

Evaluation of the near-surface wind field over the Adriatic region: Local wind characteristics in the convection-permitting model ensemble

Andreina Belušić Vozila (✉ andreina@iptpo.hr)

Institut za poljoprivredu i turizam Porec <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1477-2506>

Danijel Belušić

University of Zagreb Faculty of Science: Sveuciliste u Zagrebu Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet

Maja Telišman Prtenjak

University of Zagreb Faculty of Science: Sveuciliste u Zagrebu Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet

Ivan Güttler

Meteorological and Hydrological Service: Državni hidrometeorološki zavod

Sophie Bastin

LATMOS Site de Verrières-le-Buisson: Laboratoire Atmospheres Milieux Observations Spatiales Site Paris-Jussieu

Erwan Brisson

CNRM GMGEC: Centre National de Recherches Meteorologiques Groupe de Meteorologie de Grande Echelle et Climat

Marie-Estelle Demory

ETH Zurich Department of Environmental Systems Science: Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule Departement Umweltsystemwissenschaften

Andreas Dobler

Norwegian Meteorological Institute: Meteorologisk institutt

Hendrik Feldmann

Karlsruher Institut für Technologie: Karlsruher Institut für Technologie

Øivind Hodnebrog

Center for International Climate Research: CICERO

Stergios Kartsios

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki School of Sciences: Aristoteleio Panepistemio Thessalonikes Schole Thetikon Epistemon

Klaus Keuler

Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus-Senftenberg - Campus Cottbus-Sachsendorf: Brandenburgische Technische Universität Cottbus-Senftenberg - Campus Cottbus-Sachsendorf

Torge Lorenz

NORCE Norwegian Research Centre AS

Josipa Milovac

Instituto de Fisica de Cantabria

Emanuela Pichelli

ICTP: Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics

Mario Raffa

Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui Cambiamenti Climatici

Pedro M.M. Soares

University of Lisbon Faculty of Sciences: Universidade de Lisboa Faculdade de Ciencias

Merja H. Tölle

University of Kassel: Universitat Kassel

Heimo Truhetz

University of Graz: Karl-Franzens-Universitat Graz

Hylke de Vries

KNMI: Koninklijk Nederlands Meteorologisch Instituut

Kirsten Warrach-Sagi

University of Hohenheim: Universitat Hohenheim

Research Article

Keywords: Adriatic, Bora, Convection-permitting models, CORDEX, Regional climate models, Sirocco, wind

Posted Date: May 17th, 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1622667/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

1 **Evaluation of the near-surface wind field over the Adriatic region: Local wind characteristics**
2 **in the convection-permitting model ensemble**

3 Andreina Belušić Vozila, Danijel Belušić, Maja Telišman Prtenjak, Ivan Güttler, Sophie Bastin, Erwan
4 Brisson, Marie-Estelle Demory, Andreas Dobler, Hendrik Feldmann, Øivind Hodnebrog, Stergios Kartsios,
5 Klaus Keuler, Torge Lorenz, Josipa Milovac, Emanuela Pichelli, Mario Raffa, Pedro M.M. Soares, Merja H.
6 Tölle, Heimo Truhetz, Hylke de Vries, Kirsten Warrach-Sagi

7 Andreina Belušić Vozila
8 Institute of agriculture and tourism
9 Karla Huguesa 8, 52440, Poreč
10 E-mail: andreina@iptpo.hr

11 Danijel Belušić
12 Department of Geophysics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia
13 Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (SMHI), Norrköping, Sweden

14 Maja Telišman Prtenjak
15 Andrija Mohorovičić Geophysical Institute, Department of Geophysics, Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb,
16 Zagreb, Croatia

17 Ivan Güttler
18 Meteorological and Hydrological Service (DHMZ), Zagreb, Croatia

19 Sophie Bastin
20 LATMOS/IPSL, UVSQ Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, Guyancourt, France

21 Erwan Brisson
22 Groupe de Météorologie de Grande Échelle et Climat (GMGEC), Centre National de Recherches Météorologiques
23 (CNRM), Université de Toulouse, Météo-France, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Toulouse,
24 France

25 Marie-Estelle Demory
26 Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

27 Andreas Dobler
28 Norwegian Meteorological institute, Oslo, Norway

29 Hendrik Feldmann
30 Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research, Germany

31 Øivind Hodnebrog
32 CICERO Center for International Climate Research, Norway

33 Stergios Kartsios
34 Department of Meteorology and Climatology, School of Geology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki,
35 Greece

36 Klaus Keuler
37 Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus–Senftenberg, Cottbus, Germany

38 Torge Lorenz
39 NORCE Norwegian Research Centre, Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Bergen, Norway

40 Josipa Milovac
 41 Instituto de Física de Cantabria, (Universidad de Cantabria-CSIC), Santander, Spain

42 Emanuela Pichelli
 43 Earth System Physics (ESP), The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), Trieste, Italy

44 Mario Raffa
 45 Regional Models and Geo-Hydrological Impacts (REMHI) Division, Fondazione Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui
 46 Cambiamenti Climatici, Caserta, Italy

47 Pedro M.M. Soares
 48 Instituto Dom Luiz - University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

49 Merja H. Tölle
 50 University of Kassel, Kassel Institute for Sustainability (KIS), Kassel, Germany

51 Heimo Truhetz
 52 Wegener Center for Climate and Global Change (WEGC), University of Graz, Graz, Austria

53 Hylke de Vries
 54 Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI), De Bilt, The Netherlands

55 Kirsten Warrach-Sagi
 56 Institute of Physics and Meteorology, University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart, Germany

57 **ABSTRACT**

58 We present the first evaluation of the wind field from the CORDEX-FPS ensemble of kilometer-scale simulations, with
 59 focus on the Adriatic region. Kilometer-scale climate models, also known as convection-permitting models (CPMs),
 60 produce a good representation of small-scale topographic features and consequently a more detailed depiction of
 61 dynamical and thermal circulation. These enable a reliable view of climate characteristics of the wind field, especially
 62 in coastal regions and over complex terrain, such as the Adriatic. We investigate the (potential) added value introduced
 63 by CPMs compared to classical “cumulus-parametrized” regional climate models (RCMs), reanalysis and station
 64 observations. For this purpose, wind components at 10 meter level are used at 3-hourly frequency. All simulations cover
 65 a 10-year period, extending from 2000 to 2009. In terms of the standard statistical parameters such as correlation
 66 coefficient and temporal standard deviation, CPMs are very dependent on their parent RCM performance. However, the
 67 orographic forcing emphasizes the potential added value and CPMs contain some fine spatial scale variability (i.e.
 68 stronger extremes by 25% and accurate wind direction) that is absent in coarser RCMs and reanalysis. The potential
 69 added value is higher in the cold season compared to the warm season due to the proportion of severe wind events.
 70 CPMs reproduce well the typical wind regimes along the Adriatic coast, namely Bora and Sirocco. The benefit of using
 71 CPMs is especially pronounced in simulating Bora maximum wind speeds in northern Adriatic and Sirocco frequencies
 72 in southern Adriatic. Based on our overall analysis, we conclude that CPMs provide added value compared to coarser
 73 models, especially in the complex coastal terrain.

