

# ***GSICS MVIRI-IASI Inter-calibration Uncertainty Evaluation***

Doc.No. : EUM/MET/TEN/11/0219  
Issue : v1A  
Date : 28 April 2011  
WBS :

EUMETSAT  
Eumetsat-Allee 1, D-64295 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel: +49 6151 807-7  
Fax: +49 6151 807 555  
<http://www.eumetsat.int>

**Document Change Record**

<b>Issue / Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>DCN. No</b>	<b>Changed Pages / Paragraphs</b>
1	12 Apr 2011		A modification of the analysis which was written up as <a href="#">EUM/MET/TEN/09/0750</a> for Meteosat-7.
1A	29 April 2011		Minor revisions following review

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>General Methodology .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Systematic Errors .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Methodology for Systematic Errors .....	7
3.2	Temporal Mismatch .....	8
3.3	Longitudinal Mismatch .....	8
3.4	Latitudinal Mismatch .....	9
3.5	Geometric Mismatch .....	9
3.6	Spectral Mismatch .....	9
3.6.1	GEO-LEO Spectral Mismatch .....	10
3.6.2	LEO Spectral Calibration Accuracy .....	10
3.6.3	GEO Spectral Response Function Interpolation .....	10
3.7	Combining and Comparing all Systematic Errors .....	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Random Errors .....</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1	Methodology for Random Errors .....	13
4.2	Temporal Variability .....	14
4.3	Longitudinal Variability .....	15
4.4	Latitudinal Variability .....	15
4.5	Geometric Variability .....	15
4.6	Spectral Variability .....	16
4.7	Radiometric Noise .....	16
4.7.1	GEO Radiometric Noise .....	16
4.7.2	LEO Radiometric Noise .....	16
4.8	Combining and Comparing all Random Errors .....	17
4.9	Validation of Quoted Uncertainty on GSICS Correction .....	19
4.10	Comparison of Theory with Statistics .....	19
<b>5</b>	<b>Combining Systematic and Random Errors .....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	Method for Combining Systematic and Random Errors .....	20
<b>6</b>	<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>References .....</b>	<b>23</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This document presents an analysis of the uncertainties in the GSICS inter-calibration products for the infrared channels of Meteosat/MVIRI using Metop/IASI as a reference. It follows the guidance provided by QA4EO [1], which is based on the Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement (GUM) [2]. This analysis should be read in conjunction with the Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (ATBD) [3], as the uncertainties provide *Quality Indicators* for the inter-calibration products. Together, these form part of the documentation requirements for the GSICS Procedure for Product Acceptance.

Each process of the inter-calibration algorithm is considered and the uncertainties evaluated on the key variables due to random and systematic effects. These uncertainties are then combined to produce an *error budget* giving a Type B evaluation of the combined uncertainty on the inter-calibration bias. The random component of this is then compared to the statistics of the *standard bias* (a Type A evaluation of their uncertainty) and recommendations made for adjustments of the inter-calibration algorithm to produce more consistent uncertainty estimates.

Each infrared channel of MVIRI is analysed independently as they are processed independently in the inter-calibration products. Like the inter-calibration itself, this analysis is performed using radiances. However, the resulting uncertainties are presented here in terms of brightness temperature biases evaluated over the range of brightness temperatures observed in each MVIRI channel, as it is believed that this allows easier interpretation of the results.

The full inter-calibration process is described in the ATBD [3]. However, the basic process is based on the selection of observations from the monitored instrument (Meteosat/MVIRI) and the reference instrument (Metop/IASI) that are collocated in space, time and viewing geometry. The collocated observations are transformed to be comparable on spatial scale and spectral coverage and compared using a weighted regression. Each collocated observation is allocated a weighting based on its measure spatial variance and the specified radiometric noise of each channel. The regression propagates these variances to estimate the uncertainty on the corrected radiance, which provides a *Quality Indicator* for the inter-calibration product. However, these represent only two of many processes that introduce uncertainties to the final product, which make it prohibitive to conduct a full propagation of the uncertainties on each evaluation. So this document reviews the uncertainties through a *measurement model* of the process for case studies, which are assumed to represent typical conditions.

Because we have defined IASI as the reference for the inter-calibration, by definition any errors present in its data with respect to the truth should not be included in the uncertainty of the inter-calibration products. However, some such terms have been included in this analysis to illustrate their magnitude (which is small). In these cases (which have been highlighted in the text), errors in the reference instrument have been interpreted as errors in the monitored instrument's observations.

Although the collocation criteria were designed to minimise any systematic errors by ensuring samples are symmetrically distributed, in reality small residual differences remain, which may introduce systematic errors in the end products. These sampling differences

introduce errors in the radiances of each collocation, depending on their sensitivity to each variable, which is estimated using statistics from case studies. Where information is available on the sampling distribution, this has been used in the analysis – otherwise the collocation criteria have been taken as limits and propagated as standard uncertainties assuming the errors follow rectangular distributions within these limits. These are relatively simplistic treatments and it may be necessary to revise the estimates of one term if it becomes significant and a more accurate analysis is deemed necessary. This follows the approach recommended by ISO 14253-2, which defines an iterative procedure for uncertainty management (PUMA method). The decision of which uncertainty component needs to be improved is made on basis of the contribution of the components to the total uncertainty in the budget.

