



Toward large-domain high-resolution continuously cycling data assimilation systems

Craig Schwartz

NCAR/MMM

Background

- Convection-allowing forecasts have traditionally been initialized from convection-parameterizing analyses

 These forecasts have been good, but there are spin-up issues
- This work produces convection-allowing *analyses* over a large (e.g., 3000 km²) domain
 - Many case studies have examined convection-allowing data assimilation over small domains

What is data assimilation?



A few data assimilation (DA) approaches

- Three-dimensional variational (3DVAR)
 - Background error covariances (BECs) typically fixed/timeinvariant
 - May yield poor results when actual flow differs from that encapsulated within the fixed "climatology"
 - Computationally cheap
- Ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF)
 - Time-evolving, "flow-dependent" BECs estimated from a short-term ensemble forecast
 - More expensive than 3DVAR, but usually better

"Hybrid" DA

- "Hybrid" variational-ensemble DA systems incorporate ensemble background error covariances within a variational framework
- Combines static and flow-dependent background errors
- Can combine high-resolution background with a low-resolution ensemble in a "dual-resolution" (DR) configuration





DA experiments

•Full-cycling (6-hr period) between May 4 – June 30, 2013

- Four DA experiments (analyses every 6-hrs):
 Pure 3DVAR ("3DVAR_20km") : 20-km cycling
 Pure 3DVAR ("3DVAR_4km") : <u>4-km</u> cycling
 SR Hybrid ("Hybrid_20km") : 20-km cycling
 DR Hybrid ("Hybrid_4km") : <u>4-km</u> cycling
- •Hybrid runs coupled to a 20-km, 50-member EnKF
- •All assimilated identical conventional observations

Forecast initialization

•0000 UTC analyses initialized 36-hr 4-km WRF forecasts

•4-km initial conditions were *downscaled 20-km analyses* in the 20-km 3DVAR, and 20-km hybrid experiments

•*True 4-km analyses* initialized 4-km forecasts in the DR hybrid and 4-km 3DVAR experiments

•Forecast differences between SR and DR hybrid experiments due to analysis resolution

•<u>Control</u>: Interpolate oooo UTC GFS analyses directly onto the domain and run forecasts

WRF settings and physics

- •Forecast model: WRF-ARW (version 3.3.1)
- •57 vertical levels, 10 hPa top
- •Physics:
 - Thompson microphysics
 - •RRTMG longwave and shortwave radiation
 - •MYJ PBL
 - •NOAH land surface model
 - •Aerosol, ozone climatologies for RRTMG
 - •Tiedtke cumulus parameterization (20-km domain only)



Computational domain



Computational domain



Selected data assimilation settings

•NCEP's Gridpoint Statistical Interpolation (GSI) data assimilation system:

- -GSI-3DVAR
- -GSI-Hybrid coupled to NOAA's GSI-based EnKF
- •50 ensemble members in hybrid/EnKF
- •Hybrid: **75%** of background errors from ensemble, **25%** from the static contribution
- •Used posterior inflation for EnKF and localization in EnKF and hybrid



Precipitation verification

- •Focus on bias-corrected 4-km hourly precipitation forecasts
- •NCEP Stage IV observations as "truth"
- •All precipitation statistics aggregated over 55 4-km forecasts
- •Fractions skill score (FSS) quantifies displacement errors

Precipitation verification: the first 12-hrs

- Fractions skill
 score (FSS)
 aggregated
 over the first 12
 forecast hours
 and 55 4-km
 forecasts
- Precipitation forecasts biascorrected



Precipitation verification: 18-36-hrs

- Fractions skill score (FSS) aggregated over forecast hours 18-36 and 55 4-km forecasts
- Precipitation forecasts biascorrected



Areal coverages of precipitation

 Aggregate fractional coverage of precipitation exceeding certain thresholds aggregated over all 55 forecasts



Summary

- DR hybrid DA systems are practical
- Biggest impact from high-resolution analyses at earlier times, but some benefit persists to longer times
- DA method more important than analysis resolution
- The DR hybrid system described here does not produce convection-permitting ensemble analyses

Observation snapshot (0000 UTC 26 May)





