ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY

Validation Study of Operational Battlescale Forecast Model (BFM) Over Western Asian Regions

by Teizi Henmi, John W. Raby, John Cruncleton, and Jim Kratzer

ARL-TN-118 **December 2002**

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

NOTICES

Disclaimers

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position unless so designated by other authorized documents.

Citation of manufacturer's or trade names does not constitute an official endorsement or approval of the use thereof.

DESTRUCTION NOTICE—For classified documents, follow the procedures in DOD 5200.22-M, Industrial Security Manual, Section II-19 or DOD 5200.1-R, Information Security Program Regulation, Chapter IX. For unclassified, limited documents, destroy by any method that will prevent disclosure of contents or reconstruction of the document.

Army Research Laboratory
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5067

ARL-TN-118 **December 2002**

Validation Study of Operational Battlescale Forecast Model (BFM) Over Western Asian Regions

Teizi Henmi and John W. Raby
Computational and Informational Sciences Directorate, ARL

and

John Cruncleton and Jim Kratzer
Physical Sciences Laboratory
New Mexico State University

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Contents

List of Figures ii

List of Tables iii

1. Introduction 1

2. Review 2

3. Model Domains for Present Study 3

4. Method 4

4.1 Study Period 4

4.2 Forecast Method 4

4.3 Data comparison method 7

5. Statistical Parameters 8

6. BFM Validation Results 9

6.1 Statistical parameters at different forecast periods 9

6.2 Scatter Diagrams of model forecast against observations 13

7. Comparisons of surface wind analysis data of MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS 18

8. Summary and Consideration 24

9. References 25

Acronyms 26

Report Documentation Page 27

List of Figures

Figure 1. Approximate locations of model domains used for the BFM validation study. Each square covers the area of 500 H 500 km. 2

Figure 2. Elevation contours of the Iran model domain. 5

Figure 3. Elevation contours of the Pakistan model domain. 6

Figure 4. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for temperature over Iran model domain....14

Figure 5. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for temperature over Pakistan model domain....14

Figure 6. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for relative humidity over Iran model domain....15

Figure 7. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for relative humidity over Pakistan model domain....15

Figure 8. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for wind speed (m/sec) over Iran model domain....16

Figure 9. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for wind vector component u (m/sec) over Iran model domain. 16

Figure 10. Scatter diagrams of BFM vs. surface observation for wind vector component v (m/sec) over Iran model domain. 17

Figure 11-1. Scatter diagram of surface wind speed analysis data by MM5 against observation. 19

Figure 11-2. Same as Figure 11.1, except for u. 20

Figure 11-3. Same as Figure 11.1, except for v. 20

Figure 12-1. Scatter diagram of surface wind speed analysis data by AVN against observation. 21

Figure 12-2. Same as Figure 12.1, except for u. 21

Figure 12-3. Same as Figure 12.1, except for v. 22

Figure 13-1. Scatter diagram of surface wind speed analysis data by NOGAPS against observation. 22

Figure 13-2. Same as Figure 13.1, except for u. 23

Figure 13-3. Same as Figure 13.2, except for v. 23

List of Tables

Table 1. Terrain complexities of the three domains. 4
Table 2. Date and initialization time of the BFM run. 7
Table 2-1. Statistical parameters for temperature (C) over Iran model domain. 10
Table 2-2. Statistical parameters for temperature (C) over Pakistan model domain. 10
Table 3-1. Statistical parameters for relative humidity over Iran model domain. 11
Table 3-2. Statistical parameters for relative humidity over Pakistan model domain. 11

1. Introduction

The Battlescale Forecast Model (BFM) is an operational mesoscale forecast model, developed at the U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL) [1]. It has been extensively used to make short-range forecasts of atmospheric conditions as a component in both the Integrated Meteorological System(IMETS) and the Computer Assisted Artillery Meteorology (CAAM) System. The BFM uses, for prognostic calculation, the Higher Order Turbulence Model for Atmospheric Circulation (HOTMAC) developed by Yamada. [2]

After Operation Enduring Freedom started, a validation study of the BFM over model domains in West Asia became necessary to prepare for use of the BFM over Afghanistan.

It would have been ideal to run the BFM on the model domain over Afghanistan, but unfortunately, there are presently no meteorological data available over Afghanistan.

Therefore, two model domains in the same region, one over Iran and the other over Pakistan, were selected for the BFM validation study. Figure 1 shows approximate locations of model domains used for this study.

