May 30th, 2017
ATBD GPM V5: http://rain.atmos.colostate.edu/ATBD/ATBD_GPM_June1_2017.pdf

"Special Note" was added May 30th, 2017 (see below)

Release Notes for GPROF V5 Public Release

The Goddard Profiling Algorithm is a Bayesian approach that nominally uses the GPM Combined algorithm to create it's a-priori databases. Given the importance of these databases to the final product, they are worth reviewing before discussing particular changes to the algorithm. GPROF V03 was implemented at the launch of the GPM mission and thus had no databases from the GPM satellite itself. Instead, databases were made from a combination of TRMM, Cloudsat, ground based radars and models. V04 used the GPM generated databases but had a very short lead time as the radar and combined algorithm were in flux until nearly the date of the public release. Because the V04 of the Combined algorithm appeared to significantly overestimate precipitation over land, the a-priori databases were constructed from the Combined Algorithm (V04) over ocean, but the DPR Ku (V04) over land and coastal regions. The very short lead time to produce the a-priori databases led to insufficient testing of GPROFV04 that resulted in some less-than ideal retrievals.

GPROF V05 retains the previous version (i.e. V04) of the Combined and DPR-Ku products for its databases. Future versions of GPROF, because of its need for existing GPM products to construct it's a-priori database, will always be one version behind the Combined algorithm. In GPROF V05, we nonetheless improved some of the ice hydrometeor simulations in order to get better agreement between computed and simulated brightness temperatures. This leads to smaller bias adjustments in the radiometer simulations and to an overall better fit between the radiometer retrievals and both the Combined products as well as ground validation data.

GPROF V05 made additional changes to retrievals of high latitude oceanic drizzle and snowfall over land. Both of these changes were made because the DPR sensitivity of 12 dBZ was shown to miss substantial amounts of drizzle and light to moderate snowfall events. Because the GPM radars do not have signal in these cases, they are not addressed in the newer versions of the Combined and Radar products either.

Drizzle was addressed in the a-priori database by setting a threshold in the cloud liquid water retrieval from GMI (done before the DPR or Combined rainfall is inserted into the scene), to match the CloudSat based probability of rainfall. This is done for each temperature and Total Precipitable Water (TPW) bin used to subset the a-priori database. While this assumes that higher cloud liquid water amounts correspond to precipitation, the assumption is generally thought to be reasonable. Additional cloud water beyond the CloudSat determined threshold was partitioned

between Cloud- and rain water similar to the procedure used by Hilburn and Wentz (2008). This increases rain water at high altitudes to agree better with CloudSat and ERA and MERRA re-analyses but continues to be low relative to these estimates. More work in ongoing to assess high latitude drizzle from different sources.

Over land, the US based MRMS data was used to build a-priori databases for snow covered surfaces of each of the constellations radiometers. Two years of MRMS data were matched up with individual satellite overpasses. This removed much of the low bias that GPROF V04 had over snow covered surfaces. Because the MRMS data was only 2D and did not contain the vertical hydrometeor profiles, no profile information is available from the GPROF retrieval over snow covered surfaces.

A final modification made to GPROF V04 is the determination of a precipitation threshold. Whereas GPROF V04 reported an unconditional rain rate and a probability of precipitation, it was up to the user to set a threshold (either in probability or rain rate) if rain/no rain information was needed. While GPROF V05 reports the same information, the algorithm has internally decided if the pixel is precipitating or not, and non-precipitating pixels have been set to zero rainfall. While the original probability of precipitation is still reported, its purpose is only as a diagnostic tool. The user can treat positive rainfall rates as definitively raining. Setting thresholds for precipitation is sometimes difficult in the snowfall where the radiometric information is very limited – particularly for sensors such as AMSR2 that lack high frequency channels. A new quality flag = 2 in therefore introduced. Quality Flag = 0 still implies that the pixel is good. Quality flag = 1 means there are issues with the retrieval that require caution on the part of the user – particularly for applications such as constructing climate data records. Quality flag = 2 implies the rain/no rain threshold may not be working properly. When the quality flag is set to 3, the retrieved pixel should be used with extreme caution. A complete description of the GPROF quality flag is given below.

Limited validation done by the GPM Validation team shows significantly better correlations and smaller biases with GPROF V05 than GPROF V04. Statistics were run over the Continental United States, Middleton, AK, and over a dense set of rain gauges in the Mountains of Austria. Even more limited validation have been done on snow due to the difficulty in getting reliable ground based measurements. Over the Olympic peninsula (GPM Field Experiment), the total precipitation over the mountains appears correct, but the phase is not. The phase of precipitation in GPROF cannot be determined from the Tb signal itself. Instead, it is determined from the 2-meter temperature and dew point depression (provided by the ancillary data) according to Sims and Liu (2015). Because grid boxes of GANAL or ECMWF are relatively large, they do not capture small-scale terrain variability. Users needing to account for high resolution terrain variability will have to do so as post-processing step in GPROF V05. We hope to correct this in V06.

Almost no validation has been done on the constellation radiometer beyond comparisons of limited coincident overpasses with GMI, and comparisons of

monthly means to ensure that the retrieval is performing as expected. AMSR2 comparisons against limited GV observations has similar statistics as GMI for liquid precipitation.

The GPROF output file has a parameter labeled 'CAPE'. This parameter is set to missing in GPROF V05. It will be used and implemented in subsequent versions.

SPECIAL NOTE: At the end of May, 2017, the quality flag on MHS and ATMS products were changed for the outside 15 pixel positions. A fault was found in the retrieval using these pixel positions which is still under review. The Quality Flag was changed to "3" (use with extreme care) for these pixels.

GPROF 2017 V1 (GPM V5) Quality Flag Description

The GPROF Quality Flag variable for GPM V5 has added one additional index. The old indices in V3 and V4 included values: 0,1,2. The new index can be 0,1,2,3

The description is as follows:

Value 0: pixel is "good" and has the highest confidence of the best retrieval.

Value 1: "use with caution" . Pixels can be set to value 1 for the following reasons:

1) Sunglint is present, RFI, geolocate, warm load or other L1C 'positive value" quality warning flags
2) All sea-ice covered surfaces
3) All snow covered surfaces
4) Sensor channels are missing, but not critical ones.

Value 2: "use pixel with extreme care over snow covered surface" This is a special value for snow covered surfaces only. The pixel is set to 2 if the probability of precipitation is of poor quality or indeterminate. Use these pixels for climatological averaging of precipitation, but not for individual storm scale daily cases.

Value 3: "Use with extreme caution". Pixels are set to value 3 if they have channels missing critical to the retrieval, but the choice has been made to continue the retrieval for these pixels.

Hilburn, K.A. and F.J. Wentz, 2008: Intercalibrated Passive Microwave Rain Products from the Unified Microwave Ocean Retrieval Algorithm (UMORA). *J. Appl. Meteor. Climatol.,* **47**, 778–794, doi: 10.1175/2007JAMC1635.1.

Sims, E.M. and G. Liu, 2015: A Parameterization of the Probability of Snow–Rain Transition. *J. Hydrometeor.,* **16**, 1466–1477, doi: 10.1175/JHM-D-14-0211.1.