

Interactive comment on “Weather model verification using Sodankylä mast measurements” by M. Kangas et al.

M. Kangas et al.

markku.kangas@fmi.fi

Received and published: 11 March 2016

Thank you for your valuable comments and suggestions. Please find our response below.

Q: We regret that there is no example or illustration in this paper to prove the benefits of near-real time comparison for NWP model verification and for monitoring observations.

A: The on-line verification system itself acts, as said in the article, as a kind of alarm bell, alerting model developers that there is something in the model that would necessitate a further study, so it is hard to provide any specific and well-documented illustration of its benefit. When asked, we were told by one researcher that he had used Sodankylä data and plots several times to understand various modelling aspects,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



but mostly on talks, with no references. From our own experience, e.g. the near-real time plots did quite early on hint to some spring-time problems in HIRLAM, which were then corrected through model development. The data collected this way can, however, be also used in larger model studies. We have added a mention about this with a reference:

Introduction: Data collected this way can also be used directly in model performance studies (Atlaskin and Kangas, 2006).

References: Atlaskin, E. and Kangas M., Sodankylä data utilization for HIRLAM verification and 1D model studies. The first joint HIRLAM All Staff Meeting and ALADIN Workshop, Sofia, Bulgaria, 15-18 May 2006. Hirlam Newsletter No. 51, October 2006, 10 pp. Available at <http://hirlam.org/>.

as well as another reference of a more extensive use of Sodankylä measurements:

Coustau, M., Martin, E., Soci, C., Bazile, E. and Besson, F. Evaluation of the MESCAN system in particular for snow (using the SURFEX off-line simulation driven by MESCAN). EURO4M Project, report D.2.11, March 2014.

Q: It could have been also interesting to illustrate how the statistical comparison helps to interpret the errors physically

A: An example of statistical plots (Figure 3) with short discussion added at the end of Chapter 3.2.

Q: Section 4 presents a very brief evaluation of an Harmonie-Arome model configuration (2.5km and 65 vertical levels) with 3 different radiation schemes (IFSRAD, ACRANE2, HLRADIA). It would be interesting to describe the vertical resolution near the ground and the interpolation algorithm to diagnose screen level variables. The simulated radiative fluxes compare reasonably well with observations. It is found that there is a systematic cold bias on T2m which is not due to radiation fluxes. It is mentioned (not shown) that there is no bias on surface temperature. We regret that the study

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



of this T2m bias is not deepen. It would be for instance very interesting to evaluate the temperature biases at 3, 8, 18, 32m to investigate if the problem is rather in the interpolation method to diagnose T2m or in the physical parameterizations (turbulence scheme most probably).

A: Thank you for this comment, we agree in principle. According to the request by Reviewer 1, we have added a figure of LWUP to represent surface temperature. Deeper evaluation of T2m would indeed be interesting and even necessary. We could use all available mast measurements on temperature and the turbulent fluxes as well as soil and snow temperature measurements, closing the surface energy balance, and include a systematic discussion of the assumptions used when diagnosing T2m from the predicted surface and lowest model level temperatures. However, an exhaustive study falls beyond the scope of the present study where our aim is, with some examples, to present the possibilities Sodankylä measurements offer.

Q: Page 586 line 16 : the period is 15 January – 15 May 2014, but later the period is shorter from 15 January to 15 March 2014, which is not really a spring period as written several times in the paper.

A: We agree, and have corrected the dates and usage of the word "spring" to be consistent throughout the manuscript.

Q: Page 588 line 2 : the reference system is not described.

A: The reference system is mentioned at p. 586 lines 7-9 (original manuscript). We have modified this to: ...HARMONIE-AROME forecast system, based on the reference cycle 38h1.2 (<http://hirlam.org/index.php/hirlam-programme-53/general-model-description/mesoscale-harmonie>),...

At p. 587, lines 3-5 (original manuscript) modified to: All three schemes were tested within the framework of AROME physical parametrizations by running three series of experiments using a dedicated version (harmonie-38h1.radiation) of HARMONIE-

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



AROME over a domain covering Finland.

Further, we modified p.587 lines .10-18 (original manuscript) to

Model–observation comparison in early spring 2014

Most of the winter days before mid-March 2014 were cloudy in Sodankylä. Most observed and predicted clouds were essentially non-precipitating. The non-precipitating clouds predicted by HARMONIE-AROME consisted mainly of (supercooled) liquid droplets while the ice crystal content was small. Some amount of (precipitating) snow and graupel was practically always present in the simulated clouds and some liquid/ice condensate at the lowest model level was often predicted. This is due to a recent change in cloud microphysics treatment in the HARMONIE reference system (Karl-Ivar Ivarsson, personal communication, 2015).

and again at p.588 line 2 (original manuscript) ... deviated from the reference system where a fraction of the snow and graupel particles to ... deviated from the default HARMONIE (cycle 38h1.2) settings, according to which a fraction of the snow and graupel particles We hope this clarifies our point: our experiments were based on the reference system of HARMONIE cycle 38h1.2. The reference system contained modifications to the microphysics, suggested by Karl-Ivar Ivarsson. We took them, but did not allow precipitating particles to influence radiation fluxes, which is different from the default. In addition, we introduced two new radiation schemes, as described in section 4.1.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.geosci-instrum-method-data-syst-discuss.net/5/C276/2016/gid-5-C276-2016-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., 5, 577, 2015.

GID

5, C276–C283, 2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc


Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version


Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Fig. 1.

Interactive
Comment



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment





Fig. 3.


Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Interactive
Comment



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Fig. 4.