Porting the CAM5 Physics Suite into WRF

William I. Gustafson Jr., Jerome D. Fast, Richard C. Easter, & Philip J. Rasch

11th Annual WRF Users' Workshop 24 June 2010, Boulder, CO



Proudly Operated by Battelle Since 1965

PNNL-SA-73495

Problem Statement / Motivation

- There has been relatively little interaction between the WRF (cloud-resolving and mesoscale) and CCSM/CAM (global scale) communities
 - Models have been optimized for different purposes
 - Lessons learned on parameterizations are not necessarily shared
- CAM will be run at higher spatial resolution (10 20 km) in the future (5 – 10 years from now), but the performance of the current suite of physics modules at those scales are not known
- Rapid development and evaluation of the next generation suite for CAM requires
 - Ability to isolate processes
 - Ability to easily test parameterizations across a range of scales



Goal and Objectives

- Incorporate the parameterization suite from CAM5 into WRF
- Use the Aerosol Modeling Testbed to evaluate the parameterization suite from CAM5
 - Evaluate CAM5 physics suite at higher spatial resolution more compatible with data
 - Compare CAM5 physics against more complex and expensive representations using systematic and consistent methodology
 - Use performance metrics to identify more desirable parameterization choices for both models
- Increase communication between WRF (cloud-resolving and mesoscale) and CCSM/CAM (global scale) modeling communities



Approach



Coding Philosophy: Both emphasize modularity and have scheme independence, interface subroutines / layers

Coding Philosophy

Top priority: ease code maintenance for long-term sustainability

Methodology

- Use Subversion with vendor branches for WRF and CCSM
- Implement CAM physics via intermediary driver subroutines
- Minimize code changes outside of driver
- When possible, make schemes interoperable



Convective Parameterization

Flow Chart for Zhang-McFarlane Scheme implemented in WRF



Shallow Convective Parameterization

Flow Chart for UW Scheme implemented in WRF



Progress So Far...

Convective Parameterization:

- Zhang-McFarlane scheme ported from CAM5 to WRF
- Tested ZM in comparison with other parameterizations in WRF

Shallow Convective Parameterization:

- UW scheme ported from CAM5 to WRF
- New driver for shallow convection added to WRF, with flexibility to handle other schemes such as Larry Berg's CuP
- Added separate tendency arrays for shallow to supplement Cu and MP

Testbed Case:

WRF domain and simulation period set up to test ported code

New Hire to speed progress:

 Hired programmer to help with code development issues; starting "any day now"



Other Parameterizations

To be implemented next this summer:

- Boundary Layer: Park Bretherton TKE scheme similar to those in WRF
- Aerosols: Modal Aerosol Model (MAM) developed by Liu, Easter, and Ghan
- Microphysics: Morrison Gettleman

Activities by other groups to consider:

Radiation:

- RRTMG already implemented in WRF by AER Inc.
- Need to assess whether code is latest CAM5 version

Gas-Phase Chemistry:

- Full MOZART already implemented in WRF by NCAR, but ...
- Limited MOZART from CAM5 needs to be ported (NCAR ?)

Land-Surface:

Several groups coupling CLM to WRF, either hard-coded or via flux coupler

Macrophysics:

 Designed for large spatial and temporal scales—a foreign concept to many WRF modelers Implement interfaces consistent with our efforts ?

Testbed Case: 2007 CHAPS Field Campaign



Evaluate convective parameterizations using different Dx

- Two sets of simulations performed: Convection parameterization is either Zhang-McFarlane (from CAM) or Kain-Fritsch (from WRF); all runs use same microphysics, boundary layer, and surface layer parameterizations
- Initially looking to confirm Zhang-McFarlane is implemented correctly

Sensitivity to Convective Parameterization





Example Differences: Hourly Precipitation 12 UTC June 18, 2007

contours: 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2 ... mm/hr



Example Differences: Hourly Precipitation 00 UTC June 19, 2007



contours: 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2 ... mm/hr





Example Differences: Hourly Precipitation 12 UTC June 19, 2007

contours: 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2 ... mm/hr



Example Differences: Hourly Precipitation 00 UTC June 20, 2007





The Completed Product

- The ability to run CAM physics package in WRF at higher spatial resolution that is more compatible with cloud and aerosol data
- Simplified framework for parameterization development
 - Easily compare behavior across a range of grid spacings
 - Interoperability enables comparisons with different param. combinations
- A regional atmospheric model with self consistent physics between global and regional domains for downscaling CAM climate simulations

Acknowledgements: Funding provided by the Aerosol Climate Initiative LDRD program of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Sensitivity to Microphysics



CAM5 Physics Package in WRF



ensure interoperability: permit combination of WRF and CAM modules