



Making use of supplementary observations for the development of physical parameterizations

Linda Schlemmer, Maike Ahlgrimm, Sophie Löbel, Alberto de Lozar, Daniela Littmann



Forecasts initialized from 2025/02/20 to 2025/03/13 Reduction of RMSE [%], INI; 00, 12UTC, SIGTEST: TRUE

📕 ICON better 🗧 ICON P1 better 🛛 Significance 🛛 0.00 📃 0.25 📃 0.50 📕 0.75 📕 1.0

Standard Verification

- Verification against observations in standardised way
- Very useful and very efficient
- Sometimes it can be hard to learn something about individual processes and thus parametrizations

 \rightarrow Need additional (auxiliary) observations







Outline

- Ground-based remote sensing
 - →FESSTVaL
 - →TEAMx PIANO
- Crowd-sourced observations
- Satellite-based evaluations







Roland Potthast, NWP@DWD

PrePEP 2025

0

Deutscher Wetterdienst Wetter und Klima aus einer Hand



Outline

- Ground-based remote sensing
 - →FESSTVaL
 - →TEAMx PIANO
- Crowd-sourced observations
- → Satellite-based evaluations









Cathy Hohenegger, Daniel Klocke, Felix Ament, Bastian Kirsch, Sarah Wiesner, Finn Burgemeister, Marco Clemens, Ingo Lange, Ulrich Loehnert, Julian Steinheuer, Tobias Böck, Stephanie Fiedler, Frank.Beyrich, Carola Detring, Ronny Leinweber, Matthieu Masbou, Linda Schlemmer, Volker Lehmann, Igor Kroener, Eileen Paeschke, Christine Knist, Henning Rust, Martin Göber, Mirjana Sakradzija, Noviana Dewani, Ivan Bastak Duran, Jürg Schmidli, Andreas Platis, Jakob Boventer, Jens Bange, Chiel van Heerwaarden, Wouter Mol, Nima Shokri, Hannes Nevermann, Kevin Wolz, Johannes Speidel, vogelmann, Norman Wildmann, Luc Rochette, Dave Turner, ...











Impressions













Boundary Layer Turbulence





Comparison of vertical velocity variance to observations



Dewani et al, 2023

Boundary Layer Turbulence



Deutscher Wetterdienst Wetter und Klima aus einer Hand





滃

Dewani et al., 2023

Deutscher Wetterdienst Wetter und Klima aus einer Hand



2025, submitted

Sakradzija et al.,

	ICON-nwp		ICON-LES							
54	Domain abbreviation	Grid spacing (m)	Domain size (diameter (approx, km)	180	53.5	D1	2 / 10	1		180
54	ICON-LES	Grid spacing (III)	Domain size/diameter (approx. km)	- 150	53.0	A series			2	150
53	DOM1	626	114	120	52.5 52.5		, <u>"</u>	120	Ship	120
<u>te</u> 52	DOM2	313	63	- 90	<u>o</u> 52.0	1		A.	and a	90
51 -	DOM3	156	36	-60	51.5	100	1.9-		A.Y	- 60
50	DOM4	78	23	- 30	51.0	AN AN				30
10	ICON-LES - cold pool			• •	1	12	13 14	15	16	0
	D1	525	348				lon [°]		
	D2	260	324							
	MicroHH-LES									
	D1	75	19.2							
	D2	37.5	19.2							
	ICON-NWP									
	DOM1	5 000	610							
	DOM2	2 500	382							
*	DOM3	1 200	272							



Near-surface quantities fit well with observations



TKE: model \leftrightarrow observations



Hour UTC

0 .

• At $\Delta x=78$ m still a lot of TKE at the sub-grid scale

Hour UTC

• TKE well approximated during the daytime

Hour UTC



 10^{-2}

Hour UTC



0 -

Height above ground [m]



Outline

- Ground-based remote sensing
 FESSTVaL
 - →TEAMx PIANO
- Crowd-sourced observations
- → Satellite-based evaluations





2. Experimental Setup around the Measurement Campaign PIANO

cold air pool case, October 2017



Experimental Setup around the Measurement Campaign PIANO







DWD

Physics Configuration						
Orography	Orographic gravity wave drag ¹					
Mircrophysics	Two-moment ²					
Turbulence	TKE closure (/ Smagorinsky)					
Sfc Transfer	TKE-STC (/ Louis) ^{5.}					
Convection	Shallow convection ⁶					
Land Surface	TERRA					
 Lott an Miller (1997) Seifert and Beheng (2006) Mellor and Yamada (1982), and Raschendorfer (2001) 						

vertical level	05 Tuli (00 Hali)					
Hor. grid scale	2 km, 1 km, 500 m, 250m					
LATBC (at start)	Forecast (IFS)					
Forecast restart	0 h					
Duration	36 h					
1-way-Nesting						
Model version icon-2024.10						
* Limited Area Mode (LAM)						

22 km

GE full (GE bolf)

Model top

Vartical loval

- Smagorinsky (1963), Lilly (1962), and Dipankhar (2015)
 Louis (1979)
- 6. Tiedke (1989), and Bechthold et al. (2008)
- 7. Schrodin and Heise (2001), and Schulz et al. (2016)

15.10.2017-12 h



<u>Figure:</u> Temporal evolution of 10 m horizontal wind speed (left), 2 m temperature (middle), and 2 m relative humidity (right), averaged over the nearest neighbouring grid cell from simulations with horizontal grid spacings of 2 km (blue), 1 km (yellow), 0.5 km (green), 0.25 km (rosa), and observations from the Weather station **M07** (black) for the night between 15.10.2017, 12 h and 16.10.2017, 12 h.





