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ABSTRACT. Most of the existing coastal flood Forecast and Early-Warning Systems do not model the flood, but instead, rely on the prediction of hydrodynamic conditions at the coast and on expert judgment. Recent scientific contributions are now capable to precisely model flood events, even in situations where wave overtopping plays a significant role. Such models are nevertheless costly-to-evaluate and surrogate ones need to be exploited for substantial computational savings. For the latter models, the hydro-meteorological forcing conditions (inputs) or flood events (outputs) are conveniently parametrised into scalar representations. However, they neglect the fact that inputs are actually functions (more precisely, time series), and that floods spatially propagate inland. Here, we introduce a multi-output Gaussian process model accounting for both criteria. On various examples, we test its versatility for both learning spatial maps and inferring unobserved ones. We demonstrate that efficient implementations are obtained by considering tensor-structured data and/or sparse-variational approximations. Finally, the proposed framework is applied on a coastal application aiming at predicting flood events. We conclude that accurate predictions are obtained in the order of minutes rather than the couples of days required by dedicated hydrodynamic simulators.

1 Introduction

Natural hazards, such as the floods induced by the hurricane Katrina (2005), or by the more recent Xynthia (2010) and Johanna (2008) storms, have strong negative impacts in the living conditions of hundreds of people (Blake et al., 2006; Lumbroso and Vinet, 2011; André et al., 2013). Hurricane Katrina was one of the six most powerful hurricanes ever recorded in the Atlantic, inflicting a death toll of 1836 and a worth of damage of about 80 billion dollars (Blake et al., 2006). The Xynthia storm severely impacted low-lying French coastal areas located in the central part of the Bay of Biscay on 27–28 February, 2010 (Bertin et al., 2012). The flood induced by Xynthia caused 53 fatalities and more than 1 billion euros due to material damage assessed. The Johanna storm had smaller effects on the French Atlantic coast, but still it led to significant flood damages, for instance on the town of Gâvres (Britany; André et al., 2013; Idier et al., 2020b). These historical flood episodes reflect the need of accurate Forecast and Early-Warning Systems (FEWS’s) aiming at reducing the loss of human life and damages in areas at risk of flooding (André et al., 2013; Hoggart et al., 2014; Idier et al., 2020b).

Most of the existing coastal flood FEWS’s do not model the flood, but instead, rely on the prediction of hydrodynamic conditions at the coast and on expert judgment (see, e.g., Doong et al., 2012). Some systems in development rely on flood computations inland (see, e.g., Tromble et al., 2019; Stansby et al., 2013), but under simplifications and expecting that a high-performance computing (HPC) will allow their integration in operational platforms. In the Netherlands, the operational FEWS is based on forecasted nearshore conditions to issue warnings (as many other FEWS’s), but, in case of warnings, the flood is estimated using a database of pre-computed flooding scenarios. Those scenarios have been generated for a limited set of dike breach locations and water levels, and using a model resolution of about 10m. Most recent contributions allow the modelling of high-resolution floods, even in case where wave overtopping plays a significant role (see, e.g., Le Roy et al., 2015; Idier et al., 2020b). Such models are nevertheless costly-to-evaluate, requiring up to days of parallel computing, and therefore, their use in warning forecast systems becomes impractical.

To overcome the computational complexity of coastal flooding models, data-driven surrogates have been widely explored (Sacks et al., 1989; Rohmer et al., 2016; Liu and Guillas, 2017; Rueda et al., 2019). The latter models are
initially fed by a statistically rich but tractable amount of simulations of the former. By learning statistical features, surrogate models are then used to predict floods based on offshore condition knowledge. As shown in (Rohmer and Idier, 2012; Jia and Taflanidis, 2013; Liu and Guillas, 2017; Azzimonti et al., 2019; Betancourt et al., 2020), stochastic surrogates based on Gaussian processes (GPs) can be successfully applied in a wide range of coastal engineering applications since they form a flexible prior over functions and provide a well-founded non-parametric framework (Rasmussen and Williams, 2005). In (Rohmer and Idier, 2012; Azzimonti et al., 2019), GP-based approaches are used for assessing the impact of critical spatial offshore conditions. Both frameworks deal with levels set estimation problems aiming at identifying when the offshore conditions exceed a fixed risk threshold. In (Jia and Taflanidis, 2013; Liu and Guillas, 2017), the authors focus on the dimension reduction of expensive computer codes via GP emulators for tsunamis and storms/hurricanes risk assessment, respectively. The works previously cited have in common that scalar representations of the hydrodynamic forcing conditions (inputs) are considered rather than their functional structures (e.g. time series). We particularly refer to (Rohmer et al., 2018; Azzimonti et al., 2019) for some examples where hydrodynamic functional drivers are parametrised in scalar representations before assessing GP surrogate models. So far, the frameworks in (Betancourt et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2015) are the only ones that account for time-varying inputs in the domains of flooding hazard assessment and storm surge prediction, respectively. While Betancourt et al. (2020) further investigate dedicated kernels based on proper distances on function spaces aiming at correlating hydrodynamic functional drivers, Kim et al. (2015) introduce a time-dependent surrogate model of storm surge based on an artificial neural network.

Betancourt et al. (2020) showed that considering the hydrodynamic drivers as functions rather than scalars results in significant prediction improvements since more precise physical information is encoded into kernels. Their work has been focused on modelling, for instance, a scalar representation of the maximum cumulative overtopped and overflowed water volume. However, in practice such global scalar indicators may not be sufficient and spatial information is often needed, e.g. the maximum water level inland. Therefore, inspired by (Betancourt et al., 2020), we here introduce a GP surrogate model that accounts for both hydro-meteorological functional drivers and spatial flood data. Our framework builds on the construction of a separable kernel that incorporates both functional and spatial correlations. The resulting process can be seen as a multi-output GP (see, e.g. Alvarez et al., 2012) where spatial flood indicators (outputs) are driven by a set of hydro-meteorological time-varying drivers (functional inputs), and then the outputs are correlated by a kernel that exploits the “similarity” between functional inputs. This leads to a framework that can be easily plugged to other GP-based approaches, and with efficient implementations based on Kronecker-structured model objects (see, e.g., Alvarez et al., 2012) and/or sparse-variational approximations (see, e.g., Van der Wilk et al., 2020). While for the former case we provide R codes based on the kergp package (Deville et al., 2019), for the latter we adapt multi-output GP models from the GPflow library (Matthews et al., 2017) to account for functional input data.

There exist alternative approaches that treat spatial outputs as functional data. For instance, we refer to (Marrel et al., 2011) for a framework that model the pollution produced by radioactive wastes, to (Chang and Guillas, 2019) for an approach capable to learn spatial patterns in climate experiments, and to (Perrin et al., 2020) for a surrogate model for coastal flooding risk assessment. Those approaches first project the outputs onto truncated basis representations (e.g. Wavelets) aiming at dimensionality reduction. Then, prior distributions are placed at the level of the coefficients of representation rather than the output space. Although their works scale well with the number of spatial points, they commonly require a large amount of learning simulations (e.g. over than 500 events) in order to properly capture spatial patterns (see, e.g., Perrin et al., 2020). Here, we are restricted to highly constraining situations where less than 200 flood scenarios are available. This limitation arises from dedicated but costly-to-evaluate numerical simulators: one flood event requires almost three days of parallel computing (see, e.g., the model used by Idier et al., 2020b). We must also point out that (Marrel et al., 2011; Chang and Guillas, 2019; Perrin et al., 2020) do not account for functional inputs as our framework does, a condition that is key for properly learning hydro-meteorological forcing conditions (see the discussion in Section 2). To the best of our knowledge, our proposal is the first one that accounts for both inputs and outputs as functions in the domain of flood hazard assessment. Furthermore, unlike the cited works, our framework allows us to focus predictions on spatial design points placed at key sectors identified as of uttermost importance regarding the vulnerability of the territory (see, e.g., Idier et al., 2013, 2020a, for a further discussion).

The remaining sections are organised as follows. In Section 2, we describe the coastal flooding application that motivated the contributions in this paper. In Section 3, we briefly explain how to establish GP models for functional data. Then, in Section 4, we introduce the extension to spatial GPs with functional data where the resulting covariance function is built up via separable kernels. We also discuss the connection of the proposed framework with multi-output GPs. In Section 5, we assess the performance of the resulting GP model on various synthetic examples considering different situations depending on the data availability. In Section 6, we apply our framework to the coastal flooding application in Section 2. Finally, in Section 7, we summarise our results and outline the potential future work.
In this paper, we focus on the town of Gâvres (Figure 1, right) located along the French Atlantic coast, in Brittany. The Gâvres municipality is a peninsula that is connected to the mainland by a 6km long tombolo (Figure 1, left). The town has faced five significant coastal flood events since 1900 (Idier et al., 2020b). The latest memorable event occurred on 10 March, 2008 (Johanna storm): a combination of a spring tide, a storm surge larger than 0.5m, and energetic waves, led to the flood of around 120 houses (Idier et al., 2020b), some by about 1m of water in the street of the sports park (Le Roy et al., 2015; André et al., 2013). This marine submersion was induced mainly by wave overtopping of the sea dike at the Grande-Plage beach and a bit of overflow close to the cemetery (Figure 1, right).

