Validation of IAU initialized reforecasts (2000-2018)

Hong Guan

Kate Zhou, Bing Fu and Yuejian Zhu Environmental Modeling Center NCEP/NWS/NOAA

Acknowledgments: Scott Gregory, Jeff Whitaker and PSD staffs, and Ensemble staffs, Update: 2/28/2019

Update of reforecast 1989-1999

- Continue to run on DELL develop machine
- 750 nodes "devmax" priority
- Years has been finished
 - 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999
 - Part of 1993
 - Validation is going on
- Machine is maintained today not available

Purpose of this validation

- Purpose of these 30-y reforecasts
 - Generate systematic error to calibrate real-time forecast
- Make sure all our processes (combined to PSD's process) are right for starting reforecast from using IAU (+3)
- To find out if there is any big difference compared to retrospective runs include analysis and forecast
 - It may indicate the difference to future operation, in particularly for systematic errors.
 - It may impact our application.
- We need to understand

- There is no apple-to-apple comparison.

Experiments Setting

- Period:
 - One week for summer -7/1 7/7/2016
 - 5 members per run out to 16 days
 - 11 members for 7/6/2016 (Wednesday)
 - One week for winter -1/1 1/7/2016
 - 5 members per run out to 16 days
 - 11 members for 1/6/2016 (Wednesday)
- Model configuration
 - Frozen system (Dec. 21 2018)
 - Highlights Hord=5; radiation bug fixed; SST adjustment; GFDL MP modification
 - Initial conditions (need to further confirm both model version for cycling)
 - End of IAU (+3), and perturbations (EnKF analysis) with re-centerization.
 - Retrospective initials are using hybrid DA cycling (June 2018 version) and F06 of ENKF
- References:
 - Forecasts compare to retrospective experiments only difference is a initial conditions
 - Verification reference retrospective analysis which is more favor to retrospective experiments
- Stats
 - <u>https://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/gmb/wd20hg/html/rfc_rtro_20160101_2lines.html</u>
 - <u>https://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/gmb/wd20hg/html/rfc_rtro_20160701_2lines.html</u>

Summer













Forecast days









Forecast days

Forecast days

Winter





2 3 4

5 6

14

15

16

10 11 12 13

9

Forecast days









Forecast days





10 11 12 13 14 15 16

9

Forecast days

3 4 5

Б

Summary

- Overall, retrospective runs has better scores
- Summer
 - NH 500hPa height, 850hPa temp show inconsistent analysis
 - NH 2-m temp shows similar analysis, but forecast has difference
- Winter
 - NH 2-m temp shows difference analysis
 - NH 500hPa height, 850hPa temp and 2-m temp have less spread

More comparison!!!

- We focus on 2-meter temperature
- One week average of summer and winter
- A couple of question and concerns:
 - Which FV3 model version (PSD) is used for reanalysis?
 - What are the differences of reanalysis and retrospective analysis?
 - Retrospective analysis was from early version (June 2018 with HORD=5)
 - Note that retrospective analysis has been upgraded as well since it handled to NCO in June 2018
 - Radiation bug fixed, SST changes (9/16/2018)
 - We have evaluated OISST and NSST for 2-tier SST approach for September 2018
 - Used later (not latest) version, and differences are smaller.
 - Kate Zhou presented on November 6 2018

















F120 Winter





F360 Winter

Final Summary for surface T

- Summer:
 - Reforecast shows warmer in Northern Pacific Ocean
 - Difference is persistent (no moving) from analysis to forecast
 - Not sure where does this difference come from?
- Winter:
 - Reforecast shows much warmer in the NH land, particular in the center of Asia-Europe and North American from analysis to forecast
 - The different is moving slowly to northeast.
 - We have a difficulty to figure out why there are large land temperature differences from two analyses?
 - We assume both analyses used similar model!!!
- Questions:
 - Is the difference acceptable?
 - Do we need more diagnostics and comparison of longer period?
- What is our decision?
 - Can we start 19 years (2000-2018) reforecast?