

## Evaluating two cloud parametrization schemes using ARM and Cloud-Net observations

Cyril Morcrette, Jon Petch & Ewan O'Connor (Finnish Meteorological Institute/Reading University) June 2011

© Crown copyright Met Office



- Imagine you have 2 sets of cloud forecasts:
  - 2 different models or
  - same model, 2 different cloud parametrization schemes
- Which one is "better" ?
- "Better" one has smaller errors.
- But there are <u>different types of cloud errors</u>...

## Cloud errors can be:







© Crown copyright Met Office

## Met Office Methodology for comparing NWP

- Use 4 one-month periods: April, July, October, December 2007
- Use 5 sites:
  - Chilbolton (UK)
  - Darwin (Australia)
  - Lindenberg (Germany)
  - Murgtal (Germany)
  - Southern Great Plains (SGP, Oklahoma, US)
- Run the Met Office global NWP model from 12Z ECMWF ERA-interim.
- 36 hr forecast. Look at output from 00Z to 24Z (i.e. T+12 to T+36).
- Grid-length ~40 km, 70 levels.
- Run forecasts 2 times: once using diagnostic cloud scheme (Smith 1990) and once using prognostic scheme "PC2" (Wilson *et al.* 2008).

• Use "Cloud-Net" methodology to average observation onto model grid.

















## If cloud is present, what is the cloud fraction?









- There are multiple sources of cloud error.
- Changes to model are likely to impact some cloud errors while leaving others unchanged.

• e.g. <u>new cloud scheme</u> likely to affect FOO and AWP, but not going to directly affect timing.

- Need to use metrics that are sensitive to all aspects of the cloud error.
- Do not just use 1 metric that focuses on 1 type of cloud error.
- Think about whether metric is likely to show improvement when the cloud scheme is changed.
- Good choice of cloud-error metrics can help in model development.

