

Adaptive (Prior|Posterior?) Inflation for Ensemble Kalman Filters

Moha Gharamti, NCAR, Boulder, CO



University of Colorado Boulder

Data Assimilation [APPM 5510]

gharamti@ucar.edu Nov. 1st, 2019





Table of Contents

The Ensemble Kalman Filter

2 Covariance Inflation

- Prior Inflation
- Posterior Inflation

3 Applications

- Low-order Models: Lorenz-96|63
- High-order Model: CAM

4 Conclusions

The EnKF

- State estimation tool
- Given an observation *y* of state *x*, use Bayes:

 $\rho(x_{k}|y_{k}, Y_{k-1}) \approx \rho(x_{k}|Y_{k-1}) \cdot \rho(y_{k}|x_{k}, Y_{k-1})$ (1)

 Y_k : { $y_1, y_2, ..., y_{k-1}, y_k$ }, *k* is time index

The EnKF

- State estimation tool
- Given an observation *y* of state *x*, use Bayes:

 $\rho(x_{k}|y_{k}, Y_{k-1}) \approx \rho(x_{k}|Y_{k-1}) \cdot \rho(y_{k}|x_{k}, Y_{k-1})$ (1)

 Y_k : { $y_1, y_2, ..., y_{k-1}, y_k$ }, *k* is time index

• Successive Forecast and Update (Analysis) stages:

$$x_f^i = \mathcal{M}\left(x_a^i\right)$$

$$\overline{x}_{f} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{f}^{i}, \qquad \widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(x_{f}^{i} - \overline{x}_{f} \right) \left(x_{f}^{i} - \overline{x}_{f} \right)^{T}$$
$$x_{a}^{i} = x_{f}^{i} + \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}}{\sigma_{o}^{2} + \widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}} \left(y^{i} - x_{f}^{i} \right)$$

N is the ensemble size





$$\overline{x}_f = 4.5, \, \widehat{\sigma}_f^2 = 0.30$$



$$\overline{x}_f = 4.5, \, \widehat{\sigma}_f^2 = 0.30$$

 $y = 6.0, \, \sigma_o^2 = 0.20$



$$\overline{x}_f = 4.5, \, \widehat{\sigma}_f^2 = 0.30$$

 $y = 6.0, \, \sigma_o^2 = 0.20$



$$\overline{x}_f = 4.5, \, \widehat{\sigma}_f^2 = 0.30$$

 $y = 6.0, \, \sigma_o^2 = 0.20$
 $\overline{x}_a = 5.43, \, \widehat{\sigma}_a^2 = 0.06$

The EnKF cont.

Some Drawbacks

- 1. Sampling Errors:
 - Ideal scenario: $N = \infty$; σ_f^2 is out-of-reach!
 - $\hat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$ depends on the ensemble size

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\widehat{\sigma}_f^2(N)=\sigma_f^2$$

• When *N* is small, $\hat{\sigma}_f^2$ may **<u>underestimate</u>** σ_f^2

The EnKF cont.

Some Drawbacks

- 1. Sampling Errors:
 - Ideal scenario: $N = \infty$; σ_f^2 is out-of-reach!
 - $\hat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$ depends on the ensemble size

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\widehat{\sigma}_f^2(N)=\sigma_f^2$$

- When *N* is small, $\hat{\sigma}_f^2$ may **<u>underestimate</u>** σ_f^2
- 2. Model Errors:
 - Biased model produces ensemble predictions that are far from the observations. May lead to **ensemble collapse**

The EnKF cont.

Some Drawbacks

- 1. Sampling Errors:
 - Ideal scenario: $N = \infty$; σ_f^2 is out-of-reach!
 - $\hat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$ depends on the ensemble size

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\widehat{\sigma}_f^2(N)=\sigma_f^2$$

- When *N* is small, $\hat{\sigma}_f^2$ may **<u>underestimate</u>** σ_f^2
- 2. Model Errors:
 - Biased model produces ensemble predictions that are far from the observations. May lead to **ensemble collapse**

The goal is to maintain *enough* spread in the ensemble

Inflation

• One way to increase of the variance of the ensemble is to inflate:

$$x^{i} \leftarrow \sqrt{\lambda} \left(x^{i} - \overline{x} \right) + \overline{x}$$
 (2)

while preserving the ensemble mean.

