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## 1. Why 2 m analyses of $\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ ?

Data Assimilation cycle in ARPEGE is defined as shown bellow.


Next diagram presents Upper-air Analysis and Surface Analysis in Assimilation cycle


Upper-air Analysis
$A_{F}$ and $G_{F}$ are filtered
Surface Analysis is performed with Upper-air Analysis. Analysis is performed on next Surface parameters ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{S}}, \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{P}}, \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}, \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{P}}, \mathrm{SNS}$ )

Surface Analysis is performed in 4 steps:
a) computation of Obs - Guess,
b) control of observation to the Guess,
c) 2 m analyses $\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}, \mathrm{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$,
d) analyses of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{S}}, \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{P}}, \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}, \mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{P}}$ and relaxation for SNS.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)^{\mathrm{A}}-\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)^{\mathrm{G}}=\left(\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}\right)^{\mathrm{A}}-\left(\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}\right)^{\mathrm{G}}=\Delta \mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}} \\
& \left(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{P}}\right)^{A}-\left(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{P}}\right)^{\mathrm{G}}=1 / \tau \Delta \mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}} \\
& \left(\mathrm{~W}_{S}\right)^{A}-\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}\right)^{\mathrm{G}}=\alpha_{\mathrm{T}} \Delta \mathrm{~T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}+\alpha_{\mathrm{H}} \Delta \mathrm{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}} \\
& \left(\mathrm{~W}_{\mathrm{P}}\right)^{\mathrm{A}}-\left(\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{P}}\right)^{\mathrm{G}}=\beta_{\mathrm{T}} \Delta \mathrm{~T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}+\beta_{\mathrm{H}} \Delta \mathrm{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha_{T}, \alpha_{H}, \beta_{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\beta_{\mathrm{H}}$ are functions of soil texture, vegetation, local solar time, LAI $/ \mathrm{R}_{\text {smin }}$ ( leaf area index/min. surface resistance ) cloudiness and other met. fields ( wind, rain, snow, ...)

## 2. Description of $\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2 m}}$ Analysis

Univariates Optimal Interpolation Analysis is performed in operational ARPEGE. Variables are $\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ because they are input for Analysis of other surface fields.

For Surface Analysis Observation data from SYNOP, BUOY and SHIP are used.

For $\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ Analysis just $\mathrm{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}$ data are used

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{A}}=\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}+\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{15} \alpha_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\left(\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{O}}\right)_{\mathrm{i}}-\left(\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}\right)_{\mathrm{i}}\right) \\
& \mathbf{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{A}}=\mathbf{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}+\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{15} \alpha_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\left(\mathbf{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{o}}\right)_{\mathrm{i}}-\left(\mathbf{H}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}\right)_{\mathrm{i}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Control of Observations in operational suite is performed just with Control to the Guess like it is shown below.

Control to the Guess if $\frac{|\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{G}|}{\sqrt{\sigma_{0}^{2}+\sigma_{\mathbf{G}}^{2}}}>\mathbf{k}$ then observation is rejected.
No Quality Control $\frac{|\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{A}|}{\sqrt{\sigma_{0}^{2}+\sigma_{\mathbf{A}}^{2}}}>\mathbf{k}^{\prime}$. In case of local storm data are rejected with control of the Guess, but with Quality Control that information about storm will be in the Analysis.

Correlation function is supposed to be isotropic and homogenous. No vertical correlation for the Surface fields. Correlation function is defined with next function:
$\rho_{12}=\exp \left(-\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{2}} \frac{\mathbf{r}^{2}}{\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{2}}}\right)$, where r is the distance between two points.
Closest 15 points are used to compute Analysis in model point with next equation:

$$
\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{A}}=\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}+\sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{15} \alpha_{i}\left(\left(\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{O}}\right)_{\mathrm{i}}-\left(\mathbf{T}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathbf{G}}\right)_{\mathrm{i}}\right)
$$


