

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays from atmospheric reanalyses and radiometers and their impact on the altimeter sea level

J.-F. Legeais, M. Ablain, and S. Thao

Collecte Localisation Satellites, Parc Technologique du canal, 8–10 rue Hermès,
31520 Ramonville Saint-Agne, France

Received: 26 March 2014 – Accepted: 7 May 2014 – Published: 23 June 2014

Correspondence to: J.-F. Legeais (jlegeais@cls.fr)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Abstract

The assessment of long-term errors in altimeter sea level measurements is essential for studies related to the mean sea level (MSL) evolution. One of the main contributors to the long-term sea level uncertainties is the correction of the altimeter range from the wet troposphere path delay, which is provided by onboard microwave radiometers for the main altimeter missions. The wet troposphere correction (WTC) derived from the operational European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) atmospheric model is usually used as a reference for comparison with the radiometer WTC. However, due to several improvements of the processing, this model is not homogenous over the altimetry period (from 1993 onwards), preventing the detection of errors in the radiometer WTC, especially in the first altimetry decade. In this study, we determine the quality of WTC provided by the operational ECMWF atmospheric model in comparison with the fields derived from the ERA Interim (ECMWF) and the National Centers for Environmental Predictions/National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCEP/NCAR) reanalyses. Separating our analyses on several temporal and spatial scales, we demonstrate that ERA Interim provides the best modeled WTC for the altimeter sea level at climate scales. This allows us to better evaluate the radiometer WTC errors, especially for the first altimetry decade (1993–2002), and thus to improve the altimeter MSL error budget. This work also demonstrates the relevance of the feedbacks that the “altimetry” and “atmosphere” communities can bring to each other.

1 Introduction

Since the early 1990s, sea level has been monitored by several altimeter space missions. These measurements have become essential in the understanding of the impact of climate change on mean sea level (MSL) evolution at global and regional scales, particularly in the coastal areas of the world (Willis and Church, 2012). However, ensuring the long-term consistency and stability of altimeter measurements is challenging. The

OSD

11, 1613–1642, 2014

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



To reduce the risks of misinterpreting the observed drifts, different methods have been developed to detect, assess and correct these instrumental drifts. Examples include comparison with other radiometers and with other independent data sets (GPS, radio sounding, etc.) (Keihm et al., 2000; Zlotnicki and Desai, 2004). An illustration of this was the detection of the spurious drift of the early TOPEX TMR measurements (Fu and Haines, 2012). The Jason-1 and Jason-2 radiometers (JMR and AMR, respectively) have benefited from an internal calibration thanks to the noise diode system (Brown et al., 2007), but the associated WTC is affected by spurious jumps (Brown et al., 2011). The long-term survey of the measured brightness temperatures over naturally stable cold or hot terrestrial targets have provided a reduction of the JMR drift from 3 to 0.1 mm yr⁻¹ (Brown et al., 2007). For Jason-2, a semiautonomous radiometer calibration system (ARCS) aims to remove the largest jumps of the AMR measurements before the production of geophysical data records. However, it was not designed for climate-oriented calibration (Brown et al., 2011). For Jason-3, planned to be launched in 2015, a periodic cold-sky look has been proposed that can be achieved by pointing the radiometer antenna into open space. This should improve the stability of the associated WTC and significantly reduce the time required to perform a climate-quality calibration. Finally, the radiometer drift can also be detected by comparison with the WTC derived from meteorological numerical models. The instrumental WTC is preferred to the modeled correction since it provides a better estimation of the wet troposphere path delay with respect to precision, sensitivity and spatial sampling (Stum, 1994; Urban et al., 2001). However, the modeled corrections remain one of the few independent references to assess the quality of the radiometer corrections. Usually, the operational model derived from ECMWF (European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts) (Molteni et al., 1996) is used to make these comparisons. Drift, jumps and maneuvers have already been highlighted on TOPEX, Jason-1, Jason-2 and Envisat onboard radiometers (Obligis et al., 2010). The quality of ECMWF operational WTC is not, however, homogenous over the altimetry period (from 1993 onwards). This is due to several processing evolutions which produce jumps or drift, preventing or reducing

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



our ability to detect errors on radiometer WTC, especially in the first altimetry decade. Atmospheric reanalyses such as the ECMWF ERA Interim (Dee et al., 2011) or that of the National Centers for Environmental Predictions/National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCEP/NCAR) (Kalnay et al., 1996) have been more uniformly processed than the operational model and should not be affected by jumps. The objective of this study is to better characterize the radiometer uncertainties by comparing the instrumental correction of the main altimeter missions over the entire altimeter era with all of these modeled WTC. This should determine whether one of these modeled corrections can be used as a reference to assess the radiometer WTC performances. The novelty of our approach is that the assessment of modeled and instrumental WTC is performed through the analysis of altimeter sea level calculation and by separating several spatial and temporal scales well representative of climate signals.