Inflation

• One way to increase of the variance of the ensemble is to inflate:

$$x^{i} \leftarrow \sqrt{\lambda} \left(x^{i} - \overline{x} \right) + \overline{x}$$
 (2)

while preserving the ensemble mean.

- Which variance to inflate: Prior (after the forecast) or posterior (after the update)?
- What to choose for λ? 1.02 (2%), 1.04, 1.2, 10, ... ?
- Why this is useful?



$$\overline{x}_f = 4.5, \sigma_f^2 = 0.30$$

 $y = 6.0, \sigma_o^2 = 0.20$
 $\overline{x}_a = 5.43, \sigma_a^2 = 0.06$



$$\overline{x}_f = 4.5, \sigma_f^2 = 0.05$$

 $y = 6.0, \sigma_o^2 = 0.20$
 $\overline{x}_a = 4.75, \sigma_a^2 = 0.02$



$$\sigma_{f}^{2}: 0.05 \to 0.15$$

$$\overline{x}_a = 4.75 \rightarrow 5.18$$

 $\sigma_a^2 = 0.02 \rightarrow 0.07$



Higher spread: Larger uncertainty (less confidence in the estimates)!

• Idea is to use the data to estimate the inflation parameter.

• Idea is to use the data to estimate the inflation parameter. For a single variable case, denote the following:

Forecast (Background) error:
$$\varepsilon_f \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_f^2\right)$$
, (3)

Observation error:
$$\varepsilon_o \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_o^2\right)$$
, (4)

Analysis error:
$$\varepsilon_a \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_a^2\right)$$
; $\sigma_a^2 \stackrel{\text{Kalman}}{=} \sigma_o^2 \sigma_f^2 / (\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2)$. (5)

• Idea is to use the data to estimate the inflation parameter. For a single variable case, denote the following:

Forecast (Background) error:
$$\varepsilon_f \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_f^2\right)$$
, (3)

Observation error:
$$\varepsilon_o \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_o^2\right)$$
, (4)

Analysis error:
$$\varepsilon_a \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_a^2\right)$$
; $\sigma_a^2 \stackrel{\text{Kalman}}{=} \sigma_o^2 \sigma_f^2 / (\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2)$. (5)

The forecast innovation (discrepancy):

$$d_f = y - \overline{x}_f = y - x_t + x_t - \overline{x}_f = \varepsilon_o - \varepsilon_f, \tag{6}$$

where x_t is the true value of the variable.

• Idea is to use the data to estimate the inflation parameter. For a single variable case, denote the following:

Forecast (Background) error:
$$\varepsilon_f \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_f^2\right)$$
, (3)

Observation error:
$$\varepsilon_o \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_o^2\right)$$
, (4)

Analysis error:
$$\varepsilon_a \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_a^2\right)$$
; $\sigma_a^2 \stackrel{\text{Kalman}}{=} \sigma_o^2 \sigma_f^2 / (\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2)$. (5)

The forecast innovation (discrepancy):

$$d_f = y - \overline{x}_f = y - x_t + x_t - \overline{x}_f = \varepsilon_o - \varepsilon_f, \tag{6}$$

where x_t is the true value of the variable.

Bayesian Approach [Anderson 2007, Anderson 2009, El Gharamti 2018]

 $p(\lambda|d_f) \propto p(\lambda) \cdot p(d_f|\lambda)$

• **Prior:** $p(\lambda)$ prescribed .. a Gaussian, an inverse-Gamma

- **Prior:** $p(\lambda)$ prescribed .. a Gaussian, an inverse-Gamma
- Likelihood: $p(d_f|\lambda) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}(d_f), var(d_f))$

• **Prior:** $p(\lambda)$ prescribed .. a Gaussian, an inverse-Gamma • **Likelihood:** $p(d_f|\lambda) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}(d_f), var(d_f))$

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{o} - \varepsilon_{f}) = \mathbf{0}, \tag{8}$$

$$var(d_f) = \theta^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[(d_f - \mathbb{E}(d_f))^2 \right]$$
(9)

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon_o^2 - \varepsilon_o\varepsilon_f - \varepsilon_f\varepsilon_o + \varepsilon_f^2\right]$$
(10)

$$=\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2 \tag{11}$$

$$\Rightarrow \theta^{2}(\lambda) = \sigma_{o}^{2} + \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$$
(12)

