



Atmospheric correction discussion

K. J. Thome

Biospheric Sciences Branch
Goddard Space Flight Center

CEOS/IVOS Sioux Falls, South Dakota

May 9, 2012

Reminder

Ultimate goal of atmospheric correction discussion is to move towards an understanding of the impact of uncertainties in the correction

- Develop a set of recommended approaches to ensure better comparability between different groups
 - Permit development of new methods
 - Create a common starting point for all groups
- Areas for best practices are
 - Radiative transfer code
 - Input parameterization
 - Measurement approaches
 - Instrumentation
 - Retrieval methods



Radiative transfer code

Efforts for last 30 years have examined radiative transfer codes

- Code comparisons show favorable results when given identical inputs
- Still of interest to repeat the radiative transfer code comparison
- Difference is to evaluate processing approaches rather than the codes themselves
 - Use Tuz Golu campaign data to create a standard input data set
 - Use the standard data set to predict at-sensor radiance
 - Compare the at-sensor radiances



Standard data set

Also require a standard data set to allow groups to evaluate their processing approaches

- Web access to standard input and result from an established group using these inputs
 - Good tool for groups initiating new field programs
 - Good tool for groups implementing a new radiative transfer approach
- Rely on an artificial data set
 - Allows coupling of aerosol optical depth and surface reflectance
 - Can limit impacts from input parameterization
- Risk is that it drives users towards simply matching the standard results



Standard data set

Base input data set on a clean aerosol over a moderately bright surface

- Low aerosol absorption reduces impact of aerosol composition selection
- Modest aerosol loading (0.1 at 550 nm)
- Spectral reflectance constant with wavelength
- 45 degree view angle (no ambiguity on elevation versus zenith)
- 60-degree solar zenith angle (large difference in radiance if elevation versus zenith angle confusion)
- Lambertian surface
- Radiance output at 1-nm intervals



Atmospheric parameterization

List of parameters that will be reported include consistently derived multiple formats

- Spectral optical depth (total, component)
- Aerosol optical depth at 550 nm
- Angstrom coefficient (also known as power law exponent)
- Junge parameter
- Surface pressure
- Column water vapor amount
- Column ozone amount
- Aerosol type (colloquial model as well as real and imaginary index of refraction, minimum/maximum radius)
- View-sun geometry
- Surface height
- Sensor height



Sensitivity analysis

Combine the two standard data sets with recommended sensitivity studies to evaluate uncertainties from atmospheric correction

- Tuz Golu data set limits number participants to simplify comparison
- Artificial standard data set expands participants but helps to ensure input parameterization effects are limited
- Trade between insight gained and number of radiative transfer calculations
- Sensitivity studies concentrate on impact from
 - Atmospheric parameterization
 - Atmospheric uncertainties
 - Surface reflectance
 - Ignore lambertian vs. non-lambertian for now
- Gives insight into errors with largest impact on results
- Sensitivity is site dependent
 - Surface reflectance value
 - Aerosol composition



Summary for this IVOS

Toulouse meeting and yesterday's discussions give a path forward for developing best practices for atmospheric correction

- Radiative transfer code intercomparison
 - Simplify Tuz Golu comparison of at-sensor radiance by limiting number of data sets
 - Standard input data set for “training”
- Guidance on sensitivity analyses will help groups understand significant differences from standard output
- Compiling results leads to a set of best practices
 - Processing schemes
 - Input parameterization
 - Recommended measurement approaches
- Reduction of Type B errors in radiative transfer predictions must await more accurate imaging sensors

