
COPERNICUS SPACE COMPONENT SENTINEL OPTICAL IMAGING MISSION PERFORMANCE CLUSTER SERVICE

Data Quality Report

Sentinel-3 SLSTR - December 2023



Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Contract: 4000136252/21/I-BG

Customer:	ESA	Document Ref.:	OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12 -2023
Contract No.:	4000136252/21/I-BG	Date:	10/01/2024
		Issue:	1.0

Project:	COPERNICUS SPACE COMPONENT SENTINEL OPTICAL IMAGING MISSION PERFORMANCE CLUSTER SERVICE		
Title:	Data Quality Report - SLSTR - December 2023		
Author(s):	SLSTR ESL team		
Approved by:	P. Paolino, OPT-MPC SLSTR ESL Coordinator	Authorized by	C. Henocq, OPT-MPC S3 Technical Manager
Distribution:	ESA, EUMETSAT, published in Sentinel Online		
Accepted by ESA	S. Dransfeld, ESA TO		
Filename	OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023 - i1r0 - SLSTR Data Quality Report December 2023.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.









Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: iii

Changes Log

Version	Date	Changes
1.0	10/01/2024	First version

OPT-MPC Paulous Control Mission Performance Cluster Ontsol Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: iv

Table of content

1	EXE	CUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2	PRO	CESSING STATUS	3
	2.1	PROCESSING BASELINE STATUS.	2
	2.2	PROCESSING ANOMALIES.	
3	EVE	NTS AND INSTRUMENT ANOMALIES	4
	3.1	SLSTR-A	4
	3.2	SLSTR-B	4
4	INST	RUMENT STATUS	5
	4.1	INSTRUMENT TEMPERATURES	6
	4.1.		
	4.1.2		_
	4.2	DETECTOR TEMPERATURES	
	4.2.		
	4.2.2		
	4.3	SCANNER PERFORMANCE	_
	4.3.		
	4.3.2		
	4.4	BLACK-BODIES	12
	4.4.	1 SLSTR-A	13
	4.4.2	2 SLSTR-B	14
	4.5	DETECTOR NOISE LEVELS	15
	4.5.	1 SLSTR-A VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise	15
	4.5.2	2 SLSTR-B VIS and SWIR channel signal-to-noise	18
	4.5.3	3 SLSTR-A TIR channel NEDT	20
	4.5.4	4 SLSTR-B TIR channel NEDT	22
	4.6	CALIBRATION FACTORS	25
	4.6.		
	4.6.2	2 SLSTR-A	25
	4.6.3	3 SLSTR-B	27
5	LEVI	EL-1 PRODUCT VALIDATION	30
	5.1	LEVEL-1 TIR RADIOMETRIC VALIDATION	20
	5.2	LEVEL- 1 TIR RADIOMETRIC VALIDATION	
	5.2.2		
	5.3	LEVEL-1 GEOMETRIC VALIDATION	
	5.3.3		_
	5.3.2		
_			
6	LEVI	EL 2 LST VALIDATION	43
	6.1	CATEGORY-A VALIDATION	43
	6.2	CATEGORY-C VALIDATION	48
	6.3	LEVEL-3C ASSESSMENT	
	6.4	References	48

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: v

7 LEV	/EL 2 FRP VALIDATION	49
7.1	THE SLSTR FIRE RADIATIVE POWER PRODUCT	49
7.2	VALIDATION METHODOLOGY	49
7.3	Results	51
7.3.	.1 Global distributions of the fires	51
7.3.	.2 Nighttime Fires Validation	51
	.3 Daytime Fires Validation	
7.3.	.4 Biome influence on active fire detection	55
7.4	CONCLUSION	56
8 APF	PENDIX A	58

OPT-MPC Particle Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: vi

List of Figures

Figure 1: OME temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and Baffle temperature trends (right) during December 2023. 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
Figure 2: SLSTR-B OME temperature trends (left) and Baffle temperature trends (right) during December 2023. 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
Figure 3: SLSTR-A detector temperatures for each channel for the last month 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 4: SLSTR-B detector temperatures for each channel for the last month 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 detectors9
Figure 5: SLSTR-A scanner and flip jitter for December 2023, 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 December 2023, 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 and SLSTR-B long term trends in average +YBB temperature, showing yearly variation. The vertical dashed lines indicate the 1 st January in each year
Figure 8: SLSTR-A blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during December 2023 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit
Figure 9: SLSTR-B blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during December 2023 measured by different sensors at various positions in the BB and Baseplate. Each dot represents the average temperature in one orbit
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

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: vii

Figure 12: VIS channel signal-to-noise of the measured VISCAL signal in each orbit for the last year of operations for SLSTR-B. Different colours indicate different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month
Figure 13. SWIR channel signal-to-noise of the measured VISCAL signal in each orbit for the last year of operations for SLSTR-B. Different colours indicate different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month
Figure 14: SLSTR-A NEDT trend for the thermal channels in December 2023. 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 15: SLSTR-B NEDT trend for the thermal channels in December 2023. 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 16: 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 17: 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 18: 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 19: 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 20: Daytime combined SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B Level-1 image for visible channels on 31st December 2023 30
Figure 21: Time-series of the elementary ratios (observed/simulated) signal from SLSTR-A for (top to bottom) bands S02 and S03 (Nadir & Oblique views) respectively over January 2023- December 2023 from the six PICS Cal/Val sites. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the desert methodology uncertainty. ————————————————————————————————————
Figure 22: Time-series of the elementary ratios (observed/simulated) signal from SLSTR-B for (top to bottom) bands S02 and S03 (Nadir & Oblique views) respectively over January 2023- end-December 2023 from the six PICS Cal/Val sites. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the desert methodology uncertainty.————————————————————————————————————

