

#### Challenges and prospects for dynamical cores of oceanic models across all scales

Florian Lemarié, Hans Burchard, Knut Klingbeil, Laurent Debreu

#### ► To cite this version:

Florian Lemarié, Hans Burchard, Knut Klingbeil, Laurent Debreu. Challenges and prospects for dynamical cores of oceanic models across all scales. PDEs on the sphere, Apr 2019, Montreal, Canada. hal-02418199

#### HAL Id: hal-02418199 https://inria.hal.science/hal-02418199v1

Submitted on 18 Dec 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



florian.lemarie@inria.fr Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inria, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LJK, 38000 Grenoble, France

**Context:** the ocean model developers community has had the tendency to be split depending on target applications (global vs coastal) and on the type of horizontal grids (structured vs unstructured)



FIRST COMMODORE WORKSHOP: COMMUNITY FOR HE NUMERICAL MODELING OF THE GLOBAL. REGIONAL, AND COASTAL OCEAN

WHAT: A total of 47 participants from 9 countries representing 15 different oceanic numerica ing of future challenges in the design of oceanic dynamical cores WHEN: 17–19 September 2018 WHERE: Paris, France

## 1 - Major differences compared to atmospheric modeling

Horizontal velocities $U$	
Sound speed $c_s$	
External gravity waves $c_0$	0
Internal gravity waves $c_1$	0
First deformation radius	

	Atmosphere	Ocean
	$10 {\rm \ m\ s^{-1}}$	$0.1 \mathrm{~m~s^{-}}$
	$\sim 340 \mathrm{~m~s^{-1}}$	$\sim 1500 \text{ m s}$
0	$\sim 300 \mathrm{~m~s^{-1}}$	$\sim 100~{ m m~s}$
	$\sim 100 \mathrm{~m~s^{-1}}$	$\sim 1 \mathrm{~m~s^{-}}$
	<b>O(</b> 100 km <b>)</b>	<b>O(</b> 10 km

	$0.1 {\rm ~m~s^{-1}}$		
	$\sim 1500 \mathrm{~m~s^{-1}}$		
L	$\sim 100 \ {\rm m \ s^{-1}}$		
L	$\sim 1 \ { m m \ s^{-1}}$		
	<b>O(</b> 10 km)		

- Density variations are quite small compared to the mean density  $\Rightarrow$  Boussinesq approximation is valid ( $\rightarrow$  no acoustic modes)
- Validity of hydrostatic balance ( $\delta^2 Fr^2 \ll 1$ ): in the ocean the hydrostatic balance is violated approximately for L < 1 km and weak stratification
- $\Rightarrow$  Oceanic non-hydrostatic models are at an early development stage
- Stiffness ( $c_0 \gg c_1$ ): fast modes are meteorologically important (i.e. accuracy matters) and propagate horizontally

 $\Rightarrow$  Split-explicit treatment of 2D barotropic mode (+ consistency enforcement)

- Away from boundary layers, tracers are stirred and mixed preferentially along isopycnal surfaces :  $\kappa_{dia} \approx 10^{-5} \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  (e.g. Ledwell et al., 1993);  $\kappa_{iso} \approx 10^3 \text{ m}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  (for  $L_x \approx 100 \text{ km}$ )  $\Rightarrow$  Strong constraint on the choice of vert. coord. & tracer advection/remapping schemes
- Complex geometry (but no "Pole problem")  $\Rightarrow$  Computational domain is bounded with irregular boundaries
- Vacuum states (wetting and drying)  $\Rightarrow$  Volume-conserving treatment of dry states and non-negativity of water heights

# 2 - Overview of equations and associated modeling assumptions

### Geometric assumptions

spherical geoid, traditional shallow-fluid ▶ fixed bathymetry  $(-H(x,y) \le z \le \eta(x,y,t))$ 

### Boussinesq

• *in-situ* density  $\rho \rightarrow \rho_0$  except when associated with the gravitational term

### ► Hydrostatic

- Thermodynamically consistent description of seawater (Gibbs function) • Potential temperature  $\theta$  is replaced by the
- conservative temperature  $\Theta = h_0/c_p^0$ .
- Mode splitting: fast surface gravity waves are integrated separately (depth independent barotropic mode approximation)

Baroclinic (internal) mode

$$\begin{cases} \frac{D\mathbf{u}_{h}}{Dt} = -f\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{u}_{h} - \frac{\nabla_{h}p}{\rho_{0}} - \frac{\partial_{z}p}{\partial_{z}p} = -g\rho \\ \partial_{z}p = -g\rho \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0 \\ \frac{D\Theta}{Dt} = \frac{1}{\rho_{0}C_{p}}\partial_{z}\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{F}_{\Theta}; \quad \frac{D}{\mathcal{I}} \\ \rho = \rho_{\text{eos}}(\Theta, S_{\text{A}}, z) \end{cases}$$

Kinematic surface boundary condition:

 $w|_{z=\eta} = \partial_t \eta + \mathbf{u}_h(z=\eta) \cdot \nabla_h \eta + (E-P)$ 

► Barotropic (external) mode (  $\overline{\mathbf{u}} = \int_{-H}^{\eta} \mathbf{u}_h \, dz$  )  $\partial_t \eta = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}_h \cdot (D \overline{\mathbf{u}}) - (E - P)$  $\partial_t (D\overline{\mathbf{u}}) = -Df\mathbf{k} \times \overline{\mathbf{u}} - gD\nabla_h \eta + D\mathcal{F}_{3D \to 2D}$  $\mathcal{F}_{3D \rightarrow 2D}$ : baroclinic-to-barotropic forcing.