$\alpha$ are optimal known background and observation point statistics and is computed from next matrix equation.
$\overline{\overline{\mathbf{B}}}=\left[\rho_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{G}}\right]$ - background covariance matrix $1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq 15,1 \leq \mathrm{j} \leq 15$
$(\overline{\overline{\mathbf{B}}}+\overline{\overline{\mathbf{O}}}) \bar{\alpha}_{\mathbf{i}}=\overline{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{i}} \quad \overline{\overline{\mathbf{O}}}=\left[\rho_{\mathrm{o}}^{\mathrm{o}}\right] \quad$ - Obs covariance matrix $1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq 15,1 \leq \mathrm{j} \leq 15$
$\overline{\mathbf{C}_{i}}=\left[\rho_{j}^{G}\right] \quad$ - background error covariance between grid points and observation points $1 \leq \mathrm{j} \leq 15$

## 3. Statistical model

Canari is OI Analysis, and it changes the Guess value of the variable in model grid points. How much it will change the value depends on the standard deviation of the Observations and the standard deviation of the Guess and of course on correlation coefficient.

Operational values in ARPEGE namelist are:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\sigma_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}=2.3^{\circ} \mathrm{C} & \sigma_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}^{\mathrm{G}}=0.17=17 \% & \sigma^{\mathrm{G}}=\sigma_{\text {namelist }}^{\mathrm{G}} * \exp \left[-\alpha\left(\mathbf{m}-\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{m}}\right)\right]^{2} \\
\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=350 \mathrm{~km} & \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=300 \mathrm{~km} & \mathbf{a}^{\mathrm{G}}=\mathbf{a}_{\text {namelist }}^{\mathrm{G}} * \exp \left[-\alpha\left(\mathbf{m}-\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{m}}\right)\right]
\end{array}
$$

$\alpha=0.02$ is coefficient that defines how much namelist values will be changed dependency of stretching factor $\mathrm{m}, 1 / 3.5<\mathrm{m}<3.5$.

Extreme values for operational run are in the table bellow.

|  | France $(\mathrm{m}=3.5)$ | Antipode $(\mathrm{m}=1 / 3.5)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sigma^{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}{ }^{\circ}$ | $2.02^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $2.61^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\sigma^{\mathrm{H}} 2 \mathrm{~m}$ | $14.9 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}$ | 328 km | 376 km |
| $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}$ | 281 km | 320 km |

These values were similar to the values when CANARI was used operationally in Assimilation cycles and for Upper-air Analyses and for Surface Analyses, because at that time it was possible to have common statistical model. That is the reason why the new statistics are calculated.

## 4. Calculation of correlation and stand. deviations of Obs and Guess errors

Using a comparison between Obs and 6 hours forecast it is possible to calculate coefficient of correlation and standard deviation of Obs and Guess.

Mean difference between Obs and Guess is defined with the following formula:

$$
\overline{(\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{G})^{2}}=\overline{(\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{T}+\mathbf{T}-\mathbf{G})^{2}}=\overline{(\mathbf{O}-\mathbf{T})^{2}+\mathbf{2 ( O - T ) ( T - G ) + ( T - G ) ^ { 2 }}}=\sigma_{0}^{2}+\sigma_{G}^{2}
$$

where O is value of Observation, G is value of the Guess and T is True value which is not known. It is supposed that correlation between error of Guess and error of Obs is $=0$.

