



National Aeronautics and  
Space Administration

Jet Propulsion Laboratory  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California



# Surface Water and Ocean Topography (SWOT) Mission

## Science Team Meeting


Sep 19-22, 2023

### KaRIn Calibrations


Curtis Chen<sup>(1)</sup>

on behalf of JPL/CNES Algorithm and Cal/Val Team


<sup>(1)</sup>Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology



# Mission Phases/Timeline







# Cal/Val Objectives and Scope


- Basic objectives of Cal/Val<sup>1</sup>:
  - Calibration: Estimate calibration parameters for ground processing based on flight data
  - Error budget validation: Validate measurement performance (“*Does system behave as expected, and if not, what can/should we do?*”)
  - Data product validation: Validate measurement with respect to high-level requirements (“*Does performance meet mission success criteria?*”)
- Cal/Val scope is to fulfill objectives above by:
  - Collecting field data to enable SWOT calibration and validation
  - Performing calibration and validation analyses through comparisons between SWOT measurements and field data (as well as other independent observations)
  - Lead troubleshooting and diagnostic efforts when anomalies related to science performance are encountered

<sup>1</sup>SWOT Cal/Val Plan, Sects. 1.2-1.3



# Flavors of “Calibration” for KaRIn

- Dynamic calibration: Time scale =  $O(\text{seconds to minutes})$ 
  - Processing software uses KaRIn internal calibration data to compensate instrument drifts and on-board parameter changes over orbit and repeat cycle automatically
  - Should be transparent to science users
- Crossover calibration: Time scale =  $O(\text{hours to days})$ 
  - Multiple passes of KaRIn data are used to remove instrument drifts at orbital time scales
  - Computed operationally by XOverCal processor
  - Corrections are reported and sometimes applied in products
  - More on this in other talks
- Static calibration: Time scale =  $O(\text{years})$ 
  - Empirical estimation of parameters that are assumed not to vary in time by operational processing software
  - Static calibration estimate may be refined periodically, but this is done manually
  - May be updated for discrete changes in flight or ground configuration



# Calibration is Joint Between LR and HR

- Static calibration parameters are estimated jointly for LR and HR data products
  - Underlying mechanisms for needing to tune calibration parameters are largely same between LR and HR because both LR and HR rely on same fundamental KaRIn measurement
  - Calibration involves extensive use of LR and HR data over ocean
  - Hydro field data over inland water is *not* used directly for calibration (only for validation)
  - LR and HR products are checked for consistency with each other
  - There are only minor LR-specific or HR-specific calibration parameters to compensate for differences in processing
- Note: HR data over ocean used special, offline processing to increase complex averaging (not available in public products) in order to avoid wave-bunching effects




# Calibration Status

- **Initial calibration work completed on schedule thanks to excellent KaRIn performance and stability**
  - Initial coarse KaRIn calibration (v104) delivered to SDS 2023-04-24
    - Deployed to forward processing 2023-05-16 (PGE static manifest v036)
    - Brings residual KaRIn static height errors from O(20 m) to O(20 cm)
    - Radiometric calibration within O(3 dB)
  - Initial fine KaRIn calibration (v105) delivered to SDS 2023-06-14
    - Deployed to forward processing 2023-06-29 (PGE static manifest v038)
    - Brings residual KaRIn static height errors from O(20 cm) to O(2 cm)
    - Radiometric calibration within O(1 dB)
- **Future calibration refinements:**
  - Sept 2023: Channel-to-channel and LR vs. HR balance of radiometric calibration [O(1 dB) to O(0.1 dB)]
  - 2023-2024: Additional refinement of height calibration in conjunction with validation
  - Other adjustments as needed to compensate for any upstream changes in processing inputs (e.g., attitude reconstruction, ephemeris, KaRIn on-board configuration changes)





# Calibration Sensitivities

- Key calibration parameters:
  - Pointing biases
  - Antenna phase center lever arms and static interferometric phase
  - Channel delays
  - Phase screen
  - Radiometric scale factors
- Methodologies for estimating calibration parameters can introduce dependencies on external information
  - Example: Is it significant that KaRIn agrees with nadir altimeter, or did we simply force them to agree?
  - Relationships are detailed in following slides



# KaRIn Pointing Calibration

- What it controls: Rotations of four (H+, H-, V+, V-) antenna frames relative to KaRIn frame assumed during ground processing
- What it affects: Variations of height and sigma0 estimates from KaRIn with cross track and with attitude variations
- How it is estimated:
  - Pitch and yaw are estimated by comparison to KaRIn pulse-to-pulse Doppler estimates from KaRIn team
  - Roll is estimated by assuming symmetry of sigma0 vs. incidence angle for left and right sides from KaRIn team