A description of the method of comparison and the data used in this study is described in the next section. Then the quality of the modeled WTC is analyzed at short temporal scales. In the following section, the long-term stability of the WTC is discussed at global and regional scales. The ability to reproduce annual and interannual signals is then presented and a summary and discussion are provided.

2 Data and methods

2.1 Models of wet troposphere corrections

The ERA Interim WTC is based on the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) interim reanalyses (Dee et al., 2011) and it corresponds to the latest global atmospheric reanalysis of the model. The operational ECMWF WTC is produced by EUMETSAT using 3-D data from the ECMWF model to generate wet troposphere estimations. NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (Kalnay et al., 1996) is provided by NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD, Boulder, Colorado, USA, and is available from their website at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/>. These three data sets are available as 4-times-daily

global grids with a $0.7^\circ \times 0.7^\circ$ spatial resolution for ERA Interim, an increasing resolution over the altimetry era from $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ up to $0.12^\circ \times 0.12^\circ$ for the operational ECMWF model and a $2.5^\circ \times 2.5^\circ$ for the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis.

2.2 Altimeter data used

5 The altimetry era (1993–2012) has been sampled by two time series derived from the TOPEX/Poseidon (TP), Jason-1 (J1) and Jason-2 (J2) missions and also from the ERS-1 (E1), ERS-2 (E2) and Envisat (EN) missions. As each satellite platform has its own onboard radiometer with different spatial coverage and temporal resolution, both time series have been used for this study in order to better validate the results. The
10 altimeter measurements used are the Archiving, Validation, Interpretation of Satellite Oceanographic (AVISO) data (AVISO, 2013). The radiometer WTC is generally directly derived from level-2 altimeter products, usually called geophysical data records (GDR). However in order to use the latest and best correction available, there are some exceptions. For Jason-1, we have applied the enhanced Jason-1 Microwave Radiometer
15 (Brown et al., 2010) corrections containing better wet troposphere path delay corrections along with better land, rain and ice flagging for coastal regions than that found in the GDR-C release. For TOPEX, the radiometer WTC included in T/P Mixed-GDR products (M-GDR) has been corrected with a drift correction (Scharoo et al., 2004) and empirical correction of yaw maneuvers (TOPEX 2005 annual validation report, AVISO, 2006). For Jason-2, the correction is derived from the GDR-D release. Concerning ESA
20 missions, for Envisat, we use a very recent correction (internal technical note: reprocessing of RA2-MWR v2.1b. CLS-DOS-NT-13-114.), allowing for improvement in the small temporal scales (< 20 days) of sea level. For ERS-2, we use an updated correction derived from a neuronal algorithm (Obligis et al., 2006). For the ERS-1 mission,
25 the correction of the OPR product (ERS equivalent of GDR product) is used.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



2.3 Strategy and method of comparison

In order to accurately compare WTC between models and radiometers, we interpolate the model's grids in space and time (by bilinear interpolation) on the satellite ground tracks. This reduces the effect of the spatiotemporal sampling of altimeters. Another main interest is to directly calculate the altimeter sea surface height (SSH) using successively WTC derived from models and radiometers. Analyzing the differences between altimeter sea level estimations computed with different corrections, we are able to assess the quality of WTC separating the main signals representative of climate scales.

The analyses are focused on the long-term evolution (trend over period higher than 10 years) of the global and regional sea level which is relevant for climate studies. Global and regional trend differences between models and radiometers are computed over the 20 years of the altimetry era (from 1993 onwards) applying the MSL calculation method described in the AVISO website (<http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/en/data/products/ocean-indicators-products/mean-sea-level.html>).

We also analyze interannual (signals between 2 and 5 years) and annual signals, which are of great interest in explaining the complex mechanisms of the ocean variability. Llovel et al. (2011) have shown that the interannual global MSL variations could be linked to land water storage oscillations, especially during ENSO events. A better description of these signals requires a very accurate calculation of the GMSL at interannual timescales, and thus it is fundamental to determine WTC errors at these temporal scales.

