

MTG LI simulated performances: update and future plans

<u>Bartolomeo Viticchiè</u>, Mounir Lekouara, Marcel Dobber, Claude Ledez, Gary Fowler & Katja Hungershoefer

EUMETSAT LI IFCT





Ll performance metric

Quantifying the performances of LI: it's a matter of balance

- Level 1b
 - 1. Average Detection Probability (ADP): percentage of <u>small</u> pulses that that passes the Level 0 + Level 1b filtering (ESA presentation)
 - 2. False Alarm Rate (FAR): number of false detections at Level 1b (expressed as a rate)
 - 3. Pulse Detection Efficiency (DE): percentage pulses that passes the Level 0 + Level 1b filtering
- Level 2
 - 1. Flash False Alarm Rate (FFAR): number of false flashes at Level 2 (expressed as a rate)
 - Flash Detection Efficiency (FDE): percentage of real flashes that passes the Level 0 + Level 1b + Level 2 filtering (IMPORTANT! A lightning flash is detected if at least one of its pulses reaches Level 2)



Key information from ESA on LI performances

LI Level 1b expected performances

Presented the variation of the ADP with time during the day. ADP below 70% between 9h and 15h (roughly)

Sun near the FOV

- 1. Impact on the ADP (decrease) and FAR (increase)
- 2. Impact on the radiometric performances
- 3. Introduced a restriction zone of 16 deg around the center of each OC
- 4. Example of stray light pattern
 - The Sun directly in the FOV will not cause any leakage! The impact is localized



Key information from ESA on LI performances

LI Level 1b expected performances

Su

4.

Presented the variation of the ADP with time during the day. ADP below 70% between 9h and 15h (roughly)

In the context of the LI MAG

- 1. Assessment of the impact of the ADP variation in space and time on the Level 2
- 2. performances and on the use of the Level 2 products:
- ^{3.} I. as a function of time as average in the FOV
 - II. as a function of time and geolocation as DE/sensitivity maps (already discussed in the LI MAG forum)



End-to-end Reference Processor



End-to-end Reference Processor



End-to-end Reference Processor





Ll performance assessment – pre-launch at Level 1b

Input settings			Performance Impact
Background scenarios	Full illuminationNightDay-night terminator		 The higher the illumination the higher the shot noise The stronger the image contrast the larger the micro-vibration false events
Parameters		Value	
Pulse properties	 Size Energy Duration Location Start time 	 5 km rad. Min 0.6 msec Random Random 	 Worst case Worst case Worst case The closer to nadir and/or pixel centre the higher the DE The closer to the frame centre the higher the DE

Leonardo and ESA focus on the assessment of worst case scenario performances \rightarrow ADP



LI performance assessment – pre-launch at Level 1b and Level 2

Input settings			Performance Impact
Background scenarios	Full illuminationNightDay-night terminator		 The higher the illumination the higher the short noise The stronger the image contrast the larger the micro-vibration false events
Parameters		Value	
Pulse properties	 Size Energy Duration Location Start time 	 Realistic Realistic Realistic Random Random 	 The larger the pulse the higher the DE The "stronger" the pulse the higher the DE The longer the pulse the higher the DE The closer to nadir and/or pixel centre the higher the DE The closer to the frame centre the higher the DE
Flash properties	 Flash time Number of pulses Time difference between pulses Distance between pulses 	 Realistic Realistic Realistic Random 	7. The richer in number of pulses the higher the FDE



Ll performance assessment – pre-launch at Level 1b and Level 2

Input settings			Data source / choice
Background scenarios	Full illuminationNightDay-night terminator		SEVIRI 0.8 micron images
Parameters		Value	
Pulse properties	 Size Energy Duration Location Start time 	 Realistic Realistic Realistic Random Random 	 LIS distribution of group sizes LIS distribution of event energies Uniformly distributed in [0.6, 2] msec Random in the FOV (on background cloud mask) Random
Flash properties	 Flash time Number of pulses Time difference between pulses Distance between pulses 	 6. na 7. Realistic 8. Realistic 9. Random 	 6. Stems from other properties 7. LIS distribution of number of groups in flashes 8. LIS distribution of time difference between groups 9. Uniformly distributed in [0, 10] km wrt the flash barycentre

EUMETSAT will run an ensemble of simulations with different combinations of input parameters to assess realistic and exhaustive Level 1b and Level 2 performances (and dependencies)



Detected DTs





DTs at Level 0 (after on-board filtering)





DTs at Level 1b (on-ground processing)





DTs at Level 2 (on-ground processing)





DTs at Level 2 (on-ground processing)