74 **Keywords:** Adriatic; Bora; Convection-permitting models; CORDEX; Regional climate models; Sirocco; wind

75 1. INTRODUCTION

76 Evaluation of the wind field over complex terrain provides an excellent opportunity to assess the reliability of
77 the climate model simulations. However, it is a challenging task due to the limited accessibility of observational data
78 and high variability in both speed and direction. Consequently, extensive studies comparing the modeled and observed
79 climate characteristics of the wind field over particular parts of the Mediterranean region, where winds are strongly
80 affected by topography (e.g. Ulbrich et al. 2012), are still rare (Obermann et al. 2016, Bonaldo et al. 2017, Belušić et al.
81 2018), especially on a sub-daily scale. However, sub-daily wind data is crucial in detecting the most severe wind events.
82 Therefore, the evaluation of very high-resolution climate models, in coastal regions and over complex terrain such as
83 the Adriatic, can reveal whether they achieve a good representation of small-scale topographic features and hence more
84 details in dynamical aspects. Moreover, the evaluation of the wind for the present climate is needed for building
85 confidence in wind field projections over future decades.

86 In the last decade, the international framework coordinating regional climate simulations with the highest
87 available horizontal resolution was the Coordinated Regional climate Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX). EURO-
88 (Jacob et al. 2020) and MED- (Somot et al. 2011, Ruti et al. 2016) CORDEX simulations at 0.11° (~ 12 km), which
89 cover the Mediterranean region and the European continent, respectively, were used in a large extent to access climate
90 variability and projections. Moreover, the CORDEX results showed added value and served as input for climate change
91 impact and adaptation studies within the Fifth and Sixth Assessment Report (AR5 and AR6) of the Intergovernmental
92 Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and beyond (Patarčić et al. 2014, Gajić-Čapka et al. 2015, Belušić et al. 2018, Belušić
93 Vozila et al. 2019). Referring to the Adriatic region, Belušić Vozila et al. (2019) have already analyzed the wind field
94 projections using a multi-model ensemble composed of CORDEX regional climate models (RCMs) which showed a
95 good performance when compared to the daily observed wind (Belušić et al. 2018). However, there is still space left for
96 improvements, especially over the complex coastal region, where local winds often reach severe speeds due to the
97 interaction with coastal topography.

98 Recently, an increasing number of studies show improvements in performances, when the grid spacing is
99 further refined to 3-1 km (e.g. Ban et al. 2014, Ban et al. 2015, Meredith et al. 2020, Adinolfi et al. 2021, Ban et al.
100 2021, Kendon et al. 2021, Pichelli et al. 2021). Up until now, such studies investigated principally precipitation and
101 have revealed that convection-permitting models (CPMs) show significant advantages in representing complex
102 orographic regions, in producing high-order statistics and predicting events with small temporal and spatial scales
103 compared to RCMs (Gutowski et al. 2020) and reanalysis (Belušić et al. 2018). The international coordinated
104 framework CORDEX Flagship Pilot Study (FPS) on convective phenomena over Europe and the Mediterranean started
105 in 2016, aiming to produce and investigate the first multi-model ensemble of convection permitting simulations
106 (Coppola et al. 2020). There are over 67 individual participants representing 16 modeling groups and five non-
107 hydrostatic regional climate models with a high output temporal resolution of 1 h and a grid spacing around 3 km. A
108 large part of the simulations for the present-day climate driven by ERA-Interim reanalysis (Dee et al. 2011) have been
109 completed and, therefore, will be considered here.

110 A multi-model and multi-physics ensemble such as the CORDEX FPS gives a great opportunity to examine the
111 added value in two ways; (i) to detect the potential added value introduced by CPMs compared to the parent RCMs and
112 reanalysis and (ii) to perform in-situ statistical analysis of CPMs with respect to observations. In this study the wind
113 field of the convection permitting CORDEX FPS ensemble has been evaluated for the first time, with focus over the
114 Adriatic region. Accordingly, special attention is given to the comparison of the spatial variability of the wind speed and
115 frequency distribution of wind directions in CPMs and RCMs.

116 The aim is to inspect the capabilities of CPMs to realistically simulate the small-scale characteristics of the
117 local winds, namely Bora (Grisogono & Belušić 2009) and Sirocco (Pasarić et al. 2007, Horvath et al. 2008), which
118 were not captured well by EURO-CORDEX simulations analyzed in Belušić et al. (2018). It is important to note that
119 Bora and Sirocco winds are driven by two different mechanisms. While Bora is a gusty downslope wind, which
120 experiences a strong influence of the terrain and usually blows perpendicular to the Dinarides, Sirocco is generated by
121 synoptic-scale events and usually parallel to the coastline. The climatology of the present-day Bora wind, which is
122 obtained from observations at meteorological stations (Poje 1992), from satellites (Zecchetto & Cappa 2001), and from
123 simulations (Horvath et al. 2011, Stiperski et al. 2012, Prtenjak et al. 2015), reveals that Bora wind is the strongest,
124 most frequent, and persistent over the northeastern Adriatic (i.e. the region around Trieste and Senj). The main
125 characteristic of the Bora wind is the spatial variation in wind speed (Grisogono & Belušić 2009, Prtenjak et al. 2015)
126 due to the formation of alternating Bora jets and wakes along the coast. The wind speed often reaches severe intensities
127 (i.e. maximum mean hourly northeasterly wind speed >17.0 m/s, Bajić 1989) within the jets. These jets are associated
128 with mountain passes (Kuzmić et al. 2013), which affect the Bora wind duration and strength locally. Contrary to Bora
129 wind, Sirocco is less influenced by the coastal orography. However, it is known that the Sirocco is stronger along the
130 eastern than along the western Adriatic coast, due to the channeling effects of the surrounding mountains (Pasarić et al.
131 2007). The maximum wind speeds are lower, and the occurrence is less frequent than that of Bora events (Belušić et al.
132 2018). Characteristics of the Sirocco wind field based on long-term wind observations (Poje 1992, Penzar et al. 2001)

suggest that this wind is more frequent and the speeds are higher over the southern Adriatic than those northward of the city of Split.

In order to address the mentioned objectives, we are using an ensemble of 17 CPM simulations, including four different non-hydrostatic models, at ~ 3 km spatial scale, and 14 corresponding RCM simulations including five different models with horizontal resolutions ranging from ~ 12 km to ~ 15 km. Moreover, we perform a location-based comparison of the present-day simulations with several observational stations and ERA5 reanalysis data. All simulations and measurements cover a 10 year-long evaluation period extending from 2000 to 2009 with 3-h frequency. Four main points are addressed in this paper, which emphasize the (potential) added value in both the wind speed and wind direction;

- (i) The enhanced spatial variability,
- (ii) The possibility of simulating more intense wind speeds,
- (iii) Having enough skill to replicate the observed wind roses over the complex terrain and the ability of simulating local winds realistically,
- (iv) The skill in producing temporal correlation coefficients as high as in ERA5 reanalysis.

2. DATA AND METHODS

2.1. CLIMATE MODEL DATA

A CPM and a parent RCM are limited-area atmosphere-only models, which share the majority of their main physical components, with the main difference in removal of parametrization of deep convection as the spatial resolution increases (Ban et al. 2014). Near-surface wind components at 10 m level were available at hourly frequency for both CPMs and RCMs. However, 3-h data were extracted due to observational measurements availability. Furthermore, all simulations cover a 10 year period, extending from 2000 to 2009. ERA-Interim driven simulations were utilized, therefore, the initial conditions, lateral boundary conditions and sea surface temperatures were derived from the ERA-Interim reanalysis. Furthermore, most of the CPM simulations were run with an intermediate nest (RCM parent domain). Different simulations within the text are identified by Institution abbreviation followed by CPM or RCM name from Table 1.