# Challenges and prospects for dynamical cores of oceanic models across all scales

Florian Lemarié<sup>1</sup>, Hans Burchard, Knut Klingbeil, and Laurent Debreu A. Adcroft (Princeton, USA), A. Androsov (AWI, Ger.), H. Arango (Rutgers, USA), E. Audusse (LAGA, Fr.), S. Bachman (NCAR, USA), M. Bell (MetOffice, UK), R. Benshila (LEGOS, Fr.), M. Bentsen (Uni, Nor.), J. Berntsen (Bergen, Nor.), E. Blayo (UGA, Fr.), J.-M. Campin (MIT, USA), J. Chanut (Mercator, Fr.), E. Chassignet (COAPS, USA), S. Danilov (AWI, Ger.), C. Eldred (Inria, Fr.), D. Engwirda (Columbia, USA), R. Hallberg (GFDL, USA), M. Iskandarani (FSU, USA), T. Kärnä (FMI, Fin.), N. Kevlahan (McMaster, Can.), P. Korn (MPI, Ger.), D. Le Roux (ICJ, Fr.), M. Losch (AWI, Ger.), G. Madec (LOCEAN, Fr.), G. Marques (NCAR, USA), P. Marsaleix (LA, Fr.), M. Petersen (LANL, USA), J. Sainte-Marie (Inria, Fr.), A. Shao (UVIC, Can.), P. Wolfram (LANL, USA), J. Zhang (VIMS, USA)

#### **3 - Brief overview of some existing dynamical cores** Prima website app https://www.croco-ocean.org/ Croco FESOM https://fesom.de/ GETM https://getm.eu/ Hycom https://hycom.org/ ICON-O https://www.mpimet.mpg.de/en/science/ models/icon-esm/icon-o/ MITgcm http://mitgcm.org/ https://github.com/NOAA-GFDL/ MOM6 MOM6-examples/wiki MPAS-O https://mpas-dev.github.io/ NEMO https://www.nemo-ocean.eu/ Roms-Rutgers https://www.myroms.org/ SCHISM http://ccrm.vims.edu/schismweb/ Suntans https://sourceforge.net/p/suntans/ http://sirocco.obs-mip.fr/ Symphonie ocean-models/s-model/ http://thetisproject.org/ Thetis instructured Summary of realistic oceanic models widely used by the research and operational community. Table 1 Model Discretization technique FESOM triangular B-grid FV **ICON-O** triangular C-grid modified $RT_0 - R$

**MPAS-O** hexagonal C-grid

**SCHISM** triangles or quads

**Thetis** triangles or quads

 $+ g oldsymbol{
abla}_h \eta + oldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}_{ ext{phys}}$ 

 $\frac{\partial S_{A}}{\partial t} = \mathcal{F}_{S_{A}}$ 

Table 2: Overview of the main characteristics of some unstructured grid models.

FV

FE

FE

# 4 - Some prospects for oceanic dynamical cores

 $P_1 - P_1^{N_1}$ 

 $P_1^{\mathrm{DG}} - P_1^{\mathrm{DG}}$ 



- 1. Pseudo-compressible approach (Auclair et al., 2018) {Croco, SNH}
- 3. Artificial compressibility method (ACM) (Lee et al., 2006) {Symphonie}
- 4. Diagnostic approach for NH pressure (Klingbeil and Burchard, 2013) {GETM}





Lagrangian Dynamics

horiz. grid	NH option
structured	Yes
unstructured	
structured	Yes
structured	
unstructured	
structured	Yes
structured	
unstructured	
structured	
structured	
unstructured	
unstructured	Yes
structured	Yes
	horiz. grid structured unstructured structured unstructured unstructured structured structured unstructured unstructured unstructured unstructured

ization	Mesh	Mode splitting		
-	Arbitrary	SPI		
١o	Orthogonal	SPI		
-	Orthogonal	SPE		
١o	Arbitrary	No		
oe	Orthogonal	SPI		
structured arid models				

- Challenges for unstructured meshes: High-order methods and Local time-stepping
- Discrete closing of the energy budget
- Design of energy-conserving space and time discretizations
- Stable and consistent coupling with other Earth-system compartments
- Multi-resolution strategies with local adaptation of model equations

## 6 - Toward a "DCMIP-like" test-case suite



### Any suggestion for semi-idealized testcases are welcome

- $\blacksquare$  Eden, C., 2016. Closing the energy cycle in an ocean model. Ocean Modell. 101, 30 42.
- Modeling in an Eddying Regime. AGU, USA. volume 177 of *Geophysical Monograph Series*, p. 350.
- models: State of the art and future perspectives. Ocean Modell. 125, 80 105.
- models across all scales. Bull. Amer. Meteorol. Soc. 100(3), ES109–ES115.

### 5 - Challenges

Energy consistency and resolved/unresolved scales coupling

# Control of energy, non-negativity and dry states for nonlinear scalar conservation laws

(e.g. interactions between ocean sea ice and ice shelves



via super-parameterization (Campin et al., 2011)



via automatic selection of NH zones (Androsov et al.)

the non-hydrostati

#### References

Griffies, S., Adcroft, A., 2008. Formulating the Equations of ocean models, in: Hecht, M., Hasumi, H. (Eds.), Ocean

IOC, SCOR and IAPSO, 2010. The international thermodynamic equation of seawater - 2010: Calculation and use of thermodynamic properties. Technical Report. Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission. UNESCO.

Klingbeil, K., Lemarié, F., Debreu, L., Burchard, H., 2018. The numerics of hydrostatic structured-grid coastal ocean

Lemarié, F., Burchard, H., Debreu, L., Klingbeil, K., Sainte-Marie, J., 2019. Advancing dynamical cores of oceanic