



LaRC SD

# IASI Validation Studies using Airborne Field Campaign Data

Allen Larar<sup>a</sup>, Daniel Zhou<sup>a</sup>, Xu Liu<sup>a</sup>, William Smith<sup>bc</sup>, Henry Revercomb<sup>c</sup>, Jonathan Taylor<sup>d</sup>, Stuart Newman<sup>d</sup>, Peter Schlüssel<sup>e</sup>, and Stephen Mango<sup>f</sup>



<sup>a</sup>NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA, USA; Allen.M.Larar@nasa.gov


<sup>b</sup>Hampton University, Hampton, VA, USA

<sup>c</sup>University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

<sup>d</sup>Met Office, Exeter, Devon, UK

<sup>e</sup>EUMETSAT, Darmstadt, Germany

<sup>f</sup>NPOESS Integrated Program Office, Silver Spring, MD, USA



## Calibration validation approach \*

- Spatial
  - Landmark navigation
    - compare observations to databases for known, time invariant distinct features (e.g., coastlines)
  - Comparison with coincident observations
    - spatial feature variability (coastlines, thermal gradients, clouds, hot lava, fires, etc.)
- Spectral
  - Comparison with simulations
    - obs vs LBL RTA calculations; vary simulated instrument spectral response to minimize residuals (e.g., effective metrology laser wavenumber for FTS or channel SRFs for grating)
  - Comparison with coincident observations
    - compare obs to same-scene view high-spectral resolution measurements (i.e., a/c- or s/c-based FTS)
- Radiometric
  - Comparison with other coincident observations and simulations
    - compare varying scene temp, uniform scenes with other (a/c & s/c) observations/calculations
      - High-spectral resolution & broadband measurements
      - RTA calculations (using, e.g., lidar, radiosondes, dropsondes, a/c in-situ, NWP)
  - Applied to each detector, i.e. FTS band, grating channel, etc.



US-European collaboration focusing on validation of radiance and geophysical products from Metop (IASI/AMSU) and Aqua (AIRS/AMSU) to provide data and experience for NPP & NPOESS (CrIS/ATMS) Cal/Val and program risk mitigation

### Location/dates

– Ellington Field (EFD), Houston, TX, 14 Apr – 4 May, 2007

### Aircraft

– NASA WB-57 (NAST-I, NAST-M, S-HIS)  
– UK FAAM BAe146-301 (ARIES, MARSS, SWS; dropsondes; in-situ cloud phys. & trace species)

### Ground-sites

– Metop (IASI, AMSU, MHS, AVHRR, HIRS, ASCAT)  
– A-train (Aqua AIRS, AMSU, HSB, MODIS; Aura TES; CloudSat; and Calipso)  
– DOE ARM CART site (RAOBs, Raman Lidar, AERI, etc.) & GOM (scene uniformity—radiometric, spatial, & spectral)

### Participants

– LaRC, UKMO, UW, MIT, MIT-LL, NASA, IPO, EUMETSAT, ECMWF, + ...

In-field product comparisons provide good performance indicators:

WB-57 vs BAe-146

NAST-I, S-HIS, ARIES spectra (longwave) (observed)

Metop vs WB-57

IASI, NAST-I, S-HIS spectra (midwave) (observed)


WB-57 flight profile

WB-57 arrived on-station 20 min prior to Metop, and remained until 10 seconds after Aqua (for a 3 hr & 50 min on-station duration). Conditions ranged from very clear on northern part of race track, to low, puffy cumulus sparsely populating southern extent of flight profile

## Case Study: 29 April 2007—JAIVEx


### Flight mission objective

- Coordinated WB-57 and BAe-146 aircraft under-flight of Metop (1550 GMT) and Aqua (1919 GMT) satellites over northern Gulf of Mexico



### Aircraft flight profiles


- WB-57 flew north-south-oriented oval racetrack pattern (@ ~17 km) in between satellite overpass events; BAe-146 characterized atmosphere and surface, from a range of altitudes below the WB-57



**Infrared Spectral Radiance Comparisons:** JAIVEx aircraft underfly both Metop (1550 GMT) & Aqua (1919 GMT) within single flight mission (042907) enabling a/c sensors to obtain space/time coincident observations with both satellites

### IASI vs AIRS:



Nadir and common x-sections are compared (+/- 5 deg latitude from sub-satellite intersection point)



Nadir X-sections: coincidence = point in space

Common X-sections: coincidence = line in space


### MW-band x-section comparisons




Comparisons show IASI & AIRS matching NAST-I to within ~ 0.1 K (band-averaged spectral radiances)

### IASI vs NAST-I vs AIRS:

Images of MW band (deviation from mean) vs latitude for NAST-I nadir track legs at and in-between Metop and Aqua overpass times



### Spectral radiance comparison (mean)



## Summary and Conclusions

- Post-launch validation activities, including airborne field campaigns, are critical to verify quality of satellite measurement system (i.e., sensor, algorithms, and data products)
- High-altitude, airborne FTS systems enable assessing radiometric and spectral fidelity of spaceborne measurements
- The need for exact spatial/temporal coincidence increases with the degree of scene non-uniformity, and is uniquely satisfied by airborne sensors
- **JAIVEx was a great success!**
  - Campaign data are proving to be very useful for IASI and AIRS algorithm and product validation, and are serving to further refine methodologies for future advanced sounder validation activities (e.g., CrIS on NPP & NPOESS)
  - Demonstrates cross-validation capability and importance of field experiment campaigns

International TOVS Study Conference, 16<sup>th</sup>, ITSC-16, Angra dos Reis, Brazil, 7-13 May 2008.  
Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Space Science and Engineering Center,  
Cooperative Institute for Meteorological Satellite Studies, 2008.