



Using ICON-LES to constrain drag in global simulations

Martin Köhler

Thanks to: Daniel Klocke, Rieke Heinze, Matthias Brück, Daniel Reinert, Ayrton Zadra



 \otimes

MODIS Terra 12:10

12:10

Physical tendencies on U-wind in ICON







Orography smoothing







Std-dev of orography increased for SSO









Jan U-stress WGNE drag project (Ayrton Zadra)



u-component physics stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd



u-component PBL stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd







Jan 2012 24h average

Surface stress in ICON



Jan 2012 24h average



High definition modelling



DWD

HD(CP)2 proposal, steering committee: Stevens, Crewell, Jones, Biercamp, Burkhardt, Seifert, Macke, Simmer 2011

Between the resolution of typical GCMs and **100m** is the "grey" zone where parameterisation is hard to achieve / understand.





HD(CP)2 proposal, steering committee: Stevens, Crewell, Jones, Biercamp, Burkhardt, Seifert, Macke, Simmer 2011

A resolution of **100 meter** implies automatically a regional domain for current computer power. Bonus: Germany has a dense network of observation stations / supersites.



resolved drag:
$$\tau^{res} = p_s \nabla h$$

dynamic drag:
$$\tau^{res,dyn} = (p_s - p_{ref})\nabla h$$

reference pressure:
$$p_{ref} = p_0 \exp\left(-\frac{gz}{RT}\right)$$
 $p_0 = 1015$ hPa
 $T = 305$ K

LES topography at 156m resolution









Topography and surface pressure





topography, SSO stdev and U drag





U drag ICON 13km





U drag: LES 156m vs ICON 13km









- ICON uses turbulent and SSO (no TOFD yet)
- HD(CP)² simulations:
 - Germany at 136m (about 10 days available)
 - Tropical domain 2500m 1250m and 136m later
- Difficulty to diagnose local surface drag (residual total-static)
- Should allow verification of parameterized drags under realistic situations



Extra Slides





HD(CP)2 movie of LES over Germany:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HhwHuZR2uKo

NARVAL 2: https://goo.gl/bYflZT

Physics in ICON



Process	Scheme	Origin	Authors
Radiation	RRTM	ECHAM6/IFS	Mlawer et al. (1997) Barker et al. (2002)
	δ two-stream	GME/COSMO	Ritter and Geleyn (1992)
Non-orographic gravity wave drag	wave dissipation at critical level	IFS	Scinocca (2003) Orr, Bechtold et al. (2010)
Sub-grid scale orographic drag	blocking, GWD	IFS	Lott and Miller (1997)
Cloud cover	diagnostic PDF	ICON	Köhler et al. (new)
	sub-grid diagnostic	GME/COSMO	Doms et al. (2011)
Microphysics	prognostic: water vapor, cloud water,cloud ice, rain and snow	GME/COSMO	Doms et al. (2011) Seifert (2010)
	two-moment incl. graupel and hail	COSMO	Seifert and Beheng (2006)
Convection	mass-flux shallow and deep	IFS	Bechtold et al. (2008)
Turbulent transfer	prognostic TKE	COSMO	Raschendorfer (2001)
	prognostic TKE and scalar variances	COSMO	Machulskaya, Mironov (2013)
	EDMF-DUALM	IFS	Neggers, <mark>Köhler</mark> , Beljaars (2010)
Surface Processes	tiled TERRA + FLAKE + multi-layer snow + sea ice	GME/COSMO	Heise and Schrodin (2002), Helmert, Schulz et al. (2016), Mironov (2008) Machulskaya (2015)



Some title









Some title









u-component GWD+blocking stress (N/m2) | Jul 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd













v-component GWD+blocking stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd





v-component PBL stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd







abs. value GWD+blocking stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd



abs. value physics stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd



abs. value PBL stress (N/m2) | Jan 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd







v-component GWD+blocking stress (N/m2) | Jul 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd













abs. value GWD+blocking stress (N/m2) | Jul 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd



abs. value physics stress (N/m2) | Jul 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd



abs. value PBL stress (N/m2) | Jul 2012 | 00-24 h | dwd





Jul 2012 24h average

Jan 2012 24h average







U, V at 850 hPa stdev between models



V 850hPa



U 850hPa

vv850mb - std | Jul 2012 | 00-24 h



surface drag from physics stdev between models



tau-physics x

tau-physics y





PBL+SGO terms on surface drag



Jan 2012

Jul 2012





magnitude of PBL+SGO terms - average over all grid-cells - Jul 2012 - 00-24h



Roh-Topographiedatensatz welcher bei globalen ICON-Läufen verwendung findet GLOBE:https://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/topo/globe.html

Hochaufgelöste Alternative, die wohl auch schon unsere LES-Leute verwenden 90m global, 30m USA ASTER:https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Advanced_Spaceborne_Thermal_Emission_and_Reflection_Radiometer#ASTER_Global_Digition_Radiometer#ASTER_Global_Radiometer#ASTE

Hier der Link zu der von Marco angelegten Webseite zu den SSO-Parametern die von Extpar-Erzeugt werden. Insbesondere gab/gibts hier das Problem, dass unser Winkel THETA (principal axis) eine Abhängigkeit von der Latitude zeigt.

https://code.zmaw.de/projects/icon-aes/wiki/SSO_parameters_from_EXTPAR_for_public_DWD_grids#Latitude-dependency-of-SSC

Den erwähnten Topographie-Plot findest du hier:/e/uhome/dreinert/NCL_scripts/topo/topography_ICON_R02B06_R2B06ref_reference gezeigt ist

1)Topographiehöhe in ICON (nach Filterung) vs. Topographiehöhe wie sie aus Extpar rauskommt

2)2) Varianz der Topographie in ICON vs Varianz wie sie aus Extpar rauskommt

3)3.) Powerspektrum der Orographie wie sie in ICON verwendet wird in rot (gefiltert) vs. der aus Extpar bereitgestellten Orographie



