Validation of CERES/TRMM SSF Edition 2 Angular Distribution Models

Norman G. Loeb[1], Natividad Manalo-Smith[2],

Konstantin Loukachine[4], Seiji Kato[1], Yongxiang Hu[3]

[1]Hampton University, [2]AS&M, [3]NASA LaRC, [4]SAIC

Outline

- TOA Flux/ADM Production Schedule
- Recent Changes to SSF
- CERES ADM Types and Web Page
- SW Flux Validation
- LW and WN Flux Validation

TOA Flux Production Schedule

1. August 2001

- Delivery of SSF Edition 2 SW, LW & WN ADMs. ✓
- Prepare SSF Edition 2 validation results. ✓

2. September 2001

- Begin production of CERES/TRMM Edition 2 SSFs. ✓
- Complete SSF Edition 2 Quality Summary. ✗
- Archive SSF Edition 2 pending Science Team Approval. ✗

3. October 2001 – March 2002

- Preparation of 2-3 manuscripts for publication summarizing TRMM ADMs and validation results. ✗
- Begin developing CERES/Terra ADMs. ✗

Recent Changes to SSF (to appear in SSF Edition 2)

- Include all CERES footprints that have at least 1 VIRS pixel coverage (independent of whether imager data is bad).
  =>User's should carefully check SSF parameters: "percent imager coverage (SSF-54)" and "cloud property extrapolation over cloudy area (SSF-63)".
- Retain clear scenes over "hot" desert and land with saturated VIRS channel 4 radiances.
  - Use CERES WN brightness temperature threshold to identify clear scenes over very hot surfaces.
- Changed units of window (WN) unfiltered radiance and TOA flux from W m^{-2} μm^{-1} to W m^{-2}.
  - WN unfiltered radiance & flux is defined over 8.1 - 11.8 μm wavelength interval.

http://asd-www.larc.nasa.gov/Inversion/

CERES Inversion Group Home Page



Overview

Angular Distribution Models

ADM Version Summary

Validation Results

Publications

Conferences

Inversion Production Code

Current Research

Relevant Links

Responsible NASA Official: Dr. Bruce A. Wielicki

Web Curator: Dr. K. Loukachine K.Loukachine@larc.nasa.gov

SW Flux & Albedo Estimation from ADMs



Reflectance (isotropic albedo):

$$r(\theta_o,\theta,\phi) = \frac{\pi I(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)}{\cos\theta_o \; S_o}$$

$(I(\theta_o,\theta,\phi) =$ measured radiance)

Instantaneous Flux & Albedo Estimates:

$$\hat{F} = \frac{\pi\, I(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)}{R_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)} \qquad \hat{A} = \frac{r(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)}{R_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)}$$

where,

$R_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)$ = SW Anisotropic Factor

$$R_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi) = \frac{\bar{r}_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)}{\bar{A}_j(\theta_o)} = \frac{\bar{r}_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)}{\pi^{-1}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \bar{r}_j(\theta_o,\theta,\phi)\cos\theta d\theta d\phi}$$

CERES SW ADM Angular Bin Definitions



θ_o : 9 angular bins (0° to 90° in 10° steps)

θ : 9 angular bins (0° to 90° in 10° steps)

ϕ : 10 angular bins (0° to 180° in 10° or 20° steps)

Scene Types for CERES/TRMM SW ADMs

ADM Category		Scene Type Stratification	Actual Total
Clear	Ocean	- 4 Wind Speed Intervals	4
	Land	- 2 IGBP Type Groupings	2
	Desert	- Bright and Dark	2
	Snow	- Theoretical	1
Cloud	Ocean	- Liquid and Ice - 12 Cloud Fraction Intervals - 14 Optical Depth Intervals	62 (L) 53 (I)
	Land	- 2 IGBP Type Groupings - Liquid and Ice - 5 Cloud Fraction Intervals - 6 Optical Depth Intervals	45
	Desert	- Bright and Dark Deserts - Liquid and Ice - 5 Cloud Fraction Intervals - 6 Optical Depth Intervals	33
	Snow	- Theoretical	1
Total			203

SW ADM Frequency of Occurrence by Cloud Fraction & Cloud Optical Depth (Ocean)