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: viii

respectively over the 6 PICS sites identified by CEOS over the period January 2023- end-December 2023 as a function of wavelength. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the desert methodology uncertainty
Figure 24: The estimated gain values for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B (Nadir view) from Glint and Rayleigh methods over the period Jan 2022—end-December 2023 and PICS method over the period Jan 2023—end-December 2023 as a function of wavelength. We use the gain value of S02 from Desert-PICS method as reference gain for Glint method. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the method uncertainties
Figure 25: Ratio of observed TOA reflectance to simulated one for (black) MERIS, (pale-green) S2A/MSI, (white) S2B/MSI, (blue) S3A/OLCI, (green) S3B/OLCI, (red) S3A/SLSTR-NADIR, and (cyan) S3B/SLSTR-NADIR averaged over the six PICS test sites as a function of wavelength
Figure 26: 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 December 2023. The error bars show the standard deviation
Figure 27: 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 December 2023. The error bars show the standard deviation
Figure 28: Validation of the SL_2_LST product in Q4 2023 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) at twelve Gold Standard in situ stations of the SURFRAD network plus two Gold Standard station from the ARM network. The matchups are split between daytime (red) and night-time (blue)
Figure 29: Formation process of the pairs of superclusters depending on AFP detected each satellite. Fire clusters and superclusters are identified by their colors. At the end of the process, pairs of SLSTR and MODIS superclusters share the same color
Figure 30: Selected zones for the intercomparison over the October-December 2023 period 50
Figure 31: Fires detected by SLSTR and MODIS at nightime (left) and daytime (right) 51
Figure 32: For nighttime. In blue, AFP exclusively detected by SLSTR; in orange, SLSTR AFP also detected by MODIS; in green, AFP exclusively detected by MODIS. The dashed line indicates MODIS detection threshold
Figure 33: Comparison between the FRP of cluster pairs detected by SLSTR and MODIS during nighttime
Figure 34: For daytime. In blue, AFP exclusively detected by SLSTR; in orange, SLSTR AFP also detected by MODIS; in green, AFP exclusively detected by MODIS. The dashed line indicates MODIS detection threshold54
Figure 35: Comparison between the FRP of cluster pairs detected by SLSTR and MODIS during daytime.
Figure 36: Occurrences of commissions and omissions of active fire pixels per biome. On the left, nighttime; on the right, daytime 56

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: ix

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 15
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 15
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 18
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) 22
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) 24
Table 7. The recommended corrections that should be applied to SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B VIS, SWIR channels.
Table 8: Average absolute accuracy in K of the SL_2_LST product with respect to Gold Standard stations for Q4 2023 43
Table 9: Summary of the intercomparison between nighttime SLSTR and MODIS active fires over the October—December 2023 period. Results from previous 3-months comparisons are included for information purposes
Table 10: Summary of the intercomparison between nighttime SLSTR MWIR and SWIR active fires over the October—December 2023 period 53
Table 11: Summary of the intercomparison between daytime SLSTR and MODIS active fires over the October-December 2023 period. Results from previous 3-months comparisons are included for information purposes



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 1

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

- Gray indicates no change over the reporting period
- 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 topic header for more detailed information contained in this document.

Topic	Instrument	Comments
Processing Baseline	S3A	
Version	S3B	
Event	S3A	Several events occurred this month without impact on data quality
	S3B	Several events occurred this month without impact on data quality
Instrument status	S3A	
	S3B	
Level-1 TIR Radiometric	S3A	
Validation	S3B	
Level- 1 VIS SWIR Radiometric Validation	S3A	Vicarious validation indicates calibration offsets need to be applied to the VIS/SWIR channels
		New validation results using PICS method
	S3B	Vicarious validation indicates calibration offsets need to be applied to the VIS/SWIR channels
		New validation results using PICS method
Level-1 Geometric	S3A	
Validation	S3B	
Level 2 LST validation	S3A	



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 2

Topic	Instrument	Comments
	S3B	
Level 2 FRP validation	S3A	
	S3B	



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 3

2 Processing status

2.1 Processing baseline status

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.

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.

There has been no delivery or deployment concerning SLSTR during this period. The deployed processing baseline and IPF versions are consistent with the latest delivered versions.

IPF	IPF / Processing Baseline version	Date of deployment
S3A		
SL1	06.21 / SLL1004.06.00	25/07/2023
SL2 LST	06.21 / SLLST.004.08.02	25/07/2023
SL2 FRP (NTC)	01.08 / FRP_NTC.004.08.02	25/07/2023

IPF	IPF / Processing Baseline version	Date of deployment
S3B		
SL1	06.21 / SLL1004.06.00	18/07/2023
SL2 LST	06.21 / SLLST.004.08.02	18/07/2023
SL2 FRP (NTC)	01.08 / FRP_NTC.004.08.02	18/07/2023

No deployment has been done this month.

The Processing Baselines of S3A and S3B are aligned with the latest processing baseline version.

2.2 Processing anomalies

No specific issue or evolutions has been identified this month on SLSTR.

There has been no major anomaly on data quality within the reported period.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 4

3 Events and instrument anomalies

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

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.

