Physics-Dynamics aspects of the AROME model and its coupling with ocean model NEMO and wave model WW3
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LACy/Tropical Cyclones

AROME = ALADIN-NH DYNcore + Cloud Resolving Physics from research model MésoNH (anelastic, FV, explicit)

- Physics-Dynamics Coupling in AROME
- Ocean-Wave-Atmosphere Coupling (NEMO-WW3-AROME)
What about the weather in La Réunion?

- **Météo-France** in La Réunion has been formally designated as Regional Specialized Meteorological Centre (RSMC) - Tropical Cyclones for the South-West Indian Ocean by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in 1993.

- ⇒ Research in NWP applied to tropical cyclones

- ⇒ "Laboratoire de l’Atmosphère et des Cyclones" (LACy) is a joined lab between La Réunion University, Centre National de Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) and Météo-France.
AROME OverSeas (G. Faure, O. Nuissier, GMAP)

5 domains over French tropical overseas territories

- in operation from 2016,
- dynamical adaptation from HRES IFS, LBC every hour, +42h (+78h if needed), 4 times a day,
- 2.5 km hor. resolution, 90 levels, 60s time step
- Ocean Mixed Layer Parametrisation, IC from Mercator-Ocean.
PDC in AROME
PDC in AROME

From ALADIN to AROME (2003-2008)

from parametrised convection to explicit Convection in a LAM NWP Model

- High enough horizontal resolution (3 km to 500 m)
- Cloud Resolving Model Physics package: one moment microphysics scheme, TKE scheme + surface package, shallow convection scheme, radiation scheme ⇒ MésoNH
- LAM, NH, fast, stable with long time steps, and robust DynCore ⇒ Aladin-NH
- Lego specialists to assemble the bricks (J.-F. Geleyn, Y. Seity, S. Malardel)
PDC: a very sensitive subject

- where to call the physics in a time step: divorce between ECMWF and MF...
- Fluxes or tendencies from Physics: civil war in MF and in the ALADIN Consortium
- $C_{ph}$ inside or outside the time derivative in enthalpy equation: we are still discussing the question....
PDC: theoretical analysis, recognized topic as such
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In 2003 (still the case in the IFS in 2009), there was no prognostic "condensates" in IFS-ARPEGE-ALADIN.

In Arpege and some Aladin configurations, $q_v$ was still a spectral variable.

CRM physics: new prognostic "water" variables: cloud droplets, cloud ice crystals, rain, snow and graupel (+ TKE) $\Rightarrow$ grid point variables.

Lucky us: new data structure for state variables was coming from ECMWF (GFL and its attributes)
PDC : multiphase formulation of DynCore ⇒ prognostic condensates

moist air parcels = dry air + water vapour

\[ p = p_d + p_v = \rho_h R_d T_v = \rho_h R_h T \]

with

\[ \rho_h = \rho_d + \rho_v, \quad R_h = (1 - q_v) R_d + q_v R_v \]

multiphasic air parcels = dry air + water vapour + condensates

\[ p = p_d + p_v = \rho_m R_d T_v = \rho_m R_m T \]

with

\[ \rho_m = \rho_d + \rho_v + \sum_j \rho_j, \quad R_m = (1 - q_v - \sum_j q_j) R_d + q_v R_v \]
Water loading

\[
\rho_m \gamma_m = -\nabla p + \rho_m \vec{g} + \text{Coriolis} + \text{Physics}
\]

Thermal Inertia

\[
C_{pm} \frac{DT}{Dt} = \frac{R_m T}{p} \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \dot{Q}
\]

with

\[
c_{pm} = q_d c_{pd} + q_v c_{pv} + (q_c + q_r) c_l + (q_i + q_s + q_g) c_i
\]

- Impact of water loading significant from about 5km resolution
- In particular if the convection is explicit (condensates in parametrized convective clouds are not prognostic, except some detrained condensates at the top).
- \( R \) and \( c_p \) not always consistent between parametrisations and dynamics.
Getting the right amount of condensates is not only a question of cloud scheme or microphysics parametrization