Land and Desert IGBP Type Groupings



ADM Scene Surface Types





ADM Scene Type

Distributed by the Atmospheric Science Data Center
http://eosweb.larc.nasa.gov

Clear Land and Desert ADMs: θ_o=30°-40°



Clear Ocean ADMs: θ_o=30°-40°



Clear Ocean TOA Flux From CERES

- Define ADMs for 4 discrete wind speed intervals (m s^{-1}):
  < 3.5; 3.5 - 5.5; 5.5 - 7.5; > 7.5

- Estimate instantaneous flux/albedo using ADM:

$$\hat{A} = \frac{r(\theta_o, \theta, \phi)}{R_j(w_k, \theta_o, \theta, \phi)}$$

- Account for aerosol optical depth variations theoretically

$$\hat{A}' = \hat{A}\left(\frac{R^{th}(w_k, I^{avg})}{R^{th}(w_k, I^{obs})}\right)$$

where $R^{th}(w_k, I^{obs})$ is a theoretical anisotropic factor inferred from an instantaneous observation and $R^{th}(w_k, I^{avg})$ is determined from the average radiance used to construct the ADM class.

Clear Ocean Fluxes: Edition 2 vs Edition 1 Flux





Loeb and Kato, 2001 (*J. Climate*, Submitted)

Direct Radiative Effect of Aerosols vs Latitude
(9 Months CERES/TRMM)



Loeb and Kato, 2001 (*J. Climate*, submitted)

Ocean Cloud ADMs, f = 99.9 - 100, Ice, θ_o = 60 - 70 °



SW TOA Flux Validation

- Does mean all-sky flux depend on viewing geometry?
- Comparisons with Direct Integration Fluxes:
    - Solar zenith angle dependence (SW)
    - Latitudinal dependence
    - Regional fluxes

- Instantaneous Flux Uncertainties
    - Use alongtrack data to examine consistency of incident fluxes from the same scene

CERES SW ADM Angular Bin Definitions



θ_o : 9 angular bins (0° to 90° in 10° steps)

θ : 9 angular bins (0° to 90° in 10° steps)

ϕ : 10 angular bins (0° to 180° in 10° or 20° steps)

All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 0° - 10°



All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 10° - 20°



All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 20° - 30°



All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 30° - 40°



All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 40° - 50°



All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 50° - 60°





All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 60° - 70°





All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 70° - 80°





All-Sky Albedo: Solar Zenith Angle = 80° - 90°



Flux Bias Definitions

- ADM mean flux bias in angular bin ($\theta_o, \theta_j, \phi_k$) :

$$\Delta(\theta_o, \theta_j, \phi_k) = \overline{F}_{ADM}(\theta_o, \theta_j, \phi_k) - F_{DI}(\theta_o)$$

- Footprint-weighted ADM mean flux bias:

$$\Delta_\Omega(\theta_o) = \frac{1}{n_k}\frac{1}{n_j}\sum_{k=1}^{n_k}\sum_{j=1}^{n_j}\Delta(\theta_o, \theta_j, \phi_k) w_j$$

where w_j is a weighting factor accounting for the relative effect of different viewing zenith angles on gridded time-averaged fluxes.

n_k and n_j are the number of relative azimuth and viewing zenith angle bins.

- Standard deviation in footprint-weighted ADM flux bias:

$$\sigma_\Omega(\theta_o) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_k}\sum_{j=1}^{n_j}\frac{[\Delta(\theta_o, \theta_j, \phi_k) - \overline{\Delta}(\theta_o)]^2}{(n_k n_j - 1)} w_j$$

$\Rightarrow$ measure of consistency in ADM mean flux estimate from individual viewing directions

Crosstrack Incidence of Regional Mean VZAs
One Month of CERES Data



Footprint-Weighted All-Sky Mean Albedo and Flux Bias vs θ_o



Std. Dev. in Footprint-Wtd All-Sky Albedo and Flux Bias vs θ_o



Solar Zenith Angle Relative Frequency (40°S - 40°N; March 1998)



Tropical ADM Mean Flux Bias

(Footprint-Weighted; March 1998 Solar Zenith Angle Sampling)

