Use Of AMSU data in the UK Mesoscale Model

Brett Candy
Steven English, Richard Renshaw & Bruce Macpherson

Satellite Applications & Data Assimilation,
Met Office
Talk Outline

- Background and Motivation
- Limited Area Models at the Met Office
- Data Usage in the Mesoscale model
  - Source of observations
  - Data screening
- Bias Correction
- Impact Assessment
  - Method
  - Some results
- Future Work
Background

- Contribution of ATOVS in global NWP is very important

- To date effort has focused on assimilating satellite data in global NWP
  - *Some data types are currently precluded by timeliness*

- Initial tests of assimilating radiance data in the UK Mes encouraging
  - *Information retained in the short-range*

- But.....objectives are different.
  - *Key forecast parameters cloud cover, precip and surface temp*
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UK Mesoscale Model 2

- Assimilation system:
  - incremental 3D-Var
  - assimilation window ±1½ hours
  - 2 hour data cutoff

- Observations:
  - radiosondes, air reps, wind profilers
  - land station reps, including visibility
  - satellite winds from Meteosat

- Additionally cloud cover and surface rainrate information is assimilated via a different route (i.e. outside of Var)
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ATOVS Data Use

- HIRS data not used
  - calibration problems associated with partial super swath
- AMSU data
  - Remapped to HIRS grid (allows use of same code as global)
  - AMSUB 183 GHz channels over sea only
- AMSU data screening
  - Liquid water test in AAPP → reject channels 4, 5 & 20
  - Ice test on 183 GHz channels → reject channels 19, 20
  - Rain test in AAPP → reject channels 4-8 & 18-20
- Data Thinning
  - 1 observation every 40 km. More weight given to clear & microwave clear scenes.
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Bias Correction 1

- Airmass dependent predictors (Eyre, 1992)
  - problem in a LAM is to sample enough representative synoptic systems
  - could monitor departures over a year, assuming negligible instrument drift

- Current solution is to use global bias correction coefficients
  - assumes global and LAM NWP are unbiased
  - monitoring with sondes confirms this, at least for the troposphere
Bias Correction 2
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Strategy for Assessing Impact

- Case study for poor operational forecast.
  - Convection over S.W. Britain
  - Rain forecasts compared to radar
- Set of cases containing range of weather situations observed over UK.
  - Chosen by forecaster
  - Subjective verification from station reports of 6 hour precip, surface temp & cloud cover
  - NOAA15 & 16 assimilated
- Extended Trial.
  - Ran for 1 month
  - Avoids spin-up problems
  - Near Real Time to get operational boundary conditions
  - Forecasts assessed by forecaster
  - NOAA16 & 17 assimilated
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Verification of Case Studies

- 6 cases improved, 6 cases worsened due to inclusion of AMSU
- Worse case highlights difficulties of using sparse verification sites for reporting precipitation

Hourly Precip, 0z 26th August 2001  T+6
Conclusions

- Operational in Mesoscale model from May 2003.
  - NRT trial positive for cloud & visibility.
  - Including a significant fog clearance case.
- Similar approach adopted for European model.
- Future Work
  - AMSUB at full resolution.
    » Issues for qc & bias correction.
    » Extend number of channels
  - Assimilation in regions of significant LWP.
    » Total humidity control variable.
    » 1D Var
    » 3D Var
Additional Slides
Local – Global BT Difference

Channel 15
HIRS

Channel 16

Channel 5
AMSU

~0.5 K

Channel 6

~0.02 K
Initialisation of the Mesoscale Model: Weights given to Var & MOPs data

VAR incs

Cloud incs

RainRate incs - from hourly fields