3.1 SLSTR-A

SLSTR-A was switched on and operating nominally during December 2023, with Scan Unit Electronics (SUE) scanning and autonomous switching between day and night modes.

- ❖ 1st December, 12:25 12:31 Data gaps due to RFI
- ❖ 3rd December, 06:24 − 06:33 − Data gaps due to RFI
- 7th, 17:28 17:31, and 9th December, 03:08 03:11 Data gaps
- ❖ 10th December, 09:25 09:43 Pointing flag raised due to In-Plane manoeuvre.
- 15th December, 16:51 16:57 Data gaps due to RFI

3.2 SLSTR-B

SLSTR-B was switched on and operating nominally during December 2023, with SUE scanning and autonomous switching between day and night modes.

- 7th December, 08:27 08:42 Pointing flag raised due to In-Plane manoeuvre.
- ❖ 8th December, 21:29 21:38 Data gaps due to RFI
- ❖ 22nd December, 03:12 − 03:18 and 16:01 − 17:33 (recovery on-going) − Data gaps due to production issue.
- 22nd December, 13:21 13:27 Data gaps due to RFI.
- ❖ 22nd December, 19:00 19:02 Data gaps.
- ❖ 27th December, 07:51 − 08:47 − Pointing flags and data gaps due to OLCI lunar Calibration



Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024


Page: 5

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.

SLSTR is a scanning radiometer, and uses two black bodies for thermal calibration, and a VISCAL unit for visible and shortwave IR calibration via the Sun. The key instrument properties that are monitored include:

- instrument temperature of the baffles
- instrument temperature of the Optical Mechanical Enclosure (optical bench, flip mirror and scan mirror, internal baffles)
- detector temperatures
- scanner and flip mirror performance



Sentinel 3 A

The instrument was stable and compliant with requirements over much of the current month.

Sentinel 3 B

The instrument was stable and compliant with requirements over the current month.

OPT-MPC Payang Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 6

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.




Figure 1: OME temperature trends for SLSTR-A (left) and Baffle temperature trends (right) during December 2023. 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.

OPT-MPC Page 10 Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 7

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 December 2023. 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.

OPT-MPC Paulor Control Mission Performance Cluster Ontical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 8

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.




Figure 3: SLSTR-A detector temperatures for each channel for the last month 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.

OPT-MPC Paulor State Control of Control of

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 9

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.




Figure 4: SLSTR-B detector temperatures for each channel for the last month 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.

OPT-MPC Paulous Deptical Musica Performance Cluster Optical Musica Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 10

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 December 2023. The performance has been consistent with previous operations and does not appear to be degrading. For reference, one arcsecond corresponds to roughly 4 m 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 the month.




Figure 5: SLSTR-A scanner and flip jitter for December 2023, 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).

OPT-MPC Payang Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 11

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 the month.




Figure 6: SLSTR-B scanner and flip jitter for December 2023, 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).

OPT-MPC Particle Mattion Performance Cluster Optical Mattion Performance Cluster Optical Mattion Performance Cluster Optical Mattion Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 12

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 1st January in each year.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 13

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 ± 20 mK.




Figure 8: SLSTR-A blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during December 2023 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 December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 14

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 ± 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 9: SLSTR-B blackbody temperature and baseplate gradient trends during December 2023 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 December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 15

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 December 2023 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 last 11 months, averaged over all detectors for the nadir view.

	Average											
	Reflectance Factor	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
S1	0.187	239	242	244	239	234	235	238	236	243	246	244
S2	0.194	243	241	243	243	242	241	242	241	243	245	245
S3	0.190	229	225	223	218	213	216	222	221	222	223	222
S4	0.191	172	171	170	166	164	164	168	171	173	174	174
S5	0.193	289	284	283	280	280	279	280	283	285	287	285
S6	0.175	185	183	181	180	178	178	181	183	184	186	188

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 Reflectance			1 _	l	1 -	1	1 -	l _		l	
	Factor	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
S1	0.166	259	262	261	252	242	246	250	249	256	265	269
S2	0.170	262	260	258	255	250	256	257	256	259	264	269
S3	0.168	235	232	226	219	213	217	222	222	222	223	228
S4	0.166	138	138	138	137	134	136	138	139	139	140	140
S5	0.166	209	214	214	214	208	213	213	215	215	217	215
S6	0.155	129	131	131	131	130	129	132	134	134	137	136

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 16




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.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 17




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.

OPT-MPC Paulor Control Mission Performance Cluster Ontical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 18

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.

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											
	Reflectance Factor	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
S1	0.177	238	223	227	228	221	219	226	232	231	228	230
S2	0.192	221	218	215	214	216	214	215	217	221	225	224
S3	0.194	226	222	217	213	214	216	219	219	219	218	220
S4	0.186	130	129	129	128	126	126	126	127	127	128	129
S5	0.184	243	243	240	239	238	237	238	238	239	242	243
S6	0.162	165	162	161	159	159	157	159	158	158	162	163

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											
	Reflectance Factor	Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
S1	0.157	222	217	219	217	208	208	216	220	217	218	223
S2	0.168	255	251	245	245	245	241	242	246	255	258	257
S3	0.172	253	248	237	232	234	238	239	238	238	240	248
S4	0.168	131	131	130	127	124	126	126	128	128	128	130
S5	0.172	251	251	251	249	248	248	247	249	249	252	252
S6	0.152	186	188	187	182	180	180	182	184	185	188	188

OPT-MPC Page 1 Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 19




Figure 12: VIS channel signal-to-noise of the measured VISCAL signal in each orbit for the last year of operations for SLSTR-B. Different colours indicate different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

OPT-MPC Paragraphic Support Control Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 20




Figure 13. SWIR channel signal-to-noise of the measured VISCAL signal in each orbit for the last year of operations for SLSTR-B. Different colours indicate different detectors. The vertical dashed lines indicate the start of each month.