($W\ m^{-2}$)	ERBE-Like		SSF Edition 2	
θ-Range	Mean (Δ_Ω)	Std (σ_Ω)	Mean (Δ_Ω)	Std (σ_Ω)
$\theta < 50°$	-2.7	3.3	-0.05	2.1
$\theta < 70°$	0.50	5.6	0.11	2.2

All-Sky Direct Integration Flux by Latitude & Solar Zenith Angle



All-Sky Flux Difference ($\theta < 50°$)



All-Sky Flux Difference ($\theta < 70°$)



Solar Zenith Angle Distribution by Latitude (March 1998)



Latitudinal ADM Mean Flux Bias

(March 1998 Solar Zenith Angle Sampling)



ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases ($\theta < 50°$)

ERBE-Like – DI Flux Difference



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference





Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases ($\theta < 70°$)

ERBE-Like – DI Flux Difference



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference





Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

ADM Mean Flux Biases over 20°×20° Regions
(March 1998 Solar Zenith Angle Sampling)
(W m^{-2})

	ERBE-Like		SSF Edition 2	
θ-Range	Δ	σ_Δ	Δ	σ_Δ
$\theta < 50°$	-2.8	1.5	-0.07	1.4
$\theta < 70°$	0.35	0.74	-0.15	0.52
CERES GOAL	0	1	0	1

ERBE-Like – SSF Ed2 SW Flux Difference vs Cloud Optical Depth (Ocean Ocean; θ_o=42° - 44°; θ < 25°)



Albedos For Deep Convective Clouds: New ADMs vs Hu



Instantaneous Albedo Errors from CERES Alongtrack Data

Albedo Dispersion Parameter:

$$D_A = \frac{c_A}{\overline{A}} \times 100\%$$



Clear Ocean Alongtrack Albedo Consistency Check



Average Dispersion (%)	
CERES SSF=	2.2
CERES ES8=	8.8
Lambertian =	16.9


Dark Desert
ERBE-Like Albedo Dispersion (%)
SSF Ed2 Albedo Dispersion (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60


Bright Desert
ERBE-Like Albedo Dispersion (%)
SSF Ed2 Albedo Dispersion (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60


Mod-High T/S Coverage
ERBE-Like Albedo Dispersion (%)
SSF Ed2 Albedo Dispersion (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60


Low-Mod T/S Coverage
ERBE-Like Albedo Dispersion (%)
SSF Ed2 Albedo Dispersion (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60


Clear Ocean
ERBE-Like Albedo Dispersion (%)
SSF Ed2 Albedo Dispersion (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70


Overcast Ocean
ERBE-Like Albedo Dispersion (%)
SSF Ed2 Albedo Dispersion (%)
0
10
20
30
40
50
60

Preliminary Instantaneous TOA SW Flux Uncertainties

($\mu_o E_o$=1000 W m^{-2})



LW and WN TOA Flux Validation

- Does mean all-sky flux depend on viewing geometry?
- Comparisons with Direct Integration Fluxes:
    - Regional fluxes
    - Latitudinal flux dependence
- Flux consistency as a function of cloud and clear-sky parameters.

TOA LW & WN Flux Estimation from Satellite



Flux:

$$M = 2\pi \int_0^{\pi/2} L(\theta)\cos\theta \sin\theta \, d\theta$$

$L(\theta) =$ Measured Radiance

Instantaneous Flux Estimate:

$$\hat{M} = \frac{\pi L(\theta)}{R(\theta)}$$

$R(\theta) =$ LW Anisotropic Factor

Scene Types for CERES/TRMM LW and WN ADMs

ADM Category		Parameter Stratification	Total
Clear	Ocean	3 Precipitable Water	12
		4 Vertical Temperature Change	
	Land	3 Precipitable Water	36
		4 Vertical Temperature Change	
		3 Surface Emissivity	
	Desert	3 Precipitable Water	36
		4 Vertical Temperature Change	
		3 Surface Emissivity	
Broken Cloud Field (4 intervals)	Ocean/Land/ Desert	3 Precipitable Water	288 (O) 288 (L) 288 (D)
		6 ΔT (Sfc-Cloud)	
		4 IR Emissivity	
Overcast	Ocean+ Land+Desert	3 Precipitable Water	108
		6 ΔT (Sfc-Cloud)	
		6 IR Emissivity	

