

# Radiometry, apparent optical properties: measurements and uncertainties

David Antoine

Professor, Remote Sensing & Satellite Research Group

Curtin University, Perth, Australia

[david.antoine@curtin.edu.au](mailto:david.antoine@curtin.edu.au)

With inputs from Matthew Slivkoff

In-Situ marine Optics Pty Ltd, Perth


[matt@insitumarineoptics.com](mailto:matt@insitumarineoptics.com)

# The quest for “truth”


High precision,  
Low accuracy,




High precision,  
High accuracy,



High accuracy, Low  
precision, High  
uncertainty



Low accuracy,  
Low precision,  
High uncertainty



# Why do we care about uncertainties?

We want to:


- Do good science
- Be useful for space agencies by providing them with high-quality validation data
- Be useful for other potential users who have to make some decision from the data we provide
- Be able to quantify long-term trends in satellite ocean colour radiometry data (“climate-quality data records”)

That’s all about metrology and deployment protocols and data processing techniques

The “Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement” (GUM):

[https://www.bipm.org/documents/20126/2071204/JCGM\\_100\\_2008\\_E.pdf/cb0ef43f-baa5-11cf-3f85-4dcd86f77bd6](https://www.bipm.org/documents/20126/2071204/JCGM_100_2008_E.pdf/cb0ef43f-baa5-11cf-3f85-4dcd86f77bd6)

# Let's start simple



$$L_w = \frac{1 - \rho}{n^2} \underbrace{L_u(z) e^{K z}}_{L_u(0^-)}$$

With:

$\rho$ : water-air Fresnel reflection coefficient

$n$ : refractive index of seawater


$L_u(z)$ : upwelling radiance at depth  $z$

$K$ : diffuse attenuation coefficient for  $L_u$



Is it actually that “simple”?

Where the uncertainties come from?



## A practical example: the BOUSSOLE buoy

- $L_u(z)$ ,  $E_u(z)$  and  $E_d(z)$  measured at 2 depths
- $E_s$  measured at +4.5 m above sea level
- Used to derive  $R_{rs}$

$$K_{Lu} = \ln\left(\frac{L_u(z_1)}{L_u(z_2)}\right) / (z_2 - z_1)$$

Bialek, A., V. Vellucci, B. Gentili, D. Antoine, J. Gorroño, N. Fox and C. Underwood, 2020. Monte Carlo–Based Quantification of Uncertainties in Determining Ocean Remote Sensing Reflectance from Underwater Fixed-Depth Radiometry Measurements, J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech. 37, DOI: 10.1175/JTECH-D-19-0049.1

$$L_w = \frac{1 - \rho}{n^2} L_{u,z_1} \exp(-K_u z_1)$$

# Combining uncertainties

If  $x, \dots, w$  are measured with independent and random uncertainties  $\delta x, \dots, \delta w$ , and are used to compute  $q = x + \dots + z - (u + \dots + w)$ , then the uncertainty in  $q$  is the quadratic sum:

$$\delta q = \sqrt{(\delta x)^2 + \dots + (\delta z)^2 + (\delta u)^2 + \dots + (\delta w)^2}$$

If  $x, \dots, z$  are measured with independent and random uncertainties  $\delta x, \dots, \delta z$  and are used to compute  $q(x, \dots, z)$  then the uncertainty in  $q$  is

$$\delta q = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\partial q}{\partial x} \delta x\right)^2 + \dots + \left(\frac{\partial q}{\partial z} \delta z\right)^2}$$

From R. Palmer, “Propagation of Uncertainty through Mathematical Operations”  
[https://web.mit.edu/fluids-modules/www/exper\\_techniques/2.Propagation\\_of\\_Uncertaint.pdf](https://web.mit.edu/fluids-modules/www/exper_techniques/2.Propagation_of_Uncertaint.pdf)

