we include correction factors to account for the effects of roughness elements and soil moisture on u*t (e.g. Shao, 2001)".*

10   We agree that this sentence is misleading and we rephrased it according to the suggestion.

For application in a global or regional model, we include correction factors to account for the effects of roughness elements (f_r) and soil moisture (f_η) on u_{*t} (e.g. Shao, 2001).

8) The authors frequently use the term "emission flux" throughout Section 2.1. For the sake of clarity, I think it is important to better differentiate between saltation flux (e.g. P5L5), and dust emission flux (e.g. P4L7, P5L23, P6L1).

15   The term emission flux was already used in contrast to saltation flux. To further increase the readability, we follow your suggestion and named the two fluxes uniformly saltation flux and dust emission flux.

The resulting saltation flux is then used to calculate a dust emission flux using the parameterization of Alfaro and Gomes (2001).

The following approach to calculate dust emission fluxes applies for one single soil type.

20   where $C_{white} = 0.7$ is a linear scaling parameter to adapt the dust emission flux to measurements.

By impaction of the saltating particles, the saltation flux leads to the release of small particles creating a dust emission flux.

This leads to the following equation that connects the saltation flux with the dust emission flux of aerosol mode l (Alfaro and Gomes, 2001):

over all saltation particle diameters weighted by their cross sectional areas yields the total dust emission flux of mode l:

25   As stated previously, a tile approach is used to calculate the dust emission flux.

To consider the subgrid-scale heterogenity of soil properties, the dust emission fluxes $F_{tv,l,i}$ are calculated for each soil type separately and the result is then weighted with the corresponding fraction of the soil to get the final dust emission flux:

The calculation of dust emission fluxes $F_{tv,l,i}$ for individual soil types within one grid element differs by the use of the individual soil particle size distributions $n_{s,i}(d_p)$.

30   *9) (P13, Line 13) Cloud coverage hinders comparison with satellite-based remote sensing, but not with measurements in general.*

We agree, but it is not only difficult for satellite-based remote sensing measurements but also for ground-based remote sensing measurements like sun photometers. Hence, we changed it to 'remote sensing measurements'.

Due to extensive cloud coverage, the comparison with remote sensing measurements is complicated.

10) (P17, Lines 6-7) Model variables at the closest grid points to the pyranometer stations were used as input for PV power estimation. Did you consider interpolating the meteorological variables to the corresponding locations? The difference might be small for a horizontal resolution of 5km though.

We did consider an interpolation, but we preferred to use nearest neighbor values. The reason for this is, that interpolating incoming short wave radiation for example in case of a cloud present at one grid point nearby and no cloud present at another grid point nearby leads to some average value which always contradicts measurements that are either influenced by a cloud or not. Furthermore, we agree that with a horizontal grid spacing of 5 km, the differences between the two methods should be sufficiently small.

11) (P5, Line 16) Why is the saltation flux weighted with the particle cross-sectional area?

We have added a statement to clarify this.

The total saltation flux F_{th} is the result of an integration over all saltation particle diameters weighted by the product of the cross sectional area and the number of particles (Vogel et al., 2006). This weighting represents the contribution of particle surface area at a certain diameter to the total soil surface area:

Technical comments:

For brevity, we will not reply to the technical comments and only state the changes performed in the manuscript.

- P2L33 and P3L1: Section (capital "S").

Section 2 provides an overview of the modeling system ICON-ART.

Section 3 summarizes the synoptic situation during the Saharan dust outbreak and section 4 describes the model setup.

- P4L30: No comma after "Equation 2"

Applying Equation 3, we can analytically derive the global minimum of the threshold friction velocity, which is needed in Equation 2.

- P5L1: Independent of

Independent of the size distribution

- P6L6: energy; also I suggest "kinetic energy are chosen such that particles in the largest mode are emitted first when the threshold friction velocity is exceeded".

These percentages of kinetic energy are chosen such that particles in the largest mode are emitted first when the threshold friction velocity is exceeded.

- P6L13: heterogeneity

To account for this subgrid-scale heterogeneity, a tile approach is introduced.

- P6L15: except for

defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) except for silt where silty loam is used instead.

- P7L7: corresponding instead of according

the result is then weighted with the corresponding fraction of the soil to get the final emission flux:

- P7L19-21: Sentence seems convoluted, please consider rephrasing.

To account for the influence of mineral dust on radiation, the optical properties of mineral dust are determined offline once. For this, Mie calculations are applied which require the complex refractive index of mineral dust (Mie, 1908) as input.

- P8L25: nucleus

Homogeneous freezing describes the formation of an ice particle without the involvement of a solid ice nucleus (IN).

- P9L17: As mineral dust particles serve as ice nuclei

As mineral dust serves as ice nuclei in ICON-ART it modifies the physical properties of the simulated clouds.

- P9L28: Albedo of the surface or of the PV module?

The surface albedo is required to calculate the reflected diffuse radiation.

Furthermore, the surface albedo and station height are necessary input parameters.

- P10L4: To my knowledge, "ridge" or "upper level high" are sufficient rather than "upper air ridge of high pressure".

On 1 and 2 April 2014, a large part of Europe is influenced by a ridge, whereas an elongated, pronounced trough lies over the eastern Atlantic.

- P13L7: in Figure 4 - P13L8: the spatial distribution

This can be seen in Figure 4 which shows the spatial distribution of mineral dust optical depth at 500 nm (in the following abbreviated with AOD) at different dates.

- P13L14-15: Suggest rewording as: "However, in clear sky regions, the amount of modeled mineral dust is of similar magnitude as that observed from satellite".

However, in clear sky regions, the amount of modeled mineral dust is of similar magnitude as that observed from satellite.

- P16L6: in case of TT

While the 5th percentile slightly increases in case of TT, the 95th percentile that indicates the overestimation of SIS is drastically reduced.

- P16L20-21: the part "not only were large contributions of PV capacity are installed" is not clear to me.

These are not only the regions where large contributions of PV capacity are installed (see Figure 1b of Köhler et al., 2017), but also the forecast of incoming solar radiation was challenged by the presence of clouds and aerosols as already discussed in section 3.

- Fig. 8: The green and blue lines are somewhat hard to differentiate. I suggest replacing one of the colors. Caption: "pyranometer observed"

The colors within Fig. 8 have been changed. As in subsequent figures, black is used for observations, red for the FF-case and green for the TT-case. The caption has been adapted: Comparison of observed (black, by pyranometer) and simulated (TT in green, FF in red) surface incoming shortwave irradiance (SIS, a-d) and the resulting computed normalized PV power (e-h)

for the stations Mannheim, Meiningen, Trier and Weihenstephan on 4 April 2014, respectively. The normalization is done with respect to peak power.

- P18L2: clouds

As mentioned before, a substantial amount of clouds was present on 4 April 2014.

- Fig. 9 Caption: corresponding difference instead of according difference

Temporal evolution of the difference in normalized PV power between TT and measurements (green line, right ordinate) and the corresponding difference between FF and measurements (red line, right ordinate) on 4 April 2014 at Mannheim (top) and Meiningen (bottom).

- P20L11 ff.: I suggest giving the full names of measures such as IR when they first occur. This eases understanding for the reader. - P20L12: measure for whether

The integrated difference $\mathcal{ID}$ is a measure for the magnitude of the difference between TT and FF without any information on the sign of the difference.

The mean improvement ratio $\overline{\mathcal{IR}}$ is a measure for whether the TT result is better or worse than the FF result

$\overline{\mathcal{CR}}$, $\overline{\mathcal{CC}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{CI}}$ state the mean percentage contribution of direct radiative, indirect radiative and synergistic interaction effects on the difference between FF and TT.

- P21L2-4: I suggest moving the first sentence ("The synergistic interaction ...") to the beginning of the Section. The second sentence ("The contributions...") is then not needed any more as it repeats what has been said in the beginning.

The description of the factorial method at the beginning of the section is more general. The sentences you mention are specific about the factors that were chosen and point to the corresponding equations. We prefer to leave it as it is.

Figure 1. Fraction of loam which is used as input data for the mineral dust emission scheme. The figure was produced for the R2B07 input data, i.e. 20 km effective grid spacing.

Figure 2. Fraction of sand which is used as input data for the mineral dust emission scheme. The figure was produced for the R2B07 input data, i.e. 20 km effective grid spacing.

Figure 3. Fraction of loamy sand which is used as input data for the mineral dust emission scheme. The figure was produced for the R2B07 input data, i.e. 20 km effective grid spacing.

References

Alfaro, S. C. and Gomes, L.: Modeling mineral aerosol production by wind erosion: Emission intensities and aerosol size distributions in source areas, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 106, 18 075–18 084, doi:10.1029/2000JD900339, 2001.

Köhler, C., Steiner, A., Saint-Drenan, Y.-M., Ernst, D., Bergmann-Dick, A., Zirkelbach, M., Ben Bouallègue, Z., Metzinger, I., and Ritter, B.: Critical weather situations for renewable energies – Part B: Low stratus risk for solar power, Renewable Energy, 101, 794–803, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.09.002, 2017.

Marticorena, B. and Bergametti, G.: Modeling the atmospheric dust cycle: 1. Design of a soil-derived dust emission scheme, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 100, 16 415–16 430, doi:10.1029/95JD00690, 1995.

Mie, G.: Beiträge zur Optik trüber Medien, speziell kolloidaler Metallösungen, Ann. Phys., 330, 377–445, doi:10.1002/andp.19083300302, 1908.

Shao, Y.: A model for mineral dust emission, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 106, 20 239–20 254, doi:10.1029/2001JD900171, 2001.

Shao, Y. and Lu, H.: A simple expression for wind erosion threshold friction velocity, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 105, 22 437–22 443, doi:10.1029/2000JD900304, 2000.

Vogel, B., Hoose, C., Vogel, H., and Kottmeier, C.: A model of dust transport applied to the Dead Sea Area, Meteorol. Z., 15, 611–624, doi:10.1127/0941-2948/2006/0168, 2006.

Impact of the 4 April 2014 Saharan dust outbreak on the photovoltaic power generation in Germany

Daniel Rieger[1*], Andrea Steiner[2], Vanessa Bachmann[2], Philipp Gasch[1], Jochen Förstner[2], Konrad Deetz[1], Bernhard Vogel[1], and Heike Vogel[1]

[1]Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Hermann-von-Helmholtz-Platz 1, 76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany
[2]Deutscher Wetterdienst, Frankfurter Str. 135, 63067 Offenbach, Germany
[*]Now at: Deutscher Wetterdienst, Frankfurter Str. 135, 63067 Offenbach, Germany

Correspondence to: Daniel Rieger (daniel.rieger@dwd.de)

Abstract. The importance for reliable forecasts of incoming solar radiation is growing rapidly, especially for those countries with an increasing share in photovoltaic (PV) power production. The reliability of solar radiation forecasts depends mainly on the representation of clouds and aerosol particles absorbing and scattering radiation. Especially under extreme aerosol conditions, numerical weather prediction has a systematic bias in the solar radiation forecast. This is caused by the design of numerical weather prediction models, which typically account for the direct impact of aerosol particles on radiation using climatological mean values and the impact on cloud formation assuming spatially and temporally homogeneous aerosol concentrations. These model deficiencies in turn can lead to significant economic losses under extreme aerosol conditions. For Germany, Saharan dust outbreaks occurring 5 to 15 times per year for several days each are prominent examples for conditions, under which numerical weather prediction struggles to forecast solar radiation adequately. We investigate the impact of mineral dust on the PV power generation during a Saharan dust outbreak over Germany at 4 April 2014 using ICON-ART, which is the current German numerical weather prediction model extended by modules accounting for trace substances and related feedback processes. We find an overall improvement of the PV power forecast for 65 % of the pyranometer stations in Germany. Of the nine stations with very high differences between forecast and measurement, eight stations show an improvement. Furthermore, we quantify the direct radiative effects and indirect radiative effects of mineral dust. For our study, direct effects account for 64 %, indirect effects for 20 % and synergistic interaction effects for 16 % of the differences between the forecast including mineral dust radiative effects and the forecast neglecting mineral dust.

1 Introduction

Renewable energy such as wind and solar power is gaining in importance for energy supply in many areas of the world. For example, in Germany renewable energy currently contributes to the gross electricity consumption by up to 32.3 % in 2016, of which the contribution of solar energy is 6.5 % (AGEE-Stat, 2016). Instantaneously, solar power can even cover up to 50 % of Germany's electricity demand (Wirth, 2017). Weather dependent renewable energy, such as photovoltaic (PV) power, pose a particular challenge to transmissions system operators (TSO) and forecast providers because power production forecasts are

afflicted with errors. A summary of the diverse state-of-the-art methods and related challenges in PV power forecasting is given in Inman et al. (2013). For time horizons of hours to days, numerical weather prediction (NWP) models deliver the basis for PV power predictions. Forecast errors arise during weather situations or phenomena that are insufficiently represented in NWP models (for PV power see Köhler et al., 2017). Large errors in the power forecast for weather dependent renewables even endanger the stability of the electricity grid. To avoid power outages, the German TSOs need to take costly redispatch measures, which are short-term changes to the operating schedule of power plants. From 2014 to 2015, the gross electricity generation from wind and solar energy increased by 15~~percent~~ % (AGEE-Stat, 2016), the redispatch volume, however, ~~trippled~~ tripled (Bundesnetzagentur, 2016). Ultimately, the related costs are added to the household electricity prices. To guarantee a reliable and economic integration of increasing shares of renewables, there is a strong demand in the energy market to provide the most accurate PV power forecasts possible (e.g. Lew and Richard, 2010; Lew et al., 2010). Driven by the growth of renewable energy shares in electricity production, the accuracy of solar NWP and power forecasts has to meet increasing standards. Thus, also the literature in this field of application is growing, even if still being a young area of research.

