Assessment of the SARM processing sensitivity to swell







M. Raynal, T. Moreau, N. Tran, S. Labroue F. Boy, P. Féménias, F. Borde

Context

SARM was recommended to be activated for the first time at global scale by the scientific community and the Copernicus Services
➤ This presentation aims at giving an overview of the sensitivity of the Sentinel-3A SARM observations to swell

Moreau et al (2018) have already shown the impact on SWH based on simulations and Cryosat-2 SARM data
 We confirm these findings and go further in the assessment thanks to the global coverage of Sentinel-3A mission

Outline

- Assessment of the impact on SWH
- Assessment of the impact on Range
- What are the impacts for the users? (Sea Level and Sea State)

OSTST Conference , 23-27 October, Miami

Large scales SWH

Difference between SARM and P-LRM SWH at long wavelength (m) 0.25 1 < t02 < 2 mean curve Low period < t02 < 3 < t02 < 4 0.20 < t02 < 5 8 cm 5 < t02 < 6 < t02 < 7 SARM / PLRM Swh differences (m) < t02 < 8 Large period < t02 < 9 0.15 9 < t02 < 10 **5 cm** 0.10 0.05 0.00 -0.05 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 SWH PLRM filtred (m)

Mean wave period data from WW3 model (Ifremer)

Error on SARM SWH is correlated at first order with SWH

+

Strong impact of mean wave period on SARM SWH: Bias decreases with larger period (5 to 10 cm)



OSTST Conference, 23-27 October, Miami

Long Wavelength analysis : SWH

Wave period increasing (s) SWH difference SARM/ P_{a} RM for 2 < SWH < 3 (m) 0.28 135° 45° 0.26 10 8 9 0.24 6 7 0.22 0.20 0.18 0.16 0.14 315° 225° 0.12

Difference between SARM and P-LRM SWH at long wavelength (m)

SARM/PLRM SWH bias for SWH = 2.5m	Perpendicular configuration (AZ = 90°)	Parallel configuration (AZ = 180°)
Lowest periods (4s)	17 cm	17 cm
Highest periods (11s)	10 cm	5 cm
	X1.7	X3.7

SARM SWH is also sensitive to the relative azimuth angle. The bias with respect to P-LRM waves has the largest decrease with the mean wave period for // propagations



Short Spatial scales : SWH



While LRM altimeters present a white noise at 20 Hz, SARM data exhibit a red noise, when analysing a global PSD of SWH.







Moreau et al., 2018 showed that the noise level of Cryosat-2 SARM SWH is impacted by swell direction and period. This result is also observed on Sentinel-3A SARM SWH and noise increase is the largest for swell propagation parallel to the track.





At SWH = 2.7 m, in SARM from shortest to longest swell periods the range noise increase is about 4 cm (70% increase).





At SWH = 2.7 m, in SARM from shortest to longest swell periods the range noise increase is about 4 cm (70% increase). In P-LRM, it reaches 1 cm only.



Analysis done for SWH [2-3m]

SARM noise shows the largest increase for // propagation





Analysis done for SWH [2-3m]

SARM noise shows the largest increase for // propagation





OSTST Conference , 23-27 October, Miami



While LRM altimeters present a white noise at 20 Hz, SARM data exhibit a red noise, when analysing a global PSD of sea level.







slope signal SARM GLO 0.7-3km mean period T02 (s) -0.15 -0.10 -0.05 -50 -50 100 200 300 0 100 200 300 0 4 6 8 -0.15 -0.10 -0.05

- ≻ Stronger red noise slope (0.7-3 km) are correlated with areas of swell dominated areas (better correlation in South hemisphere)
- ≻ Red noise on SARM observations of sea level are due to swell effects on SARM range





-0.15 -0.10 -0.05 -0.15 -0.10 -0.05 -0.05 -0.15 -0.10 -0.05

=> they are larger when swell propagates along the satellite tracks

 \succ Effect is larger on the descending tracks in Pacific and Indian ocean



Short Spatia

- Drastic selection on T02 values:
 - Small < 4 s 0,4 %</p>
 - 4s < Medium < 8s 97,9 %</p>
 - Strong > 8s 1,7%
- Very small fraction of the ocean not impacted by swell
- Red noise slope is observed over all regions with continuous increase





Swell signature observed during S3B commissioning phase when comparing S3B LRM and S3A SARM range noise



All positive values are expected : LRM noise > SARM noise

Negative patches are swell signature

Impact for users

Sea Level

Swell effects corrupt the observation of the shortest scales of the ocean. Even if progress were made with SARM thanks to instrumental noise reduction, the red slope prevents from a full exploitation of the SARM observations below 20 km

➤ New LR-RMC processing cancels such error (Faugere talk in Error session)

SWH

➤ Same effect on the red slope at shortest scales, also cancelled by LR-RMC processing

➤What remains today: large scale bias correlated with the mean wave period (10 cm) that will corrupt sea level through the SSB (3 mm)

► SARM SWH quality altered by swell confirmed by Abdalla and Aouf



OSTST Conference , 23-27 October, Miami