# What do we do if uncertainties are not independent and random?

## - The Monte Carlo technique:

- 1- Define the “Probability distribution functions” of individual uncertainties (can be normal, log normal, rectangular, ...) and the sensitivity coefficients
- 2- Run the measurement equation multiple times, each time with a different subset of values for each of the uncertainty sources. These values are randomly “picked” from the PDFs, hence the “Monte Carlo” terminology
- 3- Produce enough outputs so that you end up with a distribution of the quantity of interest, e.g.,  $L_w$ .
- 4- The average and stdev of this distribution will give you the uncertainty



# Type A and B uncertainties

## - Type A uncertainty:


- You can derive it from a series of measurements.
- This is essentially the variance of the mean

## - Type B uncertainty (from the “GUM”)

When the standard uncertainty is evaluated by scientific judgement based on all of the available information on the possible variability. The pool of information may include:

- previous measurement data;
- experience with or general knowledge of the behaviour and properties of relevant materials and instruments;
- manufacturer's specifications;
- data provided in calibration and other certificates;
- uncertainties assigned to reference data taken from handbooks.

# Example at BOUSSOLE



Relative  
uncertainty  
in  $L_w$

Antoine D, Vellucci V, Banks AC, Bardey P, Bretagnon M, Bruniquel V, Deru A, Hembise Fanton d'Andon O, Lerebourg C, Mangin A, Crozel D, Victori S, Kalampokis A, Karageorgis AP, Petihakis G, Psarra S, Golbol M, Leymarie E, Bialek A, Fox N, Hunt S, Kuusk J, Laizans K, Kanakidou M. ROSACE: A Proposed European Design for the Copernicus Ocean Colour System Vicarious Calibration Infrastructure. Remote Sensing. 2020; 12(10):1535.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12101535>

# Confidence intervals


- Uncertainty is given with respect to a given confidence interval:

$$u(y) = \pm 3 \text{ cm}$$

at the 68.2% coverage probability ( $1\sigma$  or  $k = 1$ )  
at the 95.4% confidence level

$$u(y) = \pm 6 \text{ cm}$$

at the 95.4% coverage probability ( $2\sigma$  or  $k = 2$ )



Slide from A. Bialek, 2016



# More on uncertainties

Lectures by Agnieszka Bialek, IOCCG SLS 2016

<https://www.ioccg.org/training/SLS-2016/Bialek-L1.pdf>

<https://youtu.be/V4bCOCnu3cQ>

<https://www.ioccg.org/training/SLS-2016/Bialek-L2.pdf>

<https://youtu.be/rYyzVCId7FI>

The “Guide to the Expression of Uncertainty in Measurement” (GUM):

[https://www.bipm.org/documents/20126/2071204/JCGM\\_100\\_2008\\_E.pdf/cb0ef43f-baa5-11cf-3f85-4dcd86f77bd6](https://www.bipm.org/documents/20126/2071204/JCGM_100_2008_E.pdf/cb0ef43f-baa5-11cf-3f85-4dcd86f77bd6)

# Uncertainty sources

- Instrument itself
- How it is deployed in the field
- How quantities of interest (e.g.,  $R_{rs}$ ) are derived from the measurements

# Instrument-related uncertainty sources

# Radiant Flux and its conversion


Quantity	Symbol	SI units	Abbreviation	Notes
Radiant Energy	$Q$	joule	J	energy
<b>Radiant Flux</b>	$\Phi$	watt	W	radiant energy per unit time, so called radiant power
Radiance	$L$	watts per square metre per steradian	W/m <sup>2</sup> /sr	power per unit solid angle per unit projected source area
Irradiance	$E$	watts per square metre	W/m <sup>2</sup>	power incident on a surface

Radiant Flux (Power)

$$\frac{\text{joules (energy)}}{\text{time}}$$

$$\Phi = \frac{dQ}{dt}$$


Measured by Quantum (photon) Detectors



# Light Detectors

## Photomultiplier tube (PMT)

- photoelectric effect - electron dislodged from the metal cathode amplified by successive dynodes to produce electron 'cascade'
- extremely sensitive light detectors
- degradation of dynodes due to electron bombardment
- stable, high voltages needed (power consumption)
- thermal effects



