Comparison of gauge rainfall measurements with TRMM satellite estimates over Kumasi

July 29, 2015

Presented by: Marian A. Osei

Research Team: Dr. Leonard K. Amekudzi Marian A. Osei Maureen A. Ahiataku Magaret A. Oduro Eugene Asante-Bekoe

Outline

Introduction

- Motivation and Objectives
- Study site and data
- Methodology
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusion

CCPOP July 29^{th} to 31^{st}

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Introduction

- Rainfall is an essential resource for socio-economic activities especially in developing countries.
- Rainfall variability in Sub-Saharan Africa has been reported by Owusu et al. (2012), Nicholson et al. (2003), Amekudzi et al. (2015).
- ▶ To improve our understanding of the spatio-temporal variations of rainfall rigourous validation has been carried out all over the world by comparing in-situ measurements with satellite estimates. (Friesen 2002; Amekudzi et al., 2011; Adeyewa and Nakamura 2003; Haque et al., 2013).
- In the tropics, the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission (TRMM) has been specifically dedicated to monitoring rainfall intensity and distribution.

Motivation and Objectives

Motivation:

- Sparse rain-gauge network in Ghana.
- Inadequate in-country validation of TRMM satellite estimates over Ghana.
- Deployment of automated rain gauges for student training purposes.

Objectives:

- This study aimed at validating TRMM satellite estimates and OTT-pluvio measurements over Kumasi, with the objectives of checking the reliability and consistencies of both measurements.
- ► To inter-compre rainfall measurements at the same locations using Ghana Meteorological Agency (GMet) deployed rain gauge with OTT-pluvio gauge.

Study Site and Data



Figure : Study sites located between 6^0 42' N, 1^0 35' W

Rain Gauge Types



Figure : OTT-Pluvio Gauge and Standard Rain Gauge (SRG)

TRMM Specifications



Figure : TRMM satellite and its payloads

Methodology

- Daily rainfall measurements were obtained from four OTT-Pluvio instruments were considered for the period of 2011 to 2013.
- Thiessen polygon method was used to calculate for the daily rainfall average for the ground-based instruments using the mathematical expression;

$$P_{ave} = \frac{\sum A_i P_i}{A_T} \tag{1}$$

where A_T = total area of the basin.

The statistical methods used for comparison include: bias, mean bias error, root mean squared error (RMSE), normalized root mean squared error (NRMSE) and the correlation coefficient.

$$Bias = \frac{\bar{T}_i - \bar{G}_i}{\bar{G}_i} \tag{2}$$

$$MBE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (T_i - G_i)$$
(3)

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} (T_i - G_i)^2}$$
(4)

$$NRMSE = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} (T_i - G_i)^2}}{\bar{G}}$$
(5)

9

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Where G_i = rain gauge measurements, T_i = satellite estimates, \overline{G} = average of the rain gauge measurements, n = number of observations.

CCPOP July 29th to 31st

Results and Discussion



Figure : 3-year correlation plots for Agromet and Airport

10

э

イロト イヨト イヨト イヨト



Figure : Monthly averages $[\rm mm/month]$ for TRMM and Pluvio datasets from 2011 to 2013

æ

・ロト ・ 日 ト ・ モ ト ・ モ ト



Figure : Plots of Bias, MBE [mm/month], RMSE [mm/month], RRMSE for 2011 to 2013

ъ

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・



Figure : Annual correlation plots

CCPOP July 29th to 31st

æ

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・

3-year dry months correlation

3-year wet months correlation

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・



Figure : 3-Year Seasonal Correlation

CCPOP July 29^{th} to 31^{st}

æ

Summary

 $\label{eq:table:mmmonth} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{Table: Annual averages of Bias [\%], MBE [mm/month], RMSE [mm/month], NRMSE and the Total annual rainfall [mm] \end{array}$

Year	Bias	MBE	RMSE	NRMSE	Annual Rainfall Total TRMM	Gauge
2011 2012 2013	-14.97 15.21 17.82	-0.93 -0.54	6.25 5.52 5.70	1.82 2.16 2.50	1142.49 1029.88 1153.67	1454.55 1228.37 1234 57

15

CCPOP July 29th to 31st

Conclusion

- Analysis of SRG and OTT-Pluvio rainfall measurements were observed to be in close agreement with a correlation coefficient of 0.99 for the years under study.
- Monthly averages showed good agreement between the TRMM estimates and pluvio datasets.
- Analysis showed a general underestimation of TRMM rainfall data by gauge, but quite good agreement in dry seasons.
- Statistical methods used for the validation also proved TRMM to be consistent and reliable with gauge dataset.
- Therefore, TRMM rainfall data has the potential to be used for climate impact studies (agricultural, hydrological and meteorological purposes).

THANK YOU

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?