

## Verification of the ozone algorithmic climate change functions for predicting the short-term NO<sub>x</sub> effects from aviation en-route

Yin, Feijia; Grewe, Volker; van Manen, Jesper; Matthes, Sigrun ; Yamashita, Hiroshi; Linke, Florian; Lührs, Benjamin

### Publication date

2018

### Document Version

Final published version

### Published in

ICRAT 2018: 2018 International Conference on Research in Air Transportation

### Citation (APA)

Yin, F., Grewe, V., van Manen, J., Matthes, S., Yamashita, H., Linke, F., & Lührs, B. (2018). Verification of the ozone algorithmic climate change functions for predicting the short-term NO<sub>x</sub> effects from aviation en-route. In *ICRAT 2018: 2018 International Conference on Research in Air Transportation* ICRAT.

### Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).  
Please check the document version above.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

### Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.  
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

***Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository***

***'You share, we take care!' – Taverne project***

***<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>***

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.

# Verification of the ozone algorithmic climate change functions for predicting the short-term NO<sub>x</sub> effects from aviation en-route

Feijia Yin\*, Volker Grewe<sup>†</sup>, Jesper van Manen

Faculty of Aerospace Engineering  
Delft University of Technology  
Delft, the Netherlands

\*corresponding author: [F.yin@tudelft.nl](mailto:F.yin@tudelft.nl)

<sup>†</sup> also at Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre  
Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt  
Wessling, Germany

Sigrun Matthes, Hiroshi Yamashita

Institut für Physik der Atmosphäre  
Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt  
Wessling, Germany

Florian Linke, Benjamin Lühns

Institut für Lufttransportsysteme  
Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt  
Hamburg, Germany

**Abstract**—For the first time, the algorithmic Climate Change Functions (aCCFs) for ozone, methane, water vapor, and persistent contrails have been developed within the ATM4E project to provide information on the climate sensitive regions, which can be conveniently implemented for the climate based flight routing. These aCCFs need to be verified before they are implemented. In this paper, we focus on the verification of the ozone aCCFs to enable the prediction of the short-term NO<sub>x</sub> effects from aviation en-route. The verification is conducted from two aspects. Firstly, the climatology of the ozone aCCFs is calculated based on a one-year simulation and verified by the existing literature. Secondly, the effectiveness of the ozone aCCFs for optimizing aircraft trajectories concerning the climate impact is verified by the comprehensive climate-chemistry model calculation.

**Keywords**—Verification; aCCFs; flight routing; minimal climate impact;

## I. INTRODUCTION

Civil aviation, on the one hand, is the driver of global growth, is increasing at around 4.7% per annum, and is poised to maintain that growth for next few decades [1], but on the other hand, the environmental impact of aviation is increasing at a rapid pace. Advancements in technology and operations have managed to reduce fuel consumption (and thereby the CO<sub>2</sub> emission) per passenger km by around 70% in the last 5-6 decades. Even though currently aviation emits only 2.5% of the global CO<sub>2</sub>, it is responsible for 5% of global warming [2, 3]. This is because the non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from aircraft in the uppermost troposphere or the lowermost stratosphere are as harmful to global warming as CO<sub>2</sub>.

The non-CO<sub>2</sub> effects, from methane depletion and ozone formation due to NO<sub>x</sub> [4], the contrails formed by water vapor combined with aerosols, and the water vapor itself, depend on not only the quantity of emissions, but also the altitude, geographical location, time and the local weather conditions acting on different spatial and temporal scales. This provides the opportunities to mitigate the aviation's climate impact beyond CO<sub>2</sub> via the operational measures to avoid the climate sensitive regions associated to the non-CO<sub>2</sub> effects. To enable the climate-based operations, the information on the climate sensitive regions needs to be available. In the ATM4E (Air Traffic Management for Environment) project, the so-called algorithmic Climate Change Functions (aCCFs) have been developed to serve this purpose [5, 6].

Here, we present results of the ATM4E project, focusing on the verification of the ozone aCCFs, from two aspects: (1) verify the ozone aCCFs climatology and (2) verify the effectiveness of the ozone aCCFs to reduce the climate impact caused by NO<sub>x</sub>-ozone effects.