<http://learn.hamamatsu.com/articles/photomultipliers.html>


**Semiconductors** (i.e., silicon photodiodes used in PAR sensors, OCRs etc. )

- photon-induced excitation of electrons to the conduction band of the silicon, producing a current

## Diode Arrays (like HOIC, DALEC, Ramses)


- Linear or 2D area arrays of small photodiode 'pixels' i.e., 256 pixels @ ~10 $\mu$ m spacing
- Allows direct alignment with a diffracted beam (spectral resolution) or imaging (2D)
- Pixels usually need to be 'read out' sequentially – lower sampling rate

# Current to Voltage Converters



## Transimpedance Amp

- Sensitivity defined by **gain resistor**
- Instantaneous voltage output, directly proportional to photocurrent
- Feedback capacitor acts as temporal “smoother” filter
- Common approach used in individual photodiode-based sensors i.e. PAR and multispectral where signal is strong




## Switched Integrator Amp

- Sensitivity defined by storage **capacitance value** AND the **duration** that the Reset switch is open
- Time - discrete voltage ‘readouts’
- This is where spectrometer “Integration Time” comes from
- Used for diffraction-based devices where signal is low (diode array spectrometers)

# Analog (V) to Digital Conversion

Converts analog (continuous) voltage data into discretised “counts”



There are many different (~15) types of ADC architecture.

ADC Resolution defined as the number of digital numbers used to represent the converted analog photo current

2-bit resolution =  $2^2 = 4$  Counts (as shown above)

10-bit resolution =  $2^{10} = 1024$  Counts

16-bit resolution =  $2^{16} = 65536$  Counts

ADC resolution does not necessarily equate to measurement resolution, might be digitizing noise.

[https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:2-bit\\_resolution\\_analog\\_comparison.png](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:2-bit_resolution_analog_comparison.png)

# What to do about this?

- Instrument design adapted to what type of measurements are aimed at and in which environment
- Instrument laboratory characterization
- Instrument laboratory calibration



# Instrument design

- Size, shape (self shading, ease of use)
- Heat dissipation (in-water or in-air instrument)
- Collectors design (in-water or in-air instrument)
- Design and quality of the optics
- Quality of the detectors (linearity, dynamic range, SNR, blooming?)
- Choice of electronics
- Internal temperature control
- Internal temperature measurement

# Instrument lab characterisation

A number of instrument characteristics have to be assessed (quantified)

- Linearity of the detectors' response
- Spectral calibration
- Spectral band response functions (filters)
- Immersion coefficients
- Temperature dependence
- Sensitivity to polarization of the incoming (ir)radiance
- Straylight
- ....

# Instrument lab calibration

## Radiometric Calibration

- Need to compare the sensor's digital counts to a radiant flux standard so we can quantify light accurately.
- See Ocean Optics Protocols

**Ocean Optics Protocols For Satellite Ocean Color Sensor  
Validation, Revision 4, Volume II:**



**Instrument Specifications, Characterization and Calibration**

**NASA/TM-2003-21621/Rev-Vol II**


*James L. Mueller, Giulietta S. Fargion and Charles R. McClain, Editors  
J. L. Mueller, C. Pietras, S. B. Hooker, R.W. Austin, M. Miller, K.D. Knobelspiesse, R. Frouin,  
B. Holben and K. Voss, Authors.*

# Radiometric Calibration


- Need (at minimum)
  - a stable calibrated power supply
  - a NIST-traceable FEL lamp (50h)
  - Lambertian reflector for L (NIST)



# Irradiance Calibration




# Radiance Calibration



# Calibration Uncertainty


- Lamp calibration coefficients  $E_{50}$  are within 1% of NIST when less than 1 year old, and less than 50 hours burn time...
- Scale  $E_{50}$  using distance “r” between plaque and lamp surface.
  - Measure it accurately without touching the lamp or the lambertian reflector? +/- 1mm hopefully
- Delta-f. (distance between the filament and lamp surface) Which part of the filament?
- Spectralon Plaque Reflectivity / Cleanliness
- Power supply accuracy is important (8A)
  - Buy a good (expensive) one
  - Verify voltage over calibrated shunt resistors  $V=IR$
- Relies on the wavelength calibration of detector
  - use line emission source to verify and compensate if necessary, they do drift! i.e. 4nm in 15 years

