

# **INTRODUCTION**

#### Purpose

· Global applications of weather/environmental satellites require comparisons of the outputs from the various operational instruments

· Radiance validation of new instruments during post-launch checkout provides confidence in instrument performance or could provide an indication of a problem.

# Radiometric Accuracy

· AIRS on Aqua has become the desired standard to compare to all GEOs.

· AIRS calibration accuracy is believed to be within 0.1 K for most of the spectra. Knowing the limits of calibration accuracy makes satellite data more useful for a wide range of applications and products.

#### Data Collection

· Geo/Leo within +/- 30 Minutes

Leo within +/- 10 degrees Lat/Lon of geostationary satellite nadir viewing location

### Spatial Averaging

· Geo and Leo data smoothed to 100 km (effective resolution) using a moving average. · Smoothing and averaging reduces the effects of possible navigation errors and the differences between instrument resolution

· The Mean Radiance inside the Intercalibration Area is calculated from the spatially averaged data

# **METHODS**

# "Original" Intercalibration Equation

· Geo minus Leo

· Forward model calculated radiances are subtracted from measured mean radiances. This is necessary when comparing two broadband instruments to account for differences in their spectral response functions.



# Intercalibration Equation Applied to AIRS

· AIRS radiances are convolved with GEO spectral response functions.

· Spectrally convolved AIRS radiances are compared with measured GEO radiances.

 $\cdot \Delta T = B^{-1}_{Mean}^{GEO} - B^{-1}_{Mean}^{AIRS}$ 

· AIRS replaces the broadband HIRS or AVHRR and provides a more accurate comparison

# Should Differences with AIRS be expected?

· When AIRS radiances are convolved with GEO spectral response functions, any substantial gaps in the AIRS spectra creates some "convolution error." The magnitude of this error increases as the gaps in the AIRS spectral coverage increase and with more variable spectra.

· Convolution error is small for some channels, such as the IRW, but large in others, such as the water vapor channels.

. In addition to convolution error, other contributions to the difference can come from temporal, field of view size and shape, viewing angle differences and navigation differences as well as GEO spectral response function uncertainty.

# INTERCALIBRATION OF GEOSTATIONARY **IMAGERS VIA HIGH SPECTRAL RESOLUTION AIRS**



estimated Any of these methods improve the comparisons in bands with large



Meteosat-8Observed 6.2 µm Water Vapor Channel

THE GLOBAL OBSERVING SYSTEM

### **Brightness Temperature Differences**

· Spectral gaps ignored for initial analysis · Brightness Temperature Differences are GEO-AIRS

spectral gaps, such as the water vapor.

Notes:

· Central wavelengths listed on plots are approximate.

· MET-8 water vapor band is the 7.4 micron band.

· There is no MET-8 3.9 micron band comparison because the band is wider than AIRS coverage and a reasonable comparison cannot be made

GOES-12 does not have a 12 micron band







## Results Correcting for AIRS Spectral Gaps

· Gaps were filled with theoretical spectral information from an adjusted US Standard atmosphere spectrum

· The adjustment is made by forcing the calculated spectrum to fit the measured spectrum at the gap edges. Then the calculated spectrum is adjusted (up and down) by the weighted average between the gap edges.



Water Vapor Results Before Filling the gaps Filling the gaps

New To The Scene: MTSAT-1R and FY-2C

· Preliminary comparisons of the latest geostationary imagers to AIRS have begun.

· Preliminary results with MTSAT-1R show good agreement with AIRS but more work needs to be done

· Preliminary results with FY-2C indicate there may be problems with FY-2C calibration for various bands (for instance too cold in cold scenes for the IR window and imagery is unusable near midnight). Much work needs to be done to better characterize FY-2C calibration



MTSAT-1R compared to AIRS IR Window preliminary comparison.

### Discussion

· Intercalibration using AIRS is powerful due to AIRS calibration accuracy and higher spectral resolution.

· Filling AIRS spectral gaps generally improves the results (smaller satellite-tosatellite differences); there are still large differences in some bands where the gaps are too large to be reliably filled.

· Results show that the operational geostationary imagers are generally wellcalibrated for most bands

· Comparisons between AIRS and the GOES series of Imagers show similar results.

For more information, including results with more satellite instruments such as GOES, AVHRR, and HIRS visit the CIMSS Intercalibration web page: http://cimss.ssec.wisc.edu/goes/intercal/

### Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the Space Science & Engineering Center (SSEC) Data Center at the University of Wisconsin for providing easy-to-use access to real-time Center at the University of Wisconsin for providing easy-to-use access to rear-time and archived satellite data; as well as the NASA DAAC for providing global AIRS archived data via the Web. Additionally, Hal Woolf at CIMSS is to be thanked for providing the US Standard Atmosphere spectrum and forward model software/transmittance coefficients: Jim Nelson at CIMSS is to be thanked for his assistance with various programming and scripting matters. This work was supported under grant number: NA07EC0676.