Solar radiation is modified by the clouds and aerosols in the atmosphere before reaching the solar panels. Aerosol particles interact with radiation by scattering and absorption (direct effect). They also change the physical properties of clouds, such as effective radii and droplet number concentration, which also modifies the radiation reaching the ground (indirect effect). Mineral dust is a prominent aerosol species in the atmosphere (Knippertz and Stuut, 2014) with global estimates for the mineral dust emissions ranging from $1000 \, \text{Tg a}^{-1}$ to $5000 \, \text{Tg a}^{-1}$ (Shao et al., 2011). Mineral dust can be transported large distances from the source area; for example from the Saharan Desert to Europe (Vautard et al., 2005; Pérez et al., 2006; Klein et al., 2010; Papayannis et al., 2008; Hande et al., 2015). ~~Current~~

Current operational NWP models are unable to account for the effect of mineral dust during such episodes ~~. Bangert et al. (2012) have shown that considering mineral dust has the~~ as they are relying on aerosol climatologies. Nikitidou et al. (2014) investigated the spatial and temporal variability of aerosols over Europe and stress the necessity for near real-time forecasts of aerosol loads instead of climatological values. In areas of high desert-dust intrusions or intense anthropogenic activities, the reduction of direct normal irradiance (DNI) was found to reach values of up to 35 % and 45 %, corresponding to 4 and 6 kWh m^{-2} per day. Recently, Casado-Rubio et al. (2017) showed that considering prognostic dust aerosol considerably improves DNI forecasts in Spain and the Canary Islands which is of great importance for concentrating solar power (CSP). These findings are supported by the study of Schroedter-Homscheidt et al. (2016) who apply an interactive aerosol scheme for clear sky cases. Gleeson et al. (2016) highlight the importance of using accurate aerosol concentration, optical properties and an accurate vertical distribution of aerosols in NWP forecasts of shortwave radiative fluxes in case of a wildfire. Concerning mineral dust, Bangert et al. (2012) have shown a significant potential to improve the surface temperature ~~forecast~~ forecasts during a strong Saharan dust event over southern Germany if dust as well as direct and indirect effects are considered in the NWP system COSMO-ART (COnsortium for Small-scale MOdeling - Aerosol and Reactive Trace gases). For solar energy applications, however, it is of great importance to consider ~~mineral dust and its~~ the influence on ground level radiation ~~(Breitkreuz et al., 2009; Zaihidee et~~ ~~Calinoiu et al. (2013), for example, found~~ by dust aerosols (Breitkreuz et al., 2009; Zaihidee et al., 2016).

Since recent research has shown the importance of meteorology and aerosol or chemistry feedback in many research areas, many online coupled mesoscale meteorology atmospheric chemistry models have been developed. Baklanov et al. (2014) gives an extensive overview of such models in Europe. Considering prognostic aerosols and the interactions with the atmosphere in NWP models is costly in terms of computing time. However, thanks to the increase in computer power, there are several modelling systems worldwide providing daily forecasts of mineral dust distributions. Table 1 provides an overview on current operational mineral dust forecasting models. A more detailed description of available daily mineral dust forecasts and activities in this research area can be found at the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Sand and Dust Storm Warning Advisory and Assessm

Table 1. Overview on operational mineral dust forecasting models.

Model name	Institution	References
BSC-DREAM8b	Barcelona Supercomputing Center	Pérez et al. (2006); Basart et al. (2012)
NMMB/BSC-Dust	Barcelona Supercomputing Center	Pérez et al. (2011); Haustein et al. (2012)
DREAM8-NMME-MACC	South East European Virtual Climate Change Center	Nickovic et al. (2001); Pérez et al. (2006)
LOTOS-EUROS	The Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research	Manders-Groot et al. (2016); Manders et al. (2017)
SKIRON	University of Athens	Spyrou et al. (2010)
CAMS	European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts	Morcrette et al. (2009); Benedetti et al. (2009)
Met Office UM	UK Met Office	Woodward (2001, 2011)
NGAC	National Centers for Environmental Prediction	Lu et al. (2016)
GEOS-5	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Nowottnick et al. (2011)

A quantitative example of solar energy reduction due to mineral dust is given by Calinoiu et al. (2013). For 5 dust episodes in Romania, a reduction in collectable PV power of 6.5 % to 17.5 % ~~reduction of collectable solar energy for 5 mineral dust episodes in Romania.~~ was reported. Perry and Troccoli (2015) investigated a controlled fire burn in Canberra, Australia, and indicated an overall PV power reduction of 7 % during the study period and a peak reduction of 27 %. Besides a more accurate radiation forecast, operational dust forecasts also provide the possibility to account for the deposition of dust on PV panels and for better maintenance planning. For a review on energy yield losses by dust deposition see Sayyah et al. (2014).

~~At the~~ Within this paper, the focus is on the beginning of April 2014, when Central Europe was influenced by an intensive Saharan dust outbreak. At the same time, large errors in the day-ahead forecasts of PV power production challenged Germany's electrical grid management. On 4 April 2014, the day-ahead PV power forecast overestimated the actual power production for Germany by up to 5.3 GW (data source European Energy Exchange AG (2017)). The transport of mineral dust and its ~~influence~~

influence on atmospheric composition and radiation are not explicitly considered within conventional numerical weather prediction. Although it is speculated that these events have a large impact on PV production over Europe, a quantitative assessment is currently not available. In this study we use ICON-ART ~~(Rieger et al., 2015)~~ (ICOsahedral Nonhydrostatic - Aerosol and Reactive Trace assess and to quantify the effect of the Saharan dust outbreak in April 2014 on PV power production. In detail we will address the following questions:

– What is the quantitative impact of mineral dust on simulated surface radiation and PV power?

– What is the contribution of the direct aerosol effect on radiation in comparison to effects caused by modifications of clouds?

Section 2 provides an overview of the modeling system ICON-ART. In particular the new emission scheme for mineral dust, aerosol-radiation, aerosol-cloud and cloud-radiation interactions are explained. The method to calculate PV power is outlined as well. Section 3 summarizes the synoptic situation during the Saharan dust outbreak and section 4 describes the model setup. In section 5, the results are presented, followed by the conclusions.

2 Model Description

For this study, we use the online-coupled modeling system ICON-ART ~~(ICOsahedral Nonhydrostatic - Aerosol and Reactive Trace gases)~~. The host model ICON is jointly developed by the German Weather Service (DWD) and the Max-Planck-Institute for Meteorology (MPI-M). ICON features a nonhydrostatic dynamical core and physical parameterization packages for numerical weather prediction, global climate modeling as well as for large eddy simulations (Zängl et al., 2015; Dipankar et al., 2015; Heinze et al., 2017). The governing equations of ICON are discretized on a triangular mesh offering an intuitive way of grid refinement by performing bisections of the triangles. This enables the possibility of incorporating further nests with two-way interactions within one simulation. In the NWP configuration, ICON is used as a global model for numerical weather prediction by DWD since January 2015 on a so-called R3B07 grid, i.e. with 13 km effective horizontal grid spacing. In July 2015, an R3B08 nest was added over Europe with 7 km effective horizontal grid spacing. Hence, ICON in its NWP configuration is continuously validated by the DWD. A further highlight of ICON is the high scalability and, therefore, efficiency on modern computer architectures. Very important for the extended modeling system ICON-ART is the local mass conservation and the mass-consistent tracer transport featured by ICON.

The ART extension is developed at the Karlsruhe Institute for Technology (KIT) with the goal to describe the spatiotemporal evolution of atmospheric trace substances and their associated atmospheric feedback processes. A detailed overview of the governing equations and the coupling concept of ICON-ART is given by Rieger et al. (2015). Mineral dust aerosol is described by three log-normally distributed modes with prognostic specific numbers and mass mixing ratios. The standard deviations are kept constant during the simulation making the median diameters diagnostic variables which can change during transport. The initial median diameters and the standard deviations are listed in Table 2. Sedimentation, dry deposition, and washout of

Table 2. Parameters for the log-normally distributed mineral dust. $\overline{d}_{0,l,E}$ ($\overline{d}_{3,l,E}$) is the median diameter of the specific number (mass) emission of mode l. The standard deviation of mode l, σ_l, is held constant for the whole simulation.

	Dust Mode A	Dust Mode B	Dust Mode C
$\overline{d}_{0,l,E}$ [μm]	0.6445	3.454	8.672
$\overline{d}_{3,l,E}$ [μm]	1.5	6.7	14.2
σ_l	1.7	1.6	1.5

mineral dust is parameterized as described in Rieger et al. (2015), while coagulation and chemical aging is neglected. The emission of mineral dust as well as the interactions with radiation and clouds are explained in the following.

2.1 Emission of mineral dust

We have implemented the mineral dust emission scheme of Vogel et al. (2006) improved by the following benefits: (1) It is based on a global data set of soil properties (size distribution, residual soil moisture). (2) It accounts for the soil dispersion state. (3) A tile approach was introduced to account for soil type heterogenity at coarse resolutions. The Vogel et al. (2006) scheme combines the parameterization of White (1979) for the saltation flux with a parameterization of Shao and Lu (2000) for the threshold friction velocity. When the friction velocity is above this threshold, soil erosion by wind is initiated. The resulting saltation flux is then used to calculate ~~an~~ a dust emission flux using the parameterization of Alfaro and Gomes (2001). The size distribution of the emitted mineral dust varies according to soil type and meteorological situation.

The size distributions of soil particles are crucial input parameters for the mineral dust emission scheme. In order to obtain a global coverage, HWSD data (Harmonized World Soil Database; Nachtergaele and Batjes, 2012) containing the global distribution of soil types is used. For each of these soil types, two limiting particle size distributions each consisting of up to four log-normal distributions are used (see table B1 in Shao et al., 2010). The following approach to calculate ~~mineral~~ dust emission fluxes applies for one single soil type. For a grid box containing different soil types, a tile approach is used which is explained afterwards.

For the size distribution of soil particles $n_s(d_p)$ we take the soil dispersion state into account. This can be described with the help of two limiting size distributions for weak erosion $n_{s,m}$ (minimally dispersed) and strong erosion $n_{s,f}$ (fully dispersed), in which the dispersion factor γ_d (between 0 and 1) determines the actual size distribution between the two limits depending on the friction velocity u_* (Shao, 2001):

$$n_s(d_p) = \gamma_d \cdot n_{s,m}(d_p) + (1 - \gamma_d) \cdot n_{s,f}(d_p) \tag{1}$$

$$\gamma_d = e^{-0.5 \cdot (u_* - u_{*t,m})^3}. \tag{2}$$

$u_{*t,m}$ is the global minimum (in a mathematical sense) of the threshold friction velocity $u_{*t}(d_p)$. The threshold friction velocity is defined as the value of the friction velocity at an equilibrium of aerodynamic~~and cohesiveforces (Marticorena and Bergametti, 1995~~ cohesive, and gravitational forces (e.g. Marticorena and Bergametti, 1995; Shao and Lu, 2000). For values higher than the threshold friction velocity, emission of soil particles takes place. Shao and Lu (2000) derive an expression for the threshold friction velocity from the equilibrium of moments of forces acting on the particle:

$$u_{*t}(d_p) = f_r \cdot f_\eta \cdot \sqrt{A_n \cdot \left(\frac{\rho_s}{\rho} \cdot g \cdot d_p + \frac{\gamma_n}{\rho \cdot d_p} \right)}, \tag{3}$$

with $A_n = 0.0123$ and $\gamma_n = 3 \cdot 10^{-4}\,\mathrm{kg\,s^{-2}}$. ~~$\rho_s = 1500\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$ is the density~~ ρ is the air density, $\rho_s = 2650\,\mathrm{kg\,m^{-3}}$ is the density of the soil and g the gravitational acceleration. ~~In contrast to Shao and Lu (2000), who derived this expression for idealized conditions, we add~~ For application in a global or regional model, we include correction factors to account for ~~soil~~ the effects of roughness elements (f_r) and soil moisture (f_η) on u_{*t} (e.g. Shao, 2001). Applying Equation 3, we can analytically derive the global minimum of the threshold friction velocity, which is needed in Equation 2~~,~~.

