

New global Mean Dynamic Topography CNES-CLS-22 combining drifters, hydrological profiles and High Frequency radar data

<u>Solène Jousset (</u>CLS), Sandrine Mulet (CLS), John Wilkin (Rutgers University), Eric Greiner (CLS), Gerald Dibarboure (CNES) and Nicoals Picot (CNES)

OSTST2022 - 3 nov 2022

## Height referenced to which surface?



## MDT estimation method



### Synthetic Method:

The short scales of the MDT (and corresponding geostrophic currents) are estimated by combining altimetric anomalies and insitu data (Argo floats, drifting buoys)

surface float tether subsurface float

Multivariate Objective Analysis Rio and Hernandez, 2004 Rio et al, 2005, 2011, 2014

High resolution (1/8°) MDT and associated mean geostrophic currents

MDT CNES-CLS18

See CLS cnes

# New global MDT : MDT CNES-CLS22

# What is new ?

	MDT CNES-CLS18	MDT CNES-CLS22	MSS CNES-CLS15	MSS CNES-CLS22
MSS	MSS CNES-CLS15 (Pujol et al, 2018)	MSS CNES-CLS22	150'W 150'E 150'E 120'E	150'W NEW
Geoid	GOCO05S (Mayer- Gürr,et al. 2015)	GOCO06S (GOCE data fully reprocessed)	50°W	90'R
First Guess filtering	Optimal filter (Rio et al, 2011)	Optimal filter (Rio et al, 2011) + lagrangian filter along the coast to avoid streamline going into land	60°E	60'E
In-situ data (T/S profiles and drifters)	1993-2016	1993-07/2021 + update of the processing	0°W -30 -20 -10 0 10 20 30 40 50 60	ow -30 -20 -10 0 10 20 30 40 50 60



# New global MDT : MDT CNES-CLS22

# What is new ?

	MDT CNES-CLS18	MDT CNES-CLS22	
MSS	MSS CNES-CLS15 (Pujol et al, 2018)	MSS CNES-CLS22	
Geoid	GOCO05S (Mayer- Gürr,et al. 2015)	GOCO06S (GOCE data fully reprocessed)	
First Guess filtering	Optimal filter (Rio et al, 2011)	Optimal filter (Rio et al, 2011) + lagrangian filter along the coast to av streamline going into land	Did MDT CNES-CLS18 First-guess
In-situ data (T/S profiles and drifters)	1993-2016	1993-07/2021 + update of the processing	
		40.5	N 40.5°N

39°N

37.5°N



37.5°N

# New global MDT : MDT CNES-CLS22

Argo

# What is new ?

0°

65°N

		MDT CNES-CLS18	MDT CNES-CLS22					
	MSS	MSS CNES-CLS15 (Pujol et al, 2018)	MSS CNES-CLS22					
	Geoid	GOCO05S (Mayer- Gürr,et al. 2015)	GOCO06S (GOCE data reprocessed)	a fully				
	First Guess filtering	Optimal filter (Rio et al, 2011)	Optimal filter (Rio et a lagrangian filter along streamline going into	al, 2011) + § the coast to avoid land				
	In-situ data (T/S profiles and drifters)	1993-2016	1993-07/2021 + upo processing	Date of the Processed	T/S profiles	(dynamic height)	for	
sutsce	• Ir b b c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c	n-situ data are proces e consistent in ter hysical content Itimetry	sed to ms of with	MDT CNES-CLS18	Series Constraints of the series of the seri			-40 - 20 - 0 <u>[]</u> 20 20 20

0°

65°N

# Additional data in Mid Atlantic Bight : HF radar data

- > Objective: to improve the MDT in the coastal zone
- How to do it? Add coastal data: test the contribution of current data estimated by High Frequency (HF) radar in the Mid Atlantic Bight (area well observed by U.S. HF radars)



## Comparison of radar/drifters currents



 Current along the shelf-break seen by drifters more intense and narrower than in the HF radar current

#### Which data should we trust the most?

> We have chosen to rely more on HF radars because there is much more data

How to explain the differences between the two data sets ?

- Sampling:
  - Poor seasonal sampling for nearshore drifters (only summer and fall observations) and on the shelf-break (only spring observations)
  - For radars on the shelf-break: only winter observations
- Drifters have a tendency to accumulate in this front because of convergence and subduction, so there may be a sampling bias toward a narrow jet. [J. Wilkin].



## New global MDT : MDT CNES-CLS22 beta version



## MDT CNES-CLS22 - zoom in Mid Atlantic Bight (HF radar data added)



- No appreciable across-shelf gradient near the coast but very weak currents
  very influenced by the first-guess
- A more organized across-shelf gradient following the shelf-break, suggestive of a more continuous mean flow along this region from 70W to 74W, which is an improvement over the MDT CNES-CLS18 thanks to HF radar currents.



The contours are drawn every 1cm

## MDT CNES-CLS22 - zoom in Kuroshio



MDT CNES-CLS18





- 180

- 160

- 140

- 120

Intensification/Widening of the Kuroshio because the MDT is deeper at the southern coast of Japan (we have more data in this area)

## MDT CNES-CLS22 - zoom in the Arctic



> Improvement on the coverage and representation of large structures in Arctic

[Armitage et al., 2017]

Processed T/S profiles (dynamic height) for

#### RMS differences with drifters



# Validation with independent drifters – current modulus

#### RMSD(CNES-CLS-22 vs drifters) - RMSD(CNES-CLS-18 vs drifters)



Global improvement even if deterioration in some boxes



## Conclusions/Futur work

- HF radar data
  - need substantial pre-processing (here favourable case because data already detided, filtered and averaged)
  - allow a better representation of the shelf-break current
- Calculation of the new first-guess with the new MSS and the new geoid allowed
  - a better coverage and
  - a better representation of the structures in the Arctic
- Slight improvement compared to CNESCLS18 for drifters
- End of 2022: Finalize the new CNES-CLS2022 MDT
- Beta version distributed for beta users
  - happy to receive your feedbacks/validation soon
  - If you are interested to be beta tester, let me know signs stream of







# Thank you



