Atmospheric Dynamical Core Development

Chris Eldred Department of Atmospheric Science Colorado State University

July 31st, 2014

Who am I?

- PhD Student in Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University
- Work for Dave Randall at Center for Multiscale Modelling of Atmospheric Processes (CMMAP)
- Oid undergraduate work at Carnegie Mellon University



Broad Research Overview: What are dynamical cores?

- O Develop discrete models of the atmosphere (dynamical cores)
- Opposite of the second seco
- O Parameterizations: deals with "unresolved processes"
- Model: dynamical core + parameterizations



Which is the model, and which is reality? (from Miura et. al 2007)

Philosophy of Dynamical Core Development

- Model development is a series of choices: equation sets, predicted variables, numerical methods, many others
- I Are solutions between these two the same?
- ${ullet} o$ "Mimetic" methods, conservation properties
- Solution Need to use "expertise" to develop models

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial A}{\partial x} = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{A_i^{n+1} - A_i^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{A_{i+1}^n - A_{i-1}^n}{2\Delta x} = 0$$

- Equations of fluid dynamics come from conservation laws: mass, momentum, energy, etc.
- Conserved quantities provide a powerful constraint on the dynamics
- Different types of conserved quantities: integral quantities (total energy,...), parcel quantities (mass, potential vorticity,...)

A Simple Example, part 1

1-D Advection

Consider 1-D advection of A:

$$\frac{\partial A}{\partial t} + \frac{\partial A}{\partial x} = 0$$

This system conserves (with period B.C.'s)

 $\int_{\Omega} A dx$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} A^2 dx$$

(among other things)

/₽ ► < ∃ ►

A Simple Example, part 2

1-D Advection, Discretized

Now consider 2 different spatial discretizations of this system:

$$\frac{\partial A_i}{\partial t} + \frac{A_i - A_{i-1}}{\Delta x} = 0$$

and

$$\frac{\partial A_i}{\partial t} + \frac{A_{i+1} - A_{i-1}}{2\Delta x} = 0$$

Both will conserve $\sum_{i} A_{i}$ (discrete analogue of $\int_{\Omega} Adx$) Both are consistent What about conservation of $\sum_{i} A_{i}^{2}$ (discrete analogue of $\int_{\Omega} A^{2} dx$)? (Let's assume $\Delta x = 1$ for convenience)

A Simple Example, part 3

First Discretization

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\sum_{i}A_{i}^{2}=\sum_{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}A_{i}^{2}=\sum_{i}A_{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}A_{i}=\sum_{i}A_{i}(A_{i}-A_{i-1})\neq 0$$

Doesn't conserve $\sum_i A_i^2$

Second Discretization

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\sum_{i}A_{i}^{2}=\sum_{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}A_{i}^{2}=\sum_{i}A_{i}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}A_{i}=\sum_{i}A_{i}(A_{i+1}-A_{i-1})$$

$$=\sum_i A_i A_{i+1} - \sum_i A_i A_{i-1} = 0$$

Conserves $\sum_i A_i^2$

200

A Simple Example, part 4

Not so fast...

- Second discretization can be unstable with certain time stepping schemes
- ② Only first discretization is monotonic and sign-preserving
- Iradeoffs...
- G Real models must make choices like this all the time

What do I do?

- How can we develop numerical methods that conserve discrete analogues of important physical quantities: mass, potential vorticity, total energy, potential enstrophy?
- What other mimetic properties should our models have?



Shallow water simulation from Ringler et. al 2010 How can we do these things (conservation, other mimetic properties) on arbitrary, non-orthogonal polygonal grids?



Icosahedral-hexagons

Cubed Sphere



Planar Grids

- **→** → **→**

Conservation Laws: Non Canonical Hamiltonian Structure

- Equations of atmospheric dynamics have a special structure
- **2** Numerical models should reflect this structure
- **③** Non-canonical infinite dimensional Hamiltonian mechanics:

$$\frac{\partial \vec{x}}{\partial t} = \mathbb{J} \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \vec{x}}$$
$$\mathbb{J} \frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{\delta \vec{x}} = 0$$
$$\frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt} = -\left(\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \vec{x}}, \mathbb{J} \frac{\delta \mathcal{F}}{\delta \vec{x}}\right)$$

- ${\mathbb J}$ symplectic operator
- ${\mathcal H}$ Hamiltonian functional
- $\ensuremath{\mathcal{Z}}$ Casimir functional
- ${\mathcal F}$ arbitrary functional
- (,) inner product
- \vec{x} set of variables

Conservation Properties

Hamiltonian (Energy)

Requires only the anti-symmetry of $\mathbb J$ and the positive definiteness of (,) (and therefore $\mathcal H).$ Fluid dynamical systems: $\mathcal H$ is **total energy**.

