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## Alpine Twin Setup



## Outline of the talk

$\rightarrow$ The goal of the GLORI Digital Twin is to provide weather forecast for applications like floods, energy and health. It is based on the ICON model and the DACE data assimilation
$\rightarrow$ Both data assimilation and forecasts are based on ensembles

$\rightarrow$ This work focuses on the development on ensembles for the regional domains, at a resolution on $1 \mathrm{~km}->500 \mathrm{~m}$
$\rightarrow$ We would like to adapt and further develop model perturbation for this scale


## Overview of the experiments

Convection permitting ensemble experiments with 1 -moment /2-moment microphysics scheme, with

- only shallow convection parameterization,
- also deep convection parameterisation, but only gray zone tuning: Tiedtke-Bechtold convection scheme in 'grayzone deep convection' mode
> 1-moment microphysics scheme
> 2-moment microphysics scheme
Seifert and Beheng (2006): A two-moment microphysical parameterization for mixed-phase clouds was developed to improve the explicit representation of clouds and precipitation in mesoscale atmospheric models. The scheme predicts the evolution of mass as well as number densities of the five hydrometeor types cloud droplets, raindrops, cloud ice, snow and graupel.

| Two-way nesting |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizontal grid resolution | 2 km (ICON-D2), 1km (TeamX) |
| Upper boundary | 22 km |
| Vertical levels | 90 |
| LAT-BC | Forecasts (ICON-EU) |
| Perturbed initial conditions | KENDA (ICON-D2-EPS) |
| Forecast duration | 24 h starting on 2022062100 |
| Forecast restart | 6 h |
| Ensemble members | 20 |
| Microphysics | 1 mom or 2mom |
| Turbulence | TURBDIFF |
| Land | TERRA |
| Standard |  |

## Parent domain: ICON-D2



## Configuration of the experiments

$\checkmark$ 2mom microphysics scheme
$\checkmark$ Latent Heat Nudging (LHN)

## Experiments: A2 and B2

| exp ID | Convection <br> parameterization | Shallow convection <br> parametrised | Deep convection partly <br> parametrised <br> (grayTuning) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A2 | $2 \mathrm{~km} \& 1 \mathrm{~km}$ | 2 km | 1 km | 2 km | 1 km |
| B2 | ON | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | X | X |
|  | ON | X | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | X |

## Configuration of the experiments

## $\checkmark$ 2mom microphysics scheme <br> $\checkmark$ Latent Heat Nudging (LHN)

Experiments: A2 and B2

## $\checkmark 1$ mom microphysics scheme X Latent Heat Nudging (LHN)

## Experiments: A1 and B1

| exp ID | Convection <br> parameterization | Shallow convection <br> parametrised | Deep convection partly <br> parametrised <br> (grayTuning) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A2, A1 | $2 \mathrm{~km} \& 1 \mathrm{~km}$ | 2 km | 1 km | 2 km | 1 km |
| B2 , B1 | ON | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $X$ | $X$ |

Radar data (total precipitation accumulated 00-18UTC)


## Det. / 2mom @ 18 fc lead time



Radar data


- Both experiments forecast less rain than observation.
- Shallow-conv-only ( $\exp$ A2) forecasts relatively more rain than grayTuning (exp B2)
- Max. rain location forecast is shifted w.r.t. obs.


## Exp. A2 (only-shallow-conv.) @ 18 fc lead time



## Exp. B2 (conv.+grayTuning) @ 18 fc lead time









# Ens. Mean \& Spread @ 18 fc lead time 



Ensemble Spreäd


Det. @ 18 fc lead time
Comparing 1 mom \& 2 mom microphysics schemes


## Verification against Synoptic data





- $2 m o m$ Experiments produce more realistic clouds (smaller bias)
- Shallow-conv-only forecasts precipation slightly better
Shallow-only

A1: shallow-only with 1 mom
A2: shallow-only with 2 mom
B1: conv.+grayTuning with 1 mom
B2: conv.+grayTuning with 2 mom

Det. / 2mom @ 18 fc lead time Comparing 2 km vs. 1 km
A2 Shallow Conv. only


2 km


Further analyses need to be done to investigate the performance of the model at 1 km res. locally

## Summary

$\rightarrow$ Shallow-conv-only experiment (A2, A1) forecast is slightly better in generating rain,
$\rightarrow$ Experiments with $2 m o m$ microphysics produce more realistic clouds than 1 mom ,
$\rightarrow$ However, 2 mom and 1 mom are not significantly different in generating rain,
$\rightarrow$ In this case, there is no significant difference in precipitation between 1 km and 2 km in the south of Germany

## Det. / 2mom@ 18 fc lead time | 1km

A2 Shallow Conv. only


Radar data


- Both experiments forecast less rain than observation.
- Only-shallow-Conv.-Par. (exp A2) forecast relatively more rain than conv.-par+grayTuning (exp B2).
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# Ens. Mean \& Spread @ 18 fc lead time \| 1 km 



