Toward a better modeling of surface emissivity to improve AMSU data assimilation over Antarctica







GUEDJ Stephanie, KARBOU Fatima and RABIER Florence

1. Introduction



- CONCORDIASI project :
 - To improve our understanding of the ozone depletion over Antarctica
 - To study potential interaction with lower latitudes
 - To get more accurate NWP analyses and forecasts
- Satellite data assimilation in NWP in polar region (Polar orbiting)
 - Choice of microwave instruments (AMSU-A & AMSU-B)
 - main features : cross-track scanning
 - Measurements : Humidity & Temperature profiles + surface

2. Emissivity of Antarctica Land surface emissivity calculation

- Land surface emissivity is usually retrieved from satellite observations assuming the surface to be **flat and specular** (Prigent et al.,1997)
- Maztler (2005) has found questionable the use of this assumption for nadir viewing angles for some specific surface types
- Karbou and Prigent (2005) have shown that the specular assumption can be used for snow-free areas
- But can we use the specular assumption to retrieve AMSU emissivities over Antarctica ?
- To evaluate the effect of surface assumption on emissivity : different assumptions have been tested from specular to lambertian.

2. Emissivity of Antarctica Land surface emissivity calculation



<u>●effective</u>: Average angle replacing the integration over all directions (Mätzler, 1987 and Ingold et al., 1998)

Matzler (2005) : suggest to use a specularity parameter to describe natural surface

Land surface emissivity calculation

5 approximations to retrieve emissivity at AMSU-A frequencies :

	Specularity
	Parameter
- SPECULAR	1
- LAMBERTIAN	0
- SEMI-LAMBERTIAN	0.5
- QUASI-LAMBERTIAN	0.25
- QUASI-SPECULAR	0.75



PERIOD : 5 approximations x 1 year

+ Comparison with the OPER2007 version : Empirical versions of models (Weng et al., 2001 and Grody, 1988)

Analysis of land surface emissivity



for nadir viewing angles (up to 3%)

Analysis of land surface emissivity

Monthly mean emissivity maps for AMSU-A channel 3 (50 GHz) over Antarctica, for January 2007

 Emissivity is low in the centre and increases towards the coastline
Emissivity values: OPER2007 < others
Some differences between approximations



2. Emissivity of Antarctica Analysis of land surface emissivity

- Surface approximation effects are larger for AMSU-A Channel 3
- Some differences between approximations but which one is the more realistic ?
- Problem : No independant observation is available to select the best approximation

⇒One Solution : Simulation of sounding brightness temperature using emissivity of channel 3 (50 GHz) as input. And comparison with observations

3. Evaluation of land surface emissivity

Correlations between Tb_{obs} and Tb_{sim}

Maps of correlations between Tb_{obs} and Tb_{sim} of AMSU-A channel 4 (August 2007)

=> calculation of correlations in grid cell:





Correlations between observed and simulated Tbs have been improved by comparison to OPER2007 especially by LAMB and SLAMB

3. Evaluation of land surface emissivity Seasonnal dependence

Mean Fg-Departures (Tbobs-Tbsim) of channel 4 (52 GHz) as a function of months over Antarctica.

Errorbars represent the STD



- LAMB approximation would be more suitable during the winter period
- SLAMB or SPEC approximations could be used during summer

3. Evaluation of land surface emissivity Distribution of correlations in 2007

Boxplot of monthly mean AMSU-A channel 4 (52 GHz) correlations between Tbobs and Tbsim over Antarctica



The box stretches from the lower hinge (defined as the 25th percentile) to the upper hinge (the 75th percentile) and therefore contains the middle half of the scores in the distribution. The median is shown as a line across the box.

- Correlations of all approximations seems higher than the OPER2007

4. Conclusion & future developments

- The aim of this work was to extend the use of AMSU data over Antarctica (from midatmosphere to surface)
- Snow surface emissivity has been calculated from 1 year of AMSU-A measurements using 5 approximations assuming the surface to be : specular (SPEC), lambertian (LAMB), and also using a specularity parameter (QLAMB, SLAMB and QSPEC)
- The LAMB approximation could be more suitable during winter and the SLAMB and SPEC approximation could be used during summer.
- Over Antarctica sea-ice surfaces, Bouchard et al. (2009) have already shown that the SPEC approximation provided satisfactory results. (Come and see her POSTER)
- SPEC, QSPEC, have been interfaced with RTTOV as options and can be activated in ARPEGE using logical keys as inputs : more tests are still needed before operational implementation of one of these methods (SPEC is already oper)

Come and see our poster !!

Thank YOU





The surface assumption is applied to the $T \downarrow component$. For very rough surfaces, a lambertian reflection can also be supposed ...

Distribution of Fg-Departures



Each approximation have significantly been improve by comparison to the OPER
Channel 4 : SLAMB shows the lowest STD and SPEC presents the lowest bias
Channel 5: Best result to SPEC approach

Distribution of Fg-Departures



MOTIVATIONS



Lack of in-situ observations to well constrain the NWP models over ANTARCTICA







<u>b. Land surface emissivity analysis (2)</u>

Monthly mean emissivity maps for AMSU-A channel 3 (50 GHz) over Antarctica, for January 2007





Monthly mean emissivity maps for AMSU-A channel 3 (50 GHz) over Antarctica, for August 2007

OPER : Empirical scheme (Weng et al., 2001)

арр.	SPEC	LAMB
SLAMB	50%	50%
QLAMB	30%	70%
QSPEC	70%	30%



2. Emissivity of Antarctica Land surface emissivity calculation

METHOD 1: SPECULAR





The surface assumption is applied to the $T \downarrow component$. For very rough surfaces, a lambertian reflection can also be supposed ...