Department of Computer Science



USING DEEP LEARNING TO IDENTIFY ATMOSPHERIC FEATURES

Julian Kunkel¹, Bryan Lawrence¹, Daniel Galea¹ and Jeffrey Adie² ¹Uni. Reading ²NVIDIA AI Tech Center



THE NVIDIA AI TECHNOLOGY CENTER

NVIDIA AI TECHNOLOGY CENTER (NVAITC)

Catalyse AI transformation through research-centric integrated engagements



NVAITC STRATEGIC INVOLVEMENTS

Positioned alongside collaborators to catalyse and enable AI transformation





NVAITC COLLABORATORS



ONGOING PROJECT INVOLVING THE NVAITC ATMOS









See their paper: DeepTC: ConvLSTM Network for Trajectory Prediction of Tropical Cyclone using 《 Spatiotemporal Atmospheric Simulation Data, 2018





KISTI'S DL MODELS









NWP + ML MODEL





PROJECT: DEEP LEARNING ATMOSPHERIC FEATURES



- Collaboration between University of Reading and NVAITC
 - PhD student: Daniel GALEA <u>d.galea@pgr.reading.ac.uk</u>
- Supervisors
 - Primary: Bryan Lawrence
 - Secondary: Julian Kunkel
 - Supported by NVAITC (Jeffrey Adie)

MOTIVATION



- Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) models and climate model runs
 - produce TB of data every day
- Manual inspection of data to make accurate forecasts or work on improving climate science is infeasible
- Storing large amount of data leads to ever-increasing costs
- Hence, a method to reduce the data would be desirable
 - Can we store data only when we observe interesting events?





- Automatic detection of meteorological features in data using DL
 - Focus on tropical cyclones
- Integration into the existing workflow of a NWP or climate model
 - For in-situ data analysis
 - For triggering I/O upon event detection
- Constraints:
 - Detection of features in a distributed/parallel application
 - Domain decomposition must be taken into account

PROGRESS



- 1. Develop a first DL model to detect TCs
 - Learning about DL and machine learning
 - Testing parallel training ...
 - Verification of the accuracy: can TCs be detected correctly?
 - Exploring hyperparameters
 - Benefits/drawbacks of different network architectures
 - Analysis isn't complete, but many aspects tested
 - Development of appropriate training/validation sets
- 2. Ongoing activity: Integration into the model

Let's have a look at the best model we optained so far

ACCURACY - DATA



- ECMWF's ERA-Interim data set from 1st January 1979 to the 30th June 2017
- Resolution of ~75km
- Five fields were used to train the Deep Learning model
 - Mean Sea Level Pressure (MSLP)
 - 10m Wind Speed
 - Vorticity at 850hPa
 - Vorticity at 700hPa
 - Vorticity at 600hPa

Data for Hurricane Katrina at 25/08/2005 at 18Z







10m Wind Speed

MSLP



Vorticity at 850hPa

Vorticity at 700hPa

Vorticity at 600hPa

PROGRESS - DATA



Data cropped to cover Western Atlantic and Western Pacific basins



- The final dataset had 51931 cases
 - ~80% having no TC present
 - ~20% having TCs present
- Data was normalized by:
 - First applying a log scale to the wind speed
 - Min/Max normalization to obtain values in the range of [0, 1]
- Resolution: 225km (1/3rd of original data)
- Data split into
 - training set (60%)
 - validation set (20%)
 - test set (20%)

DEEP LEARNING MODEL



- DL model containing convolutional layers and fully connected layers
- Manual hyperparamter tuning was performed:
 - Method of weight initialization (Glorot)
 - Number of convolutional layers and fully connected layers
 - Number of nodes in the layers
 - Normalization method (L2 normalization penalty factor 0.0001)
 - Activation functions (Leaky ReLU)
 - Batch size (2000)
 - Methods to balance the dataset
- The final model obtained 94% accuracy for detecting Tropical Cyclones in the Western Atlantic and Western Pacific basins

DEEP LEANING MODEL

- Convolution layer 10x10 window, 8 kernels, 1 stride
 - Dropout probability 0.3
- MaxPool 2x2 window, 1 stride
- Convolution layer 5x5 window, 16 kernels, 1 stride
 - Dropout probability 0.3
- MaxPool 2x2 window, 1 stride
- Convolution layer 10x10 window, 32 kernels, 1 stride
- MaxPool 2x2 window, 1 stride
- Flatten
- Dense (Fully-Connected) layer 128 nodes
 - Dropout probability 0.3
- Dense (Fully-Connected) layer 64 nodes
 - Dropout probability 0.3
- Dense (Fully-Connected) layer 1 node, Sigmoid activation



Resolution in km

- 2250 x 2250
- 450 x 450
- 4500 x 4500
- 900 x 900
- 9000 x 9000
- 1800 x 1800



- Integration of DL model into NWP/climate workflow
 - Fortran code base!
- Approach
 - Training in Python
 - Loading weigths in C++ using the frugally-deep package
 - Fortran/C++ interface
- Reproduction of the validation results loading the same data from Fortran

Frugally-Deep: https://github.com/Dobiasd/frugally-deep

FORTRAN IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS



- Save Deep Learning model from Python
 - model.save('keras_model.h5', include_optimizer=False)
- Use python script included in frugally-deep to save the model in an appropriate format:
 - python3 convert_model.py keras_model.h5 fdeep_model.json
- Load model in C++ using frugally-deep package:
 - const auto model = fdeep::load_model("fdeep_model.json");
- Load data from FORTRAN
 - pass it to function in C++
 - make inference
 - pass inference result back to FORTRAN

NEXT STEPS



- Expand the DL model to be able to handle data from across the globe
- Improve the Deep Learning model performance
 - How does the resolution impact on the model's performance?
 - Does more training data help improve final testing accuracy?
 - Can a better method for balancing the dataset be found?
 - Can better hyperparameters be found?
 - How do more/less fields impact on the final testing accuracy?
- Deal with the domain decomposition of the parallel model
 - Convolutional layer seems a good candidate
 - Need some data from neighbours?
- Finish the DL model in the workflow of an NWP or climate model