Assimilation of High-Frequency Radar Surface Currents in a Nested Model of the Ligurian Sea

Alexander Barth[(1)], Jacopo Chiggiato[(2)],
Aida Alvera Azcárate[(1)], Baptiste Mourre[(2)],
Jean-Marie Beckers[(1)], Jochen Horstmann[(2)], Michel Rixen[(2)]

[(1)] GHER, University of Liege, Belgium, [(2)] NURC, Italy.

Remote Ocean Sensing Workshop 2011, NURC, La Spezia, Italy

GHER
GeoHydrodynamics and Environment Research

Université de Liège


Model results
Surface temperature and velocity (2010-07-06)
model error covariance
Observation Operator
Observations
WERA: site ros (2010-07-06 01)
observation error covariance
Data Assimilation: Combination of model and observations

Model

- ROMS nested in Mediterranean Ocean Forecasting System
- 1/60 degree resolution and 32 vertical levels
- Currents: Western & Eastern Corsican Current, Northern Current, inertial oscillation
- Two WERA HF radar systems (Palmaria, San Rossore) by NATO Undersea Research Centre (NURC)



Observations

- Frequency of $\nu = 12.359$ MHz and coupled to a wave length of $\lambda_b = 12.13$ m,
- Radial currents are used for the assimilation
- Azimuthal resolution of 6 degrees
- Currents are averaged over 1 h



Radial currents on 2010-07-06 21:30 relative to the Palmaria site: left panel shows WERA measurements and right panel shows ROMS results without assimilation.

Observations





Radial currents on 2010-07-06 01:30 relative to the San Rossore site: left panel shows WERA measurements and right panel shows ROMS results without assimilation.

Observation operator

- Radial currents are extracted by:

$$u_{\mathrm{HF}} = \frac{k_b}{1 - \exp(-k_b h)} \int_{-h}^{0} \mathbf{u}(z) \cdot \mathbf{e}_r \exp(k_b z) dz \tag{1}$$

  - $k_b = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda_b}$
  - $\mathbf{e}_r$ is the unit vector pointing in the direction opposite to the location of the HF radar site
  - positive values: current away from the system
  - essentially represent an average over the upper meters.

- Smoothed in the azimuthal direction by a diffusion operator to filter scales smaller than 6 degrees

Model errors covariance

- Estimated by ensemble simulation where uncertain aspect of the model are perturbed
- Perturbed zonal and meridional wind forcing
- Perturbed boundary conditions (elevation, velocity, temperature and salinity)
- Perturbed momentum equation (ε)

$$\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} + \mathbf{\Omega} \wedge \mathbf{u} = -\frac{1}{\rho_0}\nabla_h p + \frac{1}{\rho_0}\nabla \cdot \mathbf{F}^{\mathbf{u}} + \nabla_h \wedge \varepsilon\, \mathbf{e}_z \tag{2}$$

(3)

- where $\nabla_h = \mathbf{e}_x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \mathbf{e}_y \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$
- does not create horizontal convergence or divergence (linked to barotropic waves)
- can create mesoscale flow structures (absent or misplaced)

Ensemble spin-up



- Ensemble of IC is created by a 7 day ensemble integration starting from the same IC but with perturbed forcing (ensemble spin-up)
- Spin-up should create mesoscale circulation features

Velocity spread



- Velocity spread after 7 days
- Largest uncertainties near eddies

Spatial correlation



- Correlation of temperature at a specific point (magenta circle) and other surface grid points
- Resulting length-scale is about 50 km

Spatial correlation



- Correlation of zonal velocity at a specific point (magenta circle) and other surface grid points
- Resulting length-scale is about 10 km
- Adequately observing surface velocity would require measurements with higher spatial resolution that the resolution of temperature measurements

Temporal correlation



periodicity of 16 h (period of inertial oscillations is 17.6 h)

Data assimilation scheme

- Time dimension embedded in estimation vector $\mathbf{x}$
- Different definitions of estimation vector are possible:
  - $\mathbf{x} =$ (model trajectory), *i.e.* model state at all time instances
  - $\mathbf{x} =$ (uncertain forcing fields), here IC, BC, wind and stochastic error term at all time instances
  - $\mathbf{x} =$ (model trajectory, uncertain forcing fields)
- The optimal $\mathbf{x}$ is given by the Kalman analysis (using non-linear observation operators as in Chen and Snyder (2007)):

$$\mathbf{x}^a = \mathbf{x}^b + \mathbf{A}\left(\mathbf{B} + \mathbf{R}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{y}^o - h(\mathbf{x}^b)\right) \tag{4}$$

- where the matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are covariances estimated from the ensemble.

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathrm{cov}(\mathbf{x}^b, h(\mathbf{x}^b)) = \left\langle (\mathbf{x} - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle)\left(h(\mathbf{x}) - \langle h(\mathbf{x}) \rangle\right)^T \right\rangle \tag{5}$$

$$\mathbf{B} = \mathrm{cov}(h(\mathbf{x}^b), h(\mathbf{x}^b)) = \left\langle (h(\mathbf{x}) - \langle h(\mathbf{x}) \rangle)\left(h(\mathbf{x}) - \langle h(\mathbf{x}) \rangle\right)^T \right\rangle \tag{6}$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle$ is the ensemble average.