2.1.1. CONVECTION-PERMITTING SIMULATIONS

The CORDEX FPS convection permitting simulations (Coppola et al. 2020), performed over the ALP-3 domain (Fig. 1a) and are used to investigate wind characteristics over the Adriatic. The ALP-3 domain is characterized by a spatial resolution of around 3 km (details can be found in Table 1) and spans an extended Alpine domain from central Italy to northern Germany (4.56°W – 17.4°E ; 37.50°N – 52.63°N). The Adriatic domain used for the analysis covers the entire Adriatic coastal area and Croatia (12°E – 17.4°E , 41°N – 47°N ; Fig. 1b).

Four different models were considered: two flavors of AROME, namely CNRM-AROME41t1 (Fumière et al. 2019) and HCLIM38-AROME (Belušić et al. 2020), two flavors of COSMO, namely COSMO-CLM - Consortium for Small Scale Modeling (Rockel et al. 2008, Baldauf et al. 2011) and COSMO-crCLIM (Leutwyler et al. 2017), RegCM4.7 - Regional Climate Modeling system (Giorgi et al. 2012, Coppola et al. 2021) and WRF - the Weather Research and Forecasting modeling system (Powers et al. 2017, Skamarock et al. 2019). Overall, 17 simulations are examined forming a multi-model convection-permitting ensemble (Table 1). A detailed description of each simulation can be found in Ban et al. (2021).

2.1.2. REGIONAL CLIMATE SIMULATIONS

In order to inspect the potential added value of a CPM simulation, the parent RCM simulation (Table 1) was also analyzed over the same domain (Fig. 1). The horizontal grid spacing varies between 12 and 15 km depending on the model chosen. Five different models were considered: two flavors of ALADIN, namely CNRM-ALADIN62 (Colin et al. 2010) and HCLIM38-ALADIN (Belušić et al. 2020), COSMO-CLM, RACMO23 (Van Meijgaard et al. 2008), RegCM4.7 and WRF. Mentioned RCMs are implemented by several institutions and, therefore, form an ensemble of 14 RCM simulations. Two COSMO-CLM parent simulations are missing since the corresponding 3-h data was not available at the time this research was conducted, while one COSMO-CLM simulation was conducted as a direct downscaling experiment using ERA-Interim to downscale directly to the 3 km spatial resolution without an intermediate nest.

181 **Table 1.** Overview of the analyzed RCM and CPM simulations.

	CPM	Grid (km)	Parent RCM	Grid (km)	Institution (Abbreviation)
1	CNRM-AROME41t1	2.5	CNRM-ALADIN62	12.5	National Centre for Meteorological Research (CNRM)
2	HCLIM38-AROME	2.5	RACMO23E	12.5	Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (KNMI)
3	HCLIM38-AROME	3	HCLIM38-ALADIN	13	HARMONIE-Climate community: Danish Meteorological Institute and MET Norway and Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (HCLIMcom)
4	COSMO-CLM	3	/		Brandenburg University of Technology (BTU)
5	COSMO-CLM	3	COSMO-CLM	12.5	Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change (CMCC)
6	COSMO-crCLIM	2.2	COSMO-CLM	12.5	Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH)
7	COSMO-CLM	3	/		Justus-Liebig University of Giessen (JLU) (now University of Kassel (UKa))
8	COSMO-CLM	3	/		Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT)
9	RegCM4.7	3	RegCM4.7	12	International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP)
10	WRF381BG	3	WRF381BG	15	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (AUTH)
11	WRF381BF	3	WRF381BF	15	Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research (BCCR)
12	WRF381BJ	3	WRF381BJ	15	Center for International Climate Research (CICERO)
13	WRF381BH	3	WRF381BH	15	Instituto Dom Luiz (IDL)
14	WRF381BE	3	WRF381BE	15	Institut Pierre Simon Laplace (IPSL)
15	WRF381BI	3	WRF381BI	15	Universidad de Cantabria (UCAN)
16	WRF381BD	3	WRF381BD	15	University of Hohenheim (UHOH)
17	WRF381BL	3	WRF381BL	15	Wegener Center for Climate and Global Change (WEGC)

182 2.2. ERA 5 REANALYSIS

183 The potential added value of CPMs was also examined in comparison to the global reanalysis. ERA5 (Hersbach et al.
184 2020) is the fifth generation ECMWF atmospheric reanalysis of the global climate, produced by the Copernicus Climate
185 Change Service (C3S) extending from January 1950 to present. The data covers the Earth on a 0.25° (~30 km)
186 horizontal grid. Although available hourly, we extracted only the estimates of 10-m wind components at 3-h intervals
187 from 2000 to 2009 in order to be analogous with CPMs, RCMs and observed data.

188 2.3. STATION OBSERVATIONS

189 We used station observations of wind speed and direction to involve another comparison technique. We are aware of the
190 limitations of the observed data, especially when comparing them against gridded climate product. However, no high
191 quality gridded wind observational product is available, for the selected Adriatic domain.

192 Wind observations at 10-m above ground level from 2000 to 2009 were gathered from different databases in
193 SYNOP format, mostly from Meteorological and Hydrological Service of Croatia (DHMZ), Croatia control
194 (Crocontrol) and a few from NCDC-NOAA (Smith et al. 2011). We considered only stations having more than 70% of
195 3-h data available in the period of interest. Ultimately, a subset of 16 stations satisfied the criteria for both wind
196 magnitude and direction and were analyzed within the framework of this paper (Fig. 1b). Each of the station time series
197 was linked to the nearest (in longitude and latitude) simulation grid point in order to evaluate the wind climatology.

198 2.4. METHODS

199 The present-day climate wind evaluation is performed by computing the ensemble mean for the DJF and JJA season for
200 both wind magnitude and normalized wind vector over the domain of interest. Wind vectors are computed using
201 seasonal mean of u and v wind components first. Probability density functions (PDFs) are examined and are
202 complemented by calculating the Perkins skill score (PSS, Perkins et al. 2007), which measures a similarity between
203 two PDFs by computing the common area between them. Afterwards, special attention was given to the upper
204 percentiles. The score presented in Figure 3 shows the frequency distribution of the spatial 95th (Q95) percentile. It
205 involves the spatial calculation of the 95th percentile (Q95), taking into account the whole domain. Repeating this for
206 each time step over the whole period of interest, we obtained the probability distribution of Q95. Finally, we determined
207 how many times the spatial Q95 is larger than 5 or 15 m/s.

Furthermore, to assess the specific local wind regimes over the Adriatic two directional ranges are analyzed in detail following Belušić et al. (2018) and Belušić Vozila et al. (2019): *i*) perpendicular to the alongshore mountains NNE (22.5°)–ENE (67.5°) and *ii*) parallel with the alongshore mountains ESE (112.5°)–SSE (157.5°), which correspond to Bora and Sirocco directions, respectively. The direction ranges are selected in order to focus on channeling effects of the terrain on both wind types. The Bora/Sirocco events are defined as the occurrence of 3-h wind from NNE to ENE/ESE to SSE. The frequency of a particular wind type is calculated by summarizing how many time steps fell within the selected Bora/Sirocco definition in the analyzed period.
 The paper is concluded by computing standard statistical measures in time (i.e. bias, standard deviation and correlation coefficient) with respect to in-situ observations divided in two groups, namely inland stations and coastal stations.