OVERCAST LW ADM

Precipitable Water: 2.57 – 4.63



OVERCAST LW ADM

Precipitable Water: 4.63 – 10.00



Mean LW Flux vs Viewing Zenith Angle (Jan-Mar 1998)

Daytime



Nighttime



Mean LW Flux vs Viewing Zenith Angle (Jun-Aug 1998)

Daytime



Nighttime



Daytime LW ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases ($\theta < 50°$)
(Jan, Feb, Mar 1998)

ERBE-Like – DI Flux Difference



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference



Flux Difference ($W\ m^{-2}$)

Daytime LW ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases ($\theta < 50°$)
(Jun, Jul, Aug 1998)

ERBE-Like – DI Flux Difference



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference



Flux Difference ($W\ m^{-2}$)

Daytime LW ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases ($\theta < 70°$)
(Jan, Feb, Mar 1998)

ERBE-Like – DI Flux Difference



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference



Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

Daytime LW ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases ($\theta < 70°$)
(Jun, Jul, Aug 1998)

ERBE-Like – DI Flux Difference



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference



Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

Latitudinal ADM Mean Flux Bias



ADM Regional LW Flux Biases : Daytime
(10°×10° regions; Jan-March 1998)
(W m^{-2})

	ERBE-Like		SSF Edition 2	
θ-Range	Δ	σ_Δ	Δ	σ_Δ
$\theta < 50°$	3.7	1.9	0.87	1.7
$\theta < 70°$	0.67	0.60	0.21	0.57
CERES GOAL	0	0.5	0	0.5

ADM Regional LW Flux Biases: Daytime
(10°×10° regions; Jun-Aug 1998)
(W m^{-2})

	ERBE-Like		SSF Edition 2	
θ-Range	Δ	σ_Δ	Δ	σ_Δ
$\theta < 50°$	3.5	2.2	0.52	1.9
$\theta < 70°$	0.64	0.68	0.18	0.56
CERES GOAL	0	0.5	0	0.5

Nighttime LW ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases
(Jan, Feb, Mar 1998)

SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference (θ < 50°)



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference (θ < 70°)



Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

Nighttime LW ADM Mean Regional Flux Biases
(Jun, Jul, Aug 1998)

SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference (θ < 50°)



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference (θ < 70°)



Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

Latitudinal ADM Mean Flux Bias



SSF Edition 2 ADM Regional LW Flux Biases : Nighttime
(10°×10° regions)
(W m^{-2})

	Jan-Mar		Jun-Aug	
θ-Range	Δ	σ_Δ	Δ	σ_Δ
$\theta < 50°$	0.66	1.5	0.46	2.0
$\theta < 70°$	0.45	0.46	0.52	0.36
CERES GOAL	0	0.5	0	0.5

Mean WN Flux vs Viewing Zenith Angle (Jan-Mar 1998)

Daytime



Nighttime



Mean WN Flux vs Viewing Zenith Angle (Jun-Aug 1998)

Daytime



Nighttime



WN ADM Monthly Mean Regional Flux Biases
(Jan, Feb, Mar 1998)

SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference ($\theta < 50°$)



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference ($\theta < 70°$)



Flux Difference ($W\ m^{-2}$)

WN ADM Monthly Mean Regional Flux Biases
(Jun, Jul, Aug 1998)

SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference (θ < 50°)



SSF Ed2 – DI Flux Difference (θ < 70°)



Flux Difference (W m^{-2})

SSF Edition 2 ADM Regional WN Flux Biases: Daytime
(10°×10° regions)
(W m^{-2})

	Jan-Mar		Jun-Aug	
θ-Range	Δ	σ_Δ	Δ	σ_Δ
$\theta < 50°$	0.48	0.79	0.33	0.87
$\theta < 70°$	0.07	0.27	0.03	0.32
CERES GOAL	-	-	-	-

