ASOPOS-Webinar Series on the Implementation of the Recommendations Made by the ASOPOS 2.0 Panel



ORGANIZATION

## Preamble



- The focus in this webinar will be not only on the basics of the data processing to derive the ozone partial pressure from the ozonesonde (incl. radiosonde) measurements, but also on new aspects of this ASOPOS 2.0 report, specifically the individual uncertainties of different instrumental parameters that contribute to the overall estimated uncertainty of the ozonesonde data
- □ The scientific and technical basics of the data processing of ozonesonde data and their uncertainty budget are described in Chapter 3 of the ASOPOS 2.0 Report (WMO/GAW No. 268)
- The ozonesonde data processing in practice is described in detail in Annex-C (WMO/GAW No. 268) : "Practical Guidelines to Determine Ozone Partial Pressure by ECC Sonde, and its associated uncertainty"



# Outline

#### **Basic Formula**



- Ozonesonde Parameters
- Flight Time
- Uncertainty Budget
- Individual O<sub>3</sub>S-Parameters
- Key Notes







## Data Processing: Overview (Section C-3 GAW No.268)

#### **Basic ECC-Ozonesonde Equation: E-2-1**



Figure C-3 (Annex-C of WMO/GAW No. 268)

The partial pressure of ozone  $P_{O3}$  is derived from the ozonesonde (incl. radiosonde) measurements (See Left):

- Cell Current (in-flight): I<sub>M</sub>
- Background Current (preparation): IB
- **Pump temperature** (in-flight): from measured  $T_{PM}$  to  $T_P$
- **Pump flowrate** at ground (preparation):  $\Phi_{PO}$
- Absorption Efficiency (empirical):  $\eta_A(P)$
- **Pump Efficiency** (empirical):  $\eta_P(P)$ 
  - **Conversion Efficiency** (empirical):  $\eta_c(P)$
  - Radiosonde (in-flight):
    - Pressure:  $P_{Air}$ ; Temperature:  $T_{Air}$ ; Rel. Humidity:  $U_{Air}$
    - GPS: Lat, Long, Wind (Velocity & Direction)
    - Altitude (calculated): **Z** or **H**

>>> The focus here will be on the most critical parameters and their contributions to the overall uncertainty of the ozonesonde measurement









Flight Time (t<sub>F</sub>) as Independent Profile Variable (Section C-4 GAW No.268)



#### Important time markers (See also Section C-4 of WMO/GAW Report No. 268) are:

- □ Time stamp (*t<sub>UTC, IB1</sub>*) in UTC of the measurement of I<sub>B1</sub> (background current after ozone exposure) during preparation. During pre-launch the Flight Time *t<sub>F, Pre-launch</sub>* < 0 seconds
- □ Time stamp of the launch (*t<sub>UTC, Launch</sub>*) in UTC; here the flight time t<sub>F,Launch</sub> = 0 seconds

JÜLICH

□ Time stamp of the balloon burst (*t<sub>UTC, Burst</sub>*) in UTC

WORLD METEOROLOGICAI

UTC = Coordinated Universal Time = GMT = Greenwich Mean Time



## Precison, Accuracy, Bias and Uncertainty Budget (Section C-2 GAW No.268)

#### **Precision and Accuracy**

Probability

# **Uncertainty Budget Ozonesonde Equation: E-3-1**



6

Measured Cell Current:  $I_M$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta I_M$  (Section C-6.2)



$$P_{03} = 0.043085 * \frac{T_P}{(\eta_P * \eta_A * \eta_C * \Phi_{P0})} * (I_M - I_B)$$

The uncertainty of the measured sensor current  $(I_M)$  is mainly determined by the uncertainty of the current measurement made by the electronics (current to voltage converter) of the sonde data interface board, which is for modern interfaces:

#### (Section 3.3.6 of WMO/GAW No. 268)

 $\Delta I_{M} = \pm 0.005 \, \mu A$  at  $I_{M} < 1.00 \mu A$ 

 $\Delta I_{M} = \pm 0.5\% \text{ of } I_{M} \text{ at } I_{M} > 1.00 \mu A$ 

Background Current:  $I_B$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta I_B$  (Section C-6.3)



Following the recommendations in **Section 3.3.6 of GAW No. 268,** the following background current correction is to be applied:

- I.  $I_B = I_{B1}$ , i.e. the background current measured 10 min. after the ECC sonde has been exposed to a dose of ozone at a cell current of about 5 µA for 10 min.
- II. Constant through the entire sounding profile (i.e. independent of air pressure)

