# Performance of COSMO-based ensemble systems for cases of High-Impact Weather over Italy

**G. Pincini (1), A. Montani (2), T. Paccagnella (1), M.S. Tesini (1), C. Marsigli (3)** (1) Arpae-SIMC, (2) ECMWF, (3) DWD





## **MOTIVATION OF THE WORK**

Motivation: the forecast of "High-Impact Weather" (HIW) events with high spatio-temporal detail still suffers from severe limitation because of HIW horizontal dimension too small to expliced resolved by state-of-art of Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) systems.



## **MOTIVATION OF THE WORK**

Motivation: the forecast of "High-Impact Weather" (HIW) events with high spatio-temporal detail still suffers from severe limitation because of HIW horizontal dimension too small to expliced resolved by state-of-art of Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) systems.



### > Example

Maps of the ensemble mean of total precipitation cumulated over 24 hours for the **9 November 2018**:

- on the left observations from rain gauges of the national network;
- in the middle as was predicted by the run of 9 November 2018 00 UTC by the ensemble mean of the global ensemble system;
- on the right the same but for the COSMO-based limited-area ensemble prediction systems.

### There is room for improvement



# **PURPOSE OF THE WORK**





> The <u>main pourpose</u> of this study is to assess the performance of a newly developed high-resolution ensemble prediction system for a number of HIW events. It is planned to compare its performance against two state-of-art ensemble prediction systems, both running on an operational basis.

The main issues to be addressed in this work are:

- 1. How do the different ensemble systems behave in terms of prediction skill for **precipitation**?
- 2. What is the added value of high resolution? In which type of verification does it emerge more clearly?

### OUTLINE

• The ensemble forecast systems



• Description of the experiment

20 June – 27 June 2016

15 October – 15 November 2018

Conclusions



# The ensemble forecast systems

Portonovo

# **OVERVIEW ON ECMWF ENS**, COSMO-LEPS, COSMO-2I-EPS

| ENSEMBLE<br>SYSTEM<br>MAIN<br>TECHNICAL FEATURE | ECMWF ENS                | COSMO-LEPS                              | COSMO-2I-EPS          |
|---|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Integration domain                              |                          | 20°W 20°W 20°W 20°W 20°W 20°W 20°W 20°W |                       |
| Horizontal resolution (km)                      | 18                       | 7                                       | 2,2                   |
| Vertical resolution<br>(Model level)            | 91                       | 40                                      | 65                    |
| Forecast range (hours)                          | 240                      | 132                                     | 48                    |
| Type of model                                   | Hydrostatic model        | Non-hydrostatic model                   | Non-hydrostatic model |
| Type of convection                              | Parameterized convection | Parameterized convection                | Explicit convection   |
| Ensemble size                                   | 51                       | 16                                      | 10 -> 20              |
| Starting times (UTC)                            | 00, 06, 12, 18           | 00, 12                                  | 00 -> 21              |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIMENT**

Due to the limited availability of COSMO-2I-EPS, the intercomparison is performed over two periods: from 20 to 27 June 2016

✤ from 15 October to 15 November 2018,

starting at **00 UTC** and with a forecast range of **48 hours** (post-processing frequency every 6 hours).

The systems are compared over the Italian region.





# 1<sup>st</sup> VERIFICATION PERIOD: 20 JUNE – 27 JUNE 2016

500 hPa geopotential height (dam) shading and mslp (hPa) white lines from Reanalysis ERA-Interim

492 496 500 504 508 512 516 520 524 528 532 536 540 544 548 552 556 560 564 568 572 576 580 584 588 592 596 600 604 608 612



SYNOPTIC DESCRIPTION 27 JUNE 2016 500 hPa geopotential height (dam) shading and mslp (hPa) white lines from Reanalysis ERA-Interim

492 496 500 504 508 512 516 520 524 528 532 536 540 544 548 552 556 560 564 568 572 576 580 584 588 592 596 600 604 608 612



## SYNOPTIC DESCRIPTION 27 JUNE 2016

24h total precipitation (mm) from national network stations



Rainfall occurred at two distinct times of the day: during the night in the North, in the late afternoon in the Centre. In some location (Friuli Venezia Giulia and Marches) there were peaks exceeding 50 mm.



**EUMETSAT** 



MET10 RGB-Airmass 2016-06-27 18:00 UTC

In the satellite images storm cells responsible for precipitation can be noticed.

