

**Precision Validation
of MIPAS**

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

Precision validation of MIPAS-Envisat products

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

Atmospheric, Oceanic and Planetary Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

Received: 21 December 2006 – Accepted: 11 January 2007 – Published: 18 January 2007

Correspondence to: C. Piccolo (piccolo@atm.ox.ac.uk)

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

EGU

Abstract

This paper discusses the variation and validation of the precision, or estimated random error, associated with the ESA Level 2 products from the Michelson Interferometer for Passive Atmospheric Sounding (MIPAS).

5 This quantity represents the propagation of the radiometric noise from the spectra through the retrieval process into the Level 2 profile values. The noise itself varies with time, steadily rising between decontamination events, but the Level 2 precision has a greater variation due to the atmospheric temperature which controls the total radiance received. Hence, for all species, the precision varies latitudinally/seasonally
10 with temperature, with a small superimposed temporal structure determined by the degree of ice contamination on the detectors.

The precision validation involves comparing two MIPAS retrievals at the intersections of ascending/descending orbits. For 5 days per month of full resolution MIPAS operation, the standard deviation of the matching profile pairs is computed and compared
15 with the precision given in the MIPAS Level 2 data. Even taking into account the propagation of the pressure-temperature retrieval errors into the VMR retrieval, the standard deviation of the matching pairs is usually a factor 1–2 larger than the precision. This is thought to be due to effects such as horizontal inhomogeneity of the atmosphere and instability of the retrieval.

20 1 Introduction

The Michelson Interferometer for Passive Atmospheric Sounding (MIPAS) (Fischer et al., 2007¹) is an infrared limb-sounding Fourier transform interferometer on board the Envisat satellite, launched in March 2002 (ESA, 2000). It acquires spectra over the range $685\text{--}2410\text{ cm}^{-1}$ ($14.5\text{--}4.1\text{ }\mu\text{m}$), which includes the vibration-rotation bands of

¹Fischer, H., Birk, M., Blom, C., et al.: MIPAS: an instrument for atmospheric and climate research, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., in preparation, 2007.

Precision Validation of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

many molecules of interest. It is capable of measuring continuously around an orbit in both day and night and complete global coverage is obtained in 24 h.

From July 2002 until March 2004 MIPAS was operated at full spectral resolution (sampled at 0.025 cm^{-1}) with a nominal limb-scanning sequence of 17 steps from 68–6 km with 3 km tangent height spacing in the troposphere and stratosphere, generating complete scans spaced approximately every 500 km along the orbit. Using the 17 spectra from each scan as input, the ESA Level 2 (L2) processing uses a global least-squares fit algorithm (Ridolfi et al., 2000; Raspollini et al., 2006) to retrieve profiles of atmospheric temperature and pressure (pT) followed sequentially by the concentrations of 6 “key species”: H_2O , O_3 , HNO_3 , CH_4 , N_2O and NO_2 . These are the L2 products, which have now been generated for the entire full resolution dataset.

MIPAS operations were suspended in March 2004 following problems with the interferometer slide mechanism. Operations resumed in January 2005 with a reduced spectral resolution (0.0625 cm^{-1}), a reduced duty cycle and a different limb scanning sequence, but only data from the full resolution mission are discussed here.

This paper presents the validation of the precision values associated with the ESA L2 MIPAS data. Section 2 discusses the sources of the random error in the retrieved profiles, and the dependence upon the radiometric noise and atmospheric temperature; Sect. 3 describes the method used for validating the precision values; Sect. 4 presents the results of the validation and Sect. 5 the conclusions drawn from this study.

2 Precision

Each L2 profile \mathbf{x} has an associated covariance matrix \mathbf{V}_x representing the mapping of the radiometric noise through the retrieval

$$\mathbf{V}_x = (\mathbf{K}^T \mathbf{V}_n^{-1} \mathbf{K})^{-1} \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{V}_n is the covariance matrix of the noise and \mathbf{K} is the jacobian matrix (Raspollini et al., 2006). The square roots of the diagonal elements of \mathbf{V}_x represent the error in

Precision Validation of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

the corresponding elements of the profile \mathbf{x} (units of Kelvin for temperature and parts per million by volume, ppmv, for volume mixing ratios (VMR)). These are the precision values to be validated. The off-diagonal elements $(\mathbf{V}_x)_{ij}$ of \mathbf{V}_x provide the correlations between values i and j of the profile \mathbf{x} .