Mean difference between Obs and Guess at two points is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \overline{\left(\mathbf{O}_{1}-\mathbf{G}_{1}\right)\left(\mathbf{O}_{2}-\mathbf{G}_{2}\right)}=\overline{\left[\left(\mathbf{O}_{1}-\mathbf{T}_{1}\right)+\left(\mathbf{T}_{1}-\mathbf{G}_{1}\right)\right]\left[\left(\mathbf{O}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{2}\right)+\left(\mathbf{T}_{2}-\mathbf{G}_{2}\right)\right.}=\mid \text { all Guess Obs correlation }=0 \mid= \\
& =\overline{\left(\mathbf{O}_{1}-\mathbf{T}_{1}\right)\left(\mathbf{O}_{2}-\mathbf{T}_{2}\right)+\left(\mathbf{T}_{1}-\mathbf{G}_{1}\right)\left(\mathbf{T}_{2}-\mathbf{G}_{2}\right)}=\overline{\left(\mathbf{T}_{1}-\mathbf{G}_{1}\right)\left(\mathbf{T}_{2}-\mathbf{G}_{2}\right)}=\rho_{12}^{G} \sigma_{\mathbf{G}_{1}} \sigma_{\mathbf{G}_{2}}=\rho_{\mathbf{G}}^{G} \sigma_{\mathbf{G}}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is supposed that correlation between Observation errors in two points is $=0$.
Because correlation coefficient is a function of the distance between two points, mean difference between Obs and Guess ( $\overline{\left(\mathbf{O}_{1}-\mathbf{G}_{1}\right)\left(\mathbf{O}_{2}-\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)}$ ) is divided in 14 equidistance classes ( 40 km ) in calculations.

## 5. Results of statistical calculations

Correlation coefficients are calculated separately for different domains. Calculations are made for every $3^{\text {rd }}$ day in December 2000 and June 2001 for 00 run for 4 domains. For Europe domain calculations are made for December 2000 January, February, Jun, July and August 2001.


Picture 1. Coefficient of correlation dependency to distance between points for different domains, black line represents operational coefficient of correlation, and yellow the new definition

Because the correlation function $\rho_{12}=\exp \left(-\frac{1}{\mathbf{2}} \frac{\mathbf{r}^{2}}{\mathbf{a}^{2}}\right.$ ) does not fit the empirical correlation coefficient, the new function $\rho_{12}=\exp \left(-\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{2}} \frac{\mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{a}}\right)$ is tested.

Namelist values for tested function are:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\sigma^{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{~T} 2 \mathrm{~m}=1.7{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} & \sigma^{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}=0.13=13 \% \\
\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=105 \mathrm{~km} & \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=101 \mathrm{~km} \\
\alpha=0.05 . &
\end{array}
$$

Extreme values for the test run are in the table bellow.

|  | France $(\mathrm{m}=3.5)$ | Antipode $(\mathrm{m}=1 / 3.5)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sigma^{\mathrm{G}}{ }_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}$ | $1.23{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | $2.34{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ |
| $\sigma^{\mathrm{G}} \mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}$ | $17.9 \%$ |  |
| $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}$ | $9.4 \%$ | 123 km |
| $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}$ | 89 km | 119 km |

## Dependency on the domain

Correlation coefficient multiplied with square of standard deviation of Guess dependency to distance between points for different domains for December 2000 and June 2001, and with dashed line results with the first assumption for standard deviation of Guess and radius for new function are shown on the following picture. On the next two pictures it is obvious that there is not enough data in Australian and African domain, curves from those are not smooth like it is case for Europe.


Picture 2. Correlation coefficient multiplied with square of standard deviation of Guess dependency to distance between points for different domains for December 2000 and June 2001, with dashed line results with the first assumption for standard deviation of Guess and radius for new function

## Dependency to time of the year

For Europe statistical calculations are made for 6 months, variation is not that big like it is for the other domains. Red and dark blue line are minimum and maximum of multiplied coefficient of correlation and squared standard deviation of Guess. If the value for temperature is higher then the value for humidity is lower when we compare them with mean values for all 6 months.


Picture 3. Coefficient of correlation multiplied with square of standard deviation of Guess dependency to distance between points for Europe for 6 months

## 6. Definition of new and old function and namelists parameters

Next pictures will present the difference between new and old definition of parameters. Operational definition is presented with full lines and in legends with letter O , new definition is presented with dashed lines and with letter T .