4.5.3 SLSTR-A TIR channel NEDT

The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-A in December 2023 are consistent with previous operations and within the requirements. NEDT trends calculated from the hot and cold blackbody signals are shown in Figure 14. Monthly NEDT values, averaged over all detectors and both Earth views, are shown in Table 5.

OPT-MPC Paulous Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 21




Figure 14: SLSTR-A NEDT trend for the thermal channels in December 2023. 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).

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 22

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		Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	June 2023	July 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
+YBB temp (K)		303.447	302.983	302.692	302.584	302.498	302.385	302.363	302.514	303.038	303.562	303.771
	S7	17.2	17.4	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	17.5	18.1	17.3	17.2	17.0
	S8	12.0	12.0	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	11.9	12.0	11.9	12	12.0
NEDT (mK)	S9	18.5	18.5	18.6	18.6	18.6	18.7	18.3	18.4	18.3	18.3	18.4
	F1	279	284	288	290	290	290	284	302	281	282	277
	F2	35.3	34.9	34.8	34.7	34.6	34.6	34.5	34.5	34.9	35.4	35.5

SLSTR-A		Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	June 2023	July 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
-YBB temp (K)		266.319	265.801	265.594	265.630	265.589	265.224	265.201	265.299	265.941	266.571	266.883
	S7	48.5	49.4	50.1	50.4	50.2	49.8	49.8	48.3	48.7	47.7	46.7
	S8	14.6	14.7	14.7	14.7	14.7	14.7	14.6	14.5	14.6	14.6	14.5
NEDT (mK)	S9	22.7	22.8	22.9	23.0	23	23.1	22.6	22.4	22.5	22.5	22.4
	F1	1186	1218	1236	1245	1247	1243	1219	1187	1195	1177	1131
	F2	28.9	28.9	29.0	29.1	29.0	29.0	28.7	29.0	28.8	28.9	28.8

4.5.4 SLSTR-B TIR channel NEDT

The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-B in December 2023, calculated from the hot and cold blackbody signals are shown in Figure 15 with monthly averages in Table 6. The thermal channel NEDT values for SLSTR-B in December 2023 are consistent with previous operations and within the requirements. 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.

OPT-MPC Page 1 April 1 April

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 23




Figure 15: SLSTR-B NEDT trend for the thermal channels in December 2023. 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 Paulous Designation Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 24

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		Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
+YBB temp (K)		303.489	303.074	302.754	302.668	302.572	302.452	302.442	302.582	303.088	303.500	303.885
	S7	16.1	16.2	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.8	16.1	16.1
	S8	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.1	14.1	14.0	14.1	13.9	14.0
NEDT (mK)	S9	16.0	15.8	15.8	15.9	15.9	16.0	16.0	16.0	16.1	16.0	16.0
, ,	F1	369	367	368	367	369	374	378	380	393	369	367
	F2	30.4	30.2	30.3	30.3	30.2	30.1	30.1	30.1	30.2	30.3	30.4

SLSTR-B		Feb 2023	Mar 2023	Apr 2023	May 2023	Jun 2023	Jul 2023	Aug 2023	Sep 2023	Oct 2023	Nov 2023	Dec 2023
-YBB temp (K)		265.924	265.360	265.131	265.196	265.146	264.944	264.837	264.943	265.568	266.185	266.652
	S7	43.7	44.6	44.5	44.3	44.8	45.5	45.9	45.3	42.3	43.0	42.9
	S8	18.0	17.8	17.8	17.9	17.9	18.0	18.0	18.0	17.8	18.0	18.1
NEDT (mK)	S9	20.5	20.2	20.3	20.3	20.4	20.4	20.5	20.5	20.3	20.4	20.5
	F1	1564	1550	1525	1502	1529	1571	1592	1595	1503	1501	1502
	F2	33.3	33.1	33.1	33.2	33.3	33.4	33.4	33.3	33.1	33.1	33.1

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 25

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 16 and Figure 17 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 2023: an anomaly occurred on the instrument on 6st August, which was recovered with a power cycle and decontamination/cooldown. This causes a discontinuity in the gain due to the reduction in water ice after the decontamination.

OPT-MPC Page 1 A September 2 A September 2

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 26




Figure 16: 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 Particle Mission Performance Cluster Onticol Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 27




Figure 17: 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 18 and Figure 19 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

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 28

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.




Figure 18: 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 December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024




Figure 19: 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 December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 30

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 20 shows an example combined SLSTR-A/SLSTR-B image for the visible channels on 31st December 2023 (daytime only).




Figure 20: Daytime combined SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B Level-1 image for visible channels on 31st December 2023.