# **METHODOLOGY OF VERIFICATION**

### ROOT MEAN SQUARE ERROR (RMSE):

ENSEMBL

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i - \overline{Y}_i)^2}$$

RMSE provides the square root of the average square error of the forecast. The forecast corresponds to the ensemble mean value and an 'error' represents the difference between the ensemble mean  $\overline{Y}$  and the observations x. RMSE of ensemble mean measure the distance between the forecast mean and observations.

**E SPREAD (SPRD):** 
$$SPRD = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{m=1}^{M} (f_m - \bar{f})^2}$$

SPRD is calculated by measuring the deviation of ensemble forecasts from their mean (Zhu, 2005),

where M is the ensemble size,  $f_m$  is the  $m^{th}$  ensemble member and  $\bar{f} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} f_m$  is the ensemble mean.

In a perfect ensemble forecast the ensemble spread should match the root mean square error of the ensemble mean over the same period.

# **SURFACE VERIFICATION**

| Variable              | 2-M TEMPERATURE   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Verification features |   |  |
| Period                | From 20/06/2016 00 UTC<br>to 27/06/2016 00 UTC                          |  |
| Region                | Central-Northern Italy  |  |
| Method                | Nearest grid point  |  |
| Observations          | Quality-controlled<br>regional station network<br>(≈1000), no obs error |  |
| Forecast range        | 0-48 h<br>(verification every 6 h)                                      |  |
| Systems               | ECMWF ENS,<br>COSMO-LEPS,<br>COSMO-21-EPS                               |  |
| Scores                | SPRD, RMSE  |  |





small and very similar to each other.

| Verification features |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Period                | From 20/06/2016 00 UTC<br>to 27/06/2016 00 UTC  |  |
| Region                | Italy   |  |
| Method                | Nearest grid point  |  |
| Observations          | Network of Dipartimento Protezione<br>Civile Nazionale (5524 stations),<br>no obs error |  |
| Forecast range        | 0-48 h<br>(verification every 6 h)  |  |
| Systems               | ECMWF ENS,<br>COSMO-LEPS,<br>COSMO-21-EPS   |  |
| Scores                | RPS   |  |
|                       | percentage of outliers  |  |
| Thresholds            | (1, 5, 10, 15, 25, 50) mm/6h  |  |



\* Ranked Probability Scores (RPS) is an extension of the RMSE to the probabilistic world and to the multicategory events. RPS  $\epsilon$  (0,1)

# VERIFICATION 6-H TOTAL PRECIPITATION

$$RPS = \frac{1}{J-1} \sum_{m=1}^{J} (\sum_{j=1}^{m} f_j - \sum_{j=1}^{m} o_j)^2$$

- J is the number of forecast categories (one per threshold)  $O_i = 1$  if the event occurs in category j
- $O_i = 0$  if the event does not occur in category j
- $f_i$  is the probability of occurence in category j

The lower the RPS, the better the ensemble system

- The diurnal cycle of precipitation is very marked. Precipitation occurred mainly in the afternoon, when the RPS are the highest (12-18 h, 36-42 h);
- The RPS of COSMO-2I-EPS, and generally the RPS of COSMO-systems, is lower than ECMWF ENS one for all forecast ranges.



 The percentage of outliers of a probabilistic forecast system is defined as the probability of the observations lying outside the range spanned by the forecast values (Buizza, 1997).

Here it is computed as the fraction of points of the domain where the observed value lies outside the minimum or maximum forecast value.

> COSMO-2I-EPS has almost always the lowest percentage of outliers, so this ensemble system is the one whose members calculate the 'truth' (observed values) better.

## percentage of outliers



### VERIFICATION

# 6-H TOTAL PRECIPITATION: A 'NON-STANDARD' EVALUATION

| Verification features |  |      |
|-----------------------|--|------|
| Period                | From 20/06/2016 00 UTC<br>to 27/06/2016 00 UTC                             |      |
| Region                | Italy  |      |
| Method                | Nearest grid point   |      |
| Observations          | Network of<br>Dipartimento Protezione<br>Civile Nazionale,<br>no obs error |      |
| Forecast range        | 0-48 h<br>(verification every 6 h)   | 45°N |
| Systems               | ECMWF ENS,<br>COSMO-LEPS,<br>COSMO-21-EF3                                  | 40°N |
| Scores                | RPS percentage of outliers   | 35°N |



# VERIFICATION 6-H TOTAL PRECIPITATION: A 'NON-STANDARD' EVALUATION



- In most cases, regardless of the altitude, the RPS obtained for COSMO-2I-EPS is the lowest;
- The RPS values for the plain stations are lower than for hill and mountain ones;
- The strong daytime cycle for hill and mountain stations is due to the pluviometric regime of those days.

