

The Maritime Continent Prediction Barrier: Traversing vs. Collapsing observed MJO events



Augustin Vintzileos⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾ and Jon Gottschalck⁽²⁾

(1)ESSIC - University of Maryland (2)CPC/NCEP/NWS/NOAA

Representation of a strong MJO event: March 1981 Abstract Singular Value Decomposition of Traversing versus Collapsing MJO events In previous work we have shown that the most important factor hampering forecast skill for predictions of the MJO with the CFS is the Maritime Continent Prediction Barrier. In this model, eastward propagating organized convective activity associated with the MJO loses its coherence and finally MUU trajectory for the 1981 event. Rev 1200 anomaly field Traversing MJO events Collapsing MJO events collapses as it enters the Maritime Continent. This behavior was subsequently found in most of the operational forecast models Observations show that, at times, the Maritime 1100 marsh Continent can also act as a barrier to the MJO. Understanding Maritime the reasons for the intermittent action of the Maritime Continent 117-MAK-11167. Continent as a barrier would allow to incorporate the related 10-4 3- 901 physical parameterizations into forecast models. This would increase the forecast skill for the MJO. The first step towards this understanding is to classify observed MJO events that traversed the Maritime Continent or collapsed over it. 200 101 200 In this paper we consider upper level (200hPa) zonal flow from the Reanalysis-2 data set and daily OLR Figure 2 The March 1981 strong MJO event in EOF space. The Maritime observations. We classify observed MJO events as traversing Figure 3 The March-April 1981 strong MJO in geometrical space (a) as Continent is found at around (-1,0) ting to the two first EOFs and (b) ra or collapsing and describe some fundamental differences between them A simplified MJO metric Classification of observed MJO events in Traversing and Collapsing 1. We consider daily mean zonal wind at 200hPa averaged between 20S-20N 2. We remove the mean annual cycle and zonal mean. ce for 1981-2007 MJO events and o circle (red) 06-0.04-0.03-0.02-0.010.01.0.02.0.03.0.04.0.06.0.02 1.06-0.04-0.03-0.02-0.010.01 0.02 0.03 0.04 0.06 0.07 We filter the signal using a 120 days running mean, compute the EOEs and subtract the three first components from the Figure 8 SVD analysis between Traversing MJO events as seen from the daily values i.e., extracting the ENSO signal. Figure 9 As in Figure 8 for Collapsing events. nal index and QLB anomalies Maritime Maritime 4. The two first EOFs of the filtered signal correspond to the Contine Continent MJO. Projection of these EOFs to observed data provide a two-dimensional phase space plot on the status of the MJO. Sum of the squares of these two first projections indicates the 'energy' of the MJO mode. 5. During the 2002 - 2006 period (a period with no significant ENSO) this simplified MJO index is very similar to the Wheeler Hendon RMM index Figure 5 Classification algorithm. We consider all events with an amplitude exceeding one standard deviation occurring in the Indian Ocean. Events that are crossing the Maritime Continent maintaining an amplitude higher than one standard deviation are characterized as Traversing. Collapsing are events of Figure 4 The 1981 - 2007 period as seen by the simplified standardized MJO events in the 1981 – 2007 period which amplitude drops bellow one standard deviation Conclusions raversing (blue) vs. Collapsing (red) events Forecasts of the MJO with coupled models are hampered by the Maritime Continent Prediction Barrier. In ng MJO even sing MJO ever the model world organized convection associated with the MJO collapses as it crosses the Maritime Continent. · However, we show that observed MJO can also collapse over the Maritime Continent. • Traversing and Collapsing MJO events show a different structure in organized convection in the Indian Ocean. It is therefore possible to predict which MJO event will eventually Traverse or Collapse on the Maritime Continent as soon as it develops in the Indian Ocean. This means that there is no physical reason behind the Maritime Continent Prediction Barrier. Therefore, we should expect significant improvement in MJO forecast skill as numerical models improve. Figure 6 Summary of Traversing (blue trajectories) vs. Collapsing (red trajectories) for the 1981-2007 period Figure 7 Reconstruction of the MJO mode by projection on the two first EOFs. Examples of Traversing (left panel) vs. Collapsing (right panel) MJO events Figure 1 The sum of the squares of the two first principle components.