SSF Edition 2 ADM Regional WN Flux Biases: Nighttime
(10°×10° regions)
(W m^{-2})

	Jan-Mar		Jun-Aug	
θ-Range	Δ	σ_Δ	Δ	σ_Δ
$\theta < 50°$	0.34	0.66	0.25	0.86
$\theta < 70°$	0.23	0.22	0.25	0.18
CERES GOAL	-	-	-	-

ERBE-Like – SSF Ed2 LW Flux Difference vs Cloud Emissivity (Overcast; Ocean; θ < 25°; 90 days)



LW Flux Difference [F(θ < 20)-F(θ > 50)] vs Precipitable Water (20°S – 20°N)



Overcast Ocean (20°S – 20°N)

LW Flux Diff vs Precip Water



Cld Eff Temp Diff vs Precip Water



Overcast Ocean (20S - 20N)





SSF Ed2 LW Flux As Function of Cloud Effective Temperature and Emissivity (Overcast Liquid Water Clouds over Ocean; 20S - 20N)



Solid Symbols : $\theta < 20°$
Hollow Symbols: $\theta > 50°$

SSF Ed2 LW Flux As Function of Cloud Effective Temperature and Emissivity (Overcast Ice Clouds over Ocean; 20S - 20N)



Solid Symbols : $\theta < 20°$
Hollow Symbols: $\theta > 50°$

Summary and Conclusions

- CERES/TRMM SSF Edition 2 Status:

- SW, LW & WN ADMs have been delivered.
- Production of Edition 2 SSFs to begin week of September 24th.
- Archival requires:
  - (i) Science Team approval and
  - (ii) Quality Summary

- Recent Changes to SSF:

- Include all CERES footprints with any VIRS coverage.
- Include footprints over hot land and desert for which VIRS IR radiance saturates.
- Change units of window channel unfiltered radiance & TOA flux to W m^{-2}.

- New ADM web page: *http://asd-www.larc.nasa.gov/Inversion*

- SW TOA Flux Validation:

- SSF Ed2 SW fluxes show less dependence on viewing geometry than ERBE-Like ($\approx$ 10% for ES8; $\approx$ 2% SSF).
- CERES goal for regional mean flux accuracy ($1\sigma < 1$ W m^{-2}) is attained provided full viewing zenith angle coverage < 70° is used. For $\theta < 50$ °, 1σ error is 1.4 W m^{-2}.
- Near-nadir cloudy-sky SSF Ed2 fluxes larger than ERBE-Like at small optical depths and smaller at large cloud optical depths (differences up to $\pm$75 W m^{-2} for $\theta_0 \approx 43°$).
- First estimates of instantaneous flux uncertainties from alongtrack measurements: < 10 W m^{-2} for clear scenes; ~20 W m^{-2} for overcast.

  => Further study needed with multiple CERES instruments.

- LW and WN TOA Flux Validation:

- SSF Ed2 LW fluxes show less dependence on viewing geometry than ERBE-Like (9 W m^{-2} for ES8; 1.5 W m^{-2} for Ed2).
- CERES goal for regional mean LW flux accuracy ($1\sigma < 0.5$ W m^{-2}) is almost reached. 1σ error is $\approx$ 0.56 W m^{-2} during daytime.
- Nighttime LW flux shows a 0.5 W m^{-2} mean bias with 1σ of $\approx$ 0.4 W m^{-2} .
- WN 1σ flux error is 0.3 W m^{-2} . Nighttime WN flux bias is 0.25 W m^{-2}.
- Near-nadir cloudy-sky SSF Ed2 LW fluxes are smaller than ERBE-Like at small emissivity but comparable for emissivity close to 1.0 (differences at small ε up to 25 W m^{-2}).
- SSF Ed2 LW flux errors as a function of precip water are a factor of 3-4 smaller than ERBE-Like.

Future Work (Terra)

- Increase angular resolution of ADMs.
- Land SW ADMs stratified by vegetation index.
- Empirical SW, LW and WN ADMs over snow.
- Use of multi-CERES instruments for instantaneous flux errors.
- Determine flux errors by cloud type, cloud and clear-sky parameters.
- Improve theoretical tools for ADM development and comparisons between observations and theory.