5 Assuming that the radiance is proportional to the product of the Planck function and the VMR, then the precision (in ppmv) should be proportional to the noise and inversely proportional to the Planck function (therefore atmospheric temperature), but should be independent of the VMR of the gas.

2.1 Precision variability

10 The precision values given in the MIPAS L2 data have been averaged for every 5 days per month of full resolution MIPAS operation and are not expected to vary significantly over shorter timescales. Figures 1 and 2 show an example of the time series of the precision for H₂O and HNO₃, respectively (some unrealistic values have been filtered out).

15 The variability with time of the precision is evident for both species in the polar latitudes bands. All other species show a similar behavior. There are distinct peaks in the polar winter cases for the three height ranges in both hemispheres, although in second arctic winter there is a clear dip in the middle of the peak during December 2003. The mid and equatorial regions do not present strong variations with time.

20 2.2 Atmospheric temperature variability

As explained previously, the precision value in the L2 products is expected to be inversely proportional to the Planck function, i.e., smaller retrieval errors for warmer atmospheres. Figure 3 shows the time series of MIPAS-retrieved temperature.

25 Comparing Fig. 3 to Figs. 1 and 2 it is clear that the atmospheric temperature explains much of the variability in the precision of the MIPAS L2 products, including the decrease in random error observed in the arctic in December 2003 which can be at-

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

tributed to a stratospheric warming.

2.3 Noise variability

The other component of the precision value is the radiometric noise, expressed as a Noise Equivalent Spectral Radiance (NESR), which varies with radiometric gain (determined by the degree of ice contamination on the detectors, Kleinert et al., 2006) but is also slightly dependent on the atmospheric signal (larger radiance also implies larger NESR). Figure 4 shows the time series of the NESR derived from MIPAS L1B data for polar latitudes, averaged over each of the 5 different spectral bands.

The A band signal shows the clearest dependence on the degree of ice-contamination, rising steadily between decontamination events, while the noise in the other bands is more sensitive to atmospheric temperature.

So the L2 precision value is influenced by variations in atmospheric temperature in two ways in opposing directions: increasing temperature results in an increased signal but also an increased noise. However, since the seasonal noise variations are only of the order of $\pm 20\%$ while the signal variation is nearer $\pm 100\%$, the former effect dominates: higher temperatures result in more precise retrievals.

3 Methodology of validation

The precision of the retrievals may be defined as the dispersion of an ensemble of retrievals obtained from limb measurements of the same atmospheric state. Although, in practice, MIPAS does not make repeated measurements of the same limb path, an approximation is available from the pairs of measurements located at the intersections of the MIPAS viewing tracks from orbits a few hours apart. If the colocations are sufficiently close in space and time that atmospheric variations can be neglected, the actual precision of the retrievals can be estimated from the standard deviation of these pairs (Lambert et al., 1996).

Precision Validation of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Precision Validation of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Profile locations of ascending and descending tracks were matched to within 300 km in distance (compared to approximately 500 km distance between successive profiles along the orbit) for every 5 days per month of full resolution MIPAS operation. Limiting the comparisons of profile locations to 6 h time difference and 300 km horizontal difference produces regular matches at two latitudes, near the poles, in the 80 S–90 S and 80 N–90 N regions. Extending the comparisons to 12 h time difference produces matches at three additional latitudes in the regions 20 S–60 S, 60 S–80 S and 60 N–80 N. Figure 5 shows the locations of the MIPAS profiles for 30 July 2003.