Independent ~~from~~ of the size distribution, no emission is possible below $u_{*t,m}$. The factor to account for soil roughness elements is calculated using the expression of Raupach (1993). This correction term is based on the percentage of plant coverage p_p, a variable which is typically available in atmospheric modeling systems:

$$f_r = \sqrt{1 - 0.5 \cdot \lambda} \cdot \sqrt{1 + 0.5 \cdot 90 \cdot \lambda} \tag{4}$$

with $\quad \lambda = -0.35 \cdot \ln(1 - p_p).$ (5)

Higher soil moisture leads to increased adhesive forces between the soil particles. Therefore the threshold friction velocity increases for higher soil moisture. To consider this behaviour, the correction term by Fécan et al. (1998) is used which is based on gravimetric soil moisture in % η and the percentage clay content p_c of the soil:

$$f_\eta = \sqrt{1 + 1.21 \cdot (\eta - \eta')^{0.68}} \tag{6}$$

with $\quad \eta' = a_z \cdot (0.0014 \cdot p_c^2 + 0.17 \cdot p_c),$ (7)

where η' is a minimum value of η. The factor $a_z = 5$ is introduced to account for too high soil moisture content in the model (Zender et al., 2003) and to increase the performance of the emission scheme within ICON-ART. The derivation of p_c is explained in more detail at the end of this section. The saltation flux is calculated following White (1979):

$$F_h(d_p) = C_{white} \cdot \frac{\rho}{g} u_*^3 \cdot \left(1 + \frac{u_{*t}(d_p)}{u_*} \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{u_{*t}^2(d_p)}{u_*^2} \right), \tag{8}$$

where $C_{white} = 0.7$ is a linear scaling parameter to adapt the dust emission flux to measurements. The total saltation flux F_{th} is the result of an integration over all saltation particle diameters weighted by ~~their cross sectional areas (Vogel et al., 2006).~~ the

product of the cross sectional area and the number of particles (Vogel et al., 2006). This weighting represents the contribution of particle surface area at a certain diameter to the total soil surface area:

$$F_{th} = fr_e \cdot \sum_{s=1}^{4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_h(d_p) \cdot \frac{\frac{\pi}{4} d_p^2 \cdot n_s(d_p)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\pi}{4} d_p^2 \cdot n_s(d_p) \mathrm{d}\ln d_p} \mathrm{d}\ln d_p, \tag{9}$$

In contrast to Vogel et al. (2006), $n_s(d_p)$ takes into account the soil dispersion state by using Equation 1. The summation is performed for the 4 log-normal size distributions of soil particles as described above. fr_e is the fraction of erodible soil calculated based on GlobCover2009 land use data (Arino et al., 2008). The fractions $fr_{b,i}$ of the land use classes: bare areas, sparse vegetation, closed to open grassland, closed to open shrubland and mosaic grassland / forest-shrubland sum up to the erodible fraction $fr_e = \sum_{i=1}^{5} fr_{b,i}$.

By impaction of the saltating particles, the saltation flux leads to the release of small particles creating ~~an~~ a dust emission flux. Alfaro and Gomes (2001) use the kinetic energy of the impaction which has to exceed the binding energies of particles in the soil to describe this process. Larger particles are less tightly bound to the soil, hence their binding energy is smaller than that of smaller particles. This leads to the following equation that connects the saltation flux with the dust emission flux of aerosol mode l (Alfaro and Gomes, 2001):

$$F_{v,l}(d_p) = \frac{\pi}{6} \cdot \rho_p \cdot d_{3,l}^3 \cdot \frac{p_l(d_p) \cdot \beta_{kin} \cdot F_h(d_p)}{e_l}, \tag{10}$$

with $\beta_{kin} = 163\,\mathrm{m\,s^{-2}}$. The product $\beta_{kin} \cdot F_h(d_p)$ is the kinetic energy of the saltation particles and e_l the binding energy of particles of mode l. p_l is the percentage of kinetic energy that is spent to release particles of mode l and is calculated based on the binding energies as summarized in Table 2 of Alfaro and Gomes (2001). These percentages of kinetic ~~energye are chosen in a way that close to the~~ energy are chosen such that particles in the largest mode are emitted first when the threshold friction velocity ~~, only large particles are emitted~~ is exceeded. With increasing friction velocity, the share of smaller particles that are released increases. An integration of Equation 10 over all saltation particle diameters weighted by their cross sectional areas yields the total dust emission flux of mode l:

$$F_{tv,l} = fr_e \cdot \sum_{s=1}^{4} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F_{v,l}(d_p) \cdot \frac{\frac{\pi}{4} \cdot d_p^2 \cdot n_s(d_p)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\pi}{4} \cdot d_p^2 \cdot n_s(d_p) \mathrm{d}\ln d_p} \mathrm{d}\ln d_p. \tag{11}$$

Similar to the saltation flux, $n_s(d_p)$ takes the soil dispersion state into account (Equation 1). Equation 11 was derived for one specific soil type. As ICON-ART is typically used with grid spacings ranging from $10^0\,\mathrm{km}$ to $10^2\,\mathrm{km}$, a grid box may contain a mixture of different soil types. To account for this subgrid-scale ~~heterogenity~~ heterogeneity, a tile approach is introduced.

The size distributions of soil particles from Shao et al. (2010) are available for soil types as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) except ~~of~~ for silt where silty loam is used instead. Table 3 provides an overview of the soil types and the percentaged clay content $p_{c,i}$ of soil type i. To determine the soil type in an ICON-ART grid element, information from the

Table 3. Clay content assumed for the USDA soil types.

USDA Name	Abbreviation	$p_{c,i}$
Heavy clay	HCLA	100 %
Light clay	LCLA	80 %
Silty clay	SILC	50 %
Sandy clay	SCLA	45 %
Silty clay loam	SICL	30 %
Clay loam	CLOA	30 %
Sandy clay loam	SCLO	30 %
Loam	LOAM	15 %
Silt loam	SILO	10 %
Sandy loam	SLOA	10 %
Silt	SILT	5 %
Loamy sand	LSAN	5 %
Sand	SAND	5 %

high resolution (30 arc seconds) global database HWSD (Nachtergaele and Batjes, 2012) is aggregated to the target grid. By this, the fraction $f_{s,i}$ covered by soil type i with $\sum_{i=1}^{14} f_{s,i} = 1$ is available to the model. There are 14 fractions as, in addition to the 13 soil types, one fraction accounting for water, rock and urban surfaces is considered. As stated previously, a tile approach is used to calculate the ~~mineral~~ dust emission flux. For clarity, Equation 11 was derived for one single soil type i. To consider

5 the subgrid-scale heterogenity of soil properties, the dust emission fluxes $F_{tv,l,i}$ are calculated for each soil type separately and the result is then weighted with the ~~according~~ corresponding fraction of the soil to get the final dust emission flux:

$$F_{tv,l} = \sum_{i=1}^{13} f_{s,i} \cdot F_{tv,l,i}. \tag{12}$$

The soil clay content used in Equation 7 to calculate the residual soil moisture content in a grid element can be calculated with:

10 $$p_c = \sum_{i=1}^{13} f_{s,i} \cdot p_{c,i}. \tag{13}$$

The calculation of ~~mineral~~ dust emission fluxes $F_{tv,l,i}$ for individual soil types within one grid element differs by the use of the individual soil particle size distributions $n_{s,i}(d_p)$. However, it does not differ in the clay content of the soil within one grid element and therefore neither in the residual soil moisture η'. The simple reason for this is that the gravimetric soil moisture η used from the surface scheme of ICON-ART is a grid-scale variable and hence is the average value for one grid element. As

15 Equation 6 includes a difference between η and η', grid-scale values for both variables are used.

2.2 Radiation

ICON-ART includes online mineral dust-radiation interaction utilizing the Rapid Radiative Transfer Model (RRTM) (Mlawer et al., 1997) as described in more detail by Gasch et al. (2017). To account for the influence of mineral dust on radiation, the optical properties of mineral dust are determined offline once~~applying Mie calculations~~ . For this, Mie calculations are applied

5   which require the complex refractive index of mineral dust (Mie, 1908) as input. For the Mie calculations, a code developed by Bond et al. (2006) was used. This code in turn utilizes a subset developed by Mätzler (2002) for the calculation of the scattering coefficients and truncation of the series. The code was adapted to allow for processing of multiple wavelengths and averaging to the RRTM wavebands in a post-processing step. A new polynomial parameterization was introduced to account for the change in median diameter during transport.

10   The values of the refractive index of mineral dust used for the Mie calculations are of great importance for the radiative properties extinction coefficient, single scattering albedo and asymmetry parameter. Highwood and Ryder (2014) give a summary of the various influences. For example, peaks in the real part show as maxima of the extinction coefficient, whereas the single scattering albedo and thereby absorption is determined by the imaginary part of the refractive index. For ICON-ART, the same refractive index values as used by Stanelle et al. (2010) for COSMO-ART are employed. The longwave part of the

15   spectrum down to $4\ \mu$m uses values as published by Helmert et al. (2007). For wavelengths smaller than $4\ \mu$m the shape of the Helmert et al. (2007) curve is still replicated, however, with a fit through smaller values for the imaginary part which are obtained from Petzold et al. (2009). This part of the spectrum is especially important as solar radiation intensity is highest for these wavelengths. The smaller values correspond to weaker absorptive and enhanced scattering properties of mineral dust in ICON-ART for this part of the spectrum. These smaller values are in better agreement with Dubovik et al. (2002), who

20   by inversion of AERONET (AErosol RObotic NETwork) retrievals determined values similar to Petzold et al. (2009). This is further supported by Balkanski et al. (2007), who show a better representation of observed mineral dust radiative forcing in models using these refractive indices obtained from AERONET, confirming that mineral dust is less absorptive than previously thought. McConnell et al. (2010) also obtained imaginary part refractive index values similar to those used in ICON-ART.

   The local radiative transfer parameters (extinction coefficient, single scattering coefficient, and asymmetry parameter) are

25   then calculated online within ICON-ART through multiplication of the mass-specific mineral dust optical properties derived by Mie calculations with the current mineral dust mass concentration from ART. The altered radiative transfer parameters are used by the RRTM radiation scheme, thereby accounting for the local mineral dust effect on radiation. Thus changed radiative fluxes from the RRTM scheme feed back on the meteorological conditions, which themselves can influence the mineral dust processes again.

30 ## 2.3 Aerosol-Cloud-Interactions

In the operational version of ICON used at DWD, a bulk scheme is applied to treat the cloud microphysical processes. For this study, we are using the two-moment microphysics scheme of Seifert and Beheng (2006). This scheme solves prognostic budget equations for number and mass concentrations of six hydrometeor classes (cloud, rain, ice, snow, graupel, hail). For

the size distribution of hydrometeors, generalized gamma distributions with constant shape parameters are used. It considers the microphysical processes of autoconversion, accretion, self-collection and break up in the warm phase. For cold clouds, diffusional growth, freezing, aggregation, self-collection, riming and melting are taken into account.

For the nucleation of ice particles, a competition between heterogeneous and homogeneous freezing occurs. Homogeneous freezing describes the formation of an ice particle without the involvement of a solid ice ~~nuclei~~ nucleus (IN). It takes place at temperatures below 235 K at high supersaturations with respect to ice on the order of 40 % to 80 %. As this process does not depend on aerosol characteristics (Koop et al., 2000) and as there are always sufficient liquid droplets available (e.g. Köhler and Seifert, 2015), a large amount of ice particles forms nearly instantly as soon as ~~the~~ these ambient conditions are met. In accordance with these assumptions, we set the number of liquid droplets available for homogeneous freezing to $1000 \, \mathrm{cm}^{-3}$. This leads to a strong increase in water vapor depletion and therefore a fast decline of supersaturation, which in turn leads to small ice particles. Heterogeneous freezing occurs at surfaces of IN that grant favorable conditions for freezing. Depending on IN characteristics, heterogeneous freezing can even occur at temperatures close to $0°\mathrm{C}$ at ice saturation (for a review see Hoose and Möhler, 2012). Due to comparatively low concentrations of IN at heights where freezing occurs, the nucleation rate of pure heterogeneous freezing is typically one to two orders of magnitude lower than that of pure homogeneous freezing. Hence, the depletion of supersaturation takes longer and larger ice particles are formed. For ICON-ART, the empirical parameterization of Phillips et al. (2013) is used to describe heterogeneous formation of ice particles. In an ascending air parcel, heterogeneous freezing occurs earlier (i.e. at higher temperatures and lower supersaturation) than homogeneous freezing. Hence, a sufficient amount of IN can suppress homogeneous freezing due to depletion of water vapor. To account for these competing mechanisms, ICON-ART uses the parameterization of Barahona and Nenes (2009). The resulting discrepancy in number concentration and size distribution of ice particles between the two freezing mechanisms leads to differences in the radiative properties of the clouds. Mineral dust is one of the most ubiquitous types of aerosol and acts as IN at temperatures as high as $-10°\mathrm{C}$. Measurements show, that other IN can usually be neglected for modeling studies (Cziczo et al., 2013).

