

1 Introduction

The Arctic sea ice extent has continuously decreased since the first satellite observations of the Arctic was obtained in 1978 (Serreze and Meier, 2019), with an average decrease of 4% per decade (Cavalieri and Parkinson, 2012). The summer months are experiencing the greatest loss of sea ice extent (Comiso et al., 2017), with models from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 6 (CMIP6) projecting the first sea ice-free Arctic summer before 2050 (Notz and Community, 2020). As a consequence of the sea ice retreat during the summer months, previously inaccessible oceanic areas have opened up causing an increase in maritime operations in the Arctic waters (Ho, 2010; Eguíluz et al., 2016). The expected influx of operators to the Arctic regions due to the prolonged open water season call for user-centric sea ice products on different spatial scales and resolutions to ensure maritime safety in the region (Wagner et al., 2020; Veland et al., 2021).

The current and future state of Arctic sea ice concentration is supplied by various types of products with different spatial and temporal resolutions. Sea ice monitoring products designed for climate applications provide daily sea ice concentration by merging observations from multiple sensors to create a climate data record. The purpose of a climate data record is to provide accurate reference data which can be used for e.g. forecast validation or anomaly detection. Satellite monitoring are also supplied as daily observations, with a timeliness of a few hours on the same day and posing higher spatial resolutions than climate data records. For example, OSI SAF SSMIS (Tonboe et al., 2017) and OSI SAF AMSR-2 (Lavelle et al., 2016) provide single sensor daily averaged sea ice concentration, and can be used to force numerical weather prediction systems which only resolve the atmosphere with sea ice conditions.

Additionally, sea ice charts drawn analogously by a sea ice specialist merge recent sea ice observations from different sensors and satellites into a single daily product. The Ice Service of the Norwegian Meteorological Institute (NIS) provides regional ice charts covering the European Arctic. Sea ice charts consists of polygons which are manually drawn to match the resolutions of the available observations, which range from 50m to several kilometers, and are assumed to have a low uncertainties due to the quality control exerted by the sea ice specialist (Dinessen et al., 2020).

Sea ice information can also be retrieved from physical forecasting systems, which are based physical models resolving the growth and movement of sea ice forward in time. Standalone models such as CiCE (Hunke and Dukowicz, 1997) and neXtSIM (Williams et al., 2021) can be used independently or coupled with ocean models to create sea ice forecasting systems for short lead times.

The previously mentioned sea ice products serve different use cases, and it is possible to infer a correlation between the spatial and temporal resolution of a product and its

application scenario for maritime end users. While lower resolution products at larger temporal time scales can be used in long term planning, regional high resolution products delivered at a high frequency can assist strategic decision making and short term route planning (Wagner et al., 2020). However, it is currently reported by end users that available operational passive microwave satellite products are of a too low resolution, partly due to their insufficient ability to resolve leads and other high-resolution information necessary for maritime safety. Moreover, it is also reported that sea ice forecasting systems lack desired verification, are inadequate for operational use as well as being difficult to integrate with a vessel where computational resources and data-bandwidth are limited (Veland et al., 2021). Though sea ice charts provide maritime end users in the Arctic with information regarding where sea ice has been observed in the time after the previous ice chart has been published, the ice charts does not provide a description on the future outlook. Thus, the responsibility of interpreting the ice charts and other available sea ice information with a outlook on future development is delegated to the end-user and relies on their experience to ensure a continued safe navigation (Veland et al., 2021).

As such, a different approach to short-range sea ice forecasting may be necessary to deliver short-term sea ice information on a spatial scale that is relevant for end-users. Thus, this thesis proposes an alternative forecasting scheme that applies Convolutional deep learning in the form of a modified U-Net architecture (Ronneberger et al., 2015) to deliver a short lead time (1 - 3 days), 1km resolution forecasting system over a subsection of the European Arctic by utilizing the aforementioned Ice Charts as the ground truth. Moreover, the product is verified with regards to the position of the ice edge, which aims to demonstrate the operational relevance of the product (Veland et al., 2021; Melsom et al., 2019).

There have been previous attempts to develop deep learning sea ice forecasting systems. Andersson et al. (2021) propose IceNet, a pan-arctic covering U-NET which predicts monthly averaged sea ice concentration (SIC) with 6 month lead time at a 25 km spatial resolution (Andersson et al., 2021). The model classifies sea ice concentration into one of the three classes open-water, marginal ice or full ice. IceNet showed better performance compared to the numerical SEAS5 seasonal forecasting system (Johnson et al., 2019) for 2 months lead time and more, with the greatest improvement seen in the late summer months. The model is trained on SIC data provided by the European Organization for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites (EUMETSAT) Ocean and Sea Ice Satellite Application Facilities (OSI SAF) dataset (Lavergne et al., 2019), as well as other climate variables obtained from the ERA5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al., 2020). Their model was validated against SEAS5, which is a seasonal forecasting system developed by the European Center for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) (Johnson et al., 2019).