<u>Figures:</u> Vertical cross sections in the Inn Valley for horizontal grid scales of 2 km, 1 km, 500 m, and 250 m (left to right). Contours represent the averaged horizontal wind speed, arrows indicate the wind direction, contour lines show the potential temperature for a cold air pool case during the night of 15.-16. October 2017. Measurements are marked as lines (red). **A strong jet is resolved by higher resolutions**

15.10.2017-12 h

M08

11.6°E



Simulated temporal wind speed



15.10.2017-12 h





Figure: Temporal evolution of downward longwave radiation (left top), upward longwave radiation (right top), downward shortwave radiation (left bellow), and upward shortwave radiation (right below) from simulations with different horizontal grid scales (colored) and observation (black).





Outline

- ➔ Ground-based remote sensing
 - →FESSTVaL
 - →TEAMx PIANO
- Crowd-sourced observations
- → Satellite-based evaluations



Y Making use of hail reports - hail size

Deutscher Wetterdienst Wetter und Klima aus einer Hand

DWD





Sophie Löbel, Alberto de Lozar, Uli Blahak

PrePEP 2025



2025-03-21





For the specific case of hail size reports:

- The location can be used as a guide to judge if the model produced hail at the right place
- The quantitative comparison of reported and predicted hail size is difficult, probably due to a non-standardized reporting procedure
- Changed maximum value for median diameter for hail in the parametrization as a result
- Next step: add information from radar

Sophie Löbel, Alberto de Lozar, Uli Blahak



Outline

- ➔ Ground-based remote sensing
 - →FESSTVaL
 - →TEAMx PIANO
- Crowd-sourced observations
- → Satellite-based evaluations



Intercomparison setup - observations



- → Visible reflectances from 0.6µm channel
 - SEVIRI: Met-9 & Met-10 (updated calibration; A. Mousivand, Eumetsat)
 - > AHI: Him-9
 - > ABI: Goes-16 & Goes-18
- Experimental period
 - January 2024
 - > Time resolution: 3-hourly data at 0, 3, 6, ... UTC
- Observation data processing
 - > DWD: Observations averaged onto model grid cells (here at 26km resolution)
 - ECMWF: Observation superobbing to ~29km resolution

Christina Stumpf, Christina Köpken-Watts, Axel Seifert PrePEP 2025

ABI, SEVIRI and AHI 0.6µm reflectances 15 January 2024 (21,18,12,9,3 UTC)





Intercomparison setup – Global NWP models ICON & IFS

- → Similar resolutions: ICON @ 26km, IFS @ 29km
- Sub-grid cloud parameterizations
- → ICON model physics setups:
 - > 1M: 1-mom. scheme operational
 - 2Mi: 2-mom. ice scheme with MODIS CDNC
 - 2Mi, CLC: 2-mom. ice scheme with MODIS CDNC and ad hoc modification of cloud cover over sea by A. Seifert
- → Effective cloud particle radii:

2025-03-21

- ICON: radiation scheme (1M), microphysics (2Mi & 2Mi, CLC) or RTTOV param. (Martin & Wyser)
- IFS: RTTOV param. (Martin & McFarquhar)

Intercomparison setup – Radiative Transfer

- → MFASIS-NN in RTTOV-13.2: Fast RT model for visible satellite images
 - > NN-based approach with limited set of input parameters per atmospheric model column
 - Trained on RTTOV-DOM (radiative transfer DISORT, 1 dim.)



RTTOV / MFASIS-NN

→ BRDF land atlas: based on Jan. 2024 MODIS collection 6 data (J. Vidot)

2025-03-21



Refl. histograms for SEVIRI: ICON vs. IFS

2025-03-21

DWD



Overall structure of refl. histograms reproduced in sim.

Main difference: Peak at low reflectances due to too many thin model clouds in ICON (mainly oceans)

Refl. histograms for SEVIRI: ICON vs. IFS

DWD



2025-03-21

Refl. histograms for SEVIRI: ICON vs. IFS



DWD



2025-03-21

Summary

- (Novel) observations, in addition to standard verification, can help in the development of parametrizations
 - ➔ Process understanding
 - → Fine-tuning, callibration
 - → Identification of missing processes
- Each observational data set is different, need to understand how the measurement was taken and processed
- → Quick availability of data is an advantage easier to work on recent episodes