III.  $\Delta I_{B1} = \pm 0.02 \ \mu A$  in case of a proper background measurement ( $I_{B1} < 0.07 \ \mu A$ )

- The ASOPOS panel has abandoned the further recording and processing of *I<sub>B2</sub>* (after exposure of ozone, just prior to launch) as described in Section 3.3.6 of WMO/GAW No. 268.
- Therefore, the panel recommends the use of  $I_{B1}$  in formula E-2-1 (See ASOPOS-Webinar No. 3 on SOP's)



Pump temperature (in-flight):  $T_P$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta T_P$  (Section C-6-4)



 $P_{03} = 0.043085 * \frac{T_P}{(\eta_P * \eta_A * \eta_C * \Phi_{P0})} * (I_M - I_B)$ 

The (internal) pump temperature  $T_{PM}$  measured by a thermistor in a hole drilled into the Teflon block of the pump has to be corrected in order to approach the best representative pump temperature  $T_P$  (Section 3.3.8 of *WM/GAW No. 268*) by applying **Eq. E-3–15**:

 $T_P = T_{PM} + 3.90 - 0.80 * Log_{10}(P_{air})$ 

The corresponding overall uncertainty  $\Delta T_P = 0.7 \text{ K} \bigoplus \frac{\Delta T_P}{T_P} \approx 0.3\%$ 

#### Note:

JULICH

- Before 1996 the pump temperature was measured externally (box, taped at inlet or outlet of the pump tubes, or on the metal frame of the ECC-sensor).
- These measured temperatures could be 1-8 °C lower than the internal pump temperature.
- Pressure dependent correction formulas have been developed to correct for these artefacts (See Annex D of the WMO/GAW No.268 Report)



Pump flowrate at ground (preparation):  $\Phi_{PM}$  & uncertainty  $\Delta \Phi_{PM}$  (Section C-6.1)

cathode cell:



 $P_{03} = 0.043085 * \frac{T_P}{(\eta_P * \eta_A * \eta_C * \Phi_{P0})} * (I_M - I_B)$ The pump flowrate  $\Phi_{PM}$  (in ml/sec) as measured with a bubble flow meter at the gas outlet of the sensing

$$\Phi_{PM} = \frac{100}{t_{100}}$$
 [E-3-2]

 $t_{100}$  = time (seconds) measured for a bubble to pass through 100 ml of volume of the meter.

The uncertainty  $\Delta \Phi_{PM} = 1$  % of measured value  $\Phi_{PM}$ .

(same uncertainty also for well maintained and calibrated automated commercial flowmeters)

The measured flowrate  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{PM}$  has to be corrected for:

- 1. Temperature effect: small decrease in flowrate by factor  $C_{PL}$  through the slightly enhanced pump temperature  $T_P$  inside the Teflon pump base of about 2 K compared to laboratory temperature  $T_{Lab}$
- 2. Humidification effect : increase of flowrate by factor  $C_{PH}$  due to evaporation of liquid in the cathode cell and bubble flowmeter

#### 09.11.22

Corrected Pump flowrate at ground:  $\Phi_{P0}$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta \Phi_{P0}$  (Section C-6.1)

$$P_{03} = 0.043085 * \frac{T_P}{(\eta_P * \eta_A * \eta_C * \Phi_{P0})} * (I_M - I_B)$$

The measured flowrate  $\Phi_{PM}$  has to be corrected for:

- 1. Temperature effect: small decrease in flowrate by factor  $C_{PL}$  through the slightly enhanced temperature inside the Teflon pump base of about 2 K compared to laboratory temperature  $T_{Lab}$
- 2. Humidification effect : increase of flowrate by factor  $C_{PH}$  due to evaporation in the cathode cell and the bubble flowmeter.

