



### Land-surface data assimilation systems

### Pedro Viterbo Instituto de Meteorologia & Centro de Geofísica da Universidade de Lisboa

Agradecimentos: Alan Betts, Emanuel Dutra (CGUL), Matthias Drusch (ECMWF), Laura Ferranti (ECMWF)

ECMWF Workshop on atmospheric reanalysis, 19 - 22 June 2006



Layout



- Introduction: Imperfect models and inaccurate data
- Land surface in ERA-40: Strengths and weaknesses
- Soil moisture
- Snow
- Conclusions



Layout



- Introduction: Imperfect models and inaccurate data
  - Model drift
  - State variables
  - Observations
  - Reanalyses practice
- Land surface in ERA-40: Strengths and weaknesses
- Soil moisture
- Snow
- Conclusions





- Long time scales in land state variables (deeper soil water and temperature, snow): Forecast drifts are possible. A way of controlling model drift (initialisation of soil variables) is needed
- Drifts due to errors in forcing (precipitation, radiation, BL humidity) or in the land-surface model/model fluxes

Mackenzie river basin precipitation: era40 vs. observations







- There are no routine direct observations of soil state variables
- For an effective data assimilation, the state variables with longer timescales need to be initialised:

STATE VARIABLES	<b>OBSERVABLES</b>		
– Root zone soil moisture	No direct observations globally (see below)		
– Snow mass	Snow depth		
	Snow cover from remote sensing		
	<b>Snow mass from AMSR-E (saturates at higher values; does not work in forest areas)</b>		
– Above ground biomass	(Indirectly) from remote sensing: vegetation		
	indices, LAI/fAPAR		

- Proxy observations for root zone soil water
  - Screen level T and RH: Linked to Bowen ratio
  - Rainfall rates
  - Window channel brightness temperature: Early morning evolution is linked to evaporation
  - Microwave (L-band, 1.4 GHz) radiances: Top soil moisture
  - C-band passive and active systems: Top soil moisture
- State variables are non-linearly related (via the equations of the land-surface scheme) to observations: Complex observation operators



# **Current practice at global centres**



	Soil water	Snow mass	Biomass
JRA-25	???	Use of snow depth obs Snow cover	Monthly climate LAI
ERA-40	OI for root zone, based on 2T/RH	Use of snow depth obs, Cressman	Constant LAI
NCEP/NCAR R1	<b>Relaxation</b> to climate	Climate	Monthly climate LAI
NCEP/NCAR R2	(Observed precipitation "ingestion")	???	Monthly climate LAI

Land surface analysis lies, in terms of methods and data usage, far behind its atmospheric counterpart





- Global/North-American/European Land Data Assimilation Systems
  - Running offline a land surface scheme, forced by near-surface meteorology, downwelling radiative fluxes and precipitation
  - Best possible forcing, very often observation-based estimates hybridized with reanalysis
  - Inexpensive, often run with several models and several versions of the forcing. Ideal tool to have a land-surface model climate
- In most cases (GLDAS, NLDAS) LDAS is a misleading name, because there is no data assimilation involved: It assumes that the forcing is correct.
- Global Soil Water Project (GSWP) is one version of "LDAS", using best available forcing for 1986-1995



## Layout



- Introduction: Imperfect models and inaccurate data
- Land surface in ERA-40: Strengths and weaknesses
  - Surface fluxes
  - Soil water
  - Don't throw the baby with the bath water
- Soil moisture
- Snow
- Conclusions





•ERA-40: Boxes and whiskers; 2001 e 2002 ¤; 2003 •



- Positive surface solar radiation anomalies since March, associated to anomalously low cloud
- The surface starts responding in June, with an increase in sensible heat flux followed by a decrease in evaporation in July







- •SWI=1: No restrictions to evapotranspiration due to soil water
- •SWI=0: Evapotranspirations shuts



- Soil water anomalies from March onwards, peaking in August
- Summer anomalies not intense enough



### Soil water analysis increments







### Soil water: 2003 and climate





Soil water assimilation reduces seasonal soil water amplitude



### Mean annual range of soil water (Dirmeyer et al 1994, JHM)







### Reanalyses soil water (shaded) and GSWP: ranked validation against obs

**Monthly means** 





### Guo et al., 2006: QJRMS, accepted



22

673

#### Anomalies

• ERA-40 is the best reanalysis product, and better than many GSWP models

is sait helpp noch aim swap yf.

etem mose; lod ope in2 moses vise gold mme

isista -

40

r2 with swep is saib vise gold ope mma

jaba dim

lod noch reipp r1 mosesmost ere



## Layout



- Introduction: Imperfect models and inaccurate data
- Land surface in ERA-40; Strengths and weaknesses
- Soil moisture
  - What we do now: Assimilation based on two-metre temperature/humidity
  - What we should do: Sample the entire physical space, to avoid overfitting or aliasing
  - What we can do: Use LDAS as a weak constraint
- Snow
- Conclusions











### Latent heat flux

### Sensible heat flux





## What we do now

INSTITUTO DE METEOROLOGIA

PORTUGAL





- Screen level temperature and humidity are indirect linked to soil moisture through evaporative cooling.
- Microwave brightness temperature contains more direct information of near surface soil moisture and is less dependent on atmospheric conditions.
  - Penetration depth of µw Tb depends on:
    - Soil texture
    - Soil temperature profile
    - Vegetation fraction
    - Vegetation water content
    - Surface roughness
    - LSMEM (Land Surface Microwave Emissivity Model) for model equivalent of Tb
- Rate of change of thermal infrared brightness temperature contains information on soil moisture, but
  - Clear sky data only;
  - Model Tskin is very sensitive to aerodynamical resistance (surface roughness)







- Extended Kalman filter
- Assimilation of two-metre temperature and relative humidity and microwaveTb
- Updated forecast errors
- System is forced with observed estimates of precipitation and downward SW and LW surface radiation, where available







•The control simulation (indeed, all simulations) are too warm and too dry. Model day-to-day variability of humidity exceeds observations.