In such type of environments, estimating the flood requires the use of advanced hydrodynamic numerical models able to account with a good precision for overflow and overtopping processes. Such models emulate the hydrodynamics (water level and current) induced by hydro-meteorological forcing conditions (e.g. mean sea level, tide, atmospheric surge, wave conditions). An example is the non-hydrostatic phase-resolving SWASH model (Zijlema et al., 2011). The SWASH model, nested with a spectral wave model which propagates the offshore wave conditions to the SWASH model’s boundary, has proven to be successful in reproducing local past flood events at Gâvres, including the one of the 10 March 2008 (see Idier et al., 2020b). However, this modelling configuration is time consuming (6h simulated in 3 days on 48 cores), and therefore inapplicable for flood forecast.

Thus, to support the development of fast-running surrogate models for flood forecast, BRGM and IMT\(^1\) built a dataset \((X_o \rightarrow Y_o)\) based on numerical modelling. In the present work, we use this dataset. The hydro-meteorological forcing conditions \((X_o)\) are time series of the mean sea level (MSL [m], constant), tide (T [m]), atmospheric storm surge (S [m]), significant wave height (Hs [m]), wave peak period (Tp [s]), wave peak direction (Dp [°]), wind speed (U [m/s]) and wind direction (Du [°]) (see Idier et al., 2020b, for more details). These drivers, discretised with a 10 min time step over a 6h window centred on the high tide, are represented by 37-length time series. The stored model results \((Y_o)\) are the maximal inland water height \((H_{max})\) in each grid point every 3m (see Figure 2). This leads to spatial flood events containing about 64.6k inland observations. The dataset contains 131 scenarios of \(X_o\), including 21 historical, (9) flood and (12) no flood, events (see Idier et al., 2020b); 16 scenarios simulated from small variations of the 9 historical flood events; and 94 additional scenarios with both zero, moderate and significant marine submersions. For the latter (94) scenarios, they have been built by applying a combination of methods to a hydro-meteorological dataset covering...

---

the 1900–2016 period, with a 10 min time step, namely: multivariate extreme value analysis to randomly generate the joint distribution of maximum values of forcing conditions, a probabilistic classifier to locate the time instant of these maximum values, and multivariate Gaussian Monte-Carlo-based sampling procedure to generate the time series accordingly. We refer to (Idier et al., 2020b) for the dataset description, and (Rohmer and Idier, 2012; Idier et al., 2020b) for the extreme value analysis. The 131 scenarios of the hydro-meteorological functional inputs are shown in Figure 3.

3 Gaussian processes for functional data

Gaussian processes (GP) surrogate models have been widely used in replacement of costly-to-evaluate numerical simulators due to their well-founded and non-parametric framework for statistical learning (Rasmussen and Williams, 2005; Camps-Valls et al., 2016). GPs form a flexible prior over functions where regularity assumptions can be encoded into covariance functions also known as kernels (Genton, 2001; Paciorek and Schervish, 2004). In consistency with Section 2, we focus on hydro-meteorological input functions $f : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. We must note that developments in this section can be extended to the multivariate case, i.e., $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$ for $D \geq 2$.

3.1 Gaussian processes with functional inputs

Let $\{\{Y(\mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}(T, \mathbb{R}^Q)\} \}$, with $\mathcal{F}(T, \mathbb{R})$ the set of functions from $T$ to $\mathbb{R}$, be a GP with inputs $\mathcal{F} = (f_1, \ldots, f_Q)$. We say that $Y$ is GP-distributed if any finite subset of random variables extracted from $Y$ has a joint Gaussian distribution (Rasmussen and Williams, 2005). By focusing on centred GP priors, then $Y$ is completely defined by

$$Y \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k),$$

where the kernel $k(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') = \text{cov} \{Y(\mathcal{F}), Y(\mathcal{F}')\}$, for $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}' \in \mathcal{F}(T, \mathbb{R})^Q$, evaluates the correlation between $Y(\mathcal{F})$ and $Y(\mathcal{F}')$. For instance, notice that $k(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') = 0$ if $Y(\mathcal{F})$ and $Y(\mathcal{F}')$ are uncorrelated, or non-zero otherwise.

One of the main benefits of GPs relies in the tractability of conditional distributions. Consider conditioning $Y$ to an observation vector $y_N = [y_1, \ldots, y_N]^\top$ evaluated at $(\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_N)$. Then, the conditional distribution $Y|\{Y_N = y_N\}$, for the Gaussian vector $Y_N = [Y(\mathcal{F}_1), \ldots, Y(\mathcal{F}_N)]^\top$, is also Gaussian with conditional mean function $\mu$ and conditional covariance function $c$ given by

$$\mu(\mathcal{F}_*) = k^\top(\mathcal{F}_*)K^{-1}y_N, \quad c(\mathcal{F}_*, \mathcal{F}_*)' = k(\mathcal{F}_*, \mathcal{F}_*) - k^\top(\mathcal{F}_*)K^{-1}k(\mathcal{F}_*),$$

with covariance matrix $K = (k(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{F}_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}$ and cross-covariance vector $k(\mathcal{F}) = [k(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_1), \ldots, k(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}_N)]^\top$.

The conditional mean $\hat{Y}(\mathcal{F}_*) = \mu(\mathcal{F}_*)$ is usually used as a point estimate of $Y(\mathcal{F}_*)$, and $\nu(\mathcal{F}_*) = c(\mathcal{F}_*, \mathcal{F}_*)$ as the expected square error of this estimate. For fitting the GP to observations $y_N$, the covariance parameters $\theta$ are commonly estimated by maximising the log-likelihood $L_N$ (Rasmussen and Williams, 2005):

$$L_N(\theta) = \log P_\theta(y_N) = -\frac{1}{2} \log(\det(K_\theta)) - \frac{1}{2} y_N K_\theta^{-1} y_N - \frac{N}{2} \log 2\pi.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

In (3), we wrote $K_\theta$ instead of $K$ in (3) to explicitly show the influence of $\theta$ in the likelihood. By maximising (3), we are looking for a set of covariance parameters $\theta$ that improves the ability of the model for fitting $y_N$.

---

\[^2\]A GP $Z$ with mean function $\mu$ and kernel $k$ can be written in terms of a centred GP $Y$ with same kernel: $Z(\mathcal{F}) = \mu(\mathcal{F}) + Y(\mathcal{F})$.  

---

Figure 3: Hydro-meteorological functional inputs from the dataset in Section 2. The panels show the 131 replicates of the mean sea level (MSL [m]), Tide (T [m]), Surge (S [m]), wave peak period (Tp [s]), wave peak direction (Dp [°]), wind speed (U [m/s]) and wind direction (Du [°]).
3.2 Construction of stationary kernels for functional inputs

For establishing proper kernels, we need to define a distance between functions. We here consider the $L^2$-norm since it leads to simpler and closed-form expressions in subsection 3.3:

$$
\| \mathcal{R} \|^2_2 = \| \mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F}' \|^2_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{Q} \int_0^\infty \int \left( f_i(t) - f'_i(t) \right)^2 dt \, d\ell_i,
$$

(4)

with $\ell = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_Q) \in (0, \infty)^Q$ and $\int_0^\infty \int \left( f_i(t) - f'_i(t) \right)^2 dt < \infty$, for $i = 1, \ldots, Q$. Note that the parameter $\ell_i$ can be viewed as a scale parameter for the $i$-th functional input. Examples of valid stationary kernel functions are:

- Squared Exponential (SE) kernel: $k_{\theta=(\sigma^2, \ell)}(\mathcal{R}) = \sigma^2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \| \mathcal{R} \|^2_2 \right\}$,
- Matérn 5/2 kernel: $k_{\theta=(\sigma^2, \ell)}(\mathcal{R}) = \sigma^2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{\ell}} \| \mathcal{R} \| + \frac{3}{2} \| \mathcal{R} \|^2_2 \right) \exp \left\{ -\sqrt{\frac{3}{\ell}} \| \mathcal{R} \| \right\}$,
- Matérn 3/2 kernel: $k_{\theta=(\sigma^2, \ell)}(\mathcal{R}) = \sigma^2 \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{\ell}} \| \mathcal{R} \| \right) \exp \left\{ -\sqrt{\frac{3}{\ell}} \| \mathcal{R} \| \right\}$,
- Exponential kernel: $k_{\theta=(\sigma^2, \ell)}(\mathcal{R}) = \sigma^2 \exp \left\{ -\| \mathcal{R} \|_\ell \right\}$.

Figure 4 shows the effect of the kernels in (5) considering $\mathcal{F}_1 = (f(t) = 1)$, $\mathcal{F}_2 = (f(t) = t)$, $\mathcal{F}_3 = (f(t) = t^2)$ and $\mathcal{F}_4 = (f(t) = t^3)$ as functional inputs. The covariance parameters are $\theta = (\sigma^2 = 1, \ell = 1)$. The panels show: the kernels (left) and the target functions (right).

