

Introduction

- Measurements of atmospheric water vapor provide useful information for a wide range of applications including hydrological cycle studies, radiation budget studies, weather forecasting, and climate change studies.
- While many existing ground-based networks provide highly precise and accurate measurements of water vapor, the large temporal and spatial variability of water vapor results in the need for additional information on a global scale.
- In this work, we investigate the accuracy of Orbiting Carbon Observatory-2 (OCO-2) total column water vapor (TCWV) measurements by comparing them to observations from SuomiNet, the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer-2 (AMSR-2), and the Aerosol RObotic NETwork (AERONET).




Figure 1. Location of SuomiNet sites (purple), AERONET sites (green), and AMSR-2 grid cells (blue) that have a valid OCO-2 meas. co-located in time & space from 6 Sep. 2014 to 10 Feb. 2016.

Data & Methodology

- Though OCO-2's primary mission is to measure the total column of atmospheric carbon dioxide (X_{CO_2}), it also measures total column water vapor with the NASA Atmospheric CO₂ Observations from Space (ACOS) X_{CO_2} retrieval algorithm^{1,2} using information contained in two near-infrared absorption bands at 1.6 and 2.05 μm (Fig. 2).
- SuomiNet measures TCWV at over 300 locations, mostly in North America, using phase delays in GPS signals³. AERONET is a collection of several hundred sun photometers⁴. Both networks have reported accuracies of better than 2.0 mm.
- AMSR-2 is a polar-orbiting microwave radiometer that measures TCWV over water using emissions from the surface and atmosphere⁵.
- OCO-2 measurements from 6 Sep. 2014 to 10 Feb. 2016 were co-located with the other measurements to within 0.1° and 30 minutes. Co-located measurements over land with large differences in surface pressure were removed to ensure the same column of air was being compared.




Figure 2. Example of OCO-2 weak CO₂ band (left panel) and strong CO₂ band (right panel) spectra demonstrating the prevalence of water vapor absorption features (blue lines).




Figure 3. Binned retrieved OCO-2 total column water vapor for 2015. Extremely large values are not seen, as OCO-2 only measures in clear-sky conditions.




Figure 4. Left: prior OCO-2 TCWV (via the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Integrated Forecast System (ECMWF IFS)⁶) vs. SuomiNet TCWV. Top: x-y comparison. Bottom: differences (prior OCO-2 TCWV - SuomiNet TCWV) vs. SuomiNet TCWV. Right: same but for retrieved OCO-2 TCWV.




Figure 5. Same as Fig. 3, but with AERONET TCWV measurements.




Figure 6. Same as Figs. 4 & 5, but with AMSR-2 measurements and log(N) bins.




Figure 7. Standard deviation of the differences (thin line) and RMSE (thick line) of the prior OCO-2 TCWV (blue) and the retrieved OCO-2 TCWV (green) relative to SuomiNet (left) and AMSR-2 (right).

Results

- The prior OCO-2 TCWV (taken from the ECMWF IFS) differences relative to SuomiNet and AMSR-2 have a consistent standard deviation of 2.2 mm. The retrieved OCO-2 TCWV is able to reduce the scatter down to 1.4 mm relative to SuomiNet (Fig. 4) and 0.8 mm relative to AMSR-2 (Fig. 6). This represents a 67% reduction in the variance relative to the prior (compared to SuomiNet) and an 87% reduction relative to the prior (compared to AMSR-2).
- The mean prior bias against SuomiNet is 1.6% while the mean retrieved bias is 3.5%. For AERONET the prior bias is 12.5% and the retrieved bias is 9.3% (likely due to low number statistics or a bias in AERONET itself). For AMSR-2 the prior bias is -2.7% and the retrieved bias is -1.5%.
- The retrieved OCO-2 TCWV differences are less temporally sensitive than the prior differences relative to both SuomiNet & AMSR-2 (Fig. 7).
- These results are not significantly dependent on our spatial or temporal co-location criteria.

Conclusions

- OCO-2 is able to accurately and precisely measure total column water vapor, with an RMSE of 1.3 mm relative to SuomiNet and an RMSE of 0.8 mm relative to AMSR-2.
- The OCO-2 retrieval is able to reduce the variance in the TCWV differences by 67% (relative to SuomiNet) and 87% (relative to AMSR-2), compared to the ECMWF IFS prior.
- Future work includes investigating the source of the differences between the OCO-2 TCWV measurements and the SuomiNet and AMSR-2 measurements, including co-location and retrieval errors.

References

- Crisp et al.: OCO (Orbiting Carbon Observatory)-2 Level 2 Full Physics Retrieval Algorithm Theoretical Basis, Tech. Rep. OCO D-65488, Tech. rep., NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, version 1.0 Rev 4, 70 available at: http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/acdisc/documentation/OCO-2_L2_FP_ATBD_v1_rev4_Nov10.pdf (last access: January 2012), 2010.
- O'Dell et al.: The ACOS CO₂ retrieval algorithm - Part 1: description and validation against synthetic observations, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 5, 99-121, doi:10.5194/amt-5-99-2012, 2012.
- Ware et al.: SuomiNet: A Real-Time National GPS Network for Atmospheric Research and Education, Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc., 81(4), 677-694, doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477\(2000\)081<0677:SARNGN>2.3.CO;2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0477(2000)081<0677:SARNGN>2.3.CO;2), 2000
- Holben et al.: AERONET - a federated instrument network and data archive for aerosol characterization, Remote Sens. Environ., 66, 1-16, doi:10.1016/S0034-4257(98)00031-5, 1998.
- Imaoka et al.: Instrument performance and calibration of AMSR-E and AMSR-2, Int. Arch. Photogramm., Remote Sens. Spat. Inf. Sci., 38.8, 13-18, 2010
- ECMWF IFS documentation, available at: <https://software.ecmwf.int/wiki/display/IFS/Official+IFS+Documentation>, last access: February 2016.