Meeting on the Intercomparison of Satellite-based Volcanic Ash Retrieval Algorithms within WMO SCOPE-Nowcasting: 2018 Work Plan

International Space Station photograph of a volcanic ash cloud from Pavlof Volcano, AK, USA on May 18, 2013 (Image courtesy of NASA)

Acronyms used in this document

AIRS	Atmospheric Infrared Sounder
AVHRR	Advanced Very High Resolution Radiometer
CALIOP	Cloud-Aerosol Lidar with Orthogonal Polarization
CrIS	Cross-track Infrared Sounder
DLR	German Aerospace Center
EARLINET	European Aerosol Research Lidar Network
EUMETSAT	European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites
GOES	Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite
IASI	Infrared Atmospheric Sounding Interferometer
IMO	Icelandic Meteorological Office
MISR	Multi-angle Imaging SpectroRadiometer
MODIS	Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer
MTSAT	Multi-Functional Transport Satellite
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
RAL	Rutherford Appleton Laboratory
SACS	Support to Aviation Control Services
SEVIRI	Spinning Enhanced Visible and Infrared Imager
SMASH	Study on an end-to-end system for volcanic ash plume monitoring and prediction
SSMIS	Special Sensor Microwave Imager/Sounder
VAAC	Volcanic Ash Advisory Center
VIIRS	Visible Infrared Imaging Radiometer Suite
WMO	World Meteorological Organisation

1. Background and Overview

Relative to satellite-derived meteorological cloud properties, quantitative satellite-derived volcanic ash cloud properties do not have a long heritage in operational applications. To facilitate operational readiness, in response to the demand for quantitative ash cloud products from the aviation user community, an organized international effort is needed to benchmark the accuracy of various satellite products under a large variety of conditions and establish best scientific practices for operational applications. Under SCOPE-Nowcasting (http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/sat/meetings/SCOPE-Nowcasting-EP-1.php), the first component of an international effort to benchmark and inter-compare volcanic ash products derived from satellite measurements was completed in 2015. Detailed information on the 2015 activity is available:

WMO Report on 2015 activity:
http://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/sat/documents/SCOPE-NWC-PP2_VAIntercompWSReport2015.pdf

2015 inter-comparison website:
http://cimss.ssec.wisc.edu/meetings/vol_ash15/

The successful 2015 WMO Inter-comparison of Satellite-based Volcanic Ash Retrieval Algorithms activity broadly revealed that the accuracy of satellite-based volcanic ash products is a strong function of the retrieval methodology, satellite sensor capability, and scene complexity. In order to benchmark the various retrieval methodologies and satellite sensors as a function of the scene attributes (e.g. number of cloud layers, type of underlying surface, ash composition, etc.) and ascertain which methodologies and scientific practices are best suited for operational applications, the inter-comparison activity needs to be advanced further using the recommendations from the 2015 inter-comparison report as a guide. A second, WMO supported, inter-comparison activity will be undertaken in 2018 with the following objectives.

1). Analysis of certain cases (from 2015 activity) in greater detail in order to better understand ash detection and retrieval differences and sensitivities:

- The Eyjafallajokull (2010), Grimsvotn (2011), and Puyehue-Cordon Caulle (2011) cases will be utilized in a more detailed analysis.
- All participants will have an opportunity to submit new and/or updated Eyjafallajokull, Grimsvotn, and Puyehue-Cordon Caulle data sets (in the required format).
- The influence of factors such as background meteorological cloud cover, satellite viewing angle, ash cloud attributes, and underlying surface type will be examined.
- Additional independent (e.g. aircraft, space based lidar) data sets are being sought and will be incorporated into the analysis where possible.
- The human expert analysis on ash horizontal extent, utilized during the 2015

inter-comparison, will be extended to additional scenes. The results of the expert analysis will be made available to all participants, for comment, in June 2018.

- A side study, using simulated satellite data to assess ash cloud property retrieval sensitivities, will be conducted. The side study will be lead by INGV and NOAA and is open to all interested participants. Additional details on the side study will be made available in June/July 2018.

