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Overall Eta model summary:

Some of the early history:

Design of the Eta ancestor code started in Belgrade, first code written beginning of 1973

In the same time period, on 7 February 1973, for the first time fcst BCs incorporated in the NMC’s first operational PE LAM, the LFM

Aim: use the Arakawa approach

• Maintenance of chosen integral properties;
• Avoidance of computational modes;
• . . .

The very first code: some of each
Some of the features of this very first code that survive in today’s Eta

- Choice of the E horizontal grid;
- Lateral BC scheme
  - BCs prescribed (or, extrapolated from the inside) along a single outer line of grid points;

Many milestones. A few:

- gravity-wave coupling scheme (Mesinger 1973, 1974, …)
- E-grid enstrophy, energy conservation, “$\omega \alpha$”, (Janjic 1977)
- eta coordinate (Mesinger 1984);

Eta dynamical core code: Belgrade (Dushka Zupanski), FM at GFDL, -> NMC (1984), ….
Why eta?

I convinced myself (Mesinger 1982) the sigma system problem

• seems to have no acceptable solution;
• should become more serious as we increase resolution;

Quasi-horizontal coordinates are needed!
By the way, can one claim that there is a movement toward quasi horizontal coordinates?

- LM (DWD) we shall hear about, “shaved cells” (Steppeler);
- RAMS (Colo. State, Duke Univ.) (shaved cells, Walko and Avisar, manuscript available);
- Marshall et al. MWR 2004 (one code ocean atmos. model, eta in the atmosphere)
Back to NMC: more milestones:
• physics package (Janjic, Black; acknowledgements: Betts-Miller, Mellor-Yamada, Harshvardhan);
• testing, removal of physics problems identified;
• analysis system (Rogers, …)
• ...

Operational implementation at the then NMC: 12z 8 June 1993, as a replacement of the LFM
(Limited-area fine-mesh model)
Challenges, and an inadvertent experiment:

• Comparisons against the NGM and the RSM;
• The “Early” vs the “Meso” Eta;
• Eta vs the Avn/GFS
• **Eta vs the NGM**

(NGM: “Nested Grid Model”)

Self-contained grid point model, nested in itself, operational at the then NMC since mid-eighties

Principal designer: Norm Phillips;
4-th order accuracy since the early nineties
1st 24 months of the Eta, NGM and Avn precip scores:

(Both Eta and NGM ~80 km resolution, physics packages of similar/not too different complexity) “All Periods”: 00-24, 12-36, 24-48 h forecasts

Recall: NGM 4th order formal accuracy, Eta never more than 2nd
• Eta vs the “Regional spectral model”, RSM

RSM: a perturbation spectral model, “large scales” taken from the “driver” global model (“Avn” or “MRF”), same “physics”

E.g. Juang et al. 1997
Eta vs the RSM:

2 years of scores, 1996-1997, at ~50 km resolution:

Equitable Threat – All Periods
Valid 11 Jan 96 – 18 Nov 97

Bias sum of all forecasts
Valid 11 Jan 96 – 18 Nov 97

Note: Eta is using 12 h “old” Avn LBCs, RSM is using current Avn LBCs
NGM: fourth-order accuracy,  
RSM: “infinite” order accuracy/ Taylor-series defined;  
both failed to do well in comparisons with the Eta;  
there are other “complete model” results pointing to difficulties in benefiting from increased formal accuracy  
(Cullen et al. 1997)

Why?

I have repeatedly suggested that “noise” due to physics forcing at individual grid boxes or columns is the likely reason

Taylor series expansion:  
assumes smooth differentiable functions,  
with values valid at points (not averages of boxes)  
Not consistent with the way we do “physics”
The “Early” vs the “Meso” Eta (the “inadvertent experiment”)

“Early”: 48 km, 12 h old Avn LBCs,
“Meso”: 29 km, current Avn LBCs;

Domains:
Scores of the "Early" and the "Meso" Eta about the same!
The benefit of the large domain compensates the combined benefit of more accurate LBCs and higher resolution!!
Why does the large domain help so much??
If it indeed does, why are most other groups (e.g., ALADIN, UKMet) using - in comparison - very small domains?
Does large domain help some models but not the others?

Hypotheses: the large domain helps because it allows the nested model (Eta) to improve - compared to the driver global model - on the largest scales the model can accommodate (jet stream !)