• **Prior:** $p(\lambda)$ prescribed .. a Gaussian, an inverse-Gamma • **Likelihood:** $p(d_f|\lambda) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}(d_f), var(d_f))$

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{o} - \varepsilon_{f}) = \mathbf{0},$$
(8)

$$var(d_f) = \theta^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(d_f - \mathbb{E} \left(d_f \right) \right)^2 \right]$$
(9)

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon_o^2 - \varepsilon_o\varepsilon_f - \varepsilon_f\varepsilon_o + \varepsilon_f^2\right]$$
(10)

$$=\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2 \tag{11}$$

$$\Rightarrow \theta^{2}(\lambda) = \sigma_{o}^{2} + \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$$
(12)

Assumptions:

1. Observation and forecast errors are uncorrelated; $\mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon_o \varepsilon_f \right] = 0$

• **Prior:** $p(\lambda)$ prescribed .. a Gaussian, an inverse-Gamma • **Likelihood:** $p(d_f|\lambda) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}(d_f), var(d_f))$

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{o} - \varepsilon_{f}) = \mathbf{0},$$
(8)

$$var(d_f) = \theta^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(d_f - \mathbb{E} \left(d_f \right) \right)^2 \right]$$
(9)

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon_o^2 - \varepsilon_o\varepsilon_f - \varepsilon_f\varepsilon_o + \varepsilon_f^2\right]$$
(10)

$$=\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2 \tag{11}$$

$$\Rightarrow \theta^{2}(\lambda) = \sigma_{o}^{2} + \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$$
(12)

Assumptions:

1. Observation and forecast errors are uncorrelated; $\mathbb{E} [\varepsilon_o \varepsilon_f] = 0$ 2. Errors are associated only with the forecast variance. The observation error variance σ_o^2 is known and is right!

• **Prior:** $p(\lambda)$ prescribed .. a Gaussian, an inverse-Gamma • **Likelihood:** $p(d_f|\lambda) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbb{E}(d_f), var(d_f))$

$$\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_{o} - \varepsilon_{f}) = \mathbf{0},$$
(8)

$$var(d_f) = \theta^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(d_f - \mathbb{E} \left(d_f \right) \right)^2 \right]$$
(9)

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\varepsilon_o^2 - \varepsilon_o\varepsilon_f - \varepsilon_f\varepsilon_o + \varepsilon_f^2\right]$$
(10)

$$=\sigma_o^2 + \sigma_f^2 \tag{11}$$

$$\Rightarrow \theta^{2}(\lambda) = \sigma_{o}^{2} + \lambda \widehat{\sigma}_{f}^{2}$$
(12)

Assumptions:

1. Observation and forecast errors are uncorrelated; $\mathbb{E} \left[\varepsilon_o \varepsilon_f \right] = 0$

2. Errors are associated only with the forecast variance. The observation error variance σ_o^2 is known and is right!

3. Inflating the ensemble variance by λ will match the theoretical (hidden) forecast variance

• Posterior:

$$\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \Im(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{\theta}^{2}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right), \qquad (13)$$

• Posterior:

$$\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \Im \mathcal{G}(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{\theta}^{2}\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}\right)\right), \tag{13}$$

$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda^{-\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} \exp\left(-\frac{d_f^2}{2\theta^2}\right),$$
$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}\Gamma(\alpha)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta d_f^2}{2\lambda\theta^2}\right), \qquad (14)$$

• Posterior:

$$\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \Im(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{\theta}^{2}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right), \qquad (13)$$

$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda^{-\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} \exp\left(-\frac{d_f^2}{2\theta^2}\right),$$
$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}\Gamma(\alpha)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta d_f^2}{2\lambda\theta^2}\right), \qquad (14)$$

• Form very close to being inverse-gamma

• Posterior:

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}(\lambda|\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \Im(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{\theta}^{2}(\lambda)\right), \qquad (13)$$

$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda^{-\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} \exp\left(-\frac{d_f^2}{2\theta^2}\right),$$

$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\theta\Gamma(\alpha)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta d_f^2}{2\lambda\theta^2}\right), \qquad (14)$$

- Form very close to being inverse-gamma
- To find the posterior mode, need to maximize $p(\lambda|d_f)$. Not easy!