For every tangent point in every pair of profiles, the difference $z=x_1-x_2$ was calculated. However, to allow for any systematic difference between the tangent pressures of the ascending and descending profiles (associated with any relative altitude offset) it was first necessary to adjust descending profile value x_2 to the same tangent pressure as the ascending profile value x_1 by applying the following correction:

$$x_2(p_1) = x_2(p_2) + \left(\frac{dx}{dp} \right) (p_1 - p_2) \quad (2)$$

where p_1 and p_2 are the tangent pressures at the corresponding levels in profiles 1 and 2 respectively, and (dx/dp) is the average gradient of target species with pressure at that level, determined from the full set of profiles for that latitude/month. The use of the averaged gradient, rather than a simple pressure interpolation on a profile-by-profile basis, is to avoid introducing any extra smoothing to profile 2.

The mean \bar{z} and standard deviation σ_z of z are then defined in the usual way:

$$\bar{z} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma_z = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (z_i - \bar{z})^2} \quad (4)$$

where N is the number of matching pairs at each profile level within each latitude band/month.

If we assume that each profile value x_i measures the ‘true’ atmospheric value with zero mean bias and precision σ_x then, for a large statistical sample,

$$\sigma_z = \langle (x_1 \pm \sigma_x) - (x_2 \pm \sigma_x) \rangle$$

$$\simeq \sqrt{2}\sigma_x$$

The SD used in the following is therefore $\sigma_z/\sqrt{2}$.

However, before making this comparison, there is another contribution to the observed scatter σ_z in the concentration profiles that should be considered.

3.1 Pressure and temperature (pT) error propagation

In the ESA processing the temperature and tangent pressure are retrieved first, then the VMR profiles.

Errors in the pT retrieval are known to have a significant effect on the subsequent VMR retrievals and, for this study in particular, the propagation of the random errors from the pT retrieval (\mathbf{V}_{pT}) should be considered when considering the random variability of VMR profiles. This can be expressed as an additional error covariance \mathbf{V}_x^{pT}

$$\mathbf{V}_x^{pT} = \mathbf{E} \mathbf{V}_{pT} \mathbf{E}^T \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{E} represents the pT error propagation matrix ([Raspollini et al., 1999](#)).

A modified definition of VMR profile precision is then obtained by summing the matrices $\mathbf{V}_x^{pT} + \mathbf{V}_x$ prior to taking the square roots of the diagonals.

The covariance matrix \mathbf{V}_x^{pT} is included as part of the L2 product but in practice there is some ambiguity over the units and, in any case, the matrix is only calculated for the cases where spectra for all tangent heights within the retrieval range are available (e.g., cloud-free atmospheres).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Instead, here the originally-defined **E** matrices have been used and Eq. (5) was applied, which shows that the pT propagation error contributes up to an additional 10% random variability, depending on the species.

There is actually a further error which arises from applying Eq. (2) with erroneous tangent pressures, which depends on the vertical gradient of the target species (unlike the pT propagation error). However, this is a relatively small effect and is neglected here.

4 Results of the validation

Figure 6 shows an example of the comparisons between the standard deviation of the ensemble of profile pairs and the precision values given in the MIPAS data for all target species except for NO₂ (which has a large diurnal variation between ascending/descending intersections). The pT error propagation has been included in the precision values for the VMR profiles.

The temperature comparison (top left panel) is in good agreement at most altitudes, although the standard deviation is much larger than the precision below the 100 mb surface.

The VMRs standard deviation is generally consistent with the precision. For CH₄ and O₃ at low altitudes and in general for HNO₃, the pT induced error has a large contribution to the precision. For H₂O, the standard deviation of the profile pairs is consistent with the precision except for the last altitude (~6 km).

4.1 Time series of standard deviation/precision

To examine the time and latitude dependence of the SD compared to precision, the vertically averaged values of the ratio SD/precision have been calculated for profile pairs from 4 latitude bands for 5 days each month throughout the full resolution dataset.

Some filtering out of unreasonable profile values has been applied.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

In general the standard deviation of the ensemble of matching profile pairs should be larger than the precision since it is an approximation of the random uncertainties and it includes the variability of the atmosphere. On the other hand, the precision could be underestimated due to the non-linearity of the error analysis.

