Study and Comparison of Simulation of Satellite Microwave Observations in Cloudy and Rainy Areas using RTTOV and CRTM

HAN Wei\* and DONG Peiming\*\*

hanwei@cma.gov.cn

\* Numerical Prediction Center, CMA

\*\*Chinese Academy of Meteorological Sciences,CMA

## **Outline**

### Background

- Clear Radiance assimilation in GRAPES
- Cloudy Radiance assimilation: onging Research
- Comparisons of RTTOV and CRTM for Cloudy Radiance
  - Input from 24h forecast
    - → RTTOV: <u>cloud frac.</u>,water,ice,rain,snow
    - → CRTM: effective radius, water, ice, rain, snow, graupel, hail

### ♦ Jacobians

- Discussion
  - Training of the fast RT model for cloudy radiance
    - → L2 norm or H1 norm
  - Control variables choices

### **Background: Road map of GRAPES**



## Satellite data assimilation in GRAPES

- Observation Operator for Radiance Assimilation
  - RTTOV: RTTOV6->RTTOV7->RTTOV9
  - CRTM: CRTM1.2->CRTM2.1
- Satellite Observations in GRAPES
  - ATOVS(NOAA,METOP,FY3)
  - GPS Reflectivity (COSMIC)
  - IASI and AIRS
- Bias correction
  - Harris and Kelly(2001)
  - ♦ VarBC
  - Constrained VarBC :considering of mobel bias
- Observation Error tuning

## Background

- GRAPES\_VAR
  - RT model: RTTOV(9.3) and CRTM(1.2)
  - Clear radiance assimilation in preoperational mode
  - Cloudy and rain affected radiance: ongoing research

#### Daily Percentage of Data Ingested into Models



Received = All observations received operationally from providers Selected = Observations selected as suitable for use Assimilated = Observations actually used by models More than 70% of data are rejected due to cloud and rain



## Impact of AMSUs and AMVs in GRAPES

Baseline+AMVs: positive
Control+AMV\_HA: positive
Control+AMSU\_ch4: positive

Baseline:Sonde+Airep+Synop+ships+COSMIC Control: Baseline+AMVs+AMSUs



# The impact of water content: CRTM



#### Water contents

No water contents

#### Cloud Scattering and Emission in CRTM vs. RTTOV

	CRTM	RTTOV (RTTOV-SCATT)
Radiative Transfer Solver	Advanced Adding and Doubling (ADA) scheme	Delta-Eddington Approximation
Scattering Properties (look-up table approach)	Precalculated using Mie theory and tabulated as a function of frequency, temperature, radii, and hydrometeor type anddensity	Precalculated using Mie theory and tabulated as a function of frequency, temperature, and hydrometeor type and density.
Cloud types	Water, ice, rain, snow, graupel and hail	Water, ice, rain, and snow
Cloud cover	Not handle yet	Cloud fraction profile

#### From Yong Chen et al,2011

## **Comparison of Input for hydrometeors**

### RTTOV

 ♦ cloud liquid water, cloud ice water, rain flux and solid precip. flux
 N = (<sup>RH - RH</sup><sub>0</sub>)<sup>b</sup>
 effective cloud fraction
 RTTOV-SCATT

• CRTM

- water, ice, rain, snow, graupel and hail
- effective radius: const.

$$r_e = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} n(r)r^3 dr}{\int_{0}^{\infty} n(r)r^2 dr}$$

 $T_{R}^{Total} = (1 - C)T_{R}^{Clear} + CT_{R}^{Rainy}$ 

## 24h Forecast (Initial:18Z 2nd Oct. 2007)

Area(10° -30° N, 120° -140° E) water content vertical integrate, Unit: kg m<sup>-2</sup>



