

Priority Project T²RC²:

Towards a Single Precision Version of the Radiation Scheme



P. Khain¹, H. Muskatel¹, X. Lapillonne², O. Fuhrer² Thanks to: A. Shtivelman¹, V. Clement² and P. Spoerri²

¹Israel Meteorological Service, ²MeteoSwiss

COSMO General Meeting, Jerusalem, September 2017

Outline



Overview

- 2. Method to evaluate the error growth
- 3. Analysis of 5 radiation scheme versions:
- Entire Rad. Scheme in SP
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP "mixed 1"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 2"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in mixed pr. and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 3"
- Entire Rad. Scheme in DP

4. Summary

Overview

Max Number of digits Min Precision Single vs. Double Single 1038 10-38 7.2 10^{-7} precision: 10-16 10308 10-308 Double 16.0Link to example

DP \rightarrow SP saves 20-40% run time for COSMO schemes.

J. Despraz and O. Fuhrer (2012): COSMO physical schemes in SP V
Radiation scheme in SP X

Goals:

A. Find the hotspots in the radiation scheme which are sensitive to $DP \rightarrow SP$

B. Check if possible to modify the code to allow running in SP

Outline

1. Overview



- 3. Analysis of 5 radiation scheme versions:
- Entire Rad. Scheme in SP
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP "mixed 1"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 2"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in mixed pr. and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 3"
- Entire Rad. Scheme in DP

4. Summary

Method



Example: C=273.1722 There are 7 digits. How many are significant?

Add relative perturbation 10⁻⁷. Due to the SUBROUTINE, the output **C** changed to: **D=273.1256**

 \Rightarrow ERR=1.70588·10⁻⁴ \Rightarrow N_{sig}=4 \Rightarrow The SUBROUTINE causes loss of precision:

from 7 significant digits in the INPUT to 4 significant digits in the OUTPUT

Example 1

Ideal situation – same error growth in SP an DP



Example 2

Bad situation – bigger error growth in SP



Experiment

Radiation standalone scheme was used for one time step runs

Configuration:

- 80X60X60 grid points
- 0.02 deg resolution
- Date: 16/6/2014 18UTC
- Domain:





Outline

1. Overview

2. Method to evaluate the error growth



• Entire Rad. Scheme in SP

- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP "mixed 1"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 2"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in mixed pr. and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 3"
- Entire Rad. Scheme in DP

4. Summary

Radiation Scheme in SP



Radiation Scheme in DP



Effect of perturbation on error growth: histogram Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view Field=rad sohr, levels: 41-60 SP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points, 100%) Number of grid points (log scale) 10^4 10^2 10^2 sp SP: 4.63 50 10 dp DP: 5.92 delta: 1.29 40 8 6 30 4 20 2 10 0

SP vs. DP



Number of significant digits

56

34

-1012

16/6/2014 18UTC 60 1.5 50 1 40 0.5 30 0 20 -0.5 -1 10 -1.5 20 40 60 80

7 8 9 10111213141516171819

Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view $\times 10^{-4}$ DP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points 100%)

40

20



60

80

Effect of perturbation on error growth: histogram Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view Field=rad_sohr, levels: 21-40 SP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points, 100%) Number of grid points (log scale) 10^4 10^2 10^2 sp SP: 5.09 50 dp DP: 6.34 delta: 1.24 40 30 20 10 10⁰ -101234 56 20 60 80 7 8 9 10111213141516171819 40 Number of significant digits

SP vs. DP



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view $\times 10^{-5}$ DP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points 100%)

10

8

6

4

2

0



Effect of perturbation on error growth: histogram Field=rad_sohr, levels: 1-20 Number of grid points (log scale) 10^4 10^2 10^2 10^2 sp SP: 4.73 dp DP: 6.74 delta: 2.01 -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10111213141516171819 Number of significant digits



Actual Field=rad sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20

Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view $\times 10^{-5}$ DP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%) 16/6/2014 18UTC 60 1.4 50 50 10 1.3 40 8 40 1.2 30 30 6 1.1 20 4 20 1 2 10 10 0.9 0 20 40 60 80 20 40 60 80

SP vs. DP

Thermal heating rate



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 41-60 16/6/2014 18UTC DP, Field



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points_100%)



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points,100%)



SP vs. DP

Thermal heating rate

Effect of perturbation on error growth: histogram Field=rad thhr, levels: 21-40 SP: 4.97 DP: 5.39 delta: 0.42

Number of grid points (log scale) 10^4 10^2 10^2 10^2 56 -1012 34 7 8 9 10111213141516171819 Number of significant digits

Actual Field=rad thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 21-40



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points 100%)



10 50 40 8 6 30 4 20 2 10 0 20 60 80 40



SP vs. DP

SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points,100%)



Thermal heating rate

Effect of perturbation on error growth: histogram Field=rad_thhr, levels: 1-20 10⁶ Sp: 4.86 DP: 5.98 delta: 1.12 10⁷ 10⁶ -1 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10111213141516171819 Number of significant digits



SP vs. DP

Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20 16/6/2014 18UTC



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%)



Outline

1. Overview

2. Method to evaluate the error growth



- Entire Rad. Scheme in SP
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP "mixed 1"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 2"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in mixed pr. and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 3"
- Entire Rad. Scheme in DP
- 4. Summary





Radiation Scheme in SP but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP



Example: Why keeping SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP ?

zfls(k)=1000.12345678 zfls(k+1)=1000.11111111 sohr(k)=0.01234567 12 sig. digits → 7 sig. digits

Mixed 2

zfls(k)=1000.12345678 zfls(k+1)=1000.11111111 sohr(k)=0.01234567 7 sig. digits → 2 sig. digits (3)



SP vs. DP





1-60 Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view ×10⁻⁴DP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points 100%)



Radiation

Solar (SP + fesft in DP) vs. DP











1-60 Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view ×10⁻⁴DP, Field=r<u>ad_</u>sohr, Mean o<u>ver levels: 41-60 (valid grid points</u>100%)



forft

Solar (SP + fesft,zfls,zflt in DP) vs. DP



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points 100%)



Actual Field=rad_sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 41-60



1-60 Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view ×10⁻⁴DP, Field=r<u>ad_</u>sohr, Mean o<u>ver levels: 41-60 (valid grid points</u>100%)





SP vs. DP





Radiation

Solar (SP + fesft in DP) vs. DP heating rate



Actual Field=rad sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 21-40



Solar (SP + fesft,zfls,zflt in DP) vs. DP heating rate





40

20

60

Actual Field=rad sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 21-40



0

80





Actual Field=rad sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20

 $\times 10^{-5}$ DP, Field=rad_sohr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%) 16/6/2014 18UTC 60 1.4 50 50 1.3 40 40 1.2 30 30 1.1 20 20 1 10 10 0.9 20 40 20 40 60 80

SP vs. DP

Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view



SP

Radiation

Solar (SP + fesft in DP) vs. DP heating rate





Actual Field=rad sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view

Solar (SP + fesft,zfls,zflt in DP) vs. DP heating rate





Actual Field=rad sohr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20



Thermal heating rate



SP vs. DP

Actual Field=rad thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 41-60 16/6/2014 18UTC



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points 100%)





SP

Radiation

Thermal (SP + fesft in DP) vs. DP heating rate



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points 100%)



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 41-60 16/6/2014 18UTC



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points, 1,00%)



Thermal (SP + fesft,zfls,zflt in DP) vs. DP



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points 100%)



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 41-60 16/6/2014 18UTC



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 41-60 (valid grid points,100%)



Thermal heating rate



SP vs. DP

Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 21-40



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points,100%)





Radiation

Thermal (SP + fesft in DP) vs. DP heating rate



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 21-40



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points,100%)



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points 100%)



forft

Thermal (SP + fesft,zfls,zflt in DP) vs. DP



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points 100%)



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 21-40



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 21-40 (valid grid points, 100%)



fesft

Thermal heating rate



SP vs. DP

Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20 16/6/2014 18UTC



20 40 60 80





SP

Radiation

Thermal (SP + fesft in DP) vs. DP heating rate



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%)



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20 16/6/2014 18UTC



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%)



Thermal (SP + fesft,zfls,zflt in DP) vs. DP



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view SP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%)



Actual Field=rad_thhr [K/s], Mean over levels: 1-20 16/6/2014 18UTC



Effect of perturbation on error growth: domain view DP, Field=rad_thhr, Mean over levels: 1-20 (valid grid points 100%)



Outline

1. Overview

2. Method to evaluate the error growth

Analysis of 5 radiation scheme versions:

- Entire Rad. Scheme in SP
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP "mixed 1"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 2"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in mixed pr. and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 3"
- Entire Rad. Scheme in DP
- 4. Summary

Mixed 3

Radiation Scheme in SP but "fesft" in mixed precision (14 fluxes in DP) and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP



We skip the detailed results here ...

Outline

1. Overview

- 2. Method to evaluate the error growth
- 3. Analysis of 5 radiation scheme versions:
- Entire Rad. Scheme in SP
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP "mixed 1"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in DP and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 2"
- Rad. Scheme in SP , but "fesft" in mixed pr. and SW and LW radiative fluxes in DP "mixed 3"
- Entire Rad. Scheme in DP





Summary

- Not worthwhile to run fesft in DP it takes the same time as entire radiation scheme in DP
- Choose between 3 options:
 - Entire scheme in DP
 - "Mixed 3" version save 15% runtime, lose 1.1 significant digits
 - Entire scheme in SP save 20% runtime, lose 1.5 significant digits

Thank you!

Additional slides:

Synoptic situation



















Additional slides:

SP (fesft in DP) $HR_{pe} = 1.1234\frac{12}{10^{-5}} + 10^{-5}$ $HR_{np} = 1.1234\frac{01}{10^{-5}} + 10^{-5}$ Delta=0.000*10⁻⁵ fesft in DP+zfls,zflt in DP HR_{pe}=1.12341278912*10⁻⁵ HR_{np}=1.12340167801*10⁻⁵ Delta=0.00011111*10⁻⁵ SIG=5

SIG=?

All in SP (also fesft)

 $HR_{pe} = 1.1234\frac{12}{10^{-5}} HR_{np} = 1.1124\frac{01}{10^{-5}} HR_{np} = 1.1124\frac{01}{10^{-5}$

Delta=0.011*10⁻⁵

SIG=2

COSMO spectral bands

	TABLE 1. Spectral intervals and major optical constituents considered in the radiation scheme.							
	Solar			Thermal				
Interval number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Limits (µm)	1.53-4.64	0.70-1.53	0.25-0.70	20.0-104.5	12.5-20.0	8.33-9.01 10.31-12.5	9.01-10.31	4.64-8.33
Gaseous absorption,	H ₂ O, CO ₂ CH ₄ , N ₂ O	H ₂ O, CO ₂ , O ₂	O3, H2O O2	H ₂ O	H ₂ O, CO ₂ , N ₂ O	H2O, CO2, N2O	H ₂ O, O ₃ , CO ₂ , N ₂ O	H ₂ O, CH ₄ , N ₂ O, CO ₂
No. of k_i for H ₂ O, CO ₂ and O ₃	(7, 6, 0)	(7, 3, 0)	(3, 2, 5)	(7, 0, 0)	(7, 7, 0)	(4, 3, 0)	(3, 3, 5)	(7, 4, 0)
Droplet								
scattering	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
absorption	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Rayleigh scattering	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no
Aeorsol								
scattering	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
absorption	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

SUBROUTINE test_physics (from src_physics.f90)

CALL init_test (which calls read_input from src_read_write.f90)

DO ib=1,nblock

...

•••

CALL copy_to_block

CALL radiation_organize

CALL copy_from_block

•••

END DO

•••

CALL write_output (from src_readwrite.f90)

SUBROUTINE radiation_organize (from radiation_interface.f90)

CALL radiation_rg_organize-

...

...

CALL fesft

SUBROUTINE radiation rg organize

(from radiation org org.f90)

SUBROUTINE radiation_rg_organize :

The module procedure forms the interface between the model and the radiation code adapted from the global model gm_e. Method: All variables that are required for the radiation code are provided or calculated from the model variables. The results are stored as solar and thermal heating rates on the corresponding global arrays sohr and thhr. fesft organizes the radiative transfer calculations by calling routines for the calculation of basic optical properties (opt th/opt so), the derivation of layer coefficients (coe th/coe so) for an implicit delta-two-stream scheme and the inversion (inv th/inv so) of the corresponding system matrix. These operations are performed separately for thermal and solar parts of the spectrum and are embedded in loops over the various spectral intervals. Within each interval, a data-controlled decision is taken, whether the so-called ESFT or FESFT approach is used for the handling of gaseous absorption. Before the actual flux calculation starts, some preliminary steps provide utility arrays which are applicable to all spectral intervals (e.g. cloud geometry factors, integrated layer water content, etc.)

SUBROUTINE fesft (from radiation_rg.f90)

DO jspec=jpsol+1,jpspec (Thermal spectral loop)

CALL opt_th (from radiation_rg.f90)

Calculation of clouds/aerosols "grey" contribution to rad. fluxes:

CALL inv_th (from radiation_rg.f90)

Calculation of gases (h2o,co2,o3) contribution to rad. fluxes:

DO jg = 3, 1, -1 (over gases)

DO jc = icc,1,-1 (over absorption coefficients)

CALL inv_th (from radiation_rg.f90)

ENDDO ENDDO

ENDDO

...

The module procedure **inv_th** solves a linear equation system for thermal fluxes using a Gaussian elimination-backsubstitution algorithm dedicated to the specific structure of the system matrix. Method: 1) setting of the RHS of the system using the layer boundary black body radiation and allowing for partial cloud cover in each layer. 2) solution of the equation system including the lower boundary condition. 3) matrix coefficients are calculated in the course of the elimination. 4) step for one layer at a time through a call to routine *coe_th*. 5) the final result, i.e. the so-called black body flux differences (cf.Ritter and Geleyn, 1992) are stored seperately for cloudy and cloud-free part of each layer boundary

DO jspec=1,jpsol (Solar spectral loop) ... ENDDO

Example

example for 12.345 :

Precision	Rounded to significant figures
6	12.3450
5	12.345
4	12.35
3	12.3
2	12
1	10
0	N/A

Another example for 0.012345:

	Rounded to
Precision	significant figures
7	0.01234500
6	0.0123450
5	0.012345
4	0.01235
3	0.0123
2	0.012
1	0.01
0	N/A



Method

- We have performed 4 simulations of radiation standalone:
 - A. Double precision, unperturbed
 - B. Double precision, with the input fields T, PP, QV, QC, QI, T_S, PS randomly perturbed to 1e-7
 - C. Single precision, unperturbed
 - D. Single precision, with the input fields T, PP, QV, QC, QI, T_S, PS randomly perturbed to 1e-7
- After one time step the radiation-related fields were retrieved (for the cases A,B,C,D)
- At any grid point the relative error is defined as: Er_DP=abs((A-B)/max(abs(A),abs(B)) Er_SP=abs((C-D)/max(abs(C),abs(D))
- Number of significant digits is defined as: Nsig_DP=-log₁₀(Er_DP) Nsig_SP=-log₁₀(Er_SP)
- Lower number of significant digits means higher error growth.
- If for most of the radiation-related fields, Nsig_SP distribution (over all the grid points) is shifted towards lower values, compared to Nsig_DP, one should not run the radiation scheme in SP
- We present error growth analysis for the following radiation-related fields: rad_alb_rad [1], rad_clch [1], rad_clcl [1], rad_clcm [1], rad_clc_sgs [1], rad_clct [1], rad_lwd_s [W/m2], rad_lwu_s [W/m2], rad_pabs [W/m2], rad_qc_rad [kg/kg], rad_qi_rad [kg/kg], rad_sobs [W/m2], rad_sobt [W/m2], rad_sod_t [W/m2], rad_sodwddm [W/m2], rad_sohr [K/s], rad_sotr [1], rad_sotr_par [1], rad_sun_azi [deg], rad_sun_el [deg], rad_swdifd_s [W/m2], rad_swdifu_s [W/m2], rad_swdir_cor [1], rad_swdir_s [W/m2], rad_swtrdifd_s [W/m2], rad_swtrdifu_s [W/m2], rad_swtrdir_s [W/m2], rad_thbs [W/m2], rad_thbt [W/m2], rad_thhr [K/s]

Method cont.

For every field, 4 subplots are presented:

- <u>Right-hand side</u>: domain view of Nsig_SP (upper right) and Nsig_DP (lower right). For the 3D fields, we have first averaged the rel. errors over the levels ranges 1-20, 21-40, 41-60, and than calculated the numbers of significant digits.
- Upper left: histograms of Nsig_SP (blue) and Nsig_DP (red) using all the grid points as sample (see explanation figure). For 2D fields the sample is 80X60. For 3D fields at specific levels range, all the relevant levels equally contributed to the sample, enlarging sample size to 80X60X20.
- Lower left: domain view of the actual field. For 3D fields, the field values are averaged over the relevant levels ranges (1-20, 21-40, 41-60).

Special cases:

•

- Grid points with negligible fields values (max(abs(A),abs(B))<10^-12 or max(abs(C),abs(D))<10^-12) are ignored (rel. error is not calculated). These points appear as white pixels at the domain views (right-hand side), and counted to "-1" column at the histograms (see explanation figure).
- "Full precision" grid points (rel. error below 10^-7.2 for SP and below 10^-16 for DP) are counted to "18" column at the histograms (see explanation figure). Grid points with rel. error=0 (exactly) are counted to "19" column at the histograms.



Explanation figure (J. Despraz)