## II. THE ALGORITHMIC CLIMATE CHANGE FUNCTIONS

Climate Change Functions (CCFs, [7, 8]) are 5D datasets (longitude, latitude, altitude, time, type of emission), which describe the specific climate impacts, i.e. the anticipated climate change for a local emission, or in other words, the climate change per flown kilometer and per emitted masses of the relevant species. Within the EU-project REACT4C ([www.react4c.eu](http://www.react4c.eu)) high fidelity CCFs were computed for eight representative weather situations for the North Atlantic [9, 10].

To establish relations between localized emissions and their impact on climate, the ECHAM/MESSy Atmospheric Chemistry (EMAC) model was applied. The emissions were released at roughly 500 points in the atmosphere in the North-Atlantic region. The transport of these emitted species is calculated by 50 air parcel trajectories, and microphysical processes are included to simulate contrail formation, ice particle sedimentation, and sublimation. A detailed chemical mechanism provides the evolution of contributions of the initial  $\text{NO}_x$  emission to the greenhouse gases ozone and methane. Washout processes (rain) and dry deposition are parameterized to account for the removal of the emitted species. Radiation calculation provides radiative forcing (RF; stratosphere adjusted) of the changes due to contrails and ozone, and radiation parameterizations provide estimates for the RF from water vapor, ozone, methane, and carbon dioxide. These are then fed into climate metrics to provide estimates of the climate impact. Here we concentrate on one of the metrics, the average temperature response over 20 years (ATR20) since the results are almost independent of the chosen metric [11]. The CCFs were calculated for five representative winter and three summer weather situations, following classification of Irvine [12]. Fig. 1 shows exemplarily the winter weather pattern 2 (WP2) with a strong jet (dark blue) and a high-pressure ridge, which reaches from Africa to the tip of Greenland. In this high-pressure ridge, the ozone CCF shows a maximum.




Fig. 1: Ozone climate change function for weather pattern 2: Left: geopotential (isolines,  $\text{m}^2/\text{s}^2$ ) and wind speed (color,  $\text{m/s}$ ); Right: ozone CCF ( $10^{-14} \text{ K/kg}(\text{NO}_2)$ ) [9]. Note that the left figure has a slightly larger cut-out.

The calculation of these CCFs requires a large amount of computing time. It is not applicable to numerical weather forecasts. Therefore, within ATM4E, we have started to develop algorithmic climate change functions (aCCFs), which represent a correlation of the weather system at the time of emission and the respective CCFs, which can easily be implemented in any numerical weather prediction model (NWP) and thereby advancing the MET-Services.

We have developed these functions for all regarded effects, i.e. the impact of water vapor emissions on climate,  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions on ozone and methane separately [6], and the impact on contrails, separated for day and night contrails. Here we present exemplarily the  $\text{O}_3$  aCCFs, where

$$\text{ATR20}_{\text{O}_3} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot T + \beta_2 \cdot \text{geopot} + \beta_3 \cdot T \cdot \text{geopot} \quad (1)$$

With  $\beta_0 = -5.2\text{e-}11 \text{ K/kg-NO}_2$ ,  $\beta_1 = 2.3\text{e-}13 \text{ K/K/kg-NO}_2$ ,  $\beta_2 = 4.85\text{e-}16 \text{ K/kg-NO}_2/(\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-2})$ ,  $\beta_3 = -2.04\text{e-}18 \text{ K/K/kg-NO}_2/(\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-2})$ ,  $T$  is the temperature in K, and geopot is the geopotential in  $\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-2}$ . Fig. 2 shows an example of the temperature response calculated from the ozone aCCFs on a specific day over the European region at 200 hPa. In the following sections, we will verify the effectiveness of this ozone aCCFs.




Fig. 2: The temperature response ( $\text{K/kg}(\text{NO}_2)$ ) calculated by the ozone aCCFs on a specific day 1200 hour at 200 hPa.