Similarly, Liu et al. (2021) propose a Convolutional long short-term memory network (ConvLSTM) which forecasts SIC with a lead time up to 6 weeks. The model uses cli-

mate variables and SIC from two reanalysis products ERA-Interim (Dee et al., 2011) and ORAS4 (Balmaseda et al., 2013), covering the Barents Sea with a domain size of 24 (latitude) x 56 (longitude). Their results are more skillful when comparing against numerical models and persistence forecasting.

Models such as those noted above consider input variables obtained from climatologies, and represent SIC on spatial scales far larger than what is needed for an operational short-term sea ice forecast. The possibility of using higher resolution input data was explored by Fritzner et al. (2020), who developed a Fully Convolutional Network (FCN) which achieved similar performance to the Metroms coupled ocean and sea ice model version 0.3 (Kristensen et al., 2017). The work of Fritzner et al. (2020) combined SIC from OSI SAF SSMIS and AMSR-2, sea surface temperature from the Multi-scale Ultra-high Resolution (MUR) product (Chin et al., 2017), 2 meter air temperature from the ERA5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al., 2020) as well as SIC from sea ice charts produced by the NIS (Dinessen et al., 2020). However, due to computational constraints of training the FCN, the subdomain was reduced to a resolution of 224 x 224 pixels which translates to 10 - 20km (Fritzner et al., 2020). Thus, the study provide limited accuracy for short term operational usage, similar to Andersson et al. (2021) and Liu et al. (2021).

Contrary to the authors above, Grigoryev et al. (2022) propose a up to 10-day lead time regional forecasting system with a 5km spatial resolution trained on a sequential (traditional) and recurrent U-Net architecture. The authors used 5km AMSR-2 sea ice concentration as the ground truth variable, and regrid atmospheric variables from the NCEP Global Forecast System (https://www.emc.ncep.noaa.gov/emc/pages/numerical_forecast_systems/gfs.php) to match the resolution of the ground truth. Their results showed that the recurrent setup slightly outperformed the sequential architecture for predictions with a lead time up to 3 days, with both architectures significantly outperforming persistence and the linear trend. However, the sequential architecture tended to outperform the recurrent architecture for 10 day forecasts, as the recurrent model was trained without weather data as it only had a lead time of 3 days.

As mentioned in Andersson et al. (2021) and Fritzner et al. (2020), the computational cost of producing a forecast using a pre-trained machine learning model is low, such that a laptop running consumer hardware is able to generate a forecast in seconds or minutes. This is in stark contrast to numerical sea ice models, which could run for several hours on high-performance systems (Andersson et al., 2021). Training a model is a one time expense, and can be efficiently performed on a Graphics Processing Unit (GPU). With the increased complexity, efficiency and availability of high end computing power, smart usage of the available memory allows for model training using high resolution input data. Current GPUs have also seen a significant increase in available video memory, which allows for higher resolution data to be utilized during training. This work will exploit the recent advances in GPU development, as well as incorporating techniques to reduce the

floating point precision of the input meteorological variables, circumventing a reduction of the spatial resolution as seen in previous works.

Moreover, the U-Net architecture is part of the supervised learning paradigm of machine learning, which require labelled samples in order to train the network (Ronneberger et al., 2015). Furthermore, U-Nets perform pixel-level prediction where each pixel is classified according to a category. This work will utilize the image-to-image predictive capabilities of the U-Net to create a semantic segmentation based on its input variables simulating a forward in time propagation of the sea ice concentration akin to a physical model. This allows for the inspection of how changes to the architecture as well as input data configurations affect the behavior of the forecasting system.

In the present work, the development of a deep learning forecasting system will be explored. The choice and tuning of hyperparameters will be reasoned in light of the physical processes affecting sea ice and the surrounding variables. Furthermore, the quality of the machine learning forecasting system will be assessed against relevant benchmarks such as persistence, physical models and linear regression of the observed sea ice concentration. Due to the operational nature of the developed forecasting product, ice edge aware validation metrics such as the Integrated Ice Edge Error (Goessling et al., 2016) will be central to the performance analysis. Furthermore, this thesis aims at providing the framework for which a future operational sea ice prediction system can be built upon. As such, the choice and structure of data will be made with a potential operational transition in mind.