2). Assessment of volcanic ash products generated from "next generation" satellite sensors, such as Himawari-8:

- The Sarychev Peak (2009), Kelut (2014), and Kirishimayama (2011) events, analyzed in the 2015 inter-comparison, were captured by legacy geostationary satellites. Thus, these events will not be re-analyzed in the 2018 inter-comparison.
- Within SCOPE-Nowcasting, assessing the performance of retrieval techniques applied to new satellite capabilities, such as Himawari-8, is a higher priority compared to legacy capabilities.
- A small number of Himawari-8 scenes, which are coincident with Low Earth Orbit (LEO) observations of volcanic ash, will be analyzed.
- The corresponding Himawari-8 measurements will also be made available, in netcdf format, for use by those that do not have easy access to archived Himawari-8 data.

3). Assessment of product performance on ice rich umbrella-like volcanic clouds:

- Optically thick emergent volcanic clouds from explosive activity are particularly challenging to detect and characterize using passive satellite measurements.
- The emergent cloud from the December 4, 2015 eruption of Etna will be analyzed to assess the performance of the various passive satellite remote sensing algorithms on optically thick, ice rich, volcanic clouds. The analysis will be limited to the first 15 hours of the event.
- SEVIRI images that capture the early evolution of the Etna cloud will be chosen for analysis. Relevant LEO overpassed will also be analyzed.
- Human expert analysis will be used to assess the detection capabilities of the automated algorithms.

4). Documenting advances in satellite-derived volcanic ash products over the last 3 years:

- At the 2018 inter-comparison workshop (more details on the workshop are given below), each algorithm provider will have an opportunity to summarize relevant research over the past 3 years or so.
- Summaries on the use of quantitative volcanic ash satellite products in applications (e.g. modeling, alerting, operational decision-making) will also be sought.

5). Creating a consensus "road map" for meeting the increasing demand for high quality satellite-derived volcanic ash products for operational applications:

- Identify product deficiencies and research strategies for mitigating deficiencies.
- Discuss plans for improving end-user engagement/outreach aimed at more effective use of quantitative volcanic ash satellite products.

2. Timeline

March 22, 2018 – completion of participation survey:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfw8gPQuhmro2QKwvyaSzwxZkonKNXg4LY2OAvSdS2Dewlrkg/viewform?usp=sf_link

25 May 2018 – submission deadline for algorithm data sets to be included in inter-comparison analysis

June/July 2018 – additional information on workshop, "side studies," and inter-comparison analysis will be provided

8-12 October 2018 – inter-comparison workshop hosted by INGV (Catania, Italy)

31 December 2018 – finalized report on 2018 inter-comparison activity

3. Roles and Responsibilities

Each algorithm provider is responsible for providing data **in the proper format** (described in Section 6) by May 25, 2018. In order to ensure that a robust inter-comparison can be performed, algorithm data submissions from at least 1 sensor are expected for each of the pre-selected cases (Section 4) unless existing processing capabilities do not allow for processing of at least 1 sensor that is relevant to a particular case (Section 5 and Section 9). In addition, all algorithm providers must agree to the fully transparent inter-comparison methods described in this document, and provide all requested algorithm information. An external research contractor will generate the agreed upon inter-comparison analysis and make the results available to all participants prior to the 8-12 October 2018 workshop in Catania, Italy. All data used in the inter-comparison will be available to all participants and the software used by the external contractor to generate the inter-comparison analysis will also be available. Software used by algorithm providers to run their algorithms does not have to be made available to participants of this inter-comparison.

4. Cases

The cases utilized in the inter-comparison study were chosen to coincide with independent measurements that can serve as "truth" for at least some retrieved parameters (e.g. ash cloud height). In addition, an effort was made to cover a broad range of ash cloud properties and background conditions within different geostationary satellite coverage areas and VAAC regions. All of the selected cases produced large ash clouds with large-scale (e.g. regional and greater) impacts on aviation. The larger scale events allow for more robust inter-comparison/validation statistics to be computed (e.g. many pixels can be analyzed). Smaller eruptions are also important and far more common than eruptions that produce large amounts of ash. The tools developed for the inter-comparison can be applied to ash eruptions that produce more localized impacts at a later time through collaborations brought about by the inter-comparison exercise or as a possible organized follow-on activity. The following cases will be evaluated: Eyjafallajökull (2010), Grimsvötn (2011), Etna (2015), Puyehue-Cordón Caulle (2011), and Rinjani (2015). Algorithm providers should provide data (specific dates and times are provided in Section 9) for as many cases and sensors as their processing capabilities allow. The rational for selecting each case is as follows:

Eyjafallajökull (2010) – This long-duration, high impact, event is well captured by a modern geostationary satellite sensor and "validation" data (ground, aircraft, and space-based) are plentiful. Anticipated satellite sensors of relevance: AIRS, AVHRR, CALIOP, IASI, MISR, MODIS, and SEVIRI.
Volcano information: http://www.volcano.si.edu/volcano.cfm?vn=372020

Grimsvötn (2011) – This eruption is well captured by a modern geostationary sensor and the emergent, ash-rich, cloud provides an opportunity to assess retrieval performance in a high mass loading scenario. A fair amount of "validation" data (ground and space-based) is also available for this event. Anticipated satellite sensors of relevance: AIRS, AVHRR, CALIOP, IASI, MISR, MODIS, SEVIRI, and SSMIS.
Volcano information: http://www.volcano.si.edu/volcano.cfm?vn=373010

Etna (2015) – Optically thick emergent volcanic clouds from explosive activity are particularly challenging to detect and characterize using passive satellite measurements. The emergent cloud from the December 4, 2015 eruption of Etna will be analyzed to assess the performance of the various passive satellite remote sensing algorithms on optically thick, ice rich, volcanic clouds. The analysis will be limited to the first 15 hours of the event. Anticipated satellite sensors of relevance: AIRS, AVHRR, CrIS, GOME-2, IASI, MODIS, OMI, OMPS, SEVIRI, and VIIRS.
Volcano information: https://volcano.si.edu/volcano.cfm?vn=211060

Rinjani (2015) – During the week of November 1, 2015, persistent volcanic ash emissions from Mount Rinjani severely disrupted air travel in regions of Indonesia popular with tourists, including Bali. The Himawari-8 satellite captured the Rinjani event. Within SCOPE-Nowcasting, assessing the performance of retrieval techniques applied to new satellite capabilities, such as Himawari-8, is a higher priority compared to legacy capabilities. A sampling of Himawari-8 images from 4 November 2015 will be used for comparisons to several low earth orbit sensors, including a CALIOP overpass. Anticipated satellite sensors of relevance: AIRS, AVHRR, CrIS, Himawari-8, IASI, MODIS, and VIIRS.
Volcano information: https://volcano.si.edu/volcano.cfm?vn=264030

Puyehue-Cordón Caulle (2011) – This is the most silicic major eruption of the satellite era so it provides an unprecedented opportunity to assess the sensitivity of satellite retrieval algorithms to the composition of the ash. Many CALIOP overpasses are available to serve as "validation" data. Anticipated satellite sensors of relevance: AIRS, AVHRR, CALIOP, IASI, MODIS, and SEVIRI.
Volcano information: http://www.volcano.si.edu/volcano.cfm?vn=357150

5. Passive Satellite Data from "Operational" Sensors with IR Capabilities

All operational or pseudo-operational passive meteorological satellite data that will be used in this study are freely available and can be acquired from at least 1 data archive. The satellite sensors that are relevant to this inter-comparison study are listed below along with where archived L1 satellite data can be obtained. In addition, the general spatial domain specifications that will be utilized in this study are described for each sensor. **<u>In order to ensure that results from different algorithms and sensors can be easily inter-compared, the spatial domain specifications must be strictly adhered to.</u>** Most L1 satellite data for each pre-selected case and sensor will also be made available on an anonymous FTP server at the University of Wisconsin should participants need it. It is assumed that all algorithm providers are very familiar with at least a subset of the sensors listed below, so only very basic information is provided. While sensors with infrared capabilities will be the primary focus of the inter-comparison, the inter-comparison is open to utilizing non-infrared based ash cloud retrievals to serve as an independent assessment (see Section 6).

