Approaches and Challenges in Ice Sheet Modelling

Toby Isaac

December 4, 2008

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ○ □ ○ ○ ○ ○

The Equations of Motion

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{v}) &= 0 & \text{(Continuity)}; \\ \rho \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial t} + \nabla \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{v} \right) &= -\nabla \rho + \rho \mathbf{g} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T} & \text{(Momentum)}; \\ \mathbf{T} &= F(\dot{\mathbf{E}}; T, ...) & \text{(Stress-Strain)}; \\ \dot{\mathbf{E}} &= \nabla \mathbf{v} + \nabla \mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}}. \end{aligned}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● ● ● ● ●

The Stokes Approximation

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} &= 0 & (\text{Continuity}); \\ \nabla p &= \rho \mathbf{g} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{T} & (\text{Momentum}); \\ \mathbf{T} &= F(\dot{\mathbf{E}}; T, ...) & (\text{Stress-Strain}); \\ \dot{\mathbf{E}} &= \nabla \mathbf{v} + \nabla \mathbf{v}^{\mathsf{T}} \end{aligned}$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

- Good for ice at glacial time scales and pressures
- How is this time dependent?
- Must define F and boundary conditions

Rheology: defining F^{-1}

- 1. High Stress
 - Viscous, but nonlinear
 - Glen's power law: $\dot{\epsilon} = A\sigma^3$
 - A increases with increasing temperature
- 2. Low Stress
 - Viscoelastic
 - Creep :



▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶▲□▶ □ のQで

Anisotropy



- Shear easiest in basal plane
- Polycrystalline ice becomes organized with time, pressure, and shear

▲ロト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ▲ □ ト ● ● の Q ()

Order of magnitude difference in effective viscosity

Basal boundary conditions

- 1. Cold boundary
 - No slip: not complicated
- 2. "Warm" boundary
 - Thin layer of water lubricates
 - Weertman slip: $v = C\sigma^3$
 - C is a parametric roughness constant: how to determine?
 - Is "Stick-Slip" more appropriate?



$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \sigma_{xx} + \partial_y \sigma_{xy} + \partial_z \sigma_{xz} &= -\partial_x p; \\ \partial_x \sigma_{xy} + \partial_y \sigma_{yy} + \partial_z \sigma_{yz} &= -\partial_y p; \\ \partial_x \sigma_{xz} + \partial_y \sigma_{yz} + \partial_z \sigma_{zz} &= -\partial_z p - \rho g; \\ \sigma_{ij} &= F(\dot{\epsilon}_{ij}; T, ...); \\ \dot{\epsilon}_{ij} &= \partial_j v_i + \partial_i v_j. \end{aligned}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 - のへで

$$\partial_z \sigma_{xz} = -\partial_x p;$$

 $\partial_z \sigma_{yz} = -\partial_y p;$
 $0 = -\partial_z p - \rho g;$
 $\sigma_{ij} = F(\dot{\epsilon}_{ij}; T, ...);$
 $\dot{\epsilon}_{iz} = \partial_z v_i.$

<□> <圖> < E> < E> E のQ@

$$\partial_{z}\sigma_{xz} = -\partial_{x}p;$$

$$\partial_{z}\sigma_{yz} = -\partial_{y}p;$$

$$0 = -\partial_{z}p - pg;$$

$$\sigma_{ij} = F(\dot{\varepsilon}_{ij}; T, ...);$$

$$\dot{\varepsilon}_{iz} = \partial_{z}v_{i}.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ─ □ ─ つへぐ

Hydrostatic approximation \Rightarrow depth average!

$$\partial_t h = \nabla \cdot [G(\nabla h)] + B$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ─ □ ─ つへぐ

G and *B* are dependent on rheology *F*, boundary conditions, and basal slope.

AR4 draws on four studies to predict changes in ice mass:

- 1. Huybrechts and de Wolde 1999 (GISM/AISM model + simple atmosphere)
- 2. Greve 2000 (SICOPOLIS model + simple atmosphere)
- 3. Huybrechts et al. 2004 (GISM/AISM model forced by GCM)

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

4. Ridley et al. 2005 (GISM/AISM coupled with GCM)

Greve 2000 (SICOPOLIS)



3, 6, and 10 degree increase in mean temperature over 1000 years (Greenland only).

イロト 不得 とうほう イヨン

3

Huybrechts and de Wolde 1999 (GISM/AISM)



Three different CO2 scenarios for next 100 years: wide spread of outcomes

イロト 不得 とうほう イヨン

3

GISM and SICOPOLIS comparison



Remaining ice mass after 1000 years

Ridley 2005: Coupling



A new convection cycle develops, slows melting.

▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ★臣▶ = 臣 = のへで

Newer stand-alone models

- 1. Longitudinal improvements: remove fewer terms
- 2. Full Stokes where SIA is not appropriate



(Johnson and Staiger, 2007)

イロト 不得 とうほう イヨン

-

Future Directions

- Verification (Pattyn, 2008)
- Stress history dependence
- Rigorous model reduction techniques

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●