The coupling of microphysics and the parameterization to account for competing effects of the freezing mechanisms was performed in a similar way to Bangert et al. (2012) and Bangert (2012) with two exceptions. The standard deviation of the assumed subgrid-scale gaussian distribution of the vertical velocity was reduced by a factor of 0.3 to $\sigma_w = 0.3\sqrt{TKE}$, where TKE is the (prognostic) turbulent kinetic energy. The value of 0.3 was derived by tuning based on ML-CIRRUS measurements (Voigt et al., 2016). Additionally, a budget variable for mineral dust acting as IN was introduced to prevent double counting. We followed the approach of Köhler and Seifert (2015) by using a characteristic relaxation time scale of four hours in which only part of the mineral dust is available for further heterogeneous freezing.

2.4 Clouds and Radiation

As mineral dust serves as ~~an~~ ice nuclei in ICON-ART it modifies the physical properties of the simulated clouds. Consequently, the optical properties of the ice clouds are modified when mineral dust is present. The optical properties of the ice crystals are calculated according to Stevens et al. (2013) based on the cloud ice effective radius.

Since in the operational setup a one moment scheme for the microphysical processes is used, the effective radii are calculated as a function of the ice mass concentration only. Instead, for this study, the ice particle size distribution obtained from the two-moment microphysics scheme of Seifert and Beheng (2006) is used. For the calculation of the ice particle effective radii, we apply the formula of Fu et al. (1998).

2.5 PV power calculation

To calculate PV power we apply the open source PV modeling environment PV_LIB for python (Andrews et al., 2014). It converts direct and diffuse radiation, temperature and wind speed into normalized PV power. Here the normalization is done with respect to the nominal capacity. Therefore, a specific PV module and PV inverter combination, as well as the module's tilt and orientation need to be specified. Furthermore, the surface albedo and station height are necessary input parameters.

All evaluations concerning PV power presented in the following assume a south-oriented PV module with a nominal power of 220 W and a size of 1.7 m². The chosen configuration represents a typical system for applications on residential or industrial roof-tops in Germany. In more detail, a *'Canadian Solar CS5P-220M'* PV module and the micro-inverter *'ABB: MICRO-0.25-I-OUTD-US-208'* are selected. The software PV_LIB retrieves the corresponding module and inverter properties automatically from an online database provided by NREL (National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy).

3 Synoptic Situation

Figure 1 shows the large scale synoptic situation that has led to the examined Saharan dust outbreak. The contour lines depict the 500 hPa geopotential field and the color shading gives the wind speed at 10 m height. On 1 and 2 April 2014, a large part of Europe is influenced by ~~an upper air ridgeof high pressure~~ a ridge, whereas an elongated, pronounced trough lies over the eastern Atlantic. The situation represents a characteristic circulation pattern favorable for Saharan dust outbreaks, as identified by Flentje et al. (2015). As the axis of the Atlantic trough moves slowly eastwards, it affects northern Africa by supporting cyclogenesis along the border between Morocco and Algeria. This in turn favors higher wind speeds at the surface (see Figure 1) and an intensified mineral dust emission. Emitted mineral dust is lifted and transported towards Central Europe along the forward flank of the trough. Simulations suggest that the Saharan dust reaches France on 2 and 3 April, whereas Germany is affected mainly on the subsequent two days. On 4 and 5 April, extraordinarily large day-ahead PV-power forecast errors occurred. These days are amongst the 100 days with largest day-ahead PV-power forecast errors in Germany within 2013 and 2014 as analyzed by Köhler et al. (2017). Throughout this period, Germany remains under a weakening upper air ridge. Concurrently, the Atlantic trough develops into a cut off low, which traverses the Mediterranean Sea. It transports Saharan dust over Italy towards ~~southeastern~~ south-eastern Europe and the southern Alps. Only little mineral dust is transported towards southern Germany by the cut off low.

The following simulations will concentrate on 4 April 2014. On that day, Germany, Benelux and ~~north eastern~~ north-eastern France are located in the warm sector of an old, hardly moving frontal system (see Figure 2). A thicker cloud layer is influencing northern Germany and a stationary cloud band is visible along the Alps. Throughout the day, light precipitation is observed

1 April 2014, 12:00 UTC

contour lines: 500 hPa geopotential (gpdam)

Figure 1. Large scale synoptic situation on 1 April 2014, 12 UTC. Contour lines show the 500 hPa geopotential field, the wind speed at 10 m is depicted by colored shading. The fields are retrieved from a global + 12 h ICON-ART forecast with an effective grid spacing of 40 km.

in north-western Germany as the warm front moves slowly northward. Especially central and parts of southern Germany are influenced by high clouds. Even though high clouds subjectively appear transparent, they considerably reduce the incoming shortwave radiation. Additionally, Saharan mineral dust is present and reduces the transparency of the atmosphere as well. To achieve a good PV power forecast it is essential to correctly forecast the diverse clouds on 4 April 2014, as well as the mineral
5   dust particles in the atmosphere and their effects on radiative transfer.

4   Model Setup

For our simulations, we are using a global R2B06 grid with an effective horizontal grid spacing of 40 km. A nested R2B07 grid (20 km) is added covering source and target region, i.e. North Africa and Central Europe. Further successive R2B08 and R2B09 nests cover Central Europe with effective horizontal grid spacings of 10 km and 5 km. Our analysis is performed for the highest
10   resolved nest with 5 km effective grid spacing. We are using ICON-ART in its NWP configuration with the corresponding package of physical parameterizations with the exceptions described above.

Figure 3 sketches the simulation procedure applied to provide the most realistic spatiotemporal distribution of mineral dust aerosol for 4 April 2014. A spin up simulation is started from ECMWF's (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts) Integrated Forecast System (IFS) analysis on 15 March 2014, 00 UTC, in order to generate background concentrations

Figure 2. RGB composite of Germany and surrounding countries as observed by the Meteosat-10 satellite for 4 April 2014, 11:45 UTC. Frontal zones as analyzed by DWD based on surface observations for 4 April 2014, 12 UTC. Data source: EUMETSAT, DWD

Figure 3. Schematic overview of the simulations that were performed as a preparation for the simulation of the analysis period.

of mineral dust. This simulation runs free for 14 days. On 29 March, 00 UTC, a reinitialization is performed using the corresponding IFS analysis in combination with the mineral dust concentrations calculated by the spin up simulation. From 29 March until 3 April this procedure is repeated daily in order to accurately capture the emission and transport processes of the mineral dust in this important period. From 3 April 00 UTC onwards, the simulation is running free again with mineral dust

feedback processes ~~actived~~activated, i.e. no reinitialization is performed on 4 April 00 UTC, giving the clouds one day to adjust before an aerosol effect on clouds is analyzed.

As stated before, we are interested in the improvement of PV power forecast due to a better representation of mineral dust concentrations and its impact on radiation in the model. A classical approach to quantify these differences would be to carry out two simulations A and B. In case A, a climatological mineral dust distribution would be applied as it is done in operational weather forecast. In case B, the online calculated mineral dust concentrations would be used instead. Subtracting the results of both simulations the effect of mineral dust on temperature and radiation could be quantified. However, this method suffers from several shortcomings. The spatial distribution of the simulated and the climatological concentrations may differ considerably. At some places the online calculated concentrations might be higher than the simulated ones and vice versa. Thus, the effects of mineral dust on radiation and PV could not be quantified.

For this reason, we decided to choose a different approach for the reference simulation. We are using in all cases prognostically derived mineral dust concentrations. In the false case (F) however, we assume a reduced impact on radiation and/or cloud formation which is realized by a reduction of the mineral dust concentrations by a factor of 0.1 when used to calculate these processes. This results in the 2^2 simulations summarized in Table 4 we need for our analysis. Although the mineral dust horizontal, vertical and size distributions of the individual simulations differ slightly due to the feedback of radiation and cloud microphysics on the mineral dust distributions, the impact of this is negligible. Consequently, compared to the classical approach, this method has the advantages that (1) the location of extreme values agrees between the individual simulations and (2) there is no impact of different size distributions on the results.

Table 4. Simulations performed for this study and the mineral dust concentration used to calculate radiation and cloud microphysics.

Case name	Radiation	Cloud formation
TT	Original concentration	Original concentration
FF	0.1·concentration	0.1·concentration
TF	Original concentration	0.1·concentration
FT	0.1·concentration	Original concentration

5 Results

In the following, results of the simulations as well as thereof calculated PV power forecasts are presented and evaluated.

5.1 Simulated Mineral Dust Distribution

Mineral dust emitted from the Sahara during 1 and 2 April is transported towards Central Europe along the forward flank of a trough. After being transported across France it reaches Germany on the 4 April 2014. This can be seen ~~on~~ in Figure 4 which shows the spatial distribution of mineral dust optical depth at ~~550~~500 nm (in the following abbreviated with AOD) at different

dates. ~~During the night~~ Already during the night to 4 April 2014, the southern part of Germany is covered by ~~a~~ the mineral dust plume which leads to an AOD between 0.25 and 1. Over France, higher values between 1 and 1.5 are simulated. During the day, the mineral dust is transported to the ~~North~~ north so that in the evening all of Germany is affected by the mineral dust, with the highest AOD values of about 1 in the ~~Northwest~~north-west. In the remaining parts the AOD values are between 0.25 and

5 0.5.~~Due to extensive cloud coverage, the comparison with measurements is complicated. Because the mineral dust plume is located in elevated layers at heights of several kilometers, detection by ground based measurementsis also difficult. However, in clear sky regions, the amount~~

A qualitative comparison to satellite, ceilometer and lidar observations shows that the spatial distribution and temporal evolution of mineral dust as simulated over Europe is in good agreement with the available measurements. Unfortunately, these observations

10 of mineral dust are hampered by the presence of clouds. The areas with high mineral dust loads coincide also with cloudy conditions and only few observation time steps within the period of interest are available for a quantitative comparisons. In Figure 5, the mineral dust aerosol optical depth as forecasted at 20 km grid spacing for case TT is shown for 4 April 2014. On top of that, filled circles provide the corresponding AERONET measurements. The observations are averaged within a time interval of 1 hour before target time and represent level 2 coarse mode AOD at 500 nm (derived with Direct Sun Algorithm

15 (DSA) Version 2 and Spectral Deconvolution Algorithm (SDA) Version 4.1, for a description see AERONET (2017)). The arrival of the dust cloud in eastern Germany is observed by the station Lindenberg. There is only a small spatial discrepancy with the forecasted location of the dust cloud. Note, that the region with rapid increase of mineral dust ~~is in similar magnitude as satellite observations.~~ concentration also visualizes the weak frontal zone spanning from the North Sea over eastern Germany to the south-east of Europe (cf. section 3).

Figure 4. Mineral dust optical depth at ~~550~~ 500 nm over Germany on 4 April 2014 at 00 UTC, 06 UTC, 12 UTC and 18 UTC (TT case). Note the saw-tooth shape in the northern part which marks the margin of ~~nest R2B09~~ the high resolution (5 km) domain and must not be confused with mineral dust-free conditions.

Figure 5. Mineral dust optical depth at 500 nm over Europe on 4 April 2014 at 09 UTC, 12 UTC, 15 UTC and 18 UTC (TT case) at 20 km grid spacing. The filled circles represent observations from AERONET stations. Note the saw-tooth shape next to the boarders which marks the margin of nest R2B07 and must not be confused with mineral dust-free conditions.

5.2 Radiation

Figure 6. SIS of TT (left), FF (middle) and SARAH-2 dataset by CM SAF (right) on 4 April 2014 at 12:30 UTC in Germany. Dots: SIS at SYNOP (thin circle lines) and pyranometer stations (thicker circle lines).

The surface incoming shortwave irradiance (SIS, or global radiation) is the key-parameter for adequate PV power forecasts. In order to evaluate the numerical simulations we use in situ and remote sensing observations. Surface measurements of global radiation are available from SYNOP stations hourly and, with a temporal resolution of one minute, from the pyranometer-

network of the DWD. Complementary, the surface shortwave radiation as retrieved from the SEVIRI (Spinning Enhanced Visible and InfraRed Imager) sensor onboard the geostationary METEOSAT (Meteorological satellite) second generation (MSG) satellite number 10 is available for comparison with model results. In particular, hourly SARAH-2 data (Surface Solar Radiation Data records - Heliosat, Pfeifroth et al., 2017) are used, which are provided by the EUMETSAT (European Organisation

5   for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites) Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring (CM SAF). It should be noted that the retrieval algorithm for the SARAH-2 data employs a modified MACC ("Monitoring atmospheric composition & climate") aerosol climatology (Mueller et al., 2015), that deviates from the actual concentrations especially during mineral dust episodes. Therefore, the satellite derived SIS can be expected to overestimate the real SIS in the considered time period.

Figure 6 shows the horizontal distribution of SIS for the simulations TT and FF, and for the satellite product SARAH-2
10   at 4 April 2014, 12:30 UTC. In addition to the simulation results, the SIS measured at SYNOP and pyranometer stations are depicted in circles. Pyranometer stations are indicated by bold circles. There are two main synoptic features that were not correctly captured by both numerical simulations. On the one hand, the cloud band along the Alps is missed (see Figure 2). On the other hand, the activity of the frontal system in the northern part of Germany and the related clouds are represented in a different way (see Figure 2). The cloud cover and corresponding precipitation is overestimated in eastern Germany, whereas the
15   rainfall in northern Germany in the afternoon is underestimated (not shown). Such fine structures are challenging for day-ahead numerical weather predictions. Inherently, deterministic NWP forecasts are afflicted with errors. These arise from inaccurate initial conditions as well as from deficiencies in the NWP model, whereas small errors in the finer structure, such as the position of individual clouds, tend to grow more rapidly (Kalnay, 2003). Ensemble Forecasts could provide an estimate of the reliability of the forecast and of individual synoptic patterns such as the discussed frontal system. Herein, however, this is not within the
20   focus of attention and we concentrate on the differences between the simulations TT and FF.

