EUMETSAT ROM SAF – IROWG 2019 | 19 – 25 Sep 2019 | Helsingør, Denmark

Simulations and observations of cloud contributions to RO refractivity biases

P. Hordyniec^{1,2}, R. Norman¹, W. Rohm², J. Le Marshall³, C.-Y. Huang⁴

¹RMIT University, Australia ²WUELS, Poland ³Bureau of Meteorology, Australia

⁴National Space Organization, Taiwan



Content

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Liquid Clouds
- 3. Ice Clouds
- 4. PBL Clouds and Superrefractions
- 5. Summary



Refractivity and Clouds

Dispersive (frequency-dependent) refractivity:

 $N_T(f) = N_0 + N'(f) + jN''(f)$

$$N_0 = 77.6 \frac{P}{T} + 3.73 \times 10^5 \frac{e}{T^2} + N_s$$

where N_s is scattering by particles (cloud water, rain)



Clouds characterisation in NWM:

- Iiquid water content (LWC)
- ice water content (IWC)

$$\begin{split} N_{L,I} &= \frac{3}{2} \times 10^6 \left[\frac{\varepsilon_{L,I} - 1}{\varepsilon_{L,I} + 1} \right] \frac{M_{L,I}}{\rho_{L,I}} \\ N_L &\approx 1.45 \ LWC \\ N_I &\approx 0.69 \ IWC \end{split}$$

- liquid water path (LWP)
 ico water path (IMD)
- ice water path (*IWP*)

$$LWP = \int_{z=0}^{\infty} \rho_t Q_L dz$$



Motivation

Anchor observations:

RO data enter NWM without bias correction

Quality control:

Observation minus Background (O-B)

 σ threshold based on observation error

N errors (Healy et al., 2005):

1.1% at 4 km to 0.25% at 10 km

α errors (Healy and Thepaut, 2006):

• 10% at surface to 1% at 10 km



Methodology

Background model:

- GFS forecasts
- +03 timestep

- 0.5° x 0.5° resolution
- 4/day model cycle
- yearly dataset (2016)
- end-to-end simulations
- multiple phase screen
- 1D/2D atmosphere





Example of Simulation Result



Simulation Results: LWC vs. IWC



Horizontal Inhomogeneities





Simulation Results: LWC vs. LWP

Large LWC, small LWP:

- $LWC = 2 g/m^3$
- $LWP = 1.2 \text{ kg/m}^2$

Small LWC, large LWP:

UNIVERSITY

- $LWC = 0.9 \, g/m^3$
- $LWP = 4.3 \text{ kg/m}^2$



Spatial Distribution of Clouds



			Latitudinal Zone		
LWC: over wa	Hemisphere	Tropical	Subtropical	Temperate er lar	nds
	$LWC > 2.5 \text{ g/m}^3$				
	Northern	143	105	192	
	Southern	66	121	179	
	$IWC > 0.5 \text{ g/m}^3$				
	Northern	1054	484	773	
	Southern	823	851	265	UNIVERSITY

Vertical Distribution of Clouds

LIQUID



LWC: over water bodies altitude ~4 km

IWC: over lands altitude 10-12 km (UTLS)

ICE



Liquid Clouds - "Worst Case"

N observation error (Healy et al. 2005):

1.1% at 4 km



Ice Clouds - "Worst Case"

N observation error (Healy et al. 2005):

0.25% at 10 km



Superrefractions and PBL Clouds

Yearly analysis for 2016:

a) frequency distribution of b) altitudes for min(dN/dz) and refractivity gradients (dN/dz) b) altitudes for $max(N_w)$





Distribution of PBL Clouds

Gridded 2.5° x 2.5° monthly data





Superrefractions with $N_w \ge 1$ ppm



Pacific Region, Jan 2016

- atmPrf refractivity
- collocation with GFS N-profiles
- PBL clouds higher in the troposphere
- vertically extensive N-bias



UNIVERSITY

Atlantic Region, SON 2016

- atmPrf refractivity
- collocation with GFS N-profiles
- PBL clouds low in the troposphere
- less vertically extensive N-bias



UNIVERSITY



- 1. Clouds contributions can reach and exceed observation errors.
- 2. Liquid clouds dominate at 4 km.
- 3. Ice clouds affect the core region of GPSRO in the UTLS.
- 4. PBL clouds associated with negative N-bias.

References:

Hordyniec P. (2018). *Simulation of liquid water and ice contributions to bending angle profiles in the radio occultation technique*. Advances in Space Research. 62(5), pp. 1075-1089, doi: 10.1016/j.asr.2018.06.026

Hordyniec P., Norman R., Rohm W., Huang C.-Y., Le Marshall J. (2019). *Effects of liquid clouds on GPS radio occultation profiles in superrefractions*. Earth and Space Science, doi: 10.1029/2019EA000721.



Thank you for your attention

pawel.hordyniec@rmit.edu.au