Similarly, different processes can introduce random errors on each collocated radiance. The magnitude of these can be estimated from the typical range of each variable and the sensitivity of the radiances to perturbation of each variable, which again can be derived from a statistical analysis of case study scenes. The regression process used to generate the GSICS Corrections reduces the impact of these random errors on each collocation and is repeated many times for randomly perturbed sets of collocations to estimate the resulting uncertainty on the corrected radiances due to each process in a *Monte Carlo*-like approach.

The collocation criteria represent trade-offs between the errors on each collocation and the number of collocations available. The uncertainty analysis presented here allows these trade-offs to be reviewed quantitatively to make recommendations to further improve the inter-calibration products.

## 2 GENERAL METHODOLOGY

For each process, typical differences in sampling variables between the monitored and reference instruments are estimated – either from the specified limits used to select the collocations (e.g. spatial sampling), or from the known differences (e.g. in sampling time). These differences are referred to as  $\Delta x$  in this document. The sensitivity of the radiances in each collocation to perturbations in each variable is also estimated. This is referred to as  $\partial L/\partial x$  in this document.

The quantities input to the inter-calibration process are the radiances,  $L$ , of each collocation,  $i$ . In general, the uncertainty on  $L_i$  due to process  $j$ , is:

$$u_j(L_i) = \Delta x_{i,j} \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial x} \right)_j, \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

The GSICS Correction,  $g(L)$ , is based on the regression of collocated radiances observed by the monitored and reference instruments (Section 6.c of the ATBD [3]). It is a function which converts a radiance observed by the monitored instrument,  $L$ , to be consistent with the calibration of the reference,  $\hat{L}$ , which is the quantity output from the inter-calibration process:

$$\hat{L} = g(L). \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

In GUM terminology  $g(L)$  defines the *measurement model* of the inter-calibration process.

The observed radiances,  $L_i$ , are perturbed by  $u(L_i)$ . Then the regression is recalculated to generate a modified function,  $g'(L)$ , which will produce different corrected radiances,  $\hat{L}'$ :

$$\hat{L}' = g'(L_i + u(L_i)), \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

This illustrates how errors in the collocated radiances can be propagated through to errors in the GSICS Correction applied to different scene radiances. These provide estimates of the uncertainty on the GSICS Correction, which are converted into brightness temperatures using the derivative of the Planck function evaluated at each scene radiance.

The uncertainties due to various mechanisms introducing systematic and random errors are analysed in the following sections based on case studies, using all the collocations used to produce the GSICS Re-Analysis Correction for Meteosat/MVIRI-Metop/IASI on 2010-08-01.

Repeated evaluations with other cases show that the results of the combined uncertainty vary by a factor of  $\sim \pm 20\%$ , depending on the distribution of collocated radiances used as input to the calculation of the GSICS Correction. However, this variability is much less than the variability of the evaluation of individual terms, which together limit the accuracy of this uncertainty analysis to a factor of  $\sim 2$ .

### 3 SYSTEMATIC ERRORS

#### 3.1 Methodology for Systematic Errors

For processes introducing systematic errors, the radiance of each collocated point is perturbed by an amount representing its estimated uncertainty,  $u_j^s(L_i)$ ,

$$u_j^s(L_i) = \Delta x_{i,j}^s \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial x} \right)_j^s, \quad \text{Equation 4}$$

The regression used to calculate the GSICS Correction is recalculated, giving a modified function,  $g'(L)$ . This function is evaluated for a range of scene radiances and the resulting radiances compared to the corrected radiances generated by the unmodified function,  $g(L)$  to provide an estimate of the uncertainty on the corrected radiance due to systematic errors introduced by process  $j$ :

$$u_j^s(\hat{L}) = |g'_j(L) - g_j(L)|, \quad \text{Equation 5}$$

The modulo operation is necessary because the differences can have positive or negative sign.

Table 1 summarises the magnitude of typical perturbations,  $\Delta x_j$ , of processes introducing systematic errors in the collocated radiances and the sensitivity of the 8 infrared channels of MVIRI to these perturbations,  $dL_j/dx$ . The origin of these values are discussed in the following sub-sections. Their implications are assessed in the summary of this section

**Table 1 Summary of Systematic Errors' Perturbations and Sensitivities**

	$\Delta x$	Sensitivity, (dL /dx) $_j$	
		wv-1	ir-2
<b>Systematic Errors</b>			
Temporal Mismatch	0.07182 hr	-0.00544	-0.24121 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1/hr
Longitudinal Mismatch	2.14330 km	-0.00006	-0.00119 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1/km
Latitudinal Mismatch	2.14330 km	0.00009	0.00330 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1/km
Geometric Mismatch	-0.00089	0.00888	0.04663 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1
Spectral Mismatch	1.00000	0.00000	0.00000 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1
Spectral Calibration	0.50000	0.00019	0.00009 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1

### 3.2 Temporal Mismatch

Systematic differences in the sampling time of the monitored and reference instruments can introduce systematic errors in their collocated radiances due to the diurnal cycle in the temperature, humidity, cloud and, hence, radiance emitted by the Earth's surface and atmosphere.

The selection of orbital data from the monitored and reference instruments are designed to select samples that are distributed with a uniform time difference over between the limits specified in the collocation criteria:  $\pm\Delta t_{max}=900\text{ s}^1$ , in this case. For a GSICS Correction derived from  $n \approx 27000$  collocations uniformly sampled over a period of  $\pm\Delta t_{max}$ , it would be expected that the mean time difference would have an uncertainty of  $\Delta t = 2\Delta t_{max}/\sqrt{(3n)} \approx 6\text{ s}$ . However, in practice deficiencies in the orbital selection cause the mean time difference to be  $\Delta t = 259\text{ s}$  (0.07182 hr).