Finally, we also estimate the impact of WTC at smaller scales (lower than 10 days). These scales are indirectly linked with climate scales since high temporal frequency errors increase the formal error estimation of larger temporal signals previously described. The impact of using various models of WTC on the SSH performances is estimated by computing the variance of the SSH differences between ascending and descending tracks of each altimeter. Crossover points with time lags less than 10 days

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



than its reanalysis. This smaller impact than expected could be related to coastal areas which are not included in these statistics (bathymetry deeper than -1000 m), but this remains to be investigated. Charts in the top panels of Fig. 1 indicate that the ERA Interim reanalysis provides a significant improvement in the altimeter SSH performances compared with the NCEP/NCAR model (negative variance differences). The variance reduction remains relatively constant over the altimeter era regardless of whether it is computed with the TP/J1/J2 time series (5 cm^2) or with the E1/E2/EN measurements (6 cm^2). Thanks to this gain in performance with the ERA Interim WTC, the impact of using this reanalysis is now estimated by comparison with radiometer WTC at crossovers. The bottom panels of Fig. 1 display the temporal evolutions of the variance differences and clearly indicate better performances of the radiometers (positive variance differences) at these timescales. The increase in variance is relatively constant over the 20 years of both altimeter time series (between 1 and 2 cm^2).

3.2 Regional scales

Figure 2 displays the spatial distribution of the crossover SSH variance differences. The period of study is separated over the two decades of the altimetry era (1993–2002, 2002–2011) in order to take into account the evolution of the operational ECMWF model's quality. The better results obtained with ERA Interim compared with the operational ECMWF model over the first decade are spatially homogeneously distributed between 50° S and 50° N with a variance reduction of 10 cm^2 at low latitudes. This constitutes a drastic improvement in the SSH estimations. Over the second decade (upper right panel of Fig. 2), the SSH variance reduction obtained with the reanalysis is restricted to latitudes lower than 30° , where the wet troposphere physical content is higher, with differences less than 3 cm^2 . No impact is observed at these timescales at higher latitudes.

The bottom panels of Fig. 2 show the impact of using the ERA Interim reanalysis WTC compared with the use of the radiometer WTC. The positive values indicate that the altimeter SSH performances are deteriorated with the model by a relatively

homogeneous magnitude over the altimeter period. Slightly higher differences are observed in the western part of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, with values up to 5 cm² in this latter basin.

Thus, at short temporal scales and as expected, improved altimeter SSH performances are obtained with the use of microwave radiometers, demonstrating the importance of the availability of such instruments onboard satellite altimeters. However, the radiometer WTC performances are better characterized at small temporal scales with the ERA Interim reanalysis since it provides significantly improved results compared with the use of the operational ECMWF model (notably over the first altimetry decade) and the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (over the entire altimetry era). Longer timescales are also impacted by an improved precision at smaller ones since the formal error is reduced when adjusting annual signals or trends difference between models and radiometer WTC.

4 The long-term stability of the altimeter sea level

4.1 Global mean sea level

The impact of using the modeled WTC instead of the radiometer correction is now analyzed in terms of the global drift of the altimeter SSH anomalies. The suitability of reanalyses to characterize trends and the drift of the wet troposphere parameter in particular has already been discussed (Bengtsson et al., 2004; Dessler and Davis, 2010; Thorne and Vose, 2010); those studies suggest a strong sensitivity to the computational methods and to the data assimilation (changes in the global observing system). Here, we want to determine whether a modeled WTC can be used to detect a drift of the radiometers and which model is the most adapted.

Figure 3 presents the temporal evolution of differences between altimeter sea levels corrected from different WTC, where the biases between the different radiometers have been removed. The differences between the operational ECMWF model and the

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



radiometer correction (bottom panels) present a high variability (standard deviation of 1.1 and 0.6 cm for the TP/J1/J2 and E1/E2/EN time series, respectively) with some jumps as in 2002 (1 cm). This evolution is attributed to the upgrades of the operational model and illustrates that the stability of the operational model's outputs can not be guaranteed. Similar to the case of the ERS-1 anomaly observed in 1994 (see Sect. 3), we believe that the 2 cm jump observed in 1998 with TP data only is related to the update of the correction in the altimeter products. The variability of the global MSL differences is drastically reduced when the ERA Interim (upper panels) and NCEP/NCAR (middle panels) reanalyses are compared with the instrumental correction since the re-analyzed time series are much more stable than the outputs of the operational model. The standard deviation of the differences is slightly reduced with ERA Interim compared with the other reanalysis, regardless of the altimeter data used (0.1 cm vs. 0.2 cm for the TP/J1/J2 time series). The ERA Interim WTC has the closest long-term behavior to the radiometers, which suggests that the stability of the instrumental WTC can be analyzed in more detail by comparison with this reanalysis.