### III. THE VERIFICATION APPROACH

The verification of the ozone aCCFs is performed from two aspects:

- To verify the climatology of the ozone aCCFs
- To verify the effectiveness of the ozone aCCFs to reduce the climate impact caused by  $\text{NO}_x\text{-O}_3$  from a subset of European flights on the daily basis

The present air traffic simulation is performed using the EMAC model. The EMAC model is a numerical chemistry and climate simulation system that includes sub-models describing tropospheric and middle atmosphere processes and their interaction with oceans, land and human influences [13]. It uses the second version of the Modular Earth Sub-model System (MESSy2) [14, 15] to link multi-institutional computer codes. The core atmospheric model is the 5<sup>th</sup> generation European Centre Hamburg general circulation model (ECHAM5) [16, 17]. For the present study, the sub models: AirTraf [18], TAGGING [19], RAD [20], and aCCFs are used.

#### A. The flight trajectory optimization tool (AirTraf)

To analyze the impact on the atmospheric changes (exemplarily  $O_3$  in the current analysis) caused by changing the flight routes, the first step has been to calculate the flight trajectories. The flight trajectories are calculated using EMAC/AirTraf [13, 21]. AirTraf is a 4D trajectory simulation tool running on the EMAC platform [18]. It optimizes flight trajectories at cruise level with respect to different objectives, e.g., great circle or minimal flight time, considering the local weather conditions. The unique feature of AirTraf combined with EMAC provides the opportunity to assess the impact of aviation emissions, resulting from aircraft trajectory optimization on the atmospheric composition and RF.

An overview of the AirTraf principle can be found in Fig. 3. Before the simulation starts, the initial data are required, including city pairs, flight timetables, and the performance characteristics of the aircraft/engine. Depending on the aircraft routing options, the flight trajectory is calculated until the aircraft reaches its destination. The resulting fuel consumption and emissions are calculated and gathered afterward. The output files contain the coordinates of the aircraft (latitude, longitude, and altitude), flight time, flight distance, fuel consumption, and emissions ( $NO_x$  and  $H_2O$ ). The fuel flow rates and emissions are calculated using the total energy model based on the Eurocontrol's Base of Aircraft Data (BADA) method [22] and the DLR fuel flow method [23] for a specific aircraft type used. The engine performance data is taken from the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) database [24].




Fig. 3: An overview of the AirTraf simulation tool [21].

In the climate optimal routing option, the algorithm-based Climate Change Functions (aCCFs) developed within the ATM4E project are implemented [6]. The aCCFs provide the average temperature response in 20 years (ATR20) for different non- $CO_2$  effects, e.g., ozone, methane, water vapour and contrails, attributed to the changes of their quantities and the emitted locations. The ATR20s are then fed to the trajectory optimization routing to minimize the climate impact of aircraft.

#### B. The sub model TAGGING: Tracking contributions from emissions to atmospheric concentrations

The sub model TAGGING, described by Grewe et al. [19], is a diagnostic, which allows quantifying the impact of emission sources on the atmospheric composition. It is an accounting system following the reaction pathways from emissions of specific sources. Ten different chemical species and families are tagged: ozone, carbon monoxide, PAN,  $NO_y$ , NMHCs, OH, and  $HO_2$ . Ten different source categories are distinguished, which include natural emissions (e.g., lightning, soils) and anthropogenic emissions (e.g., industry, road traffic, shipping, aviation). In the current verification, we tag two aviation source categories: background air traffic and the air traffic optimized by AirTraf. We are concentrating on the emissions from optimized aircraft trajectories based on the sub-model AirTraf, only, and diagnose atmospheric changes with the TAGGING sub model.

#### C. The sub model RAD: Calculation of the Radiative Forcing

The sub model RAD [20] calculates the amount of long- and short- wave radiation traveling through the atmosphere. It takes into account radiation changes induced by clouds, aerosols, albedo, and greenhouse gases (both natural and anthropogenic emissions). Here we are analyzing the difference in radiation from all the effects aforementioned minus the radiation when the ozone produced by the emissions from the optimized air traffic is subtracted. This difference eventually defines the radiative forcing of the ozone effect from the optimized air traffic.