For this study, scientists of the Physical Sciences Laboratory (PSL) of New Mexico State University (NMSU) ran the BFM twice a day, at 00 and 12 UTC, and archived observed data available over the model domains. The BFM output and surface observation data are compared to validate the BFM. The study is based on the data obtained during the two-month period of October and November, 2001. The BFM validated is the one on the U.S Army IMETS ABCS_6_2_1_0. Meteorological data including surface and upper air data, and NOGAPS forecast data are obtained from the Air Force Weather Agency (AFWA) using the U.S. Air Force Tactical VSAT (TVSAT) system.

During the same period, surface wind field analysis data are obtained from the U.S. Navy Meteorology and Oceanography Command through Internet using METCAT system. The data are: model output by NOGAPS, AVN and MM5.

These data are compared with surface observation data archived as described in the above.

The purpose of this report is to describe the results of statistical comparisons of the BFM forecast data with observation data, and those of the NOGAPS, AVN, and MM5 with observation data over the Western Asia. It is noted that the present study is limited to the surface meteorological data, and that, because of the limited number of observation sites and data, the results should be regarded as qualitative.



Figure 1. Approximate locations of model domains used for the BFM validation study. Each square covers the area of 500 H 500 km.

2. Review

In the following, the validation studies done in the past are briefly reviewed. The forecast skill of the BFM was compared with that of MM5, by applying the models to the domain of White Sands Missile Range (WSMR), New Mexico which covers an area of 167 H 167 km (51 H 51 grid points with grid spacing of 3.33 km). Meteorological parameters forecasted by the models were compared with observed data. The comparison study showed that the forecast skills of the BFM are comparable to those of the MM5. Surface temperature forecasted by both the BFM and MM5 agreed well with observed values. Both the BFM and the MM5 showed difficulties for forecasting the relative humidity. For wind parameters, both models tend to predict wind speed less than that observed, but BFM calculations produce lower wind speed than the MM5. For wind-direction, the BFM resulted in better forecasts than the MM5. [3]

The BFM in operational mode on the IMETS has been extensively used over the model domain of 500 H 500 km with grid spacing of 10 km. A statistical evaluation of the BFM in operational mode was conducted for cases during a 30-day period over three different model domains having different terrain complexities and climate (Colorado, Washington, and Florida).[4] The model calculations were initialized with three different sets of initial conditions:

NOGAPS + upper air data + surface data H

NOGAPS + upper air data,

NOGAPS

Forecast data for 24-hr periods are statistically compared with surface observation data, by calculating parameters such as mean difference (MD), absolute difference (AD), root mean square error (rmse), root mean square vector error (rmsve), and correlation coefficient.

For all three model domains, the temperature fields of BFM initialized with (1) and (2) above are statistically better than those initialized with (3). For Colorado and Washington model domains, the BFM showed clear tendencies of forecasting dew point temperature lower than those observed throughout the 24-hr forecast period. However for the Florida model domain, forecasts of dew point temperature are higher than observed.

Three different types of initialization data did not produce significantly different wind fields throughout the 24-hr forecast period. The value of MD for wind speed are in the range of 0 to 1 m/sec. And those of AD are also between 0 and 1 m/sec for three model domains throughout the 24-hr forecast period.

For Colorado and Washington model domains where terrain is more complex than Florida, the use of the BFM improves temperature forecasts over those of NOGAPS and Navy Operational Regional Atmospheric Prediction System (NORAPS). For the Florida domain, no significant improvements in temperature forecasts are found. Similarly, the BFM produces better wind fields than NOGAPS and NORAPS over Colorado and Washington.

3. Model Domains for Present Study

The following two BFM domains were chosen for the present study:

- Iran, centered at 34.50 N and 52.98E and
- Pakistan, centered at 35.58 N and 72.72 E.

Each model domain covers a 500 H 500 km area with horizontal grid spacing of 10 km and the horizontal grid number of 51 H 51. The vertical depth of the model is 7 km above the highest point of the model domain with 16 vertical layers.

The complexities of the two model domains are summarized in Table 1. For comparison, the complexity data of the same size area centered at Kabul, Afghanistan is also given in the table.

As seen in table1, the Pakistan model domain is the most complex, containing high peaks of the Hindu Kush Mountain range in the northern part of the model domain. Compared to the Pakistan

Table 1. Terrain complexities of the three domains.

