



# Recent Progresses and Ongoing Developments on Satellite Data Assimilation in GRAPES

Ruoying Yin<sup>1,2</sup>, Hao Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, Jincheng Wang<sup>1,2</sup>, Hongyi Xiao<sup>1,2</sup>, Yan Liu<sup>1,2</sup>, Di Di<sup>3</sup>, Hao Chen<sup>4</sup>,Lei Bi<sup>5</sup>, Hejun Xie<sup>5</sup> ,Ke Chen<sup>6</sup> and Wei Han<sup>1,2</sup> <sup>1</sup>NWPC/CMA <sup>2</sup>NMC/CMA <sup>3</sup>NUIST <sup>4</sup>JMO <sup>5</sup>ZJU <sup>6</sup>HUST

ITSC-23, June 29, 2021

### **Outline**

Progresses on Satellite data assimilation in GRAPES
 FY-4A GIIRS, AGRI
 FY-2H VISSR, FY-3D MWRI, HIRAS
 HY-2B HSCAT-B Wind

Ongoing developments on Satellite data assimilation
 Assimilation of surface sensitive microwave channels
 Actual spectral response of FY-3D MWTS in radiance assimilation
 Fast non-spherical scattering calculation for all-sky FY-3D radiance assimilation
 OSSE for future GEO microwave sounder

# Fengyun Satellite Series



# Radiance data used in GRAPES global 4D-Var

#### • AMSU-A

- NOAA-15: channels 5,7-10;
- NOAA-18: channels 6,7,10,11;
- NOAA-19: channels 5,6,9-11;
- METOP-A: channels 5,6,9-11;
- METOP-B: channels 5-11;
- NPP: channels 6-12,18-22;
- FY-3D: channels 5,6,7
- MHS
  - NOAA-19: channels 3,4,5;
  - METOP-A: channels 5,6,9-11;
  - METOP-B: channels 5,6,9-11;
  - FY-3C: channels 5,6,11,12
  - **FY-3D:** channels 2,3,4,5,6
- **FY-4A GIIRS:** channels 3-6,9-13,16,19,22,24,26,27,29,32-34,38,63,65,70-75,77-90,84-92,109,112-113,121-125,135-137,154,155,158,159166,184,225,245
- FY-3D HIRAS: channels 33-49,51-79,81,83,85-87,91,93,94,97,99,100,102,103,105
- METOP-A and METOP-B IASI: channels 2-11,15-18,25-44,46-51,53-70,72,85,86
- AQUA AIRS: channels 12-14,18-21,26,28-31,44-47,49,50-53,55-80,82
- FY-3D MWRI: channels 3,5,7
- FY2H VISSR: channels 3
- FY4A AGRI: channels 8,9
- Himawari-8 AHI: channels 8,9,10

### Data assimilation of FY-4 satellite series

- observation operator, quality control, channel selection, assimilation application
- The operational assimilation has been realized in December 2018, and the 5-day forecast accuracy in East Asia improved by about 2%
- The intelligent satellite observation based on forecast demand is realized, and improved typhoon forecasts.





## Data assimilation of FY-4 satellite series



Ruoying Yin. et al ,2021, Impact of high temporal resolution FY-4A Geostationary Interferometric Infrared Sounder (GIIRS) radiance measurements on Typhoon forecasts: Maria (2018) case with GRAPES global 4D-Var assimilation system, submitted to *GRL*.

6

## The evaluation of FY4A GIIRS L1 data calibration (V3, 20191107)



**spectral correlation coefficient** between observation and simulated brightness temperature over clear-sky ocean on December,12,2018

$$R = \frac{Cov(BT_{obs}, BT_{bkg})}{\sqrt{D(BT_{obs})}\sqrt{D(BT_{bkg})}}$$

On average, R increased from 0.9964 to 0.9998.

Improvement in Calibration

#### **Biases and standard deviations** of two

versions for GIIRS channels 1-300.