AIRS

Relevant Cases	All
L1 Data Availability	NASA GES DISC – http://disc.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/AIRS/data-holdings/by-access-method/data_access.shtml
Spatial Domain	Only 15 km resolution data (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	90 (columns) x number of scan lines in time sequential granule aggregate (rows)

AVHRR (Metop satellites)

Relevant Cases	All
L1 Data Availability	EUMETSAT Data Centre – http://oiswww.eumetsat.org/WEBOPS/eps-pg/AVHRR/AVHRR-PG-6ProdFormDis.htm NOAA CLASS – http://www.class/noaa/gov/
Spatial Domain	Only time sequential orbit subsets through regions of interest at 1 km resolution (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	2048 (columns) x Number of scan lines in time sequential orbit subset (rows)
Channel number of "11 μm" measurement	4

Channel number of "12 µm" measurement	5

AVHRR (NOAA satellites)

Relevant Cases	All
L1 Data Availability	NOAA CLASS – http://www.class/noaa/gov/
Spatial Domain	Only time sequential GAC orbit subsets through regions of interest at 4 km resolution (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	409 (columns) x Number of scan lines in time sequential orbit subset (rows)
Channel number of "11 µm" measurement	4
Channel number of "12 µm" measurement	5

CrIS

Relevant Cases	Kelut
L1 Data Availability	NOAA CLASS – http://www.class/noaa/gov/
Spatial Domain	Only time sequential granule aggregates at 14 km resolution (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	Number of scan lines in time sequential orbit subset (rows) x 30 (number of fields of regard) x 9 (number of fields of view)

Himawari-8

Relevant Cases	Rinjani
L1 Data Availability	ftp://ftp.ssec.wisc.edu/pub/geocat/wmo_intercomparison/rinjani
Spatial Domain	Only 2 km resolution (at nadir) full disk results will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	5500 (columns) x 5500 (rows)
Channel number of "11 µm" measurement	13
Channel number of "12 µm" measurement	15

IASI

Relevant Cases	All
L1 Data Availability	EUMETSAT Data Centre – http://oiswww.eumetsat.org/WEBOPS/eps-pg/IASI-L1/IASIL1-PG-6ProdFormDis.htm NOAA CLASS – http://www.class/noaa/gov/
Spatial Domain	Only time sequential orbit subsets through regions of interest at 12 km resolution (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	4 (number of sounder pixels) x 30 (number of steps for observational target) x Number of scan lines in time

	sequential orbit subset (rows)

MODIS

Relevant Cases	All
L1 Data Availability	NASA LAADS – http://ladsweb.nascom.nasa.gov/
Spatial Domain	Only time sequential granule aggregates at 1 km resolution (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	1354 (columns) x number of scan lines in time sequential granule aggregate (rows)
Channel number of "11 μm" measurement	31
Channel number of "12 μm" measurement	32

MTSAT

Relevant Cases	Kelut, Kirishimayama, and Sarychev Peak
L1 Data Availability	University of Wisconsin – http://www.ssec.wisc.edu/datacenter/archive.html (The MTSAT data utilized in the intercomparison will be freely available on a University of Wisconsin FTP server in HRIT and AREA formats with details to be announced around January 15, 2015)
Spatial Domain	Only 4 km resolution (at nadir) full disk results will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	2752 (columns) x 2750 (rows)
Channel number of "11 μm" measurement	IR1
Channel number of "12 μm" measurement	IR2

SEVIRI

Relevant Cases	Eyjafallajökull, Grimsvötn, and Puyehue-Cordón Caulle
L1 Data Availability	EUMETSAT Data Centre – http://www.eumetsat.int/website/home/Data/DataDelivery/EUMETSATDataCentre/index.html
Spatial Domain	Only 3 km resolution (at nadir) full disk results will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	3712 (columns) x 3712 (rows)
Channel number of "11 μm" measurement	9
Channel number of "12 μm" measurement	10

VIIRS

Relevant Cases	Kelut
L1 Data Availability	NOAA CLASS –

	http://www.class/noaa/gov/
Spatial Domain	Only time sequential granule aggregates at 0.75 km resolution (at nadir) will be accepted.
Size of Input/Output Arrays	3200 (columns) x number of scan lines in time sequential granule aggregate (rows)
Channel number of "11 μm" measurement	M15
Channel number of "12 μm" measurement	M16

6. Independent Data

While ash cloud top height can be inferred with very high accuracy using lidar, there are no direct measurements of ash mass loading. Mass loading, however, can be derived using fewer assumptions (compared to passive satellite retrievals) when lidar and in-situ measurements are available. Given this constraint, the following were identified as primary data sets that can be used to assess passive, infrared-based satellite retrievals of ash cloud properties: UK Met Office aircraft data (Marenco et al., 2011), DLR aircraft data (Schumann et al., 2011), EARLINET lidar data (e.g. Ansmann et al., 2011), CALIOP lidar data (e.g. Winker et al., 2012). While CALIOP (http://www-calipso.larc.nasa.gov/) and EARLINET lidar data (http://www.earlinet.org/) are freely available, the aircraft data sets will need to be obtained from the UK Met Office and DLR.