The sensitivity of the radiances to changes in sampling time has been evaluated by calculating the mean difference between a large ensemble of radiances observed by Meteosat/MVIRI in successive images. In this case, the mean difference between the nominal 18:00 and 18:30 images on 2009-12-20 over the target area domain of  $(22^\circ\text{E}-92^\circ\text{E}) \times (35^\circ\text{S}-35^\circ\text{N})$ . The rate of change of radiance per hour for each infrared channel are shown in the first line of Table 1. However, these are not particularly reproducible and vary by a factor of  $\sim 2$  on different days.

### 3.3 Longitudinal Mismatch

Systematic errors in the geolocation of both the monitored instrument (MVIRI) and the reference instrument (IASI) being compared introduce errors in their collocated radiances due to small longitudinal mean gradients in their radiances over the domain of the collocations.

As the exact geolocation error on each pixel is not known, we assume they are distributed uniformly over the accuracies quoted for their navigation. The typical rms accuracy of the image navigation (rectification) for MVIRI level 1.5 images based on the operational IMPF processing is estimated to be 0.5-1 pixels ( $\sim 3.75\text{ km}$ ) [Johannes Müller, personal communication, 2011-04-08]. The geolocation accuracy of IASI level 1c data is calculated to be 1-2 km [4]. A value of 1.5 km is taken as typical. These errors are assumed to be partitioned equally between longitude and latitude. Their uncertainties are combined linearly to act as a guard-band, so errors in longitudinal position are assumed to be distributed normally over  $\pm\Delta lon_{max}=(3.75+1.5)/\sqrt{2}=3.7\text{ km}$ .

The sensitivity of the collocated radiances to systematic errors in longitude was calculated as the mean difference in radiances between adjacent scan *elements* of a Meteosat-7 image over the target domain, taken at 2009-12-20 18:00. These are shown in the second line of Table 1, expressed as radiance change per kilometre (after dividing the differences by the median pixel element separation, 5.67 km). Again, these are not particularly reproducible and vary by a factor of  $\sim 2$  on different days.

---

<sup>1</sup> The actual threshold applied in the prototype code is 1800 s – however, as Meteosat-7 completes a full disc scan in this period, the standard deviation of time differences of 623 s is closer to the value expected from a uniform sampling distribution within the  $\pm 900\text{ s}$ , so that value is used in this analysis.

### 3.4 Latitudinal Mismatch

Similarly, systematic errors in the geolocation of both instruments will introduce radiance errors due to larger latitudinal mean gradients over the domain of the collocations. Because navigation errors are assumed to be distributed equally between longitude and latitude, the combined uncertainty in the latitude of the collocations,  $\Delta lat = \Delta lon = 3.7$  km, as above.

Similarly, the sensitivity of the collocated radiances to systematic errors in latitude was calculated as the mean difference in radiances between adjacent scan *lines* of a Meteosat-7 image over the target domain, taken at 2009-12-20 18:00. These are shown in the third line of Table 1, expressed as radiance change per kilometre (after dividing the differences by the median pixel line separation, 5.67 km). Again, these are not particularly reproducible and vary by a factor of  $\sim 2$  on different days.

### 3.5 Geometric Mismatch

Collocations between different instruments on different satellites are never exactly aligned in terms of viewing and solar geometry. Although the radiances in the infrared channels of MVIRI-IASI are not sensitive solar and azimuth angles during night-time conditions used in this study, they are affected by the incidence angle – both in terms of absorption along different atmospheric paths and changes in surface emissivity.

Pixels are defined as collocations only if their incidence angles are such that the ratio of their atmospheric path difference is less than 1% (i.e.  $|\Delta \sec\theta / \sec\theta| < 0.01$ ). For a typical  $30^\circ$  incidence angle (over  $\pm 52^\circ$ N/S GEO/LEO comparison domain), this corresponds to a difference of  $1^\circ$ . In practice collocations may have different incidence angles uniformly distributed within the range  $\pm \Delta\theta = 1^\circ$ . However, if the actual distribution of viewing angles differences is not symmetrically distributed about zero, systematic biases will be introduced into the inter-calibration products. In this case we can use the actual differences in air mass ( $\sec\theta$ ) calculated for the collocations used to calculate a typical GSICS Correction, which follow a rectangular distribution within the limits of  $|\Delta \sec\theta / \sec\theta| < 0.01$ , with a mean value of  $\Delta \sec\theta / \sec\theta = -0.00069$ .

A radiative transfer model (RTTOV9) was run for a diverse set of 77 atmospheric profiles in three cloud configurations (clear sky, uniform cloud with tops at 700 hPa and 300 hPa) to predict the radiances seen by the infrared channels of MVIRI. This calculation was repeated at  $30^\circ$  and  $29^\circ$  incidence angles. The resulting sensitivities are shown in the fourth line of Table 1, expressed as radiance changes per degree of viewing zenith angle. These are equivalent to 0.02 K for the IR window channel when converted to brightness temperatures.

### 3.6 Spectral Mismatch

When radiances measured with non-identical channels are compared, great care must be taken to account for the differences introduced by their different spectral responses. Many methods have been developed to perform this *spectral correction*. However, no spectral correction method can be perfect and residual errors will remain in the compared radiances. Such errors can include systematic components, which introduce uncertainties that are not reduced by combining multiple comparisons.