Figure 1. a) ALP-3 domain and the Adriatic domain (white box) used in this study. Colors correspond to topographic elevation in meters obtained from ICTP-RegCM4.7 CPM simulation. b) Adriatic domain with stations analyzed in this study in red dots. Names are associated with the stations mentioned in text.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. THE SPATIAL VARIABILITY

Figure 2 displays the seasonal (cold season-DJF) mean wind vectors and scalar wind speeds over the Adriatic for CPM ensemble (a), RCM ensemble (b) and ERA5 reanalysis (c). The DJF season is chosen since it is the windiest season over the Adriatic (Belušić Vozila et al. 2021) with maximum spatial variance calculated from simulations (not shown). The potential added value of dynamical downscaling to finer grid spacing can immediately be recognized from much more detailed structures in the spatial wind patterns (Fig. 2a).
 The variability of the wind field over land is largely influenced by fine-scale topography, while the wind field over the open-sea is mostly affected by large-scale atmospheric circulations (Herrmann et al. 2011, Menendez et al. 2014). Following this, the wind field over the Adriatic region experiences the influence of different types of surface. Over the open-sea region, where the driving processes are mainly under the influence of large-scale motions, which are reliably simulated also by coarse resolution simulations (Di Luca et al. 2015), and where the wind field is more uniform, all simulations show similar results. In DJF over the Croatian lowlands, the relatively weak northwesterly

(NW) wind in ERA5 (Fig. 2c) does not deviate significantly from the prevailing wind in RCMs (Fig. 2b). Differences are evident in CPMs (Fig. 2a) in the vicinity of the isolated mountains in the lowlands.

Regardless of the horizontal grid spacing, the coastal region in the eastern Adriatic is characterized by northeasterly (NE) wind of greater intensity. On the other hand, for the wind intensities in the coastal region, where topography plays a significant role in the wind field modifications, refining the grid scale becomes important. Potential added value introduced by CPMs (Fig. 2a) can be seen in much finer wind structures taking into account more variable wind intensity and direction. They are related to the Bora jets, regions with higher wind speed, which are associated with coastal mountain passes, particularly along Velebit Mountain as observed in measurements and case-study simulations (Grisogono & Belušić 2009, Stiperski et al. 2012, Prtenjak et al. 2015). The maximum wind speed associated with the Bora jet in Figure 2a is 11 m/s. On the other hand, these jets are hardly visible in coarser resolution simulations, which have a smaller spread in magnitude (maximum of 8 m/s within the jet in Fig. 2b and 6.5 m/s in Fig. 2 c).

This seasonal wind climatology in Figure 2a is in agreement with the 10-m wind distribution obtained by the numerical weather forecast mode of ALADIN model at 2 km grid spacing in Horvath et al. (2011) and QuikSCAT analysis over Adriatic in Accadia et al. (2007).




Figure 2. Cold season (DJF) spatial mean of wind speed (colors) and normalized wind direction (black arrows) for a) CPM ensemble, b) RCM ensemble, c) ERA5. For the CPM ensemble every 6th, while for the RCM ensemble every 2nd vector is shown.

3.2. SEVERE WIND SPEEDS

The indication of potential added value in terms of the seasonal (DJF, JJA) spatial extremes is addressed here. If considering the whole PDF when calculating the PSS, no clear added value of CPMs has been shown. Therefore, we focus only on the strongest winds as explained in section 2.4.

Figure 3 shows the ratio in number of events between CPMs and their parent RCMs, for Q95 larger than 5 m/s (Fig. 3a and c) and 15 m/s (Fig. 3b and d). There is no value for KNMI and HCLIMcom in Figure 3d since those RCMs show zero values larger than 15 m/s in JJA. The Q95 larger than 5 m/s represents 90% of data in all simulations, with almost no differences in the number of events in CPMs and RCMs. Strong wind events (Q95 > 15 m/s) are more frequent in CPMs compared to RCMs (around 1.3 times more frequent in DJF season, and up to 2 times more frequent in JJA season). Those events constitute a small (10% in DJF and <1% in JJA) portion in the whole dataset. Due to the very small portion of the extreme events in JJA, the potential added value is more evident for the cold season. Therefore, strong wind events are more frequent in the cold season and could be much more realistically simulated with CPMs.

This section also shows how different statistical indices can indicate different potential added value depending on which part of the frequency distribution is sampled. That is, higher percentiles (strong winds) of the distribution show a much larger sensitivity to changes in resolution than central moments (moderate winds). Such a sensitivity of the potential added value to the resolution change is also evident for other variables, such as precipitation (Di Luca et al. 2012, Torma et al. 2015, Ban et al. 2021, Ciarlo et al. 2021).




Figure 3. Ratio of frequency distribution of spatial Q95 (95th percentile) of the wind speed for all available pairs of CPM-RCM simulations. First row (a, b) cold season (DJF), second row (c, d) warm season (JJA). (a, c) Q95 > 5 m/s, (b, d) Q95 > 15 m/s. Red bars indicate CPM v. RCM ratio larger than 1, while blue bars indicate ratio smaller than 1.

Names in the x-axis represent the Institution which provided both CPM and RCM data (Table 1). There is no value for KNMI and HCLIMcom in Figure 3d since those RCMs show zero values larger than 15 m/s in JJA.

3.3. BORA AND SIROCCO



In previous sections, we showed that severe winds, which involve Bora and Sirocco along the Adriatic, can be simulated with more details by CPMs. Here, we compare the simulated wind field to the actual observations. Since different regimes generate wind flow in the coastal and the continental part of the Adriatic region, we do not expect CPMs to have the same skill in simulating the wind field over the entire domain. Wind roses from observational stations (Fig. 4a), CPM ensemble mean (Fig. 4b) and the corresponding RCM ensemble mean (Fig. 4c) are shown for several stations (Fig. 1b; Zagreb-Maksimir – inland station, Pula airport – coastal station in flat terrain, Trieste, Senj and Split airport – three coastal stations in the complex terrain). The former two coastal stations are Bora representatives (e.g. Belušić & Grisogono 2009, Telišman Kuzmić et al. 2013, Prtenjak et al. 2015), while the latter is a Sirocco representative (e.g. Međugorac et al. 2015, Međugorac 2018).


For the inland station (Zagreb-Maksimir), all wind directions are equally represented (~8% each) with the maximum wind speed from 67.5° (NE direction) reaching 9.6 m/s. For the coastal flat part of the Adriatic region (Pula airport) N-NE winds prevail contributing ~48% to the frequency distribution (where 25% is within the defined Bora range). The maximum wind speed is 17 m/s blowing from 30°. Moving to the complex terrain, Bora occurs ~40% of the time at both Trieste and Senj station in the northern Adriatic. The maximum 3-h wind speed at Trieste station is 20 m/s blowing from 50°, while at Senj it is 19.2 m/s blowing from 22.5°. However, it is well-known that the observed wind speed at Senj station should be considerably larger. This issue has previously been addressed by Bencetić Klaić et al. (2009), who show that the location of the observational station is shielded from the Bora directions and therefore underestimates the Bora wind speed. The wind speed observed at the station is underestimated by about 40%, but the wind direction is realistic. Further south (Split airport), Sirocco becomes comparable to Bora in the number of observed events, with Sirocco occurring 13% and Bora 14% of the time. The maximum wind speed still occurs for the Bora wind and equals 23 m/s from 60°, while the maximum wind speed for Sirocco is 10 m/s.