Additional data sets can also be used in the inter-comparison. MISR stereo-derived ash cloud heights are available for Eyjafallajökull and Grimsvötn using the links listed below.

Eyjafallajökull:
http://www-misr.jpl.nasa.gov/getData/accessData/MisrMinxPlumes/projectArea/index.cfm?ProjectArea=29

Grimsvötn:
http://www-misr.jpl.nasa.gov/getData/accessData/MisrMinxPlumes/projectArea/index.cfm?ProjectArea=30

Microwave derived total column ash loadings may be available for the emergent, ash-rich, Grimsvötn cloud (Montopoli et al., 2013) and weather radar can be used to estimate ash cloud height with good accuracy near the vent during explosive eruptions (Arason et el., 2011). In addition, UV/visible based estimates of ash optical depth, loading, and height should be utilized if readily available (e.g. http://vast.nilu.no/media/documents/dublin2013/2A-2_vanderA.pdf).

Previous volcanic ash validation studies are leveraged where possible to help define the best scenes and independent reference data for each case. For instance, the SACS-2/SMASH Validation Report (can be provided upon request) will be leveraged for scene and reference data selection for the Eyjafallajökull and Grimsvötn cases. Similarly, a RAL report (ftp://ftp.rsg.rl.ac.uk/eumetsat_ash/pr01-

scene_selection_and_data_format_v0.2-full.pdf) will be leveraged for scene and reference data selection for the Eyjafallajökull, Grimsvötn, and Puyehue-Cordón Caulle cases.

7. File Format of Submitted Algorithm Data and Intercomparison Variables

All products derived from any of the sensors listed in Section 5 that are submitted for inter-comparison shall be in the NetCDF format described in a document produced by Rutherford Appleton Laboratory (RAL):
ftp://ftp.rsg.rl.ac.uk/eumetsat_ash/pr01-scene_selection_and_data_format_v0.2-full.pdf

All retrieval output must conform to the dimensions listed in the tables in Section 5 of this document (e.g. the same dimensions as the input L1 data). Note that the RAL study allowed for case specific geographic subsets, but in this study case specific geographic subsets will NOT be used (refer to Section 5 of this document for more information).

The RAL NetCDF conventions are as follows. NetCDF-4 with the NetCDF mode set to NC_CLASSIC_MODEL should be used. If NetCDF-4 libraries are not available, NetCDF-3 can be used. The Climate and Forecast (CF) naming convections for variables and attributes will be used (see http://cfconventions.org/ for more information on CF conventions). Each data product in the NetCDF file should have the following attributes (at a minimum).

"standard_name" - If a particular quantity is listed in the list of CF standard variables, this attribute should be included and set to the appropriate string, otherwise it can be set to "none".

"long_name" – A more descriptive name of the variable

"units" - In the case of a dimensionless variable, this should be set to an empty string

"_FillValue" - This should contain the value used to indicate missing values. Can be something like "-999.0" or an IEEE 754 floating point NaN value.

Flag variables should make use of either the "flag_values" or "flag_masks", and the "flag_meanings" attributes:

"flag_values" - used for flags with a number of mutually exclusive code values (such as 0 = water, 1 = land)

"flag_masks" - used for Boolean bit-mask flag values

"flag_meanings" - a string containing a space delimited list of the conditions indicated by each flag value or bit in the bit-mask

The inter-comparison study will focus on the following set of ash cloud properties that are commonly retrieved. IMPORTANT: *Each of the variables listed in the following table should have the same dimensions as the corresponding satellite imagery (e.g. 1 value for every pixel).*

