

Satellite Derived Volcanic Ash Product Inter-Comparison in Support to SCOPE-Nowcasting

Richard Siddans (1), Gareth Thomas (1), Mike Pavolonis (2), and Stephan Bojinski (3)

(1) STFC Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, (2) NOASS NESDIS, (3) WMO

In support of aeronautical meteorological services, WMO organized a satellite-based volcanic ash retrieval algorithm inter-comparison activity, to improve the consistency of quantitative volcanic ash products from satellites, under the Sustained, Coordinated Processing of Environmental Satellite Data for Nowcasting (SCOPEe Nowcasting) initiative (http://jwww.wmo.int/pagesjprogsatsjscopee_nowcasting_en.php). The aims of the inter-comparison were as follows:

1. Select cases (Sarychev Peak 2009, Eyjafyallajökull 2010, Grimsvötn 2011, Puyehue-Cordón Caulle 2011, Kirishimayama 2011, Kelut 2014), and quantify the differences between satellite-derived volcanic ash cloud properties derived from different techniques and sensors;
2. Establish a basic validation protocol for satellite-derived volcanic ash cloud properties;
3. Document the strengths and weaknesses of different remote sensing approaches as a function of satellite sensor;
4. Standardize the units and quality flags associated with volcanic cloud geophysical parameters;
5. Provide recommendations to Volcanic Ash Advisory Centers (VAACs) and other users on how to best to utilize quantitative satellite products in operations;
6. Create a “road map” for future volcanic ash related scientific developments and inter-comparison/validation activities that can also be applied to SO₂ clouds and emergent volcanic clouds.

Volcanic ash satellite remote sensing experts from operational and research organizations were encouraged to participate in the inter-comparison activity, to establish the plans for the inter-comparison and to submit data sets. RAL was contracted by EUMETSAT to perform a systematic inter-comparison of all submitted datasets and results were reported at the WMO International

Volcanic Ash Inter-comparison Meeting to held on 29 June - 2 July 2015 in Madison, WI, USA (http://cimss.ssec.wisc.edu/jmeetings/vol_ash14). 26 different data sets were submitted, from a range of passive imagers and spectrometers and these were inter-compared against each other and against validation data such as CALIPSO lidar, ground-based lidar and aircraft observations. Results of the comparison exercise will be presented together with the conclusions and recommendations arising from the activity.