The corrected pump flow rate  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{P0}$  at ground is  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{P0} = (\mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{C}_{PL} - \boldsymbol{C}_{PH}) * \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{PM}$  (E-3-3) 1. Temperature correction C<sub>PL</sub>

$$C_{PL} = rac{T_P - T_{Lab}}{T_{Lab}}$$
 and  $T_P - T_{Lab} \cong 2K$  (E-3-7)  
 $C_{PL} = 0.007$ 

And its uncertainty  $\Delta C_{PL}$ 

$$\Delta C_{PL} = \frac{\Delta T_{PI}}{T_{Lab}} \cong \frac{0.5}{T_{Lab}} \cong 0.007 \qquad (E-3-8)$$

2. Humidification correction C<sub>PH</sub>

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{PH} = \left(\mathbf{1} - \frac{RH_{in}}{100}\right) \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{e}_{sat}(T_{Lab})}{P_{Lab}} \tag{E-3-4}$$

And its uncertainty  $\Delta C_{PH}$ 

$$\Delta C_{PH} = (C_{PH,High} - C_{PH,Low})/(2\sqrt{3}) \qquad (E-3-6)$$

Typical  $C_{PH}$  and  $\Delta C_{PH}$  values are:

- $T_{Lab} = 20 \text{ °C: } C_{PH} \approx 0.01\text{-}0.02 \text{ and } \Delta C_{PH} \approx 0.003$
- $T_{Lab} = 30 \circ C: C_{PH} \approx 0.02-0.04 \text{ and } \Delta C_{PH}$











Absorption Efficiency (empirical):  $\eta_A(P)$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta \eta_A(P)$  (Section C-6.5)



 $\eta_A(P)$  for cathode Cell charged with 2.5 cm3 solution



- The absorption efficiency is the capture-efficiency that the sampled gaseous ozone is transferred into the aquous sensing solution in the cathode cell.
- Depending on the volume of the sensing solution in the cathode cell the following recommendations for the absorption efficiency η<sub>A</sub> and its uncertainty η<sub>A</sub> are made (Section 3.3.4 of WMO/GAW No.268):
  - Cathode cells charged with 3.0 cm<sup>3</sup> of cathode solution

 $\eta_A = 1.00$  &  $\Delta \eta_A = 0.01$ 

 Cathode cells charged with 2.5 cm<sup>3</sup> of solution require a small correction as a function of ambient air pressure *P<sub>Air</sub>*. For details see Section 3.3.4.

JULICH





Pump Efficiency:  $\eta_P(P)$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta \eta_P(P)$  (Section C-6.6 of GAW No.268)



METEOROLOGICA

- At ambient air pressures lower than 100 hPa the efficiency of the gas sampling pump degrades as a function of ambient pressure. Depending on the sonde and sensing solution type, these recommended efficiency tables should be used (Section 3.3.3 of WMO/GAW No.268):
- a. Komhyr-1986 (K86-Efficiency) for SPC-6A sondes with SST1.0 or SST0.5;
- b. Komhyr-1995 (K95-Efficiency) for ENSCI sondes with SST1.0 or SST0.5;
- c. Johnson-2002 (CMDL-Efficiency) or Nakano- 2019/2022 (JMA-Efficiency) for ENSCI sondes with SST0.1.
- □ The corresponding pressure dependent pump efficiencies  $\eta_P$  and their uncertainties  $\Delta \eta_P$  as a function of ambient air pressure  $P_{Air}$  are listed in Table 3–1 (Section 3.3.3).
- Between 100 and 10 hPa Johnson-2002, Nakano-2019 and Nakano-2022 (AMT, 2022) agree within better than 1% deviation

## Conversion Efficiency (empirical): $\eta_c(P)$ & its Uncertainty $\Delta \eta_c(P)$ (Section C-6.7)

JÜLICH



WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION In Section 3.3.5 of GAW No. 268, for the conversion efficiency  $\eta_c(P)$  and its uncertainty  $\Delta \eta_c(P)$ , the following constant values are recommended:

 $\eta_c = 1.00$  and  $\Delta \eta_c = 0.03$ 

GLOBAL ATMOSPHER



#### Overall Uncertainty and its Uncertainty Budget (Section 3.3.12 of GAW No.268)



## Data Processing: Key Points

□ In ASOPOS 2.0 the data processing methodology to follow has remained the same as that formulated in ASOPOS 1.0 (GAW Report No. 201, 2014), with some important exceptions :

- Background current  $I_B = I_{B1}$  and <u>NOT</u>  $I_{B2}$  as previously recommended.
- Corrections to the pump flowrate determined at the ground now include the pump temperature correction and the humidification correction.
- Recommendation that for low buffered sensing solution (En-Sci SST0.1) the pressure dependent CMDL/JMA pumpflow efficiencies should be used.
- New in ASOPOS 2.0 are the practical guidelines to derive the different contributions to the instrumental uncertainty, to estimate the overall measurement uncertainty budget; these values are stored in the sonde data files.
- All the supporting data necessary to derive the ozone partial pressure and its uncertainties must be included in the metadata as essential information for data processing, as well as for possible future re-processing.
- □ ASOPOS 2.0 has established the scientific basis for future resolution of the slow and fast time response of the ECC ozone sensor.
- ASOPOS 2.0 also includes practical guidelines for the homogenisation of historical long term ozone records.







