INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

Development of a SURFEX EKF for ALADIN and comparison of the offline and coupled version with the OI analysis.

Toulouse, 5th March 2012

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION RELIMINARY RESULTS

Optimum Interpolation (OI)

- Coefficients are derived using simple assumptions
- Extended Kalman Filter (EKF)
 - dynamical coefficients
 - Formulation: $\mathbf{x}_t^a = \mathbf{x}_t^b + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}^T (\mathbf{H}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}^T + \mathbf{R})^{-1} [\mathbf{y}_t^o \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}_0^b)]$

 ${\mathcal H}$: the observation operator

includes a model propagation

H: the Jacobian matrix of the observation operator:

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{y}_t}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{t_0}}$$

H is calculated by a finite difference approach:

$$H_{ij} = \frac{y_i (\mathbf{x} + \delta x_j) - y_i (\mathbf{x})}{\delta x_j}$$

Extended Kalman Filter

INTRODUCTION

IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

Finite difference approach:

$$H_{ij} = \frac{y_i \left(\mathbf{x} + \delta x_j\right) - y_i(\mathbf{x})}{\delta x_i}$$

• Calculation of $y_i(\mathbf{x} + \delta x_j)$ and $y_i(\mathbf{x})$:

- Perturb a component x_j of the control vector **x**
- Perform run with the perturbed surface field to calculate corresponding *Y_i* Offline: surface scheme decoupled from atmospheric model the forcing is taken from the lowest model level
 Coupled: surface scheme coupled to atmospheric model interaction is possible between atmosphere and surface

- In Balsamo et al. (2007,JH), the offline approach is compared to the coupled approach for a single day during the summer with the GEM model. The gain components are found to be smaller for the offline approach but with similar patterns as the coupled approach.
- In Balsamo et al (2004,QJRMS) it is mentioned that for coupled experiments the choice of the perturbation size is important. Small perturbations can lead to a noisy H matrix and inaccurate corrections.
- This presentation:
 - Implementation of offline and coupled SURFEX EKF for ALADIN
 - Comparison between offline and coupled EKF: jacobians, gain, increments
 - Comparison of forecast scores of EKF, OI and runs without assimilation

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION

PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

Prognostic variables:

- Superficial water content (wg1)
- Root zone water content (wg2)
- Surface temperature (Tg1)
- Deep soil temperature (Tg2)

Observations:

- Screen level temperature (T2m)
- Screen level relative humidity (RH2m)
- Additional information:
 - LBC data from Aladin France
 - Assimilation interval τ = 6 hours, with assimilation at 00,06,12,18 UTC
 - Forecasts with surfex + alaro and inline fullpos (interval 1 hour)
 - Background error covariance matrix **B** is kept constant (WG set to 0.1,TG set to 2 K)
 - Error covariance matrix **R**: T2m set to 1K, RH2m set to 10%



Flowchart to run EKF INTRODUCT IMPLEMENTAT Offline version RELIMINARY RESU

EKF-steps:

• Forcing:

transform fullpos FA to ascii needed for the offline runs

- Reference run: $y_i(\mathbf{x})$
 - Offline: offline surfex run (6h fc.) Ekf.sim: store fields in ascii files
- Perturbed runs: $y_i(\mathbf{x} + \delta x_j)$ Ekf.per: perturb surface variable Offline: offline surfex run (6h fc.) Ekf.sim: store fields in ascii files



Flowchart to run EKF Offline version

EKF-steps:

Analysis:

> Observations: gridded by canari Background: previous forecast

> Jacobians: obsimu/mdsimu files

 $H_{ij} = \frac{y_i (\mathbf{x} + \delta x_j) - y_i (\mathbf{x})}{\delta x_i}$

- Note: the canari run to make gridded observations is performed with high background errors to limit the effect of the model background.
- Note: B is kept constant



Flowchart to run EKF

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION

Coupled version

EKF-steps:

• Forcing:

not needed (no offline runs)

• Reference run: $y_i(\mathbf{x})$

6h forecast surface as reference Ekf.sim: store fields in ascii files

• Perturbed runs: $y_i(\mathbf{x} + \delta x_j)$

Ekf.per: perturb surface variable 001: coupled 6h forecast Ekf.sim: store fields in ascii files

Analysis

12(7/29)

Experimental Setup

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

Experiments:

- Free run: (no assimilation)
 - Surface field from 6h forecast of previous run
- Open loop: (no assimilation)
 - Surface is interpolated from Arpege analysis
- Surface Assimilation runs:
 - **Optimum Interpolation**
 - EKF with offline jacobian calculation
 - EKF with coupled jacobian calculation
 - \rightarrow Surface guess for assimilation is taken from 6h forecast of previous run

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS

EKF coupled

EKF offline



Toulouse, 5th March 2012 (11/29)

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS

EKF offline

EKF Coupled





dT2m/dWG1 (02 JULY 2010 –)



INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Jacobian Matrix Elements

EKF offline

EKF coupled



dRH2m/dTG1 (02 JULY 2010 -)





dRH2m/dTG1 (02 JULY 2010 -)