In the northern part of Germany both simulations show very low SIS values which were also observed by the satellite and by the ground-based stations. In the western part, where the AOD reaches the highest values, simulation TT gives noticeably lower SIS than in case of simulation FF which is in better agreement with the observations. These improvements can be attributed to the consideration of the interactions between mineral dust and meteorology.

25   The improvements in TT are confirmed by Figure 7a) that shows a histogram of the differences (simulation - ground observation) for 4 April 2014 using hourly data at SYNOP stations (see Figure 6). In case of underestimation (negative ΔSIS), the errors for TT are larger than for FF. The opposite happens in the range of overestimation (positive ΔSIS), where the error is remarkably lower for TT. Furthermore, the difference between TT and FF is larger in the overestimation sector than in the underestimation sector. This becomes even more clear in the joint histogram (Figure 7b)). When the difference is negative in
30   the FF case, the green regression line is almost identical to the one to one line indicating no systematic differences between TT and FF in the underestimation sector. In the overestimation sector, however, the overestimation is strongly reduced by the TT simulation as indicated by the regression line. This finding is confirmed by Table 5. The mean error and the standard deviation is substantially reduced in case of TT. While the 5th percentile slightly increases in case of TT, the 95th percentile that indicates the overestimation of SIS is drastically reduced. The same holds for minimum and maximum values. In summary, this means

Figure 7. a) Histogram of difference in SIS on 4 April 2014 (05:30 UTC - 16:30 UTC) in Germany for FF and TT simulation relative to SYNOP station measurements (see Figure 6). b) Joint histogram of SIS difference on 4 April 2014 for simulations FF and TT relative to SYNOP station measurements (see Figure 6). Green lines indicate linear regressions for the sector with negative ΔSIS FF (slope: 0.959, intersection: -12.086) and positive ΔSIS FF (slope: 0.638, intersection: -7.659).

that in the TT case, overestimations are substantially reduced compared to the FF case whereas the results remain similar for underestimations.

Table 5. Statistical quantities of the distributions of ΔSIS shown in Figure 7a).

	mean	standard deviation	5% percentile	95% percentile	min	max
TT	-4.45	125.00	-245.80	188.33	-449.90	444.98
FF	27.19	145.10	-234.42	273.59	-441.01	523.33

5.3 PV Production

Beside the technical characteristics of the solar panels, PV power output depends mainly on SIS, temperature and panel geometry such as orientation with respect to the sun. From that, it becomes clear that reliable day-ahead forecasts of PV power depend on accurate weather ~~forecast~~forecasts. The following example demonstrates that the PV power forecasts for Germany tremendously failed for 4 April 2014.

Figure 8 shows the day-ahead PV power forecast for 4 April 2014. The illustrated day-ahead PV power forecast is the so called Meta-forecast of the German TSOs. It is a multi-model and multi-method product, which combines many different NWP and power forecast models as well as many different post-processing methods. The day-ahead PV power forecast for 4 April

Figure 8. Time series of hourly averaged observed photovoltaic power production (green) and corresponding day-ahead forecast (red) for Germany on 4 April 2014. The red shading marks a large overestimation of up to 5.3 GW. At the bottom, the day-ahead forecast error for the four German control areas is depicted. Data source: (European Energy Exchange AG, 2017).

2014 overestimated the actual power production for Germany by up to 5.3 GW. The forecast error is also divided into the control areas of the four TSOs. In the areas of TenneT and Amprion, which cover ~~West, Central and South-East~~ west, central and south-east Germany (see Figure 1 of Steiner et al., 2017), the largest forecast errors occurred on 4 April 2014. ~~In these regions, not only were~~ These are not only the regions where large contributions of PV capacity are installed (see Figure 1b of

5 Köhler et al., 2017), but also the forecast of incoming solar radiation was challenged by the presence of clouds and aerosols as already discussed in section 3. These discrepancies between energy demand and day-ahead forecast of supply need to be compensated, for example on the intra-day market of the European power exchange EPEX SPOT, where electricity is traded within the Austrian, French, German or Swiss transmission systems. Corresponding market data are openly published on the EEX Transparency Platform (European Energy Exchange AG, 2017). Wrong forecasts ~~are causing~~ may cause economic costs

10 on the order of tens of million Euro per day.

The transport of Saharan dust and the interactions of mineral dust particles with the atmosphere are not explicitly considered within conventional NWP forecasts. Most likely, this has contributed to the large PV power forecast errors on 4 April 2014 (Figure 8). We will quantify the effect of the mineral dust outbreak on PV power forecast for our own model results.

PV_LIB (see subsection 2.5) is used to transfer the observed and simulated meteorological variables into normalized PV

15 power. Computed PV power based on the observed radiation by the 26 pyranometer stations throughout Germany (see Ap-

Figure 9. Comparison of ~~pyranometer observation~~ observed (~~green~~black, by pyranometer) and simulated (TT in ~~blue~~green, FF in red) surface incoming shortwave irradiance (SIS, a-d) and the resulting computed normalized PV power (~~e-f~~e-h) for the stations Mannheim, Meiningen, Trier and Weihenstephan on 4 April 2014, respectively. The normalization is done with respect to peak power.

pendix A) is taken as reference. To convert meteorological variables from the NWP simulations into PV power, the closest grid point to each pyranometer station is considered.

Figure 9 shows the observed and simulated SIS as well as normalized PV power for the stations Mannheim, Meiningen, Trier and Weihenstephan. A reduction in positive forecast error (overestimation) can be observed for the stations Mannheim, Trier and Weihenstephan. For stations with considerable cloud cover, for example Meiningen, smaller differences between the TT and FF simulations are observed. To quantify the improvement of PV power simulations of scenario TT, Table 6 summarizes error quantities for all 26 pyranometer stations and for different lead times. For 4 April 2014, the root mean square error for example is reduced by about 17 % from 0.124 to 0.103. Bold values in Table 6 indicate better results and confirm that the TT simulation showed better performance with respect to the observations.

5.4 Radiation vs. Cloud Microphysics

As mentioned before, a substantial amount of ~~cloud~~ clouds was present on 4 April 2014. From that the question arises which portion of the changes we found in PV power are due to the direct aerosol effect and which are due to the indirect effect. In our case we are using a factorial method to separate the direct radiative effects from the indirect radiative effects on PV power generation. For this purpose, an unreplicated 2^k factorial design with $k = 2$ is used (Montgomery, 2008). A short description of this factorial method (FM) is given in Appendix B. This method was also used for other similar problems in atmospheric science (e.g. Teller and Levin, 2008; Kraut, 2015).

Table 6. Statistical measures describing the quality of the simulated PV power values using data of all 26 pyranometer stations for different lead times (20140403: 0-23h, 20140404: 24-47h, 20140405: 48-72h, 20140403 - 20140405: 0-72h). Values are given for the root mean square error (RMSE), the mean absolute error (MAE), the bias (BIAS), the standard deviation of errors (STD) as well as the minimum and maximum error (E_{min}, E_{max}) in W m^{-2}. Bold values mark the better simulation.

	RMSE		MAE		BIAS		STD		E_{min}		E_{max}	
Time	FF	TT	FF	TT	FF	TT	FF	TT	FF	TT	FF	TT
20140403	0.099	**0.092**	0.049	**0.044**	0.013	**0.006**	0.099	**0 092**	**-0.534**	-0.542	**0.554**	0.563
20140404	0.124	**0.103**	0.059	**0.048**	0.009	**-0.004**	0.123	**0.103**	**-0.660**	-0.672	0.546	**0.442**
20140405	0.110	**0.079**	0.054	**0.040**	0.029	**0.003**	0.106	**0.079**	**-0.405**	-0.418	0.577	**0.418**
20140403-20140405	0.111	**0.092**	0.054	**0.044**	0.017	**0.001**	0.110	**0.092**	**-0.660**	-0.672	0.577	**0.563**

Figure 10. Temporal evolution of the difference in normalized PV power between TT and measurements (green line, right ordinate) and the ~~according~~ corresponding difference between FF and measurements (red line, right ordinate) on 4 April 2014 at Mannheim (top) and Meiningen (bottom). Contours: percentaged contribution of direct radiative, indirect radiative and synergistic interaction effects to the change between TT and FF based on the FM calculation (left ordinate).

Figure 11. Same as Figure 10 for Trier (top) and Weihenstephan (bottom).

Figure 10 and Figure 11 show the results of the FM calculation for four selected SYNOP stations (Mannheim, Meiningen, Trier, and Weihenstephan-Duernast). The geographical positions of the stations are given in Table 7. The figures show the temporal evolution of the difference in normalized PV power between TT and the measurements (green line, right ordinate) and the corresponding difference between FF and the measurements (red line, right ordinate). In contours, the percentage contribution of direct radiative (beige), indirect radiative (blue) and synergistic interaction (orange) effects to the change between TT and FF based on the FM calculation is given (left ordinate).

The more westerly stations (Mannheim, Trier) show a systematic overestimation of PV power generation in the FF case. At both stations, the PV power forecast is improved significantly in the TT simulation. For Mannheim, the contributions of the different effects is alternating, whereas in Trier the direct radiative effect dominates the result, nearly always accounting for more than 50 %. In Meiningen, the contributions of the different effects vary strongly, accompanied by several intersections of the FF and TT curves. However, the green TT curve looks like a damped version of the red FF curve. For overestimations of the PV power in the FF case, the TT result is lower and for underestimations the TT result is higher, leading to a better agreement with measurements and therefore an improvement in the forecast. One could argue, that the overestimations are damped mostly by direct radiative effects (e.g. at 10 UTC and 14 UTC) whereas the underestimations are damped mostly by

indirect effects (e.g. at 08 UTC and 13 UTC). This becomes more obvious at Weihenstephan. Between 06 UTC and 11 UTC, the overestimation of PV power is nearly exclusively caused by direct radiative effects. Starting from 12 UTC, the subsequent underestimation is nearly completely realted to indirect radiative and synergistic interaction effects. From 14 UTC on, FF shows an overestimation, whereas in the TT case, the forecast is improved mostly by direct radiative effects.

Figure 12. Visualization of the different scores described in Appendix C for all pyranometer stations. The stations are sorted by their $\mathcal{ID}$ score with the station with the highest score on top.

5   The results for all SYNOP stations with high quality radiation measurements in Germany are shown in Figure 12. For the classification of the results at these stations, 5 different characteristic measures are calculated. A mathematical description of these characteristic measures is given in Appendix C. The integrated difference $\mathcal{ID}$ is a measure for the magnitude of the difference between TT and FF without any information on the sign of the difference. The mean improvement ratio $\overline{\mathcal{IR}}$ is a measure for whether the TT result is better or worse than the FF result, where $\overline{\mathcal{IR}} = 0$ characterizes a perfect FF result,

10   $\overline{\mathcal{IR}} = 1$ a perfect TT result and $\overline{\mathcal{IR}} = 0.5$ an indifferent result. Hence, $\overline{\mathcal{IR}} > 0.5$ shows an improvement of the results due to the impact of mineral dust on cloud formation and radiation. $\overline{\mathcal{CR}}$, $\overline{\mathcal{CC}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{CI}}$ state the mean percentage contribution of direct radiative, indirect radiative and synergistic interaction effects on the difference between FF and TT. The synergistic interaction represents the nonlinear feedbacks, which are acting between the two factors direct radiative effect and indirect radiative effect,

when both effects are active at the same time. The contributions of the different effects are derived by the factorial method formulae B1-B7 given in Appendix B.

Of the 26 stations in total, 17 show an improvement of the forecast in the TT case compared to the FF case (i.e. $\overline{\mathcal{IR}} > 0.5$). However, this includes also stations with small differences between the results of TT and FF where the significance of the measure $\overline{\mathcal{IR}}$ is low as it does not contain any information on the magnitude of the change. Focussing on stations with a high difference (here defined as $\mathcal{ID} > 1$), 14 out of 16 stations show an improvement. For very high differences (here defined as $\mathcal{ID} > 2$), nearly every station (8 out of 9) shows improvements in the TT forecast. The only exception is Nuernberg where there is a strong underestimation of the PV power in the early morning which is not compensated by the improved forecast afterwards (not shown). In total, the indirect effect contributes for 45.41 % to this underestimation in Nuernberg. Averaging over all stations, 63.86 % of the differences are caused by the direct radiative effect, whereas 20.22 % and 15.92 % are caused by the indirect and synergistic interaction effects, respectively. For stations with very high differences, this shifts to higher contributions of the direct effect (68.08 %, 16.21 % and 15.71 %).