- SL advection: high order interpolation versus conservation → SL is not conservative, in particular if a min/max limiter is needed,
- IFS: linear SL interpolation, no extra diffusion,
- until now in AROME: cubic SL interpolations + limiter + Semi-Lagrangian Horizontal Diffusion (SLHD) to smooth the heavy rain (but unfortunately also light convection) and compensate the gain of rain mass from SL scheme (Seity, 2020)
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Evolution of the mass of rain in a simple test (Y. Seity)
PDC : SL advection, diffusion, conservation of condensates

for a better conservation and a better representation of light convection in AROME, from next cycle: linear interpolation + COntinuous Mapping about Departure points correction (COMAD), no need of SLHD
The continuity equation of IFS-ARPEGE-AROME formally conserves total mass instead of dry mass ⇒ subgrid transport of water species and precipitation are compensated by artificial transport of dry air in opposite direction which affect the composition of air parcels.

1. keep a continuity equation for the total mass but add source/sink of mass from physics (Malardel et al, 2019, ECMWF Tech. Memo.),

2. move to a continuity equation for dry air + dry hydrostatic pressure levels (Lautitzen et al, 2018, Peng et al, 2019, 2020)

In theory, both solutions are equivalent, but very different numerics.
PDC: subgrid transport of water mass in parametrisation

Peng et al, 2020: very large impact for DCMIP16 academic Tc
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IFS-like continuity equation

New dry air continuity equation
Solution 1 is easy to implement in AROME and will be tested soon (very little impact was found on IFS scores and TC IRMA),

Solution 2 needs much more work, project under discussion with F. Voitus.

Check what really comes from the continuity equation and what comes from changing the numerics (lesson learned from H/NH comparison).
PDC : Enthalpy versus Internal Energy equation

or : physics at constant pressure/$c_p$ versus constant volume/$c_v$, NH physics

Thermodynamics equation

in IFS-ARPEGE-ALADIN (Hydro)

\[
\frac{DT}{Dt} = \frac{1}{c_p} \frac{R_m T}{p} \frac{Dp}{Dt} + \frac{1}{c_p} \dot{Q} \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} = \omega \text{ is diagnosed.}
\]

in AROME (and NH version of IFS-ARPEGE)

\[
\frac{DT}{Dt} = -\frac{1}{c_v} R_m T \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{u} + \frac{1}{c_p} \dot{Q} \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} = -\frac{c_p}{c_v} p \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{u}
\]

instead of

\[
\frac{DT}{Dt} = -\frac{1}{c_v} R_m T \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{u} + \frac{1}{c_v} \dot{Q} \quad \frac{Dp}{Dt} = -\frac{c_p}{c_v} p \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{u} + \frac{p}{c_v T} \dot{Q}
\]
PDC : Enthalpy versus Internal Energy equation

- $p=cste$ : only option in H model ($p,V$ are strongly constrained by the H approximation)
- $p=cste$ in NH model : implicit work of the internal pressure; force already done; guess to be adjusted by dyncore (advection, continuity, 3D solver);
- $V=cste$ : work of internal pressure force explicitly computed in NH-Dyncore;
- $V=cste$ : makes sense if very small time step;
- PDC and physics must be consistent.
PDC : Physics before or after Dynamics, parallel or sequential coupling

see Termonia and Hamdi, 2007 for a complete analysis

A-A-A : First order physics, parallel coupling

\[ X_A^+ = X_D^o + \varphi_D^o + N_M^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} L_D^o + \frac{1}{2} L_A^+ \]

IFS : Second order physics (SLAVEPP), sequential coupling

\[ X_A^+ = X_D^o + N_M^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2} L_D^o + \frac{1}{2} L_A^o \]

\[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \varphi_D^o + \frac{1}{2} \varphi_A^+ \right)_{rad,conv,cld} + \left( \varphi_A^+ \right)_{vdiff,cond} \]

\[ -\frac{1}{2} L_A^o + \frac{1}{2} L_A^+ \]
PDC : Physics before or after Dynamics, parallel or sequential coupling

Termonia and Hamdi, 2007 using the simple framework of Staniforth, Wood and Coté, 2002:

- Important to have consistency between time and "parcel" position for physics contribution \((t^o \leftrightarrow D, t^+ \leftrightarrow A)\)
- AAA : easier to maintain when several physics package for different applications, compute physics with a "clean" state,
- IFS-SLAVEPP : higher order, stronger PDC.
- SLAVEPP unstable for vert. diffusion scheme, but still IFS solution more accurate if VDIFF last in sequence of call (sequential call in physics too).
- Something to try in AROME ; never too late, a lot of technical work...
PDC: What grid for the physics? What time step?