Along 20N, Vertical Section, Unit: kg/kg

18km,Lin scheme

## Input of RT model from background



Along 20N, Effective Radius, Unit: um

# **RTTOV AMSUA CH1: diff. cloud type**

280

270

260

250

240

230

220

210

200

190

180



30N

28N -

26N

24N

22N

20N

18N

clear

cloud



ice



rain

snow

4 water type

# **CRTM AMSUA CH1: diff. cloud type**



observation



cloud

30N

28N

26N

24N

22N

20N

18N

16N

14N

12N

30N T

28N

26N

24N

22N

20N -

18N

16N

14N

12N



rain



4 water type

280

270

260

250

240

230

220

210

200

190

180

280

270

260

250

240

230

220

210

200

190

180

# **RTTOV AMSUB CH1: diff. cloud type**

clear

cloud

30N

28N

26N

24N

22N

20N

18N

16N

14N

30N ·

28N

26N ·

24N ·

22N -

20N ·

18N ·

16N

141

10N

tbb RTOVmb cloud channel 1

10N 120E 122E 124E 126E 128E 130E 132E 134E 136E 138E 140E

tbb RTOVmb snow channel 1

285

280

275

270

265

260

250

245

240

235

230

225

285

280

275

270

265

260

250

245

240

235

230

225









4 water type

tbb RTOVmb clear channel 1





#### observation



SNOW

120E 122E 124E 126E 128E 130E 132E 134E 136E 138E 140E

rain

# **CRTM AMSUB CH1: diff. cloud type**

clear

30N

28N

26N

24N

22N

20N

18N

tbb CRTMmb clear channel 1

cloud

30N

28

26N

24N

22N

20N

18N

16N

14N

30N

28N

26N

24N

22N -

20N

18N

16N

285

280

275

270

265

260

250

245

240

235

230

225

285

280

275

270

265

260

250

245

240

235

230

225

tbb CRTMmb cloud channel 1

10N 120E 122E 124E 126E 128E 130E 132E 134E 136E 138E 140E

tbb CRTMmb snow channel 1

285

280

275

270

265

260

250

245

240

235

230

225













10N 120E 122E 124E 126E 128E 130E 132E 134E 136E 138E 140E



observation



rain



4 water type

## Impact of water content on O-B

AMSUA

AMSUB



## **AMSUA: water vapor Jacobian**



## RTTOV Jacobian:T,Qv,Qc,Qi,Qr,Qs AMSUA



## CRTM Jacobian:T,Qv,Qc,Qi,Qr,Qs AMSUA



## RTTOV Jacobian:T,Qv,Qc,Qi,Qr,Qs AMSUB



## CRTM Jacobian:T,Qv,Qc,Qi,Qr,Qs AMSUB



### Impact of cloud fraction on simulted Tb:RTTOV



#### Impact of effective radius on simulted Tb: CRTM

#### cloud:15, ice:30, rain:200, snow:200 um



#### cloud:8, ice:240,rain:500, snow:1400 um



## Summary

- Background
  - Clear Radiance assimilation in GRAPES
  - Cloudy Radiance assimilation: onging Research
- Comparisons of RTTOV and CRTM for Cloudy Radiance
  - Input from 24h forecast
  - ♦ Jacobians
- Discussion
  - Jacobian uncertainties for water content in RT models
  - Inter comparison studies?
  - OSSE: unknowns and obs. information content for cloudy radiance(IR+MW). Could it be conducted by ITWG?

Garand et al,2001:Radiance and Jacobian intercomparison of radiative transfer models applied to HIRS and AMSU channels, JGR,106, 24017-24031

#### **CRTM Jacobian Calculations Compared with RTTOV**

- RTTOV is another fast radiative transfer model use by NWP community for satellite data assimilation
- Radiance Jacobians at 6.2 and 7.2 micron water vapor channels (GOES-R ABI and MSG SEVIRI) are derived frc CRTM & RTTOV
- Both models produce Jacobian profiles peaked at the same altitude
- But the magnitudes are slightly different between two fast models



Assumption: surface emissivity = 0.98, local zenith angle = 0 deg., and skin temperature = 300 K

From Fengzhung Weng,2011