Analyzing thoroughly the temporal evolution of the differences between the modeled and the instrumental WTC, a “parabolic” signal is highlighted (Fig. 3, top panels) for the TP/J1/J2 time series as well as for the E1/E2/EN one. Similar evolution is depicted with the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis but not as significantly (middle panels). To better highlight this signal, the temporal evolution of the former difference is shown in Fig. 4 with a reduced range of the ordinate axis, with both altimeter time series and the associated trends computed separately for the two decades. The drift of the ERA Interim reanalysis compared with the radiometer correction is of $+0.4 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ over the first period and -0.5 and -0.7 mm yr^{-1} over the second period with the TP/J1/J2 and E1/E2/EN time series, respectively. We would like to know whether this evolution is attributed to the radiometers or to the reanalyzed fields.

The answer to this is not obvious. On the one hand, as the two consecutive linear signals are similarly observed when using the two different radiometer time series, and as the onboard microwave radiometers are different and a priori independent, this

**Evaluation of wet
troposphere path
delays**

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



right), the MSL trend differences reach almost $+1.0 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ in the equatorial Indian and Pacific oceans and they are relatively homogeneously distributed elsewhere, with an average of -0.5 mm yr^{-1} . This confirms that the operational model is not adapted to assess the regional MSL trends, particularly with the first altimeter records. Secondly, the MSL trends obtained with the WTC derived from the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis and the radiometer (bottom panels) depict differences of more than $\pm 3.0 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$, with a strong spatial variability at low and midlatitudes over the global altimeter period. Finally, the ERA Interim WTC provides the smallest differences in regional altimeter MSL trends compared with the ones derived from the radiometer (Fig. 5, upper panels). The discrepancies are mainly distributed along the Equator and are in the range of $\pm 0.5 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ over both altimetry decades. No significant geographical bias is observed. However, these reduced differences do not necessarily constitute a true criterion of quality and the spatial variability of the MSL trend differences with the radiometer is also taken into account. This is reduced the most with the ERA Interim reanalysis, especially for the first altimetry decade.

The performances of both reanalyses could not really be distinguished in regard to the impact on the global MSL trend (see previous section), but the regional approach reveals that the WTC derived from the ERA Interim reanalysis is substantially better for assessing the radiometer's stability and thus the long-term evolution of the altimeter MSL. We can not determine whether the remaining MSL trend differences obtained when comparing the ERA Interim reanalysis and the radiometer are attributed to the model or to the instrument. However, these comparisons contribute to better estimation of the errors in the radiometer at these timescales.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



centimeters between the annual signal amplitudes estimated with the WTC derived from the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis and from the radiometers, with a strong spatial variability at low and midlatitudes regardless of which period is considered. Secondly, the difference in amplitude obtained with the ECMWF operational model vs. the radiometer (Fig. 7, middle panels) is large (1 cm) over the first altimetry decade and displays significant discrepancies until 50° latitude. Improved results are observed over the second decade with differences less than 5 mm. Finally, the smallest differences and the most reduced spatial variability is detected with the ERA Interim reanalysis over the whole altimetry period (top panels of Fig. 7), with differences in the radiometer of less than 5 mm, mainly zonally distributed at low and midlatitudes (< 30°). The reanalysis provides slightly greater amplitude along the Equator and reduced at 10–30° latitude. These results are similar to that obtained with the operational model after the year 2000. The ERA Interim reanalysis is thus considered to have the best performances for the regional estimation of the annual signal of the WTC. This result is confirmed by the analysis of the phase of the annual signal (Fig. 8): very low phase differences are obtained with ERA Interim reanalysis (< 5 days) over the whole altimetry period, whereas the ECMWF operational model and the NCEP/NCAR reanalysis provide stronger differences (up to 30 days). There is no evidence to attribute the remaining differences between ERA Interim and the radiometer to the model or to the instrument. However, like for the MSL trends, these results contribute to better estimation of the radiometer errors for the estimation of the annual signals and thus refine the altimeter sea level budget error at these timescales.

