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Motivation

- Past years were devoted to achieve consistency for different Ocean Surface Wind retrievals coming from different satellites, scatterometers and radiometers
- Based on two “calibration targets”:
  1. **Radiometers intercalibration**: Use common radiative transfer model RTM V7/V8 calibrated to buoys, aircraft
     (Meissner and Wentz, 2012; Meissner et al, 2014)
     \[ \text{Tb (1.2-37 GHz)} \rightarrow \text{Emissivity Model (1K accuracy)} \rightarrow \text{wind retrieval (1 m/s accuracy)} \]
  2. **Scatterometers GMF**: GMF based on millions of rain-free collocations with radiometers
     (Ricciardulli and Wentz, 2015; Ricciardulli, 2016)
     \[ \text{Backscatter(Ku, C-band)} = f(w, \text{dir,Inc angle, pol, SST, freq)} \rightarrow \text{wind retrieval (1 m/s accuracy)} \]
- With this method we achieved a Global Monthly accuracy of \( \sim 0.1 \text{ m/s} \) (Wentz et al., 2017)
- **Yet, studies of tropical climate variability often rely on buoys only, supported by reanalyses used as observations**
- Often this is due to out-of-date information on satellite data accuracy and consistency, and difficulty/misuse with quality control of satellite data

Objective

- Focus on accuracy and consistency study in the TAO buoy array area and prove quality of the satellite wind record
- Summarize results in paper aimed at the climate variability community to increase confidence in satellite data
- Suggest framework for other groups/datasets to verify satellite wind consistency with buoys
BUOY-SATELLITE DATA COLOCATIONS

- Used only TAO array BUOYS, 1988-current
- **Buoy data**: Hourly averages (from 10-min original data), converted to 10m height, and the actual buoy location (not the nominal) is used here for colocation with satellite data
- **Scatterometers and radiometers**: 10m EN winds, daily gridded maps, 0.25 deg, asc/desc: 30 min colocations
- **Rain flags**: Strictly Rain-free only. Very important for consistency study.

### Details of analysis

1. For each buoy/satellite dataset: We developed pairs of daily timeseries (U,V, W) for buoy and colocated satellite at each buoy location only when satellite pass occurred
2. We averaged all daily timeseries for all TAO buoy locations
3. Built statistics using daily timeseries for individual buoys
4. Analyzed timeseries of individual buoys and average over TAO array, daily and 30-day smoothed

### SATELLITE MISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATELLITE MISSIONS</th>
<th>period</th>
<th>Local Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QSCAT</td>
<td>1999-2009</td>
<td>6 am/pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCAT</td>
<td>2007-current</td>
<td>9:30 am/pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WindSat</td>
<td>2003-current</td>
<td>6 am/pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI</td>
<td>1997-2014</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMI</td>
<td>2014-current</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSRE</td>
<td>2002-2011</td>
<td>1:30 am/pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSR2</td>
<td>2012-current</td>
<td>1:30 am/pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSMI/SSMIS</td>
<td>1988-current</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- F08,F10,F11,F13,F14,F15,F16,F17,F18
SAMPLE BUOY 51010 VS QSCAT: ZONAL WIND

No data prior to 1999

No data after to 2009

Ops ! Buoy discontinuity
U: ASCAT AND WINDSAT VS SAMPLE BUOYS

ASCAT vs 51306

WSAT vs 52312
U, V, W: AVERAGE OVER ALL TAO BUOYS

- Working with single buoys/single sensors is challenging
- Issues: discontinuities, noise in measurements, effects of currents...
- Timeseries were created for each buoy of the TAO array (1988-2018) colocated with each sensor: SSMI, SSMIS, TMI, QSCAT, AMSRE, WindSat, AMSR2, ASCAT, GMI.
- For each sensor/TAO buoy colocation set, we averaged all the daily timeseries for U, V, W to produce an average satellite and TAO colocated U, V, W timeseries using all TAO buoys.
BUOY-SAT U COMPARISONS: QSCAT, ASCAT, WSAT

U DIFFERENCES, TAO BUOYS

QSCAT No rain flag
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Wind speed difference (m/s)
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BUOY-SAT U COMPARISONS: QSCAT, ASCAT, WSAT