Figure 7 shows the results for the “stratospheric” component, defined as the nominal tangent altitudes from 68–15 km and Fig. 8 the “tropospheric” component, 12–6 km.

In general, the ratio is closer to the predicted value of 1 for the stratospheric component than the tropospheric component, i.e., the precision appears to more accurately represent the random error in the stratosphere than the troposphere.

For temperature particularly, the ratio appears larger for winter conditions but for other molecules (stratospheric HNO_3 , CH_4 and N_2O) the peak seems to occur in the southern hemisphere around September/October 2003.

Tropospheric ratios for O_3 , CH_4 and, usually HNO_3 are nearer 0.5 than 1, suggesting that the random error is overestimated by a factor 2.

There are various sources of pseudo-random error associated with the retrieval beyond those represented by the NESR and pT error propagation. Many of these are associated with features present in the atmospheric spectra which cannot be represented in the forward model, such as horizontal gradients (particularly in temperature) along the line-of-sight and vertical structures sharper than the 3 km profile level spacing (e.g., the tropopause, residual cloud, tropospheric water vapour gradient). Measurements at limb average the atmosphere over long horizontal distances and the profile at the tangent points is sheared horizontally. Moreover, the retrieved value at one tangent altitude is used to model the contribution of the atmosphere along the line of sight for lower altitudes, even though these altitudes are at different locations. These effects are ignored, which means assuming a horizontally homogeneous atmosphere over distance of several hundred kilometers. In addition, fine atmospheric structures are not resolved by the 3 km field of view of the instrument and this leads to incorrect modelling of the radiance and the sensitivity of the retrieval to systematic errors within the forward model representation of the atmosphere. These approximations tend to trig-

**Precision Validation
of MIPAS**

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[I◀](#)[▶I](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

ger instabilities in the retrieval, causing oscillations in the profile which may be in the opposite phase for two slightly different viewing conditions. In particular the horizontal temperature gradients may explain the larger SD observed in winter conditions and the unresolved vertical structure the increased tropospheric SD for temperature and H₂O.

5 By contrast, a ratio less than unity implies an overestimate of the random error. This applied most obviously to the two molecules (HNO₃ and O₃) where the tropospheric concentrations are relatively low compared to the stratosphere. Although not evident from Fig. 6, the relative random error for the troposphere is much larger for these molecules so the underestimate may be associated with the breakdown of the
10 assumption of linearity associated with Eq. (1).

5 Conclusions

The main source of the precision of the ESA L2 MIPAS profiles is the error due to the mapping of the radiometric noise in the retrieved profiles. This precision depends on the atmospheric temperature, which controls the total radiance received. An additional contribution to the precision for the target species profile is the pressure and
15 temperature propagation error.

The precision varies with time in the polar regions and it shows a distinct increase in the polar winters for all target species, which can be explained by a reduction in radiance received from the colder atmosphere. The noise itself varies with time, steadily rising between decontamination events. This effect is a superimposed precision time
20 dependence on decontamination events, accounting for a variation of about ±20% in the precision values.

By comparing MIPAS retrievals at orbit intersections (effectively comparing two observations of the same atmosphere) a check can be made of the actual scatter in the
25 measurements.

In general the precision appears to more accurately represent the random error in the stratosphere than the troposphere. Larger standard deviations of the matching

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

pairs observed in winter conditions are thought to be due to effects such as horizontal inhomogeneity of the atmosphere along the line-of-sight, while unresolved vertical structure may explain the increased tropospheric standard deviations for temperature and H₂O.

- 5 *Acknowledgements.* The authors would like to thank J. Hurley for the efficient help on the provision of MIPAS L1B data. The MIPAS experiment is supported by the European Space Agency (ESA). This work is supported by DARC (Data Assimilation Research Centre), UK.