A cubic grid for AROME?

- **Cubic**: \( \Delta x = 2.5 \text{ km} \leftrightarrow \lambda_{min} = 10 \text{ km} - \text{TEI}=0.85 \\
- **Linear**: \( \Delta x = 2.5 \text{ km} \leftrightarrow \lambda_{min} = 5 \text{ km} - \text{TEI}=1 \\

\Rightarrow \text{Cubic}: \Delta x = 1.25 \text{ km} \leftrightarrow \lambda_{min} = 5 \text{ km} - \text{TEI}=3.5 \\
\Rightarrow \text{Linear}: \Delta x = 1.25 \text{ km} \leftrightarrow \lambda_{min} = 2.5 \text{ km} \text{ TEI}=4.3 \\

(test with same time step for all = 1 min)

24h cumul. precip.
PDC: What grid for the physics? What time step?

24h cumul. precip. spectra

24h Cumulated Rain
OWAC in AROME
Example: MesoNH-NEMO (Bielli et al, 2020)

3 different simulations of Cyclone Bejisa (2014): no coupling, 1D coupling, 3D coupling

Surface fluxes

SST change between 01/01/2014 06UTC and 02/02/2014 12UTC

See also Pianezze et al, 2018 (MesoNH-CROCO)
## OWA coupling using OASIS and SURFEX at LACy

### AROME-WW3-NEMO
- AROME-OI : 2.5km
- NEMO : 1/12°
- Coupling with WW3, work in progress

### IC and LBC for NEMO
- 1/12° Mercator-Ocean Analysis (Copernicus), available only on Wed.
- Updated oceanic state forced by HRES IFS available from Mercator-Ocean at 00-06-12-18 UTC every day (used as IC for OML),
- AROME-NEMO "warm-up" to cycle the Ocean from Wed. to any initial date of TC forecast.
- Not clear yet what IC and LBC will be for WW3 : directly from IFS ? Need a warm-up to build up a wave spectrum consistent with the AROME wind ?
Very first results of AROME-NEMO-OI for TCs - L. Corale

TC IDAI - 11032019 00UTC - 13032019 00UTC

SST=cste
1D OML
3D NEMO
Very first results of AROME-NEMO-OI for TCs - L. Corale

Trajectory error (RMS)

- SST = cste
- 1D OML
- 3D NEMO

Pmin error (Bias, RMS)

Bias

RMS
What’s coming next for AROME-NEMO-WW3

- PhD of L. Corale: wave coupling (WW3) to improve surface flux at the interface in case of extreme winds (WASP).
- AROME-NEMO configuration available soon for the Hirlam-Aladin consortium (CY48t1), also used at Mercator-Ocean (J. Pianezze).
- Dynamical adaptation using HRES-IFS NEMO ocean state as IC and LBC (but only 1/4°, cycle the small scale? availability of IFS-NEMO ocean fields?)
- Ensemble-AROME-Overseas soon, including initial perturbation of the OML → coupled EP-AROME-overseas?
**Conclusion**

AROME : coupling a Physics package used for very high resolution (LES) applications to a NWP "long time step" Dyncore,

IFS-FVM : coupling a DynCore package used for very high resolution (LES) application to a NWP "large scale" physics,

10-30 years from now ?

$$\Rightarrow$$ IFS/AROME-FVM (+ NEMO, WAM) : FVM Dyncore+ MesoNH physics (3D turb., 2 moments microphysics, aerosols...)?

- IFS-FVM : 1km hor. resolution global
- AROME-s-FVM : 100m hor. resolution