THE DEVELOPMENT FOR MTSAT RAPID SCAN HIGH RESOLUTION AMVS AT JMA/MSC

> Kazuki Shimoji Meteorological Satellite Center Japan Meteorological Agency

#### T-PARC Enhanced Observation by MTSAT-2

1. Hemisphere scan: 15min North hemisphere image

2. Rapid-scan: 7min small area image

3. Rapid-scan: 4min small area image

Sep 2008 10<sup>th</sup> 12UTC - 13<sup>th</sup> 06UTC
Sep 2008 17<sup>th</sup> 12UTC - 18<sup>th</sup> 12UTC
Sep 2008 27<sup>th</sup> 12UTC - 28<sup>th</sup> 12UTC



### Plan of Rapid-Scan observation by MTSAT-1R





### Purpose

 To utilize excessive high time-resolution of satellite images by rapid-scan function as a substitute for spatial-resolution of Atmospheric Motion Vectors.

#### **Proposal Method for the purpose**

•By using not only 2 imageries but also sequentially rapid-scanned multiple satellite imageries, to cancel AMV quality loss caused from lack of number of pixels with narrowing down target box size.

# Cloud Tracking Method for RTN AMVs at JMA/MSC



# Cloud Tracking Method for RTN AMVs at JMA/MSC

Correlation coefficient between targets is not statistically reliable when sample number (target box size) is too small. Reasonable motion vector

Unreasonable motion vector



- Reasonable motion vector
- Unreasonable motion vector

Statistical significance of correlation coefficients between 2 small 3x3 pixels targets cut from satellite imageries is very bad.

1% significant level of correlation at sample number = 9 is about 0.798. It means that correlation coefficient less than 0.798 is emptiness for pattern matching on cross-correlation method.



- Reasonable motion vector
- Unreasonable motion vector

But average of uncertain quantities is generally more certain than each uncertain quantity.

In rapid-scan observation, sequence of many satellite imageries can be observed. Namely, it is able to compute correlation coefficient from not only a pair of timely neighboring imageries but also many pairs of those imageries.

Consistency of motion vector is supposed during rapid-scan.







Velocity and acceleration which Maximize average of correlations  $C_{mean}(\vec{v}, \vec{a})$  is most likelihood velocity and acceleration of targeted cloud.

$$C_{mean}(\vec{v}, \vec{a}) \equiv \cos\left(\frac{1}{N-1}\sum_{n=1}^{N-1}\cos^{-1}\left(C(I_n(\vec{r}_n), I_{n+1}(\vec{r}_{n+1}))\right)\right)$$
  
$$\vec{r}_n(\vec{v}, \vec{a}, t_n) \equiv \vec{r}_{tgt} + \vec{v}(t_n - t_{tgt}) + \frac{1}{2}\vec{a}(t_n - t_{tgt})^2$$

C(x, y): Correlation coefficient of small image segments x and y

- $I_n(\vec{r}_n)$  : Small image segment cut from nth imagery
  - $\vec{\mathcal{V}}$ : Target velocity
  - $\vec{a}$ : Target Acceleration
  - $t_n$ : Time nth imagery observed
  - $\vec{r}_n$ : Target position on nth imagery

# Effect of averaging operation for matching surfaces (9x9)



Matching surface from forward motion



Matching surface from backward motion



Average of matching surface from the 2 matching surface

Peak (=likelihood target velocity) on average of 2 matching surfaces is clearer than each peak derived from 2 imageries.

#### Correlation Error Dependency on Target Box Size



•Used satellite images are rapid-scanned by MTSAT-2 for THORPEX T-PARC campaign on September 2008

- •Target box size is 3x3 for seeing effect by proposal method.
- •Time-resolution of rapid-scan imageries are about 4min.
- •Continuous 3 imageries are utilized for the experiment. acceleration search is not done.
- •Quality control by QI is not available for this experiment because it is needed to compare 2 wind vectors independently computed. 5 or more imageries are needed for quality-control)









#### Comparison between AMVs(3x3) and First guess



# Comparison between AMVs(3x3) and AMVs(16x16,normal)



Blue :: u component of wind Red :: v component of wind

AMVs(3x3) VS AMVs(16x16)	2 images	3 images
U Correlation	0.258	0.513
V Correlation	0.248	0.504
BIAS (u_3- u 16)	-0.646	0.309
BIAS (v_3- v_16)	0.051	0.049
SD (u_3-u_16)	28.060	14.146
SD (v_3-v_16)	29.155	13.769

Vertical axes :: AMV (3 x 3)(m/s) Horizontal axes :: AMV (16x16)(m/s)

### **Summary of comparison**

 In case of small target box size (3x3), AMVs derived by the proposal method shows superiority compared with normal method which is using just 2 images for one AMVs dataset. Correlation, BIAS and standard deviation against first-guess-wind and AMVs(16x16) by normal method are dominantly decreased.

### Conclusions

- On comparison to NWP wind, Experimentally derived AMVs from sequential 3 imageries shows better result than that from 2 imageries.
- The proposal method has a potential to convert extra time-resolution of rapid-scan-observation into high spatial-resolution of AMVs dataset.

Rapid scan AMVs should be derived from animation, not from picture-card show.

### **Future Plan**

- To apply Quality Control by QI to the AMVs derived by proposal method. at least 5 or more imageries are required for QC.
- MSC is planning to increase rapid-scanobservations. Continuously rapid-scanned 24 imageries (5 min. intervals) has been available since last week. AMVs from 3 or more imageries will be utilized for second experiment.



# AMV Derivation from Meteosat-7 at JMA/MSC

#### Purpose

1. Improvement for frequency of AMVs for JMA NWP

2. By using JMA NWP vertical profile for height assignment on Indian ocean region, It is expected that height assignment dependency on NWP will be clear.

#### Future Plan

1. Experiment to NWP model is planned on 2010 after comparison of AMVs dataset and sonde dataset.

### AMVs Derivation from Meteosat-7 at JMA/MSC

Yellow: IR lower Green: WV