Toulouse. 5th March 2012 (12/29)

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS

EKF offline

EKF coupled









INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS



Toulouse. 5th March 2012 (14/29)

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS

TG2 **EKF** coupled **EKF** offline dT2m/dTG2 (02 JULY 2010 - 12) dT2m/dTG2 (02 JULY 2010 - 12) 0.10 Mean=0.036 Std=0.027 ö Mean=0.015 Std=0.0047 3 0.08 Pert. size: otions Pert. size: 0.06 10.9d % 00 10⁻⁶ 10^{-1} regative per 0.04 Mean=0.015 Std=0.047 Mean=0.034 Std=0.028 0.02 -0.4 -0.2 0.0 0.2 0.4 0.00 0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08 0.10 positive peturbations positive peturbations dRH2m/dTG2 (02 JULY 2010 - 00) dRH2m/dTG2 (02 JULY 2010 - 00) 0.03 0.010 Pert. size: Mean=-0.012 Mean=-0.0081 Std=0.0035 Pert. size: Std=0.0025 0.01 10^{-1} 0.005 10⁻⁶ 0.00 0.000 dive perturabitions iegalike poiriu 0.01 -0.005 Mean=-0.0081 Std=0.0038 ŝ Mean=-0.011 Std=0.0033 80.0 -0.04 -0.03 -0.02 -0.01 0.00 0.01 0.02 -0.020 -0.015 -0.010 0.000 0.005 0.010 -0.005 positive peturbations.

Toulouse, 5th March 2012 (15/29)

positive peturbations

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Jacobian Matrix Elements

T2m-WG2

RH2m-WG2

EKF offline

T2m-WG2 jacobians for 02 July 2010 1200

EKF coupled

T2m-WG2 jacobians for 02 July 2010 1200



RH2m-WG2 jacobians for 02 July 2010 1200







RH2m-WG2 jacobians for 02 July 2010 1200

Jacobian Non-linearities

39/111

0.1928

0.024632

08257

99128

27997822 20000

1749864

087493

00437466

218733 0.00109366

PRELIMINARY RESULTS

T2m-WG2

RH2m-

WG2

EKF offline

EKF coupled

|H+ - H-| for dT2m/dWG2 02 July 2010 1200



|H+ - H-| for dRH2m/dWG2 02 July 2010 1200







Gain Matrix Elements

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

EKF Offline

EKF Coupled (large pert.)

EKF Coupled (small pert.)

T2m-WG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200



RH2m-WG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200



T2m-WG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200



RH2m-WG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200



T2m-WG2 gain for 02 July 2010 1200



RH2m-WG2 gain for 02 July 2010 1200



Gain Matrix Elements

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

EKF Offline

EKF Coupled (large pert.)

EKF Coupled (small pert.)

T2m-TG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200



T2m-TG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200



RH2m-TG2 gain for 02July 2010 1200







RH2m-TG2 gain for 02 July 2010 1200



Increments (single day)

IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS

EKF Offline

EKF Coupled (large pert.)

WG2 increments for 2 July 2010







TG2 increments for 2 July 2010





O

TG2 increments for 2 July 2010



Cummulative Increments (1-21 july 2010)

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION

EKF Offline

EKF Coupled (large pert.)

WG2 increments for 1-21 July 2010



WG2 increments for 1-21 July 2010



TG2 increments for 1-21 July 2010







O

TG2 increments for 1-21 July 2010



WG2 Evolution during July 2010

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION



Toulouse, 5th March 2012 (22/29)

Scores

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION



Toulouse, 5th March 2012 (23/29)

Scores

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION



Toulouse, 5th March 2012 (24/29)

Scores

INTRODUCTION IMPLEMENTATION PRELIMINARY RESULTS CONCLUSION



Toulouse, 5th March 2012 (25/29)

Comparison offline and coupled EKF:

- Similar spatial structures for jacobians, gain and increments
- Some differences for WG2, but limited effect on the scores
- Differences

coupled: more sensitive to perturbation size.

- Too small: noisy H-matrix
- Too large: not linear

offline: less sensitive to perturbation size.

- Allows for a smaller perturbation size \rightarrow the jacobians are more linear
- Smaller gain and increments
- Computing time: 6 min. offline vs. 44 min. coupled

Effect on the scores:

- OI, offline EKF and coupled EKF scores lie close together
- Offline run: the perturbation size has limited effect on scores
- Winter: data assimilation has no effect on the scores

Future Plans:

Combine surface assimilation with 3DVAR

Bibliography:

- G. Balsamo, J.-F. Mahfouf, S. Bélair, G. Deblonde, 2007: A Land Data Assimilation System for soil moisture and temperature: An information content study. J. Hydromet., 8, 1225-1242
- G. Balsamo, F. Bouyssel and J. Noilhan, 2004: A simplified bi-dimensional variational analysis of soil moisture from screen-level observations in a mesoscale numerical weather prediction model, Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc., 130, 895-915.