•Assimilation of screen-level parameters decrease the warm/dry bias by 30-40%.

•Assimilation of mw Tb, on top of screen-level parameters, slightly deteriorates the fit to screen-level observations.





## Surface soil moisture and Tb (SGP97)





# •All assimilation configurations improve the fit to top soil moisture, in particular those using Tb.









• On its own, Tb gives a very good simulation for the root layer.

• The use of screen-level parameters, w/ or w/o Tb, brings the simulation away from observations





- Evaporative fraction [EF=LE/(H+LE)], the relevant quantity for the surface impact on the atmosphere, is underestimated by the control simulation (cf. dry/warm bias).
- μw Tb, on its own, is not effective enough to change EF.
- EF is clearly improved when screen-level parameters are used.
- The synergy of all 3 observations is again visible.



### Problem 1: Matching vertical resolution of in-situ, remote sensing, and model soil moisture





**Matthias Drusch** 



## Joint and marginal pdf





**Matthias Drusch** 





### Oklahoma data sets 2002



**Matthias Drusch** 



## **CDF** matching











• CDF matching reduces systematic errors: The bias has been removed and the dynamic range has been adjusted.

 $r^2 = 0.18 \rightarrow r^2 = 0.69$ 



**Matthias Drusch** 



## **Transferred TMI images**





### TMI Pathfinder Data Set



Transferred TMI data (2002 regional transfer functions)



### ECMWF





- The use of LAI information requires model developments
  - In order to perform data assimilation the model has to look like the observations
- At present, LAI is time-invariant in the ECMWF
- Current development (monthly LAI climatology)
- In preparation (carbon/biomass) (w/ KNMI)
  - Photosynthesis-based evaporation formulation (from ISBA-Ags), linking water and carbon cycles
  - Spin-off: (natural) Land carbon fluxes
  - Vegetation: Biomass evolves according to parameterized growth and mortality functions
- Data assimilation of biomass using LAI retrievals (at Meteo-France)
  - Biomass to LAI observation operator
  - Variational approach minimizing the difference to background and observations
  - State variables: Biomass and soil moisture







- Analysis of Biomass using LAI observations (10 days analysis period)
- Good LAI correction
  - Overall good Biomass analysis (particularly in 2002)
  - Strong (negative) impact of root zone soil moisture, w2, (different LAI → different root water extraction and transpiration rates)







•Analysis of Biomass <u>and w2</u> using LAI observations (10 day analysis period) + non stationary covariance matrix

- Good LAI correction
- Overall good Biomass analysis
- •... but w2 better in agreement with observations during high water stress period







- Running TESSEL (land surface model of ERA-40) offline, forced by ERA-40
  - TESSEL results without land assimilation





### Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI): ERA-40 vs observations





**Emanuel Dutra** 





- AAS Normalized soil water anomaly
- SPI: Standardized precipitation index
- PDSI: Palmer Drought Stress Index (Official drought indicator in Portugal)





### SPI and normalized soil water anomaly





**Emanuel Dutra** 







**Emanuel Dutra** 





# Layout



- Introduction: Imperfect models and inaccurate data
- Land surface in ERA-40; Strengths and weaknesses
- Soil moisture
- Snow
  - Large analysis increments
  - Snow cover vs. snow depth
  - Model problems: Density and melting
- Conclusions



•Surface analysis increments are of the same order of the seasonal evolution of the soil water and snow mass budget





- Background (modified short term forecast)
- Observation operator uses model snow density to go from model snow mass to snow depth
- Snow depth (conventional observations)
- NOAA/NESDIS snow cover, ScNESDIS product is used
  - ScNESDIS=0 is unambiguous information
    - This information is presented as an observation
  - ScNESDIS > 0 and Scbackground=0 is ambiguous information
    - This information is used to modify the short term forecast, assigning a small value to these points
- In the following, we will compare analysed snow mass with MODIS snow extent and a high-resolution (1 km), highquality US snow analysis product (SNODAS); both fields are upscaled to model resolution



## **Comparison with MODIS**







INSTITUTO DE METEOROLOGIA

SNODAS 30/11/04



### Analysis w/o Sc<sub>NESDIS</sub> 30/11/04



Full analysis 30/11/04



**Matthias Drusch** 



# Layout



- Introduction: Imperfect models and inaccurate data
- Land surface in ERA-40; Strengths and weaknesses
- Soil moisture
- Snow
- Conclusions





- Land surface data assimilation is necessary to correct drifts in slow components of the land system, caused by deficiencies in the forcing or inaccurate (surface) model physics
- Surface analysis still lags behind its atmospheric counterpart
- New methods allow the use of more observations
  - A more complete sampling of soil water in physical space: Evaporative feedback to the atmosphere (two-metre temperature and humidity), hydrology (1.4 and 6.4 GHz microwave Tb), and vegetation state (vegetation indices, lead area index, ...)
  - Sinergy of 3 observation types reduces the risk of overfitting and/or aliasing
- Non-linear transfer functions to match model and observation space
  - Bias correction will always be necessary
- In case of contradictory information between screen-level parameters and mw Tb on soil moisture, NWP centres will tend to tune the assimilation to fit the evaporative fraction, since that is the quantity impacting on the atmosphere.
- In practice, the output of LDAS can be used to provide a penalty term to soil assimilation
- Snow
  - Check the observations beforehand (snow)
  - Need snow cover for whole reanalysis period (it exists since 1966)
  - Optimal ingestion of special observations (Russia and Canada)?