	Iran	Pakistan	Afghanistan
Mean elevation (m)	1237	2991	2232
Max. height (m)	3744	6717	6413
Min. height (m)	-28	247	173
Standard dev. (m)	642	1513	1153

model domain, the Iran model domain is more flat with the Caspian Sea below zero level at the northern part of the domain. As far as the complexity is concerned, the 500 H 500 km area of Afghanistan centered at Kabul is fairly complex, similar to the Pakistan model domain.

Figures 2 and 3 are the elevation contour maps of, respectively, the Iran and Pakistan model domains. In these figures, the outside squares cover the NOGAPS analysis and data composite area of 800 H 800 km, and the inside square covers the model domains of 500 H 500 km. In these figures N and S represents the locations of the input data for model initialization of the model calculation. There were a few upper air-sounding stations in the surrounding areas for both domains, but because of incomplete form of the data sets they were not used to initialize the BFM throughout the study period for both domains.

In figure 2 there are seven stations of surface observations which are used to compare with the BFM forecast data. However, there is only one surface station in figure 3 used for this study. Therefore, the statistical results obtained from the Pakistan model domain should be regarded as semi-quantitative.

4. Method

4.1 Study Period

The study was initiated immediately after the commencement of Operation Enduring Freedom. Table 2 shows the date and initialization times of the BFM for this study. For most of the days when the BFM was run, the BFM was initialized at 00 and 12 UTC for 24-h forecasts.

4.2 Forecast Method

Forecast calculation of the BFM is currently done as follows:



Figure 2. Elevation contours of the Iran model domain.

Note: The outside area covers 800 H 800 km, and the inside area covers 500 H 500 km.
N = NOGAPS data points.
S = surface observation locations.



Figure 3. Elevation contours of the Pakistan model domain.

N= NOGAPS data points
S = Surface observation locations

Table 2. Date and initialization time of the BFM run.

	Iran		Pakistan	
	00 UTC	**12 UTC**	**00 UTC**	**12 UTC**
October 2001	5, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24	12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24	9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24	9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24
November 2001	14, 15, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30	8, 15, 18, 27, 28, 29, 30	14, 18, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, 30	8, 13, 15, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30

- From NOGAPS forecast data, horizontal wind vector components, temperature, dew point temperature and geopotential height at 13 different pressure levels (1000, 975, 925, 900, 850, 700, 500, 400, 300, 250, 200, 150, and 100 mb) are obtained for the forecast periods of 0, 6, 12, 18, and 24 hr. These data are interpolated to the 81 H 81 grid with grid spacing of 10 km at each pressure level for the above forecast periods. The data is then vertically interpolated from the pressure levels to the BFM's height levels to produce four-dimensional (x, y, z, t) fields of the input data for initialization and lateral boundary data
- Suppose a forecast calculation is initialized at time t_0. A precalculation will start at time t_0 – 3 hr; and for 3 hr from t_0 – 3 to t_0 the model fields are dynamically adjusted to the initial fields by the nudging method.
- The hourly lateral boundary condition data between two different forecast periods are calculated by a linear interpolation method.
- From time t to t+1, the data for t+1 are assimilated in for one hr, and this process is repeated for an entire forecast period.

4.3 Data comparison method

After the forecast calculation is completed, the following bilinear interpolation is conducted to obtain the BFM data at the surface observation locations.

Suppose a surface observation location (x' and y') is surrounded by four BFM grid points. An interpolated value φ' of an arbitrary variable φ at (x', y') is calculated using a bilinear interpolation method as:

$$\varphi_1=\varphi(i, j)+(x' -x)[\varphi(i+1, j) - \varphi(i, j)]$$

$$\varphi_2= \varphi(i, j+1)+(x' -x)[\varphi(i+1, j+1) - \varphi(i, j+1)]$$

$$\varphi'(x',y')=\varphi_1 + (y'-y)[\varphi_2 - \varphi_1]$$

Here (i, j) is the southwest grid point of the four grid points surrounding a surface observation location (x', y'), and (x, y) is the location for the grid point (i, j) : φ(i, j) is an arbitrary variable at (x, y).

5. Statistical Parameters

The following statistical parameters between the BFM forecast data and surface observation data are calculated using the data available in the cases given in Table 2. The parameters are calculated for the forecast periods 0, 3, 6, 9,12, 15, 18, 21, and 24-hr, and for the entire period. Statistical parameters are calculated for temperature, relative humidity, wind speed and horizontal wind vector components, u and v.