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 400-900 nm wavebands and <5% with reference to the sun for wavebands >900 nm 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.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 31

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	S1	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	S1	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 Radiometric validation with DIMITRI

5.2.1.1 Verification and Validation over PICS

- 1. The ingestion of the available L1-RBT-NT products from SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B over the 6 desert CalVal-sites (Algeria & 5, Libya 1 & 4 and Mauritania 1 & 2) has been performed until the **end-December 2023**.
- The results are consistent over all the six used PICS sites (Figure 21 and Figure 22). Both sensors show a good stability over the analysed period over VNIR bands for both NADIR & OBLIQUE views, with slight positive trend.
- 3. The temporal average over the period 1st January 2023 end-December 2023 of the elementary ratios (observed reflectance to the simulated one) for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B show gain values between 3-6% (NADIR) and 6-9% (OBLIQUE) over the VNIR bands S1-S3 (Figure 23).




Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/01/2024




Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/01/2024





Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/01/2024




Figure 21: Time-series of the elementary ratios (observed/simulated) signal from SLSTR-A for (top to bottom) bands S02 and S03 (Nadir & Oblique views) respectively over January 2023- December 2023 from the six PICS Cal/Val sites. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the desert methodology uncertainty.

OPT-MPC Page 10 September 10 S


Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/01/2024



OPT-MPC Page 15 Page

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024




Figure 22: Time-series of the elementary ratios (observed/simulated) signal from SLSTR-B for (top to bottom) bands S02 and S03 (Nadir & Oblique views) respectively over January 2023- end-December 2023 from the six PICS Cal/Val sites. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the desert methodology uncertainty.

OPT-MPC Paulo Suppose Suppose


Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024



Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 38




Figure 23: The estimated gain values for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B (top to bottom) Nadir & Oblique views respectively over the 6 PICS sites identified by CEOS over the period January 2023- end-December 2023 as a function of wavelength. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the desert methodology uncertainty.

5.2.1.2 Validation over Rayleigh

Rayleigh method has been performed from the available mini-files over the period **January 2022-end-December 2023** for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B. The gain coefficients of both sensors are consistent with the previous results (Figure 24).

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 39

5.2.1.3 Validation over Glint

Glint calibration method has been performed over the period January 2022- end-December 2023 for both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B. The gain coefficients of both sensors are consistent with the previous results over the Nadir view (Figure 24).

5.2.1.4 Validation results synthesis

The results synthesis displayed below on Figure 24.




Figure 24: The estimated gain values for SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B (Nadir view) from Glint and Rayleigh methods over the period Jan 2022—end-December 2023 and PICS method over the period Jan 2023—end-December 2023 as a function of wavelength. We use the gain value of S02 from Desert-PICS method as reference gain for Glint method. Dashed-green and orange lines indicate the 2% and 5% respectively. Error bars indicate the method uncertainties

OPT-MPC Paulous Deptition Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 40

5.2.1.5 Cross-mission Intercomparison over PICS:

X-mission Intercomparison between SLSTR-A, SLSTR-B, MERIS, MSI-A, MSI-B, OLCI-A and OLCI-B has been performed over the 6 PICS-test-sites. Figure 25 shows the estimated gain over different time-series for different sensors over PICS. The spectral bands with significant absorption of water vapor and O2 are excluded. OLCI-A, SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B seem to have higher gain wrt the other sensors of about 1-4% over VNIR spectral range.




Figure 25: Ratio of observed TOA reflectance to simulated one for (black) MERIS, (pale-green) S2A/MSI, (white) S2B/MSI, (blue) S3A/OLCI, (green) S3B/OLCI, (red) S3A/SLSTR-NADIR, and (cyan) S3B/SLSTR-NADIR averaged over the six PICS test sites as a function of wavelength.

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.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 41

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.

The geolocation uncertainty is stable and within requirements during the reporting period.

5.3.1 SLSTR-A

The results for December 2023 are plotted in Figure 26 for SLSTR-A, giving the average positional offsets in kilometres for Nadir and Oblique views.




Figure 26: 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 December 2023. The error bars show the standard deviation.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 42

5.3.2 SLSTR-B

The results for December 2023 are plotted in Figure 27 for SLSTR-B, giving the average positional offsets in kilometres for Nadir and Oblique views.




Figure 27: 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 December 2023. The error bars show the standard deviation.

OPT-MPC Paragraphy Optical Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 43

6 Level 2 LST validation

Level 2 Land Surface Temperature products have been validated against *in situ* observations (Category-A validation) from eight "Gold Standard" Stations. 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. 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.

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: twelve 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 8: Average absolute accuracy in K of the SL_2_LST product with respect to Gold Standard stations for Q4 2023.

Satellite	Day	Night
S3A	2.04	0.85
S3B	2.02	0.85

For both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B the daytime absolute accuracies (which are derived from the absolute values of all the mean biases from the individual stations) are greater than the mission requirement of 1K, but driven by larger biases at some sites. The main impact on accuracy and precision is driven by any errors in the cloud masking, but also higher temperatures. The recommendation would be to assess whether an improvement could be made with the retrieval coefficients particularly during the day for higher temperatures.


Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024



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


Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024



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


Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024



OPT-MPC Paragraphic Support Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024




Figure 28: Validation of the SL_2_LST product in Q4 2023 for SLSTR-A (left) and SLSTR-B (right) at twelve Gold Standard in situ stations of the SURFRAD network plus two Gold Standard station from the ARM network. The matchups are split between daytime (red) and night-time (blue).



Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 48

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 few outliers. There is a small systematic bias evident at some stations, particularly during the day, which may indicate an update to the retrieval coefficients may be worth exploring. Some cloud over-masking (night-time) and under-masking (daytime) appears for some of the sites, and may be worth exploring whether the cloud coefficients need further fine tuning. This is certainly the case for the Barrow site.

