Validation of different approaches to forecast near surface cloud water in NWP models M. Masbou, A. Bott, H. Petithomme, <u>C. Petersen</u>^[1], N.W. Nielsen, H. Seidl, A. Kann, M.D.Muller, J. Cermak, W.K.Adam

> ^[1] Danish Meteorological Institute E-mail: cp@dmi.dk



Motivation



- COST722: Comparison of 4 European High Resolution Fog Models
- Statistical comparison was done for a 4 months period for Lindenberg, Germany
- The models were compared in more details on 3 cases

Models



- 1. Non-hydrostatic, non operational, high vertical/horizontal resolution, complex microphysics
 - 1. LM-PAFOG (Germany)
 - 2. NMM-PAFOG (Switzerland)
- 2. Statistical model
 - 1. MOS-ARGEGE (France)
- 3. Hydrostatic, operational, lower vertical/horizontal resolution, ad hoc treatment of cloud water near the surface
 - 1. DMI-HIRLAM (Denmark)
 - 2. ALADIN-AUSTRIA (Austria)



Location of Lindenberg site





DMi





Observed visibility and derived cloud type























Observed visibility and derived cloud type









Vertical profile at Lindenberg



Toulouse, France 12-14.3.2007









Case 3: Reduced visibility with stratiform low clouds. 7 December 2005

DMi



Toulouse, France 12-14.3.2007



Observed visibility and derived cloud type











Vertical profile at Lindenberg











Conclusions



- Initialization and data-assimilation of cloud water, near surface profiles and surface temperature/soil water are almost not existing or sufficient
- Condensation, convection, vertical diffusion schemes are usually not designed to work well near the surface

References



COST722 HOMEPAGE http://137.248.191.94/index.php?id=120/index.html

E-mail: cp@dmi.dk

QUESTIONS?