Signal and noise in regime systems

A hypothesis on the predictability of the NAO

K. Strommen, T. Palmer (Oxford University)

Thanks to the Met Office for providing DePreSys3 data

- Growing evidence of a `signal-to-noise paradox' in winter NAO forecasts.
- See Scaife et al (2014), Eade et al (2014), Dunstone et al (2016), Siegert et al (2016), Scaife and Smith (2018), Baker et al (2018), ...

• <u>MY GOAL</u> → Convince you that paradox may be due to models not representing North Atlantic regimes properly.

• Dunstone et al (2016): our canonical example



• Dunstone et al (2016): our canonical example



- Summarized by three numbers:
 - Corr(EnsMean, Obs) = 0.62 (actual skill)
 - Corr(EnsMean, Mem) = 0.18 (potential predictability)
 - RPC = 2.31
 the `signal-to-noise paradox'

- Siegert et. al (2016) → could be a result of the model having too weak a signal.
- So `paradox' might be due to poorly propagated teleconnections
- Used a simple linear-regression style statistical model.

- On the other hand....
- Many studies suggest the existence of **regimes** are playing a part in modulating North Atlantic variability.
- How might we expect signal-to-noise ratios to look like in a more non-linear regime system?

Outline of talk

- 1. Construct a simple statistical model of the NAO based on regimes.
- 2. Show how the three metrics (actual skill, potential predictability and RPC) behave in this model.
- 3. Show that `signal-to-noise paradox' is normal behavior in this system if the NWP model has bad persistence.

0. What is RPC?



• Eade et al. (2014) provide a **lower bound** for this quantity amenable to computation.

0. What is RPC?

• If the ensemble size is sufficiently large, then their estimate simplifies to just

$$RPC \approx \frac{Corr(EnsMean, Obs)}{Corr(EnsMean, Mem)}$$
 Actual skill
Potential predictability

• Essentially uses the ensemble mean as a proxy for the real world.

• Studies suggest the North Atlantic has anywhere between 2 and 4 distinct regimes (jet stream location, geopotential height patterns, ...)

• Because 2 is an easy number to deal with, we will take a 2-state view of the North Atlantic. Probably too idealized???

• Can easily be expanded to more states (work in progress).

• Courtesy of Met Office website







• Each day the atmosphere resides in one of these states, then moves randomly according to the persistence/transition probabilities.



1. A regime view of the NAO $1-\alpha$ ß В

- Persistence probabilities are fixed at the start of a given DJF
- A DJF mean is then obtained by taking the mean of 90 days sampled using this Markov chain.

- Predictability is induced by **seasonal deviations** of the two persistence probabilities from their climatological means.
- Such deviations will cause the atmosphere to have a preferred regime state during a given DJF → signal in the NAO index.
- **Example**: a preference towards NAO+ regime means more positive daily NAO indices, hence a more positive DJF mean.

2. Representing model skill/error

- How do we represent the imperfect skill that our NWP models have in such a system?
- Need our NWP model to mess up the true persistence probabilities.

2. Representing model skill/error

- Let p_{obs} be the true persistence (of either state), and p_{mod} the corresponding persistence of our NWP model.
- Assumed to be related via a number k, a regime fidelity parameter:

$$k = 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad p_{mod} = p_{obs} + \text{noise}$$

$$k = 0 \rightarrow p_{mod} = 1/2 + \text{noise}$$

2. Representing model skill/error

• In other words, the model error considered is weak persistence.



• Almost all relevant parameters/distributions are fitted to ERA-Interim.

• `Regime fidelity' parameter k is left free: we let this vary to capture variations in model skill/error.

• Given a choice of k, we simulate 1000s of 35-year long, 40-member hindcasts and see what happens!



- Actual skill (blue)
- Potential predictability (red)
- Shading = 95% conf. intervals



- At this low level of skill, 40 ensemble members are not enough to robustly estimate true RPC!
- True RPC goes to ∞ while estimate goes to fixed *finite* limit.
- So true RPC still > 1



- Can we reproduce DePreSys3 values?
- Yes! E.g. with k=0.3, expected values of three key numbers are:
 - Corr(EnsMean, Obs) = 0.63
 - Corr(EnsMean, Mem) = 0.19

Virtually identical to actual DePreSys3 numbers

• RPC = 2.28



 With 200 ensemble members, correlation saturates at a maximum of around 0.75 ± 0.2

• This is maximum skill that can be expected in this system.



- More ensemble members → better RPC estimate
- With 1000 members, get $RPC = 3.2 \pm 0.5$
- Definitely >> 1!





CONCLUSION

- `Signal-to-noise paradox' is *expected* in a bimodal regime system.
- Predictability in this system comes from persistence probabilities: if your model has systematic problems capturing them, get high RPC, even with perfect teleconnections!
- Suggests `paradox' may be a result of poor regime structure in NWP models. Known problem in many models.
- Unless the model skill is sufficiently high then a large ensemble (>100 members) is needed to robustly estimate the RPC. *Show caution...*