Picture 4. Coefficient of correlation dependency to distance between points for old (O-operational) and new (T-test) for stretching coefficient ( $1 / 3.5,1 \& 3.5$ )


Picture 5. Coefficient of correlation dependency to stretching coefficient for different distance between points for old (O-operational) and new (T-test) function


Picture 6. Standard deviation of 2 m Temperature dependency to stretching coefficient for old (Ooperational) and new (T-test) function


Picture 7. Standard deviation of Relative Humidity on 2 m dependency to stretching coefficient for old (O-operational) and new (T-test) function

## 7. One point tests

## Impact on $2 \mathbf{m}$ Temperature

In one grid point 2 m Temperature Obs value is different from the Guess value for $+2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Impacts over Europe and Australia are shown on the following pictures. Amplitude and radius for one point impact is smaller with the new function and the new standard deviation of Guess.


Picture 8. Impact of $2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ difference between Guess and Observation in a single point over Europe and Australia for 2 m Temperature for old (OPER-operational) and new (TEST-test) function

## Impact on 2 m Relative Humidity

In one grid point 2 m Relative Humidity Obs value is different from the Guess value for -0.2 . Impacts over Europe and Australia are shown on the following pictures. Like it is for 2 m Temperature, amplitude and radius for one point impact is smaller with the new function and the new standard deviation of Guess.


Picture 8. Impact of 0.2 difference between Guess and Observation in a single point over Europe and Australia for 2 m Relative Humidity for old (OPER-operational) and new (TEST-test) function

## 8. Difference between Operational and Test experiment

Analysis in Observation points is calculated as mean value of Analysis values in 4 nearest model points. That mean values were compared with Observation values.

## 2 m Temperature

Experiment was performed for $15^{\text {th }}$ August 2001 for 12 UTC.


Picture 9. Difference between Analysis and Guess with operational (OPER) and test (TEST) function and namelist for 2 m Temperature

Amplitude and radius of changes are smaller with the new function and new values in namelist.


Picture 10. Difference between Analysis and Guess with operational (OPER) and test (TEST) function and namelist for 2 m Temperature over Europe


Picture 11. Difference between two Analyses, test (TEST) and operational (OPER) for 2 m Temperature


Picture 12. Absolute value of Observation and Analysis differences of 2 m Temperature difference between new (TEST) and operational (OPER) analysis

Highest changes between two analyses are over the sea, especially on the western coasts of Americas, Africa and Australia, high mountains and in Polar Regions. In Europe the largest impact is in Alps and Pyrenees region.

It looks like that better scores are over land for Test analysis and over sea, especially Pacific Ocean. Over Europe it is very hard to distinguish which analysis is better.
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Picture 13. Difference between two Analyses, test (TEST) and operational (OPER) for 2 m Temperature over Europe


Picture 14. Absolute value of Observation and Analysis differences of 2 m Temperature difference between new (TEST) and operational (OPER) analysis over Europe

## 2 m Relative Humidity

Experiment was performed for $15^{\text {th }}$ August 2001 for 12 UTC.

CLSHUMI.RELATIVE
ANALYSE-GUESS OPER ARPEGE


CLSHUMI.RELATIVE
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Picture 15. Difference between Analysis and Guess with operational (OPER) and test (TEST) function and namelist for 2 m Relative Humidity

Amplitude and radius of changes are smaller with the new function and new values in namelist, same like for 2 m Temperature.

On next page zoom area over Europe is shown.
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Picture 16. Difference between Analysis and Guess with operational (OPER) and test (TEST) function and namelist for 2 m Relative Humidity over Europe


Picture 17. Difference between two Analyses, test (TEST) and operational (OPER) for 2 m Relative Humidity
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Picture 18. Absolute value of Observation and Analysis differences of 2 m Relative Humidity difference between new (TEST) and operational (OPER) analysis

For difference between two Analyses largest impact is near the western coasts of Americas, Africa and Australia. Over the Europe the largest impact is in France (may bee storm), north Italy and eastern Spain.