Taking a look at outlying stations, Hohenpeissenberg, Saarbruecken, Weihenstephan and Hamburg show comparatively high contributions of the direct effect of more than 80 %. They have in common that, in the FF case, the PV power was nearly always overestimated. The direct effect in the TT case leads to a decrease in the PV power forecast which in turn leads to an improvement. At Luedenscheid and Nuernberg, indirect effects contribute more than direct effects to the changes in PV power forecast. These are the only two stations that show a worsening of the PV power forecast out of the 16 stations with high differences. For Luedenscheid, strong contributions of indirect and synergistic interaction effects in the afternoon lead to an overestimation of the PV power in the afternoon while the FF forecast already shows a good result (not shown). The forecast for Nuernberg in the FF case already shows a systematic underestimation of the PV power. A mixture of direct and indirect radiative effects in the morning ~~lead~~ leads to a strong further underestimation, dominating the $\overline{\mathcal{IR}}$ score. The improvements mostly due to indirect and synergistic interaction effects afterwards are smaller (not shown).

6   Conclusions

Reliable PV power forecast is gaining importance especially in those countries with increasing use of renewable energy as is the case in Germany. Aerosol particles have a major impact on the radiation reaching the solar panels at the ground. The aerosol concentration differs in space and time, nevertheless, most current numerical weather prediction models use climatological maps of the aerosol distribution. Thus, they are not able to account for the actual impact of aerosol particles on PV power production. Within this study we extended the operational weather forecast model ICON-ART by including the treatment of direct and indirect effects of prognostic mineral dust. By this, we are able to quantify PV power forecast improvements when considering mineral dust radiative effects for a Saharan dust episode on 4 April 2014.

Compared to observations at 26 pyranometer stations, the forecast including mineral dust feedback processes strongly reduces overestimations of incoming solar radiation that exist in the forecast without mineral dust feedback. For underestimations, the results are indifferent. For 65% of the pyranometer stations, the simulated PV is in much better agreement with

observations when the feedback between mineral dust, radiation and clouds is accounted for. For the period from 3 April to 5 April 2014, as well as for each day individually, root mean square error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), bias and standard deviation (STD) are reduced in the simulation that accounts for mineral dust feedback compared to the reference simulation. For 4 April 2014, this results in a reduction in RMSE of 17 %, MAE by 19 %, STD by 16 % and a reduction in the bias from 0.09 to -0.04 $\mathrm{W\,m^{-2}}$.

We quantify the individual contributions of the direct and indirect effect of mineral dust on PV power forecast and find that the direct effect is most important. Eight out of nine stations with very high differences between the simulation with mineral dust feedback and the reference simulation show an improvement due to the consideration of mineral dust. For stations with high differences, we find an improvement at 14 out of 16 stations. The direct radiative ~~effects~~ effect dominates these improvements, accounting for 64 % of the differences at all stations, whereas indirect effects account for 20 % and synergistic interaction effects account for 16 %. At the stations with very high differences, even higher contributions can be attributed to the direct effect (68 %, 16 % and 16 % respectively). We also find that for our simulations, the improvement also depends on the dominating effect. This means, that for stations with direct radiative effect dominating the differences, the improvement is higher than for stations with indirect effects dominating the differences. We assume, that indirect effects may be superimposed by the challenge of representing complex cloud structures, independent of mineral dust availability.

Our study shows the importance of considering mineral dust in numerical weather prediction systems. Understanding and assessing the role of mineral dust in the atmosphere and in particular during special weather situations such as Saharan dust outbreaks will not only help to improve numerical weather predictions but also contribute to reliable PV power forecasts and a safe electricity supply.

Appendix A: Pyranometer stations

The presented study relies on pyranometer observations of 26 stations throughout Germany. Their names, coordinates as well as WMO-ids are given in Table 7. Additionally, their locations are illustrated in Figure 13. At each position, direct and diffuse radiation is measured with a measurement interval of 1 minute.

Appendix B: Factorial method

A factorial method is used to separate the contributions of direct and indirect radiative effects on the outcome of the PV power forecast. A detailed description of this method is given by Montgomery (2008). Examples for the usage of this method in atmospheric sciences can be found in Teller and Levin (2008) and Kraut (2015). In our case, we are using a 2^2 experiment design, i.e. we have two factors (direct and indirect effect) on two levels denoted as T and F as described in section 4. The resulting PV power forecast at a certain station of the individual cases are then denoted as $\mathcal{PV}_{FF}$, $\mathcal{PV}_{TT}$, $\mathcal{PV}_{TF}$ and $\mathcal{PV}_{FT}$ where the indices are chosen in accordance with Table 4. The relative contribution of direct and indirect effects can be obtained by first calculating the sum of squares for each effect:

Figure 13. Positions and names of pyranometer stations in Germany.

$$SS_R = \frac{(\mathcal{PV}_{TT} + \mathcal{PV}_{TF} - \mathcal{PV}_{FT} - \mathcal{PV}_{FF})^2}{4} \tag{B1}$$

$$SS_C = \frac{(\mathcal{PV}_{TT} + \mathcal{PV}_{FT} - \mathcal{PV}_{TF} - \mathcal{PV}_{FF})^2}{4} \tag{B2}$$

$$SS_I = \frac{(\mathcal{PV}_{TT} + \mathcal{PV}_{FF} - \mathcal{PV}_{TF} - \mathcal{PV}_{FT})^2}{4} \tag{B3}$$

$$SS_T = SS_R + SS_C + SS_I, \tag{B4}$$

where SS_R is the sum of squares of the direct radiative effect, SS_C is the sum of squares of the indirect radiative effect and SS_I the sum of squares of the synergistic interaction effect. The synergistic interaction effect considers changes to the result

where both factors are T that do not appear in the cases where one of the factors is T and the other one is F. The percentage contribution of each factor can then be derived by dividing the individual sums of squares by the total sum of squares SS_T multiplied by a factor of 100:

$$\mathcal{FM}_R = \frac{SS_R}{SS_T} \cdot 100 \tag{B5}$$

$$\mathcal{FM}_C = \frac{SS_C}{SS_T} \cdot 100 \tag{B6}$$

$$\mathcal{FM}_I = \frac{SS_I}{SS_T} \cdot 100, \tag{B7}$$

where $\mathcal{FM}_R$ is the percentage contribution of direct radiative effects, $\mathcal{FM}_C$ is the percentage contribution of indirect radiative effects and $\mathcal{FM}_I$ is the percentage contribution of interaction effects.

Appendix C: Characteristic measures

The integrated difference $\mathcal{ID}$ is a measure for the magnitude of the difference between TT and FF without any information on the sign of the difference:

$$\mathcal{ID} = \sum_t |\mathcal{PV}_{TT}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{FF}(t)|, \tag{C1}$$

where t is an output timestep and $\mathcal{PV}_{FF}$ ($\mathcal{PV}_{TT}$) is the result for the PV power forecast in the FF (TT) case. Values with $\mathcal{PV}_{TT}$ or $\mathcal{PV}_{FF} = 0$ (i.e. night time values) are ignored for all calculations. As this measure states a magnitude of the difference but not whether the forecast is actually improved or not, a characteristic measure for the improvement of the forecast, the mean improvement ratio $\overline{\mathcal{IR}}$, is introduced:

$$\overline{\mathcal{IR}} = \frac{1}{t_{tot}} \sum_t \frac{|\mathcal{PV}_{FF}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{SYN}(t)|}{|\mathcal{PV}_{FF}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{SYN}(t)| + |\mathcal{PV}_{TT}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{SYN}(t)|} = \frac{1}{t_{tot}} \sum_t \mathcal{IR}(t), \tag{C2}$$

where $\mathcal{PV}_{SYN}$ is the resulting PV power calculated from radiation measurements at the SYNOP station and $\mathcal{IR}(t)$ is the improvement ratio at a specific output timestep. As for $\mathcal{PV}_{TT}$ and $\mathcal{PV}_{FF}$, values of $\mathcal{PV}_{SYN} = 0$ are ignored for the calculations. This characteristic measure is chosen in a way, that

$\overline{\mathcal{IR}} \to 0$ means a perfect FF forecast

$\overline{\mathcal{IR}} < 0.5$ means a worsening in TT simulation

$\overline{\mathcal{IR}} = 0.5$ means indifference between FF and TT

$\overline{\mathcal{IR}} > 0.5$ means an improvement in TT simulation

5   $\overline{\mathcal{IR}} \to 1$ means a perfect TT forecast.

One of the major goals of this study is to quantify the individual contribution of the direct radiative effect, the indirect radiative effect and synergistic interaction effects on changes in the PV power forecast. For this purpose, percentage contributions of the individual effects were calculated with a factorial method as outlined in Appendix B. The resulting percentage contributions $\mathcal{FM}_R$, $\mathcal{FM}_C$ and $\mathcal{FM}_I$ for direct radiative (index R), indirect radiative (index C) and interaction effects (index I) are used

10 to constrain the contributions with characteristic measures. The mean percentage contributions of direct radiative $\overline{\mathcal{CR}}$, indirect radiative $\overline{\mathcal{CC}}$ and interaction effect $\overline{\mathcal{CI}}$ are obtained by:

$$\overline{\mathcal{CR}} = \frac{\sum_t |\mathcal{PV}_{TT}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{FF}(t)| \cdot \mathcal{FM}_R(t)}{\mathcal{ID}} \tag{C3}$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{CC}} = \frac{\sum_t |\mathcal{PV}_{TT}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{FF}(t)| \cdot \mathcal{FM}_C(t)}{\mathcal{ID}} \tag{C4}$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{CI}} = \frac{\sum_t |\mathcal{PV}_{TT}(t) - \mathcal{PV}_{FF}(t)| \cdot \mathcal{FM}_I(t)}{\mathcal{ID}}. \tag{C5}$$

15 These values weight the result of the factorial method with the magnitude of the change caused by the individual effect.

Author contributions. BV initiated and coordinated the study. Various processes had to be incorporated into ICON-ART for this work: a mineral dust emissions scheme (DR, KD), aerosol-radiation interaction (PG, DR), aerosol-cloud interactions (DR) and cloud-radiation feedback making use of ice particle numbers (HV, JF). VB, AS and JF performed the PV power calculation. DR prepared the model simulation which was then conducted by HV and JF. The analysis of the data and the writing of the manuscript was performed jointly by all authors in

20 roughly equal shares.

Acknowledgements. Part of this research is funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy and was conducted within the project PerduS: *Photovoltaikertragsreduktion durch Saharastaub, 0325932A* (engl. forecasting the reduction in photovoltaic power production during Saharan dust outbreaks). The authors would like to thank the EUMETSAT Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring (CM SAF) for providing the SARAH-2 radiation data. We thank the AERONET Team for the data used in this publication. We also very

25 much appreciated the help of Florian Filipitsch concerning information on and the preprocessing of observational data. Furthermore, we want to thank Ali Hoshyaripour and Andrew Barrett for their detailed comments on the manuscript.

Table 7. Geographical position and characteristic measures as described in Appendix C for SYNOP stations with high quality radiation measurements in Germany.

Station	Latitude	Longitude	WMO-ID	$\mathcal{ID}$	$\overline{\mathcal{IR}}$	$\overline{\mathcal{CR}}$	$\overline{\mathcal{CC}}$	$\overline{\mathcal{CI}}$
Braunschweig	52.2914°N	10.4465°E	10348	0.45	0.46	74.18	13.73	12.09
Bremen	53.045°N	8.7979°E	10224	0.76	0.5	66.16	19.7	14.14
Bad-Lippspringe	51.7855°N	8.8388°E	10430	1.6	0.58	46.39	24.96	28.64
Chemnitz	50.7913°N	12.872°E	10577	1.18	0.53	64.96	16.37	18.67
Dresden	51.128°N	13.7543°E	10488	0.84	0.46	71.43	19	9.57
Fichtelberg	50.4283°N	12.9535°E	10578	1.85	0.59	59.42	28.45	12.13
Fuerstenzell	48.5451°N	13.3531°E	10895	1.28	0.57	54.08	26.9	19.02
Goerlitz	51.1622°N	14.9506°E	10499	1.23	0.53	57.16	30.77	12.06
Hamburg	53.6332°N	9.9881°E	10147	0.81	0.58	80.55	10.93	8.51
Hohenpeissenberg	47.8009°N	11.0108°E	10962	4.78	0.62	88.96	4.06	6.98
Konstanz	47.6774°N	9.1901°E	10929	3.37	0.61	70.01	12.31	17.68
Leipzig	51.3151°N	12.4462°E	10471	0.41	0.47	51.71	31.89	16.39
Lindenberg	52.2085°N	14.118°E	10393	0.74	0.49	55.03	25.96	19.02
Luedenscheid	51.199°N	7.629°E	10418	1.91	0.46	24.14	44.26	31.61
Mannheim	49.509°N	8.5541°E	10729	3.33	0.66	52.91	21.2	25.89
Meiningen	50.5612°N	10.3771°E	10548	2.02	0.62	46.21	27.99	25.8
Norderney	53.7123°N	7.1519°E	10113	0.64	0.68	62.8	20.79	16.41
Nuernberg	49.503°N	11.0549°E	10763	2.38	0.45	32.12	45.41	22.47
Potsdam	52.3813°N	13.0622°E	10379	0.65	0.49	78.12	11.19	10.69
Saarbruecken	49.2128°N	7.1077°E	10708	2.38	0.59	86.13	4.42	9.46
Sankt-Peter-Ording	54.3279°N	8.603°E	10028	0.42	0.53	74.08	17.8	8.12
Seehausen	52.8911°N	11.7297°E	10261	0.58	0.46	76.57	14.19	9.24
Stuttgart	48.8282°N	9.2°E	10739	1.76	0.62	50.99	22.84	26.18
Trier	49.7479°N	6.6582°E	10609	2.5	0.57	74.9	7.66	17.44
Weihenstephan	48.4025°N	11.6946°E	10863	3.51	0.6	83.22	8.76	8.02
Wuerzburg	49.7703°N	9.9577°E	10655	2.23	0.6	78.25	14.09	7.66

References

AERONET: AErosol RObotic NETwork, Ground-based remote sensing aerosol networks established by NASA and PHOTONS, https:// aeronet.gsfc.nasa.gov/new_web/publications.html, last accessed: 9 August 2017, 2017.