This is just the opposite of what is typically expected of nested models (“downscaling”)
Can the Eta do this only when there are major mountain ranges upstream of the main verification area (Rockies, Andes) ?
Or, do such mountain ranges only help ?
Eta vs the Avn/GFS

(1) Consider some more what is “value added” we can expect from a LAM?
Small scales near topography, higher resolution land types? Of course.
Smaller scales in the initial condition? Yes in principle, but not easy.

The nested model is able to develop smaller scales!!
(Anthes et al., QJ, 1989)

However: (2) there is the mathematical LB error, e.g.,
“the contamination at the lateral boundaries … limits the operational usefulness of the LAM beyond some forecast time range” (Laprise et al., MWR 2000, emphasis FM)

Eta (at NCEP ~ in the nineties) is using 12 h old LBCs; can one detect the impact of the advection of the error?
Recall: from Eta vs the NGM (v1, "value added")

1st 24 months of the Eta, NGM and Avn precip scores:
2nd 24 months of the Eta, NGM and Avn scores:

Eta is using 12 h old LBCs;
(issue #2) can one detect the impact of the advection of the error?
I’ve looked into 24-48 h scores vs 00-24 h:
no clear differences in the advantage of the Eta, at that time
But what about today?
Both models have increased resolution;
Eta has been extended to 84 h as of April 2001;
Can one now
detect the impact of the advection of the LB error?

Eta is now driven by the GFS forecast of 6 h ago. More accurate than 12, but still a considerable error - as we will see - once the information reaches the main verification area.

For an answer, I have looked into, Eta vs the Avn/ now GFS:
• **precip scores**, 24 accumulations, 00-48 h vs 36 to 84 h, May 2001-April 2002;
• **rms fist to raobs** as a function of time;
Relative QPF skill, Eta vs GFS, about the same!
RMS fits to raobs:
upper tropospheric winds presumably ~ the best indicator of the largest scales (jet stream !)
250 mb wind rms fits to raobs, m/s, May-Oct 2003

Eta/212
GFS/211

“Warm Season”
“Cold Season”
In cold season, 250 mb winds, for a 6 months sample, the Eta is
• ~10-11 h behind the GFS at 60 h;
• ~9 h behind the GFS at 84 h

The Eta in relative terms improves a little with time!
But if I am correct re improvement of the largest scales, how could one verify this?

Position forecast errors of “major lows” !?

Winter 2000-2001, rules, 31 cases
  (Mesinger et al. 2002, Orlando AMS, for rules and more #s)
the Eta was significantly more accurate !

E.g.: Average errors: Eta 244 km, Avn 324 km
# of wins: Eta 20, Avn 10
However: attempting to do the same verification for the next winter, I got convinced that the Orlando rules were not as successful as one might wish (included a requirement for a minimum depth, not the best idea); thus:

Revised rules
“Major lows”:

On consecutive HPC analyses, at 12 h intervals, in the first verification,

i) the analyzed center has to be the deepest inside at least three closed isobars (analyzed at 4 mb intervals). A “closed isobar” is here one that has all of the isobars inside of it, if any, appear only once;

ii) must not have an “L” analyzed between the 1st and the 2nd of its closed isobars, counting from the inside;

iii) has to be located east of the Continental Divide, over land or inland waters (e.g., Great Lakes, James Bay); and

iv) must be stamped on “four-pane” 60-h forecast plots of both the Eta and the Avn.

In the second verification,

Same, except that at least two closed isobars are required
Done manually

(NCEP HPC analyses used for verification, hand-edited, at 12 h intervals, not available electronically)