## **Closing Remarks**

- □ This webinar no.4 is part of a series of six ASOPOS Webinars:
  - 1. Introduction to ASOPOS 2.0: An Overview (Anne Thompson & Herman Smit)
  - 2. Hardware (Herman Smit & Roeland VanMalderen)
  - 3. SOP: Standard Operating Procedures (Roeland VanMalderen & Peter van der Gathen & Gary Morris & Bryan Johnson)
  - 4. Data Processing (Herman Smit & David Tarasick)
  - 5. Data Quality Indicators (DQI) (Ryan Staufer & Holger Voemel)
  - 6. Meta Data and Software (Ryan Staufer & Roeland VanMalderen)
- The webinars do not replace the report or associated video clips, but only highlight the most important topics and changes with respect to the previous ASOPOS 1.0 report (GAW Report No. 201, 2014).
- □ For questions, clarification or general advice, the authors of this webinar and the ASOPOS Team are more than happy to assist!!!

Thank you for your attention and for good collaboration in the future !!!













# Back Up Slides

Pump Efficiency (PFE):  $\eta_P(P)$  & its Uncertainty  $\Delta \eta_P(P)$  (2)

- Addendum Nov.2022: New PFE-Publication by Nakano and Morofuji in AMTD giving new PFE values and their uncertainties, obtained over all 1387 PFE Samples they obtained in period 2009-2022. <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-565</u>
- Between 100 and 10 hPa Nakano-2019 and Nakano-2022 agree within better than 1% deviation

Expanded Table 3-1 (Section 3.3.3) of pressure dependent pump efficiencies  $\eta_P$  and their uncertainties  $\Delta \eta_P$  as a function of ambient air pressure  $P_{Air}$ 

JULICH

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL

| Pressure<br>[hPa] | ECC (SPC-6a)<br>Komhyr,1986 K86-<br>Efficiency | ECC (ENSCI)<br>Komhyr et al., 1995<br>K95-Efficiency | ECC (CMDL)<br>Johnson et al.,<br>2002  | ECC (UWYO)<br>Johnson et al.,<br>2002 | ECC (JMA)<br>Nakano, 2019 | ECC (JMA*)<br>Nakano et al.,<br>2022 |
|-------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1000              | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1                                     | 1                         | 1                                    |
| 100               | 0.989 ± 0.005                                  | 0.993 ± 0.005  | 0.968 ± 0.009  | $0.978 \pm 0.011$                     | 0.976 ± 0.008             | 0.978 ± 0.009                        |
| 50                | 0.985 ± 0.006                                  | 0.982 ± 0.005  | 0.951 ± 0.011  | 0.964 ± 0.012                         | 0.962 ± 0.009             | $0.964 \pm 0.011$                    |
| 30                | $0.978 \pm 0.008$                              | 0.972 ± 0.008  | 0.935 ± 0.011  | 0.953 ± 0.015                         | $0.948 \pm 0.011$         | 0.948 ± 0.013                        |
| 20                | $0.969 \pm 0.008$                              | $0.961 \pm 0.011$                                    | 0.918 ± 0.012  | $0.938 \pm 0.018$                     | 0.932 ± 0.011             | 0.929± 0.014                         |
| 10                | $0.948 \pm 0.009$                              | $0.938 \pm 0.021$                                    | 0.873 ± 0.015  | 0.893 ± 0.026                         | $0.891 \pm 0.013$         | 0.883 ± 0.017                        |
| 7                 | $0.935 \pm 0.010$                              | $0.920 \pm 0.022$                                    | 0.837 ± 0.019  | 0.858 ± 0.029                         | $0.861 \pm 0.014$         | 0.848 ± 0.020                        |
| 5                 | $0.916 \pm 0.012$                              | $0.889 \pm 0.021$                                    | 0.794 ± 0.023  | 0.817 ± 0.034                         | $0.824 \pm 0.016$         | 0.807 ± 0.023                        |
|                   | u the second                                   |  | All and a second and a second as a |                                       |                           |                                      |

IQC

ATMOSPHE