5.3 Interannual signals

As explained previously, MSL variations at interannual timescale (2–5 years) are of main interest for climate studies. Thus, a very good knowledge of the altimetry errors is required at these timescales, especially for the water vapor in the atmosphere, whose natural variations may be on the same order as that of the global MSL (a few millimeters) (Lagerloef et al., 1999; Cazenave et al., 2012). In both cases, for the MSL

and wet troposphere contents, these interannual evolutions are strongly correlated with interannual ENSO oscillations (Nerem et al., 1999).

To analyze the differences at these timescales, we compare time series of different WTC over a few years (Fig. 9). Differences between the modeled and a radiometer WTC reveal distinct behaviors during the ENSO La Niña event of 2008. Except for the one derived from the operational ECMWF model, all corrections display a decrease in the wet troposphere path delay from the end of 2007 (drier atmosphere) followed by an increase after mid-2008. A global difference of 3 mm is observed compared with the radiometer and the other modeled corrections. As it corresponds to the order of magnitude of the signals that we want to detect, this illustrates the difficulty in providing an appropriate reference to assess the performances of the microwave radiometers at the interannual timescales. This also highlights that the associated variations of the water cycle in the atmosphere are better reproduced with global reanalyses rather than with operational models. The estimation of the interannual signals could thus constitute an improvement target in these models.

6 Discussion and conclusions

The radar altimeter range needs to be corrected from the path delay associated with water vapor content of the troposphere. Onboard microwave radiometers are preferred to provide the associated WTC since they remain the most precise and sensitive solution for estimating the highly variable wet troposphere signals with enough spatial and temporal sampling. The aim of this study was to determine to which extent a modeled correction could be used as a reference to assess the quality of the instrumental WTC, which further enables MSL climate estimations. To do this, the instrumental corrections of main altimeter missions have been compared with modeled WTC over the whole altimeter era thanks to intermediate data constituted by the altimeter measurements, separating different temporal and spatial scales. The WTC derived from the ERA Interim reanalysis appears to be the most adapted modeled reference to perform

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



5 this quality assessment, particularly over the first altimetry decade: it provides a significant improvement in the altimeter SSH performances at small scales (less than 10 days) compared with the ECMWF operational modeled correction and it is substantially better for assessing the radiometer's stability and thus the long-term evolution of the altimeter MSL at regional scales. These results help to better characterize the altimeter sea level uncertainties associated with the wet troposphere path delay. This directly contributes to the refinement of the altimeter MSL error budget, which is fundamental for answering the user's requirements for climate applications.

10 However, some errors remain, particularly for the representation of the low-frequency variability of the water cycle in atmospheric reanalyses. The two linear evolutions observed over both altimetry decades when comparing the modeled WTC with the instrumental correction (Fig. 4) could be related to an anomaly detected in global atmospheric reanalyses such as ERA Interim. Indeed, in the context of the so-called “rain assimilation”, the number of precipitate water content (PWC) retrievals from SSM/I satellites is not taken into account properly and the ERA Interim atmosphere becomes too dry (wet) whenever a SSM/I satellite is introduced (withdrawn) in the rain assimilation process (P. Poli, personal communication, 2013). As several increases in the number of PWC retrievals occurred before 2001 and some decreases occurred from 2002 onwards, this could contribute to the observed evolution in Fig. 4.

20 This study demonstrates the benefit of using independent altimeter measurements to validate some fields of atmospheric reanalyses, such as the water vapor content of the wet troposphere. Similar work has also recently been performed for the pressure and wind fields derived from ERA Interim and other models (Carrere et al., 2014). In this way, interactions between the “altimetry” and “atmosphere” communities are relevant since the expertise of each one can provide feedbacks to the other. Our approach will be adapted to assess the performances of other atmospheric reanalyses such as the new JRA-55 (Ebita et al., 2011) or the ERA-Clim/ERA-Sat reanalysis (Dee, 2012). The Japanese product, now available, is very promising, particularly because it may be free of the aforementioned problems related to the “rain assimilation”.

Acknowledgements. This work has been performed within the framework of the ESA Climate Change Initiative (CCI) project. We are grateful for the contribution of Jérôme Benveniste from ESA and also for the fruitful discussions with Nicolas Picot from CNES within the SALP project. We thank Paul Poli from ECMWF for the elements of discussion he gave us on the ERA Interim reanalysis.

References

Ablain, M., Cazenave, A., Valladeau, G., and Guinehut, S.: A new assessment of the error budget of global mean sea level rate estimated by satellite altimetry over 1993–2008, *Ocean Sci.*, 5, 193–201, doi:10.5194/os-5-193-2009, 2009.