Even using a hyperspectral reference instrument, such as IASI, there are uncertainties introduced in the comparison of collocated radiances with a broadband radiometer, such as MVIRI. These errors can be due to hyperspectral instrument's spectral calibration accuracy and gap-filling methods used to account for its incomplete spectral coverage of the GEO channels. In theory, errors on the radiances observed by the reference instrument should not contribute to the uncertainty of the GSICS Correction to that reference. However, they are evaluated here to illustrate the likely magnitude of differences to the "true" scene radiance.

### **3.6.1 GEO-LEO Spectral Mismatch**

Deficiencies in the hyperspectral LEO reference instrument's coverage of the broadband GEO instrument needs to be accounted for before their collocated observations can be compared. However, in the case of MVIRI-IASI inter-calibration, IASI provides complete contiguous coverage of MVIRI's WV and IR channels, so there is no systematic spectral mismatch.

For consistency with the methods of assessing other components of the error budget, an uncertainty of  $\Delta=1$  (dimensionless) has been assigned to the gap-filling correction and the sensitivity of the collocated radiances has been estimated as above in the fifth line of Table 1.

n.b. For AIRS this term will dominate the uncertainty budget. Its magnitude may be estimated by evaluating the maximum/minimum contours of the residuals of the gap-filling validation, as plotted in Figures 21-28(f) of TR52 [10].

### **3.6.2 LEO Spectral Calibration Accuracy**

The relative spectral calibration accuracy of IASI is estimated to be  $\Delta\nu/\nu=0.5$  ppm [8]. The sensitivity of the collocations' radiances to systematic shifts in the centre frequency of IASI's channels has been estimated by shifting the wavenumbers of the SRFs by this ratio and repeating the spectral convolution. These are shown in the sixth line of Table 1 in terms of radiance change per ppm frequency shift.

The resulting radiances are negligibly different from those calculated for the unperturbed MVIRI channels. Even when using a shift of 2 ppm, corresponding to IASI's specified maximum relative spectral calibration accuracy [9], the rms difference in brightness temperature is  $<1$  mK for all channels.

### **3.6.3 GEO Spectral Response Function Interpolation**

The official SRF of MVIRI's channels is calculated from a series of tests performed on its component parts. These are combined and expressed at irregular wavelength intervals defined to represent the full SRF with minimal errors. However, the SRF definitions are open to interpretation, which may introduce errors in the radiances when compared to a hyperspectral reference instrument. For example, although it is recommended that a linear interpolation is used to convert the published SRFs to the IASI channel wavenumbers, it is possible to use other interpolation methods. The calculations were repeated using linear and quadratic interpolation and the results compared to estimate the magnitude of likely errors introduced due to this ambiguity. This term is quite small ( $<0.01$  K), and has been neglected in this analysis as we assume the SRFs are interpreted as recommended and consistently between the application of the GEO observations and in the calculation of the inter-calibration. This


highlights the importance of communicating clear guidance in the application of published SRFs.

### 3.7 Combining and Comparing all Systematic Errors

All the uncertainties due to systematic processes, are added in quadrature to give  $u^s(L)$ :

$$u^s(L) = \left\{ \sum_j (u_j^s(L))^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \quad \text{Equation 6}$$

This total uncertainty on the corrected radiance due to all systematic errors is compared with the contribution from each considered mechanism in Figure 1. Here the uncertainties have been evaluated for the range of radiances observed over all the collocations used in the sample case. The radiances and uncertainties are converted to brightness temperatures for convenient comparison.



**Figure 1 – Contribution of each source of Systematic Error to the Uncertainty of the Brightness Temperatures ( $T_b$ ) produced by the GSICS Correction for a range of scene radiances for both infrared channel of Meteosat7/MVIRI using MetopA/IASI reference. Dotted vertical line shows standard scene radiance for each channel.**

Figure 1 shows that generally the systematic mismatches in time dominate the total systematic uncertainty of the both channels due to finite gradients in the scene over the inter-calibration target domain. However, the spatial mismatches are also significant – especially in latitude. Other terms due to geometric mismatches and the spectral calibration of the reference instrument are negligible in all cases and appear erratic due to the limitations of numerical precision.

**Table 2 Systematic Error Budget of GSICS Correction for MVIRI-IASI Standard Scenes**

Meteosat MVIRI Channel	wv-1	ir-2	
Standard Scene Radiance	236	285	K
Temporal Mismatch	-0.0029	-0.0116	K
Longitudinal Mismatch	-0.0009	-0.0017	K
Latitudinal Mismatch	0.0013	0.0048	K
Geometric Mismatch	0.0000	0.0000	K
Spectral Mismatch	0.0000	0.0000	K
Spectral Calibration	0.0007	0.0001	K
Total Systematic Uncertainty	0.0034	0.0127	K

Table 2 shows the uncertainties in the GSICS Correction evaluated at standard scene radiances due to systematic errors in each of the six mechanism considered. These uncertainties are expressed in brightness temperatures for each of the 8 infrared channels of MVIRI, based on only night-time collocation data within the target area domain for the collocations (22°E-92°E)x(35°S-35°N). The last row shows the total systematic uncertainty (unexpanded  $k=1$ ), due to all terms combined following equation (6).