AGEE-Stat, A. E. E.-S.: Entwicklung der erneuerbaren Energien in Deutschland im Jahr 2016, Quartalsbericht, in German, on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2016.

Alfaro, S. C. and Gomes, L.: Modeling mineral aerosol production by wind erosion: Emission intensities and aerosol size distributions in source areas, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 106, 18 075–18 084, doi:10.1029/2000JD900339, 2001.

Andrews, R. W., Stein, J. S., Hansen, C., and Riley, D.: Introduction to the Open Source PV_LIB for Python Photovoltaic System Modelling Package, in 40th IEEE Photovoltaic Specialist Conference, 2014.

5 Arino, O., Bicheron, P., Achard, F., Latham, J., Witt, R., and Weber, J.-L.: The most detailed portrait of Earth, ESA Bull. Eur. Space, 136, 25–31, 2008.

Baklanov, A., Schlünzen, K., Suppan, P., Baldasano, J., Brunner, D., Aksoyoglu, S., Carmichael, G., Douros, J., Flemming, J., Forkel, R., Galmarini, S., Gauss, M., Grell, G., Hirtl, M., Joffre, S., Jorba, O., Kaas, E., Kaasik, M., Kallos, G., Kong, X., Korsholm, U., Kurganskiy, A., Kushta, J., Lohmann, U., Mahura, A., Manders-Groot, A., Maurizi, A., Moussiopoulos, N., Rao, S. T., Savage, N., Seigneur, C., Sokhi,

10 R. S., Solazzo, E., Solomos, S., Sørensen, B., Tsegas, G., Vignati, E., Vogel, B., and Zhang, Y.: Online coupled regional meteorology chemistry models in Europe: current status and prospects, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 14, 317–398, doi:10.5194/acp-14-317-2014, 2014.

Balkanski, Y., Schulz, M., Claquin, T., and Guibert, S.: Reevaluation of Mineral aerosol radiative forcings suggests a better agreement with satellite and AERONET data, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 81–95, doi:10.5194/acp-7-81-2007, 2007.

15 Bangert, M.: Interaction of Aerosol, Clouds, and Radiation on the Regional Scale, Ph.D. thesis, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie (KIT), 2012.

Bangert, M., Nenes, A., Vogel, B., Vogel, H., Barahona, D., Karydis, V. A., Kumar, P., Kottmeier, C., and Blahak, U.: Saharan dust event impacts on cloud formation and radiation over Western Europe, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 4045–4063, https://dx.doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-4045-2012, 2012.

20 Barahona, D. and Nenes, A.: Parameterizing the competition between homogeneous and heterogeneous freezing in ice cloud formation–polydisperse ice nuclei, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 5933–5948, doi:10.5194/acp-9-5933-2009, 2009.

Basart, S., Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Cuevas, E., and Baldasano, J.: Development and evaluation of the BSC-DREAM8b dust regional model over Northern Africa, the Mediterranean and the Middle East, Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology, 64, 18 539, doi:10.3402/tellusb.v64i0.18539, https://doi.org/10.3402%2Ftellusb.v64i0.18539, 2012.

25 Benedetti, A., Morcrette, J.-J., Boucher, O., Dethof, A., Engelen, R. J., Fisher, M., Flentje, H., Huneeus, N., Jones, L., Kaiser, J. W., Kinne, S., Mangold, A., Razinger, M., Simmons, A. J., and Suttie, M.: Aerosol analysis and forecast in the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Integrated Forecast System: 2. Data assimilation, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 114, doi:10.1029/2008JD011115, http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008JD011115, d13205, 2009.

Bond, T. C., Habib, G., and Bergstrom, R. W.: Limitations in the enhancement of visible light absorption due to mixing state, J. Geophys.
30 Res.-Atmos., 111, doi:10.1029/2006JD007315, D20211, 1–13, 2006.

Breitkreuz, H., Schroedter-Homscheidt, M., Holzer-Popp, T., and Dech, S.: Short-Range Direct and Diffuse Irradiance Forecasts for Solar Energy Applications Based on Aerosol Chemical Transport and Numerical Weather Modeling, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 48, 1766–1779, doi:10.1175/2009JAMC2090.1, 2009.

Bundesnetzagentur: Monitoringbericht   2016,   https://www.bundesnetzagentur.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Sachgebiete/Energie/
35 Unternehmen_Institutionen/DatenaustauschUndMonitoring/Monitoring/Monitoringbericht2016.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=2, in German, last accessed: 16 March 2017, 2016.

Calinoiu, D., Paulescu, M., Ionel, I., Stefu, N., Pop, N., Boata, R., Pacurar, A., Gravila, P., Paulescu, E., and Trif-Tordai, G.: Influence of aerosols pollution on the amount of collectable solar energy, Energy Conversion and Management, 70, 76 – 82, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2013.02.012, 2013.

Casado-Rubio, J., Revuelta, M., Postigo, M., Martínez-Marco, I., and Yagüe, C.: A Postprocessing Methodology for Direct Normal Irradiance Forecasting Using Cloud Information and Aerosol Load Forecasts, Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology, 56, 1595–1608, doi:10.1175/JAMC-D-16-0297.1, 2017.

Cziczo, D. J., Froyd, K. D., Hoose, C., Jensen, E. J., Diao, M., Zondlo, M. A., Smith, J. B., Twohy, C. H., and Murphy, D. M.: Clarifying the dominant sources and mechanisms of cirrus cloud formation, Science, 340, 1320–1324, doi:10.1126/science.1234145, 2013.

Dipankar, A., Stevens, B., Heinze, R., Moseley, C., Zängl, G., Giorgetta, M., and Brdar, S.: Large eddy simulation using the general circulation model ICON, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 7, 963–986, doi:10.1002/2015MS000431, 2015.

Dubovik, O., Holben, B., Eck, Thomas Fand Smirnov, A., Kaufman, Y. J., King, M. D., Tanré, D., and Slutsker, I.: Variability of absorption and optical properties of key aerosol types observed in worldwide locations, J. Atmos. Sci., 59, 590–608, doi:doi.org/10.1175/1520-0469(2002)059<0590:VOAAOP>2.0.CO;2, 2002.

European Energy Exchange AG: EEX Transparency Platform, https://www.eex-transparency.com/, last accessed on 16 March 2017, 2017.

Fécan, F., Marticorena, B., and Bergametti, G.: Parametrization of the increase of the aeolian erosion threshold wind friction velocity due to soil moisture for arid and semi-arid areas, Adv. Geosci., 17, 149–157, doi:10.1007/s00585-999-0149-7, 1998.

Flentje, H., Briel, B., Beck, C., Collaud Coen, M., Fricke, M., Cyrys, J., Gu, J., Pitz, M., and Thomas, W.: Identification and monitoring of Saharan dust: An inventory representative for south Germany since 1997, Atmos. Environ., 109, 87–96, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.02.023, 2015.

Fu, Q., Yang, P., and Sun, W. B.: An Accurate Parameterization of the Infrared Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds for Climate Models, J. Climate, 11, 2223–2237, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1998)011<2223:AAPOTI>2.0.CO;2, 1998.

Gasch, P., Rieger, D., Walter, C., Khain, P., Levi, Y., Knippertz, P., and Vogel, B.: Revealing the meteorological drivers of the September 2015 severe dust event in the Eastern Mediterranean, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, 2017, 1–37, doi:10.5194/acp-2017-11, https://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/acp-2017-11/, 2017.

Gleeson, E., Toll, V., Nielsen, K. P., Rontu, L., and Mašek, J.: Effects of aerosols on clear-sky solar radiation in the ALADIN-HIRLAM NWP system, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 16, 5933–5948, doi:10.5194/acp-16-5933-2016, 2016.

Hande, L., Engler, C., Hoose, C., and Tegen, I.: Seasonal variability of Saharan desert dust and ice nucleating particles over Europe, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15, 4389–4397, doi:doi:10.5194/acp-15-4389-2015, 2015.

Haustein, K., Pérez, C., Baldasano, J. M., Jorba, O., Basart, S., Miller, R. L., Janjic, Z., Black, T., Nickovic, S., Todd, M. C., Washington, R., Müller, D., Tesche, M., Weinzierl, B., Esselborn, M., and Schladitz, A.: Atmospheric dust modeling from meso to global scales with the online NMMB/BSC-Dust model - Part 2: Experimental campaigns in Northern Africa, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 12, 2933–2958, doi:10.5194/acp-12-2933-2012, 2012.

Heinze, R., Dipankar, A., Henken, C. C., Moseley, C., Sourdeval, O., Trömel, S., Xie, X., Adamidis, P., Ament, F., Baars, H., Barthlott, C., Behrendt, A., Blahak, U., Bley, S., Brdar, S., Brueck, M., Crewell, S., Deneke, H., Di Girolamo, P., Evaristo, R., Fischer, J., Frank, C., Friederichs, P., Göcke, T., Gorges, K., Hande, L., Hanke, M., Hansen, A., Hege, H.-C., Hoose, C., Jahns, T., Kalthoff, N., Klocke, D., Kneifel, S., Knippertz, P., Kuhn, A., van Laar, T., Macke, A., Maurer, V., Mayer, B., Meyer, C. I., Muppa, S. K., Neggers, R. A. J., Orlandi, E., Pantillon, F., Pospichal, B., Röber, N., Scheck, L., Seifert, A., Seifert, P., Senf, F., Siligam, P., Simmer, C., Steinke, S., Stevens,

B., Wapler, K., Weniger, M., Wulfmeyer, V., Zängl, G., Zhang, D., and Quaas, J.: Large-eddy simulations over Germany using ICON: a comprehensive evaluation, Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 143, 69–100, doi:10.1002/qj.2947, 2017.

Helmert, J., Heinold, B., Tegen, I., Hellmuth, O., and Wendisch, M.: On the direct and semidirect effects of Saharan dust over Europe: A modeling study, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 112, doi:10.1029/2006JD007444, D13208, 1–24, 2007.

5 Highwood, E. J. and Ryder, C. L.: Dust Production Mechanisms, in: Mineral Dust, edited by Knippertz, P. and Stuut, J.-B. W., chap. 11, pp. 267–286, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 2014.

Hoose, C. and Möhler, O.: Heterogeneous ice nucleation on atmospheric aerosols: a review of results from laboratory experiments, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 9817–9854, doi:10.5194/acp-12-9817-2012, 2012.

Inman, R. H., Pedro, H. T., and Coimbra, C. F.: Solar forecasting methods for renewable energy integration, Progress in Energy and Combustion Science, 39, 535 – 576, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2013.06.002, 2013.

Kalnay, E.: Atmospheric Modeling, Data Assimilation and Predictability, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Klein, H., Nickovic, S., Haunold, W., Bundke, U., Nillius, B., Ebert, M., Weinbruch, S., Schuetz, L., Levin, Z., Barrie, L. A., and Bingemer, H.: Saharan dust and ice nuclei over Central Europe, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10, 10 211–10 221, doi:10.5194/acp-10-10211-2010, 2010.

15 Knippertz, P. and Stuut, J.-B. W.: Mineral Dust: A Key Player in the Earth System, Springer, 2014.

Köhler, C., Steiner, A., Saint-Drenan, Y.-M., Ernst, D., Bergmann-Dick, A., Zirkelbach, M., Ben Bouallègue, Z., Metzinger, I., and Ritter, B.: Critical weather situations for renewable energies – Part B: Low stratus risk for solar power, Renewable Energy, 101, 794–803, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.09.002, 2017.

Köhler, C. G. and Seifert, A.: Identifying sensitivities for cirrus modelling using a two-moment two-mode bulk microphysics scheme, Tellus B, 67, doi:10.3402/tellusb.v67.24494, 2015.

20 Koop, T., Luo, B., Tsias, A., and Peter, T.: Water activity as the determinant for homogeneous ice nucleation in aqueous solutions, Nature, 406, 611–614, doi:10.1038/35020537, 2000.

Kraut, I.: Separating the Aerosol Effect in Case of a" Medicane", vol. 68, KIT Scientific Publishing, 2015.