Pulse DE and Flash DE

201110291212	Level 0	Level 1b	Level 2 Pulse	Level 2 Flash
OC1	0.59	0.50	0.46	0.89
OC2	0.47	0.45	0.41	0.75
OC3	0.43	0.43	0.43	1.00
OC4	0.45	0.44	0.39	0.79
FOV average	0.49	0.46	0.42	0.86

Energy of pulses from **event** energy statistics of LIS



Pulse DE and Flash DE

201110291212	Level 0	Level 1b	Level 2 Pulse	Level 2 Flash
OC1	0.81	0.80	0.77	0.94
OC2	0.60	0.60	0.60	1.00
OC3	0.77	0.77	0.74	1.00
OC4	0.80	0.80	0.74	0.89
FOV average	0.75	0.74	0.71	0.96

Energy of pulses from **group** energy statistics of LIS



Pulse Size expressed as a radius

- Derived from the LIS distribution of number of events per group \rightarrow total group area $\rightarrow r = \sqrt{\frac{A}{\pi}}$
- LIS PROS:
 - I. Pixel size comparable to LI size
 - II. Always detects pulses at nadir \rightarrow no impact of projection



Pulse energy

- Possibility of using LIS distribution of group energies
- Possibility of using LIS distribution of event energies (lower than group energies)
- Not correlated to the background level (ESA/industry settings)
- LIS CONS:
 - I. Limited by LIS detection performances
 - II. Good assessment for daylight conditions since faint optical pulses detected by LIS at night are most likely fainter that the faintest pulse LI will be able to detect during the day



Pulse duration

- Uniform random distribution between two values; in the example between [0.6, 2] msec
- Possibility of using FEGS data



Pulse location

- Random distribution in the FOV
 - I. Uniform distribution wrt the viewing angle
 - II. Cloud mask
 - III. Possibility of using a reflectance threshold
 - IV. Possibility of employing cloud properties (also at night)



Number of pulses/groups in a flash

- Assumption pulses = groups
- Derived form the LIS distribution of number of groups in flashes



Flash duration and/or time difference between groups in flashes

- The time difference between groups in flashes has been employed
- Flash duration stems from the number of pulses and their relative time difference



Distance of pulses from the flash barycentre

- Uniform random distribution between two values; in the example between [0, 10] km
- Refine with LIS statistics



DE/sensitivity efficiency map for users

Qualitative information to support the use of the Level 2 data

- 1. Pre-flight stray light patterns (ESA contribution)
- 2. Properties of the LI Level 1b background images
- 3. Complemented by the computation of the DE and FDE against ground networks

The information will be provided offline (mechanism to be defined); in the future EUMETSAT may decide to have this computation integrated in the ground segment

An example of use:

Sun in the LI FOV \rightarrow portions of the OC will saturate preventing the lightning detection in part of the LI FOV In this case, no lightning measured DOES NOT INDICATE THE ABSEBCE OF STORMS!



Backup slides



RTPP – LI detection principle





SDTF – LI on-board filtering



EUMETSAT

MVF – LI on-board filtering





Level 1b filtering – key filtering steps

Jitter-Reconstruction Filter (JIT):

- 1. Computation for all the DTs of the ratio between the lightning signal (i.e., $\sum_{p=1,9} (\mathbf{DT}_p \mathbf{Bkg}_p)$) and the background gradient.
- 2. Individuation of "beacons" with particularly low ratio.
- 3. Estimation of the jitter movement from the "beacons" properties.
- 4. Computation of a corrected value $\mathbf{DT}' = \mathbf{DT} \mathbf{DT}_{X}^{JIT} \mathbf{DT}_{Y}^{JIT}$.
- 5. New RTPP detection run to see if the clean-from-jitter measurements would have passed the detection; the outcome is provided with a [0, 1] descriptor.

Hybrid Filter (HYB): combined check on the margin with which the on-board SDTF and RTPP conditions were passed.

- 1. If the margin at SDTF is larger than a threshold the DT is classified as true.
- 2. If the margin at SDTF is smaller than the threshold the check is done on the margin at RTPP. If the test is passed the DT is classified as true.
- 3. If the margin at RTPP is also smaller than a threshold a [0, 1] descriptor for the DT is computed: 1 meaning certainly false DT according to the filter.

Spatio-Temporal Coherency Filter (STC): check on the correlation between each DT and the other DTs in a spatio-temporal window of 0.5 sec (rolling window) and 50 km respectively.



Level 2 filtering





Level 2 filtering



MTG-LI simulated performances – LI Mission Advisory Group meeting #9 Jan 29th 2020

EUMETSAT