# **FOVs dependences** of biases (lines) and standard deviations (circles) of GIIRS channel 87

8

## Impact of GIIRS (V3) assimilation over East Asia (2020)



## The preliminary evaluation of FY4A GIIRS MW assimilation



Di, D., et.al., 2021. Geostationary Hyperspectral Infrared Sounder Channel Selection for Capturing Fast-Changing Atmospheric Information. IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2021.3078829

## **Impact on Typhoon Mangkhut (2018)**



-0.00018 -0.00012 -0.00006 0.00000 0.00006 0.00012 0.00018 0.00024 0.00030 Specific Humidity (kg/kg)





-0.0006 -0.0004 -0.0002 0.0000 0.0002 0.0004 0.0006 0.0008 0.0010 Specific Humidity (kg/kg)



-0.0012 -0.0009 -0.0006 -0.0003 0.0000 0.0003 0.0006 0.0009 0.0012 Specific Humidity (kg/kg)



EXP - CNTL lev=300 hPa





EXP - CNTL lev=500 hPa

40 Track of Typhoon Mangkhut

-0.00075 -0.00050 -0.00025 0.00000 0.00025 0.00050 0.00075 0.00100 0.00125

Specific Humidity (kg/kg)







-12

-8

-4 0

geopotential height

4

#### **Neutral impact**

# FY-4A AGRI data Assimilated in GRAPES

Quality Control Scheme

Specific content of the scheme







Forecast Hour

#### Typhoon Jongdari (2018)

0.1-4.0

4.0-13.0

13.0-25.0

(unit:mm)

25.0~60.0

>60.0

0.1-4.0

4.0~13.0

13.0-25.0 25.0-60.0

(unit:mm)



>60.0

# FY-2H VISSR data Quality Control and Assimilation effect



#### Score Card for vissr against ctrl Domain Parameter Level RMS Error Anomaly Correlation 250 UWND 600 850 260 VWND 500 \* \* EASI 850 250 TEMP 500 850 250 HGT 600 700 250 UWND 500 860 250 VWND 500 NH 850 250 TEMP 600 850 250 HGT 500 700 250 UWND 600 850 250 VWND 500 SH 650 260 TEMP 500 850 250 HGT 600 700 260 UWND 500 850 250 VWND 500 TEO 850 . . . 250 \* \* \* TEMP 600 \* \* \* **T** 850 250 **T** HGT 500 700 A: Far better ▲: Better 📕 : Better but not significant : Equality V: Far worse T: Worse 📑 : Worse but not significant

#### **Assimilation of FY3D-MWRI: Introduction**

(Hongyi Xiao, Han Wei)





## DA of FY3D-MWRI: Quality Control

(Hongyi Xiao, Han Wei)