From the picture it looks like that the scores are better over sea for Operational, and over land for Test analysis. Over the Europe it looks like that the tested analysis is better.


Picture 19. Difference between two Analyses, test (TEST) and operational (OPER) for 2 m Relative Humidity over Europe
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Picture 20. Absolute value of Observation and Analysis differences of 2 m Relative Humidity difference between new (TEST) and operational (OPER) analysis over Europe

## 9. Bias and RMS statistics for different Domain

In next tables, results of statistics for different Domains for 2 runs on $15^{\text {th }}$ August 200012 and 18 UTC for 2 m Temperature and 2 m Relative Humidity are shown. Operational is with $\mathbf{O}$ and the new with $\mathbf{T}$.

Table 1. Domains for statistics computation

| DOMAIN | LAT_NORTH | LAT_SOUTH | LON_EAST | LON_WEST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRANCE | 51.00 | 43.00 | 8.00 | -5.00 |
| EUROPE | 60.00 | 35.00 | 20.00 | -10.00 |
| ALA_FR | 57.00 | 33.00 | 25.00 | -12.00 |
| N_AM_N | 70.00 | 40.00 | -60.00 | -130.00 |
| N_AM_S | 40.00 | 10.00 | -70.00 | -120.00 |
| S_AM_N | 10.00 | -20.00 | -30.00 | -80.00 |
| S_AM_S | -20.00 | -50.00 | -40.00 | -80.00 |
| N_ATLA | 70.00 | 10.00 | -20.00 | -60.00 |
| AUSTRA | -10.00 | -40.00 | 160.00 | 110.00 |
| AFRI_N | 35.00 | 0.00 | 50.00 | -20.00 |
| AFRI_S | 0.00 | -35.00 | 50.00 | 10.00 |
| EUAS_E | 70.00 | 40.00 | 80.00 | 25.00 |
| EUAS_W | 70.00 | 20.00 | 150.00 | 80.00 |
| PACI_N | 50.00 | 10.00 | -120.00 | -180.00 |
| PACI_S | 10.00 | -60.00 | -85.00 | -180.00 |
| NOR_PO | 90.00 | 70.00 | 180.00 | -180.00 |
| SOU_PO | -60.00 | -90.00 | 180.00 | -180.00 |
| S_ATLA | 0.00 | -60.00 | 10.00 | -40.00 |
| PACI_W | 50.00 | 0.00 | 180.00 | 140.00 |
| IND_OC | 10.00 | -60.00 | 100.00 | 50.00 |

Table 2. Bias and RMS for 2 m Temperature on different Domains for 12 UTC and 18 UTC runs