## 4 RANDOM ERRORS

### 4.1 Methodology for Random Errors

A Monte-Carlo approach is adopted to evaluate the uncertainty on the final correction for processes which introduce random errors. The radiance of each collocated point is perturbed by an uncertainty calculated by multiplying a random number,  $z_i$ , drawn from a distribution consistent with a characteristic difference,  $\Delta x^r$ , multiplied by the sensitivity to random perturbations of this process,  $(\partial L/\partial x)^r_j$  as follows:

$$u_j^r(L_i) = \overline{\Delta x_j^r} z_i \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial x} \right)_j^r, \quad \text{Equation 7}$$

The regression used to calculate the GSICS Correction is then re-evaluated with one set of randomly perturbed radiances. The resulting regression coefficients are used to evaluate the radiances bias over a range of scene radiances. This procedure is then repeated a large number ( $n_k$ ) of times to give  $n_k$  evaluations of  $g'_{j,k}(L)$ . Each evaluation of which is used to calculate a corrected radiance for each of a range of scene radiances,  $\hat{L}'_{j,k}$ .

The standard deviation of  $\hat{L}'_{j,k}$  over the Monte Carlo ensemble is then calculated to provide an estimate of the uncertainty on corrected radiances due to each random process,  $j$ :

$$u_j^r(\hat{L}) = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{(g'_{j,k}(L))^2}{n_k(n_k-1)} - \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \frac{g'_{j,k}(L)}{n_k(n_k-1)} \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \quad \text{Equation 8}$$

Table 3 summarises the magnitude of typical perturbations,  $\Delta x_j$ , of processes introducing random errors in the collocated radiances and their sensitivity to these perturbations,  $dL_j/dx$ . The origin of these values are discussed in the following sub-sections. Their implications are assessed in the summary of this section.

**Table 3 Summary of Random Errors' Perturbations and Sensitivities**


	$\Delta x$	Sensitivity, $(dL/dx)_j$	
		wv-1	ir-2
<b>Random Errors</b>			
Temporal Variability	15 min	0.00730	0.20335 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1/min
Longitudinal Variability	5.67 km	0.01273	0.37853 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1/km
Latitudinal Variability	5.67 km	0.01408	0.40447 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1/km
Geometric Variability	1	0.00888	0.04663 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1
Spectral Variability	1	0.00000	0.00000 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1
Radiometric Noise (GEO)	1	0.01313	0.18994 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1
Radiometric Noise (LEO)	1	0.00076	0.01972 mW/m <sup>2</sup> /st/cm-1

## 4.2 Temporal Variability

Collocated observations from a pair of satellite instruments are not sampled simultaneously. Variations in the atmosphere and surface during the interval between their observations introduce errors when comparing their collocated radiances. The greater this interval, the larger the contribution of the scene's temporal variability to the total error budget. The uncertainty this introduces to the collocated radiances can be quantified by statistical analysis of a series of MVIRI scenes described below.

GEO imagers sample scenes at regular intervals: MVIRI can scan the whole Earth disk every 30 min. This sampling pattern introduces a temporal collocation error with a uniform distribution over  $\pm\Delta t_{max} = 900$  s. This is equivalent to an r.m.s. difference between sampling of MVIRI and IASI observations of  $\Delta t = \Delta t_{max} / \sqrt{3} \approx 520$  s.

The temporal variability of typical SEVIRI images was originally quantified for each infrared channel in [6]. The root mean squared difference (RMSD) between the channels' radiances was calculated after shifting the images sampled in rapid scanning mode by various intervals. As seen in Figure 2 (Figure 1 of [6]), the RMSD was found to increase approximately linearly with interval for closely separated time intervals.



**Figure 2 R.M.S. differences in Meteosat-8 10.8  $\mu\text{m}$  brightness temperatures with time intervals from Rapid Scanning Meteosat data (red diamonds) and with spatial separation in North-South direction (black pluses) and West-East direction (black red stars) [6].**

In this analysis the sensitivity of the radiances to differences in sampling time has been evaluated by calculating the RMSD between radiances observed by Meteosat/MVIRI in successive images. In this case, we calculate the RMSD between the nominal 18:00 and 18:30 images on 2009-12-20 over the target area domain of  $(22^{\circ}\text{E}-92^{\circ}\text{E}) \times (35^{\circ}\text{S}-35^{\circ}\text{N})$ . To best reproduce the data used in the inter-calibration, the MVIRI images are first smoothed by applying a 3x3 smoothing window. The RMSD for each infrared channel are shown in the first line of Table 3, expressed as a rate of change of radiance per minute.

### 4.3 Longitudinal Variability

Similarly, collocated observations from a pair of satellite instruments are not exactly collocated and spatial variations in the atmosphere and surface introduce errors when comparing their collocated radiances. The greater the separation between their observations, the larger the contribution of the scene's spatial variability to the total error budget. The uncertainty this introduces to the collocated radiances can be quantified by statistical analysis of a representative MVIRI scenes described below.

MVIRI's level 1.5 data has been re-projected onto a grid, with approximately uniform spacing near the sub-satellite point and over the target domain of the collocations (22°E-92°E)x(35°S-35°N), where the median distance between adjacent pixel elements is 5.67 km. It is assumed that the difference longitude between *collocated* radiances measured by MVIRI and IASI follows a uniform distribution over  $\pm\Delta lon_{max} = 5.67$  km.

The spatial variability of a typical MVIRI image was also quantified for each infrared channel in [6]. The root mean squared difference (RMSD) between the channels' radiances was calculated after shifting the images by various latitude and longitude offsets. As seen in Figure 3 (Figure 1 of [6]), the RMSD was found to increase approximately linearly with interval for closely separated spatial intervals.