Lew, D. and Richard, P.: Western wind and solar integration study, Tech. rep., National Renewable Energy Laboratories, 2010.

25 Lew, D., Miller, N., Clark, K., Jordan, G., and Gao, Z.: Inpact of High Solar Penetration in the Western Interconnection, Tech. rep., National Renewable Energy Laboratories, 2010.

Lu, C.-H., da Silva, A., Wang, J., Moorthi, S., Chin, M., Colarco, P., Tang, Y., Bhattacharjee, P. S., Chen, S.-P., Chuang, H.-Y., Juang, H.-M. H., McQueen, J., and Iredell, M.: The implementation of NEMS GFS Aerosol Component (NGAC) Version 1.0 for global dust forecasting at NOAA/NCEP, Geosci. Model Dev., 9, 1905–1919, doi:10.5194/gmd-9-1905-2016, 2016.

30 Manders, A. M. M., Builtjes, P. J. H., Curier, L., Denier van der Gon, H. A. C., Hendriks, C., Jonkers, S., Kranenburg, R., Kuenen, J., Segers, A. J., Timmermans, R. M. A., Visschedijk, A., Wichink Kruit, R. J., Van Pul, W. A. J., Sauter, F. J., van der Swaluw, E., Swart, D. P. J., Douros, J., Eskes, H., van Meijgaard, E., van Ulft, B., van Velthoven, P., Banzhaf, S., Mues, A., Stern, R., Fu, G., Lu, S., Heemink, A., van Velzen, N., and Schaap, M.: Curriculum Vitae of the LOTOS-EUROS (v2.0) chemistry transport model, Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 2017, 1–53, doi:10.5194/gmd-2017-88, 2017.

35 Manders-Groot, A., Segers, A., and Jonkers, S.: LOTOS-EUROS v2.0 reference guide, TNO report, 2016.

Marticorena, B. and Bergametti, G.: Modeling the atmospheric dust cycle: 1. Design of a soil-derived dust emission scheme, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 100, 16 415–16 430, doi:10.1029/95JD00690, 1995.

Mätzler, C.: MATLAB functions for Mie scattering and absorption, version 2, Tech. rep., Institute of Applied Physics, University of Bern, 1–26, 2002.

McConnell, C., Formenti, P., Highwood, E., and Harrison, M.: Using aircraft measurements to determine the refractive index of Saharan dust during the DODO Experiments, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 3081–3098, doi:10.5194/acp-10-3081-2010, 2010.

Mie, G.: Beiträge zur Optik trüber Medien, speziell kolloidaler Metallösungen, Ann. Phys., 330, 377–445, doi:10.1002/andp.19083300302, 1908.

Mlawer, E. J., Taubman, S. J., Brown, P. D., Iacono, M. J., and Clough, S. A.: Radiative transfer for inhomogeneous atmospheres: RRTM, a validated correlated-k model for the longwave, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 102, 16 663–16 682, doi:10.1029/97JD00237, 1997.

Montgomery, D. C.: Design and analysis of experiments, John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

Morcrette, J.-J., Boucher, O., Jones, L., Salmond, D., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A., Benedetti, A., Bonet, A., Kaiser, J. W., Razinger, M., Schulz, M., Serrar, S., Simmons, A. J., Sofiev, M., Suttie, M., Tompkins, A. M., and Untch, A.: Aerosol analysis and forecast in the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Integrated Forecast System: Forward modeling, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 114, 1–17, doi:10.1029/2008JD011235, 2009.

Mueller, R., Pfeifroth, U., and Traeger-Chatterjee, C.: Towards Optimal Aerosol Information for the Retrieval of Solar Surface Radiation Using Heliosat, Atmosphere, 6, 863–878, doi:doi:10.3390/atmos6070863, 2015.

Nachtergaele, F. and Batjes, N.: Harmonized world soil database, FAO, 2012.

Nickovic, S., Kallos, G., Papadopoulos, A., and Kakaliagou, O.: A model for prediction of desert dust cycle in the atmosphere, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 106, 18 113–18 129, doi:10.1029/2000JD900794, 2001.

Nikitidou, E., Kazantzidis, A., and Salamalikis, V.: The aerosol effect on direct normal irradiance in Europe under clear skies, Renewable Energy, 68, 475 – 484, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2014.02.034, 2014.

Nowottnick, E., Colarco, P., da Silva, A., Hlavka, D., and McGill, M.: The fate of saharan dust across the atlantic and implications for a central american dust barrier, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 8415–8431, doi:10.5194/acp-11-8415-2011, 2011.

Papayannis, A., Amiridis, V., Mona, L., Tsaknakis, G., Balis, D., Bösenberg, J., Chaikovski, A., De Tomasi, F., Grigorov, I., Mattis, I., Mitev, V., Müller, D., Nickovic, S., Pérez, C., Pietruczuk, A., Pisani, G., Ravetta, F., Rizi, V., Sicard, M., Trickl, T., Wiegner, M., Gerding, M., Mamouri, R. E., D'Amico, G., and Pappalardo, G.: Systematic lidar observations of Saharan dust over Europe in the frame of EARLINET (2000–2002), Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 113, doi:10.1029/2007JD009028, 2008.

Pérez, C., Nickovic, S., Baldasano, J. M., Sicard, M., Rocadenbosch, F., and Cachorro, V. E.: A long Saharan dust event over the western Mediterranean: Lidar, Sun photometer observations, and regional dust modeling, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 111, doi:10.1029/2005JD006579, 2006.

Pérez, C., Haustein, K., Janjic, Z., Jorba, O., Huneeus, N., Baldasano, J. M., Black, T., Basart, S., Nickovic, S., Miller, R. L., Perlwitz, J. P., Schulz, M., and Thomson, M.: Atmospheric dust modeling from meso to global scales with the online NMMB/BSC-Dust model - Part 1: Model description, annual simulations and evaluation, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 13 001–13 027, doi:10.5194/acp-11-13001-2011, 2011.

Perry, M. and Troccoli, A.: Impact of a fire burn on solar irradiance and PV power, Solar Energy, 114, 167 – 173, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2015.01.005, 2015.

Petzold, A., Rasp, K., Weinzierl, B., Esselborn, M., Hamburger, T., Dörnbrack, A., Kandler, K., Schütz, L., Knippertz, P., Fiebig, M., et al.: Saharan dust absorption and refractive index from aircraft-based observations during SAMUM 2006, Tellus B, 61, 118–130, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2008.00383.x, 2009.

Pfeifroth, U., Kothe, S., Müller, R., Cremer, R., Trentmann, J., and Hollmann, R.: Surface Solar Radiation Data Set - Heliosat (SARAH) - Edition 2. Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring, Tech. Rep. 2, EUMETSAT Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring (CM SAF), doi:10.5676/EUM_SAF_CM/SARAH/V002, 2017.

Phillips, V. T., Demott, P. J., Andronache, C., Pratt, K. A., Prather, K. A., Subramanian, R., and Twohy, C.: Improvements to an empirical parameterization of heterogeneous ice nucleation and its comparison with observations, J. Atmos. Sci., 70, 378 – 409, doi:10.1175/JAS-D-12-080.1, 2013.

Raupach, M.: Dry deposition of gases and particles to vegetation, Clean Air, 27, 200, 1993.

Rieger, D., Bangert, M., Bischoff-Gauss, I., Förstner, J., Lundgren, K., Reinert, D., Schröter, J., Vogel, H., Zängl, G., Ruhnke, R., and Vogel, B.: ICON–ART 1.0 – a new online-coupled model system from the global to regional scale, Geosci. Model Dev., 8, 1659–1676, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-1659-2015, 2015.

Sayyah, A., Horenstein, M. N., and Mazumder, M. K.: Energy yield loss caused by dust deposition on photovoltaic panels, Solar Energy, 107, 576–604, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2014.05.030, 2014.

Schroedter-Homscheidt, M., Benedetti, A., and Killius, N.: Verification of ECMWF and ECMWF/MACC's global and direct irradiance forecasts with respect to solar electricity production forecasts, Meteorologische Zeitschrift, 26, 1–19, doi:10.1127/metz/2016/0676, 2016.

Seifert, A. and Beheng, K.: A two-moment cloud microphysics parameterization for mixed-phase clouds. Part 1: Model description, Meteorol. Atmos. Phys., 92, 45–66, doi:10.1007/s00703-005-0112-4, 2006.

Shao, Y.: A model for mineral dust emission, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 106, 20 239–20 254, doi:10.1029/2001JD900171, 2001.

Shao, Y. and Lu, H.: A simple expression for wind erosion threshold friction velocity, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 105, 22 437–22 443, doi:10.1029/2000JD900304, 2000.

Shao, Y., Fink, A. H., and Klose, M.: Numerical simulation of a continental-scale Saharan dust event, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 115, D13 205, doi:10.1029/2009JD012678, 2010.

Shao, Y., Wyrwoll, K.-H., Chappell, A., Huang, J., Lin, Z., McTainsh, G. H., Mikami, M., Tanaka, T. Y., Wang, X., and Yoon, S.: Dust cycle: An emerging core theme in Earth system science, Aeolian Research, 2, 181–204, doi:10.1016/j.aeolia.2011.02.001, 2011.

Spyrou, C., Mitsakou, C., Kallos, G., Louka, P., and Vlastou, G.: An improved limited area model for describing the dust cycle in the atmosphere, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 115, 1–19, doi:10.1029/2009JD013682, d17211, 2010.

Stanelle, T., Vogel, B., Vogel, H., Bäumer, D., and Kottmeier, C.: Feedback between dust particles and atmospheric processes over West Africa during dust episodes in March 2006 and June 2007, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 10, 10 771–10 788, doi:doi:10.5194/acp-10-10771-2010, 2010.

Steiner, A., Köhler, C., Metzinger, I., Braun, A., Zirkelbach, M., Ernst, D., Tran, P., and Ritter, B.: Critical weather situations for renewable energies – Part A: Cyclone detection for wind power, Renewable Energy, 101, 41–50, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.08.013, 2017.

Stevens, B., Giorgetta, M., Esch, M., Mauritsen, T., Crueger, T., Rast, S., Salzmann, M., Schmidt, H., Bader, J., Block, K., Brokopf, R., Fast, I., Kinne, S., Kornblueh, L., Lohmann, U., Pincus, R., Reichler, T., and Roeckner, E.: Atmospheric component of the MPI-M Earth System Model: ECHAM6, J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst., 5, 146–172, doi:10.1002/jame.20015, 2013.

Teller, A. and Levin, Z.: Factorial method as a tool for estimating the relative contribution to precipitation of cloud microphysical processes and environmental conditions: Method and application, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 113, doi:10.1029/2007JD008960, 2008.

Vautard, R., Bessagnet, B., Chin, M., and Menut, L.: On the contribution of natural Aeolian sources to particulate matter concentrations in Europe: Testing hypotheses with a modelling approach, Atmospheric Environment, 39, 3291 – 3303, doi:http://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.01.051, 2005.

Vogel, B., Hoose, C., Vogel, H., and Kottmeier, C.: A model of dust transport applied to the Dead Sea Area, Meteorol. Z., 15, 611–624, doi:10.1127/0941-2948/2006/0168, 2006.

Voigt, C., Schumann, U., Minikin, A., Abdelmonem, A., Afchine, A., Borrmann, S., Boettcher, M., Buchholz, B., Bugliaro, L., Costa, A., et al.: ML-CIRRUS-The airborne experiment on natural cirrus and contrail cirrus with the high-altitude long-range research aircraft HALO, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., doi:10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00213.1, 2016.

White, B. R.: Soil transport by winds on Mars, J. Geophys. Res.-Sol. Ea., 84, 4643–4651, doi:10.1029/JB084iB09p04643, 1979.

Wirth, H.: Aktuelle Fakten zur Photovoltaik in Deutschland, Fraunhofer ISE,in German, 2017.

Woodward, S.: Modeling the atmospheric life cycle and radiative impact of mineral dust in the Hadley Centre climate model, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 106, 18 155–18 166, doi:10.1029/2000JD900795, 2001.

Woodward, S.: Mineral Dust in HadGEM2, Met Office, Hadley Centre Technical Note 87, 2011.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Sand and Dust Storm Warning Advisory and Assessment System (SDS-WAS): The SDS-WAS programme at WMO, https://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/arep/wwrp/new/Sand_and_Dust_Storm.html, last accessed on 11 August 2017, 2017.

Zaihidee, F. M., Mekhilef, S., Seyedmahmoudian, M., and Horan, B.: Dust as an unalterable deteriorative factor affecting PV panel's efficiency: Why and how, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 65, 1267 – 1278, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.06.068, 2016.

Zängl, G., Reinert, D., Rípodas, P., and Baldauf, M.: The ICON (ICOsahedral Non-hydrostatic) modelling framework of DWD and MPI-M: Description of the non-hydrostatic dynamical core, Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 141, 563–579, doi:10.1002/qj.2378, 2015.

Zender, C. S., Bian, H., and Newman, D.: Mineral Dust Entrainment and Deposition (DEAD) model: Description and 1990s dust climatology, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 108, 4416, doi:10.1029/2002JD002775, 2003.