• Posterior:

$$\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{d}_{f}) = \Im(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cdot \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{0},\boldsymbol{\theta}^{2}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\right), \qquad (13)$$

$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \lambda^{-\alpha-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta}} \exp\left(-\frac{d_{f}^{2}}{2\theta^{2}}\right),$$
$$= \frac{\beta^{\alpha} \lambda^{-\alpha-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi\theta} \Gamma(\alpha)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta d_{f}^{2}}{2\lambda\theta^{2}}\right), \qquad (14)$$

- Form very close to being inverse-gamma
- To find the posterior mode, need to maximize $p(\lambda|d_f)$. Not easy!
- Linearizing the Likelihood will simplify the problem:

$$p(d_{f}|\lambda) \approx \underbrace{p(d_{f}|\lambda_{f})}_{\overline{\ell}} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial p(d_{f}|\lambda)}{\partial \lambda}}_{\ell'}|_{\lambda_{f}} (\lambda - \lambda_{f}), \qquad (15)$$

 λ_{f} is the mode of the prior distribution. Set $\ell=\overline{\ell}/\ell'$:

$$(1 - \lambda_f / \beta) \lambda^2 + (\ell - 2\lambda_f) \lambda + (\lambda_f^2 - \lambda_f \ell) = 0$$
(16)









Follow similar Bayes' formulation:

$$p(\lambda | d_a) \propto p(\lambda) \cdot p(d_a | \lambda)$$
 (17)

Follow similar Bayes' formulation:

$$\boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{d}_{a}\right) \propto \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \cdot \boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{d}_{a}|\boldsymbol{\lambda}\right) \tag{17}$$

$$\mathbb{E}(d_a) = \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_o) - \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_a) = 0, \qquad (18)$$

Follow similar Bayes' formulation:

$$\boldsymbol{p}\left(\lambda|\boldsymbol{d}_{a}\right) \propto \boldsymbol{p}(\lambda) \cdot \boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{d}_{a}|\lambda\right) \tag{17}$$

$$\mathbb{E} (d_a) = \mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_o) - \mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_a) = 0, \qquad (18)$$

$$var (d_a) = \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_o^2\right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_a^2\right) - 2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_o \varepsilon_a)}_{\neq 0 \text{ correlated errors}}, \qquad$$

Follow similar Bayes' formulation:

where

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(\lambda|\boldsymbol{d}_{a}\right) \propto \boldsymbol{\rho}(\lambda) \cdot \boldsymbol{\rho}\left(\boldsymbol{d}_{a}|\lambda\right) \tag{17}$$

$$\mathbb{E} (d_{a}) = \mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_{o}) - \mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_{a}) = 0, \qquad (18)$$

$$var (d_{a}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_{o}^{2}\right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_{a}^{2}\right) - 2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_{o}\varepsilon_{a})}_{\neq 0 \text{ correlated errors}}, \qquad (18)$$

$$= \sigma_{o}^{2} + \sigma_{a}^{2} - 2\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - K) \varepsilon_{o}\varepsilon_{f} + K\varepsilon_{o}^{2} \right], \qquad \dots \qquad (19)$$

$$K = \sigma_{f}^{2} \left(\sigma_{o}^{2} + \sigma_{f}^{2}\right)^{-1}. \text{ Thus,}$$

Follow similar Bayes' formulation:

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}\left(\lambda|\boldsymbol{d}_{a}\right) \propto \boldsymbol{\rho}(\lambda) \cdot \boldsymbol{\rho}\left(\boldsymbol{d}_{a}|\lambda\right) \tag{17}$$

$$\mathbb{E} (d_{a}) = \mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_{o}) - \mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_{a}) = 0, \qquad (18)$$

$$var (d_{a}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_{o}^{2}\right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\varepsilon_{a}^{2}\right) - 2 \underbrace{\mathbb{E} (\varepsilon_{o}\varepsilon_{a})}_{\neq 0 \text{ correlated errors}}, \qquad (18)$$

$$= \sigma_{o}^{2} + \sigma_{a}^{2} - 2\mathbb{E} \left[(1 - K) \varepsilon_{o}\varepsilon_{f} + K\varepsilon_{o}^{2} \right], \qquad \dots \qquad (19)$$

$$where K = \sigma_{f}^{2} \left(\sigma_{o}^{2} + \sigma_{f}^{2}\right)^{-1}. \text{ Thus,} \qquad (19)$$









Low-Order Models: Lorenz-63









CAM (The Community Atmosphere Model)

- version: CESM2_0_beta05
- resolution: 1.9° × 1.9° FV core; LAT: 96, LON: 144, LEV: 26
- State variables: surface pressure (PS), sensible temperature (T), wind components (U and V), specific humidity (Q), cloud liquid water (CLDLIQ) and cloud ice (CLDICE).