6.2 **Category-C validation**

This section will be updated shortly

6.3 Level-3C Assessment

This section will be updated shortly

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

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 49

7 Level 2 FRP validation

7.1 The SLSTR Fire Radiative Power product

The SLSTR FRP NTC product (both SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B) has been released to the public on August 19th, 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 August 23, 2022 and September 5, 2022 for SLSTR-A and for SLSTR-B, respectively.

This report only focuses on measurements obtained from the thermal channels using the FRP V2 algorithm over the months of October, November, and December 2023. First, the fires detected during nighttime are assessed. Then, the same analysis is repeated for daytime fires.

7.2 Validation methodology

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

This present inter-comparison, initially based on previous work from M. Wooster and W. Xu on the FRP Prototype and on the evaluation of SEVIRI fire data, aims to assess two things:

- (i) The detection of fires' position and extent in time and space.
- (ii) The estimated radiative fire power (FRP) of active fires.

To do so, the SL_2_FRP product from SLSTR-A and SLSTR-B are compared with the operational MODIS MOD14 FRP product from MODIS Terra. 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 the satellites, as ground truth is not available.

The methodology to obtain data fit for comparison purposes is outlined hereafter:

- Once areas of interest have been defined, identify all SL_2_FRP scenes containing active fires;
- Download MODIS MOD14 data with a scene overpass time within ± 6 minutes from that of SLSTR;
- Restrict observations to a scan angle of ±20° or equivalent pixel area of 1.7 km² to avoid edge-of-swath data, and to the common area of detection between the two products. The scan angle was decreased from ±30° to limit possible pixel size discrepancies between MODIS and SLSTR data;
- Reproject MODIS pixels on 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.

Omissions, commissions, and double detections are then evaluated. A fire is classified as omitted if no SLSTR fire pixel is present in a 7 x 7 pixels window around a MODIS fire pixel. Conversely, a fire is classified as commissioned if no MODIS fire pixel is present in a 7 x 7 pixels window around a SLSTR fire pixel. If SLSTR and MODIS pixels are present within the windows, the fire is classified as double detected.

PT-MPC Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 50

The FRP analysis is twofold: it is done both at the pixel level, and at the cluster level. A cluster is defined as fires close enough to be interpreted as a single fire event (i.e. the detected fire pixels are next to one another). In both cases, as MODIS FRP data is provided before atmospheric correction, they are atmospherically corrected using the water vapor content estimated by Sentinel 3 as the basis to compute the transmission.

The detected fire clustering is done according to the following procedure: for both sensors, a connected-component labeling using an 8-connectivity is used to label clusters. Then, iteratively, clusters from one satellite having an overlap with clusters from the other are merged to form superclusters, until each supercluster from one satellite only overlaps with a single supercluster from the other. Figure 29: Formation process of the pairs of superclusters depending on AFP detected each satellite. Fire clusters and superclusters are identified by their colors. At the end of the process, pairs of SLSTR and MODIS superclusters share the same color. Figure 29 illustrates the process. Finally, superclusters associated with problematic flags (clouds/water/detection/high S7-S8 difference) are removed from the datasets. The remaining matching pairs of SLSTR and MODIS superclusters are used for further analysis regarding FRP estimates.




Figure 29: Formation process of the pairs of superclusters depending on AFP detected each satellite. Fire clusters and superclusters are identified by their colors. At the end of the process, pairs of SLSTR and MODIS superclusters share the same color.

Four areas of high fire activity between October 1st and December 30th were selected: western Canada, Australia, Southern Africa, and China (see Figure 30). Since the last report, assessing the FRP estimated from the SWIR bands through cross-comparison with those of the MWIR bands was replaced by comparing active fire detections from the MWIR and SWIR band.




Figure 30: Selected zones for the intercomparison over the October-December 2023 period

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 51

7.3 Results

7.3.1 Global distributions of the fires




Figure 31: Fires detected by SLSTR and MODIS at nightime (left) and daytime (right).

Figure 31 shows the location and radiative power of fires detected by SLSTR and MODIS during night and daytime. On one hand, SLSTR seems to be detecting more fire than MODIS during nighttime, most of them having a lower intensity, while there are few omissions. It is possible to see that SLSTR, unlike MODIS, detects fires over larger swathes of Argentina and Madagascar in particular. On the other hand, during daytime, the areas over which MODIS and SLSTR detect fires appear rather equivalent, although SLSTR still seem to detect more lower intensity fires (darker areas).

7.3.2 Nighttime Fires Validation

7.3.2.1 MWIR fires

Table 9 presents a summary of the intercomparison between active fires detected by SLSTR and MODIS over the October—December 2023 period, as well as past periods. As for previous periods, the data present a significantly larger quantity of commissions (about half of SLSTR-detected fires are commissions) compared to the omissions. Omissions are stable compared to the previous period. The FRP distributions of both MODIS and SLSTR clusters are both higher than past periods before April 2023 for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile values. While this may be due to the occurrence of more intense fires, it may also be due to the updated clustering values introduced since April.

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 52

Table 9: Summary of the intercomparison between nighttime SLSTR and MODIS active fires over the October—December 2023 period. Results from previous 3-months comparisons are included for information purposes.