The exact computation of (4) relies on its $Q$ integrals. Depending on the complexity of $f_i$ and $f'_i$, such integrals can be intractable. Furthermore, in many situations, only a finite number of evaluations of $f_i$ and $f'_i$ are available but their functional structures are actually unknown. For these reasons, functions are usually replaced by linear approximations where (4) has a closed-form solution since the integrals operate over well-defined basis functions.

3.3 Projection of functional inputs onto basis functions

Consider the projection of $f_i$ onto a set of basis functions (Ramsay and Silverman, 2005):

$$
f_i(t) \approx \sum_{j=1}^{P_i} \phi_{i,j}(t) \alpha_{i,j} := g_i(t).
$$

(6)

Similarly, let $g'_i$ be the linear approximation of $f'_i$ with the same set of basis functions $\phi_{i,1}, \ldots, \phi_{i,p_i}$, and with the coefficients $\alpha'_{i,1}, \ldots, \alpha'_{i,p_i}$. Using (6), the integral in (4) is then approximated by $\int_T (g_i(t) - g'_i(t))^2 dt$. Matricially,
this integral is given by
\[
\int_T (g_i(t) - g'_i(t))^2 dt = \int_T (\beta_i^T \phi_i(t))^2 dt = \beta_i^T \Psi_i \beta_i, \tag{7}
\]
with \( \Psi_i = \int_T \phi_i(t) \phi_i^T(t) dt \), \( \phi_i(t) = [\phi_{i,1}(t), \ldots, \phi_{i,p_i}(t)]^T \), \( \beta_i = [\beta_{i,1}, \ldots, \beta_{i,p_i}]^T \) and \( \beta_{i,j} = \alpha_{i,j} - \alpha'_{i,j} \). By applying (7) to (4), we have:
\[
\| \mathcal{R} \|^2 = \| \mathcal{G} - \mathcal{G}' \|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^Q \frac{1}{\ell_i^2} \beta_i^T \Psi_i \beta_i, \tag{8}
\]
with \( \mathcal{G} = (g_1, \ldots, g_Q) \) and \( \mathcal{G}' = (g'_1, \ldots, g'_Q) \).

From (7), the integral now operates over \( \phi_{i,1}, \ldots, \phi_{i,p_i} \) whose functional structures are known. For a wide range of basis families, such as in splines and PCA, the Gram matrix \( \Psi_i \) has an analytical form (see, e.g., Ramsay and Silverman, 2005; Shi and Choi, 2011). In terms of computational savings, since \( \Psi_i \) does not depend on \( f_i \) nor \( f'_i \), it can be computed only once, stored and reused when building up the kernels in (5). Moreover, the consideration of orthogonal or orthonormal families of basis functions (e.g. in PCA) results in significant simplifications. While for the former families, \( \Psi_i \) is a diagonal matrix given by \( \Psi_i = \text{diag}(f_i \phi_{i,1}(t)dt), \) for the latter it is the identity matrix.

In this paper, we focus on projections based on PCA approximations since they lead to some computational benefits (see, e.g., Betancourt et al., 2020, for other implementations based on splines). First, \( \Psi_i = I \) due to the orthonormality of the basis functions. Second, the most relevant information from functional inputs can be encoded in a few amount of principal components. As an example, in order to satisfy a total inertia of 99.9\% for the 37-length hydro-meteorological time series in Figure 3, PCA led to \( p_i = [1, 4, 3, 3, 2, 6, 4, 9] \) with \( p_i \) the number of principal components for the \( i \)-th functional input. Note that smaller values of \( p_i \) are assigned to lesser varying functional profiles. We refer to Appendix A for a further discussion on the construction of the PCA basis functions.

4 Extension to spatial Gaussian processes

We now consider that \( \{Y(\mathcal{F}, x); \mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})^Q, x \in \mathbb{R}^2\} \), with \( \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R}) \) as in Section 3, is a centred spatial GP with functional inputs \( \mathcal{F} = (f_1, \ldots, f_Q) \) and spatial coordinates \( x = (x_1, x_2) \). Hence, the GP \( Y \) can be fully defined by constructing a valid kernel \( k \) that accounts for both spatial information and functional inputs:
\[
k((\mathcal{F}, x), (\mathcal{F}', x')) = \text{cov} \{Y(\mathcal{F}, x), Y(\mathcal{F}', x')\}. \tag{9}
\]
If approximations \( g_1, \ldots, g_Q \) are considered as in subsection 3.3, then (9) must be rewritten for \( k((\mathcal{G}, x), (\mathcal{G}', x')) \).

For the sake of consistency with subsections 3.1 and 3.2, we continue the discussion with the notation for \( \mathcal{F} \) and \( \mathcal{F}' \).

4.1 Construction of the covariance function via separable kernels

A natural extension of GPs accounting for mix variables relies on considering separable kernels that are expressed as the product of sub-kernels (see, e.g., Fricker et al., 2013; Roustant et al., 2020). In our case, (9) can be written as
\[
k((\mathcal{F}, x), (\mathcal{F}', x')) = k_f(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') k_s(x, x'), \tag{10}
\]
with sub-kernels \( k_f : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R} \) and \( k_f : \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})^Q \times \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})^Q \to \mathbb{R}. \)

Note that the kernel in (10) is attenuated by the spatial correlation. Therefore, besides having nearby functional inputs \( \mathcal{F} \) and \( \mathcal{F}' \), distant values of \( x \) and \( x' \) can result in small correlations, and vice-versa. Since the process \( Y \) remains as a GP, the conditional formulas in (2) and the log-likelihood in (3) hold for (10) with tuples \( (\mathcal{F}_i, x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq N} \).

One of the main benefits of using the kernel in (10) relies on the exploitation of Kronecker structures. In that case, we should consider tuples \( (\mathcal{F}_i, x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq R, 1 \leq j \leq S} \), with \( R \) the number of functional replicates (i.e. number of flood scenarios) and \( S \) the number of spatial points per map. This leads to a total of \( N = R \times S \) observations. Denote the covariance matrices \( \mathbf{K}_f = (k_f(\mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{F}_j))_{1 \leq i,j \leq R} \) and \( \mathbf{K}_s = (k_s(x_i, x_j))_{1 \leq i,j \leq S} \). Then, we have from (10) the Kronecker product \( \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}_f \otimes \mathbf{K}_s \), and the Cholesky factorisation of \( \mathbf{K} \) given by \( \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}_f \otimes \mathbf{L}_s \), with \( \mathbf{L}_f \) and \( \mathbf{L}_s \) the (lower triangular) Cholesky matrices of \( \mathbf{K}_f \) and \( \mathbf{K}_s \). This results in less expensive procedures since both Cholesky and inverse operations are applied on matrices of smaller sizes, reducing the computational complexity to \( \mathcal{O}(R^3S^3) \) compared to \( \mathcal{O}(R^3S^3) \) for standard implementations, Alvaraz et al., 2012). For large datasets such as the one detailed in section 2, computing either \( \mathbf{K} \) or \( \mathbf{L} \) (or their inverses) can easily run out of memory as either \( R \) or \( S \) goes large. To mitigate this drawback, more efficient computations are obtained by solving triangular-structured linear systems rather than directly computing those matrices. We refer to Appendix B for a further discussion.

\[\text{To avoid non-identifiability of the variance parameters, } k_f \text{ is considered as a correlation function, i.e. the variance is } \sigma_f^2 = 1.\]
4.2 Connection to other GP developments

Linear models of coregionalisation (LMC): The process $Y$ can be written as a multi-output process $Z$ where the outputs are driven by a given set of functions, i.e., $Z_i(x) := Y(F_i, x)$, for $i = 1, \ldots, R$. In that case, (10) yields:

$$k_{ij}(x, x') = b_{ij}k_i(x, x'),$$

with $b_{ij} := k_f(F_i, F_j)$, for $i, j = 1, \ldots, R$. The kernel in (11) follows a similar structure to the one in LMC, more precisely, to the one in intrinsic coregionalisation models (ICMs, Alvarez et al., 2012). Here, $k_f(F_i, F_j)$ plays the role of the coregionalisation parameter $b_{ij}$. Note that $k_f$ involves only the estimation of $Q$ length-scale parameters rather than the $R(R + 1)/2$ coefficients ($R \gg Q$) corresponding to the upper triangular block of the symmetric coregionalisation matrix $B = (b_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq R}$. Another benefit of considering $K_f = (k_f(F_i, F_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq R}$ stands in its positive definiteness condition since $k_f$ is defined as a kernel. Since this is not necessarily satisfied by $B$, ICMs may lead to numerical instabilities due to non-invertible matrices. In practice, a diagonal matrix that guarantees positive definiteness is added, i.e. $\tilde{B} = B + \text{diag}([\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_R])$, but this implies the estimation of $R$ additional parameters.