Smoother scheme

- For a linear model and an infinite large ensemble, equation (4) minimizes,

$$J(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^b)^T \mathbf{P}^{b^{-1}} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^b) + (\mathbf{y}^o - h(\mathbf{x}))^T \mathbf{R}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}^o - h(\mathbf{x})) \tag{7}$$

  or

$$J(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^b)^T \mathbf{P}^{b^{-1}} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^b) + \sum_n (\mathbf{y}_n^o - (h(\mathbf{x})_n))^T \mathbf{R}_n{}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n^o - (h(\mathbf{x})_n)) \tag{8}$$

  where n refers to the indexed quantifies at time n. This is the cost function from which 4D-Var and Kalman Smoother can be derived.

- Approach is closely related to Ensemble Smoother (van Leeuwen, 2001), 4D-EnKF (Hunt *et al.*, 2007) and AEnKF (Sakov *et al.*, 2010) where model trajectories instead of model states are optimized and to the Green's method with stochastic "search directions"


x
h(.)
h(x)
Free model run
IC, BC, wind, momentum error
model
radial surface velocity
perturbations
Ensemble run
IC, BC, wind, momentum error
model
radial surface velocity
...
...
...
IC, BC, wind, momentum error
model
radial surface velocity
Observations
radial surface velocity
Analysis
IC, BC, wind, momentum error
model
radial surface velocity

Twin experiment

Scheme of a twin experiment:

- model is run with initial conditions (IC), boundary conditions (BC), forcing fields (e.g. here winds fields) that are assume to be the "true" solution.
- pseudo-observations are extracted from this simulation.
- perturbation are applied to IC, BC and forcing fields.
- Based on those perturbed fields and the extracted pseudo-observation we determine if the "true" solution can be recovered.

Variable	RMS$(\mathbf{x}^f, \mathbf{x}^t)$	RMS$(\mathbf{x}^a, \mathbf{x}^t)$
Temperature	0.080	0.067
Salinity	0.0063	0.0057
u-wind	0.61	0.40
v-wind	0.60	0.54

- RMS for temperature, salinity and currents is a volume average.
- Assimilation window is here 48 hours.

Estimation of trajectory versus estimation of forcing fields



- Both approaches equivalent for linear system (and additive noise)
- Unrealistic "ensemble extrapolation" when too small observation errors are used
  $\rightarrow$ model trajectory and forcing fields are inconsistent

Error statistics for Palmaria Site

Without assimilation (positive values: current away from the magenta dot)



With assimilation



Simulation with atmospheric model (WRF)

- blue arrows: WRF 10m wind vectors, red arrows: in situ wind measurements from ICOADS (International Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Data Set).`wind_LS2.mp4`
- 3 WRF domains at 30, 10, 3.33 km resolution (two-way nesting). The limit of those domains are shown in black.
- 30-km grid model nested (one-way) into the Global Forecast System
- 28 vertical layers



Model results with different wind forcings

- Total RMS differences (m/s):

	Pal.	Ros.
COSMO	0.14	0.11
WRF	0.13	0.14



Figure 1: Radial surface current RMS difference

Conclusions

- Embedding the time dimension into the state vector leads to a smoother scheme (which is very simple to implement)
- Smoother schemes can be used to estimate the optimal model trajectory or forcing field
- Both approaches are not equivalent for non-linear systems or multiplicative noise
- The challenge is to make consistent analyzes
- derive "optimal" perturbation first $\rightarrow$ rerun the model with corrected forcing
- The source code of smoother schemes which runs on Matlab and GNU Octave is available at `http://modb.oce.ulg.ac.be/alex` or by email (a.barth@ulg.ac.be).
- Future: what can we learn about the model error from the correction terms?

References

Barth, A., A. Alvera-Azcárate, K.-W. Gurgel, J. Staneva, A. Port, J.-M. Beckers, and E. V. Stanev, 2010: Ensemble perturbation smoother for optimizing tidal boundary conditions by assimilation of High-Frequency radar surface currents - application to the German Bight. *Ocean Science*, **6**, 161–178, doi:10.5194/os-6-161-2010.
URL http://www.ocean-sci.net/6/161/2010/

Barth, A., A. Alvera-Azcárate, J.-M. Beckers, J. Staneva, E. V. Stanev, and J. Schulz-Stellenfleth, 2011: Correcting surface winds by assimilating High-Frequency Radar surface currents in the German Bight. *Ocean Dynamics*, **61**, 599–610, doi:10.1007/s10236-010-0369-0.
URL http://hdl.handle.net/2268/83330

Chen, Y. and C. Snyder, 2007: Assimilating Vortex Position with an Ensemble Kalman Filter. *Monthly Weather Review*, **135**, 1828–1845.

Hunt, B. R., E. J. Kostelich, and I. Szunyogh, 2007: Efficient data assimilation for spatiotemporal chaos: A local ensemble transform Kalman filter. *Physica D*, **230**, 112–126.

Sakov, P., G. Evensen, and L. Bertino, 2010: Asynchronous data assimilation with the EnKF. *Tellus*, **62A**, 24–29.

van Leeuwen, P. J., 2001: An Ensemble Smoother with Error Estimates. *Monthly Weather Review*, **129**, 709–728.