The CPM and RCM ensembles show that for the inland station (Zagreb-Maksimir) all simulations perform well, however, both tend to overestimate the observed wind speed. In the flat coastal terrain (Pula airport) CPM and RCM ensemble correctly simulate the wind speed distribution over all directions. Still, simulations slightly underestimate the frequency of the northerly winds which have the same frequency of occurrence as all other directions together (44% for CPMs and for 38% RCMs compared to the observed 48%).

Moving on to the complex coastal region, the skill of simulating speed and direction distribution in RCMs is reduced. At Trieste station RCMs produce ~30% of Bora events with a maximum of 12 m/s (40% with maximum of 20 m/s is observed), while at Senj station they produce 36% of Bora events with a maximum of 24 m/s (42% with maximum of 19.2 m/s is observed). In contrast, CPMs continue displaying reliable results even here. The maximum wind speed is much more realistic for Trieste (ensemble mean is 19.5 m/s), while the maximum Bora wind speed for Senj seems to be overestimated (ensemble mean is 29 m/s). However, considering the above-mentioned underestimation of the Bora wind speed by 40% at the Senj observational station, the observed maximum Bora speed would reach 27 m/s, thus being much closer to the CPM simulation. The frequency of occurrence of the Bora in CPMs is 30% at Trieste and 50% at Senj station, compared to the observed 40% and 42% respectively.

In southern Adriatic, where Sirocco plays an important role, RCMs can not be taken as representative due to their inability to simulate Sirocco events from the defined angle range (6% compared to the observed 13% in the analyzed period). RCMs tend to simulate an exaggerated number of Bora events with moderate wind speeds along the whole eastern Adriatic coast, including Split airport station (25% of Bora events compared to the observed 14%). Sirocco events in the southern Adriatic were also poorly simulated by the previously examined CORDEX RCM simulations with daily time step (Belušić et al. 2018). CPMs simulate Bora at the Split station well, slightly underestimating the wind speed with the frequency of occurrence of 13%. The representation of both maximum wind speed (ensemble mean is 13 m/s, while 10 m/s is observed) and frequency (10%) for Sirocco is realistic with CPMs. To summarize, CPMs enhance the number of Sirocco events at the expense of Bora compared to RCMs and are hence closer to observations. Accordingly, all these points disclose directly the link between better resolved topography and the representation of the wind.






322 **Figure 4.** Wind roses for stations indicated in Figure 1b over the whole analyzed period. (a) observations (b) CPM
 323 ensemble mean, (c) RCM ensemble mean.

324 Extracting only the direction ranges defined for Bora and Sirocco and focusing on the cold season (DJF) we can inspect
 325 the added value in more detail. In Figure 5 we focus on the DJF maximum wind speed for Bora at Trieste station (a) and
 326 Sirocco frequencies at Split airport (b). Benefits introduced by CPMs are especially evident for these parameters. The
 327 maximum wind speed of DJF Bora events at Trieste station in the observed period is 20 m/s and Bora maximum speed
 328 simulated by CPMs is almost perfect, except for WRF simulations, which overestimated the maximum by 20%. On the
 329 other hand, RCMs and ERA5 perform similarly and underestimate the maximum wind speed by ~30%.

330 Sirocco frequencies, defined as strictly along shore in the southern Adriatic, are poorly simulated by RCMs,
 331 but CPMs approach close to observations. The underestimation of the number of Sirocco by RCMs (and ERA5) is
 332 larger (~50%), compared to Bora (20% shown in Fig. 4). Figure 5b supports the fact that CPMs strongly enhance the
 333 number of Sirocco events for all the simulations analyzed. The simulated frequencies come very close to the
 334 observations (~1000 events in DJF) except for CNRM-CNRM-AROME41t, KNMI-HCLIM38-AROME and
 335 HCLIMcom-HCLIM38-AROME. Those simulations would perform better for Sirocco angle definition starting at ~105°
 336 (7° discordance with our definition).



337 **Figure 5.** Cold season (DJF) Bora ($22.5^{\circ} - 68.5^{\circ}$) maximum wind speed at Trieste station (a) and Sirocco (112.5°
338 -157.5°) frequencies at Split airport station (b) from all available simulations. Red line represents the observed values.

339 3.5. THE SKILL IN BASIC STATISTICAL MEASURES

340 Standard statistical measures for all available simulations and for all analyzed stations are shown in Figure 6. Three
341 values correspond to each simulation (bias in red, normalized standard deviation in green and correlation coefficient in
342 blue), while each box-plot contains the values from all the stations in the group (5 inland stations and 11 coastal
343 stations). Numbers on the x-axis indicate CPMs and correspond to the first column in Table 1. Corresponding RCMs are
344 shaded in gray.


345 We can notice immediately that each CPM is strongly influenced by its parent RCM. If the RCM does not
346 perform well, there are low chances that CPM will be excellent. It is important to note that this implies that here the
347 choice of resolution affects the final results much less than the choice of particular CPM. This was also true for coarse
348 (50 km) and fine (12 km) resolution RCMs in Belušić et al. (2018).

349 The difference between inland and coastal regions is in the larger spread among the stations for the latter for
350 the particular statistical parameter. Grouping all the available stations for each terrain type (Fig. 6), the general picture is
351 as follows. Most of the biases over the inland stations are close to zero or positive, in the range of 0–2 m/s (Fig. 6a),
352 indicating a slight wind speed overestimation in the simulations, as we already indicated in section 3.3. Furthermore, the
353 maximum biases in the coastal region with the complex terrain are two times larger than the other maximum biases,
354 ranging from 1–4 m/s, indicating also a large spread of biases among stations. The simulated standard deviation for
355 inland stations (Fig. 6a) usually follows the observed one very well, while in the complex terrain (Fig. 6b), where the
356 wind intensity is high, the simulated standard deviation is up to 6 times larger than the observed one (depending on the
357 simulation and station chosen). Summarizing, higher moments (i.e. standard deviation) of the distribution are worse
358 simulated than central moments (i.e. mean) for both CPMs and RCMs. The presented comparison between inland and
359 coastal station agrees with Obermann et al. (2016) and Belušić et al. (2018). However, the exact values should be
360 interpreted with caution, since the in-situ observations are not necessarily entirely representative for the gridded climate
361 output.

362 Even if climate simulations with CPMs and RCMs are not primarily designed to exactly follow the
363 development of weather events, some members from the analyzed ensemble manage to follow the observed time series
364 very accurately regardless of the internal variability inside the domain (CNRM-CNRM-AROME41t1, KNMI-
365 HCLIM38-AROME, HCLIMcom-HCLIM38-AROME). As expected, the ERA5 reanalysis (last blue value in Fig. 6)
366 usually has the largest temporal correlation coefficient at all analyzed stations, since a large amount of observational
367 data is assimilated, but it has lower standard deviation due to the resolution limitations.