Sparse approximations: Further simplifications are obtained by sparse approximations (Titsias, 2009; Hensman et al., 2013). Recall that $Z_i(x) = Y(F_i, x)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, R$. The distribution of $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_R)$, conditioned to $(Z_i(x))_{1 \leq i \leq R}$, with observation vectors $z_i = [z_{i1}, \ldots, z_{is}]^T$ can be approximated by a cheaper but tractable variational distribution conditioned to $(Z_i(u_1) = z_{i1}, \ldots, Z_i(u_M) = z_{iM})_{1 \leq i \leq R}$, with $M \ll S$. Note that $\tilde{z}_{i} = [\tilde{z}_{i1}, \ldots, \tilde{z}_{iM}]^T$, for $i = 1, \ldots, R$, are observation vectors evaluated at inducing variables $u_1, \ldots, u_M \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Then, using a low rank (or Nyström) approximation of $k_s$, we have that $k_s(x_p, x_q) \approx k_s^T(x_p)K_u^{-1}k_s(x_q)$, for $p, q = 1, \ldots, S$, with $K_u = (k_s(u_p, u_q))_{1 \leq p \leq M}$ and $k_s(x) = [k_s(x, u_1), \ldots, k_s(x, u_M)]$. This leads to a complexity $O(R^3) + O(SM^2)$ (compared to $O(R^3) + O(S^3)$ for non-sparse Kronecker-based GPs). The variables $u_1, \ldots, u_M$ are commonly estimated via variational inference (see, e.g., Hensman et al., 2013), and $M$ is fixed looking for a trade-off between computational complexity and quality of approximation. While large values of $M$ lead to more accurate but expensive models, very small values result in faster but poorer approximations.

Variational inference (VI): As our functional framework preserves the structure of ICMs, it can be easily plugged to other types of multi-output GP (MoGP) based on VI (see, e.g., Hensman et al., 2013; Moreno-Muñoz et al., 2018; Van der Wilk et al., 2020). As an example, it can be fitted via stochastic VI (SVI), which scales well for large values of $S$ (Hensman et al., 2013). Considering a separable Kronecker-based kernel, and applying SVI (under sparse assumptions) only on the spatial kernel, the complexity of the resulting GP is $O(R^3) + O(SM^2)$ with $B \ll S$ the batch size. The value of $B$ is manually fixed depending on the available storage capacity. More efficient variational implementations are obtained by using interdomain approximations (see Lázaro-Gredilla and Figueiras-Vidal, 2009; Van der Wilk et al., 2020). As an another example, heterogeneous MoGPs can also be established by considering that each output has its own likelihood function (e.g. a Gaussian, a Bernoulli or a Poisson likelihood, Moreno-Muñoz et al., 2018).

Since our MoGP implementations are based on the GPflow Python library, they enjoy a great variety of dedicated VI developments (see the documentation in Matthews et al., 2017), including the ones for the SVI and heterogeneous MoGPs. Although the variational features in (Moreno-Muñoz et al., 2018) are not exploited in this paper, they are available for the scientific community for further researches (see subsection 5.1 for further details).

5 Numerical illustrations

We aim at testing the proposed framework under different situations depending on the data availability. First, we consider the case where different design points per map are considered. To simplify the multi-output learning task, we consider the case where different design points per map are considered. To simplify the multi-output learning task, strong correlations between spatial events and functional inputs are assumed. Second, highly variable maps are predicted for a trade-off between computational complexity and quality of approximation. While large values of $M$ lead to more accurate but expensive models, very small values result in faster but poorer approximations.

5.1 Python and R implementations

The core feature of GPflow Python library relies on dedicated variational inference to meet the twin challenges of non-conjugacy and scale (Matthews et al., 2017). However, to the best of our knowledge, GPflow does not support Kronecker-based composite kernels in its latest release, and therefore, implementing Kronecker-structured objects requires significant modifications at the root level. This motivates developments based on the kerGrp R package (Deville et al., 2019). Although kergp is not equipped with sparse-variational approximations as GPflow is, its object-oriented structure is flexible enough to account for both functional data and Kronecker-structured composite kernels. Both Python and R implementations are available on Github: https://github.com/anfelopea/spatGPs.
Figure 5: Sampled replicates (20) for the functional inputs (8) used in the numerical illustration in subsection 5.2.

5.2 Multi-output illustration

We first test the performance of our framework in a multi-output learning task. Results are compared to the ones provided by standard MoGPs via LMC, and developments are based on GPflow (Matthews et al., 2017).

**Synthetic dataset:** We consider a coupled system consisting of $R = 20$ multivariate outputs and $Q = 8$ functional inputs. To emulate functional patterns, the latter functions are sampled from predefined GPs given by

$$f_i \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu_i, k_o), \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \ldots, Q, \quad (12)$$

with mean function $\mu_i$ and Matérn 5/2 kernel $k_o$ with variance $\sigma_o^2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ and length-scale $\ell_o = 0.8$. Both $\sigma_o^2$ and $\ell_o$ are fixed aiming for small variations between $f_i$ and $\mu_i$. The mean functions $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_Q$ are GP realisations, i.e. $\mu_i \sim \mathcal{GP}(0, k_i)$ where the $k_i$’s are Matérn 5/2 kernels with variances $\sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and length-scales $\ell_i = \frac{1}{10}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, Q$. Figure 5 shows that $f_i$ becomes less variable as $\ell_i$ increases. Then, using the inputs in Figure 5, we sample $100 \times 100$ maps using a 2D Matérn 5/2 kernel with variance $\sigma_i^2 = 1$ and length-scales $\ell_{x,1} = \ell_{x,2} = 0.2$. To correlate the inputs, a Matérn 5/2 kernel is used with length-scales $\ell_{f,i} = 2$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 8$. For convenience, strong correlations are considered in order to sample maps that resemble each other (see Figure 6).

**Exact multi-output learning:** The predictability of GP models is assessed on unobserved values of the $100 \times 100$ maps $Y_1, \ldots, Y_{20}$. We consider different maximin Latin hypercube designs (LHDs) with $S = 35$.

4 We use the enhanced stochastic evolutionary (ESE) algorithm implemented in the SMIT Python library (Bouhlel et al., 2019; Jin et al., 2005). Note that, since tensorised designs are not considered, Kronecker-structured models cannot be exploited.

We now compare the performance of the proposed functional MoGP (denoted as fMoGP) with respect to the one provided by the standard MoGP via LCM. Both models consider Matérn 5/2 kernels with the same spatial parametrisation: $\sigma_{x,o}^2 = 1$ and $\ell_{x,1,o} = \ell_{x,2,o} = 0.5$. For the MoGP, as suggested in (Matthews et al., 2017), we randomly initialise the coefficients of $\mathbf{B}$. For the fMoGP, a Matérn 5/2 kernel is used with length-scales $\ell_{f,i,o} = 0.5$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 8$. Then, the hyper-parameters and covariance parameters of both models are estimated via maximum likelihood (ML) using $(\sigma_{x,o}, \ell_{f,1,o}, \ldots, \ell_{f,8,o})$ as initial values of a gradient-based optimisation. The gradients are computed using the automatic differentiation tool from GPflow.

Figure 7 shows that both MoGP and fMoGP capture the spatial dynamics of maps on Figure 6, leading to $Q^2$ values about 0.943 and 0.960, respectively. The $Q^2$ indicator assesses the quality of the predictive mean and is defined as:

$$Q^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{test}}} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{test}}} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}, \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{y}_1, \ldots, \hat{y}_{N_{\text{test}}}$ and $\bar{y}$ are the set of predictions and the average of test data $y_1, \ldots, y_{N_{\text{test}}}$, respectively. For noise-free observations, $Q^2$ is equal to one if predictions are exactly equal to the test data, zero if they are equal to $\bar{y}$, and negative if they perform worse than $\bar{y}$. After repeating this experiment using ten different LHDs, the MoGP and fMoGP led to $Q^2 = 93.2 \pm 1.4\%$ (mean $\pm$ standard deviation) and $Q^2 = 95.9 \pm 0.6\%$, respectively. This raises the conclusion that accounting for the functional structure in the coregionalisation matrix results in prediction improvements.

4 This budget is fixed considering the computational capacity of an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-4300M CPU@2.60GHz, 8Gb RAM.
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Figure 6: Examples of sampled spatial events (20) used in the numerical illustration in subsection 5.2.

Figure 7: Multi-output (Mo) predictions for the spatial events on Figure 6. Results are shown using either the standard MoGP via LMC (top) or the proposed functional MoGP framework (bottom). The white dots represent the spatial design points. The resulting $Q^2$ result per map is also shown on top of each panel.

Although both coregionalisation matrices $B$ and $K_f = (k_f(F_i,F_j))_{1 \leq i,j \leq R}$ exhibit strongest correlations in the diagonal (see Figure 8), $B$ led to extremely high values. This significantly impacted the estimation of the variance, leading to $\hat{\sigma}^2_{\text{MoGP}} = 5.8 \times 10^{-4}$, compared to $\sigma^2_x = 1$ (true variance) and $\hat{\sigma}^2_{\text{MoGP}} = 0.96$ (estimated one by fMoGP). For the length-scales of $k_x$, models led to $\hat{\ell}_x = (0.20, 0.22)$ and $\ell_x = (0.20, 0.21)$, compared to the true ones fixed to $\ell_x = (0.2, 0.2)$. For the length-scales of $k_f$, the fMoGP estimated $\hat{\ell}_f = (2.57, 1.84, 1.83, 1.66, 1.74, 3.55, 1.46, 1.53)$, compared to the true ones all fixed to 2.