The Not-too-bad Way

QSCAT Scatterometer-only rain flag

Wind speed difference (m/s)

± 0.1 m/s
BUOY-SAT COMPARISONS: QSCAT, ASCAT, WSAT

The Right Way

U DIFFERENCES, TAO BUOYS

QSCAT Scatterometer+Radiometer rain flag

Wind speed difference (m/s)

± 0.1 m/s

Year

2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012

BUOY-ASCAT
BUOY-QSCAT
BUOY-WSAT RF
BUOY-SAT W COMPARISONS: 2007-2012

\[ \pm 0.1 \text{ m/s} \]
• Mostly within 0.1 m/s within each other.
• Difference with buoys have seasonal cycle, currents et al.
• Instabilities/swings: F18 (pink), F13 (not shown)
• Drifts: F17 (yellow) after 2017; very small ASCAT (magenta) drift, after 2016 (see next slide)
2018 OVWST: ASCAT INTERCALIBRATION ANALYSIS

STABILITY OF ASCAT WIND SPEED TIMESERIES (55NS)

From GLOBAL comparisons between ASCAT and all other sensors
From comparisons between differences with TAO buoys, for ASCAT and all other sensors: Possible drift but harder to detect
What about Accuracy? $|U|$, $|V|$ and W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>QSCAT</th>
<th>ASCAT</th>
<th>WSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>StDev (m/s)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QSCAT</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCAT</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSAT</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIAS (m/s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QSCAT</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCAT</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSAT</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accuracy for Wind Seed, all Radiometers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>StDev (m/s)</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMI</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMI</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSR2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSRE</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F08</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Using single sensors, necessary rain-flagging, especially for QuikSCAT
2. Attach timeseries of different sensors: Be aware of small differences due to diurnal cycle, otherwise ok
3. **Best option**: Use CCMP, satellite-based wind vector analysis; scatterometers+radiometers+ buoys+ model wind (ERA-Interim or NCEP background); (Atlas et al, 2011; Mears et al, submitted)
   - 6-hourly, 0.25 deg gridded wind components, 1988-current
   - Available also in NRT-version, without buoys

---

**Example: Westerly Wind Bursts and El Nino**

- We studied occurrence of Westerly Wind Bursts (WWB) in the Pacific which contribute to trigger El Nino events.
- WWB are usually defined as anomalies in the zonal winds that exceed 2 m/s for a period longer than 3 days
- Focus on 3 major El Nino events: 1997/98; 2014/15; 2018/19
- Used all-SSMI timeseries, associated CCMP wind direction to determine zonal wind component $U_{SSMI}$;
- Compared to $U_{CCMP}$ itself
- Compared to one reanalysis (20CR)
SUMMARY

- While in situ-data will always be considered the absolute ground truth, they are sparse.
- Properly calibrated Satellite data provide uninterrupted global coverage since 1988 (Radiometers) and 1999 (scatterometers; adding ERS would go back to 1991).
- Best way to compare different sensors with different observing time, is using to use the buoy as reference and compare QSCAT-BUOY to ASCAT-Buoy, for example.

Note:
1) ASCAT and QSCAT are extremely consistent in rain-free over the TAO buoy array
2) Consistent quality control of satellite data is essential
3) WSAT U (and V) are not as closely consistent because the WSAT wind direction error is larger at low winds compared to the scatterometers.
4) ASCAT is less affected by rain than QuikSCAT. For best comparisons is better to make sure QSCAT is only rain-free

CONCLUSIONS

- Satellite wind speeds and components are calibrated over the tropics within 0.1 m/s vs TAO buoys; Uncertainty ~0.6 m/s
- Satellite data or satellite-based analysis CCMP can be used, in addition to in situ, for climate studies.
- Considering the recent degradation/lack of funding for buoys in the TAO array, we believe is important to provide an alternative and prove the accuracy of current satellite data vs buoys to the climate community, for ENSO and climate-related studies → Peer-review paper + stimulate similar analyses for other datasets
extras
ASCAT/AMSR2 aligned well
Possible ASCAT drift after 2016
Consistency of TMI/GMI
Very small WSAT drift possible after 2014
ASCAT/TMI aligned well
Possible ASCAT drift after 2016