368 From the CORDEX FPS ensemble, the CPM simulations from 1 to 3 (CNRM-CNRM-AROME41t1, KNMI-
369 HCLIM38-AROME, HCLIMcom-HCLIM38-AROME), and consequently their parent RCM simulations, appear to best
370 fit the observations at all available stations, having the smallest biases, being the closest to the normalized standard
371 deviation, and having the greatest temporal correlation coefficient (very close to the one obtained from ERA5). On the
372 other hand, the simulations between lines 10 and 17 (WRF) have the poorest performance; larger biases for coastal
373 stations, quite large normalized standard deviation and very low temporal correlation coefficients.

a) Inland stations (5)



b) Coastal stations (11)




Figure 6. Standard statistical measures for all available simulations and for all analyzed stations. Three values correspond to each simulation (bias in red, normalized standard deviation in green and correlation coefficient in blue), while each box-plot contains the values from all the stations in the group (5 inland stations and 11 coastal stations). Numbers on the x-axis indicate CPMs and correspond to the first column in Table 1. Corresponding RCMs are shaded in gray. The last group of values is for ERA5.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Studies trying to validate the CPMs downscaling technique are essential to highlight the importance of developing CPMs in the future and the use of their products. In this study, the main goal was to objectively assess the (potential) added value obtained by downscaling RCMs to CPMs in terms of the wind field over the Adriatic domain. This article concentrated on 3-h wind obtained from 17 CPMs and 14 RCMs in the period 2000-2009. We show where and with respect to which climate statistics CPMs can produce more skillful results than RCMs. In general, results tend to confirm the advantages of using high-resolution CPMs and the conclusions based on four points proposed in the introduction are as follows:

- *The enhanced spatial variability.*
CPMs display fine spatial variability that is absent in coarser RCMs or reanalysis, leading to a larger spread in intensities, which allows for capturing more extreme events. Much finer wind structures account for more variable wind intensity and direction. They are especially evident over the entire mountainous ranges along the coastline and in the vicinity of the isolated mountains in the lowlands. This is highly important for the realistic simulation of severe wind formations such as Bora jets.
- *The possibility of simulating more intense wind speeds.*
Severe wind events are mostly associated with the Bora wind in the cold season. Therefore, potential added value is higher in cold season compared to warm season due to the proportion of severe wind events. The results have shown that severe winds are more frequent and could be much more realistically simulated in high-resolution dataset. It is important to note that intense wind events show much larger sensitivity to changes in resolution than low and moderate wind speeds.
- *Having enough skill to replicate the observed wind roses over the complex terrain and the ability of simulating local winds realistically.*
Both CPMs and RCMs perform quite well in the flat terrain. In regions with complex topography, the orographic forcing emphasizes the added value of CPMs: RCMs lose the skill in simulating both the wind speed and direction distribution, while CPMs keep the reliable results. The main benefit of using CPMs is detected for Bora maximum wind speeds in the northern Adriatic and for Sirocco frequencies in the southern Adriatic. This discloses directly the link between better resolved topography and the representation of the wind.
- *The skill in producing temporal correlation coefficient as high as in ERA5 reanalysis.*
Even if climate simulations with CPMs and RCMs are not primarily designed to exactly follow the development of weather events, the assessment of the correlation coefficient showed that some of them manage to fit accurately with the observed time series. We noticed that the choice of resolution (CPM or RCM) affects the final results much less than the choice of the particular CPM. Simulations that showed superior skill in terms of standard statistical scores in time are CNRM-CNRM-AROME41t1, KNMI-HCLIM38-AROME and HCLIMcom-HCLIM38-AROME.

414 Acknowledgements

415 All authors gratefully acknowledge the WCRP-CORDEX-FPS on Convective phenomena at high resolution over
416 Europe and the Mediterranean (FPSCONVALP- 3) and the research data exchange infrastructure and services provided
417 by the Jülich Supercomputing Centre, Germany, as part of the Helmholtz Data Federation initiative.
418 ABV wishes to acknowledge the help rendered by Branimir Omazić for producing Figure 4 in GIS. EP acknowledges
419 the Consorzio Inter-universitario per il Calcolo Automatico dell'Italia Nord Orientale (CINECA) super-computing
420 center (Bologna, Italy) for computing resources dedicated to ICTP simulations.
421 DB acknowledges funding from the FORMAS project EDUCAS (grant no. 2019-00829).
422 The ETH, IPSL, ICTP, SMHI, CMCC, KNMI acknowledge funding from the HORIZON 2020 EUCP (European
423 Climate Prediction System) project ([https:// www. eucp- project. eu](https://www.eucp-project.eu), grant agreement No. 776613).
424 IPSL's work was granted access to the HPC resources of TGCC under the allocations 2019-A0030106877 and 2020-
425 A0030106877 made by GENCI.
426 HT is thankful for the computational resources granted by the John von Neumann Institute for Computing (NIC) and
427 provided on the supercomputer JURECA at the Jülich Supercomputing Centre (JSC) through the grant JJSC39 and for
428 the computational resources at the Vienna Scientific Cluster (VSC) through the grants 70992 and 71193, the long-term
429 storage provided by the cooperation project GEOCLIM Data Infrastructure Austria, funded by the Austrian Education,
430 Science and Research Ministry (BMBWF), as well as for the support received via the project "reclip:convex", funded
431 by the Austrian Climate Research Programme (ACRP) of the Klima- und Energiefonds (no. B769999).
432 JM acknowledges the support from the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación through the Unidad de Excelencia
433 María de Maeztu with reference MDM-2017-0765, the projects CORDyS (PID2020-116595RB-I00) and ATLAS
434 (PID2019-111481RB-I00), both funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.
435 ØH has received support from the project GREAT, funded by the Research Council of Norway (grant no. 275589), and
436 acknowledge computing resources from Notur (NN9188K).

