
COPERNICUS SPACE COMPONENT SENTINEL OPTICAL IMAGING MISSION PERFORMANCE CLUSTER SERVICE

Data Quality Report

Sentinel-3 SLSTR

May 2022



Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Contract: 4000136252/21/I-BG

| Customer: | ESA | Document Ref.: | OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022 | | |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Contract No.: | 4000136252/21/I-BG | Date: | 10/06/2022 | | |
| | | Issue: | 1.0 | | |

| Project: | COPERNICUS SPACE COMPONENT SENTINEL OPTICAL IMAGING MISSION PERFORMANCE CLUSTER SERVICE | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Title: | Data Quality Report - SLSTR - May 2022 | | | | | | | | |
| Author(s): | SLSTR ESL team | | | | | | | | |
| Approved by: | D. Smith, OPT-MPC SLSTR ESL Coordinator Authorized by C. Hénocq, OPT-MPC Technical Manager | | | | | | | | |
| Distribution: | ESA, EUMETSAT, published in S | entinel Online | | | | | | | |
| Accepted by ESA | S. Dransfeld, ESA TO | | | | | | | | |
| Filename | OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022 - i1r0 - SLSTR Data Quality Report May 2022.docx | | | | | | | | |

Disclaimer

The views expressed herein can in no way be taken to reflect the official opinion of the European Space Agency or the European Union.









Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: iii

Changes Log

| Version | Date | Changes |
|---------|------------|---------------|
| 1.0 | 10/06/2022 | First version |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

List of Changes

| Version | Section | Answers to RID | Changes |
|---------|---------|----------------|---------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: iv

Table of content

| 1 | PRO | CESSING BASELINE VERSION | |
|----|-------|--|----|
| 2 | EVE | NTS | 2 |
| 2. | .1 | SLSTR-A | 2 |
| 2. | .2 | SLSTR-B | |
| 3 | INST | RUMENT MONITORING | 3 |
| 3. | .1 | INSTRUMENT TEMPERATURES | 3 |
| 3. | .2 | DETECTOR TEMPERATURES | 5 |
| 3. | .3 | SCANNER PERFORMANCE | 7 |
| 3. | .4 | BLACK-BODIES | 8 |
| 3. | .5 | DETECTOR NOISE LEVELS | 10 |
| | 3.5.1 | 1 SLSTR-A VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise | 10 |
| | 3.5.2 | SLSTR-B VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise | |
| | 3.5.3 | 3 SLSTR-A TIR channel NEDT | |
| | 3.5.4 | 4 SLSTR-B TIR channel NEDT | |
| 3. | .6 | CALIBRATION FACTORS | 17 |
| | 3.6.1 | 1 VIS and SWIR radiometric response | 17 |
| 4 | LEVE | EL-1 PRODUCT VALIDATION | 22 |
| 4. | .1 | GEOMETRIC CALIBRATION/VALIDATION | 22 |
| 4. | .2 | RADIOMETRIC VALIDATION | 24 |
| 4. | .3 | IMAGE QUALITY | 27 |
| 5 | LEVE | EL 2 LST VALIDATION | 28 |
| 5. | .1 | CATEGORY-A VALIDATION | 28 |
| 5. | .2 | CATEGORY-C VALIDATION | 35 |
| 5. | .3 | LEVEL-3C ASSESSMENT | 37 |
| 5. | .4 | References | 39 |
| 6 | LEVE | EL 2 FRP VALIDATION | 40 |
| 6. | .1 | FRP VALIDATION | 41 |
| 7 | APP | ENDIX A | 51 |

OPT-MPC Page 10 April 10 Apri

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: v

List of Figures

| Figure 1: OME temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) during May 2022 showing the three paraboloid stops and flip baffle (top two plots) and optical bench at different positions (third plots), and scanner and flip assembly (bottom plots). Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. |
|--|
| Figure 2: Baffle temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) at different positions on the inner and outer baffles during May 2022. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit 4 |
| Figure 3: SLSTR-A detector temperatures for each channel for the last year of operations. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. The different colours indicate different detectors5 |
| Figure 4: SLSTR-B detector temperatures for each channel for the last year of operations. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. The different colours indicate different detectors |
| Figure 5: SLSTR-A scanner and flip jitter for May 2022, showing mean and stddev from expected position per orbit (red and blue respectively) for the nadir view (left) and oblique view (right). The plots show the nadir scanner (top), oblique scanner (middle) and flip mirror (bottom). |
| Figure 6: SLSTR-B scanner and flip jitter for May 2022, showing mean and stddev difference from expected position per orbit (red and blue respectively) for the nadir view (left) and oblique view (right). The plots show the nadir scanner (top), oblique scanner (middle) and flip mirror (bottom) |
| Figure 7: SLSTR-A blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during May 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit8 |
| Figure 8: SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B long term trends in average +YBB temperature, showing yearly variation. The vertical dashed lines indicate the 1 st January in each year9 |
| Figure 9: SLSTR-B blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during May 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit9 |
| Figure 10: VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise of the measured VISCAL signal in each orbit for the last year of operations for SLSTR-A. Different colours indicate different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month |
| Figure 11: SLSTR-A NEDT trend for the thermal channels in May 2022. Blue points were calculated from the cold blackbody signal and red points from the hot blackbody. The square symbols show results calculated from the nadir view and crosses show results from the oblique view. Results are plotted for all detectors and integrators, which is why there are several different levels within the same colour points (particularly for S8 and F2) |
| Figure 12: SLSTR-B NEDT trend for the thermal channels in May 2022. Blue points were calculated from the cold blackbody signal and red points from the hot blackbody. The square symbols show results calculated from the padic view and crosses show results from the oblique view. Pecults are plotted for all |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: vi

| detectors and integrators, which is why there are several different levels within the same colour points (particularly for S8 and F2) 15 |
|---|
| Figure 13: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-A VIS channels for the last year of operations (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month |
| Figure 14: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-A SWIR channels for the last year of operations (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month |
| Figure 15: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-B VIS channels for the past year (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month |
| Figure 16: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-B SWIR channels for the past year (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month |
| Figure 17: SLSTR-A daily offset results in km from the GeoCal Tool analysis for Nadir along- and across-track (top two plots) and Oblique along- and across-track (bottom two plots) for May 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation |
| Figure 18: SLSTR-B daily offset results in km from the GeoCal Tool analysis for Nadir along- and across-track (top two plots) and Oblique along- and across-track (bottom two plots) for May 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation |
| Figure 19: Ratio of SLSTR-A and OLCI-A radiances (red) and SLSTR-B and OLCI-B radiances (blue) for the visible channels in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites |
| Figure 20: Ratio of SLSTR-A (red) and SLSTR-B (blue) with AATSR radiances in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites 25 |
| Figure 21: Ratio of SLSTR-A (red) and SLSTR-B (blue) with MODIS radiances in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites 26 |
| Figure 22: Daytime combined SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B Level-1 image for visible channels on 15 th May 2022. |
| Figure 23: Validation of the SL_2_LST product in April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) at seven Gold Standard in situ stations of the SURFRAD network plus two Gold Standard station from the ARM network, and two Gold Standard station from the USCRN network. The matchups are split between daytime (red) and night-time (blue) |
| Figure 24: Intercomparison of the SL_2_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right). Daytime composites are in the top row and Night-time composites are in the bottom row |
| Figure 25: Monthly composites at 0.05° of LST for April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right). Daytime composites are in the top row and Night-time composites are in the bottom row |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: vii

| Figure 26: Monthly composites at 0.05° of sampling ratio for April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right). Daytime composites are in the top row and Night-time composites are in the bottom row 38 |
|--|
| Figure 27: Areas of high fire activity selected for the inter-comparison. The basemap shows night-time fires detected by SLSTR (top) and MODIS (bottom) for the months of December 2021, January, February and March 2022. |
| Figure 28: Amount of fire pixels detected only by one sensor (A and C) and by both sensors (B and D), per dataset. The percentages on top of each bar represent the proportion of pixels for that bar with respect to the total amount of fire pixel per dataset.———————————————————————————————————— |
| Figure 29: Distribution of the FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors. The lines represent kernel density estimates (KDE) computed over the bar plot 46 |
| Figure 30: Scatterplot between the FRP of fire clusters detected by both sensors. SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. The regression line (with a shaded 0.05 confidence interval) is obtained with a robust linear method (RLM), which is less affected by outliers. The scatterpoints are color-coded according to their cluster number, so that they can be traced back to the original datasets |
| Figure 31: Amount of fire pixels detected only by one sensor (A and C) and by both sensors (B and D), per dataset. The percentages on top of each bar represent the proportion of pixels for that bar with respect to the total amount of fire pixel per dataset |
| Figure 32: Distribution of the FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors. The lines represent kernel density estimates (KDE) computed over the barplot 50 |
| Figure 33: Scatterplot between the FRP of fire clusters detected by both sensors. SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. The regression line (with a shaded 0.05 confidence interval) is obtained with a robust linear method (RLM), which is less affected by outliers. The scatterpoints are color-coded according to their cluster number, so that they can be traced back to the original datasets |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: viii

List of Tables

| Table 1: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view 10 |
|--|
| Table 2: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view. |
| Table 3: Average SLSTR-B reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view |
| Table 4: Average SLSTR-B reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view |
| Table 5: NEDT for SLSTR-A in the last 11 months averaged over all detectors for both Earth views towards the hot +YBB (top) and the cold -YBB (bottom) 14 |
| Table 6: NEDT for SLSTR-B in the last 11 months averaged over all detectors for both Earth views towards the hot +YBB (top) and the cold -YBB (bottom) 16 |
| Table 7: Average absolute accuracy in K of the SL_2_LST product with respect to Gold Standard stations for April 2022 |
| Table 8: Median differences in K from the intercomparison of the SL_2_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for April 2022 35 |
| Table 9: Summary of the inter-comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP – December 2021, January and February 2022 |
| Table 10: Summary of the inter-comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP - March 2022 data 48 |



Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 1

1 Processing Baseline Version

There have been no updates to the processor in this month of operations. Summary information on the current PB version is provided below.

| IPF | IPF / Processing Baseline version | Date of deployment | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| S3A | | | | | | |
| SL1 | 06.19 / SLL1004.04.00 | 09/02/2022 10:05 UTC | | | | |
| SL2 LST | 06.20 / SLLST.004.06.00 | 09/02/2022 10:0 UTC | | | | |
| SL2 FRP (NTC) | 01.07 / FRP_NTC.004.07.00 | 28/02/2022 09:05 UTC | | | | |

| IPF | IPF / Processing Baseline version | Date of deployment | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| S3B | | | | | | |
| SL1 | 06.19 / SLL1004.04.00 | 09/02/2022 10:05 UTC | | | | |
| SL2 LST | 06.20 / SLLST.004.06.00 | 09/02/2022 10:05 UTC | | | | |
| SL2 FRP (NTC) | 01.07 / FRP_NTC.004.07.00 | 28/02/2022 09:05 UTC | | | | |

In order to ease the traceability of S3 products, the processing baseline identifier is now provided in the manifest file and in the global attributes of each file. The identifier comprises of seven characters (e.g. SL_L1_) which indicates the product type, and seven characters to indicate its version, xxx.yy.zz (e.g. 004.04.00). The version number, xxx indicates baseline collection, yy indicates change due to the IPF or ADF and zz indicates change in system components (e.g. L0, PUG) that do not impact data quality but are included to allow full traceability.

Note that more details of the processing baseline version can be found in the SLSTR Product Notice.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 2

2 Events

2.1 SLSTR-A

SLSTR-A was switched on and operating nominally during May 2022, with Scan Unit Electronics (SUE) scanning and autonomous switching between day and night modes, except for the following events:

- 18th May 2022, 06:10-06:13 pointing flag raised (platform mode not in yaw steering mode) due to scheduled in-plane manoeuvre
- 16th May 2022, 15:31-15:49 pointing flag raised (platform mode not in yaw steering mode) due to scheduled Lunar calibration manoeuvre

2.2 SLSTR-B

SLSTR-B was switched on and operating nominally during May 2022, with SUE scanning and autonomous switching between day and night modes, except for the following events:

- 4th May 2022, 00:51-00:54 data gaps caused by radio frequency interference
- 9th May 2022, 08:13-0819- missing scans
- 24th May 2022, 07:43-07:54 pointing flag raised (platform mode not in yaw steering mode) due to scheduled manoeuvre



Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 3

3 Instrument monitoring

In this section we present detailed information on the instrument over the month of operation, and in some cases, the previous year and mission for context.

3.1 Instrument temperatures

As a thermal infrared instrument, thermal stability, and uniformity of the optical mechanical enclosure (OME) is critical to the radiometric calibration. Figure 1 and Figure 2 show the orbital average temperature of the OME and instrument baffles for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B during the month. The temperatures were stable (on top of a daily variation cycle).




Figure 1: OME temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) during May 2022 showing the three paraboloid stops and flip baffle (top two plots) and optical bench at different positions (third plots), and scanner and flip assembly (bottom plots). Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit.

OPT-MPC Page of the second of

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 2: Baffle temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) at different positions on the inner and outer baffles during May 2022. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit.

OPT-MPC Paulous Distriction Performance Cluster Onticel Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 5

3.2 Detector temperatures

The detector temperatures for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B were stable at their expected values over the month. Figure 3 and Figure 4 show the annual trend in SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B detector temperatures for the past year. The temperatures from this month are consistent with the yearly trend.

The annual trend reveals one feature, explained below.

September 2021, S3A and S3B. A few orbits (e.g. end of September 2021) show slightly lower average visible channel detector temperatures due to instrument operations that were performed on those days.




Figure 3: SLSTR-A detector temperatures for each channel for the last year of operations. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. The different colours indicate different detectors.



Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 4: SLSTR-B detector temperatures for each channel for the last year of operations. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. The different colours indicate different detectors.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 7

3.3 Scanner performance

The actual position of the scan and flip mirrors is measured by the instrument, and Figure 5 shows the statistics of the difference from the expected linear control law for each mirror in each view for SLSTR-A during May 2022. Figure 6 shows the equivalent trends for SLSTR-B. The performance has been consistent with previous operations and does not appear to be degrading. For reference, one arcsecond corresponds to roughly 4m on the ground.




Figure 5: SLSTR-A scanner and flip jitter for May 2022, showing mean and stddev from expected position per orbit (red and blue respectively) for the nadir view (left) and oblique view (right). The plots show the nadir scanner (top), oblique scanner (middle) and flip mirror (bottom).




Figure 6: SLSTR-B scanner and flip jitter for May 2022, showing mean and stddev difference from expected position per orbit (red and blue respectively) for the nadir view (left) and oblique view (right). The plots show the nadir scanner (top), oblique scanner (middle) and flip mirror (bottom).

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 8

3.4 Black-Bodies

The monthly orbital average blackbody temperatures for SLSTR-A are shown in Figure 7, and SLSTR-B are shown in Figure 9. The temperatures were stable on top of a daily variation cycle. There are also longer term trends which show a yearly variation, with temperatures rising as the Earth approaches perihelion at the beginning of January – this variation is shown in the monthly averages in Figure 8 and Table 5.

Figure 7 and Figure 9 also show the gradients across the blackbody baseplate (i.e. each Platinum Resistance Thermometer (PRT) sensor reading relative to the mean). The gradients are stable and within their expected range of ± 20 mK, except for the +Y blackbody for SLSTR-B which has a higher gradient. This higher gradient is expected and consistent with measurements made before launch.




Figure 7: SLSTR-A blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during May 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 8: SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B long term trends in average +YBB temperature, showing yearly variation. The vertical dashed lines indicate the 1st January in each year.




Figure 9: SLSTR-B blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during May 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 10

3.5 Detector noise levels

3.5.1 SLSTR-A VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise

The VIS and SWIR channel noise for SLSTR-A during May 2022 was stable and consistent with previous operations - the signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal over the past year is plotted in Figure 10. Table 1 and Table 2 give the average monthly signal-to-noise (excluding the instrument decontaminations). These values average over the significant detector-detector dispersion for the SWIR channels that is shown in Figure 10. Note that these averages are now calculated for each calendar month, whereas in data quality reports before January 2022 they were aligned to the satellite 27 day repeat cycles.

Table 1: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view.

| | Average | | Nadir Signal-to-noise ratio | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Reflectance Factor | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
| S1 | 0.187 | 241 | 237 | 240 | 247 | 246 | 241 | 239 | 242 | 243 | 244 | 238 |
| S2 | 0.194 | 242 | 243 | 242 | 244 | 246 | 247 | 248 | 247 | 241 | 242 | 243 |
| S3 | 0.190 | 224 | 228 | 229 | 231 | 229 | 227 | 228 | 229 | 228 | 229 | 226 |
| S4 | 0.191 | 167 | 170 | 172 | 173 | 176 | 176 | 177 | 176 | 173 | 171 | 170 |
| S5 | 0.193 | 280 | 281 | 283 | 285 | 287 | 287 | 292 | 290 | 283 | 282 | 282 |
| S6 | 0.175 | 178 | 180 | 182 | 184 | 186 | 188 | 188 | 186 | 182 | 180 | 180 |

Table 2: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view.

| | Average | | | | | Oblique S | ignal-to-n | oise ratio |) | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Reflectance Factor | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
| S1 | 0.166 | 256 | 252 | 254 | 264 | 269 | 266 | 261 | 261 | 264 | 261 | 252 |
| S2 | 0.170 | 257 | 261 | 260 | 261 | 266 | 271 | 271 | 268 | 263 | 258 | 254 |
| S3 | 0.168 | 224 | 231 | 236 | 240 | 239 | 235 | 232 | 231 | 233 | 232 | 229 |
| S4 | 0.166 | 137 | 138 | 139 | 140 | 141 | 141 | 140 | 138 | 137 | 137 | 138 |
| S5 | 0.166 | 213 | 212 | 215 | 215 | 217 | 215 | 210 | 209 | 213 | 214 | 213 |
| S6 | 0.155 | 129 | 131 | 132 | 132 | 135 | 135 | 132 | 130 | 130 | 130 | 131 |

OPT-MPC Page 10 PT-MPC Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 10: VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise of the measured VISCAL signal in each orbit for the last year of operations for SLSTR-A. Different colours indicate different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 12

3.5.2 SLSTR-B VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise

The monthly average VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise ratios for SLSTR-B are shown in Table 3 and Table 4. These values average over a significant detector-detector dispersion for the SWIR channels. Note that these averages are now calculated for each calendar month, whereas in data quality reports before January 2022 they were aligned to the satellite 27 day repeat cycles.

Table 3: Average SLSTR-B reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view.

| | Average | | | | | Nadir Sig | gnal-to-no | ise ratio | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Reflectance Factor | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
| S1 | 0.177 | 222 | 227 | 224 | 232 | 232 | 227 | 236 | 235 | 228 | 226 | 225 |
| S2 | 0.192 | 215 | 218 | 217 | 221 | 224 | 221 | 223 | 227 | 222 | 218 | 215 |
| S3 | 0.194 | 221 | 225 | 221 | 221 | 226 | 232 | 228 | 224 | 219 | 222 | 222 |
| S4 | 0.186 | 128 | 129 | 129 | 130 | 130 | 132 | 132 | 131 | 131 | 131 | 130 |
| S5 | 0.184 | 238 | 241 | 241 | 242 | 244 | 245 | 244 | 245 | 244 | 241 | 241 |
| S6 | 0.162 | 158 | 160 | 158 | 158 | 163 | 163 | 167 | 167 | 163 | 161 | 160 |

Table 4: Average SLSTR-B reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view.

| | Average | Oblique Signal-to-noise ratio | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|
| | Reflectance Factor | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 | |
| S1 | 0.157 | 216 | 215 | 218 | 223 | 221 | 225 | 224 | 221 | 223 | 219 | 213 | |
| S2 | 0.168 | 245 | 246 | 249 | 255 | 256 | 255 | 258 | 259 | 254 | 250 | 247 | |
| S3 | 0.172 | 248 | 249 | 249 | 253 | 260 | 257 | 252 | 251 | 252 | 250 | 242 | |
| S4 | 0.168 | 126 | 127 | 128 | 129 | 127 | 129 | 130 | 130 | 131 | 131 | 128 | |
| S5 | 0.172 | 245 | 245 | 245 | 245 | 249 | 250 | 248 | 247 | 248 | 248 | 247 | |
| S6 | 0.152 | 179 | 181 | 182 | 184 | 186 | 187 | 186 | 185 | 186 | 185 | 181 | |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 13

3.5.3 SLSTR-A TIR channel NEDT

The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-A in May 2022 are consistent with previous operations and within the requirements. NEDT trends calculated from the hot and cold blackbody signals are shown in Figure 11. Monthly NEDT values, averaged over all detectors and both Earth views, are shown in Table 5. Note that these averages are now calculated for each calendar month, whereas in data quality reports before January 2022 they were aligned to the satellite 27 day repeat cycles.




Figure 11: SLSTR-A NEDT trend for the thermal channels in May 2022. Blue points were calculated from the cold blackbody signal and red points from the hot blackbody. The square symbols show results calculated from the nadir view and crosses show results from the oblique view. Results are plotted for all detectors and integrators, which is why there are several different levels within the same colour points (particularly for S8 and F2).

OPT-MPC Poptical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 14

Table 5: NEDT for SLSTR-A in the last 11 months averaged over all detectors for both Earth views towards the hot +YBB (top) and the cold -YBB (bottom).

| SLSTF | R-A | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
|--------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| +YBB t | - | 302.943 | 302.951 | 303.047 | 303.197 | 303.661 | 303.858 | 303.879 | 303.583 | 303.17 8 | 302.977 | 302.848 |
| | S7 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 18.0 | 17.3 | 17.2 | 16.9 | 17.0 | 17.3 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 17.7 |
| | S8 | 12.0 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 12.1 |
| NEDT (mK) | S9 | 18.3 | 18.4 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.7 |
| | F1 | 329 | 283 | 297 | 279 | 279 | 273 | 275 | 279 | 281 | 283 | 287 |
| | F2 | 33.7 | 33.8 | 34.2 | 35.1 | 35.3 | 35.5 | 35.4 | 35.2 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 35.2 |

| SLSTR | R-A | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| -YBB te | • | 265.528 | 265.420 | 265.480 | 266.040 | 266.641 | 266.897 | 266.824 | 266.421 | 265.97 8 | 265.896 | 265.918 |
| | S7 | 50.8 | 50.6 | 49.2 | 49.4 | 48.3 | 47.2 | 47.8 | 48.9 | 49.7 | 50.1 | 50.2 |
| | S8 | 14.6 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.6 | 14.7 | 14.7 | 14.7 |
| NEDT (mK) | S9 | 22.6 | 22.6 | 22.5 | 22.7 | 22.7 | 22.7 | 22.8 | 22.8 | 23.0 | 23.1 | 23.1 |
| | F1 | 1233 | 1223 | 1184 | 1186 | 1158 | 1132 | 1145 | 1173 | 1202 | 1209 | 1203 |
| | F2 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 29.1 | 28.8 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 29.0 |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 15

3.5.4 SLSTR-B TIR channel NEDT

The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-B in May 2022, calculated from the hot and cold blackbody signals are shown in Figure 12 with monthly averages in Table 6. Note that these averages are now calculated for each calendar month, whereas in data quality reports before January 2022 they were aligned to the satellite 27 day repeat cycles.




Figure 12: SLSTR-B NEDT trend for the thermal channels in May 2022. Blue points were calculated from the cold blackbody signal and red points from the hot blackbody. The square symbols show results calculated from the nadir view and crosses show results from the oblique view. Results are plotted for all detectors and integrators, which is why there are several different levels within the same colour points (particularly for S8 and F2).

OPT-MPC Poptical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 16

Table 6: NEDT for SLSTR-B in the last 11 months averaged over all detectors for both Earth views towards the hot +YBB (top) and the cold -YBB (bottom).

| SLSTI | SLSTR-B | | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
|------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| +YBB temp (K) | | 302.981 | 302.972 | 303.084 | 303.268 | 303.717 | 304.077 | 304.027 | 303.642 | 303.26 0 | 303.06 8 | 303.000 |
| | S7 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 16.5 | 16.3 | 16.1 | 15.8 | 15.9 | 16.1 | 16.0 | 16.1 | 16.2 |
| | S8 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 14.2 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 14.1 | 14.2 | 14.3 | 14.3 | 14.3 |
| NEDT (mK) | S9 | 16.2 | 16.3 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.3 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 16.5 |
| | F1 | 363 | 364 | 376 | 373 | 362 | 355 | 363 | 373 | 377 | 377 | 385 |
| | F2 | 30.3 | 30.2 | 30.3 | 30.5 | 30.7 | 30.6 | 30.5 | 30.5 | 30.3 | 30.3 | 30.3 |

| SLSTF | R-B | Jul 2021 | Aug 2021 | Sep 2021 | Oct 2021 | Nov 2021 | Dec 2021 | Jan 2022 | Feb 2022 | Mar 2022 | Apr 2022 | May 2022 |
|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| -YBB to | - | 265.153 | 265.041 | 265.105 | 265.667 | 266.304 | 266.725 | 266.579 | 266.052 | 265.64 0 | 265.52 3 | 265.638 |
| | S7 | 44.1 | 44.6 | 44.1 | 43.5 | 42.7 | 42.2 | 42.6 | 43.3 | 44.2 | 44.3 | 44.3 |
| | S8 | 18.0 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.0 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 18.3 |
| NEDT (mK) | S9 | 20.8 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 21.0 | 21.1 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 21.4 |
| | F1 | 1483 | 1515 | 1504 | 1489 | 1465 | 1439 | 1483 | 1514 | 1568 | 1542 | 1585 |
| | F2 | 33.4 | 33.6 | 33.6 | 33.6 | 33.5 | 33.5 | 33.6 | 33.7 | 33.9 | 33.9 | 33.9 |

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 17

3.6 Calibration factors

3.6.1 VIS and SWIR radiometric response

Figure 13 and Figure 14 show the variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-A over the past year, and Figure 15 and Figure 16 show the variation of the radiometric gain for SLSTR-B over the past year also. The data from the last month appears normal and follows the expected trend. There are several features in this annual trend plot to note.

- The visible channels show oscillations in their radiometric response due to the build-up of ice on the optical path within the focal plane assembly (FPA). Similar oscillations were observed for the corresponding channels on ATSR-2 and AATSR. As described in Section 3.2, periodic decontamination of the infrared FPA is necessary to remove the water ice contamination.
- The radiometric responses of the SWIR channels appear to be more stable and not affected by the build-up of water ice contamination, although there is a seasonal cycle of the response that could be caused by variations in the solar zenith angle on the diffuser or partial vignetting of the Sun's disc by the VISCAL baffle.
- Note that the period of the oscillations depends on the rate of build up of the ice layer, which is faster for SLSTR-B because it has had less time to decontaminate.
- ❖ S3B: There is noisy behaviour and numerous drops in signal in the radiometric gain, especially in channels S1 and S2. This gives 2-3% errors in the radiometric calibration of these channels. A number of candidate root causes have been identified, with the most likely due to motional chopping of the VIS detectors by an internal aperture in the VIS optical bench. Because the effect appears to be random it is most likely affecting all the data for S1 and S2.

It should be noted that the data from the VISCAL unit and blackbodies calibrates the signal and counteracts the degradation of the optics and other variations in signal.

OPT-MPC Paulous Department of the Control Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 13: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-A VIS channels for the last year of operations (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

OPT-MPC Paragraphics Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 14: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-A SWIR channels for the last year of operations (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

OPT-MPC Topsical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 15: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-B VIS channels for the past year (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

OPT-MPC Paragraphics Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 16: Variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-B SWIR channels for the past year (nadir view). Different colours represent different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 22

4 Level-1 product validation

4.1 Geometric calibration/validation

Regular monitoring using the GeoCal Tool implemented at the MPC is being carried out. This monitors the geolocation performance in Level-1 images by correlation with ground control point (GCP) imagettes. Each Level-1 granule typically contains several hundred GCPs, which are filtered based on signal-to-noise to obtain a daily average in the across and along track directions. The results for May 2022 are plotted in Figure 17 for SLSTR-A and Figure 18 for SLSTR-B, giving the average positional offsets in kilometres for Nadir and Oblique views. Several gaps in the data exist due to processing issues at the MPC rather than gaps in the GEOCAL data.




Figure 17: SLSTR-A daily offset results in km from the GeoCal Tool analysis for Nadir along- and across-track (top two plots) and Oblique along- and across-track (bottom two plots) for May 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation.

OPT-MPC Page 10 Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 18: SLSTR-B daily offset results in km from the GeoCal Tool analysis for Nadir along- and across-track (top two plots) and Oblique along- and across-track (bottom two plots) for May 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 24

4.2 Radiometric validation

The radiometric calibration of the visible and SWIR channels is monitored using the S3ETRAC service. The S3ETRAC service extracts OLCI and SLSTR Level-1 data and computes associated statistics over 49 sites corresponding to different surface types (desert, snow, ocean maximising Rayleigh signal, and ocean maximising sunglint scattering). These S3ETRAC products are used for the assessment and monitoring of the VIS and SWIR radiometry by the ESL.

Details of the S3ETRAC/SLSTR statistics are provided on the S3ETRAC website http://s3etrac.acri.fr/index.php?action=generalstatistics#pageSLSTR

- Number of SLSTR products processed by the S3ETRAC service
- Statistics per type of target (DESERT, SNOW, RAYLEIGH, SUNGLINT)
- Statistics per site
- Statistics on the number of records

Figure 19 shows the results of the inter-comparison analysis of SLSTR-A with OLCI-A and SLSTR-B with OLCI-B over desert sites. Figure 20 shows the results of an inter-comparison analysis of SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B with AATSR, and Figure 21 shows the results of the inter-comparison analysis with MODIS. Average ratios in each case are given in the figures.




Figure 19: Ratio of SLSTR-A and OLCI-A radiances (red) and SLSTR-B and OLCI-B radiances (blue) for the visible channels in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites.

OPT-MPC Page 15 Copylical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 20: Ratio of SLSTR-A (red) and SLSTR-B (blue) with AATSR radiances in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 21: Ratio of SLSTR-A (red) and SLSTR-B (blue) with MODIS radiances in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 27

4.3 Image quality

The Level-1 image quality is assessed when data are available at the MPC. For example, by combining all granules over one day into a single combined image. The S3A and S3B satellites are configured to be 140 degrees out of phase in order to observe complimentary portions of the earth. Figure 22 shows an example combined SLSTR-A/SLSTR-B image for the visible channels on 15th May 2022 (daytime only). There are gaps in the image due to issues with data transfer at the MPC, rather than true missing data granules.




Figure 22: Daytime combined SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B Level-1 image for visible channels on 15th May 2022.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 28

5 Level 2 LST validation

Level 2 Land Surface Temperature products have been validated against *in situ* observations (Category-A validation) from twelve "Gold Standard" Stations, and intercompared (Category-C validation) with respect to an independent operational reference product (SEVIRI from LSA SAF). The different categories of validation are first described in the LST Validation Protocol (Schneider et al., 2012) and reinforced in the CEOS WGCV-LPV Land Surface Temperature Product Validation Best Practice Protocol (Guillevic et al., 2017). In all cases it is the NTC products that are validated, and the Probabilistic cloud masking implementation is used for all cloud masking. Level-3C products for the full month of May 2022 for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B are evaluated for identifying any gross problems. Both S3A and S3B L2 products are produced with the updated LST coefficients following the operational release on 25th February 2019. In each case the latest temporal interpolation for the probabilistic cloud mask is applied following the L1 operational release on 15th January 2020. The updated cloud coefficients ADF was applied on 23rd October 2020.

5.1 Category-A validation

Category-A validation uses a comparison of satellite-retrieved LST with *in situ* measurements collected from radiometers sited at a number of stations spread across the Earth, for which the highest-quality validation can be achieved. Here we concentrate on twelve "Gold Standard" stations which are installed with well-calibrated instrumentation: seven from the SURFRAD network (Bondville, Illinois; Desert Rock, Nevada; Fort Peck, Montana; Goodwin Creek, Mississippi; Penn State University, Pennsylvania; Sioux Fall, South Dakota; Table Mountain, Colorado); two from the ARM network (Southern Great Plains, Oklahoma; Barrow, Alaska); and three from the USCRN network (Williams, Arizona; Des Moines, Iowa; Manhatten, Kansas).

For the SURFRAD field pyrgeometers the uncertainty is estimated to be ± 5 Wm-2 (Augustine and Dutton, 2013). For ARM, the uncertainty of the measured brightness temperatures was set to ± 0.5 K for Southern Great Plains (Morris, 2006), and for North Slopes Alaska the uncertainty of the IR radiance data was set to ± 4 Wm-2 (Stoffel, 2006). For the USCRN network, which uses Apogee SI-121s the uncertainty is set as the manufacturers estimate of ± 0.2 K.

The results can be summarised as follows (accuracy is used as the metric rather than uncertainty as this is then a straight comparison with mission requirements):

Table 7: Average absolute accuracy in K of the SL_2_LST product with respect to Gold Standard stations for April 2022.

| Satellite | Average absolute accuracy vs. Gold Standard (K) | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Satemite | Day | Night | | | | | | | |
| S3A | 1.1 | 1.0 | | | | | | | |
| S3B | 1.1 | 1.1 | | | | | | | |

OPT-MPC Paulo Supposed Suppos

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022


Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 29

For both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B both the daytime and night-time absolute accuracies (which are derived from the absolute values of all the mean biases from the individual stations) are within or very close to the mission requirement of 1K, even though they are impacted to some extent by very small number of matchups for some stations in the cycle due to actual cloud, or overmasking. The number of matchups across most stations for daytime are very low particularly during the day, and have impacted the biases to an extent.






Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022






Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022






Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022



OPT-MPC Paulo Musion Performance Cluster Optical Musion Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 34




Figure 23: Validation of the SL_2_LST product in April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) at seven Gold Standard in situ stations of the SURFRAD network plus two Gold Standard station from the ARM network, and two Gold Standard station from the USCRN network. The matchups are split between daytime (red) and night-time (blue).

As with past cycles cloud has reduced the number of matchups per station to single figures for most stations during day or night, with some missing statistics entirely. It is therefore challenging to determine robust statistics. The cumulative statistics are presented in each Annual Report. Nonetheless, it can be seen that overall the matchups are in general close to the 1:1 line with very few outliers. No systematic bias is evident from these matchups.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 35

5.2 Category-C validation

Category-C validation uses inter-comparisons with similar LST products from other sources such as other satellite sensors, which give important quality information with respect to spatial patterns in LST deviations. Here we compare the SL_2_LST product from both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B with the operational SEVIRI L2 product available from the LSA SAF. The typical uncertainty of the SEVIRI L2 product ranges between ~1 K over much of Africa and ~3 K over the deserts. The results can be summarised:

Table 8: Median differences in K from the intercomparison of the SL_2_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for April 2022

| Continent | Median differences in K from the intercomparison of the SL_2_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for March 2022 | | | | |
|-----------|--|-------|---------|-------|--|
| | SLSTR-A | | SLSTR-B | | |
| | Day | Night | Day | Night | |
| Africa | -0.1 | 0.3 | -0.2 | -0.1 | |
| Europe | 1.8 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 | |

For both Africa and Europe, the median differences across the continent for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B are relatively small, with very few locations with larger differences. The median is used to minimise the impact of any outliers. This is the same for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B and is primarily driven by differences in viewing geometry between the SLSTR instruments and SEVIRI and is expected, and in agreement with previous studies of polar orbiting matchups with SEVIRI (Ghent et al., 2017; Trigo et al., 2008). Eastern matchups (such as over the Arabian Peninsula and north-eastern Europe) are towards the edge of the SEVIRI disk and therefore represent large viewing angles. At these extreme viewing angles it is expected that SLSTR LST would be increasingly higher than SEVIRI LST, and the SEVIRI uncertainty increases above 3 K at these extreme angles. For both daytime and night-time the differences are mainly < 1K for Africa for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B. During daytime differences are over 1K for Europe as a result of increasing differences due to geometry as days get warmer. Differences are not the same as previous cycles for both Europe and Africa which may indicate responses due to changing seasons.

Other analysis can be summarised as follows:

- Differences with respect to biomes tend to be larger during the day for surfaces with more heterogeneity and/or higher solar insolation
- Differences increase for both day and night towards the edge of the SEVIRI disk as the SEVIRI zenith angles become larger

OPT-MPC Paragraphic Support of Control Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 36




Figure 24: Intercomparison of the SL_2_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right). Daytime composites are in the top row and Night-time composites are in the bottom row.

While some of these differences are > 1 K they are all within the corresponding uncertainty of SEVIRI at the pixel-scale (> 2K), and so the **two products can be assessed as being consistent**. It should also be noted that there are no significant differences between the two products in terms of biome-dependency - the differences are consistent across biomes. An area of stronger differences is evident over the north-east Sahara which is being investigated. Some residual cloud

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 37

contamination is evident from the large differences at the edge of cloud cleared features. While the cloud contamination is seen for both SLSTR (strong negative differences) and SEVIRI (strong positive differences), compared with cycles where the basic cloud mask was used the contamination for SLSTR is lower indicating improved masking with the Probabilistic Cloud Mask. However, less matchups are evident which suggests the cloud masking could be slightly over conservative in some biomes. This will be monitored over the following Cycles to identify whether an optimisation to the cloud coefficients should be considered for some biomes.

5.3 Level-3C Assessment

To better understand the global product and identify any gross issues Level-3 evaluation is also performed. Here we generate monthly daytime and night-time 0.05° composites of the LST field and corresponding sampling ratios. The sampling ratios are derived as clear_pixels / (clear_pixels + cloudy_pixels).




Figure 25: Monthly composites at 0.05° of LST for April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right). Daytime composites are in the top row and Night-time composites are in the bottom row.

OPT-MPC Particle Mixton Performance Cluster Optical Mixton Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 38




Figure 26: Monthly composites at 0.05° of sampling ratio for April 2022 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right). Daytime composites are in the top row and Night-time composites are in the bottom row.

The LST fields indicate the SL_2_LST product is producing values in line with expectations for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B. There are no distinct issues or non-physical values evident. The sampling ratio is now closer to what would be expected (given previous offline assessments of cloud coverage) across the globe following the implementation of the temporal interpolation for the probabilistic cloud mask on 15th January 2020. Cloud contamination appears to be low, although there appears to be some excessive cloud clearing in some regions and undermasking in other, indicating the cloud coefficients ADF could benefit from some future tuning for both instruments now the issue regarding the temporal interpolation has been resolved.

Optical MPC



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 39

5.4 References

Augustine, J.A. and Dutton, E.G. (2013). Variability of the surface radiation budget over the United States from 1996 through 2011 from high-quality measurements. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 118, 43–53.

- Ghent, D. J., Corlett, G. K., Göttsche, F.-M., & Remedios, J. J. (2017). Global land surface temperature from the Along-Track Scanning Radiometers. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 122. https://doi.org/10.1002/2017JD027161
- Guillevic, P., Göttsche, F., Nickeson, J., Hulley, G., Ghent, D., Yu, Y., Trigo, I., Hook, S., Sobrino, J.A., Remedios, J., Román, M. & Camacho, F. (2017). Land Surface Temperature Product Validation Best Practice Protocol. Version 1.0. In P. Guillevic, F. Göttsche, J. Nickeson & M. Román (Eds.), Best Practice for Satellite-Derived Land Product Validation (p. 60): Land Product Validation Subgroup (WGCV/CEOS), doi:10.5067/doc/ceoswgcv/lpv/lst.001
- Morris, V.R. Infrared Thermometer (IRT) Handbook (ARM TR-015) (2006). Technical report, Atmospheric Radiation Measurement, Climate Research Facility, U. S. Department of Energy.
- Schneider, P., Ghent, D., Corlett, G., Prata, F., and Remedies, J. (2012). AATSR validation: LST validation protocol. Internal publication, UL-NILU-ESA-LST-LVP Issue 1 Revision 0, page 1-39. http://lst.nilu.no/Portals/73/Docs/Reports/UL-NILU-ESA-LST-LVP-Issue1-Rev0-1604212.pdf.
- Stoffel, T. Ground Radiation (GNDRAD) Handbook (ARM TR-027) (2006). Technical report, Atmospheric Radiation Measurement, Climate Research Facility, U. S. Department of Energy.
- Trigo, I. F., Monteiro, I. T., Olesen, F., & Kabsch, E. (2008). An assessment of remotely sensed land surface temperature. Journal of Geophysical Research, 113(D17), D17108. https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JD010035

OPT-MPC Paragraphy Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 40

6 Level 2 FRP validation

Level 2 Fire Radiative Power products have been compared with respect to an independent operational reference product (MODIS Terra MOD14 FRP). In particular, to evaluate the performance of the night-time algorithm, an inter-comparison between the SLSTR NTC FRP (both from SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B) and the FRP retrieved from the similar MODIS MOD14 product was designed and conducted, giving important information on both spatial patterns of fire detection and FRP quantification. The inter-comparison procedure, initially based on previous work from M. Wooster and W. Xu on the FRP Prototype and on the evaluation of SEVIRI fire data, is divided into two main parts, the first one related to active fire (AF) pixel detection and omission and commission fire pixels, and the second to fire clusters. The SLSTR FRP NTC product (both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B) has been released to the public on the 19th August 2020.

The current processing baseline for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B FRP products is FRP_NTC.004.07.00 and was deployed in the Land processing centres on 28th February 2022 for both SLSTR-A and for SLSTR-B. This baseline is including an updated FRP algorithm, called FRP V2. This updated algorithm is based on the previous one, with similar night-time algorithm, but includes improved thermal fire detection over daytime products. In addition, fire detection are now also performed using SWIR channels. This report will first focus on the Fires detected using FRP V1 algorithm between December 2021 and February 2022. Then a small section will be dedicated to the quality of FRP V2 algorithm with validation of the first month of nigh-time fire detection using thermal radiometric measurements (Validation of daytime and fire detection with SWIR measurements will be included in the next reports)

In FRP V1, AF detection is initially performed using S7, and the FRP retrieval can then be performed in two ways: either using S7 when all active fire pixels in an identified active fire cluster remain unsaturated and F1 otherwise (the so called F1_OFF option), or always using F1 regardless of S7 saturation (the F1_ON option). The algorithm is predominantly delivering active fire detections and FRP data from night-time (ascending node) S3A and S3B overpasses, as the S7 (middle infrared) channel saturates frequently over warm surfaces during day-time. The configuration, used between Dec. 2021 and Feb. 2022, makes use of the F1_ON option for the processing.

In FRP V2, AF detection is performed using a mixed thermal band: by default, the S7 brightness temperature are considered. However, each pixel associated with a saturated S7 measurement will be associated with its F1 measurement. Same replacement is also performed for each neighbour included in a 11 ×11 pixel window centered over this saturated pixel and either having a S7 brightness temperature higher than 300K or a difference between S7 and S8 brightness temperatures higher than 10 K. The fire detection during nighttime remains similar than FRP V1 and the FRP value are computed using the F1_ON option (i.e. considering F1 measurements).

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 41

6.1 FRP validation

The SLSTR FRP validation uses inter-comparisons with similar FRP products from other sources such as other satellite sensors, which give important quality information with respect to active fire detection and fire clusters characterisation. Here we compare the SL_2_FRP product from both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B with the operational MODIS MOD14 FRP product (from MODIS Terra) available from the LAADS DAAC. It is important to note that the employed products have slightly different overpass times, implying that the two sensors do not observe fires in the exact same configuration nor with the same atmospheric conditions. Thus, for these reasons, and for the nature of the procedure delineated below, this inter-comparison should not be interpreted as a full validation exercise but rather as a check of the consistency of the FRP products derived from SLSTR with the ones from MODIS. The inter-comparison procedure is divided into two main parts. The first part is related to omission and commission fire pixels, i.e., fire pixels detected by MODIS without any SLSTR fire pixel in a 7x7 window around it (omissions), and fire pixels detected by SLSTR without any MODIS fire pixel in a 7x7 window around it (commissions). The second part is related to the characterisation of fire clusters, i.e., groups of one or more pixels spatially adjacent to each other and corresponding to a single fire. A description is given in the following.

Part 1, omission and commission fire pixels between SLSTR FRP and MODIS MOD14:

- Select areas of high fire activity during the relevant time period and fetch all the relative SL_2_FRP scenes (both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B);
- Discard all scenes that do not contain active fire pixels;
- Select and download matching MODIS MOD14 data with overpass time within ± 6 minutes of those of SLSTR and covering the same area of interest, and discard all scenes that do not have a matching MOD14 product;
- Restrict observations to a scan angle of ±30° or equivalent pixel area of 1.7 km² to avoid edge-of-swath data, and restrict to the common area of detection between the two products;
- Discard all scenes that do not contain active fire pixels after the restriction step;
- Re-project the MODIS pixels to the SLSTR Level 1b data grid. If multiple MODIS active fire pixels (AFP) are present in the same equivalent SLSTR grid cell, their combined FRP is used;
- Evaluate SLSTR FRP commission fire pixels, i.e., when there is a fire pixel in the SLSTR grid without any MOD14 fire pixel in a 7x7 window around it;
- Evaluate SLSTR FRP omission fire pixels, i.e., when there is a MOD14 fire pixel without any SLSTR fire pixel in a 7x7 window around it;
- Find and evaluate fire pixels detected by both sensors.

Part 2, Fire Cluster FRP comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS MOD14:

- Apply an atmospheric correction to MODIS FRP data, calculated using transmittance and water vapour content of the column above the fire pixel;
- Starting from the fire pixels detected by both sensors, find all the fire clusters detected by both SLSTR and MODIS, i.e., groups of one or more pixels spatially adjacent to each other and

MPC Optical MPC



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 42

corresponding to a single fire; cases where a single SLSTR cluster corresponds to multiple MOD14 clusters and/or vice versa are merged together and the total FRP is used;

- Compute the total FRP for all active fire pixels in each fire cluster for MODIS and SLSTR data.
- Check for cloud/water/detection flags around each fire cluster that might affect the FRP value; if none is present, the cluster is flagged as well-detected;
- If necessary, check the SLSTR S7-S8 difference for possible issues and mismatches with the detected fire clusters;
- Generate statistics and analysis based on all the fire clusters detected by both MODIS and SLSTR.

Using the procedure delineated above, fire pixels from **five areas of high fire activity between 1**st **December 2021 and 28**th **February 2022** were aggregated and compared. In particular, the five areas of interest are: sub-Saharan Africa, southeast Asia (Thailand, Myanmar, Laos, ...), exterior of Australia, centre of South America and further to the north Colombia and Venezuela, see Figure 27. From around four thousand SLSTR scenes encompassing these areas, around 190 products which respected all the criteria delineated above were selected to perform this analysis. A summary of the results is reported in Table 9.

Table 9: Summary of the inter-comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP – December 2021, January and February 2022

| Variable | Value | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Number of commission AFP | 14,972 (51.8% of Total SLSTR AFP) | |
| Number of omission AFP | 1,163 (4% of Total SLSTR AFP) | |
| FRP of commission AFP (MW) | 52,669 | |
| FRP of omission AFP (MW) | 35,105 | |
| Number of SLSTR AFP detected by both sensors | 13,921 (48.2% of Total SLSTR AFP) | |
| Number of MOD14 AFP detected by both sensors | 5,107 (81.4% of Total MOD14 AFP) | |
| Total number of AFP detected by SLSTR | 28,893 | |
| Total number of MOD14 AFP | 6,270 | |
| Mean number of SLSTR AFP per cluster | 5.6 | |
| Total SLSTR FRP within clusters (MW) | 103,668 | |
| Mean SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW) | 45.9 | |
| Median SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW) | 19.9 | |
| Mean number of MOD14 AFP per cluster | 1.9 | |
| Total MOD14 FRP within clusters (MW) | 83,808 | |
| Mean MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW) | 37.1 | |
| Median MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW) | 12.8 | |
| Mean bias of FRP per cluster (MW) | 8.8 | |




Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

| Variable | Value |
|---|------------------|
| Median of FRP scatter per cluster (MW) | 4.9 |
| Root-mean-square deviation of FRP per cluster | 53 |
| 25-50-75 percentiles of SLSTR clusters FRP | 10.6, 19.9, 41.5 |
| 25-50-75 percentiles of MOD14 clusters FRP | 7.6, 12.8,27.7 |






Figure 27: Areas of high fire activity selected for the inter-comparison. The basemap shows night-time fires detected by SLSTR (top) and MODIS (bottom) for the months of December 2021, January, February and March 2022.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 44

Overall, there is good agreement between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP, as can be seen in Figure 27. The comparison shows that SLSTR detects in general more fire pixels than MODIS (28,893 vs 6,270), albeit many of them with very low FRP. Furthermore, there is a large number of commission fire pixels and a low number of omission fire pixel. Such pixels indicate fires that were detected only by one sensor, however, these are not necessarily incorrect/missed detections. It is important to highlight, in fact, that the two sensors observe the scenes at slightly different times (the MODIS product has to be within an interval of ± 6 minutes with respect to the SLSTR acquisition). This difference in time translates into different conditions of the observed fires and also of the cloud coverage. A fire could move, increase/decrease in extent and power, whereas clouds could cover different portions of the image. On the other hand, a fraction of these pixels may represent real fires that are undetected by MODIS but are detected by the SLSTR product - for example because of the use of the smaller pixel footprint F1 channel – or vice versa. For these reasons, the reported values should not be interpreted as full validation, but rather as indication of the consistency between the two sensors. A summary of results per dataset for omission, commission, and fire pixels detected by both sensors is visualised in Figure 28.

OPT-MPC To a supplied of the supplied of the

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 28: Amount of fire pixels detected only by one sensor (A and C) and by both sensors (B and D), per dataset. The percentages on top of each bar represent the proportion of pixels for that bar with respect to the total amount of fire pixel per dataset.

OPT-MPC Particul Mixing Performance Custors Ontical Mixing Performance Custors

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 46

The distribution of FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors is quite similar between SLSTR and MODIS (see Figure 29), even though MODIS exhibits a higher peak for low FRP values and SLSTR shows a higher curve for intermediate values. Similarly, the results of a robust regression between the FRP values given by the two sensors are close to the one-to-one line, as can be seen in Figure 29, and the fire clusters appear quite similar, albeit with a few outliers. Generally, SLSTR appears to detect more fire pixels than MODIS for the same fire clusters, many of them with very low FRP, and the total FRP of all clusters is higher for SLSTR, although this number is heavily affected by a few outliers with high FRPs. Contrary to the case of omission/commission fire pixels, the cluster analysis includes a step for checking the relevant flags associated with the fire detection, in particular those related to water or clouds in the background window around the fire cluster. Thus, results of the cluster analysis are more robust against differences in the atmospheric conditions or cloud masking algorithm. Nonetheless, the detections could still have been affected by the fact that the different sensors do not observe the fires exactly at the same time and are not perfectly equivalent. Hence, some fluctuations are expected.




Figure 29: Distribution of the FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors. The lines represent kernel density estimates (KDE) computed over the bar plot.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 47




Figure 30: Scatterplot between the FRP of fire clusters detected by both sensors. SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. The regression line (with a shaded 0.05 confidence interval) is obtained with a robust linear method (RLM), which is less affected by outliers. The scatterpoints are color-coded according to their cluster number, so that they can be traced back to the original datasets.

An additional study has been carried out considering March data products and thus the implementation of the FRP IPF V2. The main parameters of the inter comparisons between SLSTR and MODIS data remain the same for consistency.

Using the same procedure previously delineated, fire pixels from **five areas of high fire activity between 1st March and 31st March 2022** were aggregated and compared considering the same areas of interest, see Figure 27. From around one thousand SLSTR scenes encompassing these areas, around 51 products which respected all the criteria were selected to perform this analysis. A summary of the results is reported in Table 10.

The results remain consistent with the previous one, with more fire detected by SLSTR than MODIS (6976 vs 1449) but a good agreement regarding fire position and regarding FRP values. The Cluster analysis regarding FRP values (see Figure 33) seems to provide even better results than with FRP V1 with fewer outliers but need to be confirmed during the following months.

OPT-MPC Paragraphic Support of Control Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Table 10: Summary of the inter-comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP - March 2022 data.

| Variable | Value |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Number of commission AFP | 3,812 (54.6% of Total SLSTR AFP) |
| Number of omission AFP | 316 (4.5% of Total SLSTR AFP) |
| FRP of commission AFP (MW) | 12,042 |
| FRP of omission AFP (MW) | 4,642 |
| Number of SLSTR AFP detected by both sensors | 3,164 (45.4% of Total SLSTR AFP) |
| Number of MOD14 AFP detected by both sensors | 1,133 (78.2% of Total MOD14 AFP) |
| Total number of AFP detected by SLSTR | 6,976 |
| Total number of MOD14 AFP | 1,449 |
| Mean number of SLSTR AFP per cluster | 4.9 |
| Total SLSTR FRP within clusters (MW) | 24,377 |
| Mean SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW) | 42.4 |
| Median SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW) | 16.2 |
| Mean number of MOD14 AFP per cluster | 1.7 |
| Total MOD14 FRP within clusters (MW) | 25,560 |
| Mean MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW) | 40.1 |
| Median MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW) | 11.2 |
| Mean bias of FRP per cluster (MW) | 1.4 |
| Median of FRP scatter per cluster (MW) | 3.2 |
| Root-mean-square deviation of FRP per cluster | 100.5 |
| 25-50-75 percentiles of SLSTR clusters FRP | 9.8, 16.2, 30.1 |
| 25-50-75 percentiles of MOD14 clusters FRP | 7, 11.2, 22 |

OPT-MPC Page 100 Optical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022




Figure 31: Amount of fire pixels detected only by one sensor (A and C) and by both sensors (B and D), per dataset. The percentages on top of each bar represent the proportion of pixels for that bar with respect to the total amount of fire pixel per dataset.

OPT-MPC Page 100 Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 50

Cyclic Validation Cluster Distribution




Figure 32: Distribution of the FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors. The lines represent kernel density estimates (KDE) computed over the barplot.




Figure 33: Scatterplot between the FRP of fire clusters detected by both sensors. SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. The regression line (with a shaded 0.05 confidence interval) is obtained with a robust linear method (RLM), which is less affected by outliers. The scatterpoints are color-coded according to their cluster number, so that they can be traced back to the original datasets.



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR May 2022

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.05-2022

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/06/2022

Page: 51

7 Appendix A

Other reports related to the Optical mission are:

- \$2 L1C MSI Data Quality Report, May 2022 (ref. OMPC.CS.DQR.001.02-2022 i75r0)
- \$2 L2A MSI Data Quality Report, May 2022 (ref. OMPC.CS.DQR.002.02-2022 i49r0)
- S3 OLCI Data Quality Report, May 2022 (ref. OMPC.ACR.DQR.02.05-2022)

All Data Quality Reports are available on the Sentinel-3 Technical Guide pages of the Sentinel Online website, at: https://sentinel.esa.int/web/sentinel-technical-guides

End of document