Mean Difference

$$MD = \frac{\sum_{j=l}^{m} \sum_{i=l}^{m} \left(\chi_{p,i,j-\chi_{o,i,j}} \right)}{mn} \tag{1}$$

Here the subscripts $_o$ and $_p$ represent observation and prediction, respectively. The subscript $_i$ represents the ith surface station, and the subscript $_j$ the jth forecast day. N is the number of surface stations, and m the total number of forecast days. A nonzero mean difference (MD) indicates bias. For instance, if MD value is positive, it indicates that the model tends to over-forecast.

Mean Absolute Difference

$$AD = \frac{\sum \sum \left| \chi_{p,i,j} - \chi_{o,i,j} \right|}{mn} \tag{2}$$

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\chi_{o,i,j} - \chi_{o,i,j} \right)^2}{mn}} \tag{3}$$

Good agreements between observation and forecast are, in general, related to smaller values of AD and RMSE.

Root Mean Square Vector Error (RMSVE)

$$RMSVE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum\sum[(u_{o,i,j} - u_{o,i,j})^2 + (v_{o,i,j} - v_{p,i,j})^2]}{mn}} \tag{4}$$

This parameter measures the differences of both wind speed and direction. Again, good agreements of wind vectors are related to small values of the RMSVE.

Correlation Coefficient

$$CC = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} y_{o,i,j} y_{p,i,j}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} y^2{}_{o,i,j} \sum_{i=1}^{m}\sum_{j=1}^{n} y^2{}_{p,i,j}}} \tag{5}$$

Here

$$y_{o,i,j} = x_{o,i,j} - \overline{x_o} \tag{6}$$

$$y_{p,i,j} = x_{p,i,j} - \overline{x_p} \tag{7}$$

and

$$\overline{x_o} \tag{8}$$

and

$$\overline{x_p} \tag{9}$$

are the means of observed and forecast values, respectively.

6. BFM Validation Results

6.1 Statistical parameters at different forecast periods

The following tables show computed statistical parameters of surface meteorological parameters using BFM calculated and observed values:

- Table 2.1 Statistical parameters for temperature over the Iran model domain,
- Table 2.2 Statistical parameters for temperature over the Pakistan model domain,
- Table 3.1 Statistical parameters for relative humidity over the Iran model domain,
- Table 3.2 Statistical parameters for relative humidity over the Pakistan model domain,•
  Table 4 Statistical parameters for wind speed over the Iran model domain,

- Table 5 Statistical parameters for wind vector component u over the Iran model domain,
- Table 6 Statistical parameters for wind vector component v over the Iran model domain, and
- Table 7 RMSVE of wind vectors over the Iran model domain.

For the Pakistan model domain, there are no statistical parameters calculated for wind parameters due to the lack of surface observations.

Table 2-1. Statistical parameters for temperature (C) over Iran model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	53	-.98	3.24	4.92	.81
3	95	-1.44	3.30	4.92	.81
6	91	-.96	3.14	3.86	.81
9	27	-2.02	3.65	4.70	.71
12	47	-2.46	2.68	4.70	.75
15	32	-4.25	4.39	5.34	.72
18	5				
21	0				
24	1				
Entire Period	351	-1.65	3.27	4.64	.81

Table 2-2. Statistical parameters for temperature (C) over Pakistan model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	10	-1.79	1.86	2.90	.94
3	37	3.44	3.95	5.15	.81
6	36	2.46	2.94	3.42	.84
9	14	.51	3.05	3.61	.89
12	4				
15	11	1.29	1.79	2.26	.85
18	7				
21	1				
24	0				
Entire Period	120	-1.79	1.86	2.90	.94

Table 3-1. Statistical parameters for relative humidity over Iran model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	53	1.5	6.4	10.6	.83
3	95	-3.2	10.4	14.8	.67
6	91	-4.8	10.5	12.8	.68
9	27	-1.5	10.1	11.7	.49
12	47	.9	10.8	13.8	.23
15	32	3.2	11.3	15.4	.22
18	5				
21	0				
24	1				
Entire Period	351	-1.8	9.9	13.4	.65

Table 3-2. Statistical parameters for relative humidity over Pakistan model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	10	2.4	3.1	3.8	.99
3	37	-31.5	31.5	34.5	.25
6	36	-24.3	25.1	27.9	.30
9	14	-21.9	22.5	28.2	.60
12	4				
15	11	-27.0	27.0	28.0	.33
18	7				
21	1				
24	0				
Entire Period	120	-24.0	25.1	29.1	.36

