Improving climate reanalysis with the offline ensemble Kalman smoother

Yiguo Wang^{1,2}, François Counillon^{1,2,3}, Yue Ying^{1,2} and Sébastien Barthélémy^{2,3}

- 1. Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center, Norway
- 2. Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Norway
- 3. Geophysical Institute, University of Bergen, Norway







What's climate reanalysis?

- NERSC
- Dynamically consistent reconstruction of the climate system, atmospheric reanalyses (ERA5, Hersbach et al., 2023), ocean reanalyses (ORAS5, Zuo et al., 2019), coupled reanalyses (Laloyaux et al., 2018, O'Kane et al., 2021)
- Reanalysis = dynamical model + observations + data assimilation
- Understanding anthropologically driven global warming
- Studying climate variability and teleconnections
- Initialising climate predictions



What do we do in CoRea?

- Developed and tested new DA techniques
- produced a long-coupled reanalysis over 1860-2022







Improving climate reanalysis with the offline ensemble Kalman smoother

Yiguo Wang¹, François Counillon^{1,2}, Yue Ying¹, and Sébastien Barthélémy²

¹Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Centre and Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Bergen, Norway ²Geophysical Institute, University of Bergen and Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Bergen, Norway

ORIGINAL RESEARCH article

Front. Clim., 15 December 2022 Sec. Predictions and Projections Volume 4 - 2022 | https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2022.918572 This article is part of the Research Topic Recent Advances in Climate Reanalysis View all 7 Articles >

Benefit of vertical localization for sea surface temperature assimilation in isopycnal coordinate model



Sébastien Barthélémy² Alexander Barth³

¹ Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center and Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Bergen, Norway
 ² Geophysical Institute and Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
 ³ GeoHydrodynamics and Environment Research (GHER), Department of Astrophysics, Geophysics and Oceanography, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

JAMES Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*

Research Article 👌 Open Access 🛛 😨 🚯

François Counillon^{1,2}

Adaptive Covariance Hybridization for the Assimilation of SST Observations Within a Coupled Earth System Reanalysis

Sébastien Barthélémy 🔀, François Counillon, Yiguo Wang

First published: 14 June 2024 | https://doi.org/10.1029/2023MS003888

Why do we need yet another reanalysis?



Dataset	Component	Description	Category	Reference
20CRv2c	Atmosphere/Land	Produced by NOAA–CIRES. Available globally from 1851 to 2014.	Surface input	Compo et al. (2011)
20CRv3	Atmosphere/Land	Produced by NOAA–CIRES. Available globally from 1806 to 2015.	Surface input	Slivinski et al. (2021)
ERA-20C	Atmosphere/Land	Produced by ECMWF. Available globally from 1900 to 2010.	Surface input	Poli et al. (2016)
ORA-20C	Ocean/Sea ice	Produced by ECMWF. Available globally from 1900 to 2009.	Surface and subsurface input	de Boisseson et al., (2018)
SODA2.2.4	Ocean	Produced by U. Maryland. Available globally from 1871 to 2010.	Surface and subsurface input	Giese et al. (2016)
CHOR	Ocean	Produced by CMCC. Available globally from 1900 to 2010.	Surface and subsurface input	Yang et al. (2017)
EN4.2.2	Ocean	Produced by Met Office. Available globally from 1900 to the present.	Subsurface input	Good et al. (2013)
CERA-20	Atmosphere/Land/ Ocean/Sea ice	Produced by ECMWF. Available globally from 1901 to 2010.	Surface and subsurface input	Laloyaux et al. (2018)

1st motivation: coupled processes

5



Hovmoller time series of spatially high-passed filtered SST (contours) and wind stress (shading) at 1°N in the eastern Pacific from April 1973 to April 1974.

(Laloyaux et al. 2018)



2nd motivation: continuous reconstruction





(Laloyaux et al. 2018)

1990

2010

Norwegian Climate Prediction Model (NorCPM)



- NorESM1-ME (Bentsen et al. 2013)
- CMIP5 forcings

7

- 2° for atmosphere and land components
- 1° for ocean and ice components
- 30 ensemble members

(Counillon et al., 2016)

Which data did we assimilate in CoRea1860+?

- The HadISST2 product (accounts for bias between measurements and provide a good uncertainty estimate)
- SST data is the most primary instrumental data prior to satellite era
- The use of new data in the course of the reanalysis introduces discontinuity





How did it work?





Key features:

- Anomaly assimilation (Carrassi et al., 2014), limiting the emergence of bias in the deep ocean
- Flow-dependent covariance (i.e., changing with the climate regime)
- Conserving heat/salt content (Wang et al., 2017)
- Isopycnal assimilation efferently use surface observations (Gavart and De Mey, 1997)
- Small ensemble size (vertical localisation, Wang et al., 2022)

Ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF)





Probabilistic characteristic:

- uncertainty quantification through Monte-Carlo ensembles
- flow-dependent forecast error covariances

(Evensen et al., 2022)

Offline EnKS



- Past and present observations as ensemble filter
- Future observations via cross-time error covariances
- Numerically cheap
- Tested in Lorenz 1963 (Dong et al., 2023)
- Investigate whether the offline EnKS as post-processing approach can improve long-term climate reanalyses