In this analysis the sensitivity of the radiances to differences in sampling longitude has been evaluated by calculating the RMSD between all radiances observed by Meteosat/MVIRI in adjacent pixel elements. In this case, the 18:00 images on 2009-12-20 covering the target area domain of (22°E-92°E)x(35°S-35°N) was analysed after first applying a 5x5 smoothing window to represent the spatial averaging that is done in the inter-calibration. The RMSD for each infrared channel are shown in the second line of Table 3, expressed as a rate of change of radiance per kilometre (after dividing the differences by the median pixel element separation, 5.67 km).

### 4.4 Latitudinal Variability

The same methodology is applied to quantify the collocated radiances' sensitivity to errors in latitude as the RMSD between adjacent scan lines of the same smoothed MVIRI image, using a median scan line separation of 5.67 km. The results are shown in the third line of Table 3.

### 4.5 Geometric Variability

Random differences between the viewing and solar geometry of the collocations observed by the monitored and reference instruments also introduce random errors to their collocated radiances. Although the infrared radiances are not sensitive to solar and azimuth angles during night-time conditions used in this study, they are affected by the incidence angle – both in terms of absorption along different atmospheric paths and changes in surface emissivity.

As in the case of systematic geometric mismatches (§3.5), the differences in viewing zenith angle between the two sensors is uniformly distributed within the range  $\pm\Delta\theta = 1^\circ$ , corresponding to a <1% difference in *air mass*. Likewise, the sensitivity of the collocated radiances to viewing zenith angle is the same as for systematic geometric mismatches, as shown in the fourth line of Table 3.

#### **4.6 Spectral Variability**

The spectral calibration accuracy of IASI discussed in §3.6.2 is assumed to also introduce random errors to the collocated radiances, following a normal distribution with  $\Delta v/v=0.5$  ppm and the same sensitivity evaluated in §3.6.2, as shown in the fifth line of Table 3.

#### **4.7 Radiometric Noise**

All radiometer observations suffer from radiometric noise caused by limitations of the instruments. This noise contributes to the uncertainty in the comparison of collocated observations. However, the impact of radiometric noise can be reduced by averaging multiple observations, spatially, temporally and spectrally.

The contributions of radiometric noise to the collocated radiances of both GEO and LEO instruments is quantified in Table 4 in terms of brightness temperatures, and summarised in Table 3 in radiance units with  $\Delta=1$ , following a normal distribution. However, these terms are implicitly included in both the spatial and temporal variability terms as they are calculated using real observational data, which is subject to radiometric errors. It is, therefore, reassuring to see these terms have negligible contributions to the overall uncertainties. So although they have been double-counted in the error budget, this does not matter as their contributions are insignificant compared to the temporal and spatial variability of the scene.

##### **4.7.1 GEO Radiometric Noise**

Typical radiometric noise on MVIRI level 1.5 radiances given in [7] are used here.

Although the radiances from 3x3 arrays of MVIRI pixels are averaged, there is considerable over-sampling in the rectified level 1.5 image data used. This results in the 9 GEO pixels not being independent, so the variance calculated from the level 1.5 data should be reduced by an *oversampling factor* to estimate the true scene variance. For each GEO channel an *effective Field of View* (FoV) can be estimated from the spatial frequencies at which the Modulation Transfer Functions are estimated to drop to 50% in the N-S and E-W planes ( $\sim 0.08 \text{ km}^{-1}$ ). The geometric average of these effective FoVs ( $\sim 6.3 \text{ km}$ ) is compared with the sampling interval of the level 1.5 image (5.0 km near the sub-satellite point) to give the oversampling factor ( $\sim 1.3$ ). The actual number of GEO pixels (9) is reduced by this factor squared to estimate the effective number of GEO pixels ( $\sim 6$ ). The radiometric uncertainty of the mean radiance of the GEO pixels is, therefore, reduced by the square root of this oversampling factor ( $\sim \sqrt{6}$ ) relative to the nominal values for MVIRI's radiometric noise given in [7].

##### **4.7.2 LEO Radiometric Noise**

The radiometric noise on each IASI spectral sample within MVIRI's passbands is estimated from Figure 1 of [9]. When expressed in brightness temperatures these range from 0.2 K for the WV channel to 0.3 K for the IR channel. After convolution with the SRF of the MVIRI channels, this is reduced by the square root of a factor referred to here as the *effective number of LEO channels*, which is estimated as the integral of the normalised SRFs sampled at the spectral interval of the IASI channels. This factor ranges from 1587 for the broad WV channel to 872 for the narrower IR channel. The effective LEO radiometric noise is evaluated as the mean radiometric noise on the constituent channels divided by the square root of the effective number of LEO channels.

**Table 4 Contributions from Radiometric Noise to Collocations' Radiances**


Central Wavelength	WV	IR	
Radiometric Noise GEO	0.25	0.30	K
Number of GEO pixels/LEO FoV	9	9	
Spatial Freq for MTF=0.5 EW	0.080	0.080	/km
Spatial Freq for MTF=0.5 NS	0.080	0.080	/km
Effective FoV	6.3	6.3	km
GEO Sampling Dist @ SSP	5	5	km
Oversampling factor	1.3	1.3	
Effective number GEO channels /Collocation	1	1	
Effective number of GEO pixels /Collocation	6	6	
<b>Radiometric Noise &lt;GEO&gt;</b>	<b>0.104</b>	<b>0.125</b>	<b>K</b>
Wavenumber	1587	872	cm-1
Radiometric Noise LEO	0.20	0.30	K
Effective number LEO channels	1025	529	
Effective number of LEO pixels /Collocation	1	1	
<b>Radiometric Noise &lt;LEO&gt;</b>	<b>0.006</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>K</b>

#### 4.8 Combining and Comparing all Random Errors

All the uncertainties due to random processes, are added in quadrature to give  $u^r(L)$ :

$$u^r(L) = \left\{ \sum_j (u_j^r(L))^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \quad \text{Equation 9}$$

This total uncertainty on the corrected radiance due to all random errors is compared with the contribution from each considered mechanism in Figure 4. Here the uncertainties have been evaluated for the range of radiances observed over all the collocations. The radiances and their uncertainties are converted to brightness temperatures for convenient comparison.