Table 4. Statistical parameters of wind speed (m/sec) over Iran model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	39	-2.0	2.6	3.27	.37
3	53	-.7	1.8	2.4	.19
6	49	-.9	1.8	2.3	.32
9	15	-.4	2.3	3.0	.05
12	40	-.8	2.4	3.0	.14
15	19	-.8	1.3	1.6	.06
18	2				
21	0				
24	0				
Entire Period	217	-.5	2.4	3.0	.35

Table 5. Statistical parameters of wind component u (m/sec) over Iran model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	39	-.3	2.6	3.1	.60
3	53	.4	2.4	2.9	.35
6	49	.2	2.4	2.7	.35
9	15	-1.0	2.5	3.0	.46
12	40	-1.4	2.9	3.6	.51
15	19	.6	1.5	1.9	.37
18	2				
21	0				
24	0				
Entire Period	217	-.1	2.5	3.0	.45

Table 6. Statistical parameters of wind component v (m/sec) over Iran model domain.

Forecast period (hr)	Number of observations	Mean difference	Absolute difference	Root mean square error	Correlation coefficient
0	39	-.3	2.4	3.0	.47
3	53	-1.3	2.2	2.7	.40
6	49	-.9	2.4	3.0	.35
9	15	.6	2.8	3.3	.20
12	40	.3	3.0	3.7	.35
15	19	-.2	1.3	2.5	.1
18	2				
21	0				
24	0				
Entire Period	217	-.5	2.4	3.0	.35

Table 7. RMSVE (m/sec) wind vector over Iran model domain.

Forecast Period (hr)	0	3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24	**Entire period**
No. of observation	39	53	49	19	40	19	2	0	0	217
RMSVE	4.3	3.9	4.2	4.0	4.9	3.3				4.3

6.2 Scatter Diagrams of model forecast against observations

The following scatter diagrams are obtained by plotting all the data for all forecast periods and days. As can be seen, there is no comparison made for forecast periods beyond 18 hr and no comparison was made for wind components for the Pakistan model domain.

As noted before, it is unfortunate that there are not enough observed data of wind speed and direction over the Pakistan model domain to make statistical comparison with BFM forecast data. Even for the Iranian model domain, comparisons could not be made for forecast period beyond 18 hr. As can be seen from Tables 2.1 and 2.2, and Figures 4 and 5, there are good agreements for temperature between the BFM forecasts and surface observation for both model domains with the CC values greater than 0.8. The MD values in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 shows that the BFM slightly under forecasted temperature values.



Figure 4. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for temperature over Iran model domain.



Figure 5. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for temperature over Pakistan model domain.



Figure 6. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for relative humidity over Iran model domain.



Figure 7. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for relative humidity over Pakistan model domain.



Figure 8. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for wind speed (m/sec) over Iran model domain.



Figure 9. Scatter diagram of BFM vs. surface observation for wind vector component u (m/sec) over Iran model domain.



Figure 10. Scatter diagrams of BFM vs. surface observation for wind vector component v (m/sec) over Iran model domain.

For relative humidity forecasts, the CC value of .65 for the entire data set over the Iran model domain should be regarded as good, considering the lack of input data for model initialization over this region. Note that for this study there were no upper air sounding data used. In a similar validation study of the BFM over model domains in the United States, the CC for dew point temperature between forecast and observation were 0.78 for the Colorado area, 0.44 for Washington, and 0.26 for Florida. [3]

For wind parameters (speed, u and v), the values of MD are slightly negative, implying that the BFM tends to under forecast the magnitudes of wind parameters. See Tables 4, 5, and Figures 8, 9, and 10. In the study over model domains in the United States, the values of RMSVE were about 3m/sec or smaller throughout the 24 hr forecast period.[4] In this study, as can be seen in Table 7, the RMSVE is about 4 m/sec. The CC values of this study are also slightly smaller than those over the model domains in the United States.

The number of meteorological observations in the Western Asia are spatially and temporally limited, compared to those over the North America. Therefore, the quality of NOGAPS data, which is used for initialization and boundary data of the BFM, may be more important over Western Asia than over North America. The present validation results may be partially attributed to the NOGAPS data over Western Asia.

7. Comparisons of surface wind analysis data of MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS

Surface wind analysis data at 00 and 12 UTC by MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS obtained from the Navy through the internet contain the gridded data covering the following areas and days:

- MM5: 24° E – 75° E, and 16.4° N – 58.4° N with 0.403° grid spacing, and
- 9day data in the period of Oct.15 to Oct. 25, 2001
- AVN and NOGAPS: 53° E - 80° E, and 21° N - 45° N with 1° grid spacing, and
- 17-day data in the period from Oct. 15 – Nov.30.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 are statistical parameters calculated for surface wind analysis data against observed data for MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS, respectively. The values of RMSVE are given in the description of each table.