We define the concatenated observations as

$$\mathbf{y}_{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{1}^{T}, \mathbf{y}_{2}^{T}, ..., \mathbf{y}_{L}^{T} \end{bmatrix}^{T},$$
(6)

where \mathbf{y}_k are observations at k time steps ahead of the existing analysis \mathbf{X}_a at time t (Eq. 3) and $1 \le k \le L$. Note that \mathbf{y}_0 (i.e., **y** in Eq. 1) has been assimilated during the production of the filter analysis \mathbf{X}_a and are not included in \mathbf{y}_s for the smoother analysis. The concentrated observation error covariance matrix becomes a block diagonal matrix as follows:

$$\mathbf{R}_{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{1} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{R}_{2} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{R}_{L} \end{bmatrix},$$
(7)

where observations from different times are assumed to be uncorrelated. The ensemble mean of the filter analyses within L time steps ahead of the model state X_a mapped to the observation space is written as

$$H_{\rm s}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{{\rm a},1:L}) = \left[H_1(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{{\rm a},1})^T, H_2(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{{\rm a},2})^T, \dots, H_L(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{{\rm a},L})^T\right]^T.$$
(8)

The tangent linear operator of the operator H_s is

$$\mathbf{H}_{s} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{1} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{2} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{H}_{L} \end{bmatrix}.$$
(9)

The concatenated ensemble anomaly is defined as

$$\mathbf{A}_{1:L} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1^T, \mathbf{A}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{A}_L^T \end{bmatrix}^T.$$
(10)

The Kalman gain of the offline EnKS is written as

$$\mathbf{K}_{s} = \mathbf{A}_{a} \mathbf{A}_{1:L}^{T} \mathbf{H}_{s}^{T} \left(\mathbf{H}_{s} \mathbf{A}_{1:L} \mathbf{A}_{1:L}^{T} \mathbf{H}_{s}^{T} + (m-1) \mathbf{R}_{s} \right)^{-1}.$$
(11)

The offline EnKS can be written as follows:

$$\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{s} = \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{a} + \mathbf{K}_{s} (\mathbf{y}_{s} - H_{s}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{a,1:L})), \qquad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{s} = \mathbf{A}_{a} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{K}_{s} \mathbf{H}_{s} \mathbf{A}_{1:L}, \tag{13}$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{s}} = \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathrm{s}} \mathbf{1}_m + \mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{s}}. \tag{14}$$

For simplification, we can rewrite Eq. 14 as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}_{s} = \mathbf{X}_{a}\mathbf{T},$$

$$\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}_{1:L}^{T}\mathbf{H}_{s}\left(\mathbf{H}_{s}\mathbf{A}_{1:L}\mathbf{A}_{1:L}^{T}\mathbf{H}_{s}^{T} + (m-1)\mathbf{R}_{s}\right)^{-1}\left(\left(\mathbf{y}_{s} - H_{s}(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{a,1:L})\right)\mathbf{1}_{m} - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{K}_{s}\mathbf{H}_{s}\mathbf{A}_{1:L}\right),$$
(15)
(16)

Experiments in NorCPM



Experiment	Idealised twin	Real-world					
Pre-existing reanalysis	1980-2010 (Wang et al., 2022)	1950-2010 (Counillon et al., 2016)					
Assimilated data	SST observations in three months in 'future'						
R Inflation factor	1	1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 16 or 25					
Spatial localization	Gaspari and Cohn, (1999) and Wang et al., (2017)						
Temporal localization	γ^n , where γ signifies the decay rate per month and n denotes the time lag (Dong ef 2021;2023), $\gamma = 0.01$, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, and 0.5						
Validation dataset	Truth	Independent datasets: EN4.2.1, ARMOR-3D L4, ORAS5					
Metrics	Mean squared skill score (MSSS)						

$$\mathbf{MSSS} = 1 - \frac{\mathbf{MSE}_{\mathrm{s}}}{\mathbf{MSE}_{\mathrm{f}}} = \frac{\mathbf{MSE}_{\mathrm{f}} - \mathbf{MSE}_{\mathrm{s}}}{\mathbf{MSE}_{\mathrm{f}}},$$

Twin experiments: Globally averaged MSSS (monthing)



Global ocean circulations



- Optimal results are obtained with the temporal parameter of 0.1 (e-folding time: 13.0 days).
- Assimilating future SST data is more efficient for MLD and T300 than SSH.

Twin experiments: monthly T300, SSH and ML



Twin experiments: monthly T300, SSH and ML

.0702

.117

.1638

.2106

.2574

.3042

.351

.3978

4447



.00313 .00939 .01566 .02192 .02818 .03444 .0407 .04697 .05323 .05949



RMSE for MLD















Real experiments: globally averaged MSSS (yearly)



- Optimal results are obtained with the R inflation factor of 4 (when $\gamma = 0.1$)
- Assimilating future SST data is more efficient for MLD and SSH than T300

Real experiments: Yearly T300, SSH and MLD







1.57	4.71	7.84	10.98	14.12	17.25	20.39	23.53	26.66	29.8



4	4'	32	1	10	.1	.2	.3	3.4	1



-	.4 -	.3 .	.2	1	0	.1	.2	.3	.4



-	.4	3	2	1	0	.1	.2	.3	.4

Real experiments: reliability (Desroziers et al., 2005)





- Smoother reduces both RMSE and total error (i.e., combination of obs and background errors)
- Reliability is not significantly change

Take-home messages



- Tested an offline ensemble Kalman smoother technique for climate reanalysis.
- Developed a methodology to fine temporal localisation parameters and R inflation factors.
- The results seem promising to improve the accuracy of the reanalysis.
- Different performance in twin experiments and real applications, due to many factors
 - Truth is unknown
 - Inconsistency between datasets
 - Model biases
- Application to deterministic reanalyses

• Refer to the EnOI, a simplified variant of the EnKF (Evensen, 2003, Counillon et al., 2009)