# Calibration source



[https://www.bs-ballasts.com/Workshop/N\\_Unzner/English/Halogen\\_Curve\\_big2.htm](https://www.bs-ballasts.com/Workshop/N_Unzner/English/Halogen_Curve_big2.htm)








# The ocean environment



Morel/Antoine 1994, JPO





# Independent checks





Intercomparison of instruments, useful to identify issues with the response of some of them

# Cosine Response




manufacturer's web page




Morrow et al. 2000

# Field Cosine Response



# Temperature Dependency in Hyperspectral Radiometers



Also see, Zibordi et. al. 2017 jtech


# Do not panic!

- The characterisation / calibration process is generally well performed by manufacturers (although you cannot necessarily blindly rely on this)
- Manufacturers will improve if we start discussing these issues in papers.
- Radiometric protocol documents to be updated to include new sensors?
- Add sensible error bars and move on!?
- The bigger the error bars, the easier disparate datasets can be said to “agree”


# Deployment-related uncertainty sources



# What makes radiometry measurement “special”?



The value of a radiometric quantity at a given point in the water column (e.g., the downward irradiance at a depth of 10 m) instantaneously results from the interaction of the light field (photons) with the atmosphere and water over a large spatial domain around the measurement point




# Environment- and deployment-related Uncertainty sources in measurement of radiometric quantities

## What to consider?

- **Weather:**
  - Is the sky cloud-free or overcast or cloudy? If the sky is cloud-free, how clear is it?
  - Is the sea rough? Can I see white caps? Significant sea spray?
- **Water:**
  - How clear or turbid the water is?
  - Can I suspect strong vertical stratification?
  - How homogeneous are the waters around me?
- **Platform and deployment:**
  - How big is the ship I'm working from? Can I move my instrument far enough from it?
  - Where can I install my deck  $E_s$  reference, if any? Is it gimbaled?
  - Can I easily communicate with the bridge? Do you have enough help on the deck?
- **Instrument:** (other than characterization/calibration considerations)
  - Did I clean the optical surfaces?
  - Was the instrument properly stored, e.g., away from excessive heating source?
  - Cables and connectors have been checked?




# Various techniques to get to AOPs



Ruddick, K.G.; Voss, K.; Boss, E.; Castagna, A.; Frouin, R.; Gilerson, A.; Hieronymi, M.; Johnson, B.C.; Kuusk, J.; Lee, Z.; Ondrusek, M.; Vabson, V.; Vendt, R. A Review of Protocols for Fiducial Reference Measurements of Water-Leaving Radiance for Validation of Satellite Remote-Sensing Data over Water. Remote Sens. 2019, 11, 2198.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11192198>

# Fiducial Reference Measurements of water-leaving radiance






Ruddick, K.G.; Voss, K.; Boss, E.; Castagna, A.; Frouin, R.; Gilerson, A.; Hieronymi, M.; Johnson, B.C.; Kuusk, J.; Lee, Z.; Ondrusek, M.; Vabson, V.; Vendt, R. A Review of Protocols for Fiducial Reference Measurements of Water-Leaving Radiance for Validation of Satellite Remote-Sensing Data over Water. Remote Sens. 2019, 11, 2198.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/rs11192198>

# The platform

Hooker and Morel, JAOT, 2003


$$r(865) = \frac{L_T(865)/L_{\text{sky}}(865)}{\rho}$$







# The platform

Hooker and Zibordi, Applied Optics 44(4), 2005



$$r(865) = \frac{L_T(865)/L_{\text{sky}}(865)}{\rho}$$





# Data processing-related uncertainty sources


The following slides barely “scratch the surface”  
They are only a few examples of typical data processing steps  
that can lead to significant uncertainties

# Data reduction

- Going from raw data to profiles (or time series) of the desired quantity (e.g.,  $L_u(z)$  or  $E_s$ ).  
Applying calibration, and “filtering”




# Getting $E_s$ from a non-gimbaled sensor




The  $E_s(\lambda)$  spectrum can be reasonably well simulated (need to know date, time, lat, long, and atmosphere parameters such as pressure, aerosol optical thickness, wind speed, ozone...)