Ablain, M., Larnicol, G., Faugere, Y., Cazenave, A., Meyssignac, B., Picot, N., and Benveniste, J.: Error Characterization of Altimetry Measurements at Climate Scales. Proceedings of the 20 years of progress in radar altimetry symposium, Venice, available at: http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/OSTST/2012/oral/02_friday_28/04_errors_uncertainties_l/03_EU1_Ablain.pdf (last access: 20 March 2014), 2012.

Andersson, E., Bauer, P., Beljaars, A., Chevallier, F., Holm, E., Janiskova, M., Kallberg, P., Kelly, G., Lopez, P., McNally, A., Moreau, E., Simmons, A. J., Thépaut, J.-N., and Tompkins, A. M.: Assimilation and Modeling of the Atmospheric Hydrological Cycle in the ECMWF Forecasting System. *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 86, 387–402, doi:10.1175/BAMS-86-3-387, 2005.

AVISO: TOPEX/Poseidon validation activities, 13 years of T/P data (GDR-Ms), CLS.DOS/NT/05.240. SALP-RP-MA-EA-21315-CLS, available at: www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/calval/validation_report/TP/annual_report_tp_2005.pdf (last access: 20 March 2014), 2006.

AVISO 2013: SSALTO/DUACS User Handbook: (M)SLA and (M)ADT Near-Real Time and Delayed Time Products, CLS-DOS-NT-06-034, SALP-MU-P-EA-21065-CLS, 2013.

Bengtsson, L., Hagemann, S., and Hodges, K. I.: Can climate trends be calculated from reanalysis data?, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, D11111, doi:10.1029/2004JD004536, 2004.

Brown, S.: A novel near-land radiometer wet path-delay retrieval algorithm: application to the Jason-2/OSTM advanced microwave radiometer, *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, 48, 1986–1992, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2009.2037220, 2010.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Brown, S., Desai, S., Wenwen, L., and Tanner, A. B.: On the long-term stability of microwave radiometers using noise diodes for calibration, *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, 45, 1908–1920, doi:10.1109/TGRS.2006.888098, 2007.

Brown, S., Desai, S., and Sibthorpe, A.: Error structures in the altimetry data from the Wet Tropospheric Path Delay correction, in: *Proceedings of the OSTST Meeting, Lisbon*, available at: http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/OSTST/2010/oral/19_Tuesday/Brown.pdf (last access: 20 March 2014), 2010.

Brown, S., Desai, S., and Sibthorpe, A.: Improvements to the radiometer processing for GDR-D, in: *Proceedings of the OSTST meeting, San Diego CA*, http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/OSTST/2011/oral/02_Thursday/Splinter%205%20IP/04_Brown.pdf, 2011.

Carrère, L.: Improvement of DAC for climate and mesoscale studies using the ERA-Interim dataset, in preparation, 2014.

Cazenave, A., Chambers, D. P., Cipollini, P., Fu, L.-L., Hurrell, J. W., Merrifield, M., Nerem, R. S., Plag, H. P., Shum, C. K., and Willis, J.: The challenge for measuring sea level rise and regional and global trends, in: *Proceedings of OceanObs'09: Sustained Ocean Observations and Information for Society*, edited by: Hall, J., Harrison, D. E., and Stammer, D., vol. 1, European Space Agency, Noordwijk, the Netherlands, 135–152, (ESA Special Publication WPP-306), 2010.

Couhert, A., Cerri, L., Legeais, J.-F., Ablain, M., Zelensky, N., Haines, B., Lemoine, F., Bertiger, W., Desai, S., and Otten, M.: Towards the 1 mm/y stability of the radial orbit error at regional scales, *Adv. Space Res.*, in press, 2014.

Dee, D. P.: The forefront of climate monitoring, *International innovation*, available at: http://www.era-clim.eu/news/p27-29_ERA_Clim_LowRes.pdf (last access: 20 March 2014), 2012.

Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., Andrae, U., Balmaseda, M. A., Balsamo, G., Bauer, P., Bechtold, P., Beljaars, A. C. M., van de Berg, L., Bidlot, J., Bormann, N., Delsol, C., Dragani, R., Fuentes, M., Geer, A. J., Haimberger, L., Healy, S. B., Hersbach, H., Holm, E. V., Isaksen, L., Kallberg, P., Kohler, M., Matricardi, M., McNally, A. P., Monge-Sanz, B. M., Morcrette, J.-J., Park, B.-K., Peubey, C., de Rosnay, P., Tavolato, C., Thépaut, J.-N., and F. Vitart The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system, *Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 137, 553–597, doi:10.1002/qj.828, 2011.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



- Dessler, A. E. and Davis, S. M.: Trends in tropospheric humidity from reanalysis systems, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 115, D19127, doi:10.1029/2010JD014192, 2010.
- Ebita, A., Kobayashi, S., Ota, Y., Moriya, M., Kumabe, R., Onogi, K., Harada, Y., Yasui S., Miyaoaka, K., Takahashi, K., Kamahori, H., Kobayashi, C., Endo, H., Soma, M., Oikawa, Y., and Ishimizu, T.: The Japanese 55-year Reanalysis “JRA-55”: An interim report, *SOLA*, 7, 149–152, doi:10.2151/sola.2011-038, 2011.
- Fu, L.-L. and Haines, B. J.: The challenges in long-term altimetry calibration for addressing the problem of global sea level change, *Adv. Space Res.*, 51, 1284–1300, doi:10.1016/j.asr.2012.06.005, 2012.
- Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Zhu, Y., Leetmaa, A., Reynolds, R., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Higgins, W., Janowiak, J., Mo, K. C., Ropelewski, C., Wang, J., Jenne, R., and Joseph, D.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-year reanalysis project, *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 77, 437–470, doi:10.1175/1520-0477(1996)077<0437:TNYRP>2.0.CO;2, 1996.
- Keihm, S., Zlotnicki, J. V., and Ruf, C. S.: TOPEX microwave radiometer performance evaluation, *IEEE T. Geosci. Remote*, 38, 1379–1386, 2000.
- Lagerloef, G. S. E., Mitchum, G. T., Lukas, R. B., and Niiler, P. P.: Tropical Pacific near-surface currents estimated from altimeter, wind, and drifter data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 23313–23326, doi:10.1029/1999JC900197, 1999.
- Llovel, W., Becker, M., Cazenave, A., Jevrejeva, S., Alkama, R., Decharme, B., Douville, H., Ablain, M., and Beckley, B.: Terrestrial waters and sea level variations on interannual time scale, *Global Planet. Change*, 75, 76–82, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2010.10.008, 2011.
- Molteni, F., Buizza, R., Palmer, T. N., and Petroliagis, T.: The ECMWF ensemble prediction system: methodology and validation, *Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 122, 73–119, doi:10.1002/qj.49712252905, 1996.
- Nedoluha, G. E., Bevilacqua, R. M., Gomez, R. M., Waltman, W. B., Hicks, B. C., Thacker, D. L., and Matthews, W. A.: Measurements of water vapor in the middle atmosphere and implications for mesospheric transport, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101, 21183–21193, doi:10.1029/96JD01741, 1996.
- Nerem, R. S., Chambers, D. P., Leuliette, E. W., Mitchum, G. T., and Giese, B. S.: Variations in global mean sea level associated with the 1997–1998 ENSO event: implications for measuring long term sea level change, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 26, 3005–3008, 1999.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Obligis, E., Eymard, L., Tran, N., Labroue, S., and Femenias, P.: First three years of the microwave radiometer aboard ENVISAT: in-flight calibration, processing, and validation of the geophysical products, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 23, 802–814, 2006.

Obligis, E., Eymard, L., Ablain, M., Picard, B., Legeais, J.-F., Faugère, Y., and Picot, N.: The wet tropospheric correction for altimetry missions: a Mean Sea Level issue, in: Proceedings of the OSTST meeting, Lisbon, available at: http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/OSTST/2010/oral/19_Tuesday/OBLIGIS.pdf (last access: 20 March 2014), 2010.

Scharroo, R., Lillibridge, J., and Smith, W. H. F.: Cross-calibration and long-term monitoring of the microwave radiometers of ERS, Topex, GFO, Jason-1 and Envisat, *Mar. Geod.*, 97, 279–297, doi:10.1080/01490410490465265, 2004.

Seele, C. and Hartogh, P.: Water vapor of the polar middle atmosphere: annual variation and summer mesosphere Conditions as observed by ground-based microwave spectroscopy, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 26, 1517–1520, doi:10.1029/1999GL900315, 1999.

Stum, J.: A comparison between TOPEX microwave radiometer, ERS 1 microwave radiometer, and European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasting derived wet tropospheric corrections, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 24927–24939, doi:10.1029/94JC01104, 1994.

Stum, J.: A comparison of the brightness temperatures and water vapor path delays measured by the TOPEX, ERS-1, and ERS-2 Microwave Radiometers, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.*, 15, 987–994, 1998.

