Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Journal 58 (2009) 209-211

Quarterly numerical weather prediction model performance summary April to June 2009

Xiaoxi Wu
National Meteorological and Oceanographic Centre, Australian Bureau of Meteorology

(Manuscript received September 2009)

Introduction

This summary, covering the three-month period from April to June 2009, continues the series reporting on the performance of numerical weather prediction (NWP) models used operationally in the Australian Bureau of Meteorology.

Verified NWP models and their upgrades during the April to June 2009 period

Local models

There will be no further development for the existing local operational models. The current NWP work will be focused on the Australian Community Climate Earth-System Simulator (ACCESS), a joint initiative led by the Bureau of Meteorology and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) in cooperation with the university community of Australia. The initial version of ACCESS is largely based on the UKMO Unified Model assimilation and prediction code. ACCESS will replace the Bureau's Global ASsimilation and Prediction Model (GASP) and Limited Area Prediction System (LAPS) model and is expected to become operational in 2009. For more details about the ACCESS model, please refer to http://www.accessimulator.org.au/.

Overseas models

Products from four global models run by overseas operational forecast centres are received in the National Meteorological and Oceanographic Centre (NMOC) and their verifications are shown in this article. The European Centre Spectral Prognosis (ECSP) refers to the European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) system, UKGC to the Unified Model from the UK Met Office, United States Aviation Model (USAVN) to the Global Forecast System (GFS) from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCEP) and Japan Meteorological Agency Global Spectral Model (JMAGSM) to the global assimilation and forecast model from JMA.

Corresponding author address: Xiaoxi Wu, National Meteorological and Oceanographic Centre, GPO Box 1289, Melbourne, Vic 3001, Australia.
Email: x.wu@bom.gov.au

On 28 July 2009 JMA started to utilise the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) F16 Special Sensor Microwave Imager/Sounder (SSMIS) radiance and MetOp-A/ Advanced Scatterometer (ASCAT) data in the data assimilation.

On 24 February 2009 the USAVN Gridpoint Statistical Interpolation (GSI) analysis system was upgraded. The upgrade included: inclusion of MetOp Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer (IASI) data; use of variational quality control; change in land/snow/ice skin temperature variance; flow dependent reweighting of background error variances; addition of background error covariance input file; reduction of the number of Atmospheric-InfraRed Sounder (AIRS) water vapour channels used; use of a new version and coefficients for the community radiative transfer model; modification of height assignment for height-based wind observations and modification of the surface land use file to remove a few permanent (~12) glacial points to improve surface temperature forecasts over those points.

For further information on the improvements made to overseas NWP assimilation and forecast models refer to the web references given below. Details on the configurations of the assimilation and forecast models are described in an earlier summary (Lee 2005).

Verification method

A description of the S1 skill score, as applied in NMOC, can be found in the paper by Skinner (1995). All results have been calculated within NMOC Melbourne, where each of the models was verified against its own analysis. From the large number of objective verification results routinely produced, the statistics presented here cover only the mean sea level pressure (MSLP) and 500 hPa geopotential height fields over the irregular Australian verification area (Miao 2003). It is noted that this particular verification grid has southerly points that are outside the TXLAPS_PT375 domain (25°N – 25°S, 100°E – 160°E) and, hence, the TXLAPS_PT375 scores are not strictly comparable with those from GASP and LAPS_PT375. Also the results for the 0000 and 1200 UTC base-times have been combined. For the locally

run, limited-area models, the verified forecast periods go out to a maximum of 72 hours and for the global models to a maximum of 192 hours.

Review of performance – April to June 2009

Local models (GASP, LAPS, TXLAPS)

The intercomparison of the S1 skill scores of the MSLP forecasts for the three local models covering the period April to June 2009 is shown in Fig. 1(a). The S1 skill scores are averaged over the three-month period for various forecast periods ranging from 0 to 72 hours. S1 skill score comparison of the 500 hPa geopotential height forecasts is shown in Fig. 1(b). In general, the coarser-resolution GASP outperforms the finer-resolution limited area models. This result is partly due to the later data cut-off of the GASP assimilation. It is also due to the disadvantage suffered by the limited area models which obtain their initial first guess and boundary conditions from the earlier run of GASP forecasts. Forecasts from earlier runs tend to be poorer than forecasts produced from later runs. One other contributing factor for the better-than-expected scores for GASP is the verification method used here, which disadvantages finer resolution models through 'double penalty' scoring. For example, a location error of a deep low pressure system from a more realistic high resolution forecast is counted once for misplacing the low where the verifying analysis does not have it and twice for not placing it where the verifying analysis does. Care needs to be taken to filter out scales below which a verification method was not intended to measure if models that are run at different resolutions are to be objectively compared.

Fig. 1(a) MSLP S1 skill score comparison, for different forecast periods, between GASP, LAPS_PT375 and TXLAPS_PT375 (April to June 2009).



Fig. 1(b) 500 hPa geopotential height S1 skill score comparison, for different forecast periods, between GASP, LAPS_PT375 and TXLAPS_PT375 (April to June 2009).



Fig. 2(a) MSLP S1 skill score comparison, for different forecast periods, between GASP, ECSP, UKGC, USAVN and JMAGSM (April to June 2009).



Fig. 2(b) 500 hPa geopotential height S1 skill score comparison, for different forecast periods, between GASP, ECSP, UKGC, USAVN and JMAGSM (April to June 2009).



Fig. 3 Anomaly correlation of MSLP comparison, for different forecast periods, between GASP, ECSP, UKGC, USAVN and JMAGSM (April to June 2009).



Global models (GASP, ECSP, UKGC, USAVN, JMAGSM)

The Bureau's own operational global spectral model, GASP, and the four global models from overseas NWP centres are operationally used by forecasters. The outputs from the models are also post processed to produce various objective guidance products used in and outside of the Bureau. Hence their forecast performance is of great interest to the forecasters and other users. The S1 skill scores for MSLP and 500 hPa geopotential height forecasts for the period April to June are presented in Figs 2(a) and 2(b). Anomaly correlations for the MSLP forecasts are shown in Fig. 3. All the global models are verified using a common 2.5 latitude/longitude grid except USAVN which is verified on a 2.5 latitude/5.0 longitude grid. However this use of coarser grid spacing for USAVN is not thought to have affected the intercomparison.

Assuming the commonly used cut-off of 60 per cent as the criterion for useful forecasts (Murphy and Epstein 1989), the anomaly correlation scores for the ECMWF show useful skill to beyond seven days, JMA also shows useful skill to around seven days and GASP around six to seven days. The UKGC is marginally better than JMA and USAVN at the shorter lead times but clearly better than JMA in the longer term up to five days.

References

Lee, J. 2005. Quarterly numerical weather prediction model performance summary – July to September 2005. *Aust. Met. Mag., 54*, 253-61.

Miao, Y. 2003. Numerical prediction model performance summary July to September 2002. *Aust. Met. Mag., 52*, 73-5.

Murphy, A. and Epstein, E.S. 1989. Skill scores and correlation coefficients in model verification. *Mon. Weath. Rev., 117*, 572-81.

Skinner, W. 1995. Numerical prediction model performance summary April to June 1995. *Aust. Met. Mag., 44*, 309-12.

Web reference:

For ECMWF:

http://www.ecmwf.int/publications/newsletters

http://www.ecmwf.int/products/data/technical/model_id/index.html

For UKMO:

http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/research/nwp/publications

For NCEP:

http://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/gmb/STATS/html/model_changes.html

For JMA:

http://ddb.kishou.go.jp

For ACCESS:

http://www.accessimulator.org.au/