# Extrapolating to “0-”




An example for fixed-depth measurements  
(Antoine et al., JGR, VOL. 113, C07013, doi:10.1029/2007JC004472)



An example for profile measurements  
(unpublished data from BOUSSOLE)



# Extrapolating to “0-”



(unpublished data from BOUSSOLE)

## Conclusion / message


- Extrapolation technique matters!
- There is definitely more to be done in that space to improve the quality of our data sets

# Extrapolating to “0-”



Method	$E_s$	$K_d$
RRS1	<b>Surface</b> $E_s$ measurements, corrected for cosine response. Spectral FOR loop median of data with less than 5 degree tilt	Full Cast model fit of $E_d(z-) / (0.96 * E_s) = \exp(K_d * z)$
RRS2	<b>Surface</b> $E_s$ measurements, corrected for cosine response, <b>combined with subsurface data</b> (corrected for transmission). Double parameter exponential fit yielding $E_s$ and $K_d$ <b>using full cast</b>	Full Cast model fit of $E_d(z-) = (0.96 * E_s) * \exp(K_d * z)$
RRS3	<b>Surface</b> $E_s$ measurements, corrected for cosine response, <b>combined with subsurface data</b> (corrected for transmission). Double parameter exponential fit yielding $E_s$ and $K_d$ using only $R_{rs}$ depths for extrapolation ( <b>initial <math>1/K_d</math> estimate</b> )	Re-run model fit of $E_d(z-) = (0.96 * E_s) * \exp(K_d * z)$ using data from $1/K_d$ or shallower
RRS4	<b>Subsurface</b> Irradiance data (corrected for transmission). Double parameter exponential fit yielding $E_s$ and $K_d$ <b>using full subsurface cast</b>	Full Cast model fit of $E_d(z-) = (0.96 * E_s) * \exp(K_d * z)$
RRS5	<b>Subsurface</b> Irradiance data (corrected for transmission). Double parameter exponential fit yielding $E_s$ and $K_d$ ( <b>initial <math>1/K_d</math> estimate</b> )	Re-run model fit of $E_d(z-) = (0.96 * E_s) * \exp(K_d * z)$ using data from $1/K_d$ or shallower

# Extrapolating to “0-”





## CVO AOP Workshop Presentations


- [Introduction](#) - Stanford Hooker
- [Survey Summary](#) - Stanford Hooker
- [Web-Based Processor](#) - Stanford Hooker
- [GSFC Processor](#) - Stanford Hooker
- [ODU Processor](#) - Richard Zimmerman
- [UCSB Processor](#) - David Siegel
- [USF Processor](#) - Dave English
- [LOV Processor](#) - David Antoine
- [SeaBASS Processor](#) - Jeremy Werdell
- [SIO Processor \(1\)](#) - Mati Kahru
- [Biospherical Processor](#) - John Morrow
- [SIO Processor \(2\)](#) - Dariusz Stramski
- [HOBILabs Processor](#) - David Dana
- [WHOI Processor](#) - Heidi Sosik
- [FURG Processor](#) - Carlos Garcia
- [NMFS Perspective](#) - Cara Wilson
- [SIO Processor \(3\)](#) - Kozlowski
- [MLML Processor](#) - Stephanie Flora, Carol Johnson
- [Legacy Processors](#) - David Siegel
- [Practical Cal/Val](#) - Sean Bailey
- [Hyperspectral Processing](#) - David Dana
- [Case2 Working Group](#) - Stanford Hooker
- [ICESS](#) - Dave Menzies

[https://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/meetings/aop\\_2009/presentations/](https://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/meetings/aop_2009/presentations/)




# Comparing data sets

Deriving the same quantity, e.g.,  $R_{rs}$ , derived from simultaneous radiometry measurements using different techniques