## IV. RESULTS

#### A. The verification of the ozone aCCFs climatology

To verify the climatology of the ozone aCCFs, we calculate the zonal mean of the ozone aCCFs based on one-year simulation. The zonal mean value is then multiplied by the emission scenario as given in Table 1 [25]. The resulted mean surface temperature changes from ozone aCCFs (Fig. 4) are compared with the results in [25]. The variation pattern of the ozone aCCFs matches well with the literature results over the northern hemisphere (the latitude between  $30^\circ N$  and  $90^\circ N$ ) and the flight corridor (roughly 9km to 12 km vertical range)

Table 1: Description of the applied aircraft emission dataset

Project	Abbr.	Year	Descriptions	Fuel [Tg/a]	EI( $NO_x$ ) [g/kg (fuel)]
SCENIC	S4	2050	Subsonic air traffic	677	10.85




Fig. 4: Mean near surface temperature changes (mK) in the confined field attributed to O<sub>3</sub> concentration change caused by NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.

#### B. The effectiveness of the climate optimization with daily routes analysis

Two simulations with daily air traffic are performed. In the first simulation, the air traffic trajectories are optimized concerning costs and in the second concerning climate impact, which is described by the aCCFs. In both simulations, the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions alter differently ozone and the Radiative Forcing (RF). The reduction of the RF in the situation of climate-optimized routes proves the concept of algorithmic climate changes functions (see Fig. 5).




Fig. 5: Sketch of the performed simulations and used EMAC sub models (boxes).

The simulation setup is given in Table 2. A subset of one day European flights selected in the ATM4E is used. The constant flight Mach number 0.82 combined with the wind speed will result in the different ground speeds. For the cost optimal flights, the operating cost, calculated using Eqn. (1), is the objective function, whereas, for the climate optimal flights,

the O<sub>3</sub>-ATR20 is used as the objective function. There are 11 design variables, among which, five variables control the vertical change between [FL290, FL410] and six variables control the lateral change. The Adaptive Range Multi-objective Genetic Algorithm (ARMOGA version 1.2.0, [26, 27]) is implemented for the trajectory optimization. The EMAC model resolution is 2.8 by 2.8 degrees in latitude and longitude and 31 vertical levels up to an altitude of roughly 30 km (10 hPa)

$$\text{cost} = C_t \cdot t + C_f \cdot m_{\text{fuel}} \quad (1)$$

Where  $t$  is the flight time in hrs,  $m_{\text{fuel}}$  is the fuel consumption in kg,  $C_t$  is the flight time-related cost in €/hr;  $C_f$  is the fuel-related cost in €/kg(fuel).

Table 2: Trajectory optimization setup

AirTraf Options	Cost optimal	Climate optimal
EMAC Resolution	T42/L31ECMWF (2.8° × 2.8° in latitude and longitude, 31 vertical pressure levels up to 10 hPa)	
Waypoints	101	
Flight plan	85 European flights	
Aircraft/Engine type	One given aircraft/engine model	
EI H <sub>2</sub> O [g/kg(fuel)]	1230 (IPCC 1999)	
Load factor	0.62 (ICAO 2009)	
Mach number	0.82	
Flight altitude	[FL290, FL410]	
Optimization objective	Cost	O <sub>3</sub> -ATR20
Design variable	11 (Location 6/Altitude 5)	
Optimization approach	Genetic algorithm	

In Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, the flight trajectories for the minimal cost (Fig. 6) and the minimal climate impact (Fig. 7) are presented. The cost depends on the flight time and the fuel consumption. Though, there might be favorable wind conditions at the lower altitude, which is beneficial to shorten the flight time, the optimization routine still chooses the flights with the highest altitude within the vertical constraints. The reason is because flying at higher altitude reduces the fuel consumption, which dominates the overall operating cost in most cases.

As for the climate optimal flights, the situation is more complicated, since the temperature response of ozone attributed to the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions depends on multi-criterions, e.g., the emitted quantity, time, location and the weather condition. On average, the altitudes of the climate optimal flights are lower than the cost-optimal flights. Lateral changes have also been observed in several trajectories contributing to the reduction of the climate impact of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.






Fig. 6: Daily flight trajectories calculated using AirTraf for the cost optimal




Fig. 7: Daily flight trajectories calculated using AirTraf for the climate optimal only considering the  $\text{NO}_x$ - $\text{O}_3$  effects.

The flight characteristics are presented in Table 3. Compared to the cost optimal flights, the fuel consumption of the climate optimal flights is 11% more and the  $\text{NO}_x$  emissions

are 15% more. The total cost of the climate optimal flights is 5% higher than the cost optimal flights.