437 REFERENCES

- 438 Accadia C, Zecchetto S, Lavagnini A, Speranza A (2007) Comparison of 10-m wind forecasts from a regional area
 439 model and QuikSCAT scatterometer wind observations over the Mediterranean Sea. *Mon Wea Rev* 135:1945–1960.
 440 <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR3370.1>
- 441 Adinolfi M, Raffa M, Reder A, Mercogliano P (2021) Evaluation and Expected Changes of Summer Precipitation at
 442 Convection Permitting Scale with COSMO-CLM over Alpine Space. *Atmosphere* 12(1):54.
 443 <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12010054>
- 444 Bajić A (1989) Severe bora on the northern Adriatic part I: statistical analysis. *Croatian Meteorological Journal*
 445 24(24):1–9
- 446 Baldauf M, Seifert A, Förstner J, Majewski D, Raschendorfer M, Reinhardt T (2011) Operational convection-scale
 447 numerical weather prediction with the COSMO model: description and sensitivities. *Mon Weather Rev* 139:3887–3905.
 448 <https://doi.org/10.1175/MWR-D-10-05013.1>
- 449 Ban N, Schmidli J, Schär C (2014) Evaluation of the convection-resolving regional climate modeling approach in
 450 decade-long simulations. *J Geophys Res Atmos* 119:7889–7907. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD021478>
- 451 Ban N, Schmidli J, Schär C (2015) Heavy precipitation in a changing climate: does short-term summer precipitation
 452 increase faster? *Geophys Res Lett* 42:1165–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL062588>
- 453 Ban N, Caillaud C, Coppola E et al. (2021) The first multi-model ensemble of regional climate simulations at kilometer-
 454 scale resolution, part I: evaluation of precipitation. *Clim Dyn* 57:275–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05708-w>
- 455 Belušić A, Prtenjak MT, Güttler I, Ban N, Leutwyler D, Schär C (2018) Near-surface wind variability over the broader
 456 Adriatic region: insights from an ensemble of regional climate models. *Clim Dyn* 50:4455–4480.
 457 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-017-3885-5>
- 458 Belušić D, de Vries H, Dobler A et al. (2020) HCLIM38: A flexible regional climate model applicable for different
 459 climate zones from coarse to convection permitting scales. *Geosci Model Dev* 13:1311–1333.
 460 <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-1311-2020>
- 461 Belušić Vozila A, Güttler I, Ahrens B, Obermann-Hellhund A, Telišman Prtenjak M (2019) Wind over the Adriatic
 462 region in CORDEX climate change scenarios. *J Geophys Res Atmos* 124:110–130.
 463 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JD028552>
- 464 Belušić Vozila A, Telišman Prtenjak M, Güttler I (2021) A Weather-Type Classification and Its Application to Near-
 465 Surface Wind Climate Change Projections over the Adriatic Region. *Atmosphere* 12,948,16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos1208094>
- 467 Bencetić Klaić Z, Prodanov AD, Belušić D (2009) Wind measurements in Senj – underestimation of true bora
 468 flows. *Geofizika* 26(2):245–252.
- 469 Bonaldo D, Bucchignani E, Ricchi A, Carniel S (2017). Wind storminess in the Adriatic Sea in a climate change
 470 scenario. *Acta Adriatica* 58(2):195–208. <https://doi.org/10.32582/aa.58.2.1>
- 471 Ciarlò JM, Coppola E, Fantini A et al. (2021) A new spatially distributed added value index for regional climate models:
 472 the EURO-CORDEX and the CORDEX-CORE highest resolution ensembles. *Clim Dyn* 57:1403–1424.
 473 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05400-5>
- 474 Colin J, Déqué M, Radu R, Somot S (2010) Sensitivity study of heavy precipitations in Limited Area Model climate
 475 simulation: influence of the size of the domain and the use of the spectral nudging technique. *Tellus A* 62:591–604.
 476 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0870.2010.00467.x>

- 477 Coppola E, Sobolowski S, Pichelli E et al. (2020) A first-of-its-kind multi-model convection permitting ensemble for
478 investigating convective phenomena over Europe and the Mediterranean. *Clim Dyn* 55:3–34.
479 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-018-4521-8>
- 480 Coppola E, Stocchi P, Pichelli E, Torres Alavez JA, Glazer R, Giuliani G, Di Sante F, Nogherotto, R, Giorgi F (2021)
481 Non-Hydrostatic RegCM4 (RegCM4-NH): Model description and case studies over multiple domains. *Geosci Model*
482 *Dev* 14: 7705–7723. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-14-7705-2021>
- 483 Dee DP, Uppala SM, Simmons AJ et al. (2011) The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data
484 assimilation system. *QJR Meteorol Soc* 137:553–597. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828>
- 485 Fumière Q, Déqué M, Nuissier O, Somot S, Alias A, Caillaud C, Laurantin O, Seity Y (2020) Extreme rainfall in
486 Mediterranean France during the fall: added value of the CNRM-AROME convection-permitting regional climate
487 model. *Clim Dyn* 55:77–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-019-04898-8>
- 488 Gajić-Čapka M, Cindrić K, Pasarić Z (2015) Trends in precipitation indices in Croatia, 1961–2010. *Theor Appl*
489 *Climatol* 121:167–177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-014-1217-9>
- 490 Giorgi F, Coppola E, Solomon F et al. (2012) RegCM4: model description and preliminary tests over multiple CORDEX
491 domains. *Clim Res* 52:7–29. <https://doi.org/10.3354/cr01018>
- 492 Giorgi F, Gutowski W Jr (2015) Regional dynamical downscaling and the CORDEX initiative. *Annu Rev Env Resour*
493 40:467–490. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102014-021217>
- 494 Grisogono B, Belušić D (2009) A review of recent advances in understanding the meso- and microscale properties of
495 the severe Bora wind. *Tellus A* 61:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0870.2008.00369.x>
- 496 Gutowski WJ Jr, Ullrich PA, Hall A et al. (2020). The Ongoing Need for High-Resolution Regional Climate Models:
497 Process Understanding and Stakeholder Information. *B Am Meteorol Soc* 101(5):E664–E683.
498 <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-19-0113.1>
- 499 Herrmann M, Somot S, Calmanti S, Dubois C, Sevault F (2011) Representation of spatial and temporal variability of
500 daily wind speed and of intense wind events over the Mediterranean Sea using dynamical downscaling: impact of the
501 regional climate model configuration. *Nat Hazards Earth Sys Sci* 11:1983–2001. <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-11-1983-2011>
- 503 Hersbach H, Bell B, Berrisford P et al. (2020) The ERA5 Global Reanalysis. *QJR Meteorol Soc* 146:1999–2049.
504 <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>
- 505 Horvath K, Lin YL, Ivančan-Picek B (2008) Classification of Cyclone Tracks over the Apennines and the Adriatic Sea.
506 *Mon Wea Rev* 136:2210–2227. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007MWR2231.1>
- 507 Horvath K, Bajić A, Ivatek-Šahdan S (2011) Dynamical Downscaling of wind speed in complex terrain prone to bora-
508 type flows. *J Appl Meteorol Clim* 50:1676–1691. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011JAMC2638.1>
- 509 Jacob D, Teichmann C, Sobolowski S et al. (2020) Regional climate downscaling over Europe: perspectives from the
510 EURO-CORDEX community. *Reg Environ Change* 20:51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-020-01606-9>
- 511 Kendon EJ, Prein AF, Senior CA, Stirling A (2021) Challenges and outlook for convection-permitting climate
512 modelling. *Phil Trans R Soc* 379:20190547. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2019.0547>
- 513 Kuzmić M, Li XM, Grisogono B, Tomažić I, Lehner S (2013). Terra SAR-X observations of the northeastern Adriatic
514 bora: Early results. *Acta Adriatica* 54:13–26.
- 515 Leutwyler D, Lüthi D, Ban N, Fuhrer O, Schär C (2017) Evaluation of the convection-resolving climate modeling
516 approach on continental scales. *J Geophys Res Atmos* 122:5237–5258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2016JD026013>
- 517 Di Luca A, de Elía R, Laprise R (2012) Potential for added value in precipitation simulated by high-resolution nested
518 Regional Climate Models and observations. *Clim Dyn* 38:1229–1247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-011-1068-3>