Comparison buoy-Free fall profiling


(Antoine et al., JGR, VOL. 113, C07013, doi:10.1029/2007JC004472)



Comparison of 2 in-water profilers

(Antoine et al., Optics Express, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.412022>)

# Comparing data sets




(Antoine et al., Optics Express, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1364/OE.412022>)

# Optical closure

## What is this?

- Derive radiometric quantities and AOPs from radiative transfer using measured IOPs as inputs, and compare to the measured radiometric quantities and AOPs




## What is required?

- Total absorption, total scattering and the phase function (PF)
- Boundary conditions (sun elev., interface, bottom)


## Main question is: do I have the required information to make it relevant?

- The particulate matter PF is generally unknown: the backscattering ratio must be known
- Typically: an AC-S would give you the required absorption and scattering data




An example from a "Thetis profiler", deployed off Rottneest Island, Western Australia

# Example of programs addressing the uncertainty issue



## FRM4SOC – Fiducial Reference Measurements for Satellite Ocean Colour



Eye of an algal storm. Copernicus Sentinel data (2015) ESA


The FRM4SOC project, with funding from ESA, was structured to provide support for evaluating and improving the state of the art in ocean colour validation through a series of comparisons under the auspices of the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites (CEOS) Working Group on Calibration & Validation and in support of the CEOS ocean colour virtual constellation. FRM4SOC also strives to help fulfil the [International Ocean Colour Coordinating Group \(IOCCG\) in situ ocean colour radiometry white paper](#) objectives and contribute to the relevant IOCCG working groups and task forces (e.g. the working group on uncertainties in ocean colour remote sensing and the ocean colour satellite sensor calibration task force).

The project makes a fundamental contribution to the European system for monitoring the Earth (Copernicus) through its core role of working to ensure that ground-based measurements of ocean colour parameters are traceable to SI standards. This is in support of ensuring high quality and accurate Copernicus satellite mission data, in particular Sentinel-2 MSI and Sentinel-3 OLCI ocean colour products. The FRM4SOC project also contributes directly to the work of ESA and EUMETSAT to ensure that these instruments are validated in orbit.

<https://frm4soc.org>

g

[https://www.mdpi.com/journal/remotesensing/special\\_issues/2nd\\_ocean\\_color\\_RS](https://www.mdpi.com/journal/remotesensing/special_issues/2nd_ocean_color_RS)





# Example of programs addressing the uncertainty issue

<https://frm4soc2.eumetsat.int>

Funded by the European Union

Logo of the European Union

Copernicus

EUMETSAT

## FRM4SOC Phase-2

Home About ▾ Team ▾ Events ▾ Documents ▾ Contact

 fiducial reference  
measurements for  
satellite ocean colour

**FRM4SOC Phase 2  
laboratory  
comparison**


14.03.2022

The absolute radiometric calibration comparisons will be implemented through a round-robin comparison of each participant's irradiance and radiance calibration capability using ocean colour transfer radiometers.



The project has a final workshop on 5-7 December in Darmstadt, Germany (on-line as well)

# Example of programs addressing the uncertainty issue



<https://www.npl.co.uk/earth-observation>



NASA's OceanColor Web is supported by the Ocean Biology Processing Group (OBPG) at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center. Our responsibilities include the collection, processing, calibration, validation, archive and distribution of ocean-related products from a large number of operational, satellite-based remote-sensing missions providing ocean color, sea surface temperature and sea surface salinity data to the international research community since 1996.

<https://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov>



[🏠 HOME](#)

[🌐 ABOUT](#)

[🌐 WHAT WE DO](#)

[📅 IOCCG NEWS](#)

[📁 RESOURCES](#)

[✉ CONTACT](#)






## Welcome to the International Ocean Colour Coordinating Group

Promoting the application of remotely-sensed ocean-colour and inland water radiometric data, across all aquatic environments, through coordination, training, liaising between providers and users, and advocacy and provision of expert advice.

<https://ioccg.org>





Thanks for your attention