# VERIFICATION 6-H TOTAL PRECIPITATION: A 'NON-STANDARD' EVALUATION

Percentage of outliers



- The percentage of outliers increases according to the station altitude;
- A diurnal cycle is visible only in systems with parameterized convection (ECMWF ENS, COSMO-LEPS) for hill and mountain datasets;
- Regardless of the altitude, COSMO-2I-EPS has the lowest percentage of outliers for most forecast ranges.

# 2<sup>nd</sup> VERIFICATION PERIOD: 15 OCTOBER - 15 NOVEMBER 2018



# SYNOPTIC DESCRIPTION 29 OCTOBER 2018

24h total precipitation (mm) from national network stations





In the satellite image are visible:

- The saharian dust transported on Italy by the currents coming from the Algerian desert;
- The warm front rising from the Central Mediterranean Sea.
- Precipitation throughout Italy;
- Heavy rainfall (even over 300mm) on areas exposed to southern wet winds: Alps, Prealps, Liguria, northern Tuscany, Lazio, Campania.

The <u>rank histogram</u> is a diagnostic tool to evaluate the **spread of an ensemble**. The ensemble member forecasts are distributed so as to delineate ranges or **"bins"** of the predicted variable such that the probability of occurence of the observation within each bin is equal. The bins are determined by ranking the ensemble member forecasts from lowest to highest.

The assumption underlying the rank is that the **probability** that the observation will fall in each bin is **equal**.



- Verification with the method of nearest grid point.
- Verification between COSMO-LEPS and COSMO-2I-EPS: the number of members is the same.

- ✓ The U-shape of the rank histograms indicates the subdispersion of both ensemble systems, in particular COSMO-LEPS.
- This subdispersion is stronger in the last bin of the most intense precipitation and in particular for COSMO-LEPS.

# CONCLUSIONS

### Period from 20 to 27 June 2016

- The results for 2-m temperature indicate the underdispersion issue for the different ensemble systems, although the performance obtained by COSMO-2I-EPS (and in general by the COSMO-based ensembles) is quite satisfactory;
- The probabilistic scores indicate COSMO-2I-EPS having the best performance, regardless of the altitude of the station;
- The performances of the systems tend to worsen with the altitude, also enhancing the diurnal cycle.





### Period from 15 October to 15 November 2018

Rank histogram: COSMO-based systems show a subdispersion of the ensembles, in particular COSMO-LEPS in cases of heavy precipitations.



Despite this is only a pilot study, the added value of high resolution in mesoscale ensemble seems to play a crucial role in the probabilistic prediction of precipitations.

# **Thanks for the attention**

white the second sector with the second sector and the second sector

Ph Daniele D'Alessandro

### **VERIFICATION METHODS**

- <u>Nearest grid point</u>: the model grid point closest to the observation station was selected
- <u>Boxes</u>: The domain is divided in squared area (in this work 0.5° x 0.5°, about 50 x 50 km); the precipitation values of all stations and all model grid points falling in the same box are aggregated and processed. The evaluation of a summarizing value for the precipitation field in each box, such as the *average* or the *maximum*, has been performed.



# UPPER LEVEL VERIFICATION

| Variable                 | GEOPOTENTIAL HEIGHT,<br>temperature            |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| Verification features    |  |  |
| Pressure levels<br>(hPa) | 500, <b>700</b> , 850                          |  |
| Period                   | From 20/06/2016 00 UTC<br>to 27/06/2016 00 UTC |  |
| Region                   | Italy and neighbouring Countries               |  |
| Method                   | Nearest grid point                             |  |
| Observations             | 17 radiosoundings,<br>no obs error             |  |
| Forecast range           | 0-48 h<br>(verification every 12 h)            |  |
| Systems                  | ECMWF ENS,<br>COSMO-LEPS,<br>COSMO-21-EPS      |  |
| Scores                   | SPRD, RMSE                                     |  |



۲



### <u>RMSE</u>

- COSMO-based models have a marked diurnal cycle;
- COSMO-2I-EPS RMSE is very close to the corresponding spread during the night;
- COSMO-2I-EPS RMSE is the lowest during the night.

| Verification features |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Period                | From 15/10/2018 00 UTC<br>to 15/11/2018 00 UTC  |  |
| Region                | Italy   |  |
| Method                | Boxes 0.5° (max, average)   |  |
| Observations          | Network of Dipartimento Protezione Civile<br>Nazionale (5524 stations),<br>no obs error |  |
| Forecast range        | 0-48 h<br>(verification every 6 h)  |  |
| Systems               | ECMWF ENS,<br>COSMO-LEPS,<br>COSMO-2I-EPS   |  |
| Scores                | RPS   |  |
|                       | percentage of outliers  |  |
| Thresholds            | (1, 5, 10, 15, 25, 50) mm/6h  |  |



- ★ <u>Ranked Probability Scores (RPS)</u> is an extension of the RMSE to the probabilistic world and to the multi-category events. RPS ∈ (0,1)
- The lower the RPS, the better the ensemble system

<u>Max</u>: the **RPS** of COSMO-LEPS is the lowest, the COSMO-2I-EPS one is the highest.