NetCDF Variable Name	**Description**	**Units**
ash_mask	yes (1) or no (0) indicator of whether pixel is considered to be part of an ash cloud	none
ash_cth	Ash cloud top height above the geoid	km
ash_ctt	Ash cloud top temperature	K
ash_cot_10	Ash extinction optical thickness at a wavelength approximately equal to 11 μm (see Section 5 for a sensor specific definition of the "11 μm" channel)	none
ash_cot_550	Ash extinction optical thickness at 0.55 μm	none
ash_r_eff	Ash effective radius	μm
ash_mass	Ash mass loading	g/m^2

The following additional parameters should also be provided, if available (these parameters will NOT be inter-compared but may be useful for a more detailed analysis). <u>IMPORTANT:</u> *Each of the variables listed in the following table should have the same dimensions as the corresponding satellite imagery (e.g. 1 value for every pixel).*

NetCDF Variable Name	**Description**	**Units**
ash_probability	An ash probability or confidence value running from 0 (definitely not ash) to 1 (definitely ash)	none
ash_cth_uncertainty	Ash cloud top height above the geoid uncertainty	km or none
ash_ctt_uncertainty	Ash cloud top temperature uncertainty	K or none
ash_cot_10_uncertainty	The uncertainty of the ash extinction optical thickness at a wavelength approximately equal to 11 μm (see Section 5 for a sensor specific definition of the "11 μm" channel)	none
ash_cot_550_uncertainty	The uncertainty of the ash extinction optical thickness at 0.55 μm	none
ash_r_eff_uncertainty	Ash effective radius uncertainly	μm or none
ash_mass_uncertainty	Ash mass loading uncertainty	g/m^2 or none

The following basic information should be provided, where possible, for quality control purposes and to help assess the impacts of sensor calibration and clear sky radiative transfer methods. IMPORTANT: *Each of the variables listed in the following table should have the same dimensions as the corresponding L1 satellite imagery (e.g. 1 value for every pixel).*

NetCDF Variable Name	**Description**	**Units**
pixel_flag	0: pixel was not processed due to viewing angle or other algorithm restrictions, 1: pixel was processed	none
latitude	Nominal latitude of each satellite pixel (range: -90° to 90°)	degrees
longitude	Nominal longitude of each satellite pixel (range: -180° to 180°)	degrees
solar_zenith_angle	Solar zenith angle of each satellite pixel	degrees
satellite_zenith_angle	Satellite zenith angle of each satellite pixel	degrees
relative_azimuth	Relative azimuth of each satellite pixel (relative azimuth = solar azimuth – satellite azimuth)	degrees
surface_type	The fraction of each satellite pixel that is treated as a water surface (range: 0.0 to 1.0)	none
bt_11	The observed brightness temperature at "11 μm" (see Section 5 for a sensor specific definition) for each satellite pixel	K
bt_12	The observed brightness temperature at "12 μm" (see Section 5 for a sensor specific definition) for each satellite pixel	K
bt_bkgrd_11	The calculated or assumed background brightness temperature at "11 μm" for each satellite pixel	K
bt_bkgrd_12	The calculated or assumed background brightness temperature at "12 μm" for each satellite pixel	K

The following basic meta-data, to be stored as a global attributes in the NetCDF file, are also required. These data will aid in the intercomparison analysis and visualization process.

NetCDF Global Attribute Name	**Description**
Title	Short name of the product (eg. ORAC_SEVIRI)
Institution	Name of the institution where the data was produced
Source	Original data source(s) (eg. list of level 1 files used in processing)
Platform	Name of the satellite platform (eg. Aqua)
Sensor	Name of the sensor used (eg. MODIS)
product_version	A version number for this particular product

date_created	Date processed; format yyyymmddThhmmssZ
creator_name	Name of contact person responsible for this product
creator_url	URL to product website (use “NA” if not applicable)
creator_email	Contact email address for this product
geospatial_lat_min	Minimum valid latitude in image in degrees north (-90 to +90)
geospatial_lat_max	Maximum valid latitude in image in degrees north (-90 to +90)
geospatial_lon_min	Minimum valid longitude in image in degrees east (-180 to +180)
geospatial_lon_max	Maximum valid longitude in image in degrees east (-180 to +180)
time_coverage_start	Beginning time of satellite image: Format yyyymmddThhnnssZ (eg. 20100507T032743Z = 03:27:43 UTC on 7th May 2010)
time_coverage_end	Ending time of satellite image: Format yyyymmddThhnnssZ

Finally, the following file naming convention should be used (Bennett and James, 2013).

<Project>-<Processing Level>-<Data Type>-<Product String>-<Case Name>-<Indicative Date><Indicative Time>-fv<File version>.nc

where each field denoted by <> is defined as follows:

<Project>	This should be set to “SCOPE_NWC_ASH”
<Processing Level>	This should be set to “L2” (level 2 data – processed at the same location and resolution as input level 1 data)
<Data Type>	This should be set to “ASH_PRODUCTS”
<Product String>	A string identifying the data source and algorithm, eg. “SEVIRI_ORAC”
<Case Name>	The name of the volcano that produced the ash of interest. (Valid strings: EYJAFALLAJOKULL, GRIMSVOTN, SARYCHEV, KELUT, PUYEHUE, or KIRISHIMAYAMA
<Indicative Date>	The starting date of the L1 satellite image from which the L2 results are derived in the format: yyyymmdd

<Indicative Time>	The starting time of the L1 satellite image from which the L2 results are derived in the format: hhmmss
<File Version>	A version number for the product – should agree with that used in the global attributes

Example file name:
SCOPE_NWC_ASH-L2-ASH_PRODUCTS-MODIS_NOAA-EYJAFALLAJOKULL-20100507-031500-fv1.nc

A sample NetCDF ash product file will be made available around January 15, 2015. In addition, important information on each algorithm (e.g. assumed microphysical assumptions, wavelengths utilized, etc.…) will be collected in a separate spreadsheet so that the results can be analyzed and discussed within the appropriate context.

8. Inter-comparison Methods

RAL will perform the inter-comparison analysis. The inter-comparison study depends heavily on the ability to co-locate measurements from different instruments in space and time. Measurement co-location is not a trivial issue. There are several complexities that must be addressed such as field of view size and shape and parallax. All co-location information will be made available to all of the participants. Once all the required co-location information is generated, RAL will perform the relevant analyses, which may include:

1) Detailed ash detection inter-comparison: construct 2D images that indicate how many of the submitted algorithms detect ash at a given location

2) Pixel to pixel comparisons where algorithms agree that ash is present: construct scatter plots with basic statistics that quantify the difference between each algorithm pairing; this will also include 2D images of inter-comparison products from each algorithm provider and the corresponding multispectral satellite imagery

3) Bar charts of total cloud attributes derived from each algorithm: total ash cloud area, total ash mass loading, and median ash effective radius

4) More detailed ash cloud property inter-comparison: construct 2D images that indicate the overall spread (standard deviation of all algorithms) in ash cloud height, ash mass loading, ash optical depth at 0.55 and 11 μm, and ash effective radius at each location where all algorithms agree that ash is present.

5) Ash cloud height from each algorithm that retrieves cloud height will be compared to CALIOP cloud heights where reasonable time/space

matchups occur. Scatter plots with statistics as well as images of the corresponding CALIOP cross sections will be constructed.

6) Ash mass loading from each algorithm will be compared to aircraft and ground-based derived estimates of ash loading when and where available.

Comparison methods 1-4 will be applied such that significant variability in solar zenith angle (e.g. day versus night), surface type, and ash optical depth (e.g. proximal ash versus well dispersed ash) is captured. Comparison method 5 will be applied to all scenes where CALIOP definitively overpasses volcanic ash. Comparison method 6 will be applied to all scenes where volcanic ash is sampled by aircraft and/or ground-based sensors (and those data are available).

9. Case Study Details

A companion spreadsheet ("WMO_volash_satellite_intercomparison_scene_selection_2018.xlsx) lists the geostationary satellite scans and low earth orbit satellite overpasses will be used for each selected case. Inter-comparison participants are asked to submit algorithm output for every scan/overpass associated with a *given* sensor. Participants are NOT expected to submit results for sensors that they do not normally work with or process. To save time and effort, only the most commonly used satellites for **ash** retrievals are contained in the spreadsheet. If a spacecraft with a sensor of interest is not included (e.g. *Aura*), please contact Mike Pavolonis (Mike.Pavolonis@noaa.gov) to make arrangements for submitting retrievals derived from that sensor. In addition to the date/time information, orbital and scanning parameters were used to determine which inter-comparisons are possible for each satellite scan/overpass, taking into account other satellite measurements and aircraft and ground based measurements (where available). An inter-comparison was deemed possible if the measurements can be reasonably matched in space and time (no more than a 60 minute time difference).

While every geostationary image listed in the spreadsheet will contain at least some detectable ash (e.g. identifiable in multi-spectral imagery), most, but not every, low earth orbit overpass will contain detectable ash. Low earth orbit overpasses were selected because they overlap the geostationary disk in space and time. It is important to include some non-ash low earth orbit overpasses that fall within the disk of the geostationary satellite of interest to ensure that the false alarm rate each ash detection algorithm and sensor can be fairly assessed. To ensure a fair inter-comparison, algorithm providers should avoid using ash detection and retrieval logic that are manually tuned to a given scene or set of scenes. If such logic is a necessary or desired component of the algorithm, then that should be clearly noted in the algorithm description table. When the results of the inter-comparison are reported back to the user community we will need to clearly identify which techniques are fully automated (e.g. capable of running in real-time) versus those that are strictly a research tool.

Given the abundance of reference data that are available (ground, aircraft, and satellite), the Eyjafallajökull case will include the greatest number of satellite scenes. An effort was made to allow for as many satellite to non-satellite comparisons as possible without requiring an excessive number of satellite images to be processed. The total number of satellite scenes is consistent with inter-comparison activities conducted by the meteorological cloud remote sensing community.

Instructions for uploading ash retrieval data sets to an anonymous FTP server will be provided.

10. References

Ansmann, A., et al. (2011), Ash and fine-mode particle mass profiles from EARLINET-AERONET observations over central Europe after the eruptions of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in 2010, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **116**, D00U02, doi:10.1029/2010JD015567.

Arason, P., Petersen, G. N., and Bjornsson, H.: Observations of the altitude of the volcanic plume during the eruption of Eyjafjallajökull, April–May 2010, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 3, 9-17, doi:10.5194/essd-3-9-2011, 2011.

Bennet, V. and S. James, "Guidelines for Data Producers – Climate Change Initiative Phase 1", ESA Technical Note, Issue 1, Revision 1, Available from http://www.esa-cci.org/ (follow links to Data Standards Working Group, accessed 16/12/2014), 2013.

Marenco, F., B. Johnson, K. Turnbull, S. Newman, J. Haywood, H. Webster, and H. Ricketts (2011), Airborne lidar observations of the 2010 Eyjafjallajökull volcanic ash plume, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **116**, D00U05, doi:10.1029/2011JD016396.

Montopoli, M., D. Cimini, M. Lamantea, M. Herzog, H. Graf, and F. Marzano (2013), Microwave radiometric remote sensing of volcanic ash clouds from space: Model and data analysis, *IEEE Trans on Geosci and Rem Sens*, **51 (9)**, 4678-4691.

Schumann, U., Weinzierl, B., Reitebuch, O., Schlager, H., Minikin, A., Forster, C., Baumann, R., Sailer, T., Graf, K., Mannstein, H., Voigt, C., Rahm, S., Simmet, R., Scheibe, M., Lichtenstern, M., Stock, P., Rüba, H., Schäuble, D., Tafferner, A., Rautenhaus, M., Gerz, T., Ziereis, H., Krautstrunk, M., Mallaun, C., Gayet, J.-F., Lieke, K., Kandler, K., Ebert, M., Weinbruch, S., Stohl, A., Gasteiger, J., Groß, S., Freudenthaler, V., Wiegner, M., Ansmann, A., Tesche, M., Olafsson, H., and Sturm, K.: Airborne observations of the Eyjafjalla volcano ash cloud over Europe during air space closure in April and May 2010, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, **11**, 2245-2279, doi:10.5194/acp-11-2245-2011, 2011.

Winker, D., Z. Liu, A. Omar, J. Tackett and D. Fairlie (2012), CALIOP observations of the transport of ash from the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in April 2010, *J. Geosphys. Res.*, **117**, D00U15, doi:10.1029/2011JD016499.