Table 3: Monthly mean characteristics of the cost optimal flights and the climate optimal flight

Parameters	Cost optimal	Climate optimal
Fuel consumption [Tons]	728	810
$\text{NO}_x$ emissions [Tons]	7.26	8.33
Flight time [hrs]	157	156
Flight distance [km]	134000	134346
Cost [k€]	636.56	667.76

### C. Ozone concentration changes

Fig. 8 and Fig. 9 present the mean  $\text{NO}_x$  emission for the cost optimal flights (Fig. 8) and the climate optimal flights (Fig. 9), respectively. We can see the climate optimal flights emit  $\text{NO}_x$  at a lower altitude between 300 hPa (=mb) and 200 hPa, whereas, the cost optimal flights emit  $\text{NO}_x$  at vertical level-up to 100 hPa, directly in the stratosphere.




Fig. 8: Monthly zonal mean  $\text{NO}_x$  in kg emitted by the cost optimal flights.




Fig. 9: Monthly zonal mean  $\text{NO}_x$  in kg emitted by the climate optimal flights.

Fig. 10 presents the difference in the  $\text{NO}_x$  between the climate optimal routes and the cost optimal routes. Since most of the  $\text{NO}_x$  is emitted at lower altitudes in the climate optimal routing case, also  $\text{NO}_x$  concentration is lower at higher altitudes and higher at lower altitudes for the climate optimal flights compared to the cost optimal flights. The residence time of  $\text{NO}_x$  is shorter at the lower altitudes due to more active chemistry and enhanced rain out, therefore, the reduction in  $\text{NO}_x$  at the higher altitude is more pronounced than the increase at lower altitudes.




Fig. 10: The changes of the atmospheric  $\text{NO}_x$ -concentration (mol/mol) caused by climate optimal flights compared to the cost optimal flights.

The changes in the  $\text{NO}_x$  location cause an increase in ozone at lower altitudes and the reduction in ozone at higher altitudes as can be seen from Fig. 11. By comparing our calculation results with the REACT4C studies in [28], we can see the variation pattern on the changes in  $\text{O}_3$  by lowering the flight altitude matches well.




Fig. 11: Ozone changes (mol/mol) arising from flying climate optimal routes compared to cost optimal flights

#### D. Radiative forcing calculation

The  $\text{O}_3$  radiative forcing (RF) has been calculated for the cost optimal flights and the climate optimal flights. The mean RF for  $\text{O}_3$  is presented in Table 4. Compared to the cost optimal flights, the climate optimal flights have smaller LW forcing and larger the SW forcing, which results in the negative  $\text{O}_3$  radiative forcing of about  $-0.3 \text{ mW/m}^2$ . This is largely because of the reduction in flight altitude.

Table 4: Mean adjusted ozone radiative forcing ( $\text{mW/m}^2$ ) for the cost optimal flight and the climate optimal flights.

	Cost optimal	Climate optimal	Climate_opt-Cost_opt
$\text{O}_3 \text{ RF } [\text{mW/m}^2]$	13.6	13.3	-0.3

#### V. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we verify the ozone aCCFs, which were developed in ATM4E, in providing information of the climate sensitive regions for climate-optimized routing. From the analysis, the following conclusions are drawn:

- The variation pattern of the ozone aCCFs matches well with the literature within the northern hemisphere flight corridor: i.e., the vertical range of about 9km to 12 km and the latitude between 30°N and 90°N.



- Altering the flight routes causes the changes in the location of the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions. The climate optimal flights emit the NO<sub>x</sub> at a lower altitude as compared to the cost optimal flights. Hence, the O<sub>3</sub> in the lower stratosphere decreases, whereas, the O<sub>3</sub> at the lower levels increases for the climate optimal flights. This pattern of the chemical O<sub>3</sub> perturbation and the sensitivity to the altitude of aircraft NO<sub>x</sub> emissions is consistent with the REACT4C studies in [28].
- By flying at the lower altitude to avoid the climate sensitive regions, the O<sub>3</sub> net radiative forcing of the climate optimal flights is about 0.3 mW/m<sup>2</sup> less when compared to the O<sub>3</sub> RF of the cost optimal flights, which confirms the effectiveness of the ozone aCCFs for optimizing the flight trajectories to reduce the climate impact.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The current study has been supported by the ATM4E project. This project has received funding from the SESAR Joint Undertaking under grant agreement No 699395 under European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program.