| 20010815 r 12 |  |  |  | 20010815 r 18 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| obs_ana_T2M_T.dta_obs_ana_T2M_O.dta |  |  |  | obs_ana_T2M_T.dta obs_ana_T2M_O.dta |  |  |  |  |
| WORLD Nb. Points $=60006000$ |  |  |  | WORLD Nb. Points= 56985698 |  |  |  |  |
| bias= | 0.915642 | bias= | 0.939620 | bias= | 0.860416 | bias= | 0.859919 |  |
| rms= | 2.406641 | rms= | 2.499656 | rms= | 2.350288 | rms= | 2.426732 |  |
| FRANCE Nb. Points= 691697 |  |  |  | FRANCE Nb. Points= |  |  | 637643 |  |
| bias= | 0.834399 | bias= | 0.803027 | bias= | 0.731397 | bias= | 0.694977 |  |
| rms= | 2.488198 | rms= | 2.558691 | rms= | 2.275484 | rms= | 2.330768 |  |
| EUROPE Nb. Points= 16911694 |  |  |  | EUROPE Nb. Points= 16191622 |  |  |  |  |
| bias= | 0.753542 | bias= | 0.744191 | bias= | 0.628851 | bias= | 0.597916 |  |
| rms= | 2.393936 | rms= | 2.520186 | rms= | 2.332144 | rms= | 2.442965 |  |
| ALA_FR Nb. Points= 16851690 |  |  |  | ALA_FR Nb. Points $=16271632$ |  |  |  |  |
| bias= | 0.806030 | bias= | 0.787077 | bias= | 0.689047 | bias= | 0.641912 |  |
| rms= | 2.431005 | rms= | 2.553799 | rms= | 2.398921 | rms= | 2.509262 |  |
| N AM N Nb. Points= 562565 |  |  |  | N_AM_N Nb. Points= |  |  | 556559 |  |
| bias= | 1.014057 | bias= | 1.088708 | bias= | 0.980396 | bias= | 0.998050 |  |
| rms= | 2.581394 | rms= | 2.756255 | rms= | 2.450257 | rms= | 2.592718 |  |
| N_AM_S Nb. Points $=210211$ |  |  |  | N_AM S Nb. Points= |  |  | 213214 |  |
| bias= | 0.689762 | bias= | 0.831185 | bias= | 1.013803 | bias= | 0.904019 |  |
| rms= | 2.122716 | rms= | 2.217592 | rms= | 2.205433 | rms= | 2.254005 |  |

Table 2. Bias and RMS for 2 m Temperature on different Domains for 12 UTC and 18 UTC runs


Table 3. Bias and RMS for 2 m Relative Humidity on different Domains for 12 UTC and 18 UTC runs