This thesis aims at exploring the following research questions:

- Can a deep learning system skillfully predict regional sea ice concentration on a high spatial resolution for short lead times?
- How does a high resolution, short term U-Net forecasting system resolve the translation and accumulation of sea ice compared to a physical based model?
- In what sense can a deep learning model be explainable / made transparent to explain the statistical reasoning behind the physical processes?

The thesis is structured as follows. Section 1 will describe the datasets used, followed by section 1 which will do a rundown of the methodological framework necessary to develop the U-Net as well as validation metrics used to assess forecast skill. Section 1 will detail the development process behind the U-Net, whereas section 5 will detail the performance assessment of the forecasts. The physical connections of the model will be explored in Section 6, followed by a discussion of the results in section 7. Finally, conclusions and future outlook are presented in section 8.

References

- Andersson, T. R., Hosking, J. S., Pérez-Ortiz, M., Paige, B., Elliott, A., Russell, C., Law, S., Jones, D. C., Wilkinson, J., Phillips, T., Byrne, J., Tietsche, S., Sarojini, B. B., Blanchard-Wrigglesworth, E., Aksenov, Y., Downie, R., and Shuckburgh, E.: Seasonal Arctic sea ice forecasting with probabilistic deep learning, *Nature Communications*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25257-4>, 2021.
- Balmaseda, M. A., Mogensen, K., and Weaver, A. T.: Evaluation of the ECMWF ocean reanalysis system ORAS4, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 139, 1132–1161, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.2063>, URL <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/qj.2063>, 2013.
- Cavalieri, D. J. and Parkinson, C. L.: Arctic sea ice variability and trends, 1979–2010, *The Cryosphere*, 6, 881–889, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-6-881-2012>, 2012.
- Chin, T. M., Vazquez-Cuervo, J., and Armstrong, E. M.: A multi-scale high-resolution analysis of global sea surface temperature, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 200, 154–169, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.07.029>, 2017.
- Comiso, J. C., Meier, W. N., and Gersten, R.: Variability and trends in the Arctic Sea ice cover: Results from different techniques, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 122, 6883–6900, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017jc012768>, 2017.
- Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Hólm, E. V., Isaksen, I., Kållberg, P., Köhler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and Vitart, F.: The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 137, 553–597, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.828>, URL <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/qj.828>, 2011.
- Dinnesen, F., Hackett, B., and Kreiner, M. B.: Product User Manual For Regional High Resolution Sea Ice Charts Svalbard and Greenland Region, Tech. rep., Norwegian Meteorological Institute, 2020.
- Eguíluz, V. M., Fernández-Gracia, J., Irigoien, X., and Duarte, C. M.: A quantitative assessment of Arctic shipping in 2010–2014, *Scientific Reports*, 6, <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep30682>, 2016.
- Fritzner, S., Graverson, R., and Christensen, K. H.: Assessment of High-Resolution Dynamical and Machine Learning Models for Prediction of Sea Ice Concentration in a Regional Application, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 125, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020jc016277>, 2020.
- Goessling, H. F., Tietsche, S., Day, J. J., Hawkins, E., and Jung, T.: Predictability of