Table 8. Statistical parameters of wind speed, u and v for surface wind analysis data by MM5. RMSVE = 4.0 m/sec.

	No. of data	**MD**	**AD**	**RMSE**	**CC**
Speed (m/s)	473	-.5	1.7	2.5	.42
u	473	.2	1.7	2.6	.62
v	473	.4	2.0	3.1	.63

Table 9. Same as Table 8, except for AVN. RMSVE = 3.3 m/sec.

	No. of data	**MD**	**AD**	**RMSE**	**CC**
Speed (m/s)	253	.8	1.9	2.6	.25
u	253	.4	1.4	2.2	.58
v	253	.4	1.7	2.5	.55

Table 10. Same as Table 8, except for NOGAPS. RMSVE = 4.0 m/sec.

	No. of data	**MD**	**AD**	**RMSE**	**CC**
Speed (m/s)	233	-.9	1.6	2.1	.45
u	233	1.3	1.8	2.7	.47
v	233	1.1	1.9	2.9	.42

Scatter diagrams of model analysis data of wind speed, u and v are shown in, respectively, Figures 11-1, 11-2, and 11-3 for MM5, Figures 12-1, 12-2, and 12-3 for AVN, and Figure 13-1, 13-2, and 13-3 for NOGAPS.

Fairly good statistical values shown in the above should have been expected, because surface observation data used for comparison might have been used to derive surface analysis data by these models.

It is cautioned that the statistical results obtained for these models, MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS shown in this section should not be used to compare quantitatively to those of BFM shown in the previous section, or those of other models, because of the following reasons:

- Model domain size and grid are different from each other,
- Numbers of surface data used for comparison are different, and
- Numbers of forecast days are different.



Figure 11-1. Scatter diagram of surface wind speed analysis data by MM5 against observation.



Figure 11-2. Same as Figure 11.1, except for u.



Figure 11-3. Same as Figure 11.1, except for v.



Figure 12-1. Scatter diagram of surface wind speed analysis data by AVN against observation.



Figure 12-2. Same as Figure 12.1, except for u.



Figure 12-3. Same as Figure 12.1, except for v.



Figure 13-1. Scatter diagram of surface wind speed analysis data by NOGAPS against observation.



Figure 13-2. Same as Figure 13.1, except for u.



Figure 13-3. Same as Figure 13.2, except for v.

8. Summary and Consideration

After the start of the U.S. military operation over Afghanistan, a validation study of the BFM in operational mode over the Western Asian region became urgently necessary.

It would have been ideal to run the BFM over Afghanistan, but lack of the availability of meteorological observation data forced the selection of model domains adjacent to Afghanistan. The current version of BFM on the U.S. Army IMETS ABCS_6_2_1_0 was run over Iran and Pakistan model domains and evaluated by comparing surface forecast data to surface observation data. Unfortunately, the availability of observation data is far less than ideal. There were very few upper air sounding data which could be used to initialize the BFM and to compare to forecast data. For surface data, there were 7 stations in the Iran model domain, and only 1 station in the Pakistan model domain. Thus, it is emphasized that the results obtained in this study should be regarded at best as qualitative.

- For surface temperature, the BFM forecast data produced good agreement with observed data with the CC of .81 for the entire data set for the Iran model domain.
- Relative humidity forecasts were also fairly well done by the BFM, with the CC of .65 for the Iranian model domain.
- The BFM showed the tendency of under forecasting wind speed throughout the entire forecast period with the MD of –0.5 m/sec for the Iran domain. Similarly, forecasted values of horizontal wind vector components u and v tended to be smaller than observed values. The CC for wind speed, and u and v were, respectively, .35, .45, and .35 for data covering the entire study period over the Iran model domain.

Questions as to whether the statistical results over Iran can be applied to Afghanistan are difficult to answer. As shown in Table 1, terrain data over Afghanistan show more complexities than the one over Iran, but not as complex as the one over Pakistan. Over the Pakistan model domain, temperature forecast data by the BFM showed fairly good agreement with observation, but based on only 1 station data. In a previous validation study of the BFM over different climatological and topographical areas in the United States (Colorado, Washington, and Florida), no significant differences in statistical parameters for surface wind parameters were obtained.[4]

Western Asia is, in general, not a good region to conduct mesoscale model validation studies because of the limited amount of observed meteorological data. Ideally, the validation study should have been done over the areas with complex topographical feature where a large number of surface and upper air data are regularly available. For instance, the state of Utah area in the United States may be a proper region to conduct such a study with an existing mesoscale meteorological observation network and complex topographical features.