**Figure 3 – Contribution of each source of Random Error to the Uncertainty of the Brightness Temperatures ( $T_b$ ) produced by the GSICS Correction for a range of scene radiances for each infrared channel of Meteosat7/MVIRI using MetopA/IASI reference. Dotted vertical line shows standard scene radiance for each channel.**

Figure 3 shows that the random variability in time dominates the total random uncertainty in both channels. This is a factor of 2 larger than the spatial variability terms (although there are two of them). Other terms due to geometric and spectral variability are negligible in both cases and the latter appear erratic due to the limitations of numerical precision. It is also reassuring to find that the contribution from the radiometric noise of both instruments is also negligible, as this term is implicitly included in the evaluation of the spatial and temporal variability.

These results suggest the time limit of  $|\Delta t| < 900$  s specified in the collocation criteria should not be relaxed as this introduces greater uncertainty than the spatial variability due to MVIRI's 5 km sampling. Furthermore, it suggests that the specified collocation criteria for the difference of viewing zenith angle  $|\Delta \sec\theta / \sec\theta| < 0.01$  could be substantially relaxed without causing a significant increase in the overall uncertainty of the inter-calibration result.

Table 5 shows the uncertainties in the GSICS Correction evaluated at standard scene radiances due to random errors in each of the seven mechanisms considered. These uncertainties are expressed in brightness temperatures for each of the 8 infrared channels of MVIRI, based on only night-time collocation data within the target area domain for the collocations (22°E-92°E)x(35°S-35°N). The last row shows the total random uncertainty (unexpanded  $k=1$ ), due to all terms combined following equation (6).

**Table 5 Random Error Budget of GSICS Correction for MVIRI-IASI at Standard Scene**

Meteosat SEVIRI Channel	wv-1	ir-2	
Standard Scene Radiance	236	285	K
Temporal Variability	0.0041	0.0091	K
Longitudinal Variability	0.0028	0.0069	K
Latitudinal Variability	0.0034	0.0076	K
Geometric Variability	0.0003	0.0002	K
Spectral Variability	0.0000	0.0000	K
Radiometric Noise (GEO)	0.0010	0.0013	K
Radiometric Noise (LEO)	0.0001	0.0001	K
Total Random Uncertainty	0.0060	0.0138	K

#### 4.9 Validation of Quoted Uncertainty on GSICS Correction

Table 6 compares the total uncertainty due to random errors predicted by this analysis with the median value of the uncertainty quoted within the GSICS Re-Analysis products for MVIRI-IASI. This shows the regression used in the ATBD tends to under-estimate the uncertainties by a factor of 2 – 4, depending on the channel (the mean ratio is 2.8).

**Table 6 Validation of GSICS Correction for MVIRI-IASI Error Budget**

Meteosat SEVIRI Channel	IR03.9	IR06.2	
Standard Scene Radiance	236	285	K
Typical Standard Correction	2.521	-2.361	K
Total Random Uncertainty	0.007	0.016	K
Median Uncertainty Quoted	0.004	0.004	K
Rolling SD of Standard Bias	0.021	0.006	K

#### 4.10 Comparison of Theory with Statistics

Table 6 also compares the results of this analysis with the day-to-day variability observed in the biases estimated for standard radiance scenes by GSICS Re-Analysis Correction. This is calculated as the standard deviation evaluated over 15 day rolling windows. These show the GSICS Correction gives more variable results than expected by considering only the random processes affecting the inter-calibration process. This is not surprising, as the uncertainty analysis does not account for real variations in the calibration of the instruments, which are included in the latter statistics. This suggests the real variations in the instruments' calibration are of comparable orders of magnitude to the uncertainties evaluated in this analysis.


## 5 COMBINING SYSTEMATIC AND RANDOM ERRORS

### 5.1 Method for Combining Systematic and Random Errors

The total uncertainties due to systematic and random processes can then be combined to give the total combined uncertainty,  $u^c$ , for a given radiance,  $L$ :

$$u^c(L) = \left\{ [u^s(L)]^2 + [u^r(L)]^2 \right\}^{1/2}. \quad \text{Equation 10}$$

Figure 5 compares the impact of all the systematic and random errors on the uncertainty of the GSICS Correction evaluated over a range of radiances. This shows that in most conditions the random components of the uncertainty dominate for all channels. It also shows that the uncertainties increase rapidly for low radiance scenes, and reach a minimum near the standard radiances for each channel. This is because the majority of the collocations give radiances near these values, whereas cold, high clouds are relatively infrequent. It is also clear that the GSICS Correction produces much smaller uncertainties in channels with stronger atmospheric absorption, as the scenes are inherently less variable.