5.3 Sparse-variational illustration

We have adapted the sparse-variational MoGP (sv-MoGP) framework in (Van der Wilk et al., 2020) to account for functional inputs. The resulting functional-driven model is denoted as sv-fMoGP. The efficiency of the sv-MoGP relies on the consideration of sparse approximations together with dedicated SVI schemes and tensor-structured data.

Synthetic dataset: A synthetic dataset is generated by following the sampling scheme used in subsection 5.2, but slightly changing some covariance parameters looking for more variable spatial events. More precisely, we fix $\sigma^2_x = 4 \times 10^{-2}$ and $\ell_x.1,.o = \ell_x.2,.o = 0.1$. We then sample 50 spatial events using a grid of $100 \times 100$ equispaced locations. Examples of the sampled spatial events are shown in Figure 9.

Approximate multi-output learning: For the spatial design points, we use a maximin LHD of $S = 500$ points. This results in $N = 50 \times 500 = 25 \times 10^3$ training data, a significant larger amount of data compared to the non-tensorised...
As discussed in Section 2, our goal is to predict the consequence (i.e., the map of maximum water level $H_{\text{max}}$) given various values of $M$. In order not to run out of memory, SVI is applied with mini-batch sizes equal to $B = 200$. Both covariance and variational parameters are estimated via SVI based on a gradient-based optimisation using automatic differentiation (see Hensman et al., 2013; Van der Wilk et al., 2020).

We tested both the sv-MoGP and sv-fMoGP using ten different designs with $S = 500$ spatial points. Q² results (mean ± standard deviation) are shown in Table 1. The Q² criterion was computed considering the spatial locations that were not used for training the models for all the 50 maps. Observe that the sv-fMoGP outperformed the sv-MoGP, leading to absolute Q² improvements greater than 12%. In particular, sv-fMoGP resulted in accurate predictions for $M \geq 100$. Although the predictability of both models improves as $M$ increases, fitting them to training data becomes costly. While for $M = 100$ the CPU times for $4 \times 10^3$ gradient evaluations of the SVI were about 0.32h and 0.74h (for the sv-MoGP and sv-fMoGP, respectively), for $M = 200$ they were about 0.96h and 1.85h. The sv-fMoGP was much slower since the gradients with respect to the length-scales $\ell_f, \ldots, \ell_{f,8}$ were more expensive to evaluate.

### Table 1: Multi-output learning performance of the sv-MoGP and sv-fMoGP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Q² [%] (mean ± standard deviation)</th>
<th>Number of Inducing Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sv-MoGP</td>
<td>53.6 ± 3.2</td>
<td>$M = 20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-MoGP</td>
<td>75.1 ± 2.1</td>
<td>$M = 50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-MoGP</td>
<td>81.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>$M = 100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-MoGP</td>
<td>84.0 ± 0.8</td>
<td>$M = 200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-fMoGP</td>
<td>69.9 ± 1.7</td>
<td>$M = 20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-fMoGP</td>
<td>87.4 ± 0.9</td>
<td>$M = 50$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-fMoGP</td>
<td>93.6 ± 1.2</td>
<td>$M = 100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv-fMoGP</td>
<td>96.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>$M = 200$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

illustration proposed in subsection 5.2. The 50 spatial events are assumed to share the same inducing variables. Those variables are initialised as a maximin LHD looking for covering the spatial space. For assessing the influence of the inducing variables, we test models using various values of $M$. Although the predictability of both models improves as $M$ increases, fitting them to training data becomes costly. While for $M = 100$ the CPU times for $4 \times 10^3$ gradient evaluations of the SVI were about 0.32h and 0.74h (for the sv-MoGP and sv-fMoGP, respectively), for $M = 200$ they were about 0.96h and 1.85h. The sv-fMoGP was much slower since the gradients with respect to the length-scales $\ell_f, \ldots, \ell_{f,8}$ were more expensive to evaluate.

### 5.4 Inference of unobserved outputs

As discussed in Section 2, our goal is to predict the consequence (i.e., the map of maximum water level $H_{\text{max}}$) of unobserved storm events. This is achieved by correlating the hydro-meteorological drivers (functional inputs). The length-scales $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_Q$ of the kernel $k_f$ can be estimated using data from the observed events. Therefore, since the

---

5This assumption can be relaxed to deal with different sets of inducing variables per map but at the cost of complex inference.

6Experiments here have been executed on a single core of an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-4300M CPU@2.60GHz, 8 Gb RAM.
We now apply our framework to the coastal flooding application described in Section 2. As we focus on forecasting purposes, we use our R implementations based on \texttt{kergp} (Deville et al., 2019).

Figure 10: Sampled replicates (1001) for the functional inputs (8) used in the synthetic example in subsection 5.4. Unlike Figure 5, here GP priors for the inputs are assumed to be centred and highly variable.

Figure 11: Examples of the sampled spatial events (1001) used in the numerical illustration in subsection 5.4.

structure of \( k_f \) is completely defined after fitting the GP, our model can be applied for forecasting purposes. The framework in (Van der Wilk et al., 2020) requires the estimation of the mean and covariance functions of the variational distribution, which can only be estimated for observed outputs. This makes both sv-MoGP and sv-fMoGP inapplicable for forecasting tasks. However, we still can exploit Kronecker-based composite kernels using \texttt{kergp}. Experiments here are executed on a single core of an HP cluster with Intel bi-processor, 32×2.2 GHz cores, 64GB RAM.

**Synthetic dataset:** We consider a coupled system consisting of \( R = 1001 \) outputs and \( Q = 8 \) functional inputs. The latter functions are sampled as proposed in subsection 5.2, but considering centred processes: \( f_i \sim GP(0, k_i) \) where the \( k_i \)'s are Matérn 5/2 kernels with variances \( \sigma_i^2 = \frac{1}{2} \) and length-scales \( \ell_i = \frac{1}{10^i} \), for \( i = 1, \ldots, q \). The corresponding 1001 maps are then generated using an equispaced grid of \( 10 \times 10 \) spatial locations. This leads to \( S = 100 \) design points per map. We use the same kernel parametrisation proposed in subsections 5.2 and 5.3. Figures 10 and 11 show the sampled functional inputs and some examples of the generated spatial events, respectively.

**Inference of new maps:** Since we aim at inferring the 1001-st map using data of the first 1000 ones, then the performance of the model is assessed in terms of the number of learning maps \( R \). Here, the covariance parameters are estimated via ML using the derivative-free constrained optimiser by linear approximations (COBYLA) implemented in the \texttt{nLOpt} package (Johnson, 2020). Gradient-based optimisers were also applied but they led to expensive procedures.

Figure 12 shows predictions using one standard deviation confidence intervals. Observe that the predictive mean becomes closer to the test data as \( R \) increases, with a \( Q^2 \) improvement of 24.1\% between results using 5 and 1000 learning events. Moreover, the model only needed \( R = 200 \) learning events to reach an accurate predictive performance of \( Q^2 \sim 90\% \). In terms of the uncertainties, the predictive intervals cover the test data and they become thinner as \( R \) increases. Figure 13 shows the spatial distribution of the absolute errors between the 1001-st map and predictions for \( R = 5, 100, 400, 1000 \). The errors for \( R = 5 \) are larger in places where the model should predict either high negative or high positive values (see also Figure 12). Then, by increasing \( R \), those errors become smaller and close to zero.

## 6 Results on the coastal flooding application

We now apply our framework to the coastal flooding application described in Section 2. As we focus on forecasting purposes, we use our R implementations based on \texttt{kergp} (Deville et al., 2019).
Figure 12: Predictions from subsection 5.4 considering one standard deviation confidence intervals. Each panel shows: the sampled test data (blue dots), the predictive mean (red dots) and the confidence intervals (red whiskers). Output values are sorted by increasing order of the sampled test data.

Figure 13: Absolute errors between the ground truth $Y_{1001}$ and predictions $\hat{Y}_{1001}$ from the experiment in subsection 5.4. Results are shown considering either 5, 100, 400 or 1000 learning spatial events.

6.1 Numerical settings

**Data preprocessing:** Some of the hydro-meteorological forcing conditions, such as the wave peak direction $Dp$ and the wind direction $Du$, are defined in the nautical convention (i.e. with the North considered as reference). Then, as $Du$ (or $Dp$) represents an angle, a slight change for winds (or waves) coming from the North may lead to high angle variations, and therefore, to complex PCA representations. To avoid this drawback, in our experiments we replace the tuples $(Hs, Dp)$ and $(U, Du)$ by the Cartesian tuples $(\hat{Hs}, \hat{Hs})$ and $(\hat{U}_x, \hat{U}_y)$ given by

$$\hat{Hs}_x = Hs \cdot \sin(Dp), \quad \hat{Hs}_y = Hs \cdot \cos(Dp), \quad \hat{U}_x = U \cdot \sin(Du), \quad \hat{U}_y = U \cdot \cos(Du). \quad (14)$$

This results in a set of hydro-meteorological functional inputs consisting of $(MSL, T, Tp, Hs, Hs, Du)$.