				40% -	CH3	After QC
	QC scheme	Details		35% -		
Abnormal Factor	1. Gross value	$T_b < 70$ K or $T_b > 320$ K (Huang et al., 2013).		-		
	2. Absolute departure	Absolute departure>3K (Yang et al., 2016).		25% - بر	-	
	3. Relative departure	Relative departure $> 3\sigma_0$ (Yang et al., 2016).	_	20% -	-	
Surface Factor	4. Surface type	1, SIC $\neq 0$ (Huang et al., 2013). 2, SST <274K (Xiao et al., 2020). 3, ASI algorithm (Speen et al., 2008): $P = T_V^{89} - T_H^{89} < P_0 = 47K;$ $GR(37/19) = (T_V^{37} - T_V^{19})/(T_V^{37} + T_V^{19}) < 0.045;$ $GR(23/19) = (T_V^{23} - T_V^{19})/(T_V^{23} + T_V^{19}) < 0.04.$	<sup>35%</sup> - <sup>30%</sup> - 25% - <sup>20%</sup> -	After QC ZZJ Before QC	-15 -10 -5 O-	и 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 5 10 15 2 В (K)
	5. Land-sea contamination	$T_{v}^{10} > 175K$ or $T_{H}^{10} > 95K$ (Huang et al., 2013).	15% -			
Weather Factor	6. Abnormal TPW	TPW<0 (Yang et al., 2017).	10% -			
	7. Abnormal wind speed	SWS>30m/s (Nielsen-Englyst et al., 2018).	5% -	800000-	CH5	After QC
	8. Rain region	1, MRR $\neq 0$ (Liu et al., 2012). 2, if anyone is satisfied (Betthenhausen et al., 2006): $T_V^{37} - 0.979T_H^{37} < 55;$ $1.175T_V^{18.7} - 30 > T_V^{37};$ $T_V^{18.7} > 170;$ $T_V^{37} > 210.$	<sub>0%</sub> <u>-20 -15 -10 -5 0</u> O-B (k	<u>44.001111111111111111111111111111111111</u>		2:2: Before QC
	9. Cloud detection	$LWP > \begin{cases} 0.3mm, CH3\\ 0.25mm, CH5\\ 0.1 mm, CH7\\ LWP is calculated by Zou and Tang (2017). \end{cases}$		10% - 5% - 0% -	20 -15 -10 -5	
Anthropic factor	10.RFIs detection	$T_H^{19} - T_H^{23} > 5$ K, $T_V^{19} - T_V^{23} > 5$ K (Zou et al., 2013).			0-	в (к) 15

## DA of FY3D-MWRI: Bias Correction and Observation Error

(Hongyi Xiao, Han Wei)

The statistics of bias correction coefficient of FY3C/D-MWRI is made by radiances data during 20180713-0725 in GRAPES\_GFS2.4.



Observation error

Bias

Correction

The statistics of observation error of FY3C/D-MWRI is made by radiances data during 20180713-0725 in GRAPES GFS2.4..

## **DA of FY3D-MWRI: Case Experiments**



Typhoon Shanshan (1813)

Hongyi Xiao' oral presentation (8.03), Impact of FY-3D MWRI Radiance Assimilation in GRAPES 4D-Var on Typhoon Shanshan Forecasts

### **Assimilation of FY3D-MWRI: Batch Experiments**

#### (Hongyi Xiao, Han Wei)



# **Adaptive Channel Selection for FY-3D HIRAS**

Local integrated channel selection scheme for assimilation: different channel subsets according to different atmospheric profile characteristics, background errors and channels sensitivity characteristics of different levels of different regions.





#### **1DVAR** experiment



Analysis Error assimilated "Plateau Channels"

# Local integrated channel selection scheme can significantly reduce the analysis error. 20

## Assimilation of NOAA19 AMSU-A over land

(Hongyi Xiao, Han Wei)



#### LSE retrieval by window channel



Previous analyses have revealed that, for most surfaces, AMSU emissivities vary smoothly with frequency and that it is possible to use window frequency emissivities for sounding ones. Thus, emissivity estimates obtained at window channels can be allocated to higher frequency channels without extrapolation.

### DA of NOAA19 AMSU-A over land: LSE calculation

(Hongyi Xiao, Han Wei)

0.053

0.11 22



while worse than LSE retrieval by window channel.

## DA of NOAA19 AMSU-A over land: Quality Control

AMSU-A质量控制									
No.	Algorithms	Targets	References						
1	latitude $> 60^{\circ}$	ice/snow							
2	mixed surface type	Land contamination	Baordo and Geer, 2016: Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc., 142						
3	land surface temperature $< 278$ K	ice/snow	2854-2866.						
4	LSE(TELSEM—retrieval)> threshold	abnormal							
5	$C = 0.8^2 + \left[ w_4 \Delta T_b \left( 6 \right) \right]^2 \ge 1$	precipitating cloud	Zhu, Liu, Kleist, et al., 2016: Mon. Wea. Rev., 144:4709-4735.						
6	$C = (w_1 \times 0.6)^2 + [w_2 \Delta T_b (4)]^2 > 0.5$	thick-cloud							
7	Ch5 (>500m); Ch6 (>1500m)	land contamination	Yang, Han, Dong, 2011: Meteorol. Mon., 37(11): 1395-1401.						