- 519 Di Luca A, De Elía R, Laprise R (2015) Challenges in the Quest for added value of regional climate dynamical
520 downscaling. *Curr Clim Change Rep* 1:10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40641-015-0003-9>
- 521 Međugorac I, Pasarić, M, Orlić, M (2015) Severe flooding along the eastern Adriatic coast: the case of 1 December
522 2008. *Ocean dynamics* 65(6):817–830. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10236-015-0835-9>
- 523 Međugorac I (2018) Izuzetno visoki vodostaji u sjevernom Jadranu i nagib morske razine u smjeru istok-zapad.
524 Dissertation, University of Zagreb. In Croatian.
- 525 Van Meijgaard E, Van Ulft LH, Van De Berg WJ, Bosvelt FC, Van Den Hurk BJM, Lenderink G, Siebesma AP (2008)
526 The KNMI regional atmospheric model RACMO version 2.1, technical report 302. Technical report, De Bilt KNMI,
527 The Netherlands. <http://bibliotheek.knmi.nl/knmipubTR/TR302.pdf>. Accessed 22 Feb 2022
- 528 Menendez M, García-Díez M, Fita L, Fernández J, Méndez FJ, Gutiérrez JM (2014) High-resolution sea wind hindcasts
529 over the Mediterranean area. *Clim Dyn* 42:1857–1872. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-013-1912-8>
- 530 Meredith EP, Ulbrich U, Rust HW (2020) Subhourly rainfall in a convection-permitting model. *Environ Res Lett*
531 15:034031. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab6787>
- 532 Obermann A, Bastin S, Belamari S, Conte D, Gaertner MA, Li L, Ahrens B (2016) Mistral and Tramontane wind speed
533 and wind direction patterns in regional climate simulation. *Clim Dyn* 47:1–18. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3053-3)
534 3053-3
- 535 Pasarić Z, Belušić D, Klaić ZB (2007) Orographic influences on the Adriatic sirocco wind. *Ann Geophys* 25:1263–
536 1267. <https://doi.org/10.5194/angeo-25-1263-2007>
- 537 Patarčić M, Gajić-Čapka M, Cindrić K, Branković Č (2014). Recent and near-future changes in precipitation extreme
538 indices over the Croatian Adriatic coast. *Clim Res* 61:157–176. <https://doi.org/10.3354/cr01250>
- 539 Penzar B, Penzar B, Orlić M (2001). Weather and climate of the Croatian Adriatic (in Croatian). Nakladna kuća “Dr.
540 Feletar”. Zagreb: Hrvatski hidrografski institut.
- 541 Perkins SE, Pitman AJ, Holbrook NJ, McAneney J (2007) Evaluation of the AR4 climate models’ simulated daily
542 maximum temperature, minimum temperature, and precipitation over Australia using probability density functions. *J*
543 *Clim* 20:4356–4376. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI4253.1>
- 544 Pichelli E, Coppola E, Sobolowski S et al. (2021) The first multi-model ensemble of regional climate simulations at
545 kilometer-scale resolution part 2: historical and future simulations of precipitation. *Clim Dyn* 56:3581–3602.
546 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-021-05657-4>
- 547 Poje D (1992) Wind persistence in Croatia. *Int J Climatol* 12:569–586. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.3370120604>
- 548 Powers JG, Klemp JB, Skamarock WC et al. (2017) The weather research and forecasting model: overview, system
549 efforts, and future directions. *B Am Meteorol Soc* 98(8):1717–1737. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-15-00308.1>
- 550 Prtenjak MT, Horvat I, Tomažić I, Kvakić M, Viher M, Grisogono B (2015) Impact of mesoscale meteorological
551 processes on anomalous radar propagation conditions over the northern Adriatic area. *J Geophys Res Atmos* 120:8759–
552 8782. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022626>
- 553 Rockel B, Will A, Hense A (2008) The regional climate model COSMO-CLM (CCLM). *Meteorol Z* 17:347–348.
554 <https://doi.org/10.1127/0941-2948/2008/0309>
- 555 Ruti PM, Somot S, Giorgi F et al. (2016) Med-CORDEX initiative for Mediterranean climate studies. *B Am Meteorol*
556 *Soc* 97:1187–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00176.1>
- 557 Skamarock WC, Klemp JB, Dudhia J, Gill DO, Liu Z, Berner J, Wang W, Powers JG, Duda MG, Barker DM, Huang
558 XY (2019) A Description of the Advanced Research WRF Version 4. NCAR Tech. Note NCAR/TN-556+STR, 145 pp.
- 559 Smith A, Lott N, Vose R (2011) The integrated surface database: recent developments and partnerships. *B Am Meteorol*
560 *Soc* 92:704–708. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2011BAMS3015.1>
- 561 Somot S, Ruti PM, The MedCORDEX team (2011) The Med-CORDEX initiative: towards fully coupled Regional
562 Climate System Models to study the Mediterranean climate variability, change and impact.
563 https://www.medcordex.eu/somot_MedCORDEX_WCRP2011_Denver_oct2011.pdf. Accessed 10 January 2022

- 564 Stiperski I, Ivančan-Picek B, Grubišić V, Bajić A (2012) Complex Bora flow in the lee of Southern Velebit. QJR
565 Meteorol Soc 138:1490–1506. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.1901>
- 566 Torma C, Giorgi F, Coppola E (2015) Added value of regional climate modeling over areas characterized by complex
567 terrain precipitation over the Alps. J Geophys Res Atmos 120:3957–3972. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JD022781>
- 568 Ulbrich U, Lionello P, Belušić D et al. (2012) Climate of the Mediterranean: synoptic patterns, temperature,
569 precipitation, winds, and their extremes. In: The Climate of the Mediterranean Region - From the Past to the Future, ed.
570 Piero Lionello, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 301–346.
- 571 Zecchetto S, Cappa C (2001) The spatial structure of the Mediterranean Sea winds revealed by ERS-1 scatterometer. Int
572 J Remote Sens 22:45–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014311601750038848>

573 **Statements and Declarations**

574 **Funding**

575 The ETH, IPSL, ICTP, SMHI, CMCC, KNMI was supported by the HORIZON 2020 EUCP (European Climate
576 Prediction System) project (<https://www.eucp-project.eu>, grant agreement No. 776613).
577

578 DB was supported by FORMAS, project EDUCAS (grant no. 2019-00829).

579 HT was supported by the John von Neumann Institute for Computing (NIC) through the grant JJSC39 and by Vienna
580 Scientific Cluster (VSC) through the grants 70992 and 71193, the long-term storage provided by the cooperation project
581 GEOCLIM Data Infrastructure Austria, funded by the Austrian Education, Science and Research Ministry (BMBWF).
582 HT was also supported via the project “reclip:convex”, funded by the Austrian Climate Research Programme (ACRP)
583 of the Klima- und Energiefonds (no. B769999).

584 JM was supported from the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación through the Unidad de Excelencia María de
585 Maeztu with reference MDM-2017-0765, the projects CORDyS (PID2020-116595RB-I00) and ATLAS (PID2019-
586 111481RB-I00), both funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033.

587 ØH has received support from the project GREAT, funded by the Research Council of Norway (grant no. 275589).

588 **Competing Interests**

589 The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

590 **Author Contributions**

591 All authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were
592 performed by Andreina Belušić Vozila. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Andreina Belušić Vozila and all
593 authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

594 **Data availability**

595 The datasets analyzed during the current study are available via the data exchange infrastructure and services provided
596 by the Jülich Supercomputing Centre, Germany, as part of the Helmholtz Data Federation initiative.