



CERES Angular Distribution Model Working Group Report

Wenying Su

Wenying.Su-1@nasa.gov

NASA LaRC, Hampton VA

Joseph Corbett Lusheng Liang

Zachary Eitzen Victor Sothcott

SSAI, Hampton VA



Delivered Edition 4 ADMs and the ADM methodology paper is published!

Atmos. Meas. Tech., 8, 611–632, 2015
www.atmos-meas-tech.net/8/611/2015/
doi:10.5194/amt-8-611-2015
© Author(s) 2015. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



Atmospheric
Measurement
Techniques



Next-generation angular distribution models for top-of-atmosphere radiative flux calculation from CERES instruments: methodology

W. Su¹, J. Corbett², Z. Eitzen², and L. Liang²

¹MS420, NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, USA

²Science Systems & Applications, Inc., Hampton, Virginia, USA

Correspondence to: W. Su (wenying.su-1@nasa.gov)

Received: 20 June 2014 – Published in Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.: 27 August 2014

Revised: 22 December 2014 – Accepted: 7 January 2015 – Published: 5 February 2015

Abstract. The top-of-atmosphere (TOA) radiative fluxes are critical components to advancing our understanding of the Earth's radiative energy balance, radiative effects of clouds and aerosols, and climate feedback. The Clouds and the Earth's Radiant Energy System (CERES) instruments provide broadband shortwave and longwave radiance measurements. These radiances are converted to fluxes by using scene-type-dependent angular distribution models (ADM). This paper describes the next-generation ADMs that are de-

veloped by combining surface and cloud-top temperature, surface and cloud emissivity, cloud fraction, and precipitable water. Compared to the existing ADMs, the new ADMs change the monthly mean instantaneous fluxes by up to 5 W m^{-2} on a regional scale of 1° latitude \times 1° longitude, but the flux changes are less than 0.5 W m^{-2} on a global scale.

Uncertainties of the monthly regional mean TOA fluxes: direct integration

SW

	Terra 2002		Aqua 2004	
	Bias (Wm ⁻²)	RMS (Wm ⁻²)	Bias (Wm ⁻²)	RMS (Wm ⁻²)
January	0.04	0.97	0.11	1.00
April	0.08	0.79	-0.16	0.75
July	-0.20	1.08	0.11	0.90
October	0.02	0.65	0.15	0.78

LW

January	0.37	0.72	0.29	0.64
April	0.47	0.76	0.37	0.60
July	0.44	0.78	0.31	0.71
October	0.39	0.65	0.36	0.61

WN

January	0.19	0.30	0.18	0.29
April	0.24	0.34	0.21	0.29
July	0.23	0.35	0.19	0.31
October	0.20	0.29	0.22	0.30

Uncertainties of the instantaneous TOA fluxes

- Uncertainties are derived from consistency tests
- Relative consistency is converted to TOA flux error using theoretical relationship

	Ocean		Land		Snow/Ice	
	Clear	All	Clear	All	Clear	All
SW	1.9	9.0	4.5	8.4	6.0	9.9
LW day	1.5	3.5	2.4	2.9	1.3	2.1
LW night	1.4	2.0	1.2	1.9	1.4	1.4

ADM validation paper and sastrugi paper are submitted!

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 1–48, 2015
www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/8/1/2015/
doi:10.5194/amtd-8-1-2015
© Author(s) 2015. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Measurement Techniques (AMT). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in AMT if available.

Next-generation angular distribution models for top-of-atmosphere radiative flux calculation from the CERES instruments: validation

W. Su¹, J. Corbett², Z. Eitzen², and L. Liang²

Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 375–404, 2015
www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/8/375/2015/
doi:10.5194/amtd-8-375-2015
© Author(s) 2015. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Atmospheric Measurement Techniques (AMT). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in AMT if available.

Accounting for the effects of Sastrugi in the CERES Clear-Sky Antarctic shortwave ADMs

J. Corbett¹ and W. Su²


From Aqua to S-NPP

- Footprint size for S-NPP is larger than that for Aqua
- Cloud properties retrieved from VIIRS can also be different from those retrieved from MODIS
- How these differences affect the S-NPP fluxes inverted using Aqua ADMs





	Aqua	S-NPP
Launch date	May 4, 2002	Oct. 28, 2011
Altitude	705 km	824 km
Inclination	98.14°	98.75°
Period	98.4 min	101.4 min

Anisotropic factors are sensitive to cloud properties





- For a footprint with cloud fraction of 20% and cloud optical depth of 4:
 - $\ln(f\tau)=4.38 \longrightarrow R=0.68$
- If cloud fraction increase by 10%
 - $\ln(f\tau)=4.78 \longrightarrow R=0.71$
- This results in ~4.4% difference in inverted fluxes







Comparison between tropical flux inverted from TRMM ADMs and Ed4ADM



Comparison between tropical flux inverted from Ed2ADMs and Ed4ADMs




Comparison between global flux inverted from Ed2ADMs and Ed4ADMs




Does MISR radiance anisotropy change as footprint size changes ?