(Hongyi Xiao,

Han Wei)



# **HSCAT-B Wind Assimilation in GRAPES\_GFS 4DVAR**



# Impact on GRAPES-GFS analyses and forecasts





The forecast skills are **improved significant** for Southern Hemisphere and Tropics.

#### Root Mean Squared Error Reduction Rate of U and V analyses by HSCAT-B Wind Assimilation

# The impact of considering actual spectral response of FY-3D MWTS in radiance assimilation

Comparing with ideal Spectral Response Function(SRF),

- 1. Dose actual SRF affect the microwave radiance simulation(MRS)?
- 2. How much dose actual SRF affect the simulation?
- 3. How dose actual SRF affect the simulation?





# Actual SRF does affect the MRS.

Chen, H.\*, Han, W.\*, Wang, H., Pan, C., An, D., Gu, S., & Zhang, P. (2021). Why and how does the actual spectral response matter for microwave radiance assimilation?.

*Geophysical Research Letters*, *48*, e2020GL092306.

https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092306

#### Effects of actual SRF on MRS varies according to channel ID and latitude



Table 1 RMSE of OM Ideal SRFs	(B, Bias of Simulated TB, and STDV of O Channel Channel Channel Me 5 6 7			∕of OMB Mean	by Actual and Relative difference between means by actual SRFs and by ideal SRFs	
RMSE(K)						
Ideal SRF	1.14	0.88	0.85	0.96		
Actual SRF	0.75	0.61	0.66	0.67	-30.2%	
Bias (K)						
Ideal SRF	0.99	0.78	0.72	0.83		
Actual SRF	0.60	0.47	0.48	0.52	-37.3%	
STDV(K)						
Ideal SRF	0.75	0.47	0.58	0.6		
Actual SRF	0.73	0.61	0.54	0.63	5%	

Abbreviations: OMB, Observation minus Background; RMSE, Root Mean Squared Error; SRF, Spectral Response Function; STDV, STandard DeViation; TB, Brightness Temperature.

(f) Longitude-mean number and difference of OMB of MWTS-2 Channel 5 (left), 6 (middle) and 7 (right) versus latitude

Five typical deformation types were formed to demonstrate the mechanism of the effects of actual SRF on MRS.









#### Different deformations have different degrees of effects on MRS.



Hao Chen' poster (3p.03), Why and how does the actual spectral response matter for microwave radiance assimilation ?

3

# **Progress on Nonspherical Particle Scattering**

Build the original database based on the latest invariant imbedding Tmatrix method.



#### **Rigorous and efficient computational technique**

(Bi et al., 2014; 2018)

> A new approach to parameterize nonspherical particle shapes



#### flexible shape control Continous shape variation

#### + A machine learning approach

# **Progress on Nonspherical Particle Scattering**

#### Horizontaly oriented ice crystals



Euler Angle ß

33

 $y_L$ 

## **Progress on Nonspherical Particle Scattering**



# **All-sky Passive Microwave Simulations of FY-3D**



Four vertical inhomogeneity scenarios for sensitivity test Observation vs Simulation @ 89.0GHz

Vertical ice habit variation has significant impact on the TOA bright temperature simulations.

Xie, H., Lei Bi, Wei Han, Jincheng Wang, 2020. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres,* 125(21): e2020JD032817.

# **All-sky Passive Microwave Simulations of FY-3D**



> An incorporation of vertical habit variation could bring simulations closer to observations.

Xie, H., Lei Bi, Wei Han, Jincheng Wang, 2020. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres,* 125(21): e2020JD032817.