The analyses I am talking about:
same as shown in the eta/ sigma experiment of lecture #2:
The experiment: Eta (left), 22 km, switched to use sigma (center), 48 h position error of a major low increased from 215 to 315 km
Table 1. Forecast position errors, at 60 h, of "major lows", east of the Rockies and over land or inland waters, Dec. 2000 - Feb. 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid at</th>
<th>HPC depth</th>
<th>Cl. isb.</th>
<th>Ctr.</th>
<th>Avn error</th>
<th>Eta error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12z 7 Dec.</td>
<td>1002 mb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>875 km</td>
<td>425 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00z 12 Dec.</td>
<td>997 mb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>125 km</td>
<td>275 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 12 Dec.</td>
<td>988 mb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>325 km</td>
<td>150 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 17 Dec.</td>
<td>1001 mb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sk</td>
<td>100 km</td>
<td>75 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 17 Dec.</td>
<td>990 mb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>175 km</td>
<td>425 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00z 18 Dec.</td>
<td>984 mb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Qc</td>
<td>450 km</td>
<td>575 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 18 Dec.</td>
<td>963 mb</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Qc</td>
<td>75 km</td>
<td>100 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00z 18 Dec.</td>
<td>1001 mb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>100 km</td>
<td>25 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02z 18 Dec.</td>
<td>1010 mb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>650 km</td>
<td>500 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 19 Dec.</td>
<td>1006 mb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>425 km</td>
<td>175 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00z 20 Dec.</td>
<td>997 mb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sk</td>
<td>250 km</td>
<td>350 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 20 Dec.</td>
<td>1002 mb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>175 km</td>
<td>175 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 21 Dec.</td>
<td>1008 mb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>100 km</td>
<td>175 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00z 22 Dec.</td>
<td>1007 mb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>100 km</td>
<td>50 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 22 Dec.</td>
<td>1011 mb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>125 km</td>
<td>375 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12z 24 Dec.</td>
<td>1015 mb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>325 km</td>
<td>150 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

etc.
Summary

Winter #1:
41 cases, 18 events;
Average errors: Avn 319 km, Eta 259 km
Median errors: Avn 275 km, Eta 275 km
# of wins: Eta 25, Avn 15, 1 tie

Winter #2:
38 cases, 16 events;
Average errors: Avn 330 km, Eta 324 km
Median errors: Avn 262.5 km, Eta 250 km
# of wins: Eta 19, Avn 17, 2 ties

Eta somewhat more accurate both winters, in spite of this being at 2.5 days lead time, plenty in winter for the western boundary error to make it into the contiguous U.S.!
An aside:
The Eta advantage the 2nd winter not as conspicuous as the 1st
(Even though the Eta resolution the 2nd winter was higher,
12 compared to 22 km the 1st)
Overall summary:

No sign of the loss in relative skill of the Eta vs GFS at longer lead times identified;

In relative terms, the Eta is doing best in winter, and, if anything, it improves with time!

Ingredient(s)/ component(s) must exist in the Eta that compensate for the inflow of the LB error!
Strong case can be made that the primary candidate for this role is the **eta coordinate**

Some of the arguments

- The eta/ sigma experiment of lecture 2;
- Precip scores for the 1st 12 months of the availability of three model scores on NMM domains (ConUS “East”, ..., “West”, ...), and for the “last” 12 months shown in lecture 2

**Consistent with the Eta doing a little better in winter, as this is the time when the jet stream tends to impinge the Rockies at its southernmost latitudes**
The “Workstation Eta” (WS Eta) code:

As maintained by NCEP (Matt Pyle): followed the operational Eta, mostly (with some delay)

However: situation changed with the movement toward the “Weather Research and Forecasting” (WRF) “framework”

“WRF framework”: may not be practical for users outside US

In this situation, WS Eta in one aspect went ahead of the operational Eta: nonhydrostatic option
• Non-hydrostatic option:

Janjic et al. 2001:

\[
\left( \frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \right)^{\tau+1/2} \rightarrow \frac{w^{\tau+1} - w^\tau}{\Delta t}
\]
ICTP 2005 Eta code

Features included that are considered improvements/refinements compared to NCEP WS Eta:

• Sloping steps eta discretization (lecture #2);

• Changes in the continuity and hydrostatic equations to account for mass removal and addition due to precipitation and evaporation, and the presence of condensates (Mesinger and Lazic, “Blue Book” 2004);

• Changes in the BMJ convection to remove/ameliorate the problem of undergoing intense convection (reversed DSPs, and no extension of relaxation time);

• Averaging of all four surrounding velocities at h points (including those that are zero at vertical sides) to do turbulence quantities (improves lowest layer winds over topography);
Efforts will be made to support users of the ICTP Eta, probably in cooperation with COLA (Center for Oceans, Land and Atmosphere, Calverton, MD):

- Code upgrades downloadable;
- Manual upgrades, model documentation;
- . . .

(ICTP site, and/or contact fedor.mesinger@noaa.gov, or fedor@essic.umd.edu, and/or chou@cptec.inpe.br)
Some of the references made