- the Arctic sea ice edge, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 1642–1650, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015gl067232>, 2016.
- Grigoryev, T., Verezhenskaya, P., Krinitskiy, M., Anikin, N., Gavrikov, A., Trofimov, I., Balabin, N., Shpilman, A., Eremchenko, A., Gulev, S., Burnaev, E., and Vanovski, V.: Data-Driven Short-Term Daily Operational Sea Ice Regional Forecasting, *Remote Sensing*, 14, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs14225837>, URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/14/22/5837>, 2022.
- Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., Nicolas, J., Peubey, C., Radu, R., Schepers, D., Simmons, A., Soci, C., Abdalla, S., Abellan, X., Balsamo, G., Bechtold, P., Biavati, G., Bidlot, J., Bonavita, M., De Chiara, G., Dahlgren, P., Dee, D., Diamantakis, M., Dragani, R., Flemming, J., Forbes, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A., Haimberger, L., Healy, S., Hogan, R. J., Hólm, E., Janisková, M., Keeley, S., Laloyaux, P., Lopez, P., Lupu, C., Radnoti, G., de Rosnay, P., Rozum, I., Vamborg, F., Villaume, S., and Thépaut, J.-N.: The ERA5 global reanalysis, *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 146, 1999–2049, <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>, URL <https://rmets.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/qj.3803>, 2020.
- Ho, J.: The implications of Arctic sea ice decline on shipping, *Marine Policy*, 34, 713–715, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2009.10.009>, 2010.
- Hunke, E. C. and Dukowicz, J. K.: An Elastic–Viscous–Plastic Model for Sea Ice Dynamics, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 27, 1849–1867, [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485\(1997\)027<1849:aevpmf>2.0.co;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1997)027<1849:aevpmf>2.0.co;2), 1997.
- Johnson, S. J., Stockdale, T. N., Ferranti, L., Balmaseda, M. A., Molteni, F., Magnusson, L., Tietsche, S., Decremier, D., Weisheimer, A., Balsamo, G., Keeley, S. P. E., Mogenssen, K., Zuo, H., and Monge-Sanz, B. M.: SEAS5: the new ECMWF seasonal forecast system, *Geoscientific Model Development*, 12, 1087–1117, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-12-1087-2019>, URL <https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/12/1087/2019/>, 2019.
- Kristensen, N. M., JensBDebernard, SebastianMaartensson, Keguang Wang, and Hedstrom, K.: Metno/Metroms: Version 0.3 - Before Merge, <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.1046114>, 2017.
- Lavelle, J., Tonboe, R., Tian, T., Pfeiffer, R.-H., and Howe, E.: Product User Manual for the OSI SAF AMSR-2 Global Sea Ice Concentration Product OSI-408, Tech. Rep. 1.1, Danish Meteorological Institute, 2016.
- Lavergne, T., Sørensen, A. M., Kern, S., Tonboe, R., Notz, D., Aaboe, S., Bell, L., Dybkjær, G., Eastwood, S., Gabarro, C., Heygster, G., Killie, M. A., Brandt Kreiner, M., Lavelle, J., Saldo, R., Sandven, S., and Pedersen, L. T.: Version 2 of the EUMETSAT OSI SAF and ESA CCI sea-ice concentration climate data records, *The Cryosphere*, 13, 49–78, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-13-49-2019>, URL <https://tc.copernicus.org/articles/13/49/2019/>, 2019.

- Liu, Y., Bogaardt, L., Attema, J., and Hazeleger, W.: Extended Range Arctic Sea Ice Forecast with Convolutional Long-Short Term Memory Networks, *Monthly Weather Review*, <https://doi.org/10.1175/mwr-d-20-0113.1>, 2021.
- Melsom, A., Palerme, C., and Müller, M.: Validation metrics for ice edge position forecasts, *Ocean Science*, 15, 615–630, <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-15-615-2019>, 2019.
- Notz, D. and Community, S.: Arctic Sea Ice in CMIP6, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019gl086749>, 2020.
- Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., and Brox, T.: U-Net: Convolutional Networks for Biomedical Image Segmentation, in: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 234–241, Springer International Publishing, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24574-4_28, 2015.
- Serreze, M. C. and Meier, W. N.: The Arctic’s sea ice cover: trends, variability, predictability, and comparisons to the Antarctic, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1436, 36–53, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.13856>, 2019.
- Tonboe, R., Lavelle, J., Pfeiffer, R.-H., and Howe, E.: Product User Manual for OSI SAF Global Sea Ice Concentration, Tech. Rep. 1.6, Danish Meteorological Institute, 2017.
- Veland, S., Wagner, P., Bailey, D., Everett, A., Goldstein, M., Hermann, R., Hjort-Larsen, T., Hovelsrud, G., Hughes, N., Kjøl, A., Li, X., Lynch, A., Müller, M., Olsen, J., Palerme, C., Pedersen, J. L., Rinaldo, ., Stephenson, S., and Storelvmo, T.: Knowledge needs in sea ice forecasting for navigation in Svalbard and the High Arctic, Tech. Rep. NF-rapport 4/2021, Svalbard Strategic Grant, Svalbard Science Forum, 2021.
- Wagner, P. M., Hughes, N., Bourbonnais, P., Stroeve, J., Rabenstein, L., Bhatt, U., Little, J., Wiggins, H., and Fleming, A.: Sea-ice information and forecast needs for industry maritime stakeholders, *Polar Geography*, 43, 160–187, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1088937x.2020.1766592>, 2020.
- Williams, T., Korosov, A., Rampal, P., and Ólason, E.: Presentation and evaluation of the Arctic sea ice forecasting system neXtSIM-F, *The Cryosphere*, 15, 3207–3227, <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-15-3207-2021>, 2021.