	Value					
Variable	2023			2022		
	Oct.—Dec.	Jul.—Sep.	Apr.—Jun.	Jan.—Mar.	Oct.—Dec.	
Commissions (% of total SLSTR AFP)	49%	54%	49%	56%	55%	
Omissions (% of total MODIS AFP)	4%	3%	3%	14%	17%	
SLSTR AFP double detec. (% of total SLSTR AFP)	51%	46%	51%	44%	45%	
MODIS AFP double detec. (% of total MODIS AFP)	96%	97%	97%	86.0%	83%	
Total SLSTR AFP	26,910	82,970	19,265	26,911	23,758	
Total MODIS AFP	5,019	10,921	3,323	4,048	4,035	
Percentiles 25, 50, 75 of SLSTR clusters FRP (MW)	18, 37, 86	19, 39, 102	10, 34, 61	11, 19, 35	12, 21, 40	
Percentiles 25, 50, 75 of MODIS clusters FRP (MW)	10, 23, 63	10, 25, 72	17, 23, 79	7, 12, 23	8, 14, 30	
Mean bias of FRP per cluster (MW)	-18	17	-59	7	7	
Median bias of FRP per cluster (MW)	9	9	8	5	6	




Figure 32: For nighttime. In blue, AFP exclusively detected by SLSTR; in orange, SLSTR AFP also detected by MODIS; in green, AFP exclusively detected by MODIS. The dashed line indicates MODIS detection threshold.

As visible in Figure 32, a large proportion of the fire pixels SLSTR detects present a very low FRP (< 4 MW). Conversely, almost fire pixel detected by MODIS had a FRP above 4 MW. The distribution of the FRP of commission pixels confirms that almost all commissions concern fires with very low FRP, highlighting the fact that SLSTR is much more sensitive than MODIS to detect active fires. Omissions, on the other hand, concern fires of very common intensities (~10 MW). Figure 33 shows that there is a good agreement between the FRP of clusters detected by MODIS and those detected by SLSTR. For low FRP values, SLSTR clusters seem to be more intense, which is in line with the lower threshold of SLSTR to detect an AFP: this allows for the detection of larger low-intensity clusters. Overall, the median absolute error between MODIS and SLSTR cluster FRP is 14 MW.

OPT-MPC | Page | Page

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 53




Figure 33: Comparison between the FRP of cluster pairs detected by SLSTR and MODIS during nighttime

7.3.2.2 SWIR fires

The AFP and FRP detected by the SWIR channels are now part of this validation report. Only the FRP value estimated from the SWIR channels is validated, through by cross-comparison with those estimated from the MWIR channels. As SWIR and MWIR channels do not have the same sampling grid (500 m vs 1 km), the validation algorithm is as follow:

- 1. Reproject the SWIR fires on the MWIR grid using nearest-neighbours;
- Omissions and commissions are evaluated in the same fashion as between MODIS and SLSTR MWIR AFP, using 7x7 pixels windows. AFP detected by the SWIR channels but not by the MWIR channels are commissions, while AFP detected by the MWIR channels but not by the SWIR channels are omissions.

Table 10: Summary of the intercomparison between nighttime SLSTR MWIR and SWIR active fires over the October—December 2023 period.

	Value		
Variable	2023		
	Oct.—Dec.		
Commissions (% of total SWIR AFP)	0.5%		
Omissions (% of total MWIR AFP)	14%		
SWIR AFP double detec. (% of total SWIR AFP)	99.5%		
MWIR AFP double detec. (% of total MWIR AFP)	86%		
Total SWIR AFP	11,159		
Total MWIR AFP	26,910		

It appears that the SWIR channels, after reprojection of the SWIR AFP on the MWIR grid, detect much less AFP than the MWIR ones (11,159 vs 26,910). As such, there are very barely any commissions, while 3791

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 54

MWIR AFP did not have a SWIR counterpart. However, this does not necessarily indicate a lack of sensitivity of the SWIR channels, as isolated SWIR AFP might have been lumped with larger cluster, due to the reprojection on the MWIR grid and the 7 x 7 pixels window used for AFP matching.

7.3.3 Daytime Fires Validation

Table 11 presents a summary of the intercomparison between active fires detected by SLSTR and MODIS over the October—Deecember 2023 period, as well as past periods. The proportion of commissioned fire pixels is in line with previous periods, while the proportion of omissions is in line with the periods from April—June 2023 onwards. This difference in proportion between before and after April 2023 corresponds to the introduction of the improvements in the MODIS-SLSTR grid matching. The FRP distributions of both MODIS and SLSTR clusters are higher than past periods before April 2023 for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile values. While this may be due to the occurrence of more intense fires, it may once again be due to the updated clustering values introduced since April.

Table 11: Summary of the intercomparison between daytime SLSTR and MODIS active fires over the October-December 2023 period. Results from previous 3-months comparisons are included for information purposes.

	Value					
Variable	2023		2022			
	Oct.—Dec.	Jul.—Sep.	Apr.—Jun.	Jan.—Mar.	Oct.—Dec.	
Commissions (% of total SLSTR AFP)	44%	43%	31%	27%	48%	
Omissions (% of total MODIS AFP)	26%	33%	27%	42%	46%	
SLSTR AFP double detec. (% of total SLSTR AFP)	56%	57%	69%	73%	52%	
MODIS AFP double detec. (% of total MODIS AFP)	74%	67%	73%	58%	54%	
Total SLSTR AFP	13,845	37,754	22,069	16,257	11,163	
Total MODIS AFP	8,144	20,458	10,930	14,946	8,114	
Percentiles 25, 50, 75 of SLSTR clusters FRP (MW)	25, 47, 119	18, 36, 86	17, 37, 90	15, 28, 51	17, 27, 52	
Percentiles 25, 50, 75 of MODIS clusters FRP (MW)	21, 46, 128	15, 32, 82	19, 35, 91	12, 22, 46	13, 22, 43	
Mean bias of FRP per cluster (MW)	-18	-9	-13	6	4	
Median of FRP scatter per cluster (MW)	1	3	3	4	4	




Figure 34: For daytime. In blue, AFP exclusively detected by SLSTR; in orange, SLSTR AFP also detected by MODIS; in green, AFP exclusively detected by MODIS. The dashed line indicates MODIS detection threshold.