References

- 10 ESA, SP-1229: ESA ENVISAT-MIPAS: an instrument for atmospheric chemistry and climate research, European Space Agency, ESTEC, Noordwijck, The Netherlands, 2000. [912](#)
- Kleinert, A., Aubertin, G., Perron, G., et al.: MIPAS Level 1B algorithms overview: operational processing and characterization, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 6, 10 673–10 711, 2006.
- Lambert, A., Grainger, R. G., Remedios, J. J., et al.: Validation of aerosol measurements from the improved stratospheric and mesospheric sounder, *J. Geoph. Res.*, 10(D6), 9811–9830, 15 1996. [915](#)
- Raspollini, P. et al.: High level description of the new functionalities to be implemented in MIPAS Level 2 processor, Technical Report IROE-GS98-11, 1999. [917](#)
- Raspollini, P., Belotti, C., Burgess, A., et al.: MIPAS level 2 operational analysis, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 5605–5630, 2006, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/6/5605/2006/>. [913](#)
- 20 Ridolfi, M. Carli, B., Carlotti, M., et al.: Optimised forward model and retrieval scheme for MIPAS near-real-time data processing, *Appl. Opt.*, 39(8), 1323–1340, 2000. [913](#)

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 1. Time series of the precision derived from MIPAS L2 data for H_2O [ppmv] from July 2002 to March 2004, split in eight latitude bands. The red line shows the precision averaged between 47 km and 36 km tangent heights, the black line between 33 km and 24 km and the green line between 21 km and 12 km. The gaps in the southern hemisphere in July–August 2002 and October 2002 are caused by missing Antarctic L2 profiles.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

EGU

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 2. As Fig. 1, except for HNO_3 [ppbv].

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 3. Time series of retrieved temperature [K] derived from MIPAS L2 data, corresponding to precision variations shown in Figs. 1 and 2.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

EGU

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 4. Time series of NESR at 33 km tangent altitude for the 5 different spectral bands (A: $685\text{--}970\text{ cm}^{-1}$, AB: $1020\text{--}1170\text{ cm}^{-1}$, B: $1215\text{--}1500\text{ cm}^{-1}$, C: $1570\text{--}1750\text{ cm}^{-1}$, D: $1820\text{--}2410\text{ cm}^{-1}$). Southern Hemisphere gaps correspond to the missing Antarctic L2 profiles for July–August 2002 and October 2002. Arrows indicate decontamination events.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

EGU

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 5. Locations of the ESA L2 profiles of MIPAS for 30 July 2003. Colored points represent positions where orbital tangent tracks intersect when two observations are made of the same atmosphere 6 h apart (red for South Pole and magenta for North Pole) and 12 h apart (green, blue and yellow). The black orbit intersections in the South Pole regions come from observations made more than 12 h apart.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

EGU

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 6. Example of polar summer comparisons at 80N–90N latitudes for 30 July 2003. It shows comparisons for temperature (top left), H₂O (top right) O₃ (middle left), HNO₃ (middle right), CH₄ (bottom left) and N₂O (bottom right). The black line is the bias between the matched pairs profiles, the red bars are the precision values (for the VMR plots the pT induced error is included and shown as an additional contribution to the red bars) and the green line is the standard deviation of the ensemble of the matching profile pairs.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 7. Time series of the ratio standard deviation(SD)/precision for each species derived from the analysis of the matching ascending/descending profile pairs from July 2002 to March 2004. This ratio is computed averaging the whole standard deviation/precision profiles down to the nominal tangent height of 15 km (i.e. stratosphere). For each species, Black indicates 80S–90 S, Red 80,N–90 N, Blue 60 S–80 S and Green 60 N–80 N regions as a function of time. Solid lines indicate matching pairs within 6 h, while dashed lines within 12 h. The precision includes the precision values given in the MIPAS L2 data and the pT error propagation component for the VMR target species plots.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Precision Validation
of MIPAS

C. Piccolo and A. Dudhia




Fig. 8. Same as Fig. 7 where instead of averaging over the whole profile down to 15 km, the average is only over the lowest three nominal tangent heights from 6 to 12 km (i.e. troposphere).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion