COPERNICUS SPACE COMPONENT SENTINEL OPTICAL IMAGING MISSION PERFORMANCE CLUSTER SERVICE

**Data Quality Report** 

Sentinel-3 SLSTR - November 2022



**Optical Mission Performance Cluster** 

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 Issue: 1.0 Date: 08/12/2022 Contract: 4000136252/21/I-BG

Customer:	ESA	Document Ref.:	OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022		
Contract No.: 4000136252/21/I-BG		Date:	08/12/2022		
		Issue:	1.0		

Project:	COPERNICUS SPACE COMPONENT SENTINEL OPTICAL IMAGING MISSION								
•	PERFORMANCE CLUSTER SERVICE								
Title:	Data Quality Report - SLSTR - November 2022								
Author(s):	SLSTR ESL team								
Approved by:	D. Smith, OPT-MPC SLSTR ESL Authorized by C. Henocq, OPT-MPC S3								
	Coordinator		Technical Manager						
Distribution:	ESA, EUMETSAT, published in S	entinel Online							
Accepted by ESA	S. Dransfeld, ESA TO								
Filename	OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 - i1	.r0 - SLSTR Data Qual	ity Report November 2022.docx						





## **Changes Log**

Version	Date	Changes				
1.0	08/12/2022	First version				

## List of Changes

Version	Section	Answers to RID	Changes



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR

November 2022

### Table of content

1	EXEC	UTIVE SUMMARY	1
2	PRO	CESSING BASELINE VERSION	2
3		ITS	2
5			-
	3.1	SLSTR-A	
	3.2	SLSTR-B	3
4	INST	RUMENT STATUS	4
	4.1	INSTRUMENT TEMPERATURES	4
	4.1.1	SLSTR-A	5
	4.1.2	SLSTR-B	5
	4.2	DETECTOR TEMPERATURES	6
	4.2.1	SLSTR-A	6
	4.2.2	SLSTR-B	7
	4.3	SCANNER PERFORMANCE	9
	4.3.1	SLSTR-A	9
	4.3.2	SLSTR-B	10
	4.4	BLACK-BODIES	11
	4.4.1	SLSTR-A	11
	4.4.2	SLSTR-B	12
	4.5	DETECTOR NOISE LEVELS	13
	4.5.1	SLSTR-A VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise	13
	4.5.2	SLSTR-B VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise	17
	4.5.3	SLSTR-A TIR channel NEDT	18
	4.5.4	SLSTR-B TIR channel NEDT	20
	4.6	CALIBRATION FACTORS	22
	4.6.1	VIS and SWIR radiometric response	22
	4.6.2	SLSTR-A	22
	4.6.3	SLSTR-B	25
5	LEVE	L-1 PRODUCT VALIDATION	.28
	5.1	Level-1 TIR Radiometric Validation	28
	5.1 5.2	Level-1 VIS SWIR RADIOMETRIC VALIDATION	
	5.2		-
	5.3	Level-1 Geometric Validation	
	5.3.1		
	5.3.2		
_			
6	LEVE	L 2 LST VALIDATION	.37
	6.1	CATEGORY-A VALIDATION	37
	6.2	CATEGORY-C VALIDATION	44
	6.3	LEVEL-3C ASSESSMENT	46
	6.4	REFERENCES	46
7	LEVE	L 2 FRP VALIDATION	.48
	7.1	FRP VALIDATION	49
	· · <del>·</del>		75



## Optical MPC Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR

November 2022

0	AFFLIN		.04
8		DIX A	61
	7.1.2	Day-Time Validation	57
	7.1.1	Night-Time Validation	. 50



### **List of Figures**

Figure 1: OME temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and Baffle temperature trends (right) during November 2022. The OME plot shows 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). The Baffle plot shows the temperature at different positions on the inner and outer baffles. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. ------5

Figure 2: SLSTR-B OME temperature trends (left) and Baffle temperature trends (right) during November 2022. The OME plot shows 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). The Baffle plot shows the temperature at different positions on the inner and outer baffles. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. -------6

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.-----7

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.------ 8

Figure 5: SLSTR-A scanner and flip jitter for November 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).------9

Figure 6: SLSTR-B scanner and flip jitter for November 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). ------ 10

Figure 7: SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B long term trends in average +YBB temperature, showing yearly variation. The vertical dashed lines indicate the 1<sup>st</sup> January in each year.-----11

Figure 8: SLSTR-A blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during November 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. ------ 12

Figure 9: SLSTR-B blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during November 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit. ------ 13

Figure 10: VIS 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. ------ 15

Figure 11. 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. ------ 16



Figure 13: SLSTR-B NEDT trend for the thermal channels in November 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). ------- 20

Figure 15: 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. ------ 24

Figure 16: 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.-----26

Figure 17: 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.------27

Figure 18: Daytime combined SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B Level-1 image for visible channels on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022.------28

Figure 21: Ratio of SLSTR-A (red) and SLSTR-B (blue) with MODIS radiances in Nadir view using combined results for all desert sites. ------ 33

Figure 22: 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 November 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation.------ 35

Figure 23: 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 November 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation.------ 36

Figure 24: Validation of the SL\_2\_LST product in November 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).------43

Figure 25: Intercomparison of the SL\_2\_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for November 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. ----- 45

Figure 26: Monthly composites at 0.05° of LST for November 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.-----46

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 July, August and September 2022.

Figure 28: The basemap shows night-time fires detected by Sentinel 3A (top) and Sentinel 3B (bottom) for the months of July, August and September 2022.----- 54

Figure 29: Cluster formation for a specific area. ----- 55

Figure 30: Scatterplot between the number of fires detected by both sensors (night-time). SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. ------55

Figure 31: Distribution of the FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors. The lines represent kernel density estimates (KDE) computed over the barplot. ----- 56

Figure 32: 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 colour-coded according to their cluster number, so that they can be traced back to the original datasets. R=0.835. -------57

Figure 33: Areas of high fire activity selected for the inter-comparison. The basemap shows day-time fires detected by SLSTR (top) and MODIS (bottom) for the months of July, August and September 2022. ---- 59

Figure 34: The basemap shows day-time fires detected by Sentinel 3A (top) and Sentinel 3B (bottom) for the months of July, August and September 2022.----- 60

Figure 35: Scatterplot between the number of fires clusters detected by both sensors (day-time). SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. ------ 61

Figure 36: 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.- 61

Figure 37: Scatterplot between the FRP of fire clusters detected by both sensors (with an FRP < 500MW). SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. R = 0.925.----- 62

Figure 38: SLSTR vs MODIS clusters (FRP < 200) comparisons with regression line – night-time (left) and day-time (right).-----62



### **List of Tables**

Table 1: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal forthe last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view14
Table 2: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal forthe last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view.14
Table 3: Average SLSTR-B reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal forthe last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view17
Table 4: Average SLSTR-B reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal forthe last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view.17
Table 5: NEDT for SLSTR-A in the last 11 months averaged over all detectors for both Earth views towardsthe hot +YBB (top) and the cold -YBB (bottom).19
Table 6: NEDT for SLSTR-B in the last 11 months averaged over all detectors for both Earth views towardsthe hot +YBB (top) and the cold -YBB (bottom).21
Table 7. The recommended corrections that should be applied to SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B VIS, SWIR         channels
Table 8. A year-by-year breakdown of the drift in % since the start of the mission for SLSTR-A Note the trends for S6 are based on comparisons with MODIS-Aqua which are limited to June-July where the geometry matches 29
Table 9. A year-by-year breakdown of the drift in % since the start of the mission for SLSTR-B. Note the trends for S6 are based on comparisons with MODIS-Aqua which are limited to June-July where the geometry matches. Furthermore, the drift for S6 is relative to 2019 comparisons. For SLSTR-B the reference measurements were obtained before an update to the flight calibration coefficients that was performed after the S3B-IOCR. A correction factor of 2.4% has been applied to the drift rates to account for the update 30
Table 10: Average absolute accuracy in K of the SL_2_LST product with respect to Gold Standard stationsfor November 2022
Table 11: Median differences in K from the intercomparison of the SL_2_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for November 2022 44
Table 12: Summary of the inter-comparison between night-time SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP – July and August 2022. Results from previous comparison obtained between April and Mary 2022 also obtained with FRP V2 and between December 2021 and February 2022 obtained with FRP V1 have been added respectively in the second and third column for information and comparison 51
Table 42. Common of the internet internet internet of CTD CDD and MODIC CDD. From the to August

Table 13: Summary of the inter-comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP – From July to August2022 data.58



# **1** Executive Summary

This section provides a summary of the data quality for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B over the month of operation.

Any relevant formal instrument data requirements are added under the subsequent section headers for reference.

Each month the data measured by SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B are checked for quality and it is determined whether they meet the requirements specified in Sentinel-3 Mission Requirements Document, using the methods in the Sentinel-3 Cal-Val Plan.

A summary of the status from each check performed is provided below. A traffic light system is used, where the categories are determined as follows

- Green indicates that aspect is performing optimally
- Amber indicates there are some issues noted that may affect data quality or availability this month, or a user correction that needs to be applied
- Red indicates a significant quality issue, or instrument anomaly for some of the month

Follow the link on each to	pic header for more	detailed information	contained in this document.
	pic ficauci for filore	uctaneu mormation	contained in this document.

Торіс	Instrument	Comments
Processing Baseline	S3A	
Version	S3B	
Events	S3A	Several events occurred this month.
	S3B	Several events occurred this month.
Instrument Status	S3A	
	S3B	
Level-1 TIR	S3A	
Radiometric Validation	S3B	
Level- 1 VIS SWIR Radiometric	S3A	Vicarious validation indicates calibration offsets need to be applied to the VIS/SWIR channels
Validation	S3B	Vicarious validation indicates calibration offsets need to be applied to the VIS/SWIR channels
Level-1 Geometric	S3A	
Validation	S3B	
Level 2 LST	S3A	
validation	S3B	
Level 2 FRP	S3A	
validation	S3B	



# 2 Processing Baseline Version

The Processing Baseline Version allows traceability of any changes to the software used to process the SLSTR products, and any updates to the auxiliary data files used to generate them.

There have been no updates to the S3A or S3B processor in this month of operations. See table below for details of the current PB.

Summary information on the current PB version is provided below. More details of the processing baseline version can be found in the SLSTR Product Notice [Latest Level-1 Product Notice, Latest L2 Land Surface Temperature Product Notice], which is released each time the processing baseline is updated.

IPF	IPF / Processing Baseline version	Date of deployment			
S3A					
SL1	06.19 / SL_L1004.04.00	09/02/2022 10:05 UTC			
SL2 LST	06.21 / SLLST.004.07.00	23/08/2022			
SL2 FRP (NTC)	01.08 / FRP_NTC.004.08.00	23/08/2022			

IPF	IPF / Processing Baseline version	Date of deployment			
S3B					
SL1	06.19 / SL_L1004.04.00	09/02/2022 10:05 UTC			
SL2 LST	06.21 / SL_LST.004.07.00	05/09/2022			
SL2 FRP (NTC)	01.08 / FRP_NTC.004.08.00	09/09/2022			

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.



# 3 Events

Any events that have occurred in this month that cause significant data gaps and impact on quality are reported here.

There have been several events affecting S3A and S3B this month.

### 3.1 SLSTR-A

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

- 29<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 23:54-00:04 data gaps due to missing X-Band data
- 25<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 17:17-17:23 data gaps due to RFI
- 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022, 08:17-08:29 pointing flag raised due to In-Plane manoeuvre
- 21<sup>st</sup> November 2022, 21:45-21:48 data gaps due to RFI
- 10<sup>th</sup> -11<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 01:36-04:35 pointing flag raised due to ground segment anomaly
- 8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 21:05-00:27 pointing flag raised and data gaps dues to Lunar calibration manoeuvre
- 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 14:48-14:51 data gaps due to RFI

### 3.2 SLSTR-B

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

- 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 05:35-05:38 pointing flag raised
- 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2022, 07:41-0753 pointing flag raised due to In-Plane manoeuvre
- 20<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 21:27-21:30 data gaps dues to RFI
- 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022, 17:22-17:31 data gaps dues to RFI

Some background to the typical events that might occur are provided below.

**RFI Radio Frequency Interference** occurs when another satellite causes the data downlink to the receiving station to be interrupted, and the data is lost.

**Scheduled manoeuvres** may take place for Lunar views for calibration purposes, collision avoidance, or to maintain the nominal orbit. Will often result in the pointing flag being raised, and the geolocation accuracy is not nominal during this time.

**Blackbody cross over tests** occur approximately once per year and the hot and cold blackbodies are swapped round for instrument testing.

**De-icing** occurs when the instrument is heated to remove the build-up of ice.




Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR

November 2022

# **4** Instrument Status

The health of the instrument impacts the data quality. This section contains in depth analysis of several instrument parameters over the month of operation, and in some cases, the latest annual and mission tends for context.

The SLSTR-A instrument was stable and compliant with requirements over much of the last month, with the exception of the period when a black body cross over test was performed. The SLSTR-B instrument is stable and compliant with requirements this month.



### 4.1 Instrument temperatures

As a thermal infrared instrument, thermal stability and uniformity of the optical mechanical enclosure (OME) is critical to the radiometric calibration. In this section we show the orbital average temperature of the OME and instrument baffles during the month. We expect to see a very small daily variation in temperature superimposed on a stable level over the month.



#### 4.1.1 SLSTR-A

Figure 1 shows the orbital average temperature of the OME and instrument baffles for SLSTR-A during the month. The temperatures were stable (on top of a daily variation cycle).




Figure 1: OME temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and Baffle temperature trends (right) during November 2022. The OME plot shows 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). The Baffle plot shows the temperature at different positions on the inner and outer baffles. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit.

#### 4.1.2 SLSTR-B

Figure 2 shows the orbital average temperature of the OME and instrument baffles for SLSTR-B during the month. The temperatures were stable (on top of a daily variation cycle).






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

### 4.2 Detector temperatures

The detector temperatures for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B were stable at their expected values over the month.

### 4.2.1 SLSTR-A

Figure 3 shows the annual trend in SLSTR-A detector temperatures for the past year. The temperatures from this month are consistent with the yearly trend.

The annual trend reveals several features, explained below.

August 2022. An anomaly occurred on the instrument on 1<sup>st</sup> August, which was recovered with a power cycle and decontamination/cooldown (see Section 3.1). This can be seen in the detector temperature plot as a rise in temperature, followed by a recovery.








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.

### 4.2.2 SLSTR-B

Figure 4 shows the annual trend in SLSTR-B detector temperatures for the past year. The temperatures from this month are consistent with the yearly trend.

The annual trend reveals several features, explained below.

June 2022. An anomaly on the 20<sup>th</sup> of June resulted in an instrument decontamination and cooldown. This can be seen in the increase in detector temperatures and subsequent recovery.



Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 Issue: 1.0 Date: 08/12/2022

November 2022

Page:

ate. 06/12 age: 8




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.



### 4.3 Scanner performance

The actual position of the scan and flip mirrors is measured by the instrument, and in this section we show the statistics of the difference from the expected linear control law for each mirror in each view during November 2022. 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.

### 4.3.1 SLSTR-A

Figure 5 shows the statistics of the difference from the expected linear control law for each mirror in each view for SLSTR-A during November 2022.




Figure 5: SLSTR-A scanner and flip jitter for November 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).



#### 4.3.2 SLSTR-B

Figure 6 shows the statistics of the difference from the expected linear control law for each mirror in each view for SLSTR-B during November 2022.





Figure 6: SLSTR-B scanner and flip jitter for November 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).



### 4.4 Black-Bodies

The monthly orbital average blackbody temperatures are shown in this section. 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 7 and Table 5.



*Figure 7: SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B long term trends in average +YBB temperature, showing yearly variation. The vertical dashed lines indicate the 1<sup>st</sup> January in each year.* 

#### 4.4.1 SLSTR-A

The monthly orbital average blackbody temperatures for SLSTR-A are shown in Figure 8. The temperatures were stable on top of a daily variation cycle. Figure 8 also shows 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  $\pm 20$ mK.



Blackbody temperature over the month

**Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR** 

November 2022

Date: Page: 12

S3A +YBB Temperatures




Figure 8: SLSTR-A blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during November 2022 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit.

### 4.4.2 SLSTR-B

The monthly orbital average blackbody temperatures for SLSTR-B are shown in Figure 9. The temperatures were stable on top of a daily variation cycle. Figure 9 also shows 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  $\pm 20$  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.



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR

November 2022

Date: 08/12/2022

Page: 13




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

### 4.5 Detector noise levels

### 4.5.1 SLSTR-A VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise

The VIS and SWIR channel noise for SLSTR-A during November 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 and Figure 11. 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 11. 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 last11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view.

	Average					Nadir Si	gnal-to-n	oise ratio				
	Reflectance Factor	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022
<b>S1</b>	0.187	239	242	243	244	238	234	238	237	239	246	245
S2	0.194	248	247	241	242	243	242	242	241	241	245	248
<b>S</b> 3	0.190	228	229	228	229	226	222	221	225	222	224	226
<b>S4</b>	0.191	177	176	173	171	170	167	167	168	171	171	172
S5	0.193	292	290	283	282	282	281	280	281	283	285	286
<b>S6</b>	0.175	188	186	182	180	180	179	179	181	183	183	184

Table 2: Average SLSTR-A reflectance factor, and signal-to-noise ratio of the measured VISCAL signal for the last11 months, averaged over all detectors for the oblique view.

	Average					Oblique S	ignal-to-n	oise ratio	1			
	Reflectance Factor	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022
<b>S1</b>	0.166	261	261	264	261	252	243	248	251	253	264	267
S2	0.170	271	268	263	258	254	249	257	257	256	262	269
<b>S</b> 3	0.168	232	231	233	232	229	221	223	227	224	226	231
<b>S</b> 4	0.166	140	138	137	137	138	135	137	137	139	139	139
S5	0.166	210	209	213	214	213	207	213	213	216	215	217
<b>S6</b>	0.155	132	130	130	130	131	130	130	131	133	132	133






Figure 10: VIS 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. 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.



### 4.5.2 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 Signal-to-noise ratio												
	Reflectance Factor	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022			
<b>S1</b>	0.177	236	235	228	226	225	221	224	225	226	233	220			
<b>S2</b>	0.192	223	227	222	218	215	214	213	218	218	218	256			
<b>S</b> 3	0.194	228	224	219	222	222	217	214	219	223	224	248			
<b>S4</b>	0.186	132	131	131	131	130	127	127	127	127	127	129			
S5	0.184	244	245	244	241	241	238	237	239	239	240	251			
<b>S6</b>	0.162	167	167	163	161	160	158	157	159	158	157	187			

 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	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	Jul 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022			
<b>S1</b>	0.157	224	221	223	219	213	211	214	213	217	224	220			
<b>S2</b>	0.168	258	259	254	250	247	243	241	248	246	249	256			
<b>S</b> 3	0.172	252	251	252	250	242	235	234	243	249	250	248			
<b>S4</b>	0.168	130	130	131	131	128	124	126	127	129	129	129			
S5	0.172	248	247	248	248	247	246	248	248	248	247	251			
<b>S6</b>	0.152	186	185	186	185	181	178	182	183	184	185	187			



### 4.5.3 SLSTR-A TIR channel NEDT

The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-A in November 2022 are consistent with previous operations and within the requirements. NEDT trends calculated from the hot and cold blackbody signals are shown in Figure 12. 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 12: SLSTR-A NEDT trend for the thermal channels in November 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). A blackbody cross over test was performed this month, which can be observed in the data near the 26<sup>th</sup>.



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).

SLSTR-A		Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	July 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022
+YBB temp (K)		303.879	303.583	303.178	302.977	302.848	302.615	302.557	302.394	302.553	303.014	302.179
	<b>S7</b>	17.0	17.3	17.3	17.4	17.7	17.7	17.7	17.6	83.8	17.4	17.3
	<b>S</b> 8	11.8	11.8	11.9	12.0	12.1	12.1	12.2	11.9	16.0	12.0	12.0
NEDT (mK)	<b>S</b> 9	18.5	18.6	18.6	18.6	18.7	18.8	18.9	18.3	18.5	18.4	18.5
	F1	275	279	281	283	287	288	289	283	311	282	279
	F2	35.4	35.2	34.8	34.8	35.2	35.5	34.7	34.6	53.0	34.9	35.2

SLSTR-A		Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	July 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022
-YBB temp (K)		266.824	266.421	265.978	265.896	265.918	265.684	265.543	265.185	265.310	265.867	266.569
	<b>S7</b>	47.8	48.9	49.7	50.1	50.2	50.9	50.6	50.6	48.9	49.6	48.5
	<b>S8</b>	14.5	14.6	14.7	14.7	14.7	14.7	14.8	14.6	14.5	14.6	14.6
NEDT (mK)	<b>S</b> 9	22.8	22.8	23.0	23.1	23.1	23.2	23.2	22.6	22.5	22.7	22.7
	F1	1145	1173	1202	1209	1203	1227	1228	1223	1192	1211	1176
	F2	28.9	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.1	29.1	28.6	29.0	28.8	28.8



### 4.5.4 SLSTR-B TIR channel NEDT

The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-B in November 2022, calculated from the hot and cold blackbody signals are shown in Figure 13 with monthly averages in Table 6. The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-B in November 2022 are consistent with previous operations and within the requirements, except around 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> October where the impact of the Blackbody cross over test can be observed 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 13: SLSTR-B NEDT trend for the thermal channels in November 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).



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).

SLSTR-B		Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	July 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022
+YBB temp (K)		304.027	303.642	303.260	303.068	303.000	302.745	302.642	302.565	302.706	303.13 8	303.723
	<b>S7</b>	15.9	16.1	16.0	16.1	16.2	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.8	16.2
	<b>S8</b>	14.1	14.2	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.1	14.0
NEDT (mK)	<b>S</b> 9	16.4	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.4	15.8	15.8	15.9	16.0	15.9
	F1	363	373	377	377	385	396	368	367	362	375	350
	F2	30.5	30.5	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.4	30.2	30.1	30.1	30.4	30.4

SLSTR-B		Jan 2022	Feb 2022	Mar 2022	Apr 2022	May 2022	Jun 2022	July 2022	Aug 2022	Sep 2022	Oct 2022	Nov 2022
-YBB temp (K)		266.579	266.052	265.640	265.523	265.638	265.316	265.060	264.868	264.982	265.52 5	266.348
	S7	42.6	43.3	44.2	44.3	44.3	44.3	44.7	45.6	45.2	43.3	43.2
	<b>S8</b>	18.1	18.1	18.2	18.2	18.3	18.2	17.9	17.9	17.9	17.8	17.9
NEDT (mK)	<b>S</b> 9	21.0	21.1	21.3	21.3	21.4	21.1	20.3	20.3	20.4	20.2	20.4
	F1	1483	1514	1568	1542	1585	1602	1526	1549	1521	1441	1435
	F2	33.6	33.7	33.9	33.9	33.9	33.7	33.1	33.3	33.2	33.1	33.1



### 4.6 Calibration factors

#### 4.6.1 VIS and SWIR radiometric response

The radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals over the past year are shown in this section. 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 observed in the plots.

There are several features that appear in this parameter that can be explained as:

- 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 4.2, 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.

### 4.6.2 SLSTR-A

Figure 14 and Figure 15 show the variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-A over the past year. The data from the last month appears normal and follows the expected trend. The following features in this annual trend plot should be noted:

August 2022. An anomaly occurred on the instrument on 1<sup>st</sup> August, which was recovered with a power cycle and decontamination/cooldown (see Section 3.1). This causes a discontinuity in the gain due to the reduction in water ice after the decontamination.



Page:

23






Figure 14: 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.



Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 Issue: 1.0 08/12/2022 Date:

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR November 2022

Page: 24




Figure 15: 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.



#### 4.6.3 SLSTR-B

Figure 16 and Figure 17 show the variation of the radiometric gain derived from the VISCAL signals for SLSTR-B over the past year. The data from the last month appears normal and follows the expected trend. There are several features in this annual trend plot to note.

- 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.
- The impact of the anomaly reported on 20<sup>th</sup> June and subsequent decontamination/cooldown can be observed in the data as a discontinuity.



## **Optical MPC**

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR

November 2022

 Ref.:
 OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022

 Issue:
 1.0

 Date:
 08/12/2022

 Page:
 26




Figure 16: 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.



November 2022

Date:

Page: 27





Figure 17: 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.



## 5 Level-1 product validation

#### Level-1 product quality is assessed in terms of radiometric and geometric accuracy

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 18 shows an example combined SLSTR-A/SLSTR-B image for the visible channels on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022 (daytime only).



*Figure 18: Daytime combined SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B Level-1 image for visible channels on 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022.* 

## 5.1 Level-1 TIR Radiometric Validation

**S3\_MR\_1000 Relative radiometric accuracy:** Sentinel-3 infrared channels shall have a relative radiometric accuracy of <0.08K (threshold) with a goal of 0.05 K over a range of 210-350 K expressed as NEDT traceable to international reference standards.

The absolute radiometric calibration of the IR channels is being validated by EUMETSAT using comparisons against IASI-A and B (Tomazic et al 2018). These results confirmed very good performance with almost no bias (<0.1 K) for channels S8 and S9 in the nadir view over the temperature range 220 – 280 K.

## 5.2 Level- 1 VIS SWIR Radiometric Validation

**A3\_MR\_1010** Absolution radiometric accuracy: Sentinel-3 VIS reflectance at TO shall have an absolute radiometric accuracy goal of < 2% with reference to the sun for the 400-900nm waveband and <5% with reference to the sun for wavebands >900nm traceable to international reference standards.

Validation of the VIS/SWIR radiometric measurements is performed by various methods to establish the magnitude of any calibration offset. Some activities are routinely performed each month and reported here, and some are less regular and reported in the annual data quality reports.



The results of these different methods have been collated and have been found to agree that there is a calibration offset present in the VIS/SWIR radiances. It is recommended therefore that users apply an offset in-line with the values presented in Table 7. These offsets are stable and apply to the entire mission. Note that uncertainty estimates are at k=1.

Nadir View	<b>S1</b>	S2	S3	S5	S6
Correction	0.97	0.98	0.98	1.11	1.13
Uncertainty	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Oblique View	<b>S1</b>	S2	S3	S5	S6
Correction	0.94	0.95	0.95	1.04	1.07
Uncertainty	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05

Table 7. The recommended corrections that should be applied to SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B VIS, SWIR channels.

### 5.2.1 S3ETRAC latest mission trend SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B

The radiometric calibration of the visible and SWIR channels is routinely monitored using the S3ETRAC service. SLSTR data is compared to three different satellite instruments over these sites, with average ratios in each case are given in the figures.

- 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.
- Figure 21 shows the results of the inter-comparison analysis with MODIS.

A year-by-year breakdown of the drift in % since the start of the mission for SLSTR-A is provided in Table 8. Uncertainty in the drift rate is estimated at 1%.

 Table 8. A year-by-year breakdown of the drift in % since the start of the mission for SLSTR-A Note the trends for

 S6 are based on comparisons with MODIS-Aqua which are limited to June-July where the geometry matches.

	S	1	S	2	S	3	SS	ia 🛛	S5	ib	Se	5a	S6	ib
Year	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob
2017	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	-	0.0	-
2018	0.7	1.0	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.9	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.6	-	-0.7	-
2019	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-	-0.3	-
2020	1.1	0.7	0.6	0.5	1.4	1.6	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	-	-0.3	-
2021	1.4	0.9	0.6	0.6	1.6	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-	-0.3	-
2022	2.2	1.3	1.1	0.7	2.2	2.3	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.7	-	0.6	-

A year-by-year breakdown of the drift in % since the start of the mission for SLSTR-B is provided in Table 9. Uncertainty in the drift rate is estimated at 1%.



Table 9. A year-by-year breakdown of the drift in % since the start of the mission for SLSTR-B. Note the trends for S6 are based on comparisons with MODIS-Aqua which are limited to June-July where the geometry matches. Furthermore, the drift for S6 is relative to 2019 comparisons. For SLSTR-B the reference measurements were obtained before an update to the flight calibration coefficients that was performed after the S3B-IOCR. A correction factor of 2.4% has been applied to the drift rates to account for the update.

	S	1	S	2	S	3	S	5a	S	ib	Se	5a	Se	ib
Year	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob	Na	Ob
2019	0.7	-1.2	0.5	-0.3	0.3	0.0	0.2	-0.1	0.3	-1.1	-	-	-	-
2020	0.9	-0.8	0.5	-0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3	-0.3	0.3	-1.3	-0.2	-	-0.2	-
2021	1.3	-0.4	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.3	-0.3	0.2	-1.3	0.0	-	-0.1	-
2022	2.1	-0.5	1.2	-0.1	1.5	1.2	0.7	-0.2	0.6	-1.2	1.0	-	0.9	-

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 sun-glint 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 **<u>S3ETRAC website</u>**, including

- 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



Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 Issue: 1.0 Date: 08/12/2022 Page: 31

November 2022




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.



November 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

Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 Issue: 1.0 Date: 08/12/2022

November 2022

Date: 08/12, Page: 33




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



### November 2022

## 5.3 Level-1 Geometric Validation

**S3\_MR\_1090 Geolocation accuracy:** Improved geo-location accuracy is possible when using ground control points and Sentinel-3 shall be designed to ensure a geolocation accuracy of better than 0.5rm of the spatial resolution of the optical sensor when using ground control points

**S3\_MR\_1100 Inter channel co-registration.** The inter channel spatial co-registration for Sentinel-3 visible measurements shall be < 0.5 of the spatial resolution of the sensor over the full spectral range (goal of 0.3 of the spatial resolution of the sensor)

**S3\_MR\_1100 Inter channel co-registration:** The inter channel spatial co-registration for Sentinel-3 SWIR and TIR measurements shall be sufficient to allow these channels to be co registered with visible channels at higher spatial resolution data.

Regular monitoring using the GeoCal Tool implemented at the MPC is normally carried out. On average, the geolocation accuracy of the VIS-SWIR channels meets requirements for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B.

GeoCal is a tool that monitors the geolocation performance in Level-1 images by correlation of the images with reference features containing ground control points (GCP). Each Level-1 granule typically contains several hundred GCPs if over land, which are filtered based on signal-to-noise to obtain a daily average in the across and along track directions.



### 5.3.1 SLSTR-A

The results for November 2022 are plotted in Figure 22 for SLSTR-A, giving the average positional offsets in kilometres for Nadir and Oblique views. The higher offset on the 11<sup>th</sup> November is attributed the ground segment anomaly event.




Figure 22: 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 November 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation.



### 5.3.2 SLSTR-B

The results for November 2022 are plotted in Figure 23 for SLSTR-B, giving the average positional offsets in kilometres for Nadir and Oblique views.




Figure 23: 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 November 2022. The error bars show the standard deviation.



# 6 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 November 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 25<sup>th</sup> February 2019. In each case the latest temporal interpolation for the probabilistic cloud mask is applied following the L1 operational release on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2020. The updated cloud coefficients ADF was applied on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2020.

## 6.1 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  $\pm 5$  Wm-2 (Augustine and Dutton, 2013). For ARM, the uncertainty of the measured brightness temperatures was set to  $\pm 0.5$  K for Southern Great Plains (Morris, 2006), and for North Slopes Alaska the uncertainty of the IR radiance data was set to  $\pm 4$  Wm-2 (Stoffel, 2006). For the USCRN network, which uses Apogee SI-121s the uncertainty is set as the manufacturers estimate of  $\pm 0.2$  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 10: Average absolute accuracy in K of the SL\_2\_LST product with respect to Gold Standard stations for November 2022.

Satellite	Day	Night
S3A	1.1	0.6
S3B	1.0	0.5

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.





Ref.: OMPC.RAL.DQR.04.11-2022 Issue: 1.0 08/12/2022


Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR November 2022


Date:


Page: 38














Figure 24: Validation of the SL\_2\_LST product in November 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.



## 6.2 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 11: Median differences in K from the intercomparison of the SL\_2\_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for November 2022

Continent	SLSTR-A		SLSTR-B		
continent	Day	Night	Day	Night	
Africa	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.3	
Europe	0.4	1.2	-0.1	0.8	

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






Figure 25: Intercomparison of the SL\_2\_LST product with respect to the operational LSA SAF SEVIRI LST product for November 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**.



## 6.3 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 26: Monthly composites at 0.05° of LST for November 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.

## 6.4 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



# 7 Level 2 FRP validation

Validation of the SLSTR L2 FRP products can be performed using either in-situ data such as airborne measurements or using a reference satellite product for inter-comparison. Active fires in situ data are unfortunately not frequent enough to validate fire satellite data products on an operational basis. We are therefore using NASA Moderate-Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) as reference fire data for inter-comparisons.

This inter-comparison is aiming at validating two elements:

- 1. The detection of fire regarding position and extent in time and space.
- 2. Once a fire has been detected, the computation of the Fire radiative power either for each pixel confirmed as an active fire or for the entire fire cluster.

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 (see previous reports for complete results). The same intercomparison is now performed over daytime products.

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 relates 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 19<sup>th</sup> August 2020.

The current processing baseline for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B FRP products is FRP\_NTC.004.08.00 and was deployed in the Land processing centres on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2022 for SLSTR-A and on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2022 for SLSTR-B. However, the FRP algorithm has not been changed since the previous processing baseline, FRP\_NTC.004.07.00, implemented on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022 for both instruments. That baseline is including an updated FRP algorithm, called FRP V2. That algorithm is based on the previous one, with similar night-time algorithm, but includes improved thermal fire detection over daytime products. In addition, fire detections are now also performed using SWIR channels (note however that this functionality is not yet part of this validation report and will be included in the following ones).

This report will first focus on the fires detected **during night-time** using FRP V2 algorithm **and thermal measurements only**, considering July, August and September 2022 data products (three 27-days orbital cycles). Then a section will be dedicated to the quality of FRP V2 algorithm with validation of **the day-time fire detection using thermal radiometric measurements** between July, August and September 2022 (three 27-days orbital cycles).

In the current FRP algorithm, AF detection is performed using a mixed thermal band: by default, the S7 brightness temperature are considered. However, the F1 channel is used instead for pixels where the S7 channel saturates. The 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 300 K or a difference between S7 and S8 brightness temperatures higher than 10 K. The fire detection during night-time remains similar to FRP V1 and the FRP value are computed using F1 measurements.

## 7.1 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 (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.

The validation procedure is described 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 km<sup>2</sup> to avoid edge-ofswath 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 F1 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 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<sup>st</sup> July 2022 and 30<sup>th</sup> September 2022 were aggregated and compared. In particular, the five areas of interest are: the Amazonia forest, Central Africa (Congo, Gabon, Angola, Zambia,...), the Eastern Europe (Ukraine and Black Sea periphery), Eastern Asia (east of China, Vietnam and west of Japan) and the exterior of Australia, see Figure 27. From around three thousand SLSTR scenes encompassing these areas, around 300 products which respected all the criteria delineated above were selected to perform this analysis.

The report includes a study and analysis of the performance of **SLSTR FRP night-time and daytime** algorithms. Summaries of the results are reported respectively in Table 12 and Table 13.

### 7.1.1 Night-Time Validation

Night-time validation is performed considering two 27-days orbital cycle and 160 SLSTR FRP (1,980 clusters) products are compared to MODIS MOD14 fire products to identify fires and other thermal anomalies for the months **July and August** 2022.

Note also that the summary from previous DQR has been added to the table for information. The comparison might be done with caution as we compare FRP V1 with FRP V2 / 3 months with 2 months / not the same validation sites, but this comparison might still be interesting. However, the table presents two validation time series with FRP V2 and highlights the stability of the results.




Table 12: Summary of the inter-comparison between night-time SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP – July and August 2022. Results from previous comparison obtained between April and Mary 2022 also obtained with FRP V2 and between December 2021 and February 2022 obtained with FRP V1 have been added respectively in the second and third column for information and comparison.


Variable	Value (July – August 2022; FRP V2)	Value (April – May 2022 ; FRP V2)	Value (Dec. 2021 – Feb. 2022 ; FRP V1)
Number of commission ACD	20,092 (62.3% of Total	5,531 (53.7% of Total	14,972 (51.8% of Total
Number of commission AFP	SLSTR AFP)	SLSTR AFP)	SLSTR AFP)
Number of omission AFP	883 (2.7% of Total SLSTR AFP)	401 (3.9% of Total SLSTR AFP)	1,163 (4% of Total SLSTR AFP)
FRP of commission AFP (MW)	58,380	20,164	52,669
FRP of omission AFP (MW)	34,123	7,940	35,105
Number of SLSTR AFP detected by both sensors	12,147 (37.7% of Total SLSTR AFP)	4,775 (46.3% of Total SLSTR AFP)	13,921 (48.2% of Total SLSTR AFP)
Number of MOD14 AFP detected by both sensors	4,089 (82.1% of Total MOD14 AFP)	1,798 (81.8% of Total MOD14 AFP)	5,107 (81.4% of Total MOD14 AFP)
Total number of AFP detected by SLSTR	32,239	10,306	28,893
Total number of MOD14 AFP	4,972	2,199	6,270
Mean number of SLSTR AFP per cluster	5.9	5.8	5.6
Total SLSTR FRP within clusters (MW)	95,704	27,436	103,668
Mean SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW)	50.4	42.9	45.9
Median SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW)	21.7	20.3	19.9
Mean number of MOD14 AFP per cluster	1.9	1.9	1.9
Total MOD14 FRP within clusters (MW)	85,814	23,367	83,808
Mean MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW)	45.2	36.5	37.1
Median MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW)	14.3	13.0	12.8
Mean bias of FRP per cluster (MW)	5.2	6.4	8.8
Median of FRP scatter per cluster (MW)	5.2	5.2	4.9
Root-mean-square deviation of FRP per cluster	71	40	53
25-50-75 percentiles of SLSTR clusters FRP	12.1, 21.7, 42.6	11.2, 20.3, 43.7	10.6, 19.9, 41.5

OPT-MPC
Control Mission Performance Cluster

Variable	Value (July – August 2022; FRP V2)		Value (Dec. 2021 – Feb. 2022 ; FRP V1)
25-50-75 percentiles of MOD14 clusters FRP	8.1, 14.3, 31.2	7.8, 13.0, 28.7	7.6, 12.8, 27.7



Longitude - Degrees



Longitude - Degrees

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 July, August and September 2022.



Overall, **there is good agreement between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP**, as can be seen in Table 12. The comparison shows that SLSTR detects in general more fire pixels than MODIS (32,239 vs 4,972), 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  $\pm$  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.

There is a huge difference of detection in the Central Africa zone. The results show an important number of commission fire pixels in this area, especially true for day-time data. Central Africa is the only geographic zone providing more commissions than omissions in night-time.

A comparison of fire pixels detected distinctly by Sentinel 3A and Sentinel 3B is visualised in Figure 28.






Figure 28: The basemap shows night-time fires detected by Sentinel 3A (top) and Sentinel 3B (bottom) for the months of July, August and September 2022.

Longitude - Degrees

The fire pixels dispersion is significantly similar between both satellites Sentinel A and B in all the areas of high fire activity for night-time SLSTR products. However, it could be noted that for night-time and day-time Sentinel 3B provide respectively 56% and 53% of the fire pixels detection.

**The dispersion of active fires** is lightly not uniform. Clusters are generated based on active fire density zones (groups of one or more pixels spatially adjacent to each other and corresponding to a single fire - hotspot location that radiates a heating signal within a pixel size of 1 km<sup>2</sup>.). The Figure 29 is providing an example of what is called a cluster :

- The left panel is showing all the pixels confirmed as an active fire. The FRP product will provide the position and an equivalent FRP value for all these pixels;
- However, some of these pixels are close enough to be interpreted as a single fire event, called fire cluster (see distribution of the pixels into three distinct fire clusters in the middle panel). Each cluster will then be analysed separately and each single FRP value will be computed taken into account the whole cluster;



The right panel is representing 3 fire clusters, each of them associated with an global average FRP and an specific geographical extent (i.e. the number of fire pixel included in this cluster). This cluster distribution will be the basis of the following validation activities.





Figure 29: Cluster formation for a specific area.

In the following, we are then comparing clusters detected by MODIS and by SLSTR. In particular, if a fire cluster is detected by both satellites, the number of individuals fire pixels inside this cluster can be different for SLSTR than for MODIS (for example on a specific cluster, MODIS could detect 3 fire pixels whereas SLSTR detect 6 fire pixels). These proportions for both sensors are visualised in Figure 30.



# Figure 30: Scatterplot between the number of fires detected by both sensors (night-time). SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis.

The graph compares the number of fires detected by SLSTR with the one detected by MODIS over a single cluster. Each circle counts then for a fire cluster and its coordinates on the graph indicates the number of fires detected by the sensors SLSTR (X-axis) and MODIS (Y-axis).

The first information provided by this graph is then that all clusters detected by MODIS are also detected by SLSTR (no circle on the Y axis), where we can have small fire cluster detected by SLSTR and missed by MODIS (see the small point on X-axis).

In addition, the size of each circle specifies the number of cases with a similar MODIS/SLSTR fires detection ratio (i.e. the same couple of coordinates corresponding to the same proportion of fires detected by both sensors) in the manner of a 3D graph. The colour of each point indicates the total Fire Radiative Power of the cluster detected by satellites.


Figure 30 is then showing that:



- SLSTR is detecting more fire pixels than MODIS in a single cluster. However, these clusters are associated with low FRPs and with larger circle size indicating a higher sensitivity of SLSTR to smaller fires.
- Considering large fire clusters, these are always associated with large FRP and the ratio SLSTR/MODIS regarding the number of pixel fires included in these cluster is showing again a higher sensitivity of SLSTR with more individual pixel detected as active fires.

The distribution of FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors is quite similar between SLSTR and MODIS, even though MODIS exhibits a higher peak for low FRP values and SLSTR shows a higher curve for intermediate values. Figure 31 is strengthening the fact that SLSTR is detecting 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.



Cyclic Validation Cluster Distribution

*Figure 31: Distribution of the FRP for fire clusters detected by both sensors. The lines represent kernel density estimates (KDE) computed over the barplot.* 




Figure 32: 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 colour-coded according to their cluster number, so that they can be traced back to the original datasets. R=0.835.

### 7.1.2 Day-Time Validation

Day-time validation is performed considering three 27-days orbital cycle and 174 SLSTR FRP (2,887 clusters) products are compared to MODIS MOD14 fire products to identify fires and other thermal anomalies for the months July and August 2022.

This additional study has been carried out to evaluate the performance of 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 July and 31st August 2022** were aggregated and compared considering the same areas of interest, see Figure 27. A summary of the results is reported in Table 13.

The results remain relatively consistent with the previous one, with more fire detected by SLSTR than MODIS (15,667 vs 11,565) but a good agreement regarding fire position and regarding FRP values.




Table 13: Summary of the inter-comparison between SLSTR FRP and MODIS FRP – From July to August 2022
data.


Variable	Value (Jul. 2022 – Aug. 2022; FRP V2)	Value (Apr. 2022 – May. 2022; FRP V2)		
Number of commission AFP	7,613 (48.6% of Total SLSTR AFP)	3,071 (42.7% of Total SLSTR AFP)		
Number of omission AFP	5,720 (36.5% of Total SLSTR AFP)	2,484 (31.5% of Total SLSTR AFP)		
FRP of commission AFP (MW)	96,572	40,883		
FRP of omission AFP (MW)	191,942	52,621		
Number of SLSTR AFP detected by both sensors	8,054 (51.4% of Total SLSTR AFP)	4,127 (57.3% of Total SLSTR AFP)		
Number of MOD14 AFP detected by both sensors	5,845 (50.5% of Total MOD14 AFP)	2,947 (54.2% of Total MOD14 AFP)		
Total number of AFP detected by SLSTR	15,667	7,198		
Total number of MOD14 AFP	11,565	5,431		
Mean number of SLSTR AFP per cluster	2.7	3.0		
Total SLSTR FRP within clusters (MW)	156,059	56,580		
Mean SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW)	59.0	64.1		
Median SLSTR FRP per cluster (MW)	27.4	34.0		
Mean number of MOD14 AFP per cluster	1.8	1.9		
Total MOD14 FRP within clusters (MW)	143,963	51,904		
Mean MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW)	54.4	58.9		
Median MOD14 FRP per cluster (MW)	22.5	25.7		
Mean bias of FRP per cluster (MW)	4.6	5.3		
Median of FRP scatter per cluster (MW)	3.4	5.7		
Root-mean-square deviation of FRP per cluster	64.0	66.0		



Variable	Value (Jul. 2022 – Aug. 2022; FRP V2)	Value (Apr. 2022 – May. 2022; FRP V2)
25-50-75 percentiles of SLSTR clusters FRP	16.0, 27.4, 54.4	19.2, 33.9, 63.5
25-50-75 percentiles of MOD14 clusters FRP	12.2, 22.5, 48.6	13.5, 25.7, 50.4


The comparison shows that **SLSTR detects in general more fire pixels than MODIS (15,667 vs 11,565) and many of them with very low FRP**. There is a quite similar number of commission and omission fire pixels comparing with night-time data. The results remain consistent with the previous report.






Longitude - Degrees

Figure 33: Areas of high fire activity selected for the inter-comparison. The basemap shows day-time fires detected by SLSTR (top) and MODIS (bottom) for the months of July, August and September 2022.






Longitude - Degrees

Figure 34: The basemap shows day-time fires detected by Sentinel 3A (top) and Sentinel 3B (bottom) for the months of July, August and September 2022.

As for day-time data products, the fire pixels dispersion is significantly similar between both satellites Sentinel A and B in all the areas of high fire activity for day-time SLSTR products (53% of the fire pixels accounting for S3B detection for day-time data).



Number of Fires Detected by SLSTR

Figure 35: Scatterplot between the number of fires clusters detected by both sensors (day-time). SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis.

To compare with night-time results, dots are less aggregated close to the SLSTR axis, reflecting the closer number of omissions and commissions. The high FRP clusters are more detected by MODIS while SLSTR detect more low FRP fires.

The ratio SLSTR/MODIS regarding the number of included pixel is also closer to 1 specifically for large FRP values, showing equivalent sensitivity in case of strong fire for both MODIS and SLSTR.




Figure 36: 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.




Figure 37: Scatterplot between the FRP of fire clusters detected by both sensors (with an FRP < 500MW). SLSTR values are reported on the x-axis, whereas MODIS ones are on the y-axis. R = 0.925.

There is a higher dispersion of the points than for night-time data, while the regression line shows a higher correlation between both variables. Both detected the higher fire power intensity located close to the regression line on the graph.




Figure 38: SLSTR vs MODIS clusters (FRP < 200) comparisons with regression line – night-time (left) and day-time (right).



This report has provided a detailed performance evaluation of SLSTR FRP product generated by Sentinel-3 A and Sentinel-3 B. On a "per-fire" basis there is a strong correlation ( $r^2$ =0.79 for night-time data and  $r^2$ =0.84 for day-time data) between the FRP measures recorded by Sentinel 3 and by MODIS near simultaneously, and a slope of the linear best fit line close to the unity (0.925 for day-time and 0.785 for night-time). Overall, the number of SLSTR AFP detected by both sensors reaches 48% of night-time products and almost 60% of day-time products.



# 8 Appendix A

Other reports related to the Optical mission are:

- S2 L1C MSI Data Quality Report, November 2022 (ref. OMPC.CS.DQR.001.07-2022, v81.0)
- S2 L2A MSI Data Quality Report, November 2022 (ref. OMPC.CS.DQR.002.07-2022, v55.0)
- S3 OLCI Data Quality Report, November 2022 (ref. OMPC.ACR.DQR.02.11-2022)

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

End of document