**Design of experiments (DoE):** As the complexity of our model increases with the number of spatial design points $S$, we focus the computational budget on a subset of spatial locations. First, we consider locations where the empirical flooding probability (EFP) over the 131 flood scenarios is non-zero. This results in a total of $34 \times 10^3$ (approximately) possible candidates (see Figure 14, left). Second, since the dataset is “unbalanced” in terms of the EFP (see histogram in Figure 14), it is divided into two classes: one class corresponding to locations with $EFP \in [0.4, 0.8]$ ($\sim 2.5 \times 10^3$ points), and a second one corresponding to locations with $EFP \in (0, 0.4)$ ($\sim 31.5 \times 10^3$ points). While the first class targets a very limited neighbouring (Figure 15, left), constrained by the road network, the second one provides a space filling of the flood event (Figure 15, right). For each class, a k-means clustering scheme is applied (see, e.g., Hartigan and Wong, 1979) where the closest point to each cluster will be part of the DoE. The clustering scheme uses as inputs the spatial coordinates and the EFP, i.e. $x_{\text{clustering}} = (x_1, x_2, \text{EFP})$. The influence of the EFP contributes to grouping spatially-close points into different clusters if they exhibit unalike flooding probabilities. Note that the number of clusters $\kappa_1, \kappa_2$ are hyper-parameters to be defined depending on how many spatial design points we would considered.
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Figure 14: (left) 2D visualisation of the empirical flooding probability (EFP) over the 131 map replicates. (right) Histogram of the EFP. Both panels account for non-zero values of the EFP.

Figure 15: 2D visualisations of the EFP for spatial points with \( EFP \in [0.4, 0.8] \) (left) and \( EFP \in (0, 0.4) \) (right).

6.2 Leave-one-out (LOO) test

For validating our framework, we first test it on an experiment where each scenario from the dataset is predicted using data of the other ones. This will give us an idea about the capability of the model for forecasting flood events. For training the 131 models, the same spatial design points are fixed for each scenario in order to apply Kronecker-based computations. For instance, we define a DoE with \( S = 103 \) locations (including the town-hall, the gymnasium and the sports field) using the k-means-based methodology discussed in subsection 6.1. This leads to \( N = 130 \times 103 = 13390 \) spatial points that are then used for the covariance parameter estimation. For the selection of the types of kernels used for correlating the functional inputs and spatial locations, different combinations of kernels in (5) have been tested. After running the corresponding LOO tests, the use of Matérn 5/2 kernels commonly outperformed any other combination. Therefore, results here and in further experiments will consider functional and spatial Matérn 5/2 kernels.

Examples of the LOO predictions are shown in Figure 16. Since negative predictions do not have physical meaning in our application, we set them to zero for further analysis. From scenarios 1, 43 and 100, our framework properly infer their flood levels, leading to accurate RMSE and \( Q^2 \) values.\(^7\) In order to assess the quality of the predictive variances, the coverage accuracy of the two-standard deviation confidence intervals, denoted as \( CA_{\pm 2\sigma} \), is considered. This indicator designates the proportion of test data that are contained in the confidence intervals. Note that for all the three scenarios, the \( CA_{\pm 2\sigma} \) covers more than 92% of the test data.

Considering the predictions for the 131 LOO tests, they resulted in \( Q^2 \) and \( CA_{\pm 2\sigma} \) median values around 95.8% and 99%, respectively. However, for some scenarios, our framework led to misprediction as observed for the 38th scenario (see Figure 16). Indeed, in the coastal flooding dataset, there are scenarios that strongly differ from each other or that are unique of their kind, and misprediction arises when one of those scenarios is analysed and if there is no

\(^7\)The \( Q^2 \) defined in (13) is not valid when the variance of the test data (the flood event that is predicted) is equal to zero. In our application, since some of the scenarios are nowhere flooded, we redefine the \( Q^2 \) criterion by normalising the MSE using the variance of the 131 scenarios instead but considering only spatial locations where the EFP is non zero.
Figure 16: $H_{\text{max}}$ predictions for the experiment in subsection 6.2: (left) ground truth, (middle) predictions, (right) ground truth (blue) vs predictive mean ($\pm$ two-standard deviation confidence intervals, red). For the flood event profiles, the town-hall, the gymnasium and the sports field are represented by a red square, a red circle and a red triangle, respectively. For the right side panels, $H_{\text{max}}$ values are sorted in increasing order of the true observations. RMSE, $Q^2$ and CA $\pm 2\sigma$ values are shown on top of right side panels.

similar flood events available in the learning dataset. As we show in Figure 17, this drawback can be mitigated by incorporating additional and similar scenarios in the learning set of flood events. There, a new flood event, denoted as scenario 132, has been added into the LOO test. The hydro-meteorological conditions for this scenario are generated by slightly modifying the (Tp, Hs$_x$, Hs$_y$, U$_x$, U$_y$) from the 38th scenario but preserving the same profiles for (MSL, T, S). From Figure 17, correlations between the hydro-meteorological functional inputs of scenarios 38 and 132 are stronger than if we compare their inputs with the ones of other scenarios. Note also that predictions for the 38th scenario were significantly improved by exploiting data from the 132nd one, and vice-versa.
As pointed out in subsection 6.2, the performance of the model depends on the availability and diversity of learning scenarios. The learning scenarios are taken only from the remaining 94 simulated ones of the coastal flooding dataset.

6.3 Influence of the number of learning scenarios

As pointed out in subsection 6.2, the performance of the model depends on the availability and diversity of learning scenarios. In this experiment we stress the impact of enriching the set of learning scenarios for forecasting purposes. We focus on the prediction of (21) historical flood and no-flood events, and (16) slightly reinforced historical flood events, i.e. the first 37 scenarios of the dataset. Those scenarios are predicted using data of the remaining 94 simulated ones. Since the latter set of scenarios was generated aiming at covering a wide range of hydro-meteorological conditions (see Section 2), accurate predictions are expected also when considering only a few learning scenarios.

We train GP models considering different subsets of the 94 learning scenarios. The selection of those scenarios is performed via k-means clustering using as inputs the scalar representations of the hydro-meteorological forcing conditions proposed in (Rohmer et al., 2020). A k-means algorithm considering 20 clusters is applied where the index (number of scenario) of the closest point (set of scalar hydro-meteorological conditions) to each cluster is kept for building up the learning set of scenarios. This leads to an initial subset $E_0$ with 20 learning scenarios. For enriching the learning dataset, new scenarios are added by repeating the same procedure but applying the k-means algorithm over the scenarios that have not been previously chosen. Therefore, for each addition, we have $E_i = \{E_{i-1}, \Delta E_i\}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, N_R$, with $\Delta E_i$ the subset of added scenarios and $N_R$ the number of enrichments. The corresponding amount of learning scenarios is denoted as $R_i$. After having defined the learning sets of flood scenarios, we then fit the corresponding GP models for the resulting 37 test cases. Both training and prediction steps are performed considering the spatial design points proposed in subsection 6.2.

Boxplots of the RMSE, $Q^2$ and $CA_{\pm 2\sigma}$ values of the 37 predictions, and considering $R = 20, 40, 60, 94$ learning scenarios (i.e. $R_0 = 20, N_R = 3$), are shown in Figure 18. Improvements are obtained on the three performance indicators as $R$ increases, leading also to smaller dispersions of the boxplots. For each test scenario, the $CA_{\pm 2\sigma}$ remains...
A preprint - Multi-output Gaussian Processes with Functional Data: A Study on Coastal Flood Hazard Assessment

Figure 19: RMSE results of predictions for the first 37 scenarios of the dataset in Section 2 and considering $R = 20, 40, 60, 94$. The bars represent the magnitude of the RMSE criterion for each scenario. The fifteen scenarios where the RMSE values have been improved at each of the three increases of $R$ are in bold. Sub-indices at the bottom of the x-axis designate which case provided the smaller RMSE values.

Figure 20: (a) Correlations between the hydro-meteorological conditions of the scenario 32 and the ones of the learning set. Results are shown considering different numbers of learning scenarios. (b) Time series of the still water level ($SWL(t) = MSL + T(t) + S(t)$) for scenarios 32, 64 and 68. (c) True $H_{\text{max}}$ maps of scenarios under analysis.

satisfactory whatever $R$, and the RMSE and $Q^2$ results are commonly outperformed when considering a larger learning dataset. More precisely, 24 of the 37 predictions are improved by considering all the 94 learning scenarios. However, for some cases (see Figure 19, e.g., RMSE results for scenarios 31 and 32) the quality of predictions was degraded.

