

How do we make Ameriflux useful for ecosystem models?

And upscaling, and
model-data fusion,
and synthesis, and ...


Ankur R Desai (U Wisconsin)
Matthias Mauder (KIT IMK-IFU)
Stefan Metzger (NEON, Inc.)
Michael C Dietze (Boston U)
Ke Xu (U Wisconsin)

A rant






We've become good at gap-filling and flux partitioning

We even know how uncertain they are, not that we tend to tell anyone



Moffat et al., 2007, AgForMet



Desai et al., 2008, AgForMet

We've become good at gap-filling and flux partitioning

We even know how uncertain they are, not that we tend to tell anyone


But it's led to massive abuse in the model evaluation and model-data fusion community (i.e., "observed GPP", gap-filled "data" for assimilation)

What could we do better to make Ameriflux useful for models?

Perform rigorous QA/QC

- Automate some of data quality reports (e.g., helpful reports from Bai Yang and Dario Papale)
- Automate flagging of suspect observations (NEON approach, Mauder TK3 method)
- We have a few hundred million observations in Ameriflux – we can choose to be picky!

N does not equal N



Desai, 2014,
Photosynthesis
Res.

QA/QC strategy for long-term EC measurements (TK3)

(Mauder et al., AgForMet, 2013)

Tests on high-frequency data

- Instrument diagnostic flags (e.g. CSAT3 0-63, LI7500 240-251)
- Instrumental/plausibility limits (site-specific)
- Spike-detection with MAD-test, $z = 7$



Tests on statistics, flux calculation + corrections



- Maximum number of missing values: $\leq 10\%$: flags = 0, $> 10\%$: flags = 2
- Stationarity test covariances (FW96, MF04, $< 30\%$: flag = 0, $< 75\%$: flag = 1)
- Test on well-developed turbulence (ITC test: FW96, MF04, $< 30\%$: flag = 0, $< 100\%$: flag = 1)
- $[w]$ after planar fit $> 0.10 \text{ m s}^{-1}$: former flags +1, $> 0.15 \text{ ms}^{-1}$: flags = 2
- Interdependence of flags due to corrections/conversions:
 - if $flag_{\lambda E} == 2$ then former $flag_H + 1$
 - else if $flag_H == 2$ then former $flag_{\lambda E} + 1$
 - else if $flag_{\lambda E} == 2$ or $flag_H == 2$ then former $flag_{NEE} + 1$



Quantification of errors/uncertainty estimates

- Stochastic error: use Finkelstein&Sims (2001) on high-pass filtered time series.
- Instrumental noise error after Lenschow et al. (2000)
- Systematic error: flux underestimation and lack of energy balance closure, only applicable for *daytime*: $EBR = \text{sum}(\lambda E + H) / \text{Sum}(R_n - G - J)$ for one day
- Footprint: Kormann&Meixner(2001); calculate percentage of flux contribution from several targets of interest


Signal from noise?





Address uncertainty


- Random flux uncertainty
 - Empirical approaches (Lenschow, Richardson/Hollinger)
 - Direct approaches (Billesbach, Finkelstein, Salesky)
- Systematic uncertainty
 - Primarily u^* sensitivity (Barr, Papale)
 - Also footprint bias (Wang, Desai, Metzger)
- Meteorological and energy balance uncertainty might be a bigger deal for models
 - Models want gap-filled met as driver, usually assume energy balance or closed water budget
 - Ameriflux roving standard (Hanson/Biraud/Law)

Random error is important!




Footprint bias is important!





Environmental response functions




Ameriflux Park Falls 'very tall tower' (447 m):
Eddy flux at 122 m.

Credit: Matt Rydzik (U Wisconsin)

Before:




After:



Based on: Metzger et al., 2013, Biogeosci.

Use model informatics to identify observational needs



Recommendations

- Make all data available freely, in automated fashion!
- Gap-filling met (Ricciuto/Yang/Papale style) and ET > gap-filling NEE
- Systematic uncertainty > random uncertainty
- Uncertainty in energy balance, met components as important as NEE
- Stop calling GPP, RE observations
 - provide community tool to output range of GPP and RE based on methods and uncertainty
- Automate flagging and random/systematic flux uncertainty (TK3), report roving comparison met uncertainty or bias in tower metadata
 - May require archive and access to high-freq (10-20 Hz)
- Run footprint models for all sites, all hours
 - use methods like ERF to identify representative observations
- Make BADM files machine-readable (XML, NetCDF, CSV) to allow easy model ingest
 - using standard units, naming conventions – use model experiments to identify what key BADM obs every site should collect and at what frequency

Also: Engage future tower monkeys



Reading suggestions

- Barr AG, et al., 2013. Use of change-point detection for friction-velocity threshold evaluation in eddy-covariance studies. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.* doi:10.1016/j.agformet.2012.11.023
- Desai, A.R., 2014. Influence and predictive capacity of climate anomalies on daily to decadal extremes in canopy photosynthesis. *Photosynthesis Res.*, doi:10.1007/s11120-013-9925-z
- Dietze, M., et al., 2014. A quantitative assessment of a terrestrial biosphere model's data needs across North American biomes. *JGR-G*, doi: 10.1002/2013JG002392
- Mauder, M., et al., 2013. A strategy for quality and uncertainty assessment of long-term eddy-covariance measurements. *Agric. Forest Meteorol.*, doi:10.1016/j.agformet.2012.09.006
- Metzger, S. et al., 2013. Spatially explicit regionalization of airborne flux measurements using environmental response functions. *Biogeosciences*, doi: 10.5194/bg-10-2193-2013
- Salesky, S., et al., 2012. Estimating the Random Error in Eddy-Covariance Based Fluxes and Other Turbulence Statistics: The Filtering Method. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol.*, doi:10.1007/s10546-012-9710-0