- SSFM data provide radiance anisotropy of each CERES along-track footprint from nine spatially matched directions
- CERES footprint size changes as viewing zenith angle changes
 - At nadir: 16 by 32 km
 - At $\theta=31^\circ$: 18.5 by 37 km
- Examine MISR 0.56 μm radiance anisotropy from these two different size of footprints




Radiance anisotropy from MISR for different footprint size

- For a CERES footprint, MISR provides spectral radiance measurements from nine angles
- Separate the CERES footprints by cloud type and solar zenith angle
- Calculate the mean radiance for each camera angle from the two different sizes of footprints
- Compare the shape of the normalized radiances
- Difference the normalized radiances, calculate the standard deviation





PCL: CF = 0.1-40%	High: EP < 440 hPa	Thin: $\tau < 3.35$
MCL: CF = 40-99%	Mid: EP = 440-680 hPa	Mod: $\tau = 3.35 - 22.63$
OVC: CF = 99-100%	Low: EP > 680 hPa	Thick: $\tau > 22.63$

Standard deviation for different cloud type and solar zenith angle



Simulate Aqua and NPP footprints to quantify flux error due to different footprint sizes



- Derive broadband radiances for these simulated Aqua and NPP footprints

$$I_{sw}^{md} = d_0 + d_1 I_{0.65} + d_2 I_{0.86} + d_3 I_{1.63}$$

- Based upon the scene identifications of the simulated Aqua and NPP footprints to select the ADMs
- Compare gridded fluxes from these simulated Aqua and NPP footprints to quantify the effect of different footprint size on flux

Rotating Azimuth Plane (RAP) scan for RBI



- Do we need RAP scan mode for RBI?
- If so, how much do we need?
 - Build one set of ADMs with 2 years of RAP measurements: referred to as "2yrADMs"
 - Build another set of ADMs assuming only taking RAP measurements every third day during the 2-year period: referred to as "reduced 2yrADMs"
 - Only tested clear land and clear ocean
- Apply these two sets of ADMs to Aqua data
- Investigate instantaneous flux difference on footprint level and on grid box level

SW angular distribution model over clear land: Modified RossLi

- Collect clear-sky reflectance over $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ regions for every calendar month;
- Stratify reflectance within each $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ region by NDVI (0.1) and $\cos\theta_0$ (0.2), and by elevation variability over rough terrain;
- Apply modified RossLi fit to produce BRDF and ADM for each NDVI and $\cos\theta_0$ intervals within each $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ region.

$$\rho(\mu_0, \mu, \phi) = k_0 + k_1 \cdot B_1(\mu_0, \mu, \phi) + k_2 \cdot B_2(\mu_0, \mu, \phi)$$

from Maignan et al., 2004




Number of clear land ADMs is reduced by 25-30%

# of clear land ADMs	2yr of RAP	RAP every third day
Jan	28555	21303
Apr	48906	33457
Jul	48440	33337
Oct	44094	30562


Footprints with valid fluxes from both sets of ADMs

	Bias (Wm^{-2})	RMS (Wm^{-2})	% of FOVs $ \text{Bias} > 5$	% of FOVs $ \text{Bias} > 10$
Jan	-0.1	3.3	5.8	1.3
Apr	-0.3	4.4	11.2	2.1
Jul	-0.0	3.4	5.3	1.1
Oct	-0.1	3.1	6.2	1.3




Gridded instantaneous flux differences from reduced RAP sampling


200404:Aqua-FM4 ClrLnd 2yrADM flux glbmn= 200.0Wm^{-2}




200407:Aqua-FM4 ClrLnd 2yrADM flux glbmn= 180.4Wm^{-2}



0404:Aqua-FM4 ClrLnd reduced2yrADM-2yrADM Dflux = 0.065Wm^{-2}




0407:Aqua-FM4 ClrLnd reduced2yrADM-2yrADM Dflux = 0.123Wm^{-2}



Clear ocean: missing bin fraction increased by 5~10%


- Clear ocean: $R(w, \theta_0, \theta, \phi, \text{AOD}, \text{aerosol type})$;
- Build one set of clear ocean ADMs using 2 years of RAP measurements;
- Build another set of ADMs using a subset of the these RAP measurements (every third day);





Clear ocean flux difference from these two sets of ADMs

- Apply these two sets of ADMs to one year of cross track data
- The "reduced 2yrADMs" fail to produce fluxes for 2% of the footprints
- The bias and RMS error calculated using matched footprints are 0.0 and 1.2 Wm^{-2} , about 7.3% of the matched footprints with flux difference greater than 2 Wm^{-2}
- Global annual mean gridded instantaneous flux difference is about 0.1 Wm^{-2} , about 10% of the grid boxes have flux difference greater than 1 Wm^{-2} and about 2% of the grid boxes have flux difference greater than 2 Wm^{-2}

Annual mean clear ocean flux from 2yrADMs



Flux difference (reduced2yrADMs-2yrADMs)



Future plan

- Assess the effects of different footprint sizes and inconsistent cloud properties on NPP flux inverted using Aqua ADMs
 - MISR multi-angle measurements
 - Compare gridded fluxes derived from simulated Aqua and NPP footprints
 - Compare the radiance vs. $\ln(f\tau)$ relationship derived using CERES-Aqua with that derived using CERES-NPP. Any difference in this relationship indicates that footprint size affects the ADMs
 - Time series mix-and-match: study global/regional deseasonalized trend using CERES-Aqua, then replacing data after 2012 with CERES-NPP
- Extend the RBI rotating azimuth plane sampling study to cloudy land/ocean