

Clouds and Aerosols Improvements in ICON Radiation Scheme - CAIIR Priority Project

Harel Muskatel (IMS) 22nd COSMO General Meeting, September 09, 2020

BUT FIRST...

some T²(RC)² issues

Aerosols Input for COSMO Radiation



New:

COSMO Cloud Optics Web-App

http://www.cosmo-model.org/content/tasks/operational/ims/cloudOptics/default.htm





Operational

Cloud Optical Properties

Sep. 8

the GM2020

Introduction

Priority Tasks

Priority Projects

Work Groups

Model Management

Operational

The programs in these pages use advanced spectral averaging methods to calculate cloud optical properties.

The optical properties and the effective size and aspect ratio are calculated for each PSD in an ensemble of 7500 particle size distributions. The calculations, for each single wavelength data is based on Fu (DOI) and Hu & Stamnes (DOI). The collection of these 7500 points are fitted to a Padé approximation using a non-linear fitting algorithm selected to adequately reproduce asymptotic behavior

This way, we can extend the effective size range to include large hydro meteors categories such as snow, graupel and rain.

For a full discussion on the scientific aspects and numerical implementation see the Liquid and Ice Clouds Optical Properties Parametrizations in Numerical Weather Prediction Models

Related COSMO priority projects are T²(RC)² and CAIIR.

Running

The authors of the programs doing the fitting, are Harel Muskatel from IMS (ice calculations) and Ulrich Blahak from DWD (liquid water calculations) You may contact them for further details.

On how to run the programs yourself, using the web interface, see this user manual. To run your own simulations, you will need a username and password. These are free and you can get them by contacting Harel Muskatel. When you have your credentials, you can start.

References

1. Muskatel, H. B., Blahak, U., Khain, P., Levi, Y. and Fu, Q., Liquid and Ice Clouds Optical Properties Parametrizations in Numerical Weather Prediction Models.

Submitted to Royal Meteorological Society - Meteorological Applications, Aug 2020.

- 2. Fu, Q., 1996: An Accurate Parameterization of the Solar Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds for Climate Models. J. Climate, 9, 2058–2082.
- 3. Fu, Q., Yang, P., & Sun, W., 1998: An Accurate Parameterization of the Infrared Radiative Properties of Cirrus Clouds for Climate Models

Journal of Climate, 11(9), 2223-2237.

- 4. Fu, Q., 2007: A New Parameterization of an Asymmetry Factor of Cirrus Clouds for Climate Models. J. Atmos. Sci., 64, 4140-4150.
- 5. Hu, Y.X. and K. Stamnes, 1993: An Accurate Parameterization of the Radiative Properties of Water Clouds Suitable for Use in Climate Models.



► To remove an already present range, click its x button.





Cloud Optical Properties: results

► CLICK < an image to see its text; ► CTRL+CLICK < it to redraw with custom axis ranges. Alternatively, get the collective text results. Last updated: Feb 2020

Liquid



Band : a0 a1 a2 a3 a4 a5 a6 a7 a8 AbsMaxErr MaxErr[%] AveErr[%] (0.500-1.000) -8.498057e+02 -3.690528e+03 2.763773e+03 -4.006478e+01 -1.119932e+00 1.227676e+00 -3.142682e+00 1.822229e+00 -2.614157e-02 2 < >

Ice

New:

COSMO Cloud Optics Web-App

http://www.cosmo-model.org/content/tasks/operational/ims/cloudOptics/default.htm



Many thanks to Theodore Andreadis

Clouds and Aerosols Improvements in ICON Radiation scheme - CAIIR

Project duration: March 2020 - February 2022

> Total FTEs : 6.6

Participants:

- Harel Muskatel (IMS)
- Pavel Khain (IMS)
- Alon Shtivelman (IMS)
- Yoav Levi (IMS)
- Ulrich Blahak (DWD)
- Daniel Rieger (DWD)

- Alexey Poliukhov (RHM)
- Julia Khlestova (RHM)
- Gdaly Rivin (RHM)
- Natalia Chubarova (RHM)
- Marina Shatunova (RHM)

New modular radiation scheme: ECRAD (Hogan & Bozzo, 2018)



- **Gas optics:** RRTM-G (lacono et al. 2008)
 - Plan to develop new scheme with fewer spectral intervals
- Aerosol optics: variable species number and properties (set at run-time)
- Cloud optics:
 - liquid: SOCRATES (MetOffice)
 - ice: Fu 1996, 1998 (default) ,
 Yi et al. 2013 or Baran et al. 2014
- **3D effects** (SPARTACUS): globally warm by ca. 2 Wm⁻² or 1K
- Surface (under development) Rigorous and consistent treatment of urban and forest canopies
- Implemented in ICON (D. Rieger)
- planned: operational early 2021
- Improves results in troposphere
- Ongoing tuning



• Solvers:

- McICA (Pincus et al. 2003),
 Tripleclouds (Shonk & Hogan, 2008) or SPARTACUS (Schäfer et al. 2016, Hogan et al. 2016)
- SPARTACUS makes ecRad the only global radiation scheme that can do 3D radiative effects
- Longwave scattering optional
- Can configure cloud overlap
- Cloud inhomogeneity: stochastic subcolumns (McICA) or two cloudy regions (Tripleclouds / SPARTACUS), can configure width and shape of PDF

Slide content: Sophia Schäfer



Liquid hydrometeors

<u>COSMO</u>:

- Original RG92 based on Stephens (1989), Slingo & Schrecker (1982)
- COSMO New optical properties after Hu and Stamnes (1993)

$$f(R_e) = a_1 R_e^{a_2} + a_3$$

• Extended size range - including rain

<u>ecRAD</u>:

1. SW- Slingo (1989) similar to RG92 (Valid only for: $R_e = [4.2 \ \mu m, 16.6 \ \mu m]$!)

LW- Lindner and Li (2000)

$$\begin{cases} \beta_{ext}/LWC = \sum_{i=-3}^{l=1} a_i r_e^i \\ 1 - \varpi = \sum_{i=-1}^{i=2} b_i r_e^i \\ g = \sum_{i=-1}^{i=2} c_i r_e^i \end{cases}$$

2. SOCRATES

$$f(R_e) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i R_e^{i}}{\sum_{i=k}^{m} b_i R_e^{i}}$$
12

Liquid hydrometeors



Warming effect of the new scheme compared with RG92!

Ice hydrometeors

- Single particle optical properties after Fu
- Assuming randomly oriented hexagonal particles
- Using AR and D_{ge} as the bulk parameters:



- Size range expended using 7000 generalized gamma distributions
- Include snow and graupel in the radiation scheme
- Option: rough or smooth particle surfaces



Ice hydrometeors



Cooling effect vs. RG92

Manuscript submitted to RMetS-App (2020)

CKDMIP: Correlated K-Distribution Model Intercomparison



https://confluence.ecmwf.int/display/CKDMIP/



Task 5: CAMS climatology in ICON-ecRAD (RHM)



0.02 0.05 0.1 0.15 0.2 0.25 0.3 0.35 0.4 0.5 0.6

Task 5: CAMS climatology in ICON-ecRAD (RHM)

Jun-Aug T2m, t+48h control bias



Nov-Feb T2m, t+48h control blas

Jun-Aug T2m, t+48h mean difference



Nov-Feb T2m, t+48h mean difference





Bozzo et al., 801 ECMWF Memorandum, 2017

Günther Zängl's scheme:

Prognostic equation for 2D AOD $\psi_j(x, y)$, using vertically averaged horizontal wind $\overline{v_{H,j}}$



Subtask 6.1: Improve mineral dust AOD source function S_{e,dust}

- Use cheap emission paramaterization, e.g.: Kok et al. (2014) - An improved dust emission model–Part 1: Model description and comparison against measurements. Atmos. Chem. and Phys., 14(23), 13023-13041

- Perform offline Mie calculations to derive optical properties
- Calculate AOD flux from emission flux

Accumulated dust flux (1 year, arbitrary units, nonequidistant scale) for Kok et al. parameterization in ICON (preliminary results)





CAIIR Task 6, 2D-Aerosol





Subtask 6.2: Improve sea salt AOD source function $S_{e,ssa}$ based on an established emission parameterization

Subtask 6.3: Improve anthropogenic AOD source function S_{e,anth}

e.g., based on emission dataset, extensive literature review required



Task 7: Implement MACv2 climatology in ecRAD (RHM)





Droplet concentration: Segal & Khain (2006) scheme

- Cloud nuclei profile n_{CN}(z) is estimated from Tegen/CAMS aerosols
- Activation of n_{CN} to n_{CCN} is estimated from Segal & Khain (2006)
- 4D look-up table: n^S

 $n_{ccn}^{SK} = f(n_{cn}, log(\sigma), r_{mod}, w_{CB})$



Segal & Khain (2006)

Segal & Khain scheme in COSMO

In "active" clouds (w_{nuc} > w_{cb,min} and q_c > 0 or clc_con > 0 over several adjacent height layers), activation is at cloud base and n_{CN} decreases exponentially above cloud base (→ autoconversion, accreation)

$$n_{C}(z) = \begin{cases} n_{CCN,SK} \left(n_{CN}(z_{cb}), w_{nuc}(z_{cb}) \right) \exp \left(-\frac{z-z_{cb}}{\Delta z_{a,1/e}} \right) & \text{if } w \ge w_{cb,min} \land q_{C}(z) > 0 \land z \ge z_{cb} \\ n_{CCN,SK} \left(n_{CN}(z), \max[w_{nuc}(z), w_{cb,min}] \right) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{kg}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

 Effective updraft speed w_{nuc} for nucleation, including turbulence, radiative cooling an parameterized convection:

$$w_{eff} = \overline{w} + 0.7 \sqrt{\frac{2 TKE}{6}} - \frac{c_p}{g} \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}\Big|_{\text{radiation}}$$

$$w_{nuc} = \max \left[w_{eff}, w^* \right]$$

$$w^* = \left(-g z_{topcon} \frac{\overline{w'\Theta'_{v,S}}}{\overline{\Theta_{v,S}}} \right)^{1/3} \text{ (convective velocity scale by Deardorff)}$$

z_{top_con}: PBL height as determined from Θ_v < Θ_{v,surf}+0.5 K, or upper bound of lowest continuous "clc_con" layer

CAMS Forecasted Aerosols number concentration



New cloud droplets number concentration

CAMS effects on cloud number concentration [cm⁻³] 2018-04-25 01:00:00Z



icloud_num_type_gscp/rad = 4



Peak event April 25 14Z

R_{eff}(QC) [µm] 2018-04-25 14:00:00Z



Case study: April 25-27, 2018

New cloud_rad

CAMS background aerosols

CAMS & SK Ncn → rad + microphysics

0.95 0.94 0.93 0.93 0.92 0.78 0.38 0.04



OBS for 6h before 2018042518 Fraction: 0.98 0.88 0.77 0.71 0.60 0.30 0.06 0.00



COSMO oper

0.97 0.97 0.96 0.96 0.95 0.85 0.48 0.07



0.1 0.5 1 3 5 10 15 20 30 40 60 80 100 150 200 [mm]

INP number concentrations (for IWC > 0.03 gm⁻³)



IN(T) occurrences (for grid points with IWC > 0.03 gm⁻³)

Results for 45 test cases Oct-Nov 2019



INP(T) Model vs. OBS



COSMO model results for 45 test cases Oct-Nov 2019

Vergara-Temprado, J. et al., PNAS 115.11 (2018)

<u>*R_{eff}* in Sub-Grid Scale Clouds (P. Khain)</u>

 R_{eff} is does not change much horizontally and can be analitically estimated

 $\overline{R_{eff}} = fct(CCN_{cloud\ base}, H_{above\ c.base}, T)$





Unified Effective Radius Calculation in ICON



Slide content: Alberto de Lozar



Re-analysis of SGS clouds using the Stochastic Convection Scheme (Sakradzija et al. 2016, 2018)

→ Traditional closure assumptions for convection no longer hold at high resolution

Grid box area too small to contain a complete ensemble of convective clouds



- Convection is not in equilibrium with the large-scale state (closure)
- The mass flux on large scales (where traditional assumptions are a good approximation) is determined with the classical parameterisation (Tiedtke-Bechtold/IFS)
- → At individual grid points, a stochastic cloud_{p(M)} ensemble is generated whose mass flux (averaged across larger scales) converges to that of the classical parameterisation
- Bonus: The ensemble automatically adapts to the grid resolution. The smaller the grid spacing, the greater mass flux departures from the cloud ensemble mean



Taken from Maike Ahlgrimm presentation

Stochastic convection scheme (P. Khain)

Subtask 9.1 Testing the stochastic convection scheme

- Verified against observations/soundings
- Find the weaknesses and the advantages of the stochastic parametrization over the default Tiedke-Bechtold scheme

Subtask 9.2 Estimating the cloud cover from the SC scheme

- The detrainment approach will be implemented in the new scheme to deduce the cloud cover of shallow convection
- Verification against observations
- Simulated in idealized fair weather situations, and compared to idealized LES simulations of cloud cover

Subtask 9.3 Precipitation from the SC parametrization

- Utilize the sub-grid variability of the stochastic parametrization to estimate the sub-grid PDF of cloud and rain water contents.
- Grid-box averaged microphysical rates will be estimated
- Estimation of precipitation from shallow convection vs. Tiedke-Bechtold

CAIIR Project Plan

Cloud optics

- Aerosols inputs: CAMS forecasted, CAMS climatology, 2D advection scheme, MACv2 climatology
- Microphysics R_{eff} and LWC revised, Realistic cloud formation
- Stochastic convection scheme
- > Model testing (RHM) and tuning (P. Khain)





i nov

Thank