| 20010815 r 12 | $20010815 \mathrm{r18}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| obs_ana_H2M_T.dta obs ana H2M O.dta | obs_ana H2M_T.dta obs ana H2M O.dta |
| WORLD Nb. Points= 56025602 | WORLD Nb. Points= 53595359 |
| bias $=0.013183$ bias $=0.014468$ | bias $=0.011493$ bias $=0.014462$ |
| $\mathrm{rms}=0.082589 \mathrm{rms}=0.090244$ | rms $=0.089975$ rms $=0.095807$ |
| FRANCE Nb. Points= 626631 | FRANCE Nb. Points= 589595 |
| bias $=0.005128$ bias $=0.003883$ | bias $=-0.003005 \quad$ bias $=0.004420$ |
| rms $=0.076243 \mathrm{rms}=0.084762$ | rms $=0.093106$ rms= 0.099433 |
| EUROPE Nb. Points= 15941597 | EUROPE Nb. Points= 15491552 |
| bias $=0.008908$ bias $=0.008817$ | bias $=0.007063$ bias $=0.012545$ |
| rms= 0.086769 rms $=0.098813$ | rms= $0.107332 \mathrm{rms}=0.116684$ |
| ALA_FR Nb. Points= 15871591 | ALA_FR Nb. Points $=15541559$ |
| bias $=0.007139$ bias $=0.007813$ | bias $=0.003166$ bias $=0.010616$ |
| rms= 0.087003 rms= 0.099363 | rms= 0.108494 rms= 0.117694 |
| N_AM_N Nb. Points= 475477 | N_AM_N Nb. Points= 473475 |
| bias $=0.020063$ bias $=0.015849$ | bias $=0.015645$ bias $=0.020274$ |
| rms= 0.082581 rms $=0.087638$ | rms= 0.084601 rms= 0.092090 |
| N_AM_S Nb. Points= 201202 | N_AM_S Nb. Points= 204205 |
| bias $=0.025821$ bias $=0.020891$ | bias $=0.013529$ bias $=0.021366$ |
| rms= 0.077937 rms= 0.075982 | rms= 0.082462 rms $=0.087156$ |
| S_AM_N Nb. Points= 205205 | S_AM_N Nb. Points= 194194 |
| bias $=0.009805$ bias $=0.006585$ | bias $=0.006443$ bias $=0.011907$ |
| rms $=0.064328$ rms= 0.069229 | rms $=0.085461$ rms= 0.088600 |
| S_AM_S Nb. Points= 152152 | S_AM_S Nb. Points= 147147 |
| bias $=0.023750$ bias $=0.018618$ | bias $=0.012925$ bias $=0.015918$ |
| rms $=0.102216$ rms $=0.100003$ | rms $=0.097861$ rms= 0.095789 |
| N_ATLA Nb. Points= 107108 | N_ATLA Nb. Points $=8888$ |
| bias $=0.012056$ bias $=0.017778$ | bias $=0.012955$ bias $=0.019659$ |
| rms= 0.069679 rms $=0.075314$ | rms $=0.068788$ rms $=0.077158$ |
| AUSTRA Nb. Points $=9696$ | AUSTRA Nb. Points $=9091$ |
| bias $=0.049062$ bias $=0.040937$ | bias $=0.040667$ bias $=0.030000$ |
| rms $=0.119491$ rms $=0.111966$ | rms $=0.107176$ rms $=0.092801$ |
| AFRI_N Nb. Points= 265266 | AFRI_N Nb. Points= 247248 |
| bias $=0.012340$ bias $=0.010977$ | bias $=0.019595$ bias $=0.019476$ |
| $\mathrm{rms}=0.077657 \mathrm{rms}=0.077736$ | $\mathrm{rms}=0.093661$ rms= 0.095379 |
| AFRI_S Nb. Points= 190191 | AFRI_S Nb. Points= 155155 |
| bias $=0.035474$ bias $=0.034503$ | bias $=0.045290$ bias $=0.029355$ |
| rms= 0.090309 rms= 0.096556 | rms= 0.109474 rms= 0.102784 |
| EUAS_E Nb. Points= 393393 | EUAS_E Nb. Points= 402403 |
| bias $=0.000178$ bias $=0.012290$ | bias $=0.006667$ bias $=0.006352$ |
| rms= 0.079689 rms= 0.097906 | rms= 0.076050 rms $=0.088922$ |
| EUAS_W Nb. Points= 713713 | EUAS_W Nb. Points= 687687 |
| bias $=0.010884$ bias $=0.015316$ | bias $=0.010102$ bias $=0.010393$ |
| rms= 0.076918 rms= 0.085592 | rms $=0.058960$ rms $=0.066615$ |
| PACI_N Nb. Points= 7475 | PACI_N Nb. Points= 7778 |
| bias $=0.039459$ bias $=0.038267$ | bias $=0.047143$ bias $=0.044872$ |
| rms= 0.120113 rms $=0.115349$ | rms $=0.114750$ rms $=0.107429$ |

Table 3. Bias and RMS for 2 m Relative Humidity on different Domains for 12 UTC and 18 UTC runs


The bias of 2 m Temperature for European Domains are better for the operational then for the test run. On other Domains sometimes is better for the test run.
The RMS of 2 m Temperature is better for test run for most of the domains for.
For 2 m Relative Humidity bias is better for the operational run for more then $60 \%$ of the domains. The RMS of 2 m Relative Humidity is same for operational and the test run, but is better for all domains in Europe.

## 10. Conclusion

Because the calculated values of the correlation coefficients were not similar to the operational Gauss correlation function $\rho_{12}=\exp \left(-\frac{1}{\mathbf{2}} \frac{\mathbf{r}^{2}}{\mathbf{a}^{2}}\right)$ it was proposed that new function is tested $\rho_{12}=\exp \left(-\frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{2}} \frac{\mathbf{r}}{\mathbf{a}}\right)$.
Namelist values for tested function are: $\sigma^{G}{ }_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=1.7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \sigma^{\mathrm{G}}{ }_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=0.13=13 \%, \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{T} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=105 \mathrm{~km}, \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{H} 2 \mathrm{~m}}=101 \mathrm{~km}$ and $\alpha=0.05$.

It is not possible to conclude are the results of new analyses better or worst, and more experiments are needed.