Surface wind analysis data calculated by MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS over Western Asia were also compared with observed data, showing slightly better statistical results than the BFM over Iranian model domain. However, intercomparisons of different models operated over different model domains and periods are not valid comparisons. The results should be regarded at best as qualitative.

Another consideration must be taken into account when comparing observed parameters such as wind speed and vector components, temperature and humidity to model calculations of these parameters. Observed data typically represent brief (~10 min,) averages of each parameter taken from instruments which require regular calibration and tend to characterize the time period at the top of the hour. Model calculations, on the other hand, are more representative of mean values of the parameters over larger temporal and spatial scales.

9. References

Henmi, T. and R. Dumais,Jr. "Description of the Battlescale Forecast Model (BFM)." ARL-TR-1032, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, 1998.

Yamada, T. and S. Bunker. "A numerical Model Study of Nocturnal Drainage Flows with Strong Wind and Temperature Gradients." Journal of Applied Meteorology, 28, pp. 545–554, 1999.

Henmi, T. "Comparison and Evaluation of Operational Mesoscale MM5 and BFM over WSMR." ARL-TR-1476, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, 2000.

Henmi, T. "Evaluation Study of an Operational Mesoscale Forecast Model Over Three Climatologically Different Areas." ARL-TR-1034, U.S. Army Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, 2000.

Acronyms

AD	Absolute difference
AFWA	Air Force Weather Agency
ARL	Army Research Laboratory
AVN	Aviation Model
BFM	Battlescale Forecast Model
CC	Correlation coefficient
HOTMAC	Higher Order Turbulence Model for Atmospheric Operation
IMETS	Integrated Meteorological System
MD	Mean Difference
MM5	Mesoscale Model Version 5
NMSU	New Mexico State University
NOGAPS	Navy Operational Global Atmospheric Prediction Model
PSL	Physical Sciences Laboratory
RMSE	Root mean square error
RMSVE	Root mean square vector error
TVSAT	Tactical VSAT system
UTC	Universal Time Coordinate
WSMR	White Sands Missile Range

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.
PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

1. REPORT DATE *(DD-MM-YYYY)*	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED (From - To)
December 2002	Final	Oct. – Dec. 2001

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Validation Study of Operational Battlescale Forecast Model (BFM) Over Western Asian Regions

5a. CONTRACT NUMBER

5b. GRANT NUMBER

5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER

6. AUTHOR(S)
Teizi Henmi, John W. Raby, John Cruncleton, and Jim Kratzer

5d. PROJECT NUMBER

5e. TASK NUMBER

5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
U.S. Army Research Laboratory
Computational Information Sciences Directorate
Battlefield Environment Division (ATTN: AMSRL-CI-EB)
White Sands Missile Range, NM 88002-5501

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
ARL-TN-118

9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)
U.S. Army Research Laboratory
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)

11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT
The current version of the Battlescale Forecast Model (BFM) on the U.S. Army Integrated Meteorological System was evaluated by comparing the model's forecast data with observed meteorological data. Two model domains adjacent to Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan were selected to run the BFM for 24-hr forecast periods in operational mode. Due to the limited number of observation stations and data, the results obtained in this study should be regarded as qualitative. The following findings were obtained: For surface temperature, the BFM forecast data were in good agreement with the surface observation data for both Iran and Pakistan model domains. Relative humidity forecast by the BFM was also in fair agreement with observation. The BFM showed the tendency to underforecast wind speed throughout the entire forecast period. Similarly, forecast values of horizontal wind vector components u and v tended to be smaller than observed values. Surface wind analysis data calculated by the MM5, AVN, and NOGAPS over western Asia were also compared with the observed data, showing slightly better statistical results than the BFM over the Iranian model domain. Statistical intercomparisons of different models operated over different model domains, grid configuration, and different initialization data were not valid comparisons. It is suggested that a validation study of the BFM be done over the area where a large number of surface and upper air data are regularly available and where topographical features are complex enough to generate diurnal wind patterns, such as Utah.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
mesoscale model, short-range forecast, western Asia, BFM

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			Teizi Henmi
UNCLASSIFIED	UNCLASSIFIED	UNCLASSIFIED	N/A	33	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (*Include area code*) 505-678-3519

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8/98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39.18