*Foss Reservoir, Oklahoma, USA*









# Calibration Error Effects

Range difference  
(interferogram phase is  
proportional to number  
of wavelengths mod  $2\pi$ )

$$\phi = \frac{2\pi}{\lambda} B \sin\theta$$





# Antenna Lever Arms and Static Phase

- What it controls: Translations of antenna phase centers relative to KaRIn frame in 3-D and interferometric phase constant
  - Baseline roll and static phase are nearly equivalent
  - 3-D lever arms control baseline length, baseline roll, baseline yaw, and absolute vertical offset
  - Separate baseline parameters for H and V sides (separate lever arms for H+, H-, V+, V-)
- What it affects: Systematic height vs. cross track trends
  - Static phase and baseline roll (vertical component of lever arms) change gives tilt in height vs. cross track
  - Baseline dilation or length change (cross-track component of lever arms) gives quadratic height vs. cross track
  - Baseline yaw (along-track component of lever arms) is from pre-launch estimates but has negligible impact on products
- How it is estimated:
  - Estimate linear and quadratic height terms vs. cross track by:
    - Comparing observed KaRIn LR heights over ocean to mean sea surface (CNES/CLS 2015 MSS) after extensive along-track averaging (assumes MSS is correct on average)
    - Comparing observed KaRIn LR heights between short-time ocean crossover passes (assumes ocean surface does not change much at swath scales over ~12 hours)
  - Invert linear and quadratic heights to estimate vertical lever arm components and static phase analytically
  - Confirm that HR and LR heights are consistent with each other



# Channel Delays


- What it controls: Absolute delay of radar echoes
- What it affects: Absolute height bias of KaRIn measurement before crossover calibration
  - But crossover calibration will update height biases based on LR data
  - Most important factor is that HR and LR biases are consistent so that crossover calibration estimated from LR data is equally applicable to HR data
- How it is estimated:
  - Tune differential channel delays to optimize interferometric coherence (KaRIn team)
  - Tune common delays of KaRIn LR data to agree with SWOT nadir altimeter over long length scales
  - Tune common delays of KaRIn HR data to agree with KaRIn LR data



# Phase Screens


- What it controls: Compensation of systematic interferometric phase variations vs. elevation angle (i.e., across swath for each side)
- What it affects: Arbitrary pattern of height error vs. cross track
  - Phase screen is defined to exclude linear and quadratic terms for cleaner bookkeeping
  - Phase screen has many degrees of freedom, so it is easy to hide other artifacts in phase screen estimate (i.e., unresolved problems can look like time-varying phase screen)
- How it is estimated:
  - Multiple estimation methods are used for both LR and HR due to complexity of phase screen:
    - Comparing observed KaRIn heights over ocean to mean sea surface (CNES/CLS 2015 MSS) after extensive along-track averaging (assumes MSS is correct on average)
    - Comparing observed KaRIn heights between short-time ocean crossover passes (assumes ocean surface does not change much at swath scales over ~12 hours)
    - Comparing observed KaRIn heights to MASS airborne lidar data collected within hours of KaRIn pass (assumes MASS correctly measures SSHA)
  - Confirm that HR and LR estimates are consistent with each other





# Phase Screen Estimates



- Phase screen estimation approaches:
  - Compare KaRIn SSHA to MASS SSHA, assuming MASS is truth
    - Agreement to ~1 cm
  - Compare KaRIn SSHA to SSHA from nadir altimeters, assuming nadir altimeter is truth
    - CNES
  - Compare KaRIn SSHA between two crossing passes, assuming little change in SSHA
    - Consistent with other estimates
  - Average KaRIn SSHA in along track, assuming SSHA is zero mean
    - Surprisingly little residual ocean signal
    - Residuals are below 1 cm
- **Phase screen is very well behaved**
  - Relatively stable and repeatable
  - Magnitude is relatively small
  - Variations have low spatial frequency



**Phase screen residuals from along-track SSHA average after coarse calibration (v104) and fine calibration (v105) for single pass (cycles 563 for v104 and 565 for v105, pass 026)**

**Phase screen residuals compared to MASS\* lidar (H swath, one MASS flight) and one SWOT pass**


\*MASS = Scripps Modular Aerial Sensing System





# Radiometric Calibration


- What it controls: Power scaling of KaRIn channels (H+, H-, V+, V-)
- What it affects: Overall scaling of KaRIn sigma0 estimates
  - Tuning of HR water detection parameters depends on radiometric calibration
- How it is estimated:
  - Compare LR sigma0 to geophysical model function (GMF) over ocean and average over lots of data to estimate overall absolute scaling
    - GMF is based on Global Precipitation Mission (GPM) data
    - Comparison is binned by incidence angle and model wind speed (ECMWF)
  - Tune HR to match LR over ocean
  - Adjust individual channels (H+, H-, V+, V-) to give consistent results with each other



# Conclusions


---

- Initial fine static calibration is complete
  - Calibration refinements may continue, but residual static calibration errors are small and will not hold up validation work








# Backup






# Corner Reflector Data

- Corner reflector deployment completed on schedule before start of commissioning
- Maintenance visits have occurred as planned
- Have gotten everything we need from corner reflectors and ready to remove




Corner Reflector S11K survived grass fire in early March 2023




2-D Point target response (PTR) of S15K


**Corner reflector PTRs look great (better than simulation)**



# Top-Level Algorithm Flow


Radiometer, POE/MOE, KaRIn Calibration Flow





# LR Algorithm Flow

KaRIn LR Flow





# HR Algorithm Flow

