# **Observed Characteristics of Representation Error**

Elizabeth Satterfield<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Hodyss<sup>1</sup>, David D. Kuhl<sup>2</sup>, Craig H. Bishop<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Naval Research Laboratory, Monterey, California, USA <sup>2</sup>Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA

# Can Ensemble Variance Predict Observation Error of Representation?

Elizabeth Satterfield<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Hodyss<sup>1</sup>, David D. Kuhl<sup>2</sup>, Craig H. Bishop<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Naval Research Laboratory, Monterey, California, USA <sup>2</sup>Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, DC, USA

# **Representation Error**

- Arises from the inability of the forecast model to resolve small-scale properties:
  - Unresolved processes
  - Boundaries of resolved features
- Results in incompatibility between coarse model grids and observations, which observe a higher resolution state.
- Must be accounted for in the observation error covariance matrix:
  - The best state that the model can represent is a "smoothed truth"
  - Adding the penalty term to the background error covariance matrix would result in noise once the model is integrated
- Key, if not dominant, contributor to correlated observation errors

# **Estimating Covariance Matrices**



1. Split Observation-minus-Background statistics into observation and background error covariances (e.g. Rutherford (1972) and Höllingsworth and Lonnberg (1986))

- Requires a dense observing network
- Dependent on the chosen correlation function
- Assumes observation errors are uncorrelated

$$\left\langle \left( \vec{\mathbf{O}} - \vec{\mathbf{F}} \right) \left( \vec{\mathbf{O}} - \vec{\mathbf{A}} \right)^T \right\rangle = \mathbf{R}$$
$$\left\langle \left( \vec{\mathbf{A}} - \vec{\mathbf{F}} \right) \left( \vec{\mathbf{O}} - \vec{\mathbf{F}} \right)^T \right\rangle = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H}^T$$
$$\left\langle \left( \vec{\mathbf{O}} - \vec{\mathbf{F}} \right) \left( \vec{\mathbf{O}} - \vec{\mathbf{F}} \right)^T \right\rangle = \mathbf{R} + \mathbf{H} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{H}^T$$

2. **Iterative procedures based on updating the Kalman gain** (e.g Desroziers and Ivanov (2001), Desroziers et al. (2006))

- Easy to implement
- Dependent on prescribed error covariance matrices
- Iterative procedure may be required

Hodyss and Satterfield (2016) show that when the observation is higher resolution than the model state the Desroziers method and the H-L method have contributions from representation error as well as errors from resolved scales.

## **Estimating Representation Error**



3. Observation based methods to calculate representation error (e.g. Forget and Wunsch (2007), Oke and Sakov (2007))

- Average observation data to model resolution and interpolate back to high resolution grid to compute differences
- Ideally, we would like a continuous field, which observations cannot provide (using a spectral filter was discussed by Mitchell and Daley (1997) and Liu and Rabier (2002))
- effective spectral resolution of a particular model may be smaller than the spectral resolution of the model due to diffusion or model error terms which may act to smooth the field

### **Error of Representation**

200 hPa temperature 1 Jan 2015 **ECMWF** analyses 32km resolution

200 hPa temperature 1 Jan 2015 Filtered ECMWF analyses 125 km resolution



Filtering acts to smooth features

# **Error Variance due to spectral truncation of ECMWF analyses**

#### Error Variance due to Spectral Truncation. Shown for temperature.



Shown for January 2015

## omparison with ensemble variance

#### **Temperature shown for January 2015**



Error Variance due to Spectral Truncation of ECMWF deterministic forecast Time averaged ECMWF Ensemble Variance

## Is Representation Error Dependent on Ensemble Variance?

- We apply both the H-L and Desroziers methods to two equally populated subsets of data based on ensemble variance.
- We use the NAVGEM ensemble and model background and restrict the observation type to temperature measurements from Vaisala RS92 radiosondes to limit the influence of spatial variation of instrument error, correlation, errors from observation operator, and bias.

#### **Binning by ensemble variance** 50 100 150 H-L lower 50% 200 250 H-L upper 50% 300 **DES lower 50%** evel hPa 400 **DES upper 50%** 500 استحصالها ا 600 Pressure 650 700 **Boxes indicate** 800 levels at which both 850 methods result in 925 estimated 1000 observation error

0

variance values that are dependent on ensemble variance

**Estimated Observation Error Variance** 

2

3

4

### **Accounting for Representation Error**

#### Results for NAVGEM temperatures

A regression based method would allow us to prescribe a static error, as is currently done in the observation covariance model, and also allow for representation error to vary as a function of ensemble variance.





## Summary

- We then examined fluctuations in estimated observation error variances when the Desroziers and H-L methods are applied to subsets of innovations based on binning by ensemble variance.
- Our comparison of the two methods demonstrates that deficiencies in the estimation methods cannot explain such fluctuations.
- Regions of these fluctuations are in qualitative agreement with maps of variances due to spectral truncation.
- Our study indicates that the ensemble variance could be used as a predictor of representation error. The relative benefit of a flow dependent versus static form are the subject of current work.
- This procedure is general enough to be applied to other observation types, although potential spatial variations in instrument error as well as correlated errors need to be accounted for.



# Extra Slídes

# **Example Spectrums**

If our coarse resolution model truncated the spectrum at wavenumber 4 it would be entirely missing the "small-scale" processes creating the peak at wavenumber 8.

If we truncate at wavenumber 4, we will remove a substantial portion of the tail of the feature represented by the blue curve. This results in a misrepresentation of the feature and what we believe to be a key contributor to error of representation.



# Error Variance due to spectral truncation of ECMWF analyses

#### Zonally averaged Error Variance due to Spectral Truncation





July 2013

# Error Variance due to spectral truncation of ECMWF analyses

#### **Error Variance due to Spectral Truncation at 200hPa**



Jan 2015



July 2013

# **Comparison with ensemble variance**

#### Shown for January 2015

60N

55N

50N

45N

40N

35N

30N

25N

20N

15N

10N

5N

EQ 🕂



Error Variance due to Spectral Truncation of ECMWF deterministic forecast for Temperature at 200hPa

Time averaged ECMWF Ensemble Variance for Temperature at 200hPa

ğów 8ów 7ów 6ów 5ów 4ów 3ów 2ów 1ów -

60N 55N 45N 40N 35N 30N 25N 20N 15N 10N 5N EQ

0.35

Ó

EQ 90w 80w 70w 60w 50w 40w 30w 20w 10w 0

> Time averaged ECMWF 200hPa Temperature



0° 30° E 60° E 90° E 120° E 150° E 180° E 150° W 120° W 90° W 60° W 30° W 0°







The **Desrozier diagnostic (blue)** and the **prescribed observation error variances** (red) for a) a perfectly dispersive ensemble (a=1) b) an under dispersive ensemble a=0.2 and c) an over dispersive ensemble (a=2). (d-f) repeat (a-e) with reduced day to day variation of forecast error variance. (g-i) repeat (a-c) with reduced ensemble size.



Bins based on Ensemble Variance



### **Error of Representation**

200 hPa temperature 1 Jan 2015 ECMWF analyses 32km resolution 200 hPa temperature 1 Jan 2015 Filtered ECMWF analyses 125 km resolution



Filtering acts to smooth features





0.35