Distribution

	Copies
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER DTIC OCA 8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD FT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218	2
COMMANDING GENERAL US ARMY MATERIAL CMD AMCRDA TF 5001 EISENHOWER AVE ALEXANDRIA VA 22333-0001	1
INST FOR ADVNCD TCHNLGY THE UNIV OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN 3925 W BRAKER LN STE 400 AUSTIN TX 78759-5316	1
US MILITARY ACADEMY MATH SCI CTR EXCELLENCE MADN MATH THAYER HALL WEST POINT NY 10996-1786	1
DIRECTOR US ARMY RESEARCH LAB AMSRL D DR D SMITH 2800 POWDER MILL RD ADELPHI MD 20783-1197	1
DIRECTOR US ARMY RESEARCH LAB AMSRL CI AI R 2800 POWDER MILL RD ADELPHI MD 20783-1197	1
DIRECTOR US ARMY RESEARCH LAB AMSRL CI LL 2800 POWDER MILL RD ADELPHI MD 20783-1197	3

DIRECTOR US ARMY RESEARCH LAB AMSRL CI IS T 2800 POWDER MILL RD ADELPHI MD 20783-1197	3
IMETS PROJECT OFFICE ATTN: SFAE-C3T-IE-MET BLDG 1622 RM 131 WSMR NM 88002-5501	5
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB AMSRL CI EB (DR. HENMI) BLDG 1622 RM 228A WSMR NM 88002-5501	20
DR JERRY DAVIS NCSU PO BOX 8208 RALEIGH NC 27650-8208	1
US ARMY CECRL CECRL GP ATTN DR DETSCH HANOVER NH 03755-1290	1
US ARMY ARDEC SMCAR IMI I BLDG 59 DOVER NJ 07806-5000	1
ARMY DUGWAY PROVING GRD STEDP MT DA L 3 DUGWAY UT 84022-5000	1
ARMY DUGWAY PROVING GRD STEDP MT M ATTN MR BOWERS DUGWAY UT 84022-5000	1
DEPT OF THE AIR FORCE OL A 2D WEATHER SQUAD MAC HOLLOMAN AFB NM 88330-5000	1
PL WE KIRTLAND AFB NM 87118-6008	1

USAF ROME LAB TECH 1
CORRIDOR W STE 262 RL SUL
26 ELECTR PKWY BLD 106
GRIFFISS AFB NY 13441-4514

AFMC DOW 1
WRIGHT PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-5000

US ARMY FIELD ARTILLERY SCHOOL 1
ATSF TSM TA
FT SILL OK 73503-5600

US ARMY FOREIGN SCI TECH CTR 1
CM
220 7TH STREET NE
CHARLOTTESVILLE VA 22902-5396

NAVAL SURFACE WEAPONS CTR 1
CODE G63
DAHLGREN VA 22448-5000

US ARMY OEC 1
CSTE EFS
PARK CENTER IV
4501 FORD AVE
ALEXANDRIA VA 22302-1458

US ARMY CORPS OF ENGRS 1
ENGR TOPOGRAPHICS LAB
ETL GS LB
FT BELVOIR VA 22060

US ARMY TOPO ENGR CTR 1
CETEC ZC 1
FT BELVOIR VA 22060-5546

SCI AND TECHNOLOGY 1
101 RESEARCH DRIVE
HAMPTON VA 23666-1340

US ARMY NUCLEAR CML AGCY 1
MONA ZB BLDG 2073
SPRINGFIELD VA 22150-3198

USATRADOC 1
ATCD FA
FT MONROE VA 23651-5170

ATRC WSS R WSMR NM 88002-5502	1
US ARMY RESEARCH LABORATORY AMSRL CI E COMP & INFO SCI DIR WSMR NM 88002-5501	1
DTIC 8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD STE 0944 FT BELVOIR VA 22060-6218	1
US ARMY MISSILE CMND AMSMI REDSTONE ARSENAL AL 35898-5243	1
US ARMY DUGWAY PROVING GRD STEDP3 DUGWAY UT 84022-5000	1
USTRADOC ATCD FA FT MONROE VA 23651-5170	1
WSMR TECH LIBRARY BR STEWS IM IT WSMR NM 88002	1
US ARMY RESEARCH LAB AMSRL D DR D SMITH 2800 POWDER MILL RD ADELPHI MD 20783-1197	1
US ARMY CECOM INFORMATION & INTELLIGENCE WARFARE DIRECTORATE ATTN AMSEL RD IW IP FORT MONMOUTH NJ 07703-5211	1
Record copy	1
TOTAL	54