We first analyse results for the 32th scenario. By comparing the similarity between the hydro-meteorological conditions using either 20 or 94 learning scenarios (i.e. the scenarios numbered from 38 to 57, and 38 to 131, respectively), the strongest correlations are provided with the scenarios 64 and 68, respectively (Figure 20(a)). We must clarify that $E_0 (R_0 = 20)$ includes the scenario 64 but not the 68 one, while $E_3 (R_3 = 94)$ includes both of them. For ease of discussion, we put our attention on the comparison of the still water level (SWL) which is given by:
Figure 21: $H_{\text{max}}$ predictions for experiments in Figure 16 considering 1003 spatial design points per flood scenario. Panel description is the same as in Figure 16.

SWL($t$) = MSL + $T(t) + S(t)$.\footnote{By performing a sensitivity analysis (SA) based on GPs, models were more sensitive to the MSL, T and S rather than the other hydro-meteorological drivers. For the SA, the sensitivity package \cite{looss2020} was adapted to account for functional data.} Figure 20(b) shows that the SWL of the scenario 68 is actually closer to the one of the scenario 32. Therefore, it has sense that, after adding the scenario 68 in the learning dataset (event already added for $E_2$, $R_2 = 60$), models may consider stronger correlations with respect to this scenario rather than the 64th one. However, while scenarios 32 and 64 correspond to moderate flood events, the 68th one corresponds to a minor one (Figure 20(c)), explaining the misprediction when considering such scenario in the learning dataset.

Akin to the scenario 32, similar behaviours were observed in other scenarios where the RMSE is systematically degraded as $R$ increases. To avoid this kind of drawback, we can enrich the learning dataset with additional flood scenarios, and/or consider adding complementary hydro-meteorological conditions (or prior information of flood events) as inputs of the GP model that may help to the discrimination of scenarios. Figure 20(b) shows that small variations on the hydro-meteorological conditions may lead to events with and without flood. Indeed, we should remind that flood is occurring only if the instantaneous water level resulting from the joint action of the MSL, tide, surge, waves and wind exceeds the level of the (natural or man-made) coastal defences crest. In that case, our framework can instead be adapted for learning the critical forcing conditions leading the instantaneous water level to exceed the defence crests.

### 6.4 Influence of the number of spatial design points

We now assess the impact of the number of spatial design points $S$ in predictions. To do so, we repeat the experiment in subsection 6.2 but considering 900 additional design points per flood event, i.e. $S = 1003$. This leads to a total of $N = 130 \times 1003 \sim 1.3 \times 10^5$ spatial design points. The same parametrisation proposed in subsection 6.2 is used here. Figure 21 shows the predictions for scenarios 1, 43 and 100. As also observed in Figure 16, the model provides accurate
predictions, leading to $Q^2$ and CA values above 85% and 99%, respectively. In practice, we may be interested in predicting flood areas rather than locally predicting values only at the subset of $S$ spatial locations. This can be achieved by applying the conditional predictive GP formulas over the spatial domain of interest (see the discussion in Sections 3 and 4). Predictions of scenarios 1, 43 and 100 considering only spatial locations with non-zero EFP ($\sim 34 \times 10^3$ points) are shown in Figure 22 for $S = 103, 1003$. For both cases, our framework tends to capture the intensity of those flood events. While spatial profiles are smoother by considering $S = 103$, a better predictability resolution is obtained for $S = 1003$. This is caused by the difference in magnitude of the estimated length-scales $(\ell_{x,1}, \ell_{x,2})$ [m]. We should remind that for larger values of $(\ell_{x,1}, \ell_{x,2})$, models lead to stronger spatial correlations, and therefore, to smoother predictions. Here, while the former GP model with $S = 103$ resulted in length-scale (median) estimations equal to $\hat{\ell}_{x,1,103} = 42.7$ and $\hat{\ell}_{x,2,103} = 135.1$, the latter model with $S = 1003$ resulted in smaller length-scales: $\hat{\ell}_{x,1,1003} = 19.1$ and $\hat{\ell}_{x,2,1003} = 28.4$. For both $S = 103$ and $S = 1003$, overestimations are commonly yielded in the areas surrounding buildings (small white zones). Indeed, the model overestimate $H_{\text{max}}$ values at the centre of buildings (locations that were never observed in the training step, see the discussion in subsection 6.1) where those values are actually equal to zero. Therefore, because of the smoothness condition of GPs, predictions at the buildings’ neighbourhood are affected.

Table 2 assesses the quality of predictions in Figure 22 according to the following categories recommended by the French Risk Prevention Plan (Direction Générale de la Prévention des Risques, 2014): minor if $H_{\text{max}} \leq 0.5$, moderate if $0.5 < H_{\text{max}} \leq 1$, serious if $1 < H_{\text{max}} \leq 1.5$ and severe if $H_{\text{max}} > 1.5$. Then, for the scenarios in Figure 22, we point-wisely assign predictions $\hat{H}_{\text{max}}$ to their corresponding categories, and we compare the resulting proportions [%] per flood category with respect to the ones led by the true observations $H_{\text{max}}$. From Table 2, we can observe
Table 2: Quality assessment of predictions in Figure 22 considering the flood categories recommended by the French Risk Prevention Plan. Flood events are classified as minor ($H_{\text{max}} \leq 0.5$), moderate ($0.5 < H_{\text{max}} \leq 1$), serious ($1 < H_{\text{max}} \leq 1.5$) and severe ($H_{\text{max}} > 1.5$). The proportions [%] per category are computed using spatial locations with non-zero EFP. Results are shown considering the true observations ($H_{\text{max}}$) and predictions using either $S = 103$ ($\hat{H}_{\text{max}}^{103}$) or $S = 1003$ ($\hat{H}_{\text{max}}^{1003}$). The closest proportions to the ones provided by $H_{\text{max}}$ (in grey) are in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Category</th>
<th>$H_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>Proportions [%] per Category</th>
<th>Scenario 43</th>
<th>Scenario 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serious</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>severe</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23: Performance indicators for the experiment in subsection 6.4 considering the first 37 scenarios of the dataset in Section 2. Results are shown for $S = 103, 503, 1003$.

that both models, considering $S = 103$ or $S = 1003$, globally lead to reliable flood proportions. Misclassification between consecutive categories mainly results from the overestimation or underestimation around the $H_{\text{max}}$ threshold that defines the limit of each category. As an example, for the scenario 43, a significant amount of $H_{\text{max}}$ values close to 0.5 were assigned in the moderate category when they actually belong to the minor one.

Finally, Figure 23 shows boxplots of the performance indicator values for the LOO predictions and considering $S = 103, 503, 1003$. As discussed in subsections 6.2 and 6.3, to avoid misprediction due to the uniqueness of some scenarios, the analysis is focused on the first 37 flood events. The indicators ($\text{RMSE}, \ldots, \text{CA}_{\pm 2\sigma}$) are computed considering only spatial locations with non-zero EFP (see Figure 14). They improve as $S$ increases, leading also to smaller dispersions of the boxplots. In terms of the computational cost, note that, although CPU times for both training and prediction steps grow as $S$ increases, they remain tractable. In practice, since the training step is executed only once and can be computed offline, we only need to be aware about the computational cost of the prediction step. Here, the prediction of a single map take a couple of minutes, an advantage compared to the couple of days required by numerical simulators. Hence, this makes possible the use of our framework for FEWS’s.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, we further investigated a Gaussian process (GP) surrogate model for spatial coastal flooding hazard assessment. We aimed at predicting spatial flood events (e.g. maximal inland water height, $H_{\text{max}}$) by exploiting data of hydro-meteorological time-varying conditions (e.g. tide, storm, surges, etc.). We demonstrated that our framework can be easily applied without any parametrisation of the hydro-meteorological drivers onto scalar representations, a step that is not always simple and that can lead to misleading predictions. To the best of our knowledge, our proposal is the first one of its kind that considers both inputs and outputs of a coastal computer code as functions.

The proposed GP model was built on the proposition of a separable kernel that correlates both hydro-meteorological forcing conditions (functional inputs) and spatial input locations. The resulting process can be seen as a multi-output GP where correlated spatial outputs are driven by multiple hydro-meteorological functional inputs. Efficient implementa-

---

9These experiments were executed on a single core of an HP cluster with AMD quad-processor, RAM 256GB.
ations were explored by considering Kronecker-structured operations and/or sparse-variational approximations. This led to models that run fast up to hundreds of outputs and thousands of spatial design points. Both Python and R codes were provided based on object-oriented GP implementations.

Our framework was tested on various examples considering different situations depending on the data availability. According to numerical experiments, our approach led to accurate predictions that outperformed standard GP implementations that cannot account for functional data. For forecasting unobserved spatial events, we numerically showed the convergence of our approach as the number of the learning flood events increases. We demonstrated on a coastal flooding application that accurate predictions can be obtained within tractable time lapses. More precisely, predictions were obtained in the order of minutes compared to the couple of days required by dedicated simulators. This is key for FEWS’s. We must note that the performance of the proposed framework will depend on the availability and diversity of learning flood scenarios. The richer and diverse the learning dataset, the better the predictability.