> <u>Average</u>: the RPS of the three ensemble systems does not show substantial differences.

### ECMWF ENS COSMO-LEPS 0.14 COSMO-21-EPS 0.12 0.10 0.08 RPS 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.00 24 (max) 24 (average) 48 (average) 48 (max) forecast range

RPS tp24h boxes 0.5° max & average

- ★ <u>Ranked Probability Scores (RPS)</u> is an extension of the RMSE to the probabilistic world and to the multi-category events. RPS ∈ (0,1)
- The lower the RPS, the better the ensemble system

<u>Max</u>: the **RPS** of COSMO-LEPS is the lowest, the COSMO-2I-EPS one is the highest.

> <u>Average</u>: the RPS of the three ensemble systems does not show substantial differences.

ECMWF ENS COSMO-LEPS 0.14 COSMO-2I-EPS 0.12 0.10 0.08 RPS 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.00 24 (max) 48 (max) 48 (average) 24 (average) forecast range

RPS tp24h boxes 0.5° max & average

- The percentage of outliers of a probabilistic forecast system is defined as the probability of the observations lying outside the range spanned by the forecast values (Buizza, 1997).
- Here it is computed as the fraction of points of the domain where the observed value lies outside the minimum or maximum forecast value.

#### Max and average:

The COSMO-based ensemble systems have the lowest **percentage of outliers**, despite the lower ensemble size with respect to ECMWF ENS. So these ensemble systems are the ones whose members calculate the 'truth' (observed value) better.





- The rainiest ensemble system is COSMO-2I-EPS followed by ECMWF and COSMO-LEPS
- The areas with the largest forecasted precipitation quantities are the same and with comparable cumulate
- The main differences concern areas where it rained less



- Standard deviation increases with the ensemble resolution.
- Standard deviation increases in areas where the forecasted rainfall is greater.



- The ensemble spread increases with the resolution of the model.
- The ensemble spread increases in areas where the forecasted amounts of precipitation are greater.

#### **Perfomance diagram**

It is possible to exploit the geometric relationship between four measure of dichotomous forecast performance: <u>Probability Of Detection</u> (POD), the <u>Success Ratio</u> (SR), <u>bias</u> and <u>Critical</u> <u>Success Index</u> (CSI). For good forecast, POD, SR, bias and CSI approach unity, such that a perfect forecast lies in the upper right of the diagram.

#### Systems:

COSMO-2I-EPS ensemble 20 members COSMO-2I deterministic COSMO-I2 deterministic Variable: 24h total precipitation Verification method: max precipitation on DPCN macroareas of alerting Thresholds: 1 mm/24h, 20 mm/24h 50 mm/24h, 100 mm/24h



\* 21-eps3+48h

# 21-eps4 +24h

# 21-eps8+34h

\* 21-eps8+48h

\* 25-eps12+48h

21-eps13+24h

= 21-mos17+24h

= 25-eos17+49h

COSMO-12 +48h

#### Systems:

COSMO-2I-EPS ensemble 20 members COSMO-2I deterministic COSMO-I2 deterministic Variable: 24h total precipitation Verification method: max precipitation on DPCN macroareas of alerting Thresholds: 1 mm/24h, 20 mm/24h 50 mm/24h, 100 mm/24h

- The results worsen and spread slightly with more intense precipitation.
- ✓ The forecasts of 20 members of COSMO-2I-EPS are similar to COSMO-2I and COSMO-I2.



# 21-cos8+34h # 21-cos12+49h # 21-cos17+24h

\* 21-eps8+48h \* 21-eps13+24h \* 21-eps17+49h

COSMO-12 +48h

\* 21-eps3+48h

# 21-eps4 +24h

# **DESCRIPTION OF THE OROGRAPHY**

The different **horizontal resolutions** of the three ensemble systems play a crucial role in the representation of the orography.

Models with a higher horizontal resolution can capture smaller details of the territory; models with a lower resolution are able to solve only the broad features of a geographical area.



