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• **For high-impact weather prediction:**
  - When, where, and how intense will the event be?
  - High-resolution model to ‘resolve’ convection
  - Computational constraints – so regional domain
  - Target skill/reliability for short-term window (e.g., 0-36 h)

• **A push toward model unification**
  - Single dynamic core to simplify support and development, physics suites, interfaces, same prediction systems for global and regional (e.g., FV3, MPAS)

• **Maintain good spread – error relationship** throughout prediction
  - Dominated by model errors and inadequate growth of model errors
  - Would need less error growth with a better forecast model

• **Visualization and Verification**

• **Research applications of formal CAM ensembles**
Current state of 0-36 hr CAM ensemble prediction

- **HREFv2 operational convection-allowing model (CAM) ensemble**
  - Operationalized storm-scale ensemble of opportunity
  - Conglomeration of well-tuned 3-km deterministic model forecasts
    - NAM nest, NSSL-WRF, NMMB, ARW
    - multi-model, time-lag (0,-12 h), multi-IC
  - Performs quite well for ‘next-day’ prediction applications (12-36 h)

- ‘**Formal**’ CAM ensembles
  - Purposefully designed, e.g. former NCAR ensemble
  - Best practice in ensemble design still a work in progress
  - Current state: similar or worse skill and lower reliability than HREFv2
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• **Initial condition uncertainty**
  • Flow-dependent background/analysis errors (e.g., initialized from EnKF analysis)
  • Time lag
  • Multi-analysis (e.g., GFS ensemble)
  • Inflation options in analysis system

• **Boundary condition uncertainty**
  • Lateral (from external) and lower boundary uncertainty (LSM, SST)

• **Model error representation**
  • Multi-model
  • Multi-physics
  • Multi-parameter
  • Stochastic methods (e.g., SKEBS, SPPT, SPP)
• Would like to have:
  • All members equally likely
  • Flow-dependent perturbations
  • Appropriate spread skill (e.g., low [high] spread indicates high certainty [uncertainty]), which persists into the forecast
  • Smooth transition from analysis into the forecast

• Ensemble DA provides flow-dependent errors for ICs, but may not lead to optimal error growth (area of active research)
  • Sensitive to inflation options, additive noise

• Lateral boundary conditions should include errors – ideally flow dependent
Regional MPAS

- The same model as in global forecasts: no discrepancy in physics and dynamics

- No artifacts or reflection along the lateral boundaries for inflow and outflow!

- In this test, physics versions were slightly different between global and regional MPAS.

See Skamarock et al. 2018

From S. Ha
LBC errors minimized with frequent updates

Additional sources of error:
- changes in model climate (including physics) across boundary
- changes in grid resolution

Optimal for regional CAMS:
- Flow-dependent errors at LBC
- Regional domain of adequate size

Lower boundary condition diversity also important to promote BL error growth

From S. Ha
Ensemble model error representation

**None**
Rely on lateral boundary perturbations and initial condition diversity
e.g., downscalers from global ensembles

**Multi-model/multi-physics/multi-parameter**
- Uncertain representations of physical processes
- Ensemble members may have varying skill and biases
- May be challenging to post-process (e.g. grids, variables, state size)

**Stochastic methods**
- Random model error process – *designed for global model applications*
- Single physics climate
- Options available in WRF-ARW:
  1) Stochastic Kinetic Energy Backscatter Scheme (SKEBS)
  2) Stochastically Perturbed Parameterization Tendencies (SPPT)
  3) Stochastic perturbed parameters (SPP)
Control ensemble:
• Roughly approximates true evolution of the atmosphere, unknown exact truth
• Lacks sufficient dispersion to capture the observed evolution after short integration

Select options:
Multi-XXX, calibration, perturbed boundaries, stochastic methods
Perturbing the lateral boundary condition improves spread somewhat, but later in the forecast owing to the nested design. Ensemble mean stays about the same.
SKEBS leads to greater dispersion, beginning earlier in the forecast, with nearly the same ensemble mean as the control and perturbed boundary ensemble.
SPPT leads to even greater dispersion, beginning much earlier in the forecast, but the ensemble mean is further from the observed state relative to the control. See Romine et al. 2014
Observation + error estimate

Imperfect observation measurement: instrument + representativeness + conversion errors

Model + error estimate

Flawed model, simplified representation of true system, potential systematic errors: Ensemble spread

- These states are effectively indistinguishable despite minimal overlap
- DA can be used, with sufficient observations, to pull toward the observed state, but will drift to model attractor during the forecast
- In cycled DA, model errors can be can be time averaged to identify systematic problems
Instead of relying on spread to compensate for a poor model trajectory, try to **improve the forecast model** to evolve more like the real atmosphere. *Sounds great, but difficult in practice.*
Model error – cycled data assimilation

Kain-Fritsch cumulus scheme

Tiedtke cumulus scheme

700 hPa temperature difference in 6 hr forecasts from GFS analyses – shallow cumulus scheme

See Torn and Davis 2012, Romine et al. 2013
Model error – NCAR ensemble vs. HRRR physics

- NCAR ensemble physics configuration has less temperature bias
- Continuous cycling led to degraded analyses and poor forecast quality
Seasonal variability in analysis increments
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Averaged analysis increments balanced by model tendencies, which can be disaggregated to reveal sources of model error (See Rodwell and Palmer 2007; Cavallo et al. 2016; Rodwell et al. 2018).
Forecasts initialized with updated cumulus scheme have slower spinup of precipitation. Source of slower spinup tied to mean moisture analysis. The cumulus scheme, with interactions with the microphysics, are likely driving the differences we see in the $q_v$ analysis state.
Ensemble spread – flow dependence
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See Schwartz et al. 2019
Verification - Ensemble spread – Paintball (spaghetti)
Cannot assess the value of a probability forecast from a single event!
Verification - Ensemble reliability – stochastic methods

Stochastic methods can improve reliability in longer range storm-scale forecasts, but less so in short-range (< 12 h) prediction (Romine et al. 2014)
Storm hazard verification

NWS warning polygons overlain on daily severe storm surrogate probabilities
NCAR ensemble had similar skill to HREF, less reliable, but users felt quite good about the provided dispersion.

See Schwartz et al. 2019
How many members are need in a CAM ensemble?

About ten or so members seems adequate to capture most of the degrees of freedom

Left – Schwartz et al. 2014; Right – Clark et al. 2011
Examples of CAM ensembles in physical process studies

Trier et al. 2015 (left); Torn et al. 2017 (right)

Ensemble sensitivity analysis

\[
\frac{\partial J}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\text{cov}(J, x_i)}{\text{}(x_i)}
\]
Positive contributions to CAM ensembles:
- Skillful model climate (essential in continuous cycling)
- Ensemble DA to generate flow-dependent ICs
- 10 members appears adequate for next-day prediction

Not so hot:
- Multi-X for investigation of systematic model errors and error growth characteristics – push toward model unification is ongoing

Some areas ripe for work:
- Distilling high-resolution CAM guidance
- Best practice CAM ensemble design
- Forecast model performance
- Capabilities to improve model performance in a systematic way
- Verification of CAM ensembles – lack adequate observations to observe processes