**Figure 4 – Impact of Total Systematic and Random Errors on Uncertainty of the Brightness Temperatures ( $T_b$ ) produced by the GSICS Correction for a range of scene radiances for each infrared channel of Meteosat7/MVIRI using MetopA/IASI reference. Dotted vertical line shows standard scene radiance for each channel.**

**Table 7 Overall Error Budget of GSICS Correction for MVIRI-IASI for Standard Scenes**

Meteosat MVIRI Channel	wv-1	ir-2	
Standard Scene Radiance	236	285	K
Typical Standard Correction	2.521	-2.361	K
Total Systematic Uncertainty	0.003	0.013	K
Total Random Uncertainty	0.007	0.016	K
Total Combined Uncertainty	0.008	0.020	K

Table 7 shows the systematic, random and combined uncertainties of the GSICS Re-Analysis Correction for standard radiance scenes. These values are generally small, with total combined uncertainties of 8 mK and 20 mK for the WV and IR channels, respectively. This can be compared to typical levels of the correction for each channel, which are generally two orders of magnitude larger and clearly statistically significant.

## 6 RECOMMENDATIONS

This analysis has evaluated the uncertainties for the GSICS Re-Analysis Correction of Meteosat7/MVIRI using Metop/IASI as a reference. Random errors on the Near Real-Time corrections would be approximately  $\sqrt{2}$  larger due to approximately half the number of collocations being used in the regression. Systematic errors would remain unchanged.

This analysis yields some suggestions to improve the performance of the inter-calibration of the infrared channels of MVIRI-IASI. In particular, the geometric collocation criteria could be relaxed considerably without increasing the collocations' noise or systematic biases, but producing many more<sup>2</sup>. However, the temporal limit of 900 s should not be relaxed as this would increase the uncertainty of the final GSICS Correction.

Ideally, the ATBD should be revised to account for correlations within the data when estimating the uncertainty on the GSICS Correction, following this analysis. Alternatively, the uncertainty estimated from the weighted regression in the ATBD should be inflated empirically by a factor of  $\sim 3$  to achieve greater consistency between the statistics of the GSICS Correction and this analysis. However, this should be reviewed once statistics from the pre-operational product become available.

This analysis does not include contributions associated with the interpretation of the SRFs published for the GEO imager, as explained in §3.6.3. If included, this term could dominate the systematic errors of most channels. This highlights the importance of communicating clear guidance in the application of published SRFs.

Although some of these recommendations can be generalised to other pairs of GEO-LEO hyperspectral infrared inter-calibrations, the analysis should be repeated for each inter-calibration pair. Particular attention should be paid to the analysis of any gap-filling methods used in spectral corrections, which could dominate the uncertainties for other inter-calibrations. The analysis should also be repeated following any substantial changes to the ATBD – and when applying it to Meteosat data sampled in rapid scanning mode, due to the much larger scene variability in target domain of the collocations.

---

<sup>2</sup> Since this technical note was produced the proposed relaxation of the geometric collocation threshold has been tested [[EUM/MET/REP/11/0263](#)]. Analysis of the test result showed small, but significant changes to the relative biases (up to 0.05 K) were produced by this change. This unexpected result suggests there may be other factors influencing the overall systemic errors which are not accounted for in the assessment presented here. It was recommended that this threshold not be relaxed unless required to increase the number of collocations.

**REFERENCES**

1. Nigel Fox, 2010: *A guide to expression of uncertainty of measurements*, QA4EO Guideline [QA4EO-QAEO-GEN-DQK-006](#).
2. JCGM 2008: *Evaluation of measurement data – Guide to the expression of uncertainty in measurement*, <http://www.bipm.org/en/publications/guides/gum.html>
3. Tim Hewison, 2011: *ATBD for EUMETSAT Prototype GSICS MVIRI-IASI Inter-Calibration*, [EUM/MET/TEN/11/0217](#).
4. IASI L1 Cal/Val Team, 2007: *Presentation of the IASI Level 1 Cal/Val Results*, 23/10/2007, EUMETSAT, Darmstadt
5. Tim Hewison, 2009: *Quantifying the Impact of Scene Variability on Inter-Calibration*, [GSICS Quarterly, Vol. 3, No. 2](#).
6. Schmetz, Johannes, Paolo Pili, Stephen Tjemkes, Dieter Just, Jochen Kerkmann, Sergio Rota, Alain Ratier, 2002: *An Introduction to Meteosat Second Generation (MSG)*. *Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, **83**, 977–992.  
[doi: 10.1175/1520-0477\(2002\)083<0977:AITMSG>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2002)083<0977:AITMSG>2.3.CO;2) and supplement:  
[doi:10.1175/BAMS-83-7-Schmetz-1](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-83-7-Schmetz-1)
7. Denis Blumstein, 2007: *In-flight performance of the infrared atmospheric sounding interferometer (IASI) on Metop-A*, Proc. of SPIE, Vol. 6684, 66840H-1, [doi: 10.1117/12.734162](https://doi.org/10.1117/12.734162).
8. B. Tournier and Co-Authors, 2007: *IASI on MetOp-A – Radiometric and spectral performances measured during commissioning*. First IASI Conference, Anglet, France, 13-16 November 2007, <http://smc.cnes.fr/IASI>.
9. Denis Blumstein, 2008: *MetOp-A IASI Level 1 Cal/Val at IASI TEC*, [GSICS Quarterly, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2008](#).
10. Tahara, Yoshihiko and Koji Kato, 2009: *New Spectral Compensation Method for Inter-calibration Using High Spectral Resolution Sounder*, JMA Meteorological Satellite Center [Technical Note No. 52](#), 1-37.