

UKCA–GungHo! Coupling: Possible Strategies

- 1. UKCA code is distributed throughout the appropriate physics routines, e.g. wet removal is done in convection, emissions are done in the boundary-layer scheme etc.**

Pros:

- No need to pass large numbers of variables around the model.
- UKCA processes occur concurrently with the relevant physical process.
- Testing and code management is supported by the LFRic team.

Cons:

- UKCA code is spread between many different sections – ownership of code is not the main UKCA developers.
- Difficult to maintain, easy to break.

- 2. UKCA code is self contained within the LFRic source-tree, similar to its location within the MetUM code (although not necessarily at the end of the timestep).**

Pros:

- Familiar set-up and similar to current structure.
- Testing and code management is supported by the LFRic team.
- Coupling to LFRic straight-forward (i.e. modules, subroutine calls etc.).

Cons:

- Tied to LFRic release cycles.
- Load balancing may be harder to achieve due to existing PE decomposition.
- May be harder to run with a different resolution to LFRic, if this is required.

- 3. UKCA is held within a separate code repository, e.g. similar to JULES.**

Pros:

- Allows for easier creation of stand-alone model, e.g. box model, trajectory following, CTM etc.
- Possibility to re-merge with TOMCAT/SLIMCAT/GLOMAP model.
- Allows for possibility of more flexible release cycle.
- Allows for the possibility of running the same version of LFRic with different UKCA versions.

- Allows for different PE decomposition to LFRic (depending on how the coupling is done).
- Allows for different resolution to LFRic (depending on how the coupling is done).

Cons:

- Testing and code management would most likely need to be supported by UKCA team. Extra resources might be needed, but may not be available.
- Extra work will be required to maintain capability of running in multiple models.
- How would the diagnostics be output? How would the model restart system work? Would this be managed through LFRic, or be UKCA specific?
- Coupling would not be straight-forward. Will it be a separate binary or built as part of LFRic? It is likely that a large number of 3D fields will need to be passed. Would OASIS cope?
- Would tracer transport be done in UKCA? How about processes like convection and boundary-layer mixing etc.?

Notes:

- It may be possible to use this UM+UKCA only code that is being developed for UKESM1 here – this would also cover the output (STASH) and restart (dumps) system.
- Just because UKCA is in a separate repository it doesn't mean that it can't be built in the same executable as LFRic.
- It also doesn't mean that we must use a coupler such as OASIS, we could couple with subroutine calls or modules etc. However, using a coupler would allow for more flexibility in terms of resolution and PE configuration.