OPT-MPC Paulor Company Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 55

Figure 34 is the equivalent to Figure 32, but for daytime. The peaks of commissions, omissions, and double detections are very close, meaning commissions and omissions are mostly in ranges detectable by both SLSTR and MODIS and concern the same type of fires.




Figure 35: Comparison between the FRP of cluster pairs detected by SLSTR and MODIS during daytime.

Figure 35 shows that daytime and nighttime clusters have, in general, the same patterns, with the FRP values of SLSTR clusters being generally in line with those of MODIS. Once again, there is a close match between SLSTR and MODIS cluster, with a median absolute error of 16 MW.

7.3.4 Biome influence on active fire detection

The present section consists in a preliminary study on the biome influence over errors of commission and omission. The biome corresponding to each fire is determined using the Global Land Cover 2000 data. This per-biome analysis may help identify biome-dependent behaviours concerning active fire detection. For each biome, over nighttime and daytime, the absolute numbers of commissions and omissions as well as the relative numbers (with regards to the total number of SLSTR and MODIS AFP for commissions and omissions, respectively) are evaluated over the October—December 2023 period.

OPT-MPC Paragraphic Control Mission Performance Cluster Optical Mission Performance Cluster

Optical MPC


Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 56






Figure 36: Occurrences of commissions and omissions of active fire pixels per biome. On the left, nighttime; on the right, daytime.

Figure 36 shows the absolute (top) and relative number (bottom) of commissions, omissions, and double detections. For clarity purposes, similar biomes were aggregated together, while some were rejected from the analysis. Overall, most fires occurred over Broadleaved, Shrub, Herbaceous biomes for both nighttime. Commissions represented the majority (>60%) of SLSTR AFP over the Needle-leaved class, and dominant over Mosaic and Cropland classes during nighttime. Also during nighttime, while omissions are in any case few, they were relatively more present over the Needle-leaved and Mixed classes than over the other biomes. Nevertheless, these findings might be due to the very low number of fires actually detected in these land classes. During daytime, classes Broadleaved, Shrub, Herbaceous, and Cropland presented a large quantity of AFP. The quantity of omissions was relatively smaller and the number of double detections higher for the Shrub and Herbaceous classes, compared to the other two.

7.4 Conclusion

This performance report seems to confirm that the accuracy improvements of the geographic locations of fires in the FRP monitoring algorithm put in place for the last report have led to a reduction in the number of commissions and omissions compared to previous periods. This period, as the last one, showed that the active fires detected by the satellites were much more in line, with increased numbers of double detections.

Overall, in line with previous reports, it appears that for both nighttime and daytime products, much more AFP are detected by SLSTR than MODIS. Indeed, SLSTR's FRP threshold to detect active fires is much lower than that of MODIS (<1 MW vs ~3 MW), leading to a very high number of low intensity commissioned fires.

OPT-MPC Page 1 A Company of the Com

Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 57

For most active fire clusters, trends are coherent with past periods, with good agreement between SLSTR and MODIS clusters' FRP. The reduction in maximum scan angle from 30° to 20° may have contributed to the better relationship found between SLSTR and MODIS cluster, as possible pixel size discrepancy was more limited. Overall, for both daytime and nighttime, there seem to be a linear relationship between MODIS and SLSTR cluster FRP, and a median absolute error of 15 MW.

The analysis of the number of AFP detected from the SWIR channels shows that the extent of fires detected by the SWIR is slightly less than that of the MWIR, with more 14% of MWIR AFP not having a SWIR counterpart. Conversely, almost all (99.5%) of SWIR AFP have a MWIR counterpart. Overall, there is a good agreement between the location a SWIR and MWIR AFP.

Finally, most fires were detected over the Broadleaved, Needle-leaved, Shrub, and Herbaceous land classes. The results of the per-biome analysis seem to confirm behavioural differences between Broadleaved and Needle-leaved biomes: the former are much more prone to commissions than the latter. Cropland seemed the most uncertain biome, was a rather equal split in terms of quantity of commissions, omissions, and double detections. Further investigations need to be made to draw definite conclusion regarding the stability of omissions, commissions, and double detections proportions over these biomes.



Optical MPC

Data Quality Report – Sentinel-3 SLSTR December 2023

Ref.: OMPC.LDO.DQR.04.12-2023

Issue: 1.0

Date: 10/01/2024

Page: 58

8 Appendix A

All Data Quality Reports, as well as past years Data Quality Reports and Annual Performance Reports, are available on dedicated pages in Sentinel Online website, at:

- https://sentinel.esa.int/web/sentinel/technical-guides/sentinel-2-msi/data-quality-reports
- https://sentinel.esa.int/web/sentinel/technical-guides/sentinel-3-olci/data-quality-reports
- https://sentinel.esa.int/web/sentinel/technical-guides/sentinel-3-slstr/data-quality-reports
- OPT Annual Performance Report Year 2022 (PDF document)

End of document