# **Geostationary microwave sounder (GEO-MW)**

ThMan-50 3-2012-10-29 00 00 00 mat

## **GEO-MW:** Provide high-frequent measurements of 3D atmosphere structure



Chen Ke, Hong Pengfei, Han Wei, et al. 2021. Geostationary microwave observation system simulation experiments based on GRAPES 4D-Var. Acta Meteorologica Sinica, accepted. (in Chinese)



TbMap-54.4-2012-10-29 00 00 00.mat

ThMap-88 2-2012-10-29 00 00 00 mat

# **Motivation**

**Problem:** As unprecedented satellite observation data, the application effect of GEO- MW observation on numerical weather prediction (NWP) is still unknow.

**Goal:** Provide an independent assessment of GEO- MW based on <u>Observing</u> <u>System Simulation Experiments (OSSEs)</u>, which examine if these very frequent microwave observations would be beneficial to mesoscale NWP.



# **GEO-MW OSSE** flow chart based on GRAPES 4D-VAR



# **GEO simulated observed brightness temperature**



# **GEO-MW OSSE – various frequency bands**





True bright temprature assimination Observed bright temprature assimination Controlled trial

Sprectrum/GHz

425

ALL

118

50-60

# **GEO-MW OSSE** –various time intervals













# **GEO-MW OSSE** –various noise level









#### Summary

Progresses on Satellite data assimilation in GRAPES
 FY-4A GIIRS, AGRI
 FY-2H VISSR, FY-3D MWRI, HIRAS
 HY-2B HSCAT-B Winds

#### Ongoing developments on Satellite data assimilation

- Use of surface sensitive channels
- Considering the actual spectral response of microwave sensors in RT models
- All-sky assimilation: Nonspherical Particle Scattering (shape, size, parameterization,...)
- OSSE for GEO-MW: Channels, Resolution, NeDT, ...

This study has been jointly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (42075155) and National Key Research and Development Programs of the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (2018YFC1506405)

#### References

- Yin, R.,W. Han, Z.Gao and D.Di. 2020, The evaluation of FY4A's Geostationary Interferometric Infrared Sounder (GIIRS) longwave temperature sounding channels using the GRAPES global 4D- Var. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146, 1459–1476. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3746</u>.
- Yin R., W. Han, Z.Gao, G. Wang, 2019, A study on longwave infrared channel selection based on estimates of background errors and observation errors in the detection area of FY-4A. Acta Meteorologica Sinica, 77(5): 898-910, doi:10.11676/qxxb2019.051
- Di, D., J. Li, W. Han, W. Bai, C. Wu, and W. P. Menzel, 2018: Enhancing the fast radiative transfer model for FengYun-4 GIIRS by using local training profiles, Journal of Geophysical Research Atmospheres, 123, doi:10.1029/2018JD029089.
- Xiao, H., Han, W., Wang, H., Wang, J., Liu, G., Xu, C., 2020. Impact of FY-3D MWRI Radiance Assimilation in GRAPES 4DVar on Forecasts of Typhoon Shanshan. J Meteorol Res 34, 836–850. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s13351-020-9122-x</u>
- Xie, H., Bi, L., Han, W., Wang, J., 2020. Vertical Inhomogeneity Effect of Frozen Hydrometeor Habits in All-Sky Passive Microwave Simulations. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 125, e2020JD032817. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020JD032817</u>
- Chen, H., Han, W., Wang, H., Pan, C., An, D., Gu, S., Zhang, P., 2021. Why and How Does the Actual Spectral Response Matter for Microwave Radiance Assimilation? *Geophysical Research Letters* 48, e2020GL092306. <u>https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL092306</u>
- Di, D., Li, J., Han, W., Yin, R., 2021. Geostationary Hyperspectral Infrared Sounder Channel Selection for Capturing Fast-Changing Atmospheric Information. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 1–10. <u>https://doi.org/10.1109/TGRS.2021.3078829</u>
- Chen Ke, Hong Pengfei, Han Wei, Li Zeyu, Wang Hao, Wang Jincheng, Chen Hao, Zhang Zhiqing, Xie Zhenchao. 2021. Geostationary microwave observation system simulation experiments based on GRAPES 4D-Var. Acta Meteorologica Sinica, accepted. (in Chinese)