Thorne, P. W. and Vose, R. S.: Reanalyses Suitable for Characterizing Long-Term Trends. *B. Am. Meteorol. Soc.*, 91, 353–361, doi:10.1175/2009BAMS2858.1, 2010.

Urban, T. J., Pekker, T., Tapley, B. D., Kruizinga, G. L., and Shum, C. K.: A multiyear intercomparison of wet troposphere corrections from TOPEX/Poseidon, ERS-1 and ERS-2 microwave radiometers and the European centre for medium-range weather forecasts model, *J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans*, 106, 19657–19669, doi:10.1029/2001JC000486, 2001.

Willis, J. K. and Church, J. A.: Regional sea-level projection, *Perspect. Sci.*, 336, 550–551, 2012.

Zlotnicki, V. and Desai, S. D.: Assessment of Jason Microwave Radiometer's Measurement of Wet Tropospheric Path Delay using Comparisons with SSM/I and TMI, *Mar. Geod.*, 27, 241–253, 2004.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 1. Temporal evolution of sea surface height (SSH) variance differences at crossovers (in cm^2) using different wet troposphere corrections successively in the calculation of SSH: ERA-interim and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (on top), ERA Interim and ECMWF operational (on middle), ERA Interim and radiometer (on bottom). Statistics have been computed with TOPEX/Jason-1/Jason-2 data on the left and ERS-1/ERS-2/Envisat on the right without any selection of the data.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 2. Map of SSH variance differences at crossovers (in cm^2) using the ERA-interim and radiometer wet troposphere corrections (bottom) and the ERA-interim and ECMWF wet troposphere correction (top) successively in the calculation of SSH. Statistics have been computed over the first altimetry decade (from 1993 to 2002) using TOPEX data and the second altimetry decade (from 2002 to 2011) using Jason-1 data.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures



Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 3. Temporal evolution of global mean differences between altimeter SSHs corrected from wet troposphere corrections computed with several models and the radiometers (in cm): ERA-interim reanalysis (top), NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (middle) and ECMWF operational (bottom). Statistics have been computed with TOPEX/Jason-1/Jason-2 data on the left and ERS-1/ERS-2/Envisat on the right without any geographical selection of the data. The biases between the radiometer measurements of the altimeter missions have been removed.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 4. Temporal evolution of global mean differences between altimeter SSHs corrected from wet troposphere corrections computed with ERA-Interim and the radiometers (in cm). Statistics are computed with TOPEX/Jason-1/Jason-2 data (in red) and ERS-1/ERS-2/Envisat data (in blue) without any geographical selection. The drifts between ERA-Interim and radiometer WTC have been computed by decades (1993–2001 and 2002–2010) for both time series and are indicated at the top.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 5. Map of the regional differences (centered on the mean, in mm/yr) between the trends of altimeter sea levels, successively corrected from modeled wet troposphere corrections and the radiometer corrections: ERA-interim reanalysis (top), ECMWF operational (middle) and NCEP/NCAR reanalysis (bottom). Statistics have been computed over the first altimetry decade (from 1993 to 2002) with TOPEX data (left) and over the second altimetry decade (from 2002 to 2011) with Jason-1 data (right).

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion



Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 6. Amplitude of the annual signal (in cm) of the global altimeter mean sea level derived with different wet troposphere corrections over the first (top, T/P data) and the second (bottom, Jason-1 data) altimetry decade.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 7. Regional differences in the annual signal's amplitude of the wet troposphere corrections (in cm) comparing each model (top: ERA Interim; middle: operational ECMWF; bottom: NCEP/NCAR) with the radiometers over the first (left, T/P data) and the second (right, Jason-1 data) altimetry decade. Contrary to other figures, we compare here the annual signal of the WTC itself.

Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 8. Regional differences in the annual signal's phase of the wet troposphere corrections (in days) comparing each model (top: ERA Interim; middle: operational ECMWF; bottom: NCEP/NCAR) with the radiometers over the first (left, T/P data) and the second (right, Jason-1 data) altimetry decade. As in Fig. 8, we compare here the annual signal of the WTC itself.

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


Evaluation of wet troposphere path delays

J.-F. Legeais et al.




Figure 9. Time series of wet path delays (opposite of the wet troposphere correction, in cm) derived from the Envisat MWR radiometer, the ERA Interim and NCEP/NCAR reanalyses and the operational ECMWF model. Data at latitudes lower than 66° are selected and time series are 2-month-filtered and adjusted from annual and semiannual signals.

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