Casimirs (Mass, Potential Vorticity, Potential Enstrophy)

Functionals $\mathcal Z$ such that

$$\mathbb{J}\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}}{\delta \vec{x}} = 0$$

will be conserved. Some important examples are the **mass**, **potential vorticity** and **potential enstrophy**.

Shallow Water Equations

Vector Invariant Shallow Water Equations

$$\vec{x} = (h, \vec{u})$$
$$\mathbb{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \vec{\nabla} \cdot \\ \vec{\nabla} & q\hat{k} \times \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}g(h, h) + \frac{1}{2}(\vec{F}, \vec{u})$$
$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \vec{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi \\ \vec{F} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} gh + K \\ h\vec{u} \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\mathcal{Z} = \int_{\Omega} d\Omega hC(q)$$



Chris Eldred CMMAP Student Colloqium Presentation

Generalized C Grid Discretization

- Discrete variables are $m_i = \int h dA$ (discrete primal 2-form) and $u_e = \int \vec{u} \cdot \vec{dl}$ (discrete dual 1-form)
- C grid staggering $(m_i \text{ at cell centers}, u_e \text{ at edges})$
- General formulation is:

$$\vec{x} = (m_i, u_e)$$
$$\mathbb{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D_2 \\ \bar{D}_1 & Q \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}g(m_i, m_i)_{\mathbf{I}} + \frac{1}{2}(F_e, u_e)_{\mathbf{H}}$$
$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \vec{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I} \Phi_i \\ \mathbf{H} F_e \end{pmatrix}$$



Non-orthogonal primal-dual C grid (from Dubos 2012)

Discrete Energy Conservation

Requires two things:

9 J is anti-symmetric: $D_2^T = -\overline{D}_1$, and $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}^T$

O \mathcal{H} is positive definite: **I** and **H** are symmetric positive definite This gives semi-discrete energy conservation (fully discrete is a different matter).



Icosahedral-hexagons

Cubed Sphere



Planar Grids

- General discrete framework can conserve mass, potential vorticity, total energy and potential enstrophy on general, non-orthogonal polygonal meshes
- Framework cleanly splits topological (D₁, D₂, etc.) and metrical (I, H, etc.) aspects; can change one component without changing others
- Getting total energy and potential enstrophy conservation together is tricky (having only one is "easy")
- Hamiltonian/DEC framework also has useful mimetic properties (linear stability, no spurious vorticity production, etc.)

同 ト イ ヨ ト イ ヨ ト

Mass and Potential Vorticity Conservation

Mass Conservation

$$\frac{\partial m_i}{\partial t} + D_2 \mathbf{H} F_e = 0$$

Local and global conservation by form alone ("flux form", independent of how F_e is formulated)

Potential Vorticity Conservation

$$\frac{\partial m_{v} q_{v}}{\partial t} + \bar{D}_{2} \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{H} F_{e} = 0$$

Local and global conservation by form alone ("flux form", independent of how ${\bf Q}$ is formulated)

Discrete Potential Enstrophy

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{C}} = \frac{1}{2} (\eta_{\nu}, \mathbf{J}^{-1} q_{\nu})_{\mathbf{J}}$$
$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{C}}}{\delta \vec{x}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{R}^{T} \frac{q_{\nu}^{2}}{2} \\ \bar{D}_{2}^{T} q_{\nu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{R}^{T} \frac{q_{\nu}^{2}}{2} \\ D_{1} q_{\nu} \end{pmatrix}$$



Construction of **R** from Thuburn et. al 2009

- Discrete vorticity is $\zeta_v = \bar{D_2} u_e$
- Mass-weighted potential vorticity $m_{\nu}q_{\nu} = \zeta_{\nu} + f = \eta_{\nu}$
- $m_v = \mathbf{R}m_i$; **R** maps primal 2-forms to dual 2-forms

Discrete Potential Enstrophy Conservation

Conservation

Casimir conservation requires

$$\mathbb{J}\frac{\delta \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{C}}}{\delta \vec{x}} = 0$$

which gives

$$D_2 D_1 q_v = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$-\bar{D}_1 \mathbf{R}^T \frac{q_v^2}{2} + \mathbf{Q} D_1 q_v = 0 \quad (2)$$

Operator Requirements

- (1) is automatic $(D_2D_1 = 0)$ (2) is tricky- depends on R^T
 - TRiSK and Arakawa and Lamb 1981 schemes both construct **Q** such that (2) is satisfied
 - Only Arakawa and Lamb 1981 also has $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}^T$ (energy conservation)
- Form of (2) gives hope that Arakawa and Lamb 1981 scheme can be extended to non-orthogonal, arbitrary polygonal meshes