## REFERENCES

1. *Growing Horizons 2017/2036*, in *Global Market Forecast*, Airbus, Editor. 2017: Airbus: Toulouse, France.
2. Lee, D.S., D.W. Fahey, P.M. Forster, P.J. Newton, R.C.N. Wit, L.L. Lim, B. Owen, and R. Sausen, *Aviation and global climate change in the 21st century*. Atmospheric Environment, 2009. 43(22–23): p. 3520-3537.
3. Lee, D.S., G. Pitari, V. Grewe, K. Gierens, J.E. Penner, A. Petzold, M.J. Prather, U. Schumann, A. Bais, T. Berntsen, D. Iachetti, L.L. Lim, and R. Sausen, *Transport impacts on atmosphere and climate: Aviation*. Atmospheric Environment, 2010. 44(37): p. 4678-4734.
4. Stevenson, D.S., R.M. Doherty, M.G. Sanderson, W.J. Collins, C.E. Johnson, and R.G. Derwent, *Radiative forcing from aircraft NO<sub>x</sub> emissions: Mechanisms and seasonal dependence*. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 2004. 109(D17): p. n/a-n/a.
5. Matthes, S., V. Grewe, K. Dahlmann, C. Frömming, E. Irvine, L. Lim, F. Linke, B. Lührs, B. Owen, K. Shine, S. Stromatas, H. Yamashita, and F. Yin, *A Concept for Multi-Criteria Environmental Assessment of Aircraft Trajectories*. Aerospace, 2017. 4(3): p. 42.
6. van Manen, J. and V. Grewe, *Algorithmic climate change functions for the use in eco-efficient flight planning*. submitted to Transp. Res. Part D, 2017.
7. Grewe, V., C. Frömming, S. Matthes, S. Brinkop, M. Ponater, S. Dietmüller, P. Jöckel, H. Garny, E. Tsati, and K. Dahlmann, *Aircraft routing with minimal climate impact: the REACT4C climate cost function modelling approach (V1. 0)*. Geoscientific Model Development, 2014. 7: p. 175-201.
8. Matthes, S., U. Schumann, V. Grewe, C. Frömming, K. Dahlmann, A. Koch, and H. Mannstein, *Climate Optimized Air Transport*, in *Atmospheric Physics: Background – Methods – Trends*, U. Schumann, Editor. 2012, Springer Berlin Heidelberg: Berlin, Heidelberg. p. 727-746.
9. Frömming, C., V. Grewe, S. Brinkop, A.S. Haslerud, S. Matthes, E.A. Irvine, S. Rosanka, and J. van Manen, *Influence of weather situation on aviation emission effects: The REACT4C Climate Change Functions*. in preparation for Atmos. Environm., 2017.
10. Grewe, V., S. Matthes, C. Frömming, S. Brinkop, P. Jöckel, K. Gierens, T. Champougny, J. Fuglestad, A. Haslerud, E. Irvine, and K. Shine, *Feasibility of climate-optimized air traffic routing for trans-Atlantic flights*. Environmental Research Letters, 2017. 12(3).
11. Verbist, P., *Green Flight Trajectories-A REACT4C data analysis*. 2016, Delft University of Technology: Delft.
12. Irvine, E.A., B.J. Hoskins, K.P. Shine, R.W. Lunnnon, and C. Froemming, *Characterizing North Atlantic weather patterns for climate-optimal aircraft routing*. Meteorological Applications, 2013. 20(1): p. 80-93.
13. Jöckel, P., A. Kerkweg, A. Pozzer, R. Sander, H. Tost, H. Riede, A. Baumgaertner, S. Gromov, and B. Kern, *Development cycle 2 of the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy2)*. Geosci. Model Dev., 2010. 3(2): p. 717-752.
14. Jöckel, P., R. Sander, A. Kerkweg, H. Tost, and J. Lelieveld, *Technical Note: The Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy) - a new approach towards Earth System Modeling*. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 2005. 5(2): p. 433-444.
15. Jöckel, P., H. Tost, A. Pozzer, M. Kunze, O. Kirner, C.A.M. Brenninkmeijer, S. Brinkop, D.S. Cai, C. Dyroff, J. Eckstein, F. Frank, H. Garny, K.-D. Gottschaldt, P. Graf, V. Grewe, A. Kerkweg, B. Kern, S. Matthes, M. Mertens, S. Meul, M. Neumaier, M. Nützel, S. Oberländer-Hayn, R. Ruhnke, T. Runde, R. Sander, D. Scharffe, and A. Zahn, *Earth System Chemistry integrated Modelling (ESCiMo) with the Modular Earth Submodel System*.