CAM (The Community Atmosphere Model)

- version: CESM2_0_beta05
- resolution: 1.9° × 1.9° FV core; LAT: 96, LON: 144, LEV: 26
- State variables: surface pressure (PS), sensible temperature (T), wind components (U and V), specific humidity (Q), cloud liquid water (CLDLIQ) and cloud ice (CLDICE).
- DA: 08.16.2010 to 09.30.2010
- 80 members
- data available every 6 hours



CAM (The Community Atmosphere Model)

- version: CESM2_0_beta05
- resolution: 1.9° × 1.9° FV core; LAT: 96, LON: 144, LEV: 26
- State variables: surface pressure (PS), sensible temperature (T), wind components (U and V), specific humidity (Q), cloud liquid water (CLDLIQ) and cloud ice (CLDICE).
- DA: 08.16.2010 to 09.30.2010
- 80 members
- data available every 6 hours



Observations available at 2010.09.06 00:00:00 UTC

- 40°S 60°S 60°S 60°E 60°E 120°E 180°W 120°W 180°W 120°W 10°W 10°W
- Horizontal localization: \approx 960 km
- DART: latest 'Manhattan' release

CAM Assimilation Results: Bias Treatment











Al-b, Average bias: 0.07 K







Al-ab, Average bias: -0.01 K

CAM Assimilation Results: Inflation Fields







B- Inf. maps time-correlation, AI-b & AI-ab

Overall correlation avg. 0.69

0.4

0.2

30-Sep-2010

OIL

86

119 164

227 14 434

601

788

930

993

15-Sep-2010





Conclusion

- Inflation is an important tool for ensemble Kalman filters
- The adaptive algorithm is based on Bayes' and uses forecast/analysis innovations to update the inflation
- With no model errors, posterior inflation produces higher quality estimates than prior inflation (better treatment of sampling errors)
- When model errors are dominant, as in CAM4, posterior inflation is found less useful
- Compelling results obtained by combining both prior and posterior inflation

Conclusion

- Inflation is an important tool for ensemble Kalman filters
- The adaptive algorithm is based on Bayes' and uses forecast/analysis innovations to update the inflation
- With no model errors, posterior inflation produces higher quality estimates than prior inflation (better treatment of sampling errors)
- When model errors are dominant, as in CAM4, posterior inflation is found less useful
- Compelling results obtained by combining both prior and posterior inflation

Papers

- Gharamti, M. E. (2018) "Enhanced Adaptive Inflation Algorithm for Ensemble Filters." *Monthly Weather Review*, 2, 623-640
- Gharamti, M. E., Raeder, K., Anderson, J. and Wang, X. (2019) "Comparing Adaptive Prior and Posterior Inflation for Ensemble Filters Using an Atmospheric General Circulation Model." *Monthly Weather Review*, 147, 2535-2553

THANK YOU

DART webpage: https://dart.ucar.edu/

NCAR|DART

National Center for Atmospheric Research

DOCUMENTATION RESEARCH ABOUT US SUPPORT RELEASES

WELCOME TO DART

DART has been reformulated to better support the ensemble data assimilation needs of researchers who are interested in nativo natCDF support, less filesystem I/O, better computational performance, good scaling for large processor counts, and support for the memory requirements of very large models. Manhattan has support for many of our larger models (*MRF*, *POP, CAM, CICE, CLM, ROMS, MRAS_ATM,*) with many more being added as time permits.

DOWNLOAD

THE DATA ASSIMILATION RESEARCH TESTBED (DART)

DART is a community facility for ensemble DA developed and maintained by the Data Assimilation Research Section (DARoS) at the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), DART provides modelers, Observational scientists, and geophysicilists with powerful, fluckible DA tools that are easy to implement and use and can be automized to support efficient operational DA applications. DART is a software environment that makes it easy to explore a variety of data cassimilation methods and