The framework presented here can be improved in different ways. A natural extension relies on projecting the spatial outputs onto (truncated) basis representations such as Wavelets (see, e.g., Perrin et al., 2020). In that case, functional inputs can be treated as discussed in this paper, and Gaussian priors will be placed over the space of the coefficients of representations rather than the output space. This would lead to significant improvements in terms of the computational cost for applications with large learning data sets, e.g., involving thousands of outputs and tens of thousands of design points. The nature of the coastal flooding data, more precisely the non-negative, zero-inflated and discontinuous patterns (as illustrated by Figure 2), cannot be easily learned by considering purely GP assumptions. Hence, alternative GP-based priors may be explored aiming for more realistic surrogate models. We refer to (Lopez-Lopera et al., 2018) for GP-based implementations with positive priors, (Hegde et al., 2018) for a variational approximation of zero-inflated GP-based priors may be explored aiming for more realistic surrogate models. We refer to (López-Lopera et al., 2018) for GP-based implementations with positive priors, (Hegde et al., 2018) for a variational approximation of zero-inflated GPs, and (Remes et al., 2017) for the construction of non-stationary covariance kernels.
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A Projection of functional inputs onto PCA basis functions

Consider the $\tau$-length functional vector $f = [f(t_1), \ldots, f(t_\tau)]^\top$. Let $F = [f_1, \ldots, f_N]^\top$ be a matrix containing $N$ replicates of $f$. The PCA of $F$ can be obtained using the variance-covariance matrix (Ramsay and Silverman, 2005). Denote the matrix $F_c$ as the centred version of $F$ where the mean of each column of $F$ is subtracted to the column. Then, the variance-covariance matrix is given by

$$\Omega_\tau = \frac{1}{N} F_c^\top F_c = \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \lambda_j \nu_j \nu_j^\top,$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

where $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_\tau$ and $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_\tau$ are the corresponding eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\Omega_\tau$. In practice, (15) is commonly truncated after reaching a predefined inertia $I_\tau$, where the contribution of each eigencomponent is given by

$$I_j = \frac{\lambda_j}{\sum_{k=1}^{\tau} \lambda_k}.$$ 

Then, the “optimal” number of PCA components is obtained by the smallest value of $\tau_\kappa$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\tau_\kappa} I_j \geq I_\kappa$, with $\tau_\kappa \leq \tau$. Finally, the eigenvectors of the truncated matrix $\Omega_\kappa$ can be used as basis functions in the linear approximation in (6), i.e. $[\phi_{i,1}, \ldots, \phi_{i,p_i}] = [\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{\tau_\kappa}]$ with $p_i = \tau_\kappa$. Due to the orthonormality of $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{\tau_\kappa}$, the vector of coefficients $\alpha_\kappa$, for $\kappa = 1, \ldots, N$, associated to the replicate $f_\kappa$ is given by $\alpha_\kappa = \Phi^\top f_\kappa$ with $\Phi = [\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{\tau_\kappa}]$.

B Kronecker-based operations for Gaussian processes with separable kernels

For large datasets, computing the covariance matrix $K = (K_f \otimes K_x) \in \mathbb{R}^{RS \times RS}$, with $R$ the number of outputs and $S$ the number of spatial design points per output, may easily run out the memory. This limitation holds when building up
the (lower triangular) Cholesky factorisation $L = (L_f \otimes L_x) \in \mathbb{R}^{RS \times RS}$ and its inverse. To mitigate this drawback, instead of computing $K$ or $L$, we propose to solve triangular-structured linear systems involving Kronecker products.

### B.1 Properties of the Kronecker product

We first recall the properties of the Kronecker product that are needed in this appendix (see Laub, 2004; Alvarez et al., 2012, for further details). Consider the matrices $A, A' \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$, $B, B' \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times Q}$, and the vectors $u \in \mathbb{R}^{NQ}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^{MP}$. Then, some useful properties of the Kronecker product are:

- $(A \otimes B)^\top = A^\top \otimes B^\top$, 
- $(A \otimes B)^{-1} = A^{-1} \otimes B^{-1}$, 
- $(A \otimes B)(A' \otimes B') = (AA' \otimes BB')$.

We are also interested in computing (or solving) linear systems of the form:

$$v = (A \otimes B)u.$$  

For computing (17), note that it is possible to rearrange the vectors $u$ and $v$ in matrices in order to avoid building up $(A \otimes B)$ (a step that required computing and storing an $MP \times NQ$ matrix). Consider the matrices $U \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times N^2}$ and $V \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times M}$ where elements of $u$ and $v$ are indexed by columns, respectively. Then, (17) is given by

$$V = BAU A^\top.$$ 

After computing $V$, which involves computing and storing matrices of smaller sizes, we can obtain $v$ by vectorising $V$.

### B.2 Computation of the likelihood

Note that the complexity of the likelihood in (3) relies in the computation of the quadratic term:

$$z = y^\top K^{-1} y,$$

with covariance matrix $K = K_x \otimes K_f$, and an observation vector $y = [y_1, \ldots, y_N]^\top$ with $N = SR$. Note that, aiming for numerical simplifications in further steps, we change the order of the Kronecker product proposed in (10) since commonly $R \ll S$. This only implies properly rearranging the indexation of the observations in $y$, i.e.

$$y = [Y(F_1, x_1), \ldots, Y(F_1, x_S), \ldots, Y(F_R, x_1), \ldots, Y(F_R, x_S)]^\top.$$ 

Then, using the Cholesky factorisation of $K$, we can show that (19) is given by

$$z = y^\top (LL^\top)^{-1} y = (L^{-1} y)^\top (L^{-1} y) = a^\top a.$$

For computing $a = L^{-1} y = (L_x^{-1} \otimes L_f^{-1}) y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, by using (18), then we have:

$$A = L_f^{-1} Y (L_x^{-1})^\top = (L_x^{-1} L_f^{-1} Y)^\top = (L_x^{-1} B)^\top,$$

with $B = L_f^{-1} Y$. Hence, for building up the matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times N}$, we need to solve the linear system $L_f B = Y$, which can be efficiently computed since $L_f$ is a lower triangular matrix. Similarly, the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{R \times S}$ is obtained by solving the triangular-structured system $L_x A^\top = B^\top$. Finally, the vector $a$ results from vectorising the matrix $A$.

Note that, for computing (19) using (20), intermediate steps require constructing and storing $R \times N$ and $R \times S$ matrices rather than the inverse of the $N \times N$ covariance matrix. In our application, this led to significant computational improvements since we considered large numbers of spatial design points $S$.

### B.3 Computation of the conditional mean and covariance functions

From (2), we can note that the conditional mean function $\mu$ and the conditional covariance function $c$ depend also on the computation of $K$. As in Appendix B.2, we here provide efficient computations of those quantities by exploiting the properties of Kronecker product (see Appendix B.1).

We first focus on the computation of $\mu$. For ease of notation, we denote $\mu := \mu(x_*, F_x)$ and $k := k(x_*, F_x) = [k((x_1, F_x), (x_1, F_1)), \ldots, k((x_N, F_x), (x_N, F_N))]^\top$. Then, following a similar procedure as the one used in Appendix B.2, and using (16), we can show that $\mu$ is given by

$$\mu = k^\top K^{-1} y = k^\top (L_x^{-1} \otimes L_f^{-1})^{-1} a.$$ 

...
with \( a = ([L_x^{-1} \otimes L_f^{-1}]y). \) Now, since \( k = k_x \otimes k_f \) with \( k_x = \begin{bmatrix} k_x(x_s, x_1), \ldots, k_x(x_s, x_S) \end{bmatrix}^T \) and \( k_f = \begin{bmatrix} k_f(F_s, F_1), \ldots, k_f(F_s, F_R) \end{bmatrix}^T \), (16) yields:

\[
\mu = ([L_x^{-1}k_x]^T \otimes [L_f^{-1}k_f]^T)a.
\]

(21)

As discussed in Appendix B.2, the computations \( b_x = L_x^{-1}k_x \) and \( b_f = L_f^{-1}k_f \) are efficient since \( L_x \) and \( L_f \) are lower triangular matrices. Then, (21) is obtained by applying (18).

Now, denote \( c := c((x_s, F_s), (x'_s, F'_s)), k := k((x_s, F_s), (x'_s, F'_s)) \) and \( k' := k(x'_s, F'_s) = [k(x_1, F_1), (x'_s, F'_s)], \ldots, k(x_N, F_N), (x'_s, F'_s)]^T \). By following a similar procedure as the one used for \( \mu \), we have that \( c \) is given by

\[
c = k - k^\top K^{-1}k' = k - (b_x \otimes b_f)^\top (b'_x \otimes b'_f) = k - (b_x b'_x)(b_f b'_f),
\]

(22)

with \( b_x = L_x^{-1}k_x, b_f = L_f^{-1}k_f, b'_x = L_x^{-1}k'_x, \) and \( b'_f = L_f^{-1}k'_f \).
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