- (MESSy) version 2.51. Geosci. Model Dev., 2016. 9(3).
16. Roeckner, E., R. Brokopf, M. Esch, M. Giorgetta, S. Hagemann, L. Kornblueh, E. Manzini, U. Schlese, and U. Schulzweida, *Sensitivity of simulated climate to horizontal and vertical resolution in the ECHAM5 atmosphere model*. Journal of Climate, 2006. 19(16): p. 3771-3791.
  17. Roeckner, E., G. Bäuml, L. Bonaventura, R. Brokopf, M. Esch, M. Giorgetta, S. Hagemann, I. Kirchner, L. Kornblueh, and E. Manzini, *The atmospheric general circulation model ECHAM 5. PART I: Model description*, E. Roeckner, et al., Editors. 2003, Max Planck Institute for Meteorology: Hamburg.
  18. Yamashita, H., V. Grewe, P. Jöckel, F. Linke, M. Schaefer, and D. Sasaki, *Air traffic simulation in chemistry-climate model EMAC 2.41: AirTraf 1.0*. Geosci. Model Dev., 2016. 9(9): p. 3363-3392.
  19. Grewe, V., E. Tsati, M. Mertens, C. Frömming, and P. Jöckel, *Contribution of emissions to concentrations: The TAGGING 1.0 submodel based on the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy 2.52)*. Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 2017. 2017: p. 1-33.
  20. Dietmüller, S., P. Jöckel, H. Tost, M. Kunze, C. Gellhorn, S. Brinkop, C. Frömming, M. Ponater, B. Steil, A. Lauer, and J. Hendricks, *A new radiation infrastructure for the Modular Earth Submodel System (MESSy, based on version 2.51)*. Geosci. Model Dev., 2016. 9(6): p. 2209-2222.
  21. Yamashita, H., V. Grewe, P. Jöckel, F. Linke, M. Schaefer, and D. Sasaki, *Towards Climate Optimized Flight Trajectories in a Climate Model: AirTraf*. in *USA/Europe Air Traffic Management Research and Development Seminar*. 2015.
  22. Eurocontrol, *User Manual for the Base of Aircraft Data(BADA) Revision 3.9*, in *EEC Technical/Scientific Report*. 2011.
  23. Deidewig, F., A. Döpelheuer, and M. Lecht, *Methods to assess aircraft engine emissions in flight*, in *20th Congress of the International Council of the Aeronautical Sciences 1996*: Sorrento, Italy. p. 131-141.
  24. *ICAO technical report-ICAO Engine Exhaust Emission Data*. 2005: ICAO: Montreal, QC, Canada.
  25. Grewe, V. and A. Stenke, *AirClim: an efficient tool for climate evaluation of aircraft technology*. Atmos. Chem. Phys., 2008. 8(16): p. 4621-4639.
  26. Sasaki, D., S. Obayashi, and K. Nakahashi, *Navier-Stokes optimization of supersonic wings with four objectives using evolutionary algorithm*. Journal of Aircraft, 2002. 39(4): p. 621-629.
  27. Sasaki, D. and S. Obayashi, *Efficient Search for Trade-Offs by Adaptive Range Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithms*. Journal of Aerospace Computing, Information, and Communication, 2005. 2(1): p. 44-64.
  28. Søvde, O.A., S. Matthes, A. Skowron, D. Iachetti, L. Lim, B. Owen, Ø. Hodnebrog, G. Di Genova, G. Pitari, D.S. Lee, G. Myhre, and I.S.A. Isaksen, *Aircraft emission mitigation by changing route altitude: A multi-model estimate of aircraft NOx emission impact on O3 photochemistry*. Atmospheric Environment, 2014. 95(0): p. 468-479.